



Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

—
Division

Section

Shelf

Number



KEIM'S HISTORY
OF
JESUS OF NAZARA.
VOL. IV.

THE HISTORY
OF
JESUS OF NAZARA,

FREELY INVESTIGATED

IN ITS CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL LIFE OF ISRAEL,
AND RELATED IN DETAIL.

BY
DR. THEODOR KEIM.

TRANSLATED BY ARTHUR RANSOM.

VOL. IV.



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
11, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON:
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1879.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
178, STRAND.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

IN this, as in previous volumes, I have aimed simply at reproducing in readable English every shade of the Author's meaning. The greatest liberty taken with the original text has been to break up long and involved periods into shorter ones. In doing this I have been very careful to preserve the essential features of the original.

The notes are retained in full, as they form a very important comment on the text, and contain a mass of information from sources not easily accessible to the majority of readers. Some of the Author's criticisms in the notes are so purely exclamatory and elliptical as to make it almost necessary to have at hand the work criticised, in order to know what sense to attach to the passage. It is possible that, when I have not been able to refer to the book in question, I have now and then failed to catch the correct meaning. But I believe this will not be found to have occurred frequently, if at all. I have verified all the references to the Canonical Scriptures, the Apocryphal Books, the Septuagint, Josephus, and a number of other works ancient and modern. The original text is so generally correct that the references which I have not been able to verify may on the whole be relied upon.

In order to ensure the highest possible degree of accuracy, my custom is to read every sheet in proof with the original work, and not with my manuscript. In this way, accidental omissions and errors of transcription are guarded against, and an opportunity is also afforded of re-considering difficult passages.

I cannot refrain from making a reference to the recent death of the learned Author, at a comparatively early age. For several years the results of excessive application to study had been apparent in the painful nervous affections to which Professor Keim was a frequent victim. As one of his hearers, I can bear testimony to his honesty and candour, to his indefatigable perseverance, and to the zeal with which he defended—sometimes perhaps too warmly, and occasionally with a touch of the grotesque—what he held to be the truth. No student could listen long to him without acquiring the habits of thinking boldly and originally, and of judging honestly and fearlessly.

The remainder of the translation is being rapidly proceeded with, and will be placed in the hands of the readers at an early date.

ARTHUR RANSOM.

MARCH, 1879.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECOND PART.

	PAGE
THE GALILEAN STORMS	1
I.—CONFLICTS AND DISILLUSIONS	4
A. The Pharisees	4
B. The Baptist and his Disciples	27
C. The People of Galilee	42
II.—STRENGTHENED SELF-CONFIDENCE	45
A. The Personal Self-confidence of Jesus	45
B. The Self-confidence of Jesus in his Task	76
III.—JESUS' LAST EFFORTS IN GALILEE	106
A. Jesus' last Efforts as Teacher	106
B. The last Mighty Works	149
C. The last Successes	210
IV.—THE SIGNS OF THE APPROACHING FALL	215
A. The Death of the Baptist.—The Tetrarch and Jesus	215
B. Journeys of Flight	230
V.—RECOGNITION OF THE MESSIAH, AND FORESHADOWING OF THE CROSS	256
A. The Proclamation of the Messiah at Cæsarea Phi- lippi	256
B. The Announcement of the Passion	268
C. The Messianic Perspective	281
D. The Galilean Crisis according to the Fourth Gospel	299

	PAGE
VI.—THE GALILEAN CLOSE	303
A. The Return to Galilee.—The Transfiguration of the Messiah	303
B. The Messianic Exemption from paying Tribute	325
C. The Organization of the Community of the Messiah	332
D. Prince and Messiah	343

Second Part.

THE GALILEAN STORMS.

ACROSS the blue spring sky of Galilee, over the fresh green and the fragrant blossoms of the initial period of Jesus' ministry, over the joyous mood of the people and the disciples, even over the successful work of the first and solitary labourer of the kingdom, there spread dark clouds, growing from scarcely perceptible specks to huge threatening masses, chasing each other from all sides, but mostly from the south, harbingers of impending storm. As in nature, so in history, we often meet with startling and unexpected turning-points. That tendency which seems destined to be the prevailing one, or which has already established itself as such, all at once meets with an obstruction, and, after a temporary oscillation, is ruthlessly reversed, and event after event is fatally controlled by the new tendency which has declared itself. In the life of Jesus there is such a reverse in the course of affairs. We find ourselves already in it even while we are witnessing Jesus' successes, and we feel its influence while we are still standing with him on the mount which overlooks the world. This turning-point is exhibited more or less in all the Gospels. It is shown most noticeably and most startlingly by the unexplained naked facts of the Gospel of Matthew, in which the wind changes, from one chapter to another,

without any sufficient and tangible cause. The fourth Gospel, however, exhibits it with more effect, more pragmatically, more pointedly, but also more artificially: here the great turning-point, which has as its immediate consequence the isolation of Jesus, of his confining himself to the circle of his twelve disciples, is represented as brought about by an address, by a single address, of Jesus, by the absolute and offensive enigma of its ideas.¹

But when we look more closely, we find that the turning-point has its laws and its natural origin, and that in particular Jesus himself, who was never a dreamer overlooking the signs of the times, by no means so under-estimated the weak points of his position and the strength of the resisting forces as to be surprised into an unintentional fulfilment of his destiny. And we see still more evidently that it was the storms which fell upon him, and the rain-torrents that beat against his house and against his young creation, which established his strength, revealed him as the man he really was, made him the man who—according to his own parable—built his house and his cause upon the rock, in order that it might be immovably throned as the eternal spiritual stronghold of mankind, above the history of the world, and even above the final judgment of God.²

As the period of this change, we here give generally the summer of A.D. 34. We sadly miss any more exact data; but the time of the late summer and the autumn of A.D. 34 is in general indicated by the parables—those evidences of an already widely extended success, but also of a redoubled effort on the part of Jesus,—by the execution of the Baptist, and by the bath

¹ In Matthew, the two great sections—Sermon on the Mount and the cycle of miracles (v.—vii. and viii. ix.)—are predominantly representations of fresh vigour and of success. The mission sermon also begins with a glad outlook (x.). Yet in the cycle of miracles there are already shown—based on earlier representations (see above, Vol. III. p. 358, note 2)—pharisaical shadows (ix. 1—17, 34), and the mission address anticipates gloomier subsequent addresses (verse 16); in chap. xi., Jesus stands in conflict with John, the people, the Pharisees; and in xiii. 53, begins the long final section of the despised and rejected Prophet whose career is leading him to death. On Luke and Mark, see above, Vol. III. p. 1. The crisis in John's Gospel, vi. 66.

² Matt. vii. 24.

of blood of the Galileans at the feast at Jerusalem.¹ This increasingly sombre period extended over about eight months, from the summer of A.D. 34, nearly to the fatal Easter of A.D. 35, while the Galilean spring-time lasted only half as long. These eight months, however, fall again into two groups. The first half is occupied by ministry, the second by flight. To give a further confirmation of this provisional chronology of the last Galilean activity of Jesus will be the office of the following history.

¹ Matt. xiii. 8 sqq., xiv. 1 sqq. See more in detail, on the parables and the death of John. The feast of Tabernacles, evidently, Luke xiii. 1. Hausrath has endeavoured to fix the date of the Nazara sermon by following Bengel (*Ord. Temp.* p. 220) in appealing to the fact that the *haptara*, Isaiah lxi. 1 sqq. (Luke iv. 17), was prescribed for the day of atonement (in the autumn). But neither Luke's initial sermon nor the arrangement of the text for reading can be certainly referred back to the time of Jesus. Moreover, the words, "he found the place," in Luke iv. 17, point to the opposite of a fixed arrangement.

DIVISION I.—CONFLICTS AND DISILLUSIONS.

A.—THE PHARISEES.

THE silently and imperceptibly growing dark point in the heaven of Jesus had for some time been the Jewish hierarchy. Not indeed the hierarchy of places and dignities, the possessor of the high-priest's chair and its Sadducean faction, which troubled itself little about the provincials, about the Galileans; but the dominant and threatened influence over the people, the authority of the Scribes and of Pharisaism. It is illustrative of the character of Jesus' ministry, that he was not in any way interfered with by the political rulers; that neither the tetrarch Antipas, nor the Roman governor of Syria or Judea, as the superior of the tetrarch, seriously opposed him, as they did the Baptist. The movement he commenced was not political at all, but simply a doctrinal one, which spread from himself to the people, and was resisted to the death by the hitherto all-powerful party of the Scribes.¹

This struggle, the beginnings of which we have seen, had its own clearly-defined forms, limitations, and modes of procedure. The old doctrine was compelled to resist the new, if not directly in the central point of principle—for which it was too spiritless—yet in details and from the standpoint of the Law. It resisted first of all by such disputations as were customary among teachers, but next also by undermining the people's respect for Jesus, and finally by accusations or violence. In this mode of conflict there prevailed for a long time, as might be expected, a certain

¹ In Matt. xvi. 1, there are also Sadducees introduced as opponents, but see Mark viii. 11, Matt. xii. 33. In the first passage, the controversies at Jerusalem (xxii. 23) are probably carried back to Galilee. Hilgenfeld does not find the introduction of the Pharisees surprising (p. 133).

tameness and uniformity. Jesus repeatedly exhibits the same causes of offence, which are as often treated in detail by his opponents in the same manner, and are met by no more specific arguments than such as are drawn from the Law and from custom. Jesus, unweariedly confining himself to a circumspect and cautious defensive attitude, gladly keeps to the individual question at issue and to the necessary rebutting of the attack, until he on his own part assumes the defensive. He then proceeds to attack the whole system, the subtleties of which he crushes by brief descriptive characterizations instead of long criticisms, and the contradictions of which to the elements of piety he exhibits in their odious and ludicrous nakedness. Even in the time of his reticence, his replies are as vigorous and rich in significance as the attacks of his opponents are poor and paltry; so that even here we are compensated by him for the dreary steppes in his history which his opponents compel him to travel over, and we are, in particular, truly grateful for being spared the long and tedious discussions which occupy so much space in the Talmud, and which were characteristic of the spirit and tone of the trifling and pedantic intellect of the time.

If we postpone for a moment the highest and ultimate legal questions which were in dispute, we easily discover that, quite apart from them, the growing number of Jesus' adherents and the remarkable success of his ministry of healing—which again increased the reputation of the new Teacher—daily magnified the uneasiness and the displeasure of his opponents. His intercourse with publicans and sinners, already so keenly animadverted upon at the call of the publican,—this inexhaustible theme is perpetually re-introduced against Jesus. This intercourse with the unclean was again, as is well known, closely bound up with the legal questions; but it is very natural, and indeed we see plainly, that jealousy as to his influence over the people took advantage of this favourable point, that Jesus' opponents consoled themselves and others with the reflection that they could quiet the people or arouse their distrust by drawing attention to the

popular elements of which his party was composed.¹ Among the Evangelists, Matthew repeatedly points to this continuous attack, while Luke has narrated quite a series of distinct collisions on this ground, though it is not always possible to establish with perfect certainty the historical character of the separate finely-sketched narrations.² The fourth Gospel, also, has handed down at least the expression of the rage of the ruling classes on account of Jesus' popular following, in a characteristic exhibition of sovereign disdain: "Has any of the rulers believed in him, or of the Pharisees? But this multitude who know not the law, they are cursed!"³ In an affecting manner, with the profoundest personal sympathy, and by the most minute doctrinal instruction, Jesus ever anew interested himself in and protected his clients. The murmurs occasioned by his intercourse with publicans and sinners he met by fine parables, in which earthly incidents, whose truth and higher consistency nobody could deny, proclaimed God's love for sinners and Jesus' mission to the lost. The woman who possesses ten drachmæ or francs is not indifferent to the loss of one piece; she lights a lamp, sweeps the house, seeks, and does not leave off seeking until she finds the lost piece, and then exultingly makes known her success to her friends and neighbours.⁴ The owner of a hundred sheep is—not merely because he is owner, but also because he is a sympathetic man—not indifferent to the wandering of one sheep; he leaves the ninety-nine, goes upon the hills, brings home on his shoulders exultingly in the sight of his associates the sheep that was lost; thus presenting a picture of God, a picture of heaven where there is more joy over the repentance of one sinner than over the integrity of ninety-nine righteous men.⁵ In a similar connection, Jesus ori-

¹ See above, Vol. III. pp. 361 sqq.; comp. Luke xv. 1.

² Matt. xi. 19, xxi. 31; Luke, *l.c.* and below.

³ John vii. 48; see Vol. I. p. 344.

⁴ Luke xv. 8. Similarly the Rabbis, Lightfoot, p. 542.

⁵ Matt. xviii. 12; Luke xv. 4. The figure of the strayed sheep, 1 Kings xxii. 17 (Numb. xxvii. 17). The Jews often used the expression, ninety-nine to one, Lightfoot, pp. 342, 540. The pursuit after one lost from among duodecim jumenta, Schöttgen, p. 292. The joy of God, *ib.* p. 293.

ginally gave the story of the lost son. The two sons are seen at once to be the two classes, the pharisaically righteous and the publicans and sinners. The younger son, who frees himself from the restraints of home, squanders his fortune in debauchery, is brought to his right mind and led to reflect on his ways by hunger, determines to lay his confession of sinfulness and unworthiness before his father, yet before his confession is cordially received and embraced, then gorgeously clothed and joyously and sumptuously entertained, is the publican who has returned to God, a living man from among the dead. The other son, who is envious, who boasts that he has never transgressed a command, who complains that no feast is ever made for him, and who is ultimately quieted and blamed by the father, represents the class of the Israelitishly righteous.¹ Tenderly as Jesus has here treated his opponents, he has nevertheless even in this story uttered a censure. This censure is more strongly given, and yet consistently with the truth, in the picture of the Pharisee and the publican who go to the temple, the one with his thanksgiving before God that he is not as other men, a robber, unjust, an adulterer, or even as the publican there present, but that he is a man who fasts twice in the week and taxes all his earnings for the benefit of the temple; the other casting his eyes upon the ground, and striking upon his breast, from which there escapes the brief and sorrowful cry, "O God, be merciful to me, the sinner!" Jesus predicates of the one justification and exaltation; but of the other, who exalts himself, abasement.² But even when the pha-

¹ Luke xv. 11. From Augustine (*Quest. cr.* 2, 33) down to the critical school (even Schenkel), the parable has been explained as referring to Judaism and Heathenism; and without doubt Luke has added this Pauline sense to it (Luke xv. 13, 15). But originally the reference was a different one, as the parable still shows (verse 29), as does also the context, xv. 1 sqq. Thus also Bleek, Meyer, Weisz., though the last sees in the second son the paganized Jew (p. 501). Comp. the old form, Matt. xxi. 28 sqq. The Gospel of the Hebrews in Hilg., *N. T. extra can.* pp. 17, 25. *Siliculas edere*, also among the Jews, Schöttgen, p. 297. Several features from Exod. x. 16; 2 Sam. xii. 13; Gen. xxxiii. 4, xli. 42; Daniel v. 29; Gen. xviii. 7, xxxviii. 17.

² Luke xviii. 10. Standing at prayer, see above, on Matt. vi. 5, Vol. III. p. 333. Lightfoot, p. 298. Self-praise forbidden and indulged in, Schöttgen, p. 306. Fasting by the Pharisees on the second and fifth days of the week, Lightfoot, p. 553; see above,

risaically righteous man, who nevertheless needs forgiveness, obtains forgiveness and justification, what a complete difference there is between the gratitude, love, and self-surrender of the debtor to whom much is remitted, and of the debtor to whom little is remitted! This truth of a later time is in a wonderful manner interwoven with the narrative of the woman of Bethany whom we shall meet with during Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem.¹ Several other narratives and speeches of Jesus belonging to this province are to be found. On one occasion, he reproaches the Pharisees with justifying themselves only before men; on another occasion, he accuses them of—not only spiritual, but also—worldly ambition, and rebukes their hunting after the highest seats at table, by humorously but earnestly commending to the guests the lowest seats.²

Yet his success among the people was not more unfavourably regarded than his healing ministry. Indeed, his opponents were exasperated to madness by his cures; for it was by means of those cures chiefly that he attracted the people, threw the old teachers into the shade, and procured for himself that mysterious prestige which awed the masses and fostered the growth of his increasing pretensions. Once in the later Galilean period, under the powerful excitement produced by the cure of a heavily afflicted demoniac, assembled multitudes of the people deliberated whether Jesus was not the Son of David, the Messiah. There were present also Pharisees, venerable grey-headed masters, according to the amplified report of Mark Pharisees from the metropolis who were travelling through the country.³ They did

Vol. I. p. 342. Tithes, see Matt. xxiii. 23. Downward look required by the Law (*oculus deprimere*), Schöttgen, p. 307. Every Jew was said to go away justified after offering sacrifice, *abiit justus*, Schöttgen, p. 307.

¹ Luke vii. 36; comp. Matt. xxvi. 6.

² Luke xvi. 15, xiv. 7.

³ Matt. xii. 22; Luke xi. 14; Mark iii. 22 (the surroundings similar to Luke v. 17); comp. John vii. 20, viii. 48. Matthew has the narrative twice, giving it also in the cycle of miracles, ix. 32 (probably from the hand of the interpolator, see above, Vol. III. p. 160, note 1), and the general reproach in the missionary address, x. 25. The identity of the incidents in ix. and xii. has already been recognized by De Wette and

not know at which to be the more vexed, whether at the mighty deed in comparison with which their own and their most ardently inspired disciples' exorcisms became insignificant, or at the ominous mood of the people, which snatched out of the hands of the recognized teachers both doctrine and authority at once. This embarrassment, this anger, gave birth to the most senseless and infamous accusation which they ever uttered, an accusation which at this period passed into circulation and was never forgotten by Jesus, viz., that he was possessed by Beelzebul, that is, by Satan, the Phœnician supreme divinity, and that he cast out demons only through the chief of the demons.¹ The folly of this accusation is scarcely lessened by the supposition based on Mark's narrative, the supposition, namely, that Jesus, by his passionate exhibition of his force of will in the presence of the possessed, produced the impression that he was beside himself, and thus suggested the thought of powers of darkness.² If such an impression were really produced, it exercised at most but a trifling influence; the chief motive of the charge was the desire of the representatives of a hopeless cause to degrade in the eyes of the people a great and noble ministry by a truly diabolical accusa-

Strauss; these passages are equally parallel to Luke xi. 14. The representation in Matt. xii. 22 is altogether superior to that of Luke (who, indeed, misled by the *vioi òi*, mentions the people instead of the Pharisees) and Mark, a fact which scarcely needs to be pointed out here to critical eyes.

¹ It is true that in the Talmud we meet with Asmodeus or Sammael (see above, Vol. III. p. 228) as chief, head, king of the demons; but Beelzebul is older. The false reading, Beelzebub (Jerome, Vulgate, Luther), is certainly to be given up; and when that is given up, we can no longer—as, however, Winer, Bleek, Merx (Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, article *Baal*), still do—introduce the Ekronite Baal sebul=god of flies (2 Kings i. 2, 3, 16). Nor is the explanation, lord of dung (zebul, zibbul, *Talm.*), on the ground of the scoffing designation of idolatry as zibbul (Buxt. p. 641; Lightf. p. 526)—an explanation partly adopted by Winer and Bleek—appropriate to the form of the word. But the simple explanation baal (Chald. beel, contracted bel) zebul=lord (god) of the dwelling (Mich., Paulus, Hitzig, Meyer), is the most consistent with circumstances, for the Phœnicians, who were neighbours of the Galileans, called their sun-god Baal shamaim (lord of heaven) or zebul (of the heavenly dwelling); comp. Movers, *Phönizier*, I. p. 260 sqq. Hence the abstract signification of Meyer (and, after him, Volkmar), lord of his dwelling, of his kingdom, is also to be rejected. It is to be noted, as a curious fact, that Volkmar (p. 269) thinks the reproach directed rather against Paul than against Jesus.

² See above, Vol. III. p. 181.

tion. Both compassion and anger—the latter not merely because he was personally insulted, but because he had been treated with actual frivolity—filled the soul of Jesus, and impelled him to utter a repudiation which passed over from a remarkably calm, consecutive, and transparently clear argumentation against his opponents and for his own cause, to a determined attack, nay, to an overthrowing of the enemy with truly irresistible blows. “Every kingdom”—so began he with a faultless logic—“every town, every house, which is divided against itself, is unable to endure, is destroyed. But if Satan drives out Satan, then is he actually divided: how can his kingdom endure?” Jesus gives them even the conclusion: therefore is it impossible that he can drive out Satan by Satan! And he hastens on to overthrow his opponents not merely by the logic of ideas, but also by that of facts: “If I cast out demons by Beelzebul, with what do your disciples cast them out? *They* shall be your judges!” He hurries on yet further, and after the rejection of the false, the foolish conclusions, gives the correct conclusions: “But if *I* cast out demons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God suddenly and beyond expectation come among you! Who can enter into the house of the strong man, and spoil his goods, his property, his possessions, if he has not previously bound *him*, if he has not vanquished the kingdom of the enemy of God?” At a stroke, exciting surprise and producing an imposing effect by the greatness of his claim, by his openness after his reticence, by his argumentative proof in detail, by his victory after an appearance of discomfiture, he declares his high position, and then, assuming the offensive after completing his defence, he draws the conclusions for himself and his opponents. A world-historical position admits only of a “Yes” or a “No,” and clothes the “No” with responsibility. “He who is not with me is against me; and he who gathers not with me, scatters. Every sin and blasphemy even against the Son of Man shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, either in this world or in that which is to come.”

This word of blasphemy his opponents had spoken; they had not spoken insultingly of himself, at whose personality or obscurity they might take offence, but they had spoken insultingly of the unmistakable, efficacious, holy power of God himself.¹ Therefore at last he utters against them his open and undisguised sentence of rejection. Man makes himself either good, a tree that bears good fruit, or he makes himself corrupt. "Ye brood of vipers, how can ye speak that which is good, since ye are essentially wicked? for out of the fulness of the heart, out of the treasure of the heart, the mouth speaks. But the judgment-day of God"—with this menace he closes the future—"will justify and condemn man for everything good or bad which the mouth has spoken."²

¹ Matt. xii. 22—32. Luke xi. 14—23 follows Matthew as far as verse 30 in all essential points. Only the account is later, more pictorial. Mark is (after Matthew) less perfect, though in the first principal repudiation unpleasantly paraphrastic, with a trivial imitation of the three great hypothetical sentences of his predecessors; in particular, he passes over the apparent expression of intolerance, Matt. xii. 30, which in ix. 40 (Luke ix. 49) he inverts in a liberal sense. On the other hand, he has, in iii. 28—30, the passage about the sin against the Spirit (Matt. xii. 31 sq.), which is wanting in Luke (unskillfully introduced in xii. 10); but he gives an unsatisfactory subjective motive for the passage (verse 30), having omitted the determining utterance, Matt. xii. 28, Luke xi. 20 (finger of God).

² These last parts, Matt. xii. 33—37, are wanting in Luke and Mark. Luke has one portion in his Sermon on the Mount, vi. 43—45 (somewhat more copiously than in Matt. vii. 16—20). Jesus might have frequently uttered these passages, and there is by no means a lack of distinction in the concrete. The passage about the return of the evil spirits—which in Matthew stands a little later, viz., as the concluding threat after the conflict (comp. the milder passage in verse 36), in Luke xi. 24 is immediately joined on to the Beelzebul speech and seems to harmonize with this—was evidently not spoken in this controversy, but was addressed to the *people*, and will come under our notice further on among the addresses to the people. I look upon only the quotation from the Hebrew, xii. 17—20, as an addition by the interpolator, and this because the connection between vv. 15 and 22 is disturbingly broken, and the appropriate places for the annotation would have been viii. 4, ix. 30. Hilgenfeld (p. 412) is inclined to regard the whole narrative as an interpolation, though compiled out of old materials. I would rather regard Matt. ix. 32 as an interpolation (see above, Vol. III. p. 160, note 1), or, with Strauss, believe in two sources of the Gospel. The awkward connection in xii. 14, 15, 24, proves nothing at all; comp. Mark iii. 6, 7, 19, 22. As to the materials of the address, it need be here only remarked that Meyer's forced explanation of *καρπὸν ποιεῖν* is already quite excluded by Matt. vii. 17 (comp. the Hebrew). Further, the blasphemy against the Spirit was foreign to Jewish dogmatics; they knew only blasphemy against God; comp. Lightf. p. 324. On the other hand, *verba vana* were also forbidden, Schöttgen, p. 125.

Such expressions of Jesus, in which he unreservedly avails himself of the Baptist's armoury of reproaches against the Pharisees, naturally not only made the breach irremediable, but more and more plainly revealed to the opponents the Messianic view of Jesus, if indeed they had not already detected this in his following in the wake of the Baptist, and in his mysterious references to the Son of Man and to the power of the Son of Man. Messianism was, however, the formulated breach. It is true the kingdom of heaven was the watchword of Jesus' opponents also; but since the condition of things was endurable, since Moses ruled in the land and they with Moses, they were never quite clear whether they did not already possess the kingdom of heaven, or whether it was to be looked for in the future as the result of special miracles of God.¹ Under all circumstances, the bold announcer of the kingdom of God in unique connection with himself, was guilty of a criminal attack in the first instance upon themselves and upon their heaven on earth, and in the next instance upon the sovereign God whose omnipotence he would lay hold of by his own power—nay, which he, merely a miserable, foolish Galilean, a disciple of Judas the Galilean, would replace by his weak human intellect and his weak human arm. It was quite consistent with Pharisaism that already, in the last Galilean period, the impetuous preaching of the kingdom should be met, half coolly and half in biting scorn, with the question, When, then, will the kingdom of God really come? or that a clear and undeniable miracle, a sign from heaven, a declaration by God himself, should be mockingly demanded of the still unauthorized teacher, of the man of whom one could only say, "If he were a prophet?"² Jesus answered the first question with calm dignity: "The kingdom of God will not come in such a

¹ See above, Vol. I. pp. 346 sqq. Those who are still inclined to the opinion that Jesus was attacked on account of his non-political Messiahship (Pressensé, p. 387), should remember that this view can at most be held only with reference to the latest period of his life.

² No prophet, Luke vii. 39. Sign from heaven, Matt. xvi. 1; Acts ii. 19; comp. Joel ii. 30 and 4 Esra often, v. 1, vi. 12. Hilgenfeld, p. 433.

way as to be recognized by the senses ; nor shall ye say, Lo, here, or there ! For behold, the kingdom of God is in your midst.”¹ But the second request, which denied everything and ignored all that had been in existence, had lived, and had borne testimony since his début, he so indignantly met with an outburst of intellectual power as to put his enemies to the blush. The Pharisees were almanack-men and astrologers. “When it is evening,” he answered, “then ye say, It will be fine weather, for the sky is fiery, there is the red of evening ; and on the morrow, To-day it will be stormy, for the sky is red and louring. Ye understand how to judge of the appearance of the sky, but of the signs of the times ye are unable to judge ? An evil and adulterous generation eagerly seeks a sign, and no sign shall be given it, except the sign of Jonah.” He meant the sign of the preaching of repentance. He then left them and went his way.²

To the controversial entanglement which thus early and in different ways menacingly developed itself, it was unnecessary to add the passion and bitterness of legal disputes. And yet these were the end as well as the beginning of the irreconcilable antagonism. For what was the kingdom of God itself which Jesus proclaimed, more than the purifying of the Law, release from the ordinances, a moral constitution of the world, by which

¹ Luke xvii. 20 sq. This passage (comp. Bleek, II. 244) will not bear the interpretation : in your hearts. But besides that given above, the apocalyptic interpretation is possible : the kingdom will *suddenly* stand in your midst. The author has evidently thus understood it, as is shown by what follows (verses 22—24) ; but this was not the original meaning.

² Matt. xvi. 1. With merely somewhat different pictures, but inappropriately addressed to the people, Luke xii. 54. Without the pictures, Mark viii. 11. A similar, yet very different, address, Matt. xii. 39, is, notwithstanding verse 38, spoken to the people, as Luke xi. 16 and Matthew himself (verse 46) show. In Matt. xvi. 2 sq., the splendid pictures are neither to be struck out nor—with Tischendorf—to be put in brackets because they are wanting in Sin., Vat., al. Hier. Not only do they stand in a large majority of the Codd. Patr., and particularly in Ital., but the question must be asked, Who made them at a later period ? The meteorological trivialities of the Pharisees and Jews generally, who observed the clouds and smelt the rain, Lightfoot, p. 334 ; see also above, Vol. I. p. 360, note 1. It might rather be asked whether Jesus spoke of the sign of Jonah (see Mark viii. 12) in this controversy also (as well as in Matt. xii. 38). Perhaps it was only the author who repeated this formula. According to Volkmar (p. 403), the whole is without historical basis.

men, in the attainment of their dignity and the fulfilment of their destiny, should acquire peace and friendship with God, divine likeness and sonship? Hence the controversy about the Law never ceased. The Sabbath controversies were the most frequently repeated, because it was just to that day of popular leisure and popular assemblies that Jesus chiefly postponed his works of mercy to the sick. Three Evangelists testify to the healing in the synagogue of the man with a withered hand: the simplest narration of it is in Matthew. The incident belongs to the later period, in which the opponents were attempting to seize upon tangible grounds of accusation.¹ In order, therefore, to incite Jesus to heal the man and to commit a verbal breach of the Law, they asked him directly whether it was lawful to heal on the Sabbath.² On this occasion, Jesus, quite artlessly and without appeal to Scripture, drew his justification from that fact of unsophisticated every-day life, from that natural and unpremeditated exercise of compassion, which even among the Jews the ordinances were unable to suppress. "A sheep, an ox, when it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, do not men lift it out? But how much more is a man than a sheep! Therefore it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath. And he healed him."³ But the

¹ Matt. xii. 9; Luke vi. 6; Mark iii. 1. Luke and Mark place the incident earlier, because they connect it with the actually earlier first healing on the Sabbath; at the same time, they wish to obtain a decisive issue for the so significantly grouped five conflicts. Matthew has more correctly placed the second healing later (and incorrectly placed the first with it). It is clear that if the resolution of the Pharisees (according to Mark, indeed, of the Herodians also) to accuse and destroy Jesus had been so early arrived at as appears in Luke and Mark, the very long delay is inconceivable. Matthew's greater simplicity in the narration itself shows itself in his report of the healing, and also in the questions, which are free from generalizing, popularizing phraseology.

² According to Luke and Mark, he saw into their hearts without their questioning him. Hilgenfeld (p. 410) thinks that the Evangelist Matthew has given greater emphasis to the antagonism to the Pharisees than the Gospel of the Hebrews. This is not at all correct; moreover, who does not see in the mason begging for healing, in the Gospel of the Hebrews (Hilg. *N. T.* p. 16), a heightened colouring of the much simpler incident in Matthew?

³ Among the Jews, this question of the saving of animals is much more rarely referred to than that of men (see above, Vol. III. p. 363). Shammai's inhumanity, see above, Vol. I. p. 346. Leading forth to drink permitted, Lightfoot, p. 536; Schöttgen, p. 287. Indeed, it is disputed whether it were lawful to lift out an animal that had

Pharisees, beside themselves with anger, went away and took counsel how they might destroy him. Several such incidents are narrated by Luke, and others in the fourth Gospel, which latter are however, both in their details and in the justification of Jesus, overwrought.¹ The cure of a man that had the dropsy, in Luke, almost literally coincides with the incident given above, and its historical character is therefore open to question. More original, and therefore also more credible, is the healing of the deformed woman.² In a very diverting manner is the controversy here introduced by the reprimand which, after the cure, the pharisaically-minded president of the synagogue addresses to the synagogue-public. The prudent man attacks the people, but he is thinking of Jesus; the thick-headed, heartless fellow, the hard-and-fast observer of ordinances, draws up a plan of hours, and fixes by paragraphs how help is to be given to the necessitous. "There are six days," he cries, "in which man may work; on those days come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath!" "Ye hypocrites!"—thus Jesus breaks in upon his speech—"does not each one of you loose his ox or his ass from the stall on the Sabbath, and lead him away and water him? And ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham, to be loosed from this bond, from this eighteen-year bond of Satan, on the Sabbath?" These conflicts always closed with triumph; the popular sentiment greeted with acclamations the man who spoke the language of human nature against the ordinances; even the opponent was silenced as if before his own better self, while Jesus triumphantly proclaimed the success of his cause in the parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven. It is true, however, that the opponent's other self, which clung to the ordinances, murmured and cried for vengeance.³

fallen into a pit with its young, or whether it were not necessary to kill the mother animal, though its young might be fed in the pit. Hier. *Jom tob*, f. 62, 1, in Light-foot, p. 322.

¹ In the fourth Gospel, the healing of the paralytic (v. 9), and that of the man born blind (ix. 14), are both described as breaches of the Sabbath.

² Luke xiv. 1, xiii. 10.

³ Luke xiii. 17, 18.

Though matters had already gone far, Jesus had not made such incisive attacks upon Pharisaism and the Judaism of the Law as Luke and John have represented; neither had he made such precise declarations of his divine sonship as are given us by John quite in the spirit of his late book.¹ Nevertheless, the breach already existed. To the Pharisees he was the instigator of transgression, to him they were the enemies of the kingdom of God; he was the lawless one, they were the wicked and adulterous generation; he was the blasphemer of God, they were the hypocrites; he was the confederate of Satan, they were the brood of vipers.² They passed from ambush to ambush, from war of words to legal process and to violence. He renounced the co-operation of the heads of the nation, which he had desired, and began, instead, to vindicate his cause without reserve, and to seek to secure for himself the people whom he had hitherto refrained from alienating from their teachers and their teachers' doctrines.

It is not long before we see Jesus distinctly occupying this significant position. It is true that to a certain extent it has been necessary here to devise a definite chronology, since the Evangelists themselves offer us nothing that is precise, or nothing that is trustworthy. On this account we have on our part refrained from giving a consecutive arrangement of the controversies. But if we leave undecided the chronological relation, for example, between the Sabbath controversy in the synagogue and that concerning Beelzebul, and if we are compelled to rest satisfied with simply ascribing these struggles to the later Galilean period generally, yet fortunately the time of the closing point at least of these struggles is capable of being more certainly defined. Matthew and Mark have most distinctly placed the most violent attack and counter-attack about the close of the Galilean period, and after the death of the Baptist, i.e. in the

¹ Luke iv. 24, vi. 27 sqq., vii. 30 sqq., x. 1, xi. 37, xvi. 16; John v. 18, 45, &c.

² Inciter to transgression, Matt. v. 17, xii. 2, xv. 2, xxii. 16. Foes, xxi. 32, xxiii. 13. Adulterous generation, xvi. 4. Blasphemer, ix. 3. Hypocrites, vi. 2, xv. 7; Luke xii. 56. Beelzebul, Matt. xii. 24. Vipers, xii. 34.

late autumn of A.D. 34, a few months before the end of Jesus' residence in Galilee, and previous to the commencement of the journey towards Jerusalem.¹ Subsequently to this date there falls, according to all the indications of the Gospels, only the already narrated controversy concerning signs, the hasty termination of which on both sides is itself a sign that the Galilean disputations are at an end, and that the struggle is seeking new weapons.² The testimony of the Evangelists is, moreover, surprisingly confirmed by the incident itself: the isolated conflict to which we are invited to become eye-witnesses betrays itself as the end and the crown of all the Galilean conflicts.

The Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem appear before Jesus. Luke has already introduced such Pharisees from Jerusalem in his account of the healing of the paralytic, and Mark has done so in the controversy concerning Beelzebul. But the presence of the Jerusalemites is certainly and manifoldly attested only in the incident we are now dwelling upon.³ At all events, they here make such an official impression as they do nowhere else; they appear as ambassadors from the school at Jerusalem, perhaps of the Sanhedrim, such as we meet with in the history of the Jewish War, and with less certainty in that of the Baptist. They are announced in the same way as ambassadors would be, and their approach to Jesus is marked by a gravity and dignity which the previous addresses of individual Pharisees generally

¹ Matt. xv. 1; Mark vii. 1. Comp. Luke xi. 33. Also H. Sevin, *Chronol. d. L. J.* 1870, pp. 13 sqq., obtains for the incident in question the time after the feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 34, but he errs in seeing in the Scribes from Jerusalem, Galileans returning from the feast. On the contrary, also Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift*, 1871, p. 148.

² Matt. xvi. 1; Mark viii. 11; Luke xii. 54. See above, p. 13. According to Luke (comp. xiii. 1), the controversy concerning signs took place in the autumn of A.D. 34. According to Matthew and Mark, it must be placed at the close of the year 34 or the beginning of 35, since the Tyrian journey precedes it, and it is immediately followed by the last retreat to Cæsarea Philippi.

³ Luke v. 17; Mark iii. 22. The premature introduction of the Jerusalemites in Mark iii. 22, led Sevin (p. 14) to his false hypothesis. According to Volkmar (pp. 380, 384), the whole is an attack upon the Jews and the Jewish Christians by the dogmatic constructor, who was "perhaps" in possession of a tradition.

lack.¹ There is here no strategem, no cunning, no invective, and no cowardly attempt to surprise the weak disciples. They approach Jesus himself, they come with certain facts which they themselves have observed, or their informants—perhaps the same who had at an earlier period collected data for accusations—have reported orally or in writing. And as they briefly exhibit their facts to him, they require from him a direct answer. It was a great moment. The leaders of the national piety, the venerable fathers of the orthodox church, find themselves compelled to take notice of the new Galilean teacher. The despised movement has become important. To an indifferent looking on follows action. The audacious innovator must give himself up to the authorities, or atone for his rebellion by excommunication, perhaps by losing his life. They must be blind who cannot see that this proceeding stands in connection with the death of the Baptist—which both Evangelists place before this incident—quite as much as in connection with the growing apostasy of Galilee, and with the increasing tension of the antagonism there. The death of the Baptist was a triumph for Pharisaism, even though the Pharisees had not brought it about, but had only wished it. Relieved of the one foe, Pharisaism now faced the other more courageously: when the master had fallen, who would be afraid of the disciple?² The latter must either surrender or fall himself. For Jesus also this was a new situation. Hitherto he had stood in antagonism to individuals of the party, and with reference to those individuals he had indeed pushed his antagonism to an extreme point: now he found himself opposed to the highest spiritual power of the land, and the consciousness of his independent divine vocation might once more come into collision with his piety towards the spiritual rulers, with his respect for the learned and pious leaders of the country who possessed the prestige of past centuries, with his deference to the chief men at

¹ *Jos. Vita*, pp. 38 sqq. John i. 19. Their official character is recognized also by Holtzmann, Lange, Schenkel, and Weizsäcker.

² *Comp. Matt.* xvii. 12.

Jerusalem, who could shut or open to him the gates of the holy city and take away his life, as they had done that of the Baptist. In this crisis, Jesus remained heroically steadfast, retracting nothing, qualifying nothing. In the cause of truth he made the small schism great and decisive by placing himself at the head of the antagonistic movement. Actually and morally he annihilated his opponents, and in the ears both of his disciples and of the people he openly proclaimed the new principles by means of which he laid the axe at the roots of the whole system of Pharisaism.

“Wherefore”—thus began the Jerusalemites—“wherefore do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders?” Thus they at once confessed their party-colour and asked to know his; they exposed their own principle and condemned his. As their own principle, they mentioned simply the authority of tradition, the *mizvot sckenim*, the commandments of the men of old, which from the time of Ezra downwards had been gradually elaborated by a succession of great Scribes, and had been inherited by that generation as holy ordinances.¹ The Jerusalemites did not mention God, or the Scriptures, or Moses; they appealed to neither reason nor conscience; they offered no proof, and they asked for none. The thing was settled: religion stood fast, required no research, no thought, and deprecated anything like disturbance: the men of old had spoken, the men of later times listened obediently to the holy men of God who had spoken better than Moses himself.² But Jesus and his disciples did not listen obediently to them; and the Jerusalemites laid especially emphasis on the fact that the disciples did not obey. They emphasized their reference to the disobedience of the disciples, not because they were afraid to make a direct attack upon Jesus, but because the erroneous principles had already become embodied in a school. But in what respect, then, did Jesus transgress the

¹ Lightfoot, p. 330; Schöttgen, p. 136. See above, Vol. I. p. 334, III. p. 303.

² *Verba legis gravia et levia, at verba scribarum sunt omnia gravia.* Hier. Bcr. f. 3, 2; comp. Schöttgen, p. 246.

holy tradition? After the high-sounding attack, one is astonished to find how trivial were the actual charges. "For they wash not their hands when they eat bread." But we must not be surprised, for Pharisaism did not distinguish between great and small: every ordinance as such possessed eternal worth; its transgression was a sin and a breach of the universal holy law. This spiritless estimate of human conduct was in itself the characteristic of a dead traditional faith; but under the high-sounding title of purity, the "pure," the Pharisees—as Mark specially intimates to his Roman readers—had gone far beyond the precepts of the Law, and had made the external purity of the hands, of the body, of clothing, of food, of tables and chairs and vessels, the cardinal point of a pious life. Indeed, the great teachers of the age, Hillel and Shammai, had become renowned as the originators or revivers of the command of hand-washing, attention to which they required particularly at the beginning of a meal, and almost more urgently at the close of it. Those who neglected to wash their hands were childishly menaced with the devil *Shibta*.¹ It may be that Jesus' assailants kept ready in reserve a number of other questions besides the important one here referred to, and intended by an increasingly vigorous attack to evoke those admissions which would justify their definitive verdict. But they did not carry out their intention, because Jesus, quite unexpectedly, disclosed everything to them.

His presence of mind and the claims of the truth itself quickly rescued Jesus from his embarrassing surprise. To the plain and direct question, he—as Matthew reports the best by far—retorted by the direct and penetrating counter-question, which cut his opponents to the heart, "Why do *ye* transgress the command-

¹ *Hier. Shabb.* f. 3, 4: Hillel et Shammai decreverunt de munditia manuum (antea exhibita erat ista traditio, sed ipsorum exciderat memoria). Lightfoot, p. 331. Before eating in arbitrio, post cibum necessaria. Schött. pp. 137, 26. The demon *Shibta*, in *Bab. Taan.* f. 20, 2; Lightfoot, p. 331. Also excommunication even for Rabbi Eleazar, quod vilifaceret lotionem manuum, *ib.* p. 330; Schöttgen, p. 246.

ment of God with your tradition?"¹ He thus admitted the fact with which he was charged, as well as tacitly many other facts; but at the same time he justified the fact by drawing a distinction between the divine commandment and tradition as "their" work, as human work; and then, with a tremendous counter-thrust, he accused them of transgressing that which was incomparably the greater, and of neglecting the divine law in favour of the human. As his opponents themselves had laid hold of only one point, so he confined himself to reminding them of only one commandment which they had violated; but the force of this representative example was so much the greater because the commandment that he mentioned, the complete abrogation of which by the human ordinances—in spite of the resistance of several venerable men—he was able to refer to, was a lofty one, and yet was very simple and quite clear and intuitive to every human consciousness. God, he said, had imposed upon them the duty of honouring father and mother. Again, God had said, "Whosoever despises father or mother shall die the death."² But ye say, Whosoever says to his father or mother, whatever thou mightest obtain by me to thy advantage, is *Korban*—that is, a gift, an offering to the temple—is exempt. And consequently he will not honour his father and his mother at all: ye have made the law of God of no avail by your ordinance?" Is it not as if we here heard again the Reformers who reproached the old Church with having made her own voluntary good works the means of trampling under foot the commandments of God, and with having released the cloister-seeking son from obedience to his father? But the Reformers learnt from him, and from the same voice of nature and of that conscience which he, with so much fidelity to humanity and with so much effectiveness, jus-

¹ Notwithstanding the very favourable opinion of its supporters (even Weizsäcker), Mark is quite secondary, mixes the chief points confusedly, inappropriately and prematurely introduces the passage from Isaiah, and has a number of objectionable paraphrases or generalities.

² Ex. xx. 12, xxi. 17.

tified against the sanctimoniously perverted, unnatural sentiment which declared vows, especially those of giving to the temple, the *neder hakodesh*, to be binding even when they involved the breach of the first moral commandment.¹ In this one reproach there was indeed a world of significance. The instance adduced had its own broad reference: he said not merely that they subordinated the commandment of reverence of parents to ceremonial ablutions, but he said that they subordinated it to the sacrifices. Therefore ablutions, and sacrifice, and fasts, and alms, all the voluntary, ostentatious, meretricious services rendered to God, were almost valueless in comparison with obedience to the great and eternal commandments of God, and they became crimes, antagonism to God, when they insolently usurped the place of the latter. Hence he follows up the single example by a general reference. "Hypocrites," he cries to them, "well did Isaiah prophesy concerning you, when he said, This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; but in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." He here pronounced sentence, as had never been done before, upon Pharisaism as a whole, upon the prevailing orthodoxy: the whole system, so highly lauded, so pretentious, so genuinely Mosaic, was of human origin, a breach of the Law, antagonistic to Moses and the prophets, the end of the true Israel; all the pious performances were but external service, hypocrisy, cheating God, whom they honoured in word and with the toys of novel actions.²

¹ Votum consecrationis (opp. v. obligat. vel prohibit.). Lightfoot, p. 332. On the obligatory force of vows, even when in collision with duty to others: voto me obstrinxi, quod tecum (wife) cohabitare nolim, ejusm. vota non sunt infringenda. Schöttgen, p. 139. Comp. the interesting account of Origen, how Jewish creditors compel their debtors to pay: Korban, quod mihi debes! See Winer, *Darlehen*. But excellent injunctions to honour parents are not wanting, comp. *Hier. Kidd.* f. 61: tenetur filius patrem nutrire, imo pro eo mendicare, *ib.* Some express themselves with less definiteness: nosti, quod patrem et matrem contemnas, propterea quod ad hæc vota tam facilis es? Schöttgen, p. 140.

² Isaiah xxix. 13. According to Hilgenfeld (1847, p. 429), Jesus did not condemn the system—particularly in xv. 13—but only the persons: Hilg. here sides with De Wette and Bleek against Meyer. But everything points to principles, doctrines of men

The Pharisees disappeared. It would be superfluous to mention other points of controversy: all controverted points were included in the above. To the men of tradition there was nothing more to be said, to the conscientious among them there was nothing further to object. Indeed, did any conscientious men remain to the end? Vexed, and deeply scandalized by the false, the seditious teaching, the Pharisees all went away. Jesus stood alone; he felt his isolation, and that the retreat of the Pharisees was not their last word. He therefore strove to escape from his isolation by appealing to the people. Here is consistency: having broken with the hierarchy, if he will not hopelessly founder and carry his cause down with him, he must find support among the people. He must make the people the confidants of his thoughts, more than he had hitherto done. He must remove the offence of having come into collision with the hierarchy, and he must make his higher teaching against the ordinances the common property of all, not the mere esoteric teaching to his disciples. Only thus could he and the kingdom of God triumph against the Pharisees; only thus could opposition be successfully met or silenced. Without hesitation, therefore, he now for the first time called to himself the people who had, at a distance at least, been witnesses of the controversy. But as a wise teacher, even while illuminating the people, even in self-defence and in the moment of great excitement, he did not hurry on to such an entire destruction of faith in the system and the men of the system, as he had previously effected at one blow when opposing the Pharisees, but he confined himself at first to the single detail which had been mentioned; and—what he had not found necessary in his annihilating defence against the Pharisees—he established the legality of his freedom and the freedom of his disciples in the matter of ablutions, and of course at the same time he proved the utter worthlessness of the Pharisaic

(comp. xvi. 12), and xxiii. 3 cannot overthrow this fact, even though Jesus, before his end, somewhat modified his representation. Also among the Rabbis: bene, pulcre dixit Rabb. Jose, Schöttgen, p. 140.

practices. "Hear and understand: not that which goes into the mouth makes a man unclean and common; but that which comes out of his mouth makes a man common. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."¹ He contented himself with this intimation, leaving the people to question him further. His pregnant words contained the nucleus of his teaching against the doctrine of the Pharisees—indeed, in its wider bearings, against the doctrine of the Law.² Nothing that is external makes clean or unclean, holy or unholy; cleanness and uncleanness come from within, from the inner man,—this was the meaning of his words. It is true his words referred directly to food alone, which was carried to the mouth by the unwashed hand: such food did not make a man unclean. But they also contained a further allusion to the scrupulous attention to the distinction between clean and unclean meats which Moses himself had inculcated, and which Pharisaism only more vexatiously insisted upon: he taught that even the quality of the food did not make a man unclean. His words had a still wider bearing. Like a fire rapidly spreading over a house of straw, their force reached the long, infinite series of external religious observances which had no internal sanctifying power, the host of levitical observances, of temple services and sacrifices, and condemned them as empty, vain, and worthless,—as utterly worthless if to that which was external there was not added, in accordance with the requirement of Moses and the prophets, that which was internal, purity of heart and mind. It is true that he did not openly utter what he thus implied; and the people might have less clearly understood than did the disciples the immediate sense of his figuratively enigmatic utterances, to say nothing of the

¹ Matt. xv. 10 sq.; Mark vii. 14. Exactly the reverse in *Soh. Lev. f. 17*: quicquid, ut in vita cœli portionem habeat, custodiat os suum a cibo et potu, qui animam immundam reddit et custodiat os a verbis malis, ne iisdem profanetur. Schöttgen, p. 141. He that has ears, a favourite expression, Matt. xi. 15, xiii. 9, 43; Rev. ii. 11 sqq. After Ezekiel iii. 27.

² Weizsäcker has (p. 463)—as elsewhere—so emphasized this super-legal element, as to represent Jesus as abrogating the Law, though not in direct words.

wider meaning implied by them. Will any one therefore accuse him of halting half-way, of appealing to the people and then timidly practising reserve, of having, by leaving his instruction inadequate, deprived himself of the most powerful confederacy? But his conscientiousness did not permit him to precipitate the spiritual progress of his nation, and his faith in God did not allow him to despair, notwithstanding the immaturity of the means of resistance at his command.

He opened his mind more clearly, however, to his disciples, the maturer part of his new community, the bulwark of his faith and hope, so far as he looked for such a bulwark in man. They themselves also, afterwards, in the house according to Mark, in intimate and confidential intercourse, desired him to explain himself more fully.¹ They asked him whether he knew how grievously he had vexed the Pharisees? His answer was neither an affirmation nor a denial, but it was the definite, decisive, never before so distinctly uttered announcement of the destruction by the judgment of God of the ordinances, together with the teachers of them and their whole party, self-condemned. Only upon one point did he judge more leniently. His opponents had furnished him with an expression descriptive of sin due to ignorance and imperfection, not to wicked intention. "Every plant which my Heavenly Father has not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them go; they are blind leaders of the blind; but when a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into the ditch."² As plants that God had not planted, he understood the whole of the ordinances which had encrusted the Law of God; by the rooting up, he meant the divine decree of the future against the additions to the Law; by the ditch, he meant the catastrophe which would naturally befall a commonwealth, short-

¹ Matt. xv. 12. House stereotyped in Mark i. 29, ii. 1, iii. 19, vii. 17, 24, ix. 28, 33. Here quite inappropriate, comp. Matt. xv. 12, 21.

² So also Matt. xxiii. 16; Rom. ii. 19. "Leaders of the blind" was their self-chosen title; and Paul does not here (Hilg. p. 429) by any means presuppose the existence of the Gospel.

sightedly directed, inwardly corrupt, and that had proved untrue to its past and to its destiny.¹ But he had given even his disciples credit for too much discernment. Whilst he was showing the general issues of his antagonism, Peter had not been able to master the bearings of the figurative address to the people, concerning the single detail mentioned. Jesus answered Peter's question with a sigh over his disciples, but also with a welcome explanation.² "That which goes into the mouth, passes into the belly, and is cast out into the sewer; but that which comes out of the mouth, comes from the heart, and this makes a man unclean. For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. It is this that makes a man common; but to eat with unwashed hands does not make a man common."³ He here covertly widened his conception of cleanness and uncleanness. It is true he adhered to the cardinal proposition, and inculcated it with stronger emphasis: it is not that which is external, but it is the heart of man which determines concerning cleanness and uncleanness, or indeed worthiness and unworthiness; as the offspring of the heart, however, he no longer mentioned, as in the figurative speeches, the words, the actions of the mouth, but, in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount, the total range of human conduct, from the word backwards to the inner world of thought, from the brooding mental conception outwards to the manifold and evil actions of the external life. And again in the spirit of the

¹ See against Hilgenfeld, above, p. 22, note.

² Matt. xv. 12, 15—20 (Peter); Mark vii. 17—23 (disciples). Hilgenfeld (p. 429) groundlessly regards these so thoroughly original utterances as an addition of the Evangelist's to the self-explanatory parable.

³ Besides a copious paraphrase, Mark vii. 19 offers the noteworthy addition of the sewer: he makes all food clean (comp. 1 Sam. xxi. 5; Matt. xxiii. 17), and he distinguishes from it what has become unclean. The addition is not only quite unæsthetic, but it is not relevant to the thoughts of Jesus, to whom the idea of the Levitically unclean was of no serious import at all (Volkmar, p. 333, incorrectly translates *ἀφ* = rump, "a dainty witticism"!). On the catalogue of sins, comp. *Ab. Nat.* 20: quic. verbis legis attendit, ab eo auferuntur cogitat. gladii et famis, cog. stultitiæ, scortationis, concupiscentiæ praviæ, cog. de verbis vanis. Schöttgen, p. 119.

Sermon on the Mount, he understood by the clean and unclean offspring of the heart, not merely thoughts, words, and works, in their relation to God, but, above all, in their relation to the men whom his services to God concerned. It was a worthy conclusion to this conflict: the antithesis to the ordinances was the Law, the antithesis to ablutions was the heart, the antithesis to ceremonial was morality and brotherly love. Every road necessarily led him to the same goal; from the ludicrous washing of hands for the honour of God, he inevitably passed to the noble, ardent fostering of humanity in one's self and in others, the reversed religion.

B.—THE BAPTIST AND HIS DISCIPLES.

John the Baptist was the diametrical antithesis to the Pharisees; and if we are to make a division, we must place John and Jesus on one line and the Pharisees on the other. But it was one of the disillusionings of Jesus, that he had miscalculated little less on John than on the Pharisees. Upon one point, Jesus could certainly not expect from John much more than what he could see and trace in his own personal surroundings; he knew, and could not help knowing, that he could scarcely wean the man who neither ate nor drank from his asceticism, that he could scarcely induce him to recognize the new freedom. Yet it was not upon this ground that the Baptist, who, in comparison with his own disciples, was a large-minded man, took offence.¹ Fasting was but the habit of his life; it was in the Messiah that the end and purpose of his life lay. He could have endured the Galilean freedom, if only the one who was free had shown himself to be the Messiah. He had been half a year in prison, so that the "days of John" had already faded into a distant and

¹ Scandalizatur Ioa. auditis virtut. Christi, Tertullian, *Marc.* 4, 18. *Matt.* ix. 14 (the disciples).

indistinct remembrance in the popular consciousness: how impatiently he there waited for the coming up of the seed which he had sown, and, more than that, the working of God in Israel, which he had so certainly and with such an assurance of triumph announced on the banks of the Jordan!¹ Naturally his glance was directed towards Jesus, the only man in Israel who had taken up the unfinished development, the man who had indeed carried yet further the torch of the Baptist. We have evidence enough—thus much of free air had John in the deadly stillness of the fortress on the Dead Sea, as Paul had later in Cæsarea—that he was able, through his disciples who went to and fro, to obtain information as to the course which things were taking in the country; and particularly that he could maintain a tentative intercourse with Jesus.² It is therefore simply a somewhat crude pragmatism on the part of the Gospels, at least of Luke, when they represent the Baptist's attention as being arrested first by the deeds of Jesus, and when Luke makes the news of the restoration of one nearly dead and of another quite dead reach John's ears through his disciples, of course in order to prepare him for the answer of Jesus, "the dead are raised up."³ This representation is certainly altogether incorrect: John went backward towards Jesus, rather than forward, and certified as to Jesus, not deeds, but rather the lack of them. When we look more closely, we see that Matthew at least gives a more carefully-worded introduction,—he speaks not so much of the fame of the acts of Jesus, as of that of his activity, i.e. of his quiet

¹ The days of John, Matt. xi. 12, comp. xxi. 25; Luke xvii. 22.

² Comp. above, Vol. II. pp. 345 sq. According to Volkmar, John is already dead (!) when Jesus makes his appearance (comp. below); of course it is therefore considered to be "absurd" that John should have been able to send messengers from Machærus to Jesus (p. 74), although the admission that he did so is made much easier by the favourite Mark (vi. 20). According to Schleiermacher (*Luk.* p. 109), with whom Bleek agrees (*Syn.* I. p. 443), and Neander disagrees (6th ed. p. 256), John was still at large, since Luke makes no allusion at all to his imprisonment, only Matthew. The fourth Gospel should be consulted in this context. But Matt. xi. 12, Luke iii. 20? According to Weizsäcker (p. 321), there existed at least no bond between John and Jesus. So also Weiff., p. 31.

³ Matt. xi. 2; Luke vii. 18 (verses 2, 12).

preaching and of his missionary activity.¹ Hence, after a protracted observation of this quiet activity, John, in the late summer of the year 34, sent to Jesus, through trusty disciples, a brief, concise, genuinely Johannine message, the substance of which was exactly the question as to the Messiah.² "Art thou the coming one, or are we to look for another?" The question was not that of one who had been undeceived, but of one strongly excited and still eagerly expectant, though not altogether satisfied. The man of the future, who should put an end to uncertainty, the "Coming One"—a veiled title of the Messiah which the Old Testament furnished—was the subject of the daily thought, and speech, and expectation of the fettered hero at Machærus; and to the Coming One *he* was the waiting one—nay, he grandly and gracefully placed himself on a level with the people, as if, in the presence of the Messiah, he, the Leader, were but a man like other men: "Are *we* to look for another?"³ The waiting John both saw and did not see the coming one in Jesus: he saw the coming one in Jesus' call, in the force of his preaching, in the impetuosity of his attack on the Pharisees, in the power which he put forth in healing, in the flocking together of the people to him, in the alarm at Jerusalem; he could not see him in Jesus' reticence, in his silence concerning, or indeed his denial of, his Messiahship, in his reluctance to lay hold of the kingdom of God, to establish the question of the future on the ground of present fact. Between the alternative—he is the Messiah and he is not—John was not able to come to a decision. Each seemed to him possible, and he himself inclined to the

¹ The *ἔργα* in Matt. xi. 2 are not miraculous works (Tert. virtutes, Vulg. opera), for which, certainly, the Gospel of John, but not Matthew (xi. 20 sqq.), uses this expression. Comp. Matt. v. 16, xxiii. 5; Acts xv. 38.

² Matt. xi. 2 has in the earlier codices (also Ital.), *εἰὰ τῶν μαθ.*; Luke vii. 19 has *εἶς*. Hilgenfeld would retain the latter also in Matt. (p. 402). Comp. the duality elsewhere in connection with John and Jesus. Pressensé (p. 446) conveniently shifts the message to Nain.

³ The coming one, after Ps. cxviii. 26; comp. Matt. xxiii. 37. Hengstenberg (*Christol.* 2nd ed. III. 664) thought of Mal. iii. 1; Hitzig, of Dan. ix. 26; Meyer, of Ps. xl. 7. Comp. Hilgenfeld, p. 402.

affirmative; hence he was willing to accept from Jesus himself—a strong proof of confidence in him—the definitive answer, the decision, not only for his disciples, but for his own guidance also; and hence he was wishful, by means of the question itself, and by the intentional proposition of the question by his disciples in the hearing of the general public, to hasten the decision in harmony with his own opinion.¹ From early times, men have spoken simply of a misapprehension by the Baptist of Jesus, his method, or his Messianism generally, a misapprehension which Tertullian explains as due to the passing of the fulness of the Spirit from the Baptist to Jesus; but this conception rests upon an exaggeration of Jesus' animadversion upon the Baptist, and still more on too strong a belief in the narrative of Jesus' baptism, and on the references of the fourth Gospel to the Baptist, who in that Gospel leaves the stage with loud and repeated announcements of the actually present—nay, of the spiritual Messiah.²

The answer of Jesus was as concise as the question. It was solemn, self-conscious, precise, dignified; in a word, it was an answer, and it was a refutation of the opinion that the independent and sublime personage who here spoke, had ever been a disciple of the Master, a co-disciple of the disciples.³ Against the assumed absence of facts, he appealed to facts; in view of

¹ Strauss (I. p. 367, 4th ed.) has some ground for seeing in the words of the Baptist an incipient (Neander, p. 252, steadfast) rather than an expiring faith; but in I. p. 391, and still more in his *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. ed. II. p. 120, he pushes his doubts too far, holding, in fact, that the discourses about John might have been spoken without this introduction. Since Origen, many, even Calvin (see Meyer, Bleek), have held that John wished to induce his disciples to believe in Jesus; Lightfoot, Bengel, Kuinoel, Paulus, Ammon, Fr., Hase, Theile, Neander, have referred the question to impatience on John's part. Ewald, p. 430: instigation rather than doubt.

² This is the general view held by Wetst., Meyer, Bleek, Gams, Schenkel. Tert., *con. Marc.* 4, 18. Marcion, on his part, refers John's mistaken materialistic Messianism to the work of the Demiurge. Paulus, De Wette, Olsh., Ebr., Wieseler, question the correctness of the representation. The latter view does not do justice to the importance of the embassy; but the former ascribes to the Baptist a fearless apostasy from the divine signs at the baptism. Strauss's *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. ed. II. p. 404.

³ According to Bleek (p. 464), we have only a résumé of the speech, not a full report.

the apparent lack of proof, he adduced evidence which made a verdict possible; and to meet the still possible doubt and the obtrusive impatience, he insisted upon the profitableness and blessedness of faith that cannot be shaken. "Go, tell John what ye see and hear: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are quickened, and to the poor the gospel is preached. And blessed is he who is not offended in me." This is again, when looked at as a whole, a genuinely characteristic answer, rich in suggestion yet reticent, intelligible yet obscure, meeting the question yet throwing the decision and the verdict upon the questioner. And thus was he compelled to answer, not only because of the presence of the general public, not only because there were there those who wished to force from him a decisive utterance, but most of all in order to remain consistent with himself, since it was his will to leave the revelation of his nature to the understanding of men, to time and to God. And on the whole he spoke intelligibly enough, even though he refrained from uttering the conclusion deducible from his premises, and though the details might sound unintelligible. He built upon a passage from Isaiah: it was that prophet who had formed the basis of the Messianic preaching of John; it was the words of that prophet that had pointed incontrovertibly, without any obscurity and independently of any artificial interpretation, to the golden future of Israel; finally, it was the prediction of those very facts of the future, that Jesus was conscious of having fulfilled, and that John was indisposed to see or to heed.¹ But what, now, were really the facts to which Jesus was able to point, to which he was able to point as fulfilment of prophecy and as convincing evidence? According to the language and conception of the Evangelists, of Matthew and yet more of Luke—who speaks of

¹ Several passages in Isaiah are suggested, xxxv. 5 sq., 8, xxix. 18 sq., xlii. 7, lxi. 1 sqq. Only of instances of raising from the dead nothing is said directly. Of lepers (unclean), xxxv. 8. But to a lifting up, to a *komem* and *ἐξανάσῃσαι* of the downtrodden nation, to a blossoming of the wilderness (*ἀνατελεῖ*), reference is made in many places, xlv. 26, lviii. 12, lxi. 4. John and Isaiah, see above, Vol. II. p. 217.

the presence of many that had been healed, of the possessed, and specially of many blind persons—they were first of all the miracles which possibly were so copiously grouped from the sources themselves, and secondly the preaching of salvation among the poor. But this was scarcely the meaning of Jesus' words, which were thus interpreted first by the superficial miracle-loving intellect of a later period. The Old Testament, in the passage in question, had not referred to miracles performed on the body, but to spiritual miracles which it described in figures. Moreover, Jesus always laid the chief emphasis upon his preaching, not upon his miracles. His watchword in the presence of the Pharisees was, "only the sign of Jonah;" preaching, the preaching of the kingdom of God, is the one theme of the following discourse about John.¹ Even in his answer to John, Jesus commissions the messengers—at least in Matthew—to tell him in the first place what they heard, not what they saw; and the forms they saw were moreover significantly bound up with what they heard, the preaching of the gospel to the poor.² It might possibly be supposed that it was because the questioner asked for works that Jesus appealed not only to his preaching, but also to his works of healing, as he did on other occasions, and that in this instance he mentioned his works before his preaching. But it is improbable that he should have so far yielded to the demand for merely material facts; and it is altogether impossible that he should not only have placed the works of healing first, but should also have enumerated them in a five-fold series, leaving his preaching to be mentioned briefly in a supplementary manner. Finally, it is impossible that all these works of healings, which he performed during a protracted period and partly only as quite isolated events, should have been pointed out by him then and there, for conviction's sake, as if they had been collected together on that very spot; and that he should have called attention to cases of resurrection

¹ Matt. xii. 39, 41. Consequently Luke xiii. 32 is not quite genuine.

² Comp. Isaiah xxix. 19, lxi. 1—3.

from the dead, which according to all evidence were derived from this passage and were not actual historical occurrences. These considerations are not so unimportant as may be supposed. If we free ourselves from the customary interpretation—an interpretation which is the most consonant with the greatness of Jesus in appearance only—and admit at the most a slight allusion to the material types of spiritual works, we then discover the greatness of Jesus and of his answer. He does indeed draw John's attention to his works, his success, but it is in the main the spiritual success of his preaching: the people, who had shared the blindness of the Pharisees, had obtained understanding; the leprous publicans had been cleansed; the dead who buried their dead had been raised; to the poor, in the sense of Isaiah's language and of that of John, to all the troubled and the sorrowing among the people, not merely to the indigent, the good glad message had been delivered. In these facts, the kingdom of heaven had found not merely its harbingers, but its dawn.¹ In such an answer, he fully and worthily met the Baptist's question: for himself he clearly and incontrovertibly acknowledged that the essence and reality of the kingdom of God lay in the spirit and the blessing of his announcement of the truth; and he made it incumbent on the Baptist to break with both old and new materialistic dreaming, and, with a true believing glance which sees where unbelief cannot see, to look for the Messiah in the building up of a spiritual world.

Nevertheless, there remains something enigmatical in Jesus' answer. It is, after all, a short and unsympathetic dismissal. There is no inquiry after John, the first champion and the martyr of the kingdom of God, no word of sympathy, no striving

¹ The poor (spiritually poor, also Neander), see Isaiah xxix. 19, lxi. 1—3. The preaching to the poor stood perhaps originally in the first place, as in Isaiah (lxi. 1); if so, the miracle-loving Evangelists transferred it to the close. Neander (even 6th ed. p. 253), Bleek (p. 446), A. Schweizer (*Stud.* 1836, pp. 106 sqq.), Strauss (Eng. ed. I. p. 364, II. p. 119), are in favour of a spiritual meaning (especially as to the resurrection). Comp. on the resurrection, the later miracles. To the above extreme admission is to be added that Jesus loved paradox, ambiguous profundity, comp. Matt. v. 25, viii. 28.

after a fundamental understanding with John and his disciples, who were immediately sent away; and in the closing words, there is an upraised finger, a warning, which is at the same time a public censure: "Blessed is he who is not offended in me!"¹ And notwithstanding Jesus' high estimate of John, a similar tone of dissatisfaction marks his subsequent address to the people concerning the Baptist. If we reflect that John, in his question, as it lies before us, expressed himself as favourable to Jesus rather than unfavourable, that he showed himself inclined to recognize Jesus as the Messiah, and that consequently—in spite of his distance from the theatre of events, in spite of his being compelled by his imprisonment to content himself with hearsay—he used and brought into vogue a title, a name, that up to this time had been seriously used by neither the on-looking people nor even the disciples, his daily eye-witnesses—if we remember all this, then the behaviour of Jesus and his condemnatory reference to taking offence must appear as a chilling and incomprehensible repulse of the Baptist, explicable only on the supposition that Jesus was the subject of morbid irritability, ill-humour, and exasperation, and that he was too exacting and self-conscious, too jealously ambitious. Finally, the immediately subsequent opinion concerning the Baptist, expressed in the presence of the people, that the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he,—was it not a cruel injustice, seeing that such members of the kingdom of heaven as then existed were far behind the Baptist in presentient understanding, and were scarcely his superiors in the strength of their indefinite and general faith.² But we cannot seriously look for an explana-

¹ Taking offence, comp. Matt. xv. 12, xvii. 27. The word in itself does not (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 49, note 2) necessarily (as in xviii. 6) require that there should have been a positively good antecedent impression. 'Ev Hebraïses; comp. *Kashal be*.

² The expression, "he who is less in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. xi. 11, has been, from the times of the Father until Meyer, erroneously thus explained: less than he, John, who is, however, also placed lowest in heaven. But on the comp. = superl., comp. Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 32. The reference of "the less" to Jesus (*Chrys.*) or to the Christians, is found as early as Tert., *Marc.* 4, 18: *Christus vel quisque modicus*.

tion in the supposition that Jesus was moved by jealousy to be harsh towards John, for his whole tone exhibits repose and calm dignity. Nor can we assume the existence of an excusable passionate excitement aroused by a concatenation of miscarriages, for such an excitement did not exist. Unless we believe that Jesus was omniscient and saw that the Baptist's heart did not correspond with his question, or unless, on the other hand, we hold the narrative to be a Christian fabrication intended to depreciate the Baptist, we are shut up to the one assistance which the Gospels themselves offer us, and which at the same time serves to justify the Gospels, viz., the supposition that Jesus had a right to expect more from John than from all others, that he had a right to look for not merely the insight of the prophet of the kingdom who could not be mistaken, even in his prison, as to the Messiah of the kingdom who had recently appeared, but also the unshaken fidelity of the old acquaintance, of the well-instructed witness at the Jordan, who had formerly recognized him with a deeper penetration and had acknowledged him, if not as the Gospels narrate in the presence of the people, at least when he and Jesus were together, by giving expression to the trust which he placed in him.¹ If this trust had previously existed, then the present embassy to Jesus was certainly an evidence of retrogression, of the weakening of old impressions, of an attitude between belief and unbelief which seemed to point to unbelief as the final position. Upon such a supposition, Jesus had a right to give expression to resentment, and to yield to a feeling of sadness which was only too justifiable in the

¹ See above, Vol. II. p. 287. The above might itself give occasion to yet another explanation. As Jesus held John to be a prophet, he might have believed that the Baptist must necessarily have known from God of his—Jesus'—mission, but that he had, in human weakness, disavowed this knowledge. But this is impossible, inasmuch as Jesus, with his usual sobriety, could not presume to see deeply enough to know what was the extent of the revelation granted to John, because he, after his humble manner, believed generally in limitations to divine revelation, and because he actually charges him, not by any means with obdurate resistance to divine teaching, but merely with the human limitations of his faith.

coincidence of so many disillusions, when indeed everything tottered to the very foundations.

The manliness of Jesus appeared again here, in the stand which he made against the objections, against even the apostacy, of the man on whom his existence and his authority seemed to rest,—for the kingdom of God was from John, and not the kingdom of God only, but he—Jesus—himself, and indeed his word. But even in John we may honour the man who remained the same in his fundamental ideas, who did not forsake himself when everything forsook him. Were the ways of the two men henceforth altogether separated? There are few questions which we more eagerly press upon the silence of history than this. There is preponderant evidence in favour of the supposition that Jesus and John again approached each other; that John, though he did not give up his views, yet retained his inclination towards Jesus; and that later, Jesus, without any reservation or qualification, called the Baptist the preparer of his way.¹ In the first place, it is a fact that the disciples of the Baptist maintained their connection with Jesus, and that most significantly at the last catastrophe of the Master. In the next place, after the death of the Baptist, Jesus used concerning him a noticeably different language, recognizing and indeed lauding him; nay, in Jerusalem he distinctly mentioned him, in the very face of the hierarchy, as the great representative of the new movement.² It does not suffice to say that death had brought about reconciliation, had in Jesus' judgment freed the lights of John's character from its shadows. Why should the death of the Baptist have momentarily produced such a trepidation in Jesus, if he had seen in him the apostate, nay, the prophet condemned by God? For the strength of principle in Jesus forbids us to think of subsequent change, or, indeed, considerable vacillation, without sufficient cause; and finally, the Baptist's dis-

¹ Ammon (*Fortb.* p. 276), speaks of a permanent alienation (specially on account of Jesus' severe judgment); also Ewald, p. 433.

² Matt. xvii. 12, xxi. 25, 32.

ciples speak for themselves by coming to Jesus and hearing from him afresh, without contradiction, the name of Messiah.

With those disciples, however, Jesus had himself again to combat, not, it is true, over the Messiah question, about which they agreed, but concerning fasting, a turn of the controversy which certainly shows the lower standpoint of the disciples as compared with that of the Master, for they attached importance to questions which he passed by and left to be settled by the common enemy. This notorious controversy on fasting has a variety of minor questions connected with it.¹ The Gospels are not unanimous as to the controversialists: Matthew represents the disciples of John as disputing with Jesus, Luke the Pharisees, Mark perplexed introduces both, or leaves the decision to the reader.² Then, again, the Gospels, though they quite agree among themselves as to the early date of the controversy, do not agree with us. As to the first point, Matthew alone can be correct, since the others harmonize with him between the lines, and since the utterances of Jesus with reference to his Messiahship and his anticipation of death, the old and the new doctrine, as well as the mildness of his condemnation and of his penetrating reproach of going only half-way, are appropriate solely to his relation with the disciples of the Baptist.³ As to the second point, it is easy to be seen that it is merely through the

¹ Matt. ix. 14; Luke v. 33; Mark ii. 18.

² Mark must be understood to make the disciples of John and the Pharisees ask at the same time, so that he here again patches Matthew and Luke together. We may, it is true, assume that in the words "they come" there is, as in other places, an indefinite subject = people come, comp. Mark ii. 3, v. 35, &c. (thus Volkmar); but how idle would then be the preceding sentence, which, in itself to a certain extent superfluous, gains significance only by the identity of those whose actions are referred to and those who ask. And how inconsistent such a redundancy would be with the utter absence of any definition of the persons of the questioners!

³ They harmonize between the lines sometimes completely, sometimes in the precedence of the disciples of John, as if the Pharisees had given to these the place of honour before themselves. The chief feature in the erroneous explanation of Luke was, that he immediately connected the publican-controversy with the fasting-controversy, an error which derives light from the mention of the Pharisees by Matthew also (ix. 14). For Luke were Schleiermacher, Neander, Bleek; for Matthew, De Wette, Meyer.

association of ideas that this conversation has found its place by the side of that with the Pharisees on the publicans and on eating with the publicans, a controversy which in fact belongs to the earlier period. The energetic guarding of the new principle against the addition of sere and obsolete forms might, indeed, appear to point to the period of the original and fresh consciousness of the new, creative teaching which demanded a clear course. But the later Galilean period is pointed to by the name of Bridegroom, a name so well attested in this narrative, and which Jesus himself assumes, and actually bears afterwards, especially in Jerusalem; and also by the well-attested and original intimation of the taking away of the bridegroom from his disciples, in which there is unmistakably expressed the presentiment of a catastrophe of violent separation, nay of death. These incontestable facts will be yet more distinctly shown in the subsequent course of this history; but we have already seen that Jesus had not, even in the presence of his most intimate disciples, begun with a complete repudiation of the Pharisaic ordinances, and that, when questioned about fasting, he boldly started from the point of view of rejoicing, while here he ends with the direct antithesis to mourning. Indeed, he could not represent both points of view at one and the same time; but he could, as we have seen, pass on from one to the other, from the artificial preservation to the relinquishment of a course of action of which mourning was and remained an essential characteristic. The exact point of time in the later Galilean period cannot now be fixed with certainty; we can only say that the conversation took place between the Baptist's embassy and his death, or after his death. We should have to think of a date after his death if we were to adopt a definite fasting time, before Easter for instance, as Ewald supposed; but nothing points to a fixed fasting time, and it would first be necessary to show the existence of a Jewish Easter fast. We would rather urge that it was the death of the Baptist which, weighing on the mind of Jesus, first matured in him the presentiment of his own near

departure.¹ It is true that of late controversialists have not disputed about the date, but the historical character of the whole circumstance; the force of their denial is, however, destroyed not only by the original utterance of Jesus, but also by their own unrestrained capriciousness.²

For the rest, this transaction is so shaped as to have many points of coincidence with the controversies with the Pharisees, and looks like a desirable complement of the narrative of the breach of Jesus with the Pharisaic ordinances; and even the Gospels themselves, not altogether without justice, have effected a kind of fusion of the two antagonisms by their juxtaposition. And if, as Matthew represents, the disciples of John asked, "Why do we and the Pharisees fast much, but thy disciples do not fast?" then they themselves on their side initiated this wonderful blending, though at the same time they involuntarily and strikingly gave expression to the contradiction between their stiffly legalistic attitude and the fundamental idea of the Baptist's mission, and thereby also pronounced their own condemnation.³ The Baptist was antagonistic to the Pharisees, his disciples appealed to the Pharisees; the Baptist saw hypocrisy in the Pharisaic righteousness of works, and demanded, instead of all those punctilios, a repentance of the heart, while his disciples

¹ Ewald (p. 378), Kuinoel, Weizsäcker, think of the Baptist's lifetime; Kuinoel of his imprisonment, on account of which his disciples fasted.

² According to Volkmar, this narrative points to the apostolic period and to the disputations of the Jewish Christians and the illuminated, by the use of the word bridegroom (thus, indeed, Jesus could not have called himself), and by the allusion to his death. No fasting was to be permitted except on the *day* of Jesus' death (Mark ii. 20), as was practised in the second century. As if Mark spoke of only one day; as if the fasts of the middle of the second century (themselves, indeed, questionable) were in vogue here; as if Paul knew of such a fast; as if—if we look for something later—we were not to think of the mourning of the disciples after the death of Jesus (comp. Mark xvi. 10). On the bridegroom (here in a new way a bloody bridegroom, Exodus iv. 25), see next page, note 1.

³ The self-comparison of John with the Pharisees is unjustly found fault with, especially by Neander, p. 261. Nor can we with Volkmar say, that they could not have thus (why?) asked, they must have known why they fasted. Every one sees that, in popular discourse, a ground is sought, not for the first, which forms the instance, but for the second.

lived easy lives of faith in the old punctilios. A part of the reproach fell here certainly upon the Baptist himself: the antagonist of the Pharisees was fatally at one with them in his fasting observances; but the rest of the reproach, the charge of attacking Jesus on such principles and of explicit appeal to that rotten support the Pharisees, belonged to the weaker at least of John's disciples. Jesus' answer is uncommonly precise, and reveals his present clear and complete perception of the novelty of the principle which he upheld, and of the impossibility of concluding a concordat with the old principle, whether as upheld by the Baptist or as insisted upon by the Pharisees. This is a pearl of his utterances concerning the ordinances, inasmuch as the schism is of the most conscious and distinct character, and the ground of the schism is the inner nature of the new spirit, and not merely—as is predominantly the case in the controversy about ablutions—the formal conflict between a divine and a human rule. He shows that the principle of fasting is, as understood by the Jews, not precisely in Isaiah's sense, the principle of mourning; in *his* presence, joy reigns, the marriage-joy of the kingdom of God. "Can the sons, the friends of the bride-chamber 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."¹ Of course he did not here mean an ordinance-prescribed fast, as the later church, from the middle of the second century, has made his words to mean; but he vigorously describes the abstemiousness naturally accompanying the emotion of sorrow.² The two principles cannot be harmonized: if we patch the new upon the old, like a new piece of cloth upon an old garment, it tears the old garment and

¹ The sons of the bride-chamber (*bene chüppah*) are the *παρανύμφιοι, νεμφαγωγοί*, who with the bridegroom fetch the bride home, where there follows a seven days' feast. Comp. Matt. xxii. 2, xxv. 1; John iii. 29. Lightfoot, p. 310, &c. Winer, *Hochzeit*. Such mirth, *ut soliti sint frangere vasa vitrea in nuptiis*. Such a title given by Jesus to himself (Volkmar thinks only of Rev. xix. 7), is quite intelligible from the Old Test. and the Messianic pictures there. Isaiah lxii. 5; Jer. ii. 2, iii. 1—14; Ezekiel xvi. 8, &c. (Hosea i. ii.). On fasting, Isaiah lviii. 5.

² Comp. Luke xxiv. 17; Mark xvi. 10; John xx. 11.

makes it more ragged than before; or if we, recognizing the independent spiritual dignity of the new, nevertheless violently compress it into the old forms, then it must act like new wine in old leathern bottles; it will burst the bottles, and thus destroy and be destroyed. Therefore for the new wine there must be new bottles—for the new, strong, joyous spirit, new forms of expression and of life, and in that way will persistence and durability be ensured to it and them.¹ This confutation, at once incisive and picturesque, as usual, and preserved more purely and with more variety by Matthew and Mark than by Luke, had doubtless its special points bearing upon the disciples of John.² *He* would have acted inconsistently had he connected contradictory things; *they* did really act inconsistently by coupling the faith of the kingdom of God with the faith of the Pharisees. They were themselves, in a certain sense, representatives of the new principle of divine grace, of the joy of the kingdom, even though they had not yet become adherents of the Messiah; but they merely set the new principle as a patch upon the old garment, or required him to put his young and fermenting wine into the old leather. In Luke, at the close, there is a beautiful and delicate treatment of the transition question, an apology by the strong one for the weak, by him who has definitively resolved for those who are hesitating and narrow-minded among his contemporaries: he admits that it is difficult for men to go from the old mild wine to the new and still fermenting.³

¹ Comp. Job xxxii. 19. *Pirke Ab.* 4, 20: Interdum cantharus novus repletus vino veteri. Schöttgen, p. 94. Wine was kept in leathern bottles (goat-skins). Hebr. obot, nebalim.

² Luke v. 36 introduces artificially and in bad taste (because actually inconceivable) the new as an independent principle (Pauline) in the illustration of the garment: when one cuts a piece from a new garment and puts it upon an old one, the new one is destroyed and does not harmonize with the old. Mark ii. 19 sq. gives diffuse periphrasis. A reference to the disciples of John is assumed by Schenkel; whilst Weizsäcker and Weiffenbach hold that Jesus, associating John purely with the old principle, spoke of the possibility of a fusion only in himself. But Matt. ix. 16 sq. has the universal "No one."

³ Luke v. 39. Vinum vetus prodest visceribus. Lightfoot, p. 332. *Pirke Ab.* 4, 20: Edere uvas inmat. et bibere vinum ex torculari (opp. vin. vet.). Schöttgen, p. 94.

C.—THE PEOPLE OF GALILEE.

The attitude of the people of Galilee towards Jesus was that of witnesses, to some extent impartial, true to nature, and directly exposed to his influence, yet standing midway between the hierarchy and the prophet John, drawn towards both, half dependent and half independent. The tide of the great spiritual agitation which accompanied the appearance of Jesus had indeed by no means begun to ebb: the close of the Galilean ministry will exhibit this in detail. Masses of the people flowed together, the enthusiasm excited by the deeds of Jesus once rose—as the controversy with the Pharisees shows—to a presentiment of his Messiahship, and Jesus himself, after the embassy of the Baptist, boasted in his address on the Baptist, that from the days of the Baptist until then the kingdom of heaven had been stormed, and that the assailants took possession of it with violence.¹ But at the same period begin also the first faint complaints of Jesus concerning his people; and out of the first irony concerning his weak ones, there is at last developed a frightful prediction of woe. In the commencement and close of the address on the Baptist—the chief subject-matter of which belongs to a later section—there is very noticeable a not exactly bitter but rather a humorous and yet dissatisfied irony against the Galilean children. When he exclaimed to the people, “What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken by the wind? But what went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings’ houses,”—he plainly not merely prepared the way by beautiful and striking figures for his description of the unique and imposing greatness of the Baptist; but in the reed shaken by the wind he saw a picture of the impulsive and fickle Galileans; and by his reference to the curiosity that delighted in gazing at aristocratic and courtly forms, he lashed the eager pursuit of the country people after material attractions and novelties, the frivolous, senseless

¹ Matt. xii. 23, xi. 12. Exposition of the latter passage, see below, Division iii.

running after and staring at the costumes and pageantry and pastimes of the court and palace at Tiberias, perhaps also at the military uniforms at Capernaum.¹ At a later period also in his parables, he similarly complained on one occasion of the worldly care of the age, on another of the deceitfulness of riches, as things that disturbed and led men to despise the preaching of the kingdom. At the close of the fore-mentioned discourse, he crowned his sorrowful irony with the comparison between his disciples and children at play in the market-place for whom no one can do right, just as, after him, Josephus experienced, who was at one time adored and at another insulted with a mocking sham burial by the Galileans. Whilst some wished to have in sport a wedding with pipe and dance, others longed to have a funeral procession with a mourning for the dead. John came mourning, neither eating nor drinking, and then men said he had a devil. Jesus came with joy and gladness, eating and drinking, and men cried that he was a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. And Wisdom was justified of her children.²

¹ Matt. xi. 7. The chief part of the discourse on the Baptist (Matt. xi.) stands also in Luke vii. 13 sqq., viz. (1) embassy of the Baptist: (2) address to the people concerning the Baptist; (3) satire upon the generation dissatisfied with both John and Jesus; then, on the other hand, (4) the condemnation of the Galilean cities stands in the missionary address to the Seventy (Luke x. 13—15); and (5) the thanksgiving for the partial harvest (Matt. xi. 25) without the closing invitation, is given on the return of the Seventy (Luke x. 21). The last two positions have no superiority over Matthew's arrangement, since the connections are artificial; but in Matthew, also, passages which have connection in fact are placed in juxtaposition. Comp. also Holtzmann, p. 143. For (1) only the Baptist's embassy and the address concerning the Baptist are really connected; (2) the satire upon the dissatisfied generation does not belong to xi. 12; (3) the condemnation of the Galilean cities has still less connection with the satire; (4) the thanksgiving does not assume the condemnation, but a breach with the Pharisees.

² Matt. xi. 16; Luke vii. 31 (where there is a false reference to Pharisees). Hilgenfeld (p. 404), in a thoroughly untenable manner, maintains that these original words are an unhistorical addition by the Evangelist from the standpoint of a later period. Josephus affords a hitherto disregarded interesting parallel concerning the Galileans. On the occasion of a very characteristic revulsion (*μεταβολή*, *Vita*, 28) of public opinion in Galilee, the inhabitants of Tiberias went through the ceremony of burying him before his own eyes. His effigy was placed on a gorgeous litter or bier, the people stood around, *ὁδῶροντό με μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ γέλωτος*. He could not refrain from laughing at the naiveté of this proceeding. *Vita*, 62.—The passage above mentioned is very variously expounded. (1) Since Chrysostom, the persistently non-responsive children

The reproaches, in the face of which Jesus comforted himself with the fluctuating opinion of his adherents, had their very serious side. They necessarily assumed infinitely greater importance as soon as the situation became decisive and critical, as soon as that ruling class, for whose nimbus the Galilean had both a keen eye and a deep reverence, assumed an attitude of open antagonism to Jesus, and thereby carried with them even those of whose adherence Jesus might until then boast. Besides, the accusations against Jesus show that the people of the land were not only—as they always were—capricious, and that they morosely and foolishly criticised, in their countryman, themselves, their own love of a joyous life, but also that they made themselves the echo of the ruling class. Glutton and wine-bibber, the friend of publicans and sinners, was the Pharisaic watchword against Jesus: the Galileans were beginning, as is proved by Jesus' utterance, to adopt this expression from the Pharisees. There was therefore already the beginning of a Pharisaic reaction, as appears also in the shrewd un-Galilean and yet Galilean saying about the wine: The old is milder!

have been readily supposed to be the Jews, and thus it was Jesus that piped and John that mourned! (2) The phrase "was justified" is very variously interpreted. Chrysostom: pronounced free from blame by the people, so that there is no charge laid against it. Schneek and Weizsäcker: mastered by the people. But the phrase never has these significations in the New Testament, particularly not in Matt., comp. xii. 37, and in Luke vii. 29, 35, it has altogether the (also in the Talmud, Schöttgen, p. 114) usual meaning. Comp. Ps. li. 4; Ecclus. xviii. 2. The children are then the adherents (Luke, falsely, the whole people, opp. Pharisees; Jerome, contrary to Matt. xi. 12, too narrowly, only the apostles) or pupils (Prov. i. 8, iv. 1; Ecclus. iv. 11) of wisdom, which is represented by Jesus (not God, Matt. xi. 25). Between this title and the Old Testament personification of God as Wisdom (comp. Luke xi. 49), there is however a great distance. There is, moreover, here a variety of readings. Tischendorf now reads Matt. xi. 19, *ἐδικ. ἡ σοφ. ἀπὸ τ. ἔργων* (instead of *τέκνων*) *αὐτῆς*, whilst he inconsistently adheres to *τέκνων* in Luke vii. 35, notwithstanding Sin. But with the exception of Sin., Vat., all the Codd., among the versions especially It., are for *τέκνων*. This is also the more difficult reading, whilst *ἔργων* is explained from Matt. xi. 2, 4; comp. Prov. viii. 22, sqq.

DIVISION II.—STRENGTHENED SELF-CONFIDENCE.

A.—THE PERSONAL SELF-CONFIDENCE OF JESUS.

Both his success and his disillusion bore proportionate fruit in the self-consciousness of Jesus. But we should make a mistake if we supposed that his conviction of his own worth and his self-reliance were the outcome of his success, and his modest self-limitation and sorrowful resignation the result of his reverses. The former was dependent first on his own personal character, and next on his success; it was further dependent also upon his reverses. We should, however, make a still greater mistake if we assumed a self-consciousness superior to all fluctuations, perpetually self-consistent and immovable as a rock in the torrent of earthly influences, a self-consciousness which would compel us altogether to deny any serious influence exercised by terrestrial things and their unrest upon the mind of Jesus, with the exception of the joy and the gloom which the undulations of the course of earthly events would cause to pass in fleeting waves across his face, or of the pedagogical advances of his preaching, which would be proportionate to the growing appreciation of his hearers.¹ This second assumption—on which the most credulous rely—is indeed easily seen to be improbable: we have only to study the personal life of Jesus among his disciples, the necessity he felt of deriving sustenance for his own life of faith and his own courage from their fellowship, the

¹ Von Hofmann, of Erlangen, in his review of my *Gesch. Chr.*, in the *Erl. Zeitschr.*, 1865, has attempted, in a manner as exemplary as it is untenable, to defend against modern research this self-consciousness of the ordinary Christology, the self-consciousness that is steadfast, assured, only slightly affected and altered by external relations, particularly by pedagogical considerations. My answer in *Prot. Kirchen-Zeit.*, 1865, No. 8.

great spiritual edification afforded him by the confession of his disciples, and the paralyzing doubt awakened by their contradiction and by their warning against the new way, the way of suffering, which he had resolved to tread. This second assumption still more completely falls to the ground when we examine the claims of the former one. Here we have, first of all, undoubtedly the encouraging influence of success. We penetrate to the inner joy of the soul of Jesus, which finds expression in emphatic words of praise and, in contradistinction to the initial reticence and refusal, in lavish gifts, when Israel believes, when the centurion has even greater faith than Israel, when the Canaanitish woman overcomes, with her humility, her perseverance, her infinite trust, every human obstacle. Here, again, we see the consolation which he derives from his circle of pious hearers in the face of the unbelief of his family, from the sympathy of the country in the face of the unbelief of Nazara, from the adhesion of the "babes" in the face of the self-sufficiency of the "wise," from the settled convictions of the members of the kingdom in the face of the questioning uncertainty of the prophet, from the understanding of his adherents and disciples in the face of the incapacity of the masses. Here, finally, in view of the actual spiritual storming of the kingdom of God, we hear the decisive word, nay the daring conclusion, concerning the end of prophecy, concerning its fulfilment in his own person; here, under the beneficent influence of the "babes" who seek and find in his presence rest of soul and release from bondage, we listen to Jesus' highest word of revelation, that of the giving of all things into his hands by the Father, and of the complete reciprocity of knowledge between him and the Father.¹ That this does not imply that Jesus always derived his influence only from himself and God and not from facts, he himself shows best by appealing to facts: he refers John to the miracles wrought upon the dead and to the gospel of the poor; the Pharisees, to the signs of the

¹ The passages are well known. Comp. Matt. xi. 13, 25.

times, the overthrow of the kingdom of the devil by his successful mighty works; the people, to the impetuous flowing of the age, or rather of the best men of the age, to the kingdom of God.¹ All these passages prove at once that the advances of his preaching were not mere pedagogic, for under the influence of facts not only did the people ripen towards him, but he also towards them and his destiny. No one, indeed, can fail to see that the communications which had the widest bearing sprang generally from exalted personal moods, and not immediately from the exalted mood or capability or understanding of the people,—that indeed they often, as the fruit of his own elevation of soul, went far beyond the comprehension of the people and of the disciples.

It is, however, impossible not to perceive that—as the above has already shown—his spirit and his conviction of his own worth were not damped, but rather animated and strengthened, by resistance. In this respect he stands in the line of the great minds whose inner faith has not been shaken, but established and matured, by storm; and though at first he was able to make very copious appeals to his success in the face of reverses, there was approaching the lonely hour at Jerusalem, when all his success was overthrown, when his party consisted of none but himself, and when in the overthrow and breaking up of all things he yet did not lose confidence in himself. Nothing is plainer than that Jesus gave expression to the greatest confessions concerning himself just at the very time when he was encompassed by contradiction, and that he did this as a direct reply to that contradiction. In answer to the question of John, he confessed himself to be the one who had come, and the one pointed to by all prophecy; in the face of the indifference of the wise, he confessed himself to be the revealer of God; he met the attack of the Pharisees by declaring himself to be greater than the temple and David, and the pioneer of the kingdom of heaven; and when the people proved unfaithful, he claimed to be superior

¹ Matt. xi. 5, xvi. 3, xii. 28, xi. 12, 19, 25.

to Solomon and Jonah, to be the highest and the last of the prophets.¹

We are far from connecting with all these facts the assertion—and early in this history the narrative of the youthful development of Jesus and his baptism supplied evidence to the contrary—that his self-consciousness was the product of them, that mere success put a stop to his modest confession of teachership, and that the heat of the struggle, the wily questions of his opponents, or their malicious disavowal of him, drew from him the increasingly lofty titles which he assumed and his growing claims.² He already had his self-consciousness when, going forth alone, he raised his first cry and with his word of command pressed his first disciples into his service; and he had it again at Jerusalem, when even Peter disdainfully repudiated him. Moreover, this self-consciousness never obtruded itself inquisitively upon the world, nor coveted recognition, nor estimated its own importance by its actively controlling influence. On the contrary, at a late as at an early period, Jesus preferred to live within himself; and he knew so little what the people thought and said of him, that he needed the eyes and ears of the disciples in order to become acquainted with a fact in which he felt an interest, but which he had never inquisitively observed.³ Finally, the great confessions also in the Galilean storm-period are not explained by regarding him merely as an adventurous calculator between success and non-success, as a hot-headed man who met contradiction by contradiction. His claims were much too definite, much too confidently made to be the mere results of the vicissitudes of external facts, much too lofty to have been suggested by the most brilliant earthly surroundings, much too profound not to have been the product of the husbandry of quite a different world, not

² Matt. xi. 1 sq., 25, xii. 3, 6, 28, 41 sq., xiii. 17. Also Weizsäcker (p. 423) has recognized this exaltation of the self-consciousness of Jesus under conflict. So also Längin, p. 98.

² Weizsäcker (*Untersuch.*, pp. 422 sqq.) has repeatedly argued on the other side.

³ Matt. xvi. 13.

to have been derived from a calm, comprehensive, observant, meditative, introspective study of the enigmas and revelations of the spiritual world. In proof of this we need merely recall his description of the inner connection binding together the Father and the Son, a description based on the profoundest and acutest self-knowledge. But admitting all this, we cannot on the other hand deny that the development of the inner genius of the personality of Jesus was instrumentally due to the external stimulus of friendly and antagonistic influences, which performed for him a service similar to that performed by the sunshine, air, and wind, for the produce of the soil, the same service in fact which the natural and religious surroundings performed for the youth of Jesus. At least, without this stimulus, he would—as one sees plainly at once—never have clearly disclosed to the world the *I* which he bore in him, but he would have timidly and modestly and anxiously retired into himself. He certainly would never have clearly and sharply realized and fashioned his own character in its full distinctiveness; he would have imprisoned and smothered it in embryo within himself, as an undeveloped existence, if the friction of the world, the intercourse with others, had not acted upon and shaped him, whilst he was shaping, and that he might shape, himself and the world with whose possessions and wants, with whose desires, susceptibilities, and opinions, with whose sympathy, sense of satisfied longing, and edification through himself and his work, experience made him acquainted.

The most important advance made in the self-consciousness of Jesus at this period lay in his just then dawning faith in the actual commencement of the kingdom of God, and at the same time in his clear understanding of the nature of his Messiahship, and in his conscious and more unreserved disclosure of his Messiahship. What inner gain he had won in these great questions lies before us in his sayings and doings among friends and foes—which will elsewhere come afresh under our notice from other points of view—as a confession, an independent exhibition and treatment of which, apart from the restless hurrying current of

his active ministry, must be permitted on account of the decisive position of this self-consciousness.

We recollect that Jesus' preaching of the kingdom had cautiously commenced in the anticipatory and hopeful Johannine future tense. The messenger of the kingdom had spoken of the impending dispensation of God as if he were its harbinger; the Lord of the kingdom had spoken as if he were a servant; he had called his people to prepare themselves, and had projected the beatitudes into the future. When he began, there stood nothing ready; nothing existed which announced and justified itself before the eyes of faith or of unbelief, no community of the kingdom, no disciples nor adherents—whom he had first to gather together—no spirit of repentance, no good works to the glory of God, no great deed of the Master himself who still veiled both his character and his name. As soon, however, as he opened his mouth or moved his hand, he overstepped his self-appointed limitations; he drew the just and the unjust to himself; he aroused the publicans and sinners; he taught righteousness; he turned men from wickedness and evil; and, what was more important than all else, he made known the Father, and imparted sonship and freedom from anxiety, and from the yoke of a difficult and frivolous system of ordinances; and those whom he healed, delivered, and edified, were to themselves and the world the announcement of a new era of physical and moral salvation, of present blessedness, the present kingdom of the earth, the palingenesis, the new-birth of the world. Thus came of itself the point of time when, with the logic of facts as well as with the logic of logic, and by the aid of a passage from the book of Daniel, he proved to the Pharisees the actual advent of the kingdom of God: "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom come suddenly to you;" the time when he no longer pronounced the disciples blessed because of what they should see and receive at a future date in the kingdom of God, but when he could say, "Blessed are your eyes that they see, and your ears that they hear; verily, I say unto you that many

prophets and righteous men have earnestly desired to see what you see, and have not seen it, and to hear what you hear and have not heard it!" And to the Pharisees he said, "The kingdom is in your midst;" and he cried to all, "Blessed are they that hear the word and do it."¹ The blessedness-imparting things, therefore, no longer lay in heaven or in the womb of a future which should bring heaven to earth: they were already come to the earth. The pearl, the treasure, lay on the ground, and was seized with joy; the seed of the word brought forth fruit a hundred-fold; the mustard-seed of the kingdom was growing; the fishing was being carried on; the marriage-feast had begun, and some had gone into it to their joy, while others had short-sightedly excluded themselves from what was best.²

This bold conception of the presence of the kingdom of God was something more than merely an alteration of phraseology and mode of speaking: it was the greatest possible spiritual act, and it was the greatest possible deed of heroism. It was the one, because the proclamation of the presence of the kingdom exhibited the well-nigh complete deliverance of the mind of Jesus from the material figures of splendour which the New Testament exhibits side by side with the moral, and which so powerfully affected both the heart and the imagination of the whole nation and its leaders, that no one had had the courage to initiate the happy era whose greatness was so much above human thought and ability: here Jesus, putting the seal to his first Messianic faith, estimated the kingdom of the Spirit which he established as greater than all the glory of the world, as great enough to deserve the proud name of the manifested kingdom of heaven. It was the other, because the proclamation of the pre-

¹ ἔφθασε, Matt. xii. 28 sq.; Dan. vii. 22 (comp. 13), ὁ καιρὸς ἔφθασε (simna methab) κ. βασιλείαν κατέσχον οἱ ἄγιοι. Of the non-perception of the stages in the development of Jesus, by both conservatives and radicals, notice has been taken in Vol. III. p. 41, note 4. Also Schenkel, Hausrath, Längin, Weiffenbach, Wittichen, regard the kingdom as having come, from the beginning. On the other hand, Holtz (*Gesch. J.* p. 409) and Beyschlag (p. 52) agree with the text. Weizs. p. 411. Colani, pp. 94 sq. Matt. xiii. 16, 17; Luke xvii. 21, xi. 28.

² Matt. xiii. 1 sq., ix. 15.

sence of the kingdom did not take into account the obstacles which not merely the material but also the spiritual world just at that time visibly and forcibly placed in his way, in the menacing animosity of system, in the unreliableness of the people, in the lukewarmness of the Baptist himself: here Jesus, as a hero, was conscious of being stronger in himself and in his achievements than all his opponents, and, in the light of his renovation despising the false shadows of an old sinking world, he cried out, The kingdom is here! A child of God, he awaited with faith the coming of the one and the spontaneous dissolution of the other; the earthly Old Testament accessory might still be realized without prejudice to the existence of the spiritual fundamental facts, the resistance of the enemies might cease or might be suppressed by God. Thus he was in a position to meet the sceptical, cold, derisive question of the Pharisees, "When comes the kingdom of God?" with the calm answer, "The kingdom of God comes not with the observation of material things; nor shall men say, Lo here! lo there! For behold, the kingdom of God is in your midst."¹

J If the kingdom was there, then must the Messiah also have been present, since, for Jesus as well as for the Old Testament and the popular view, both conceptions lay inseparably together. The novelty was, not that Jesus now perceived himself to be the Messiah—this perception had marked the commencement of his ministry; but that he clearly saw the nature and extent of his Messiahship, and that he more and more openly confessed this Messiahship before the world—this was a sign that his great faith had strengthened and ripened to the definite conclusion.² In fact, not only had the enigmatical name of the Son of Man been made increasingly rich in signification by Jesus' designation of him as the Lord of the Sabbath, as the one who was authorized to forgive sin and even to sit as judge at the head of ministering angels, as the one who was higher than John and less than the Holy Spirit, but the effectual instrument of the Spirit, and with-

¹ Luke xvii. 21.

² *Comp.* Vol. III. p. 78, note 2; *Son of Man; ib.* p. 79.

out qualification as the bringer and lord of the kingdom of God. He had even advanced beyond the enigmatical name, by calling himself the coming one, the bridegroom, the desire of the Old Testament, and therefore of equal authority with David, and superior to Solomon the wise, or to Jonah the prophet of repentance; and he did this in the presence of the Pharisees, of the people, and in his intimate intercourse with the disciples, so that in truth he withheld from his hearers only the ultimate word, the definitive title of Messiah or Christ which was really implied in all his figures and paraphrases.¹ Under such circumstances, expectation was no longer intently directed towards the future when the long-withheld word should finally break forth from his own mouth or from the mouths of his disciples, since it was in truth already present, was not like a helpless thing in need of being set free by a stronger. Expectation was rather directed chiefly to the great decisive question, in what sense he considered himself the Messiah, the coming one, the bridegroom, or whatever he may be called; in what sense he raised his high claim of rights and superiority to the Old Testament and to the men of the Old Testament. The explanation nearest at hand is here the simplest, viz., that he was in a position to claim every superiority to prophets and kings, and every divine privilege merely as the Messiah, as the fulfiller of prophecy, as the God-appointed bringer of the fulness of time for Israel's prosperity, whatever might be its characteristic; and accordingly all those expressions would appear to be merely variations upon the one theme, "I am the Messiah of Israel," carried beyond the figures of Judaism either by himself or—according to radical criticism—by the later community.² In the first place, these self-given titles

¹ Matt. xii. 8, ix. 6, xiii. 41, xi. 11, 13, xiii. 31. Ibid. xi. 3, ix. 15, xi. 13, xiii. 17, xii. 3, 41 sq.

² It is interesting to find that Judaism itself had similar representations of the Messiah, yet not exactly these in substance, form, and number. *Elatior Abrahamo et excelsior Mose, nam major est patribus. Abr. sedebit ad sinistram Dei, Mess. ad dextram. M. sublimior est angelis ministerii. Major erit toto mundo.* Bertholdt, pp. 100—103. Renan thinks that Jesus was vain, carried away by the admiration of the disciples; he knew also that the world needed legends, and was willing to be deceived.

would certainly be offensive to us if they were merely conclusions, in part trifling and in part self-gratifying legal deductions, from a popular official title, and not rather derived from the consciousness of a personal and intrinsic peculiarity, capability, and elevation. In the second place, we know that he took hold of the name of Messiah as the name inseparable from the kingdom of God, not in the traditional but in a new signification; and that he had found this name and this signification through the contemplation of his own character. Fortunately we are in a position to discover what he, exactly at this decisive period, understood his Messiahship to be, and especially what was his view of his own person which he was able to regard as the bearer of the Messiahship.

In two Gospels, Matthew and Luke, nay—if we refer back the divergent readings of the early Church to their proper sources—in others also, chiefly in the Gospel of the Hebrews, there is preserved to us the precious reminiscence of a sacred hour of Jesus, an hour of earnest and sorrowful deliberation with himself concerning his success and his non-success, but also of lofty and solemn avowal of his vocation, issuing in the resolve to prosecute a new and joyous ministry—nay, in the immediate, vigorous, and perhaps yet more cordially tender and warm, prosecution of this ministry. We see at once, however, that the narrators are somewhat uncertain as to the source of this pearl of the sayings of Jesus, as to its place and time and auditors, even as to the extent of its meaning and the actual words of Jesus; and Matthew has done well to leave the place and time and auditors a little more indefinite than Luke, who represents the confession to have been spoken after the return of the mythical so-called seventy disciples and in the presence of those favoured ones.¹ Certainly, neither of these two Evangelists has

¹ Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21. The auditors are in Luke x. 22 most probably the Seventy, but in verse 23 the Twelve. We see, indeed, tentative uncertainty in the words themselves. Matt. xi. 28—30 has nothing corresponding to it in Luke. Instead of it, the passage Matt. xiii. 16 sq. is interpolated in Luke x. 23 sq., as if for the purpose of collecting all the sublimest passages in the neighbourhood of the Seventy.

found exactly the most fitting place for the confession. What is important, however, is, that they have correctly made it to belong to the later Galilean period ; still more, that the confession itself, by its contents, indicates its time and place ; and finally, that its differences of statement and of language are altogether of secondary importance.

The introduction to Jesus' speech renders it perfectly plain that he is taking a retrospect over a protracted experience, and that that experience is compounded of the two antitheses : the spiritual rulers of the nation, the Scribes and the Pharisees, have rejected him, while the unlearned and child-like people, in their simplicity and good-nature, have understood and accepted him.¹ These facts bring us necessarily to the height of his Galilean period ; but Jesus' great confession is connected on the one hand with these general facts, and on the other with a particular date on which he was gratified even to strong emotion and compensated for the hard-heartedness of the leaders by the thronging to him of the believing people or of the wider circle of disciples. That date itself—presenting a situation similar to that in which Jesus contrasted his frigid blood-relations with his ardently devoted disciples—cannot be restored for us ; and moderns, with as little skill as that displayed by Matthew in connecting Jesus' confession with his reprimand of the Galilean people, or by Luke in connecting it with the return of the Seventy exercising disciples, have supposed it to have been uttered after the return of the Twelve from their missionary journey. But this is impossible, because Jesus certainly did not restrict the application of the term “babes” to the Twelve, and because the “babes” whom the Twelve had converted were not the objects

The Gospel of the Hebrews, see below, p. 57. Irenæus, *Hær.* 4, 6, 1, thought he could show the passage in all the Synoptics (οὐρ. John). In John, similar passages are, viii. 19, x. 15, 30, xiv. 9, xvi. 15. Clem. *Hom.* 18, 13, interesting on the passage : ὁ λόγος οὗτος μυρίας ἔχων ἐκδοχάς.

¹ Very good, Clem. *Hom.* 8, 6 : ἐκρυψας ἀπὸ σοφῶν περισβυτέρων, ἀπεκαλ. νηπι. θηλάζουσι ; perhaps in allusion to Ecclesiasticus vi. 22, 34. The νήπιτοι, see on Matt. xviii. 2 sqq. The saying is certainly later referred also to the Gentile Christians. Clem. *Hom.* 8, 6 ; 18, 13—17. Also Just. *Ap.* i. 63. Similarly now also Hilg. p. 406.

of such a warmly-felt experience of his own; to say nothing of the fact that the ministrations of the Twelve were much too unimportant, and were assuredly not distinguished by futile labour bestowed on the Scribes.¹ But we will leave the immediate occasion, which we cannot recover and which is a matter of indifference; we will fix our attention upon the utterance that Jesus bases upon his experience.

“With praise I confess to Thee”—thus he commences his prayer, surrounded by his company of adherents, as is plainly seen at the close—“I praise and worship thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden this from men wise and of understanding, and hast revealed it unto babes, yea, O Father, that so it has been well-pleasing unto Thee.”² Thus relinquishing his own first thoughts and attempts, he submits to the fact that had become incontestable; he accepts the fact not merely from the world, but from the Almighty God who, as the One high above the power of his own working, has thus brought it about, who has withheld the knowledge of the kingdom of God and of its proclaimer from the wise, and has bestowed it upon babes; and he accepts this fact from God with resignation and yet with praise and thankfulness, because he sees the wisdom of God in the abasement of haughtiness and the elevation of humility, and the grace of God in giving him a harvest, and that among the humble. From prayer he passes to a confession before his disciples, from resignation to the proud consciousness that he is recognized by the humble as leader of salvation, while by the wise he is short-sightedly disdained. Thus are these words of dignified self-consciousness a consequence of the fact, and they are besides its justification, since they explain the enigma; at

¹ Comp. as to the futile search for the situation (return of the Seventy, Lücke, Bl., Ebr.; of the Twelve, Ew., Mey., Weiff; of the Seventy or Twelve, Strauss), Meyer on Matt. xi. 25. Schenkel (p. 166) thinks of the departure for Judea. The supposition that the passage could not stand before Matt. xvi. 16, is merely plausible. Comp. above, pp. 52 sq.

² The Marcossii read the future in Irenæus, 1, 20, 3, (*εξομολογήσω*, also other small differences, particularly *οὐὰ, ὁ π. μου, ὅτι ἐμπρ. σου ἐνδ. μοι ἐγεν.*). Clem. Hom. 8, 6: *ἀπὸ σοφῶν προσβετ.—νηπίοις θηλάζουσι* (this also xviii. 15).

the same time they themselves issue in humility, for all that he is and has, what he reaps and what he does not reap, is from the Father. "Everything has been given to me of my Father. And no one *has known* the *Father* except the *Son*, nor the *Son* except the *Father* and he to whom *He* reveals it." Thus must the utterance of Jesus—often quoted but often spoiled by addition—have originally sounded. The present prevailing reading of our Gospels, "No one perfectly *knows* the *Son* except the *Father*, nor does any one perfectly know the *Father* except the *Son*, and he to whom the *Son* is willing to reveal it," is the farthest possible from originality; it boldly gives an artificial glorification of Jesus, ascribing to him the position of the one revealer, of a supra-temporal presence—in fact, the prior position in his relation to God, and it does this in contradiction to all that Jesus had said generally as well as in this connection. But, in opposition to these Gospels, the construction of the passage, "No one *has known* the *Father* except the *Son*, nor the *Son* except the *Father*, and he to whom the *Son* reveals it," is very strongly attested as early as the middle of the second century, and thence downwards to the Church Fathers of the fifth.¹ This reading is in itself to be preferred to that of our Gospels, because the latter first obtained currency at the end of the second century to the special honour of Jesus, and to the diminution of the bitter persecutions of the Gnostics on account of their teaching that

¹ See particularly Semisch, *Die apost. Denkwürd des Märtyr. Justinus*, 1848, pp. 364—370. Hilg. *Krit. Untersuch.* p. 201; *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 215; *Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 407. Also Anger, *Synopsis*, 1st ed. 1852, pp. 136 sqq. 273. *Just. Ap.* 1, 63; *Tryph.* 100. *Clem. Hom.* 17, 4; 18, 4, 11, 13 (bis), 20; *Rec.* 2, 47. Marcion, *Marcosii*, in *Irenæus*, 1, 20, 3; *Irenæus* himself, ii. 6, 1, iv. 6, 1—7. *Tert. Con. Marc.* 2, 27; 4, 25. *Clem. Strom.* 7, 18, 109; *Quis dives* c. 8. Later writers down to Epiphanius in Semisch. The chief difference is that the other reading (1) has the aorist (*ἔγνω*, *novit*) instead of the present; (2) places the knowledge of God by the Son first in order; (3) smaller differences are, (a) *ὡς οὐδέ τῶν υἱῶν τις οἶδε* (*Clem. l.c.*), (b) the conclusion, *οἷς ἂν βούληται* (*Clem.*), or *οἷς ἂν—ἀποκαλύψῃ* (*Just.*), or *ᾧ ἂν—ἄ.* (*Marcosii*, *Clem.*). The compound *ἐπιγινῶ*, rare, *Clem. Quis dives* c. 8. In Luke, the simple form is established. Infinite confusion as early as in Justin, *Irenæus*, Tertullian, particularly the present tense in Justin (*Tryph.*), as well as the aorist (*Ap.*), and the censure of the Gnostics by *Irenæus* (iv. 6, 1), whilst he himself reads the same in ii. 6, 1. Tertullian censures the Gnostics for the use of the present (*Con. Marc.* 4, 25).

the true God had remained unknown until the time of Jesus, and consequently throughout the whole of ancient Jewish history.¹ But not even this reading is quite genuine. For since Jesus at the outset taught that the knowledge of himself by men was altogether dependent upon the revelation of God, since he also continually spoke of revelations of God and not of his own revelations, since, moreover, the proposition that God alone knew the Son naturally carried with it the further proposition that He, God, and not the Son, revealed the Son, therefore the original though weakly attested utterance must have been: No one has known the Father except the Son, and no one has known the Son except the Father, and he to whom He (the Father) is willing to reveal him. And the introduction of the revelation by the Son is the result of the same glorification to which the other alterations owe their origin.²

¹ The present tense of our text is found, indeed, as early as Justin, *Tryph.* 100, Clem. A. bis; but the prior position of the knowledge of the Son by the Father is not found until *Rec.* 2, 47, and Irenæus, 4, 6, 1. The inferences drawn from the aorist by the heretics, that therefore historically and universally God had not been known before Jesus, Clem. *Hom.* 17, 4; 18, 4, 13; *Rec.* 2, 47; Irenæus, 1, 20, 3; 4, 6, 1 (indeed, essentially thus already in Just. *Ap.* 1, 63, and even in Irenæus). The aorist is then artificially interpreted, Clem. *Hom.* 18, 13. Indeed, Tertullian (*Con. Marc.* 4, 25) represents the Gnostics as drawing false conclusions also from the present tense. At any rate, the present tense more completely shut out those conclusions, and at the same time gave the knowledge of Jesus an absolute position, and both of these results were in like manner facilitated by placing first the knowledge of the Son by the Father. The nearer approach to originality of the ancient reading has been held probable, not only by Hilgenfeld, Zeller, and others, but also by Semisch and Meyer. On the contrary, Weizsäcker, p. 433.

² It must be admitted that this had almost as entirely disappeared among the Gnostics (see above) as in the Church, in the earlier as in the later form. But, in view of the effort to glorify the Son, and of the interest both of the Church and of the Gnostics to make the advent and the revelation of the new true knowledge coincide with the appearance of the Son, the alteration is very intelligible; chiefly so in the existing though only supplementary post-position of the knowledge of the Father by the Son, whereby the Son (instead of the Father) forms the natural subject of the sentence. Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, found the formula not quite correct, the Father, who in the context is placed in the foreground, and who elsewhere—Matt. xi. 25, xiii. 11, xiv. 17, xix. 11, 26—is always the revealing and imparting subject, being depreciated. Faint traces of the original in *Hom.* 18, 20 (no addition concerning the revealer). Irenæus, 4, 6, 5: *filium revelavit pater*, in Stieren contrasted with the Vulg.: *f. rev. patrem*; Epiph. thrice merely *ἀποκαλύψῃ* without *ὑῶς*, Semisch, p. 370. Finally, we need only

For the rest, let us take what attitude we may towards this minor controverted point, the glory of Jesus, and an important testimony and self-evidence as to his general position is to be found in all the forms, even in the simplest and most modest which we lay hold of. Everything is given over to him by his Father, i.e. by the God whom he here for the first time calls his Father in a peculiar sense, thereby distinguishing between himself and all other men. The things given over to him are in the first place those "babes," the nucleus of the nation, to whom the Father has shown the Son; but also all the Messianic rights among men, rights which the faith of the people legalizes, and which the unbelief of the wise does not suppress. But what are they in detail—these still so obscure and intangible Messianic rights? He answers this question in what follows: "No one has known the Father but the Son, and the Son but the Father, and he to whom He reveals it." His right, his privilege, his peculiarity, lies chiefly in the knowledge of the Father for the first time perfected through him, in his being known through the Father, and in his becoming known through the men whom the Father gives to him by giving to them the knowledge of the Son. It is, briefly expressed, the advocacy and representation of the highest spiritual truths, as the exclusive communicator of which he, the revealer and the revealed at once, is appointed for a believing and obedient human world.¹ In this weighty sentence lie three important declarations. He is the first and the only one who through himself and through God has attained to the knowledge of God the Father, which no

see the earlier form of the text in Clem. *Hom.* 17, 4; 18, 4, &c. (in contrast with the smoother form of the present text, *Rec.* 2, 47, and Clem. Alex. *I.c.*), in order to perceive the interpolation of the revelation of the Son.

¹ It is a mistake to understand the giving over of everything in the sense of Matt. xxviii. 18; comp. Gen. ix. 2, Dan. ii. 38, vii. 14 (thus Meyer, Hilgenfeld). Not only is, in Matt. xxviii., the concrete subject-matter—which there appears at first undefined—definitely indicated; but the undefined subject-matter of the first, i.e. our passage, receives its definition from the explication which follows in verse 27. Comp. Baur, *N. T. Th.* p. 113; Schenkel, pp. 167, 389.

Abraham, no Moses, no David and Solomon, no Isaiah and Daniel—to say nothing of the wisdom of the wise of that day—had found. In the second place, just as he knows God, God on the other hand knows him; he knows God as Father, as Father of men, and yet more as his own Father, and God knows him as Son, as Son among many, and yet more as the One among many; and exclusively related to each other, each being to the other a holy, unveiled secret, worth knowing and discovered by effort, they mutually approach with love in order to discover and to enjoy one another in the self-satisfaction of the enjoyment which is based upon the similarity of spiritual activity, upon the likeness of essence, of nature.¹ In the third place, this self-enclosed world of the Father and the Son opens itself to the lower world, to men, only by its own free act, because it wills to open itself and to admit to companionship whom it will. And because, after all, the Father is greater than the Son, though the Son speaks upon earth to the ears of men, it is really not the Son but the Father who is the decisive revealer, pointing out to the minds and hearts of men the Son, and, in the Son, himself, admitting the babes and excluding the wise and men of understanding. With uncommon beauty, with profound sublimity and skilfully based on the context, there follows the confession, the benediction, more correctly given by Luke than by Matthew, of the eyes and of the ears which see and hear what prophets and righteous men had not seen and heard; and finally, preserved only by Matthew, Jesus's new cordial invitation addressed to his flock of disciples, by whom he hastens to complete, in the name of God who blesses the words of his mouth and the first impulses of the heart, the successes he had been pausing to contemplate. "Come to me," he cries, in utterances which bear the impress of the Old Testament, "all ye weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find

¹ Comp. Ps. i. 6, cxxxix. 1; Gal. iv. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 19.

rest to your souls: for my yoke is easy and my burden is light.”¹ The weary, the heavy laden, whom he calls to himself, are those very “babes” upon whom the Scribes laid so many and such heavy burdens, that there was indeed weariness enough, but no rest. In the place of the Scribes, he promises an easy yoke, and a burden which will bring rest to the soul.² This burden, this yoke, seems to have little connection with the subject-matter of his confession; yet it is not as if he required, in addition to the knowledge of the Father, something essentially new, an action and a performance in specific external works of the hands. That knowledge itself, with all it implies and involves, is an easy and sweet burden, one which as such gives rest and leads to that voluntary doing of the will of God, to those deeds of glorification of God, of which the Sermon on the Mount had already spoken, to the service of the love of God and of our neighbour, the service which comes from the heart and is not merely an affair of the hands, the service which gives peace to the heart because it meets the requirements of God and of itself. In the consciousness that everything is given over to him, Jesus urgently invites all the weary to partake of the new rest; and fearing lest men might be

¹ The benediction of the eyes stands much more appropriately in Luke x. 23, than in Matt. xiii. 16 (in the parables, which see). Otherwise Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 4th ed. Vol. I. p. 620. The absence of the passage of the light yoke (comp. also 1 John v. 3) from Luke x. 22, is easily explicable from the special purpose of the writer to give a cordial recognition to the performances of the Seventy Apostles (opp. Matt. xi. 28). The Old Testament passages, Isaiah xiv. 3, xxviii. 12, lv. 1 sqq.; Jeremiah vi. 16, xxxi. 2, 25; Proverbs ii. 1, iv. 20, v. 1, 12; Eccelus. vi. 22 sqq., xxiv. 21 sqq., li. 1, 10 sqq., 17, 23—27, are similar. Yoke, Hosea xi. 4; Lam. iii. 27. Very often among the Rabbis: *suscipere in se jugum regni cœlorum*, Schöttgen, p. 115. Strauss (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. II. p. 66) has pointed to Eccelus. li. (previously in *Zeitschrift f. Wiss. Theol.* 1863, p. 92); comp. Hilg. 1867, p. 408. He has not adduced the other passages in Ecclesiasticus, though Eccelus. vi. 22, 24, 28 sq., 34, offer the same parallel. But however carefully we search here for minute resemblances, and though we might explain the whole section out of Ecclesiasticus (wisdom, Eccelus. xi. 24; wisdom hidden, verse 25 and vi. 22, Job. xxviii. 21; knowledge, Eccelus. vi. 27, li. 17; yoke and rest, ib. vi. and li.), yet not only is the subject-matter of chapter xi. much too independent and original, but even the form is almost everywhere so independent (comp. also Matt. xii. 43, xxiii. 4), that nothing more is to be assumed than a slight reminiscence by the author.

² Matt. xxiii. 4. Clem. *Hom.* 3, 52, κοπιῶντες = ἀλήθ. ζητοῦντες κ. μὴ εἶρησκ.

deterred by his exalted character, he draws attention more affectionately than ever to his genuine humanity: "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart."

This passage, then, more than any other, is the interpreter of the Messianic conception of Jesus. To express its meaning in the simplest way possible, we should say that here he has made his Messiahship consist in his world-historical spiritual achievement, in the communication to mankind of the highest knowledge of God and the perfect and blessed life in God. If we glance backwards, we see that in fact the central point of his preaching concerning the kingdom, the point to which he both in teaching and in controversy again and again returned, was the paternal God and the ordinance-less law of the heart and of morality. What is new is the bringing both together in one formula, as indeed both actually proceeded from one individual spirit and spiritual trait; the finding in this one achievement his whole peculiarity, significance, and greatness, and finally the justification and essence of his Messiahship. We now know what his desire is when he calls himself the Messiah. We knew before that, in all his preaching concerning the kingdom, he was aiming at making men spiritually blessed; but he now gives his clear and certain word that in full consciousness he sought here his field, and that he sought this very field in the name of Messiah; that, therefore, he regarded everything else which in any way he reckoned as belonging to the Messianic conception—whether it was rulership in the nation, the regeneration or the judgment of the world, healing or miraculous power, to which he himself appealed—as a secondary matter in view of the principal fact that he led mankind to the knowledge of and communion with God. At the same time he thereby places us in the happy position in which we may do him homage without reserve. We can now not merely understand how he could seize an office with all the assumptions involved in it, because the historical circumstances, the imagination and expectation of his nation, placed in his hands a title which then represented the complete ideal of

Israel, though it has now lost its meaning and importance; but we can to-day still give him our assent, and even apply to him the name of Messiah, because in that Jewish name he sought, and actually realized, the sublimest and truest ideal among men, one which abides for ever, the knowledge of God and the life in God after which we still thirst and upon which we still feed: for to-day and to-morrow and for ever we know nothing better than that God is our Father, and that the Father is the rest of our souls. So must every one say who does but admit the general fact that Jesus really brought a higher and more satisfying religion, our religion, into the world. It is this fact, moreover, which makes intelligible a circumstance we have hitherto passed over, namely, that in the classical passage of his confession he has given to his actual achievement for mankind a personal expression, an expression which was destined to appear to many to-day so mysteriously and pretentiously superhuman, that their agitation can be allayed by nothing short of the denial of the genuineness of the utterance, and its explanation as due to the Johannine longing for a deified Christ, whose first indications they have sought for here.¹ By the defenders of the fourth Gospel, this assumed visible similarity between the utterance of the synoptical Christ and the Johannine expressions, is of course appropriately used to demonstrate the harmony of the Gospels on the basis of the fourth, and the actual divinity of Jesus, a divinity which even the opponents themselves admit against their will by their avoidance of the earliest testimony.² There is no more violent criticism than that which, since Baur's time, Strauss has introduced,—the repudiation of a passage which, as

¹ Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 274 sq. Also Hilg., 1867, pp. 406 sqq., now ascribes to the second hand this passage, anti-Jewish, and at the same time speaking of Messianic omnipotence. Instead of any elegy or artistic exaltation, the (probably apocryphal) sentence of the Gospel of the Hebrews originally stood: ὁ θανάσιμος βασιλεύσει καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται. Certainly there now comes somewhere the assertion that it is all artificially constructed out of Ecclesiasticus.

² The defenders of the fourth Gospel (Bleek, I. p. 467) all appeal to this passage as of equal authority with the Johannine views; and Strauss agrees with them, since he finds John x. 15, xvii. 6, 10, similar.

the culminating point of Jesus' description of himself, does not so easily adapt itself to the level of humanity as do others. The profundity of the passage, the similarity of other passages, the recognition of a justifiable egoism in the creator of a new religion, and finally a little more diligence in interpretation, ought to have prevented this violence, which springs from the wish to lop away from the sublime spirit that dwelt among us the pinions of his divine-human consciousness.¹ From this standpoint we must ultimately find it intelligible that Jesus claimed the having known God as a characteristic peculiar to himself: but is not, then, the exclusive becoming-known of the Son through the Father, merely the reverse side of this, and in itself also intelligible and equally legitimate? To the man who for the first time since the creation penetrated into the nature of God, there must have belonged a dignity much greater than that human dignity which he himself was the first to announce to all, a dignity that challenged, not equality of rights, but recognition, even on the part of God. And this man, who, little among men, pointed out to humanity its destiny and the divinity of its nature, must have had a character which to God himself presented an interest, opened up a problem, exhibited a relationship, and by everything belonging to him, even by the strong contrast between his inner and outer existence, won from God love and sympathy and help, so that God bowed himself to his person, to his prayer, to his undertaking, and, to the men who understood his lowness but did not understand his loftiness, revealed him in those hearts that should acknowledge him as God acknowledged him. Does

¹ I have already (in *Gesch. Chr.* p. 107) pointed out that Strauss has not questioned the very similar passage in Matt. xvi. 17, which represents the knowledge that Jesus is the Messiah as derived from divine revelation. By the removal of the "revelation of the Son," the mysteriousness of the passage is plainly still more diminished, and the subordination of Jesus—notwithstanding all his high dignity—placed in such a light as even to satisfy Strauss. Formerly Strauss (4th ed. I. p. 620) raised no opposition, and Baur (*N. T. Th.* p. 113) accepted the passage as genuine and weighty. Also Weizs. (p. 432), Schenkel (p. 167), Holtzm. (*Gesch. Isr.* p. 432), defend it. The good A. Schweizer (*Doqm.* 2, 84): great utterances intelligible in the light of a central individuality.

there still remain here an obscure mystery, if we follow the traces of the historical facts? No; in this regal confession of Jesus, we discover a character sublime, it is true, and godlike, but not divine in the sense of the fourth Gospel; on the contrary, a genuinely human character. Where the divine and the human are to be united in peace and friendship, it is not necessary to disturb, instead of strengthening, the alliance of hearts by the descent of a divine man; but there needs only the upward striving of a godlike man—such as is seen here in the joyous utterance of Jesus—whose knowledge of and friendship with God, and whose endowment with his right to everything and to all mankind rests quite plainly, not upon heavenly citizenship, but upon earthly-human achievements, upon the cry of a man who in the limitations of his existence and action has discovered himself to be the creature, the ward and protégé of God, and yet with as much pride as happiness announces himself as the Wise Man in comparison with Solomon—nay, as Wisdom present among men: “I have known the Father, and the Father has known me!”¹

This sublime utterance of Jesus, into which he threw all his self-consciousness concerning his Messianic work and person, is accompanied by a series of less emphatic intimations of a similar character, but which do not exactly repeat the weight and dignity of the confession that, according to his nature, was the solemn expression of a sublime moment in his life, and of a festive mood and excitement which not all the reticence which he usually exercised could conceal. It was in this later period that Jesus relatively with the greatest frequency explicitly or implicitly designated himself the Son, a name which has just been mentioned in the great confession. In the Galilean period, we meet with the express mention of the name Son, or Son of God, only—to say nothing of the demoniacs—in the mouth of the disciples,

¹ Beyschlag (*Christol.* 1866, p. 60) draws too great conclusions from the passage. Jesus evidently bore the title of “Wise,” indeed of “Wisdom,” Matt. xi. 19, 26, xii. 42. The artificial introduction of the Old Testament idea of Wisdom or of the Logos is not to be thought of (except perhaps in Luke xi. 49). Comp. above, p. 44, note.

with whose confession of the Son of God Jesus was well pleased ; whilst the most important of such utterances by Jesus himself were at Jerusalem. On the other hand, there repeatedly occurs in his mouth, while in Galilee, the exclusive appropriation of God as *his* Father, whereby he mediately declares himself to be the Son.¹ "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted out. The guardian angels of children always behold the face of my Father in the heavens. Only he who does the will of my Father in the heavens, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, is my mother, is my brother. Whosoever confesses me before men, him will I confess before my Father in the heavens. Neither will my heavenly Father forgive ye, if ye do not forgive your brother."² What is peculiar is, that the name Son, and Sons of God, which Jesus previously, especially in the Sermon on the Mount, attributed to the pious generally, now rarely stands in this comprehensive sense. He uses the name for himself alone in passages where it might easily be used to designate, not himself, but others, and to mark their filial relationship to the Father. And finally, in utterances exactly corresponding to those in which he formerly said "your Father," he now puts "my Father."³ Unless it be assumed that all this is only the accidental consequence of the defective representation of our documents, it must be admitted that this remarkable alteration is in harmony with Jesus' more unreserved and heightened self-designation, and also with the intensified Messianic self-consciousness which we otherwise abundantly meet with in this later period. Accordingly this new self-designation appears to be a kind of explanatory substitute for the obscurer

¹ Demoniaes (or Satan himself), Matt. iv. 3, 6, viii. 29 ; Luke iv. 3, 9, 41, viii. 28 ; Mark iii. 11, v. 7. Disciples, Matt. xiv. 33, xvi. 16. Jesus' utterances in Galilee, xvii. 26 (sons); in Jerusalem, xxi. 37 (Luke xx. 13, *ὁ ἀγαπῶν*; Mark xii. 6, *ἐγὼ ὁ ἀ.*), xxii. 42, xxiv. 36 (Mark xiii. 32), xxvi. 63 sq., xxvii. 43.

² Matt. xv. 13, xviii. 10, vii. 21, xii. 49, xviii. 35, x. 32 (xx. 23).

³ Comp. especially Matt. vi. 14 sq. and xviii. 35. Certainly "your Father" occurs again and again at a later period as the generally used communicative term, Matt. x. 20, xvii. 25, xviii. 14, xxiii. 9. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 41.

expression Son of Man, which he was formerly wont to use, though it can be shown that he never gave up the use of this significant favourite name to the end of his career.¹

As to the meaning and bearing of the new use of the term Son of God, he has not left us in any doubt.² It has been customary to regard the names Son of Man and Son of God as antithetical; and the manifold significations borne by the name Son of God in the Old and New Testaments have been often discussed. But in both cases, men have gone too far. It may, indeed, be correct that the two designations give expression according to their respective meanings to two distinct sides of the nature of Jesus and of his Messiahship, his attitude towards men and his attitude towards God. In point of fact, however, the Son of Man was always the chosen of God, and the Son of God remained a human being, to whose nobility it belonged to be godlike and yet a man.³ It may also be quite correct that the divine Sonship is ascribed in the Scriptures sometimes to man generally, sometimes to the pious, sometimes to the people of God, sometimes to their kings, sometimes to the Messiah, sometimes—passing beyond the earthly—to the angels and similar beings; and further that this relationship has sometimes a physical or metaphysical, sometimes a theocratical, sometimes an ethical, signification, although in the end everything is referable to two significations—a relationship which carries with it the protection and guardianship of God, the Creator and Governor, and an affinity of nature. In the case of Jesus, however, it is never to be doubted that, in the great variety of opportunities which the Old Testament phraseology gave him of employing this term, he preferably seized upon the profoundest though never fully developed fundamental signification of it, the divine relationship of human nature; and that particularly in the appro-

¹ See above, Vol. III. pp. 79, 90.

² Schleusner, *viŕg* (Grimm, p. 435); Neander, p. 115; Schmid, p. 156; Baur, p. 113; Beyschlag, p. 40; Schweizer, p. 107.

³ Schl. p. 293: *ŕ. ŕ.* specific distinction from, *ŕ. ŕ.* equality with, men.

priation of the name to his own person, he was principally guided by the perception—never belied even when his own position became more exalted—which had disclosed to him the children of God in the pious, in those whose hearts were turned towards God and whom God regarded with love.¹ It is only because he now and then used, or approved of the use of, the name Son of God in a purely Messianic-Jewish sense, that one might suppose he based his own self-designation principally upon that theocratical Messiah-designation. But if we consider the subject more carefully, we shall find it improbable that, in naming himself, he should have leant more to the popular Jewish views than to his own old favourite conception of the Sons of God. He would certainly explain his Sonship, not at all in the sense of the Messianic, but entirely in the sense of the spiritual, Sonship which he ascribed to the pious, as a divine relationship in knowledge and love of the Highest.² It may,

¹ Son of God : man, Luke iii. 38 (comp. Gen. i. 26 sq., Isaiah lxiii. 16); the pious man, Ps. ciii. 13 (comp. above, Vol. III. p. 73); the nation, Exodus iv. 22, Hosea xi. 1, Isaiah i. 2, xxx. 1, 9, Ps. lxxx. 17; kings, 2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. ii. 7, lxxxii. 6, lxxxix. 27. The Messiah has been found in Ps. ii. 7. The name Son of God for the Messiah in *Henoch*, cap. 105 (I and my Son). 4 Ezra vii. 28: *revelabitur filius meus*. In late Judaism often *primogenitus*, after Ps. lxxxix. 27 sq. Bertholdt, pp. 33 sq. Angels, Genesis vi. 2 sq. &c.; comp. Luke xx. 36. The nation and its kings are under the protection of God, as are also men generally, and the pious. The angels are of kindred nature to God; but so are also the men of the creation (Gen. i. 26) and of the resurrection (Luke xx. 36), and finally he who became the Messiah through the power and Spirit of God, Luke i. 35. The transition from the one to the other is due to the impartation of the Spirit of God, which is communicated to man by creation or by special official or personal *charisma*, Gen. i. 26; 1 Sam. xvi. 13; Isaiah xi. 1 sq.; Ezekiel xxxvi. 27. The failing to rise to the higher conception, see above, Vol. III. pp. 69, 74.

² Schmid (*N. T. Theol.* 1st ed. I. pp. 156 sqq.) assumed that Jesus, in calling himself Son of God, started from the theocratic conception of the Messiah as it existed among the people, and then further developed that conception ideally (similarly, I myself, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 37, and Beyschlag, *Christol.* pp. 40 sq., only that he understands the popular conception too ideally as a relation to God without parallel, a community of spirit and nature). According to Baur (*N. T. Theol.* p. 118), the conception of Jesus is a purely moral (ideal) one, equally distinct from the metaphysical one of the fourth Gospel, and from the national one of the Jewish consciousness. He calls himself Son of God because the idea of moral good presented itself to his consciousness in its purity, and because he was conscious of the perfect realization of this idea through his moral striving. What is correct here is (also in Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*,

indeed, be that, in assuming this designation, he was thinking both of the title of honour given to the pious, a title by the assumption of which he placed himself to a certain extent in their ranks or rather at their head, and of the title of honour of the Messiah which he readily allowed to be given to him, and by which he more completely established that exclusiveness which he had given to the title of Son. Above all, so much is certain, viz., that his opinion of the character of the Son of God was fully and exhaustively expressed in that self-given designation we have just been considering.¹ Though a later ecclesiastical exegetical tendency—to the detriment of history, still represented in our department—has found in this “Son of God” very much more than the above, namely, a Pauline, Johannine, nay, even Nicene Son of God, as definitely as possible metaphysically constructed, yet the standard of our explanation of the words must lie in the utterances of Jesus about himself; and his clearest and loftiest utterance is and remains the great confession of the Son who knows God and is known of God, and is, because of his great knowledge, appointed Lord over all.

In fact, fuller explanatory utterances of Jesus about himself are not extant, or at least the utterances never rise above the height indicated by the great confession. Still, several explanatory utterances can yet be found which are pitched in the same key as this confession. We have already met with his assertion—so strongly controverted by his opponents—that he had a right to forgive sins, as God had. In his later addresses to his disciples, he uttered the already mentioned speech, “Every one who confesses me before men, him will I also (in the judgment) confess before my Father in the heavens;” again, “He who receives you,

Eng. ed. I. p. 269) the laying stress upon the ideal, not theocratic, starting-point; what is incorrect is partly the complete abstraction of the latter, partly the non-recognition of the duality of the universally human and specific affinity of nature with God.

¹ The ideal view has strengthened itself through the theocratic, which Jesus, however, sometimes recognizes, Matt. xvi. 16 sq., xvii. 26, xx. 23, xxi. 37, xxvi. 63 sq. He reacted against the merely theocratic view, Matt. xxii. 42.

receives me, and he who receives me, receives Him who sent me."¹ These are merely claims which, in themselves capable of a lower theocratic meaning, are placed in a higher light through their connection with the great confession, since they are bound up with the—not divine, but human—personal and official individuality by means of which there is established between him and mankind, especially the men of that time, a relation of dominance and dependence, between him and God a relation of world-commanding unanimity.² Nothing can be more incumbent upon history than to give prominence to these facts of his life and consciousness, and to make them intelligible from his palpable fundamental sentiment. But history may leave open the question, not so much whether a human consciousness made such claims, as whether it were able, by means of merely human organization and endowments, to attain to those actual performances upon which his just claims were grounded. We shall take up this question at the close, and in the mean time, on the basis of facts—only from the other side—we shall strengthen the impression that it was a genuinely human nature which achieved the work and made the claims.

For instance, by the side of all these instances of Jesus' loftiness and self-exaltation, complementary expressions of his humility are by no means wanting. In these he describes himself as equal to men, and with them a subject of God. At first we look round altogether in vain for utterances of Jesus concerning those conditions of higher heavenly glory which subsequent Christian dogmas, since Paul and John, have ascribed to his person before his entrance upon an earthly life, and which have been impressed upon the Christian consciousness until now as a firm and im-

¹ Matt. ix. 6, x. 32, 40. The *Alterego* placed on an equality with God, Exodus iii. 12, iv. 16, xvi. 8; 1 Sam. viii. 7; Ezekiel iii. 7; and in innumerable instances by the Rabbis,—*e.g.* *Shiv h. f.* 12, 3: *si quis recipit viros doctos, idem est ac si reciperet shechinam.* Wetstein, p. 378.

² Wittichen found only a "genetic and *quantitative* difference" between the Sonship of Jesus and that of other men. That this assumption does not answer to the standpoint of the self-consciousness of Jesus, has been already shown in the *Gesch. Chr.* p. 39.

movable presupposition of his faith and thought. Jesus speaks of one who is to come, but not of one who has descended; he also speaks in the same way of the Baptist as having come; he speaks of a going away, but not of a returning home to the Father.¹ When he mentions the divine ordinance from the time of the creation, the longing of the prophets for the days of the then present, the permanence of the angelic vision of God—all this does not of course prove that he had had personal experience of those things; it is simply a mental contemplation projected into heaven and antiquity, and specially into the Scriptures.² Beyschlag and Hofmann (of Erlangen), toilsomely seeking where nothing is to be found, have in an impossible manner drawn the most far-reaching inferences as to a previous life in heaven; the former from the expression, "Lord of David," and the latter from the glimpse of the fall of Satan from heaven, which Jesus had, certainly not in the days of the creation, but in the time then present.³ Rather we might make the most of the facts that Jesus called himself Wisdom, by which he did not mean either the Old Testament participant with God in the creation, or the Johannine Logos; and that he characterized the Baptist as the greatest among those who were born of women, although he did not here intend to ascribe to himself a kind of superhuman position. Or we might recall the subjection of the angels in the consummation of the kingdom of God, although the servants of God were rightly also the servants of His Messiah. Or we might lay stress upon the expressions, "kingdom of heaven," "Son of God," and "Son of Man," as Beyschlag attempted to do, although the correct meaning of them has long been pointed out.⁴ Abso-

¹ Matt. xi. 18, xv. 24. Going away, xxvi. 24. Therefore an entrance into, not a return to, glory, Luke xxiv. 26 (xix. 12, 15).

² Matt. xix. 8, xxv. 34 sq., xiii. 17, xviii. 10.

³ Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 61; *Gesch. Chr.* p. 104.

⁴ Wisdom, Matt. xi. 19; a strengthened form of the expression, Luke xi. 49. At any rate, the Evangelists might have first introduced this higher conception, if it be correct, for instance, that Matthew had Ecclesiasticus before him. If an intimation of Jesus' higher nature, in contrast to the woman-born (which, however, he himself was, Gal. iv. 4), to the preponderantly human, be sought in Matt. xi. 11, then must

lutely nowhere has Jesus fallen back upon pre-earthly, pre-human, godlike conditions, although in his conflict with his foes it would have been an advantage to employ this means of defence against the charge that he made himself equal to God. But his language never turned towards the past, but only towards the future, never even hinted at an exalted rank which was abased; but it did, however, mention a lowliness which of God's grace struggled towards an exalted position, God having in the then present given all things into his hands, and his works proving that he was the plenipotentiary of God even to the forgiving of sins and the bringing in of the kingdom of heaven.¹ But perhaps he intentionally refrained from lifting the veil from his divine past, in order to avoid exciting the fear and the curiosity of men, and in order to keep their attention fixed upon the great human task, the task which was both his and theirs? But this supposition also necessarily falls when we see that he describes the very opposite of a divine past, namely, himself with his human nature and his human attitude towards God. In his great confession, also, he calls this God the God and Lord of heaven and of earth, proclaims Him as the only Creator and Preserver of the world, as the Lawgiver of Israel, as the Author of the salvation of the world, of the kingdom of God and its good things, the distribution of which is reserved to the Divine Will.² He himself had—as he said on the occasions of his highest declarations, at the forgiving of sins as well as in his great confession—simply a deputed power, an authority of which he must continually reassure himself both generally and in detail by prayer and faith.³ The weightiest part of this authority was his equipment with the divine Spirit, which opened to him the knowledge of the Divine

the antithesis be looked for only in xii. 28. Hilgenfeld (p. 414) says incorrectly that Jesus placed himself and his followers above those born of women. Beyschlag's vindication of the pre-existence, pp. 27, 59 sqq., 64, although he does not go beyond an ideal pre-existence.

¹ Matt. xi. 25, xii. 28; *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 103 sq. Comp. even Krauss, pp. 325 sq.

² Matt. xi. 25, xix. 4, vi. 26 sqq., x. 29, xv. 3, 6, xviii. 14, xx. 23.

³ Matt. ix. 6, xi. 25 sqq., xvii. 20, xxi. 21.

nature, wisdom, and holiness, as to no one else; although his human organization in its elements was the same as that of others, of men, of his brethren, namely, a combination of spirit and flesh, the latter of feeble power, fearful before danger, despairingly timid in the presence of a great task, and the former good in its desires and strong.¹ And not only this combination, but also the divine gift of the Spirit in and of itself, which he regarded as something foreign, higher, intangible, in contrast with the gladly yielded, serving organ, the Son of Man, continually placed him, notwithstanding his lofty characteristics, under God and on an equality with others.² He lacks the perfection of the Divine knowledge of things, even of the future of the kingdom of God. He lacks the perfect goodness of the Divine Nature, for he has to struggle against the desires and the fears of the flesh, and on that account he repudiates the title of "Good." He lacks the perfection of the Divine Wisdom, whose ways he admires, and to which, in the Gethsemane prayer, he subordinates his own short-sightedness.³ His ability to work is also limited. Not only is all the ability he possesses a loan, but his sublimest preaching, his most attractive and alluring call, each becomes vain or loses its penetrating force if God does not give His aid, the Mighty One who is superior to the impossibilities of unaided humanity, in the bonds of which Jesus himself stands, until God operates by His Spirit upon the spirits of men, and, by His revelation of the Son, calls whom He will—in reality, fewer and other than the Son at first willed.⁴ All these are his human limitations, which he again and again acknowledges in immediate connection with the lofty features of his character. These admissions of limitation are certainly themselves lofty features; they are the virtues of a man who, though distinguished above all others by the unction of God, yet continues in humility, and

¹ Matt. xii. 28, xxvi. 41.

² Matt. x. 20, xii. 28, 32, xxii. 43. Spirit without measure, John iii. 34.

³ Matt. xxiv. 36, xix. 17, xxvi. 41, xi. 25, xxvi. 39 sqq.

⁴ Matt. xi. 25 sq. xiii. 11, xvi. 17, xix. 11, 26.

denies neither to himself nor to others the limitations, the over-springing of which seemed to be excused, to be permitted, by his own consciousness of power and by the enthusiasm of the multitude.

In this holding fast to the limitations of the creature lies the difference between the Jesus of the earlier Gospels and the Jesus of the fourth Gospel; and that not only in the province of the author's mode of conception, but also—and it is of this we are here speaking—in the province of the self-given testimony and of the self-consciousness of Jesus. In detail, there is much similarity. The Johannine Christ does not lack the consciousness of dependence. There is only One true and adorable God; the Father is greater than he and than all. He himself is only an ambassador of God; he has a commission and authority; he is dependent on God's command and type, on God's protection and favourable response to his petitions, on God's revelation in himself and in the souls of men. And he wins for himself the love of God by the faithful performance of his works unto death, a performance which he, as human in intellect and flesh, does not bring about without struggle and anxiety.¹ Taking our stand on this ground, we might find even the strong utterances concerning himself—"I and my Father are one!" "He who sees me sees the Father!"—quite intelligible as the expression of the fellowship with God to which he had attained by love and obedience, as a higher inference from the facts of his self-consciousness set forth in his great confession; and indeed we find the weaker language of the earlier Gospels expressly repeated—"No one has looked upon the Father, save he who is from God;" and, "He who receives me receives Him that sent me."² But if we confidently proceed further, we find ourselves suddenly upon very different ground, in the midst of a metamorphosed world, as repellent as it is sublime; for we perceive close at hand sen-

¹ John iv. 23 sq., xvii. 3, x. 29; comp. v. 19, 36, vi. 45, viii. 55, x. 18, xi. 42, xii. 49.

² John x. 30, xiv. 9; also vi. 46, xiii. 20; comp. Matt. xi. 25.

tences which could not proceed from a human mouth, and which stamp the unsuspecting acceptance of the previous sentences as a deception. For in truth he is one with the Father, and the equal of the Father, not as a man whom God acknowledges and loves, but as the divine being who, through the Father has, like the Father, life in himself; who was before Abraham; who enjoyed the love of the Father and the fulness of his glory before the existence of the world and before the foundation of the world; who has exclusively seen the Father, and in reality perceived the truth; who came down from heaven, and will ascend again to heaven; and who, though provisionally clothed with flesh, is full, not only of heavenly reminiscences and anticipations, but even of the heavenly glory that is derived from constant intercourse with God and from the immanence of divine powers.¹ Let each one choose for himself which Jesus he will recognize as his own: to us choice is already denied, because the exaggerated Jesus is the more recent, the unhistorical Jesus of later times; because the language of this Jesus is entirely the language of the Evangelist, who directly converts him into "God;" because, finally, the Evangelist himself has combined the Jesus of history and the Jesus of dogmatic by means of formulæ which are spontaneously decomposed by their own contradictions. It is, however, impossible for us here to undertake to examine this dogmatic, from Paul till Chalcedon, as an authority, or indeed as a witness. This dogmatic, a result not of facts but of reflections, often arbitrary, and in almost every case untenable, can at most demand a certain degree of attention when the final word is spoken.

¹ John v. 26, viii. 58, xvii. 5, iii. 32, vi. 46, viii. 38, 40, vi. 62, &c. Comp. also with x. 28, Isaiah xliii. 13. Beyschlag (and here A. Schweizer agrees with him, pp. 76, 112) has, as is well known, brought down this consciousness of a real pre-existence to that of an ideal one (p. 62). We find—not to assume mere verbiage and sophistry—real pre-existence, and therewith, like Schleiermacher (p. 288), "spectral existence." Comp. also *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 203 sq.

B.—THE SELF-CONFIDENCE OF JESUS IN HIS TASK.

Whilst, on the one hand, the self-consciousness of Jesus thus asserted and developed itself in the presence of successes and reverses, on the other hand the consciousness of his vocation necessarily accommodated itself to the stubborn reality which had now become undeniable, and was making itself more and more keenly obvious to him.

Here—as his confession shows—he gained for himself rest and support above all things in the strong Old Testament faith which ran unbrokenly by the side of his New Testament faith. He rested not, it is true, upon faith in the vagrant play of terrestrial antagonisms, but upon a recognition of the sovereign divine will, the divine “good pleasure,” which imposed the quiet of resignation upon his own human wishes and plans.¹ Certainly a mind like that of Jesus could never remain content with bare facts themselves, even though they were divine. The man who intelligently penetrated into the nature of God, must learn the grounds of facts and the grounds of God. Consequently he understood why God hid the knowledge of the divinely-appointed time from the wise and men of understanding, and revealed it unto babes. He beheld the principle of God, the principle of humbling the exalted and exalting the lowly; he rejoiced in the practical application of that principle, whilst it gave him pain, and he hastened to incorporate it into the whole of his preaching of the kingdom, announcing that the kingdom of God belonged to humility, to the child-like disposition.² The Old Testament, also, in which he lived, showed him, together with the principle of God, the primitive obstacle to divine purposes, the inflexibility of men. Out of Moses, he established the nation’s hardness of heart; out of Isaiah, their lip-service without heart-service, their gross and material mode of conception, the greater susceptibility

¹ Matt. xi. 25.

² Matt. xviii. 3 sq., xxiii. 12; Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14 (comp. Prov. xi. 2, xvi. 18, xviii. 12, xxix. 23; Ps. xviii. 28, lxxv. 7; 1 Sam. ii. 7 sq.).

to good impressions of the heathen than of the Jews; he recalled the indulgence of Moses, the complaint of Isaiah, the parting cry of Hosca, the paths of flight and of blood in which the servants of God had had to travel, even to the days of the Baptist.¹ And, finally, he recognized the concealed, invisible actor, who, in strong and determined attitude, stood behind the oscillating reeds of the people and the manifold counter-currents of the hierarchical lip-servers,—that Lord of the inimical kingdom, Satan, whom he had indeed smitten, and whom he daily smote, who nevertheless daily tried afresh the fortune of battle or of strategy, who, not merely in the persons of the possessed, but by scattering all kinds of evil seeds and destroying the seed of the kingdom, and backed by all the auxiliaries of the world—covetousness, avarice, care, and anxiety—stormed the lines of the kingdom of heaven, and snatched half his success out of his hands.²

If, in the light of all these facts, Jesus reflected upon his task, such as it remained to him, he never spent a moment's thought on renouncing it. His commission stood fast; the little flock, confidingly happy at his feet, indemnified him, his heart, and his purpose, for much; and over and above all, when he interrogated the cause which he represented, it became a certainty to him that it must finally conquer in one way or another.³ But his perception that it was the will of God to bestow the kingdom not upon all but only a part, made it henceforth necessary to give to his task a limitation which it had not previously possessed. To speak plainly, under this discovery Jesus found himself in more than one way forced back upon the initial preaching of the kingdom by John. The salvation of a part, of the noble nucleus, of Israel had been, after the example of the prophets themselves, the starting-point of the Baptist; but beyond expectation it had come to pass that the whole nation, and even the weakest and the most reprobate of the nation, had been laid hold of. On the

¹ Matt. xix. 8, xv. 7, xiii. 14, xi. 21, xii. 41, x. 35, v. 12, xxiii. 37.

² See the parables in Matt. xiii.

³ Luke xii. 32; Matt. x. 26 sq. and parables.

other hand, the salvation of the whole nation was the natural starting-point of Jesus; the salvation of a remnant was the point to which his experience ultimately led him. John had introduced this salvation of a remnant by the most powerful and thrilling summons to repentance. Jesus, on his side, had begun with more friendly enticement, by which he hoped to win all; but in the face of the circumstances which arrayed themselves against him, he undeniably frequently fell back—not merely through irritability and displeasure, which he certainly at this period often exhibited towards the people and the disciples, but from principle—upon the Johannine formula, upon the urging and compelling which he had previously used only in the case of disciples who were called to be his immediate followers, upon menacing and alarming with the approaching judgment of God. In this way he aimed at hastening, strengthening, and forcing the decision of the salvable part of the nation for the cause of the kingdom of God. In fact, at this time Jesus gave forth the watchword that few could find the narrow way of the kingdom of heaven and be saved.¹ He demanded an absolute decision—whichever was not for him was against him. Whoever wished to follow him must be prepared to break with his own family, to accept their enmity, to repudiate father and mother. He was come to bring, not peace, but war, sword, fire, division. Thus must his adherents also salt themselves with fire in order to escape the eternal fire, mortify and cut off their offending members that their whole body might not fall into hell.² And woe to him who did not repent! Sodom and Gomorrah, Tyre and Sidon and Nineveh, would fare better in the impending judgment; Nineveh and the Queen of Sheba would stand forth as condemning witnesses against a generation that refused to be converted!³

¹ Luke xiii. 23; Matt. vii. 13. Displeasure, Matt. xii. 39, xiii. 11 sqq., xv. 16, xvi. 8, xvii. 17.

² Matt. xii. 30, x. 34, 37; Luke xii. 49, xiv. 26. The expression about salt from Mark ix. 43—50, if we think there is anything genuine in the no longer original language (comp. Matt. xviii. 8).

³ Matt. xi. 21, xii. 41.

It was quite consistent with this changed attitude that Jesus should narrow here and broaden there the range of his call. He did the former by confining his preaching to the *poor* in the nation, who were to compensate him for the falling away of the rich, the cultured, the wise, and who should at the same time represent the most genuine form of self-renouncing, hopeful sympathy with the kingdom. He did the latter by overstepping the narrow and thankless boundaries of Israel, by attracting the *Gentile world*, already, perhaps, ripe for repentance. As is well known, Renan has enumerated a whole series of such rapid and violent advances of the at first so lovable moralist, who was over-balanced by both success and opposition, and who enthusiastically hurried from one revolution to another, from the social one to the cosmical.¹ In fact, however, this is nothing but artificial forcing of the history of Jesus, to a certain degree apparently based upon the sources of this history, but mainly contradicting them,—that is, if we learn to use them with judgment and discrimination.

It is a very plausible opinion that Jesus had resolved upon preaching a gospel of the poor, and heading a great poor men's agitation in Israel, thus making himself a forerunner of that Jesus of Tiberias, son of Sapphias, who at the beginning of the Jewish war stood at the head of "the mariners and men without means."² Jesus did in reality number poor men among his adherents; he regarded riches as a hindrance to the kingdom of heaven; he demanded indifference to the world and self-denial; he described, in a parable, the calling of the poor and the rejection of the rich. When he at this time turned towards "babes," were they not virtually the poor? When he now required every kind of self-renunciation, was not this a condemnation of riches? In entering upon a new campaign against the ruling classes, did he not thereby make an appeal to the oppressed classes, by whose

¹ Similarly also Hausrath, pp. 406 sqq.

² Josephus, *Vita*, 11 sq. There is also a reminiscence of David (1 Sam. xxii. 2).

help he could render his antagonism alarming?¹ And what is of still greater weight, the third Gospel has already in the Sermon on the Mount exhibited Jesus as the patron of the poor, the foe of the rich, though it has postponed his most vigorous sayings in praise of poverty to the period about which we are here writing. Here it is sometimes voluntary poverty which Jesus inculcates, sometimes actual poverty to which he predicts glory and blessedness, sometimes—midway between both—the fostering of the poor which he requires and blesses with rich promises.²

But we have long since discovered that he did not, could not, have so spoken; that he blessed the poor in spirit and not the poor in material means; and that a late Judaizing source of Luke has interpolated this distortion of the preaching of Jesus.³ To speak plainly, these pauperism-preaching sermons are in the highest degree objectionable, and are the direct reverse of the teaching of Jesus. We can understand that, according to this source, Jesus, in order to rebuke the avarice which he detected in the man who asked for his mediation in a quarrel with his brother about an inheritance, should narrate the parable of the Rich Husbandman, who, revelling in earthly goods but poor towards God, proposed to build larger barns in which to store the corn that had grown for *him*, and to take his ease and enjoy the provision gathered together for many years, when that very night God called away the fool—an evident copy of Nabal, David's contemporary. We can also understand his insisting upon the tearing the affections from what is earthly, as the genuine outcome of the disposition required in the kingdom of heaven, and ascribing to alms given without expectation of human recompence a moral worth—indeed, the worth of a treasure laid up in heaven: this he had already done in the Sermon on the Mount, and still more in his conversation with the rich young

¹ Matt. xix. 23 (xi. 5 proves nothing); Luke xiv. 21 (Matt. xxii. 1).

² Luke vi. 20 sqq., xi. 41, xii. 33, xiv. 13, xvi. 1 sqq.

³ See above, Vol. III. pp. 234 sq.; comp. also *ib.* 120, 260.

man.¹ But he never converted these inculcations of self-denial into precise, harsh, imperative commands. He placed the material act in the first rank as little as Paul afterwards did. He never so disregarded and overlooked the moral ground in the material act as he is represented to have done in Luke's reading of his speeches to the disciples: "Sell what ye have and give it as alms; make to yourselves purses which never become old, a treasure imperishable in the heavens;" again, "Make to yourselves friends of the unrighteous mammon, that when it fails they may receive you into eternal houses."² He was also very far from allowing to the Pharisees that everything would be pure among them as soon as they not merely cleansed the outside of the platter, but gave alms of what was within. In truth, with such sentiments, the determined antagonist of the Pharisees would have himself become a Pharisee, only an improved one; a preacher of outward works, only a somewhat more earnest one; not a preacher of the works of the heart and of the conquering principle that not what was external but what was internal made a man clean or unclean.³ In a word, in the glorification of not merely voluntary poverty, but poverty as such—when, for example, in Luke's Sermon on the Mount, in the parables of the Unjust Steward, and of the Rich Man and the Poor Lazarus, the poor man as such receives the privilege of the kingdom of heaven, of the eternal houses, of the bosom of Abraham, whilst the alms-withholding rich man, nay the man who is simply rich, is to burn in eternal fire—we have the direct reverse of the teaching of Jesus; and we are compelled to choose between the complete disintegration of the biography of Jesus, and the rejection of these unhistorical utterances of an already morbidly degenerate Christian piety.⁴ The latter decision is all the easier

¹ Luke xii. 13 sqq., 33 (comp. Matt. vi. 20, and the complement, vi. 33, above, Vol. III. pp. 30 sqq.); Matt. vi. 3, 4, xix. 21. Nabal, 1 Sam. xxv. 2 sqq.

² Luke xii. 33, xvi. 9.

³ Luke xi. 41, and, on the other hand, the genuine saying, Matt. xxiii. 26. The principle, Matt. xv. 18 sqq.

⁴ Luke vi. 20 sqq., xvi. 1 sqq., 19 sqq. The ethico-religious element comes in but faintly, vi. 22 sq., xii. 21, xvi. 13, 19 (but see also 25).

since the impress of a later culture is unmistakably apparent in these so characteristically self-consistent utterances.¹ In particular, the parables of the Steward and of the Rich Man display a copiousness and an occasionally exaggeratedly refined artificiality of narrative, woven out of earlier materials and pictures, and altogether unlike the simplicity of the sayings of Jesus. In the parable of the Steward, God and the world, the heavenly and the earthly—the latter with its unclean and unrighteous good things and wealth, which are to be unhesitatingly given up—are made to possess a character of sharp and violent antithesis, such as they never possessed in either the teaching or the nature of Jesus. And in the other parable, in the praise of the fraudulent man, the prototype of the Christians, who diminishes the debtors' debts at the expense of his master, i.e. God, in order, as a dismissed and base steward, to induce the debtors to open their houses to him and give him a place there, like the Christian in the houses of the kingdom of God,—in this praise there is contained a gross instance of a morality of expediency which never came from the mouth of Jesus, and has occasioned to Christian expositors difficulties without end. Again, the parable of the Rich Man, which might be called sublime if the fundamental thought were not so inconsistent with other passages, betrays itself as an interpolation both by a dogmatic of the future life and of the governor of the future, Abraham, which is neither Jewish nor Christian, and by allusions to the masters of Judea and to the uselessness of the resurrection of Jesus in the face of Jewish unbelief, which were not possible until after the departure of Jesus. But enough on this subject.² Others have written

¹ See above, Vol. I. p. 99. Also Strauss, 4th ed. I. pp. 603, 633, suspected an Ebionite Essene colouring, and found an obscurity in Luke's source possible. Comp. Pressensé, p. 523 ; now also Volkmar, p. 536.

² See the commentaries. For the rest, Weizsäcker also (pp. 502 sqq.) is critically opposed to these narratives, of which, however, he would retain a remnant, applicable to unrefined publicans. Chek. Abr. Lightfoot, p. 547. Parallels to the parable of the Rich Man, Schöttgen, p. 223. Wetstein, p. 513. Steward, Lightfoot, p. 543. Hitzig, in his criticism of the Pauline Epistles (1870, p. 8), explains the five brethren, Luke xvi. 28, from the five brethren of Judah, Gen. xxix. 30. I am reminded of the

at great length on these things; we may be allowed to be brief in treating of a province which is unfruitful for the biography of Jesus. We everywhere arrive at the same conclusion. Even the individual sayings about poverty and the virtue of alms vanish into nothing when placed face to face with the earlier sayings, which are capable of being verified as fundamental principles.¹

But if Jesus, in his answer to the Baptist, calls the poor the recipients of the glad tidings; if, in the parables, he complains of the deceitfulness of riches, and with a menace turns from the rich to the poor; if, on the way to Judea, he declares the entrance of the rich into the kingdom of God humanly impossible, and demands, as a preliminary, of the rich young man that he should devote his wealth to the service of the kingdom of God;—then are not Luke's representations half true? At least, is not the gradual repudiation of the rich and the appeal to the poor historically correct, even though the rejection of riches as such, and the choice of poverty as such, are not capable of being proved? But since, in his answer to John, the poor are, in Old Testament phraseology, merely the sorrowing and lowly citizens of Israel; since those who are simply materially poor do not by any means appear, even at the meal in Bethany, as the privileged of the kingdom of God; since poor and rich, the worldly-minded of every kind, are in the parables made obnoxious to the same censure; since, moreover, in the narrative of the inquisitive youth, the rich are not at all represented as excluded, but rather as called, though subjected to a severe test; since all this is so, Jesus' patronage of poverty, both in the earlier and in the later part of his ministry, simply falls to the ground. Abidingly self-consistent in his great broad principles, he did not, even to the end, exclude any one. Among the "babes" whom he called his own, he reckoned those influential and rich men by whose fidelity he, without any levying of tribute on his part, was liberally

Herods I. to VI. who reigned in purple, and who are most appropriate to the Ebionite standpoint (comp. *Bibel-Lex.* III. p. 38). The dogs, which give ease to the ulcerous Israel (xvi. 21), are (suggested by Matt. xv. 27) the Romans.

¹ Particularly Luke xi. 41 and Matt. xxiii. 26.

supported. And when, in parables of the kingdom, he described the substitution of needy and grateful poor men for satiated rich men, he mentioned a fact rather than announced a principle, he gave expression to moral menace rather than to a strict decree.¹

An altogether different probability from that of his passing over to a narrow pauperism is suggested by the broadening of his missionary views from Judaism out towards the heathen. Had he originally taken the whole world as the horizon of his operation, at what moment would he have been more likely to have unreservedly, unhesitatingly, and indefinitely published his views, than at the very period of the rise of the fatal hostility against his nation-saving plans on the part of the rulers of the country, and when there had arisen a growing lukewarmness on the part of the people themselves, in whom the dawn of the happy time itself kindled no holy fire? Certainly this question is beset by great difficulties; but through these difficulties we have ourselves already broken a critical path, by transposing—against both old and new testimony—the question of this change from the Galilean spring-time to the Galilean storm-period we are now discussing. The common view represents Jesus as believing from the beginning in his vocation for the Gentiles; and we do not deny that that view has on its side the majority of the Gospels—in a certain sense, four Gospels—together with the Acts of the Apostles, as well as the conviction of Jesus' actual greatness and of his penetrating insight into his own vocation.² On the other hand, the modern critical view is based

¹ Comp. Matt. xi. 5, xiii. 22, xxii. 5; Luke xiv. 18—20. Matt. xix. 16, 21, 23, xxvi. 11. If we concluded from the parable, Luke xiv. 16, that Jesus had in thought contrasted the satiated rich with the poor of the people, then, on the supposition that the parable was perfectly genuine, we should have to think only of a menace similar to the anti-Jewish one. But in that passage there are not exclusively the rich, but the worldly-minded (Matt. xiii. 22, xxiv. 38); and we can deduce an Ebionite treatment of the conclusion from Matt. xxii. 9.

² Besides the Synoptics (see below, pp. 90 sq.), comp. Acts i. 8, ii. 39, iii. 26; John iv. 4 sqq., x. 16, xi. 52, xii. 20. The earlier view still in Schleiermacher, p. 344; Neander, pp. 339, 369; Weisse, pp. 405, 416; Ewald, pp. 309 sqq.; Schenkel, pp. 160 sqq.; Renan, pp. 224 sqq.; Scholten, *Joh.* pp. 155 sqq.; Weizs. p. 466; comp. Hofmann, and Albaric, in *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 53, 55.

on a series of Judaistically narrow sentences of the first Gospel; perhaps still more on the facts of the apostolic period, that the Apostle Paul was compelled almost to force the mission to the Gentiles against the resistance of the community at Jerusalem and even of the Apostles of Jesus, and that then, in consequence of his coming forward and of the compromise which followed it as a consequence, the Gentile-favouring tendency was fictitiously referred back to Jesus, the originator of all missions, by Pauline and even by Jewish-Christian authors.¹ But in the midst of these differences, a conciliatory idea here introduces itself, a new method of conciliation, after all the efforts of conciliation with which the critical school found the old Church and the old authors busied. And this method of conciliation can already point to so much of success as to be reckoned possible and spoken well of by many investigators in this province, and not last by Strauss.²

According to this method, both views are to an equally small extent historical. The first comes as much in collision with the distinct traces of Jesus' reticence with regard to the heathen—a reticence which the original of the first Gospel undoubtedly contains, and which even the Paulinizing later manipulation has not been able completely to expunge—as with the undeniable facts of the apostolic time. It is also opposed to the obvious probability that a Jewish self-consciousness—such as must have existed in Jesus, since he placed the Jewish conception of a Messianic time in emphatic contrast with an iron Gen-

¹ Thus (after the example of the *Wolf. Fragm.* p. 72) Schwegler (1846), and particularly Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* 1854, and also 1867, pp. 388, &c.; comp. *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 55 sq. Baur himself, the founder of the critical school, has, from his *Krit. Unters. über die Ev.* (1847, p. 610) down to his *Neutest. Theol.* (1864, pp. 118 sqq.), spoken against a narrow particularism of Jesus, and in favour of his universalism, though he did not attempt to reconcile the particularist and universalist elements of the Gospels from the standpoint of the consciousness of Jesus, and remained doubtful concerning several passages. Equally moderate, Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 533; K. Plauck, *Theol. J.* 1843, pp. 18 sqq. Hase expresses himself sceptically; Geiger is in favour of pure Judaism. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 55.

² *Gesch. Chr. l.c.* Strauss's *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. ed. I. pp. 296 sqq., 302. Holtzmann, p. 364. Hausrath, p. 409; comp. Längin, pp. 64 sqq.

tile period—necessarily, in common with the Baptist and the prophets, sought first of all the salvation of Israel, and could not without a struggle yield itself up to the idea of salvation for the Gentiles, for the Roman world which was at that very time making its harsh encroachments felt.¹ The second view brings into the whole ministry of Jesus a narrowness of aim which is inconsistent with the field of vision of the prophets and even of his contemporaries, and still more with the inevitable results of his teaching as well as of the facts of his life.² But this view also increases the enigmas both of the Gospels and of the apostolic period, instead of solving them. It moreover requires the rejection of sayings and incidents of the Gospels which, exceptionally well attested and conceived in the very spirit of Jesus, give to the favourite mutilation of Matthew's Gospel—whose second hand must have supplementarily fabricated everything that favours the Gentiles—the appearance of sheer arbitrariness.³ And by means of the facts of the apostolic period, it can establish only—what the Gospels themselves have already shown—that Jesus gave his attention chiefly to the Jews, by no means that he never presentiently overstepped the limitations by which his success was

¹ Remarkable self-contradictions of the upholders of this view, not only in Längin, pp. 64 sqq., but also in Weizs. pp. 340, 466.

² The teaching of Jesus is, in its nucleus, universally human and above the Law, comp. Strauss, *l.c.* The prophets, comp. above, Vol. I. p. 315; the universalism of Philo and the Egyptian Jews, *ibid.* I. pp. 283 sq. The universalism of the Pharisees themselves, Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 23. Narrow-mindedness and broad-mindedness of later Jews, in Schöttgen, pp. 86, 450 sq.; Bertholdt, pp. 162 sqq. Sometimes were the Gentiles regarded as proselytes, sometimes admitted as worshippers on an equality with the Jews; sometimes they were permitted merely to look on with envy, or even this was not allowed, judgment overtaking them.

³ Hilgenfeld spoke in such a way of the second hand, more recently of the "Evangelist" who is making use of an earlier Aramaic Jewish-Christian Gospel, in brief of the Gospel of the Hebrews (*Matthäus, Zeitschrift*, 1867). Firm critical ground! I have no inclination here to prove—easy as it is—the capriciousness of his rejections afresh or more in detail than I have already done in *Die Gesch. Würde Jesu*, p. 17, in Schenkel's *Zeitschrift*, 1865, and in *Gesch. Chr.* p. 55. If he attack me for ascribing to the second hand at least Matt. viii. 11 sq., I have adduced reasons which show the possibility of a later addition. On the other hand, I hold it just as possible that the original author introduced these words of rejection, unhistorically, it is true, and unpragmatically, but in harmony with his programme.

crippled.¹ And when, moreover, it is perfectly certain that the narrow aims of his disciples failed in other respects to do justice to his far-reaching reforming glance; that by their side the freer Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, in the persons of Stephen, Philip, Paul, immediately sought the broader paths, in the conviction that to do this was to fulfil the will of Jesus himself; that, finally, even the Twelve, when they saw the successes of Paul, learnt to respect the mission to the Gentiles as the will of the Lord himself, perhaps not without a recollection of some of his utterances; in view of all this, the evidential force of the scruples of the earlier Apostles—of which such an immoderate use has been made—vanishes of itself.²

An exact and impartial examination of the old traditions will lead to this result: Jesus *at first* made his nation the exclusive object of his ideas of salvation, and of his love as a ministering and seeking Redeemer. A number of facts exhibit this early exclusiveness. In the first place, his actual labour was from first to last confined to Israel. In Galilee, he sought not the Gentiles, but the Jews, the children of Abraham; when he sent forth his Apostles, he prohibited to them the streets of the Gentiles and the Samaritans; in going from Galilee to Jerusalem, he avoided Samaria; in Jerusalem, he fought for the Jewish Messiahship. These fundamental facts are seriously denied by none of the Gospels. Matthew and Mark have reported them most distinctly; but even the sources of the Pauline Acts of the Apostles give the same testimony, and Paul relates that Jesus had been a servant of the circumcision.³ Certainly these facts do not prove that his conception was as narrow as his conduct. Even that profound compassion which he exhibited towards his nation, and which impelled him to cry to his Apostles, "Go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," does not incontrovertibly prove that he had merely Israel upon his soul, but

¹ Comp. remarks on the Apostle Paul, above, Vol. I. pp. 54 sq. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 56.

² Galat. ii. 7—10.

³ Acts x. 38—42; Rom. xv. 8; Gal. iv. 4.

only that he was most keenly alive to Israel and Israel's need.¹ An absolute exclusiveness appears first in the words of the Sermon on the Mount, where the heathen, the heathenish, denote that sphere of extremely low religious and moral life which stands in diametrical antagonism to, despises, and abhors, the kingdom of heaven and its members, and is a permanent and warning example of an aberration which must be earnestly avoided, if for no other reason than not to do as the heathen do. If the faults are but inconsiderable in themselves, it can still be said, "Do not the publicans, do not the heathen, the same?" If it be a question of babbling in prayer, or of giving much thought to eating and drinking and clothing, it can be said, "Babble not as the heathen do in their mistaken opinion;" and, "After all such things do the heathen anxiously, ardently, and violently seek." Even the Roman empire does not impress him by its universality; it is only the fruit of these heathen sins.² The most vigorous expression of this sentiment appears to be the utterance towards the close of the Sermon on the Mount, "Give not that which is holy to dogs, nor throw your pearls before swine;" yet it must be admitted that the Evangelist plainly gave this utterance a general application in the direction of every sort of unclean men.³ An absolute exclusiveness is, however, shown most certainly and most strongly in the harshness of Jesus towards the Canaanitish woman, near the close of his ministry in Galilee. This narrative has already had to endure much. Sometimes it is made to say less than it does say, because the critic reads it in the light of the opinion that Jesus is the Saviour of the world. Sometimes it is held that the Jewish-Christian

¹ Strauss remarkably contradicts himself in his criticism on this, *Leben Jesu*, 4th ed. I. p. 530, and now, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. p. 187.

² Matt. v. 47, vi. 7, 32 (comp. xx. 25), xv. 26, xvi. 26.

³ Matt. vii. 6. Just as the word "dog" is in the Old Testament a word of reproach for enemies of all kinds, so is such an application here possible also. Jesus, in particular, could not have spoken thus contemptuously of the heathen without special provocation (Matt. xv. 22, 25), which in Matt. vii. 6 (comp. viii. 34) might be assumed. In the improbable case of the spuriousness of the expression, it is probably due to a bitter Jewish Christian.

author has too crudely formulated the words of Jesus; and sometimes that the Jewish-Christian Church invented the whole narrative as a mere allegory of the admission of the heathen into the way of grace.¹ But these are only so many arbitrary suppositions which are negatived by the narrative itself. In particular, no one will succeed in making it credible that a narrative so strangely attested, toned down with noticeable art by the later Mark, and re-appearing even in Luke, though in a new form,—that such a vigorous and spiritual utterance of Jesus, or the tender, delicate answer of the heathen woman, her infinite faith and her conquest of Jesus, could have been invented by a Jewish Christian tenacious of his rights.² On the frontier district of Tyre, there approached to Jesus a Canaanite or Phœnician woman, whom the whole description shows to have been no mere heathen, but rather a person friendly disposed towards Judaism, if not exactly a proselyte like the centurion. She came crying aloud to the Son of David, beseeching him to have mercy on her daughter who was possessed with a devil.³ But Jesus answered not a word, until the disciples themselves began to commend her

¹ The first explanation is generally in this form: Jesus merely tested the woman. Thus, after Olshausen, Ebrard, not only Hofmann, but even Baur, *N. T. Theol.* p. 129; Schenkel, p. 131. Or (comp. Mark vii. 24, 27) he indicated only his personal mission, not his general principle, and then yielded to the woman's faith. Thus Bl., Ew., Hofmann, Meyer, Neander, Scholten, Stier, and Weizs.; *Gesch. Chr.* p. 53. Both assumptions are somewhat similar to the old opinion of Chrysostom and the Fathers, that Jesus wished to make the woman's faith publicly evident. According to Lange (pp. 865 sqq.), an excited state of feeling (Matt. xv. 23) was aroused in the woman and in the disciples, which justified his performing an act out of the ordinary range of his mission. As to the several accounts, Matthew has language which is harsh but correctly explanatory, so says Weizs. p. 466. But whilst even Weizs. and Holtzmann (*Syn. C.* p. 85) more or less openly admit here the superiority of Matthew to Mark, Volkmar (p. 387) adduces the long since refuted objection that the harsh version of Matthew (opp. Mark) is inconsistent with the general character of the context (p. 387, comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 52). Volkmar regards the whole (pp. 384 sqq.) as a free composition, in the Pauline style, on the basis of the Sarepta-bread of Elijah (1 Kings xvii.).

² Matt. xv. 22 sqq.; Mark vii. 24. Comp. the rich man in Luke xvi. 20, in which parable Luke, contrary to the earlier sense of the Gospel of the Hebrews (see above, p. 82, note 2), regards Lazarus as a representative of the Gentiles (xvi. 21, 31).

³ Matthew, Canaanite; Mark, Syro-Phœnician. The "Son of David" cry occurs at a later period, xii. 23, xx. 30, xxi. 9. The external situation will be referred to when treating of the flights of Jesus from public notice.

to his notice by echoing her appeal. "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of Israel," was even for them his brief reply.¹ The woman came nearer, bowed herself before him, and faltered out, "Lord, help me!" The third time he repulsed her, and his language is unsoftened; he not merely refuses, he speaks harshly and in a manner calculated to give pain; we might almost fancy he was smarting from his expulsion by the Gadarenes. "It is not allowed," he says, "to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs."² Yet he does not drive her away, and he does not embitter her. She admits he is right, but only, in a touching manner, to enforce her own claim. "Yea, Lord," she replies to him; "yet the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their masters' table." They have a right—she would say—not to the children's bread, but at least to the refuse.³ Sublime moment! She has conquered him with her humility, her unmeasured trust in him and in Judaism. "O woman!" says he to her, "great is thy faith: be it unto thee as thou wilt!" Yet it is evident that Jesus for some time still kept himself quite separate from the Gentiles. His missionaries were sent only to the Jews. To turn towards the Gentiles—an idea which did not spontaneously occur to him, which was to be forced upon him from without—appeared to him, so far as he reflected upon it, so far as he, in his thoroughly searching manner, had surveyed it with its consequences—first, healing, and then preaching—as an abuse of office and power, a forbidden thing, a sin, doubly a sin inasmuch

¹ Comp. x. 6, and the Old Testament use of the expression, Numbers xxvii. 17, 1 Kings xxii. 17.

² In this strong utterance lies the principal evidence against the representation of Mark: first Israel, then—the dogs. It is true that Cropp (*Stud.* 1870, comp. Bl. and Lange) understood by the dogs, tractable pets, and found in the expression almost a tenderness (= sheep). An opprobrious term in Old Testament, 2 Kings viii. 13; 1 Sam. xxiv. 14; 2 Sam. ix. 8, xvi. 9, iii. 8. Still, at the present day, a name of derision in the East, used against Christians; by later Jews, a synonym for Gentiles. *Midr. till.* f. 6, 3: nationes mundi assimilantur canibus. *Pirke Elieser*, c. 29: qui comedit e. idololatra, similis est comedenti e. cane; uterque incircumcisus est.

³ Comp. *Bav. Bathr.* f. 8, 2: ciba me ut canem, ut corvum. Also *Philost. Vit. Apoll.* i. 19. The "Yea," considered by most to be an admission that he is right; by Fritzsche and Bleek, as an assertion of her own right.

as Israel lay in sorrow and the Gentiles were given up to the sinfulness of "dogs." Here is decision, here is principle, which imposes silence upon the most affectionate heart, but of which neither Mark nor the modern expositors have any suspicion—the former when he represents Jesus as saying, "First to the Jews, then to the dogs;" the latter when they are able to find the words were not spoken in earnest, but as a mere test or question of the day.

Now the facts which we have here insisted upon are mentioned quite incidentally, or even not at all, by our Evangelists, who in general represent a very different opinion. Dominated by the views of a later time—a time in which Gentile Christianity formed a part of the Church—they have transposed to the commencement of Jesus' ministry the Gentile-favouring tendency which at any rate did not show itself till towards the end of that ministry. If we take Matthew's Gospel as it is, we find the first utterance of Jesus in favour of the Gentiles and against the Jews, immediately after the Sermon on the Mount, in connection with the narrative of the centurion of Capernaum. Mark, enlarging the very temple of the Jews to a sanctuary for all nations, modifies the narrow utterance of Jesus against the Tyrian woman. Luke and John go yet further back. The former gives the well-known initial address at Nazara, a premature introduction of a purposely procured breach with Judaism. The latter reports a great conversion of the Samaritan city, which Jesus, at the very beginning, brings to pass in two days during a cursory visit, with those genuine supra-Jewish principles which we elsewhere meet with. Fortunately all these accounts are without any kind of historical attestation whatever; they are the authors' confessions, and no facts, as has in part already been shown, and in part will be shown.

An historical fact excuses these errors of the narrators: not only Christianity, but Jesus himself, was really, if slowly, on the way towards the Gentiles. His conception of God knew nothing of limitations, even while he believed in limitations to the king-

dom of God. In the most characteristic spirit of the Old Testament, he, in the Sermon on the Mount, conceived of God as the Lord of all worlds, of all men, as the Benefactor of both the good and the evil. His idea of humanity had not much to say of Jews or of Gentiles, but of men in general, in whose ranks he placed himself as Son of Man, in whose organization he found no distinction, because he found in every individual an impulse upwards and an impulse downwards, a prompting of the conscience and a prompting of the passions. The only distinction he found was in the different tendency of minds, in the practice of religion, righteousness, morality, which his clear eye showed him was not quite extinct even among the Gentiles, but extremely stunted. From the very beginning, his Messianic idea took so high a flight that he believed in his importance to the whole world, called himself the Light of the world, the Salt of the earth, and later the Sower in the field of the world. He wished to repeat in himself and in his followers the goodwill of God towards all creatures, not excepting the evil and the unjust, even to the love of enemies and persecutors. Finally, he believed that everything was handed over to him—all the possessions of God, the celestial and terrestrial kingdoms—in a word, therefore, the world of the Gentiles. Here all the threads of his knowledge met and led up to a widened conception of his task. Particularly when to him, in the Sermon on the Mount, the public foe of the nation coincided with the private foe, with the unjust man; when to him the Gentile closely approached the publican; when he recognized the obligation of loving all enemies, and admitted a vocation to save the publicans; when, finally, he detected even in the Gentile—not merely in the publican—among the characteristics of human nature those faint traces of a higher nature, a direction towards God, importunate prayer though marred by babbling verbiage, a longing to hear, an impulse to love and to gratitude towards men, at least towards relations, friends, and benefactors;—must not the Gentile become to him an object of his mission, like the publican? Nothing is more

surprising, nothing more instructive, than this abundance of compelling influences which triumphed, though but slowly even in the mind most definitely called, over the power of Jewish birth, of inherited views, of the spirit of the age, and of the first purpose which was shaped by those circumstances.

It was the historical ways of God that first led Jesus above and beyond himself, and elevated the impelling influences to necessities and to results which his self-consciousness and his will slowly recognized. It was a victory which he gained over himself, and which made him master of the history of the world, not merely because he opened the doors of the kingdom of heaven to the wide world, but also because he thus created the religion whose spotless greatness made it worthy of all the ages, and of the adhesion of all human minds. The historical way of God with him was a double one. First, there was that tragical fate which he endured at the hands of Israel, of the spiritual rulers, and of the people themselves. It had not yet occurred to him to forsake an ungrateful field, and to devote the strength of which he was conscious to more favourable soil, to the Samaritans or the Gentiles, as in the fourth Gospel the Jews on one occasion scornfully ask, "Will he not go to the dispersed among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?"¹ This idea was still quite impossible, because Israel had not yet by a long way made its final decision; and a Jewish Messiahship was not capable of being transplanted among the Gentiles by a mere waving of the hands. But whilst he thought and pondered over the opposition which paralyzed him, there came to him, through the Old Testament, like a ray of light, a perception of the fact that this nation had always shown hardness of heart towards God and those whom He sent; and at the same time he perceived a second fact, viz., that the despised Gentile world had often enough put God's peculiar people to shame by repentance, longing, and faith. Together with these facts, the probability forced itself upon his

¹ John vii. 35.

soul that a rejection of the whole nation, a rooting up of the unfruitful fig-tree, might be among the purposes of a severe Divine government of the world.¹ "The men of Nineveh," he said at this later Galilean period, "will rise up in the judgment with this generation and will condemn it, because they repented in conformity with the preaching of Jonah, and lo! more than Jonah is here! The Queen of the South will rise up in the judgment with this generation and will condemn it, because she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and lo! more than Solomon is here!"² It would be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, the Gentile haunts of vice, than for the towns of Galilee; "for if the mighty works which are done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."³ Perhaps also the widow in Phœnician Sarepta to whom Elijah went, while he turned his back upon Israel, perhaps also Naaman the Syrian whom Elisha saved from leprosy, were mentioned by him in a similar connection: Luke has placed these examples prematurely in the initial sermon at Nazara.⁴ But the perception of these things in the Old Testament by no means led Jesus to a new resolve. Yet here it seems to be only a step. If Nineveh repented, why did he not turn towards Nineveh? If the Queen of Sheba came, why did he not go to Edom and Arabia? If Tyre and Sidon would certainly have repented under the influence of the works of Jesus, why did he not give to the Tyre of his day the opportunity to repent? But the heart of Jesus remained bound up with Israel; and more than his heart, his knowledge which qualified him for his vocation, and his mental horizon. To him, the Gentiles were only the adversaries of Israel; he did not imagine that they might join Israel in seeking his help. Hence it altogether failed to occur to him to recall, together with the narratives of the Old Testament, the

¹ Comp. the genuine parable, Luke xiii. 6.

³ Matt. xi. 21 sqq.

² Matt. xii. 41 sqq.

⁴ Luke iv. 25 sqq.

prediction of the prophets that the Gentiles should come from Arabia and Egypt to worship God with Israel, and to be priests in God's temple.¹

To the first historical way of God must be added a second. This was the path of experience.² In the path of experience, Jesus had acquired his inner and outer world, and had become acquainted with the heart of the publicans and the religion of the Gentiles, in which the ordinary Jew did not believe at all. So far he had perceived fragmentary remains of religion and morality, but no healthy and earnest piety. He had not met with any faith in himself whatever, because he had not looked for it. But the faith *came* and sought him. It sought him in almost the only form which was at first possible: Gentile proselytes or friends of Judaism, perhaps also neighbourly Samaritans—who are at least introduced by the sources of Luke—addressed themselves to the new Teacher of Israel, and besought his help in their most urgent necessities, when sickness was in their houses. The one who first encountered him was the centurion of Capernaum, whose humility and trust he rewarded with the exclamation, "Not once have I found such faith in Israel!" His reflection seemed to be about to lead him to the point of decision: he not merely commended the man's faith, but he at once drew a comparison between the Gentiles and the Jews, as if they were rivals suing for his love; and were not the former the more deserving of that love? But no; he did not pass beyond making the comparison. Israel was immovably fixed in his heart, so much the more because at that time Israel also still had faith; and though in reality the Gentile put Israel to shame, Israel was the highest unsurpassable standard by which he measured the Gentile.³ A second and still more important encounter was that with the Phœnician woman. It has been assumed, with equal incorrectness, that the two incidents coincide, or that they

¹ Comp. Isaiah lvi. 3 sqq., lx. 1 sqq., lxvi. 18 sqq.

² *Gesch. Chr.* p. 54.

³ This remark is made on the necessary supposition that Jesus did not utter Matt. viii. 11 sq. in the same connection as viii. 10. Luke vii. 9, xiii. 28.

directly contradict each other. The first assumption has been already refuted; the second falls to the ground because a Gentile dweller in Capernaum and a well-known proselyte to Judaism stood much nearer to Jesus than the unknown distant Gentile woman from a Gentile district. Thus he could permit the approach of the centurion, and yet drive the Phœnician woman from him. We saw how *he*, full of piety towards Israel even when Israel did not believe, and harsh towards the Gentiles even when they believed, brought into the field all the forces of his inner opposition to the Gentiles; and how *she* conquered with a faith much stronger than that of the centurion, who had not to authenticate his faith by a persistent stand against heartlessness and insult. Now if all this—reflection upon his task, the unbelief of his people, one page of the Old Testament history after another, even the impression produced by the soldier of Capernaum—wrought no change, the incident on the Tyrian boundary was an event that surpassed all the rest, and could not fail to leave unmistakable traces in the life of Jesus. Here he not only witnessed the highest exhibition of faith he could ever expect to witness; here he was not only led to reflect in the depths of his soul which wavered between his principle and the impulse of his heart; here he did not merely yield to momentarily overmastering impression, afterwards to become again himself, the advocate of the Jewish kingdom of heaven. But when he listened only to the principle of the kingdom, and therefore coldly refused to hear the voice of his heart and the doctrines of common human duties which he was wont to recognize, then his yielding was the result of no temporary victory over his heart, but of the victory of a newly-dawning conviction. And when the individual instance became his principle and his help in a question of good and evil, of Divine command and prohibition, then his decision in that individual instance was not an exception to the rule, not a “once and never again,” not a self-given dispensation for this once, i.e. not a turning aside and a slighting of the Divine command; but it is necessarily the birth of a new principle, the first

recognition of the common right of the Gentiles, of the Divine will, and the declaration of that will, in favour of the Gentiles.¹

In receiving here anew, as on a former occasion when he mentioned the "babes" of Israel, a decision from the hand of God, and in working up together—as was his wont—the new and gradually self-shaping perception, with all those impressions which experience and the Old Testament had till then produced upon him, it was not at all necessary for him to overstep the missionary lines which he had hitherto prescribed to himself in accordance with the will of God. Israel held the first, the Gentiles the second, rank; and his task in Israel was not accomplished until he had compassionately once more dug about and dunged the unfruitful fig-tree, until he had filled Israel with the call of his preaching, until he had fought out his fight with his foes, until he had brought the kingdom of God to a public manifestation in Jerusalem. Thus all the circumstances of the case, as well as the slow maturing of the perception itself, would make the Gentiles an object of future effort; and we have no trace of missions to the Gentiles in this later Galilean period. The great, the decisive, thing was, that the general principle had been reached, or at least had been caught sight of,—the principle which, according to the wish of the Founder himself, assured to Jesus' religion of humanity the human future. If we ask the Gospels more exactly how far the subsequent ministry of Jesus confirmed or overthrew the inferences derived from the incident at Tyre, we find that the Galilean ministry of Jesus was then virtually at an end; and on this account, as well as because the crisis at Jerusalem was close at hand, we should think it quite natural if the concluding passages of the Galilean history did not say much of the Gentile sympathies of Jesus, and we should not be surprised if they did not mention it at all. It is quite sufficient for us that, a few weeks later, Jesus' addresses in Jerusalem exhibit those sympathies in an undeniable

¹ Hilgenfeld admitted the exception from the rule which was afterwards still observed. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 56.

manner.¹ But one utterance of Jesus the Gospels Matthew and Luke agree in placing, not at Jerusalem, but in Galilee. Matthew has prematurely introduced it immediately after Jesus' speech of recognition to the centurion, to which it seems, when superficially looked at, exceedingly appropriate, but to which, nevertheless, it is not appropriate; at any rate, it stands here much too early, as is shown by the Phœnician incident, which would become an enigma if preceded by the utterance in question. Luke places this utterance correctly quite at the close of the Galilean period, in connection with a declaration of punishment against the Jews, which Matthew also places in the Galilean period, though incorporating it into the Sermon on the Mount. Nevertheless, the form of the utterance is more original in Matthew. "But I say unto you," thus speaks he now, in genuinely Isaian words, to which, prompted by events, he began with astonishment to have recourse,—“I say to you, that many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the sons of the kingdom shall be cast out into the outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”² Here the Gentiles are already, in the mind of Jesus, the substitutes for the Jews; in the festive seat—the sight of which would, according to Jewish opinion, put the Gentile to shame—the despised stranger was installed, to the amazement of the hearers.³ Yet the utterance was at first only a menace intended to arouse Jesus' own people, and—in Pauline phraseology—to make them jealous. Moreover, the kingdom of heaven still remained upon a Jewish basis: a Jewish consciousness was unable to conceive of it differently. The Gentiles were to take their places, as younger sons, by the side of the patriarchs of Israel, the prophets—as Luke gives it—the righteous of the nation generally.

¹ Matt xxi. 41; much more certainly, xxvi. 13.

² Matt. viii. 11 sq.; Luke xiii. 28. Comp. above, III. p. 223, IV. 85. The Isaiah-passages, particularly xlix. 12, lix. 10. Least likely (Meyer), xlv. 6.

³ Comp. *Bam. rabb.* 5, 21, f. 245, and *Tanch.* f. 75, 1: in mundo futuro mensam ingentem vobis sternam, quod gentiles videbunt et *pudērent*. Schöttgen, p. 86.

We cannot possibly regard as serious the objection made by some, that Jesus, when journeying to Jerusalem, could not, in harmony with such sentiments, have promised twelve judicial thrones to his twelve disciples, as if nothing existed besides Israel, and as if the Gentiles no longer existed in his consciousness.¹ For, in the first place, Jesus had before his eyes, as the practical end of conflicts and victory, Israel above all, and those children of Israel, his disciples, and not the merely mental conception of the Gentiles; and in the second place, it belonged, as we saw above, to Jesus' necessary mode of viewing these things, that the Gentiles should themselves submit to the ordinances of Israel.² Thus the form in which exclusively the mind of Jesus could open itself to universal citizenship, was the old prophetic form. Though for us these forms have disappeared, who can be so unhistorical as to overlook the amount of actual progress, and to require leaps which would be too much even for Jesus, and would be contrary to nature? And who so ungrateful as not to recognize with joy the consequences which this circumspect progression of Jesus, effected under the combined influence of anxious hesitation and biddings of conscience, has brought to the world?

When we review this grand self-entrenchment of Jesus behind his faith in his own person and in the actual presence of the kingdom, this steady resistance to obstacles, and this determined anticipation of a new world which was to make amends for the apostacy of the Jewish one, we involuntarily and almost necessarily yield to the impression that to his lofty mind and clear and penetrating glance there lay open the prospect of a kingdom of heaven which, as a self-contained and self-sufficient spiritual power secure through itself of its present and its future, needed not to wait for another or to care for any of the bulwarks of the antagonists, but needed simply to complete, by the sure step of historical progress, its great and conspicuous victories. But

¹ Hilg. *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 57.

² Has not even Paul something similar? Rom. i. 16, xi. 15 sqq.

in the midst of these impressions of a sublime era, there ultimately springs up before us, with vivid distinctness, a diametrically opposite, truly Jewish, world of the latest ideas of Jesus concerning the aim and the conclusion of his work. All the utterances of Jesus in this last Galilean period are full of announcements of the great judgment-day of God, as we have already seen and shall yet more fully see; and hand in hand therewith, we ever find a reference to universal catastrophes and to a judicial and ruling activity of the Messiah in the then first perfected kingdom of heaven.¹ At the same time, when we look closely, we discover that this mode of view, with its severity, its renunciation of historical development, its demand for Divine interference in the course of the world and in the material shaping of the future, does not come before us as an explicit contradiction to the bright world of Jesus, and to his spiritual and, as such, present kingdom of heaven. Whether from indecision he taught first one and then the other, or whether he fell back from the height of his spiritual mode of view into the Messianic world of the Jews, both are there, side by side—the present kingdom, and the kingdom that was to come and which would purify and perfect the one that then existed; the kingdom that would need time to develop, and the sudden day of judgment, that end of all terrestrial development; finally, the Lord who by word and deed would give fresh spiritual life, side by side with the judging, rewarding, punishing, reigning Messiah. This is particularly shown by the parables, where the sower of the word at once also gathers in the harvest of the judgment, and the fishing for men closes with the sorting out of the contents of the nets.² We cannot entertain even the opinion that these glimpses of the future by Jesus are to be regarded merely as a distant, slightly and hazily outlined horizon, which bounded the

¹ Matt. x. 32 sq., 39, xi. 21 sqq., xii. 36, 41, xvi. 27, &c.

² Future kingdom, *e. g.* Matt. vii. 21, 24, viii. 11, x. 23, xiii. 30, 39, 49, xvi. 28, xx. 21, xxv. 1, xxvi. 29. Present kingdom, xi. 5, 12, xii. 23, xiii. 31, 44, xxi. 31, 43, xxii. 1, xxiii. 13; Luke xvii. 21. *Comp. Gesch. Chr.* p. 43. Beyschlag (p. 52) and Weizsäcker (pp. 416, 479) agree with above.

indefinite development, and promised to the restless process of "becoming" a perfected corresponding "being." For easily as a modern mode of view can be read into the parables of the fishing, of the mustard-seed, and of the leaven, parables which, taken by themselves, appear really to justify the modern comprehensive-ness, yet Jesus undoubtedly—like Paul, later—knew nothing whatever of such wide and large dimensions of terrestrial development. On the contrary, according to all the sources, nothing is more certain than that he believed in a brief and speedy terminus as well as speedy victories; and he placed the final events, inclusive of the day of judgment, in sight of the living generation, of himself, and of his Apostles.¹ His announcements of his passion, and his references to his coming again, will disclose additional details of the picture which stood before his mind. It is sufficient here to exhibit the subject generally; though it is also requisite here to explain the remarkable fact which appears inconsistent with the great spiritual perceptions of Jesus, and with the eternal validity of his view of the universe, in which we would fain believe.

Why, therefore, did he add to his announcement of the presence of the kingdom, an announcement of the kingdom of the future—why to the development of the kingdom of God, the abrupt cessation of development—why to the spiritual, the material Messiahship? Why did he add to the unimpeachable, new, genuine, grand, spiritual view of the universe, the stunted, defective, old view? In the first place, because spiritual truths ripen slowly, because the new great movements in humanity which break through and outstrip the past and the present and consecrate the future, never quite repudiate the material soil from which they spring—even though they come from heaven—namely, the common sentiment and the modes of view of the historical surroundings, and the given time in which they make their appearance. The material kingdom of God was the passionate sentiment of the time of Jesus, the counterpart to the

¹ Matt. x. 23, xvi. 28, xxiv. 34.

palpableness of the heathen empire; the impending divine judgment was the trust of the pious, both rude and cultured, in the presence of the deadening influence of heathen wickedness and of Jewish decay. Indeed, the opinion of the age and its expectation were sanctioned and sanctified by those divine voices which, from the prophets until John, announced the approaching day of the Lord in anger and in blessing. But who, in that age, believed more firmly in the prophets and in John, and who accepted the horizon of the Baptist with more of conviction and of assurance, than Jesus himself? From the beginning, therefore, we meet with traces of Johannine expectations in the cry of Jesus, "The kingdom is at hand!" It is equally beyond doubt that these expectations were for a long time thrown into the background in the soul of Jesus and of his adherents by the announcement of the spiritual blessings of the kingdom of heaven which naturally brought the future into the present, and by the great, visible, and varying results of Jesus' words and deeds. Nay, in that joyous, fruitful, blessed life in Galilee, when for Jesus, his disciples, and the people, the prevailing emotion was one of ecstacy, Jesus, sharing the common sentiment of all, began to speak of the dawn of the Messianic time, and therefore of the transposition of the future to the present, and without hesitation to introduce the complete breaking down of the first limitations, and the bringing in of the supra-Jewish kingdom of heaven which was to be conterminous with the history of the world. That he went no further on this right road to which the future belonged, that he went backward, that he who saw beyond the old perspectives and burst through Jewish limitations should be compelled to pay tribute to those very limitations, had its ultimate ground neither in him nor in the prophets, nor in indefiniteness and want of energy, nor in a bondage to the old standpoint, but in the circumstances of the Galilean storm-period. Success matured faith in the kingdom as an actually present one; the check, the tragic struggle between light and darkness, belief and unbelief, expansion and limitation, force and

opposing force, begot faith in the kingdom as a future one, by re-invigorating and calling forth anew the sentiments that lay in the background of the soul of Jesus. In fact, we can discover beyond a doubt that Jesus' thoughts of the future, of the judgment, and of his reigning, revived in the face of the obstacles which blocked his way and threatened his existence. Once and again he placed himself with unbelieving Galilee before the impending judgment-seat of God. He threatened the seed sown by the devil with the day of harvest, the Pharisees with the uprooting of ungodly growths, the false adherents with the examination and separation of the contents of the fish-net; and he again and again indicated, by his references to the misunderstood and despised Son of Man, not merely his greatness, but also his participation in the judgment and his sovereign majesty. Heroically as he thus adapted himself to the breach in Israel, his mind nevertheless refused to regard that breach, the perpetual duality of a kingdom of the good and a kingdom of the bad, and a kingdom of heaven distinguished by humility in the midst of the children of the world, as the end of the ways of God. In the face of the presentiment to which he from time to time gave expression, that the antitheses would be toned down and reconciled, that the mustard-seed would grow to a great tree, and the leaven thoroughly leaven *everything*, finally, that all Israel, rejoicing in the new wine, would believe,—in the face of this presentiment, the serious and gloomy thought was ever regaining the upper hand, the thought, namely, that God would put forth His power and end the breach, the intolerable association of friends and foes, by His judicial destruction of the foes, and would then lead the true children of the kingdom into undisturbed enjoyment of the eternal possessions administered and allotted by the Messiah. Indeed, these serious and severe ideas of separation were so firmly fixed in his soul, that he brought them to bear even upon his friends and adherents, whose weakness aroused his mistrust. Though in the parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven he was disposed to reckon with ardent hope upon an infinite harvest of the world,

yet immediately after, in the parable of the Net cast into the Sea, there is exhibited the melancholy anticipation that he should have judicially to make a separation among the numberless contents of the net, and to hand over the rotten and the bad to destruction.¹

Thus the strong and yet at the same time tender human soul of Jesus found its limitations in these paralyzing facts, and did not overstep them. To us, however, it is permitted to overstep them in the spirit of his truth and of his presentiment. We do this on the strength of his watchword, "The kingdom of God is spirit, and it is the present." We do it because we believe in the development which he suspended, but which nevertheless he established; because we have over-lived the birth-throes of his kingdom, have witnessed the infinite development of his cause, and have seen the obstacles which stood like giants in his way laid in the dust before his illustrious personality. There remains to us the elevating reflection, not merely that he has shown us the way, that he trod it in the middle of his career, and that he held it fast in his loftiest presentiments even to the end, but also that it was not an innate limitedness of nature, but rather the weight of superhumanly oppressive facts which confined him to the obsolete track. Moreover, nothing is plainer, nothing more edifying, than that he himself, as long as he was here, struggled against the limitations by which he was beset. He did not remain constant either to his resignation or to his expectation of an impending divine judgment. Disillusions and soul-chillings were all afresh thrown off, that he might fulfil his Messianic obligation to Israel, that he might—once more wrestling with the nation's spirit of contradiction and with the will of God himself, in which he could not yet acquiesce—testify to the *whole* nation, and, in Galilee, finally in Jerusalem, conquer the heart of Israel. And if it is possible for us to discover that the very idea of the impending decisive judgments of God, which took possession of his soul with fresh strength, steeled his human

¹ Matt. xiii. 44--50.

courage, and heightened his self-renouncing devotion, by instigating him to save from judgment whatever could by any means be saved, we gladly surrender our minds to the narrowed conception, as the good will of God, who could only in such a way uphold the sinking human energies of His instrument, and secure the fruits of his campaign in violently shaken and vanquished human souls.

DIVISION III.—JESUS' LAST EFFORTS IN GALILEE.

A.—JESUS' LAST EFFORTS AS TEACHER.

When Jesus yet once more sought out his Galilean people with all his energy and all his love, in order to give them the bread that belonged to the children, it was necessary—if he would serve them all—to distribute his efforts. Here he must push further and complete his missionary tours in order to scatter the first seed; there he must deepen the impression already made in the localities of his previous efforts; he must confirm what was already won, strengthen what was giving way, and call frivolity to repentance. The accounts of the Evangelists testify to the preponderant activity of Jesus in the old localities. The speeches which they report are throughout addressed to old acquaintances, to the people that had long seen and heard him, and whom he in the most urgent manner once more invited, or—having given the rudiments of doctrine—instructed in the deeper questions of the kingdom. The most important speeches and actions are connected with the old region by the Lake of Gennesar, and with the cities of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin. We can easily understand why he should concentrate his efforts here: it was his own planting which he must bring to perfection; it was his own stronghold which he had to protect and maintain against the assaults of his foes; whilst the extension of his mission involved the risk of losing the old ground, as well as of making a merely superficial conquest of the new. It is noticeable that from this time forward more than before, Jesus, like a thoughtful general, instead of taking and defending everything—which he had always anxiously avoided doing, and which was now altogether impossible—rather sought to gain and to keep the commanding positions, first the

lake district of Galilee and then Jerusalem. Yet his principles prevented him from renouncing altogether the extension of his mission. If he did not acquire power in other parts of Palestine, yet it was necessary that Galilee should know the harvest was close at hand; Galilee must have the "testimony," in order that it might be saved or perish without excuse.¹ Moreover, the parables of this period—the Sower, the Net cast into the Sea—make it evident that the idea of extending his mission was continuously in his mind; and the Gospels show, although in scanty traces, that the realization of this idea was not completely lacking. Whilst Matthew, in describing the later days of Jesus, desists in a significant manner from using his customary general formulæ about journeys and progresses, Luke at least makes mention, after the sayings about John, of one more such journey, plainly deriving his information from a good old source, since he gives the names of the women who accompanied Jesus. But Matthew and Mark deserve our thanks still more for preserving the record of a definite solitary journey, indeed the longest hitherto described at all, namely, that to the old home of Jesus, Nazara; and Mark, moreover, has represented it as itself only introductory to a more widely-extended mission.²

Both Evangelists have postponed the journey to an already advanced period, namely, immediately or not long after the parables. And it is exceedingly appropriate to this period, since Jesus very evidently delayed the difficult task of proving the legitimacy of his course in his native town until he could remove, by the fame of his teaching and works, the natural disinclination to believe of those who had known his youth.³ The astonishment at the teachership of Jesus, and his own boast of his reception by the rest of Israel which he held up in contrast to Nazara, do not point to the period of his prosperous beginning;

¹ Comp. Matt. viii. 4, x. 18, xxiv. 14 (Book of Enoch, 96 sq.).

² Last formula in Matt. xi. 1. Then Nazara, xiii. 53 sqq. (Mark vi. 1). In Matt. xiv. sqq., journeys of flight. Luke's report of journey, viii. 1.

³ Matt. xiii. 57.

and, on the other hand, his quick irritation at the conduct of the people of the district betrays very plainly the embitterment of a late period. The motive prompting the journey to Nazara was naturally not the wish to present himself to his astonished fellow-townsmen as one who had become great, but the feeling that it was his duty to point out to his native place, to his kindred, to his acquaintances, the time that was big with blessing and terror of every kind. Perhaps also he felt an involuntary tender longing to see his home, his mother, his brethren, once more before the great crisis of whose coming he had a presentiment, and whose issue he did not know.¹ Doubtless, in company with

¹ I may here remark that Ewald's doubt as to the originality of the name *Nazara* (see above, Vol. II. pp. 16 sq.), in the review of a former volume (*Gött. gel. Anz.*, Oct. 9, 1867), has not induced me to desist from the use of this form of the name, however ready I am to acknowledge him as in other respects an authority upon this question. Hitzig's variation—to which Hirzel appeals—is, according to above, Vol. II. pp. 16 sq., intelligible. Ewald has passed lightly over the difficulties of arriving at Nazara from Nazareth,—difficulties which I have copiously established; and he has not done justice to the earliest MSS., to which now the Vat. of Luke iv. 16 has to be added. He mentions only that Jerome, *Onom.* ed. Larsow-Parthey, 1862, p. 297, gives it (where he says: *usque hodie* in Gal. viculus nomine *Nazara*). How can he be silent about all the others, especially Origen, who prefers to write *Ναζάρα, ἐν Ναζάροις* (thus like Jul. Afr. in the same third century) in X. 16 of his commentary on Matthew (three times), in X. 1, 2, 9, of his comm. on John (repeatedly), with an appeal to Luke iv. 16. He has *Nazareth*, with an appeal to Matt. and Mark, in the latter of which it stands thus without exception in the MSS., in XVI. 18, 19, of his comm. on Matt., and in VI. 31, and X. 1, 2, 9, 15, 17, of his comm. on John. It should be added that the reading is often—as in the N. T.—open to question, as in X. 1, 9, of his comm. on John. (Latin Translation, *Hom. in Luk.* 33, naturally has Nazareth.) Unfortunately, Celsus does not mention Nazara, only 7, 18: ὁ Ναζωραῖος ἄνθρωπος! The supposition of an elegant transformation into Nazara, which is made plausible specially by Origen's comm., X. 1, 2, on John, is shut out by the text itself (Matt. iv. 13, τὴν Ναζαρά), and by the juxtaposition of *Ναζάρων καὶ Κωχαβὰ*, in Jul. Afr. The accentuation oscillates between *Ναζαρά* (N. T., also Tisch.) and *Ναζάρα* (Jul. Afr. and X. 1, 2, of Origen's comm. on John); and in view of the derivation of the word as well of analogy, the *proparoxyt.* *Ναζάρα* is to be repudiated. Ewald quite erroneously defends himself by saying that Jerome has similarly abbreviated Gennesaret into Gennesar, for the latter (see above, Vol. II. p. 363) is notoriously the original, and the present form simply shows the article or *stat. emph.*, just as in the case of Nazara. This *Gennesaret*, without doubt formed from Gennesar, is therefore rather the most brilliant evidence for *Nazara*, if evidence were still needed after the cases analogous to Nazaráth and Gennesaráth: Rabbathá, Ramathá, Reblathá, Ulathá, from Rabbah, Ramah, Riblah, Hul (Region of the Lake of Huleh or Merom), and the most similar case, Naarathá, Naaráth, from Naarah, Joshua xvi. 7; Jerome, *Onom.* p. 294. But

his disciples—as Mark expressly says—he took the road southwards from Capernaum by the lake, past Magdala; there turned westward from the shore into the valley of Wady Human (the Brook of Doves), which brought him to Arbela; thence he would go past the Horns of Hattin and Mount Tabor, in a south-westerly direction towards Nazara. The distance would be nearly seven leagues, which he might accomplish in a day's journey.¹ He remained at Nazara several days, as Matthew and particularly Mark show; and he abode without doubt in his mother's house.²

It was on this occasion that the question of the belief or unbelief of his own family was decided. For if, according to the chronology of the Evangelists, that visit of his mother and brethren to Jesus at Capernaum, which he received with such extreme coolness, had already taken place, not merely should we have an altogether unexplained beginning of animosity, but we are compelled to think that in such a case Jesus would have refrained from making any subsequent visit to Nazara whatever.³ If it be assumed that the intercourse which would follow that cool reception gave to Jesus better impressions of his relations, and that he had thus been induced to venture upon the journey, then great errors on the part of the Evangelists, great vacillations on the part of the relations of Jesus, and great delusions on the part of Jesus himself, must also be assumed. It was a tragic fate, re-echoed in the utterances of Jesus concerning the divisions

Nazaret is the worst of the readings and pronunciations. Furrer, *Bedeut. der bibl. Geogr.*, 1870, p. 15, agrees with me. What remains is but of secondary importance. Ewald takes *Nezoret* as I do = Protectoress (from *nazar*); also Volkmar, p. 37; Furrer thinks rather of *Neszira*, from *naszar*, with the letter *Zayin* = the separated one (feminine). But *Nezoret* would give *Nezorta* (*Gulgolta*; *Asarta*, *Jos. Ant.* 3, 10, 6), and *Neszira* would not give *Nazara*; and Furrer's remark that the Hebrew *Tsade* would in Greek be *S* is not quite correct; comp. *Zoar*, *Kapharzaba*, and the examples given by Ewald, also the Syriac translation which assumes *Tsade*.

¹ Comp. Van de Velde's map.

² *Matt.* xiii. 54; *Mark* vi. 2, 6. *Widow*, says Volkmar, p. 345. But see above, Vol. II, pp. 148 sq.

³ *Matt.* xii. 46; in *Mark* still earlier, iii. 31; in *Luke* viii. 19 admirably well placed after the parables.

in families which he was called to bring into the world, and it was a bad omen, that Jesus found no support in Nazara from his mother, his brethren, his sisters, from any of his kindred. Natural affection was not withheld from him,—hence he was able to remain a short time at home; and it was this natural affection—not, as has long been fancied, a desire to get possession of a member of the family who was looked upon as insane—that afterwards prompted the visit to him by the lake. But neither his personal influence nor his words, nor even the great fame of his works, produced belief.¹ It must therefore have been a very powerful opposition that prevented the recognition of the man who owes his greatness certainly not alone—as some might suspect—to the prejudices of mistaken centuries. In the first place, the pusillanimity repeatedly exhibited by his fellow-townsmen would prevent them from regarding as a prophet of God him who had grown up in ordinary circumstances. In the next place,

¹ Long ago critics discovered in Mark iii. 21, 31, what was assumed to be a very old anecdote of Mark's—"demolished" by Matt. and Luke (through the "deifying" virgin-birth, says Volkmar)—of extreme family opposition, which reminds us of the history of the founder of Islam. Many, from Neander to Schenkel, have thought that the Pharisees instigated it! The interpretation became (especially through Fritzsche) so general, that not only all the upholders of Mark, and Bleek also, adopted it, but even Schleier., De Wette, Strauss, Baur and his school, escaped only through their scepticism as to Mark. Comp. the commentaries, and Strauss, I. p. 717. I have (Vol. I. p. 138) briefly spoken of this celebrated excursion of Jesus' relations as a mere fancy, and have on that account received from Volkmar, p. 265 (although he knew from express information that I should vindicate this view in the historical narration, which in the critical part of my work I could not anticipate), a very angry reprimand, as if he were the ignored discoverer. I now simply remark (1) that in Mark iii. 21 no one (comp. next page, note 1) can look for strangers coming from a distance (from Nazara to Capernaum!), since only those who were in the immediate neighbourhood could know of the crowds that were present and of the hindrances to eating; indeed even the Pharisees had already been for some time on the spot. (2) *οἱ παρά τινος* (Vulg. *sui*) can be connections of any kind (comp. 1 Macc. xiii. 52, Susanna 30, 33, 63, but particularly Luke viii. 49), and here we can think only of the disciples (as in Mark iv. 10: *οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν*), since their going out of the house is described (comp. Luke viii. 49; Mark v. 35), out of which Jesus had again departed on account of the throng. (3) In Mark iii. 31 is no longer to be read *οὐν*, but *καὶ* (Volkmar's frail trust, p. 272), therefore, according to Mark's style (see above, Vol. III. p. 4, note 1) an altogether independent fresh incident, and from this follows another and unnecessary proof that the *peaceful* visit shows no iota of any intention to arrest Jesus. (4) The connection of this incident with Exodus xviii. 1 is (as is shown above, Vol. III. pp. 371, 379, and as is clear of itself) the purest caprice.

the severe, Pharisaic, if not indeed Essene, piety of his house, as exhibited to us in its pupil James, the brother of the Lord, may have taken offence at the despiser of the ordinances and of the holy teachers. These facts are sufficiently striking to explain the difficulty which they early occasioned to the believers, and the attempted improvements which later writers introduced, without taking into account the prompting of the literary opponents among Jews or Gentiles, who ridiculed these weak points in the evangelical history. Luke has already dropped out, not indeed the cool reception by the shore of the lake, but Jesus' disappointment in his kindred at Nazara; and on that account he has robbed the participation of the family in the first reunions of the believers at Jerusalem, after the resurrection, of everything that is striking. The fourth Gospel, however, covers all and everything with a thick veil. Contrary to the other accounts, it puts Mary and the brethren, as well as the disciples, among the companions of Jesus on his first journeys, and even represents them as dwelling with him at Capernaum. It indicates the persistency of the faith which Mary had so strikingly exhibited at the marriage at Cana, by mentioning the later unbelief of Jesus' brethren; and at the close it represents Mary as standing under the cross of her Son at Golgotha, an incident about which all the other sources are silent.¹ Even the unbelief of the brethren has become less positive, whilst it can be partially admitted into history. It is no unbelief as to his deeds, his greatness, his principles; but only a dissatisfaction at his veiled Messianism, an unbelief which is also itself a belief, like that of the Apostles who desired a public manifestation before the world. It is only a crude faith, in contrast to that which is genuine and refined and asks for no external pomp, but renders complete and blissful homage to the person and the life-utterance of the Son of God.² These corrections of history find an

¹ Luke iv. 16 sqq.; Acts i. 14; John ii. 1—12 (Grot., Ewald, Lange, find his kindred in Capernaum also in Mark iii. 21 sq.), vii. 5, xix. 25.

² John vii. 3, xiv. 22; Luke xix. 11; Acts i. 6.

excuse, and the silence of a calumniating Celsus finds an explanation, in the fact that, at least later, after the resurrection of Jesus, both mother and brethren very probably went over to the congregation of those who confessed him.¹

Jesus, doubtless with his hopes already sufficiently shattered, went on the Sabbath into the synagogue which still and, as so many evidences show, even to the end stood open to him, notwithstanding the hostility between him and the Pharisees.² Yet he spoke with ardour, energy, and profundity, fighting against external influences, and the surer of his cause where it was attacked. He would hardly have based his discourse on the Messianic passage from Isaiah, which the initial address at Nazara given by Luke—already discussed and disposed of—represents him as having taken for his text.³ In many respects, it is true, this fine passage would seem to harmonize with the previous course of the history of Jesus. He had begun to announce the kingdom as present, and to indicate his Messiahship with increasing definiteness; and the passage from Isaiah and its exposition as given by Jesus, in Luke's Gospel, show in fact the presence of the Messiah and his kingdom. Moreover, the favourable impression made on the Nazarenes by the wisdom of Jesus, as reported by Matthew and Mark, proves that in the main he spoke winningly and not alarmingly; and indeed the passage from Isaiah itself distilled sweet consolation. On the other hand, however, we have no example in which Jesus greeted a fresh mission-field otherwise than with the proclamation of the approaching kingdom.⁴ His wisdom would indeed have overshot itself had he anywhere, and particularly in reluctant and mistrustful Nazara, immediately proclaimed the presence of the

¹ Acts i. 14; and Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 5, xv. 7; Gal. i. 19, ii. 9.

² Luke xiii. 10; John xviii. 20; Matt. xxvi. 55. The views of Ewald (pp. 384, 452) and others, concerning the expulsion from the synagogues, and even a minor excommunication with which Jesus was threatened, are altogether unproved. Based upon John ix. 22, xi. 57, xii. 42, they are refuted not only by Matt. xxvi. 55, but also by John xviii. 20. But more upon this further on.

³ See above, Vol. III. pp. 21 sqq.

⁴ Matt. x. 7.

kingdom and the Messiah. Matthew and Mark show plainly also that it was the wisdom of Jesus, the actual beauty and excellence of his words, and no great claim whatever, no Messianic pretension, which astonished the Nazarenes. Again, the condition of things at that time was so very unsettled, the mind of Jesus was so much less happy in the present than hopeful of the future, that he could not have celebrated the actual fulfilment of all the divine promises in such a full and unqualified manner as would have been involved in the appropriation of Isaiah's words. Thus, renouncing Luke and his quotation from Isaiah, let us be content to know that the wise utterances of Jesus deeply impressed the minds of the Nazarenes whom the Sabbath, and still more the presence of their fellow-countryman, had brought together in great numbers. But the powerful impression produced was at once met by the reflection, "Whence did this man get this wisdom and these powers? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence, therefore, has he all this?" This is a criticism as interesting as it is genuinely human and true to the life. We have elsewhere but little information as to the whispering and murmuring and speaking which generally went on in the synagogue after the address.² Here we have a picture of the manner in which success flowed towards Jesus and then ebbed again. The people could not contradict, they were carried away, the thing spoke for itself; but the inquiry after a sufficient ground—an inquiry apparently very acute, yet in truth very paltry—reversed everything. For to the popular understanding the sufficient ground of a profound fact lay on the surface of

¹ Matt. xiii. 55 and Luke iv. 22, opp. Mark vi. 3, and the new fiction of Volkmar's concerning Matthew's Son of God (p. 349); comp. Holtzmann, p. 82. See above, Vol. I. p. 124, note 1. With a little logic there is much to be done here, but not *for* Matthew, who (opp. Mark) admits the *human father*, and also (opp. Luke) the handicraft.

² See above, Vol. II. p. 158. Germany now sees a similar thing among the Mohammedan prisoners of war.

experience. Profound wisdom necessarily implied a renowned teacher or miraculous divine instruction, or it was inexplicable, therefore impossible, therefore indeed not present. In point of fact, they argued thus,—the wise men, the shrewd Philistines of Nazara. They took the family tree, and went through it completely, from the father and the paternal handicraft to the sisters: nothing there beyond the ordinary; even the names could not be remembered without reflection! Passing from name to name, it became more and more certain that the wisdom was no wisdom, because it came from no good house; and the question which, in their perplexity, the people repeated at the close, “Whence has he all this?” is equivalent to the answer, He has nothing, or he has everything from an evil source—only froth and fancy, only the lies and deceptions of a common fellow, of a fool.¹ It was essentially the same process that took place in the house of Jesus, only the house mistrusted itself, while the town despised the house. And this was the process which, most distinctly developed in the family, in the native place, necessarily repeated itself in a like manner in Galilee, in Judea generally, in connection with so many points which placed Jesus’ ministry and significant position in contrast with his antecedents and with the external appearance of the Son of Man. Met by the offence and the unbelief of the people of the place, Jesus’ mission to his native town was quickly brought to a close. “A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country and in his own house,”—with these words Jesus ended his utterances in the synagogue. Very few believers, besides the sick upon whom, according to Mark, he laid his hand, indemnified him for the general failure of his efforts there. “He did not many mighty works there, because of their unbelief,” says Matthew; and Mark adds, “He could not do them,” for lack of subjects and of a willing disposition.²

¹ According to Volkmar (p. 345), the cause of offence was his prophetic, or, indeed, his *regal* claim.

² According to Volkmar (pp. 343 sqq.), Nazara really represents Judea! Why not a *xx* or symbol?

But he could not punish, for the unbelief of Nazara, the whole district which from his youth up he had had so near his heart, and in which he now afresh felt himself happy and secure as in the presence of an old and faithful acquaintance. Besides, it is by no means probable that, in this later period, when every day was precious to him, he devoted a whole journey, and at any rate a whole week, to a sentimental and personal interest, and confined himself solely to the town of Nazara. We can find in Mark an allusion to missions in the neighbourhood of Nazara, that Evangelist telling us that, immediately after the incident just dwelt upon, Jesus went round about the villages, an expression which is not one of Mark's favourite general formulæ, but derives its significance from the fact that Nazara—in the neighbourhood of which Mark, as we have seen, erroneously places the sending forth of the twelve Apostles—was surrounded by the villages of the rich plain of Jezreel. Luke supplies an interesting contribution by telling us that Jesus entered into Nain, a town south of Nazara. Certainly Luke knows nothing of a connection of this journey with that to Nazara; on the contrary, the description reads as if Jesus travelled directly and in one day's journey from Capernaum to Nain. Moreover, the journey itself is questionable, because it stands bound up with the questionable incident of the resurrection of the young man at Nain.¹ Neither of these objections, however, is final. The connection between the journey from Nain and that to Nazara—which is almost necessary—may have been the more easily lost by Luke, because he had disposed of the journey to Nazara by placing the initial sermon there in the beginning of the Gospel. Though the incident of the resurrection is probably mythical, we need not sacrifice the journey to Nain because the distinct mention of the name of this unimportant town—which, however, was situated on a frequented route—represents an historical reminiscence not immediately suggested by the fact that, southward from Nain, but separated from it by Little Hermon, lay the

¹ Luke vii. 11 (read τῆ). The resurrection, see below.

Shunem where, like Jesus at Nain, the prophet is said to have raised a widow's son. We have elsewhere no details of this excursion, which extended from the hill district of Jesus' native town to the foot of Little Hermon, two or three leagues across a small arm of the plain of Jezreel, that stretched out towards the south broad and beautiful as a green sea. Perhaps he went beyond Nain, which still exists as the little village Neïn, and beyond the adjacent Shunem, to the south-eastern central region of the great plain, to the larger town of Jezreel, only two leagues distant, the ancient royal residence, whence two leagues would bring him to the Samaritan boundary at Ginea (Dshenin).¹ At any rate, this was the limit of this southern campaign, the longest expedition Jesus ever made, unless we take into account his later journeys of flight. The extreme extent of this mission-district, from Chorazin on the north and east, to Jezreel on the south, and Nain or Nazara on the west, was about ten leagues by five or six. He could return from the neighbourhood of Nain and Jezreel—if he did not exactly retrace his steps—by three routes: he could take the Jalud valley eastward to the Jordan near Scythopolis, or he could go northward through the hill district, over Little Hermon to Tabor, or north-westerly across the great plain and through Sepphoris to the plain of Zebulun, on whose northern border, in the latitude of Magdala, lay that Cana of Galilee (Cana el Dshelil) which the fourth Gospel repeatedly mentions as the sojourning place of Jesus, and whence three leagues in an easterly direction would bring him again to the Horns of Hattin, and two or three leagues to Capernaum.² Concerning

¹ Nain = a pasture, not lovely, naim, as first the Rabb. (Lightfoot, p. 478), and then It., Vulg., Jerome. Eus., Jerome (*Onom.* p. 296), κόμη (oppidulum) two (Eus. twelve) miles south of Tabor, near Endor. Not to be confounded with Nain in the south-east, on the Idumæan border, *Jos.*, *B. J.* 4, 9, 4. At present Neïn; comp. Brok. in Lightfoot; Robinson's *Palestine*; Winer and Herzog. Jezreel, Ahab's residence, 1 Kings xviii. 45.

² Cana, John ii. 1, iv. 46, xxi. 2. No trace of it in the Synoptics. Possibly, by a misunderstanding, derived from Cananaean (Matt. x. 4), though certainly Canæus should have been formed from that. Possibly it has a symbolical meaning, kanah (he has created, comp. John iv. 46). No certainty can be arrived at, as a tradition might

Jesus' only partial success we may listen to Matthew. It is noteworthy that Matthew, and to a certain extent Mark also, mention the keen interest felt by the tetrarch Antipas in Jesus and his striking works, immediately after the ministry of Jesus in the south. As the journey from Capernaum to the south led Jesus into close proximity to Tiberias, the residence of the tetrarch, and was accompanied by a considerable coming together of the people—a fact which Luke records—it is easy to conceive that the attention of the anxious tetrarch would chiefly at this time be directed towards Jesus and the works which, despite the unbelief of his home, were not lacking on this journey. The doubt whether the saying of Antipas, which was preceded by the execution of the Baptist, does not belong to a later period, is set at rest by assuming that its date is soon after the bloody harvest feast.¹

The journey into the south, to his native country, to Nazara and Nain, was, as far as we can see, Jesus' last new missionary tour. His more important task lay in the old mission-field, where he had to defend his acquisitions, nay, his whole position, against the attack of foes, against the apathy and fickleness of the people. The extreme seriousness of the future and of the present, the necessity of a steadfast decision irrespective of the great mass hurrying to perdition, of father and mother, brethren and household, without tenderness or pity for one's own person,—this, above all, was now the spirit of his addresses. “Enter

have been here ready at hand for the use of the fourth Gospel, although we see little of the same thing elsewhere. All agree on one point, that we are not (according to tradition from the sixteenth century downwards, which even Burckhardt followed) to think of the present little village, Kefr Kenna, situated on an eminence a league and a half N.E. of Nazara, on the road to Tiberias; but, according to the sound of the word, as well as to Josephus (*B. J.* 1, 17, 5; *Vita*, 16) and to the earlier tradition, the present Kana el Dshelil (the Galilean, not the Kana near Sidon), nearly three leagues N. of Nazara on the northern border of the plain of Zebulun (el Buttauf), at the foot of Dshebel Kaukab, near Jotapata, five leagues W. of Capernaum; ruins W. of the village. Comp. Rüetschi, article *Kana* in Herzog. Something historical in the mention of Cana may be assumed, inasmuch as Jul. Afr. ap. Eas. 1, 7, sought for the residences of the kindred of Jesus in Nazara and Kochaba. As to Kochaba, however, we are not to think of the Celo-Syrian (above, Vol. II. p. 24, note), but the Galilean to the north, Dshebel Kaukab, a league and a quarter N.W. of Cana.

¹ Matt. xiv. 1; Luke ix. 7; Mark vi. 14.

in at the narrow gate," thus spake *he* now to the people, describing the obscurity, the toilsomeness, the unfrequentedness of the way of the kingdom, in an utterance which Matthew misplaces in the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, but which Luke much more correctly postpones to a later period, and inserts in an address to the people: "Enter in at the narrow gate, for wide and broadly traced is the way which leads to destruction, and many there are who go in it; for narrow and indistinctly marked out is the way which leads to life, and few there are who find it.¹ By their fruits shall ye know them. Men do not gather thorns from vines, nor from the three-pointed weed figs. The good tree brings forth fine fruit, the corrupt tree bad fruit, and it cannot do otherwise. But every tree which does not bring forth fine fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire.² Not every one who says to me, Lord! Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father in the heavens. Many will say to me in that day, Lord! Lord! we ate and drank in thy presence, and thou didst teach us in our streets. And then will I confess to them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye workers of iniquity!"³ It was perhaps in such a connection that he also gave, in what was with the Jews a favourite metaphor, the two great pictures of the hospitable meal, pictures no longer preserved in their integrity in the Gospels: the picture of the lord who sent his servants to call the guests, and of

¹ Matt. vii. 13; Luke xiii. 24 (addressed to the people; the occasion of the sayings is also given, the question, "Are there few that will be saved?"). In the explanatory sentence in Matt., "the gate" is not established; comp. Tisch., who puts it in brackets. Similar figures often used in the Old Testament (Prov. viii. 34) and by the Rabbis, comp. *januæ lacrymarum, orationis, pœnitentiæ*. Lightfoot, p. 305. A few, *Succ. f. 45, 2: vidi filios cœnacula, qui numero admodum pauci sunt*. Schött. p. 80.

² Matt. vii. 16—20; Luke (also in the Sermon on the Mount) vi. 43 sq. In Matthew the logic is fine: main proposition, verse 16, prologue, then proof (1) from fact, with application, vv. 16 sq.; (2) from impossibility, verse 18; (3) from final issue, verse 19. The figure of fruits also often in the Talmud, *fructus ferre*. Schöttgen, p. 81. Prettily used, *Bab. Berac. 48, 1: cucurbita, cucurbita, ex semine dignoscitur*. Lightfoot, p. 305.

³ Matt. vii. 21 sqq.; comp. with the partially older form, Luke xiii. 26 sq. Jesus often (comp. Matt. xii. 50, xxi. 31) requires the doing of God's will (*Sin. Θ.λήματα*). *Pacere voluntatem creatoris*, often in the writings of the Rabbis, Schöttgen, p. 81.

the lord's retaliation of the disdain of the prosperous by summoning the vagrants and the poor; and the picture of the king who dismissed from his son's marriage feast the men that came in their ordinary dress. "For many are called, but few chosen."¹

While these later addresses were marked by menace and alarming announcement, they were never completely without kindly appeals. These popular addresses, moreover, would be the less likely to lack the cordial words of invitation to all who were weary and heavy-laden which he spoke to his adherents, because Jesus brought before the people at this later period such charming parables as those of the Treasure and of the Pearl. Nevertheless, the call to conversion, enforced by the most alarming threats, preponderated. The very events of the day became to him signs from which he at once drew an application to the people. He was told of a massacre which Pilate the procurator had quite recently brought to pass at Jerusalem among some Galileans who had gone up to sacrifice, doubtless at the Feast of Tabernacles in the autumn of A.D. 34. We have no reliable trace elsewhere of this bloodshed, but it may have been at the same disturbance as that in which Jesus Barabbas was implicated, who was reserved in prison for execution at Easter, A.D. 35.

¹ Luke xiv. 16 sqq.; Matt. xxii. 1—14. (1) These utterances (at least the first) belong scarcely to Jerusalem (Matt.), where Jesus evidently combated only the hierarchs, not the people, for in the few days he spent there he could not form a decisive opinion as to the latter. Comp. Luke and the other Galilean utterances. (2) What is genuine is to be found out by comparing Matt. and Luke together. Luke is, on the whole, more original; only what is Ebionite (Luke xiv. 21 sqq., and the second sending, xiv. 22 sq.) belongs to the Ebionite source (comp. Matt. xxii. 9 sq.). But Matthew has not only incorrectly placed his parables at Jerusalem, and directed their points to the downfall of Judaism as a whole by the destruction of the city, but he has also incorrectly blended (comp. the Jerusalem period) two easily distinguished parables (xxii. 11). Strauss, 4th ed., I. p. 637. The parables suggest, in the Old Testament, Prov. ix. 2 (comp. Genesis xxix. 22). Comp. Lightfoot, pp. 354, 631; Schöttgen, pp. 86, 88, 174, 289. From these passages it is in particular to be gathered that the poor and the vagrants were often invited. *Pirke Ab.* 1, 5: sint pauperes filii domus tue. *Beresch. R.* s. 62, f. 60: rex peregrinos et in itinere constitutos invitavit. Coming in ordinary clothing, in turpitudine sua, instead of gloria, Wetstein, p. 471. Even the word ἀπιστοι, and the separate calls, in the Talmud.—Many called (see above, pp. 76 sqq.), comp. 4 Esdras viii. 3: multi quidem creati sunt, pauci autem salvabuntur. Only this sentence is not (Volkmar) the basis of that in the Gospels.

But in point of fact there was never any scarcity of bloodshedding under Pilate; and the impulsive Galileans, whether prompted by Messianic hopes or not, were always among the foremost in a tumult.¹ In accordance with genuine Jewish habits—as we perceived in the insurrection under Archelaus, at Easter, B.C. 4—they had first insulted the Romans, perhaps had attacked, or even slain, the temple guard, in order to be able to offer their sacrifice to God in a self-satisfied frame of mind.² Then the Romans advanced upon them; the sanguinary procurator, present at the feast, knew no clemency; the worshippers were hewn to pieces, and streams of human blood mingled with the blood of beasts in God's court.³ Not long before this, Jerusalem had been the scene of another disaster. A tower at the spring of Siloah, according to general opinion on the S.E. of the town, had fallen in and buried eighteen men beneath its ruins.⁴ It was characteristic of Jesus' religious habit of mind that he saw in these events a divine dispensation, or more exactly an avenging justice against sinners; and his then predominant mood led him to find in it a token of divine anger on account of the persistent impenitence of the whole nation, and to discern a visible warning for all in the destruction of a few.⁵ While the messengers were describing to him with horror the bloody deed of the procurator, there did not for one moment occur to him the

¹ Luke xiii. 1. On Barabbas, see below, on the passion. The Galileans, see above, Vol. II. p. 10. Some have quite erroneously thought of the insurrection under Judas Galileus (I. p. 261), or the Samaritan insurrection (II. p. 259). On the ground of Luke xiii. 22 and the fourth Gospel, Lightfoot (p. 534) also thought of the Feast of Tabernacles.

² See above, I. p. 254. Conflicts with the temple guards frequently mentioned by Josephus. Comp. only *Ant.* 20, 5, 3.

³ See above, I. p. 254. The expression frequently occurs: *ego commiscebo sanguinem tuum cum sang. ejus.* Lightfoot, p. 535. Schöttgen, pp. 286 sq.

⁴ Copious and sweet fountain of Siloam, *Jos. B. J.* 5, 4, 2. Ravine, *ib.* 5, 12, 2; 6, 8, 5, according to the description, on the S.E. In the Old Testament, Shiloach, or Shelah. In *Aq.*, Symm., Theod., Siloa. In the Vulgate, Siloe. In LXX., Josephus, N. T. (comp. John ix. 7), Siloam. Tit. Tobler, *Die Siloah-Quelle*, 1852. Comp. Winer and Herzog.

⁵ Comp. Matt. ix. 2; John ix. 3.

thought that his slaughtered fellow-countrymen suffered unjustly,—he did not even inquire whether they were guilty. The thought did not for one moment occur to him that the distress of Israel cried aloud for redemption, and that Rome was preparing herself for the day of divine reckoning. However readily such thoughts might have suggested themselves to the Baptist, there awoke in the mind of Jesus, as soon as he had heard, and especially at this period, a very different perception; he saw the chastising arm of God even in the detested Romans, and commenting on one event after another, he announced to the astonished listeners, not that which brought consolation, not a prospect of help and of revenge, but the storm about to burst over Galilee, nay, over Jerusalem and the whole nation of the Jews. “Think ye,” he said, “that these Galileans were sinners above all Galileans, because they suffered such things? By no means, I tell you; but if ye do not repent, ye shall all likewise perish. Or those eighteen upon whom the tower at Siloah fell and slew them,—think ye that they were debtors above all men that dwell in Jerusalem? By no means, I tell you; but if ye do not repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” He added a parable. “A certain man had planted a fig-tree in his vineyard; and he came seeking fruit on it, and found none. But he spake to the labourer in the vineyard: Lo, three years (the time required for the tree to arrive at maturity) have I come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, and have found none; cut it down; why cumberest thou the ground? Lord, let it alone this year also, answered the labourer” (in whose person Jesus describes the genuinely Israelitish care for the fruit-trees, as well as still more himself), “until I dig about it and dung it. Then if it bear fruit, well; but if not, after that thou mayest cut it down.”¹

¹ Luke xiii. 6—9 (in Matt. and Mark it has become mythical in the narrative of the passion, Matt. xxi. 19). Fig-tree attains maturity in three years, Wetstein on the passage, p. 744. Otherwise we might think that three was simply a round whole number, see on Matt. xvi. 21. Ancients as well as moderns have held the number to be symbolical. Sometimes the three years have been thought to represent the Law, the Prophets, and the time of Jesus (Theophyl.); but much oftener the three years of

In the midst of his threatening, he here exhibits the redeeming love which throbbed in his heart; and yet the people compelled him to proceed further, and to add to his threats the announcement of terrible judgments. Many had he freed from demoniacal possession, from diseases of every kind, and had led them, after they had suffered every variety of bodily and mental suffering, to the joyful heaven of divine grace, to the paternal God. But in the midst of the sense of security of the slothful, idle minds only made ready to return again to sin, he was disposed to anticipate that the evil spirits, nay, the old terrible night-fiend of the past, must inevitably return in seven-fold strength to Galilee. "When the unclean spirit is gone out of the man," said he to the people, "it goes through dry places, seeking rest and finding none. Then says he, I will return to my house whence I came out. And he comes and finds it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goes he and takes with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and take up their abode there, and the last state of that man is worse than the first. So will it be also to this wicked generation."¹ But beyond the temporal punishment lay the judgment. Not only the Pharisees, but at one time the people also, in the miracle-loving spirit of the Jews, and, though unbelieving, excited by

Jesus' ministry (Bengel, Wies., Weizs.), according to which interpretation (thus Meyer, rightly) Jesus would have taught four years. The attention bestowed by the Jews on the culture of trees, see Deut. xx. 19, and the Rabbis: *stercorant, fodiant, evellunt surculos, avellunt folia, conspergunt cineres, fumigant sub arb. ad enecandos vermiculos.* On barbarous destruction: *non mortuus fuerat filius meus, nisi quod succidit ficum intempestive.* Lightfoot, p. 535.

¹ Matt. xii. 43 sqq.; Luke xi. 24 sqq.; in Matt. erroneously addressed to the Pharisees; in Luke, to the people. But even in Matt. the supplementary verse 46 is more correct. In Luke, an apparently good connection with the Beelzebul controversy. But this was carried on with the Pharisees (thus Matt. and Mark correctly). There is here the double possibility that the passage about the return of the demons formed, as in Matthew, the close of the popular demand for signs, perhaps also mediately of the antecedent controversy with the Pharisees concerning Beelzebul, harmonizing with both, the demand for signs being renewed at the cessation of actual miracles; or that simply the author's association of ideas brought these scenes into connection.—The dwelling-places of demons, see above, II. p. 304, III. 228 (comp. Schöttgen, p. 128: *ejeci eum in regionem aridam et desertam*). Seven, Luke viii. 2. The last state, comp. Daniel xi. 29.

a powerful work of healing and lusting after a greater, demanded a sign.¹ "A wicked and adulterous generation"—thus he answered the people, in a similar though more diffuse form—"seeks a sign, and no sign shall be given to it, except the sign of the prophet Jonah. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and lo! more than Jonah is here. The Queen of the South shall rise up in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, because she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and lo! more than Solomon is here!"² With a denunciation of woe, he particularly appointed this divine judgment to the three cities of his unwearied activity. "Woe unto thee, Chorazin; woe unto thee, Bethsaida, for if the mighty works which have been done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Further, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, hast thou not been exalted to heaven? thou shalt go down to hell! For if the mighty works had been done in Sodom which have been done in thee, it would have remained to this day! Further, I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee!"³ In this connection it

¹ Matt. xii. 38—42; Luke xi. 29—32. Luke is right as to fact in representing the people asking; Matt. says Pharisees, but afterwards, verse 46, also mentions the people, like Luke. Hilgenfeld (1867, pp. 412 sqq.) wishes to cut away Matt. xii. 17—45; indeed, though it all bears the stamp of originality, at any rate the author has, in ix. 27—34, abbreviated and inserted it in the wrong place. Comp. above, III. p. 160, note 2, IV. p. 9.

² Evil generation, God's utterance concerning Israel, Numbers xxxii. 14: tarbut anashim chathaim; Rabb. tarbut raah, evil after-growth. Schöttgen, p. 127. Jesus said: t. raah veszonah. Signs, comp. above, p. 12 sq. Sackcloth and ashes, at Nineveh, Jonah iii. 5. Matt. xii. 40 is an unskillful addition based on the death and resurrection of Jesus, which a later period the more readily connected with Jonah ii. 1, because Jesus had compared himself to Jonah. Verse 40 is wanting in Matt. xvi. 4, Luke xi. 30, and Mark viii. 11 sq. Moreover, the verse is altogether immaterial to the context, nay, is in contradiction to verse 41 and its spiritual meaning.

³ Matt. xi. 20—24; Luke x. 13—15 (fine, but capricious in the sending forth of the Seventy). The reading in Matt. and Luke is, according to Tischendorf, $\mu\eta\text{---}\epsilon\psi\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\zeta$?

was but a step to the announcement of the entrance of the Gentiles instead of the Jews into the kingdom of God, an announcement which, to the extreme humiliation of the latter, but with the most powerful incitement, he couched in the words, "But I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outermost darkness; there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth."¹ Though in his bitterness and indignant excitement he uttered such words, we can never forget that the sorrow and love of an Israelite were hidden under the harsh expressions, and that even the announcement of the impending evil did not exclude the wish, nay, the will, to sacrifice these dark predictions to a changed attitude and a self-recovery of the people smarting under the heavy blows and sharp stings of his strong sayings.

These last summonses to the kingdom of heaven, in the form of threats of exclusion from that kingdom, betray the ultimate aim of gaining the people by force and pressure through their remarkable connection with an unreserved communicativeness concerning the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, the greatness of his person, and his relation to the Old Testament past. Such a frank unreserve had not been hitherto exhibited, and it could have been inspired only by the importance of lifting every veil from the impending and obvious catastrophe, and of thus bringing about a final favourable change by making the most powerful impression upon the minds and the wills of the people. The predictions of punishment are full of this unreserve: as, *e.g.*, when he placed himself above Solomon and Jonah, when he spoke of his wisdom and his works as unprecedented and as grounds of con-

By the lifting up is to be understood not only external prosperity, but the honour of being the residence of Jesus, comp. Luke xiii. 26. Sodom, *Sanh.* f. 107: Sodomitæ non habent partem in seculo futuro.

¹ Matt. viii. 11—13. See above, p. 98. *Tenebræ interiores* (after the *jom din*), Schöttgen, p. 88. Gnashing of teeth in Old Testament (Ps. xxxv. 16, xxxvii. 12; Job xvi. 9) symbol of inimical fury, here of quaking with pain.

denunciation for unbelief at the judgment, when he thus set forth his person as the central point of divine and human history, and claimed the judgment-seat and regal authority as his privilege and property. In connection with these things stands the fact that he no longer—as far as can be shown—strongly prohibited the making widely known his name and his works, and that he began to inquire expressly about the opinion of the people.¹ The most remarkable fruit of this principle of candour was—besides his weighty disclosures of opinion concerning the ordinances of the Pharisees, which have been already referred to—the address to the people concerning his forerunner, on the occasion of the embassy sent to him by the Baptist.² It is true that the outward occasion naturally carried with it publicity and openness; but it was evidently the above-mentioned striving to discover himself, together with the general attitude of sharpened antagonism in which he already found himself, that led him to take upon his lips, and certainly not for the last time, the name of the man of the people whom the hierarchy hated and persecuted, the man concerning whom he had hitherto observed the profoundest silence, although he had derived much of his teaching from him. And not only did he now mention his name, but he pointed out his epoch-making greatness with a piety which he had hitherto kept hidden in his own breast. With a calm clear presence of mind which appears almost miraculous in the midst of such agitating circumstances, he disclosed the points of connection between John and himself, and the common character of their work of bringing the kingdom of God into actual existence. Prompted by the Baptist's expressed doubt, he also threw light upon the subaltern character of one so highly placed, of the highest among men and prophets, upon his merely preparatory office as foretold by Malachi, indeed upon his sinking and falling

¹ It is true we find prohibitions in Matt. xii. 16, Luke viii. 56, Mark v. 43, vii. 36; but either these are injunctions placed in most inappropriate positions (see the passages in Luke and Mark), or the narrations (Mark vii. 36) or commands to keep silent (Luke, Mark, the case of Jairus, opp. Matt.) are weakly attested.

² The former, see above, pp. 22 sq.

below the least in the kingdom by his own self-exclusion from the kingdom which he announced. He finally, however, recurred to John's permanent achievement, and to his vocation of being, with Jesus, the founder of the kingdom and the teacher whom that people, those children, did not understand.¹ "What went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet.² This is he of whom it was written: Behold, I send my messenger before thee, and he shall prepare thy way before thee.³ Verily I say unto you, there has not arisen among those born of women a greater than John the Baptist; but the least in the (already commenced) kingdom of heaven is greater than he."⁴ From recognition he here passed quickly to negation; but from negation again to correct historical criticism. "From the days of the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven has been violently coveted, and the violent seize it to themselves. For all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John. Who has ears, let him hear!"⁵

¹ Matt. xi. 2, 7 sqq.; Luke vii. 24 sqq. Hausrath has made the great mistake of placing this speech at Jerusalem, as if the Galileans had not made pilgrimages to John in the wilderness. From this time, Jesus frequently speaks of John, not only Matt. xvii. 11 sq., but in Jerusalem, before the hierarchs, Matt. xxi. 25. Comp. above, pp. 27 sqq.

² The people continued to regard John as a prophet, Matt. xxi. 26. [The author translates Tisch.'s reading, *τί ἐξήλθατε; προφήτην ἰδεῖν*; thus, "Was seid ihr hinausgegangen?" &c. As this would be in English, "What went ye out?"—a mere fragment of a sentence—and the author was evidently anxious to be exact, I have made the text grammatical, and given the author's reading here.—*Tr.*]

³ The passage, Mal. iii. 1, belongs to the original text of the Gospel (comp. Luke, and Mark i. 2, where indeed the passage, for the sake of getting a good introduction, is—under the unfortunate palliation of Volkmar—ascribed to Isaiah), although the *κατασκ.* does not agree with the LXX. (*ἐπιβλέψ.*), but with the original text (*pinnah*). But it was not necessary to turn to the Heb. text for this word; it was the sense of the passage and the tenor of evangelical tradition. Jesus can have uttered the speech, even though xi. 14 was evidently not spoken until later, xvii. 11.

⁴ On the jehide nashim, see above, p. 71. With the passage comp. Matt. v. 19. Erroneous explanations of the "less" mentioned by Meyer, who, however, himself makes the mistake of referring the compar. to John, instead of to the other members of the kingdom. See above, p. 34.

⁵ In defiance of the context (Matt. xi. 13) and of Luke xvi. 16, Schneek. and others refer the violence to opponents, either Pharisees (Schneck., Hilg., p. 404), or Paul and the Gentile Christians (Baur, *Kan. Ev.* p. 616). Luke gave to the sentence about the

There was something affecting in the attempt of Jesus to secure greater results, nay, to bring about a change in the course of events, and even in the distribution of divine gifts, by stooping so low to the inclinations and mental capacity of the people. He had always spoken in pithy figurative sentences, in a popular manner, with perfect simplicity, without embellishment and pedantic subtlety. Yet he had often felt he was not understood even when the heart of the people seemed to go with him; and from their non-knowing, as well as from their non-willing, he explained to himself the manifold unproductiveness of the seed he had sown. Hence it was worth a trial to place before this people the spiritual truth, clothed, not merely here and there in isolated pictures and sketches portraying the supersensual, but throughout—even to the complete obscuration of the higher soul—in such a material representation of the universe as common men could touch, conceive, and understand. The form he chose was the simile, the *mashal*, the parable, of which the East is still fond, and which was familiar to the Israelite, and indeed an old acquaintance, through the tradition of the holy books, from Jotham the son of Jerubbaal, Abimelech's brother, in the Book of Judges, to the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel, nay, to the Scribes, among whom Rabbi Meir was reckoned an unequalled speaker of parables. Jesus was careful, however, to preserve his parables from becoming mere imaginative fables, by soberly and seriously drawing his material exclusively from the provinces of reality and of human life. An unapproached plastic artist, whose praise has lived through all the centuries, he moulded the people to what was highest, instead of keeping them on the ground of the timid morality of expediency, and threw light upon the profoundest secrets of God and of the universe.¹ And he chose this course the

Law and the Prophets an anti-Jewish direction (so also Baur, Hilg.). Who has ears, see Ezekiel iii. 27: ὁ ἀκούων ἀκούετω.

¹ Old Testament *mashal* (similarity); comp. also the verb *dimmah*. Greek, *παραβολή* (comparison), LXX. and the Synoptics (already Plato, Arist.) and *παραομιμία*, properly a speech that is unusual, going out of the way, then an utterance with a wider and higher meaning, proverb, enigma, allegory, appearing exclusively in the

more readily because it was so peremptorily necessary for him, on the threshold of his great decisions, of his conflicts with the hierarchy, and of the divine judgment, to have on his side a well-equipped body of adherents equal to the seriousness of the position and fully instructed in the secrets of the kingdom of heaven. Thus, as a master of the hidden truth which his profound mind had discovered, he knew how to make the rise, the development, the consummation, of the kingdom of heaven tangible to the popular consciousness, without passing beyond the every-day conceptions of this people, and by means of the forms and figures which the lake and the land made familiar to them. The lake gave him the picture of casting into the water the net which at every throw collected a quantity of all kinds of fishes, of both high and low class, good and bad, to become the subject of a great scrutiny and selection on the dry land. Pictures of sowing and harvest were furnished to him by the flourishing district of Gennesar, that oasis with rich black mould, with vivifying springs, with a soil which was made to produce its utmost, and, apart from the treasures which an industrious spade here and there turned up, was pregnant with blessing, though it was, certainly, at the same time a region of perpetual conflict, here with the rocky ground of the hill-ranges and the crumbling basalt blocks of the lake-shore, there with the irrepressible tropical luxuriance of weeds and the plunderings of numberless

fourth Gospel (x. 6, xvi. 25, 29), where for the most part the parables have become allegories. The usual expression of the Synoptics, parable, is mostly used of fictitious narratives in the above sense of the text, now and then of proverbs, Luke iv. 23, and of metaphorical speeches generally, v. 36 (comp. Bleek, I. p. 509, and Grimm). The meaning of the expression, parable, is generally made clear in the Gospels themselves, as there usually stands as introduction, ὁμοίως, ὁμοιωθῆναι (nimshal). Old Test. parables, *c. g.* Judges ix. 7; Isaiah v. 1; Ezekiel xiii. 11. Allegory, Proverbs ix. 1. Rabb. in Lightfoot, p. 326. Shorter metaphorical speeches of Jesus, of light, salt, bread, house, children, the blind, foxes, wine-bags, clothing. On the distinction between the parable and the fable (the Æsopian apologue), comp. Cicero, *D. inv.* 1, 19: fabula est, in qua nec vera nec verisimiles res continentur. Fame of Jesus as a teacher by parables, see Galenus, quoted above, I. p. 30. Steffens, *Rel. Ph.* I. p. 146, in Neander. Renan: creator of the parable. On the parables in general, F. A. Unger, 1828; Fr. G. Liscow, 1832; F. Nippold, 1870; Bleek, I. p. 510.

birds.¹ Here, again, the road which meandered by the lake suggested the seed-corn trodden down by the wayside or fruitlessly sprouting. It suggested also the pearls which the passing merchant had successfully bargained for in order to convey them to Galilee, Syria, or Damascus, as precious things from Arabia and Persia. Here, finally, in his domestic intercourse, Jesus had musingly watched the wife or maiden of the house busily mixing with skilful hand the wheaten meal and the leaven, then waiting for the dough to rise, until it was fit to be made into round cakes and to be baked. As he looked at all these material things, he added to them the spiritual leaven; and what he had already imagined under these external forms, he placed, when the need arose, in the most vigorous pictures before his people as their most nourishing bread.

While in the details of this province of the parables of Jesus much may remain or appear to be uncertain, on the whole things are here perfectly clear, and in truth no question stands undecided.² Above all, the aim of the parables is distinctly indicated by Jesus, and this indeed in very evident antithesis to the paradoxical and—as Strauss quite correctly says—astonishingly morbid meaning which the pessimist Gospels, despairing of the Jewish people, have more or less introduced into his words.³ As to his reason for teaching in parables, Jesus himself spoke explicitly. The new mode of teaching appeared so striking to the disciples, that—as Matthew has expressly said, and less distinctly Mark also, while Luke, with inferior tact, has remained silent—immediately after the first parable, they asked him his motive for thus speaking.⁴ He named as his reason the non-

¹ Comp. among the Rabbis, *seminare supra petras, scopulos et saxosa*. Also, in *agro arboreo* (with trees and bushes). Lightfoot, p. 327.

² Matt. xiii. 1; Luke viii. 4; Mark iv. 1. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. Trans., I. 349: most genuine. Even Volkmar, p. 301: three parables genuine, although belonging to different periods.

³ Strauss, *l. c.* p. 348, note. Approved by Hilg. p. 421.

⁴ Matt. xiii. 10. On the other hand, according to Luke viii. 9, the disciples at once asked for the meaning of the parables. This conception (preferred by Neander, De Wette, Weiss, Holtzmann, and others) stands in evident contradiction to the answer of Jesus, which harmonizes only with the question in Matthew. Thus also Bleek, I.

understanding, nay, the incapacity of the people to receive the secrets of the kingdom of heaven: "Because *to you* it is given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but *to them* it is not given.¹ For whoever has, to him shall be given, and he shall be made rich; but he who has not, even that which he has shall be taken from him,"—that is, in spiritual things it happens as in material things, the rich become richer, the poor become destitute.² Therefore, because they are so poor, "I speak to them in parables, because they, seeing, see not, and hearing, hear not nor understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah that says: By hearing ye shall hear and not understand at all, and seeing, see and not see at all. For the heart of this people became hard, and with their ears they were dull of hearing, and their eyes they closed that they might not see at all with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn, and I should heal them."³ These words have been

p. 512. Mark has prudently used a neutral expression (between Luke and Matt.): they asked about the parables; this is too indefinite, and it is unskilful also, because only one parable had been given. Volkmar's subjective criticism here also delights to attack Matthew.

¹ Given by God, as xi. 26, xvi. 17. *Tauch.* f. 7, 3: Deus myst. sua non concedit nisi justis. Paulus, Kuin., Mey., Bl., Ew., rightly seek in these words the recognition of some kind of knowledge already given to the disciples, and not a statement of their exclusive privilege to know with or without parables (Olsh., De Wette, Neand., Baur, Strauss, Holtzm., Hilg., Weisz., Volkm., and others). Comp. Bleek, I. p. 514. With reference to the former interpretation, Hilg. (p. 421) is right in distrusting his eyes only so far as this, that *the original utterance of Jesus is nevertheless misunderstood by Matthew.*

² This expression also in Matt. xxv. 29. Comp. Mart. 5, 81: Dantur opes nulli nunc nisi divitibus. Terence, *Phorm.* 1, 1, 7 sq. Other examples, Wetstein, p. 400. But he forgot Philemon, *Fragm.*: ἀχόραστος ῥύχη. Luke viii. 18, Mark iv. 24, give this passage at the close, addressed to the disciples and their understanding; but this is by no means (Bleek, p. 515) original.

³ Isaiah vi. 9 sq. (after the LXX.). Something similar, Isaiah xxxii. 3, Jeremiah v. 21. That Luke viii. 10, Mark iv. 12, with their greater or less abbreviation of the passage from the prophets, do not give the original, while Matthew first introduced the quotation (thus Neander and others), is concluded by Bleek (I. pp. 512, 517) from the fact that Matthew quotes the LXX., which points to the sources of Matthew; and even Holtzmann (p. 80) here agrees with him, ascribing the passage to the source A. The certain proof lies in the decisive weight of the Biblical passage, in its actual harmony with the situation, in the conceivability of a similarity of conviction between Jesus and the prophecy on this point, and finally (see below) in the evidently rapid and cursory compilation of Luke and Mark just here.

made to imply that Jesus, in speaking in parables, in presenting the truth to the seeing of the material eye, to the hearing of the material ear, renounced any expectation of real success, but had in view only the demonstration of the total unsusceptibility of the people, or indeed the bringing about of the same in the sense of the prophet, the definitive impoverishing and ruining of the poor.¹ Certainly that would have been morbid indeed, and, more than that, it would have exhibited an unamiable disposition; and the most strenuous efforts of Jesus to bring himself down to the level of the popular understanding would have stood from the outset in a most wonderful manner side by side with despair of success—nay, with a desire for non-success. But this was an impossibility. De Wette's assumption alone is possible, namely, that Jesus spoke with such a gloomy resignation at the close of his futile attempts to make himself understood by parables; but according to the above interpretation, he would have thus spoken at the beginning, he would have explained the new method of teaching by asserting that that method was purposely employed in order to be futile.² But if we examine more closely Matthew's not faultless yet relatively best account, we discover it was rather the purpose of Jesus to speak in parables *because* hitherto the people, seeing, had seen nothing—hearing, had heard nothing; and their seeing not-seeing, and hearing not-hearing, had no reference whatever to the visible and audible parables, but—as Matthew's interpolation of the longing of the prophets for a sight of the Lord partly shows—to the sum-total of the previous and futile testimony of Jesus in person, word, and work, and now called for this new last attempt of speaking to the material-

¹ See previous page, note 1; also next page, note 2. Olsh.: they are not to see, that they may not see and understand. Bleek, p. 515. And yet by means of the parables the disciples were to be formed into teachers of the *people*. Weizs., p. 413. What contradictions!

² De Wette: Jesus wished, by his parables, to evoke questions, but only the disciples were induced to put questions (thus already Chrys.); and in consequence of this experience, Jesus *finally* arrived at this verdict concerning the people. Then is the Gospel representation incorrect. What is correct in De Wette's explanation is immediately afterwards admitted in the text above.

mind in material figures.¹ What follows in the text shows the correctness of this supposition. At the close of the parables addressed to the people we find nothing about a withdrawal, but something about a revelation, of the secret of the truth. At the close of the exposition of the parables for the instruction of the disciples, this method of teaching the people is also commended to them in their character of the new scribes. And the fact that the exposition of the parables was uttered in the presence of the disciples alone and not of the people, is sufficiently explained by the eager curiosity of the former, who indeed, as Mark intimates, ought to have understood the parables at once.² In spite of the unsullied preservation by Matthew of the original motive for speaking in parables, even this author distinctly betrays the great mistake of assuming an intentional veiling of the truth from the people; and Luke and Mark, encouraged by Matthew, have yet more completely fallen into the same error. They

¹ Matt. xiii. 13. xiii. 16 sq. is certainly an interpolation by the Evangelist, not without alteration of the meaning (comp. only verse 15 in relation to verse 17). See above, p. 61, note 1.

² What is decisive is the ὄρα, Matt. xiii. 13, of which the later writers incorrectly (opp. Neand. and others; see above, p. 130, note 1) make ἴρα; at the same time there also occurs a μίπρωτ in the midst of the Old Testament passage in Matthew (xiii. 15). Luke viii. 10; Mark iv. 12. Comp. in connection with the chief passage in Matthew, also xiii. 34, 35, 52. I certainly regard verse 35 as an addition by the second hand, because of the Hebrew quotation. In Matthew, the *originality* of the text co-exists with an *erroneous point of view*: the meaning of the parable is disclosed only to the disciples (verse 18) without being asked for by them, so that it looks as if the knowledge were intended only for them; and especially does it thus appear in the express transition to verse 18: ye *therefore*, i. e. ye who alone see and are privileged (verses 16 sq.), hear the parable. The original meaning of verses 11 and 13 is distorted by making it appear that the parables are rather intended to disclose the mysteries of the kingdom to some and to veil them from others; wherefore also half the parables at the close are dedicated only to the disciples. With all the errors of their representation, Luke and Mark have the superiority (1) in representing the disciples (above, p. 129, note 4) as asking the meaning of the parables, whereby the appearance of addressing the parables exclusively to the disciples and their comprehension is avoided (Luke viii. 9 and Mark iv. 10, the latter skilfully connecting and giving a neutral character to the two questions, Matt. xiii. 10 and Luke viii. 9); (2) in representing Jesus as being angry (Mark iv. 13; comp. Matt. xv. 16, xvi. 11) at the question of the disciples, who ought to have understood the parable at once, although he afterwards, contradictorily enough, without impatience and as a matter of principle, explains all parables to them (Mark iv. 34).

represent Jesus as defining the object of speaking in parables, thus: others, those who stand without, receive parables, *in order that* seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not hear; and not until a later period are the disciples to disclose to the people the veiled truth which has been unveiled only to themselves.¹ And yet they have shown the incorrectness of this rendering by their own further representation,—Luke, by immediately afterwards representing Jesus as being found by his mother and his brethren the happy centre of a listening crowd; Mark, by distinctly representing—in connection with Jesus' displeasure at his disciples' misunderstanding—the parables as addressed to the lower horizon of the popular mind, parable after parable being offered to the people and not merely to the disciples, and the whole being brought to a close by the remark, “In many such parables spake he the word to them, to the people, as they were able to hear it,” i. e. to comprehend it.²

We may with certainty further say that the parables themselves which are collected together at this point by either or by all of the Evangelists, as well as the exposition of those parables, can be ascribed to the mouth of Jesus without any doubt as to their genuineness. Only two or three addenda in Luke and Mark, which in Matthew are correctly placed in other connections—particularly in addresses to the disciples—have been incorrectly introduced here as a result of the erroneous view that the parables were addressed rather to the disciples than to the people; and the parable which is peculiar to Mark, the parable of the seed growing of itself without the assistance of the sleeping and glorified Lord, is a picture of that later period when the Lord was no longer upon earth.³ All the rest is stamped with

¹ Luke viii. 10, 16—18; Mark iv. 11 sq., 21—25 (here, indeed, very awkwardly addressed to the people).

² Luke viii. 19; Mark iv. 11 sq., 21—22 (to the people, according to 33 sq.).

³ The short parables of Light, Luke viii. 16, Mark iv. 21, and of Measure, Mark iv. 24, in Luke at least addressed only to the disciples, are better placed in Matthew v. 15, vii. 1, x. 26 (comp. also Luke xii. 2). The later date of the automatic seed in Mark iv. 26, is betrayed by its position at the close, and by the absence of the parable

the spirit and genius of Jesus, and is appropriate to the circumstances of the time. The same can be said of the expositions, notwithstanding recent attempts to detect faults in them, and to represent them as possessing more of the characteristics of the Evangelists than of Jesus.¹

We come now to the relations of time and place of these parables. The immediate connection of the so-called parable-preaching with any particular point in the career of Jesus cannot now be restored, though the Evangelists are agreed in this, that the parable-preaching belonged to the same period as the journey to Nazara. The chief thing is, that we know for certain it belonged to the second half of the Galilean ministry. This is to be gathered from the sources themselves, most distinctly from Matthew and Luke, even though the latter has, with Mark, placed the parables before the mission of the Twelve. And if this was not enough, an advanced period would be incontrovertibly proved by Jesus' rich experience of success and non-success, by his verdict concerning the people and the disciples, by his mention of troubles and persecutions, by his bold fresh attempt, by his advance into the depths of his teaching, and by his anticipation of the judgment and of the consummation of all things. We have a right here, as elsewhere, to draw conclusions from the predominant pictures of the utterances of Jesus. We find in the parables, not only the suggestive picture of the sower, but predominantly that of the harvest, with its produce, and its bundles, and its barns. The sowing leads us—like the *débüt* of Jesus

from Matthew and Luke. According to Volkmar, indeed, who accuses the Tübingen school of always rejecting what is most rational, Matthew composed his second parable as a substitute for this! And Holtzmann (p. 189) also is inclined to prefer the parable of Mark to Matthew's second one. On the contrary, Strauss, I. p. 625. Moreover, verses 27, 29 evidently point (which Volkmar, p. 290, and Weiff, p. 29, are unwilling to see, representing the details as of subordinate importance), especially in so late a writing, to the church of the absent, dying, risen, and glorified Messiah.

¹ As already in his *Evangel.*, Hilgenfeld pronounces (1867) all the addenda to the seven parables—explanation, signification, retirement to the house—to be not original. This, indeed, gives a smoother *schema*, but in the face of the consensus of the three Gospels it is quite arbitrary.

himself—to the spring; the harvest, to the close of the summer and to the autumn of A.D. 34, a date which will also approximately synchronize with the death of the Baptist.¹ Nor do the sources permit any doubt to remain concerning the locality of the first parables. Matthew and Mark distinctly point to Capernaum and its lake shore; and when we examine Luke closely, we find his Gospel confirming the others, though not without contradictions. Another confirmation is to be found in the subject-matter of the parables themselves, as we have already seen.²

In the presence of these fundamental facts, we may dismiss all uneasiness aroused by the not insignificant yet nevertheless immaterial diversities of the Evangelists. There is only one parable, the first, that of the Sower (the individual parables will thus be named after the leading material figure in them), about which the three Evangelists are at one; and in this case they also agree in the subsequent exposition addressed to the disciples. For the rest, Matthew—who has a fondness for certain numbers—has seven, Mark five, and Luke only two parables.³ Matthew, with his sacred number seven, has a decided advantage

¹ Comp. Matt. xiii. 3 sqq., 24 sqq., 31 (sowing); xiii. 8, 23, 41 sq. (harvest results). The latter points to the time of Pentecost and the whole of the ensuing summer; the former, to the spring or autumn sowing, in February or November. The first is to be preferred, because nothing indicates the winter; and Jesus, the sower, began his ministry in the spring. Comp. Winer, *Ackerbau* and *Ernte*. On John, see below. In Matthew, the parables are in chap. xiii. Death of John, chap. xiv. Jesus' resolve to die, chap. xvi. In Luke, parables, chap. viii.; resolve to die, chap. ix. In Mark, the parables stand immediately after the choice of the disciples, chap. iv.; resolve to die, chap. viii.; therefore the parables are placed in the middle of the Galilean period. Weiff., p. 30.

² Matt. xiii. 1, 36; Mark iii. 19, 31, iv. 1. Luke viii. 1 certainly exhibits Jesus on a journey, and the parables immediately follow, verse 4; but in viii. 19, 22, Jesus is evidently by the lake and at Capernaum.

³ Mark has the parables of the Sower, the Light, the Measure, the Automatic Seed, the Mustard Seed. Those of the Light and the Measure stand thoroughly co-ordinated with the other parables (comp. the opening formulæ, iv. 2, 11, 21, 24, 26, 30, 33); Holtzmann and Volkmar, therefore, incorrectly reckon only the three seed-parables; and the latter accounts it a fault in Matthew that he goes beyond the seed-parables. Differing from both, Weizs., pp. 412 sqq., retains only the first parable as a foundation. Luke has the parables of the Seed and the Light. The number seven in Matthew, see above, Vol. III. p. 291, note 4.

over his colleagues. All his parables are irreproachably ancient and admirably consecutive. The Sower exhibits the rise of the kingdom; the Weeds of the devil, its obstacles; the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, its growth; the Treasure and the Pearl, its appropriation by mankind; the Net, the separation at the judgment which closes the history of its development. In details, also, Matthew offers the clearest and oldest text. Since Luke had such a distorted view of the aim of the parables, it was doubtless the most fitting thing for him to give to the people only one parable, as an expression of unfriendly feeling, because every additional parable would have compromised Jesus by representing him as teaching the people, when in truth he did not teach and did not intend to teach them. Further, since only the disciples were able to understand the parable, Luke could consistently devise the parable-like sentences about the light on the light-bearer, sentences intended to show the duty of the disciples to understand and to diffuse the teaching of Jesus, and ultimately to reveal the secrets to the people.¹ That, notwithstanding all this, Luke was acquainted with other quite different parables, is shown, both at the commencement and at the close, by the imposingly-sketched gathering of the people, to whom Jesus must of necessity have dispensed more than the one parable, especially as, according even to Luke, he felt himself happy in the midst of them. Thus in Luke we find ourselves coming into contact with Matthew; and we find Matthew still more distinctly in Mark, although the latter, true to his own method, skilfully welds together Matthew and Luke, and to some extent also enlarges them by the association of ideas and the addition of later material. He—Mark—expressly says, both at the beginning and the end, that Jesus spake much before the people in parables, and still more than he found it good to report. He also very plainly follows the course of Matthew, after having in a curious way

¹ The latter is the clear sense of the words, Luke viii. 16—18 (Mark iv. 21—25, where it is already incorrectly held to be addressed to the people); comp. Matt. x. 26, Luke xii. 2.

exhausted Luke ; he substitutes for the weeds which grow while men are sleeping, the good plant which during the sleep, in the absence of, the sower who has been carried away to heaven, ripens of itself for the harvest ; and then he prematurely closes with the parable of the Mustard-seed.¹ Nevertheless, Matthew himself, although in the main more original than the others, has not absolutely the original text. The group-collector can here also be detected, although his successors, evidently deprived for the most part of other sources, were compelled to follow him in the main. This array of parables, and particularly as a group of seven, was not poured out by Jesus at one time, though it would not have been exactly an "overflowing," if, as in Matthew's text, he gave the most—five out of seven—merely in outline.² He would not have divided the parables, addressing half to the people and half to the disciples, an arrangement which Mark—not quite intelligibly, it is true—sought to improve, and which Matthew adopted for a well-known purpose, and because at the close of the first four parables he hastened to give the explanation of the difficult second one. Moreover, since he was compelled or had resolved to transfer this explanation to the audience of the disciples, he was under the necessity of transferring the parables from the fifth to the seventh into the house.³ The strongest

¹ Mark iv. 2, 23 (for the people). Verses 21—25, curious (see previous note), after Luke viii. 16—18, where the parable is addressed exclusively to the disciples ! Then verses 26, 30, after Matt. xiii. 24, 31.

² The parables of the Mustard-seed, the Leaven, the Treasure, and the Pearl, are not further amplified ; only three are amplified, those of the Seed, the Double-sowing (this is also copiously explained), and the Net. Of an "overflowing" Strauss (I. pp. 621 sqq.) speaks, as well as many others.

³ Matthew gives four parables for the people, three for the disciples. Such a division was not impossible ; for Jesus, after he had so strongly excited the disciples by his parables, might have given them the three remaining within, although he had first had recourse to parables for the people. But the occasion of the division given above (together with p. 132) speaks for itself, whether the author did not find (Hilg. p. 415) a repeated interruption of the address to the people by explanations to the disciples (as xiii. 10) convenient, or found in his sources the explanation of the second parable distinctly placed in the house. Mark improves upon Matthew by representing all the parables as addressed to the people, although again the being alone (verse 10) is then as obscure as the audience in verses 21 sqq., only that in verse 33 he asserts, by way

evidence of a later articulation is given by the third and fourth parables, those of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven. These parables of the victorious extension of the kingdom of heaven through the world, without obstacle and without permanent dissonances, Jesus could not have delivered in the same breath with the parables of the fate of the seed and of the weeds, parables marked by a resigned and melancholy spirit. These two parables Luke discovered in some other sources, and affixed them to a brilliant victory of Jesus over his foes, as an expression of triumphant assurance in the face of all temporary obstacles.¹ Though it is now impossible to find the original text in its completeness in Luke or in Mark, and though it is also impracticable to retain Matthew's narrative as it is, or to hold, with Hilgenfeld, that everything would be rectified if we simply allowed the seven parables of Matthew to follow in one consecutive series, and laid aside the expositions as an addition,—it may, on the other hand, be assumed with much probability that the parables three and four, of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, were originally delivered together, as also the fifth and the sixth, the Treasure and the Pearl, and finally, the first and the second, perhaps also the seventh, the Sower, the Weeds, the Net, the fundamental conception and the external form of which are so plainly analogous. Again, these three parables *might* have been originally delivered, together with the two of the Treasure and the Pearl, in such a way that Jesus would describe the rise of the kingdom in the parable of the Sower, the inimical principle that checked its growth in that of the Weeds, its human reception in those of the Treasure and the Pearl, and the definitive selection of its members in that of the Net. Such a collocation is strongly supported by the arrangement in Matthew; by the hints in Luke and Mark, where there is a more or less distinct suggestion of the existence

of supplement, confusedly enough, that the audience—according to his predecessor, Luke (see above, p. 136, note), the disciples—were the people.

¹ Luke xiii. 18. For Luke, Schl., Olsh., Schneck., and others. On the contrary, Strauss, I. p. 626.

of a great collection of parables; by the consistency of their subject-matter; by the necessity and the habit of Jesus of not merely giving, in an address to the people, the facts together with the metaphysics of the kingdom, but also of calling forth a movement of the human will, such as would be produced especially by the parables of the Treasure and of the Pearl.¹ But the parables of the Mustard-seed and of the Leaven must have been spoken on another occasion. Finally, the explanation of the first parable was given—according to Matthew and Mark—in the midst of his address to the people; that of the second, in the quiet of the house. But this is the most appropriate place to bring both into connection with the general course of events.²

Jesus chose a very unusual pulpit from which to deliver his parables. He had gone from his house at Capernaum to the lake, and had seated himself down on the shore. There the multitude of people who wished to hear him, and who, according to Luke, had come thither "by towns," compelled him to go, from the low and level shore, upon the lake, in order that he might be visible and intelligible to all. He sat in the ship, and the people stood on the shore listening, while he spake with a voice loud enough to overcome the difficulties of his position. Matthew and Mark at least give such a picture, the uniqueness of which in the evangelical accounts, and to a certain extent also the introduction of the remarkably appropriate parable of the Draught of Fishes, protect it from the suspicion of being invented by the authors. He began with the parable of the Sower, with the *planting* of the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom owed its origin to a peaceful man who scattered abroad his seed. But many disasters befel the seed. Some grains fell by the wayside and were devoured by the birds; others fell on stony ground and could not flourish

¹ We may recal the continual emphasis thrown upon the *ethical* task, Matt. vii. 21, xii. 50. The hint of Luke, viii. 21 (immediately after the parables); of Mark, iv. 2, 33.

² If doubts were not suggested by parables 3 and 4, we might find that Matt. and Mark indicated that the first four parables were the original address, and that all else was a later interpolation.

long; others among thorns and were choked. Only one-fourth of the seed fell into good ground and brought forth fruit, here more, there less, varying from a hundred-fold to thirty-fold, and of that again only a fourth was good.¹ The explanation in the presence of the disciples, given either immediately, as Matthew says, according to whom the disciples that were in the ship went to Jesus asking him the reason, and indeed also the meaning of the parable, or somewhat more probably at the close of the parables,—this explanation, in bold unstudied lines and suggestive strokes, exhibited in a general way the word of the kingdom of heaven as the seed, the hearts of men as the ground.² The seed, the word by the wayside, found no heart's ground, was scarcely heard and was not understood, and moreover was snatched out of the soul by the winged power of Satan. The seed on the stony ground flourished as long as things went tolerably well, and then it was wrecked on the rocky reefs of need and persecution. The seed among thorns gained strong roots, but it could not breathe freely, and was stifled by the anxiety and striving attendant on riches. The good ground represented the good and understanding hearts, in which ripened a joyous divine harvest.³ What this parable most clearly shows is Jesus' distinct perception of the spiritual character of his kingdom; he uses spiritual means, not force, nor authority, nor even miracle, but the word and preaching. And his aim is spiritual, the fructifying of the heart

¹ The great fertility of Palestine, particularly of Galilee (comp. above, Vol. II. p. 6) and the plain of Jezreel, which at the present day bears corn without cultivation, is universally known. In *Ausland*, 1858, No. 7, it was reported that, on the south-west of Bethlehem, an Englishman had, by draining, made seven potato harvests in one year. Comp. Arnold, in *Herzog*, Vol. XI. p. 24. A hundred-fold harvest of Isaac in Philistia, Gen. xxvi. 12. Matthew has hundred—thirty, Mark thirty—hundred, Luke 100. Volkmar naturally prefers Mark.

² Matt. xiii. 10; Mark iv. 10 (Luke viii. 9). The carelessness of the genuinely Oriental mode of representation is responsible for (1) the immediate identification of the seed with men; (2) the finding the obstacle less in the heart than in the external accidents. Yet in Matt. xiii. 19 (the others are here more exact in form) the seed plainly = the word, the soil = the heart.

³ *Talm.*: vanitates hujus mundi (hable olam). Schöttgen, p. 130. *Ivit hostis ad ipsos* (ba sone alehem), *ib.* p. 131.

and life with knowledge, consolation, and good works. It also shows his sober estimate of his results: he reckons upon deriving increase from a fourth, and he reviews all the obstacles—superficiality, worldliness of mind, faint-heartedness in the evil day and covetousness in the good day, and besides all this, the cultivator of human weakness, Satan. Yet he does not doubtfully or complainingly overlook the splendid partial result, a result rivalling the fertility of the Paradaical soil of Gennesar. This parable exhibits the *obstacles*, more particularly only the human ones. But the wicked enemy, the ruler of the kingdom of wickedness, does not simply destroy the good plants of God, but puts his own diabolical plants with the divine. In the night, while men sleep, the good sower, who had sown good seed, has his footsteps traced by his implacable foe, who scatters the weed, the poisonous darnel, among the wheat, and goes his way unmarked.¹ Afterwards the weed is seen growing luxuriantly with the wheat, and the servants ask, “Whence?” The master understands the state of the case,—“An enemy has done it.” The servants are anxious to root out the weed, but the master postpones it till the harvest, for before then the wheat might easily be pulled up with the weed. In the harvest, when the growth of each plant has been so completed that the difference is easily distinguished, and the separation can be effected without danger and is required, he will command the reapers to gather into bundles first the weed and then the wheat, the former to be burnt, the latter to be stored in the barns.² It is plain—as his explanation also showed—that by the sower he meant himself; by the servants, the disciples and the members of the kingdom who, like the sons of Zebedee, were vexed by the

¹ Comp. Matt. xii. 44. *Zizanion* (formed from the Syriac) *Lolium temulentum*, species tritici mali, with black seeds, which stupefy. *Talm.* *zsunin.* Buxt. p. 680; Lightfoot, p. 327.

² Picture of divine harvest also in Old Testament; e.g. Micah vii. 1. Reapers, Isaiah xvii. 5. See also above, Vol. II. p. 217, note 1. Comp. still more similar, 4 Esdras iv. 28: *seminatum est malum et necdum venit destructio ipsius*; verse 30: *quantum impietatis generavit usque nunc, et generat usque dum veniat area.*

wickedness of the people and of the opponents of Jesus; by the harvest, the last judgment, he being the judge and the angels of God his ministers. At most in *this* parable we might be tempted to see a picture of a later period, of the Church in conflict with impurity in its own midst, ultimately indeed with impure, lawless, Pauline members, and of the Messiah taken up into heaven, forbearing, and restraining the impatient angels of the judgment.¹ We should then have simply a companion picture to that of Mark's automatic seed, Mark giving the development of the good, Matthew that of the bad, seed in the time of the absence of the Lord.² But this interpretation would be fundamentally erroneous; for the good sower is not represented as absent; the servants who whisper to him are definitely distinguished from the reapers of the universal judgment, who are the angels; and the germinating weeds, the children of the wicked one, do not grow up in the kingdom of heaven, but upon its soil and field of labour, yet again only by the side of the kingdom. Moreover, we can easily see how, in view of the enigmatical animosities, weaknesses, and perversities, which met him in his way, and in view of the indignation and zeal of his disciples, Jesus could conceive this parable, and colour it with the most genuine tone of his utterances.³ If this is so, we here have a glimpse of the sad earnestness as well as of the confidence of Jesus, and chiefly of his profound wisdom which rejected the violent human attack upon evil as an interference, not only with the divine judicial dispensations, but also with the law of terrestrial development of

¹ Hilgenfeld (pp. 422 sq.) will not (any longer) allow that the inimical man refers to Paul, but thinks that the parable is, at any rate, erroneously explained, and that the good seed cannot apply to Jesus, whose person, according to the parables, is unessential (!), but to God, and must comprehend the whole course of terrestrial history, otherwise we must understand by the evil one at any rate Christian aberrations (therefore also Paul)! Thus has Volkmar also found the sower superfluous when the seed is automatic.

² According to Volkmar (p. 299), this parable is only a one-sided metamorphosis of the genuine one in Mark (automatic seed). No one but a *lazy* husbandman would think thus; Jesus, according to the first parable, not. What logic!

³ Comp. Matt. xiii. 38, children of the devil, by whom he might have meant slanderous Pharisees and their adherents. See also Luke ix. 49, 54.

good and evil; and this suggests the fine idea that undeveloped good may appear to the human eye as evil, the evil as good, and that therefore the permanent character of the one and of the other will be acquired only by the process of development.

In these parables of the planting of, and the obstacles to, the kingdom of God, Jesus had preponderantly referred to the higher powers which interested themselves in the hearts of men. Commendation of human willingness, and the sting of blame, had not been quite wanting. The pious must have mentally rejoiced when he, with Daniel, spoke of the sunny radiance of the righteous in the kingdom of their Father. The frivolous must have trembled when he, with the Baptist, bound up the fire-bundles of the judgment.¹ But the herald of repentance, of faith, of the free, vigorous act of will, could not delay to paint to the people, in an attractive and charming picture, the participation of the individual's yearning love for the cause of the kingdom of heaven. The human Yes, the human *acceptance*, is exhibited by him in the parables of the Treasure and of the Pearl, parables only slightly sketched by our sources. "The kingdom of heaven is like a treasure, hidden in the field, which a man found and hid, and for joy he goes his way and sells all that he has, and buys that field. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a man, a merchant, who sought fine pearls; but after he had found one precious pearl, went away and sold all that he had and bought it."² Aentely and deliberately he here distinguishes a two-fold assent, that of the finders and that of the seekers. The majority come to the kingdom of heaven as to a fortunate discovery. It is true that which is discovered is hidden in the world, as the treasure in the field; it makes no noise, produces no startling effect, after the manner of the material Messianic kingdom, for the kingdom is not one of pomp and show, nor is it one of miracle, but of the word; yet it comes to meet the man who without trouble, asto-

¹ Matt. xiii. 43; Dan. xii. 3; Book of Enoch, chap. civ.; 4 Esdras vii. 55.

² Matt. xiii. 44 sq. On the Treasure, comp. Prov. ii. 4; Job iii. 21. The Pearl, Prov. iii. 15, viii. 19. The Rabbis, in Schöttgen, pp. 131 sqq.

nished, takes what to him, as soon as his eyes are open, forthwith appears to be valuable metal. But some, like merchants in the markets, have sought for noble, pure, brilliant, pearl ornaments: they are they who hunger and thirst after the kingdom of God, after righteousness, who, like the prophets and righteous men of the Old Covenant, unsatisfied with all the finery of the market of the world in material or mental goods, longingly gazed towards the consolation and pride of their souls, and towards the purification of their consciences. But then there is one and the same way for the finders and for the seekers, who are at last themselves also finders, upon whose eyes the brilliance of the one precious pearl falls. Both have a presentiment of the infinite worth of the property which lies before their eyes. The finder hides the hidden which he has by accident unearthed. He cannot carelessly expose it to the risk of being taken away by others whilst it lies uncovered; and he cannot carry it away until he has acquired a right to do so. The seeker cannot hasten any further to look for something else or something more; he can only hasten to fetch the purchase-money for the dealer in whose firmly-grasping hands the pearl lies. Thus they both hasten, the one to pay the dealer who has the pearl, the other to pay the owner of the field for the field that contains the treasure. And both find no sum too high; they sacrifice all their possessions. The title to the kingdom of heaven and its fellowship must be acquired and secured by the sacrifice of all things, by the mental renunciation of everything earthly, of house and home, of father and mother, of one's own person, in favour of the Lord of the kingdom.¹

Jesus sought a fitting close to his great parable-preaching in a picture of that which was the conclusion of all seed-sowing, of all hindrance, of all obedient response, and which was to him at that time the ever-present limit of his own horizon, a picture,

¹ Hilgenfeld (p. 418) is mistaken in thinking he finds, in the parable of the Treasure, the meaning that that treasure is concealed in the field of Jewish doctrine from the possessors of the field, from the Jewish Scribes, whilst the Christian doctrine digs up the treasure. This meaning is brought to, and is not in, the parable.

namely, of the *consummation* of the kingdom of heaven. The second parable had already lightly sketched it in the picture of the harvest-bundles. But there this subject was not the nucleus of the parable; and there was an appropriateness in closing the series of parables with a delineation which should include both beginning and end, and should lay special stress on the final perspective. This he gave in the picture of the Net or the Draught of Fishes, the explanation of which to the disciples—closely bound up by the summarizing Evangelist with the picture itself—strongly favours, through its great similarity in colouring with the second picture, the assumption that it was contemporary with that parable. As there, Jesus' outlook is a subdued and resigned one. The fishing ends with a sorting of the contents of the net, just as the sowing issues in a harvest of a fourth part, and the double sowing in a double set of bundles. But the draught of fishes is at first as copious as the first sowing, when the whole field is apparently full of healthy, growing plants; and it is, according to the first impression, a picture of much greater success than that second sowing, together with which there grows from the beginning the devil's false wheat as unnoticed as it was unplanted by the good sower. But as there the hopeful plants gradually die off, so here ultimately the bad fish are brought to light; and as there in the harvest of the devil's wheat, so here in the sorting out, what is useless, though not exactly the work of the devil, is thrown aside. "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a net thrown into the sea, and gathering of every kind. This, after it is full, they drew to the shore, sat down, and sorted the good together into vessels, but the bad they threw away. So shall it be," said he to his disciples, "at the end of the world. The angels shall come forth and separate the wicked from among the righteous, and cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

In these parables he gave the people an abundance of matter for reflection. He presented before them splendours and terrors, pleasant prospects and disillusion, both quite near at hand, just

as the harvest followed the sowing in a few months, and the sorting of the fish took place on the same day as the casting of the net. From some he took away the false notion that the kingdom must come in no other way than at his mere word; from others, the self-deception that there were no lost devil's children among the sons of Abraham, and no outcasts among his goodly-seeming adherents. To a fourth part, to the possessors of the pearl, he gave joyous feelings which they had no need to hide. What impression this preaching made, and how satisfied he himself was, almost contrary to his own expectation, Luke involuntarily shows by giving the arrival of Jesus' mother and brethren at the right point of time, namely, immediately after the parables. Matthew and Mark have unskillfully placed this visit immediately before the parables, and at the close of one of Jesus' most vehement controversial addresses,—a position which is not appropriate to it.¹ When their arrival was announced to Jesus, he said: "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? Then he stretched out his hand towards his disciples"—not merely to the Twelve, but the wider circle, as Mark particularly intimates in connection with the parables—"Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever does the will of my Father in heaven, he is my brother and sister and mother."² Even Mark points out, as we have seen, that the people were able to understand some of his teaching, although they did not venture to question him about the meaning of what he said.³ The best proof of the satisfactory character of the experiment is the fact that from this time Jesus habitually spoke in parables.⁴ Several

¹ Luke viii. 19; Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 31.

² Shortest account in Luke; then Matt. (from which xii. 47 should be omitted); the most detailed, particularly as to the sisters, in Mark. The wider circle, Mark iv. 10.

³ Mark iv. 33 sq.

⁴ Volkmar has objected against Matt. xiii. 34 (a bad copy of Mark iv. 33!) that, according to Matt. and Luke (who therefore wisely passes over Mark iv. 33), Jesus had delivered many parableless addresses from Matt. v. downwards. As if the assertion was not limited to this address! At least, it does not admit of any retrospective application. And as if Mark also had not such discourses without parables, i. 15, 22, 38, vi. 2, 12, 34, vii. 14, viii. 34, x. 17, xii. 35, 38.

of these, chiefly out of this period, have come under our notice, as the parables about Publicans, those of the Fig-tree, of the Rich Husbandman, of the rules at festive meals, and, if one will, those of the Householder and of Lazarus. Others will crop up in the course of this history, to the very end at Jerusalem. Parable-speaking, congenial to the intellect of Jesus, and necessitated by his compassionate impulse to descend to the level of the popular understanding, became an artistic specialty in Jesus, in which he has never, before or since, been equalled. Hence, in the various Gospels, later artificial, unnatural imitations are easily detected.¹ Whilst the parables met with favour at the hands of the people, they evidently very strongly moved the disciples also. The latter stormed Jesus with entreaties to explain his parables; and he readily acceded to their requests, because he saw in their mental agitation an open door through which he might, almost as a pastime, introduce into their minds the knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. "Have you understood everything?" Matthew represents him as asking, at the close of the parables. When their glad "Yes" is heard, he himself also shows his joy and satisfaction by crying to them: "Therefore every Scribe that is learned in the kingdom of heaven is like a man that is a householder, who gives forth out of his treasure things new and old." He thus seized the opportunity of adding to the parables already given, and of exhibiting his predilection for the method which connected the new with the old, and made even that which was oldest and most familiar fresh and piquant; nay, he even commended this method to them for their preaching of the kingdom.² And since the parables were the means of so quickening the interest of the disciples, the wise and circumspect teacher himself, taught by his own experience, went a step further. Departing from his original principle of placing the secrets of the kingdom before the people in parables while he showed

¹ The artistic specialty, see above, p. 127. Later fabrications in Luke and John.

² Matt. xiii. 51 sq.; comp. Luke vi. 40. Those who rely more upon Luke and Mark than Matthew, will also bring Luke viii. 16 sqq. and Mark iv. 21 sqq. into this connection. Comp. above, p. 136.

them openly to his disciples, he henceforth employed parables for the instruction and use of the disciples also, even to his going to Jerusalem. And what was suitable to the people and to the disciples would necessarily be useful to the Scribes. Whether he still hoped to be understood, or whether he found it advantageous to veil his latest opinions, he spoke in parable also to his foes, until he went to Jerusalem. As a consequence, with reference to many of the parables, we are not at all sure whether they were spoken to the people, or to the disciples, or to the Scribes. The same uncertainty rests upon their time and occasion. We can at least allow to find their place here the two short parables which Matthew has interwoven into the great series of parables, those, namely, which, treating also of the kingdom of heaven, of its planting, its growth, and its consummation, bring together everything which he had in the others given piecemeal, and at the same time indicate a frame of mind that, on the ground of victorious facts, if not on the ground of the success of the parables themselves, hoped for something better than the double harvest, the double sorting out—hoped, namely, for *one* great universal harvest of the world. “The kingdom of heaven is like a mustard-seed, which a man took and cast upon his field; which though it is less than all seeds, yet when it is grown is larger than the herbs of the garden and becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and build their nests in its branches. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like leaven, which a woman took and kneaded into three measures (*seah*) of meal, till the whole was leavened.”¹

In these two parables there evidently breathes a livelier hope.

¹ Matt. xiii. 31 sqq.; Luke xiii. 19; comp. p. 137. Mustard cultivated in the gardens, Lightfoot, pp. 327 sq.; Schöttgen, p. 131. Arnold, XI. p. 25. The least seed (which it is not, however) also by the Rabbis: *pro quantitate grani sinapis, guttulæ s.* But the mustard-tree which the Rabbis also mention (sometimes so great that a ladder is necessary to get up into it, and roof-timber can be made of the wood) is not grown from this mustard-seed, which produces at the best a modest shrub of about two feet in height; but it is the *Salvadora Persica*, which occurs in Palestine, but has nothing to do with mustard. Furrer (*Bedeutung*, &c. p. 34) must have meant this by the “rider-high mustard-shrub.”

They speak only of propagation; they have not a word of loss. In fine, the leaven exhibits the material world as not merely touched and breathed upon, but as permeated, made enjoyable and relishable in all its parts, by the kingdom of God. The mustard-tree shows the external greatness of what was then still small; multitudes of men, not exactly of nations, or indeed of men and angels, shall find a peaceful dwelling-place under the sheltering roof of the kingdom of heaven. The leaven adds to the external greatness—which is represented in the perfect number of three measures,—the inner, efficacious, chemical, spiritual force which transforms humanity and makes it enjoyable for God, as leaven and salt make bread eatable for man.¹ In these concise parables he himself stands forth in perfected glory. His work of infinite worth has an infinite future of victory over all the obstacles of earthly weakness and wickedness. This manly hero and conqueror of universal history is at the same time a woman, a motherly fosterer of the welfare of the great household of humanity.

B.—THE LAST MIGHTY WORKS.

In this later period, Jesus laid great stress upon the recognition of his non-miraculous preaching. He refused to give miraculous signs, and—a severe reckoner—he made the works he had already done a ground of reproach and disparagement to the Galilean towns. Yet he could not so strictly confine himself to preaching as to cease to do works of healing. Such signs could not fail so long as the compassion of Jesus was in exercise, and human need was accompanied by human faith. Such a combination of need and faith met him a hundred times, and to some extent also even in unbelieving Nazara. Indeed, according to a well-known but doubtfully authentic passage in Luke, Jesus

¹ *Seah*, 1½ Roman measures (modii). Worthless allegorical meanings drawn from the three measures by the Church Fathers (three is the divine perfect number).

saw, in his work of healing, his last vocation previous to the completion of his ministry.¹ His Beelzebul-controversy with the Pharisees, and the tetrarch's astonishment at the miracles which he had wrought between Capernaum and Nazara, might show that the mightiest and most striking of his works, which were not accompanied by any prohibition of making them widely known, fell in the period of his last and highest efforts. And we have far back learnt that the Gospels are consciously anxious to transpose the greatest works of healing, even miracles of raising the dead and astounding nature-miracles, to this last Galilean time.²

Among the cures of the possessed, the best attested, that of the dumb, or the dumb and blind, demoniac—a work of healing which won for Jesus the name of confederate of Beelzebul—is not narrated to us in detail; and that of the lunatic must be left to be treated in connection with the occurrences at Cæsarea Philippi.³ There thus remains for us here only the celebrated incident at Gadara, if we are willing to use the name of this town provisionally, without defending its correctness. This incident has a firm hold on all the three Gospels, though it is very variously narrated in detail. According to the more probable account of Luke and Mark, it has its place after the parables, as the second of the great quaternion of miracles—the storm, the Gadarene, the dead maiden, the woman with the issue of blood; while Matthew, with mingled correctness and incorrectness, placed the same facts in about the same order, at the very beginning, in the series of great miracles that followed the Sermon on the Mount.⁴ For if there is anything historical at all in

¹ Luke xiii. 32. Censure, Matt. xi. 20, xii. 43.

² A ludicrous prohibition (by the authors) in the narrative of Jairus, Luke viii. 56; Mark v. 43. Also at the healing of the deaf mute, Mark vii. 32 sq., 36.

³ Matt. ix. 32, xii. 22; Luke xi. 14. Comp. above, p. 8. The lunatic, Matt. xvii. 15.

⁴ Luke viii. 26; Mark v. 1; Matt. viii. 28. Here the correct and the incorrect are blended. In the source of Matthew the narratives of the *archon* and of the woman with the issue of blood certainly stood immediately after the controversies about publicans and about fasting, for the disturbing interpolation of the controversies into the

the incident at Gadara, it must be connected with the journey to the south-east end of the lake in Jesus' last journey of flight, a period in which, moreover, his being called the Son of God by the possessed or the non-possessed is most conceivable.¹ For the rest, Matthew's account is by far the simplest and the most original. Accordingly, Jesus crossed over in the Gennesar boat to the district of the wealthy town of Gadara, a town of the province of Syria and the capital of the so-called Decapolis, a town moreover which was chiefly heathen, though Jews also resided there. About half a league from the lake, above the lake-side path and the steep rise of the hill-range, as he was journeying along the mountain road that led to Damascus, and ran northward from Gadara into the interior of the north-eastern parts of the country, he was met in this lonely and desolate high-land by two demoniacs of the most dangerous kind, who dwelt in the caves that were used as sepulchres, such as are to this day found numerous, both on the east and on the west of the lake, in the limestone hills. These demoniacs were so much like formidable highwaymen that no one ventured to pass that way.² They knew Jesus, and cried out, "What have we to do with thee, thou Son

cycle of miracles can be explained only by an unbroken tradition. But since the controversy about the publicans at any rate happened early (the controversy about fasting was certainly much later), and since the incident of the Gadarenes had a symbolic value, Matthew might thus have been led to antedate that incident. As, however, even in Matthew the connection of the incident of the Gadarenes with a series of later events points to a later period, Luke and Mark must have found the incident placed later in their sources.

¹ On Gadara, the ruins, and the sepulchres, see on Jesus' journeys of flight.

² We must take the circumstances simply as they are, and not send the beasts at Gadara by the worst way, as Furrer himself does (p. 18), merely to make Gadara more remote. Of this I shall have a word to say further on. If we had only Mark (v. 2), we should be obliged to fix upon the lake-side road (see Van de Velde); comp. Matt. viii. 28. But everything points, even in Mark, to the hill and the elevated plain and solitude. Moreover, if Jesus were on the lake-side road, we could not think of the beasts as in the background on the hill,—for then Jesus would bar their way to the lake. Thus we are led to the high-road, away from the lake and above the steep ascent. If Jesus was going along this road S.E. towards Gadara, then the natural direction of the beasts was northward over the hill-top, about half a league to the lake. This lake, bounded by steep hills, has a *κορημὸν*, sometimes close upon the lake, sometimes at a little distance from it, four leagues long, from Wady Sulam on the north

of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time? If thou drivest us out, send us into the herd of swine." At some distance—on the hill, according to Luke and Mark—there was a great collection of swine feeding. "Go forth!" said Jesus. And lo! the whole herd rushed out in an opposite direction, down the precipice into the lake, and died in the water. The swineherds, terrified, fled into the neighbouring town, making known the unheard-of occurrence. The whole town was moved, and went out upon the highway which, running from South Perea, from Gerasa, to the lake, cuts at a right angle the road going north-east, a league below Gadara, in the ravine of the river Hieromax (Yarmuk),—the whole town here met Jesus and urgently besought him to leave the district. He showed himself ready to yield, and, refraining from following up his victory, he returned to the vessel and re-crossed the lake.

But let us examine also the accounts of the later authorities. They bring before us only one demoniac, though it is true that the singular number does not represent a diminished, but rather an augmented, estimate of the incident.¹ The one demoniac unites in himself all the horribleness of the two; nay, he contains all devils and is the incarnate devil and antichrist himself. This citizen, as Luke calls him, has for a long time been possessed by a legion of devils, wanders from home, rends his clothes, and mocks at all the chains and fetters which men put upon him, for

to Es-Sumrah on the south. No one would think of a road up and down the hill from the Hieromax to the open Jordan valley and the lake. Sepulchres, Lightfoot, p. 308; Wetstein, p. 354.

¹ Comp. also Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 23 sq.; ib. *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 182. Ludicrous harmonizing of the accounts (Lange, II. p. 658, and Steinmeyer, p. 144), or preference sometimes for Matthew, the publican well known on the east coast (Lange, II. p. 657), sometimes for the descriptive minutiae, as if by eye-witnesses, in Luke and Mark. (Weisse, I. p. 497, and even Bleek, I. p. 367). Recently (from Schleiermacher downwards) a preference has been generally shown for one possessed rather than two. Demoniacs are said to be unsocial, and to exhibit a sharp individuality. (Hase, p. 169.) Matthew is said to have made a duality arbitrarily in xx. 30, and here to have exhibited a duality either on account of the plurality of demons, or because of his erasure of the possessed of Capernaum (thus Weisse, Ebrard, Volkmar). But many in one is after all the most horrible, Matt. xii. 45; Luke viii. 2.

he breaks them asunder, and is driven by the demon into waste places and among the tombs. He appears yet more terrible, if possible, in Mark. He has been often bound, but has burst his bonds asunder and broken his fetters in pieces, and no one has been able to secure or to tame him. He wanders night and day among the tombs and on the hills, crying and cutting himself with stones. When he saw Jesus—according to Mark, at a distance—he rushed towards him; nay—according to both Luke and Mark—he fell at his feet in worship, constrained, as the devil in St. James' Epistle, to do homage to the higher, and, when Jesus hastened with a loud voice to bid the demon go out, cried, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, Son of the most high God? I conjure thee by God (thus at least Mark relates), torment us not!" Doubtless the oath excites in Jesus a still stronger interest: he negotiates. "What is thy name?" "Legion is my name, for we are many"—thus he explains to him the foreign word.¹ Now follows the capitulation, the proposal concerning the swine. "Only not to go into the abyss," is the entreaty in Luke; "not out of the district," in Mark. According to Mark, Jesus acceded to the proposal forthwith.² We already know the fate of the herd, which Mark estimates at about two thousand head, i.e. half a legion. But of the fate of the possessed men or man, Matthew's defective account relates nothing. Was he really healed or not? Did the act of Jesus produce *only* alarm and destruction? No; when the people from the town and country arrive, they see the possessed (who had had the legion, says Mark significantly) sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind. Whence he had obtained the clothes is not told us; certainly, Mark has not previously said anything about his being without clothes. Gadara is astonished and alarmed, and hears once more from the eye-witnesses what had happened

¹ Luke gives the explanation as that of the author; Mark hastens to place it in the mouth of the possessed, Mark v. 9. Oath of a demon also in Philostratus, *Vita Ap.* 4, 20.

² Tischendorf strikes out from Mark v. 13 the "forthwith," which is, as might be supposed, also rejected by Sin. and Vat.

to the possessed and to the swine. Then they beg Jesus to go away. He embarks, and is already on board when the possessed man wishes—the superlative sign of healing and of gratitude—to go with him. Jesus cannot, however, accede so much to the legionary: “Go home to thy own people, and tell them what the Lord has done to thee!” This he did, and made known, to the astonishment of all throughout the town—according to Mark, in the district of the ten confederated towns, the whole of Decapolis—the mighty work of Jesus.

The impartial reader will not be offended if we at once refuse to defend this incident in this its latest and most artificial form, with its exaggerated terrors, its sensationalism, its allusions, and its impossibilities. And doubtless many men of the most temperate judgment would gladly throw into the bargain the whole incident—the “splendid masterpiece” of this world of myths, as Strauss says—with even its best-attested features.¹ In fact, the difficulties here are only too manifold. There is a difficulty in the instantaneous certainty of the devils as to the person, if not indeed, as the later authorities show, the name, of Jesus, his divine sonship, and their own gloomy prospects,—a subtlety of the understanding which is only made the less probable by their shortsightedness, and their low tastes as content with swine as with men, with bodies as with souls.² There is another difficulty in the amicable negotiation of Jesus, which is as open to question if we understand him to have been pliant and yielding to the apparently reasonable wishes of the devils, as if we suppose him to employ cunning and subtlety so to allure the—this once—stupid devils into a snare, that they must necessarily be drowned with the cattle or fall downwards through the water

¹ The legendary embellishment of this incident is more or less admitted by almost all modern writers, not excluding Neander, Bleek, Meyer, and Ewald. Weizs. (pp. 377 sq.) even despairs of discovering the historical basis. Splendid masterpiece, Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 183.

² See above, III. p. 231. Clem. *Hom.* 9, 10. Eisenm. II. p. 447. According to Olshausen, the demons are subtle, and wish to excite Gadara against Jesus by the injury they do.

into hell, whilst at the same time the just interests of the Gadarenes are violently interfered with.¹ There is yet another difficulty in the very circumstances that the devils went into the swine from a distance, and that the swine behaved less tractably and more independently than the men, and, following their wild habits, rushed frantically forwards and precipitated themselves into the abyss. Naturally it has been competent to theologians—who would feel themselves somewhat alarmed in this atmosphere—to make the narrative rational or edifying to themselves and others by explanations and reconciliations, and by toning down the details, without exactly humiliating themselves to the degree of taking refuge in the inexplicability of Divine Providence and the general finiteness of human knowledge.² Either, then, they were real devils, who knew Jesus, but had not correctly estimated the effect of the violent shock of their wicked desire upon the nervous system of the beasts; or both devils and swine were only the fixed ideas of insane men who were to some extent acquainted with the fame of Jesus, and whose violent onset upon the beasts, perhaps even their mere gesticulations and howling, produced a commotion in the herd.³ Jesus' acquiescence, again, was given either with the view of punishing by divine right the devils, and to a certain extent also the avaricious, unclean Gadarenes, though perhaps only to put them to the test by vigorous means; or simply for the sake of the cure, and to

¹ Steinmeyer (against Strauss) has a charming way of defending the devils from the charge of foolishness! He says the self-annihilation is the deed of the (therein noble) beasts, not of the demons (p. 154). But are demons so shortsighted? Woolston drew up the bill of costs, see Strauss, *L. J.* 4th ed. II. p. 33.

² Krabbe, Ebrard, Delitzsch, and recently Steinmeyer, adhere to the narrative (*Wunderthaten des Herrn*, pp. 144 sqq.); in general also Lange, Pressensé.

³ The shock, Ebr. on Olsh., p. 306. Weisse had previously (I. pp. 497, 499), with an appeal to Kieser, *System des Tellurismus*, II. p. 72, spoken of the possibility of the magical production of demoniacal conditions in animals. This Krabbe (p. 228) and Lange, speaking of the psychical influence of angels and men upon horses, asses, and Bolognese puppies (II. p. 662), eagerly turned into capital. Gesticulations, Ewald, p. 418. Howling, Lange, II. p. 661. Similarly, Bleek, I. p. 374. Fixed idea, Paulus, Ammon, Hase, Bleek, Ewald, Meyer, Schenkel, Pressensé. The latter, it is true, says (p. 455), *cas de folie sous une influence démoniaque*.

drive out the fixed ideas of the possessed by the help of the leaping and drowning swine.¹ All this may be very well, but the principal thing is that the non-literal interpretation is without attestation, while the literal interpretation has no rational basis outside of the sources, but rests only upon the Jewish popular belief or superstition. Everything, however, can be explained from this popular belief: the devils know the Messiah both near at hand and at a distance; they tremble before his judicial sentence; they are fond of dwelling in men or in beasts, and as spirits can reach them even when far off; they choose the swine because these unclean animals are the abhorrence of the Jews, and the most distinctive mark of the swinish and swine-keeping heathenism of the district; they go into the water because the Jewish hell lies in the sea; and they carry the swine with them because the Jew is best pleased to know that his own loss through the Messiah has a counterpart in the loss by the Gentiles of their detestable property.² Beyond everything, the passing of the demons into the swine, and, by the leaping of the swine, into the sea, demonstrates the power of *this* Master much more brilliantly and visibly than that of Eleazar was demonstrated before Vespasian, or that of Apollonius at Athens.³

If we are compelled thus to decide, the incident apparently dissolves into nothing. The conception is possible that the Jewish-Christian myth wished to preserve the record of a mighty work of Jesus the Messiah upon possessed persons in the special province of Satan, on the peculiar soil of demoniacs, and in the

¹ Divine right, Bengel, Ebr., Ullmann, Steinmeyer. Punishment, Olsh., Ebr., Press. Test, Schegg (Meyer, p. 212). Unforeseen, Paulus, Vent., Hase, Bleek. Accidental at the same time (after Krug and Schmidt), Neander, Meyer; on the contrary, correctly, De Wette.

² Mythical view, in Strauss, De Wette, and others. Recognition of Jesus, see above, III. p. 245. Swine, Isaiah lxx. 4; Matt. vii. 6. *Bab. Kama*, f. 82, 2: ne alant porcos alicubi. Lightfoot, p. 308. Anima idolol, quæ venit a spir. immundo, vocatur porcus. *Jalk. Rub.* 10, 2. Wetstein, p. 356. Hell: tria ostia gehennæ: alterum in mari. Lightfoot, p. 286. Rev. xiii. 1.

³ See above, III. p. 243. In the case of Apollonius, the demon of the youth overthrew a statue "as a sign."

home of swine incapable of appreciating the pearl of the gospel; and that that myth wished to fill the very details of the portrayal with dignity and derision. Thus, to some extent, it was taken up by Matthew, who quite intentionally throws the anti-Gentile masterpiece into the foreground. In the spirit of this tendency, Luke and Mark, on the one hand, would have still further heightened the colours of heathenism in this Pantheon of devils, in this title borrowed from the Roman legion, in this appeal to the most high God, in this attachment to the beautiful heathen land,—on the contrary, not exactly in these bonds and fetters, which a fanciful explanation would represent as referring to the legislation of pagan antiquity, from Lycurgus and Solon.¹ On the other hand, as protectors of the Gentiles, they would have depicted the conciliatory conclusion, and would have introduced the clothed and sane demoniac—a forerunner of the youth of Apollonius, who was healed and converted into a disciple—as a type of the Gentiles converted to Christ from fierce passions and impurity. They would have made Jesus' sending him home a type of the Gentile community that built up itself on its own soil by its own messengers of the faith, by Paul the Apostle, or by Titus who was born a Gentile.² While ideas of this kind undoubtedly dominate the narrative in Matthew, and still more in his successors, an historical nucleus, if of the smallest extent, is notwithstanding lying at the bottom.³ An historical reminiscence is to be found in the name Gadara, and in the resolve of the Gadarenes to expel Jesus. There is no reason whatever why the myth should transfer itself to Gadara without some historical connection with the locality. Gadara lay very remote, and it had no pre-eminent notoriety either for its heathenism, its impurity, or

¹ First, Baur, *Ev.* p. 431 (with limitation to Luke). Without measure, Volkmar, *Rel. J.* p. 229, *Ev.* p. 315. Comp. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 186. One should see the description of the demoniacs in Lightfoot, in order to find that no one would, with Volkmar, think of Solon.

² Baur, yet more Volkmar, *l.c.* Hence the "filth" or the heathenism, which falls into the sea, "most ingenious and beautiful poesie." Titus, Gal. ii. 3.

³ Weisse (p. 498) has pronounced against the absolutely mythical character of the incident, especially in view of the dismissal by Jesus. Also Schenkel, p. 111.

its swine-breeding. Other more or less heathen points lay nearer to Jesus and were to some extent visited by him,—the points, namely, on the line from Capernaum, Tiberias, and Tarichææ: Gamala and Hippos in the east, Bethsaida, Cæsarea Philippi, and the region of Tyre and Sidon in the north. The myth did not seek to fix itself at any of these points—why at Gadara? Moreover, the demand that Jesus should leave the district quite gives the impression of a sober historical fact. Such a circumstance is nowhere else mentioned in the whole history of Jesus, and yet such a dismissal of an unbidden and dreaded guest is as possible as it is probable. The narrative is not decorated with attempted but unsuccessful deeds of violence, not even with a last punitive example in the miracles and words of Jesus. The issue is a pacific one; indeed, Jesus is forced to accept the rôle of yielding, nay, of retreat. It has yet to be added that in this last Galilean period it can be shown that Jesus escaped to distant places and coasts in heathen districts in order to withdraw himself from his foes. Finally, the oldest narration by no means exhibits everywhere the tendency, the dominant presence of which we might expect to find in connection with the entire absence of an historical basis. In Matthew, the two demoniacs, although they introduce a victorious assault upon heathenism, are by no means clearly and plainly described as Gentiles; but had the narrative such an origin as above mentioned, the demoniacs could scarcely fail to have been described as Gentiles, just as Matthew distinctly described the centurion of Capernaum and the Canaanite woman. Indeed, according to the impression produced by what was said, they may have been Jews, and there were many Jews settled in the district of Gadara.¹ From all this we may infer that Jesus actually landed in the district of Gadara; that he healed two demoniacs who persecuted him with their cries; and that the strange Jewish wonder-worker was persuaded by the Gadarenes

¹ Jos., *B. J.* 2, 18, 5, *Vita*, 4, 6. Ewald and Steinmeyer also think of Jews. Weizsäcker, of paganized Jews, p. 377. Neander, of Gentiles acquainted with Judaism, p. 244.

to go away, and against his will was compelled to re-embark. For the swine we get no room, not even in the innocent and certainly, notwithstanding all its shrewdness, sterile and ludicrous explanation popular to the present day with many expositors, that a herd of swine which by accident was one belonging to the Gadarenes, also by accident met with a disaster.¹ The quadrupeds have been added by the myth in order to draw from the life a comment on the healing, and to explain and avenge the exorcism by biting Jewish satire.²

Under any circumstances, the incident at Gadara, with its unquestionably mythical characteristics, is a significant hint,—we will not say suggesting to us mistrust and anxiety, for we have long experienced these,—but suggesting moderation to those who, either from indolence or a defective appreciation of truth, are accustomed to defend loudly the miracles of the Gospel history. Before we go any further, we commend it—as a kind of *memento mori*—once more to them for their consideration. We have yet to treat of several purely physical *healings of the sick*, and in that way to reach, step by step, the highest and most wonderful works, the cases of raising the dead. First, then, there is a series of tolerably similar cases of healing on the Sabbath, and at the head of them the best attested, that of the restoration of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue at Capernaum. Three Evangelists have described it, Matthew—as we long ago saw—in the simplest way and in the most appropriate place.³ The simple cry, “Stretch forth thy hand!” restored to the sick man his hand. According to Luke and Mark, the incident was broken into two stages: first the sick man had to stand up and step forth into the midst of the company, and then followed the

¹ Neander, Meyer, see above. Even Hase (p. 170) is unwilling to give up the hecatomb of swine. Since we uphold the work of Jesus, the sentence of Steinmeyer’s against Strauss’s “masterpiece” may partly remain: a picture full of the majesty of the Lord.

² Ewald, Hilg., Strauss, and even Meyer, think of Jewish satire.

³ Matt. xii. 9; Luke vi. 6; Mark iii. 1. Comp. John v. 3, and see above, III. p. 176.

healing words. The purpose of the narrators evidently is to show, not the gradual character of the proceeding, but the majesty of the healer, who was fearless in the presence of his evil-intentioned watchers, and who triumphantly contemplated his own work while he indignantly scanned his foes.¹ Not one of the narrators has spoken with such minuteness as could have been wished concerning the restoration of the hand. If it consisted merely in a renewed capability of movement, we have before us only such an influencing of the patient's volitional and muscular powers as would be more easily explained by the supposition of the man's—certainly not reported—faith, than in the case of the healing of the paralytic. But if it consisted in a total recovery from the witheredness, i.e. in the removal not merely of an "inflammation" or of a "rheumatism," but of a local atrophy and consumption of the hand, of the arm, so that the hand became again fleshy and vigorous like the other—as Matthew seems to make prominent—then we have nothing similar to such an instantaneous result, such a really perfect, complete, expansive filling out of the organism, taking place under the very eyes of the spectators, except it be the multiplication of the few loaves into a meal for thousands.² In a doubtful case, the more easily executed conception is decidedly to be preferred; and when we look more closely, we find that here it is unanimously supported by all the Gospels, which mention only the capability of movement. It is true that a very similar case of healing in the Old Testament excites fresh doubts. The man of God out of Judah, who threatened king Jeroboam on account of his idolatry, smote back the hand which the king had stretched out to lay hold of

¹ Mark portrays particularly the feelings of Jesus at the time. Luke's peculiarity is, that he does not—like Matt. and Mark—place the incident on the same Sabbath as that of the controversy about the ears of corn. The question of the Pharisees in Matt. is not worse than their lying in wait in Luke and Mark, or, indeed, the request of the mason in the Gospel of the Hebrews (Hilg. p. 410, and *N. T.* IV. 16, 23), concerning which, since its later origin is clear (comp. I. IX.), even Bleek (I. p. 481) wastes no words.

² Inflammation, Paulus, II. p. 48. Rheumatism, Schulthess; sprained hand, Venturini.

him, and made it dry, i.e. paralyzed it, and did not restore it to its former condition until the king had entreated him to do so.¹ On the ground of this Old Testament precedent, Strauss has rejected the whole incident as mythical; and any one who was disposed to do so might derive several further doubts from the passage in the Old Testament.² But the similarities are in truth too superficial, Jesus' defence is too original, the account of the Sabbath and synagogue conflict, and of the attempt of Jesus' foes to use violence, has too much of the character of an historical reminiscence to justify us in sacrificing the whole incident after mature consideration.

Besides the above, we find in Luke the Sabbath healing of the deformed woman and of the dropsical man, which the Evangelist places in the long journey to Jerusalem. In a synagogue, Jesus meets with a woman who for eighteen years has suffered from a "spirit" of infirmity, and who goes bowed down and cannot stand erect. When Jesus sees her, he calls her to him and says, "Woman, thou art released from thy infirmity;" he lays his hands upon her, and immediately she stands up straight and erect.³ We may have suspicions of this incident because it is found in but one authority, and in many points shows a late colouring. Among the questionable points are, the assumption of a spirit—hence of possession—to explain a deformity, the chronic over-long continuance of the infirmity, with a suspicious number of years, the healing quite independent of faith, the

¹ 1 Kings xiii. 4, 6. Comp. infancy of Jesus, above, II. pp. 76, 139.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 4th ed. II. p. 115; *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 165. In the king's words of violence we might find the prototype of the violence of the Pharisees (Matt. xii. 10, 14); and in Josiah, the predicted offspring of David, the destroyer of false doctrine, we might find a type of Jesus. Volkmar (p. 206) allegorizes thus: it is the Pauline releasing, to moral activity, of the hand bound by the Sabbatic law. He refers to Jerome on Matthew: usque ad adventum salvat. arida manus in synag. fuit Judæorum et Dei opera non fiebant in ea.

³ Luke xiii. 10, comp. Matt. xv. 30. The number 18 appears to be a reminiscence from xiii. 4, just like viii. 42 and 43. Imaginary possibilities, Volkmar, p. 219. He explains the incident as an imitation of the preceding. Its meaning, he says, is the restoration of antiquated Judea. Eternal repetition of man and woman, Judea and Pagana. He holds that 40 or 38 should stand there instead of 18!

unnecessary laying on of hands after the releasing words. But this may all belong to the form of the narrative in Luke's Ebionite source, while the nucleus, with the elsewhere recounted sayings and replies, remains untouched.¹ The consequential interference of the rulers of the synagogue, Jesus' able and triumphant reply, and, finally, the jubilation of the people, inspired by the presence of the strong one to resist their teachers,—all this is truly drawn from the life, from the fresh reality. Even the mention of the devil as the author of the illness, though without the assumption of a formal possession, is not contradictory to Jesus' mode of view; and the actual healing is not more impossible than that of the paralytic.² On the other hand, the healing of the dropsical man is only a copy of that of the man with the withered hand.³ The details are the same in almost all particulars. Nearly the only differences are, that the one healing is made to occur in the house of a chief Pharisee, and the other in the synagogue; in one case there is a swelling, in the other an atrophy; one healing is effected by a laying hold, the other by the command to stretch forth the limb; one healing is followed by the silence of the opponents, the other by their secretly intriguing. In both cases there is a lying in wait of the Pharisees and lawyers; in both cases there is a question by Jesus concerning the lawfulness of healing on the Sabbath, challenging a public conflict; in both cases, Jesus appeals to the saving of the unfortunate, whether of the sheep, or the son, or the ox fallen into the pit. Moreover, it is evident that Luke based his account of the healing of the dropsical man on the narrative of the healing of the man with the withered hand, partly as given by Matthew and partly as given by himself; and that he took pains to diminish the necessary similarity of the two narratives by a generalization and expansion of Jesus' defence in the former incident, in which

¹ See above, p. 14.

² Bowed down is not hunchbacked. Hohenlohe's expression: Hunchback I cannot blow away! Hase, *Gnos.* I. p. 453.

³ Luke xiv. 1. Strauss had already seen in it a copy, 4th ed. II. p. 117. Dropsy as a curse in the Old Test., Num. v. 21; Ps. cix. 18: comp. Judas the betrayer.

Mark—who, like Matthew, gave only one of the incidents—without any reason blindly followed him. Our decision concerning this case of healing is supported not only by the scanty attestation of the incident, and by our perception of the easy transition from the one kind of disease to the other, but also by the total inconceivableness of a sudden subsidence of swelling and a sudden dispersion of the water in a dropsical patient, in whom, if the malady were serious, there would not only be water in the external parts, such as his hands, but a process of general decay in the more vital organs. This subsidence of swelling would be as easy or as difficult to explain as the above—rejected—expansion of an atrophied member.¹

Finally, we have the testimony of the three Synoptics, and, if we are disposed to believe Eusebius, the eye-witness, even monumental evidence, for the healing of the woman with an issue of blood, later erroneously called Bernice (Veronica), whose disease probably consisted in a debilitating periodical bleeding of the uterus.² A late period is supported by Luke and Mark, who place the miracle after the parables and after the voyage to the Gadarenes. And even Matthew involuntarily corroborates this date, by making the miracle subsequent to the controversy about fasting. When, after the above-mentioned voyage, Jesus returned to Capernaum, where he was met by a multitude of people, and where also he received the petition of the archon for his sick or deceased little daughter, in the throng of people accompanying Jesus to the town and to the house of the ruler, a woman, who had suffered twelve years from an issue of blood, summoned

¹ Paulus (*Exeget. Illb.* II. p. 341) assumed (1) dropsy only in the external part, arising from atony of the skin; (2) previously employed means. Volkmar (p. 212): after Judea, a Gentile!

² Matt. ix. 18; Luke viii. 41; Mark v. 22. Matthew found the incident in connection with the controversies about the publicans and fasting. As the former fell early, whilst the latter was late, he placed these healings early, whilst in the case of the two controversies about the Sabbath (xii. 1 sqq.) he was guided by the later incident (xii. 9 sqq.). The statue of the woman with the issue of blood (Gentile woman), Eus. 7, 18. Comp. above, I. pp. 35 sq., II. p. 190. Bernice, first in *Act. Pil.* b. 7, and Malalas; in *Hom.* the daughter of the woman of Canaan is thus called; see above, I. p. 35.

courage to take hold of the hem of his mantle behind him. She hoped for healing from the mere touch. To touch a Rabbi was forbidden ; and to the woman, confused with shame, nay, legally unclean, the way least likely to be observed by Jesus, the disciples, and the people, was the most desirable.¹ Jesus felt the touch, which the woman's faith did not effect without a sensible pull ; and a look at the seeking invalid showed him what she sought, even if he did not know the nature of her sufferings. Where he saw faith, there he also saw help, help at the instant, and indeed help to which faith itself largely contributed, even if it erred as to the form of help. "Be of good cheer, daughter ; thy faith has saved thee." The woman was free, so relate the Gospels. Luke and Mark have certainly artificially elaborated the matter, and the later writer still more so than his predecessor. They describe the futility of all medical aid, the spending of the woman's whole wealth on physicians, under whose treatment—thus decides Mark more emphatically than Luke, the medical man—she had only become worse. In this way is explained the woman's reluctant resolution. The writers then seek also to make intelligible the secrecy of the healing, probably not without reference to the fact that in the first narrative the healing remained obscure or the exclusive benefit of the woman herself. When Jesus becomes aware of the touch, he feels at once that at the same time power is gone out of him. He asks for the person who has touched him. Every one denies any knowledge of the fact ; the disciples, with Peter at their head according to Luke, seek to show to Jesus the conceivability of his being touched in a crowd, and the unintelligibility of his question. He adheres to his question ; according to Luke, he speaks of power having gone out from him ; according to Mark, he looks round upon the woman who has touched him. In her confusion, in this extremity, the woman falls trembling before Jesus, confesses everything to him before the people, and especially the joyful fact that the

¹ Levit. xv. 19 sqq. Pharisei non permittebant se tangi a populis terre. Schöttgen, p. 275.

flowing of her blood had been immediately stayed, dried up. Referring to the already accomplished result, he no longer exhorts her to be of good cheer, but offers her the congratulation, "Daughter, thy faith has saved thee; go hence in peace." According to Mark, indeed, Jesus healed her a second time.¹

In the presence of these so artificially amplified reports, we can have no doubt as to where we are to look for that which is original. In Luke and Mark, the exaggeration shows itself as much in the portrayal of the distressing character of the disease, as in the delineation of the secret miraculous power of Jesus, and of his enigmatical knowledge of its involuntary effect. In their faith in a material miraculous power dwelling in the person of Jesus, and even independent of his will, they were in harmony with the superstitiously exaggerated popular opinion cherished by the woman herself and elsewhere among the people of the district of Gennesar.² We might suppose that they have preserved the original more fully than Matthew in this one feature, namely, that they find the help in the act of touching and not in the words of Jesus, even though it was not the case—as they thought and as they make Jesus himself think—that the act of touching drew power out of the body of Jesus, but that that power was derived rather from the sufferer's own infinite trust and hope. Yet this superiority does not exist; for even in Matthew, or at least in the speech of Jesus in Matthew, there is, only much purer, the faith that helped to bring about the result, or co-operated with the words of Jesus to effect the cure. Doubtless, as

¹ Mark v. 34 thus combines Luke viii. 48 and Matt. ix. 22. Also Hase, p. 171; Lange, p. 682. Ewald (p. 420) says he confirmed, recognized, the healing. Steinmeyer (p. 59) amusingly says that the improvement by psychological means would have endured only a day, but Jesus gave permanence to the healing.

² As usual, the pictorial account of the later writers is preferred by Schulz, Olsh., and others. Volkmar (p. 322) also finds Mark's account excellent. Similarly, also, Weisse (pp. 501 sq.), who, indeed, introduces magnetism. But the whole representation of the later writers reminds us very much of Matt. xiv. 36, Acts v. 15, xix. 12, and the apocryphal books, comp. *Ev. Jac.* 20. Much more correctly than Weisse, Paulus has guarded himself against accepting a body "impregnated" with forces; and Olshausen rejects at least the independence of these forces upon the will of Jesus. Both favour a simulation in the question of Jesus.

was shown in our general examination of the miracles, this is one of the most instructive incidents on the subject of the effectual power exercised in the healings. The power lies in the believer and it lies in Jesus, for he calls forth faith and strengthens faith, without being under the necessity of exercising a further influence of his own or of the divine powers in order to produce the required result.¹ And doubtless this is at the same time, for our minds also, the clearest explanation of many other cases of healing besides the one in question. No one can find much fault with this so well-attested incident, except perhaps with the triviality that the period of twelve years looks as much like a round mythical number as the eighteen years of the woman who was bowed down. In other respects, everything is simple, natural, life-like; and it is the less probable that we have here the fabrication of a feminine parallel to the unclean leper, because the question of uncleanness is not at all referred to.² Strauss, although he mistrusts the incident as a whole, does not object to the result, the woman's sense of actual improvement, however long it may have lasted. In a state of extremely shattered health, especially when the debility is so closely connected with enfeebled nervous power, as in the case of this woman, modern examples show that a strong hope will or can revive the bodily vigour, and a fresh calling forth of mental effort will create an invigorated force of resistance in the physical organs.³

The cases of *raising the dead* are altogether different in character from the above case of healing, and indeed from all Jesus' works of healing in the necessities of sickness. In the case of

¹ See above, III. p. 188. Similarly, Schleier. p. 214.

² According to Volkmar, the more detailed narrative is shipwrecked on the twelve years (which Neander, p. 248, after Strauss, 4th ed. II. 94, gave up); it is just again "Judea," not without an imitation of the Shunammite woman, the prototype of the following resurrection-incident, and who had only one son, therefore afterwards had remained "in her blood" (in ihrem Blut), p. 321.

³ Paulus, *Hdb.* I. p. 525, comp. III. 941; *L. J. I.* p. 244. Ammon, p. 417 (terror). Schenkel, p. 113. Ventur. (II. p. 145) fancies she derived private aid from a kindly offered plant, which Paulus finds in Eus. 7, 18. Comp. Padioleau, p. 72. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 93, and *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. pp. 193 sqq.

the woman with the issue of blood, the healing was effected almost exclusively by the faith of the invalid; in other cases, faith co-operated. Even demoniacs were not altogether unable to contribute something out of their own mental activity. Here, however, with extinguished life, the co-operation of the individual becomes impossible. It is simply and alone the power of Jesus, weakly seconded by the sympathetic wishes and hopes of the bystanders, of the father or the mother of the deceased, which, mighty in word and deed, conquers death and compels life to unfold itself afresh. Thus these hitherto unheard-of incidents form the direct transition to those imposing creative effects produced upon purely involuntary, dead matter, which, seen in the miracles of the Loaves and of the Storm, are lauded by the Evangelists as the greatest among the works of Jesus. But what tradition narrates so believingly, so impressively, so luminously, is perpetually a rock of offence, not only to unbelief, but to history.¹

A three-fold testimony, it is true, encircles, like an invincible body-guard, the resurrection of the little daughter of the archon, or chief of the town, at Capernaum,—an incident which is postponed to the same late period as the so closely connected healing of the woman with the issue of blood.² When Jesus had crossed the lake from Gadara and had landed at Capernaum, in the crowd of people an archon comes to him with reverent salutation: “My daughter is just dead; but come, lay thy hands upon her, and she shall live.” Jesus follows him at once, with his disciples.

¹ The unheard-of character of the raising the dead, comp. Pliny and Pilate’s report, under Lazarus, in a subsequent volume. Comp. Isaiah xxvi. 14, and even Luke viii. 49; John xi. 21 sqq. The raiser Alexander of Abonoteichos, Lucian, *Alex.* 24, and the Hyperboreans, ib. *Philopseud.* 13. Further, Apollonius, in Philostr. 4, 45; and many others. Comp. Wetstein, p. 363.

² Matt. ix. 18, &c. (see above, p. 163). Archon was the title of the Galilean town magistrate, *Jos. Vita*, 57; of temporal rulers, also Matt. xx. 25; Luke xii. 58, comp. xviii. 18 (judge); Acts iv. 26; 1 Cor. ii. 6; Rom. xiii. 3, &c. For harmonizing purposes, the title is made to apply to the synagogue rulers; and Luke and Mark thus understood it, because spiritual authorities, *e. g.* the high-priest, Acts xxiii. 5, the Synedrists, Luke xxiii. 13, heads of the Pharisees, xiv. 1 (comp. also Grimm), were thus called. Hence Ireneus, 5, 13, 1: *fil. summi sacerdotis*.

The crowd and the woman with the issue of blood retard him. In the house there are already the piping mourners with their pipes, and the assembled public cry aloud with Jewish lamentations.¹ "Give place," he cries to them; "for the maiden is not dead, but sleeps!" They deride him; but he causes the crowd to be put out, enters the room, takes the maiden by the hand, and, to the astonishment of the whole neighbourhood, the maiden comes to life again.²

This simple account of Matthew's has, in Luke and Mark, already become doubly and triply elaborated. Hence Storr's marvellous expedient of assuming that there were two raised from the dead, and two women healed of an issue of blood.³ He who with many words falls on his knees before Jesus, has here his name, his new and erroneously fuller title: he is called Jairus, and is the chief of the synagogue of the town. The little daughter—according to Luke, an only child—is twelve years old, just as old as the malady of the woman. The account at first says only that she lay at the point of death. But while Jesus is consoling the woman, there comes one, there come several, from the house, with the sad news, "Thy daughter is dead; do not any longer trouble the Master." Jesus hears it: "Fear not," says he to the father; "only believe, and she will be saved." He limits his escort to the house, or into the house, to Peter, James, and John. After the prelude with those who are weeping and mourning, who scoff at his consoling words because they know that death has taken place, he goes with the parents and his three disciples into the room. "Talitha kumi! Maiden, stand up!" he now cries, and takes the corpse by the hand; and

¹ Piping not only at dances, Matt. xi. 17, but also on occasions of mourning, Jos. *B. J.* 3, 9, 5 (where he says that they piped in Jerusalem over his supposed death). Comp. *Chetub.* c. 4, hal. 6: etiam pauperrimus inter Israel. præbebit mortuæ uxori non minus q. duas tibias et unam lamentatricem. Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 19, 8, 2; *Vita*, 62. Suet. *Cæs.* 84. Lightfoot, pp. 309 sq., 514. Also among the Greeks and Romans, comp. Dio C. 56, 31.

² The laughter of unbelief, Genesis xviii. 12. There was wine at lamentations, Lightfoot, p. 311; Jos. *Ant.* 17, 8, 4.

³ *Zweck d. Ev. Joh.* p. 351.

immediately she stands up and walks.¹ Whilst the beholders are amazed, he quietly orders food to be given to her, and bids those present keep the event secret,—a precaution which it was not at that period his custom to take, and which under the circumstances was simply impossible.²

Even here we shall find a permanent residuum, particularly in Matthew's report. The elaborations of that report do not help us at all, the falling at Jesus' feet as little as the long petition, the ruler of the synagogue as little as the name Jairus,—for Jairus is only a fabricated name, and means "He will make clear." The age of the daughter has been not unskillfully welded, in significant word-play, with the woman's years of illness.³ But the exaggerations help us still less. It may, indeed, be thought that here again we come into contact with originality in the later accounts, because their maiden is not yet dead, and because Mark is ready with a sentence that points to a thoroughly natural procedure, namely, that Jesus took care that strengthening food was given to the maiden when she rose up out of her swoon. But that which some might call the more natural, is the more artificial. The dying maiden immediately afterwards really dies, even according to Luke and Mark: the only thing we cannot understand is, that the unhappy father does not urge Jesus to make greater haste. All this looks as if the additions merely enhanced the gloom and hopelessness of the situation; but it is intended that the self-confidence of Jesus also, and the power of the

¹ Similarly, Acts ix. 40.

² *Talitha*, from Aramaic (Buxt. p. 875) *thale*, *thalia*, fem. *thalieta*, puella, comp. Hebr. thaleh, theli, tender lamb. *Kum* (Syriac pronunciation, or infinitive for imp.) is not established against the regular *kumi* (imp. fem. Gen. xxi. 18, comp. Buxt. p. 1991). Thus against Tisch., It., A., D., and St. Gall. Volkmar in error, p. 323. The secrecy is defended by Ewald, p. 421.

³ Jairus, with Aleph, LXX. *Ἰαῖρος*; Jos. *Ant.* 5, 7, 6, *Ἰαίρης*, Luke, Mark—*ος*; in Old Test., Num. xxxii. 41; Judges x. 3, and elsewhere. With Ayin, of which Paulus thought (he awakens, thus Volkmar), only in the Keri reading of 1 Chron. xx. 5. The meaning given in the text is quite appropriate also to 2 Kings iv. 35. Strauss (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 209) also quotes Ps. xiii. 3. The *προσκυνεῖν* in Matt. is at any rate less definite than the *πίπτειν* of the later writers; comp. Matt. ii. 11, iv. 9; Acts x. 25; Rev. v. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

real and genuinely Pauline faith, defying the opposition of actual fact, should be made more brilliantly conspicuous. Hence the message which would persuade the archon—who, according to Matthew, still believes even after the death of his daughter—to throw away his faith and hope, and describes the further troubling of Jesus as useless and vexatious importunity. The augmented amazement and secrecy are thus introduced. Jesus is certain, and makes the father certain; he limits his escort to a few trusty companions; he once more, with contempt of the crude reality, clears the place where he is; instead of a silent taking hold, he causes to resound through the apartment the powerful, confident cry of command, in mysterious Aramaic words; the maiden is not merely restored to life, she stands up, walks, and eats, and the incredible, the supernatural, looks like nature, to which we are compelled to yield our confidence, while, on account of the infinite contrast, we mistrust it again as something magical.¹

Matthew's account, however, does not, in and of itself, so completely refuse to give place to a more accommodated view, as to compel us to exercise an absolute belief in miracles. When Jesus distinctly says, "The maiden is not dead, but sleeps," it is equally possible either that he knew the fact of her death, and encouragingly opposed to the external fact and its paralyzing influence the higher and kindlier view and the victorious anticipation; or that he was seriously convinced that the maiden's apparent death was not a real fact, though the superficial multitude did not perceive this, and that he based upon the presence of the slumbering life the hope of a restored activity.² The latter assumption is not shaken by the fact that those who were present, the astounded standers-by, and even the narrating Evangelist, think the case to be otherwise,—although it must be noted that the certainty of death does not appear so great as in the

¹ On the foreign language, see above, III. p. 183, note 2.

² Death as sleep, already in Old Test., Ps. xiii. 3; Job iii. 13; Jer. li. 39; Dan. xii. 2. Rabbis, in Lightfoot, p. 311. Not actual death, Acts xiv. 19, xx. 9, 10.

accounts of Luke and Mark. We know the child-like condition of these people and their medical knowledge, the exaggerations of popular conversation and tradition; and we have a protecting bulwark against both in the preserved verbal utterance of Jesus, which mocks every attempt to establish the decisively miraculous view, the so-called higher, believing standpoint.¹ This assumption, then, permits us to apply to this incident, which is on the whole so well attested by its connection with the healing of the woman with the issue of blood, the same explanation as to other healings. On the side of Jesus, there is in this case the calling forth of all his compassionately sympathetic mental power; on the side of the sick person, there is no faith, it is true, but at least—as surely as physical and spiritual life lay slumbering there—a sensibility capable of being stimulated, and doubtless a greater degree of sensibility than in the cases of the certainly very different demoniacs. And since the nature of the disease and the death-like weakness are not definitely described, there remains open the possibility that a lethargic faintness, at one and the same time the result of exhaustion and the critical point of the development of fresh energy, was, by the entrance of Jesus and the parents, chiefly by Jesus' vigorous and reviving taking hold and lifting up of the patient, shaken off at the most favourable moment, and converted into recovery of health.²

Notwithstanding all these possibilities, there still remain many

¹ Strongly emphasized, not only by Paulus, but also by Schleier, p. 233, and Weizs. p. 373. Steinmeyer waxes warm, on the other side, incidentally stating that apparent death occurs in adults, but not in children (p. 186).

² A merely apparent death has been thought of by Paulus, Schleier., Ammon, Neander, Hase, Weisse, Ewald, Schenkel, Weizs., even Olshausen, and partly also Bleek. Actual death has been held by the ancients, Krabbe, Meyer, Lange, Steinmeyer, Pressensé. Lange, certainly, thinks also (II. p. 277) that the dead were kept *not far from life* by parental and family love. According to the Rabbis (Lightfoot), they remain three days! A number of instances of apparent death, in ancient and modern times, collected by Paulus, *Hdb.* I. pp. 532, 722. He and Ammon say much of the period of development of oriental girls. According to Venturini, Jesus had obtained intelligence on the way. Deception, with pretended death, Lightfoot, pp. 141, 424.

suspicious features in the whole incident. In the first place, there is the conception of the author on whom we wish to build, and who evidently believes in a resurrection of the strictest kind. Further, there is the archon's faith, which is steadfast as a rock, and which is much less intelligible in connection with the facts of the moment than in connection with the later hopes of Christendom. This objection, when fully applied, is indeed the most weighty. There is elsewhere no reliable trace whatever of any case of raising the dead by Jesus. It is most significant that the disciple of Jesus who wished to go to bury his father, and those disciples of the Baptist who announced to Jesus the death of John, make no attempt to procure from Jesus a resurrection of the dead; and that, at the close of the history of Jesus, it does not strike the Apostles to expect or to bring about a resurrection of Jesus himself.¹ On the other hand, we can quite understand that a later time would wish to regard as a conqueror of death and the grave, even in the days of his earthly ministry, that man who, contrary to all expectation, himself arose and gave to Christians the blessed hope that he would also raise up them after their brief "sleep" in their graves, after that which to a believer in the resurrection is really only a sleep. We can quite understand that a later age would ascribe this power to Jesus in attestation of his greatness, in confirmation of their own hopes as to the future, which were almost more deeply interested in the resurrection of ordinary men than in that of one who was great and unapproachable. This tendency was furthered by an utterance of Jesus, to which men were prone to give a false interpretation; still more by the prototype presented by the ancient prophets Elijah and Elisha, whom Jesus must be made to rival in raising the dead, and by the well-attested expectation that the Messiah would perform such works.² Since the woman of Sarepat (Sarepta) had said to Elijah, after the restoration of her son, "Now I know that thou art a man of God, and that the

¹ Comp. Matt. viii. 21, xiv. 12, xxvii. 58 sqq.

² Matt. xi. 5. See above, III. p. 166, IV. pp. 30 sqq.

word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth," therefore the man of God in the highest sense, the Messiah who stood above all prophets, must in the same way legitimize himself; and he could and must do it so much the more because he was actually what no other was, the risen and the awakener. In point of fact, we can detect in the narrative the imitation of the ancient miracles of the prophets, especially of that of Elisha.¹ It is true there is considerable difference: but as there a son dies, so here a daughter; as there the mother exerts herself, so here the father; as there Elisha orders Gehazi to lay his staff upon the boy's face, so here the father asks for the laying on of Jesus' hands. In both cases, there is the saver's arrival from a journey, an entering into the house to the room of the dead, an exclusion of strangers, a touching of the hands; and finally, while there at the first ineffectual attempt the words stand, "The child has not come to life again," here there is the triumphant sentence, "And the maiden came to life again." Even the differences show points of relationship. There we have the disciple Gehazi with his firm conviction that the boy was past help, here the guests hopeless as to anything Jesus can do; there Gehazi's breathless hurrying into the house of mourning, without being able to salute any one by the way, here the tardy but confident approach of Jesus; there Gehazi's futile attempt, and the long labour of the prophet with prayer and action till at last the child sneezes and opens his eyes, here the taking hold and the rising up in one and the same instant. The later writers have yet more closely copied the prototype. Both children are represented as the only offspring of the marriage; both are grown up; in both cases death comes gradually; in both cases the parents fall at the feet of the man for whose help they are entreating and show importunate, invincible faith; in both cases the increasingly mournful message is brought to the seeker of help in the presence of the helper; in both cases only the disciple, or a trio of the disciples (besides

¹ 1 Kings xvii. 17; 2 Kings iv. 8, 18. Comp. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 206.

the parents), are allowed to enter the room; and in both cases the activity of the renewed life is described, and then the amazement of the parents, which, in the presence of Elisha, found expression in the prostration of the mother at his feet. It may be that, against these suspicious circumstances, much can be said of the simplicity, vividness, independence, and calm dignity of this narrative, as well as of the easy warding off of the chief objections by adopting a somewhat reduced representation of the fact which has been subsequently exaggerated. But it is impossible to attain to anything like certainty in such a way; and the very lack of any characteristic feature teaches us resignation and cautious sobriety.

Besides this case of raising the dead, Luke's Gospel contains a second, peculiar to itself, if not indeed a third. When, namely, he describes the Baptist's embassy and Jesus' answer, "The blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, to the poor glad tidings are announced;" and when, in the spirit of all the Gospels, he gives a material application of these words, which are to be interpreted by the spiritual works and actions of Jesus,—he not merely introduces—in distinction from Matthew—a number of blind and sick men of every kind whom Jesus had just relieved, but he assumes the occurrence of one or two cases of raising the dead; and though these, not being every-day events, could not well have happened in the general crowd of the people, he represents them as having taken place at least not long before.¹ One case is that of the restoration of the dying—in Matthew, as we long ago saw, only sick—servant or boy of the centurion; the other is that of a still more imposing resurrection than that at Capernaum, namely, the case of the young man of Nain.² Doubtless the date given to this incident, and the placing of it before the resurrection of the daughter of the archon—which event is inseparably connected with the series of

¹ Luke vii. 18—22, comp. vii. 2, 11.

² In spite of Neander and others, Steinmeyer (p. 191) rejects the view that one is a greater work than the other.

other miracles—can be explained only by the desire to present to the Baptist's embassy an attestation of fact; for the journey to Nain actually took place at any rate later, and the greater miracle would in point of fact necessarily have followed the less as an advance upon the latter in magnitude. When Jesus, in the midst of numerous disciples and a great multitude of people, neared the town gate of Nain, behold! a dead man was being carried out, with the customary procession of mourners, and in front, at the head of the women, was the mother, a widow, whose only son the deceased was.¹ "Weep not!" said Jesus, deeply affected, to the sorrowing mother. He went up and touched the coffin; the bearers—generally friends—as well as the mourners, stood still, and he said, "Young man! I say unto thee, arise!" And the dead man raised himself up, and began to speak, and Jesus gave him to his mother. Fear and magnifying gratitude to God were at conflict in the hearts of the beholders. "A prophet has risen up among us," they cried; "God has looked down upon His people." The fame of the miraculous deed ran through the whole neighbourhood, through all Judea.

In this incident a natural explanation becomes entirely impossible: here is a divine creative act. Death has taken place for hours; on the way to the burial, the last hopes must have lost all support in the appearance of the corpse. But divine power is associated with the genuinely human compassion of Jesus. The touching of the coffin is a sign for the bearers, but also, according to the meaning of the author, for the dead, who literally rises as the result of the touch and the call. The natural mode of explanation here hangs by a straw, appealing only to the haste of Jewish burials and the Jewish shrinking from contact

¹ Unusually numerous participation in burial, with emulation as to carrying (on the shoulders): *pro mortuo, qui effertur in lecto, multi lugent, multi comitantur; ab operibus s. cessavit tota urbs, ut exhiberet misericordiam.* The women in front. Wetstein, p. 699. Lightfoot, pp. 223, 311, 514 sq. The coffin was not closed, so that the dead could be seen. *Jos. Ant.* 17, 8, 3; *Vita*, 62. The graves remote (unclean): *cœmeteria non erant prope urbem.* Lightfoot, p. 514. Erroneously, p. 582, eight stadia. Comp. Winer and Herzog, *Begehrnisse*.

with the dead, circumstances which would prevent a sufficient observation of the dead and the requisite caution and certainty, the rapid decomposition of the corpse and dread of uncleanness usually causing burial to take place a few hours after death.¹ There is indeed a remote possibility that the dead man still lived, and that Jesus—who, according to Paulus, was specially observant after the incident of the little daughter—noticed, thanks to the open bier, some sign of life, some movement.² But the narrative at least shows nothing of an observation of the dead, but only of the mother; a mere cry would hardly awaken one who was apparently dead; the sitting up of the dead man and his speaking exhibit a too rapid process of revival; and, besides, there is the improbability of these accidents themselves, these repeated accidents. The reality, the daily repetition, of this incident, a mortal race may yearn and long for, and may compel an Asclepiades, and later an Apollonius at the bier of a noble Roman bride, to bring about exactly the same thing; but the beautiful narrative is, however, unfortunately not above suspicion.³ Suppressing the great, the general doubt, it remains that the belief in a power proceeding from the body of Jesus and penetrating through the wood of the bier to the dead man, may be that of the Evangelist, but it is not ours. The genuine histories of the life of Jesus do not compel us to have this belief, but only the later

¹ Strauss (*N. L. of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 212) speaks of four hours, plainly following Paulus, *Exeg. Handb.* I. p. 526, where however the decision is based upon J. D. Michaelis' conclusion from Acts v. 6, 7, 10. The rule was the close of the day, *Jos. B. J.* 3, 8, 5; 4, 5, 2; *Ant.* 4, 8, 6. Lightfoot, p. 141. Anciently, it was otherwise, *Gen.* xxiii. 2 sqq. *Comp. Herod, B. J.* 1, 33, 8 sqq. Uncleanness, *Num.* xix. 11. Bearers, Lightfoot, pp. 310, 515; *comp. Amos* vi. 10.

² Paulus, *l. c.* p. 718. He also appeals to the address to the young man, which presupposes life. Venturini speaks of shaking, and of balsam on the temples. Even Neander (p. 251) describes the incident as "allied to" the previous one; and Ewald thinks it of a late date, and misses the "closer view," p. 424. Similarly, Hase, p. 206.

³ *Comp. Celsus, De re med.* 2, 6: quosdam fama prodidit in ipsis funeribus revivisse. Asclepiades funeri obvius intellexit eum vivere, qui efferebatur. Also Pliny, *His. Nat.* 26, 8. Philostr. *Vita Ap.* 4, 45; *Artem.* 4, 82. *Comp. Paulus*, p. 722. Strauss, *N. L. of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 212.

authors. Nor should we overlook the fact that it is only one later author who is acquainted with this incident. This miracle, known throughout all Judea, remained entirely hidden from the other Evangelists, who, if they had known or believed it, would have eagerly registered it as an occurrence of the first importance.¹ But the most dangerous rival and opponent of the miracle is the Old Testament, and the miracle of Elijah in the Phœnician Sarepat, near Sidon; although here also it is impossible to overlook a certain independence of the Christian narrative, a delicate trace of new, characteristic, and poetical treatment. In the Old Testament incident there is an arrival at the gate of the town; there is a widow, who does not, it is true, accompany the wooden coffin of her son, but who collects a number of wooden splinters in order to prepare some food to appease the hunger of herself and her son, "that we may eat it and die." There, also, the son becomes ill and dies, even in the prophet's presence, and is carried by the latter himself into the upper room. The prophet stretches himself over the dead youth, cries complainingly, beseechingly, to God, "Lord, my God, let this child's soul come into him again." The Greater One simply cries, "Young man, I say unto thee, stand up." In the Old Testament also the soul returns to the son, he revives, and the prophet delivers the son to his mother (this is reported in the very same words). There also the mother—as here the bystanders—verbally acknowledges that of a truth Elijah is the man of God.² We must also make use of the miracle of Elisha. This miracle was performed at Shunem, near the Little Hermon, only about half a league south of Nain, the place of Jesus' miracle. Indeed, we are compelled to admit that the Christian tradition here derived its material from Elijah and Elisha; and especially that it gave the most striking expression to the close connection—itsself another miracle—of the Old and New Testaments, by placing the act of Jesus in the neighbour-

¹ Volkmar (p. 325), according to his rigid theory, thinks that Matt. knew Luke's narrative, but passed it by.

² 1 Kings xvii. 17—24.

hood of that of Elisha.¹ Though in certain circles the opinion may persistently linger that such a coincidence of events is possible and indeed providentially sublime, others will remain firm in their conviction that it might occur to the literal mind, to the wit and wisdom of a Jew, but not to God, to seek in the development of history copies of Judaism in things from the greatest to the smallest, whether in words—as at the baptism of Jesus—or in facts and localities.²

The resurrections of the dead form the immediate transition to the great *nature-miracles* of Jesus. The best attested of these latter are placed just in this period of Jesus' highest exhibitions of power and revelations of his own nature: a fact which may be made use of as much in the interest of the actual historical character of these occurrences, as in evidence of the artistic skill of the authors of the Gospels. A storm scene on the Galilean lake, and a case of miraculously feeding a multitude, have the strong evidence of from three to four Gospels. Indeed, both these incidents exist in a double form, since Matthew and Mark are able to report a second feeding and a second storm, and the second storm has the support of the fourth Gospel. With these incidents may conveniently be connected two other nature-miracles which are in themselves much less strongly attested, and are placed at a much earlier period than those that are historically best supported. We refer to the marriage at Cana in the fourth Gospel, and Peter's draught of fishes in the third. The latter has been already set aside, in our notice of the calling of the disciples. Several others, some of a subordinate character—Peter's small draught of fishes in Matthew, the great one in John, the withered fig-tree of Matthew and Mark—have their natural place in a subsequent part of this history.

The lake-storm is narrated by Luke and Mark more or less

¹ 2 Kings iv. 8, 18. It is astonishing that the expositors mention Endor (north-east) in preference to Shunem, and that Strauss and Volkmar have not once referred to the geographical question. Indeed, the latter (p. 325) considers Nain (grace!) as neighbour to Capernaum!

² Comp. Strauss against Hengstenberg, *l. c.* II. p. 242 sq.

immediately after the parables, and immediately before the visit to the country of the Gadarenes. Matthew also recognizes the latter arrangement, though, as we have seen, he places both incidents much earlier.¹ On the voyage to the south-eastern shore of the lake, which, according to Matthew and Mark, occurred in the evening, Jesus and his disciples were overtaken by one of the tempests which frequently arise on that deep-lying lake. From all appearances, it was the south-east storm, well known to the boatmen of the lake, and which burst violently from the open lower valley of the Jordan and the deep ravines of the eastern coast. This frightful foe, with its howling and its tempestuous waves, would directly strike the bows of the suddenly overtaken vessel.² Wave after wave sweeps in, the hold fills with water, the ship becomes heavier and sinks deeper, a little while longer and it must founder. No help from any quarter is to be had on the enraged element; of the ships which, according to Mark, accompanied Jesus, there is in the other sources, and in Mark's Gospel itself, no trace. But Jesus slept, like Alexander before the battle; according to Mark, he lay on a cushion upon the still protected after-deck.³ It was indeed the evening of a day of hard work; and yet more, Jesus' sleep was the divine rest in the terrestrial unrest, in the human distress. But the distress awakes him, as Parmenion did Alexander. "Lord, save!" cry the disciples to him; "we perish!" "Master, dost thou not care that we perish?" they cry reproachfully, in Mark's Gospel, without any reason. "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" is his calm answer. But he then rises and commands the winds and the sea—according to Mark, with a loud cry first to the wind, then to the sea—"Peace! be still! And there was a great

¹ Luke viii. 22; Mark iv. 35; Matt. viii. 18, 23, 28.

² Russegger, *Reisen*, III. p. 136. De Vitriac, gest. D. p. Fr. 1075. Joliffe and others. Winer, articles *Genesaret* and *Wind*. Comp. Ex. xiv. 21. Σεισμὸς in Matt. means, not earthquake (Volkmar), but, as is well known, also storm. Matt. xxvii. 51: ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθη.

³ Alexander, Justin, *Hist.* 11, 13.

calm." The men, amazed, exclaim, "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?"¹

Unquestionably there rests upon this brief and pregnant narrative a rare majesty, such as does not re-appear in the other nature-miracles. With a few masterly strokes there is here, sketched a most sublime picture from the life of Jesus, and a picture full of truth. Thus might the storm have raged, thus might the men have despaired, thus might Jesus have first slumbered, and then mildly rebuking his disciples with his words "Ye of little faith!" finally have saved them like a hero. Even his rising up against weather and sea is told by Matthew and Luke quite simply, without any ostentation; and the tentative query of the disciples, after their deliverance was accomplished, "Who is this?" is the slightest possible, the only too modest and yet the true, utterance of the impression which they must at that time have received. Whoever, in the present day, is disposed to believe in a God in whose providential hand we stand, and in whose hand stood the man who, in God's name, must crown the world's history; or whoever will believe only in a man that, in the storm of elements and of men, remained undismayed in the surrounding human confusion and tumult, a greater than Cæsar and his pilot, a man that did not lose himself, but retained for himself and others his presence of mind; whoever believes either in such a God or in such a man, is able joyfully to admit that the deliverance was possible, since God would protect His instrument, or the instrument would protect himself and others.²

But criticism must not be diverted from completing its task by the religious sentiment. There exists here a mythical element.³ The menace of the storm and the consequence

¹ Of little faith, see above, III. p. 33, note 1.

² Comp. *Gesch. Christus*, pp. 127 sqq. (against Strauss). Forceful, but unfair, objections, which not without "rhetoric" make me say what I do not, in Biedermann, *Dogmatik*, p. 590. Cæsar, Plutarch, *Cæs.* 38.

³ Weizsäcker (pp. 449 sq.) says incorrectly that in the narrative itself everything except the ethical action is of secondary importance. On the other hand, Schleiermacher (p. 223) seriously recognizes the task, in connection with these nature-miracles,

of that menace, find parallels in several similar heathen and Christian myths.¹ If we assume the reality of the occurrence in its main features, the action of Jesus consisted in the interposition of a purely human power, in his pious, courage-imparting calm and decision, quite independent of any weather calculations such as Venturini assumes; or it consisted in a petition to God for help, in answer to which help was given or appeared to be given.² The narrative, however, contains a miracle, and a miracle without a prayer, an instance of just such an immediately imperative and effective power of Jesus over the wildly enraged waters as he had exercised over demoniacs. This power over the natural elements a man as such does not possess; and Jesus did not ascribe this power over nature, this giving and taking of terrestrial things, to himself, but to God. God feeds, God protects, God saves, God brings about death and destruction,—this is the key-note of his preaching. And against inimical force, whether it come from seas or only from men—against whom it is that he has the shield of the spirit rather than against the waters—he has only one weapon, as Gethsemane shows, and that is prayer. This prayer is here forgotten; on the contrary, Jesus himself is portrayed in the form of a commanding God, just as in the Psalm where it is said of God, “He rebuked the Red Sea, and it was dried up.”³ If he could thus have controlled the weather, why

of bringing hypotheses to the aid of the obscure narratives,—a necessity which is certainly not felt by the crude faith of an Olshausen, a Pressensé, and a Steinmeyer, a faith unintelligibly satisfied by the dogmatic watchword, “supernatural.”

¹ Philostratus, *Ap.* 4, 13; Jamblichus, *Pyth.* p. 135. Also Acts xxvii. 22, 24, 34. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 168.

² Reliance upon God, Paulus, Hase, Ammon, Schleierm., Lange, Schenkel, Ewald, Weizs., and others. For the letter of the narrative, Meyer, Neander, Steinmeyer, Press. Weisse (I. p. 495) says, somewhat mysteriously, Jesus possessed a sympathetic influence over nature, but only such as is possessed by other *thaumaturgi*, even Shamans. Lange, II. p. 314, upholds a natural explanation, and then, pp. 655 sq., speaks of the creative founding of the new æon. Bleek (I. p. 354) will hold both the one and the other.

³ Ps. cvi. 9. Therewith Beyschlag’s apology—based upon prayer—for these nature-wonders (against Weisse, *Christol.* XIII. sq.) sinks to the ground. Steinm. (p. 233) finds less difficulty with his “divine Son.” But why words of command to the ele-

had he not commanded fine weather at first? Doubtless, only because he appointed the rough weather as a test.

If, however, we have here a glorifying transformation of history, who will be security for the rest, or who will show us an historical remainder? It is indeed possible, as Strauss has admitted, that Jesus was overtaken by a storm on the lake; but was his act merely that of calming the minds of his disciples, of those of little faith, or was it an effectual prayer of faith? No one can now determine. Nay, as we examine more closely, the genuine nucleus of the narrative grows ever less and less, and the additions grow greater and greater. Thus many of the words and the principal features of the description correspond with the sea-pictures of the Psalms. In Psalm cvi., the passage through the Red Sea is described, the evidence of Divine power, the salvation through the Divine name, the rebuking the sea, the overwhelming the foes with water, the faith in the Divine word, and the proclamation of Divine love. The following Psalm—cvii.—compares Israel's return from the exile to salvation from a storm at sea. "They that go down to the sea in ships have seen the works of the Lord, and his wonders in the deep." A storm arises, the waves lift themselves up, the ship goes up and goes down to the depth, the heart melts, all their own wisdom is at an end; they cry to the Lord in their distress, and He commands the storm, causes a soft wind to blow, and silences the waves. Such gladdened men are to thank the Lord for His goodness, and for His wonderful works to the children of men. Let us take two other passages from the Psalms: "Arise; why sleepest thou, O Lord? Awake, and cast us not off for ever!" "Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, like a mighty man that shouts by reason of wine!" Let us add to these the human antitype, the prophet Jonah, who slept soundly in the great storm, was awaked, and saved the ship and crew, though only by the sacrifice of his own life. We can now piece together our whole narrative out of

ments (comp. Schlicerm. p. 230)? Not for the sake of the elements, but of the men. Simulation?

the Old Testament.¹ The great improbability of such an actual repetition of the Old Testament—which Hengstenberg was compelled to represent as a thing at which Jesus aimed—is as apparent as the probability of a Jewish-Christian imitation of the Old Testament.² The intention of the copyists is not that of placing Jesus on an equality with Moses, who controlled the ebb and flow of the Red Sea by his uplifted hand, but that of exhibiting the Messiah directly as the representative of God: as indeed, in the Psalms, it is the work of God, not of Moses, that is described, and in the Gospel it is somewhat striking that the amazement exhibited is not that of the “disciples,” but of the “men.”³ After the above, it remains quite uncertain what fact really lies at the base of this narrative. It was the opinion of Strauss that the Church, reading the Psalms in times of persecution, had constructed these pictures for itself; but it is a much more probable supposition that an actual occurrence on the lake formed the historical basis, and that that occurrence was artistically re-cast until it was no longer recognizable under the colouring and the ideas borrowed from the Psalms, with which every Jew was well acquainted.⁴ Strauss’ explanation is contrary not only to the undeniable antiquity of the narrative, but particularly to the facts that the aim of the narrator is not so much to report the escape from the storm as to give a proof of Jesus’ majesty, and that the salvation of the earthly Church by the heavenly Jesus would scarcely have been expressed in the picture of a

¹ Ps. xlv. 23, lxxviii. 65; Jonah i. 4, 6. Strauss (4th ed. II. p. 166) has already referred to Ps. cvi. 7 sqq., and to Ex. xiv. 16, and Hengstenberg to Ps. cvii. 23 sqq. Comp. Strauss, *N. L. of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 242. Hase, p. 169.

² *Ev. Kirchen-Zeitung*, 1861, pp. 4. sqq. Strauss, *l.c.*

³ Matt. viii. 27, comp. ix. 9; Mark iv. 41. The striking expression, “the men” (Steinm. p. 230), Meyer, Neander, Fr., against Bl., De W., explain by supposing they were others than the disciples. Volkmar (p. 312) speaks very disparagingly of the naturalistic and mythical modes of explanation; as if he could remove the Messiah from the Gospels, and as if there were anything to suggest the “Christ of Paul” who calms the storm of the world-sea and expels the demons from the Gentiles. Moreover, in Mark vi. 45, the “world-sea” comes into notice after the Gentiles.

⁴ Even Volkmar, as well as Strauss, has found an actual occurrence possible. Schneck., Olsh., Strauss, have given prominence to the symbolic element.

voyage taken by Jesus and the disciples together. The second storm also gives force to this last remark.¹

The supposition of a totally unhistorical character is far more applicable to the second lake-storm, which by three Gospels is closely bound up with the first great miracle of the loaves at the close of the Galilean period.² In the first place, what is repeated is quite as striking as the new material which this narrative contains; and though there are three authorities, yet while the earlier Luke is altogether silent, the incident is described by the much later John, so dependent upon the earlier writers. The little ship voyages afresh across the lake; Jesus' labour among the people is again at an end; the evening falls again, and again there blows a contrary wind. Only this time the route, instead of leading to the south-east, is rather from the north-east to the north-west, from Peræa to Gennesar. The fresh wind of the autumn equinox, the north-west instead of the south-east, begins to blow; and, what is the weightiest circumstance, Jesus, but none of the disciples, is absent from the ship.³ He has induced his disciples to embark, to take the direction towards home, towards Gennesar, while he himself purposed to remain still among the people, and afterwards to pray upon the mountain. This quite unusual course of sending the disciples on before him points of itself to an unusual occurrence, which seems at this time to be lying distinctly before the mind of Jesus. When night began to fall, the ship was in the very middle of the lake; according to the correct measurement of John, it had made from twenty-five to thirty stadia, i.e. from one league to one league and a half, and was as far, or at least still a long way, from the opposite shore.⁴ But the contrary wind was so strong that the

¹ Here we must see absence symbolized by sleep, as in Mark iv. 27; comp. Matt. xiii. 25, and see above, p. 182. Absence is more distinctly mentioned in Matt. xiv. 22.

² Matt. xiv. 22; Mark vi. 45; John vi. 15.

³ Furrer inclines to think of the south-eastern part of the lake; but this is by no means necessary; see below, the miracle of the loaves, p. 192. The winds, see above, p. 179, note 2.

⁴ Breadth of the lake, 40 stadia (two leagues), Jos., *B. J.* 3, 10, 7; more correctly, from two to three leagues (above, II. p. 360); Furrer, $1\frac{1}{2}$ — $2\frac{1}{2}$ (Schenkel, *B. Lex.*,

disciples were still struggling against it in the fourth watch of the night, in the first light of the morning.¹ At that time Jesus approached, without a ship, walking upon the water. According to Mark, he had already, at nightfall, seen the distress of the disciples, but had waited until morning,—a cruel testing.² But now, this apparition! The disciples held him to be a spirit, especially as, according to Mark, he gave himself the appearance of a stranger, of one who, superior to the need of the protection of timber and planks, was about to pass by the ship; and they cried out in terror. He calmed their fears: “Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid!” When he had got on board the vessel, the wind sank. The disciples were amazed beyond measure; according to Mark, they were the subjects of indefinite feelings, and were really hardened in understanding; according to Matthew, they threw themselves at Jesus’ feet with the cry, “In truth, thou art the Son of God!”³ In Matthew, this great ovation by the disciples is bound up with a representation of the glory of Jesus magnified by contrast.⁴ When the words of Jesus had calmed the fears of the disciples, Peter said, “Lord, if it be thou, bid me come to thee on the water.” “Come!” answered Jesus; and lo! Peter also walked upon the water towards Jesus. But when he saw the tempest, he was alarmed, and began to sink, and to cry, “Lord, save me.” Jesus stretched out his hand and caught him: “O thou of little faith! why didst thou doubt?” Then he went with him into the ship, and the wind ceased. John furnishes another exaggeration in the track of Mark, but,

Galil. Meer.) Matt. and Mark distinctly say in the middle of the lake, and John (vi. 19) certainly does not indicate proximity to the shore (against Bleek, II. p. 20).

¹ From 3 a.m. to 6 a.m.; comp. Winer, *Nachtwache*.

² Ewald (p. 444) quite incorrectly says that to notice and to help were one. Still more incorrectly Lange, II. p. 788 (comp. Neander, p. 348), that Jesus had tarried on the eastern shore for the fresh disciples that were now flocking to him.

³ Meyer understands by the people in Matt. viii. 27, not the disciples, but others who happened to be in the ship (see above, p. 183, note 3). But Matt. xiv. 22, and Mark vi. 51, viii. 17!

⁴ Matt. xiv. 28, comp. John xxi. 4—8, wherein Rat., and also Hase (p. 178), Ewald (p. 363), and Meyer (on John), find the original.

according to Chrysostom, quite a distinct incident, a second walking on the water. In the fourth Gospel, Jesus did not go on board the ship: the disciples wished to take him in, but the ship was at once away from the middle of the lake and at the shore to which they were steering.¹

These two last outgrowths of tradition, each given by one Evangelist, are the first to be cut away. The water-walking of Peter is at once seen to be an addition to the original narrative, an addition which, together with the overdrawn and solemn confession of the disciples, this misplaced anticipation of the decisive confession at Cæsarea Philippi, is justly to be ascribed to the second hand, although he has successfully imitated the language of the Evangelist.² It is at any rate certain that these proceedings of Peter interrupt and delay in a most inconvenient manner the urgently necessary help for the ship and the people on board the ship. The narrative emphasizes the fact that the storm was not hushed until Jesus had embarked. Did the water-walking experiment of Peter take place before the hushing of the storm, and had Peter so suddenly found courage to put his foot upon the dreaded waves, and to go to him whom he had just before been fearing as a spirit? Either the quieting of the storm happened as the author has described it: then it must have occurred at once, and Peter's water-walking could not have taken place at all, for Jesus was at that time on board the ship. Or, if the feats of Peter on the water really took place, then no stilling of the storm could have been necessary, though that is the capital point of the narrative to the author, as well as to the

¹ Comp. Meyer on John vi. 21. On the other hand, Ewald (p. 445) says that the ship sped to land as swiftly as an arrow with (accidentally) a suddenly favourable wind. Chrys., *Hom. in Joa.* 43.

² Also Hilg. p. 426 (comp. *Er.* p. 84), questions this narrative; but he immediately ascribes the whole storm narrative, as repetition of Matt. viii. 23, to the Evangelist (second hand). It might be more correct (in view of Mark, who also has both storms) to regard—with Strauss—the second storm as a duplicate originally belonging to the Gospel, but to reject the additions of Peter's water-walking and the utterance of amazement, which rejection would be justified by Mark and John (the latter has something similar in a false connection, xxi. 7), who have neither, and yet it cannot be said that they have suppressed the glorification of Peter, since that was not really before them.

other sources. Therefore Peter's getting into the water did not take place, or, if it did, it was of a different character, similar to that given to it by a later authority. The former supposition is at once the more probable one, quite apart from the actual truth of the water-walkings. Certainly Peter is an energetic and sanguine man, who later promises to follow Jesus to prison and to death, and he becomes subsequently the brave leader of the Apostles; but would he, who knew himself to be human, who looked up to Jesus as to a higher nature, who later also, on firm dry land, was so poorly able to find his way from words to deeds,—would he have voluntarily longed to walk upon the sea like his Master, and would he have successfully carried his longing into effect? This incident is, indeed, cleverly conceived, but only when it is understood in a higher sense. It is a picture of the life of a disciple called to walk in the footsteps of his Lord, to do what his Lord does by the power of faith, and to yield to him in miracles and victory. And it is the picture of the life of Peter who defied the storms raised by the enemies of Jesus and by the community, and yet who, often put to shame by his own weakness, was upheld only by the saving hand of the Lord.¹ Tradition gives expression to these ideas in the picture of the waves, having in view the words of the Old Testament, "The Lord makes a way in the sea, and a path in mighty waters."² We refrain from any subtle exposition of the passage.³ Another biblical passage was present to the mind of John, for he represents Jesus as not only completing his passage of the lake without embarking, to the amazement of both the disciples and the multitudes, but also as suddenly transferring both himself and

¹ John xxi. 7 sq.; comp. above, p. 185, note 4. The symbolic element is generally acknowledged, with rejection or retention of an actual occurrence; comp. Schneek., Strauss, Weisse, Ewald, Pressensé, and others. Weisse (p. 521) thought of a symbolic caution and warning to Peter.

² Isaiah xliii. 16, 19. Comp. the passage through the Red Sea, Ex. xiv. 21 sqq.

³ We might mention Peter's half-heartedness in the Gentile mission, or (thus Strauss, *N. L. of Jesus*, Eng. trans., II. p. 249) his behaviour at Jerusalem. Volkmar (p. 378) finds an anti-hierarchical element, which appears also in the universalist Jewish Christian, in xxiii. 8. Why not also in xvi. 18?

the ship to the shore, and overcoming the storm and annihilating space in a truly magical way. For, in this account, there is nothing that can be modified.¹ But a peculiar exposition of Psalm cvii. gave the Evangelist his starting-point. There it is said, "Then were they glad because the waves were laid, and he led them to the desired shore."²

But now, as the nucleus of the narrative, the water-walking of Jesus. The very opening of the account excites suspicions enough. Why did Jesus send the disciples on before? Although it is plain, notwithstanding the reserve of the Gospels, that he had finished his mission to the people, why did he follow the disciples so late?³ Plainly because everything was arranged with reference to a great spectacular miracle. Here is the chief difference between this evidently later narrative and the former one. In that there is a natural necessity, in this there is an artificial one. Did Jesus dramatically create difficulties, while his own life and the lives of his disciples were already full of diffi-

¹ The peculiar description in John vi. 22—25 is merely intended—as Bretschneider (p. 181) and Strauss (4th ed. II. p. 176) already saw—if not to certify the miraculous crossing of Jesus to the people, at least to suggest it to them. The people on the eastern shore had noticed that only one ship came with Jesus and the disciples, and that that ship was gone again with the disciples. They sought Jesus for a time, and then (to the number of thousands!) embarked in ships which—according to W.—by accident came thither from Tiberias, and went to Capernaum, where they found Jesus. The rationalistic interpretation of John's account of the passage of Jesus, that the ship was immediately on the shore by natural means, and that Jesus in the darkness of the night had walked along the adjacent bank (not on the lake), is numerously advocated (see below, p. 190, note 2) by Paulus, Ventur., Gfrörer, Baumg., Crus., Schleierm., Bleek, Hase, Schenkel. Ventur. (according to *Henke's Mag.* VI. p. 327) develops the explanation that Jesus, from the bank, drew Peter out of the shallow water in which he was wading (John xxi. 7 sq.). Schenkel (p. 123) sees in the conjecture of the disciples (John vi. 19; Mark vi. 49) a bad conscience, and thereby anticipates John vi. 66. Neander once more adhered to the miracle, as also did Meyer; the latter—contrary to Hilgenfeld—saw no Docetism in the incident; the whole Gospel he held to be anti-Docetic. Furrer, on the contrary, speaks (*Bibl. Geogr.* p. 24) with justice of the land of magic. Since the lake, even in the south where it is narrowest, is 40 stadia broad, and the disciples had gone from 25 to 30, there remained at least from 10 to 15 to be passed over miraculously: from this it is to be assumed, contrary to Furrer, that the Evangelist *knew* the distances.

² Ps. cvii. 30.

³ Matt. xiv. 22; Mark vi. 45.

culty? Did he perform spectacular miracles or give signs from heaven? His mode of helping, also, here shows an enhanced degree of majesty. In the other narrative he was obliged to rebuke the storm; here he needs no speech, no crying out, no chiding, no praying, only a getting on board the ship. There he was already on board, and yet the storm arose which here quickly subsided when he embarked. There everything was so full of effort and toil; here everything goes on as if in sport. Or was the rebuking superfluous there also? Did it depend upon his will to command the elements by a word, or by the act of embarking, or in any way he pleased? The most important feature is certainly that which is fresh, the walking on the water. This is not usually reckoned among human capabilities, though heathen legends tell of several walkers on the water. Lucian, in his "Friend of Lies," describes an hyperborean who, in his native cow-leather shoes, sped rapidly over the waters; and in his "True Histories" he speaks of an island, Phello, or Corkland—not very far from the Isles of the Blessed—the inhabitants of which, the Phellopodes, who were for the rest good Greeks, went in multitudes on the blue-green sea-water with feet of corkwood, keeping themselves easily above the waves, and with talk and laughter gallantly escorting ships for long distances. A nobler and more worthy parallel is furnished by the Hellenic myth of Herakles, the representative of the sun, who as the messenger of God steps triumphantly over the elements, over the seas.¹ As might have been expected, expositors have not been fond of quoting these resembling instances; they have preferred to cite cases of men and beasts who, for physiological reasons, have not sunk. Bolten has referred to the ordinary art of swimming; Johann Peter Lange, in his *Life of Jesus*, has written a great deal about swimmers, water-treaders, somnambulists, dogs and cats; while Krabbe, rising higher, has quoted the enigmas of tellurism and

¹ Lucian, *Philops.* 13 (comp. Jamblichus, *Pyth.* 136); *Ver. Hist.* 2, 4. Also Julian, *Orat.* 7, 219 (Zeller, *Philos. d. Griech.*, III. ii. 900), represents Herakles as walking on the sea, because the elements must be obedient to the divine messenger.

magnetism, and Olshausen has announced a progressive etherealization of the body of Jesus.¹ A kingdom for a natural explanation! is the cry of even the most pious in the presence of this incident. Even Schleiermacher called this walking "aimless;" and Bleek wrote about the "violence done to his feelings." Hence arose the ingenious interpretation which Paulus first propounded, and Schleiermacher and Bleek did not find altogether despicable, namely, that Jesus, at least according to the account of John, which is most like that of an eye-witness, walked not upon but by the sea, and, perhaps amid the self-illusions of the disciples, went round the northern point of the lake by land in an altogether natural manner.² But if we adhere to the actual narrative, the going on the water was far from being an act of an ordinary character—it was something divine or ghostly; and the Evangelist John, like Olshausen recently, will have reckoned it as a property of the divinity of the person or of the body of Jesus. Even the earlier Gospels conceived of it as a divine performance, the writers doubtless having in mind the passage in the book of Job, "God walks upon the sea as upon a floor;" but they—at least Matthew—thought this proof of Godlikeness could be exhibited through the faith which was possible to Peter as

¹ Bolten on Matt. xiv. 25. Lange, II. pp. 287 sqq., 336, 788. According to Lange, it belongs to the new Christian æon not to sink in water. There was retrogression in Peter's case: first, he was a "high water-treader," then he swam, and finally sank. The ascension, he holds, exhibits the same problem, but with the new analogy of the eagle, who, in spite of bones and claws, ascends high. Krabbe calls in the aid of Kieser's tellurism (p. 320). Olsh. I. p. 481 ("disembodiment," Hase, p. 195; "rarefaction of the body," A. Schweizer, *Doym.* II. p. 210).

² The creator of the "philological miracle," Paulus, *Memorab.* (1794), then in the *N. Theol. Journ.* (1795) and *Exeget. Handb.* (1831). He was followed by Stolz, S. G. Lange, Gfrörer, and Baumg. Cr. Paulus appealed to John xxi. 1, 4, 7, 8, besides vi. 19; after this latter passage had fallen away, Hase (see above, p. 185, note 4), with others, upheld the opinion that John xxi. 4, 7, described the natural occurrence which was the prototype of the exaggerating popular myth in Matt. xiv. 25. But Bleek, whose "feelings" were revolted by this incident, let go the philological miracle, and referred the notion of the disciples that Jesus was upon the sea to a mistake on their part. *Beitr.* p. 103, and *Syn.* II. pp. 20 sqq. Schleier. (p. 235) had shown the way by remarking on the difficulty of making certain observations in the circumstances in which the disciples found themselves. Comp. above, p. 188, note 1.

well as to Jesus.¹ Since we, in the present day, are as little accustomed to consider it in the nature of a man, even of a believer, as in the nature of God, to walk in a literal sense upon the water, it is necessary here to throw aside the letter. The fundamental idea of the narrative is not merely the proof of the divinity of Jesus, but particularly the proof of it to the waiting Church in its forlornness and distress. According to the Gospel tradition, men do not know in what watch of the night the deliverer will come, whether he will not tarry until the last, the fourth watch.² From that tradition this narrative has sprung, whether it refer directly to Jesus' coming again, or more generally to his assistance in earthly storms. The picture of the sea, used in the previous narrative, was already familiar; the picture of the divine walking on the sea had been employed by Job; and there may have been an utterance by Jesus similar to that in which he ascribed to faith the possibility of casting mountains into the sea, such as "One who trusts in God can walk upon the sea!" And no one, at least in the present day, would be tempted to understand such an utterance in a Jewish sense, *i.e.* literally.³

This glorification of Jesus on the water was, according to the account in the sources, immediately preceded by a proof of glory on land: another sign that either Jesus or his biographers wished to accumulate the grandest events at this closing point of the Galilean ministry. It does not here escape us that, according to Luke, this evidence of glory fell immediately before Jesus' proclamation of his Messiahship and of his death at Cæsarea Philippi, a chronology in which John followed Luke, whilst Matthew and Mark wished to illumine the darkness of the flight after the Baptist's death by a first royal sign, the splendour of

¹ Job ix. 8. A reference to 2 Kings ii. 14, vi. 6 (Strauss, Hase, and others), is less probable.

² Matt. xxiv. 43; Mark xiii. 35; comp. Luke xviii. 7.

³ Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21. Here again Volkmar naturally thinks of the Pauline conquest over the limitations imposed by the sea (p. 371), and believes (p. 378) that Mark had specially in view Acts xx. 11—15. What parallels! And the way into the district of Gennesar, a way to the Gentiles!

which should reach the ruler of the land, and to explain the sublime and grave occurrence at Cæsarea by a second sign exactly similar to the other.¹ We now stand before the greatest and the best attested of all Jesus' nature-miracles, that of the feeding the five thousand. Like Matthew, Luke and Mark also place this miracle after the death of John, which had induced Jesus to retire; but they bring it into close connection with the return of the Apostles from their mission. This is an unhistorical though ingenious arrangement, as we have seen and shall see, and as is at once shown by the fact that Jesus, when he wished to procure for the Apostles "rest," and rest to eat apart from the thronging of the people, could not well impose upon them fresh fatigues on the lake and in the wilderness.² Contrary to all possibility, but for artistic reasons, John places the miracle of the loaves in the last Eastertide but one of Jesus' ministry, whilst his soberer predecessors represent it as happening not quite half a year before his last Easter. We find, then, that Jesus went by ship to Perea—more exactly, according to all evidences, to the northern shore of the lake; according to Luke's definite account, into the district of the Philippic, but at this period Roman, Julias (Bethsaida), at the point where the Jordan flows into the Gennesar.³ Hither there followed him, knowing the direction in which he was gone and taking the road by the shore, multitudes of people, whom Mark especially shows to be very numerous and zealous, for he represents them as coming

¹ Luke ix. 12; John vi. 1; Matt. xiv. 14, xv. 32, xvi. 9; Mark vi. 34, viii. 1, 19.

² Thus Mark vi. 30—32. On the mission of the Apostles, see above, III. p. 404.

³ Mark also has Bethsaida, vi. 45 (correct reading, *πέραν Βηθσαι*, comp. the next division). Without ground, Furrer (p. 15) assumes that John vi. 23 places the incident in the south-eastern part of the lake, opposite Tiberias. The ships from Tiberias do not, however, decisively prove the locality was in the east. It is clear also that Tiberias is mentioned only because either the author names the lake as a whole after the chief town (as Pausanias, 5, 7, 3; Eusebius, *Onom.* 80, 144, 156, 326; comp. Ptol. 5, 16, 4), or he wishes to give prominence to the flocking to Jesus of people from the chief town. Had John seriously thought of the south-east, then the Galilean people must have gone right round the lake—about six leagues—to come to Jesus' ship, for the starting-point is evidently—as in the Synoptics—the northern part of the lake, and in particular Capernaum.

from the towns, arriving at their goal before the ship, and completely frustrating Jesus' purpose of procuring rest. In the lonely grassy expanse of this Jordan district, the present plain El Butihah, Jesus halts,—according to Matthew, healing sick persons; according to Luke, teaching as well as healing; according to Mark, teaching many things until late in the day. Then the disciples come to him and entreat him to send away the people that they may buy food in the villages and—say Luke and Mark—in the country houses. That is not necessary, answers Jesus; “give *ye* them to eat.” “We have here only five loaves and two fishes.” According to Luke, they added, “For we should have”—an impossibility—“to go to buy food for all these people!” The later writers have still more developed the narrative. According to Mark, who misunderstands his predecessor Luke, the disciples, without having reckoned the provisions they have with them—which they do not produce until Jesus commands them to do so—declare themselves at once ready to purchase bread to the value of 200 denarii, doubtless overvaluing their money. According to John, the whole question is started by Jesus. He already knows what he intends doing, and asks Philip, with the view of testing him, “Whence are we to buy bread that these may eat?” and Philip thinks 200 denarii will not suffice to procure a little bread for each one. Then Andrew steps forth as an extremely sober, practical man: “A boy”—according to Ewald, a dealer in food—“is here, who has five barley-loaves and two fishes; but this, what is it among so many?” All these enhanced descriptions of the embarrassing situation, from which Mark alone, in an impossible way, frees the Apostles, have naturally but one aim, that of introducing the miraculous power of Jesus in the presence of the powerlessness of men. He sends for no provisions; according to the three later Gospels, he merely orders the people to lie on the abundant “green” grass,—in companies of fifty, according to Luke; in companies some of a hundred and some of fifty, according to Mark.¹ He takes the provisions, looks up to heaven,

¹ Comp. Exodus xviii. 21. Green grass, Mark vi. 39. Much grass, John vi. 10; comp. Matt. xiv. 19.

blessees or thanks, breaks it, and gives it to the disciples for distribution. According to John, he distributes it himself. According to John and Mark, every one partook even of the two fishes. And lo! they were satiated, full; even of the fishes, every one had, according to John, received as much as he wished for. There were about 5000 men—Mark says roundly, 5000 men—but, according to Matthew, even the women and children were not neglected. And how large was, according to all the Evangelists, the quantity which remained, and which, the fourth Gospel says, Jesus himself, like a good economist, commanded to be collected? Twelve baskets full of bread were gathered, besides, as Mark does not forget, a quantity of remains of the fishes. The Gospels nobly refrain from describing the impression produced; John alone reports that with reference to this sign the people said, "This is of a truth the Prophet that is to come into the world!" He adds that Jesus, withdrawing himself from those whom the miraculous meal had excited, and who wished there and then to make him king, a bread king, went secretly and alone to the mountain from which, according to the same account, he had descended before the miracle.

This regal miracle, attested by four authorities, cannot possibly have taken place in a literal sense, and, as in the case of the storm, a higher interpretation spontaneously forces itself upon every one. We think of the spiritual bread which Jesus dispenses and which he distributes by means of his Apostles, making even the deserts green and pleasant, and with one loaf satisfying a thousand men, as five loaves did five thousand. We think of the heavenly treasure unexhausted by distribution—in truth, magnified by use of it—so that to each of the twelve Apostles, the missionary successors of Jesus, there remains in the twelve baskets more for giving away than had at first been at the disposal of Jesus and themselves. In its literal sense, the narrative is at once seen to be improbable, because it represents Jesus as performing an unnecessary miracle, whereas elsewhere his helping will and his saving power are brought into activity only by

compassion for the sorrows of men. The disciples point out the natural and easy way to meet the difficulty, and Jesus does not for a moment contend that the distance from a food supply is too great. But he is here resolved, under any circumstances—as John quite correctly intimates—to perform a great wonder; in fact, to give a sign from heaven, such as the Jews were always begging for and he had always refused. But in its literal sense the narrative is more than improbable, it is impossible. To create food for 5000 and more out of five loaves, and not even to call in the aid of prayer (for the sources speak only of an offering up of praise or thanksgiving), but to create this food by his act of will, and to do this in such a way that to the distributing disciples or to the receiving and eating people—as Meyer prefers, in order to spare the time of Jesus and the disciples—the pieces grow and extend indefinitely, so that in a moment the quantity increases a thousand-fold, while everything is at the same time perfect and complete, not only corn and meat, but also the most conventional baking and shape of the loaves,—all this is not human work, but the work of God, and yet not the work of God.¹ It is not the work of man, nor of Jesus, for he never played the part of Lord over nature. He called God the Lord of the earth and its nourishing products; he taught men to call upon God for their daily bread; he bought bread for himself and for those who were with him; and in the desert—according to the sources themselves—he rejected as a temptation of the devil the proposal to convert magically the stones of the desert into bread for his hunger.² It is most certain that, like ourselves, he was all his life long under the control of natural laws; that therein consisted a large part of his greatness; and that the literal narrative of the miracle of the loaves exhibits the most glaring contrast to the

¹ *Εὐλογεῖν* (Synoptics) not essentially different from *εὐχαρ.* (John); see 1 Cor. xiv. 16, Mark viii. 6, 7, Matt. xxvi. 27; also the second miracle of feeding, Matt. xv. 36, Mark viii. 6. Even with the accusative (1 Sam. ix. 13, 1 Cor. x. 16, and Luke and Mark), *εὐλ.* (to consecrate by praise) has by no means the sense of a creatively multiplying blessing, as Exodus xxiii. 25.

² Jesus is no magician. Weizsäcker, p. 445.

severe reality of his life of self-denial, and of his, at that very time commencing, earthly failure. But neither is it a divine work.¹ However lofty may be our conception of the omnipotence of God, who created this world and can create a new one and rejuvenate the old one beyond human understanding, we know Him also as the God of order, of discipline, who does not trifle with the fundamental regulations of His creation, but—as the ancient sacred books show—adheres to its laws as He compels us to do. Least of all does He descend, as manufacturer of His natural products, to supersede human labour or to come into competition with human handicraft.² A theology as poor as it is well-meant has devised hollow supports for this divine miracle. It has been found natural here that higher laws—not anti-natural nor supernatural—should throw their light upon the lower visible laws; that in particular the new creation of the world in Christ should go side by side with an abrogation, and at the same time an elevation and illumination, of nature; as if the natural laws of God had not stood firmly as granite pillars to the present day; as if they were not strong enough to support, through the greatness of the Creator, even the highest development of the spirit; as if the higher order of things which threw its light upon the lower were not the very spirit which is able to uphold and yet to illuminate nature; as if the promiscuous mixture of so-called higher and lower law, which is in an incomprehensible way thought to be corroborated by the divine creative periods, were not a dishonour to God, bringing by its capriciousness and characterless weakness instantaneous confusion into the Kosmos.³ Here, by the aid of a rationalizing sub-

¹ Unhappy expression of Rothe's (*Zur Dogmatik*, 1863, p. 99): God acts magically.

² Gen. viii. 22; Matt. xxiv. 41, xiii. 33; Luke xii. 18.

³ I have not here to take up the dogmatic debate. Among the more recent defenders of miracles, I mention specially—besides Joh. Hirzel and Just. Heer—Rothe, *Zur Dogm.* 1863, p. 99; and Krauss, *Offenb.* 1868, pp. 299 sqq. On the other hand, Strauss, Zeller, A. Schweizer, Biedermann. The superiority of weapons is on the latter side. Heer (*Dies ist der Sieg*, &c., 1865, p. 23) has by no means made the non-interruption of natural law plausible by saying that the bread which was eaten and the wine which was drunk at Cana immediately nourished the people in a perfectly natural

tlety, men have dreamt that in the miracle of the loaves, as in the miracle of the wine, there was in truth no departure from simple natural law; and they have explained the difficulty by the invention of the golden phrase of an accelerated natural process, or of the increased potency of the natural forces.¹ That which in nature takes place slowly, and yet, under special circumstances, with unusual rapidity, the progress from the seed to the stalk, to the ear, to the ripe ear, God and even Jesus would be able to bring about in a moment. As if this would not be quite a different order of things from the fundamental order established by God, according to which seed-time and harvest shall follow each other, "as long as the earth stands;" as if, again, Jesus possessed seed-corn for five thousand; as if he had not transformed five baked loaves, and then also distributed baked loaves, not, properly speaking, the immediate product of nature, but baked ware and baker's ware. Strauss has most crushingly shown the monstrosity of this theory, against Augustine, Olshausen, and their followers. We have here touched upon questions the very mention of which threatens to profane the Most High. It is impossible to be altogether silent: but let this suffice.

If we wish to retain an historical remainder of this narrative, the best is that which critics, from Paulus to Ewald, have explicitly or implicitly again and again substituted for the letter; namely, that in the wilderness, Jesus, having first by his words lifted the minds of his hearers above earthly necessities, evoked from those who were prepared to make sacrifices a grand exhibition of hospitable brotherly love, men who possessed the means helping those who were in need. Thus every want was supplied

way, and that in the increase of corn and wine there was nothing changed! Notwithstanding Krauss' exclamation, "Are we Pantheists or Theists?" (p. 248), and his assertion that to give up miracles infallibly shows a giving up of the hitherto-held objective religion (p. 257), I do not admit that I am uncertain whether I am a Pantheist or a Deist.

¹ Olshausen, *Comm.* I. pp. 480 sq. (after the precedent of Pfenninger). Increased potency, Neander, pp. 343 sqq. Substantially first in Augustine, *Tract. in Joh.* viii.: ipse vinum fecit in nuptiis, qui omni anno hoc facit in vitibus (per nubes, &c.). Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 192 sqq.

with limited resources, first the spiritual wants, but next also the physical.¹ The possibility of such a basis of the narrative is not to be denied. Many have found frugal meals to be rendered nourishing and satisfying through the zest given to them by the mutual sympathy of fellowship. In the wilderness, the social spirit of the Jews, the kindly disposition of the Galileans, the attractive force of the person of Jesus, which had already proved strong enough to break down the social barriers between poor and rich, could easily have brought about such a result; and in the wilderness of John, a similar result had, beyond all doubt, been produced.² With the majority of critics down to the present day, we are the more particularly driven to look for such an historical—though modest—basis by the strong attestation to which the narrative can appeal, as well as by its coherence with the strictly historical fact of Jesus' fugitive retreat into a strange land, and by the perfectly intelligible spiritual elevation of the dispersed community of the Messiah, who in retirement, in flight, doubly rejoiced in their higher possessions while tyranny persecuted them, and who were able to conquer even external want by heroism and frugality. But to the glorification of this conquest over necessitous circumstances, and to the glorification of him who even in persecution was the invincible and veritable Messiah, there came this transforming myth. Such a myth could more easily arise than any other. It at once occurs to us that Moses also, the prototype of the Messiah, provided for the people in the wilderness manna and quails to eat in abundance, and more than enough. And side by side with this, only on a reduced scale, stands the miraculous supply of food by Elisha the prophet, who with twenty barley-loaves and a quantity of garden fruits

¹ Paulus, *Exeg. Hdb.* II. pp. 203 sqq.; *L. J.* pp. 352, 383 (similarly also Gfrörer and Ammon). Hase, p. 175. Ewald, p. 442. Renan, p. 198. Schenkel, p. 119 (chiefly forgetfulness of the material, because of the spiritual). Approximately even in Olshausen (spiritual hunger of the people), Lange (sanctifying power of natural food), and even Neander, who—like Paulus and Lange—finds plausible the provisions of those who were on their Easter journey. Bleek adheres to the letter (especially on account of John, whom, on the contrary, Hase thinks absent), as does also Meyer, admitting the inexplicable.

² Luke iii. 11. Comp. Matt. ix. 10, xix. 21, xxv. 42, xxvi. 11.

appeased the hunger of a hundred sons of the prophets.¹ We know that the Messiah was expected to repeat these wonderful works, and that they were repeated by the Rabbis.² In both cases, then, in that of Moses and in that of Elisha, there were loaves and something besides; at the Lake of Galilee, the additional food was fish, instead of quails and fruits. Elisha's miracle is evidently the more closely imitated. Twenty loaves to a hundred men,—in the case of Jesus, five loaves to five thousand men,—here is similarity; and Jesus with a fourth produces a fifty-fold result, or a total result two hundred times greater than Elisha, for while the latter feeds five men with one loaf, Jesus in a truly God-like manner feeds a thousand. Again, Elisha speaks to his servant as Jesus to his Apostles: "Give it to the people, that they may eat." Again, Elisha's servant, like the company of Apostles, says: "How shall I give of this bread to a hundred men?" But Elisha also persists in his command: "They shall eat, and there shall remain something over." He places it before them; they eat, and there is something to spare. John has imitated the account of Elisha's miracle most closely of all; he gives Easter-tide, barley bread, and makes Jesus himself the distributor of the bread.³ A cleverly developed myth does not, however, slavishly imitate the purely external features of a miraculous incident; nor does it here. Not only was there conjecturally an actual occurrence at the base of this narrative, but that occurrence itself was only an isolated testimony to a great and general truth. This Jesus seeking his people, these Apostles returned—according to Luke and Mark—from their mission, have scarcely till now by parable or by mission scattered abroad the hundred-fold fruitful seed of the spiritual bread; they

¹ Ex. xvi. 8 sqq.; 2 Kings iv. 42 (1 Kings xvii. 8). Tert. *Marc.* 4, 21: de pristino more.

² See above, III. pp. 165 sq. Comp. *Joma*, f. 39, 1: in the days of Simeon the Just, such a blessing was upon the two Pentecostal loaves and the ten of the shewbread, that whilst each priest received only a piece of the size of an olive, yet singuli sacerdot. ad satietatem comederent, imo ut adhuc reliquæ superessent. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 205.

³ Like Elisha's miracle, 2 Kings iv. 42, that in Ex. xvi. 1 sqq.—a feeding of the people as in Jesus' case—is made to occur near Easter.

have scarcely distributed the nutritious bread even to the children of the Twelve Tribes. Again, he—Jesus—by his presence at the domestic table, by his breaking of bread and distribution of it as the head of the household, even down to the Last Supper, has made the very material element of bread memorable and sacred.¹ These facts in the life of Jesus contributed, again, to make it easy to transfer to him the old miracles of feeding. The myth naturally found the external miracle of importance, and at the same time, with genuinely Oriental play of imagination, infused into it hints of a secret profundity, making the hearer the subject of a delicious tremor as he peers into the semi-obscurity of the material and supra-material, whose mingled tide still, more or less, flows to us from the Gospels.

If the historical character of the literal account of the first miracle of feeding has to be given up, the narrative of the so-called second miracle must share the same fate. The second feeding is related by only Matthew and Mark.² Luke does not give it; John, though acquainted with it, does not relate it, but kneads certain of its features into his account of the first feeding.³ Several differences in the two narratives are easily detected. In the second and later feeding, there is an actual present need; the impulse proceeds, not from the disciples, but from the compassion of Jesus, who is unwilling to send home, hungry and fainting, the people who have been three days gathered together in the wilderness. The disciples at once raise—even before Jesus has

¹ Comp. Matt. xiii. 8, xv. 26; John vi. 35. Meals, see above, III. pp. 344 sq. It is to be noticed that in Matt. xiii. xiv., parables and the miracle of feeding are consecutive; in Luke ix. 1—17, and Mark vi. 7, 34, mission and miracle of feeding. The points that follow are also adduced by De Wette, Hase, Ewald, Strauss, and in part by Schenkel. Weisse (I. pp. 510 sqq.) would take a parable from that province (comp. Matt. xvi. 6) as foundation. Schleier. quite despaired as to the miracle of feeding and all the nature-miracles, and left them to find natural explanation in the future (pp. 222 sqq.). Volkmar—proud as ever of his discovery—produces (p. 377) a night meal of the “multitude of Gentiles,” thereby combining the miracles of the storm and of the feeding; and (pp. 371, 378) he even finds the passage an imitation drawn from the life of Paul, Acts xx. 11—15. Unfortunately the natural course is deranged, for the storm, “the Gentile world-sea,” follows the feeding, and moreover, in spite of Perea, the persons fed are not Gentiles, but Galileans, Jews (Matt. xiv. 13, 20). Even the easterly situated Golan contained a multitude of Jews; comp. my *Herodier*.

² Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 1.

³ See below, p. 202, note 1.

asked them to feed the people—the objection of impossibility; and Jesus then asks how many loaves they have. The quantity of provisions is somewhat different,—seven loaves and a few small fishes; the number of the people is only about 4000, and there are only seven baskets. But the resemblances preponderate, and that quite differently than in the duality of the storm miracles. The district is about the same, namely, the north-eastern end of the lake, but on a hill instead of in the plain. There is, again, a great collection of people, with healings related in detail; there is a discussion between Jesus and his disciples; the provisions in bread and fish are brought forth; the number of the loaves corresponds with that of the baskets, as in the other case with that of the thousands of the people; the people have to lie down; the bread is broken by Jesus and distributed by the disciples; all are satiated, and baskets are filled with the remainder; the return voyage is, as before, towards the west coast.¹ Briefly, it is without doubt one and the same incident, only handed down in a somewhat different mythical form. The narrative itself establishes the unity of the incident, by making the disciples reject with despair the very idea of satisfying so many people,—as if a former miracle of feeding had never taken place.² A later, artistically fabricated utterance of Jesus, referring to both the first and the second feeding, is no proof of the duality or of the historical character of the incident.³ John, with his blending of

¹ Mountain, Matt. xv. 29 (Mark viii. 1, not mentioned); but also Matt. xiv. 23 (Mark vi. 46).

² Olshausen explained this as due to forgetfulness (so with reference to the announcements of the Passion), Lange as due to the “heavenly disposition” in the first incident. Paulus found in the forgetfulness an indication of natural, not miraculous, procedures.

³ Matt. xvi. 9 sq. The identity of the two narratives has been contended for by a large majority of expositors—Thiess, Schultz, Schleierm., Fritzsche, Kern, Credner, De Wette, Hase, Neander, Bleek, Ewald, Strauss, Baur, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar. In most cases a mythical reduplication is assumed; Hilgenfeld thought of a free treatment by the Evangelist (comp. 1867, pp. 425, 427). Also Volkmar, p. 396. The former opinion is much the more probable, because of the differences in the details (comp. *ἐβλογ.* and *ἐβχαρ.* in A and B; then the baskets, Matt. xiv. 20, *κοφίνους*, xv. 37, *σπερίδας*; just so Mark vi. 43, viii. 8). Wilke and Br. Bauer assumed an interpolation in Mark. The duality is defended by Paulus, Ammon, Olsh., Krabbe, Ebrard, Lange, Hoffm., and even Meyer; Bleek vacillates. Grätz, Sieffert, Ewald, believe in a mythical assimilation of two facts.

the two accounts, would rather show that there existed forms of the narrative of the one feeding which contained in themselves the features afterwards broken up into two incidents; this would be a more reliable evidence for the original unity, if only it were not more probable that John learnt his facts from the double account of Matthew and Mark.¹ It may be, moreover, that Matthew and Mark were all the more disposed to accept the duality, because a double manna might, by a misunderstanding, be discovered in the history of Moses.² But it would be a matter of dispute which form of the narrative is the more original. This honour might by some be given to the second feeding, because it exhibits a real need, and, in all its details, less calculation and smaller dimensions: seven loaves (the sacred number) against five, several fishes against two, 4000 men against 5000, seven baskets against twelve, one-third as much provision as Elisha had, and not merely one-fourth, and a forty-fold instead of a fifty-fold result.³ But the preference given to, and the prior position of, the first feeding, lend it at once a preponderance of claim; and as Elisha's example was notoriously imitated, the numbers in the first feeding are more in proportion with the original than those of the second. It is also a better conception to make the number of the people proportionate to that of the loaves than to that of the baskets, and the number of the baskets to that of the Apostles and of the tribes than to that of the loaves. In the individual narratives, Matthew is, as usual, superior to Mark; and if we were inclined to conjecture that the introduction of the second feeding was the work of the second hand, yet the use made of it by Mark and the language of the piece at once show that the remarkable duplicate was admitted into Matthew's Gospel at the very beginning.⁴

¹ John has derived from Matt. xv. 29 the mountain, the sitting, the initiative by Jesus, and the giving thanks.

² Ex. xvi. 2 sqq.; Numbers xi. 4 sqq. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 190.

³ Hilgenfeld (p. 425) prefers the second account, because of the necessitous circumstances; Volkmar (p. 397) finds the repetition of the world-historical activity of Jesus quite intelligible in a didactic poet.

⁴ Comp., in contrast with Matt., merely the description in Mark viii. 3, 7.

It has been mentioned that two Gospels, impatient on account of the late appearance of the nature-miracles in the ministry of Jesus, have attempted to glorify his entrance on his public career by similar mighty signs. But criticism is much less willing to spare these daring advanced troops than the respectable corps of veterans with which it has, time after time even to weariness, measured its strength. We have, in fact, already left behind us Peter's great draught of fishes in honour of his entering upon his office of Apostle; and we have found that this great success was not an accident, but the result of the Lord's word, or, more exactly, of his miraculous power, not merely of his natural or supernatural knowledge of the congregating place of the fishes; and that this miraculous result directly contradicted the plain and miracle-less narrative of the earlier Gospel. We saw that this superfluous miracle ceased to be a stumbling-block only when the rejected incident, which possessed its parallel in the Pythagoras myth, ceased to be a history and became the mere picture of an utterance of Jesus drawn for the eyes of "babes."¹ Exactly similar objections and suggestions are pertinent to the introductory narrative of the fourth Gospel, that of the marriage at Cana. As this narrative affords another instance of the unnatural, creative action of Jesus in the province of nature, and as there is a natural relation of complement between wine and bread, the miracle may be most appropriately connected with that of the feeding, and we shall therefore briefly review it here.²

¹ See above, III. p. 264. Factually there are to be found in the lake very dense swarms of fish, which, according to Tristram, often extend over nearly or quite an acre, in thickly crowded shoals ruffling the surface like violent rain. See Furrer, *Bedeut. d. Bibl. Geogr.* p. 17. Divine omnipotence, as in the case of migratory birds, Olsh. *Bib. Comm.* I. p. 283; comp. Strauss, 4th ed. I. pp. 561 sqq. Neander (p. 203): Providence bringing about the coincidence in nature. Lange (p. 315): magic of human influence. Paul. (I. p. 449): natural knowledge of Jesus. Similarly Schleierm. p. 235. Lange (p. 315): perhaps a knowledge resulting from the electric effect of the swarm of fish. Venturini (p. 105): supposition based on approaching noontide storm. Lange (p. 315) once more: a shrewd fisherman, who could see the traces of the fish in the play of shadows in the water. The non-originality of the narrative, Strauss, Weisse (II. p. 138), even Meyer, and Ewald, who (like Hase, p. 112) finds John xxi. more original (pp. 362 sq.). Pythagoras, Porphyr. 25; Jambl. 36; in Strauss, 4th ed. I. pp. 565 sq.

² John ii. 1.

After being three days with John in the wilderness, Jesus started for Galilee, accompanied by the first six Apostles.¹ At the end of another three days, he is received with a welcome at the marriage-feast in Cana, three leagues to the north of Nazara, on the border of the intervening Plain of Zebulon (el Buttauf), and at the foot of the hill district of Upper Galilee (Dshchel Kaukab). Here was his mother; and he with his disciples had also been invited hither. The merry-makings at a wedding usually continued for a week; thus it happened that the good people ran short of wine.² Jesus' mother drew his attention to this circumstance, expecting—as he plainly saw—a miracle from him. He replies to her from the higher standpoint of his divine dignity, in the presence of which his piety towards his human mother diminished: "What have I and thou to do, woman? My hour is not yet come."³ But his mother, after quietly accommodating herself to his reply, nevertheless added to her first and correct feeling that he should do something, the second that he would do something. Anticipating the character of what he was about to do, she said to the servants: "Whatever he says to you, do it." Jesus then ordered the servants to fill with water the six stone water-vessels which stood there, in accordance with the Jewish custom of purification.⁴ They were filled to the brim. Then he gave a fresh order: "Draw, and bear it to the master of the feast."⁵ The water had then become wine; in the whole of the six vessels there would be several pailfuls, about 300 measures, of wine.⁶ The master of the feast tried the liquor in the

¹ See above, II. p. 301.

² Comp. *Bab. Berac.* f. 31, 1: soliti sunt frangere vasa vitrea in nuptiis. According to the Gamara, this would take place in order to check effusiora gaudia. Lightfoot, p. 310. Comp. also *Moed Kathon*, f. 8, 2, p. 605. Many guests, Lightfoot, pp. 310, 368. Seven days, Judges xiv. 12 sqq.; Tobit xi. 19. See also Winer, *Hochzeit*.

³ Mah li valach, 2 Sam. xvi. 10. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 216.

⁴ The number cannot be proved from ancient authorities (Lange thinks—instead of the six Apostles present, after the analogy of Matt. xiv. 20—of a symbolical allusion to the six work-days), but vessels, vasa majora, minora, were set out. Lightfoot, p. 605. Comp. Mark vii. 3 sq.

⁵ On the master of the feast, see Wetstein, p. 847.

⁶ Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 213; comp. Hilg. *Ev.* p. 247, after Wurm, *De pond. rat.* pp. 123 sqq., 5th ed. p. 510: 2—3 Würtemberg eimers, 3—5 Baden ohms. [A Wür-

wine-vessels, and not knowing whence the wine had come (but the servants knew), he cried out with astonishment to the bridegroom: "Every one sets on the good wine first, and when men are drunken, then that which is worse: thou hast saved the good wine until now." This was the beginning of the signs of Jesus in Galilee, the revelation of his glory in the wine-making at Cana, and his disciples acquired faith in him.¹

If we were to accept literally this miracle—which suggests the Dionysos myth—we should find the difficulties great, even greater than in the case of the miracle of feeding.² The miracle at Cana supplies no pressing want, but only furnishes a luxury, and, according to the feast-master's expression, ministers to drunkenness, a vice not common among the Jews and unworthy of the encouragement of Jesus. It tends only to justify the slander of the Jews and the scoffing of Venturini: "A glutton and a wine-bibber!"³ The miracle at Cana is inconsistent with the deep seriousness with which Jesus began his ministry, and makes it almost appear as if he had commenced his vocation as a pastime and not as a conflict. It is inconsistent also with his principle—especially in the beginning of his official career—to win men by preaching and not by signs, especially to win thus his disciples, whom in this narrative he compels to believe by a sign, while the company at table merely enjoy the wine.⁴ Further, the miracle at Cana is as unnatural as that of the feeding; it is apparently simpler, because the quantity of the natural material is not increased, and the number of the drinkers does not swell

temberg eimer=293·927 litres; a Baden ohm=150 litres.—*Tr.*] Paulus and Olsh. are at some pains to diminish the quantity.

¹ John ii. 11.

² Similar myths in Wetstein, p. 848. Comp. De Wette, and Hase, p. 113. In Christian times, a change of water into oil, when the means of lighting failed at the Easter vigils, through the prayer of Bishop Narcissus of Jerusalem. Eus. 6, 9.

³ Matt. xi. 19. Venturini supposes that John himself was in the condition described in ii. 10, and therefore did not know what was going on. On the objectionable features in the narrative, Chrys., Woolston, Bretschneider, Paulus, De Wette, Lücke, Olshausen. Josephus boasts of the temperance of the Jews; see above, II. p. 147; but see also the note on previous page.

⁴ Tholuck gives prominence to the object of producing faith, as does also Brückner.

to thousands. But if instead of an increase in quantity there is an absolute change in quality, if water passes into wine, and that without any external effort, without prayer, without a touch, without a word, without a command, by a silent act of will,—what could be more mysterious? This again is a work of God and not of man, a work certainly of the Jesus of this Gospel, who “creates” as God does and can “make” wine; but not of the Jesus whose principle was, “By men impossible, by God possible,” and who humbly proclaimed human weakness by the utterance, “Thou canst not make one hair white or black.” But neither is it, in truth, a work of God, because in the order of nature God does not make wine out of water alone, nor in a moment; and because He refrains from preparing wine—whether out of water or out of the fruit of the earth—and from dealing in wine, for the advantage of the petty consumer.¹ The strongest evidence against this miracle is that derived from the earlier Gospels, with which the fourth harmonizes only in the mention of Galilee as the ground on which Jesus began his ministry and his miracles. On the other hand, however, they know nothing about his going from John to Galilee after a sojourn of three days in the wilderness, about his taking six disciples with him, or his going to Cana, or his beginning with miracles, with great miracles, with this miracle in particular. Since at the present time they are on all hands accredited with giving the most exact account of the Galilean ministry, their ignorance of this miracle is equivalent to a veritably annihilating sentence against a fact which could not have escaped them, or have been regarded as indifferent by them, had it really occurred. Therefore it occurred as little as the initial miracle of the disciples in Luke, the great draught of fishes. Had these miracles taken place, the six as well as the four would have related them, and the Twelve and

¹ Comp. John iv. 46: water *made* into wine. But the Hebrew word *Kanah* means to create! According to Origen, *In Joh. t.* 13, 60, it means to acquire, to possess the world. Comp. the deification in John x. 28 sq. (Isaiah xliii. 13). In a truly Johannean way, Irenæus (5, 15, 2 sq.) also regarded the healing of the man born blind as *adimpletio plasmationis Verbi*.

their successors must have kept burning the beacon of the great miracles.

As soon as we have acquiesced in this result, the efforts to preserve the incident by making a few deductions become objectless.¹ The representatives of the more orthodox side—when they do not at once surrender themselves, with Ebrard and Brückner, to the divine miracle, or, with Lücke and Meyer, to the divine enigma—seek to make the miracle plausible, sometimes by reproducing the ludicrous accelerated natural process manipulated by Augustine and Chrysostom down to Olshausen, sometimes by a miraculous intermediate substance between water and wine prepared by Neander after rationalistic recipes by Woolston, Langsdorf and Ammon, a substance which one might, with Lange, most innocently call “Selters Water,” and to which at any rate is to be preferred the so-called “miracle of mental exaltation.” A similar attempt is made, in a more satisfactory manner, by representatives of the illuminated school, who assume that Jesus and his company good-humouredly and slyly smuggled in an exceedingly practical wedding gift.² But that which comes to the critic's door with such an absolute claim to be an imposing miracle, must go away again at once as it came. We can only ask what induced the author to give—not, certainly, any narrative of a miracle at all, for we can easily understand why he should do so, but—just this narrative? In the case of a so pronounced and unattested miracle, it is useless to attempt to lay

¹ The spuriousness of the whole section was earlier advocated by A. Schweizer, *Ev. Joh.* 1841, in connection with his view of the composition of the Gospel.

² Aug. *In Joh. tract.* 8, see above, p. 197, note 1. Chrys. *Hom. in Joh.* 21. Olsh. II. pp. 74 sqq. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 206 sqq. Neander, p. 208: increased potency, analogy of mineral waters and effervescing springs. To which Lange (II. pp. 306 sqq.) added the tastes of magnetized waters, which were like Selters Water. Comp. Baur, *Kanon. Ev.* p. 119. Even Tholuck found Neander's view plausible, which had been advocated, only in a coarser form, by Woolston (liqueur), Ammon (spirits of wine), Langsdorf (extract of herbs). The “miracle of mental exaltation” (in which the water became the best of wine), Lange, Ewald. The wedding gift, or a kindly joke, Paulus, Venturini, Kaiser, Gfrörer, Ammon; plainly also Schleierm. pp. 215, 221. Certainly an assistance in emergency, Schenkel (pp. 84, 377). We must not, however, with Meyer, call such explanations frivolous.

hold of a definite historical fact, such as Hase, Lücke, and Schenkel think did and must underlie the narrative.¹ Failing this, the Old Testament has again been appealed to for information, and several miracles wrought in liquids, but not this one, have been extracted. It is not to be supposed that the fourth Gospel would occupy itself so anxiously with imitations of Moses or Elijah; it had already done this in the miracle of feeding.² It is much more probable that here, as elsewhere (as happened also in Luke in the miracle of the draught of fishes, in the other Gospels in that of the fig-tree), the Evangelist has portrayed an utterance of Jesus in a picture, and has vividly signalized the debüt of Jesus in that utterance and picture.³ According to the earlier Gospels, Jesus certainly had spoken words appropriate to this narrative, and had spoken them, or is represented to have done so, early in his career—words referring to John and the Pharisees: "The sons of the bride-chamber cannot mourn so long as the bridegroom is with them;" and, "New wine is not put into old wine-skins, which tear, but into new ones, and both are preserved."⁴ From this, and from the actual joyous and friendly feasts which Jesus held with his disciples and with the publicans, and which placed him in such a strong contrast to the ascetic in the wilderness and to the gloomy Pharisees, as well as to the genuinely Johannine and mournful picture which the ancients painted of Jesus fasting in the wilderness, could easily be derived the picture of a wedding festival at which Jesus was—naturally not the bridegroom, but—the bringer of joy for the

¹ Hase, p. 114; Lücke, I. p. 477; Schenkel, p. 378.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 220, refers to Ex. vii. 17 (water in blood), xv. 23 (bitter water rendered sweet), xvii. 6 (water from a rock); 2 Kings ii. 19 (water of Jericho rendered wholesome by Elisha). He also quotes the passage from *Midr. Kohel. f. 73, 3*: Goel primus ascendere fecit puteum; sic quoque Goel postremus ascendere faciet aquas. Schöttgen, II. p. 251. Similarly, Lützelberger. Hase (p. 113) disputes this, as he does every other interpretation.

³ This is also the fundamental thought of Weisse, II. p. 200: there underlies the narrative, a parable of Jesus about his ministry in relation to the Old Testament and to John, a ministry which is initially unapparent, but eventually powerful as wine. Origin, *l. c.*: πρὸ Ἰησοῦ ἡ γραφὴ ἕδωρ ἦν, ἀπὸ Ἰ. οἶνος ἡμῶν γεγεννηται.

⁴ Matt. ix. 10, 15—17.

guests and particularly for his disciples, and thus in a higher style the bridegroom.¹ As the bridegroom he is afterwards expressly described by the Baptist.² In the miracle he presents to some the material wine—to others, who recognize the Son of God in the worker of miracles, the spiritual wine. This is the simple and—particularly in the commencement of the ministry of Jesus—thoughtfully elaborated fundamental idea which to this author, who always even in the miracles struggles after a deeper and spiritual meaning, is at any rate of as much importance as the materially super-material fact in which the idea clothes itself.³ With this author then, in particular, we have to look for mysterious deeper hints even in the separate details of a narrative; though in the case in question we must be content with probabilities, because we do not know for certain how far his portrayal is intended to sketch merely the material occurrence or to point to something spiritual. The hint which is here most plainly given is, that up to this time Judaism has possessed no wine, or at most only a small and insufficient quantity. Besides this small quantity of wine, it has possessed the water of purification; but copiously as that may have been exhibited, it has not sufficed—nay, it has itself been exhausted. The austere purifications of the Jews, John the Baptist included, have consumed much water, and yet a complete purification has not been effected.⁴ Now comes Jesus; though he keeps the people waiting, and that not merely because he appears upon the stage of Israel and of history late and subsequently to John, in relation to whom, however, he is the earlier, the eternal, but also because even after his

¹ Herder, and afterwards Weisse and Baur, thought of a symbolizing of the relation to John, whose wilderness indeed immediately preceded; comp. note 4, below. Hilgenfeld (*Ev.* p. 248) refers to the parallel of the temptation.

² John iii. 29.

³ Thus, in particular, Baur, *Kanon. Ev.* pp. 114 sqq. But Hoffmann, also, conceived in his way the feast as prototype of the heavenly marriage feast.

⁴ Similarly Origen, 503, 3. Luther (Walch's ed.), XI. p. 648 (Hase, p. 114). Then Herder, *Von Gottes Sohn nach Joh. Ev.* p. 131. Further, Flatt, Olsh., Baumg.-Crus., Weisse, Luthardt (in fulfilment of the prologue), Baur, Hilgenfeld, and now also Strauss.

coming upon the earth his decisive hour does not at once appear.¹ He, too, begins with water up to the brim; he begins with baptism, and purifies effectually with the baptism which he administers by the hands of his deacons, his Apostles, his six Apostles.² But then comes his hour, his death-hour, when he administers the complete purification, namely, his blood, and together with his blood the festival wine, the wine of joy of the Holy Ghost. He comes, indeed, with water and blood, and even therein he is a higher repetition of Moses; and in the hour of his death, water and blood, the signs and bringers of grace, stream forth from his body.³ This interpretation has its firm support in the fundamental conceptions of the author, and it moreover applies to all the features of the picture.⁴ It is true that the above interpretation causes the actual and material incident to disappear from the narrative altogether; but that incident is replaced by what is profoundly spiritual, and the narrative is freed from everything objectionable, and is saved from the scoffing to which it would be exposed as long as it was understood in a material, and not in a spiritual, sense.

C.—THE LAST SUCCESSES.

However many of Jesus' latest acts in Galilee, and especially such as appeared to faith without knowledge to be his highest

¹ The utterance in John ii. 4 unavoidably suggests the frequent words of Jesus and of the Evangelist with reference to the hour of Jesus' death, vii. 30, viii. 20, xii. 27, xvi. 4, 21, xvii. 1; comp. Matt. xxvi. 45.

² John iii. 22, iv. 1, 2.

³ 1 John v. 6; John xix. 34, comp. iii. 5, vi. 53 sqq., vii. 38 sq. More in detail in the narrative of the passion, on xix. 34. We are also reminded of Acts ii. 13, 15 sqq. Comp. finally, the change of water into blood by Moses, Ex. vii. 17. Noack's foolish *Gesch. J.* 1870, p. 156: Jesus leads the sober to the intoxication of enthusiasm.

⁴ Bruno Bauer, *Kr. der evang. Gesch. des Joh.*, pp. 61 sqq., has also given prominence to this relation of the wine, and has been, on insufficient grounds, opposed by Baur, *Kanon. Ev.* p. 117. Weisse (II. p. 200) rightly found in the "hour" an allusion to Jesus' death, but incorrectly made it refer to the meeting again of Jesus with

and to be sure proofs of his deity, may have to be given up, there still remain many achievements of different kinds, many preachings and healings. And even myth has, by inserting the greatest miracles in this very period, historically shown what a focus of effort and energy and splendid proof in the midst of severe struggles this latest Galilean period had been. *And the result of these latest Galilean efforts?* Everything tends to show that the external result was mightier than perhaps ever before. In the Gospels, censures and repudiations retire again somewhat into the background; and a number of incidents show the eager thronging of the people to the Prophet who once more woos the heart of the nation by reprimand and love, by taking and giving. A miscarriage is expressly reported only at Nazara; that at heathen Gadara was of a very different character, and had no reference to Jesus' vocation. The visit of Jesus' mother and brethren, the parables, the controversy with the Pharisees about purification, the incident of the feeding,—all these things show how he was beset by the people, though there may not be wanting exaggerated descriptions of the crowds, especially in Luke and Mark.¹ The people flocked to him by towns, often from a distance; he went to the other shore, but the people went after him either by land or by ship; he returned to Capernaum or into the country of Gennesar, and he was received by multitudes of reverential people, and messengers went through the whole district announcing his arrival.² The largest gatherings were estimated to contain four or five thousand men, an estimate by no means too high, considering the denseness of the population of Galilee and the villages with thousands of inhabitants. Luke,

his mother at the cross, John xix. 25. De Wette had also thought at least of a prototype of the wine of the last Supper, just as the miracle of feeding represented the bread. Hilgenfeld and Strauss do not entirely exclude this reference.

¹ Comp. only Matt. xiii. 2 and Luke viii. 4. Mark iv. 1. Matt. xiv. 13 and Mark vi. 33. Matt. xv. 30 and Mark viii. 1. Matt. ix. 20 and also Luke and Mark. The earlier exaggerations (see above, III. pp. 351 sqq.) repeated here. What a representation in Luke xii. 1!

² Luke viii. 4; Matt. xiv. 13; Mark vi. 33. Reverential people, Matt. xiv. 33, xvii. 14; Mark ix. 14 sq.; Luke viii. 40.

indeed, speaks of such myriads that the people trod one upon another.¹ Besides the men, there were women and children present, even in remote localities; the sick were also brought on beds spread out in the market-places, or thrown down before him, or he was besought to allow them to touch merely the tassels of his garment.² The throng was often so great and dense that he could not walk or teach or eat, and those who came to see him could not penetrate the crowd to him. He had to get into a ship in order to preach, and to go into the mountains or the wilderness in order to be able to rest.³ But the people were captivated by a higher interest than merely that of obtaining aid in need and sickness. They hung upon his lips, and while listening to him they resisted, for two, three days, weariness, abstinence, hunger.⁴ Enthusiastic exclamations accompanied his preaching: "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God!" cried a fellow-guest at table on one occasion. And out of doors a woman shouted: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked!" "Yea, rather," answered he to the enthusiastic woman, in a friendly way turning her attention from his person to his cause, "Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it!"⁵ Popular opinion at this time had reached the firm conviction that he was a Prophet. On all hands, men sought to find the highest title for him. All Israel had acknowledged John the Baptist as a prophet.⁶ No greater honour could be paid to Jesus than to call him by the name of the greatest man of that age; and many persons were inclined to the opinion that John was not in prison or had not died, that in Jesus he had returned or even risen from the tomb. Others believed that one of the old prophets was come again. The most sanguine found in him Jeremiah or Elijah, the prophets who were to return

¹ See the miracles of feeding, above, pp. 192 sqq. Myriads, Luke xii. 1. The population of Galilee, see above, II. p. 7.

² Matt. xiv. 21, xv. 38. Ib. xiv. 14, 35 sq., xv. 30. Mark vi. 54—56, viii. 1, 3.

³ Luke viii. 42, 45; Mark v. 25, 31.—Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 2; Mark iii. 20, vi. 31, 46.

⁴ Matt. xv. 32.

⁵ Luke xiv. 15, xi. 27.

⁶ Matt. xi. 9, xiv. 5, xxi. 26; comp. *Jes. Ant.* 18, 5, 2.

before the day of the Lord, before the dawn of the great time of God.¹ But the mass of the people withheld the name of Messiah, although several were again and again inclined to take it upon their lips inquiringly or believingly.² The ground of this reticence was not that the people thought Jesus too little, but that his public attitude was not materially imposing and authoritative enough. It may be that the same little faith which, in that time of suppression and of distrust of its own power, expected no new man of God, but only the return of one who had already lived, had concentrated itself upon the advent of a Messiah who should drive away all sorrow.³ Upon this point we must distinctly reject the exaggeration—based essentially upon the fourth Gospel—which assumes that, in the exalted frame of mind of the people or indeed of the Pharisees, it needed only Jesus' acceptance of a material Messiahship in order to bring about an irresistible movement of the masses. At the same time, on another line, the opinion is advocated that the ministry of Jesus to the very end was quiet, and that what is said about great gatherings of the people is fiction,—an opinion which is too timid and undervalues all the facts.⁴ It is nevertheless

¹ Matt. xvi. 14, and parallel passages; also John vi. 14; Luke vii. 39, ix. 7, 8. Elijah, Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5. Jeremiah, 2 Macc. ii. 1 sqq. Lightfoot (p. 384) refers to the fact that according to the Rabbis (*Bab. Bava Bathra*, f. 14, 2; comp. Kimchi, *Præf. ad Jer.*), Jeremiah originally stood, in the series of prophets, before Isaiah, as contemporary and describer of the destruction (he passed as author of the books of Kings). Comp. De Wette, *Einl. A. T.*, 8th ed., by E. Schrader, pp. 21, 30. Thus a new light is thrown both upon the special importance attached to this prophet and upon his intimate connection with the palingenesis of Israel. Comp. the narrative of the transfiguration.

² Matt. xii. 23, xv. 22, xx. 30. Comp. the demoniacs, above, III. p. 246.

³ Above, II. p. 295 sq. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 80.

⁴ Weizs. (p. 453) grounded upon John vi. 15 his supposition of a decisive Galilean crisis, the fortunate issue of which Jesus frustrated by his spiritual-moral programme. With the same passage, O. Pfeiderer now connects (*Hilf. Zeitschr.* 1870, pp. 200 sqq.) the hypothesis that *there* lies the historical basis of the narrative of Jesus' temptation, a narrative until now so vaguely treated. But we can neither construct the Synoptics out of John, nor find support on this untenable ground for the narrative of the temptation. Pfeiderer's remarks on Matt. xvi. 1, &c., are the opposite of an historical mode of regarding the passage. The directly contrary opinion in Volkmar,—"quiet ministry" (comp. p. 655). But, apart from Gospel evidence, how weak is the proof

true that the success which, in the great flocking together of the people and in their verdict, fell to the lot of Jesus' unequivocally spiritual-moral ministrations, was great enough to revive the hopes of Jesus himself, and to make his despair of gaining the people appear premature. Hence we can understand how it was that in this later period expressions of dissatisfaction passed somewhat into the background; that at Nazara he resented the treatment he received from his family and fellow-townsmen, a treatment such as he had not elsewhere experienced; that he rejoiced less in the visit of his mother than in the presence of the hearers and doers of the word; that he begrudged the Canaanite woman the children's bread. His higher and more joyous mood broke forth most markedly in the parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, in which he contemplated the universal and thorough victory of his cause; and in the prophetic utterance of his confidence in the future, before his disciples, "Nothing is covered which shall not be revealed. What I say to you in the darkness, speak ye it in the light; and what ye hear in the ear, preach ye it on the house-tops!"¹ Yet after having experienced so many disillusionings, he was not sanguine enough to believe in the constancy of the popular susceptibility or in the steadfast and protecting fidelity of the masses; nor did he overlook the magnitude of the danger which was rising ever more threateningly and was approaching ever nearer, from the hierarchy in Galilee and Jerusalem, out of the fortress-walls of Machærus and the ruler's palace at Tiberias.

from the silence of Josephus, who, according to Volkmar, would certainly have spoken at least of an entry into Jerusalem participated in by the masses of the people (p. 507), an occurrence which would have surpassed the importance of a Theudas (*Ant.* 20, 5, 1; Acts v. 26) and of others (*Ant.* 20, 8, 6). Josephus is more careful not to hear (see above, I. pp. 16 sqq.); and when, at the beginning of the second century, the Galilean Justus of Tiberias—unknown to Volkmar—in his book of the Jewish kings, οὐδενός ἕλωσ μνήμην ἐποιήσατο, Photius, *Bibl.* 33, expresses a correct opinion: ὡς τὰ Ἰουδαίων νοσῶν.

¹ Luke xiii. 18; comp. above, pp. 15, 148 (Matt. xiii. 31). Matt. x. 26 (Luke viii. 17, xii. 2; Mark iv. 22).

DIVISION IV.—THE SIGNS OF THE APPROACHING FALL.

A.—THE DEATH OF THE BAPTIST.—THE TETRARCH AND JESUS.

THE Pharisaic opposition which was gathering round Jesus was brought to a crisis by the vigorous counter-blow which he struck. With all his strength and passion he struggled for the victory; the vehemence and inexorableness of his attacks increased; the people followed him and greeted his success against his opponents—as in the case of the Sabbath healing of the woman who was bowed down—so often and with such a heartiness, that the solidarity of the popular interests with the cause of Jesus was only too evidently betrayed. It was therefore necessary that, after the surprises, frustrations, and perplexities already experienced, the opponents' plan of campaign and attack, conceived since the notorious Sabbath healing, should be more firmly, more determinedly, and more speedily carried out.¹

The first successful blow against Jesus was struck at Machærus. It was inevitable that Pharisaism should not rest until it knew that the most terrible opponent which it had ever known during the two centuries of its influence, the people's preacher, the despiser of the Law, the harbinger of the Messiah, John, was within the safe keeping, not only of prison walls, but of death. But the suppressed movement in Galilee revived. Jesus, after all his reticence, was exhibiting more and more visibly the colours of the Baptist: such was the inference drawn from his teaching, an inference confirmed by the popular opinion. Every one knew—and busybodies magnified the fact—that messengers were going to and fro between the Baptist and Jesus. Either, then, there was a prospect of a redoubled, uncontrollable popular

¹ Luke xiii. 17; see above, p. 15. The plan, Matt. xii. 14, and parallel passages. See above, p. 14.

movement throughout the Holy Land from north to south, of the flight or liberation of the Baptist, and of the combined operation of the two powerful leaders, far superior to a Judas Galileus and a Zadok; or the matter must be dealt with without delay, by destroying the one opponent who was already in the hands of the authorities, and by driving the other, intimidated and disarmed, to his ruin.¹ Matthew and Mark place the shocking catastrophe which befel John in prison just at the later period of the Galilean ministry of Jesus, and give it a very traceable influence upon his destiny.² It is true they make the death of John quite independent of the agitation against Jesus, and the initiative of his embittered foes, the Pharisees. They give it as the fruit of a court intrigue, which was so completely independent of Jesus, that the murderer of the Baptist, the tetrarch Antipas, was afterwards, and not until afterwards, startled and puzzled by the news of Jesus and his doings.³ But without overthrowing the report of the Gospels, we have nevertheless sufficient ground for supplementing it by other accounts which, in age, unmythical simplicity and probability, are not only equal but superior to it. To begin with, let us recal the information given us by the Jewish historian, that the fear of a great convulsion induced the tetrarch Antipas first to imprison and then to execute the Baptist.⁴ Let us next examine the Gospels themselves more closely. We there find the fact that the disciples of John without delay carry to Jesus the message of sorrow and alarm; that Jesus, immediately on receiving the message, makes a flight-like retreat, at least for a time, from the soil of Galilee; that, soon after, in his confidential utterances to the disciples, he calls John the forerunner and prophet of his own destiny; that finally—and this is the weightiest circumstance of all—he, referring to the same subject, speaks of the Scribes as

¹ The opinion of the Pharisees, Matt. xxii. 16; comp. xxi. 25. The popular opinion, Matt. xvi. 14; Luke ix. 7.

² Matt. xiv. 3; Mark vi. 17.

³ Matt. xiv. 1; Luke ix. 7; Mark vi. 14.

⁴ *Jos. Ant.* 18, 5, 2; comp. above, II. p. 332.

the intellectual co-authors of the sufferings of the imprisoned teacher and of his murder, and also as the men who are responsible for his own future of suffering.¹ This chain of facts shows that, notwithstanding the isolation of the two series of events in the main narrative of the Gospels, there really existed a connection between the action of the Scribes and the murder of the Baptist, between the attack upon the Baptist and the attack upon Jesus. The most reliable source is Jesus himself, with his conviction awakened by the authentic report of John's disciples. Next comes Josephus, with his distinct account of the political considerations which weighed with the tetrarch in his imprisonment and execution of the Baptist—considerations which might have been affected to some extent by the actually uneasy condition of the country. And this array of evidence is closed by the tangible probability that the proceedings against the Baptist were not merely the result of caprice or of unlucky accident, but were a well-calculated and two-edged political and ecclesiastical movement against the dangers of the situation which the blindest man, and not merely the keen-scented tyranny of the ruler of the country, must have seen.²

According to the report in the Gospels, the implacable foe of the Baptist, Herodias, had, on account of the caution, or indeed conscientiousness, of the tetrarch, only postponed, not relinquished, her scheme for the murder of John.³ A festive occasion had brought together a number of guests at a splendid banquet in Antipas' castle, we are not told whether at Tiberias or Machærus.⁴ Mark knew the invited well enough to be able to

¹ Matt. xiv. 12 sq. (against Luke and Mark, on which below). Then xvii. 12; "they" here plainly means the Scribes. Agreement of Hausrath, *Zeit-Gesch.* I. p. 337.

² Whether Antipas himself thought of the Galilean agitation when he murdered the Baptist may, on account of Luke ix. 9 (Matt. xiv. 1), appear doubtful. But the real expression of Antipas has not been authentically preserved; see below, pp. 227 sq.

³ Matt. xiv. 3; Mark vi. 17.

⁴ We must fix upon Machærus because of John's confinement there, and of the prompt handing-in of his head to the daughter. But Tiberias lay nearer, and it seems to be implied by Mark vi. 21. However, the Machærus of Josephus as the place of the confinement and death of the Baptist is not to be sacrificed for the sake of the

classify them,—courtiers, captains, stewards, leading men of all kinds from Galilee and perhaps also from Peræa.¹ Nor were the wife of the tetrarch and her daughter absent. Herodias had her plan. She knew well the weakness of her consort, whom she ruled without his perceiving it. In the elevated mood which, though between fifty and sixty years old, he was still wont to exhibit at banquets, the otherwise irritable and nervous, but then bold, boastful, and haughty prince, could be most conveniently induced to acquiesce in the deeds which the enterprising and ardently passionate princess loved.² The guests were surprised by the entrance into the room of Salome, Herodias' daughter, in all the fulness of those youthful charms for which the princesses of the house were renowned even as far away as Rome and the palace of the Cæsars. With skill and grace she executed her dance, to the ravishment of the lustful Antipas, and also of the guests, as Mark the painter expressly reports.³ “Ask for whatever thou wilt, thou shalt have it, though it be the half of my kingdom,” Mark represents him as saying to her, and confirming his promise by an oath. She already knew what she wished to have,—she had learnt it from her mother. She begged for the head of John the Baptist on a dish. According to Mark, she first went out to take counsel with her mother, and then hastened back and eagerly and impetuously made her demand. The prince

Gospels (against Hug, *Gutachten*, p. 32). Indeed Matthew makes no assertion whatever about the place of the banquet and execution, and therefore by no means excludes the fortress at Machærus, the most convenient place in every respect (so also Meyer). Comp. above, II. pp. 332 sqq., and *Geschick. Chr.* p. 233. Also, against Wieseler's latest, in the *Beiträgen*, 1869, p. 5, according to which fleet messengers brought in a few hours the head of John to the Peræan residence, Julius, *Prot. K.-Z.* 1869, p. 51.

¹ Volkmar (p. 369) admits that Mark misplaces the banquet, therefore also John's prison, at Tiberias; if needful, Mark can be saved by the observation that the tetrarchy of Antipas is often, *a parte pot.*, designated merely Galilee, *Jos. Ant.* 18, 5, 4; comp. 17, 8, 1; 18, 2, 1; 18, 7, 1; opp. 17, 11, 4; *B. J.* 2, 6, 3.

² *Jos. Ant.* 18, 6, 2. See above, Vol. I. pp. 269 sqq., and my articles on the Herods in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, III. pp. 27, 38, 42 sqq. Antipas was born about 20 B. C. (now 54 years old). Herodias was born about 14 B. C. (now 48 years old). According to Volkmar (p. 354), Antipas was a surname!

³ On the princesses, comp. article *Agrippa II.* in Sch.'s *B.-Lexikon*, III. pp. 56 sqq.

was shocked, but his oath bound him, as in the case of Pheroras, the brother of Herod the Great. He was also influenced by the presence of the guests, not one of whom urged a plea against the demand. He therefore sent one of his guards into the prison; John was executed in a manner not Jewish, but in accordance with the detested Roman custom; and his head was served up on the dish to the awaiting maiden, and given by the maiden to her mother without.¹

This incident is so much like real life and so characteristic of Herodian manners, that we are captivated by it, as Antipas was by Salome. Both Antipas and Herodias were such as they are represented to be in this picture. Thus did the tetrarch celebrate his banquets; thus did he allow himself to be led and managed; thus did he struggle against, yet did not withstand, the influences brought to bear upon him; and at Machærus, the fortress where, according to Josephus, the Baptist actually died, the captains of Mark's account would very naturally be found at the table. It is plain, however, that the Gospels, and Mark in particular, possess very indefinite information. Antipas is called king and talks about his kingdom. The daughter of Herodias, to whose wish he succumbed, is for Matthew and Mark a little daughter. Mark thinks the banquet was at Tiberias in Galilee, not at Machærus in Peræa, although in the former case the little daughter would have to wait for the Baptist's head a week rather than an hour. The worst is the dancing maiden. Salome, the

¹ Pheroras refused to go to Herod when sick, ἐπὶ τῇ τιμῇ τοῦ ὄρκου, *Jos. Ant.* 17, 3, 3. The body-guard, *speculator*, in Mark vi. 27: the police of the military rulers and the Cæsars. Hirtius, *Bell. Al.* 31: per sp. et nuncios imperat. *Ib.* 37: sp. apparitoresque presto. Suetonius, *Cal.* 44: message to the senate per sp. (vehiculo). *Ib. Claud.* 35: sp. cum lanceis circumstantes (at the banquet). Tacitus, *Hist.* 2, 11: speculorum lecta corpora (also 1, 31). Seneca, *De Irâ*, 1, 16: tunc centurio supplicio præpos. condere gladium specul. jubet (also *Benef.* 3, 25). The Herods had *σωματοφύλακες*, *Jos. B. J.* 2, 15, 1; *ἰσορροφάροι*, *Ant.* 17, 8, 3. Execution by the sword, Egyptian, Persian, particularly Roman, comp. Acts xii. 2. In the Old Testament the sword used, not to decapitate, but to pierce, comp. Deut. xiii. 15; and with 2 Kings x. 7, read the passage 1 Sam. xvii. 54. Winer, *Lebenstrafen*. Decollatio ignominiosissimum apud Judæos mortis genus habebatur, Wetstein, II. p. 525; comp. *Sanh.* 7, 3; 52, 2. Justly so, see 1 Cor. xi. 7.

only daughter of Herodias, not—as the endlessly erring Mark thinks—of Antipas, was at that time very much older, namely, from twenty to thirty years of age, had been many years married, was a reigning princess, the consort and probably already widow of the tetrarch Philip, Antipas' brother. As wife, as princess, as widow plainly—unless she emulated Julia, the dissolute daughter of Augustus—it was impossible she could be a dancer in the presence of the subjects of the tetrarch, and a puppet in the hands of her mother.¹ And even if these historical facts did not exist, was it possible that a young daughter, that even an Herodias, would so abruptly beg the head of the Baptist on a dish, and that on a day of festival—the day of granting favours even with the Herods—and at the table before the guests? Or was it possible that Antipas should feel more strongly bound by an oath—and by both the Jews and the Herods oaths were generally held cheaply enough—than by regard for humanity, propriety, usage, and prudence?² And was it possible that among all those Jewish notabilities there was not one whose barbarity or cowardice did not prevent him from indignantly or compassionately opening his mouth for the man in whom the whole nation revered the oracle of God? If we cannot now decide whether we are to regard the actors in this scene as brutish hyenas or as perfectly childish children, then we have reached the point at which serious history passes into naive myth. This is the conclusion to which Josephus would lead us, for such a scandal would

¹ Mark speaks five times of king and kingdom; Matt. and Luke speak of the tetrarch, Matt. once in a very excusable way (comp. ii. 22) of king (xiv. 9). Volkmar's hypercriticism finds Matt. here dependent on Mark, whose report shows itself on all points as the later one. Naturally, the poet Mark is in thought with Ahab and Jezebel, and queen Esther. The other mistakes of Mark are (besides the fatal brother Philip, see above, II. p. 343, note 2) the paternity of Antipas with reference to the little daughter (earliest codd. read in vi. 22 *αἰροῦν*, against Tisch.; so also Volkmar, correctly), and the exclusively Galilean great men. On Salome, see above, II. p. 391, and article *Herodias* in Sch.'s *Bibel-Lexikon*.

² Comp. the release of the imprisoned general, Silas, at the birthday festivities of Agrippa I., Jos. *Ant.* 19, 7, 1, although the poor fellow was at once again taken into custody, and immediately after the death of Agrippa was, like John, executed in prison. *Ant.* 19, 8, 3.

escape him as little as it would the people; but he merely reproaches Antipas with political murder, and says nothing about a birthday or state-festival or dance-prize. We again suspect an imitation of other myths. In a similar manner, Esther the queen, by her charms and at a feast, forced Ahasuerus the Persian to command the death of Haman, the enemy of the Jews; and Mark has imitated the Esther incident to the letter, making Antipas offer the half of his kingdom, as did Ahasuerus.¹ Josephus has very similarly told the story of the petition of Herodias' brother, Agrippa I., to the emperor Caligula, on behalf of the temple at Jerusalem; though the earlier Philo had described the incident very differently. Josephus says that Agrippa gave a magnificent banquet, obtained a promise that whatever he asked should be granted, sued for that which the emperor's stubbornness made it most difficult to obtain, and obtained what he asked for because Caligula would not act the liar before so many witnesses.²

This last-mentioned incident occurred at about the same period as ours, the former in A.D. 40, the latter in A.D. 34; so that it might be supposed by some either that Agrippa had imitated his sister, or that the report of the sister's conduct had been copied from that of her brother. It would be more correct to say that both narratives have imitated the Esther myth—which was exceedingly popular among the Jews—with the view of giving pictorial definiteness to an obscure event, an enigmatical issue. In our narrative, the little dancing daughter is substituted, very intelligibly, for the charms of Esther or the dainty dishes of Agrippa. Not only had Herodias a daughter possessed of still greater attractions than her mother who was growing old; but Jesus, when speaking about the stern Baptist, had compared his contemporaries to little children who cried one to another, "We

¹ Esther v. 3, 6, vii. 2. On the "convenient day" of Mark, comp. also Susanna 15: ἡμ. εὐθερος.

² Jos. *Ant.* 18, 8, 7; see also above, I, p. 311, note 3. Josephus mentions other banquets with important results, *Ant.* 12, 4, 9; 18, 6, 2.

have piped to you, and ye have not danced.”¹ He who had not danced, and who therefore was obnoxious to the censure, was John: how easy was it, and what a drastic effect it would have, to make the serious and severe John perish at the dance-play of the child! Here everything becomes plain. This relieves Herodias of the crime which posterity has again and again depicted with ever-increasing hideousness, and which even moderns have believed, as if she, like a second Fulvia, received into her possession the head of her fatal enemy. However, one fact in the Gospel report will remain, namely, that she, a real and not merely fictitious Jezebel, actually co-operated in the death of the Baptist, and gratified her personal animosity under the cloak of the danger to state and religion bound up with the life of the hated John. It appears perfectly possible that, on this as on other occasions, she wrung her purposes from the nervously hesitant prince; that to this end, like other Herodian princesses, she became complicated in the machinations of the Scribes; and that she achieved the success of a sudden and secret execution, when Antipas was in a highly excited festival mood, and perhaps at the close of the very festival referred to in the narrative. The Christian myth then took up the dark secret of the castle, and worked it up into the elaborate plastic composition which has been handed down to us.²

¹ Matt. xi. 17.

² Further mythical accounts of maltreatment of the dead, in Jerome, *C. Ruf.* 3, 42; Niceph. 1, 19, according to whom Herodias secretly buried the Baptist's head in the castle precincts, and threw away the trunk, expressly to prevent the re-union of the body (evidently with reference to the resurrection, Matt. xiv. 2). It was reserved to Volkmar (after Br. Bauer) to reject the *whole* of the Gospel narrative (pp. 354 sqq.), leaving “not one sentence of the episode correct.” According to him (comp. also pp. 67 sqq.), John was put to death before the public appearance of Jesus (Mark i. 14), when Machærus still belonged to Antipas' father-in-law; the marriage with Herodias did not take place until later; and Antipas had no control over Machærus, the fortress of his father-in-law, from the date of his adultery downwards, and could not possibly have obtained subsequent possession of it. John died *about* A. D. 30, Jesus *about* A. D. 33. On the contrary, (1) it is mere caprice to find in Mark i. 14 (comp. vi. 17; Matt. xiv. 3; Luke iii. 20) a description of the exact and immediate date of the death of the Baptist. Even Josephus knows, like Mark vi. 17 sqq., of a *δίακουος*, after which *κρίνωται*. The expression, “to deliver up,” and its meaning, Matt. xvii. 22, &c.;

Thus died, in a shocking manner, at Machærus, whether in the presence or in the absence of Antipas and Herodias, probably in the autumn of A.D. 34, about the time of the thirty-eighth celebration of the tetrarch's accession, the noble, the great first leader of the movement of the kingdom.¹ His death, alas! is as silent

Mark ix. 31, xiii. 11, xiv. 41, xv. 1, 10, 15. Even in Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23; Rom. viii. 32, not simply death, as Rom. iv. 25. (2) That Machærus passed from one owner to another is seen from *Jos. Ant.* 18, 5, 1 (ῥότρε), the subsequent possession of the fortress by the Romans, then by the insurgent Jews, and finally again by the Romans. And as the legate Bassus (*Jos. B. J.* 7, 6, 1, 4) acquired possession of the fortress by strategy, so Antipas, in the war with the Arabs, the theatre of which was evidently in the neighbourhood of Machærus, might have surprised it by cunning (*Prot. K.-Z.* 1869, p. 51; *Jos. Ant.* 18, 5, 1, read Galaditis for Gamalitis). (3) John must have lived until hard upon A.D. 36, therefore into the time of Jesus' official activity, since Jesus died in A.D. 35. Volkmar's "abouts" are however quite untenable, though he appears to have based upon them his pretentiously calculated chronology of Mark! (4) The address of Jesus about the living John (*Matt.* xi. 1 sqq.) is thoroughly genuine; and the nucleus of our narrative (*Matt.* xiv. 3 sqq.) is unassailable, and perfectly independent of Jezebel and Esther. Thus also Hitzig, *Gesch. Israels*, p. 567. Complot of Herodian women with the Pharisees, *Jos. Ant.* 17, 2, 4 (see above, I. p. 249); comp. *B. J.* 2, 15, 1.

¹ The date cannot be calculated with absolute certainty. Would that it were only firmly established that the *Genesis* of Antipas denoted the anniversary of accession (*Grot.*, Paul., Wies., *Synopse*, pp. 293 sqq.; *Beitr.* p. 182; also Ebr. [formerly], Hausrath, Volkmar), and that this definition of date were historical, despite the mythical character of all the rest! For Antipas' accession (according to Casp. p. 131, and others, unknown), I can definitely fix in the autumn of B.C. 4 (opp. Wieseler; Ebrard, Easter; comp. above, I. pp. 254 sqq.). See the nomination and the disturbances in the autumn, *Jos. Ant.* 17, 11, 4; 17, 12, 1 sq.; comp. *B. J.* 2, 6, 3; 2, 7, 1 sq. And this time would be admirably appropriate! But although the Rabbis understand the word Hebraised by them, *jom ge(in)nusa shel malkin*, in the sense of *constitutio regis* (*Buxt.* p. 460; *Wetstein*, p. 411; *Wies. l. c.*), and the celebration of the years of reigning was customary from the time of Herod (*Ant.* 15, 11, 6; 17, 8, 4; comp. *Hosea* vii. 5), yet the expression *γενέσια* (originally a festival in honour of the dead, *Herodotus*, 4, 26) in later Greek, in *Alciphro*, *Dio Cass.*, LXX. (*Gen.* xl. 20), *Philo*, *Josephus* is understood as essentially synonymous with *γενέθλια*, *jom hülledet* (*Gen.* xl. 20) = birthday, *Jos. Ant.* 12, 4, 7; comp. *Con. Ap.* 2, 25 (*γενέθλια*, *Ant.* 19, 7, 1; *Philo*, *Con. Flacc.* p. 977; *Dio C.* 47, 18; 59, 11, 20), and the anniversary of accession is expressed by *ἡμέρα τῆς ἀρχῆς*, *Jos. Ant.* 15, 11, 6; comp. *Dio C.* 58, 24. Hence *Schleusner*, *Grimm*, *Meyer*, *Bleek*, *Ebr.*, *Casp.*, have translated *birthday*, of the date of which, however, we are not certain (comp. my article *Herodes* in *Sch.'s Bibel-Lexikon*). Allowing these two explanations to be about equally probable, we may ultimately give a preference to the former, because of the agreement of (1) the Rabbinical tradition concerning *Genesis*; (2) the Latin use of *Natales*, *Pliny*, *Pan.* 92; comp. *Cicero*, *Ad Att.* 3, 20, *Flacc.* 40; (3) the appropriate date, for the death of John as given in the Gospels decidedly points beyond spring (*Wies.*, *Ebr.*) and summer (*Ew.*, *Hitzig*, *Sevin*), to autumn, or indeed to winter.

as his prison. No one describes for us the dreadful moment, the last words of the Baptist. We may be certain that the exercise of brutal power was not accompanied by a trial: the Herods were not fond of public inquiries.¹ We know not whether the daring man of freedom uttered a last withering word against his wretched murderers, or whether in his perfect self-relinquishment to God he knelt speechless, unresisting, to receive the terrible blow. Judging from the narrative in the Gospels, not even his disciples were present to attend to his last requests; they were afterwards perhaps at Machærus, only not in the prison, having gone to the neighbourhood of the fortress in order to bury the corpse, from which even Antipas would not withhold honourable interment, though the later myth represents Herodias as preventing even this.² The people also solemnly mourned the Baptist's death. A deep pang went through the whole land when the terrible news from the fortress was spread abroad. It is true that no one stirred to execute vengeance, to demolish the fortress; no one attacked the ruler's castle at Tiberias, which was reserved to the firebrands of the revolution of the autumn of A.D. 66; no one fell upon Antipas or Herodias. The Johannine movement had run its course; the people were intimidated, and the tetrarch's armies were well equipped and his arsenals well furnished. But while the prisoner had been faithfully remembered, the martyr was still more profoundly revered. Faith did not bow to the external issue; men condemned the wretched prince, called John a prophet, and—as the history of Jesus in Jerusalem shows—compelled the Scribes to be silent about him instead of rejoicing over his fall.³ And when Antipas suffered an ignominious defeat in his ill-starred Arabian war in A.D. 36, not only was there a general satisfaction felt, but the religious consciousness of the people spoke aloud of divine vengeance for

¹ *Jos. Ant.* 15, 10, 4; 19, 7, 1; 19, 8, 3. Above, I. p. 252; IV. p. 220, note 2.

² Volkmar (p. 363) denies to John, as to Jesus, the "grave of honour." The account of the Passion will show that a humane custom gave the corpse of executed persons to the relatives of the deceased. Herodias' refusal, see above, p. 222, note.

³ *Matt.* xxi. 26 (xiv. 5). See also above, I. p. 270 sq.

the murder of the prophet. This cry, which at this point grows loud enough for us to hear it, was not silenced through the whole history of the misfortunes of this princely house, on which one disgrace fell after another,—helplessness against the Arabs, disillusion by the Romans, outflanking by Agrippa I., deposition and banishment by Caligula in A.D. 39: “God has done it!”¹

Before the news of the Baptist’s death had been spread among the people, an express embassy of John’s disciples had acquainted Jesus with the course of events. With what view the information was conveyed to Jesus and what impression it produced upon him, we discover from his immediately subsequent conduct—his flight from the land of Galilee—as well as from the general tone of his later sayings.² Jesus was most profoundly moved; he had not believed that Antipas, the pacific, the timid, would have ventured to murder the prophet, that Israel would have endured it, and that God would have thus abandoned the preacher of His kingdom. It did not need the warning of John’s disciples, who told him of the blow of brutal power: he recognized the connection between John and himself, and there immediately awoke in him the gloomy presentiment that the Baptist’s fate foreshadowed his own. “They knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed,” said he soon after; “thus also shall the Son of Man suffer at their hands.”³ A higher repetition—if we may apply to what is sacred an illustration from profane history—of the story of Hannibal and his brother Hasdrubal, whose head the Roman Claudius threw to Hannibal before his camp. “I see the fate of Carthage!” said the Phœnician. Jesus might afresh ask himself whether he did not see the fate of the kingdom of God,

¹ Jos. *Ant.* 18, 5, 2. Josephus also says of the deposition of Antipas: *ἐκίνησεν αὐτὴν ἡ ἐπιτίμησις ἡ τοῦ ἑοῦδος* (on account of Herodias’ envy of her brother, and of Antipas’ yielding to the ambition of his wife), *Ant.* 18, 7, 2.

² The influence of John’s death upon Jesus has been recognized by Weizsäcker (pp. 441 sqq.), in spite of his hypothesis about Mark; and also by Holtzmann, *Gesch. Isr.* II. p. 363; Längin, p. 75; Sevin, p. 43. Many prefer, like Schenkel, *B.-L.* III. p. 285, to make the flight of Jesus follow the utterance of Antipas.

³ Matt. xvii. 12.

the dispelling of all his dreams of the kingdom by the sovereign's sanguinary declaration of war. But no! It was impossible now for any one to rob him of faith in the kingdom—no Antipas, not even God could do it. The servants might fall; and either by the mysterious will of God or—as at this time he was wont emphatically to say—through the wickedness, baseness of men, one after another of his followers in preaching might suffer death; yet the rock remained rock, the pearl pearl, and Jesus, while sadly anticipating his own end, did not devote a single thought or fear to a possible end of the kingdom.¹ This, then, was the conclusion of his intercourse with John and John's disciples: such a little while, a few months, or only weeks, after the embassy from the prison! The Fates had been expeditious! From this time until his journey to Jerusalem, until he stood on Golgotha, the Baptist's prison was ever weighing upon his mind; whilst, doubtless, the Baptist's disciples, a few of whose successors still linger on the banks of the Euphrates, totally repudiated the Messiah, who, like their master, and verily only as his pupil, passed through the horrors of bonds and of death.²

It is, then, not quite an accident that the Gospels connect the murder of the Baptist and the tetrarch Antipas' first serious notice of Jesus with the co-operation of the Pharisees and hierarchs with Antipas. In the last Galilean period, the three Gospels report a remarkable expression of the tetrarch's sentiments about Jesus; and as this utterance makes reference to the death of the Baptist, Matthew and Mark have taken occasion therefrom to give their detailed account of the circumstances of

¹ Livy, 27, 51. Baseness, Matt. xvii. 12.

² This is indicated by the later independent attitude of John's disciples towards Christianity, as much as by the initial offence (Matt. ix. 14) at the non-Messianic character of Jesus' external life (Matt. xi. 1); comp. Acts xviii. 25, xix. 3. Just., *Trypho*, 80: βαπτισται (perhaps also Essenes). On the still-existing Nazareans, Mendreans, or Sabians (about 500 men on the lower Euphrates and the Tigris), comp. Gieseler, *K. G.* I. p. 76; Hase, *K. G.* 9th ed. p. 70; Ewald, p. 212. Also Jul. Euting, *Rituale, &c. der Mandäer*, 1867. Fate of the remains of John, Ruf. *H. E.* 2, 8; Soz. 7, 21; Nic. 10, 13. Body at Genoa, A.D. 1096; head at Amiens, beginning of thirteenth century.

that death.¹ As to why the prince said what he did, and what it was exactly that he said, we have no certain information. As the death of the Baptist must have taken place some time before, the prince's utterance could not have been made earlier than the latter part of A.D. 34: this is one among many evidences of the unhistorical character of the report of Luke and Mark, who write as if the Twelve had been engaged in missionary work just at this late date.² The utterance itself is very differently related by Matthew and Luke, whose reports Mark endeavoured, not very successfully, to fuse together.³ According to Matthew, Antipas held Jesus to be the risen Baptist. "This is John the Baptist," said he to his servants, courtiers, or pages; "he is risen from the dead, and therefore the powers work in him."⁴ According to Luke, however, he combatted this notion, which was told him certainly not as the belief of the court, but as that of the people, as in fact it was: Jesus was the risen John, or Elijah come again, or one of the old prophets risen again.⁵ "John have I beheaded," answered the tetrarch; "but who is this of whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him." These diverse narratives show that the only stable feature in the tradition was this: the Galilean prince had, in the latter part of Jesus' minis-

¹ Matt. xiv. 1; Luke ix. 7; Mark vi. 14.

² Antipas' interest in the opinions of the people concerning Jesus, Luke ix. 7, point to a late period, for those opinions are shown by Matt. xvi. 13 to belong to the early part of the year of Jesus' death. We have already (above, III. pp. 375 sqq.) rejected the late mission. The manipulation of the narrative by Luke and Mark reveals itself particularly in the fact that, while Antipas' utterance refers merely to the exclusive ministry of Jesus, they, timidly enough it is true, especially Mark, make it refer to the missionary work of the Twelve (Luke ix. 7; Mark vi. 14). Comp. above, III. p. 404; and below, the retreat of Jesus, pp. 230, 235.

³ Mark gives (1) the utterance in Matt. as that of the prince, (2) Luke's report of what others said, (3) a synthesis, or confirmatory repetition of the first utterance, by Antipas. But who can imagine that any one in the court would express a different opinion from the prince, that the courtiers (Luke says the people) would trouble their heads about the prophetic claims of Jesus, or that the prince would repeat his miraculous view with so much seriousness?

⁴ The resurrection imparted a higher, godlike nature; comp. Matt. xxii. 30.

⁵ It is in fact the popular belief, Matt. xvi. 14; also Luke ix. 19. De Wette thinks of the belief at court.

try and subsequent to the execution of the Baptist, more keenly watched the doings of Jesus, and had allowed expressions to fall which were intended to have the effect of discovering what connection existed between Jesus and John. No one among the people or the disciples had heard these utterances of the palace: only a confused account of them had been spread abroad, perhaps through the agency of Joanna, the wife of the Herodian steward, Chusa. At first sight, the forms given to the utterance by Matthew and Luke appear equally striking. In Matthew, we see the evil conscience and the superstitious anxiety that are so often found in company, both so easily occasioned by the frivolous levity of the execution, and the prerogative of the great man to linger in the minds of the people and of his assassins as one who was immortal. In Luke, the believer does not speak of his belief, but of irrevocable facts, and of the brutal power which is certain of its work and knows no remorse: it is possible, then, that even the scrupulous hesitation, which Matthew and Mark mention as preceding the murder, is fictitious. The utterance given by Luke, half contemptuous and half foreboding, sceptical and contradictory to the popular opinion, is notwithstanding the more probable one.¹ The author of the execution, the Hellenistically illuminated, if not exactly, as Lightfoot and Wetstein think, the Sadducean Herod, certainly thought much less of a resurrection of the Baptist than did the people. He could not, with his own eyes open, believe in the identity of Jesus and John; and any misgiving as to the continued existence of the Baptist, or as to a renewed, free, public activity, would have been at once allayed by another despatch of officers with power to apprehend: of this, however, we have not a word.² But the utterance itself, the fresh or increased attention fixed upon him by Antipas after a

¹ Thus also De Wette, Neander, Bleek. Weizs. erroneously looks for derision in Matt. and Mark.

² According to Lightfoot (p. 328), his evil conscience led him to forget the Sadducee, and to become himself a Pharisee. Others, since Grotius (also von Cölln), make him believe in a mere metempsychosis; while, on the other hand again, Meyer (also Schenkel) finds everything made possible by his evil conscience.

long absence of the latter from Tiberias, and the juxtaposition of the two names John and Jesus,—all this was menacing to Jesus, even though the Gospels should be right in making it appear that no immediate action was taken, not even that for which Luke had a preference, viz., a formally expressed desire on the part of Antipas to see Jesus. Such a desire, if seriously felt, could have been gratified; but Luke mentions it merely because he was about to describe the long-wished-for meeting at Jerusalem.¹

We owe to Luke our knowledge of a circumstance tending to show that the tetrarch's mistrustful utterance and glance were followed by machinations, and indeed by machinations with those very Scribes who had brought about the death of John, and had long meditated one fate for both him and Jesus. Luke gives the remarkable fact that at the commencement of the journey to Jerusalem several Pharisees went to Jesus with the urgent warning, "Get thee out, depart hence, for Herod will kill thee." We shall certainly not err if we regard this crafty warning, the historical genuineness of which we provisionally assume, as given in pursuance of a conspiracy arranged between the Pharisees and the prince. Thus, indeed, did Jesus understand it, as is evident from his contemptuous answer to Antipas.² If this was the real state of the case, we at once discover not only the fact of the alliance of the hierarchy with the prince, but also the concerted war-plan. A violent blow at Jesus was not to be extorted from the timid ruler. He had reluctantly enough proceeded to the length of executing the Baptist. In the midst of the imprecations drawn from the people by the Baptist's murder, it was perilous to arouse afresh the popular anger; and no one could

¹ It is generally assumed that Antipas now had his attention drawn to Jesus for the first time. Even Meyer adopts this view. If we assume this, we must, with Grotius and Baronius, also assume a longer absence of Antipas from Galilee, which might be a consequence of the war with Aretas in Peræa (thus Baron.). Possibly, however, his attention was simply drawn to Jesus more strongly than before, he having hitherto ignored, and been in a position to ignore, the activity of Jesus. The trial of Jesus before Antipas at Jerusalem, Luke xxiii. 7 (scarcely historical).

² Luke xiii. 31. Similarly Ewald, pp. 450 sq.; Weizs. p. 443.

confidently predict a successful issue to a new act of violence against the religious movement, against the still vigorously propagated Galilean excitement, against the favourite and the pride of thousands. The best way of operating was that of intimidating Jesus and separating him from the Galilean district. The execution of the Baptist had already contributed towards effecting this. Now rumours of intended apprehension were to be spread; menaces, warnings, espionage, and craftily tempting discussions, were to be brought into play. Indeed, we meet with the very noticeable fact that the Pharisees are still on the stage; and, well informed of the movements of Jesus by good spies, they re-appear as soon as he is again visible: evidence enough of the critical nature of the situation in which Jesus was. If only the Galilean movement were quietly to exhaust itself, as the Peræan movement had done, everything seemed gained, whether Jesus fled into the province of Syria, or went to Judea and committed himself into the hands of the Sanhedrim and the secular authorities. Throughout, the Pharisees undertook the active rôle: the immediate participation of the court is as little demonstrable as that of the so-called Herodians and of the Sadducees, who made their appearance on the stage at Jerusalem, and—somewhat contrary to other testimonies of Matthew and Mark—retired to the background in the Galilean struggles.¹

B.—JOURNEYS OF FLIGHT.

The above facts enable us to understand those remarkable movements of Jesus which characterize the close of his ministry in Galilee. The attempt of his enemies succeeded. We have

¹ Mark mentions Herodians as early as iii. 6; then again viii. 15 (against Matt. xii. 14 Luke vi. 11). Sadducees, Matt. xvi. 1, 6 (against xii. 38; Mark viii. 11). Herodians really appear first, Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 13. Sadducees first, Matt. xxii. 23, and parallel passages. Lightfoot (p. 325) had already brought the Herodians and Sadducees in Galilee into connection with Antipas the Sadducee.

retirements and flights, which, at first but less extensively occasioned by the complot of the Pharisees on account of the healing on the Sabbath, are now prosecuted in the most diverse directions, in order to avoid and deceive his foes.¹ Only the most intimate of his adherents—nay, only the Twelve—accompany him; the crowds of people are escaped from as much as possible; public ministrations in the open air and in the synagogues are suspended; Capernaum is seldom visited, and then only in passing. It is true that the later Gospels have striven to obliterate this fugitive character of Jesus' movements. The traces of flight have almost disappeared in John's Gospel; and in Luke and Mark it is only with difficulty that they can be detected by contrasting the smooth, featureless accounts of these Gospels with the sharp drawing of the first. We know not whether Luke or Mark is here the more descriptive. The former hastens hurriedly over these parts of his history; even Jesus' retirement after the controversy concerning the Sabbath is not mentioned; while after the death of John and after the great feeding, there is at once given, without the slightest trace of a motive, Jesus' assertion that he will be put to death. Mark, on the other hand, shares the greater copiousness of the closing events in Galilee with Matthew; but the characteristic of flight is almost entirely obliterated,—he knows only of miracles as at other times, and of distant wanderings *incog.*, voluntarily undertaken and not from necessity.² Though Luke and Mark speak of retirement, it is merely of a retirement of rest for the disciples; and the Baptist's

¹ First retirement, Matt. xii. 15; Mark iii. 7.

² The retirement after the controversy about the Sabbath is wanting in Luke vi. 11 sq.; and Mark, although he gives the retirement (iii. 7), is so much influenced by Luke and his context, that he immediately afterwards reports the great gathering of people on the occasion of the choice of the disciples, indeed the tranquil return of Jesus to his house at Capernaum (iii. 19). In Mark, besides the systematic *incognitos*, vii. 24, 33, viii. 23, 26, ix. 30, there is the most remarkable publicity, viii. 1, 34, ix. 14. That in Matt. xii. 14 sqq. we meet with something imperfect in the composition, I have long since honestly admitted.—To return to Luke, see ix. 7—22. In John (comp. iv. 1, 3, vii. 1, viii. 59, x. 40, &c.), the retreats happen in the south, though they are not absolutely necessary (viii. 20), and Galilee is twice the direction in which he retreated.

death, though mentioned in the immediate context, is not represented as having the slightest influence upon the destiny and resolutions of Jesus.¹ If Jesus makes an unwonted and distant excursion to Tyre and Sidon, in consequence of the dispute about purifying, Mark, far from speaking of retreat, makes Jesus first go composedly into the house from the midst of the Pharisees.² If Jesus crosses the lake to Bethsaida and Cæsarea Philippi, every semblance of a flight is avoided by the quiet character of the previous conversation with the sign-requiring Pharisees.³ Thus the enigmatical solitary journeys, the enigmatical announcement of suffering at Cæsarea Philippi, are to these writers quite groundless, and altogether isolated occurrences.

The determined defence of Mark still perpetuates the dispute whether Matthew or Mark be correct; indeed, it is asserted that Matthew has merely developed a favourite notion of his own.⁴ But we can indulge in the belief that the inferior historical character of Mark must be evident to the impartial student, whose

¹ Luke ix. 10; Mark vi. 28—32, comp. with Matt. xiv. 12—14. Here, indeed, is the point where the Mark hypothesis charges Matthew with confusion; whilst Mark, with Luke, is held to be correct in making the retreat of Jesus follow the return of the Apostles from their mission, and not a consequence of the news of the Baptist's death brought by John's disciples. It is said to be particularly evident that Mark alone reverts from the episode concerning the Baptist's death to his main narrative, while Matthew allows the episode to get entangled in the threads of the main narrative itself. Comp. on this, my remarks in *Gesch. Chr.* xiv. sq. Ignoring all this, Volkmar (*Ev.* p. 374) reproduces the old complaints of his *Rel. J.* against the confusion of Matthew (thus also Wilke, Holtzmann, Weizs.). One cannot trust his eyes. What is the more probable in itself? Who has the death of John in the older form? Who has here unhistorically interpolated the mission of the Apostles? And since the anecdote about Antipas is simply the occasion of and the prelude to the narration of the more important incident—the death of John—and indeed even in Mark is related with a brevity similar to that of Matthew, and stands quite unconnected with the mission of the Apostles, Matthew was quite correct in spinning the thread of his further narrative on to the main fact, the death of John, and not on to the introductory anecdote.

² Mark vii. 24, comp. 17 (Matt. xv. 21).

³ Mark viii. 11—13 (Matt. xvi. 1—4).

⁴ Thus Volkmar, p. 74, and elsewhere. He says that while Mark has but one retreat, iii. 7 (consistent with fact, though not historical), Matthew is ever introducing such incidents from iv. 12 onwards. Volkmar does not see that one could certainly retire from Perrea to Galilee without avoiding Scylla to fall into Charybdis (comp. above, II. p. 347). But is that criticism?

assent it is worth while to endeavour to win. For in Mark, everything is disconnected, arbitrary, inexplicable,—effectless prophet-murders, resultless controversies, causeless journeys into other lands, unnecessitated thoughts of death; while in Matthew, everything lies before our eyes like a harsh yet ennobling reality we have ourselves experienced, like the prologue to an inevitable passion-story. The ground of this derangement of the actual history by the later writers in question lay, however, much deeper than merely in their superficiality. Their mode of conceiving of Jesus as an altogether mysterious and divine personality prevented them from cherishing the idea—except as a distortion of history—of his wandering about in Galilee as a fugitive. This idea must have been offensive, not merely to a Celsus, but above all to those authors who had already, in the alleged attempt upon him at Nazara, described him as victoriously and miraculously breaking through the ranks of his enemies, or who purposed to describe him later, when on his way to Jerusalem, as the hero courageously advancing in front of his terrified disciples.¹ On the other hand, it cannot occur to any one to discover in Matthew an idea which would have moved him to an artificial depreciation and obscuration of his lofty conception of the Messiah, to a partizan delineation of the mighty Son of God as a poor fugitive. We are compelled to think of the beautiful conception of the Evangelist, or more correctly the second hand, of Jesus as the lowly servant of God, or we must indeed again recall the example of the fleeing Elijah: but Elijah repeatedly presented himself before the face of royalty, a course which Jesus did not imitate, and the journeys of flight did not belong exactly to the lowliness of the beginning of Jesus' ministry. Those journeys were rather contradictory to the thus emphasized glory of Jesus, as well as was the subsequent Passion at Jerusalem, the gloomy character of which no narrator has endeavoured to inten-

¹ Luke iv. 29 sq.; Mark x. 32. John, the consequence thereof, viii. 20, x. 18, 39, xviii. 6.

sify, but every one has endeavoured to tone down.¹ In brief, this flight was—like the Passion itself—simply the bare historical fact, without fictitious colouring and embellishment, adorned, mitigated, not by silently passing over the fundamental fact, but merely by the accompaniment of a number of evidences of glory which the fugitive was nevertheless able to exhibit, and by which he could prove himself the Son of God.

But *could Jesus have fled?* Do not the sharp arrows of the scoffing heathen Celsus strike him in his flight?² Certainly, if he had been a man of divine omnipotence, the worker of the miracles of feeding and of calming the storm—miracles which are thrust into this very context for the purpose of toning down and obliterating the contrasts—then he need not have fled, he could not have fled: unless with theological arts we excite a smile by extracting from these circumstances reasons why he may have done the one and not have left the other undone. Even if he had been merely a man of resignation, of determinism, of faith in divine appointment and reprobation, a man of prayer who left everything to God and looked to God for everything, then he could not have fled. But, like the whole of his career, this fleeing also exhibits that genuinely human character which consisted not merely in his being the subject of want and suffering and the dread of death, like the rest of us, but in his experience of the human obligations of self-preservation and spontaneous action, of prudence and discretion, of bravery both in attack and in defence without, in a spirit of false one-sided piety, relinquishing self-dependence and handing over at once existence, destiny, and vocation, into the sustaining hands of God. Hence we discover a strength, a glory, just here in the midst of the apparent weakness of Jesus; and we estimate them so much more highly, because the elements of resignation and devotedness were so powerfully developed in his deeply religious

¹ Matt. xii. 17. Elijah's flight, 1 Kings xix. 3; on the other hand, xviii. 1 sq., xxi. 18.

² Origen, *C. Cels.* I. 62, 65, 66; II. 10, 67, &c.

spirit. These elements were, however, not alone: the greatness of his endowments and achievements consisted in his being such a many-sided and richly-gifted man, that he, who could teach his disciples to fear no man and to rely upon Him without whose will not a hair of their head should fall, could nevertheless himself flee and commend flight to his disciples also.¹ But wherefore flee? Not merely because he wished to preserve his life, for he was soon to confess, perhaps already had confessed, that that man would lose his life who wished to preserve it; but certainly for the sake of his vocation.² It was not yet his steadfast conviction that the Messiah must die; on the contrary, up to this time both he and every one had connected living, working, ruling, blessing, with the idea of the Messiah. Moreover, it was his firm belief that he could not fall a victim to the storm raised against him by the ruler of the people, since the nation itself still went after him; and that he could not have thoroughly finished his work until he had made a last appeal to the people, in particular until he had gone up to the City of the Great King, and until he had prepared his disciples for all contingencies. Thus he spared and guarded himself, going repeatedly out of the way of inimical intrigues; whilst at the same time he hoped for the preserving protection of God, who could not allow His own peculiar cause, His kingdom, to fail.

In contemplating these journeys of flight, we are surprised to find that we possess more detailed and local information about them than about the whole of his missionary work. We can distinguish four journeys of flight, all undertaken with the intention of becoming invisible to Galilee, or at least to the middle district of Galilee, the populous lake region, with Capernaum and Tiberias the state capital. Two of these journeys were into the country east of the Jordan on the shores of the lake, now to the north and then to the south; and two of them were towards the extreme north of the country, N.W. and N.E. Thus we straightway find that Jesus took advantage of every possible line of

¹ Matt. x. 23.

² Matt. xvi. 25.

retreat, and again and again increased the length of his excursions ere he exhausted his Galilean resistance.

Immediately after he had heard of the Baptist's death, Jesus made a relatively unimportant digression from the scene of his ministry. He went with his disciples by ship in a north-easterly direction a little more than two leagues, to the point where the Jordan enters the Lake of Gennesar; on the left bank of the Jordan he crossed on foot the fertile alluvial district of Bethsaida or Julias, the plain Et-Batiha, as it is now called, at the foot of Et-Tell or "The Hill," from which the massive ruins of the city of Julias still look down picturesquely to the lake a league away.¹ It is true that there are here several questions to be considered. Luke and Mark are not altogether prepared to see a flight in this short journey; and for a moment one might ask in what respect this little retirement was calculated to help Jesus, for he certainly did not withdraw himself from publicity, since the people hastened to him by the road along the northerly bend of the lake.² Therefore Luke and Mark may after all be right in bringing the retirement into connection, not with the death of John, but with the return of the Apostles from their mission. But even Luke leaves open the possibility that Jesus went aside thither not merely for the sake of the disciples, but to avoid the notice of Antipas; and Mark gives the benevolent but impossible explanation that Jesus, out of compassion for the travel-tired disciples, took them on a new journey to give them rest in the solitude of the desert. "Come apart to a solitary place and rest a little." It must also not be forgotten that the arrival of John's disciples, with their horrible news, while it is by no means an invention of Matthew's, is not mentioned by Luke and Mark, but is converted by both—particularly by Mark—into an arrival

¹ On Julias, see above, I. p. 274, and my article *Philippus*, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lex.*, also Furrer's art. *Bethsaida*, in same. Pliny, *II. Nat.* 5, 15: lacus, quem plures Gennesaram vocant, amœnis circumseptum oppidis, ab Oriente Juliade et Hippo. *Jos. Ant.* 18, 2, 1: πρὸς λίμνη.

² Matt. xiv. 13, 34, xv. 39; Luke ix. 10; Mark vi. 32 sq., 45, 53, viii. 10; John vi. 1.

of Jesus' own disciples, a circumstance which certainly did not at that time occur, and is simply artificially interpolated. Let each reader choose for himself between the impression and the non-impression produced by the Baptist's death, between the arrival of John's disciples and that of Jesus', between the flight and the retirement for rest; but let the telling fact be also taken into account, that even Mark is compelled later incidentally to mention the depressing influence produced on the mind of Jesus by his forerunner's death.¹ But was the journey too short, the part to which Jesus withdrew too near, too Galilean? As to the locality in which the journey terminated, the Gospels agree, though Luke alone, more correctly Luke and Mark, mention the region of Bethsaida.² For the description of all the Gospels leads us to a point on the northern shore which could be reached either by water or by land. But the district of the north-east coast actually afforded shelter. It was a part of the land of Golan (Gaulanitis), in the tetrarchy of Philip, since whose death, A.D. 34, it had been a dependency of the Roman province of Syria, Bethsaida or Julias being Philip's residence and place of sepulture. During Philip's lifetime, Jesus would have found shelter here, even though Salome, Herodias' daughter, was Philip's consort; for Philip was a very pacific, just ruler, and, according to all evidences, no friend to his restlessly busy, intriguing, arrogant half-brother Antipas. Still more secure was this corner of refuge under Roman domination, because while Antipas was compelled doubly to respect this district, the new addition to the province,

¹ Matt. xiv. 12; comp. Luke ix. 10; Mark vi. 29 sq., ix. 13.

² Luke ix. 10 (somewhat inaccurately: to the town Bethsaida). Matthew does not mention the exact locality, but it must have been beyond the lake; the same remark applies to John. Mark, according to the received text, makes Jesus return to Bethsaida on the western shore (south of Capernaum, says Volkmar, without any ground for his assertion)—a direct contradiction, which Volkmar very arbitrarily explains by the dependence of Luke upon Mark. But in Mark vi. 45, the old Itala and other texts have the correct original reading, *a Bedsaida*, or *in contra B.*, that is, *εἰς τὸ πέραν Βηθσαιδῶν*; comp. Matt. iv. 25, xix. 1 (xi. 21), which was displaced by the easier reading, *πρὸς* (adopted even by Tisch.). Ewald in error, pp. 439 sqq.; also Furrer (above, p. 192, n. 2), who, at least with reference to the fourth Gospel, thinks of a south-eastern point opposite Tiberias.

far remote from Antioch and as yet scarcely incorporated, was left comparatively free and to itself.¹ How long Jesus sojourned here, whether only a day, as the Gospels appear to indicate, or days and weeks, can never be determined. Since the Gospels place in this period the great miracles of the feeding and of the storm, the genuine mythical antithesis to the straits of the fugitive, it is evident that the historical facts are not here preserved with any approach to exactitude. At the same time, it may be that Matthew and Mark are correct in making Jesus, on his return, pass through the district of Gennesar south of Capernaum, probably the neighbourhood of Magdala—Mark says Dalmanutha, i.e. Zalmanut, or “Shady Place”—without having entered Capernaum itself, being still anxious to prolong his *alibi*.²

This visit to the country east of the Jordan at once reminds us of another. The excursion to the south-eastern shore of the lake and thence to Gadara is narrated by the Gospels as occurring certainly before the death of the Baptist, and is by no means represented as the retreat of a fugitive. After the parables—if, as before, we follow Luke and Mark—Jesus voyaged to the country of the Gadarenes. Certainly there is not the faintest suggestion of a motive why Jesus should have undertaken this long journey of more than three leagues, first to the south-east end of the lake and thence further into the country, if his pur-

¹ Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 4, 6; 18, 5, 1.

² Gennesar, Matt. xiv. 34; Mark vi. 53. In the second feeding (which is identical), Matt. xv. 39 has Magdala, Mark viii. 10 Dalmanutha. The readings vary, however, with reference to these two names. In Matt. Magada (against the most frequent Magdala) is found in Sin., Vat., Bez., Itala (also Mageda, Magida, M——n); in Mark, Magada, or in Bez. Melegada, is also strongly supported by MSS., but Vat., It., Codd. ap. Ang., have Dalm. Magada most probably = Magdala. Megiddo (Μαγγιῶν), which Ewald, and now also Volkmar, wish to adopt, is not to be thought of, since it lay on the south-western border of the plain of Jezreel, three leagues to the west of even Shunem and Jezreel. (According to Volkmar, p. 406, Megiddo was the principal town of the N.E.!) I would explain Dalm. from Zalmonah, Numbers xxxiii. 41. Yet the word is rather connected with a nom. abstr. *zalmanut* than with the plural *zalmonot*. Light. p. 414. Ewald, p. 455 sq.: Zalmon (Talm.). Casp. p. 138, Delhemiyeh in the Jordan-Yarmuk region! To increase the confusion (in the face of Matthew), Volkmar (pp. 399, 408) looks for Dalmanutha in the S.E., and the Bethsaida in Mark viii. 22 he takes to be the western one. But Mark viii. 13, 14, 22, 27!

pose was not that of hiding himself from his enemies. It was not necessary to go so far, or at least to go to a Gentile district, in order to find solitude and to recover breath. Jesus had never extended his missions to the eastern shore at all. He was not driven thither by the storm,—for why, after landing, did he still proceed towards Gadara? Hence it is probable that here also—so far as the Gadara journey, when freed from its additions, is to be retained as historical—we have a hiding from watchful enemies, a retreat into the Roman territory. In such a case, the name of the town, Gadara, is decidedly to be retained. It is true that since Origen's time the evidence of manuscripts—particularly of Luke and Mark—is perhaps more strongly in favour of Gerasa, and Origen himself suggested, plainly as a mere guess, the name Gergesa. Origen found a number of followers, and, as consequence, a trio of places disputes the honour of having given or refused asylum to Jesus.¹ Origen was quite right in rejecting Gerasa. He thought it impossible that the sacred authors should be so ill informed or so untruthful as to mention as the landing-

¹ From Origen on John, Vol. VI. 24 (comp. X. 10), it is very clear that, at the beginning of the third century, Gerasa was by far the best-attested reading in the three Gospels, the rare one (*ἐν ὀλίγοις εἰρομένῳ*) being Gadara. His own hypothesis, based on the accounts of persons acquainted with the lake-coast, was Gergesa: it may be that he had in view the recently found Kherza, to the east of the lake, or another locality with a similar name. He does not say whether the place lay to the west or to the east. The Itala also gives the preference to Gerasa in the three Gospels. In the Codd. there is now a veritable confusion, three readings occurring in each of the three Gospels, Gadara and Gerasa in particular being supported in them all by the most respectable and ancient texts: *Gadara* in Matt., Sin., Vat., Ephr., St. Gall.; in Luke, Al., Nitr., Ox., Petr.; in Mark, Al., Ephr., Petr.: *Gerasa* in Matt., It.; in Luke, B., D., It.; in Mark, Sin., B., D., It.: *Gergesa* in Matt. in many codd., and by later hands in Sin. and Ephr.; in Luke, Sin. and Reg.; in Mark, Reg., Venet., St. Gall. Also Epiph., *Har.* 66, 33, supports Gergesa in Luke and Mark, and Gadara preponderantly for Matt. What is the original in all and in each? The latter cannot now be discovered, since both Gadara and Gerasa are strongly supported in all three: this supplies a standard by which to estimate the position advanced by Volkmar (with the peculiar motto, *Honesty is the best policy*), who, rejoicing in the recent discovery of Kherza, would save Gerasa for Mark, and fix Gadara in Matt., in order to dispose of Matt. as ignorant, nay, as not being a Palestinian, while the circumstances (see below) *are altogether different!* Setting aside even Tisch.'s distribution of the texts (Matt. Gadara, Luke [now] Gergesa [!], Mark, Gerasa), I maintain that we must look away from all the readings, and gather the correct name from the connection, and that gives in all—without trivial partizan criticism—Gadara. See below.

point of Jesus an Arabian town which had never had anything whatever to do with a sea or a lake.¹ On the one hand, Gerasa was a very important town; and the ruins of Dsherash, discovered by Seetzen on the north of Wady and Dshebel Zerka (Jabbok), in the hilly country of the east, still cover an area with a circumference of more than a league. On the other hand, as a frontier town of Peræa and Arabia, a neighbour of Philadelphia and Bostra, it lay too far to the south in the latitude of Samaria, and too far to the east—probably two full toilsome days' journeys from the southern shore of the lake, ten leagues inland from Gadara—to allow us to think either of a "landing" at Gerasa or of a journey thither. The patristic author's topographical remarks about Gadara are, indeed, partially correct: we certainly do not find in close proximity to that place a lake or sea or a precipitous declivity towards the sea. Instead of the lake must be substituted the river Hieromiax, which flows northwards from Gadara, and is shut in on both sides by walls of hills. But let us test Origen's own guess. Relying on the statements of his Jerusalemite authorities, Origen believed he could point to an old town Gergasa on the Lake of Tiberias, and also the abyss of the swine in its immediate neighbourhood; and this place specially commended itself to him because, in a most remarkable manner—as he twice emphatically says—Gergesa had for centuries predicted Jesus' double expulsion in its name, which signified the "home of the expeller."² Eusebius speaks of a village on the hill; Jerome, of a little village. Whilst, subsequently, the existence of this little village has been continually becoming less evident and has been less and less believed in, there has been growing up an erroneous supposition of the existence there of a town Ger-

¹ See Origen on John, Vol. VI. 24; Lomm. I. p. 239.

² ἀλλὰ Γέργεσα, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ Γεργεσαῖοι, πόλις ἀρχαία περὶ τ. νῦν καλουμ. Τιβ. λίμνην, περὶ ἣν κρημνὸς παρακείμ. τῇ λίμνῃ, ἀφ' οὗ δέικνυται τοὺς χοίρους. . . . Origen was reminded of the expelled by the word, because *garash* means to expel; but Gerasa was thus called as pasturage. The Girgashites, however, into connection with whom Origen brings Gergesa, had dwelt rather in the south (in the region of Jericho), and were quite extinct. Joshua xxiv. 11. Jos. *Ant.* 1, 6, 2.

gesa, the imaginary dwelling-place of the long extinct Canaanite tribe of the Gergashites, *Grace* Gergesaioi. And now, recently, there has been found to the east of the lake and opposite Magdala, therefore not very far from Capernaum, a corresponding little village called Khersa, which has naturally been regarded as the re-discovered old Gergesa, or indeed Gerasa.¹

But whatever may be the real character of this discovery, the chief fact remains that the journey of Jesus was not towards Khersa, but towards Gadara.² The Gospels positively require Gadara: they speak of no village, of no little town, but of an important town, the centre of a district containing villages, on the borders of the so-called Decapolis, or Country of the Ten Cities, and not in the Gaulonitis territory; and Luke speaks of a voyage down, not merely of a voyage over. All this points simply to Gadara, and not to Khersa-Gergesa.³ The town Gadara, properly Gader or Gadra, i.e. the "unwalled place" (like Gadeira or Gades-Cadix), is called by Josephus the strong capital, the metropolis of Peræa, with at least 30,000 inhabitants, at a distance of three leagues from Tiberias. According to Eusebius, it lay high on a hill, east of Scythopolis and Tiberias; according to Pliny, it was on the river Hieromias, the present Yarmuk or

¹ Eus., *Onom.* (ed. Larsow and Parthey, 1862): *καὶ νῦν ζεῖκεται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους κόμη παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβ.* (plainly merely copied from Origen; Khersa does not lie on a hill). Jerome: *viculus demonstratur*. Recently mention has been made of some small ruins called Khersa (not Gersa), at the mouth of Wady Semakh, in the middle of the eastern shore (comp. Van de Velde and Menke), and held to be the actual Gerasa with the steep declivity (south of the place). Thus, after W. Thompson, particularly Furrer, *Bedwat. bibl. Geogr.* p. 19; also Volkmar. To Furrer (following De Bertou), the insignificant remains have acquired the more importance, because of the (for future times) favourable situation of the place as the outlet of commerce and intercourse between the Gaulonitis and the Auranitis, by way of the Semakh valley.

² But does Khersa = Gerasa, *i. e.* Dsherash? Can we speak of a hill there on which the herd pastured? And the village, and little village? It is not worth the trouble to enumerate all the objections. See following note.

³ Matt. viii. 28; Luke viii. 26; Mark v. 1 (everywhere, country of the G.). Matt. viii. 34 (the whole town; its borders). Luke viii. 26 (voyage down); 34 (town and country); comp. 37, 39. Mark v. 14 (town and country); 20 (Decapolis). Khersa would have been situated in the Gaulonitis, like Gamala, and would have had simply nothing to do with Decapolis. Also Meyer, Schenkel, Weizs., Winer, for Gadara; Bleek, Ewald, Lange, for Gergesa; Casp. and others, uncertain.

Sheriat-el-Mandhur.¹ Its modern name is Dshedâr; and its ruins have been discovered by Seetzen and Burckhardt in the village Umkeis, covering a parallelogram more than half an English mile long, a league to the south of the meandering hill-enclosed river, on the ridge of the limestone and basaltic chain to the south-east of the Lake of Gennesar, and distant from that lake between two and three leagues.² We meet with this town as early as in the Syrian times. It was taken by king Alexander Jannæus after a ten months' siege, and was destroyed by the Jews. The Roman Pompey rebuilt it (B.C. 64) at the wish of his freedman Demetrius; and Gabinius made it the seat of the second national council.³ In B.C. 30, it passed into the hands of king Herod as a gift from Octavian, but was not happy under the king, and at his death (B.C. 4) it was restored to the Roman province of Syria, and became one of the confederated Ten Cities.⁴ It was reckoned a Greek city from the time of the emperor Augustus till that of Gordian, and its numerous coins exhibit Jupiter and the Tyrian Hercules; whilst there are to be found in Strabo several celebrated scholars who sprang from this place: hence its antipathy to Judaism.⁵ Nevertheless many Jews dwelt there; and though in the beginning of the last Jewish war, Gadara exhibited, both at home and abroad, animosities of all kinds against the Jews, it soon became an ally of the Jewish revolution. It passed into the hands of the enemy only through the treachery of some of its nobility; and a great part of the population that left the town fell fighting bravely against Rome

¹ Jos. *B. J.* 4, 7, 3; *Vita*, 65. Eus. *Onom.* 132: ἐν τῷ ὄρει. Pliny, 5, 16: Hieromiace præfluente.

² Comp. article *Gadara* in Winer, Herzog, and Schenkel.

³ Jos. *Ant.* 12, 7, 4; 13, 13, 3; (Pompey) 14, 4, 4; *B. J.* 1, 7, 7.

⁴ Jos. *Ant.* 15, 7, 3; 15, 10, 2 sq. (complaints against the temple-plunderer, Herod). Syria, *ib.* *B. J.* 2, 6, 3; *Ant.* 17, 11, 4. Decapolis (the largest city of which was the neighbouring Scythopolis, *B. J.* 3, 9, 7, with at least 40,000 inhabitants, *B. J.* 2, 18, 3; *Vita*, 6), Pliny, 5, 16; Ptolem. 5, 17; Eus. *Onom.* 171, 133. Rabbis, in Lightfoot, p. 563.

⁵ Greek town, Jos. *Ant.* 17, 11, 4. Coins, in Eckhel, III. pp. 348 sqq. Strabo, 16, 2, seems to confound Gederah beyond Jabneh with the more important Gadara.

at Jericho and Tarichæa.¹ The town, favourably situated in proximity to the lake, and on the great connecting roads of Peræa, the lake, and the Jordan valley, and renowned for its still frequented hot sulphur springs (Chammat) on the bank of the river, possessed many rich inhabitants. Its district, the Gadaris or Gadaritis, extended to the lake, on which account its coins bear ships and sea-fights; and Josephus reckoned its distance from Tiberias as only about three leagues, plainly meaning not from the town, but from the boundary of its district on the lake shore.² He makes its size, its territory, appear very considerable, speaking in one place of a people [ἐθνος] of the Gadarenes.³ The town seems to have developed its greatest prosperity under the Antonines. Remains of temples and theatres, a high road paved with stones and flanked with columns, a quantity of rectangular masonry and marble pillars, a number of sarcophagi, and the large extent of the ruins as a whole, tell of its former splendour. It is quite evident that these accounts, as well as the reports we have of the many sepulchral caves, in which nearly two hundred troglodytes dwell at the present day, perfectly correspond with the Gadara of the Evangelists; and as to the much-discussed route taken by the swine, we have long since set our minds at rest about the difficulties of Origen and recent writers, by the aid of the fact that it was not the town, but the district belonging to the town, which afforded to the swine the required declivity.⁴ Now a retirement towards Gadara protected Jesus completely from the arms and even from the eyes of his opponents. The Greco-Roman ground excluded all the operations, not only of Antipas, but also of the Pharisees, more completely even than the district of Julias. Nay, the thought would never occur to his opponents that Jesus, the Jew with Jewish

¹ Jos. *B. J.* 2, 18, 1 and 5; 3, 10, 10; 4, 7, 3 sq. and 6. Jews in Decapolis, also Matt. iv. 25.

² Wealth, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 7, 3 sqq. Gadaris, *B. J.* 3, 3, 1 (inhabitants Gadareis, *Ant.* 15, 10, 2), and Gadaritis, *B. J.* 3, 10, 10. Also coins, in Eckhel, *l. c.* Thermal springs, Eus. *Onom.* 133. Sixty stadia, Jos. *Vita*, 65.

³ Jos. *Vita*, 10.

⁴ See above, p. 151.

principles, would have withdrawn into this country of the Gentiles. On this very account, the procedure is a very significant sign of the increasing straits of Jesus; though we must not overlook the fact that he went, not to a purely Gentile population, but only to one that was mixed. The retreat was, however, suddenly arrested by Jesus' meeting with the two assailant demoniacs. But whether Jesus immediately returned to Capernaum must remain an open question, even though the Gospels be held to have spoken plainly upon the point; in truth, they report the return only generally, and the waiting of the people for his return would be better explained by the longer absence than by the shorter one. If we could rely upon Mark, who, besides this short visit to Decapolis, speaks of a later and longer one, we might well combine the two visits and introduce a retirement of several days, or indeed of several weeks, into the district of Hippos, Pella, and Scythopolis.¹

A new occasion of fear is to be found in the collision between Jesus and the Pharisees on the question of the principle of purifying, which is narrated by the Gospels immediately after the return from Julias. This was, as we saw, the greatest and the most decisive of all the struggles of the Galilean period. It was marked by a deputation from Jerusalem; an inquiry as to Jesus' non-observance of the ordinances; Jesus' terrible denunciation of the breach of the inviolable ordinances of God by hypocritical human doctrines; his repudiation of the system because based on false principles; his explanation to the people of the true nature of the system as opposed to God: in fact, it was a decisive blow at his enemies, and from it he learnt that the victory of his words would necessarily be closely followed by more active intrigue—nay, by the employment of force on the part of his foes. He went away from the place, and retreated—apparently in the beginning of winter—to the region of Tyre and Sidon. Thus Matthew relates; whilst Mark describes first a

¹ Mark vii. 31; it is however untenable; see below, pp. 247 sq.

quiet retirement to the house, and then, without any reason, the distant excursion.¹

This journey to the north-west was one of Jesus' longest marches; though the goal towards which he was pressing can no longer be exactly determined. Mark alone says that he went over the boundaries of Tyre as far as Sidon; indeed, this distant extension of his journey is simply not possible, except in the eyes of those who regard the whole merely as a beautiful fiction, that is, as a journey imagined by the Gentile-Christian author. Jesus had no reason for retiring to a greater distance than was necessary; his principles prevented him from setting foot on purely Gentile ground; and, finally, the intentional alteration of the more moderate older representation with a view to show Jesus among the Gentiles, is quite evident.² The road from Capernaum to the region of Tyre would alone represent a journey of from twelve to fifteen leagues, and that from Tyre to Sidon another of from eight to ten leagues.³ According to Matthew, Jesus went only to the Tyro-Sidonian frontier, and from the Tyro-Phœnician region came out to him the Canaanite woman entreating him on behalf of her daughter.⁴ But the district of the maritime city of Tyre—which city was still prosperous after all the storms of conquest that had swept over it, and luxuriously splendid in spite of its narrow, crooked lanes of inconveniently high houses and its disagreeable factory odours—extended far inland to Galilee.⁵ Only five leagues north-west of Capernaum, in the

¹ Matt. xv. 21; Mark vii. 24 (comp. 17). The controversy, see above, pp. 16 sqq.

² Naturally, Volkmar has here also again pleaded for the Mark-poesy; and has traced, even in the mention of bread (pp. 384 sqq.), the imitation of Elijah's journey to Sarepta near Sidon (1 Kings xvii. 9), *i. e.* between Tyre and Sidon! In order to make this possible, instead of the oldest reading, Mark vii. 24, ὄρια Τύρου, he is compelled to read μεθόρια.

³ Thus, after Van de Velde. Strabo (16, 2) reckons the distance from Tyre to Sidon 200 stadia, Antoninus Martyr 24 miles=10 leagues.

⁴ Phœnicians as Canaanites, Gen. x. 19. Also according to Obadiah 20. Sidon may be mentioned in addition to Tyre merely to complete the designation of Phœnicia, as Matt. xi. 21. Ecclesiastical tradition, it is true, knows something of an occurrence at the city of Sidon, and can point to a chapel. Lightfoot, p. 414.

⁵ Tyre, Strabo, 16, 2; Pliny, 5, 17. Luxuriousness, Matt. xi. 21.

neighbourhood of the town of Giskala (at present El-Dshish)—a town rendered famous by the last Jewish war—there lay Tyrian villages; and the old Jewish town of Kedesh or Kedesa (now Kades), seven leagues north of Capernaum, and midway between Tyre and Sidon, was a Tyrian possession.¹ Assuming the old and abolished country and tribal frontiers, there is so far nothing to show that Jesus went through the whole of the north-western hill district, the present Belad Besharah, to the gates of Tyre, namely, as far as the town of Kama in the tribe of Asher (still a large village). He probably pushed his way no further than to the region of Kedesh in a northerly, or of Giskala in a north-westerly, direction. He now trod, for the first time, the hill country of Upper Galilee, which begins north-west of the Lake of Gennesar. He went along the Damascus road through the hills to the Khan Dshubb Jusuf (Joseph's Grave), whence he could go to Kedesh either over the Safed hill—which lay three leagues from the lake—and its northern spurs, or to the left of the mountain bights of the upper Jordan valley. To the vine-clad hill of Giskala, the road led, alternately rugged and pleasant, and rich in fine prospects, past the highest points of Naphtali and Galilee, the Dshebel Safed rising to a height of 3000 feet on the right, and Dshebel Dshermak to a height of 4000 feet on the left. From Giskala it was five leagues to Tibnin, and another five to Tyre.² Either here or there, Jesus would be in perfect security. Since he sought safety and had no missionary intentions, nothing is said of preaching and healing either in Upper Galilee or, least of all, in the Tyrian Gentile region: a cessation of activity which Mark has, in a trivial and affected manner, described, representing Jesus going into a house in which he seeks to preserve a strict *incognito*, but unsuccessfully,

¹ Tyrian strongholds near Giskala (see above, II. p. 8, note 1), *Jos. B. J.* 4, 2, 2 sq.; *Vita*, 10 (Tyrian neighbours of G.). Kedasa of the Tyrians, *B. J.* 2, 18, 1; comp. 3, 3, 1.

² According to *Jos. B. J.* 3, 3, 1; 2, 20, 6, Upper Galilee begins with Bersabe, near Jotapata, north of the plain of Buttauf; according to the Talmud (*Lightfoot*, p. 140), with Kefr Anan, south of Dshermak. But see Van de Velde, and Furrer (pp. 332 sqq.).

since a Greek woman, a Syro-Phœnician, the well-known Canaanitish woman of Matthew, at once hears of him, and, falling at his feet, begs aid for her daughter.¹ Mark, however, so far adheres to historical truth, that, though he makes Jesus travel through the Tyrian region and through the Phœnician metropolis Sidon, he does not mention any other instance of his activity, intending the whole journey to be merely a dumb prophecy of the subsequent introduction of Christianity to Phœnicia, or among the Gentiles generally, in the age of the Apostles.²

We have no reliable account of the return journey. Matthew favours the assumption that Jesus took the road leading from the hill district in a south-easterly direction to the Jordan valley, and returned to the Lake of Gennesar by the outer or inner road on the right side of the Jordan, so that he went "along" the lake shore to his home. But it must be objected that the author introduced this route merely on account of the following second feeding, the copy of that of Bethsaida.³ This route, however, is far preferable to the totally erroneous one which Mark would have us accept. He says that from the far distant Sidon, in the same latitude as Damascus, Jesus returned to the Lake of Gennesar through the district of the Ten Cities. This route would agree with the other in this respect, that Jesus would travel in the Jordan valley, though on the left side, for there lay the mass of the country of Decapolis. But it is impossible to make out what special geographical ideas Mark connected with the district of the Ten Cities,—whether he regarded the whole country from Sidon to the Jordan and the Lake of Gennesar as the district of

¹ Φοινίκη Συρία, Diod. 19, 93. Συροφοινίκη, Justin, *Τρυφή*, 78. Συροφείνιξ, Lucian, *Conc. Decor.* 4. Syria Paëstina, Tert. *Ap.* 5, as already Herod. 3, 91; 4, 39. According to Volkmar, the Syria in the designation of the woman points to the Pauline Syria, the Phœnicia to Elijah.

² According to Ewald (pp. 452 sqq.), it was not only on account of the ban (!) against him in Galilee, but also because of his friendly feeling towards the Gentiles, that Jesus went to Sidon, as far as Jews had dwelt! According to Schenkel (pp. 130 sq.), he wished to study the disposition of the people. Such as hunt after myths, might explain Matt. xv. 21 out of xi. 21.

³ Matt. xv. 29; comp. above, p. 200.

the Ten Cities, or whether he gave to that district the position which seems to be historically attested, and which he himself recognizes in Jesus' journey to Gadara, namely, south-east of the Lake of Gennesar.¹ If, as is most reasonable, we are to assume the latter, then, in his description of the return journey, he has not only in a wonderful manner completely omitted the whole extent of country between Sidon and the Lake of Gennesar—namely, Cælo-Syria, Paneas, Ulatha (Chul, Huleh), or the country of Merom, and Golan—but he has also represented Jesus as traversing the whole of the eastern shore of the lake, and has located the second feeding on the southern shore in the region of Hippos and Gadara, instead of on the northern shore in the region of Julias. This route of travel is, however, purely fabulous. The distances are immense; for from Sidon to Julias would have been a three days' journey, thence to the southern shore another day's journey, and Jesus would have had to travel through broad tracts

¹ Decapolis (Matt. iv. 25; Jos. *B. J.* 3, 9, 7; comp. *Vita*, 65: οἱ τῶν ἑκα πόλεων ἔθνη; also 74: οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν τῆς Συρίας ἑκα π.; Pliny, 5, 16 sq.: decapolitana regio; Ptolemy, 5, 15, 22: Δεκαπόλιος πόλις) was a confederacy of Ten Cities, of which several belonged temporarily to the Jewish kingdom, as Gadara, Hippos (*Ant.* 17, 11, 4), even Scythopolis (when under the jurisdiction of Agrippa II., *Vita*, 65; comp. *B. J.* 3, 9, 7). Under Roman supremacy (the province of Syria) they were united for the fostering of common interests, and also for military protection (*Vita*, 65, 74; comp. Strabo, 16, 2); at the head of the confederacy stood the πρῶτοι of the several cities (*Vita*, 74), who, *e. g.*, laid complaints before the Romans (*ib.* 65, 74). Among the cities of Decapolis near to Tiberias (*Vita*, 65), Josephus reckons in the first place Scythopolis, the greatest of those cities (*B. J.* 3, 9, 7); agreeing with him (*B. J.* 2, 18, 1; *Ant.* 15, 7, 3), Ptolemy, 5, 15, 22, gives as its neighbours Hippos, Kapitolias, Gadara, Gerasa, Pella, Dios, Philadelphia, Kanatha, &c. Eus. *On.* 170: αὐτῆ (Decap.) ἔστιν ἡ ἐπὶ Περσεία κειμένη ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἰππον καὶ Πέλλαν καὶ Γαδάρων. Comp. the correct delineation in Menke's *Bibelatlas*. Lightfoot (pp. 417 sqq.) has quite groundlessly and untenably reckoned with them Cæsarea Philippi, Kapbar Zemach, Kapbar Karnaim, and Beth Gubrin. The facts given above show very plainly that the Ten Cities lay S.E. of the lake of Gennesar, and that Pliny's view (5, 16)—expressed with a reservation—that Damascus and Raphana (see above, I. p. 267, note 3) in Cælo-Syria belonged to Decapolis, is erroneous. Josephus never reckons Damascus, which was so much greater than Scythop., as one of those cities. Even Mark looks for Decapolis near Gadara (v. 20), which agrees with the above. Hence, once more, Volkmar has no ground whatever for thinking (p. 388) of Damascus and Cæsarea as cities of Decapolis which Jesus, *i. e.* Paul, visited. Such mistakes are on a par with the notices of Capernaum (p. 84), Bethsaida, Megiddo, Nain, and the pro-consuls (sic) Quirinus (sic) and Vitellius; see also below, p. 254, note.

of Gentile territory.¹ We have not here to go into the question of correctness, for that is decided by what we have seen above, and by the steadfast tradition of the feeding on the northern side of the lake near Julias; but we have to seek an explanation of the mistake. In the first place, that this author did not possess exact conceptions of these routes is shown by the great leap to Sidon, and then the omission of the country between Sidon and the Ten Cities. In the next place, it would appear that Matthew misled him; for when the latter spoke of a journey along the lake shore, Mark thought of a complete circuit of the lake. Finally, already on a false track, Mark found it appropriate to make Jesus wander through Decapolis as he had done Phœnicia, i.e. not indeed, as Volkmar thinks, the Pauline Damascus and Arabia, but the south-eastern, as previously the north-western, Gentile neighbourhood of Galilee.² It was indeed interesting to think of Jesus as coming into contact with the Gentiles on all sides, and healing their demoniacs, their blind, and their deaf mutes. And there really existed later a Christian Decapolis; and the well-watered Pella, south of Gadara, was a place of refuge for the Christians both before and after the destruction of Jerusalem.³ In this way, then, through misunderstanding, and on the basis, not of tradition, but of fancy, these remarkable and closely resembling journeys of Mark's came into existence. And though it appears almost as if Mark wished—at least supplementarily—to treat Jesus' journeys of flight as serious realities, the prodigiousness of these tours is made still more apparent by the perception that neither their commencements nor their closes exhibit a flight, and therefore show no good and reasonable ground for the gigantic extent ascribed to these journeys.

Soon after, according to the Gospels almost immediately, probably in February or March, A.D. 35, followed the fourth and

¹ From Sidon to Julias, 17 leagues; thence to the southern part of the lake, 5 to 6 leagues.

² Volkmar, p. 388, with so many inaccuracies.

³ Pellam aquis divitem, Pliny, 5, 16. On the deaf mute, Mark vii. 32; see above, III. pp. 155 sqq., 184.

last retreat of Jesus, again northerly, but this time into the north-east.¹ Immediately after his return home, Matthew says in the borders of Magdala, Mark says in the "Shady Place" (Dalmanutha), the indefatigable and well-represented Pharisees again presented themselves before him, and tempted him by begging a sign from heaven, i.e. a Messianic sign. No sure reliance is to be placed upon the localities just mentioned, as they may refer to the terminus of the first flight and not of the third; but we have already noticed the fact of the conversation, and Jesus' curt refusal, which must have afresh endangered his position.² On this ground the plausible supposition is to be rejected that this journey is not a fresh one, but is connected with the previous, the third, one, and is thus simply the return from Kedesh through Caesarea Philippi. The suspicious new onset gave no encouragement to sitting still; and with the brief, incisive, newly provocative answer—which Mark, indeed, tones down—Jesus quickly left his opponents and re-embarked, without giving his disciples time to think of providing food. Only one loaf, Mark says, was taken on board. They again crossed the lake to the eastern shore.³

On the way, Jesus, his mind filled with thoughts suggested by the new occurrence, by the unyielding, venomous enmity of his opponents, warned his disciples against the "leaven" of the Pharisees.⁴ If Jesus actually used the word on this occasion, it

¹ Since, according to Matt. xvii. 24, xix. 1, the journey to Jerusalem soon followed this retreat, the latter must be placed in the very beginning of the spring. In Palestine, winter lasts from November to January as a rainy season, and snow also occurs towards the end of the season. But the snow does not lie long on the ground, and is mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 14, 15, 4) as something remarkable; but its possibility would make travelling inadvisable. As spring weather does not begin until February and March, and even then the roads are in very bad condition, the time mentioned in the text is the earliest that can be fixed upon. Comp. article *Witterung* in Winer; and Arnold, *Paläst.* in Herzog.

² See above, p. 13.

³ Matt. xvi. 1, 4 sq., 13; Mark viii. 11. On the controversy, see above, p. 13. Magdala and Dalmanutha, see above, p. 238.

⁴ Matt. xvi. 6 has the addition of the Sadducees; Mark viii. 15 has Herod. Comp. Luke xii. 1.

remains a question whether by "leaven" he meant, as Matthew and Luke think, the doctrines and practice of the Pharisees, or their malice, as Mark intimates. In the latter case it was a warning for the disciples to be on their guard against the plots and snares of the opponents.¹ According to the Gospels, the disciples misunderstood the reference of the word, and applied it to their lack of provisions, of bread. This gross and altogether inconceivable misunderstanding could not have occurred. The same may be said of the censure by which Jesus—according to Mark, with special harshness—reminded the disciples of the miracles of the first and second feeding.² For this reason the conversation during the passage across the lake cannot be securely established. Yet it is possible that, through the association of ideas, Jesus' warning led the disciples to give expression to their anxiety concerning their lack of provisions, and that Jesus replied to them with his reproach of littleness of faith; whilst subsequently, in the narration of the circumstance, an artificial connecting-link was made between the saying about leaven and the loaves, and between the loaves and the miracles of feeding.³ We know with certainty nothing of the journey, except its goal, Cæsarea Philippi. Mark gives the more detailed information that Jesus went first into the village, or more correctly town, of Bethsaida or Julias.⁴ We need not positively distrust this communication, either on account of the public entry into the town, or of the late narrative of the blind man of Bethsaida which hangs thereupon, or, finally, of the perhaps artistic re-union of Mark with Luke, who leaps at once from the feeding at Beth-

¹ Matt. xvi. 6, 12; Luke xii. 1; Mark viii. 15, 21. Comp. *Bab. Berac.* f. 17, 1: quod impedit voluntatem tuam nos facere, tu subde: fermentum scil. quod est in massa (Gloss. pravi affectus) et tyrannidem regnorum. Lightfoot, p. 334.

² Matt. xvi. 7 sqq.; Mark viii. 16 sqq. Could the disciples have understood that they were to buy no bread of Pharisees?

³ If—with Volkmar—we think of the western Bethsaida, then the anxiety about bread is entirely unintelligible, for in the west Jesus was well known and was at home. The anxiety could have been felt only in the unknown east, imperfectly provided with the necessary means of obtaining food.

⁴ Mark viii. 22. Here It. has *castellum*.

saida to the occurrences at Cæsarea Philippi, to which indeed Matthew and Mark pass, but more slowly.¹ It must, after all, be acknowledged that the route to Cæsarea might lead through Bethsaida: Jesus might here, in the security of the Roman province, make his first halt, and then, returning to the right bank of the Jordan, pass on by the river-side road, for a distance of about three leagues, to the locality of the present ancient basaltic Jacob's Bridge (Dshisr benat Jakub).² Here he would again take—first on the Damascus road—the left bank of the river, and scale the heights by the side of the little Lake of Merom, the prelude to that of Gennesar, about two leagues in length and breadth. Going round the plain of Merom (Ard el Huleh), at this time of the year converted into a part of the lake and rendered quite impassable, a journey of six leagues would bring him to the village-district which bounded Cæsarea Philippi on the south.

He here stood on the border-line of the ancient land of Israel—the measure of whose length “from Dan (near Cæsarea) to Beersheba” had become proverbial—and in a district which, judged by the eye alone, was one of the most splendid and luxuriant of the country, one which had of old been much visited and admired.³ Here, between the numerous sources of the Jordan, lie tracts of exceedingly fertile marsh land, where, as early as the days of the Judges, the Danites, migrating from the south, found everything that the earth could produce. Here are fields with wheat, barley, maize, sesame, and rice; hedges of olives and stretches of luxuriant pasturage; while in summer the whole district is a sea of flowers, whence the bees gather a rich harvest.⁴

¹ On the blind, Mark viii. 22; see above, III. pp. 155 sqq., 184.

² See Van de Velde; there can be no doubt concerning this route. Cæsarea, Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27. Luke ix. 18 gives the situation, but not the place. Matthew speaks of the regions or districts of Cæsarea (comp. xv. 21, ii. 22; Mark viii. 10; Acts ii. 10); Mark, of villages. The plain of Merom, particularly in inclement seasons, a swamp, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 1, 1.

³ Boundaries, 2 Sam. xvii. 11, &c. The country, Jos. *B. J.* 3, 10, 7; 4, 1, 1.

⁴ Judges xviii. 10; Jos. *Ant.* 5, 3, 1: γῆ ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶμφυρος. Comp. Jos. on the sources of the Jordan, *B. J.* 3, 10, 7; *Ant.* 15, 10, 3. In modern times, Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. p. 195; Robinson; Furrer, *Hand.* p. 362.

The Jordan, here only twenty paces wide, and the many nameless sources and brooks which are collected in its channel, sportively dash their clear, sparkling waters into foam among islands and rocks. A thicket of oaks, terebinths, *Sindian* trees, and bushes, alive with all kinds of birds, surrounds the foot-hills of Hermon, whose snow-capped summit rises above bald and broken walls of rock. Then there are the towns, the villages, and beyond Cæsarea there rises proudly and boldly from its girdle of ravines, to the height of 700 feet, the castle, the tower on Lebanon, which looks towards Damascus. Certainly here Jesus was no longer in Israel. On the left was the town of Dan, Grecized into Daphne, the ancient pleasure-loving Sidonian Laish, with Jero-boam's temple of the Golden Calf, to which Josephus was still able to point, at the source of the "Lesser Jordan."¹ On the right, in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea, there was the three-fold charm of the district: the mysterious rocky grotto of the Greek pastoral god Pan, with its unfathomable well of water, and with well-conceived decorations of inscriptions and statues in niches; outside on the hill, the crystalline, copious springs of the Jordan gushing from the perpendicular rocks; and, vying with the charms of nature, the splendid marble temple of Augustus—who was deified while living—built in B.C. 19 by Herod as an expression of gratitude for the gift of the district of Paneas and Ulatha. Cæsarea itself, the ancient Paneas, existing to this day, among a quantity of ruins, as a handful of about 150 houses bearing the name "Baniyas," lay in the angle formed by two arms of the Jordan. It was a creation of Herod's son Philip, who built here, B.C. 3, his well-walled residence city, and called it after Cæsar Augustus. It was enlarged by Agrippa II., about A.D. 64, and named Neronias, in honour of Nero. This

¹ *Jos. Ant.* 8, 8, 4. The geographical ideas of Josephus concerning the sources of the Jordan are very imperfect. In the main, he knows only of the two sources at Dan and Panion; in *B. J.* 3, 10, 7, he traces the source back from Panion to the Phiala lake, which had a subterranean connection with Panion. A branch does, in fact, flow from this eastern district; several branches come from the north, particularly (quite unknown to Josephus) the copious Hasbany, which rises far beyond Cæsarea.

city was of a preponderantly Gentile character, notwithstanding its numerous Jewish inhabitants; and it was proud of its temple of Augustus, which Philip stamped upon his coins in the form of four pillars. In July, A.D. 67, and again in October, A.D. 70, it was the glad participator in the offerings and festivities of Vespasian and Titus in celebration of the subjugation of Galilee and the destruction of Jerusalem.¹ We do not know how much of this heathenism Jesus saw and gazed upon; for, according to the Gospels, he did not enter the city of Cæsarea itself, but visited only the villages in its neighbourhood. However much or little he saw, here in this Roman country he was quite safe from the intrigues of his foes; but so much the more certainly was he as good as completely outside of Israel. The feeling that he was driven out from among the people whom he wished to serve, the consciousness of being thrown into an unnatural and intolerable position, weighed powerfully on his mind during this journey. Under the pressure of such gloomy thoughts, he had no time to grieve over the losses which his people had suffered here since the days of Solomon and of Jeroboam; and he had no eyes for the glories of nature, to which he generally gave a loving attention, and which wooed him here with the first balmy breath of spring. Here he became the subject of a heavy presentiment,

¹ Laish, Judges xviii. 27—31; 1 Kings xii. 28—30; *Jos. Ant.* 8, 8, 4; *B. J.* 4, 1, 1. Comp. the idolatry surviving to the third Christian century, when a sacrificial animal was yearly sunk in the spring, *Eus. H. E.* 7, 17. Panion (also Paneion) *Jos. B. J.* 1, 21, 3; 3, 10, 7; *Ant.* 15, 10, 3 sq.; 18, 2, 1. Temple of Herod, *B. J.* 1, 21, 3; *Ant.* 15, 10, 3. The country called Panias, *ib.* 17, 8, 1 (in distinction from the city Paneas, *B. J.* 2, 9, 1; *Ant.* 18, 2, 1, and to Paneion or Panion). Volkmar looks for Cæsarea in Gaulonitis (so indeed does Overbeck, article *Cæsarea* in *Bibel-Lexikon*), and in Decapolis; and represents it as named by Philip, the prince of Ituræa (!), son of Alexandra (!), in honour of Tiberius! See *Ant.* 18, 2, 1, opp. *B. J.* 2, 9, 1. The city of Cæsarea—Talm. Buxt. p. 2082, Kesa ja (on)—is distinguished from the Herodian Cæsarea *ad mare*, by being called Cæsarea Philippi (*Matt.* xvi. 13; *Jos. Vita*, 13, &c.), Cæsarea Sebaste (*Eckhel*, III. p. 491), or Cæsarea the place of refuge (*Eckhel*), or Cæsarea Paneas (*Pliny*, 5, 15; *Ptolemy*, 5, 15). Later, often again Paneas. *Eus.* 7, 17: C. Ph. which the Phœnicians call Paneas. *Bibel-Lexikon*, III. p. 41. Jewish inhabitants, *Jos. Vita*, 13. The celebrated Alexandrian peripatetic in the second century before Christ, Aristobulus, is said to have sprung from Paneas (see above, I. p. 280). The later festivities, *B. J.* 3, 9, 7; 7, 2, 1. *Bibel-Lex.* III. pp. 62 sq. Neronias, *Ant.* 20, 9, 4.

and here he made a strong resolve. Tentatively looking in every direction, and amid a hundred distresses and self-deprivations, he had sought air, freedom, deliverance. But what remained to him if he merely saved himself and not Israel, whom he would have to renounce if he went forth alone? In the insupportableness of this existence, he resolved to bow to his destiny, nay, to the will of God, who was afresh showing him his path, the path of the Jordan from its source to its mouth, the long, mysterious, dangerous, but great path to Jerusalem.¹

¹ Comp. Schleierm. p. 406.

DIVISION V.—RECOGNITION OF THE MESSIAH, AND
FORESHADOWING OF THE CROSS.

A.—THE PROCLAMATION OF THE MESSIAH AT CÆSAREA PHILIPPI.

THE retreats of Jesus were not merely journeys of flight, they were epochs of reflection. He could best retire within himself and draw near to God when he had left the tumult and importunity of men behind him, when the loneliness and solemnity of the situation checked conversation even in the circle of his intimate companions, and imposed silence upon every one. It was doubtless because he had internally to labour, to think, to test, to choose, and to do all this with the full energy of which he was capable, that he pushed the goal of his wandering, on this journey, farther off than was absolutely necessary. Julius and its environs, nine leagues nearer than the remote northern Cæsarea, would have afforded him all the protection he needed. Hence every league, every step, farther is a mark of internal questionings and conflicts which refused to be decided, growing in magnitude until they threatened to break up that lofty self-confidence with which Jesus had begun, and to resolve it into a hair-splitting irresoluteness. We can scarcely think of him otherwise than as Mark describes him when going up to Jerusalem: he himself in advance, only not so courageous and determined as then, but lost in profound meditation; and the disciples as then—nay, quite otherwise than then, following their Master's footsteps with anxiety and alarm.¹ At Cæsarea Philippi he halts. Out of his reverie and brooding, and out of the pressure of external influences—of flight, privation, foreign surroundings, the Gentile atmosphere—there is begotten, with the aid of the

¹ Mark x. 32.

prayers mentioned by Luke, a distinct idea which he himself discloses and no longer hides from his associates.¹

At Cæsarea, in the autumn of A.D. 70, the military hero of Rome, Caesar Titus, with his mistress, the Herodian Bernice, celebrated in the marble temple of Augustus, with hecatombs of thank-offerings and with human sacrifices, the triumph over Israel and Jerusalem. At Cæsarea, a generation—exactly thirty-five years—before the presence there of the mortal enemy, the so much greater hero of the spirit, with whose history we are now concerned, resolved upon a march to Jerusalem, a struggle for life or death, an attempt to save his people from the internal and the external enemy by the sacrifice of *his own* life.² Ever since Jesus had known himself to be the Messiah of Israel, Jerusalem had been the ultimate goal of his undertaking, and Galilee only the starting-point. At Jerusalem was the temple; there were the ministers and teachers of the temple; there had the prophets laboured; there had David reigned; there must the Messiah rule, establish the honour of God, create the kingdom of the Great King. As the Messiah of Israel, he had always destined the bread of his gospel for all the children, the whole house, of Israel, the twelve tribes, and not merely the tribes of the north.³ In his Sermon on the Mount he had spoken of the city of the Great King.⁴ He had borne witness to the priests of Jerusalem, and had threatened the scribes of Jerusalem with the downfall of their ordinances.⁵ Pointing to the harbingers of divine anger, he had warned Galilee, together with Judea and Jerusalem, to repent, if they would not suffer ruin.⁶ From the beginning, Jerusalem had been merely a question of time, and

¹ Luke ix. 18. To pages 248, 254, above, add that even Ewald (p. 96) looks for Cæsarea in Decapolis, appealing to Pliny, 5, 16, where Paneas is directly distinguished from Decapolis. Meyer (p. 317), in Gaulonitis! Others have followed in the same wake.

² Jos. *B. J.* 7, 2, 1; comp. above, p. 254. During the long sojourn of Titus, numerous Jewish prisoners must have died either in fighting with beasts, or in a kind of gladiatorial conflict.

³ Matt. x. 6, xv. 26.

⁴ Matt. v. 35 (Ps. xlvi. 3; Isaiah lx. 14).

⁵ Matt. viii. 4, xv. 9, 13.

⁶ Luke xiii. 1 sqq.; Matt. xv. 14.

had now become the urgent question of the moment. He could, in truth, no longer refrain from assuming his Messiahship; that which had been impressed upon his mind from within and without did not bow before the storm; we have seen that it grew under the storm. But his Galilean ministry was at an end. He saw with sorrow it was not perfected; but at the close of so many flights, he knew it was irretrievably frustrated and cut short.¹ He could go back, but only to succumb altogether; for he had completed nothing in Galilee, had begun nothing at Jerusalem, whilst it was his mission to begin and to complete his work at Jerusalem. Thus he found that he must go in the name of God to Jerusalem; and that quickly, for his fate was quickly approaching, and the will of God, which besides the Pharisees and Herod shut Galilee to him, was urgent. The divine intimation was clear and steady; the way was plain; but the result remained obscure to him. His course must be otherwise than in Galilee. He could no longer tread the quiet path of the teacher of the kingdom of God. This course was too slow, too barren of decisive results, too powerless against the accumulated resources of the enemies into whose hands he must fall before he could fulfil his destiny of being the Messiah. At the same time, the Galilean testimony had been much too clearly and fully delivered to leave it possible for him to begin altogether afresh at Jerusalem. He had always openly avowed what he wished for; all knew what he thought of himself and of his opponents, whose teaching he had denounced before the people, and whose fall he had predicted.² It was now, much more than during the months he had just passed through, his business and aim to exhibit a Johannine candour and regardlessness of consequences: he must be the Messiah; he must exhibit the Messiah; he must excite a movement among the people who during the next few weeks would crowd to Jerusalem by millions to keep the Passover. He must strike his opponents with a sharper weapon, and thus in

¹ Thus (notwithstanding John) correctly also Schleierm. p. 406.

² Matt. xv. 13 sq.

Jerusalem win at once what in Galilee he had long been fighting for, but had eventually lost. The whole of the subsequent history shows that two presentiments were at conflict within him as to the result. It seemed possible, through the decision of the assembled nation to whom he would appeal, and still more as the result of the appointment of God, who would guide the hearts of men and aid by the mighty works of His arm, that it should be granted him to gather power, like the mountain stream swelling in strength as it flowed from Cæsarea to Jericho, and to make his Messiahship a recognized fact. Yet in calm meditation upon all the circumstances and all the indications of the time, it seemed to him much more probable that he, already by the will of God a mere fugitive on foreign soil, should, in the stronghold of the ancient rigid faith and of the fanatical watchmen of Zion, be compelled to yield to the malice and violence of his foes, and to commit the salvation of his honour, his person, his kingdom, to God. This uncertainty did not paralyze his resolve. He steadfastly adhered to this ending of his perpetual retreats, this bold progress to Jerusalem. He resolutely suppressed his human desires and hopes, the human voice of his immediate personal predilection, in order to play the hero in the path of duty, and as a pious Israelite to leave the final decision to God. Thus he resolved, on the one hand, to strive with all bravery to conquer the position at Jerusalem; and, on the other hand, in the midst of the obscurity of his destiny, to realize to his own consciousness and to that of his disciples the lofty seriousness of the situation, the loud menace of death, the mysterious divine purposes.

The disciples had the first claim upon the silent process of thought, upon the solemn mental work, which Jesus had here completed within himself. He could not withhold from them his secrets, because he felt towards them a human love, and because he needed, not, it is true, their advice on the course to be pursued, but their co-operation. If he would be the Messiah in Jerusalem, he must first know the Messianic sentiment of the Galilean people and of his disciples, concerning which he, in his

noble self-reliance, had hitherto never inquired; and he must have his disciples, to a certain extent also the Galileans, as associates, adherents, and escort. If he were destined to fall in Jerusalem, they must be prepared for the tragical issue, and for their task after the Master's death.¹ Hence we have those solemn questions and disclosures at Cæsarea Philippi to which we also owe our first glimpse of the secret thoughts and resolves of Jesus. All the Gospels are acquainted with these great disclosures; but Luke has located them indefinitely at some spot where Jesus prayed, and John in the neighbourhood of Capernaum.² The various accounts also exhibit more important divergences; yet the three earlier Gospels, with Matthew at their head, agree in the main, whilst John betrays his arbitrary treatment of the subject when he builds on the foundation of his predecessors.

In the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi—by the way, according to Mark—Jesus suddenly addressed to his twelve disciples the question, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" He asked for the opinion of the people concerning his person; and he asked for the conception which the people attached to the veiling and yet revealing name which he had hitherto almost exclusively borne.³ The disciples enumerated to him the whole

¹ Schenkel, contrary to the authorities, speaks of an appeasing of the doubt and vacillation of the disciples. Jesus had been *driven to a declaration*, p. 138. This suggests both Weizs., p. 545, and Grätz, III. p. 239, according to whom Jesus was compelled to make the Messianic entry.

² Matt. xvi. 13—28; Luke ix. 8; Mark viii. 27; John vi. 59 sq.

³ Matt. xvi. 13. Me is—in spite of Bleek, II. p. 44—to be struck out, with Sin., Vat., It., Vulg. Luke and Mark diminish the force of the passage by representing Jesus as asking only about himself (Who do men say that *I* am?), not about the popular conception of the Son of Man. On the other hand, immediately after, they differ from Matthew xvi. 21 in having "Son of Man" in the first announcement of the Passion (as Matthew also has in all the later announcements of the Passion). Volkmar (p. 453) says of Matt.: *idem per idem!* As if De Wette had not long ago shown, and as if every one to-day did not know (comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 498), that the Son of Man was the enigma, the persistently veiled Messiah. For the rest, Bleek and Weizs. (p. 470), and others also, see an addition in Matthew. That Jesus himself had not then for the first time acquired a certain conviction of his Messiahship (comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 501 sqq.; differently in his *New L. of Jesus*, Eng. trans., I. p. 310; Schenkel, pp. 19, 128), and on that account was gratified at having the sympathetic

series of designations which have already been registered: he was John the Baptist, he was Elijah or Jeremiah, or some other one of the ancient prophets.¹ Jesus did not express either pleasure or displeasure on hearing these conclusions at which the people had arrived, and which disclosed their liveliest interest, their serious reflection, and a disposition to find in him the highest character possible. On this account, we cannot help concluding that, as his calm demeanour itself indicates, the answer was on the whole satisfactory. But by at once pushing his questioning further, he showed that this opinion did not altogether suffice, and that he expected from his disciples, from the privileged witnesses of his person, of his teaching, something higher. "But ye, whom do ye call me?" And Simon, the spokesman, is as ready with a definite answer as Jesus was urgent in pressing his question: "Antah Meshicha, thou art the Messiah, Christ! Thou art the Christ of God!" or, as Matthew gives it most appropriately, because most solemnly, "Thou art the Messiah (Christ), the Son of the living God!"² In the neighbourhood of the Gentile imperial city, suddenly, contrary to all expectation, contrary to all foreseen possibility, there was proclaimed the King of Israel, who began his government of the world as a fugitive and as the wearer of the crown of thorns.³

In this confession, given by Simon in the name of all, Jesus received back, as the spontaneous verdict of the nation, particularly of the circle of his most intimate adherents, and as a return gift for all his sayings, deeds, and blessings, the view of himself

coincident confession of his disciple, see above, III. pp. 78 sqq. Moreover, how could the Messianic resolve and the death resolve coincide! It is true that Schenkel and others hold the opinion that Jesus, and even Peter, had fully given up the conventional Messianism.

¹ See above, p. 212.

² In this addition of Matt. the friends of Mark (Weizs. p. 470) see a subsequent explanation.

³ Volkmar, while emphasizing this, at the same time undermines its historical character. But the unimportant character of Cæsarea shows this coincidence to be purely accidental (more weight would have attached to it had the city been Cæsarea ad mare, the Roman capital, caput Judææ, Tac. *Hist.* 2, 79).

which he had hitherto refrained from expressing in words, and had disclosed to the world only in the enigmatical expressions, "Son of Man" and "Son," in antithesis to the "Father." The greatness and significance of this confession cannot be valued highly enough, assuming, of course, that no doubt is entertained of its genuineness, which is sufficiently guaranteed against any apparent grounds of doubt by the songs of the disciples when Jesus entered Jerusalem, and by the Messianic death in that city.¹ Jesus, by all his suggestive and significant testimonies, had directed the minds of the people towards the highest possible conception; and Simon's utterance may appear to be merely the careful collection and skilful, original epitome of all the previous great impressions in one appropriate and striking word. Indeed, according to the first Gospel—more correctly the second hand in that Gospel—the cry, "In truth thou art the Son of God!" had already come from the mouths of all the disciples after the second, certainly only mythical, storm on the lake.² But the comparison of the present cry with the former—only alleged—cry, the enthusiastic reflex of the greatest miracle of divine power, places Simon's confession in the bright light of a grand, decisive discovery, of a solemn mental parturition as difficult as it was happy, by which mankind, represented by the disciples, contributed, in a susceptible, appropriate, imitative manner, the equal-born counterpart to that eldest-born of the spirit which

¹ According to Volkmar, pp. 449 sqq. (comp. his Ezra, p. 398), Peter first confessed "Christ" after the resurrection of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 20; he could have quoted Rom. i. 4; Acts ii. 36), combining Dan. ix. with Dan. vii. ! It is something altogether different when Holtzmann (*Prot. K.-Zeit.* 1867, p. 18; *Gesch. Isr.* II. pp. 207 sqq.) ascribes the resuscitation of the extinguished Messianic idea to the distresses of the time of Jesus, and particularly to Jesus himself, although this can hardly be correct; comp. above, I. pp. 314 sqq. Weiffenbach, pp. 47 sqq. But Volkmar with his assertion goes beyond even Br. Bauer, who finds the beginning of the Messianic idea in the time of the Baptist (comp. *Krit. d. ev. Gesch. d. Syn.* I. p. 181). And he strikes himself when he thinks Jesus' entry into Jerusalem to be Messianic, pp. 507, 544, 555, 588. Comp. also Zeller, *Messian. Dogmatik der Juden, Theol. Jahrb.*, 1843, pp. 35 sqq. See also the references above, III. p. 79, note 2.

² Matt. xiv. 33; see above, p. 185. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 500, gives expression to the view that the recognition of the Messiahship perhaps took place earlier than the Gospels represent. According to John ?

had stepped into the light of universal history in Jesus' faith in his Messiahship, and in his retention of this faith even amid the storms of the time.¹ From the very first, the human simplicity, nay, the poverty, of the life of Jesus, his rooflessness, his travelling afoot, his general insignificance as Son of Man, compelled his daily witnesses both to place an equipoise against the great occurrences of which they were the privileged participants, and continually to tone down their mental impressions; and these last days of distress and of flight spread a veil of mourning over the manifestation of Jesus' glory. Under these circumstances, Simon's confession was a solemn event of the very highest character. And we do not know which first to designate great, whether this lofty flight of the disciples who renounce the Jewish standard, quash the verdict of the hierarchs, leap over the popular opinion which hung midway between the two extremes, find the insignificant and the down-trodden lofty and divine, because spiritually to spiritual eyes it is something high and remains something divine; or that personality of Jesus which compels such weak disciples, even under the paralyzing influence of all external facts, distinctly and simply and nobly to mirror back the total impression of his ministry. Certainly the Christ, the Son of God, whom Simon confessed, and whose conception and name he by no means invented, was far from being the essentially divine Son of God; but he was, as all evidences show, simply in a Jewish sense and in Jewish terminology the Messiah, the chosen, the *protégé*, the servant of God whose grace Simon immediately afterwards invoked on behalf of Jesus.² But

¹ Matt. xvi. 16 itself shows that xiv. 33 is unhistorical, but also that the original Evangelist could not have written that passage, since it is quite contrary to his pragmatism. Comp. also the simpler conception in the duplicate miracle, viii. 27.

² On the name Messiah, comp. above, I. p. 321, note 3. The name, later frequent among Christians, Saviour, σωτήρ (above, III. p. 355, note 2), often occurs in the Old Test.: Is. xix. 20; Obad. i. 21 (LXX.); 2 Kings xiv. 26. In the Old Test., Messiah, of priests (hakkohen hammashiach), ὁ ἀρχ. ὁ χριστός or κρισίμ., Levit. iv. 3 sqq.; of kings (mesh. Jahve), 1 Sam. xii. 3 sqq., xvi. 6, xxiv. 6, &c.; Ps. ii. 2, xviii. 50, xx. 6. Even of the Persian king Cyrus, ὁ χ. μου, Is. xlv. 1. Of prophets, Ps. cv. 15 (1 Kings xix. 16). Of patriarchs, but also to be understood of the whole nation, Ps. cv. 15:

this spiritual conquest, this recognition of him who was chosen by God to be not merely a witness and a speaker, but the fulfiller of prophecy without a rival among the prophets new or old, the ruler of the kingdom, was, particularly in the discouraging nature of the external situation, so great, that Jesus' praise and benediction of the recognizing disciples was more than merely the outflashing of an irrepressible sentiment, but was, without any reference to the anxious questions of the time and the situation, an absolute and sacred affirmation.¹

"Blessed art thou, Simon, son of John (bar Jochanna)," answered Jesus, "because flesh and blood have not revealed it to thee, but my Father in heaven."² He meant that such an opi-

μὴ ἀψήσθῃ τῶν Χριστῶν μου. The future ideal king of the nation was specially pointed to by Ps. ii. 2; 1 Sam. ii. 10, 35; Dan. ix. 25 sq. The Talmud often appeals to Ps. ii. About the time of Jesus, the name appears in this ideal sense in the Targum of Onkelos (meschia), see above, I. p. 321; in 4 Esdras, filius meus unctus, or Christus, *Vulg.* vii. 28 sq., xiii. 37; *Book of Enoch* (perhaps Christian), 48, 52; comp. *Ps. Salom.* 17, 36, βασιλ. αὐτῶν χ. κήριος (also 18, 8), here perhaps interpolated. In the Talmud quite commonly, rex Messias, malcha meshicha, the king Messiah. Buxt. pp. 1267 sqq.; Schöttg. p. 233. Wünsche, *Leiden des Messias*, 1870, pp. 30, 42, &c. Although the pre-Christian origin of the expression cannot be verified by numerous quotations, yet its antiquity is proved by the Messianic expectation and the Old Testament passages; and no one will believe that Peter at Cæsarea, or later at Jerusalem, was the inventor of it, and the Jews the adopters of it. According to the Gospels, Jesus used the word Christ, Matt. xxiii. 10; Mark ix. 41 (comp. Matt. xxiv. 23, xxvi. 64); and king, Matt. xxv. 34, xxii. 2.

¹ The merely Messianic reference of the idea as conceived by Peter is not only probable in itself, but is evidenced by all the expectations of the disciples, Matt. xx. 20 sqq.; Luke xix. 11, xxiv. 19, 21, 37; Acts i. 6, ii. 36. An elevation above the ordinary Messianic idea is incorrectly assumed by Schenkel, p. 138; Weizs. pp. 470 sqq.; Längin, pp. 50 sq. The last thinks he can prove it from Matt. xvi. 17. But the overcoming of flesh and blood lies *only* herein, viz., that Peter, with a spiritual glance it is true, believes in Jesus' Messiahship in spite of his adversity. According to Schenkel (p. 166), the Messianic idea of Jesus himself was only an accommodation to circumstances. More correctly, Neander, p. 357; Wittichen, *Idce d. Menschen*, p. 154.

² Basar vedam, Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 50. Rabbis, in Lightfoot, pp. 335, 364 (also already in Old Test. basar and dam naki). Comp. Matt. xxvi. 41. Revelation of God, Matt. xi. 26, xiii. 11. According to Barn. 5 (comp. Weizs. p. 417), Jesus, after the choosing of the Twelve, revealed himself as the Son of God. It is not thence to be inferred—with Weizs.—that the epistle was here independent of Matt. (see above, I. p. 69). Matt. x. and xvi., in connection with xiv. 33, nay, xi. 4, do not stand too far apart. The supposition that Barnabas had John ii. 11 in mind, I no longer maintain, because I believe I am now able to show the somewhat later date of that Gospel (about A.D. 130). Comp. below, the Passion; and above, I. pp. 148 sqq.

nion could not under any circumstances, and that it did not in this instance, when flesh and blood—i.e. the human element in this throng and pressure of the external situation—opposed every lofty estimate of his person, originate in man left to himself, material, weak-minded, weak-spirited, but was suggested to the mind of the disciple by the immediate revelation of God, nay, of Jesus' gracious Father. Therefore Jesus, glad to receive a sign, a pledge of the hidden Father, happy to find among the disciples the man, the courage, the mind, that would uphold like a rock his good cause—not simply the new Messianic faith of Jesus himself—in the storms of both the present and the future, now bestowed on Simon on his part the honourable title of Kepha, Petros, Rock, under which name history has immortalized this Apostle. In Isaian words he confessed that on this rock, i.e. not on such a belief—as many, since Origen, have thought—but on such a believing Simon, he would found his Church, invincible even by the lord of hell. And he committed to Simon the authority which entitled him to claim that his future commands and permissions should be respected both upon earth and in heaven.¹ It is true that these words of recognition and promise are wanting in all the Gospels except Matthew. Luke and Mark represent Jesus as at once proceeding strictly to enjoin his disciples to let nothing of what had been said be heard by others; indeed, we get the impression that the confession itself is found fault

¹ Keph=rock, Aram. with article, Kepha; comp. al kepha, Targum, Ps. xl. 2, Buxt. p. 1032. This Aramaic name for Peter, used by Paul, Gal. i. 18, &c., very commonly. Since in Gal. i. and ii. Peter and Kephias stood side by side, and Paul's censure did not appear to apply to Peter, the Church (Clem. Al., ap. Eus. 1, 12) imagined a second Kepha, one of the Seventy! Petros as a proper name also among the Greeks (Pindar, Περραιός), and among the Jews, e.g. the freedman of Berenice, Agrippa I.'s mother, Jos. Ant. 18, 6, 3. Petros as appellative also among the Greeks, particularly in the tragic poets, expressive of strength (Κένταυρος περραιός), and also of hardness, insensibility. Lightfoot (p. 335) has already referred to Isaiah xxviii. 15 sq. with the figure of a foundation-stone and hell, and a reference to the perverse rulers of the land. To bind and to loose, asar and hittir (comp. hattir asurim, Is. lviii. 6), see Lightfoot, p. 336; Schöttgen, p. 144. Comp. the key-bearer of the house of David, Is. xxii. 22; Rev. iii. 7; and the later incorrect—though followed by Neander, p. 358, and others—interpretation of John xx. 23. Origen on Matthew, XII. 11; comp. Paulus, *Ilb.* II. p. 410.

with as untimely, or, as it says, "censured." This counter-testimony is not, however, of decisive weight. But as little is it to be overlooked; for it might be assumed that Matthew had referred back the precedence of Peter in the apostolic age to an investiture by Jesus.¹ But it is impossible that Jesus should have met a confession which he himself had provoked, only by silence or indeed by censure. It is impossible that Jesus should not have greeted a confession which was a result, an outcome, the end and aim, of his past efforts, the hope of his future, with that joyful recognition which he, genuinely human in his feelings and in his words, accorded in his happy hours on so many other occasions. It is impossible that he should have been silent here, and especially that he should have uttered a most emphatic and harsh censure when Peter objected to the anticipation of suffering. Further, the other Gospels themselves suggest a foregoing separate dialogue with Peter, for they—notably Luke—immediately afterwards introduce sayings addressed to "all." They also mention, though at an inappropriate and distant place, that Simon received from Jesus the honourable title of Peter. John thinks this name was given him at the very beginning, at the first sight of Simon; Luke and Mark fix it at the choosing of the Apostles, and on this account the defenders of Mark have quite arbitrarily invented all kinds of explanations of the name.² Finally, the utterance in Matthew is peculiar in its opening, its matter, and its form; indeed, it possesses just that vigorous, pithy, figurative

¹ Comp. Renan; Strauss, *New L. of Jesus*, Eng. trans., I. pp. 381 sq. One might think of Gal. ii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 10 sq.; Rev. xxi. 14, iii. 14. The genuineness of Jesus' answer is essentially admitted by Schenkel, p. 139; ib. *Bibel-Lex.* III. p. 286; Weizs. p. 471.

² John i. 42 (yet the tense is future). Luke vi. 14 (indefinite: whom he also named P.). Mark iii. 16 (distinctly at that time!). Among moderns, Neander and Ewald abide by John, with an assumption of the repetition of the unrepeatable (Neander, p. 359; Ewald, pp. 322, 459). Weizs. abides by Mark; Hausrath (p. 390) explains the name from the asylum which Jesus had found in Peter's house. Volkmar (p. 247) found indeed an *alios!* Weisse thought of an accidental occasion and a later false interpretation (p. 397). Similarly, Strauss, *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., I. p. 373, who at the same time finds it possible that Peter did not acquire the name until later in the Church (against Gal. i. 18). Schenkel's *Bibel-Lex.* III. p. 286, for Matthew.

character which stamps the genuine coin of Jesus, and which cannot be counterfeited. That the Father reveals the Son,—this conception runs through all the teaching of Jesus. It is the habit of his life to acknowledge his dependence on the Father in his most exalted moments. Conflict with the prince of hell, and faith in his victory over the powers of hell,—herein we find the basis of his kingdom of heaven, the heroic spirit of his ministry.¹ The founding of a community, the installation of Peter as the foundation-stone of this community,—this by no means definitely includes the idea of a separation of the Church from Judaism, and the idea of a substitute for and successor to himself when ascended into heaven. If such had been the case, there would have been ground for believing in a later origin of the passage, perhaps in the apostolic period. But in truth he does not in any way mark off the community of which he speaks from Judaism, which joined the community as soon as it—Judaism—believed in Jesus as the Messiah; and he bestowed the ruling office upon Peter, the first human herald of his Messiahship, without any diminution of his own personal paramount authority,—just in the same sense as he further named a united headship of the twelve Apostles, with twelve apostolic chairs.² Why, then, the enigmatical silence of Luke and Mark concerning the promise to Simon? Simply because the later Evangelists, Luke above all, do not favour the prerogatives of the Jewish-Christian Apostles, with Peter at their head, and plainly enough take every opportunity of abridging and cruelly depreciating those prerogatives. And as to the promise made to Peter, they immediately after-

¹ Comp. Matt. xii. 29, as well as the passage quoted from Isaiah, xxviii. 15; Rev. ii. 13. Neander (p. 357; also Bleek) has no ground for thinking of the Hades of death, after Is. xxxviii. 10.

² Ecclesia, Hebr. kahal, in a genuine utterance of Jesus; also Matt. xviii. 17 (only the two passages). In the LXX. Judges xxi. 8, &c., eocl. = kahal. Of the actual company about Jesus, there stands the expression *μικρὸν ποίμνιον* in Luke xii. 32. The permanent application of the Greek name eocl. to the Christian community may have been due to Paul. Strauss (*New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., I. p. 382) naturally sees here a later interpolation. Schleierm., on the other hand, thinks (p. 373) of the possibility of an official spiritual presidency without detriment to the hierarchy.

wards suggest the opinion—quite contrary to historical fact—that the solemn declarations of Jesus were addressed to more than merely the Twelve.¹

B.—THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PASSION.

The approval of the great confession of the disciples—the subject-matter of which Jesus at first wished to be kept secret—was almost immediately followed, according to all the sources, by the great confession of Jesus, in which he in his turn again advanced as great a distance beyond the knowledge of his disciples as that which they had covered in reaching their Messianic confession. “The Son of Man must go away to Jerusalem,”—thus did he now for the first time disclose to them the future; “he must suffer many things of the elders, high-priests, and scribes; must be rejected, killed, and on the third day will rise again.”² An indescribable scene followed this disclosure. The contrast to the elevated mood of the confession, to his great anticipations, to his express promises, was so enormous, that the disciples, particularly Peter, could not listen to the communication in silence. Even though Peter was able to harmonize the temporary adversity of Jesus with his idea of the Messiah, he could not accept as a conceivable possibility the idea of the suffering of Jesus, and especially of his violent death at the hand of Israel, in pursuance of the solemn decision of the Sanhedrim. At once horrified and sympathetic, he abruptly interposed, and seizing Jesus by the arm, deprecatingly cried to him: “May He be gracious to thee,

¹ Comp. only the many instances of incapacity and “hardening of heart” of the Twelve in Luke and Mark; an extreme instance is Mark viii. 17, where the same charge is made against the Twelve as against the people with reference to the parables! Volkmar himself (p. 575) talks of the imbecility of the Twelve.

² Matt. xvi. 21, and parallel passages. Luke and Mark have here, correctly, Son of Man, as Matt. himself has in all subsequent announcements of the Passion, xvii. 22, xx. 18, xxvi. 2. Jesus’ foretelling already in Tert. *Ap.* 21: *prædixerat et ipse, ita facturos.*

O Lord; that shall indeed not happen to thee!"¹ These words of a friend pierced the soul of Jesus like a double-pointed thorn: the sympathy and the horror of the faithful friend spoke to his very inmost being, showed him the extreme bitterness and unacceptableness of his course and of his departure, and, by awakening sorrow and even doubt, gave a severe shock to his heroically-won resolve. It sounded to him like an unholy and sinister suggestion against the strict command of his duty; and since to him his duty stood above everything else, and God high above men, his indignation conquered, his friend became to him seriously as a foe, the awakener of sorrow and instigator of tender sensibility was to him as a devil. He turned away from Peter—not towards him, as Mark erroneously has it—and said: "Get behind me, Satan; thou art an offence to me, my seducer from good to evil, because thou dost not think the thoughts, the plans, the interests of God, but those of men."² He then immediately turned himself towards the whole circle of his disciples,—by no means to the people, as is said by Mark, who, with Luke, would claim the solemn declaration for the whole of Jesus' followers, even for Paul and for all the persecuted of the future, although it was impossible to speak of a presence of the people at that time. He expounded to the disciples the grounds of his resolve, and the participation in his path of suffering which awaited them also: following the Messiah meant self-renunciation and the cross, to preserve one's life was to lose it, to lose one's life for the Lord's sake was to gain it. The gain and conquest of a whole world, of all the Roman universal empire, profited nothing to him

¹ Hebr. jochneka, Gen. xliii. 28. Or the well-known ehalilah, ἰδεὸς μοι, 2 Sam. xx. 20; comp. Symm. 1 Sam. xx. 9, xxii. 15 (σοι); 1 Macc. ii. 21 (ἡμῖν). Or channun, chasid lecha (chanana lak). Or Rabb., chos veshalom (compassion and salvation), Schött. p. 146.

² τὰ τοῦ; comp. Matt. xxii. 21, xxvi. 42. Hence! devil! Matt. iv. 10 (taken from the historical utterance, but Holsten inverts the relation of the passages). Sob el acharai, 2 Kings ix. 18 sq., has a different meaning. On the other hand, comp. 2 Sam. xix. 22; Zach. iii. 2. Holsten (*Zum Ex. des Paulus u. des Petrus*, p. 225) thinks that I, by admitting the assailability of Jesus' resolve, lower his human dignity. But what a medley of the human and the superhuman this book presents! Further on this controverted point below.

who lost his soul, for which there was no ransom when it was lost. For the Son of Man purposed to come in the glory of his Father with his angels, to give to every one according to their work; and, in truth, of those who were there present, some would live to see him.¹

We do not deny that these declarations of Jesus are full of difficulties, even though we feel no anxiety about the smaller differences between the several Gospels. In this instance the questionable characteristics attach to the most unanimous testimony. Could he at this time, and later, have thus distinctly announced his death, and then a few weeks afterwards enter Jerusalem as the Messiah, amid the songs of praise and jubilation of his disciples? Could he have thus exactly announced his death, his condemnation by the Sanhedrim, a little later on the road to Jerusalem his betrayal, his being handed over from the Jews to the Gentiles, the scoffing, the scourging, the cross of the Gentiles—all so many evidences of superhuman knowledge—whilst in other matters his knowledge appears to possess human limitations? Could he have repeatedly uttered predictions of sorrow with ever-increasing exactness and of an increasingly discouraging character, while his disciples were cheering the way to Jerusalem with hopes of thrones?² Could he have foretold his resurrection, his return in coming decades, and yet his disciples did not look forward to a resurrection, and did not seek consolation in anticipating his late return, instead of an early one, until fruitless years and generations had come and gone? These and other difficulties might give rise to the supposition that such alleged announcements of Jesus' death were nothing

¹ Matt. xvi. 24—28. Luke and Mark similarly, only in later form (comp. in Luke the daily cross), and with very unskilful interpolations (Luke ix. 26; Mark viii. 38), and fictitiously (with Weiff.'s permission, p. 64) addressed to the people (Mark viii. 34; comp. Luke ix. 23). The corrections of the promise, Luke ix. 27; Mark ix. 1; John xxi. 22 sq. *Mundum conservare, perdere*, Schöttg. p. 147. *To taste of death, thaam thaam hammavet (mitah)*, ib. p. 148. *Wetst.* p. 414. 4 Esdras vi. 26: *qui mortem non gustant a nativitate sua.* John viii. 52; Hebr. ii. 9.

² The announcements of death increasingly definite, Matt. xvii. 22, xx. 18, (with fullest details) xxvi. 2, (brief *resumé*) 45.

more than utterances ascribed to him by a later time, which sought to illumine and relieve the dark point of his death and his cross, that terrible scandal to the Jewish Messianic belief, as the Apostle Paul shows; and that that later time sought to do this by means of predictions of Jesus, which would bear witness to his clear knowledge, to his free will, and to a recognized higher necessity. From this point of view, Jesus' predictions of his resurrection, of his return, of his late return, would be regarded simply as expressions of subsequent Christian experience and the consolations of impatient hope.¹ We may the more readily imagine such a fictitious prophesying as the keen-scented, scoffing foe of the Christians, Celsus, in the second century, and Reimarus in the eighteenth, conjectured it to be, because we find these pre-announcements introduced so designedly, so emphatically, so repeatedly. Besides, the attempts—in part much overdone and inconsistent with history—of our sources to justify the death-destiny of Jesus, can be established beyond all doubt.² Thus it has come to pass that, while Baur and Strauss, with all the keenness of their criticism, took objection only to the details of the predictions, but not to Jesus' general presentiment, Holsten and—without much ceremony—Volkmar have recently undertaken to deny everything, from the announcement of death and Simon's contradiction, to that of the resurrection on the third day. Holsten has advocated the view that Jesus, with as much lively and gladsome courage as his disciples, went to Jerusalem to proclaim his kingdom of righteousness as he had done in Galilee, and now in a final and definite manner to establish it; that, until the events of Gethsemane and Golgotha, he had hoped for the intervention of God, perhaps indeed had relied upon the swords of his adherents, and even during the last Supper had only momentarily given up this hope: hence his terrible disillusion, and still

¹ 1 Cor. i. 23; Luke xviii. 7; comp. 2 Peter iii. 4 sqq.

² Comp. history of the Passion, and only, *e.g.* Luke xxiv. 25 sqq.; John i. 29, ii. 19, xiii. 19. Against the announcements beforehand, Celsus ap. Origen, *Con. C.* ii. 13, 16, 18—20, 44, 54 sq. Reimarus, *Fragmente*, pp. 112 sqq.

more that of his disciples, who might have anticipated at most a temporary suffering, but were by no means prepared for such a catastrophe.¹

It is true that the above explanation of the passage, with its exact logical consistency, with its jaunty dispersion of all obscurities and mysteries, with its piquant conversion of the troublesomely superhuman features into genuinely human characteristics, is as convenient as it is plausible: but looked at closely it is found to be purely arbitrary. The diagnosis of the situation of Jesus is altogether erroneous. This situation was not a rosy, hopeful one; it was one of adversity and flight, one which made it appear that, in all human probability, the enterprize at Jerusalem would be infinitely dangerous, and would be crowned with suffering and death. Seen from this side, the death-announcement of Jesus, and not its opposite, was the expression of a natural, reasonable, correct anticipation, unless we run counter to all the most important evidences, and make Jesus an enthusiast who overlooked all the signs of the situation, or blindly calculated upon help from God, help which had been withheld from both the Baptist and himself.² By the supposition we are combating, the most unassailable scenes and words—the contradiction by Simon, the excited answer of Jesus, his announcement of the way to life through death, his subsequent conversation

¹ Earlier views, in Paulus, II. p. 415; Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 293. Baur, *Neut. Theol.* pp. 96 sqq. Strauss, *l. c.* pp. 287 sqq., 295, 307; *ib. New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans., I. pp. 320 sqq., 387 sqq. (still more positively than Baur). Holsten, *Ev. Pet. u. P.* 1868, pp. 150 sqq.; after him also II. Lang (*Zeitstimmen*, 1868). Volkmar, pp. 450 sqq., 570, 575. I refute in *Prot. K.-Z.* 1868, No. 8 (Jesus' anticipation of death), Holsten's argumentation against my *Gesch. Chr.* Holsten's cleverly supported view had already had the way prepared for it by Strauss (*l. c.* Eng. trans., I. p. 386), who found it possible that Jesus, particularly in the festival week, had gained ground in Jerusalem, and purposed to strengthen his position there by further festival visits.

² Fritzsche (*Mark.* p. 381) and Schleierm. (p. 440) have given prominence to the perfect feasibility of Jesus' pre-announcements. The defenders of Mark (Volkmar, Lang) found a good means of denying those pre-announcements by striking out the retirements of flight; Holsten, however, goes with Matthew, not so "slavishly" as others, it is true. In another way, Weisse (pp. 431 sq.) fails to recognize the true ground of Jesus' anticipation of death, by thinking of a consciousness of decay of miraculous power, instead of adverse circumstances.

with the sons of Zebedee about the cup of suffering, his sayings about the departing bridegroom, about the forerunner in work and suffering, about murderous Jerusalem, about the anointment for his burial, and, finally, his utterance at the last Supper—all would be rejected with that recklessness which is its own condemnation.¹ The difficulties, however, are exaggerated. Perhaps Jesus did not announce the details of his death, nor the form of his resurrection, nor the time of his return; he might nevertheless have announced his death, and life from the dead, and return. Perhaps he did not announce his death so constantly, so prominently, so definitively, but rather as a dark presentiment, as a depressing foreboding, from which in elevated moments he was freed; the weighty issue might nevertheless repeatedly be the subject of his talk, and still more the pre-occupation of his silent self-consciousness. Under such circumstances, it is possible that he himself never entirely relinquished hope till he was face to face with his irrevocable destiny. And it is still more possible that the disciples had their attention less arrested by his depressed than by his exalted mood, and that in their enthusiastic state of mind the looking forward to the speedily approaching Messianic kingdom, to which even Jesus' announcements of suffering ever pointed, covered, if it did not indeed altogether prevent, any notice of or faith in the gloomy period of transition, and thus paved the way for the terrible disappointment which followed. It is, therefore, more judicious—as Schleiermacher, Baur, and Strauss saw—to allow the fundamental facts to remain, reserving the possibility of later exaggerations and descriptive developments of the events which actually happened.² And to pass from

¹ As Strauss had already spoken sceptically about the last Supper (comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 130), so now does Holsten, pp. 178, 190 sqq. (a thought of the moment!), and indeed Volkmar, pp. 570, 575. The scene with Peter, which Weisse praised as specially characteristic (p. 423), Holsten thinks unnatural (pp. 207 sqq.), and—listen!—an imitation of Matthew iv. 10! Yet a note on p. 209 admits that Jesus, perhaps before the journey to Jerusalem, expected “greater suffering,” but not death, which was an impossibility for the Messiah, and that he had harshly rebuked the objecting Peter.

² Comp. Schenkel, p. 440; Baur, p. 97; and Strauss, *l. c.* Also Fritzsche, *l. c.* Weisse, p. 423, 460. Hase, pp. 189 sqq. Schenkel, p. 141. Weizs. p. 474. Ewald, p. 505. Holtzmann, *Er.* p. 481. Weiff. pp. 62 sqq.

the indefinite to the definite, we must believe that at Cæsarea and afterwards Jesus repeatedly disclosed to his disciples the distinct presentiment he had of his death at Jerusalem, and also of his life from the dead, of his ascension to the heaven of his Father, and of his victorious return to earth to set up his kingdom. On the other hand, neither in his words nor in his action, certainly not in his heart, did he despair of the possibility that the God under whose direction he, with the absolute faith of an Israelite and the consciousness of the limited character of his own knowledge and power, placed himself, and in whose Scriptures, in the Psalm cxviii.—which he had attentively read—he could find a salvation from extreme peril, from a fatal destiny, would by his miraculous arm now and without his—Jesus'—fall bring to pass that which he had been calculating upon and expecting to achieve by a sacrificial death.¹ It is probable that he did not foretell a death accompanied by the scorn and scourging of the Gentiles, nor a living again by means of a resurrection from the tomb, nor indeed the betrayal, of which in fact no mention is made until the eve of his death. On the other hand, he could nevertheless have foretold his condemnation by the Sanhedrim, his being handed over to the Gentiles, the cross of the Romans; because no other way was conceivable, and certainly not that of a popular tumult and murder of a prophet. Moreover, as certainly as he knew that he was the Messiah, must he have foretold his living and rising from the dead, perhaps with the conventionally prophetic round number of three days—which did not find a literal fulfilment in his resurrection—and the divine restitution in the providential control of the terrestrial kingdom of heaven.²

¹ The dialectic of fear and hope can be followed in many of the utterances of Jesus, Matt. x. 26—28. Very instructive, however, is Ps. cxviii. 6—18; comp. 22 (Matt. xxi. 42). Many would explain Matt. xxvii. 46 therefrom.

² The things to be cut away are chiefly the most definite announcements, Matt. xx. 18. It is true that resurrection from the tomb stands in Matt. xii. 40, but this passage is by the second hand; xvi. 25, x. 39, are less definite; and xvi. 27 shows rather the belief in an ascension to heaven. Jesus necessarily thought (Matt. v. 22, xii. 10) of an accusation before, and a condemnation by, the Sanhedrim, the legal tri-

Such, in brief, are the results at which an impartial judgment will arrive upon this obscure subject. But many questions have yet to be answered, if we would track the enigmatical paths by which Jesus' self-consciousness arrived at the idea of dying, and of finding through death life and victory, and the setting-up of the longed-for, the already brought in and yet still to be brought in kingdom of heaven. Suffering and death as such did not at all form a part of the Messianic dogmatic of the Jews; in fact, it was through the death of Jesus that it first became a leading tenet of Christian, to a certain extent also of Jewish, doctrine. The exceedingly few Old Testament passages that can be quoted in support of the doctrine of a suffering Messiah are all disputed. Even if it were permissible to understand the suffering "servant of God" in the second part of Isaiah to be a personality instead of the ideal community of Israel, that personality of a prophet would be by no means identical with that of the Messiah, the Davidic king of salvation.¹ The expectation of the age of Jesus

bunal; on the other hand, not of a popular tumult (thus Hausrath, p. 430, then Lang, who indeed speaks of the Sicarii, who did not flourish until A.D. 55!): the people were in the main sympathetic (xxi. 46; see above, pp. 42, 211), and naturally so. Violent murderous attempts on the part of the hierarchy (Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 292, on the authority of John!) were much more improbable, *Jos. Ant.* 20, 9, 1; 13, 10, 6; *Gesch. Chr.* p. 239; above, I. p. 359. And Antipas' plots were not to be feared (Strauss, *l. c.*); however, Jesus went out of his way. Jesus would necessarily have to be handed over to the Gentiles by the Jews, by the Sanhedrim; and there was no other punishment but the cross in Palestine and for alleged rebels (comp. the history of the Passion). Hence Jesus could not anticipate stoning (*Matt.* xxiii. 37; Hausrath, p. 430). Hence, also, *Matt.* xvi. 24, x. 38, *may* be genuine, without requiring a figurative interpretation (Cicero, *Ad. Quint. Fr.* 1, 2: *crucem sibi ipse constituere*). Betrayal first in xxvi. 21 (not xvii. 22; comp. xx. 18 sq.). The divine restitution in passage from Hosea, Messianically applied also by the Rabbis (Hosea, the favourite of Jesus; comp. Hosea vi. 6), vi. 2: *bajom hashel. jakimenu* (comp. Wünsche, p. 90). On the form of Jesus' anticipation, more in detail below. The number three (*perfectus numerus*), *Matt.* xxvi. 34, 61 (xii. 40; John ii. 19); *Luke* xiii. 7, 32. See in Old Test., 1 Sam. xx. 5, xxx. 12; 2 Sam. xxi. 1; 1 Kings xii. 12; 2 Kings xx. 5. With reference to Jesus' actual resurrection, the history of the Passion will show that, according to the oldest source—*Matt.* xxviii. 1 (comp. *Luke* xxiii. 54), opp. xxvii. 62, xxviii. 11 (xii. 40)—and *Luke*, *Mark* and *John*, Jesus rose on the second day, on Saturday evening, or was believed to be risen. Comp. Lightfoot, p. 564.

¹ Comp. briefly, Gfrörer, *Jahrh. Heils.* II. pp. 212 sqq.; Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 295 sqq.; Oehler, *Messias*, in Herzog, IX. pp. 420 sqq. Isaiah lii. liii., Zech. xii. 10—14, xiii. 7, Dan. ix. 25 sq., are disputed. Quite recently, A. Wünsche (*Leiden*

is the reflection of ancient prophecy. Philo and Josephus know nothing whatever of a belief in a dying Messiah, but simply of faith in a mightily acting Saviour of the nation. The Apostle Paul, as a Jew, indignantly rose against the crucified Messiah, and afterwards spoke of the cross of Jesus as an insurmountable obstacle to the Jews.¹ Jesus himself—if we accept the passages as genuine—did not appeal to Old Testament prophecy in support of this conception of the Messiah until late; and Paul made scarcely more than an allusive appeal, if we leave out of sight his speech before the procurator Festus.² The death of Jesus remains a divine inexplicability to the Jewish-Christian sources of the Acts of the Apostles. First in the Philip source, then in Luke, in the first Epistle of Peter, and in John's books—all later productions—Jesus is plainly connected with the suffering servant of God.³ If we go back upon Jewish ground beyond the time of Jesus, we find the fourth book of Esdras representing the Messiah as dying, but not until the termination of the four hundred years of Messianic rule, when the whole human race, the whole world, returns to the ancient silence. The Chaldee paraphrase of the Prophets, the so-called Targum of Jonathan, makes the servant of God the Messiah; but it takes from him his peculiar character of a sufferer, and transfers it partly to the nation and partly to the enemies of the nation. Again, the Jew Trypho, or Tarpho, who in the middle of the second century disputed with Justin Martyr, admitted that the Old Testament plainly depicted a suffering Christ like a lamb led away to be slaughtered, but denied that any Scripture had pointed to the despi-

des Messias, according to the Rabb.) has boldly revived the views of the old theologians. His Talmudic extracts, however, are not altogether without value.

¹ Above, II. p. 297. 1 Cor. i. 23.

² Matt. xxvi. 31 (Zech. xiii. 7), 56; xvii. 22 not from Is. liii. 12. Comp. Matt. viii. 17! Luke xxii. 37 (Is. liii. 12), xxiv. 25 sqq., 44 sqq.; Mark ix. 12 (Dan. iv. 14). Paul. Acts xxvi. 22 sq.; 1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. iv. 25 (Is. liii. 4, 12); comp. Is. liii. 1 in Rom. x. 16; Is. lii. 15 in Rom. xv. 21; Ps. lxi. 9 in Rom. xv. 3.

³ Acts ii. 23—36, iii. 17 sqq., &c. (The way to glory: thus quite correctly, also Holsten, pp. 146 sqq.) The Philip source, Acts viii. 32 sqq. Luke xxii. 37; 1 Peter ii. 22 sqq.; John i. 29.

cable and dishonourable death, the death on the cross, which was cursed by the Law.¹ Finally, the Talmudic teachers have, on the basis of Isaiah, Zechariah, and Daniel, spoken of the Messiah's suffering and lowly condition before his glorification, of an atonement and intercession for Israel, of a dwelling of the consoler, of the poor and the leprous, amidst the sick and the miserable whom he had banded together, and also of his wounds, stripes, and tears, of the millstones of his pain; but of his dying they know nothing, and they have characteristically transferred the death which the Old Testament appeared to announce, from the real Messiah, the son of David, to the pre-Messiah; the son of Joseph.²

Under these circumstances it is readily conceivable that Jesus should at first say nothing of a dying, because the living and not the dying of the Messiah seemed to belong to the setting-up of the kingdom of God; and that, moreover, he should reluctantly arrive at the thought of death only when his fate—not the Old Testament—imposed it upon him. It is true that the latest source of the life of Jesus, the fourth Gospel, has introduced the anticipation of death as early as the first utterances of the Baptist and of Jesus, as if it were intended to tone down the terrible character of his fate by keeping it in view as long as possible, and by producing the impression of an unconditional and absolute necessity. In this Gospel the Baptist announces to his disciples, in Isaian language, the Lamb that bears the sin of the world; and Jesus to his disciples at Cana exhibits his blood in the wine, and to Nicodemus at Jerusalem his cross in the serpent lifted up by Moses in the wilderness.³ But the unhistoricalness

¹ Jonathan, extracts in Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 302 sqq.; *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., I. p. 318; comp. Oehler, p. 441. Wünsche (certainly misunderstood), pp. 40 sqq. Justin, *Tryph.* 36, 89 sq.; see above, II. p. 297, note 2. 4 Esdras vii. 28 sqq. (O. F. Fritzsche, *Libri apocr. V. T.* 1871, p. 606): *Jocundabuntur, qui relictii sunt, annis CCC. Et erit post annos hos et morietur fil. m. Christus et omnes.—Et convertetur sec. in antiquum silentium.* Then the resurrection, and the divine judgment.

² Lightfoot, p. 687; Bertholdt, pp. 75 sqq., 157; Oehler, pp. 438, 440; Wünsche, pp. 56 sqq.: the suffering one week (p. 79), nine months (p. 105), four hundred and more years (p. 92). Ben Joseph, above, II. p. 349; Wünsche, pp. 109 sqq.

³ John i. 29, 36, ii. 9, iii. 14. To the many who defend John, Gess has to be added. He says that the first mention of death is x. 11 (at the Feast of Tabernacles, a few

of this representation is seen at once in the impossibility that the Baptist, the man of action and the awaiter of the Messiah of action, should look for a suffering lamb, which would in truth be an offence to his brave soul; and that Jesus should anticipate a cross before either Judea or Galilee had shown him any serious enmity.¹ This unhistoricalness becomes still more clearly apparent when we turn to the earlier and more faithful sources. The most we can here find is that Jesus, as early as the Sermon on the Mount, pronounced the persecuted for righteousness' sake, the followers of the prophets, to be blessed; and again that he—tolerably early, according to the sources—foresaw a fasting of the disciples when the bridegroom should be taken from them.² But in the first instance he was far from having a death in view, for the persecution of which he spoke—and that not in the beginning of his ministry, as we saw—plainly culminated in mere verbal revilings; and in the second instance, though he doubtless spoke of his death, the whole bearing of what he said evidently shows that the utterance belongs to a later period than the Gospels now represent.³ It is a fact whose clearness and convincingness leave nothing to be desired, that the first period of Jesus' ministry absolutely lacked the gloomy perspective which suddenly, and to Jesus himself unexpectedly, appears in the later Galilean time, and presses from all sides upon his life of action like a ring of iron necessity. In the early part of his ministry, Jesus rejoices in his people and in the longing of his people; he announces the kingdom that is approaching; soon afterwards, the kingdom that is present: a sign that he says nothing about, has no presentiment of, a deep cleft between promise and fulfilment, an abyss of ruin. But then come the disillusionings, the occasions of anxiety, the perplexing death of the Baptist, and the journeys of flight. In such a time of distress there broke upon the mind of Jesus

months after Caesarea[!]); and that the sayings in ii. iii. vi. are still quite obscure, even for clear heads (p. 263). Therefore only a pedagogic obscurity, which Gess himself understands already in p. 6.

¹ See above, II. pp. 301 sq.

² Matt. v. 11 sq., ix. 15.

³ Above, III. p. 287, IV. p. 38.

the prevision of his own death which he first uttered to the disciples of John after the death of the Baptist, and then to his own disciples near Cæsarea, after his flights and before his journey to the Passover festival. All other instances of foretelling his death are later or are not historical, in particular those in Matthew of the three days and nights in the tomb, the Jonah-sign in the bosom of the earth.¹

That which taught him this oppressive thought was evidently experience, and in a higher degree the disposer of human destinies, God. But the most impressive lesson taught by fact and by heaven was the death of the Baptist, by which Jesus was alarmed to the very depths of his soul. He discovered what he had held to be impossible, viz., that God did not refuse to add to all the blood-sacrifices of the ancient prophets that of the new prophet of the kingdom: why not, eventually, the Messiah also, who was himself only a man, a prophet, and only the successor of God's first messenger?² He could not, indeed, seriously believe that God would repudiate His kingdom and His Messiah, unless the kingdom and the Messiah were no truth in the eyes of God, or the personal Messiah, the weak man, had no permanent value for the kingdom of God, for the cause of God. Both ideas were impossibilities to him, and therefore he could not think of a rejection by God; he could think only of the diabolical wickedness of men, though at the same time he relied on a hidden divine purpose of salvation.³ Hence, when near Cæsarea, he speaks of a "*must*," and places in contrast the human and the divine thoughts, so different from each other, and the latter of

¹ Matt. xii. 40; above, p. 123, note 2.

² Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34 (iv. 24). Holsten holds that Jesus anticipated all possible, even "greater" suffering; only not death, the expectation of which was impossible for the Messiah. "The immense difference between the death of a prophet of the Messiah and of the Messiah himself seems to have escaped Keim" (p. 188.) In the *Prot. K.-Z.*, l. c., I have examined this abstract proposition. Hausrath (p. 429), again, has groundlessly thought that the death of the Baptist was not needed to prove to Jesus his rejection by the nation (?).

³ Jesus often reverts to human violence, against John, Matt. xvii. 12; against himself, in all his announcements of the Passion (xvi. 21), particularly xxvi. 24. He reverted (in a noticeable manner) to a higher divine will only with reference to himself.

which were to be fulfilled by means of his death, not only apart from and beyond him, but through him and through his acquiescence in the Divine will. It is easy to find this salvation through death in those Old Testament sacrificial views which Jesus afterwards expressed at Jerusalem, in part incidentally in conversation with the sons of Zebedee, and in part intentionally at the last Supper. Yet the utterances near Cæsarea about the anticipated passion do not contain a trace of this explanation; indeed, when closely examined, we find in them quite another mode of view, which, if we will be faithful to our sources and to the course of Jesus' development, we must first dwell upon. The idea by which Jesus illumined to himself and his followers the darkness of the path of death, is a genuinely Jewish watchword. Through death to life, eternal life, eternal glory, through the sacrifice of life in the service of God,—this had been the cry of the pious in Israel since the Syrian period, and is again and again heard from the mouths of the Scribes, of the Pharisees, of the Essenes, of the enthusiastic rejectors of the Herodian golden eagle, of Judas the Galilean, of the Zealots in the last war, as well as in the testimonies borne by the martyrs of the second book of Maccabees.¹ With the same strength of conviction with which his fellow-countrymen—to the terror of their foes, even of the Romans, as Tacitus testifies—equipped themselves to endure the worst, to endure that from which human nature generally shrinks with dread, or to which it yields itself only in the enthusiasm of the moment,—with the same strong hope and expectation did Jesus prepare himself and his followers for the path of death.² “He who will save his life, shall lose it; but he who loses his life for my sake and in following me, shall find it,”

¹ Daniel xii. 2 sq.; 2 Macc. vii. 9, 14, 23. Pharisees, *Jos. B. J.* 1, 33, 2 (*Ant.* 17, 6, 2); 2, 8, 14; 3, 8, 5; *Ant.* 18, 1, 3. Essenes, *B. J.* 2, 8, 10 sq. Comp. above, I. pp. 261, 333, 372. Also Hausrath, p. 430. How general the belief in a future life was, Silas, the commander under Agrippa I., can show: he (*Ant.* 19, 7, 1) hopes to be still able to rejoice in his deeds after the separation of soul and body.

² Tacitus, *Hist.* 5, 5: animas proelio aut suppliciiis peremtorum æternas putant. Hinc generandi amor et moriendi contemptus. Comp. therewith, chiefly, *Jos. B. J.* 1, 33, 2; 2, 8, 10; 7, 8, 7.

—this saying passes his lips at this period again and again.¹ He might, even as Messiah, have been the more inclined to this watchword, because from the beginning to the end he had heroically placed his life and work under the point of view of conflict, test, temptation; and also because he regarded the gift of the kingdom of God—which in a certain sense came even to him from the bosom of the Divine mercy—as a pearl for which each one must give up everything, and the Messiah, above all others, must sacrifice his own life in order to be fully deserving of it.² He believed that by following this path of sacrifice, which had been already traced in the ancient histories of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Job, and the prophets, he should receive for himself induction into life and into the kingdom; whilst the acquisition of the world, as he pointed out, appeared to him to be useless without this induction. By this same path, sanctified by himself as pioneer, by the path of personal, not representative, sacrifice, he believed he could promise to his followers also the cancelling of their liability to punishment, the salvation of their souls from the impending divine judgment of the life-work of men, and from divine retribution.³

C.—THE MESSIANIC PERSPECTIVE.

Here is at once the solution of the question, what had Jesus in view after this death, and as the consequence of it? Death itself could not be the end of his purpose; and Holsten's assertion is self-evidently correct, viz., that the Messianic faith of Jesus could not be fixed upon the Messianic death, or could not

¹ Matt. xvi. 25, x. 39. The most similar (Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetst., give no parallels), Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 10: *εὐθυμοὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἠφίεσαν, ὡς πάλιν κομιοῦμενοι.* Wetst. (p. 378) mentions the saying of the Roman governor, Tert., *Scorp.* 11: *cum cohortantur negationi, serua animam tuam, dicunt et noli animam t. perdere.*

² Temptation, Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 28. Conflict, Matt. xii. 25 sqq. Cup, xx. 20 sqq. Pearl, xiii. 45. Note how this view coincides with the Acts of the Apostles (above, p. 276, note 3), and with the *μάργς πιστὸς*, Rev. i. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 13.

³ Plainly enough the reference in Matt. xvi. 25—27 is to the personal conduct of the man who secures himself against future liability to punishment; comp. v. 25 sq.

find its ultimate rest in that. But his second assertion is just as erroneous, viz., that since Jesus evidently did not foretell his resurrection, he therefore did not foretell his death, the absolute end, the renunciation and retraction of all Messianic belief; wherefrom Holsten gathers fresh support for his opinion that Jesus' anticipation of death does not belong at all to real history, but only to the fictitious system of the immediately succeeding age. In point of fact, Jesus as a man anticipated death, and as the Messiah he looked beyond death; but what he anticipated beyond death is to be gathered, if anywhere, from his Caesarean utterances. The beginning of these utterances, the usual Gospel formula concerning the Passion, speaks of a resurrection which is understood to mean a coming out of the tomb; on the other hand, the latter part of those utterances, evidently preserved in its essential integrity, speaks of nothing but a finding and a re-acquisition of life—nay, of an elevation to heavenly glory. We cannot here entertain any doubt in which part to find the original. Life from death is the less definite and the more obscure proposition, and yet is satisfactorily illumined by other utterances about the immortality of the soul after the martyrdom of the body. It is the form of communication to which Jesus, in the beginning of his unveiling the future, most readily had recourse, and one which the views of the age had already brought into use; it is, moreover, the form which was least calculated to awaken in the minds of the disciples immediately definite, certain terrestrial hopes for the moment after Jesus' death. But a prediction of resurrection, although quite in harmony with the belief of the age, is rendered improbable by the thoroughly specific postulate as to God's action which it would have involved, by the notorious hopelessness of the disciples at the tomb of Jesus, and, finally, by the explicability of the alleged prediction from subsequent facts. Another argument against the prediction of resurrection is to be seen in the harmonious connection between the finding of life and the subsequent return from heaven, a connection which does not exist between the resurrection and the ascension into heaven.

In order to be in heaven and to come from heaven, Jesus needed life, but not the restoration of corporeal life upon earth; and the future consolation of a return from heaven, instead of a resurrection upon earth—which quite exclusively, according to all evidences, he placed before his disciples—he could in fact have emphatically insisted upon only in the absence of any reference to a resurrection, to a consolation close at hand.¹

If we accept this imperative inference, we certainly gain a very different idea of the expectations of Jesus from that usually entertained. He did not look for a resurrection succeeded by an ascension into heaven, an existence upon earth and an existence in heaven. But his hopes, in the first instance, were limited to heaven; and, what is still more important, they went out towards a future which involved nothing extraordinary, no unheard-of miracle, but simply claimed the rights and acquisitions of the pious. It is true that since the Jews, under the sorrows of their national reverses, had learnt from the Persians the doctrine of a personal future, they had not been unanimous concerning the expectations of the pious. The orthodox Pharisaic doctrine located the continued existence of the immortal soul, even in the case of the pious, in the nether world, in the blissful paradise of Abraham's bosom, separated from the hell of torments. They held that this condition of medium happiness was followed by the resurrection at the end of days, when the pure souls wedded afresh to pure bodies should return to the earth, and here enjoy the perfect bliss of the children of God.² But this doctrine, to a great extent constructed on the ancient Jewish model, was no longer the prevailing one. Not only Philo, but also the Essenes, believed in the ascension of the soul to the heavenly home; and Pharisaism itself was the less able to offer vigorous resistance to

¹ Since it is now customary to drop the prediction of the resurrection (above, pp. 270 sqq.), that prediction is generally transformed into the (modern) presentiment of a future or eternal victory (Strauss, Schenkel, Volkmar). Weisse finely speaks of Jesus as guarding his work from ruin (p. 317), of his presentiment of personal ultimate sufficiency (p. 319).

² Comp. Daniel xii. 2, and the passage above, p. 280, note 1.

this higher view, because the Old Testament favoured the loftier aspirations by its accounts of the ascension of Enoch and Elijah to heaven. This explains the facts that the Pharisee Josephus at one time mentions the nether world, at another—when he expresses his own conviction—the highest heaven, as the abode of the pious; that the Rabbis mix up the two conceptions of an upper and a nether paradise; that Paul the Apostle also, by education a Pharisee, speaks in one place of the sleep of the faithful in the tombs, and in another of the hope of an ascension to the presence of the heavenly Christ.¹ We have few well-attested utterances from the lips of Jesus upon this subject; but so much is certain, that he, with the Pharisees, declared the soul to be immortal, incapable of death. It is a little less certain that he placed before the mind of one of his co-sufferers on the cross the prospect of entering paradise with him, the paradise which—if we are not willing to be guided by the very questionable parable of Lazarus—must, according to the whole tenor of his teaching, be sought above, and not in the nether world.² It would indeed have been in itself a remarkable circumstance if the Son of the Father had sought his position below, and had left heaven and the Father to the angels, the ministers of the Messiah, who for ever gaze on his Father's face. That Jesus sought his future in

¹ Jos. *B. J.* 1, 33, 2: ἀθάνατος ψυχή και ἡ ἐν ἀγαθοῖς αἰαθησις αἰώνιος. 2, 8, 14: ψ. πᾶσαν μὲν ἀφάρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαύλων αἰδῖον τιμωρία κολάζεσθαι. Netherworld, *Ant.* 18, 1, 3: ἀθαν. ἰσχὲν ταῖς ψ. και ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαίωσις τε και τιμας—και ταῖς μὲν εἰργμὸν αἰδ., ταῖς δὲ μῦστώνην τοῦ ἀναβιοῦν. Heaven, *B. J.* 3, 8, 5: καθαροὶ αἱ ψ. χωρον οὐρανοῦ λαχοῦσαι τὸν ἀγιώτατον, ἐθελ ἐκ περιτροπῆς αἰώνων ἀγροῖς πάλιν ἀντενοικίζονται σώματα. The impure souls: ἡδῆς ἔχεται σκοτιώτερος. The heavenly paradise (where are Enoch, Moses, Elijah, Ezra, the just) in 4 Esdras; see Volkmar, pp. 6, 13, 45, 61, 188, 195, 199, 212. The Rabbis (paradisa), in Lightfoot, pp. 546 sqq.; Schöttg. pp. 317, 1096; Wetst. pp. 818 sqq.; Berth. pp. 135 sqq.; Wünsche, pp. 88 sqq. It is also called Garden of Eden, and Rakia, Arabot—*i. e.* Heaven—comp. Buxt. pp. 1802, 1659, 2287. Parad. superior pro animabus justorum perfectorum (sub throno Dei). Comp. Luke xvi. 22, xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7. Ascension to the heavenly Christ, Paul, 2 Cor. v. 8 (Phil. i. 23), against 1 Cor. xv. In the later Christian Scriptures, the ἐπουράνιος βασιλεία, 2 Tim. iv. 18; ἐπ. πατρις, Heb. xi. 16; οἰκία πατρὸς, John xiv. 2; opp. παροιμία, 1 Peter i. 17. Comp. 2 Peter i. 11. Heg. ap. Eus. 3, 20.

² Matt. x. 28, xvi. 25 sq., x. 39. Paradise, Luke xxiii. 43; comp. xvi. 22 (the nether paradise in Abraham's bosom, with the division which was current among the Jews, Light. p. 546).

heaven and not in the depths of the earth, is still more clearly shown by his hope of coming again.

He believes that, being lifted up to heaven, he should come again to earth; and by the aid of this thought, of this privilege which he claimed for himself, he reconciled the contradictions by which his Messiahship appeared in danger of being shipwrecked, or of being rendered without effect. As death without life would be the grave of his Messiahship, so life without the second advent would abolish his Messianic work upon earth, the kingdom upon earth, the kingdom of heaven. Our modern faith may have learnt not to despair of the existence of a kingdom of heaven upon earth, even though the founder of the kingdom of heaven no longer sojourns upon earth, but is present among us only in the blessing of his history, of his words, or of his spirit. But the Jews never possessed this kind of Messianic conception; nor did the ancient Christianity of apostolic and post-apostolic times know anything of it. Credible tradition has unanimously taught us that Jesus himself, the mediator between the old hope and the new, announced his speedy return to the earth. It is true that this personal belief of Jesus has been as often denied as asserted by liberal and impartial investigators, although or even because the universal and veritably passionate belief of the Apostolic Church, even of Paul, is altogether beyond question.¹ Indeed, it has appeared impossible, especially to abstract thinking, that Jesus, the proclaimer of the spiritual kingdom, of the enduring word, of the infinitely growing seed, should upon this point have sunk into the materialism and narrowness of view, or indeed into the phantasies, of the Jewish standpoint. It has appeared so very probable, in part even demonstrable, that the Apostles have referred back their wishes, their Old Testament views, to Jesus,

¹ More in detail, *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 44—47. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 341. Against Jesus' belief in his return (he believed merely in the eternity of his cause—quite modern), Schleierm., Hase, Weisse, Bleek, Meyer, Ewald, Schenkel, Baur, Colani, Albarik, Volkmar. For his belief, Renau, Strauss, Geiger, Weizs., Hausrath, Weiffenbach, Wittichen. Even Weiss, *Lehrb. bibl. Theol. N. T.*, 1868, pp. 167 sqq. Undecided, Holtzmann, *Gesch. Isr.* pp. 424 sqq. Gess (*Christi Person u. Werk*, 1870, I. p. 236) admits a return, but not "after a few years."

or have applied lofty utterances in which he perhaps with material figures prospectively described his governing and judicial authority in the world, in the Church, notwithstanding all separation, to a visible second advent, though they had already learnt to distinguish between a visible and an invisible presence.¹ Indeed, many have relieved themselves of all anxiety in the matter, since they have seen that John, the favourite disciple, the man of subtle intellect, gives us nothing whatever of this gross material conception, to use Ewald's words, of these additions of grosser men.²

The fact is, that the earlier Gospels, true to tradition, are completely full of the utterances of Jesus concerning this question. Near Cæsarea, he consoled his disciples by telling them that they, or at least some of them, shall see his return. At his departure, he exhorts them to be mindful of his return and of the final reckoning. At the last Supper, he shows them the end of their table-fellowship until it shall be celebrated afresh in the kingdom of God. To the Galileans he announces the judgment of the current generation; to the people of Jerusalem, the acclamation with which the Messiah shall be received; to the Sanhedrim, during the fatal trial, the spectacle of his coming again on the clouds of heaven.³ In words which are unassailable, he declares that he does not know the exact time, because that lies in his Father's hands. But that he shall appear in the days of "this" generation—the previous propagation of his Gospel among all men being secured—is the distinct teaching of all his utterances. While a later time was prone to devise all sorts of procrastinations to explain the delay of his return, and to place some of them in his own mouth, or to promise his coming to only a rem-

¹ Comp. Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20. On the other hand, x. 23 may be regarded as a later Jewish-Christian impatient fabrication. Notably, Weisse thought of the disciples (pp. 593, 596); comp. A. Schweizer, II. p. 146. Weiff. p. 110.

² Above, Vol. I. p. 174. Thus not only Meyer, but even Schenkel, p. 262.

³ Mark xvi. 28 (altered in Luke, Mark, John xxi.; see above, I. pp. 95, 114 sq.); comp. x. 23, xxiv. 25, 32 sq., xxvi. 29; Luke xiii. 3; Matt. xxiii. 36, 39, xxvi. 64. Comp. history of Passion.

nant of the Apostles, as the Passion speech near Cesarea itself gives it; in other utterances, on the contrary, there is a very distinct mention of a speedy coming, even before the Apostles have gone through Israel, and, in the most genuine passages, of a survival of the Apostles as a body, of the then living Galileans, Jerusalemites, and Synhedrists: declarations of Jesus with which certainly the cautious confession of the Church that Jesus shall return at the end of days only half harmonizes.¹ With the above witnesses the Apostle Paul agrees, an earlier voucher than John—who, however, is himself two-sided—since he, with the general body of the Christians, a few severely-felt cases of death excepted, expects to see the Lord, and in this expectation comforts himself and others with the words of Jesus.² In the face of these testimonies, to doubt would be an act of violence. Doubt here puts aside the most unanimous, the most certain of all traditions, the most decisive utterances in the most decisive hours: if we doubt here, no single tradition remains sure, and the weak spiritual understanding of the disciples is in no case trustworthy. Doubt here mistrusts the Jerusalemite disciples, whose adherence to the letter of their Master's teaching has always been insisted upon; it assails even the Apostle Paul, whose conscientious exactitude has always been respected. And what surpasses all the rest, doubt here converts the Messianic consciousness of Jesus into something incomprehensible, because a Messiahship in heaven was to the Jews the purest nonsense; and Jesus, despite all his freedom still restrained by the fundamental views of his nation, had in reality only a choice between the renunciation of his

¹ The time, Matt. xxiv. 36. That generation, xxiv. 32 sqq. Γενεά, a period of from 30—33 years (third of a century), Herodotus 2, 142; Heracl. ap. Plut. *Def. Or.* 11. See on Matt. xxiv. Procrastinations, already in Matt. xvi. 28 (only some shall survive); then the decease of all his followers to the—only hypothetical—John left behind by the author of the fourth Gospel, John xxi. 22 sq. Also the whole of the eschatological utterances, and in addition Matt. xiv. 25; Mark vi. 48, xiii. 35.

² John's Gospel also has, in part, a return, xiv. 3, 18, xvi. 16, xxi. 22. Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 23, 51. Certainly Paul already reflects upon a law of procrastination, which he finds in the mission to the world, Rom. xi. 25. Differently in Luke xxi. 24.

Messiahship and remaining upon earth, whether without separation by storm and victory, or with separation through death and glory and a speedy return.

This, then, was the direction which the thoughts of Jesus took, and it is easily conceivable why. By suffering death to the honour of God and in the service of the kingdom of heaven, he earned at the throne of God life, reward, legitimation and investiture in the Messianic office, contested upon earth but approved by God. This is an idea which evidently lies at the base of all his utterances about his coming again, and most strikingly expresses itself in Luke's parable of the nobleman who goes into a far country—not simply to Rome, like Archelaus, but to heaven—to receive induction into his kingdom.¹ But the form of the idea, indeed more than the form, the subject-matter and conviction of it—in truth, the divine instruction and consolation, the first plain “Scripture” in the difficult turning-point in the road—came from Daniel, the prophet of Israel, the prophet of Jesus. In view of Daniel, Jesus had previously assumed the name of Son of Man. In view of Daniel, whose book was so vitally moulded by the later Jewish Messianic expectation, and who in the visions of the night saw One like a Son of Man going in the clouds into the presence of the Ancient of Days, and endowed with regal dignity over all and for ever,—in view of this prophecy, Jesus now believed both in his ascension to God and in his induction into and acquisition of sovereignty through a descent from heaven accompanied by the angels of heaven.² With his soul absorbed

¹ Luke xix. 12; Acts ii. 36; Rom. i. 4. The sitting (or standing, Acts vii. 55) at the right hand of God (after Dan. vii. 13 and Ps. cx. 1), only Matt. xxvi. 64 (comp. xxii. 44), and parallel passages. On the contrary, often in Apostolic period, Rom. viii. 34; Acts ii. 35 sq., vii. 55, &c. According to the Talmud, the souls of the pious are sub throno gloriæ, tachat kisse hakabod, Lightf. p. 546 (comp. Rev. vi. 9). The Messiah with the pious in paradise, 4 Esdras xiv. 9. God to Ezra: tu enim recipieris ab hominibus et conversaberis residuum c. filio meo et c. similibus tuis, usquequo finiantur tempora. Comp. above, p. 285, note 1. Thus also the Rabbis, in Berth. pp. 135 sqq.

² Daniel vii. 13 sq: im anane shemaja; comp. Matt. xxvi. 64, xiii. 41, xvi. 27; Rev. i. 7. Dan., Rev., Mark, Esdras, *μετὰ*; Matt. *ἐπι*; Luke and Mark, *ἐν*. In 4 Esdras xiii. 3: volabat ille homo enim nubibus cæli. Bab. *Sanh.* f. 98: si boni sunt

in God, he renounced, in his passage to heaven, the path of clouds foreseen by Daniel, but which the Christian narrative subsequently made an accompaniment of the ascent into heaven. On the other hand, since he, in his personality, was to appear again upon earth and with glory, he appropriated for his second advent the prophecy of the environment of clouds, though the question is not altogether beside the mark whether he did not rather in a figurative sense "clothe himself in the authorized sumptuous drapery of Daniel."¹ This manner of returning, assumed also by Paul, is anticipated both in the Passion utterances near Cæsarea and in all the later sayings of Jesus. In his confession before the Sanhedrim—the correct handing down of which, above all other sayings, might be expected—he appropriated, in the clearest words, Daniel's prophecy of the Messianic investiture as well as of the path of clouds. We cannot therefore—even if we wished to do so—give up this position with a good conscience, and without rejecting the trustworthiness of the Gospel.

It is usual for critics, when they have arrived at this point, to speak again of a gross, indeed of a frivolous conception of the subject-matter, or else of the phantasies and fanaticism of Jesus, from which, however, Strauss and Colani would gladly protect him. The reproach of fanaticism arises so much the more menacingly because in the earlier Judaism itself the expectation of

Isr., tunc veniet in nubibus cœli; si vero non boni, tunc inequitans asino. Lightfoot, p. 349. This representation of the cloud-man (Anani, bar ananin, niblin) in the Talmud and in the book Sohar, which expressly—as evidently also Bab. *Sanh.*—alludes to Daniel in the words, intelligitur rex Messias. Schött. p. 233; comp. Gfrörer, p. 358; Oehler, p. 439; Colani, p. 62. That this transcendent view acquired currency with difficulty is seen from Trypho's definition in the second century: *ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* (c. 49), above, II. p. 297. The cloud, after Ex. xiii. 21, Targ. Ex. in Wetst., p. 503. Comp. Philo, above, I. p. 323. According to Volkmar, the transcendent expectation of the Jews themselves (Esdras) was derived from Christianity, though not from Jesus, but from the apostolic age and the Apocalypse. As if they would have embraced their mortal enemy! See note, next page.

¹ Thus A. Schweizer, *Glaub.* II. p. 147 (only that he ascribes the second advent to the imagination of the disciples); also Holtzm. *l.c.*, and Weiff. (pp. 100 sq.), who, however, errs in assuming the identity of the prediction of return with the immediate restitution (by resurrection). Similar imagery as to the throne of God, above, p. 288, note 1.

a mysterious advent of the Messiah, though not exactly an advent in an environment of clouds, is to be found. The cloud-man—so it is said, with a forgetfulness of several things—does not appear among the Jews until after the time of Jesus, in the fourth book of Esdras. But did Jesus, then, open the way to these dreams? Why not rather his disciples, who could only thus expect him?¹ We can give but one answer. Even admitting that Jesus was the first to seize hold of the passage in Daniel, and admitting still further that he gave it an incorrect interpretation, applying the regal investiture to the Messiah instead of to the people of God, and rendering the passage literally as to word and place instead of spiritually,—even admitting all this, nothing is proved against him except his genuine humanity. For the words of the prophets, even the words of Daniel, were to him the words of God. And it must not be overlooked that the passage in Daniel was the more favourable to his conception because he stood forth with Messianic interests and with the explanation of his personal destiny. In fact, there is as little to be said here of gross misunderstanding as of strong fanaticism. We might have discovered the latter had Jesus thought of an ascent to heaven and a return in the midst of clouds when he began his ministry, when strength and courage and men alike preached to him of earthly work; but his thinking of such things when he did was not mere predilection, it was a last resource. Indeed, his wish, his aim, lay upon the earth, not in heaven; he was, if one will say so, the purest realist. And when he was compelled to think of death, he could not be expected either to renounce his own person in favour of the “eternal cause,” or to

¹ Like Renan, Strauss also, though after long reflection, allows the charge of fanaticism to stand,—the great men of history are characterized by a touch of fanaticism (*N. L. of J.*, Eng. trans., I. p. 324). On the other hand, Volkmar here becomes the most zealous apologist for the dignity of Jesus: he speaks of the brutal, frivolous dishonouring of the clear, great, but veritably crazy, man, whose mind produced Mark iv. 26 (p. 550)! This is not the only point upon which this critic dresses Jesus in a modern mantle; the instances of the other view are not considered. The book of Esdras A.D. 96, but Paul A.D. 54 and 58; Rev. A.D. 69. Philo, Targum! See above, p. 288, note 2. Just scorn, in Gess, p. 243.

accept with a simple and blind, instead of an intelligent, resignation, the veiled divine future. He must understand his situation, must reflect, must adjust his relations: his means of self-preservation for the earth, his only conceivable path to the earth, was the circuitous path up through heaven, which was sympathetic while earth was inimical. He now saw this path of the Messiah, therefore his own personal path, with the eyes of his destiny in Daniel; and to a Jewish consciousness this path was not a dark one, for that consciousness could believe in an entrance of the soul into heaven, in a return of Moses and Elijah to the earth, in the majestic coming of God himself to judgment, in miracles, and in the Divine omnipotence, more intimately than can the present generation.

Jesus brought into direct connection with this return, not merely the resumption of his ministry of the kingdom, but its completion, its consummation. The Passion utterances near Cæsarea—the genuineness of which as a whole we do not venture to question—close with the second advent and the judgment. A series of utterances, from the parables of Galilee to the farewell sayings of Jerusalem, exhibit the same point of view. Here it is evident that the second advent was intended to be the means of adjustment not only for the personal position of Jesus, but also for the factual difficulties of the kingdom of God. The close of the Galilean period has exhibited the contradictory juxtaposition of the proclamation of the presence of the kingdom of God, and the often passionate menace of the impending judgment of the resisting world. This contradiction is now removed,—perhaps not exactly as we might wish, for we would like to see the belief in the kingdom of the present triumphant against all the mountains of obstacles, and against all the outbreaks of miracle and exhibitions of omnipotence; but it is removed in the only way possible, when the ideas and paths of Jesus find their outlet in heaven, namely, by a solution from above. At the second advent, the defilement of evil and the resistance of evil to the kingdom of heaven cease, and the judgment takes

place. At the second advent every imperfection ends, every perfection begins, the regeneration of the world takes place, the real, the consummated kingdom of heaven comes in. Certainly we should be totally deceived if we expected now or later great pictorial representations of this future from the mouth of Jesus. He gives the merest hints, isolated particulars, whose connection, nay, whose consistency, remains manifoldly questionable,—a defect founded in the meagreness, in part also in the imperfect preservation, of his words, as well as in the obscurity of the subject. Hence clear views were not obtained even by those—Jews or Christians, Paul or John in the Revelation—who undertook to delineate the future exactly and with precision. We scarcely venture, therefore, upon what must ever be a precarious combination of the details. Jesus frequently claims the judgment for himself: he sits upon the throne as Messiah, and the twelve Apostles by his side as judges of the twelve tribes of Israel,—a sign that the place of judgment at least is Israel. Elsewhere, it is true, Jesus stands before God and the holy angels, and like an authorized deputy confesses or refuses to confess men.¹ Without doubt the latter representation, an expression of humility, which perhaps takes into account a final judgment of God, is at once to be accepted as genuine. The loftier claim, which in truth is more strongly attested, and does not exclude God's supremacy over the instrument of consummation, is not therefore to be regarded as later glorification or indeed as arrogant pretension; for in the Old Testament also the men of God judge, Daniel makes the judgment the future privilege of the people of God, and Paul makes the judgment of the world and of the angels the future privilege of the Christians.² The

¹ Jesus the judge, Matt. vii. 22 sq., xvi. 27 (xiii. 41), xix. 28, xxiv. 31 sq., xxv. 19, 31. Only advocate, x. 32 sq.; Luke xii. 8 sq. (perhaps after Rev. iii. 5); comp. Matt. xviii. 35 (vi. 14). Only administrator in the name of God, xxv. 34 (xx. 23).

² The judicial action of Jesus in the sense that everything depends upon the attitude towards him and his word, recognized also by Baur (*N. T. Theol.* pp. 109 sqq.). Strauss (*New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., I. p. 331), and Weizs. (pp. 552 sq.), with the reservation that the more detailed portrayal belongs to later writers. Weak objections of Gess

judged are the contemporaries, particularly the people of Israel. The subjects of the judgment are the deeds and words of men, chiefly faith in him and deeds of love towards his adherents.¹ The judgment is described as a severe one; at the same time there is forgiveness for the pious, and even for opponents who perhaps have blasphemed the Son of Man but not the Spirit of God.² To Gentile sinners, to Nineveh, Tyre, and Sodom, Jesus promises a milder divine judgment than to unbelieving Jews, especially Bethsaida, Chorazin, Capernaum, the cities in which he had laboured.³ There appears to be a certain inconsistency between the earlier view of Jesus, according to which the judgment crowned the universal mission, and this later one, according to which the judgment opens the official debüt of the Messiah. Yet the latest utterances, which we shall have to consider when we follow Jesus to Jerusalem, suggest the thought that the Jews, or indeed Gentiles, will be gained over by the gospel in the interval of Jesus' going and coming; and traces of a final divine judgment are not altogether wanting.⁴ Of the possibility of participation in the kingdom of heaven by the dead, there is no trace, except that Abraham and the fathers who longed for the days of the Messiah appear at the table in the kingdom of

(pp. 241 sqq.) against the human judge, whose divinity he naturally postulates. As if Moses, Joshua, and the Judges, 2 Sam. xii. 13, Dan. vii. 22, Matt. iii. 12, xvi. 19 (according to the usual exposition), xix. 28, 1 Cor. vi. 2 sq., Rev. xx. 4, did not exist. Also Schleierm. (p. 358) has naturally rejected the judgment, as well as the second advent.

¹ Matt. vii. 22, xvi. 27, xix. 29; comp. xi. 20 sqq., xii. 41 sq. Deeds, xvi. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10 (Rev. ii. 23, xx. 12 sq., xxii. 12; comp. Rom. ii. 6; all these passages assume works). Words, Matt. xii. 37. Deed of love, x. 41 sq., xxv. 31.

² Matt. xii. 36 sq., xvi. 27, xviii. 35. Forgiveness, vi. 14 sq., xii. 31 sq., xviii. 35.

³ Matt. xi. 20 sqq., xii. 41 sq. These passages certainly do not say that he shall hold the judgment of this world and of the Gentiles. In particular he is not the raiser from the dead. Yet it is not a mere poetical certification of Jewish guilt. Matt. viii. 11 sq. has a more limited meaning (see next note); xxv. 31 sqq. is of later origin.

⁴ Comp. Matt. xiii. 47 sqq. with xvi. 27. A degree of accommodation to circumstances is already to be found in x. 23, xxi. 43, xxiv. 14; see also below, p. 295, note 1. Noteworthy view in viii. 11 sq., according to which the judicial act (no final judgment) is to consist in rejection of the Jews and admission of the Gentiles.

heaven as the companions of him who comes again from heaven.¹ The judgment, whose executors are the angels, closes with the reward of life, and the punishment of eternal suffering in the hell of darkness and fire, with different degrees of torment.² The blessedness of the pious, who, in Daniel's words, shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father, is freedom from the Pharisaical yoke, filial relationship to God, a great and manifold recompence from heaven.³ To abundance of terrestrial gain Jesus makes only the faintest allusions, and of any kind of worldly rule he never speaks, though he evidently assumes the autonomy of Israel. His eminence above his disciples he nobly represents as based on serving more than on ruling.⁴ There is nothing said about great cosmical changes: the "regeneration" of the world has no such reference, and the falling of the stars from heaven belongs to the Jewish-Christian description of the second advent. In general terms it is said, "They shall possess the earth."⁵

Only one great change is indicated, viz. the resurrection and the angel-like life of the resurrection. But since Jesus distinguishes between the separations, assemblings, and recompences of the Messianic kingdom, and eternal life, and since he is altogether silent about his prerogative of universal judgment and awaking the dead, the resurrection is evidently supposed to take place at the expiration of the Messianic period, which both Jews and Christians believed would be closed by a final universal

¹ Matt. viii. 11 sq., xiii. 17; comp. p. 282, note 2. xi. 22 sqq., xii. 41 sq., have nothing to do with this subject.

² Matt. xiii. 41—43, 49 sq. *Jos. B. J.* 3, 8, 5: ἡ ὄψις σκοτιώτερος. Also the Book of Enoch (Dillm. XX.) has fire and darkness. On the other hand, in Matt. xiii. 30, 41, 49, eternal life is not the subject.

³ Matt. xiii. 43 (Dan. xii. 3; Book of Enoch, 104; 4 Esdras vii. 35; Lightfoot, p. 564). The gifts, Matt. v. 3 sqq., xix. 29. End of Pharisaism, xv. 13.

⁴ Comp. Matt. xix. 29; Luke xviii. 29 sq.; Mark x. 30 (grosser). Rev. xxi. is more ideal. The gross chiliastic view, alleged to be contained in utterances of Jesus, maintained by Papias (after Enoch, 10, 19), see above, Vol. I. p. 39. Service, Matt. xx. 20 sqq.

⁵ Matt. xix. 28 (see later), xxiv. 29. v. 5.

divine judgment.¹ It remains obscure to what extent the angels and the pious of the Old Testament, or the glorified Messiah himself, can previously rule upon the earth, can dismiss the wicked in Israel to hell, or indeed can dwell together with the living, imperfect, unilluminated pious. But Paul and the book of Revelation suggest similar questions. The whole consummation which is to be brought about, Jesus includes under the title of the world that is to come; the second advent and the Messianic judgment will be the end of the present, the beginning of the coming era. It was left for Luke and Mark, influenced by the Apocalypse, and following Ebionite sources which sharply separated the terrestrial from the super-terrestrial world, to place—like the later Rabbis—the terrestrial kingdom of Jesus, in which earthly loss would be compensated, in the present era, resurrection and eternal life in the future one.²

¹ Matt. xxii. 30. Here opens up a very weighty question. Is the resurrection an element in the second advent? It has been thought to be so, because of Matt. viii. 11 sq., xi. 22 sq., xii. 41 sq. But where has Jesus, except in the fourth Gospel (v. 25), ascribed to himself the raising up of men? The Talmud has placed it in the hands of God rather than of the Messiah (Lightf. pp. 363 sq.). And, what is more important, has he not, in Matt. xix. 29, distinguished between the Messianic reward and eternal life, and also, in xxii. 30, represented the resurrection life as something quite new, a divine law? The passages above mentioned, therefore, refer to the final judgment, which included the whole of the Jews and was reserved to God; comp. even Rev. xx. 11; 1 Cor. v. 13; Rom. ii. 5 sq., xiv. 10 (together with 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. ii. 16; Acts xvii. 31). To this also point in the Gospels such passages as Matt. v. 25, x. 28, 32, xvi. 26, in distinction from viii. 11, xvi. 27, xix. 28 (comp. iii. 12), xiii. 30, 41, 49, xxiv. 31, 40. Both judgments frequently pass one into the other (Matt. xiii. 42, 50), as also in Paul's writings. The distinction between the two judgments is most clearly expressed in the Revelation (xx. 4, 11); comp. 1 Peter iv. 17. On the other hand, it belongs to the idealism of the fourth Gospel that *only* Jesus is the judge, as well as the awaker of the dead.

² Matt. xii. 32, xiii. 22, 30, 40, xxiv. 3, 14, xxviii. 20. Comp. Paul, Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4. Differently, Luke xviii. 30; Mark x. 30 (also Luke xx. 35, xvi. 8 sq.; Mark iv. 19); and, on the other hand, Matt. xix. 29. The customary expressions among the Rabbis (Lightf. p. 324; Schött. p. 1153; Berth. p. 38) are, *olam hasch* and *haba*, Greek *αἰὼν (καρὸς) οὐρανος* and *μέλλον (ἐρχόμενος)*. The Rabbis certainly distinguish from both, the days of the Messiah, *jemot meshicha*, as something intermediate, yet preponderantly attributed to the *olam hasch*. Comp. the often-repeated passage in the Talmud: *nihil interest inter hunc mundum et dies Messie præterquam sola subjugatio regnorum*. Schött. p. 1156. *Berac.* cap. 1 hal.: *omnibus diebus vitæ tuæ superindueuntur dies Messie*. *Tanch.* f. 52: *mundus futurus*

We must not be discontented because Jesus' teaching about the future remains thus obscure, colourless, and formless. Not only had he no time to explore this dark region, he did not even glance at it, and he had no inclination to do it, no talent in that direction. It is an evidence of the thorough soundness of his intellectual nature that he did not lose himself in this province—as did a little later the John of the Revelation—much as his fate might urge him to turn from the present to the future. He trod this ground, but he did not lose himself in it; he depicted only so much of the future as to his moral-religious thought was a projection of so much as was necessary, viz. judgment, recompence, grace, undisturbed blissful filial relationship to God. By this broad treatment of the doctrine of the future, he distinguishes himself essentially from those who indulged in the subtleties of the Jewish theology, and also from his disciples in Christendom. He unfolds no mysteries; he abides by the moral-religious nucleus; and while Jews and Christians give themselves up to fancies about universal temporal dominion, he, the Messiah, does not once on his own part put forth his hand towards throne or diadem.¹ He, nevertheless, in a most decisive manner, places his person and his cause in the middle position, and thereby impresses his ideal, his Christian character, upon the doctrine of the future, in which he touches Jewish theory. He is the judge, though not the final one, yet the Israelitish one; whilst according to Judaism, almost universally, the only judge is God, who is in truth jealous of His absolute prerogative. But Jesus is the minister, the perpetual instrument of the love and the compassion of God, even in the judgment, and still more in the kingdom of universal sonship. But he regards this his position as an eternal one, since eternal life is not a substitute for,

est, cum jam exiit homo ex hoc mundo. Comp. Gfrörer, II. p. 213. Colani, p. 63. Oehler, p. 434. More in detail on Matt. xix. 29.

¹ Comp. 4 Esdras xii. 34: pop. m. liberabit; then the Talmud on the subjunctio regnorum which constitutes the special characteristic of the days of the Messiah. See previous note; also above, III. pp. 56, note 1, 58, note.

but the perfection of, that which he already has.¹ Later Judaism had a preference for placing the Messianic period before the days of the judgment of God, and in *this* the present era, and therefore held the Messianic salvation to be finite, transient, only a kind of introductory stage in the sovereign reign and rule of God, and estimated its duration at 40, or 400, or 1000, or at most 2000 years,—a view which, with noteworthy Christian alterations, was to some extent followed by even the Revelation of John and by Paul. Jesus, however, is not merely in harmony with the ancient prophets and the Baptist, who placed the Messianic days after the judgment of the nation, but he definitively distinguishes the character of Christianity from that of Judaism by continuing the cleft between God and man to the end, by making—notwithstanding the prerogative of God—his Messianic kingdom, the rights of the Son and of the sons, as eternal as God himself.²

Such were the prospects of Jesus when he, near Cæsarea Philippi, with the resignation of a pious man, made his death the basis on which to build his future. He was reconciled to the

¹ The judgment of God, as in the Old Test., so in the Book of Enoch, cap. 90; 4 Esdras (Vul.) v. 55, vi. 1—6, vii. 33 sqq., xii. 34. To the question in v. 55: *domonstra servo tuo, per quem visites creaturam tuam?* the answer in vi. 6: *facta sunt omnia per me solum et non per alium, sic et finis per me et non per alium* (Christ). vii. 33: *revelabitur altissimus super sedem judicii*. Similarly later writers: comp. Berth. pp. 206 sqq.; Colani, p. 63. In New Test. particularly Rev. xx. 11; James iv. 12, v. 9; 2 Peter iii. 7. Yet here there is also the Messianic prior judgment (only in a grosser manner) by Christ and the Christians, Rev. xx. 4 sqq. (by no means the angels, iv. 4); comp. ii. 27, iii. 21, xix. 15. Daniel vii. 22; Matt. xix. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 2. The Baptist is Jesus' forerunner, Matt. iii. 11 sq. Eternal position, xix. 29, 16, xxii. 30, v. 3 sqq., x. 32, xii. 32.

² Resurrection and judgment in the *olam haba* (opp. to Messianic days), comp. above, p. 295, note 2. Berth. pp. 186 sqq., 206 sqq. Colani, p. 63. Oehler, p. 435. The duration of the Messianic kingdom as long as the wandering in the wilderness (40 years), the years of the Egyptian captivity (400), or as long as a day of God, Ps. xc. 4 (1000); see Lightfoot, p. 131. Berth. pp. 36, 195 sqq. Forty years, in Lightf. p. 317. The 400 years, in 4 Esdras vii. 28; see above, p. 276. Then seven days' pause, 4 Esdras vii. 30 (according to others 1000 years, Lightf. p. 364), till the judgment and the palingenesis. Comp. Rev. xx, 4; 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28 (but 1 Thess. iv. 17). In a certain respect the Revelation of John is more faithful to the Christian principle than Paul, since, notwithstanding its representation of two judgments, two resurrections, and two kingdoms of heaven, it makes the Messiah also rule in the heavenly-earthly Jerusalem with God for ever, xxi. 22, xxii. 3.

horrible thought not merely by his perception of the necessity of things, but also by his eager hope, not so much of the interposition of God, as of the finally victorious progress of his kingdom among men. But he would not have been human had he not trembled when he meditatively anticipated dying without looking beyond to the consequences, or had he not, in such a fear of death as, in truth, springs from the sense of spiritual strength and longing, at once vigorously made room for the thought of life, the thought which indeed his religion, his waiting upon the ways of God, still made possible to him. Thus we are enabled to understand, not indeed an indecision on the part of Jesus, but his allowing the difficult question to remain open until he reached Jerusalem, particularly and above all the intimate distress which was caused to Jesus by the protest of Simon, a protest which was at once prompted by anxious love and amazement at the impossible. It is true he did not retract, he persisted mentally and externally in his plan; but the displeasure which he exhibited towards Simon flowed not so much from moral irritation at a despicable and detestable sentiment, as from moral anxiety. His faithful companion's utterance of sympathy and astonishment appeared to him as a diabolical temptation, which sought to tear from him that which he had only recently and with difficulty won, and to instigate his own centrifugal forces to flee from the harsh, unreasonable, and impossible destiny. In fact, if the resolve of Jesus were thus recently and painfully arrived at, as we are here able to see, and if, while still contemplating the journey, while still at a distance from the sufferings of death, he was easily influenced by tender human words, then we look once more deeply into a life human in its feelings, its thoughts, its desires, and we are not fully certain, not merely whether the ways of God and the presentiments of Jesus will coincide, but whether the resolves made in Galilee will remain unshaken at Jerusalem.¹

¹ I have already (*Gesch. Chr.* pp. 34 sq.) urged, on the ground of the scene with Peter, the recentness of Jesus' resolve, with Hase, pp. 189 sqq.; Weizs. p. 475;

D.—THE GALILEAN CRISIS ACCORDING TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The important consequences of the resolves of Cæsarea have almost hidden from our sight the crowded, pregnant pictures of Cæsarea, the homage rendered to the Messiah and the confession of the cross. We recall these once more by reviewing, in conclusion, the peculiar portrayal of these proceedings which the fourth Gospel—in this respect both like and unlike the earlier sources—places before us. This book has compressed into one chapter the rising and setting of the star of Jesus in Galilee.¹

Schenkel, p. 141; and now Holtzm. pp. 419 sq.; Hausrath, p. 429; Längin, p. 72; Weiff. p. 105. On the contrary, others, willing as they may be to approve the upholding of the Passion-resolve as a fact (against Holsten), place themselves in a very eager attitude of defence in favour of a much earlier knowledge. Thus Dorner, *Sündl. Volk*, 1862, p. 31; Ullmann, *Sündlos*, 7th ed. 1863, pp. 111 sqq.; Hofmann, *Erl. Zeitschr.*, 1865, p. 1; Herzog, *Real-Enc.*, 1866, XXI. p. 204; Graf, *Heidenheim's Zeitschr.*, 1868; Gess, 1870, pp. 254 sqq. It is after all admitted that the thought of the Passion now first came to the foreground in the soul of Jesus (Ullm. p. 111), though rather pedagogically, in view of the disciples (Herzog; comp. Schweizer, II. p. 82). Ullm. says that the late origination of the idea would cause an immense revolution in the mind of Jesus, of which we have no trace. Gess says that Jesus must have known it from the prophets, in Nazara, before he assumed his official position, and Herzog says when he was twelve years of age! Herewith we are offered an uncritical collection of passages which prove nothing; and Dorner appeals to the initial sermon at Nazara! Gess says that the late resolve is not to be explained from the circumstances of the time, the conflicts had not become so severe. Herzog and Gess say that the strong feeling exhibited towards Peter proves nothing; suffering often became, from the testing in the wilderness till Gethsemane, in a genuinely psychological manner a temptation to Jesus; and, says Herzog, after all the passage in question is mainly a pedagogical utterance addressed to Peter. All these objections are wrecked on the impossibility that Jesus should find in Peter a tempting devil if he had been for a long time daily steeling himself to bear suffering. They are also refuted by the plain facts of the situation. If it be objected that the necessity of death may long have been perceived (according to John's Gospel), and that the *passing to the execution of his purpose*, and first of all to the disclosure of it to his disciples, may yet have been accompanied by a momentary wavering, we reply that even *in abstracto* this is not correct, since the execution of his purpose (opp. Gethsemane) still lay far off, and the strong internal struggle, notwithstanding a long preparation and a distant perspective, and in the very moment of determined didactic announcement, would distinctly point to *weakness*, whilst the concrete circumstances unmistakably show that perception, resolve, and excitement, coincide as to time.

¹ John vi. 1 sqq. From the abrupt transition Ewald infers the loss of a piece between the fifth and sixth chapters. But this Gospel is by no means free from un-

Jesus is suddenly absent from Jerusalem, where he would be persecuted on account of the Sabbath healing of the sick man of Bethzatha; and for the third and last time he is in Galilee, and indeed on the east side of the Lake of Tiberias.¹ Here the miracles of feeding and of stilling the storm excite to the utmost the popular enthusiasm. After the feeding, the people not only recognize in him the prophet that was to come, but wish to make him king by force. But then the movement is suddenly reversed by Jesus' repellent, satirical, and strange synagogue-utterances, in which he, as on the Easter-eve before his death, presents to the faith of the people his body and his blood as the true food, the true drink. A murmur arises among the Jews; even the outer circles of his disciples murmur and withdraw from him. Jesus, thus forsaken by the majority—though not surprised, because he knows beforehand that those who fall away have not been given him by the Father—asks his disciples: "Do ye also wish to go away?" And Simon Peter answers: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and confessed that thou art the Holy One of God!" Therefore he remains, whilst others go, and he recognizes the Holy One in word and person, whilst others dream of a king. Yet secession, the third instance of it, breaks in upon the circle of the Twelve. "Have I not chosen you, the Twelve? And one of you is a devil." He means Judas, who just a year later was to betray him. This Galilean crisis is one of the most ingenious compositions of the whole book, and its numerous coincidences with the earlier tradition are easily detected. In particular, Luke also places the Cæsarean scene immediately after the miracle of feeding, Matthew and Mark almost immediately after the second miracle of feeding, and John has woven the first and

connected, harsh (if not so harsh) transitions, viii. 12, 21, ix. 1, xii. 44. And it is impossible to be surprised at this when the idea so strongly dominates the matter and the geography. Moreover, the explanation comes after, in vii. 1.

¹ This expression itself betrays the late author. The Lake of Gennesar is first called the Lake of Tiberias by later writers (above, p. 192, note 3). Paus. 5, 7, 3. Origen on *Joa.* (ed. Lomm.), p. 239: *νῦν καλοῦμε. Ἀμνη Τιβ.*

second accounts of the feeding into one. In the earlier tradition also the enthusiasm is followed by a reaction; Jesus stands at last alone with the Twelve; Peter utters the confession of fidelity to the faith, and a devil appears, only instead of Judas the traitor, it is Peter; and there also the path of Jesus leads from Galilee to Jerusalem. It is true that the dissimilarity is quite as perceptible as the similarity. The apostacy of Galilee did not take place in a moment as a reaction from the preceding enthusiasm; those who would set up the kingdom of heaven at once did not go beyond giving Jesus the name of prophet, they did not attempt to make him king. Jesus' Passion-confession and Simon's faith-confession were uttered not at Capernaum, but far away from that place, at Cæsarea Philippi. Peter's confession preceded that of Jesus. Peter's confession, following, not the apostacy of Galilee, but Jesus' question about the disciples' faith, had for its subject-matter the Christ, the king according to popular opinion, and did not include a recognition of the Holy One of God. Jesus did not disclose his anticipation of the Passion in the synagogue or before the people—Mark scarcely alludes to such public disclosures—but only to the Twelve; and he did not speak in enigmas provocative of unbelief, but plainly and intelligibly. The devil was Peter, and not Judas, whose betrayal Jesus did not foresee until he was at Jerusalem. Finally, Jesus did not remain six months longer in Galilee, seeking there the security which he could not find in Judea, performing great works before the people and his disciples, and ultimately yielding to the exhortation of his brethren and seeking a wider stage in the south. Rather he ceased to work in Galilee, where he was persecuted and no longer found any place in which to work; and he went to Jerusalem, there to win new ground or to die. On account of these important contradictions, we have already declined to make any use of this account. It assumes the earlier and well-attested one, and has freely and completely re-modelled it. This is seen at once in the narrative of the miracle of feeding, and in that of the storm, with the sudden and magical

approach to the shore. It is easy, on all points, to detect the unhistorical character of the synagogue utterances, with their cruelly difficult enigmas, their anticipation of Jesus' sayings at the last Supper, their indistinct and hazy transformation of the eating of the body of the dying or dead Jesus—first inculcated on the eve of his death—into an eating of his spiritual personality and of his words of life, which, in contrast to the flesh, are alone nourishing.¹ But the most decisive point is one we have long since settled. The Messianic confession of the disciples, especially of Andrew and Philip, and the naming of Simon, took place, according to John, in the very first days of Jesus' ministry, immediately after Jesus had first seen the disciples; but according to history, at the end of the Galilean ministry in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi. According to the fourth Gospel, the disclosure of the death-passion was made by the Baptist on the second day, and by Jesus at the first Passover in the presence of a multitude of people and also to Nicodemus, and therefore was not made also at the second Passover before a multitude of people at Capernaum. In actual history, however, Jesus made this disclosure, as a secret, in solitude, to only a handful of his most intimate adherents.² In brief, with reference to whatever detail one may be inclined to question the general conclusion arrived at as to this Gospel and to institute a fresh examination, it will be found that the localities, the dates, the situations, the possibility of the occurrences, are everywhere and always so ingeniously and arbitrarily dealt with by this source, that the historian must incredulously and silently pass it by, if he would not reject everything in despair.³

¹ Comp. my essay on *Das Nachtmahl im Sinn des Stifters*, in *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1859. Comp. the supper at Jerusalem.

² John i. 42 sq., 46. Also i. 29, 36, ii. 19, iii. 4. Comp. above, II. p. 302. In contrast to vi. 15 (comp. ii. 23, vii. 31, viii. 30, xi. 27, 45, &c.), John has, for the rest, more carefully preserved historical decorum (after Matt. xvi. 14 sqq.) by making the belief of the people in Jesus as a prophet develop into a belief in his Messiahship only in consequence of Jesus' own declarations, iv. 19, 26, ix. 17, 37.

³ The harmonistic attempts even of Weizs. and Pfleiderer (above, p. 214) are hereby rejected.

DIVISION VI.—THE GALILEAN CLOSE.

A.—THE RETURN TO GALILEE.—THE TRANSFIGURATION OF THE MESSIAH.

The sojourn of Jesus in Galilee now drew near its termination. According to all evidences, we have only to trace his return journey from the north to Capernaum, and then watch his departure from that place for Jerusalem. It is true we have no definite or certain information concerning the length of his stay in the north, and the character of his return journey to the south. But the narrative we possess, which certainly is largely interwoven with the mythical, suggests a sojourn of a week, then a return to Galilean soil, a secret transient visit to the Galilean towns.¹ We may infer therefore, with tolerable certainty, that Jesus went westward across the principal arm of the Jordan (Hasbany), and thence, by a journey of from ten to twelve leagues along the Jordan valley at the foot of the Galilean hill district, passing Kedesh and Safed, again reached the lake district and his home. If we have sufficient ground for assuming that the whole journey necessarily fell in the beginning of spring,—that

¹ Matt. xvii. 1, 22, 24. In verse 22, the reading of the original, and even of the translations, is uncertain. Lachm., with Vat., read *συστρέφ.*; now also Tisch., with Sin. and Vat. On the other hand, C., D., unc. 14, have *ἀναστρέφ.* Origen on Matthew, Vol. VIII. 8, *στρεφομ.* (comp. Sah. Copt. *vertissent se*); Ital. sometimes *conversantibus*, sometimes *redeunt* or *revertent*, which can represent *ἀνάστρ.* and *συστρ.* (against Tisch.). Even in Origen the reading *ἐν τῇ* alternates with *εἰς (τῆν) Γαλ.*; see Lommatzsch. *Ἀναστ.* means to turn about, or to go hither and thither, or to sojourn in a place; *συστρ.* to congregate, assemble, or to turn about. As we cannot reasonably (Jesus was chiefly at Paneas) talk about a collecting together, a sojourning, or a going up and down in Galilee, the word may at any rate—and the second announcement of the Passion best harmonizes with this—be translated *to turn about* (comp. It.), and then *συστρ ἐν τῇ* is the more difficult reading. (The simple verb often in Matthew, vii. 6, xvi. 23, xviii. 3.) If this be correct, then the author by one word expresses the meaning that the return journey had been commenced, and that it was completed in Galilee (instead of the country east of the Jordan). Mark ix. 30: *παρεπορεύοντο.*

the resolve to go to Jerusalem, more exactly the Passover journey, immediately brought Jesus back again to the south,—that, finally, his arrival at Capernaum took place about the 25th of Adar, that is, a few days before the commencement of the Passover month, and scarcely three weeks before Easter,—then we may conclude with the highest probability that the sojourn in the north is to be reckoned rather by days than by weeks, that the whole journey occupied only the month of Adar (March) to the 25th, and that a few days afterwards, as the Evangelists narrate—on the 3rd of April, A.D. 35, as we shall see—Jesus started for the south, being anxious to appear at Jerusalem in the middle of this month, in good time and before the commencement of the feast.¹

Jesus effected his return without attracting any attention. In the foreign country near Cæsarea and Dan and Kedesh, it was only natural that he should not be observed; but he escaped observation also in Galilee. According to Mark, he passed by the towns and villages, and wished to avoid being recognized by any one.² But as he approached the lake, this rôle could no longer be completely carried out. In this district occurred the healing of the lunatic, which the Evangelists were not compelled, even by historical motives, to transpose to the neighbourhood of Cæsarea.³ His reason for returning home thus quietly was of course, in the first instance, his desire to continue to escape the notice of his foes, not, properly speaking, any longer in order to

¹ The chronology is determined partly by the notice in Matt. xvii. 24, which points to the end of the month of Adar (see below), and partly by the beginning of the Easter feast on the 14th, or virtually on the 10th, of Nisan. Adar, the last month of the year, corresponded in general to March (not February, Paulus, *Handb.* II. p. 497; Sevin, p. 12), Nisan to April. Wieseler (*Chron. Syn.* pp. 264 sqq.; *Beiträge*, pp. 108 sqq.), on harmonistic grounds, and in order to bring together Matt. xvi. xvii. and John vii. 1 sq., thought of the autumn (Feast of Tabernacles) instead of the spring, the Roman tax instead of the temple tax! On the way in which theologians have played with this clear text, see below, pp. 326 sq., 330 note.

² Mark ix. 39; comp. vii. 24. At any rate, Jesus' manner.

³ Myth has connected this incident with the Mount of Transfiguration, but the latter was placed in the district of Cæsarea; see below. Certainly crowds of people, Matt. xvii. 14 (comp. Luke and Mark), cannot be spoken of near Cæsarea, even though many Jews dwelt in that city. Thus already Neander, p. 375.

save his life, but in order to obtain an unharmed passage through Galilee to Jerusalem, and there—if God should so will it—to win a prophet's death. Besides, it behoved him to utilize the last days previous to his departure in instructing his disciples, and in organizing his little community of faithful adherents.

The main topic of conversation between him and his disciples was, naturally, the Messiah question. The confession at Cæsarea, the forward glance toward Jerusalem, the hope of the near approach of the kingdom of God, occupied entirely, as may be easily conceived, the imagination and the thoughts of the Twelve. A weighty question for them was the relation of the proclaimed Messiah to the Messianic dogmatic of Israel. Brought up in the school of the Scribes, immediately or mediately the scholars of the theology of the day, they still found a stumbling-block in the break which they had discovered between the Then and the Now, between the comfortless waiting-time and the dawning Messianic period. The prophet Elijah, the preparer of the way for the Messiah, announced by Malachi and the Scribes, had not appeared.¹ They, and not merely the three favourite disciples, therefore asked him expressly: "Why do the Scribes say that Elijah must first come?" Their question showed that they themselves, now that events had progressed so far, no longer expected this advent, and in the presence of the living and acting Messiah were willing to renounce the advent of the ancient and dead prophet; but that nevertheless they were rendered somewhat anxious, and felt the joyousness of their belief in the Messiah somewhat damped by their dogmatic reminiscences, by the current doctrine which was opposed to the reality. Indeed, their question also showed their lack of a profound spiritual appreciation of the signs of the times. They had not for a moment suspected that the predicted Elijah had come in a higher form in

¹ Matt. xvii. 10; Mark ix. 11 (with forced, unskilful introduction, verse 10). Malachi iii. 1, iv. 5, 6. See also Rev. xi. 3 sqq. In Talmud and by the later Jews, his return and his relation to the Messiah often mentioned, Lightfoot, p. 339; Wetst. p. 436; Wünsche, pp. 90 sqq., 110. Comp. above, p. 212.

the person of the Baptist, whose preparation of the way they had witnessed, and whose mysterious *rapport* with Jesus, whose fore-runnership, they had learnt from the utterances of Jesus, though—as is clearly evident from this conversation—Jesus had never before applied the name of Elijah to the Baptist.¹ Jesus now spoke openly, leaving, however, the last word of the partly-solved enigma to be discovered by the questioners themselves: “As for Elijah, he comes and will restore all things; but I say unto you”—thus he continued, turning from the future to the past as if they stood before their eyes—“Elijah is come already, and they did not know him, but did unto him whatsoever they listed: thus also is the Son of Man about to suffer at their hands.”² Mark has reported his answer more enigmatically, but not with more historical correctness.³ The disciples now understood that he meant the Baptist.⁴ This obscure, elegiacal prediction which he here incidentally made, and in which he clearly disclosed the profound and resultful impression produced upon him by the death of the Baptist, was once more repeated by him on the return journey, not exactly at the commencement of it, but just

¹ See Matt. xvii. 11—13, against xi. 14. See above, p. 126, note 3.

² Restoration, in Mal. iv. 5 sq., heshib. With his word, Jesus maintained the restoration-activity of the Baptist (among the people, Matt. xxi. 32); but he was wrecked on the hierarchy (ib.).

³ Mark ix. 12 sq.; comp. Dan. iv. 14. The passage evidently has the meaning: Certainly the returning Elijah has the positive office of restoring. But how can the negativity of the death of the Messiah stand by the side of this positivity of the fore-runner? The explanation lies herein, that even Elijah, who has actually already come again, suffered without prejudice to his restoration-activity (by the preaching of repentance), just as the Messiah was about to suffer on the ground of the Scriptures. Volkmar (p. 458) very arbitrarily, harshly, and incorrectly reads ἀποκ—ν, and explains: Elijah, when he comes, in order to restore all things,—how is it then written, &c. That is, the two are contradictory; therefore we must not take Malachi literally, and Elijah is no restorer, but one rejected by the people. We might think the Mark passage, as the more paradoxical, to be the original. But how could the main question of verse 12 about the coming of Elijah be thus forced back in verse 13, how could the idea of restoration be thus dismissed, how could there be any mention of predictions of the sufferings of Elijah (certainly not 1 Kings xvii.—xix.)? Also see the unskilful introduction, ix. 10. Ewald (*Er.* p. 275) would restore something midway between Matt. and Mark, and is supported by Holtzmann, *Synopt.* p. 88, and Weizs. p. 67.

⁴ Matt. xvii. 13.

before his entry into Capernaum, either in view of the nearer approach of his destiny, or rather with reference to the exuberant and sanguine anticipation of the disciples. "The Son of Man"—he said—"is about to be delivered into the hands of men, and they will kill him, and on the third day he will rise again." This repeated outbreak of the sorrowful mood of Jesus, combined with the moderating instruction for the disciples, appears so natural, the communication itself—deducting the little divergence of the reference to the resurrection—is so simple, brief, and inartificial, that we cannot understand the doubts of those who think that Jesus may indeed have once spoken of his dying, but that he did not thus superfluously refer to it twice or thrice.¹ Matthew relates that the disciples were deeply troubled, Luke and Mark that they did not understand Jesus. They are both right, although the two later Evangelists thus intentionally give prominence afresh to the incapacity of the Twelve. In the face of the clear words of Jesus, the disciples' agitation must have repeatedly exhibited itself, just as a cry was extorted from Peter by Jesus' words near Cæsarea. But the agitation would be no permanent one, and would not grow into a perception or conviction, because their Messianic hope was too powerful, and because again Jesus himself closed his utterances with an anticipation of triumph. This hastening over the bitter period of transition by these children of hope is so thoroughly human and intelligible, that we cannot follow Holsten in drawing from it ground for doubting the actuality of Jesus' pre-announcement, but we rather find in it ground for faith. Who does not notice how, later, the sons of Zebedee press beyond the cups of suffering to the thrones of glory? And who does not perceive how Jesus, at this very

¹ Matt. xvii. 22; Luke ix. 43; Mark ix. 30. The repetition is questioned by Köstlin, p. 76; Hilg. p. 440. Only so much is to be conceded, that the triplet of announcements previous to arrival at Jerusalem—viz. (1) Cæsarea, (2) on turning towards Galilee, (3) before arriving at Jerusalem—although placed at the most fitting points, may nevertheless be an artificial Jewish arrangement, similar to what is so often found elsewhere (above, p. 274, note 2). On the prediction of the being delivered up (not out of Is. liii. 12) and the resurrection, see above, pp. 274, 281 sq.

period, his soul filled and bound by the darkness of his future, and moreover anxious to sustain the courage and faith of his disciples, is as reticent and as sparing of his words as possible in giving his disciples those intimations which they were to ponder over for the moment and for the future? A little later, in the matter of the thrones expected by the sons of Zebedee, we see both how he allows the phantasies to remain, and how he nevertheless repudiates them.

The Gospels have connected with the Elijah conversation between Jesus and his disciples a remarkable narration, or, more correctly, they have added the conversation to the—to them—much more important narration, namely, to the incident of the transfiguration of Jesus on the Mount, and his talking with Moses and Elijah. Six days—in Luke, eight days, therefore on the first Sabbath—after the festival Sabbath of the solemn declarations of Cæsarea, and evidently when still among the hills that skirted Hermon, Jesus is said to have taken Peter, James, and John, his favourite disciples, with him upon a high hill, which only carelessness can mistake for either Tabor, lying near Nazara far to the south, or the Mount of Olives.¹ Suddenly, according

¹ Matt. xvii. 1; Luke ix. 28; Mark ix. 2. The six or eight days show the reckoning of a week from Sabbath to Sabbath, Wetst. p. 434; Hilg. p. 436. It is true that, according to several, Elijah was not to come on the Sabbath, Light. p. 339. Since the situation in Matthew and the others is not essentially different from that in xvi. 13, and the turning towards and going through Galilee does not appear before xvii. 22, the tradition of Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome, and others (comp. even Hilg. 1867, p. 439), that the hill was Tabor, is completely erroneous; and the refutation by Robinson, and also by Caspari (p. 142), based on the fact that a town was situated on Tabor, is almost laughable. The earliest tradition in the *Itiner. Burdig.* A.D. 333, refers to the Mount of Olives, Herzog, X. p. 550. We must think of a spur (above, p. 253) of the Hermon chain (Lightf., Paulus, Ewald) which was from four to eight leagues north-east of Cæsarea, and at this season naturally quite inaccessible; though not only Lange, but even Meyer, Schenkel, and Pressensé, are inclined to think of either the Panion hill—which certainly, according to Josephus, rises abruptly—or Hermon proper (westward of Cæsarea, says Pressensé), where, according to Lange, Jesus sought “fresh air.” Jerome (*On.* 19) was not aware of the remoteness of Hermon when he thought that, according to the testimony of his Hebrew informant, montem Aeron (whence the Tyrians derived *aestivas nives ob delicias*) Paneadi imminere. Neander, p. 375 (also Bleek, II. p. 56), prefers to think of a Galilean hill, because of the narrative which follows; and he would be correct if the hill were as well attested as the following narrative. Caspari (p. 142) despairs of identifying the hill.

to Luke during his prayer, he was transfigured before them, his face shone like the sun, his clothes became white as the light, whiter than any fuller on earth could whiten them, says Mark inelegantly, in the tone of a handicraftsman. And lo! there appeared to them Moses and Elijah, who spoke with Jesus. Peter, enraptured, said: "Lord, it is good for us to be here; wilt thou that we build here three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah?" But in the same moment there arose a veritable tabernacle of God; a shining cloud enveloped the three men of God, and a voice spoke out of the cloud: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear him!"¹ The divine revelation was over; with the voice, the cloud and the men from heaven vanished. When the disciples, who had fallen to the ground in their alarm, but whose fears were allayed by Jesus, opened their eyes, Jesus stood before them alone.² On going down from the hill, upon which Luke makes them spend the night, Jesus forbade them to speak of what they had seen until he had risen from the dead.

To believe in the literal accuracy of this narrative is a difficult business. A transfiguration of the corporeal part of Jesus to the extent of a sunlike brightness of his face and an illumination of his clothing, and then a subsequent return to the previous grosser terrestrial condition,—all this is entirely out of character with his human terrestrial life; it is purely a divine miracle wrought in a man, or the miracle of a God walking upon earth in human shape. It is without any confirmation, and stands in direct contradiction to the realism of his dying and his yielding to circumstances.³ A descent to earth of heavenly spirits has no attestation

¹ The last words are wanting in 2 Peter i. 17.

² The disciples calmed by the touch of Jesus, only in Matt. xvii. 7, exactly like Daniel viii. 18, x. 10, 16, 18.

³ Olsh. I. p. 534 (comp. Lange, II. p. 904), found here a station in the process of refinement and glorification of the corporeal part of Jesus, which ended in the ascension. Remarkable that the process retrograded again. Gess (p. 71) now finds that by the transfiguration is expressed the ripeness of Jesus for heaven; therefore (!) the dying was voluntary. In every noble man, moreover, he says, this transfiguration is present as nobility of soul in the eye, &c.

either in the ordinary course of things or in the Old and New Testaments.¹ Of the divine voices which speak out of the clouds and utter a medley of Old Testament sayings, we have spoken when considering the baptism of Jesus.² Moreover, the purpose of this transient magic picture is difficult to understand. According to the spirit of the narration, its purpose is limited to the disciples; for it is before them that Jesus is transfigured, they witness the interview of the three men, and to them the voice from the cloud is addressed.³ Luke first arbitrarily made the purpose have a reference to Jesus, by representing the two men as talking with him about his approaching decease,—of which there is not a trace in Matthew or Mark.⁴ But why the revelation to the disciples? Speaking generally, it might perhaps be to confirm their faith in the Messiahship of Jesus. But why, then, such imposing signs from heaven, especially as Jesus had always refused to give signs, and had rendered them unnecessary by his person and his words so triumphantly, that, even when a fugitive, he procured the lofty spiritual confession that he was the Messiah of Israel? With a perception of these difficulties, writers since the days of Tertullian, down to Herder, and down to Krabbe, Lange, Bleek, and Weizsäcker, have spoken, not of external actualities—with which Schleiermacher also was not able to accomplish anything—but of visions, or, with Neander, of the pictures of a dream, cautiously remarking that a vision also may rest upon divine appointment and may exhibit what is really supra-terrestrial, or wisely distinguishing that the trans-

¹ Gess, p. 71 (comp. Pressensé, p. 484): who will prove that this occurrence, &c., is inconsistent with the laws of the next world? We do better to admit our ignorance of those laws.

² The passage, Matt. xvii. 5, is compounded of (a) Ps. ii. 7; (b) Is. xlii. 1; (c) Deut. xviii. 15. Comp. Matt. iii. 17, and above, II. p. 284.

³ Hence also in 2 Peter i. 16 sqq.: *ἐπόπται μεγάλ. αὐτοῦ*.

⁴ Luke ix. 31; comp. 51, and particularly the emphatic justification of the death of the Messiah out of the Old Test., in xxiv. 25, 44. After Luke, Krabbe, p. 401 (strengthening). Beyschlag, *Christ.* p. 55; A. Schweizer, II. p. 82. Luke's representation has an analogy among the Rabbis (Wünsche, pp. 90 sqq.), who make Elijah and other pious men in Paradise encourage the Messiah to suffer.

figuration of Jesus was a reality, but the rest a vision.¹ But unfortunately, not only Luke—who here, as in the case of the baptism, gives the most vigorous sketch of the external fact—but the others also, despite the word “vision,” describe a reality, a conversation of the three men, an actual cloud and an actual voice out of the cloud, to say nothing of the impression produced upon the minds of the three disciples, who were prepared to build tabernacles for their guests.² It has also been completely overlooked that visions are by no means consistent with the spirit of the life and work of Jesus, with the sobriety and intelligibility of his religion and even of his death. Only apparently more appropriate was the explanation of rationalism, from Paulus to Schleiermacher, that Jesus had arranged a secret meeting on the hill, and that a peculiar play of light and of clouds—such as may be observed, for example, on the Hohentwiel—perhaps also a thunder-storm, caused the disciples to think they perceived a transfiguration of Jesus, and helped them to mistake the two confederates—Essenes or otherwise—who had come to speak with Jesus and them, for Moses and Elijah.³ But Weisse claims our ear most of all when he says that in this incident we have a symbolization of the disciples’ “intoxicated” perception of the

¹ Tert., *Con. Marc.* 4, 22: *habitus visionis*. Herder, *V. Erlös d. M.* (the transfiguration was the middle bright point of heavenly attestation between baptism and resurrection), p. 115. Thus also Grätz, Wurm, Bleek (II. p. 66), Krabbe (p. 398), Lange (II. p. 906), Press. (p. 482), Steinm. (p. 164). These think of a real insight into the supra-terrestrial which itself moved to meet Jesus. Vision, Weisz. p. 481. Comp. Schleier. p. 224. Meyer regards the transfiguration as real, the rest as a vision. Dream, see Rau, Gabler, Kuinöl, in Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 243. Also Neander, p. 373; Caspari, p. 141.

² Bleek (II. p. 60) has also admitted that *ὄρατα* (Hebr. *chason*, *mareh*) designates not only subjective visions, but also objective supernatural facts (Acts vii. 31), and in the context finds it probable.

³ Paulus, *Handb.* II. pp. 436 sqq.; *Leben Jesu*, I. ii. p. 7: in the early morning light on Hermon. Similarly Kuinöl, Venturini, but even Schleier. *Lukas*, pp. 148 sq.; Hase, p. 196. Partly, Theile, p. 55: play of light. In the voice from heaven, Paulus found the mere quotation of the voice at the baptism, by one of the unknown persons present. Venturini (III. pp. 178 sqq.) thinks the men were two Essenes, one of whom was Joseph of Arimathea, the father of Jesus (see above, II. p. 79), and that plans were there arranged.

destiny of Jesus and his relation to the Old Testament.¹ It only remains to ask, how came the three Apostles, even in the greatest excitement, to conceive this phantastic picture; and is it not more probable that others than the witnesses of the life of Jesus created these scenes?

This, indeed, rises to a certainty when we consider that the narrative is evidently not old but recent, and that it is based upon a very carefully elaborated imitation of the Old Testament. Old it is not. It is true that three Gospels give it, Matthew in the main in its earliest form. It is true that the silence of the fourth Gospel has not much weight, because it has the glorified Jesus in part earlier, and in part preferably not before his suffering but in his very suffering itself. It is true, finally, that the late author of the spurious Second Epistle of Peter, a writing composed near the end of the second century, tries hard to establish his character of eye-witness on the sacred hill.² But the actual facts of history, and particularly the conversation between Jesus and the disciples about Elijah, show that the disciples never saw Elijah, and that they would have seen him on the hill very gladly, in order to be thoroughly freed from the objection which their dogmatic raised against a Messiah not accompanied by Elijah. The facts of history also show that Jesus made no effort to remove the uneasiness of these disciples by appealing to their having seen Elijah, if not on the earthly plain, at least upon the hill; but, on the contrary, taught them they had seen and known him in the person of a very different man, namely, the

¹ Weisse, pp. 540 sqq. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 260. Similarly on the whole, though more temperate, Baumg. Crusius, Ewald, Holtzm., Schenkel, Schweizer, and Weiffenbach.

² In Matt., the only elaboration is xvii. 6 sq., introduced from the prophets, Is. vi. 1 sqq.; Dan. viii. 15—18, x. 7—10, 15—18. For the rest, everything is older and better than in the other Gospels, which delineate glaringly the folly and alarm of the Apostles; this is chiefly true of Luke, who represents Peter as thinking of building tabernacles for the guests as they were going away (ix. 33). Mark evidently has, in ix. 4 (Elijah, Moses), Rev. xi. 4 sqq. before him. The silence of the Gospel of John — which is emphasized by Neander, Theile, Hase, Caspari — is incorrectly explained by Schneek. (*Beitr.* p. 62) as due to antagonism to Docetism. 2 Peter i. 16.

Baptist. This genuine conversation, most naively bound up with the incident on the hill, thus at once quite incontrovertibly shows the spuriousness of the incident. It also suggests the how and the why this incident was necessarily developed in a later period, namely, in order to satisfy the theology of the Scribes and the Jewish and Jewish-Christian dogmatic, though in a somewhat different, yet not exactly later, form than the Revelation of John, which postpones the return of Moses and Elijah to the days immediately preceding the re-appearance of Jesus from heaven.¹

This incident betrays its artificial character in proportion as its great similarity to Old Testament incidents can be shown—in other words, its dependence and its imitative details. Strauss's mythical explanation found here, in fact, a most grateful soil, and Strauss has still left possible a gleanings of resemblances.² The prototype of the incident is, however, less the life of Elijah than that of Moses, although the former might supply materials, in so far as Elijah, like Moses, was upon the Mount of Horeb or Sinai, and received the well-known revelation of God, not in the stormy wind, nor in the earthquake, but in the soft murmuring of the breeze out of which the word of God made itself heard to him. The Mount of Transfiguration is an imitation of the progress of Moses to and from the Mount of the Giving of the Law. Moses ascended Sinai, as Jesus Hermon. Moses also took with him three companions, his most intimate adherents, his brother Aaron, and

¹ This contradiction has been already pointed out by Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 252; *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., II. p. 286; Köstlin, *Syn.* p. 75. It is amusing that Schleier., De Wette, Neander, have questioned the connection of this conversation with the incident, thinking it had taken place elsewhere, whilst others, as Fr., Olsh., Krabbe (p. 402), have unsuccessfully attempted to prove that connection. On the other hand, Köstlin, and since him Hilgenf. (p. 438), have quite arbitrarily found here an interpolation. According to Köstlin, Matt. xvii. 10 originally followed xvi. 20 (or 27).—Rev. xi. 4 sqq. An influence of this book upon the evangelical myth (Volk. p. 455) is by no means to be assumed. Why is not Elijah in Matt. xxiv.? The relationship is rather the reverse, for the Gospel is much simpler. It is noteworthy that Mark, like the Revelation—which *he* perhaps uses—mentions Elijah before Moses.

² Strauss concerned himself particularly with the details; he does not emphasize the organic origination out of Matt. xvii. 10. Even as to the details, several things remain to be noticed. Former advocates of the mythical theory, in Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 258, particularly Credner and De Wette.

Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu, and into the more immediate presence of God his minister Joshua.¹ Moses also received the divine revelation on the seventh day, the Sabbath day, and indeed out of the cloud which had hovered over the Mount for six days.² The God of Israel shone on Sinai, as Jesus did, like the sky in clear weather; the face of Moses also shone after he had spoken with God.³ Moses stood in the midst of the cloud out of which God spoke, and enjoyed afterwards in the tabernacle the advent of the pillar of cloud and the word of God.⁴ The people were afraid in the presence of the cloud of Moses, as the disciples are represented to have been by Luke; and they bowed themselves down, and no one—not even Aaron himself—ventured to go near to Moses, because of the brightness of his countenance, just as, in Mark, the people were violently alarmed when Jesus came down from the hill.⁵ Moreover, Moses calmed the anxious people, as Jesus did the disciples. When Moses went down, everything was in confusion, as we find was the case when Jesus returned. In the former instance, there was a noise among the multitude—according to the supposition of Moses' companion, a noise of war; so in the latter instance, according to Mark, there was a loud controversy between the Scribes and the disciples. In both instances, there was incapacity in the representatives, though the disciples did not, like Aaron, take part in idolatry; but the unbelief of the people and that of the disciples combined to bring about a want of success. Finally, in both cases, there was exhibited a violent displeasure against the perverse generation, Moses throwing out of his hands the tables of the Law and wishing before God that he might die, and Jesus crying out passionately, "How long shall I be with you, how long shall I bear

¹ Ex. xxiv. 9, 13 (Joshua), and xxxii. 17.

² Ex. xxiv. 16.

³ Ex. xxiv. 10, xxxiv. 29 sq. For the figures, comp. Daniel and Revelation, also the Book of Enoch, xiv. 18 sqq.: the throne in appearance like hoar-frost, and around it as it were the shining of the sun. The raiment of God glittering like the sun, and whiter than pure snow (hail). Also Matt. xxviii. 3. Comp. Wetstein, p. 435.

⁴ Ex. xxiv. 18, xxxiii. 7 sqq.

⁵ Ex. xix. 16, xxxiii. 10 (Luke ix. 34), xxxiv. 30 sq. (Mark ix. 15).

with you?"¹ Looking at these strong resemblances, it is impossible to rest satisfied with the belief that they are accidental, or indeed that they are divinely-arranged fulfilments of ancient prophecy. Nor can we get help by pleading that likenesses are gleaned from a number of different scenes, or even that they are bound up with a number of dissimilar features.²

But what was the real end and aim of this myth, so copious in details, so elaborately and skilfully constructed? We have assumed as its starting-point the Elijah dogmatic; but does this assumption suffice? If that scholastic notion was the occasion, it might have been appropriate to bring Elijah into connection with Jesus, if possible between earth and heaven, and on a high hill to which the ascended Elijah, the lover of Horeb and Carmel, came down; but wherefore Moses and all the other details?³ Yet how simply there opens out from Elijah a wider connection! The longing for Elijah's forerunnership was at base only the special expression of the expectation that the Messiah would crown the work of the whole of the Old Testament, as the kindred in spirit and as the greater one. This being the general opinion, and the Old Testament exhibiting, even previous to the prophet, the lawgiver, the Moses whom the Scribes had in reality deified, how short a step it was to make both Moses and Elijah appear in the interest of the faith of the disciples and of all Christians, especially since Moses was in fact the earliest of the ancient series of prophets, and had already in Malachi stood side by side with Elijah! Moreover, Moses also was currently held to have ascended to heaven in a cloud, as Josephus shows; and was expected to come from heaven with the Messiah, as is taught by

¹ Noise, Ex. xxxii. 17 sqq., and Mark ix. 14. Incapacity, Matt. xvii. 16 sqq. In the history of Moses there is repeatedly a mention of stiffneckedness, Ex. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 5. In Deut. xxxii. 5, exactly (see below, p. 323, note 1) like Matt. xvii. 17, mention is made of *γενεὰ σκολιά και διστραμμένη* (*dor ikkesh upetaltol*).

² Thus apologists, as Krabbe, pp. 393 sqq.

³ The high hill reminds us at once of the Mount of Temptation—also mythical—in Matt. iv. 8, which is described in an exactly similar manner. Also Ezekiel xl. 2; Rev. xxi. 10.

the Revelation of John and the book of the prophet Ezra.¹ The rest would follow of itself. Those who were to come again had to acknowledge the Messiah: therefore they and Jesus, the sacred trio of the men of God, took lofty counsel together. Again, the Messiah had to be equal and more than equal to both: therefore his countenance was illumined like that of Moses—which the later Rabbis have solemnly denied; he further appeared as the chief person in the trio, a fact which the disciples plainly noted; and finally, the voice of God commended him to the faith of the disciples as the end of the divine ways, and did this indeed in words which Isaiah and the second Psalm had used of the Messiah and of Moses the prophet of the future: "Hear ye him!"² There remains to be decided the final question, how far this scene is connected with this period of the life of Jesus, with the proclamation of Messiahship, with the announcement of the Passion near Cæsarea, or with the approaching catastrophe at Jerusalem. We can by no means find in the history itself that which both ancient and recent exegesis has found, namely, that it was felt necessary to place this glorification by the side of the dawn of the Messianic Passion as a counterpoise, as a proof that Jesus' Messiahship was nevertheless true and was tending towards glorification.³ All the initial features of the myth and the whole of its subject-matter point in reality, not to the Messianic Passion,

¹ Deut. xviii. 15 (comp. Matt. xvii. 5; Acts iii. 22; in the voice from heaven is a part of the Mosaic passage). Comp. Moses, in Mal. iv. 4 sqq. Moses in heaven (Deut. xxxiv. 6), *Jos. Ant.* 4, 8, 48, and the writing *Assumptio Moyses* (Fritzsche, p. 700), written, according to the only possible calculation (Volkmar, *Mose Prop. u. Hiim.*, 1867), under the emperor Hadrian, first referred to in Jude 9; on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, thinking of the composition of the *Ass. Moy.* about A.D. 44, derives from it Matt. xvii. 3, and other passages (Fritzsche, p. 36); Rev. xi. 3 sqq. (where Elijah stands first, as in Mark); 4 Esdras vi. 26, vii. 28, xiii. 52; comp. above, p. 284. Also according to the Rabbis, Moses is to come again, *Tanch.* f. 42: tempor. N. T. tu venies primus omnium (Schöttg. p. 149). *Debar. Rabb.* 3: tempore futuro, quando Eliam proph. ad ipsos mittam, vos duo, eodem tempore venietis. Wetst. pp. 435 sq. Bleek, II. p. 58.

² *Nizzachon Vct.* p. 40, on Ex. xxxiv. 33 (in Wetst. p. 435): Jesus non præditus fuit ullo splendore (opp. Moses); quapropter constat, non esse in eum credendum, &c.

³ Hilg. p. 437: prelude to the resurrection and ascension. Comp. above, p. 310, note 1.

but simply to the Messiahship. In order to calm and satisfy the anxious and the questioning, it was necessary that the full and solemn consensus of the Old Testament and of the Lord of the Old Testament should with convincing clearness and power accompany the proclamation of the Messiah near Cæsarea, the appearance of the Messiah at Jerusalem,—in a word, the fully developed and active Messiahship,—just as it had formerly accompanied the introduction of the Messiah at his baptism.

The theory of the Messiahship, with or without Elijah, was, however, not the only subject of this last conversation of Jesus with his disciples: the companions of the Messianic progress must be fully instructed as to his position, and more particularly as to their own. Of the addresses of instruction to his disciples, collected together at one point quite at the beginning by Matthew, and more widely scattered by Luke, a good half belong to the present period, and another portion is plainly shown by a comparison of the Gospels to belong to the Jerusalem period.¹ Jesus is compelled to check again and again the sanguine anticipations of the disciples, who as happy sons of the East are ever inclined to dream of the Davidic kingdom, of a kingdom of peace upon earth, of mere rest, joy, and blessing, by reminding them of the approaching struggle, and of those sacrifices in which they, his successors, must share. The preaching of the cross of Cæsarea is repeated.² Moses had formerly, in the presence of idolatry, given the command in the camp of the children of Levi: "Bind every man his sword to his loins, and slay every man his brother, his friend, and his neighbour." Now Jesus preaches his energetic sword-sermon, ending in the cross-sermon: "Think not that I came to cast peace upon the earth; I came not to cast abroad

¹ Comp. above, III. p. 393. Matt. x. 17--23 belonged originally to the eschatological discourse at Jerusalem (although Luke also transposes similar utterances in part to an earlier period, xii. 11 sq.); see Matt. xxiv. 9--13; Luke xxi. 12--19; Mark xiii. 9--13.

² This is the place of the discourse to the disciples, Matt. x. 34--39. Luke xii. 49--53, in its characteristic formation = Matt. x. 34--36; also Luke xiv. 26 sq. (and xvii. 33) = Matt. x. 37--39. In Luke, the latter passage is incorrectly addressed to the people.

peace, but a sword.¹ For I came"—thus spoke he of the last time, in the words of Micah—"to set a man at variance against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a bride against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes are his household companions.² He that loves father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loves son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that does not take up his cross and follow after me, is not worthy of me. He that has found his life shall lose it; and he that has lost his life for my sake shall find it."³ Passing on to the building up of the kingdom of God, he referred to the building of a tower, the cost of which should be well calculated if the builder would not reap derision and shame; he referred—with perhaps the war between Antipas and the Arabian king before his eyes—to a campaign of two kings, of whom the one with his ten thousand men must consider whether he can defeat twenty thousand, because, if not, he would do well to seek peace without a battle.⁴ Here he endeavoured to awaken energy to endure to the uttermost; then he encouraged and consoled, as he encouraged himself, and looked forward to the possibility that these Twelve, upheld by God, after his departure and happy even in death, would have to carry his cause into much wider and greater circles than the Master himself.⁵ "Behold, I send you as sheep into the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents and simple as doves."⁶ A learner is not

¹ Matt. x. 34; comp. Ex. xxxii. 27; Micah v. 6, in contrast to the Messianic abolition of the sword, iv. 3; comp. Ezekiel vi. 3, xiv. 17, xxi. 12; Luke xxii. 36. Brennus, Livy, 5, 48. The βαλεῖν, as in Matt. ix. 38, descriptive of the energetic, epoch-making character of his action (Luke xii. 49).

² Micah vii. 6. Rabbis, in Schöttg. p. 105. Comp. on Matt. xxiv.

³ In Luke xiv. 26 even hate of relations is required. Thus becomes modified the command previously so strongly emphasized, Matt. xv. 4. Dent. xxxiii. 9 probably underlies. The cross, see above, p. 274, note 2.

⁴ Luke xiv. 28 sqq. The war of Antipas, see above, I. p. 272.

⁵ This part mainly in Matt. x. 26—33, parallel Luke xii. 1—9. Also Matt. x. 16 = Luke x. 3. Matt. x. 24 sq., parallel Luke vi. 40. Comp. Mark iv. 22.

⁶ Matt. x. 16 (Luke x. 3). Similar in *Shir hash Rabb.* f. 15, 3: Deus dixit de Isr.: erga me sunt integri sicut columbæ, sed erga gentes astuti sunt sicut serpentes. Schött. p. 97. Figures of wolf and sheep among the Jews and the Gentiles, Wetst.

above his teacher, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the learner that he be as his teacher, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household! Fear them not therefore!"¹ But not only is there honour and consolation in equality with him; a yet greater consolation is the victory of this cause, the deathlessness of its confessors, the protection of God. "For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hidden that shall not be made known. What I say to you in the darkness, that speak ye in the light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops.² And fear nothing from them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him"—namely, God—"who can destroy the soul as well as the body in hell.³ Are not two little birds sold for one *ass*? and one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father. But of you, the very hairs of the head are all numbered. Therefore fear not: ye are more than many birds."⁴ He added a last consolation when he spoke of the final prospects of his disciples and of their adherents. "Whosoever, therefore, confesses me before men, him will I also confess before my Father in heaven; but whosoever denies me before men, him will I also deny before my

p. 370. 4 Esdras v. 18: non derelinquas nos sicut pastor gregem suum in manibus luporum malignorum.

¹ The utterances in Matt. x. 24 sqq. on the ground of Matt. ix. 34, xii. 24. See above, p. 9. Another application in Luke vi. 40.

² Matt. x. 26 sq. Hilg. (p. 400) quite erroneously refers the uncovering to the judgment. Rather might we refer the first member of the passage to the obscure parable-teaching, the two-fold veil to logical and local concealment; but it is purely a Hebrew parallelism. A Pauline and anti-Jewish application, Luke xii. 2 sq. More original, Mark iv. 22. Flat roof, see above, III. p. 215.

³ Comp. Deut. xx. 3, i. 21; Ezekiel ii. 6. The devil is not to be thought of, but the punishing God; comp. Matt. xvi. 26, v. 25, 29, xviii. 34. Rabbis, in Lightfoot, p. 270: creasti paradisum, creasti et gehennam.

⁴ Matt. x. 29—31. Luke xii. 6 has five little birds for two *asses*. Among the Jews, these Roman coins (*assar*, *issar*, *assir*, Bux. p. 175) were referred to in proverbs: *præceptum leve, quod vix assario (beïssar) æstinatur*. Schött. p. 104. Belief in Providence: *avis sine cælo non capitur. Non est vel minima herbula in terra, cui non præfectus sit aliquis in cælo, id.* Not a hair shall fall, 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 1 Kings i. 52; comp. 2 Kings x. 10.

Father in heaven.”¹ “He that receives you, receives me; and he that receives me, receives him that sent me.”² He that receives a prophet with a reference to his name as prophet, shall receive a prophet’s reward; and he that receives a righteous man with a reference to his name as righteous man, shall receive a righteous man’s reward. And he that gives to drink to one of these little ones only with a cup of cold water, with a reference to his name as disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall by no means lose his reward.”³ This is sufficient to show us how carefully Jesus, though he did not speak very much of his death, obviated disillusionings; still more how unwearyingly, how touchingly, he collected all possible grounds and means of a higher—not visionary—calm and consolation, in order to secure to his disciples, the bearers of his future, that faith which he himself was able at anxious times to win for his own person only step by step, only drop by drop, by the aid of the same grounds of consolation which one after another he offered to them.

To the equipment of the disciples for their independent future campaign, belonged also the actual impartation to them of the ministry of healing, so far as this was at that time still open. Upon this subject, only one narrative gives us any information, and that is the narrative of the restoration of the lunatic son,—a narrative which, by its connection with that of the appearance of Elijah, seems to be robbed of its credibility exactly in the main point, in the independent healing ministry of the Twelve. If the Mount of Transfiguration was arranged after the pattern of the Mount of Moses, then it was necessary, as we saw, that

¹ Matt. x. 32 sq. (Luke xii. 8 sq.: before the Father and his angels, perhaps after Rev. iii. 5). Comp. Rabbis, *ne abnega me tempore judicii* (from the disciple to his master), Schött. p. 105.

² The views which here follow, Matt. x. 40 sqq., Luke x. 16, Mark ix. 41, belong to this advanced period, as is shown by their whole contents and their relationship with other passages (comp. xi. 27, xviii. 5, xxv. 35). Comp. the parallel passages in Luke and Mark.

³ Hebr. *leshem* (*c. g. l. pesach, olah*), Schött. p. 108. To give to drink, comp. *Soh. Gen. f. 129: qui doctorem legis cibatur, benedict. accipit a Deo et hominibus, &c., ib.* Comp. Wets. p. 378. Little ones, see above, III. p. 252; also below, pp. 335 sq.

the incapacity of the followers should exhibit itself at the foot of the Mount. And even if we put this evidence of spuriousness out of sight, the mythical view superfluously brings forth Gehasi, Elijah's servant, who, as prototype of the weak disciples, is compelled to leave his master to effect a healing, more correctly a resurrection, which he is not able to bring about.¹ Nevertheless, these questionings do not satisfy us. This incident is, in its kernel, much too independent, much too characteristic, much too telling at this period—in a word, much too inartificial, to rest merely upon the books of Moses or of the Kings. In particular, if it were desirable to resuscitate Gehasi, we do not understand why it was not much more appropriately attempted in the incident of the little daughter of Jairus. Even Strauss is compelled to admit the possibility or probability that the attempts of the disciples to perform works of healing had frequently miscarried.² Only we must reserve one point, namely, that to the real history of the last Galilean period the incident of the transfiguration has been annexed as a kind of offshoot, answering somewhat to the Old Testament prototype of the Mount of Moses, an annexation which Mark has most fully carried out. But it is quite possible to sever this connection, and to admit that the incident did not belong to the neighbourhood of Cæsarea, and that this exhibition of incapacity on the part of the disciples did not take place exactly during the absence of Jesus on the hill, and that the healing by Jesus did not occur on the day of or—as Luke thinks—on the day after the ascent of the hill.³ In fact, these events will have happened on Jesus' return to the neighbourhood of the lake and to the population already acquainted with him,—a conclusion supported by the impossibility of a large concourse of

¹ Matt. xvii. 14 sqq.; comp. Ex. xxiv. 14, xxxii. 1—21; 2 Kings iv. 29 sqq.

² Strauss, *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., II. p. 187 sq.

³ Mark ix. 14—16 imitates Ex. xxxii. 17 sq., xxxiv. 29—31; Luke ix. 37, in Jesus passing the night on the hill, the sojourn of Moses on the hill, Ex. xxiv. 12, 18. Ewald (p. 464) explains, after Mark, the controversy with the scribes as resulting from the miscarriage of the attempt at healing.

people near Cæsarea, and by the presence of the Scribes mentioned in Mark.¹

This attempt at healing by the disciples was in fact no healing. The disciples were not yet, and they never became, the Master. It had to be sufficient for them—as Jesus had already said—to be as, nay, partially to become as, the Master.² In the midst of the multitudes from which Jesus could the less escape the nearer he approached the old familiar districts, was a father with his lunatic son—his only son, as Luke adds—afflicted from childhood, both deaf and dumb, as Mark further adds. As Wetstein very copiously shows, the symptoms of epilepsy were described by pagan antiquity exactly as they are here in Jewish circles. The disease was brought into connection with the moon; on account of its remarkable fits, it was regarded as “sacred;” and, particularly when it attacked persons in early life, it was ascribed to the indwelling of a demon. It is true that, in our narrative, Jesus says nothing of a demon; but one is mentioned by Matthew, Luke, and Mark; in Matthew also by the disciples, in Luke by the father, and in Mark by Jesus and the disciples.³ The disciples tried their power in vain on the sufferer. Then the father, with the courage of despair, urged his way to Jesus, and, kneeling, prayed for mercy on his child, who often fell into the fire and into the water in his fits. “Thy disciples could not do it.” Jesus exhibited a passionate impatient excitement, not directly on account of the unbelief of the disciples, as is frequently supposed,

¹ See above, p. 304, note 3.

² Matt. x. 25, and still more appositely to the above in Luke vi. 40. Steinmeyer (p. 167) defends the disciples,—they allowed themselves to be influenced by the cries of the possessed, and forgot their gift. But the people were, according to Mark, perplexed on account of the reproaches which had been made against Jesus and the impotence of his disciples (p. 165).

³ Herodotus, 3, 33: (νόσον) τὴν ἰρίην ὀνομάζουσι τινες; comp. morbus comitalis. Aretæus, *Caus. morb. diut.* 1, 4: διὰ τῆς ὀξείης δαίμονος εἰς τὸν ἀνθρ. εἰσοδοῦν. Excerpts from Hippoc. *περὶ τῆς ἰερωῆς νόσου*, and the later physicians, with literal repetition of the symptoms here exhibited (affectio puerorum, spuma oris, exclamatio, cadere in flumina vel mare), in Wetstein, p. 282. See also above, III, pp. 226 sqq. Winer, *Bcess.* Whilst even Olsh. is inclined to explain, with Paulus, the disease naturally, Steinm. (p. 176) fights for the demon, in order to avoid staining the clearness of the face of Jesus! Only the father speaks of lunacy, Jesus of the devil!

and as it is customary to infer from Matthew's account in particular, and as, indeed, would best harmonize with an imitation of Moses; but, as all the Gospels, and most plainly Mark and Luke, show, on account of the unbelief of the father, of the people, of his contemporaries, which—according to the first impression—greeted him afresh on his re-appearance. To him this unbelief seemed to be responsible for the miscarriage which was specially intolerable on the threshold of his Messialship: "O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I bear with you? Bring him hither to me."¹ With these words he at once administered rebuke and compelled faith; and behold! a word of menace was sufficient, and the boy was healed. Now came the disciples to him: "Why"—asked they, in no way applying his harsh words to themselves—"why could we not cast him out?" "Because of your unbelief," answered Jesus, who now for the first time looked for the guilt not only in the father, but in the disciples as well. Yet he did not condemn them so harshly as he had previously done the people: "For verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible to you."²

¹ To whom the censure was addressed is a subject of violent controversy (the censure recalls Ex. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 5; Deut. xxxii. 5; on the other side, Ex. xxxii. 21, 25). Not to the disciples, Chrys., Theoph., Calv., Grot., Neand., Strauss (formerly differently, 4th ed. II. p. 38); therefore rather to the father, or the son, or indeed to the scribes. To the disciples, Fritzsche, Meyer, Baumg. Crus., Volkm., Steinm.; others to the persons present in general, Kühnöl, Paulus, Olsh., Krabbe, Ewald, Bleek (II. p. 70). We must here make a distinction. In Mark, it is evidently (against Volkm.) addressed primarily to the father; comp. ix. 22—24. In Matt., the passage xvii. 20 makes the disciples appear the first recipients of it (in Luke, this censure of the disciples is wanting). But since Matthew also gives at first only Jesus' answer and summons to the father, and represents the disciples as approaching later and being much more mildly censured, and moreover, since the expression, "perverse generation" (Numbers xiv. 27, xxxii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 5; Isaiah i. 4; comp. above, p. 315, note 1), is not at all applicable to the disciples, but only to the people (xi. 16, xii. 39, xvi. 4), the father and the people must be intended. Very similar passage, Numbers xiv. 27.

² Matt. xvii. 20 (does not refer to the Mount of Transfiguration). Similar, xxi. 21 (mountain cast into the sea). See also Mark xi. 23; Luke xvii. 6 (sycamore cast into the sea). Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. Similar saying among the Rabbis often: eradicator montium, Lightf. p. 354. In the book *Sohar* repeatedly: commovens montes excelsos,

There is as little fault to find with this act in its simple form as with the declaration of Jesus.¹ The resultful—at least for the moment—action of the influence of Jesus upon the boy suffering from a nervous disease (more is not told), cannot be regarded as at all out of the range of the graduated scale of his deeds. The means, which he here as ever acknowledges, is simply confident faith, that energy of will and trust which he bore unbroken in himself, and which was active also in the father and in the son, whilst the disciples could not find it and could not transfer it. In Luke certainly, and still more in Mark, the incident has been robbed of its simple character by a detailed elaboration and exaggeration. The malady is described as of a most frightful nature; the deaf and dumb spirit falls upon the boy and tears him till he foams, gnashes with his teeth, and suffers collapse. At the very time when the boy is brought to Jesus to be relieved of the demon, a fit occurs, the boy wallows foaming on the ground; and in the moment of exorcism, the hitherto dumb spirit cries out, tears long at his victim, till he finally yields. The boy lies there apparently dead, but Jesus takes him by the hand and lifts him up, when he is able to stand. The greater the foe, the greater also the effort of Jesus. Hence, in Mark, the exact information about the disease and its duration; hence the difficult, though finely delineated—from a Pauline point of view—arousing of faith in the father; hence the long and solemn formula of conjuration, and finally the vigorous lifting-up of the half-dead boy.² The very mode of explaining the miracle has now become different. Jesus is silent about the faith which was his only

Schöttg. p. 171. Lucian, *Vot.* 45: ὄρη ὄλα κινεῖν ἄκρω τῷ δακτύλῳ. Livy, 9, 3: montes moliri sede sua paramus? Horace, *Ep.* 16, 29: in mare seu celsus proruperit Appenninus. Wetst. p. 438.

¹ Strauss adheres to the imitation of 2 Kings iv. as the main point; Volkmar finds this symbolic-lesson (p. 462): an admonition of the hidden Christ to increase faith in the midst of the demoniacal powers of the present (*sic!*).

² This arousing of faith may recall the test of the faith of the woman of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii.) and of the woman of Shunem (2 Kings iv.). Luke had the test of faith in the incident of the centurion. The conjuration, Mark ix. 25, exactly like the Jewish, see above, III. p. 242.

power, and talks quite in the style of Mark's mode of thought, as if he were a professional healer speaking of classes of diseases, of preparations, and of taking hold of hands: "This kind can go forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting,"—as if Jesus, and the sufferers from this disease at that time—like the Church of a later period—ever fasted; as if he on this occasion had prayed, as if he had held lunacy to be the worst kind of possession.¹

B.—THE MESSIANIC EXEMPTION FROM PAYING TRIBUTE.

The return journey ended with the arrival at Capernaum towards the close of the month of Adar. Jesus could venture into Capernaum, because at that time he was not supposed to be there; and he was compelled to run the risk, because he had at this last moment to set his house in order, i.e. to fortify and to organize his body of adherents concentrated in this district. Moreover, his steadfast purpose to go to Jerusalem, and the will of God which bade him attend the Easter feast, lifted him above his anxiety about persecution. With human prudence limiting his sojourn to the shortest possible duration, he was at the same time possessed by the religious belief that a prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem. At Capernaum, he was at once met by a demand to pay the temple tribute. The needs of the temple

¹ Matt. xvii. 21 has found its way in from Mark ix. 29. Strauss adheres to the uncritical text, not only in 4th ed. II. p. 40, but in the *New L. of J.* of 1864; see Eng. trans., II. p. 188. Indeed, Bleek, II. p. 73, Hilgenf. p. 440, Ewald, p. 464, Steinm. p. 168, retain it nevertheless. In Mark, "fasting" is wanting in Sin., Vat., and It. (once), as in 1 Cor. vii. 5 in the oldest codices; but in all the other codices, and in the Ital., it is present. I hold it to be original, since it harmonizes very well with the views of the Gospel. Comp. also Luke ii. 37; Acts xiv. 23; Clem. *Hom.* 9, 10; Hilg. p. 440. For the rest, it may with equal right be said that offence was later taken at the narrative as it at first stood, and the addition was required. Jews and Gentiles advised—as Clem. 9, 10—fasting (*seipsum adiligere*) against demons, Lightf. p. 341. Porphyry, *De abstin.*, in Winer, *Besess.* On the miraculous explanation of this proposition of Mark, see the commentaries. Mark may have come by the "prayer" from the prayer-sojourn of Jesus on the Mount, after Luke ix. 28.

had been early provided for in the books of Moses, by the tribute the so-called "ransom," half a shekel (a bekah) or an Attic didrachmon, worth about two francs. This tribute was levied on every Israelite of twenty years of age, even the poorest.¹ It was to a great extent from this tribute, collected from the Jews of the whole world, and carried from the remotest countries to Jerusalem by the *Hieropompoi*, or embassies sent to the feasts, that the temple treasury was replenished with those millions of silver money which again and again attracted the covetous eyes of the Greeks and Romans.² According to the Talmudic tractate Shekalim, payment was publicly ordered yearly on the first of Adar, the beginning of the last month before Easter. It was levied in the provincial towns between the 15th and the 25th. With a view to this, the official money-changers at this time set up their tables, and provided two chests for the tribute of the current year and of that just ended. These men exchanged the ancient shekel coinage for the *agio*, a coin worth a few farthings, and at the same time received the tribute—"peaceably," it is true, and without force or distraint, which was not employed until the close of the collection at Jerusalem. On the 25th, this work of collection was transferred to Jerusalem for the citizens and foreign Easter guests, who now either paid or were compelled to give something in pledge, e.g. an under-garment.³ We shall therefore meet with

¹ Ex. xxx. 11 sqq. Verse 12: *kopher naphsho*; LXX.: *λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς*. Hence Phil. *De Mon.* II. 2, 224 (in Wetstein, p. 439): *αἱ εἰσφοραὶ λύτρα ἐπονομάζονται*. Further explanations on Matt. xx. 28. Jos. *Ant.* 3, 8, 2: *εἰσφορὰν προσέταξεν εἰσφέρειν σίκλον τὸ ἥμισυ καθ' ἕκαστον. ὃ δὲ σίκλος, νόμισμα Ἐβρ. ὦν, ἄττικὰς δέχεται ἑρραχμῆς τέσσαρας*. The poor, Lightfoot, p. 350, according to Ex. xxx. 15. Comp. also 2 Chr. xxiv. 6; Neh. x. 32. The *darkomon* of the Rabbis, taken by Buxt. (p. 577) and Schöttg. (p. 149) to be equal to the *dúdrachmon*, is rather the Persian gold *darikos*, as in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

² Comp. particularly Jos. *Ant.* 18, 9, 1, where the collection of the Babylonian Jews is mentioned, which was conveyed to Jerusalem by thousands (on account of the Parthians). Further, Phil. *De Mon.*, *l.c.*; see Wetstein. The treasure, see above, I. p. 279.

³ Light. p. 350, out of Maim. *Shekal.* 1, and Talm. *Shek.* 1: *primo die mensis Adar publ. præconium ediderunt de hisce siclis, ut in promptu habeat unusq. hemisicl. summ. Decimo quinto istius mensis sederunt trapezite (hashülchanin) in unaquaque civitate, pacate nummum hunc exigentes; a dante receperunt, non dantem non compulerunt.*

the tribute again in the history of Jesus at Jerusalem. At the expiration of the period above mentioned, about the 25th of Adar, the duly appointed collectors of the temple tribute, citizens of the place as it appears, went to Peter with the respectfully reminding question: "Your Teacher, does he not pay the didrachma?"¹ The demand naturally also concerned Peter and the whole of the circle of disciples, since they had been wont to have everything in common as one consolidated community. Peter answered affirmatively; he knew that Jesus did not refuse to recognize the ordinances of the Law, and when he reached home he hastened to make Jesus aware of the demand.² "What thinkest thou, Simon"—said Jesus—"the kings of the earth, from whom do they take custom or tribute? From their sons, or from strangers?" "From strangers," answered Peter. "Then are the sons free."³ By these fine and spirited words, Jesus did

Die mens. vices. quinto sederunt in templo et jam coegerunt, ut darent et ab eo, qui non daret, pignus extorserunt vel ipsam tunicam. (According to Mainm., the beggar was to beg money, vel vestem dividere.) The *agio* (kolbon, from the Greek κόλλη-βος(*v*), small coins, namely, a half obolus to a whole obolus, *i.e.* from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{6}$ of a drachma, Buxt. p. 2032. Lightfoot, pp. 351, 341. Also Wetstein, *l.c.* The above shows the incorrectness of Wieseler's assertion (*Beitr.* p. 112) that there were no collectors of the temple tribute, which had to be carried to the sanctuary, but simply of the Roman tribute (which, however, did not exist for Galilee). Comp. above, p. 304, note 1. Also Meyer, Bleek (II. p. 76), Sevin (pp. 12 sqq.).

¹ Matt. xvii. 24. The Talmudic gabbæ thimion (mathmon), exactores rerarii, Bux. pp. 375, 383. We read also of gabb. zedakah (ex. eleemos.); comp. Light. p. 341: tobim shekalim, exact. siclorum. For gabb. zedakah were chosen anashim jeduim venæ-zemanim, viros notos et fide dignos in urbe. The respectful reminder, Matt. xvii. 24, is in harmony with the pacate in the previous note. An imperial tax would have been *differently* demanded (Casp. p. 154). Paulus (*L. J.* I. ii. 17) quite erroneously thinks of a mistrust of Jesus' recognition of the Law; Ewald (p. 466), speaking of the officers of the priests, thinks indeed of the opinion of Jesus' Messiahship; Steinm. (p. 220) of his freedom as spiritual teacher! Schenkel, *B. L.* III. p. 288, speaks of a legal proceeding.

² Here again Volkmar (p. 472) finds confusion, "terrible pell-mell," in Matthew, because he cannot form a concrete conception of the order of entry into the house. Since Neander (p. 385), many (thus Krabbe, p. 403) speak of an inconsiderate answer by Peter; at the same time (*ib.*) the most subtle motives are ascribed to him. According to Steinmeyer (p. 220), Peter referred simply to the payment of tribute of the previous year's tribute.

³ Census, a detested word (kenas, *i.e.* mulcta, Bux. p. 2071; on the other hand, kissum, *ib.* p. 2080, census); see above, Vol. I. p. 262. Matt. xxii. 17.

not mean to say that he was a king or a king's son, like the Roman or Herodian princes. But he was speaking in a parable; and since he could not call himself a relation of the worldly rulers, and since the tribute was not levied by the worldly magistrates either of the Roman emperors or of the Herods, but by the rulers of the temple, therefore primarily by God, he meant to say that he was, with Peter, the Son and relation of the Great King of the Holy City, the Son of God, and as such free.¹ Thus he here directly claimed Messianic rights, regal rights of a higher kind in Israel, and in a graphic manner impressed them upon the consciousness of his Apostle also. He felt himself, not free from the Law, but tribute-free, not simply as to the temple, but as to God.² He did not wish, however, to avail himself of his freedom from obligation to pay tribute. "That we may not scandalize them, i.e. give them any offence, as if we were despisers of the ordinance of Moses"—he said to Peter—"go to the sea, cast out a hook, and give it instead of [*ἀντι*] me and thee."³

Such would be the general character of the incident which has been handed down to us in a narration half historical and true, and half mythical.⁴ Matthew, the only narrator of it, has intro-

¹ Although the Romans ruled in Jerusalem, they exercised no control over the temple treasure or its collection. Pilate had learnt by experience (see above, Vol. I. p. 305), and the Romans themselves found it good, after the death of Agrippa I. (A.D. 44) to appoint Herod of Chalcis, then Agrippa II., as temple overseer; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 9, 7. Wieseler's notion of an imperial tax is thus shown to be quite an erroneous one. Neander, Bleek, Ewald, Meyer, Casp., are unanimous in defending the view given above, from the standpoint of the utterance of Jesus.

² There is a difference of opinion as to the freedom of the priests. Wetstein, p. 440, questions their freedom; Steinmeyer, p. 220, asserts it. A prediction of the emancipation of the temple is here incorrectly sought for by Dorner, *Sündlos*. p. 37, Steinmeyer, p. 222, and Gess, pp. 289, 291. Meyer thinks that Jesus did not include Peter (p. 341); Beyschlag (*Christ*. p. 60) holds that he distinguishes himself from strangers as a king's son by *birth!*

³ The *ἀντι* again recalls the *λίτρον*; comp. Matt. xx. 28. Wetstein, p. 439, gives an interesting parallel of a king who, for the encouragement of others, pays tribute though it belongs to him.

⁴ Strauss (4th ed. p. 184, *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., II. pp. 237 sqq.) assumes the absolutely unhistorical character of the narration, regarding it as legendary offshoot of the lake anecdotes, on the ground of the question of the temple tribute, the mythical fisherman, and the mythical fish. Schleier, Weisse, and Schenkel, also mistrust the

duced a double miracle. He represents Jesus as having a higher and divine knowledge of the question about the tribute, and as anticipating Peter and beginning to speak before the latter had delivered his message. Then he represents Jesus as having arranged the catch of fish in such a way that Peter should find in the mouth of the first fish that rose, a silver stater, i.e. a four-drachma piece. According to all we know of the life of Jesus, he was not possessed of such miraculous knowledge and power. He knew of the Baptist's death, the fact that was decisive of his own fate, only through the Baptist's disciples; would he, within the walls of his house, have known, without being told, of the unimportant question of the temple official? The fish-miracle itself would have to be explained either by the supernatural creation of a coin bearing a Gentile impression in the fish's mouth, or by the supernatural bringing of the fish to Peter's angle, or even—as recent writers prefer—by the miraculous knowledge of such a remarkable specimen in the lake, and the determining it to fall to Peter's lot to take it. But these are truly childish assumptions belonging to the province of fable, particularly as the fish gives rise to several other difficulties. It is certainly not impossible for fishes to lodge heavy coins within them; but this fish, instead of swallowing the coin, must have kept it in its jaws, and at the same time greedily—nay, insatiably, as Dr. Schnappinger has shown—snapped at the angle!² We must therefore give up this miracle, which even Olshausen

whole story. Weisse (II. p. 98; comp. Ewald, p. 491) thinks that the incident has been introduced because of Matt. xviii. 6.

¹ Steinmeyer, p. 220: certainly not through the ear, but by intuition. Comp. the mistake of Jesus in the case of the lunatic, above, p. 323.

² The well-known example of the ring of Polycrates, which was found again in the stomach of a fish that had been taken by a fisherman. Herodotus, 3, 42; Strabo, 14, 1. Ancient writers (and still Arnoldi) represent the stater as having been created in the fish's mouth; Bengel (according to Steinmeyer, p. 223, the critic who sees most profoundly into this question) thought of a command given to the fish; Grotius, Schnappinger, Krabbe, and now also Meyer and Bleek, think of simply a miraculous knowledge, and Bleek takes the liberty of finding the position of the money in the stomach (as in the case of the ring of Polycrates) more probably than in the mouth. Schnappinger, in Paulus' *Haub.* II. p. 508; Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 182.

considers a "most difficult one," and Paulus has coarsely ridiculed as the "miracle for a thaler;" but it is not therefore necessary to renounce the whole of the incident, guaranteed not only by a chronological reckoning so evidently exact and artlessly appropriate, but still more by words of Jesus which could not have been invented. And this nucleus of the incident is so peculiarly weighty that we may fearlessly dispense with the restoration of the details, about which many critics have indulged in various conceits. We may be indifferent to the questions whether Jesus himself heard the inquiry of the tribute collectors, or received a report of it from Peter; whether Peter obtained the small needful sum from the sale of the fish or of the fishes which he had caught, or—if we have no faith in the mythical fisherman—from the resources of the family or of the adherents in Capernaum, which he could have done in some way even in the absence of the "bearer of the purse," without any dishonour to either God or Jesus.¹ In truth, mythical tradition is shrewd enough—as

¹ The utilization of the calendar is always avoided by the leading harmonists, and by others, as by Wieseler. What fancies about times and places in Paulus, *Handb.* II. p. 497; Neander, p. 385; Ewald, p. 491; Casp. p. 153 sq.! Summer, autumn, and winter, are found possible, since Matthew *accidentally* placed the incident here, or Jesus *incidentally* referred to the *old* tribute (of the previous year). The natural explanation already present to Paulus (*Handb.* II. p. 508); by Paulus himself in different forms, so that he understood the result of the capture of the fish, with the "opening of the mouth," at one place in reference to the fish itself (which was made saleable by the abstraction of the angle from its jaws), at another place in reference to Peter (who was to offer his (ἀβροῦν) fish in the market). *Handb.* p. 502; *L. J.* I. ii. 20. Similarly, Kaiser, *Bibl. Th.* I. p. 200, fishing so long, &c.; on the other hand, Schnappinger imagined the first fish to be very large. Eichhorn, *Einkl.* I. p. 486, found in the fish's *mouth* a false translation from the Hebrew. Neander was at first disposed to retain the stater (comp. Hase, p. 199); but he afterwards (p. 386) fell back, with Hase (p. 198) and Ewald (p. 467), upon a blessing on the labour. Lange, II. p. 316, found that the construction of the fish's mouth did not make the matter so impossible; and he also (as Krabbe, p. 405) thought of clairvoyants who were able to see metals; finally, however, he adopted the rationalistic explanation that Peter was directed to give up the fish *in natura*. Weisse, later (*Ev. Frag.* p. 265) adopted a symbolical interpretation: the first catch of disciples was to be put to Peter's credit instead of legally compulsory contributions (similarly Volkmar, p. 523). And Steinmeyer, p. 225, holding fast the fact as a symbolical prophetic miracle, is very proud of the explanation that the Apostles were to be allowed to demand *money* for their preaching, as Christian tribute for the Christian temple.—Olshausen, I. p. 541. Also Lange refers (p. 319) to a readily obtained loan. Also Krabbe, p. 404. Bearer of the purse, Steinm. p. 224.

Neander and Ewald see—not to plume and adorn itself with a report of the actual success of the fisherman-apostle Peter, about whom it does not concern itself. Why this incident is wanting in Luke and Mark, the children of a time that wished to keep the temple tribute out of sight and cursed the vexatious introduction of it, has been explained in the introduction; and we may here add that these Gospels were not pleased with the preference shown for Peter.¹ Recent critics have, however, quite erroneously explained Matthew's unwelcome narration, i.e. the unwelcome fish-miracle, by supposing that a later writer had attempted to commend to the Jewish Christians the forgotten or detested temple tribute (which, after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, went to the victorious deities of Rome, to Jupiter Capitolinus) by the sanction of actual or supposititious words of Jesus, who wished to avoid offending the Jews—more correctly the Gentiles—and, although himself a king, obeyed the Heavenly King—more correctly the kings of the earth.² But it is not per-

¹ See above, I. p. 66. Jos. *B. J.* 7, 6, 6 (not as early as the LXX., as is generally said, and even by Volkmar, but during the third year of Vespasian, between 15th of July, A.D. 69, and A.D. 72, therefore the summer of A.D. 72): *φόρον τοῖς ὕπου δῆποτ' οἷσιν Ἰουδ. ἐπέβαλε, ἑνὸν ἑραχμᾶς ἕκαστον κελεύσας ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος εἰς τὸ κασιπέωλιον φέρειν, ὡσπερ πρότερον εἰς τὸν ἐν Ἱερ. νεῶν συνετέλουον.* Dio C. 66, 7: *ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἑὶραχμῶν ἐτάχθη τοῖς τὰ πάτρια αὐτῶν ἔθῃ περιστέλλοντας τῷ καπ. Δὴ κατ' ἔτος ἀποφέρειν.* Suet. *Dom.* 12: *Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est* (examination even of grey-headed men as to their having been circumcised). Nerva afterwards forbad accusations of *ἰουδαϊκος βίος*, Dio C. 68, 1.

² The first impulse was given by Karl Köstlin, *Synopt.* 31, who believed that this incident was intended to commend the temple tribute (which was a matter of weight at the period of the LXX.) to the Jewish Christians of Palestine, who, like Jesus himself, were disinclined to a connection with the temple. Similarly Hilgenfeld, *Er.* p. 91, and *Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 440; Strauss in *ib.* 1863, p. 293; *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., II. p. 237 sqq. Between Köstlin, Hilgenfeld and Strauss, there is this difference, that while the two former hold the conversation to be historical, Strauss does not. All three agree in admitting that Luke and Mark, as later writers, omitted the narration because in their time the temple tribute had no longer any meaning. Then, on the contrary, Volkmar, *Rev. Jesu*, p. 358, has seen in the narration a commendation to the Church (even to the Gentile Christians) of the Jewish capitation tax paid to the Romans, and in the Gentile Christian interest: i.e. Peter, as fisher of men, was not to be too scrupulous, but was to take the first human fish—viz. even Gentiles—he could, and thereby gain a stater for the emperor (!); and in order to avoid giving offence, he was to pay it, notwithstanding the freedom of the Church (in the Trajan time, about A.D. 115). Volkmar is right in recognizing the importance of the question

ceived that this interpretation, even when reduced to the most rational formula, is a violent, nay, an absurd one. Jesus could never, not even in the mouth of one who was writing fiction, reckon himself among the tribute-free princes of this world; and no single Jewish Christian could be so deficient in the proverbial sagacity of his race as not to pronounce such an utterance to prove nothing in altered times, or one to be immediately rejected as Gentile, godless, idolatrous. And under such circumstances the idle invention might have been well spared.¹

C.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY OF THE MESSIAH.

Jesus accomplished his last Galilean task, not so much by performing fresh miracles of healing on sick persons who flocked to him after his absence, as chiefly by giving to his community the organization which was necessary in order to prepare them

even after the destruction of the temple; but Hilg. and Strauss are right, against him, in finding the question at that time completely changed, and the exhibition of the temple tribute as a prototype of the Gentile tribute "altogether too clumsy" (Strauss, *l. c.*). And in point of fact, with reference to the absolutely odious Gentile tribute, which as an abomination far outvied the census (*Jos. Ant.* 18, 1, 1), no single Jew, no Jewish Christian, could be driven by his conscience—as Volkmar still (though he now sees a little more clearly into the subject) has the boldness to think (*Er.* p. 523)—to make himself a martyr to this tribute; and no one could think of representing Jesus as commending the present idolatrous tribute either to Jewish, or indeed to Gentile Christians (!). Does not history exhibit the extortions, nay the sufferings, endured by the resisting Jews? The utterance of Jesus himself cannot by any means be turned to such a meaning, as the above satisfactorily shows. Had any one given such a turn to the utterance, *he* must in truth have passed among the Jewish Christians as the false prophet of the beast (*Rev.* xiii. 11) with much more right than the Apostle Paul, to whom Volkmar applies that character in such a very reckless manner. We have here at once a chronological sign for Luke and Mark, the latter of whom betrays the original text by the mention of Capernaum (ix. 33), and indeed also by the subsequent controversy. Notwithstanding his leaning to Mark, Schenkel (*Bibel-Lex.* III. p. 288) has rejected the capture of the fish, but allowed the question of the temple tribute to remain. According to Volkmar, the foundation of Matthew's passage is to be found in Mark xii. 14; Luke xxiii. 2! Daring!

¹ Similarly, Hilgenfeld and Strauss, *l. c.*

for the future.¹ Such a precaution was in harmony with his discretion—nay, with his wisdom and his love, which he could not fail to exhibit even under the pressure of his approaching destiny. We have, it is true, only meagre and in part contradictory, and in several cases controvertible, traditions of these latest arrangements. After the incident of the temple tribute, and indeed in the same hour, Matthew represents the disciples as coming to Jesus with the question, who among them was the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. As we have long seen, the Twelve were much addicted to such considerations of the approaching period of their good fortune. But this incident is particularly instructive in connection with the question of the temple tribute, in reference to which Jesus had cast off in a moment every trace of depression, and had promptly and joyously claimed his regal and Messianic right, and had to a certain extent shared that right with the favoured Peter or with them all. Here therefore we may, indeed, see afresh that the incident of the temple tribute is not forcibly thrust into this context, but rather springs out of it. And in fact Luke, though he introduces the controversy as to who should be the greatest, gives no context whatever; Mark (evidently based on Luke) gives only a very artificial one, by representing the disciples as engaging in the controversy on the way to Capernaum, and as afterwards asking Jesus about it when they were in the house at that place. Here we see at once that the disciples would scarcely have spoken out their anticipations of coming good, after the startling announcement of Jesus' death, which in Mark immediately precedes; and that the Jesus who was able to reproduce their whispered conversation from his higher knowledge, was far from being the Jesus of history.² In other respects also Matthew is

¹ Healings, Matt. xvii. 14; Luke xiii. 32. Organization, Matt. xviii. 1; Luke ix. 46; Mark ix. 33. That in the later period Jesus thought of such an organization can be inferred from Matt. xvi. 18, xxi. 42; Luke xii. 32; comp. Mark iv. 11. Also Ewald, p. 465, and Schenkel, *Bibel-Lex.* III. p. 286, justly give prominence to this last activity.

² Bleek (II. p. 80) also saw the development of Mark ix. 34 out of Luke ix. 46.

very decidedly superior to his two successors in the description of the rebuking of the disciples' ambition; and again in the reproduction of the longer address, there is another example of this superiority to Mark, who as awkwardly as possible substitutes for the address passages from Luke, and then closes with circumlocutions and affectedly obscure utterances.¹ For Matthew, it is a more suspicious circumstance that Jesus' long address, which he gives consecutively in good, yet here and there only tolerable, connection, is found in Luke scattered over different points of this middle period; and, moreover, that individual sentences, found elsewhere in no Gospel, awaken the suspicion of a later origin.² Too much importance, however, should not be attached to these uncertainties. As to the first point, we may unhesitatingly admit that Matthew, according to his wont, has bound up together everything which he found existing of the sayings of Jesus connected with the question of the community, in the one closing Galilean address that took its occasion from the historical controversy at Capernaum as to who should be the

¹ The superiority of Matthew has been admitted not only by De Wette, Strauss, and Bleek, but even by Meyer. On the subject of ambition, Luke and Mark have clean passed over the indispensable feature in Matt. xviii. 3, and Mark even places Jesus' statement of the idea before he gives the symbol in the person of the child (ix. 35 sq.). With Wilke, Volkmar would *erase* this inconvenient verse 35, and justly—the criticism is confirmed by the absence of the verse in It. (d. k.). But what are we to do with the isolated (even in It. isolated) testimony? for it is much easier to explain how the verse went away than how it came. And it did not come from Mark x. 43. The most colossal error of Mark is the interpolation of the exorcist of devils in the midst of the inseparable context (ix. 38—41, between verses 37 and 42, corresponding to Matt. xviii. 5 sq.), for the purpose of connecting Luke (controversy about greatness in Luke briefly, ix. 46—48, then, separated from this and new, as an introduction to Jesus' Samaritan tolerance of the exorcist, ix. 49) and Matthew, whereby Mark, with a crude association of ideas, believed he could harmonize the two-fold "in the name of Jesus," ix. 37 sq. (Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 642; comp. Schleier. on Luke, p. 153, and Bleek, II. p. 82), or indeed thought the "little ones" and the exorcist were eadem res! According to Volkmar (pp. 467, 484), Mark has splendidly introduced the Pauline Christians under the title of "little ones," and Paul as the "exorcist." Volkmar found the really apocryphal conclusion of Mark ix. 48—50 (see below, p. 337, note 4) to be particularly fine.

² Luke ix. 46—48 and Matt. xviii. 1—5 are parallel. Offences and forgiveness (Matt. xviii. 6 sq., 15, 21 sq.) briefly, Luke xvii. 1—4. The parable of the lost, xv. 3—7. Mark also has isolated passages elsewhere, x. 15, xi. 26. On the other hand, his salt, ix. 49 sq., Matthew has in v. 13.

greatest.¹ But his connected arrangement is to be taken as a basis the more readily, not only because it is on the whole consistent, but also because—as Luke indeed shows—it makes use of material derived from one and the same period, and in a remarkable manner exhibits unity of spirit, lofty self-consciousness, and affectionate consideration; and, finally, because Jesus' closing organizing activity with reference to the community is in harmony with the circumstances of the case, and is guaranteed by the historically certain utterances about greatness in the kingdom of heaven, as well as by his actual gathering together of a number of adherents, and his actual leading of them with him to Jerusalem.² The question of isolated interpolations, from the standpoint of the later apostolical community, will have to be examined in its proper place.

The controversy and the question of the Twelve about greatness in the kingdom of heaven, Jesus first of all met with a sign, a parable, which he exhibited before them in nature, in flesh and blood. He called to him a child belonging to the house where he dwelt, placed it in their midst—according to Mark, he even embraced it—and said: "Verily I say unto you, unless ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."³ From this exhibition he drew a number

¹ Thus Bleek (II. p. 78) also decides. The connection is less good (external association of ideas, Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 643) in xviii. 8 sq. (also in Mark), and particularly in xviii. 15 sq. The latter may (comp. Luke xvii. 1) have been spoken on another occasion. Hilgenfeld, pp. 442 sq., would take out xviii. 8 sq. and 11—13.

² On the formation of the community, see above, p. 334, n. 2. Note particularly the constant form of speech, "my Father," xviii. 10, 14, 19, 35. In verse 14 (against *μou*, Vat.), *ἰμῶν* has the preponderant attestation (Sin., Bez., Reg., Gall., It.).

³ Chrysostom spoke rightly of a child, Niceph. ludicrously of St. Ignatius, Paulus of an orphan, Bolten of a young disciple (Meyer). It belongs to the added colouring of Mark that Jesus sits down and takes the child in his arms (= x. 16). The quoted sentence of Matthew (xviii. 3) is, as the first feature after the exhibition of the symbol, quite indispensable in view of the ambition controversy; by Luke it is (as to the meaning) awkwardly placed, ix. 48 to end, and by Mark prematurely, ix. 35. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 641. Less appropriately, Luke and Mark have something similar at the blessing of the children; Luke xviii. 17; Mark x. 15 (comp. Matt. xix. 14). Similar to this passage, John iii. 3; Justin, *Ap.* 1, 61; Clem. *Hom.* 11, 26. Comp. Anger's *Synopsis*.

of inferences in favour of the members of his fellowship, particularly of the humble, who, being despised by the haughty and ambitious, are in danger of being ill-treated. It is easy to pass on to the thought that the disciples, while they ambitiously disputed among themselves which should have the places of honour, looked down as proudly and with as great an assumption of superiority upon the other adherents of Jesus, before whom they had the precedence through their election by Jesus, and still more, they might think, through their achievements, through their accompanying Jesus faithfully in his journeys of flight. Above all, they would look down upon the women who were spoken of as healed demoniacs, and upon the sinful publicans.¹ "Whosoever, therefore"—said he—"shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greater in the kingdom of heaven. And whosoever shall receive one such little child on the ground of my name, of my person, receives me."² But whosoever offends one of these little ones who believe in me, it were profitable for him"—thus strongly was he compelled to judge—"that the stone of an ass-mill were hung round his neck, and he (by a genuinely Galilean mode of punishment) were sunk in the depths of the sea."³ He justified this terrible wish by a reference to the dread-

¹ Comp. Weizs. pp. 498 sq.

² Comp. Matt. x. 40. By those who have become as children, most have rightly understood the humble; Paulus, Neander, De Wette, Bleek, Strauss (4th ed. I. pp. 641, 643), Weiss (II. p. 101), Hilg. (p. 442), incorrectly actual children! But the child is only a symbol; and elsewhere (x. 42, xxv. 40), and in xviii. 10, 14, even Jesus calls his own "little ones." Comp. above, III. p. 252, note 1. Certainly Volkmar did not think of this when he, after Rom. ii. 20, understood the "little ones" to be Gentile Christians. How unfortunate also is his assertion (p. 485) as to the blessing of the children, that a Jew could not take actual children as prototypes. Comp., however, the Rabbis. *Tanch.* f. 36, 4: gloria juveni, quando fit sicut infantes. *Be-midb.* 14: verbum ex ore parvuli tanq. ex ore sapientis. See Schöttgen, pp. 150, 115. Wetstein, p. 720.

³ It is said that penal drowning was practised only by the Syrians, Phœnicians, Greeks, and Romans (Diod. 16, 35; Suet. *Oet.* 67). Thus even the Rabbis, who are familiar with the Hebrew. But in Galilee it was customary, perhaps introduced from Phœnicia. *Jos. Ant.* 14, 15, 10: τοὺς Ἡρώδου ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ κατεπόντωσαν. Ass-millstone = the largest, opp. to the millstone turned by girls, Matt. xxiv. 41. Millstone round the neck, Schöttgen, p. 150.

ful future punishment of offences, but also by a reference to the value of his *protégés*. "Woe unto the world because of offences! For it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence comes! Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that their angels in heaven continually behold the face of my Father in heaven!"¹ He himself has indeed sought and with joy found them again, like the shepherd the sheep of his flock which wander on the hills.²

But at this period the question might occur to Jesus, how were the members of his community to behave in the matter of conflicts?³ First of all, each one was to guard himself against giving offence to others. The favourite utterance of Jesus is here heard afresh and in a new form, that a man must tear away foot and eye whenever they incline towards what is bad, towards doing violence to a neighbour: better only one hand, one foot, one eye, than the whole man in hell.⁴ But when my neighbour does

¹ Offences, comp. Zeph. i. 3. *Vae mundo*, Schöttgen, p. 151. Guardian angels, among the later Jews, comp. Wetst. p. 443; Acts xii. 15. Guardian angels of the Gentiles, of Israel, as early as the later books of the Old Testament. Michael, sar Israel, Dan. x. 21; comp. maluch meliz, Job xxxiii. 23. The angels behold God's face; hence among the Rabbis often *malache panim*, Michael sar panim, Schöttgen, p. 151. The expression is borrowed from Asiatic court life, *roe pene melech*, 2 Kings xxv. 19. Jesus does not exactly say that their guardian angels are the *first* angels (*sarim rishonim*, Dan. x. 13), as is commonly thought; it is the right of all angels, Matt. xxii. 30. Verse 11 in Matt. is from Luke xix. 10. Hilgenfeld (p. 443) would retain it.

² Matthew xviii. 12. We had this parable above, p. 6. Comp. Luke xv. 3; Hosea iv. 16; Isaiah xl. 11; Micah ii. 12; Jer. xxiii. 1, l. 6; Ez. xxxiv. 4 sqq. Strauss (4th ed. I. p. 644) did not find the lost in connection with the little ones; Hilg. p. 443, comp. Bleek, II. p. 88.

³ On the connection, see above, p. 335, note 1.

⁴ Matt. xviii. 8 sq. and Mark ix. 45 sqq. are at any rate better placed in this connection. The passage of the Sermon on the Mount following the mention of adultery in Matt. v. 29 sq., is related to these. There is there mention made of only the eye and the hand, and then of a right member, and of giving one member for the saving of the body (here for the saving of the other corresponding member and of the body). More in detail, see above, III. p. 308. Principle of punishment in Egypt: *ἕκαστος οἷς μέρει τ. σώματος παρηγόρησεν, εἰς ταῦτα κολαζόμενος*. Dioid. 1, 78. Comp. also Judges i. 6. Cicero, *Off.* 3, 11. Val. Max. 9, 2.—This is the place to say something about the addition of Mark in ix. 48—50, which is rightly regarded by most expositors as an obscure fabrication of the author's, based perhaps upon genuine words

violence to me? "If thy brother sin, reprove him between thee and him alone; and if he hear thee, forgive him, and thou hast gained thy brother.¹ But if he hear thee not, then take with thee one or two more, that by the mouth of two or three witnesses everything may be established. But if he refuse to hear them, tell it to the church. But if he refuse to hear the church, let him be to thee as a Gentile and a publican."² A casuistic question from Peter brought this command to a still purer, a still higher expression, by leading Jesus to point out the duty of unconditional forgiveness of the brethren, and the religious motive of forgiveness. "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me and I shall forgive him? Until seven times?" "I say not unto thee"—answered Jesus—"until seven times, but until seventy and seven times," i.e. one must forgive as often and as incessantly as Lamech had formerly wished to be avenged.³ To this great rule Jesus added the parable of the Two Debtors. A king made a reckoning with his servants. One owed him 10,000 talents—sixty million francs. Being unable to pay, he

of Jesus (also Strauss, Bleek). Verse 48 from Is. lxvi. 24. Sacrificial salt, Lev. ii. 13. It would lead us too far to register the many expositions of this obscure passage (in the spirit of the Gospel of the Egyptians). Volkmar makes the "ingenious" passage refer to moral self-salting and self-denial; and in this way we most readily gain for it a meaning (comp. Schenkel, *Bibel-Lex.* III. p. 288). Also Bleek's exposition of the 49th verse—"every one shall be salted with fire as every sacrifice with salt"—is to be commended. But under any circumstances, (1) the transition from the fire of hell, verse 48, to fire in life through self-discipline or divine discipline is very forced; and (2) the salt of verse 50, according to its necessary meaning, is not the salt of discipline, but of abundance of spirit (Col. iv. 6) and of wisdom, and on this account Mark himself is able at the close to return, though quite artificially, to the original theme.

¹ For the kingdom of the Messiah, 1 Cor. vii. 16. Comp. Ezekiel iii. 19; James v. 19.

² Matt. xviii. 15—17; comp. Luke xvii. 1; Mark xi. 26.

³ Somewhat differently in Luke xvii. 1 sqq. (but by no means older: seven times in a day). Just so the language of the Gospel of the Hebrews (Hilg. *N. T. ausserh. Kanon's*, p. 16), after Luke (septies in die), and then Matt., is evidently younger, as the more copious treatment and also the reference to the sinfulness of the prophets show. Expositors are not agreed whether it should be 70 + 7 or 70 × 7. Evidently the former, not only after the Hebrew, but also after the LXX. The prototype, Gen. iv. 24: Cain to be avenged seven times, Lamech seventy-seven. The Rabbis were not wont to commend often repeated forgiveness: homini in alterum peccanti semel remittunt, secundo r., tertio r., quarto non remittunt. Lightfoot, p. 344.

was to be sold, with his wife and children and property. Then fell he at his lord's feet and begged for patience, promising that in the future all should be paid; and his lord, out of compassion, remitted all his debt. Then he who had been thus graciously treated met a fellow-servant who had to pay him only 100 denarii, a hundred francs, merely one six-hundred-thousandth part of his own debt. He seized his fellow-servant by the throat: "Pay, if thou owest anything!" Here no falling at his feet availed, no beseeching, no promise. The creditor had his companion thrown into the debtors' tower. The fellow-servants complained to their lord, who reproached the wicked servant with the detestable character of his behaviour: "Shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, as I had compassion on thee?" And his anger burnt against the servant; he delivered him over to the tormentors till he should pay all; the remission was withdrawn, the punishment was without cessation. "So likewise will *my* heavenly Father do unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother!" It was a confirmation of the proposition Jesus had already uttered in the Sermon on the Mount.¹

With such devout earnestness, the product of his care for the new community and of his zeal for the cause of God and of men—nay, for the fundamental conception of the new religion of divine grace and of the brotherhood of men—Jesus sought to disperse the dark shadows of the humanly trivial and ungodly sentiments which he found insinuating themselves into the circle of his followers under his own eyes, and which he could not but fear would grow stronger and more incurable in case of his being called away. These antagonistic ideas, these dissensions, these ruptures, naturally led him to reflect and to speak upon the

¹ The parable only in Matt. xviii. 23; to some extent akin to xxiv. 45 sqq.; Luke vii. 41 (500 and 50 denarii). Jewish parables on the subject of debts, in Schöttgen, pp. 63, 154 sq., 95. An Attic talent about 5500 francs. An insolvent debtor could be sold, with his house; comp. Lev. xxv. 39; 2 Kings iv. 1; Is. l. 1. *βασανισται*, torturers, not in the Old Test., introduced by Herod; *B. J.* 1, 30, 2 sqq.; *Ant.* 16, 8, 1. The last sentence and the teaching of the parable resemble the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi. 12, 14 sq.; comp. above, III. pp. 337 sqq.

means of keeping the community together should he have to leave them. For serious and protracted disputes between individuals, he therefore thought of a series of appeals. If private reproof should be ineffectual, then, according to the analogy of the Law itself, was to follow a kind of court of arbitration, and finally an appeal to the community, with which the last means was exhausted, and the still obstinate offender was then to be treated as a dissevered member, as much a stranger as the publican and the Gentile.¹ To these decisions of the company called together by the Apostles, he gave, in a remarkable manner, and in order to create a firm and fixed centre, the same divine legitimation as earlier to Peter near Casarea Philippi; and he placed above the guarantee of this self-government of the faithful the help of God, which should never be denied in answer to their prayerful appeal to heaven.² "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth concerning anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together with a reference to my name, my person, there am I in their midst." Thus, in the spirit of his life and work, he finally subordinated human counsel and help to faith and trust in God, who was to be appealed to upon all questions and in all times of need, and who would infallibly hear and give His effectual aid. And Jesus believed himself able to promise that in and among all who should thus call upon the Father by appealing to the person of Jesus, he himself would be spiritually present, and that he, the absent, would thus be spiritually represented in their midst.³

These last declarations do not, it is true, possess the same full

¹ The reproof (*ἐλέγχω*), Levit. xix. 17. The legal rule, Deut. xix. 15, comp. xxv. 8; Matt. xxvi. 60; Acts vi. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 19.

² Matt. xviii. 18—20, comp. xvi. 19. It is disputed whether the legitimation was conferred upon the Twelve, as before to Peter, or to the community generally. The context at least points to the latter. Thus also Bleek and Schenkel, against Meyer and Strauss.

³ Matt. xviii. 18—20 shows that at any rate Jesus is present only as one who prays, as intercessor, not directly as a helper; comp. Meyer; less exact, Bleek.

certainty as those which preceded them. It may be thought possible that the later orphaned community first placed in the Master's mouth the ordinances concerning the community, the consolatory assertion of the spiritual presence of the glorified one.¹ It may be thought questionable whether Jesus ever spoke of a community, and still more whether he ever spoke thus in detail, whether he entertained fear of dissensions so bitter as to need the introduction of a series of courts of appeal into the future constitution of the community. And it may also be thought questionable whether he so surely anticipated his departure and the interposition of his influence from heaven, whilst his future was in such an indefinite and fluid condition, and the foreground of his mind was occupied with the thought of his personal ministry in Jerusalem. But no one will deny that his Jerusalemite purposes did not exclude the most careful arrangements even for the event of his death; and the historical controversy as to who should be the greatest has shown that his daily experience among his disciples and adherents must have increased this tendency.² He thought of a community, as is proved by his promise to Peter and by much else. The series of tribunals which he set up are at once original and genuinely Jewish in their character, and exhibit, particularly in their reference to the Gentiles and the publicans, the peculiar colouring of his language; moreover, they were never practicable in the subsequent history of the Church, therefore could not well have been

¹ Comp. Matt. xxviii. 20.

² Bleek also, II. p. 91, holds fast the main point, even if Jesus did not use the expression *cclesia*, or a similar Aramaic one. Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 644, *New L. of J.*, Eng. trans., I. p. 382, says that in Matt. xvi. 19 and in xviii. 18 (correctly of the disciples), we have the reflexion of different standpoints and stages of the earliest (*i.e.* later) church constitution. As if at that time, when this Gospel came into existence (about A.D. 70), there were already definite theories of church constitution! Also Weisse, II. p. 102, thought of later "hierarchical" principles. On the other hand, Schenkel (p. 199) has found the rights of the community (not of the Twelve) to be historical, but the promise to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19) is omitted, since this could not be repeated.

invented for him afterwards.¹ Notably, we find the full authority which he gives to the community in perfect harmony with the genuine utterances about the equality of all men which he spoke on the way to and in Jerusalem; and, on the other hand, it is not so completely consistent with the practice of the apostolic Church. For in the latter, the decision is sometimes given by the community, but sometimes, in an encroaching spirit even in the circle of Paulinism, by the Apostles.² But the reference to Jesus' future presence permits somewhat stronger doubts if we assume it to imply a certainty on the part of Jesus as to his God-like spiritual presence upon earth. Yet even this objection disappears when we explain the passage to mean, not an actual presence, but only a spiritual sympathy surviving separations, or, finally, only a spiritual substitution by the representatives that, from his person, from his spirit, cry to God.³

¹ It will not be objected that Jesus could not thus have spoken, at least concerning the publicans, see Matt. v. 46 sq. What is genuinely Jewish lies partly in the reference to the passage in the Law, partly in the imitation of Jewish originals in these appeals. Comp. the passages above in note 1, p. 340. Rabbi Elijah in Schöttgen, p. 152, where distinctions are made in proceeding against a sinner: *si non convertitur, in pudorem agunt coram pluribus, donec respiscat. Si non, sola domus judicii diris eum devovet.*

² Comp. only Gal. ii. 1 sqq.; 1 Cor. v. 1 sqq., xii. 28; 2 Cor. xiii. 1—10; Acts i. 15, vi. 2, xi. 1, xv. 1.

³ By the Rabbis, frequent sayings about the presence of God (comp. Gen. xlix. 6; Levit. xxvi. 11; Haggai ii. 5), the Shekinah, in the synagogue, at judicial courts, in studying the Law. *Pirke Ab.* 3, 6: *decem qui una sedentes occupati sunt in discenda lege, quiescit divinitas inter illos.*—*Decem (quinque, tres, duo) precant. div. maj. adest. Div. maj. adest duobus sedentibus atque studio legis vacantibus.* Schöttgen, p. 153. Also Lightfoot, p. 344; Wetstein, p. 444. Accordingly, most expositors make the passage refer to the real spiritual presence (even Bleek); and Meyer finds indeed that this is factually the Paraclete promise of the third and fourth Gospels. But the passage is capable of a more sober interpretation, as Jesus nowhere else (except in the doubtful passage, xxviii. 20) has spoken of a presence in the circle of his followers, but rather of a separation (xxvi. 29) till he saw them again, and of the Spirit of God (x. 19). It would, moreover, be strange if Jesus, dwelling in heaven and being there as intercessor (Rom. viii. 34) nearer to the throne of God, should pray with his people from earth to heaven.

D.—PRINCE AND MESSIAH.

Whilst the Gospels, in these last moments in Galilee, relate so much of Jesus' provident care for the future, and also for the pure spirit of his community in the present, they are altogether silent about his influence upon the wider circle of adherents, and particularly about that Messianic faith which was kindled among the Apostles after the events at Cæsarea, and which was aroused among the masses in a degree almost indispensable to the success of the march upon Jerusalem. With reference to the former point, our sources are evidently somewhat defective. Jesus could not have spoken to the disciples so emphatically of the relation to the mass of believers unless he had maintained with the latter a continuous *rapport*; and he could not have been afterwards accompanied to Jerusalem by so many Galileans if he had previously withdrawn himself from them altogether. But the Gospels are right in so far as they avoid making him appear to be in any way an agitator for his Messiahship. He was so great, that while he forgot nothing which would affect the permanence of his sacred word even in case of his death, he yet troubled himself little about human means of success. He was the more reticent because at Cæsarea he had forbidden the disciples to make known the declaration of his Messiahship, a prohibition based both on the prudence that sprang from his certainty, and on a repugnance to popular tumult prompted by carnal motives. But without his opening his mouth before the people on the subject of his Jerusalemitic purposes, the news of the actual presence of the Messiah and of the immediate coming of the Messianic kingdom was rapidly spread by the whispers and significant hints of the Twelve through the wide circle of avowed and secret friends. Thus it happened that at the very outset he found himself in the midst of an escort which he had as little sought as expected.

In these last moments, or in the very moment of his setting

out, his never-resting, keen-scented Pharisaic foes once more approached him in order to annoy him in the wonted way, and thus to induce him to leave the neighbourhood.¹ "Go away and depart hence"—said the Pharisees—"for Herod desires to kill thee." In an instant Jesus scented the conspiracy between these pretended friends and the petty cunning tetrarch, who, though apparently strange to these Pharisees, was the real author or co-author of this masterpiece of artful, bloodless, pacific stratagem to get Jesus out of the way. And Jesus, the more perfectly assured of the protection of God on his journey to the south because the sanguinary Herod now acted so mildly, so humanely, answered contemptuously: "Go, tell that fox, Behold, I cast out demons and do cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day I shall be perfected. But I must travel to-day and to-morrow and the third day, because it cannot be that a prophet perish outside of Jerusalem."² This prompt and spirited answer is certainly to be regarded as genuine in its essential features. But the cures stand forth too prominently and one-sidedly, as if—

¹ Only in Luke xiii. 31—33. The scene belongs to Galilee or Peræa, through which Jesus afterwards travelled. Both were provinces of Antipas. Luke thinks of the commencement of the journey to Jerusalem (comp. xiii. 22); but how much has he crowded into the journey! Here indeed verse 33 appears really to point to the commencement of the journey, and the ἔξελεθε must be referred to the place whence he started; but the activity in verse 32 points plainly to the neighbourhood of Capernaum, for according to all traces Jesus first became again a public character when he entered Judea, Matt. xix. 1 sq. The purely figurative utterance in verse 33 must not be pressed too far.

² That Antipas was in the plot has been concluded from the words of Jesus by Paulus, Kuinöl, Meyer, Bleek, Ewald, and others. Euth., Theoph., Olsh., Ebr., De Wette, are inclined to think of a premature mention of Antipas; and Olsh. and Ebr. imagine that the "fox" properly belongs to the Pharisees. Fox, the sly beast, not the beast of open pillage (wolf), against Volkmar (p. 500), who by sleight of hand would transpose the historical picture of Antipas. See the scriptural passages (comp. Song of Sol. ii. 15; Ezekiel xiii. 4; Neh. iv. 3), and *Shem. R.* 22: astuti fuerunt Ægyptii ideoque comparantur vulpibus. Comp. Wetst. p. 748.—Τελειοῦμαι is already correctly in the Vulg. consummur; also the Fathers, see Bengel, Neander, Baumg.-Crus. On the other hand, De Wette, Meyer, Bleek, render it "I finish." Thus already John xvii. 4, comp. xix. 30. But Luke xiii. 31, 33, comp. ix. 51, allows us to think only of death, and verbally the exposition (I shall be perfected) is unobjectionable; comp. the double sense in Heb. ii. 10. De Wette thinks the sarcasm halts, since the Baptist was not put to death in Jerusalem!

even on the supposition of fresh crowds of sick persons—Jesus had nothing to do but to heal. It must therefore be assumed that Jesus spoke of healing, rather than of his more suspiciously regarded teaching, in order to keep these last days free of any molestation from his enemies; or, much better, that he in truth spoke only generally of a “working to-day and to-morrow,” whilst the Evangelist or his source, knowing nothing of more importance than demons, translated the working into healings. An affectation of mysteriousness, which does not belong to Jesus, but to later invention, is by no means to be found in his words. Three days as a figure of a short period is genuinely Jewish, and would be readily used even by Jesus. The triality has no reference whatever to the well-known three days between death and life; and the double triality, which is not self-contradictory but self-complementary, is introduced merely because Jesus did not wish literally to reckon the third day, the day on which he should be perfected, but wished to prolong and divide this one day itself again into three, the three days of the journey to Jerusalem.¹ If we adopt this natural meaning, we discover on a closer inspection a still greater degree of genuineness in this utterance. It was a part of Jesus’ lofty scorn of his adversaries that he opposed to their stealthy ways the completest—and for the crafty opponents an almost alarmingly strange—candour, nay, the most wonderful fearlessness; and that, as it were with the calendar in his hand, he placed his diary before their very eyes so fully that he calculated the days of his journey in order to obviate any error as to the date of the third day. It belonged to his firm resolve, that, after he knew his path himself, he no longer hid himself from his foes, and had nothing to object when his party sent letters to Jerusalem to make known beforehand

¹ The scriptural phraseology, see above, at Cæsarea, p. 274, note 2. By the Rabbis (and even by the Greeks, Arr. Epict. 4, 10, &c.), Wetstein, p. 749: *hodie et cras debeo arare, tertio die ibimus unâ*. A medley of incorrect interpretations (*e.g.* to travel = to travel round about, or a correspondence of working days and journeying days, as Meyer thinks) and corrections of the text, *e.g.* in Neander, and Bleek, II. p. 204.

his coming. Finally, it belonged to Jesus' human limitation that he considered a violent issue possible or even probable in Jerusalem at the very outset, at his entry or immediately afterwards; he could even believe that Pharisaic Jerusalem, warned of his coming, was preparing herself for him. The genuine utterance is important to us chiefly because it shows how distinctly the presentiment, nay, the conviction of impending death, occupied his mind immediately before he set out. In such a mood, then, did he bid adieu to Galilee, to his Capernaum, to Nazara his native town, though he went no more to visit either mother or brethren, and did not betray the separation by a word. He sought his aim and his end in Jerusalem.

Prospectus of the
THEOLOGICAL TRANSLATION FUND.

As it is important that the best results of recent theological investigations on the Continent, conducted without reference to doctrinal considerations, and with the sole purpose of arriving at truth, should be placed within the reach of English readers, it is proposed to collect, by Subscriptions and Donations, a Fund which shall be employed for the promotion of this object. A good deal has been already effected in the way of translating foreign theological literature, a series of works from the pens of Hengstenberg, Haevernick, Delitzsch, Keil, and others of the same school, having of late years been published in English; but—as the names of the authors just mentioned will at once suggest to those who are conversant with the subject—the tendency of these works is for the most part conservative. It is a theological literature of a more independent character, less biassed by dogmatical prepossessions, a literature which is represented by such works as those of Ewald, Hupfeld, F. C. Baur, Zeller, Rothe, Keim, Schrader, Hausrath, Nöldeke, Pfleiderer, &c., in Germany, and by those of Kuenen, Scholten, and others, in Holland, that it is desirable to render accessible to English readers who are not familiar with the languages of the Continent. The demand for works of this description is not as yet so widely extended among either the clergy or the laity of Great Britain as to render it practicable for publishers to bring them out in any considerable numbers at their own risk. And for this reason

the publication of treatises of this description can only be secured by obtaining the co-operation of the friends of free and unbiassed theological inquiry.

It is hoped that at least such a number of Subscribers of *One Guinea Annually* may be obtained as may render it practicable for the Publishers, as soon as the scheme is fairly set on foot, to bring out every year *three 8vo volumes*, which each Subscriber of the above amount would be entitled to receive gratis. But as it will be necessary to obtain, and to remunerate, the services of a responsible Editor, and in general, if not invariably, to pay the translators, it would conduce materially to the speedy success of the design, if free donations were also made to the Fund; or if contributors were to subscribe for more than one copy of the works to be published.

If you approve of this scheme, you are requested to communicate with Messrs. Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, and to state whether you are willing to subscribe; and if you are disposed to assist further, what would be the amount of your donation, or the number of additional copies of the publications which you would take.

We are, your obedient servants,

JOHN TULLOCH,	H. J. S. SMITH,
H. B. WILSON,	H. SIDGWICK,
B. JOWETT,	JAMES HEYWOOD,
A. P. STANLEY,	C. KEGAN PAUL,
W. G. CLARK,	J. ALLANSON PICTON,
S. DAVIDSON,	ROBT. WALLACE,
JAMES MARTINEAU,	LEWIS CAMPBELL,
JOHN CAIRD,	RUSSELL MARTINEAU,
EDWARD CAIRD,	T. K. CHEYNE,
JAMES DONALDSON,	J. MUIR.

The number of Subscribers is as yet far from that required to cover the cost of the undertaking. But it is hoped that a considerable accession will accrue as soon as the progress of the scheme is further advanced.

A Committee selected from the signatories of the original Prospectus agreed upon the works to commence the series. Of these, the following were published in

The *First* Year (1873):

KEIM (TH.), HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA. Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Second Edition, re-translated by Arthur Ransom. Vol. I. Introduction; Survey of Sources; Sacred and Political Groundwork; Religious Groundwork.

BAUR (F. C.), PAUL, THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST, his Life and Work, his Epistles and Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Second Edition, by Rev. Allan Menzies. Vol. I.

KUENEN (A.), THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL TO THE FALL OF THE JEWISH STATE. Translated by A. H. May. Vol. I.

The *Second* Year (1874):

KUENEN'S RELIGION OF ISRAEL. Vol. II. Translated by A. H. May.

BAUR'S PAUL; the second and concluding volume. Translated by the Rev. Allan Menzies; and,

BLEEK'S LECTURES ON THE APOCALYPSE. Edited by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson.

The *Third* Year (1875):

KUENEN'S RELIGION OF ISRAEL; the third and concluding volume.

EWALD'S COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. Vol. I. General Introduction; Yoel, Amos, Hosea, and Zakharya 9—11.

ZELLER, THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES CRITICALLY EXAMINED. To which is prefixed, Overbeck's Introduction from De Wette's Handbook, translated by Joseph Dare, B.A. Vol. I.

The *Fourth* Year (1876):

ZELLER'S ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Vol. II. and last.

KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA. Vol. II. Translated by the Rev. E. M. Geldart. The Sacred Youth; Self-Recognition; Decision.

EWALD'S PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. II. Yesaya, Obadya, Mikha.

The *Fifth* Year (1877):

- KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS OF NAZARA. Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Translated by A. Ransom. Vol. III. The First Preaching; the Works of Jesus; the Disciples; and the Apostolic Mission.
- PAULINISM: a Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology. By Professor O. Pfleiderer, of Jena. Translated by E. Peters. 2 vols.

The *Sixth* Year (1878):

- BAUR'S (F. C.), CHURCH HISTORY OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES. Translated from the third German Edition. Edited by the Rev. Allan Menzies (in 2 vols.). Vol. I.
- HAUSRATH'S HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. The Time of Jesus. Translated by the Rev. C. T. Poynting and P. Quenzer (in 2 vols.). Vol. I.
- EWALD'S COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. Vol. III. Nahum, Ssephanya, Habacquq, Zakharya 12—14, Yeremya.

The *Seventh* Year (1879) will contain:

- KEIM'S LIFE OF JESUS OF NAZARA. Vol. IV.
- BAUR'S CHURCH HISTORY. Vol. II. and last.
- HAUSRATH'S NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. Vol. II. and last.

Beyond these, the following Works are in the hands of Translators, and will be included in the next years' Subscriptions:

- A SHORT PROTESTANT COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT; including Introductions to the Books, by Lipsius, Holsten, Lang, Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, and others.
- The Fifth Volume of KEIM'S HISTORY OF JESUS, translated by A. Ransom; and
- The Fourth and Fifth Volumes of EWALD'S PROPHETS, translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith.

As a means of increasing the number of Subscribers, it has been suggested to us that many of the present supporters will probably be able to furnish us with lists of persons of liberal thought, to whom we would send the Prospectus. We shall thankfully receive such lists.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

CATALOGUE
OF SOME OF
WILLIAMS & NORGATE'S
THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

THE HIBBERT LECTURES.

Each Volume uniform in original binding. 8vo. Cloth. 10s 6d. Cheap Editions. 8vo. Cloth. 3s 6d; will be published one volume per month during 1897.

- 1894.—Rev. Principal DRUMMOND. *Via, Veritas, Vita.* Lectures on Christianity in its most Simple and Intelligent Form.
- 1893.—Rev. C. B. UPTON, B.A. Lectures on the Bases of Religious Belief.
- 1892.—C. G. MONTEFIORE. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.
- 1891.—Count GOBLET d'ALVIELLA. Lectures on the Evolution of the Idea of God. Translated by Rev. P. H. Wicksteed.
- 1888.—Rev. Dr. HATCH. Lectures on the Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. Edited by Dr. Fairbairn. 2nd Edition.
- 1887.—Professor A. H. SAYCE. Lectures on the Religion of Ancient Assyria and Babylonia. 3rd Edition. (Cheap Edition to be issued in February, 1897.)
- 1886.—Professor J. RHYS. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by Celtic Heathendom. 8vo. cloth.
- 1885.—Professor PFLEIDERER. Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity. Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith.
- 1884.—Professor ALBERT REVILLE. Lectures on the Ancient Religions of Mexico and Peru.
- 1883.—The Rev. CHARLES BEARD. Lectures on the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge. (Cheap Edition, already published.)

- 1882.—Professor **KUENEN**. Lectures on National Religions and Universal Religions.
- 1881.—**T. W. RHYS DAVIDS**. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by some Points in the History of Indian Buddhism. 2nd Edition.
- 1880.—**M. ERNEST RENAN**. Lectures on the Influence of the Institutions, Thought and Culture of Rome on Christianity, and the Development of the Catholic Church. Translated by the Rev. Charles Beard. (Cheap Edition, already published.)
- 1879.—**P. LE PAGE RENOUF**. Lectures on the Religion of Ancient Egypt. 2nd Edition.

Works published by the Hibbert Trustees.

- WALLIS (H. W.)** The Cosmology of the Rig-Veda. 8vo. cloth. 5s.
- POOLE (R. L.)** Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought in the Departments of Theology and Ecclesiastical Politics. 8vo. cloth. 10s 6d.
- STOKES (G. J.)** The Objectivity of Truth. 8vo. cloth. 5s.
- EVANS (G.)** An Essay on Assyriology. With an Assyrian Tablet in Cuneiform type. 8vo. cloth. 5s.
- SCHURMAN (J. G.)** Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution. A Critical Study. 8vo. cloth. 5s.
- MACAN (R. W.)** The Resurrection of Jesus Christ. An Essay in Three Chapters. 8vo. cloth. 5s.
- WICKSTEED (P. H.)** The Ecclesiastical Institutions of Holland, treated with special reference to the Position and Prospects of the Modern School of Theology. 8vo. 1s.

Theological Translation Fund. A Series of Translations by which the best results of recent Theological investigations on the Continent, conducted without reference to doctrinal considerations, and with the sole purpose of arriving at truth, will be placed within reach of English Readers.

* * * The following volumes in this series are now reduced to 6s per volume.

- BAUR (F. C.)** Church History of the First Three Centuries. Translated from the Third German Edition. Edited by the Rev. Allan Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

BAUR (F. C.) Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Work, his Epistles and Doctrines. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity, Second Edition. By the Rev. Allen Menzies. 2 vols. 12s.

BLEEK'S Lectures on the Apocalypse. Edited by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson. 8vo. cloth. 6s.

EWALD (H.) Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. 5 vols. 8vo. Each 6s.

EWALD (H.) Commentary on the Psalms. Translated by the Rev. E. Johnson, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

EWALD (H.) Commentary on the Book of Job, with Translation by Professor H. Ewald. Translated from the German by the Rev. J. Frederick Smith. 8vo. cloth. 6s.

HAUSRATH (Professor A.) History of the New Testament Times. The Time of Jesus. By D. A. Hausrath, Professor of Theology, Heidelberg. Translated, with the Author's sanction from the Second German Edition, by the Revs. C. T. Poynting and P. Quenzer. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth. 12s.

— *vide end of List of Old Storics.*

KEIM (Th.) History of Jesus of Nazara. Considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Translated by Arthur Ransom and the Rev. E. M. Geldart. 6 vols. 8vo. cloth. Each 6s.

Vol. I. is only supplied with sets of the work.

KUENEN (A.) The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. Translated by A. H. May. 2nd Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth. Each 6s.

PFLEIDERER (Professor O.) The Philosophy of Religion on the Basis of its History. Translated by the Rev. Allan Menzies, and the Rev. Alex. Stewart, of Dundee. 4 vols. 8vo. cloth. Each 6s.

PFLEIDERER (Professor O.) Paulinism; a Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology. Translated by E. Peters. 2nd Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth. 12s.

Protestant Commentary on the New Testament; with General and Special Introductions to the Books, by Lipsius, Holsten, Lang, Pfeleiderer, Holtzman, Hilgenfeld, and others. Translated by the Rev. F. H. Jones. 3 vols. 8vo. Each 6s.

REVILLE (Rev. Dr.) Prolegomena of the History of Religion. With Introduction by Professor Max Müller. 8vo. 6s.

SCHRADER (Professor E.) The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. Owen C. Whitehouse. 2 vols. 8vo. Map. Each 6s.

Vol. I. is only supplied when sets of the T. T. F. are ordered.

ZELLER (E.) *The Acts of the Apostles Critically Examined.* To which is prefixed Overbeck's Introduction from De Wette's Handbook. Translated by Joseph Dare. 2 vols. Each 6s.

Theological Translation Library. New Series. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Rochester; and the Rev. A. B. Bruce, D.D., Professor of Apologetics, Free Church College, Glasgow.

Volumes already published.

WEIZSÄCKER (C. von). *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.* Second and revised Edition. Translated by the Rev. James Millar, B.D. Vols. I. and V. of New Series. 8vo. cloth. 2 vols. Each 10s. 6d.

HARNACK (A.) *History of Dogma.* By Adolph Harnack, Ordinary Professor of Church History in the University, and Fellow of the Royal Academy of Science, Berlin, etc. Vols. I. and II. Translated from the Third German Edition by the Rev. Neil Buchanan. [*The other Volumes in Preparation.*] Each 10s. 6d.

The History of the Hebrews. By R. Kittel, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Breslau. Translated by the Revs. J. Taylor, Hope W. Hogg, B.D., and E. B. Spiers, B.D. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth. Each 10s. 6d.

The Communion of the Christian with God. A Discussion in Agreement with the View of Luther. By Willibald Herrmann, Dr. Theol; Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Marburg. Translated from the Second thoroughly revised Edition, with Special Annotations by the Author, by J. Sandys Stanyon, M.A. 8vo. cloth. 10s. 6d.

ALVIELLA (Count Goblet d') *The Contemporary Evolution of Religious Thought in England, America and India.* Translated from the French by the Rev. J. Moden. 8vo. cloth. 10s. 6d.

BARNABAS' Epistle, in Greek, from the Sinaitic Manuscript of the Bible, with a Translation by S. Sharpe. Crown 8vo. cloth. 2s. 6d.

BAYNES (H.) *The Idea of God and the Moral Sense* in the light of Language; being a philological Enquiry into the rise and growth of Spiritual and Moral Concepts. 8vo. cloth. 10s. 6d.

BEARD (Rev. Dr. C.) *The Universal Christ,* and other Sermons. Crown 8vo. cloth. 7s. 6d.

— **Port Royal,** a Contribution to the History of Religion and Literature in France. Cheaper Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. cloth. 12s.

BEARD (Rev. Dr. John R.) *The Autobiography of Satan.* Crown 8vo. cloth. 7s 6d.

Bible, translated by Samuel Sharpe, being a Revision of the Authorized English Version. 6th Edition of the Old, 10th Edition of the New Testament. 8vo. roan. 5s.

CHANNING'S Complete Works, including "The Perfect Life," with a Memoir. Centennial Edition. 848 pp. 8vo. cloth. 2s.

CLARK (Archd. Jas.) *De Successione Apostolica nec non Missione et Jurisdictione Hierarchie Anglicanæ et Catholicæ.* 8vo. (*Georgetown, Guiana.*) Cloth. 21s.

——— **Seven Ages of the Church**; or Exposition of the Apocalypse. Sewed. 1s.

Common Prayer for Christian Worship: in Ten Services for Morning and Evening. 32mo. cloth. 1s 6d. Also in 8vo. cloth. 3s.

DRUMMOND (Dr.) *Philo Judæus*; or, the Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion. By James Drummond, LL.D., Principal of Manchester New College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth. 21s.

Echoes of Holy Thoughts: arranged as Private Meditations before a First Communion. 2nd Edition, with a Preface by Rev. J. Hamilton Thom. Printed with red lines. Feap. 8vo. cloth. 1s.

FIGG (E. G.) *Analysis of Theology*, Natural and Revealed. Crown 8vo. cloth. 6s.

Four Gospels, the, as Historical Records. 8vo. cloth. 15s.

FUERST (Dr. Jul.) *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament.* 5th Edition, improved and enlarged. Translated by Rev. Dr. Samuel Davidson. Royal 8vo. cloth. 21s.

GILL (C.) *The Evolution of Christianity.* By Charles Gill. 2nd Edition. With Dissertations in Answer to Criticism. 8vo. cloth. 12s.

——— **The Book of Enoch the Prophet.** Translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library, by the late Richard Laurence, LL.D., Archbishop of Cashel. The Text corrected from his latest Notes by Charles Gill. Re-issue, 8vo. cloth. 5s.

GOULD (Rev. S. Baring) *Lost and Hostile Gospels.* An Account of the Toledoth Jeshu, two Hebrew Gospels circulating in the Middle Ages, and Extant Fragments of the Gospels of the first Three Centuries of Petrine and Pauline Origin. Crown 8vo. cloth. 7s 6d.

- HARDY (R. Spence)** **Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development.** Translated from Singhalese MSS. 2nd Edition, with a complete Index and Glossary. Svo. cloth. 21s.
- HAUSRATH (A.)** **History of the New Testament Times.** The Time of the Apostles. Translated by Leonard Huxley; with an Introduction by Mrs. Humphry Ward. 4 vols. 42s.
- Hebrew Texts**, in large type for Classes :
 Genesis. 2nd Edition. 16mo. cloth. 1s 6d.
 Psalms. 16mo. cloth. 1s.
 Isaiah. 16mo. cloth. 1s.
 Job. 16mo. cloth. 1s.
- HEMANS (Chas. I.)** **Historic and Monumental Rome.** A Handbook for the Students of Classical and Christian Antiquities in the Italian Capital. Crown 8vo. cloth. 10s 6d.
- **History of Mediæval Christianity and Sacred Art in Italy (A.D. 900-1500).** 2 vols. crown 8vo. cloth. 18s.
- HOERNING (Dr. R.)** **The Karaite MSS.,** British Museum. The Karaite Exodus (i. to viii. 5) in 42 Autotype Facsimiles, with a Transcription in ordinary Arabic type. Together with Descriptions and Collation of that and five other MSS. of Portions of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic Characters in the same Collection. Royal 4to. cloth, gilt top. £2. 12s 6d.
- HORNE (W.)** **Religious Life and Thought.** Crown 8vo. cloth. 3s 6d.
- JONES (Rev. R. Crompton)** **Hymns of Duty and Faith,** selected and arranged. 247 pp. Foolscap 8vo. cloth. 2nd Edition. 3s 6d.
- **Chants, Psalms, and Canticles,** selected and pointed for Chanting. 18mo. cloth. 1s 6d.
- **Anthems,** with Indexes and References to the Music. 18mo. cloth. 1s 3d.
- **The Chants and Anthems,** together in one vol. Cloth. 2s.
- **A Book of Prayer,** in Thirty Orders of Worship, with Additional Prayers and Thanksgivings. 18mo. cloth. 2s 6d.
- The same, with Chants, in one vol. 18mo. cloth. 3s.
- KENNEDY (Rev. Jas.)** **Introduction to Biblical Hebrew,** presenting Graduated Instruction in the Language of the Old Testament. By James Kennedy, B.D., Acting Librarian in the New College, and one of the additional Examiners in Divinity at the University, Edinburgh. 8vo. cloth. 12s.

MALAN (Rev. Dr. S. C.) **The Book of Adam and Eve**, also called the Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan. A Book of the early Eastern Church. Translated from the Ethiopic, with Notes from the Kufale, Talmud, Midrashim, and other Eastern Works. 8vo. cloth. 7s. 6d.

MALAN (Rev. Dr. S. C.) **Original Notes on the Book of Proverbs.** According to the Authorized Version. Vol. I. Chap. i. to x. 8vo. cloth. 12s.
Vol. II. Chap. xi. to xx. 8vo. cloth. 12s.
Vol. III. Chap. xxi. to xxxi. 8vo. cloth. 12s.

MARTINEAU (Rev. Dr. James) **The Relation between Ethics and Religion.** An Address. 8vo. sewed. 1s.

MARTINEAU (Prof. Russell) **The Roots of Christianity in Mosaism.** 8vo. sewed. 1s.

MASSEY (Gerald) **A Book of the Beginnings.** Containing an Attempt to recover and reconstitute the lost Origines of the Myths and Mysteries, Types and Symbols, Religion and Language, with Egypt for the Mouthpiece and Africa as the Birthplace. 2 vols. Imperial 8vo. cloth. 30s.

——— **The Natural Genesis; or Part the Second of "A Book of the Beginnings."** 2 vols. Imperial 8vo. cloth. 30s.

Our Christian Creed. 2nd and greatly Revised Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth. 3s 6d.

PERRIN (R. S.) **Religion of Philosophy, the, or the Unification of Knowledge: a Comparison of the chief Philosophical and Religious Systems of the World.** 8vo. cloth, 16s.

QUARRY (Rev. J.) **Genesis and its Authorship.** Two Dissertations. 2nd Edition, with Notice of Animadversions of the Bishop of Natal. 8vo, cloth. 12s.

SADLER (Rev. Dr.) **Prayers for Christian Worship.** Crown 8vo. cloth. 3s. 6d.

——— **Closet Prayers, Original and Compiled.** 18mo. cloth. 1s. 6d.

SAVAGE (M. J.) **Beliefs about the Bible.** 8vo. cloth. 7s. 6d.

SHARPE (Samuel) **History of the Hebrew Nation and its Literature.** With an Appendix on the Hebrew Chronology. 5th Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth. 4s. 6d.

——— **Critical Notes** on the Authorized English Version of the New Testament. 2nd Edition. 12mo. cloth. 1s. 6d.

——— **Short Notes** to accompany a Revised Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. 12mo. cloth. 1s. 6d.

STRAUSS (Dr. D. F.) **Life of Jesus; for the People.** The Authorized English Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth. 10s 6d.

SUFFIELD. *Life of the Rev. Robert Rodolph, Author of "The Crown of Jesus."* Photogravure Portrait. Crown 8vo. cloth. 4s 6d.

TAUCHNITZ'S English New Testament. Authorized Version; with Introduction, and various Readings from the three most celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text. By C. Tischendorf. 12mo. sewed, 1s 6d; cloth, 2s.

TAYLER (Rev. John James) An Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel, especially in its relation to the first Three. 2nd Edition. 8vo. cloth. 5s.

Testament, the New. Translated from Griesbach's Text by S. Sharpe, Author of "The History of Egypt." 14th Thousand. Fcap. 8vo. cloth. 1s 6d.

VICKERS (J.) History of Herod; or, Another Look at a Man emerging from Twenty Centuries of Calumny. Crown 8vo. cloth. 6s.

——— **The Real Jesus; a Review of his Life, Character, and Death, from a Jewish Standpoint.** Crown 8vo. 6s.

——— **The Crucifixion Mystery.** Crown 8vo. cloth. 3s 6d.

WRIGHT (Rev. C. H. H.) Book of Genesis in Hebrew Text. With a critically revised Text, various Readings, and Grammatical and Critical Notes. Demy 8vo. Reduced to 3s 6d.

——— **Book of Ruth in Hebrew Text.** With a critically revised Text, various Readings, including a new Collation of Twenty-eight Hebrew MSS., and a Grammatical and Critical Commentary; to which is appended, The Chaldee Targum. Demy 8vo. 7s 6d.

WRIGHT (G. H. Bateson, D.D.) The Book of Job. A new critically revised Translation, with Essays on Scansion, Date, etc. 8vo. cloth. 6s.

Was Israel ever in Egypt? or, A Lost Tradition. By G. H. Bateson Wright, D.D., Queen's College, Oxford; Headmaster Queen's College, Hong Kong. 8vo. linen. 7s 6d.

"A contribution of considerable weight to the literature of the higher criticism. The work is one which well deserves the attention of all serious students of the higher criticism, and while it sums up and confirms some conclusions of prior critics, it has an original and independent value as offering a new theory of the Exodus. It is a carefully reasoned and acute book, which will add to its author's already high reputation as a critic of the Scriptures."—*Scotsman*.

WRIGHT (Rev. J.) Grounds and Principles of Religion. Crown 8vo. cloth. 3s.



Date Due

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



BS2420 .K278 v.4
The history of Jesus of Nazara, freely

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00164 0483