LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

THE LIFE OF JESUS

THE
LIFE OF JESUS

BY

OSCAR HOLTZMANN, D.D.

TRANSLATED BY

J. T. BEALBY, B.A.

AND

MAURICE A. CANNEY, M.A.

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1904

BT301
H22

GENERAL
STACK

PREFACE

THE *Life of Jesus* here presented to the English public is an accurate translation of my book *Leben Jesu*, which was published in German in 1901 (Tübingen and Leipsic). I myself have seen proof-sheets of the translation, and I hope that the book, in its new form, may win many friends amongst English-speaking people.

All my scientific publications deal to some extent with the same subject. For an earlier date, I may instance my book on the Johannine Gospel (Darmstadt, 1887), the last section of Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Berlin, 1888), my *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Freiburg and Leipsic, 1895), besides some minor lectures and essays. More recent examples of my interest in various questions concerning the Life of Jesus will be found in my lectures "Die jüdische Schriftgelehrsamkeit zur Zeit Jesu" and "Das Messiasbewusstsein Jesu und seine neueste Bestreitung" (Giessen, 1901); in my essay on the same question in the *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament und Urchristentum* (ii. 265–274); in my *Religionsgeschichtliche Vorträge* (Giessen, 1902); in my latest book, *War Jesus Ekstatiker?* (Tübingen and Leipsic, 1903); and, finally, in an essay on the Lord's Supper to be published next May in the *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament, etc.*

OSCAR HOLTZMANN.

GIESSEN, 1904.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION, pp. 1–6.

The Life of Jesus and the World's History, p. 1. Life of Jesus and Christianity, pp. 2 f. Reluctance to reconstruct the Life of Jesus, pp. 4 f. Use to be made of the Works of predecessors, p. 5. New points of view, pp. 5 f.

CHAPTER II.

THE SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF JESUS, pp. 7–61.

No real First Sources, p. 7. Paul, pp. 7–11. Non-Pauline New Testament Epistles, pp. 11 f. Apocalypse, Acts of the Apostles, p. 12. Non-Christian: (*a*) Tacitus, p. 13; (*b*) Josephus, pp. 13–16. The Gospels, pp. 16–54. Choice by the Church, p. 17: (*a*) Justin, pp. 17–20; (*b*) The settling of the Gospel Canon, p. 20; (i) Muratori's Canon, p. 20; (ii) Irenæus, pp. 20 f. The Synoptics, pp. 21–32: (*a*) Mk. and Parallels, p. 22; (*b*) Mk. a Source of Lk., pp. 22 f.; (*c*) Mk. and Mt., pp. 23–25; (*d*) Conclusion as regards Mk., p. 25; (*e*) Matter common to Mt. and Lk., pp. 25 f.; (*f*) Lk. did not borrow from Mt., p. 27; (*g*) Not Mt. from Lk., p. 27; (*h*) Nature of the Second Source, pp. 28 f.; (*i*) Two Sources, p. 29; (*j*) Mk. originally Greek, pp. 29 f.; (*k*) Mt.'s Collection of Discourses, p. 30; (*l*) Use of the Logia by Mk., p. 31; (*m*) Mt.'s Gospel used by Lk., p. 31; (*n*) Origin of the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 31 f.; (*o*) Deductions from this, p. 32. The Johannine Gospel, pp. 32–46: (*a*) Difference between it and the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 32 f.; (*b*) Absence of the Preaching of Repentance, pp. 33–36; (*c*) The form of the Johannine Discourses, p. 36; (*d*) Johannine metaphors, pp. 36 f.; (*e*) The good shepherd, pp. 37–39; (*f*) The grain of wheat, p. 39; (*g*) The vine and the branches, pp. 39 f.; (*h*) Johannine narrative, pp. 40 f.; (*i*) Scene of Jesus' Ministry, p. 41; (*j*) Its duration, p. 41; (*k*) Violent

alterations, pp. 41–45 ; (*l*) Value of the Fourth Gospel as an original Source, pp. 45 f. Gospel of the Hebrews, pp. 46–52. The Gospel of Peter, pp. 52–54. Agrapha, pp. 54–59. Textual additions, pp. 59 f. The Papyrus Logia, pp. 60 f.

CHAPTER III.

TURNING-POINTS IN THE LIFE OF JESUS, pp. 62–80.

The Collection of the Lord's Discourses, pp. 62 f. The problem, pp. 63 f. Jesus' public Ministry according to Mk., pp. 64–69. Periods according to Mk., pp. 69–71. The Lord's Sayings and Mk., pp. 71–73. The centurion of Capernaum, p. 73. The Sermon on the Mount, pp. 73 f. Credibility of Mk., pp. 74 f. Later accounts ; fading traditions, pp. 75 f. The Miracles, pp. 76 f. Lacunæ in Mk., pp. 77 f. Possibility of a Life of Jesus, pp. 78 f. The title : The Life of Jesus, pp. 79 f.

CHAPTER IV.

LIFE OF JESUS BEFORE HIS MINISTRY, pp. 81–107.

Name and family, pp. 81 f. Genealogy, pp. 82–84. Joseph the father of Jesus, p. 84. The Virgin-birth according to Mt. and Lk., pp. 84 f. Comparison of the two narratives, pp. 85 f. Date. Herod I., p. 86. Census of Quirinius, pp. 86 f. The age of Jesus, p. 88. Nativity-narratives, pp. 88 f. The literal facts, pp. 89 f. Nazareth, pp. 90 f. The Synagogue, p. 91. Knowledge of the Scriptures, p. 91. The Biblical History, pp. 91 f. Imitation, pp. 92 f. Biblical language, pp. 93 f. Study of the Bible, pp. 94 f. Biblical quotation, pp. 95 f. The Law, p. 96. The promises, pp. 97 f. First study of Scripture, pp. 98 f. The boy of twelve, pp. 99 f. His handicraft, etc., pp. 100–103. Popular life, pp. 103–106. His relations to the learning of the Scribes, pp. 106 f.

CHAPTER V.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, pp. 108–126.

Sources, p. 108. The forerunners of Jesus, p. 109. Synchronistic dates, pp. 109–111. Place of his Ministry, pp. 111–113. The ascetic, pp. 113 f. John's personal attraction, pp. 114 f. John's preaching ; expectation of the Messiah, pp. 115 f. Preaching repentance to the children of Abraham, pp. 116 f. Promise to Abraham, p. 117. John's disciples, pp. 117 f. Preaching to the people, p. 118. John's baptism, pp. 118 f. The Messianic hope, pp. 119–121. New use made of the expectation of the Messiah, pp. 121 f. Grounds for the expectation of the Messiah, pp. 122 f. Denunciation of Antipas, pp. 123 f. Antipas' offence, p. 124. John's imprisonment and death, pp. 124 f. Jesus' judgment regarding John's death, p. 125. Later disciples of John, pp. 125 f.

CHAPTER VI.

The Baptism of Jesus, pp. 127–139.

Sources, p. 127. Jesus' visit to the Baptist, pp. 128 f. John's forgiveness of sins, pp. 129 f. Correctness of the tradition, pp. 130 f. Jn. vii. 1–10, p. 132. Conclusion, pp. 132 f. John baptises Jesus, p. 133. Impression made by the Baptist upon Jesus, pp. 133 f. The revelation of the Messiah, pp. 134 f. Nature of the event, pp. 135 f. Prophetic vision, pp. 136 f. Significance of the vision, p. 137. Nothing unhealthy in it, p. 137. Correctness of the Messianic belief, p. 138. Contents of the Messianic belief, pp. 138 f. A glimpse ahead, p. 139.

CHAPTER VII.

The Temptation, pp. 140–154.

Authorities, p. 140. Elements of temptation in the baptismal vision, p. 141. Ideas of the future, pp. 141 f. Enthusiast conduct, p. 142. Overcoming of the enthusiast, p. 143. The description of Mk., pp. 143 f. Temptation and Messianic belief, p. 144. Order of the temptations, pp. 144 f. Original elements in the Gospel of the Hebrews, pp. 145 f. The Messiah's sovereignty of the world, pp. 146–148. Proving the Messiah, pp. 148–150. Jesus and Dt. vi.–viii., pp. 150 f. Concealment of his Messianic belief, p. 151. The Messiah hungers, pp. 151 f. Form of the story of the Temptation, pp. 152 f. An artistic presentation of inner experiences, pp. 153 f.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Nearness of the Kingdom of Heaven, pp. 155–180.

Sources, p. 155. Jesus' stay with the Baptist, pp. 155 f. Necessity for preaching repentance, pp. 156 f. First preaching, p. 157 f. The time is fulfilled, pp. 158 f. Nearness of the kingdom of God, pp. 159 f. Kingdom of God or kingdom of Heaven, pp. 160–165: (*a*) No approximation of Mt. to Jn., p. 161; (*b*) Heaven and kingdom of perfection, pp. 161 f.; (*c*) Form of the expression, p. 162; (*d*) The kingdom of Heaven in Jewish literature, pp. 162 f.; (*e*) Substitute for the name of God, pp. 163 f.; (*f*) Signs of the kingdom of God, pp. 164 f. Practical deductions, pp. 165 f. Eschatological addresses, p. 166. Son of Man, pp. 166–171: (*a*) Jesus' name for himself, pp. 167 f.; (*b*) Jesus' description of himself as the Messiah, pp. 168 f.; (*c*) The suffering "son of man," pp. 169 f.; (*d*) The Messiah generally, p. 170. The Evangelists, pp. 170 f. Description of the Judgment, pp. 171–176. The duty of watchfulness, etc., pp. 176–179. Hope of the kingdom of God, pp. 179 f. A respite, p. 180.

CHAPTER IX.

Jesus' Preaching in Galilee down to the Calling of the Twelve, pp. 181–250.

Sources, p. 181. Geographical facts, pp. 181–185. The first disciples, pp. 185–187. Capernaum, pp. 187 f. Sabbath worship, pp. 188–190. Jesus and the Scribes, pp. 190 f. Miracles of Jesus, pp. 191–194. Healing of demoniacs, pp. 194–197. Jesus departs from Capernaum, pp. 197 f. The leper, pp. 198 f. The captain of Capernaum, pp. 199 f. Second stay in Capernaum, pp. 200–233: (*a*) The paralytic, pp. 200–203; (*b*) Levi the publican, pp. 203 f.; (*c*) Separation from sinners, pp. 204 f.; (*d*) The laws as to eating and drinking, pp. 205 f.; (*e*) Reasons for associating with sinners, pp. 206 f.; (*f*) The duty of love, p. 207; (*g*) Parables of things lost, pp. 207 f.; (*h*) Need of deliverance, p. 208; (*i*) The prodigal son, pp. 208 f.; (*j*) The labourers in the vineyard, pp. 209 f.; (*k*) Invitation to beggars, p. 210; (*l*) The feast, pp. 210 f.; (*m*) Temptation by sinners, pp. 211 f.; (*n*) The unjust steward, pp. 212–214; (*o*) Fasting, pp. 214 f.; (*p*) The old and the new piety, pp. 215–217; (*q*) Almsgiving, prayer, fasting, pp. 217 f.; (*r*) Mission from the Baptist, pp. 218–223; (*s*) Jesus and the Law, pp. 223 f.; (*t*) Plucking the ears of corn, p. 224; (*u*) The law as to the Sabbath, pp. 224–226; (*v*) Breach with the Law, pp. 226 f.; (*w*) Signification of the Sabbath, pp. 227 f.; (*x*) The paralysed arm, pp. 228–231; (*y*) Other disputes as to the Sabbath, pp. 231–233. Jesus withdraws, p. 233. The multitude comes to Jesus, pp. 233 f. Choosing the Apostles, pp. 234 f. Names of the Twelve, pp. 235–237. Peter, pp. 237 f. The Sermon on the Mount, pp. 238–248: (*a*) The beatitudes, pp. 239 f.; (*b*) The beatitudes in Mt., pp. 240 f.; (*c*) Evidence against Mt., p. 241; (*d*) Denunciations of woe, pp. 241 f.; (*e*) The injunction to love our enemies, pp. 242-245 f.; (*f*) The false perishes, p. 245; (*g*) Amend thyself, pp. 245 f.; (*h*) The two builders, pp. 246–248. Jesus' family in Capernaum, pp. 248–250.

CHAPTER X.

Preaching in Galilee down to the Dispute about the Precepts of Ceremonial Purity, pp. 251–298.

Sources, pp. 251 f. Presence of the kingdom of God, pp. 252 f. Preaching from the Lake, pp. 253–257: (*a*) Success and value of the preaching, pp. 254–256; (*b*) Jesus' preaching and the kingdom of God, pp. 256 f. Narrower and wider circles of hearers, pp. 257–259. Traditional interpretations, pp. 259 f. The Lord's Prayer, pp. 260–266. Jewish formulæ of prayer, pp. 260 f. Brevity in prayer, pp. 261 f. Relation to Mt., p. 262. (i) Mode of address, p. 262; (ii) Hallowing of God's name, p. 263; (iii) Thy kingdom come, p. 263;

(iv) Daily Bread, pp. 263 f.; (v) Sins committed, pp. 264 f.; (vi) Future sins, p. 265. Retrospect, p. 265 f. Exhortation and encouragement of the disciples, pp. 266–269. In the storm on the lake, pp. 269 f. In the Decapolis, pp. 270 f. Healing of the demoniac, p. 272. The Daughter of Jairus, p. 272. The woman with the flux, pp. 272 f. Reanimation of the girl, p. 273. Criticism of the story, pp. 273 f. Other instances of awakening from the dead, pp. 274 f. In Nazareth, pp. 275–278. The sending forth of the disciples, pp. 278–280. Impression in Galilee, pp. 280 f. Return of the disciples, pp. 281–286. Jesus in the eyes of his disciples, pp. 286 f. Legends about Jesus, p. 287. Feeding the multitude, pp. 287–289. Walking on the lake, pp. 289 f. Last works of healing, p. 290. Scribes from Jerusalem, p. 291: (*a*) Washing of hands, pp. 291 f.; (*b*) Jesus against tradition, pp. 292–294; (*c*) Clean and unclean, pp. 294 f.; (*d*) Explanation to his disciples, pp. 295 f.; (*e*) League with Beelzebul, pp. 296 f.; (*f*) Unpardonable sin, p. 298; (*g*) Issue of the dispute, p. 298.

CHAPTER XI.

Amongst the Heathen, pp. 299–345.

Sources, p. 299. Jesus amongst the heathen, pp. 299 f. Tradition regarding this, p. 300. Jesus is compelled to flee, pp. 300 f. Lamentation over the cities, pp. 301–303. Jesus' companions, pp. 303–308. Care for their subsistence, pp. 308–311. The Syro-Phœnician woman, pp. 311–313. On the east of the Lake, p. 313. Excursion to the west shore, pp. 314–318. In the villages of Cæsarea Philippi, p. 318. Opinions about Jesus, pp. 318–320. Opinion of the disciples, pp. 321 f. Peter's avowal, pp. 321–323. Importance of this avowal, pp. 323 f. Jesus' reply, pp. 324–326. Simon-Peter, pp. 327 f. The power of the keys, pp. 328–330. Jesus forbids announcement of Messiahship, pp. 330 f. Expectation of death, pp. 331 f. First announcement of his Passion, pp. 332–334. Passion and death of the Messiah, pp. 334 f. Hope of resurrection, pp. 335–338. Peter's remonstrance, p. 338. The disciples called upon to make the fatal journey, pp. 338–341. Transfiguration, pp. 341–345. Healing of the epileptic, p. 345.

CHAPTER XII.

Journey to Jerusalem, pp. 346–391.

Sources, pp. 346 f. Setting out, pp. 347 f. Through Galilee, p. 348. Teaching the disciples, pp. 348–353. Capernaum, p. 353. The Temple dues, pp. 353–355. The child and the disciples, p. 355 f. Exhortation to duty, p. 356. Adherents outside the community, pp. 356 f. Giving away of one's possessions, pp. 357–359. Not a festival journey, pp. 359 f. Rejection in Samaria, pp. 360–362. Preaching to the people, pp. 362 f. Warning against Antipas, pp. 363–365.

Road and time, pp. 365 f. Divorce, pp. 366–368. Ideal and Law, p. 368. Celibacy, pp. 368–370. Blessing the children, pp. 370 f. Conversion of rich men, pp. 371–378: (*a*) The parable of Lazarus, pp. 371–373; (*b*) The rich man's question, p. 373; (*c*) God alone is good, pp. 373 f.; (*d*) Jesus and the commandments, pp. 374 f.; (*e*) The special requirement, pp. 375–377; (*f*) Criticism, p. 377; (*g*) Parting words to the rich man, p. 378. Danger of riches, pp. 378 f. Renunciation will be rewarded, pp. 379–382. Fresh announcement of the Passion, pp. 382 f. Petition of the sons of Zebedee, pp. 383–385. Greatness in God's kingdom, pp. 385 f. Jesus as a pattern, pp. 386 f. Places at a feast, pp. 387 f. Jericho; Zacchæus, pp. 388 f. Bartimæus, p. 389. To Jerusalem, p. 390. Parable of the money entrusted, pp. 390 f.

CHAPTER XIII.

Appearances as the Messiah, and Death, pp. 392–491.

Sources, pp. 392–394. Exact tradition, pp. 394 f. Day of Jesus' death, pp. 395–397. On the day before the festival, pp. 397 f. Anointing in Bethany on Monday, pp. 398 f. Decision to proclaim himself the Messiah, pp. 399–401. Jesus' acquaintance with Jerusalem, pp. 401 f. In Bethany, p. 402. Jesus' associates, pp. 402 f. Mary and Martha, pp. 403 f. Entry into Jerusalem, pp. 404–406. Participation of the people, pp. 406 f. In the house of Simon the leper, pp. 407–411: (*a*) According to Lk. and Jn., pp. 408 f.; (*b*) Leper and Pharisee, p. 409; (*c*) What happened, pp. 409–411. Cursing the fig-tree, pp. 411–413. The market in the temple, p. 413. Jesus' anger, pp. 413 f. Cleansing of the temple, pp. 414 f. His accompanying sayings, p. 415. Announcement of the Messiah, pp. 415–417. The authorities do not interfere, pp. 417 f. Preaching on this day, pp. 418 f. The fig-tree withers, pp. 419–421. Message of the Synedrium, pp. 421 f. Jesus' counter-question, pp. 422 f. The wicked vinedressers, pp. 424–426. Lament over Jerusalem, pp. 426–428. The Romans to judge, pp. 428 f. The tribute money, pp. 429 f. The tax question, pp. 430 f. The heathen coin, pp. 431 f. Jesus' decision, pp. 432 f. The Sadducees' question, pp. 433–437: (*a*) The Sadducees and Jesus, pp. 433 f.; (*b*) The difficulty, pp. 434 f.; (*c*) Jesus' answer, p. 435. This world and the world beyond the grave, pp. 435 f.; (*d*) The quotation from Scripture, pp. 436 f.; (*e*) God's almighty power and faithfulness, p. 437. The greatest commandment, pp. 437–442: (*a*) Love of one's neighbour, pp. 439 f.; (*b*) Parable of the good Samaritan; the story, pp. 440 f.; (*c*) Meaning, pp. 441 f.; (*d*) One's neighbour, p. 442. Thursday, p. 443. The adulteress, pp. 443–445. Resolve to seize Jesus, pp. 445 f. Treachery of Judas, p. 446. His motives, pp. 446–449. The son of David, pp. 449 f. Against Scribes and Pharisees, pp. 451–454. The widow's gift, pp. 454 f. Prophecy of the destruction of the temple, p. 455. Discourse on the second coming, pp. 455 f. Re-

casting of the discourse, pp. 456 f. The Last Supper, pp. 457–464: (*a*) Indication of traitor, pp. 457–459; (*b*) The sinful disciples as citizens of God's kingdom, pp. 459 f.; (*c*) The sacred rite, pp. 460–464. Rejected interpretations, p. 464. Value of the death of Jesus, pp. 464 f. Jesus goes to the Mount of Olives, pp. 465–467. Gethsemane, pp. 467–469. Death-agony of Jesus, pp. 469 f. Seizure of Jesus, pp. 470 f. Before the Synedrium, pp. 471 f. Purpose of the Synedrium, pp. 472 f. Right to condemn, pp. 473–475. Curtailment of the proceedings, pp. 475 f. The sentence, pp. 476 f. Formal correctness, p. 477. Deeper reasons, pp. 477 f. Mocking him as prophet, p. 478. Denial of Peter, pp. 478–480. Handing him over to Pilate, p. 480. Accused to Pilate, pp. 480 f. Proceedings with regard to Jesus, pp. 481. f. Release of Barabbas, pp. 482–484. Mocking by the soldiers, p. 484. Death by crucifixion, pp. 484 f. Crucifixion of Jesus, pp. 485–488. Jesus' death, pp. 488–490. Burial, pp. 490 f.

CHAPTER XIV.

Resurrection and Continued Life, pp. 492–529.

Influence in history, pp. 492 f. Hope of resurrection, pp. 493 f. Accounts of the resurrection, pp. 495 f. Peculiarity of Mk.'s account, pp. 496 f. Truth of this account, pp. 497 f. The empty grave, pp. 498–500. Paul's account, pp. 500 f. Appearance to Paul, pp. 501–503. Order of the appearances, pp. 503–505. Resurrection and return, pp. 505 f. Transitory and permanent elements, pp. 506. Comparison with the Baptist, pp. 508 f. Hillel, pp. 509–512. The prophets of ancient Israel, pp. 512–514. Greek philosophers, pp. 514 ff.: (*a*) Jesus and Plato, pp. 515–518; (*b*) Jesus and the Stoa, pp. 518–521. Founders of religions pp. 521 ff.: (*a*) Kongtse (Confucius), pp. 522 f.; (*b*) Muhammed, pp. 523 f.; (*c*) Gautama-Buddha, pp. 525–527. Christian Confessions, pp. 527 f. Conclusion, pp. 528 f.

Index of Passages quoted . . . pp. 531–542.

9

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIFE OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE LIFE OF JESUS AND THE WORLD'S HISTORY.—Historical science is under an imperative obligation to furnish a picture of the life of Jesus which shall be as far as possible trustworthy. The significance of Christianity for the general development of mankind is so obvious that the inquiry into the origin of that religion, and the study of the life of the person who founded it, and thus became himself the object of religious belief, must be considered indispensable tasks, if to gain a knowledge of the growth of the world which at present surrounds us is regarded at all as a duty of civilisation. Even if it should be found that for a presentation of the life of Jesus free from blanks we lack the necessary Sources, still, Science will always require us to gather together carefully and set forth in an orderly way all that can be gleaned from the Sources, scanty though they perhaps are, as to the character and fate of this personality which was of such supreme significance for succeeding time. It would be a grievous mistake to wish to renounce this task because there is still so much that is open to question and doubt. On the contrary, the conditions of the problem demand that the lines of discrimination between what is certain, what is probable, and what is uncertain, should be drawn as sharply as possible. In thousands of cases, this is the utmost the historian can achieve.[1]

[1] Cp. Chap. III., last paragraph but one. See Hase, in his *Geschichte Jesu, nach akademischen Vorlesungen* (*Gesammelte Werke*, iv. 118): "The

LIFE OF JESUS AND CHRISTIANITY.—But history does not stand alone in being unable to refuse the task of giving a scientific account of the life of Jesus. The execution of the work is imperatively demanded by the Christian religion itself. The great interest which the person of Jesus, his public ministry, and his fate, possess for Christianity is as clearly as possible shown by this fact, that of all its sacred writings, the four Gospels are unquestionably the best known and the most popular throughout the whole Christian world.[1] The early Christian community might have rested satisfied with these four written Sources. It read in them how the life of Jesus was passed; and from the fact that the Church handed down these writings from generation to generation as her sacred treasure, it might be regarded as an act of piety to believe in them in the smallest matters as well as in those of great importance without further question. But such an attitude can no longer be taken at the present day, and for these reasons. On the one hand, scholars have diligently applied themselves to the study of the Biblical writings, and more especially the Gospels. On the other hand, we know also, at least with approximate exactness, how it was that the New Testament arose. Thus it is now an established fact that

most that the biographer can do is to be an epitomator; as Goethe once put it (in his *Briefe an Boisserée*, p. 348), when alluding to his own *Wahrheit und Dichtung*, that stimulating autobiography of his youth, 'I have gone on to be my own epitomator.'"

[1] It is not unnecessary to call attention to this; the historical development of dogma might suggest the erroneous idea that the personal experiences of Jesus never possessed more than a slight degree of interest for Christianity. The Apostle's Creed mentions, it is true, his conception and his birth; his passion, death, and resurrection, his ascension into Heaven, his exaltation, and his second coming; but it makes no allusion whatever to any other experiences of the Saviour's earthly life. From the fourth to the seventh century there was much discussion about the Lord's equality with God, and about the relation which existed between his human and his divine nature; but his historical struggle with the Pharisees, and his public activity generally, were almost entirely ignored in dogmatics. Nor was any very appreciable change made in this respect through Anselm's and Abelard's theories about reconciliation, or even in the recasting which dogma underwent at the time of the Reformation. But alongside of all this dogma, Christendom has always and everywhere gone on telling the story of the life of its Lord and inculcating his teachings.

our four Gospels are to this extent inter-related, that one of them was a Source for the other three. But it is also an established fact that a yet older written Source, notwithstanding its eminent value, is now lost to us. We know, further, that another Gospel—a Gospel, on the whole, of equal rank with the four which we possess—has now only survived in a few small fragments; and that in the case of the four Gospels themselves there is one which for historical purposes can be used only with the greatest caution.[1] These results have been obtained by comparing the Gospels one with another, and with the fragments of the Gospel of the Hebrews. Nor can the Church neglect or disavow this comparative study without detriment to herself.[2] And out of it another task arises, that of presenting the picture of Jesus Christ afresh, on the new foundation thus secured. The Christian world knows well the value of its Saviour; in knowing this, it also knows that his image can lose nothing by being set in its true historical environment. Just in proportion as the desire grows more and more sincere, that the influence of the historical personality of Jesus shall be extended as widely and as universally as possible, the less is the Church able to shirk the task of constructing, from the Sources handed down to her, as clear and accurate a picture of this personality as the circumstances will permit.[3]

[1] Cp. on this head, p. 7 ff.

[2] The clergy often show a pronounced disinclination to test the Biblical accounts by comparing them as regards their mutual relations one to another, and their historical trustworthiness. The refusal to do this in the case of many faithful pastors arises out of the conviction that the various questions affecting the reform of moral and social evils, to which they have to devote their attention, are both more pressing, and, for the dignity of their profession, of greater importance, than historical investigations such as those just alluded to. And it cannot be denied that this view is to a certain extent right. On the other hand, it is absurd to condemn a task, which is certainly on the whole necessary, because it holds out no promise of great usefulness in a man's own particular calling. After all, it is, and always will be, the pastor's first duty to preach the Gospel (*Augsburg Confession*, § v. and § xiv.). As a preacher, he must realise the worth of Christ, not merely on the strength of an uncertain tradition, but by taking his stand upon the results of a searching Biblical criticism, conducted with all the resources available at the present day.

[3] This duty has often been disregarded because what was sought was

Reluctance to Reconstruct the Life of Jesus.—At the same time it is, of course, easy to understand why Christendom should to some extent shrink from undertaking this task. The same kind of hesitation may be felt when the attempt is made by some later hand to restore an edifice that has been hallowed by the memories of a long-distant past. At once the natural fear arises, lest in the process of so-called restoration many valued features of the original should be destroyed, and, on the other hand, lest the taste of the restorer should foist upon it all kinds of accessories and embellishments which absolutely refuse to harmonise with the earlier work. Similarly, in the case of a work dealing with the life of Jesus, two things are chiefly dreaded: the accretions of tradition, and the additions of free invention. There is also a further consideration to reckon with; the critical examination of tradition is a task as little exhilarating as that of rearing a scaffolding and making a thorough examination of the walls and rafters of an ancient building.[1] And as we should very much prefer that a work of this kind should not be performed in the full blaze of publicity, it is also quite proper that the investigations which concern themselves with the life of Jesus should be conducted not in the presence of the great mass of the educated, but in that of the small company of the specially trained. And there is an

to express the nature of the Saviour in a brief formula; in this attempt the historical conception was, as a rule, preceded by a certain subjective view. The nature of the Saviour was deduced, not from the evidence of tradition, but from a total conception as to the redemption which he brought. This is as true of the Christology of Athanasius, who regards the eternity of the Logos as a fact, because he brings eternal life, as it is of the Christology of Schleiermacher, whose view of the unclouded God-consciousness of Jesus is not derived from a study of the historical Sources, but drawn as an inference from the conception of the Redeemer as an ideal prototype. Such inference, however, back from pure speculations to historical facts, is no more permissible in theology than in any other science.

[1] The chief offence lies, of course, in doubting what has been hallowed by the ecclesiastical tradition. In work of a purely edifying nature and in poetry no difficulty is raised. The legends of St. Peter and the goat in Hans Sachs, and of the horseshoe in Goethe, or the additions which Klopstock makes to the Gospel history in his *Messias*, have never been objected to.

additional inducement to adopt this reserve in the fact that a premature regard for the onlooking public may easily beguile one into a desire to obtain particular effects in the picture by artificial means—a proceeding which is absolutely indefensible, at any rate when dealing with sacred subjects.[1] In the work itself it is further essential that the inquirer should be guided by that conscientious carefulness which on the one hand abstains from unnecessary iconoclasm, but on the other shall not lack the courage to sweep away whatsoever does not belong to the original edifice—a carefulness, too, which, when he is building up anew, never suffers him to be carried away by his own thoughts, nor yet allows him to hesitate about making such additions as are proved by the building itself to have formed part of the original plan.

Use to be made of the Works of Predecessors.—There exist already a very large number of works dealing with the life of Jesus, as well as with particular questions connected with it. To decline to make ample use of them would be very ungrateful as well as very unwise. But in every case the ultimate decision must rest with the original Sources. And, if regard is had to the particular subject of inquiry, it is not perhaps quite fitting that the disputes of scholars should be constantly quoted; instead of throwing any additional light upon the picture presented by tradition, this procedure very often does but obscure its clearness and simplicity. Fortunately we now possess literary organs, such as *Die Theologische Rundschau*, which make it their regular business to record in an adequate manner the various opinions which gather about particular problems.[2]

New Points of View.—But when all is said and done,

[1] The endeavour to attain literary beauty might indeed seem peculiarly appropriate in dealing with sacred subjects; but, however that may be, the two essentials—clearness and exactness—must never be sacrificed to any such consideration. D. F. Strauss gave most grievous offence indeed by his *Leben Jesu* in 1835, yet in the domain of science his work achieved no inconsiderable success, because it was, in its method, undertaken in a strictly scientific spirit. Renan's success was that of a writer of romance.

[2] The present work nowhere expressly indicates its acceptance or rejection of the views of other writers. The only references given are to original Sources. This course is further justified by the fact that at least

the important question still remains: Is it wise to add yet another to the already numerous books which deal with the life of Jesus? The question can only be answered in the affirmative if there is a real likelihood that previous inquiries will be supplemented by the new work and in some degree, however modest, surpassed. As it happens, the past few years have been exceptionally rich in discussions on various special questions that arise out of the life of Jesus. I need only mention the investigations as to Jesus' belief about the Messiahship, as to his ethical teaching, and as to the conception of the Son of Man. These investigations have been very little used by those who have previously described the life of Jesus. Then, again, previous biographers of Jesus do not seem to have been guided by any sound principle in fitting together the several Gospel narratives into a completed life; and, above all, our conceptions of the personal characteristics of Jesus—in a certain measure the pith and marrow of any such biographical attempt—as based upon the extant Sources, admit of being framed now with greater vividness and sharpness than has been done heretofore. It will hardly be granted to any single individual ever to say the last word on this subject; but there is at least a certain satisfaction in the reflection that one has been enabled to advance, even if it be only in certain particulars, the scientific study of the life of Jesus.

the works which deal with the life of Jesus as a whole, represent no actual continuity of work. True, the same remark does not apply to discussions of particular questions affecting the life, yet even these we often find proclaiming as entirely new something which has merely lapsed into temporary forgetfulness in this or the other quarter, while in other quarters it had long been the common possession of scientific inquirers. One instance of what I mean is the perception that even for Jesus the Messianic kingdom was to be established by a future fiat of God's will, even if a foretaste of it was to some extent actually realised in the immediate circle of Jesus.

CHAPTER II

THE SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF JESUS

No real First Sources.—Whereas the life of the Apostle Paul can for the most part be clearly traced in those of his Epistles which are unquestionably genuine, and these Sources, excellent as they are for this portion of the early history of Christianity, may be supplemented by the authentic account of a companion of Paul, as preserved to us in the so-called "We"-sections of the Acts of the Apostles, for our knowledge of the life of Jesus we are thrown back on purely second-hand accounts.[1]

Paul.—We can hardly attribute any higher value than this even to Paul's own statements, valuable as they are. It is, to say the least, doubtful whether Paul knew Jesus during his life on earth; it depends upon what interpretation is put upon 1 Cor. ix. 1 and 2 Cor. v. 16. At any rate, there certainly were no close and intimate relations between the two. Nor is there evidence of any profound impression having been made upon Paul at that period. Paul testifies of Jesus that he was sprung of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom.

[1] Even the information regarding the life of Paul is especially detailed only for short portions. For instance, for the seventeen years which elapsed between his conversion and the so-called Council of the Apostles, owing to the untrustworthiness of this particular section of the Acts of the Apostles, we are almost entirely dependent upon Gal. i. 13–24. As for Paul's life before his conversion, we are practically as ignorant of it as we are of Jesus' life before his public appearance. The period of Paul's life with regard to which we have the clearest information is that which extends from his first journey to Europe down to his arrest in Jerusalem and his deportation to Cæsarea; but even in this period many points are obscure.

i. 3)[1]; that he was born of a woman, and was subject to the Mosaic law (Gal. iv. 4); and that he knew no sin (2 Cor. v. 21). But this last statement cannot be explained on purely historical grounds, for sinlessness is not a fact that can be demonstrated by experience. And the same criticism applies with even greater force to Paul's observation in Phil. ii. 5–11, that Jesus had originally the divine nature in him, yet thought not to snatch for himself a sovereignty equal to God's by a violent act of robbery, but received it as a gift of God's grace, by humbling himself to become man and to render obedience in the form of a servant, maintaining it even unto death on the cross. In this statement the emphasis is laid on the pre-existent nature of Jesus, as well as on his present equality with God in sovereignty, as pure intuitions of faith beyond and outside of all historical apprehension. Whether by the prominence given to "the form of a servant" a humble position generally in human society is to be understood, is open to question.[2] Jesus' obedience to God is mentioned again in Rom. v. 19; precisely the same remark applies to it as to what is said about his sinlessness (2 Cor. v. 21).

That which *is* historical is the death on the cross, which Paul always solemnly dwells upon as the most important event in Jesus' earthly career (1 Cor. ii. 2). The passage just quoted from the Epistle to the Philippians is very closely related to 2 Cor. viii. 9: "Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor." Here again Paul, in the words of the last clause, *may* have had the outward circumstances of Jesus' life in his mind. But the other idea is far the more prominent, that in him a divine being put on the nature of man; and this is not a simple historical statement.

On the other hand, Paul does give us information of strictly

[1] Cp. Chap. IV., the section, "Jesus' Descent from David."

[2] If Paul was alluding to the standing of Jesus in the social order, δοῦλος would be too strong an expression to use; for we nowhere read that Jesus had been any man's slave. The antithesis between βασιλεύς and δοῦλος would, indeed, be appropriate enough, but precisely in this passage there is no reference at all to the kingly dignity of Jesus. The actual antithesis, namely, that between Θεός and δοῦλος, leaves Jesus' social position untouched.

historical value, when he mentions incidentally (1 Cor. ix. 5) that the brethren of the Lord made journeys in connection with missionary work, accompanied by their wives; and that James, one of these brethren, was personally known to him (Gal. i. 19), and was esteemed a mainstay of the first community (Gal. ii. 9), although subsequently he chose a path which was opposed to that of Paul (Gal. ii. 12).[1]

There was one man in particular, belonging to the circle of Jesus' most intimate friends, with whom Paul was well acquainted, and that was Peter or Cephas. It was for the purpose of making his acquaintance, that Paul undertook his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion (Gal. i. 18). Peter had been indicated to him as the chosen messenger to the Jews, amongst whom he had laboured with much success (Gal. ii. 7 f.). Paul spent some time with Peter in Antioch, where at length strife arose between them, owing to Peter's ambiguous attitude (Gal. ii. 14). Of Peter also, Paul mentions that he had his wife with him in his missionary journeys (1 Cor. ix. 5). In Corinth there was a party of Cephas, opposed to another party of Paul, as also to a third party of Apollos (1 Cor. i. 12 and iii. 22).

Similarly Paul also reproduces in his Epistles, as occasion offers, particular sayings of Jesus. Here, however, it is important to distinguish between quotations properly so called and mere brief allusions. Direct quotations of sayings of the Lord occur in four passages only. In 1 Thess. iv. 15, Paul appeals to a description by Jesus of the coming of the Messiah, in which the prospect was held out that the dead who had belonged to the Messiah should be brought to life again. That Jesus uttered any such saying is not explicitly handed down in our other Sources.[2] But, apart from the

[1] The expression τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου indicates, not merely the accidental circumstance that these men were of the *entourage* of this brother of Jesus, but indicates also the authority relied on by this school, which was opposed to Paul, and also at the same time took a line which was different from that of Peter. Had Paul desired to indicate merely where they came from, he would have written ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας or ἀπὸ (ἀφ') Ἱερουσαλήμ (Ἱεροσολύμων). If James was not the inspirer and instigator of this anti-Pauline school, Paul's language would be, to say the least, misleading.

[2] With regard to the Johannine Gospel, see pp. 32–40 below.

excellent testimony of Paul, it is in itself extremely likely that he did utter it, because at least shortly before his last entry into Jerusalem he did foresee the death of certain of his disciples, as well as his own death (Mk. x. 39).[1]

The other three citations of sayings of the Lord occur in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. In vii. 10 f. Paul appeals to Jesus' prohibition of divorce (Mk. x. 11 f.); in ix. 14 to Jesus' direction, that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel (Mk. vi. 8–10; Mt. x. 9 f.; Lk. x. 5–7); and in xi. 23–25 to the institution of the Supper "in the night in which Jesus was delivered up unto his enemies." In this last the way of fixing the date is also of importance.

Undoubted allusions and references to sayings of the Lord occur in 1 Cor. xiii. 2 = Mk. xi. 23, faith removes mountains; in 1 Thess. v. 2 = Mt. xxiv. 43, Lk. xii. 39, the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night; and in Rom. xiii. 9, Gal. v. 14 = Mk. xii. 29–31, the greatest commandment. Lastly, 1 Cor. xv. 3–8 is of fundamental importance for a historical understanding of what underlies the Easter festival. Paul there tells us what he was in the habit of teaching as a missionary with regard to the burial, resurrection, and appearances of the risen Jesus. There, too, he calls special attention to the fact that most of the witnesses of Jesus' resurrection were still alive (*v.* 6). Thus the events about which he preached were of no very distant date.

The references quoted exhaust what Paul has to tell us about the life of Jesus. It is therefore all the more to be regretted that they in nowise enable us to construct a clear

[1] It is thus very probable that Jesus did speak of the resuscitation of his friends, in some such words as those of 1 Thess. iv. 16 f. The absence of the corresponding saying of Jesus from the Gospels is attributable to the objection which the Church as early as the second century had to such chiliastic expressions (see p. 55 below). In the utterance in question, we may take it, Jesus had referred to the death-awakening sound at his second coming: "He descendeth from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. Then those that are his, who until now have slept, shall awaken, and they and those faithful ones who are yet alive shall be transfigured and caught up into the air to meet him." To us all this sounds fantastic; still, that does not make it spurious.

picture of what that life was. Not only are there no answers here to our questions as to where and when; even Jesus' preaching, the oppositions which affected his life, even the precise circumstances which led up to his crucifixion, are either not mentioned at all, or only mentioned in the scantiest fashion.[1]

NON-PAULINE NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES.—And yet, notwithstanding all this, the genuine Epistles of Paul convey far more historical information as to the actual course of Jesus' life than any other Epistle in the New Testament. In fact those Epistles of the New Testament which do not emanate from Paul cannot be used as Sources for the life of Jesus. The First Epistle of Timothy mentions (vi. 13) that Jesus suffered under Pontius Pilate; but the chronological position of this Epistle is clear from the fact that in v. 18, while it follows the example of 1 Cor. ix. 9, 14, in coupling the Old Testament passage, Dt. xxv. 4, with the saying of the Lord in Lk. x. 7, it cites both (our Lord's saying included) as a passage of Scripture. And the hope of finding vivid reminiscences of Jesus' earthly life in the Epistles of John and Peter is only doomed to disappointment. 1 Pet. ii. 21–25 recalls the example of Christ, but does so partly in Old Testament language (Is. liii. 9, 5, 6), partly in terms so general that any Christian preacher might say the same thing on the basis of the general Gospel tradition. The second Epistle of Peter mentions the transfiguration of Jesus (i. 16–18); but, as we know from the direct testimony of the Epistle

[1] Cp. 1 Thess. ii. 15 and 1 Cor. ii. 8. On the other hand, it ought to be expressly observed, that none of the traits which fundamentally characterise Jesus are wanting in Paul's writings. Jesus' eschatological attitude Paul clearly has before him in 1 Thess. iv. 15 and v. 2. Jesus' own confident faith inspired Paul with certainty in his own preaching of faith (1 Cor. xiii. 2). The sombre solemnity with which this confident faith was overshadowed by the expectation of death was also known to him (as we see from 1 Cor. xi. 23–25). Jesus' command to every man to love his neighbour was for Paul of fundamental importance (Rom. xiii. 9 and Gal. v. 14). But he also knew that certain of Jesus' ordinances, such as his prohibition of divorce (1 Cor. vii. 10 f.), and his direction with regard to the disciples' subsistence (1 Cor. ix. 4), are not necessarily and without qualification obligatory under all circumstances (1 Cor. vii. 15 and ix. 15).

itself (iii. 4), it was not written until a second generation after Christ—"The fathers have been now a long time asleep." The material afforded by the Epistle to the Hebrews is only apparently possessed of greater historical value. Besides mentioning that Jesus was descended from Abraham (ii. 16) and sprang out of Juda (vii. 14), this Epistle speaks of temptations of Jesus (ii. 18, iv. 15); in v. 7 we appear to have an allusion to Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane; his faithfulness (iii. 2), his obedience (v. 8), his courage under pain (xii. 2 f.), are commended; and the place of his execution is mentioned (xiii. 12)—"without the gate."[1] But there can be no doubt that here also, apart from the dogmatic conceptions of the Pauline theology, no other authority is presupposed than the tradition preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. Since, moreover, we have no means of fixing the exact date of the Epistle, it can possess no independent value as a Source for the life of Jesus.

Apocalypse, Acts of the Apostles.—Nor does the Apocalypse of John throw any light upon the life of Jesus. Here also, apart from the all-important fact of Jesus' violent death, the only thing mentioned is Jesus' descent from David (v. 5, xxii. 16). According to the Acts of the Apostles itself (i. 1), that book is the second portion of a historical work—the first portion being the Gospel of Luke—and, consequently, it proceeds on the assumption that the earlier tradition of the life of Jesus is already known (*e.g.*, i. 22, x. 37–43, xiii. 22–31). But there is one saying of the Lord in Acts which has been handed down nowhere else. It belongs indeed to the so-called "We"-portions, and its genuineness is equally attested both by its own pregnant force and by its substantial agreement with the spirit of other sayings of the Lord. It is the passage in xx. 35: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."[2]

[1] ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθεν. The passage is of importance for the topography of the Jerusalem of the New Testament, in so far as it is not quite easy to think that the site which tradition indicates as having been the place of the Holy Sepulchre and Golgotha lay outside the city walls. The passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews is supported both by internal probability and by the expressions in Mk. (xv. 20 f.), ἐξάγουσιν . . . ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ. But, taken alone, it scarcely has the value of a decisive Source.

[2] The value of the New Testament writings as Sources for the life of

NON-CHRISTIAN: (*a*) TACITUS.—The earliest notices which we possess about Jesus in non-Christian writers are found in Josephus, assuming his testimony to be genuine, and in Tacitus. The statement of the latter writer[1] occurs in his account of the persecution of the Christians under Nero (*Annal.* xv. 44—the *Annals* date from the years 115–117 A.D.). Here Tacitus calls Christ the founder of the Christian community; the Messianic title is already taken to be a personal name. According to the historian, this Christ was put to death in the reign of Tiberius by the Procurator Pontius Pilate—a precise note of time of great value. He goes on to say that by this act the spread of the pernicious superstition was for a time checked, but that it broke out again, "not only in Judæa, the original birthplace of the pest, but also in the capital, to which place everything that is hateful and shameful flows from every quarter, and there meets with sympathy." It is plain, therefore, that Tacitus abhorred Christianity. He called it an *exitiabilis superstitio*, a *malum*; it belonged to things which were *atrocia aut pudenda.* From this, however, it is impossible to say whether he had any definite knowledge of the contents of the Christian belief.[2]

(*b*) JOSEPHUS.—As to Josephus, it is but in accordance with the general character of the work to assume that in the *Antiquities* he has noticed in his usual fashion the public appearance of Jesus and the rise of the Christian Church. Of every movement which is in any way comparable to

Jesus is here examined apart from the other early Christian literature. This is in accordance with the position which they actually take in the Church. Our decision as to the value of the Source has not indeed been influenced by that circumstance; but it would be unscientific to ignore the fact that it is precisely their value as original Sources, even if that value is more apparent than real, that has led to their being made the foundation of all Church worship and all Church instruction.

[1] We place this first on account of its undoubted genuineness, although Tacitus wrote later than Josephus.

[2] From the fact that Tacitus reckons Christianity among things *atrocia aut pudenda*, we can hardly be wrong in assuming that he already held the opinion, against which the Apologists regularly argue, that at the Lord's Supper human flesh was eaten, and that immoral practices were tolerated at the Christian love feasts (cp. the passages in Oehler's Tertullian, I., *Apologet.*, vii. a.).

early Christianity he has given us some information, however brief; and it would be quite a mistake to suppose that Josephus perhaps preserved silence with regard to the growing Christianity because of his hatred of it. It is by no means that writer's habit to observe silence where his hatred is provoked. But indeed there exists actual evidence that as a matter of fact in the work cited he did make mention of the public appearance of Jesus. In a passage, the genuineness of which is not at all open to question (xx. 200),[1] he speaks of the condemnation of "James, the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ" (*τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ*). That this James should have been at last stoned by the Jews for having transgressed the Law was an especially harsh stroke of destiny in return for his Christian zeal for the Law, which he manifested particularly in his opposition to Paul (Gal. ii. 12 and Acts xxi. 18–25). And yet this must have been the real cause of his being put to death, for, as Paul rightly saw, the Christian movement was in its essence a movement lying outside the law (Gal. ii. 15–18).[2] Now in the passage just cited Josephus assumes that his readers know who Jesus Christ is. He introduces James by calling him the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ. Therefore he has spoken of Jesus before. Perhaps we might be justified in inferring also from this passage that Josephus was not too severe in his condemnation of the Christian movement. He emphasises (xx. 199) the fact that the Sadducees, from which sect the judge who condemned James was drawn, were in their sentences more unmerciful than any other Jews, and in § 201 he says that those who were mildest and strict with regard to the law would not have approved of the execution of James. Therefore he may also not have approved of the execution of Jesus, even if he

[1] I cite Josephus according to the large edition by B. Niese (Berlin, 1887–95).

[2] To the Jews, who were rigid observers of the law, a crucified Messiah was, by reason of Dt. xxi. 23, of necessity a stumbling-block. That James, despite his pious devotion to the law, was able to disregard this offence, may be explicable by the fact that, notwithstanding his fundamental position, his mind was far more occupied with the Messianic hope than with the interpretation of the law. Such inconsistencies between theory and practice are exceedingly common precisely in religious matters.

looked upon the Galilean, in virtue of his Messianic claim, as a foolish enthusiast who, on account of his opposition to the law, was not altogether an innocuous person. Origen must still have read something like this in his Josephus; for in two places he tells us that Josephus did not acknowledge Jesus to be the Messiah (*Contra Celsum*, i. 47; cp. *In Matth.* x. 17). On the other hand, Eusebius already (*Hist. Eccl.*, i. 11, and *Dem. Evan.*, iii. 5, 105, 106) contains that passage about Jesus (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 63 f.)—now given by all MSS.—which, in view of its contents and form, cannot possibly be genuine. If this section were indeed derived from Josephus, it would mean that he, a Jew, who everywhere steps forward as a champion of his Judaism, first called Jesus a wise man, and then added the hesitating qualification, "if indeed he may be called a man at all." The writer then proceeds to justify this qualifying clause by adding, further, "for he was a performer of acts incredible"; though what those acts were he does not tell us. The same passage also goes on to say that Jesus was a teacher of such men as willingly accept the truth. That is to say, Josephus here describes the nature and content of Jesus' teaching by the simple term, "the truth" (τἀλήθῃ). Jesus drew to himself those who thirsted for the truth—such a sentence can only have been written by one who reckoned himself to belong to the community of Christ. Again, it is said of Jesus, in distinct contradiction to historical fact, "and many Jews, many also of the people of the Greeks, did he draw to himself." Josephus the historian, in describing the earthly life of Jesus, could never have made such a statement as that contained in the second clause. But the account goes on to say of Jesus, "this man was the Messiah." If Josephus had written thus, he would not have been content to devote only one short chapter to the account of Jesus' life; for we must remember that Josephus was a Jew and perfectly familiar with the Messianic belief. If he could have so written, Jesus must have been for him the man of men, the future lord of the world; at any rate, from this particular passage onwards the fate of Jesus must have seemed important for the whole future development of his narrative. But of this there is not the slightest trace. The only further passage in which Josephus makes mention of Jesus is that already

cited (*Ant.*, xx. 200). This circumstance, more than any other, proves that the passage under consideration (xviii. 63, 64) is not genuine. This same passage then goes on to speak of the end of Jesus: "When the chief men amongst us had notified him unto Pilate, and Pilate had punished him with the death on the cross, those who had formerly loved him fell not away, for on the third day he appeared unto them again alive, as the holy prophets had foretold (and many other wonderful things also); and even down to this present time the Christian folk who are called after him have not ceased to be." Here, then, the whole body of Old Testament prophecy is referred to Jesus; this is the standpoint of a Christian. Nor is the expression "the Christian folk" (τὸ φῦλον) appropriate in the mouth of one who is a Jew and wishes to remain so. The word φῦλον expresses really the idea of a common descent; it is precisely the characteristic element of the idea that was manifestly wanting in Christianity, made up as it was of an assemblage from all peoples. Christianity knows differently: to it all the members of the Christian community are children of God and brethren of Christ. Almost the only designation for the Christian community that was available for a Jew to use was the term αἵρεσις (Acts xxiv. 5, 14, xxviii. 22). Thus the passage attributed to Josephus is unquestionably spurious. And as there are no inherent contradictions discernible in it, it would be a piece of pure arbitrariness to attempt to pick out a genuine kernel from what is as a whole spurious. On the contrary, we are obliged to hold that the text which we now have has supplanted another which was less agreeable to the Christians of a later date. And the time when this substitution took place was no doubt the period between Origen and Eusebius. The Church, struggling as she was after power, deleted from Josephus, an author both widely read and in many respects serviceable to her, a passage which was repugnant to her, and substituted for it a text which from her standpoint was unassailable, but which, as a matter of fact, is in no sense compatible with the authorship of Josephus.

THE GOSPELS.—Accounts, in the true sense of the word, of the life of Jesus are those contained in the Gospels. The use of the word "gospel" so early as the time of Justin, who

employs it as the name of a book (I. *Ap.*, 66 [98 B]), proves that amongst Christians, even at a very early period, the narratives of Jesus' life were looked upon as containing the essential elements of the Christian glad-tidings, no doubt to a certain extent in opposition to the Pauline declaration, according to which Christ in the flesh was a figure belonging wholly to the past (2 Cor. v. 16).[1] According to Lk. i. 1, 2, these narratives were put together and consolidated into a single story by many hands in the second generation of Christians. "Many," he says, "have taken in hand to set forth in order the story of those events which have come to pass amongst us, even as they have been delivered unto us by those who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the preaching." The tradition, therefore, took its rise naturally in the first generation of Christians; the attempts to give an ordered account date from the second. Consequently, no Gospel was written, we may suppose, before the beginning of the second half of the first century.

CHOICE BY THE CHURCH.—Now for our knowledge of the whole of this Gospel literature it was a disastrous circumstance that already in the second century the Church took the Gospels which were then current, sifted them, and made a selection amongst them. Those writings which from her point of view were the more valuable she retained to be read in the services of the community; such as were less valuable, or in her opinion were hurtful to the faith of the community, she excluded from use in divine worship.

(*a*) JUSTIN.—Justin Martyr (who died between 163 and 167 A.D.) tells us that in the divine worship of his day, the Gospels were read in definite sections (I. *Ap.* 67, and cp. 66). But at the same time, although Justin is acquainted with the Gospel of Jn. as a Christian document, and uses it as such

[1] The relatively frequent appeal to sayings of the Lord in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (see pp. 7–10) was occasioned by the assertion of Paul's enemies, that he was not a true apostle, and that he had never seen the Lord (1 Cor. ix. 1), whereas they described themselves as helpers of Christ (διάκονοι Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. xi. 22). When Paul came to Corinth, he had resolved to confine his preaching to two articles of faith (1 Cor. ii. 2, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον). But the community itself soon desired a more apprehensible gospel.

(I. *Ap.*, 61), it was not yet accounted of equal value with the other Gospels; so it would appear from the citations of sayings of the Lord and of the Gospel history which are given by Justin. On the other hand, he offers us information which we do not find in our Gospels. For instance, he says that the manger of Jesus was in a cave near Bethlehem (*Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 78). This does not appear in our text of Lk. (ii. 7), though Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 51, 9; cp. 78, 15), it is true, asserts that in his text of this passage in Lk. the "cave" was spoken of. It is quite possible that he is right. For the mere use of the words "They laid him in a manger" does indeed point in a sense to the unusual character of the halting-place; and the reason for selecting it is given in the immediately following sentence, "For there was no room for them in the inn." But the latter clause would fit the context still better, if a cave had actually been mentioned along with the manger. James' Gospel of the Infancy and the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy also speak of the cave,[1] and Origen says (*Contra Celsum*, i. 51) that in his day the cave was pointed out at Bethlehem. Justin tells us, further, that Jesus as a τέκτων made yokes and ploughs (*Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 88); we shall see later that τέκτων in Mk. vi. 3 designates a working builder. It has been plausibly suggested that this statement rests upon a tradition which originated in a really somewhat childish interpretation of Mt. xi. 29 (ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) and Lk. ix. 62 (ἄροτρον).[2] But the same thing is also related in the Gospel of Thomas (ch. 13); it is not impossible that Justin borrowed it from this source.

The detail about an appearance of fire at the baptism of Jesus appears to be derived from a good traditional source (*Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 88).

According to Justin (I. *Ap.*, 32), the disciples found the ass's colt, upon which Jesus rode to Jerusalem, tied to a vine. But this is a clear instance of adaptation of the Gospel history to the Old Testament (Gen. xlix. 11); the origin of the idea may be sought in one of the Apocryphal Gospels, or it may even be due to Justin himself, who was always ready to

[1] *Protevang. Jacobi*, 18; *Evang. inf. Salv. Arab.*, 2.
[2] Cp. Otto, *Justini Opera*, ii. 324.

find hints of the Gospel story in every part of the Old Testament.

Justin also tells us (I. *Ap.*, 35) that in mockery Jesus was set upon a judge's seat with the words, "Come! Deliver Thou judgment unto us!" Mk. xiv. 65 states that Jesus, after his condemnation at the Council, was mocked as a prophet; and Mk. xv. 16–19 that, after his condemnation by Pilate, he was mocked as king of the Jews. As Jesus did actually proclaim himself at the Council to be One who was about to appear soon as the judge of all the world (Mk. xiv. 62), such a mockery of him as judge is quite conceivable in addition to the other mockery (as prophet). So this may be historically true information, which came in Justin's way, though it is lacking in our canonical Gospels.[1]

Little importance is to be attached to the fact that according to Mt. ii. 1 the Magi came from the East (*μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν*), but according to Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, 77, 78, 102) from Arabia (*ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας*); for by Arabia was meant the country bordering upon Judæa on the east—that is to say, the Nabatæan kingdom of Petra, which in New Testament times was always called Arabia, and extended as far as Damascus. Similarly, Justin's statement (*Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 69), that Jesus was traduced and called a *μάγος*, is merely a way of alluding briefly to the reproach made against him, that it was by the power of Beelzebul that he cast out demons (Mk. iii. 22).

On the other hand, Justin's further allegation (*Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 106), that at the crucifixion Jesus' disciples deserted him, and only turned to him again in consequence of the resurrection, is a statement of greater importance. Of this the Gospels which form part of the New Testament tell us nothing; but in Mk. xiv. 27 (=Mt. xxvi. 31), and Lk. xxi. 31*f*, there are sayings of the Lord which do have in view some such conduct on the part of the disciples; and even the heathen Tacitus is able to tell us, "Repressa in praesens exitiabilis superstitio." There can be no question that Justin

[1] Justin's Source was no doubt the Gospel of Peter (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græci Suppl.*, Leipzig, 1896, p. 68, v. 7—*ἐκάθισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ καθέδραν κρίσεως λέγοντες· δικαίως κρῖνε, βασιλεῦ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*).

here follows some better Gospel tradition than that contained in the Biblical Gospels.[1]

(*b*) THE SETTLING OF THE GOSPEL CANON.—These divergences between Justin and the Gospels to which alone at a later date importance was attached, show that at the time of Justin the canonical authority of those Gospels was not yet fixed. But the uncertainty as to the Gospel canon did not continue much longer in the Church; for Justin's pupil Tatian drew up for the Syrian Church, from the Four Gospels now found in the New Testament, a Gospel harmony—his Gospel *διὰ τεσσάρων*, the one Gospel compiled from the four.[2]

(i.) MURATORI'S CANON.—Moreover, the catalogue of New Testament writings, belonging to the end of the second century, and known from its discoverer and first editor as the Canon of Muratori, calls Lk. the third, and Jn. the fourth and last, of the Gospels, and thus plainly enough excludes all the extra-canonical Gospels.[3]

(ii.) IRENÆUS.—Irenæus, who may have written his great work against the various forms of heresy about the year 180, adduces (iii. 11, 8) a number of reasons for limiting the number of the Gospels to four. For instance, there are four regions of the world, four quarters whence the wind blows; also the Christian community which was scattered throughout the world needed four pillars to rest upon. A type of the four-fold Gospel are the four-fold creatures of Ezekiel. And God has made four covenants with men—namely, through Noah, through Abraham, through Moses, and through Christ.

Thus about the year 180, other Gospel writings were indeed still known to the Church at large; but the four books which

[1] At the same time, the falling away of the disciples must be attributed only to despair, not to a denial of their Master. The death on the cross was so very contrary to all the accepted ideas with regard to the Messiah, that the disciples may at first quite well have taken it for a judgment of God. And by men who had had a Jewish upbringing the solemn enunciation of the death sentence by the Synedrium could not be regarded as having no significance. But there is nothing to suggest that any of the disciples, with the solitary exception of Judas, ever again went over to the enemies of Jesus.

[2] Cp. Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Litteratur*, i. 493–496 and ii. 284–289.

[3] The text is given in Preuschen, *Analekta*, pp. 129–137.

were afterwards given the place of honour in the New Testament were even then regarded as the only Sources which could be authoritatively used for the life of Jesus Christ. One result of this decision of the Church of the period is that none of the extra-canonical Gospels is now extant in its entirety. They were rejected by the Church censorship, were no longer copied, and have now more or less completely disappeared. But before we proceed to consider the fragments of these extra-canonical Gospels which have been preserved to us, we must first briefly discuss the value possessed by the canonical Gospels themselves as Sources for the life of Jesus.

THE SYNOPTICS.—That the first three Gospels of the New Testament Canon are most intimately related both as regards form and contents, and have much more in common one with another than any of the three with the Johannine Gospel, was perceived long ago. Augustine says (*De Consensu Evangelistarum*, iii. 4, 13), "Tres igitur isti eandem rem ita narraverunt, sicut eam unus homo ter posset cum aliquanta veritate, nulla tamen adversitate." Since the time of Griesbach (about 1790) these three Gospels have consequently been called the Synoptic Gospels, or those which take a common view. Not only do they relate, broadly speaking, the same incidents; they do so also for the most part in an almost identical form, even to the extent of preserving details in the structure of the sentences and in the wording. Nor do the narratives common to all three occupy in any one of them a merely subordinate position, but, on the contrary, in every case alike they constitute the backbone of the entire work. If we look at them more closely, we find that the relations between the three are as follows.[1] Mk. is contained

[1] The following statements do not, of course, make any pretensions to the thoroughness of a special work on the Synoptic Gospels. Still, a condensed summary of the evidence, from which subordinate matters may be excluded, possesses this advantage, that it perhaps throws the essential facts into stronger relief. Besides, the main point here is not to exhaust all the possibilities that are in any way conceivable, even though a supporter, or, if you will, an authority, is found for everyone of them in theological literature; the only important point is to show which out of all these possibilities is the most likely one. And the measure of the probability is afforded by what can be observed in other literary works, especially those of the same period.

almost in its entirety in Mt. and Lk. Over and above this, Mt. and Lk. have other considerable sections in common with one another, which do not occur in Mk. And each of the three has certain matter peculiar to itself.

(*a*) MK. AND PARALLELS.—Peculiar to Mk. are: the parable of the seed of corn (iv. 26–29), the healing of the deaf mute (vii. 32–37), and of the blind man at Bethsaida (viii. 22–26),[1] and the flight of one of the disciples when Jesus was taken prisoner (xiv. 51 f.). Some of Mk.'s passages are wanting in Mt., but are contained in Lk.: for instance, the incident of the demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum (i. 21–28); but the statement with regard to the manner of Jesus' preaching in Mk.'s narrative (i. 22) is given in Mt. at the end of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. vii. 28 f.). Another instance is Jesus' first departure from Capernaum (Mk. i. 35–39); this might seem to be a transition which could easily be spared. What is said about the return of the disciples whom Jesus had sent out (Mk. vi. 30 f.), which also is not contained in Mt., was regarded, we may be sure, in the same light. Further, the story of the poor widow's mite (xii. 41–44) is not found in Mt. In Lk., not only is the matter absent which we have already pointed out as being peculiar to Mk., but there is a section of considerable length missing which is contained in Mk. (vi. 45–viii. 22),—that is to say, the entire portion from the end of the first feeding of the multitude to the end of the second. Besides this, Lk. does not contain the saying of the Lord (Mk. xi. 25) about the duty of forgiveness in prayer; Mt. has it, but in a different context from Mk.

(*b*) MK. A SOURCE OF LK.—The first indubitable conclusion from this is that Mk. served as a Source upon which Lk. drew. For, in consideration of the complete parallelism of diction in large portions of the two, it is quite obvious that the one stood in literary dependence upon the other. That Lk., however, is not merely excerpted from Mk. is proved by the long passage which in Mk. follows the first miracle of feeding the multitude but does not appear in Lk. Yet the most reasonable explanation would seem to be that Lk. passed in-

[1] But cp. p. 24, below.

voluntarily from the first story, which he had adopted, to the end of the second of a like nature; just as, in old MSS. where the same word occurs twice pretty close together, the eye of the copyist inadvertently wanders from the first to the second, so that the word only appears once instead of twice, and the intervening text drops out. And that this really did happen in the case of Lk. is proved also by the substance of the passage which has fallen out, for it is a narrative which would have been of great interest for that Evangelist's life of Jesus, containing as it does the controversy about the laws of purity and Jesus' flight into the territory of the heathen Phœnicians (Mk. vii. 1–24).[1]

It might perhaps at first sight be thought possible that Lk. used as his Source, not Mk., but Mt. alone, because Mt. contains nearly all Mk.'s narratives and almost in precisely the same words. On examination, however, the possibility will be found to disappear; for Lk. gives quite a series of narratives which are found in Mk. but do not occur in Mt. —namely, those enumerated above (Mk. i. 21–28, 35–39; vi. 30 f.; xii. 41–44). Thus it is hardly possible to conceive of Mk. as having stood to Lk. in any other relation than that of a Source upon which Lk. drew. Whether the form of Mk. which Lk. had before him was exactly the same as that which we now possess is another question, which cannot be settled here.

(*c*) MK. AND MT.—Augustine even in his time declared (*De Cons. Evang.*, i. 2, 4), "Marcus eum [Matthæum] subsecutus tamquam pedisequus et breviator eius videtur." So also Griesbach wrote (1789–90) two "Academic programmes," entitled "Commentatio, qua Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse monstratur."

[1] It might, indeed, be supposed that the omission was perhaps intentional, but it is hardly possible to find a reason for it. Lk. can have found no real difficulty in the rejection of the Jewish laws of purity, or indeed in anything that is related in the passage (Mk. vii. 1–23) in question, for he himself actually has a parallel to it in xi. 37–41. And just as little would he be likely to take exception to Jesus' flight into heathen country, for not only does he introduce the saying about the Son of Man having nowhere to lay his head (Lk. ix. 58), but he also repeats the sayings about the sending of Elijah to the widow of Sarepta and about the healing of Naaman the Syrian by Elisha (Lk. iv. 25–27).

Griesbach here goes beyond Augustine, in that he sees in Mk. an excerpt from the two longer Gospels, whereas Augustine only recognises in Mk. an abbreviated version of Mt. The literary interdependence between Mt. and Mk. is perhaps more obvious than that between Mk. and Lk., and stands in no need of proof. But Mk. has not made an excerpt from Mt. In Mk. the story of Jesus' first stay at Capernaum (i. 21–39) is a well-rounded, complete narrative, while Mt. gives nothing but the middle portion (Mt. viii. 14–17)—a torso without a head and without feet. And with regard to the stories of healing a deaf mute (Mk. vii. 32–37) and a blind man (Mk. viii. 22–26), which are also wanting in Lk., it is not the case that they have simply dropped out of Mt., for we do find them, though in an abbreviated form, and devoid of graphic touch (Mt. ix. 27–33), tacked on to the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk. v. 22–43). Mt.'s intention is clear: it was to bring together as far as possible all incidents—here miracles—of a like character.

Further, let Mk. ii. 23–28 be compared with Mt. xii. 1–8. If Mk. had had the text of Mt. before him, it is inconceivable that he would have substituted the act of making a way through the corn fields for that of eating the ears of corn; that he would have interpolated an erroneous date ('when Abiathar was high-priest'); and that he would have omitted not only the instance in which violation of the Sabbath was permissible—namely, that by the priests in the Temple—but also the exalted designation applied by Jesus to himself, "Here is one greater than the Temple," as well as the allusion to Hos. vi. 6—an allusion which, strange to say, occurs also in Mt. ix. 13, but is missing again in the corresponding passage of Mk.; and that for all these omissions he should have made such compensation (it is indeed ample) by the saying which supplies the ground for his final conclusion: "The Sabbath exists for man, and not man for the Sabbath." How much more intelligible does the relation between the two texts become, when we assume Mk. to have been the Source of Mt.! In that case we see how Mt. removes the difficulties which lie before him: the erroneous date; the logical twist which makes Jesus defend the act of plucking the ears of corn to make a path by quoting the example of David who *ate* the shew-

bread; and the hazardous dictum, that the Sabbath exists for man, was created for his sake, when according to Gen. ii. 2 f. God ordained it for his own sake. More than this, Mt. evidently considered that the argument of Jesus as given in Mk. was not convincing, for he has thought it desirable to introduce two other passages from the Old Testament. If Mt. was the Source, it is impossible to explain Mk.'s procedure, but if Mk. was the Source, it is easy to understand every one of Mt.'s alterations.

(*d*) CONCLUSION AS REGARDS MK.—Nor should we escape from such difficulties as these if we adopted Griesbach's assumption that Mt. and Lk. served as Mk.'s source. In that case the agreement which exists between Mt. and Lk. is still entirely unaccounted for. In a word, there is only one theory which helps us to explain the relation of Mk. to Mt. and Lk.: Mk. was a Source made use of for both the longer Gospels.

(*e*) MATTER COMMON TO MT. AND LK.—In addition to the sections which Mt. and Lk. have derived from Mk., they both have in common other sections standing to one another in precisely the same literary relationship as these. In the case of Lk., it is comparatively easy to separate them out, for in this Gospel they come between (vi. 20–viii. 3, ix. 51–xviii. 14) the Mk. sections in two compact masses, whereas Mt. groups them together and weaves them into the Mk. narratives much more skilfully.

This group of passages is as follows:—(1) The Sermon on the Mount or on the Plain, Lk. vi. 20–49 = Mt. v. 3–vii. 27; (2) the mission from the Baptist, Lk. vii. 18–35 = Mt. xi. 2–19; (3) the admonitions to those who wish to follow Jesus, Lk. ix. 57–60 = Mt. viii. 19–22; (4) the instructions to the disciples, Lk. x. 2–16 (Lk. ix. 1–6 = Mk. vi. 8–11) = Mt. x. 5–42; (5) Jesus' lament over the places which had witnessed his ministry, Lk. x. 12–15 = Mt. xi. 20–24; (6) the praise to God for his revelation to "babes," Lk. x. 21–24 = Mt. xi. 25–27; (7) the Lord's Prayer, Lk. xi. 1–4 = Mt. vi. 9–13; (8) the promise regarding the granting of prayer, Lk. xi. 9–13 = Mt. vii. 7–11; (9) the warning against relapse into wickedness, Lk. xi. 24–28 = Mt. xii. 43–45; (10) the sign of Jonah, Lk. xi. 29–32 = Mt. xii. 38–42; (11) Hold fast to that which giveth thee light, Lk. xi. 34–36 = Mt. vi. 22 f.; (12) Jesus' apostrophe to

the Pharisees, Lk. xi. 39–52 = Mt. xxiii. 1–39; (13) his address of warning and encouragement to his disciples, Lk. xii. 2–9 = Mt. x. 26–33; (14) Be ye not anxious, Lk. xii. 22–31 = Mt. vi. 25–33; (15) Sell that ye have and give it as alms, Lk. xii. 33 f. = Mt. vi. 19–21; (16) the thief in the night, Lk. xii. 39 f. = Mt. xxiv. 43 f.; (17) the faithful and unfaithful house-stewards, Lk. xii. 42–46 = Mt. xxiv. 45–51; (18) the Messiah brings strife upon earth, Lk. xii. 51–53 (= Mt. x. 24–36); (19) the signs of the weather, Lk. xii. 54–56 (= Mt. xvi. 2 f.?); (20) the admonition to be conciliatory, Lk. xii. 58 f. = Mt. v. 25 f.; (21) the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, Lk. xiii. 18–21 = Mt. xiii. 31–33; (22) the difficulty of entering the kingdom of Heaven, Lk. xiii. 24–30 = Mt. vii. 13 f., 22 f., viii. 11 f., xix. 30; (23) Jesus' lament over Jerusalem, Lk. xiii. 34 f. = Mt. xxiii. 37–39; (24) obligation to work on the Sabbath, Lk. xiii. 15, xiv. 5 = Mt. xii. 11; (25) the haughty and the humble, Lk. xiv. 11, xviii. 14 = Mt. xxiii. 12; (26) the parable of the great supper, Lk. xiv. 15–24 = Mt. xxii. 1–14; (27) the seriousness of following Jesus, Lk. xiv. 26 f. = Mt. x. 37 f.; (28) the parable of the lost sheep, Lk. xv. 4–7 = Mt. xviii. 12–14; (29) the serving of two masters, Lk. xvi. 13 = Mt. vi. 24; (30) the place of the Baptist in the development of religion, Mt. xi. 12 f. = Lk. xvi. 16; (31) the fulfilment of Old Testament promise, Lk. xvi. 17 = Mt. v. 18; (32) offences must come, Lk. xvii. 1 f. = Mt. xviii. 7; (33) the brother's trespass, Lk. xvii. 3 f. = Mt. xviii. 15, 21 f.; (34) the faith that can remove mountains or trees (cp. Mk. xi. 23 = Mt. xxi. 21), Mt. xvii. 20 = Lk. xvii. 5 f.; (35) sayings about second coming, Lk. xvii. 22–37 = Mt. xxiv. 26–28, 37–41; (36) the parable of the money intrusted, Lk. xix. 12–26 = Mt. xxv. 14–30; (37) Jesus' promise to his disciples, Lk. xxii. 29 f. = Mt. xix. 28.

All the passages hitherto enumerated as common only to Mt. and Lk. consist of discourses of the Lord. To the common passages we must now add three others—(38) the speech of the Baptist, Lk. iii. 7–9, 16 f. = Mt. iii. 7–12 (Mt. iii. 11, and Lk. iii. 16, is all that is found in Mk. i. 7 f.); (39) the story of the temptation, Mt. iv. 1–11 = Lk. iv. 1–13; and (40) the incident of the centurion at Capernaum, Lk. vii. 2–10 = Mt. viii. 5–13.

(*f*) LK. DID NOT BORROW FROM MT.—The theory that one of these two Evangelists directly borrowed these passages from the other cannot be entertained. Lk. cannot have taken them over from Mt., for that would mean that he picked to pieces the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 3–vii. 27) in such a way as to give one extract from it in Lk. vi. 20–49, but other fragments in Lk. xi. 1–4, 9–13, 34–36, xii. 22–31, 33 f., 58 f., xiii. 24–30, xvi. 13, 17, mixed up with other matter, though it is not possible to assign any reasonable ground for such disintegration. On the other hand, it is easy to understand how Mt., aiming at greater coherence in his narrative, should have worked up scattered materials into longer discourses. And that Mt. did actually proceed on these lines is proved especially by those instances in which Lk. has two texts, one taken from Mk. and the other drawn from some other Source, whilst Mt. combines both texts into one. Examples are: the instructions to the disciples, Lk. ix. 1–6, x. 2–16 = Mt. x. 5–42; the apostrophe to the Pharisees, Lk. xi. 39–52, xx. 45–47 = Mt. xxiii. 1–39; the discourse about the second coming, Lk. xvii. 22–37 xxi. 8–36 = Mt. xxiv. 5–xxv. 46. Lk. cannot therefore have borrowed from Mt. the sections which are common only to him and to the latter.

(*g*) NOT MT. FROM LK.—Nor yet has Mt. borrowed them from Lk. If he had, he would hardly have retained one only out of the three parables about lost things which he found together in Lk. xv.—namely, that of the lost sheep (Mt. xviii. 12–14). Moreover, the different methods which Mt. and Lk. have followed in incorporating what they took from Mk. make it more likely that they have both independently taken those common sections from a second Source, in precisely the same way as they borrowed the others from Mk.[1]

[1] The freedom of arrangement as regards the discourses of Jesus which Mt. and Lk. show in their different methods of working them into the Mk. text, is really only intelligible on the supposition that the tradition lying before them furnished these discourses in a form which showed no attempt to work them into a consecutive life of Jesus. If, on the one hand, it is quite inconceivable that Lk. can have cut up the discourses of Mt. in the way in which he presents to us these sayings of Jesus, on the other hand, it is very unlikely that Mt. would have constructed these discourses in the way he has done if he had had Lk.'s text of them actually lying before him in anything like its present form.

(*h*) NATURE OF THE SECOND SOURCE.—The second Source was, we thus see, principally made up of discourses of Jesus. Nor is this conclusion impaired by the fact that it also contained the story of the temptation; for the disciples would assuredly never have known anything of these temptations of Jesus unless he himself had told them of them. As we shall see presently,[1] this story is actually found figuring in the Gospel of the Hebrews as a narrative by Jesus. The only element which might occasion any difficulty is the speech of the Baptist; if this formed part of the second Source, it must have served as its introduction. As far as we can see, however, every Gospel narrative began with it (cp. Acts i. 22, x. 37); in the four canonical Gospels, and in the extra-canonical Gospel of the Hebrews, it is the starting-point for the account of the public ministry of Jesus. Moreover, the Source under consideration touches yet a second and a third time upon the work of the Baptist (Nos. 2 and 30 above), so that it is, to say the least, not inexplicable that this collection of discourses began with the preaching of John.[2]

As regards the incident of the centurion of Capernaum, the case is different. This story of a miracle of healing certainly does not fit well into the discourses; it bears rather the character of the Mk. text. Possibly it may have dropped out of our Mk. text at some early period, though we are unable to assign any reason for this. At any rate, the story as presented in Lk. vii. 2–10 is preserved in a more original form than in Mt.; for Mt. has inserted into it a saying of Jesus taken from another context, as if for the purpose of drawing a special lesson from it (Mt. viii. 11 = Lk. xiii. 28 f.). The intercession of the elders of the synagogue presupposes (Lk. vii. 4 f.) that Jesus was as yet but little acquainted with the state of affairs at Capernaum. Consequently, if the incident is

[1] See p. 47.

[2] We shall scarcely err in inferring that the very reason (and that a good one) for including the preaching of the Baptist amongst the discourses of Jesus was the fact that it was originally based upon an account of it which Jesus himself gave to his disciples. It was doubtless the address which Jesus heard John deliver before his baptism. And Jesus was well aware of the fundamental importance which John's exhortation to repentance and his description of the Messiah coming to judgment had for his own subsequent preaching.

historical, it would certainly have been inserted in the account of the first days of the Lord's stay in Capernaum (Mk. i. 21–v. 43).[1]

(*i*) TWO SOURCES.—We have thus to assume that Mt. and Lk. had two Sources upon which they drew—Mk. and a Collection of Discourses of Jesus. As regards its whole arrangement, this collection of Sayings of the Lord may have resembled one of the prophetical books of the Old Testament. Both Mt. and Lk. used it in the same Greek text. It may be accepted as certain that Jesus spoke the popular Aramaic of the day.[2] The only question that remains is whether his Sayings were translated into Greek at the time the collection was being made, or whether the collection as a whole was translated afterwards.

(*j*) MK. ORIGINALLY GREEK.—At the same time, we might also ask whether the Gospel of Mk. was originally written in Greek or whether it is a translation from the Aramaic. The latter supposition is not tenable, for the Gospel of Mk. was quite manifestly written for non-Jewish Christians; this is particularly shown by the passage in vii. 3 f., in which customs of the Pharisees and of all the Jews are explained to the reader. The somewhat frequent explanations of Aramaic words, on the other hand, cannot be used as evidence on this point, because these would, naturally enough, be inserted when the translation was made (iii. 17, *Βοανηργὲς = υἱοὶ βροντῆς*; v. 41, *ταλιθὰ κούμ = τὸ κοράσιον, ἔγειρε*; vii. 11, *κορβᾶν = δῶρον*; vii. 34, *ἐφφαθά = διανοίχθητι*; xiv. 36, *ἀββᾶ = ὁ πατήρ*; xv. 34, *ἐλωὶ ἐλωὶ λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί = ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με*). The statement of Papias also, which is very old, though in point of value not above

[1] Compare, for a fuller discussion, Chap. IX.

[2] Compare the Aramaic expressions used by Jesus which the Gospel of Mk. preserves in their original form (see (*j*) in text). The only matter of uncertainty is whether Jesus did not perhaps understand Greek to some extent. In view of the tide of Hellenistic culture which swept over Palestine, this is not inconceivable. Jesus' prayer in Aramaic at Jerusalem was not understood by all those who stood by the cross (Mk. xv. 35). The proceedings before Pilate were no doubt conducted in Greek, perhaps with the help of an interpreter, though such a person is not mentioned. The people of Jerusalem were gratified when Paul addressed them, not in Greek, but in their own mother tongue (Acts xxii. 2).

suspicion (in Euseb., *Hist Eccl.*, iii. 39, 15), is in favour of the original language of Mk. having been Greek. According to Papias, Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and noted down exactly from memory, in accordance with Peter's recitals, what Christ had said and done. Peter of course spoke according as the exigencies of the moment required; consequently, Mark was unable to place the narratives in their proper chronological order. As the interpreter of Peter, Mk. would naturally write in Greek. As for the alleged want of order in his arrangement of events, it is Mk. alone of the Evangelists who furnishes a clear view of Jesus' ministry, and it is precisely in Mk. that the chief turning-points of his career are sharply emphasised. In Mt. and Lk. much of the picture has been effaced. For instance, in Mt. vii. 21–23 Jesus in a public address (cp. vii. 28) already designates himself the judge of the world, and yet he is not recognised by Peter to be the Messiah until xvi. 16, and in xvi. 17 we learn that Peter did not receive this revelation from any human source. In Mk. Jesus never calls himself the Messiah before Peter's confession (viii. 29). Nor does Lk. give us a clear picture of the development of Jesus' work. For instance, he omits the important discussion about the laws of purity (Mk. vii. 1–23), and also, along with this, the flight of Jesus into heathen country (Mk. vii. 24). Thus the reproach of Papias, or rather his authority, that Mk. did not arrange his matter in the proper order, shows merely that in his day the order of events as followed by the later Evangelists found more favour.

(*k*) MT.'S COLLECTION OF DISCOURSES.—In the same fragmentary passage in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39, 16) Papias tells us of an original Aramaic collection by Mt. of Sayings of the Lord—Ματθαῖος . . . . Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. He himself (Papias) wrote five books of commentaries on Sayings of the Lord (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις—Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39, 1). This Collection of Sayings of the Lord, but in the same Greek translation,[1] may have been the Source, in addition to Mk., upon which Mt. and Lk. drew.

[1] That their work was based upon the same Greek translation is shown by the agreements both in the mere wording and in the order of words.

(*l*) USE OF THE LOGIA BY MK.—But while this work is certainly to be traced to one who belonged to the circle of the Lord's immediate disciples, the Gospel of Mk., on the contrary, as an original Greek work, clearly belongs to the second generation. Hence it is *a priori* probable that Mk. itself is dependent upon this same collection in the relatively few fragments of discourses introduced by him. It is clearly the case with regard to the Baptist's preaching in i. 7 f.; for although John's discourses must have been many and various, all that is given here is a fragment of a speech recorded in greater detail in Mt. and Lk. Plainly, the same translation already lay before Mk. as was afterwards used by Mt. and Lk. (cp., in all three, the words *οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός*).

(*m*) MT.'S GOSPEL USED BY LK.—Further, the possibility that Mt. also was made use of by Lk. is not precluded by the consideration that Lk. derived the discourses which he has in common with Mt., not from Mt., but from the Collection of Discourses. The assumption of a concurrent use of Mt. by Lk. is supported, for example, by the fact that the position of the first great discourse (the Sermon on the Mount or on the Plain) is the same in both—after the words of Mk. iii. 7 f. and before the story of the centurion of Capernaum.

In addition to all this, Mt. and Lk. have much matter that is peculiar to each. How much of this is taken from the Collection of Discourses or from some other traditionary source, cannot now be determined.

(*n*) ORIGIN OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.—The growth of the Synoptic literature would seem, then, to have been somewhat after this fashion. First Mt. collected the sayings of Jesus in the Aramaic language. At an early date this collection was translated into Greek. But as the Christian community grew, such a collection manifestly did not meet all its requirements. It wished to know, not merely what Jesus had said, but also what he had done and what he had suffered. Accordingly, the Gospel of Mk. was written by way of supplement to this Collection of Discourses, and at the same time to supply a historical framework in which to set them. Naturally Mk. could not entirely pass over the Discourses; whenever he needed them, he took them over from Mt.'s collection. At a still later period it was felt to be

undesirable to have the actions and sufferings of Jesus any longer separate from his sayings; and so Mt. and Lk., besides other gospels, were written, and Lk., in the course of writing his version, made use of that of Mt.

(*o*) DEDUCTIONS FROM THIS.—On this basis we get the following principles for a historical investigation of the life of Jesus. The first and best Source is always the Collection of Discourses; the next best is the Gospel of Mk. The principal difficulty which confronts us to-day is precisely the same as that which existed in the time of Mt. and Lk. themselves—namely, how to fit the Lord's utterances, as taken from the Collection of Discourses and from other Sources, into his public ministry as described for us by Mk.[1]

THE JOHANNINE GOSPEL.—But besides the Synoptic Gospels, the Church has also assigned a place in the New Testament to the Johannine Gospel; and thus we have yet another picture of the life of Jesus—an account which, whilst it shows abundant points of contact with the Synoptic texts, yet, on the whole, presents us with a description differing essentially from the Synoptic picture.

(*a*) DIFFERENCE BETWEEN IT AND THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.—Now Mt. indeed—though not Lk., if we except the story of Jesus' birth—already effaces the special feature of Jesus' preaching as it is seen in Mk., namely, that at first Jesus deliberately said nothing about faith in himself as the Messiah. But the Gospel of Jn. represents him as coming forward from the very beginning with the one purpose of proclaiming himself to be the Son of God, the Messiah, whose task, however, in this case lay more in the present than in the future. The result is that the picture of the Messiah drawn in the Johannine Gospel possesses only a few features in common with the Messianic belief of Judaism. After his very first meeting with Jesus, Andrew says to his brother

[1] If this task is described as one of special difficulty, it is not meant to imply that the investigation into the historical credibility of Mk.'s narrative is one that can be easily disposed of. But the insecurity in the accounts of Jesus' life which have hitherto been offered is attributable essentially to the fact that they have failed to make strict use of Mk. as the foundation of their work, and that, in fitting the sayings of the Lord into the text of Mk., they have followed the play of fancy rather than strict scientific principles.

Simon Peter, "We have found the Messiah" (Jn. i. 41). Nathaniel reaches the belief, that is to say, the knowledge, that Jesus is the Son of God, the King of Israel, by the fact that he is able to perceive things from a distance (i. 48–50). The miracle in Cana manifests the majesty of Jesus (ii. 11). Jesus tells Nicodemus that he has come down from heaven, and consequently can reveal heavenly things (iii. 12 f.). To the woman of Samaria Jesus expressly designates himself the Messiah (iv. 26). After the healing at the Pool of Bethesda, Jesus goes on to defend his claim to be equal with God (v. 18–47). In the synagogue at Capernaum he describes himself as being the bread which has come down from heaven, to partake of which confers eternal life (vi. 25–59). And it is not until this point is reached that the confession of Peter is recorded in connection with the rejection of Jesus by many of his disciples (vi. 60–71).

(*b*) ABSENCE OF THE PREACHING OF REPENTANCE.—In this claim of Jesus to be acknowledged as the Son of God, we have one of the principal differences between the Johannine account of the purport of Christ's preaching and the account given by the Synoptic Gospels. A second essential difference is the entire absence in the former of the moral preaching with universal application addressed by Jesus to his people. Apparently the Johannine Christ repeats (iii. 3) the saying about second birth which is to be traced to the Synoptic account (Mt. xviii. 3; Justin, I. *Ap.*, 61). But to make Nicodemus understand it as referring to an actually physical re-birth is to convert it into an absurdity; and this can only be explained as having arisen through a misinterpretation of the Greek ἄνωθεν. What is intended is not re-birth, but birth from above, birth from the Spirit. If from this we conclude that the author of the Gospel makes Jesus converse with Nicodemus in Greek, it is a clear proof that he was a stranger to the condition of things in Palestine.[1] But it is also clear from the same passage that the author assumes that there is

[1] The conclusion is valid notwithstanding note 2 on p. 29 above. The masters in Israel and the members of the Synedrium, it would seem, understood Aramaic (Jn. iii. 1 f., 10, vii. 50); consequently, there can be no doubt that a conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus would have been carried on in the language of the people.

a natural difference amongst men, whereby some, owing to their having sprung from the higher world of the spirit, are enabled to perceive the kingdom of God, but others are not. And the conversation with Nicodemus concludes in a manner which is quite in accordance with this view, in that it is said that the wicked shun the light, but the good come to the light, and in this way the judgment of God is fulfilled (iii. 19–21). Thus Christ's work is not to make the wicked better, but to gather together the good. But "the good" are so in virtue of their having sprung from on high.

It is true that Jesus, in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, goes on to speak about the faults of her private life (iv. 17 f.), but he does so solely in order to allow her to guide his words to a subject of a very different nature—namely, the right place for worshipping God. But if in contradistinction to worshipping God at Gerizim or in Jerusalem, he enjoins a worshipping in spirit and in truth—by which perhaps is meant the worship which consists in a life of moral activity—it is, to say the least, very doubtful whether from remarks of so general a character the woman would draw the needful conclusion with regard to the peculiar circumstances of her own private life.

Jesus says, it is true, to the man who was healed at the Pool of Bethesda, "Sin no more"; but he does not lay on him any definite injunction to do what is good (v. 14). In this respect there is an essential difference between this saying and the quite similar one recorded in viii. 11, the latter having pointed reference to a particular sin; but viii. 11 does not properly belong to the Johannine Gospel,[1] any more than the entire pericope to which it belongs.

Jesus' defence of the right to labour on the Sabbath (Jn. v. 17, vii. 12–14) is reminiscent of the Synoptic Gospels; but the former passage merely furnishes the occasion for expounding Jesus' equality with God. In vii. 19 Jesus, it is true, brings against the Jews this reproach: None of you doeth

[1] It may well be that a particular sin was perhaps also the cause of the illness of the sick man at the Pool of Bethesda, but it is characteristic of the Johannine Gospel that the nature of the man's sin, whatever it may have been, is not indicated more definitely, but only alluded to in the most general terms.

the law; but he makes no effort to better them, nor does he enforce upon them any fresh motives for self-improvement. In viii. 24 he declares to his adversaries, "Ye shall die in your sins." He does not point to any perversion of the will on their part as the ground of this condemnation; it rests upon non-fulfilment of the condition stated in the clause, "unless ye believe that I am he"—that is to say, the one decisive person with whom it is necessary to be associated in order to be saved. And in viii. 31–36 he amplifies the idea still further: "He who holds fast to Jesus' words knows the truth, and this knowledge of the truth makes him free from the servitude of sin." In this case Jesus' preaching is looked upon as taking effect in the way of reform; but the improvement is to be effected, not by an immediate influencing of the will, but by a satisfying of the desire for knowledge. This improvement, therefore, was not the immediate aim of Jesus' words, but rather a subordinate consequence of their acceptance.

Indeed, we do not discover in Jesus' teaching any precise injunctions for the regulation of man's conduct towards his fellow-men, except when he is addressing the intimate circle of his disciples. Then he does exhort them to love one another and serve one another; but no moral relation with the world outside of that circle is presupposed (cp. ἀλλήλων, xiii. 14, 34 f.; xv. 12, 17). We get the clearest conception of his idea of the relationship of the community of his disciples to the world, when we observe that in the high-priestly prayer it is expressly said, "I pray not for the world" (οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ—xvii. 9). The trend of thought which appears in these passages is quite other than that attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, when he lays down the highest commandment (Mk. xii. 29–31), or utters the parable of the good Samaritan (Lk. x. 30–37), or describes the Last Judgment (Mt. xxv. 31–46).[1]

[1] The attitude of mind is that of a community persecuted by the heathen (and Jewish) world. The "new commandment" to love *one another* (Jn. xiii. 34 f.) presupposes a community bound together by far closer ties than Jesus had contemplated if we are to judge by the Synoptic accounts, as well as a much sharper separation between the Christian community and "the world."

(*c*) THE FORM OF THE JOHANNINE DISCOURSES.—But in the *form* also which is given to the preaching of Jesus, the Johannine Gospel differs completely from the Synoptics. In the latter, Jesus throughout both learns for himself and teaches to others the truths of morality and religion from the sights of nature around him and from the manifold circumstances of the lives of the people among whom he lives. The sower waiting for his harvest teaches Jesus patience to wait for the results of his preaching. When he sees the fishermen sitting on the shore, separating the good fish from the bad, it puts him in mind of the future judgment of God, to be accompanied by a separation between the evil and the good. The observed fact that an old and torn coat cannot be patched with a piece of quite new stuff without making a fresh rent beside the old one, serves as a lesson to Jesus that the new views he is preaching with regard to piety must inevitably cause a breach with ancient practice, even though he himself should take no further step hostile to the old order of things (Mk. iv. 26–29; Mt. xiii. 47–50; Mk. ii. 21). This habit of drawing lessons from the things of earth, a habit which permeates the whole of the preaching of Jesus as represented in the Synoptics, is entirely alien to the Christ of the Johannine Gospel.

(*d*) JOHANNINE METAPHORS. — In a few passages the Fourth Evangelist makes a halting attempt to put into the Lord's mouth metaphorical sayings similar to those of the Synoptics. One of these is the saying contained in viii. 35: "The *servant* abideth not in the house for ever; but the *son* abideth ever." Now in so far as the ordinary circumstances of antiquity are concerned, this is a scarcely intelligible sentence; but it becomes intelligible if it is referred back to Gal. iv. 30 as its source.[1] This reference to the circumstances of domestic life must be supposed to possess a certain

[1] If this saying of the Johannine Christ had been known to Paul, he would have been able to make use of it in support of his argument. Gal. iv. 30, however, makes it clear that the original source of the figure of speech is to be traced to the apostle's own meditation on the Old Testament. And it is only as a quotation of this Pauline figure that the saying of the Johannine Christ is intelligible; consequently, the Evangelist when he framed the sentence must have had in mind what he had read in the Epistle to the Galatians.

force as evidence, and in this lies the possibility of comparing it with the much more apposite parabolic utterances in the Synoptic Gospels.

(*e*) THE GOOD SHEPHERD.—The Johannine Gospel has also the parable of the Good Shepherd (x. 1–16). Here at the outset it is given as the distinguishing mark of the authorised shepherd, as compared with the thief and the robber, that he enters the sheepfold by the door, whereas thieves and robbers make their entry by some other way. The sheepfold is clearly imagined as very large, and the doorkeeper opens the door to the authorised shepherd; then the shepherd calls his own sheep by name. It is evident that the writer thinks of several flocks as gathered together into one sheepfold, and there are therefore several authorised shepherds, each of whom, however, has his own sheep. The sheep follow their own shepherd out into the pasture, but will not follow a stranger, that is to say, one of the other authorised shepherds to whom belong the other flocks which are gathered with them into the same fold. In so far, therefore, as we hold fast to the conception of a spacious sheepfold in which several flocks are gathered together, the picture presented to us in x. 1–6 is clear and consistent. And it is also clear that it has something to teach us—namely this, that there are many authorised preachers of the Gospel, but each is successful only with those men whom God assigns to him.[1] Thus this parable has a similar meaning to the parable of the sower: it was intended to afford consolation for the apparent ill-success of preaching, and might very well be referred back to Jesus himself. Whether the reference to those who came in over the wall or otherwise is not a later addition to the original parable may be left an open question. The picture of the shepherd entering the spacious sheepfold, and calling his own sheep to him out of the large collection of animals, is for Jesus an allegory to be applied to the preacher who knows how to win over the people whom God has specially destined for *him* to win. But the Johannine Evangelist is at pains (x. 7–16) to interpret the parable, just as in the Synoptic Gospels the parable of the sower in Mk. iv. 14–20 and the parable of the tares among the wheat in

[1] Perhaps Jesus in the parable was giving the reason for his own action in sending out his disciples two by two (Mk. vi. 7).

Mt. xiii. 36–43 are each interpreted in circumstantial detail.[1] He is, however, very unfortunate in his interpretation (x. 7–16) of the preceding figure; for while *vv.* 7, 9 make Jesus expressly call himself the door of the sheepfold, in *vv.* 11–14 he describes himself as the good shepherd. The first interpretation would in a sense still correspond to the original meaning, that they only are called to preach the Gospel who are sent by Jesus. But the application of the parable as a whole to Jesus personally can only be described as perverse. The ἐγώ εἰμι of *vv.* 7, 9, 11, 14 is out of place here. We expect rather: "The Gospel is like unto a shepherd which calleth his sheep out from amongst the many sheep that are gathered together in the sheepfold"; or, agreeably to Jesus' customary forms of speech, the original parable no doubt ran thus: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a shepherd which cometh to the gate of the sheepfold. And the keeper of the gate openeth unto him, and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them forth. And when he hath led them all forth, he goeth on before them, and the sheep follow after him, because they know his voice. And a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him, because they do not know his voice, for he is a stranger unto them."

Now this original parable has been recast in such a form that, at the outset, a contrast is drawn between the shepherd who enters the sheepfold by the gate, and thieves and robbers who enter in by other ways; to this added trait the explanation that Jesus is the door, and he who addresses himself to the Church apart from him is a false teacher (*i.e.*, a thief and robber), is quite appropriate. This later recasting of the parable, then, already pre-supposes our Gospel. Its final form is not due to the Evangelist himself. For it does not rest content with regarding Jesus as the door through which the good shepherd enters: it holds Jesus to be himself the good shepherd. This not only gives rise to distressing confusion—Jesus requiring to be at the same time both the door and the shepherd—but it also compels us to interpret the thieves and robbers, not as false teachers, but as pseudo-Messiahs who preceded Jesus (*v.* 8). Moreover, the interpretation of Jesus as the door is not taken in *v.* 9 in the sense of the

[1] For a discussion of the genuineness or otherwise of these interpretations, cp. Chap. X.

parable, according to which the shepherd indicates himself as such by his entrance through the door, but it is taken with reference to the sheep, in the sense that through Jesus men come to the right pasture. Then, in *vv.* 11–15 Jesus is pictured as the good shepherd, but again not in the real meaning of the parable—that comes into play only in v. 14 f.—but in a new application of the metaphor, whereby the owner of the sheep is contrasted with the hired shepherd at the moment when the wolf approaches the flock. So Jesus is to show himself to be the good shepherd by suffering death for his sheep. But a faithful shepherd, who dies fighting with the wolf, does not save his sheep. Lastly, the Evangelist makes further use of this same parable of the good shepherd and his sheep to illustrate the union of Jews and Gentiles into one community (*v.* 16). Here, then, we have at the foundation of the passage a genuine parable of Jesus; but the Johannine Evangelist only knew it in a form which had already been altered, and was evidently unable himself to give a clear and consistent interpretation of the original image.

(*f*) THE GRAIN OF WHEAT.—The next Johannine parable of Jesus is that of the grain of wheat which remains not alone but produces much fruit, only in the event of its being cast into the ground and dying. It is a well-established fact that Jesus sought in many ways to make intelligible to his disciples what was so difficult for them to understand, the death to which he was destined, and it cannot be doubted that he made abundant use of the image of the seed-corn. The idea, however, that Jesus by his death does not so much render possible the manifestation of God's kingdom as effect the enlargement of the Christian community, though frequent in the Johannine Gospel, is nowhere met with in the Synoptics; here, therefore, it may well be allowed to be due to the Evangelist himself (cp. Jn. iii. 14 f., x. 16 f., xi. 52, xii. 32).

(*g*) THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES.—The allegory of the vine and the branches is dwelt upon with more circumstantiality (xv. 1–6). God is the husbandman who prunes away the useless growth and cleanses the fruitful branches; but the branch only retains its sap as long as it is on the vine. This parable seems to be an elaboration of certain of the

Synoptic metaphors (cp., for instance, Mt. iii. 10, xv. 13). But, in spite of Mt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20, this idea—passing over to the mystical—of a union between Jesus and his followers does not at all fit in with the vivid and concrete picture which the Synoptists give of the relations between Jesus and his disciples. The idea, however, is again thoroughly Johannine (xiv. 18, 20, 23, 28).

Finally, the Johannine Evangelist reproduces the figure of the birth-woes of the Messiah (xvi. 21)—a conception current with Judaism and primitive Christianity alike. The expression is one which cannot have failed to occur in his discourses about the second coming, singular in character though these indeed are (cp. Mk. xiii. 8, Mt. xxiv. 8, 1 Thess. v. 3, Rev. xii. 2). In any case, the five figurative sayings enumerated are trifling in extent when compared with the long-drawn-out discourses of the Johannine Christ. In contrast with the short, pithy utterances of the Lord in the Synoptists, the Johannine discourses can only be described as colourless, full of repetitions, and altogether lacking in dialectical keenness. By way of proof, let it be enough to cite a single passage, xvi. 8–11. Psychologically, it is absolutely impossible that these words can have come from the same person who speaks to us in the language attributed to Christ in the Synoptic Gospels.

(*h*) JOHANNINE NARRATIVE.—As might be expected from the nature of the case, the narrative portion of the Johannine Gospel has many points of contact with the Synoptic Gospels. Like these, it begins with an account of the preaching of John, in whose vicinity Jesus also is staying (i. 19–51). The narrative then goes on to tell us of Jesus' return to Galilee and of his going to Capernaum and taking up his abode there; nor is its author ignorant of the fact that Jesus' mother and his brethren once came to visit him there (ii. 1–12). The rejection of Jesus in his own home, the succour he gave to the centurion of Capernaum (iv. 43–54), the healing of a lame man, in the course of which Jesus in some sense places himself on an equality with God (v. 5–18), the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus' walking on the sea (vi. 1–21), several violations of the Sabbath (v. 9–17, vii. 22 f., ix. 16), the healing of a blind man (ix. 1–7), the raising of one from the dead (xi. 17–44), and the

entire story of the Passion (some portions, but only at the beginning, are told in a totally different order; xi. 47–xix. 42, also ii. 13–22)—all these things are common to John and to the Synoptists. But the difference between the Johannine and the Synoptic way of writing history will impress the observer far more than their points of agreement.

(*i*) SCENE OF JESUS' MINISTRY.—One of the things which most arrest attention is the frequency of Jesus' activity in Judæa and Jerusalem. He begins his ministry at Jerusalem in Jn., as he does in the first three gospels, by purifying the Temple (Mk. xi. 15–18; Jn. ii. 13–22). But the only passages in the Johannine Gospel which indicate that Jesus laboured outside of Jerusalem and Judæa are i. 19–ii. 12, iv. 1–54, vi. 1–vii. 10, x. 40–xi. 16. He is represented as being in Galilee in only three passages—ii. 1–12, iv. 43–54, vi. 1–vii. 10. What led to his being frequently in Judæa was the Jewish feasts—ii. 13, v. 1, vii. 2, xi. 55. But the public discourses of Jesus in Jerusalem reported in the Johannine Gospel are not more numerous than in the Synoptists; they are merely more diffuse, not richer in contents. The explanation is that the discourses and disputes of Mk. xi. 27–xiii. 37 are absent from the Johannine Gospel. In place of them, we are given the elaborate parting discourses addressed by Jesus to his disciples during his last stay at Jerusalem (xiii.–xvii.)

(*j*) ITS DURATION.—The mention of three feasts of the Passover (ii. 13, vi. 4, xi. 55) seems to extend the historical narrative in the Fourth Gospel over a longer period of time than in the Synoptists, who mention only the one feast on which Jesus suffered death (Mk. xiv. 1). Notwithstanding this, however, the narrative material is not extended.

(*k*) VIOLENT ALTERATIONS.—It must certainly cause surprise when we find the purification of the Temple violently separated from the last Passover, and the institution of the Supper supplanted by the washing of the disciples' feet. That the act of purifying the Temple was closely connected with the last Passover is historically substantiated by the circumstance, that the saying of Jesus, which, according to Jn. ii. 19, was uttered on this very occasion, was made a subject of accusation against him at his trial and an occasion for mockery

at his crucifixion (Mk. xiv. 58, xv. 29 f.). That is to say, when Jesus was arrested and crucified, that saying of his was still fresh in men's minds.[1] Besides, in the Synoptists it is Jesus' defence of the purification of the Temple that is the direct occasion of the public breach between him and the Jewish Council (Mk. xi. 27–xii. 12). Similarly, that the institution of the Holy Supper ought to be assigned to the evening before Jesus' death is perfectly assured, not only from the Synoptic account (Mk. xiv. 22–25), but also from the express words of Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23–25). Therefore, the transference of the purification of the Temple to an earlier ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem, and the omission of the institution of the Holy Supper on the last evening on which Jesus was with his disciples—an evening which, as a matter of fact, is described in the Gospel of Jn. in five long chapters (xiii.–xvii.)—is an act of great violence on the part of the narrator such as cannot but shake very seriously his historical credibility. Precisely the omission of the institution of the Supper, however, shows that the Johannine Evangelist was not at all concerned to be taken as a trustworthy historian in the ordinary sense of the words. The Last Supper was celebrated in every place where Christians were to be found, and in these circles everybody knew that Jesus had instituted the practice on the evening before his death. Yet, in the place where every Christian would expect to find an account of the institution of the Last Supper, the Johannine Gospel offers its story of Jesus washing his disciples' feet. He who does not share in this act has no share in Christ; but it is quite sufficient for him that his feet should be washed: he has no need to have his hands washed and his head. It is evident that the Evangelist (xiii. 4–10) in this passage is offering an account of an institution of baptism such as will be looked for in vain in the Synoptists. Contrary to the Synoptic tradition, the Fourth Evangelist represents Jesus as himself baptising (iii. 22, 26, iv. 1); and then in iv. 2

[1] On the other hand, it might be urged that the witnesses during the proceedings before the Synedrium contradicted one another as to the precise form of expression which Jesus had used (Mk. xiv. 59). But it is surely inconceivable that Jesus would be condemned on the strength of words uttered two years before, when, according to the Gospel of Jn., he had laboured so often and so long in Jerusalem since then.

he follows on with a halting concession to the common Christian tradition. And his object in putting the institution of baptism in the place of the institution of the Supper is not in any way to depreciate the value of the latter, but rather to elevate the holy washing in baptism to the dignity of the Holy Supper. In doing so, he at the same time very plainly offers the suggestion that washing the feet should be allowed to take the place of complete immersion. A proof that it was not his intention to depreciate the Supper is seen in the fact that, immediately after the miracle of feeding the five thousand (vi. 1–13), he represents Jesus as delivering in the synagogue at Capernaum an obscure and mystical discourse about eating his flesh and drinking his blood (vi. 26–59).[1] The discourse is on the face of it devoid of all the characteristics of a popular address; but the attribution of it to Jesus when preaching in the synagogue at Capernaum is moreover historically quite inconceivable; for if there was any one thing in Christianity which from the first was regarded as being reserved for the company of the disciples, assuredly it was the rite of the Supper and the words which accompanied it. Anyhow, such words as these were certainly not in place in an address in the synagogue, especially at a time anterior to the institution of the Supper. The Evangelist next goes on to say that many took offence at them, although the inner group of disciples remained faithful to Jesus. And here we get the transition to the confession of Peter.

The omission in the Fourth Evangelist of any account of the dispute about the laws of purity, and of Jesus' flight, need occasion no surprise, for Lk., too, in his turn makes an almost similar leap from the feeding of the five thousand to the confession of Peter (Lk. ix. 10–22). But in this case

[1] These words are really by their position not to be referred directly to the eating of the Supper, but to the inward union of the believer with his Saviour. But the result was, as a matter of course, that this utterance about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man was directly applied by the later Church by way of interpretation of the words of the institution, and such an application was clearly also in the mind of the Evangelist. Nay, more, the objection to eating human flesh and drinking human blood (vi. 52 f.) is an anticipatory reference to the horror of the heathen at the "Thyestean banquets" of the Christian Church. Cp. note 2 on p. 13 above.

also, he has made violent changes. From the very beginning the Fourth Evangelist makes Jesus declare himself to be the Messiah ; consequently, he could not well represent Peter as being at this point the first to give expression to the belief, and for the first time. All that Peter does confess is his recognition from Jesus' own words that his claim to be the Messiah is correct, and his determination to persevere in this belief. And Mt. (xvi. 23) tells us that immediately after making this confession this same Peter was repulsed by Jesus as being a tempter (σατανᾶς), because he sought to prevent his Master from going to encounter the sufferings which awaited him. Jn. also tells us that immediately after Peter's confession Jesus described one of his disciples as διάβολος. In this case, however, he meant the traitor Judas Iscariot (vi. 70 f.).

In the story of the Passion the Johannine Gospel leaves out the prayer in Gethsemane, and the cry on the cross from Ps. xxii. 2, as being unworthy of the Son of God, though a portion of the Gethsemane prayer is reproduced in another passage (xii. 27 f.), where Jesus lays this matter, most personal to himself, before God in the presence of the surrounding crowd. The Evangelist is quite consistent when he goes on to report Jesus as saying that God's answer to his prayer was given, not for his sake, but for the sake of the people (xii. 30). Another portion of the Gethsemane prayer appears in xviii. 11, in the proud question put by Jesus to Peter, "Shall I not drink the cup which my Father hath given to me?"

Again, Jesus' silence in presence of his accusers likewise appeared unworthy of the Son of God. But as the Evangelist did not dare to make any alteration in the proceedings before the high-priest Caiaphas, because they were too well known, he gives the story of a preliminary inquiry by Caiaphas' father-in-law, Annas (xviii. 12 f., 19–23). Jesus' defence seems here to be connected with the saying at his arrest in Mt. xxvi. 55. According to Mk. xv. 1–5, Jesus preserved an almost unbroken silence before Pilate. In Jn. xviii. 33–37, xix. 8–11, he is by no means silent, but gives much information about his ministry. The words of xix. 9 are merely inserted in order to explain the Synoptic tradition. In this matter, then, the entire Gospel history is essentially altered and reconstructed,

and even the secondary personages of the story are made to have a hand in the remodelling.

In the Fourth Gospel, John the Baptist is not the preacher of repentance announcing the approach of the day of judgment. The one and only object of his mission is to direct the attention of God's chosen people to Jesus, and to Jesus alone, as being the promised Messiah. This done, his work is accomplished: "He must increase, but I must decrease" (i. 6–8, 19–37; iii. 27–36; x. 41).

(*l*) VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS AN ORIGINAL SOURCE.—The observations already made may on the whole be sufficient for determining the value which attaches to the Johannine Gospel as a Source; and the present is not the place to discuss its value for Church history or as a work of art. But in respect of its value as an original Source, some additional remarks still require to be made. One might very much prefer not to have to use such a free redaction and reconstruction of the traditional materials as a historical Source at all. But we have already drawn attention to the fact that it is only in the Fourth Gospel (ii. 19) that the saying upon which the accusation in Mk. xiv. 58, and the mockery in Mk. xv. 30, were based, is represented as having been actually uttered by Jesus himself, and that, demonstrably, in the proper context.[1] Further, from Jn. x. 1–6 it is possible to disentangle a parable of Jesus traditionally handed down to the Evangelist (but no longer to be found in the Synoptic tradition), the genuineness of which there appears to be no reason for doubting. Again, as we shall see, apart from the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, the Johannine Gospel is the only Source which correctly gives the day of Jesus' death, in so far as it places it on the day before the beginning of the Passover festival, while according to Mk. (Mt., Lk.) Jesus was crucified on the first day of the actual festival. We shall also see that the same accuracy characterises the date of the anointing in Bethany (Jn. xii. 1). It is precisely this freedom exercised by the

[1] With regard to the particular expression used, the Johannine Gospel puts into the mouth of Jesus the innocent form of the words, whereas in Mk. xiv. 58, xv. 29 f., his enemies give the other form on which condemnation must ensue. For a fuller discussion of this point, compare Chap. XIII.

Evangelist in the handling of his materials which shows that at the time he composed his work the traditions of the life of Jesus had not yet become crystallised in the Church's faith, so that the current of the Gospel narrative was still able to carry along with it much material that had not been utilised by the Synoptics. At the same time, the poverty of the Fourth Gospel in matter really peculiar to itself proves that after all there were very few of these details; and we shall always be obliged to ask ourselves to what extent the Evangelist made additions on the strength of his own power of invention.[1]

GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS.—There is one extra-canonical Gospel which as a Source can certainly be said to rank as equal to the Johannine Gospel in value, although only fragments of it have been handed down to us—namely, the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews.[2] This Gospel, used for several centuries by the Jewish Christians of Palestine, was doubtless written in the Aramaic language; Harnack places it, with good reason, between 65 and 100 A.D. It was, therefore, we may be sure, an authority of equal rank with the Gospels of Lk. and Jn., possessing the same antiquity and, what is more, having its origin in Palestine, the native soil of Christianity. We know nothing of any account of the infancy of Jesus in this Gospel. For the passages of Jerome on Mt. ii. 5, 15, 23, which Nestle gives as the first fragment, do not belong to the Gospel of the Hebrews, but to a Hebrew translation of Matthew. The Gospel of the Hebrews, however, told in detail how that Jesus' mother and brethren urged him to go with them to be baptised of John. Then Jesus replies: "What sin have I done that I should go and suffer myself to be baptised of him, unless, indeed, what I have said has been spoken in ignorance?" With this cp. Mt. iii. 13–15.

[1] We may conjecture the following passages to be based upon sound tradition:—vi. 42, Jesus' parents; vii. 1–10, Jesus refuses at first to accompany his brethren into Judæa, but eventually goes; vii. 42, the Messiah cometh not out of Galilee, but out of Bethlehem and of the seed of David; xi. 1, Bethany the village of Mary and Martha; and also xi. 16, Thomas' readiness to die with Jesus. Cp. the index to these passages at the end of the vol.

[2] The fragments are conveniently collected in Nestle, *Novi Testamenti Græci Supplementum* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 76–80. Cp. also A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, i. 6–10, ii. 625–651.

According to Mt., Jesus suffers himself to be baptised by John that he may fulfil all righteousness, that he may do all things which are reckoned as belonging to piety, although he knows as well as the Baptist that he stands in no need of the forgiveness of sins. In the Gospel of the Hebrews, Jesus declares himself to be unconscious of any sin, though perhaps this may be only due to ignorance. An utterance like this would never have found a place in any Gospel unless it had actually fallen from the lips of Jesus.[1] In the third century the story gave offence.[2]

According to the Gospel of the Hebrews, when Jesus was baptised, the Holy Ghost itself in descending upon him spoke these words: "My son,[3] in all the prophets I expected thee to come, and I rested in thee, for thou art my rest, my firstborn Son, who reigneth to eternity." Here, more clearly than anywhere in the Synoptists, we find Jesus designated as the firstborn of the Holy Spirit of God expected by the Prophets, eternally reigning—in a word, the Messiah. The word is addressed to himself, as in Mk. Lk., not to the bystanders, as in Mt. Jn. The story of the temptation was told in a peculiar manner. The saying, "Now my mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs and carried me up to the great Mountain of Tabor," is vouched for five times. This belongs to that part of the narrative in which the Holy Ghost drives Jesus on (Mk. i. 12, Mt. iv. 1, Lk. iv. 1). The high mountain recurs in Mt. iv. 8. The feature in the Gospel of the Hebrews, as compared with the Synoptists, that it is Jesus himself who tells the story of his temptation, may certainly be taken as original. Nor is the grotesque picture of the Holy Ghost seizing Jesus by one of his hairs at all inconsistent with this. In the Synoptists it is only in the opening phase of the temptation that the Holy Ghost drives Jesus; thus Mt.'s third temptation and Lk.'s second was the first temptation

[1] In all subsequent time it has been accounted a sin to doubt the sinlessness of Jesus, Paul having asserted it in 2 Cor. v. 21 (cp. Jn. viii. 46, 1 Pet. ii. 22). For Jesus' own opinion regarding himself, see Mk. x. 18, xiv. 36.

[2] *De Rebaptism.*, 17, from the *Praedic. Pauli*; see Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, ii. 641.

[3] The reason for regarding the Holy Ghost as the mother of Jesus is that the Semitic word for "Ghost" is feminine.

in the Gospel of the Hebrews. And this corresponds to historical expectation: the first thing the Messiah would look for would be his world-kingdom. Mt. Tabor was the highest mountain in the neighbourhood of Nazareth; it fits admirably into this narrative. The temptation in Jerusalem was also given. And perhaps this pericope closed with the saying of the Lord which has been handed down to us in the theophany of Eusebius (as preserved in Syriac; ed. Lee, pp. 233 *et seq.*): "I will choose this for myself; that which my Father in heaven hath given unto me is glorious, glorious."[1]

The story of the rich young man, as told in the Gospel of the Hebrews, is preserved to us in a complete form by Origen. But in this case the account of Mk. (x. 17–27) is historically the more trustworthy, as is at once apparent from the fact that the form of address to Jesus has been altered in the Gospel of the Hebrews (exactly as in Mt. xix. 16). In Mk. x. 17 = Lk. xviii. 18 the rich man asks, "Good master, what must I do?" and Jesus puts aside the epithet "good" as applied to himself. In Mt. and the Gospel of the Hebrews we read, "Master, what good thing shall I do?" Jesus' comprehensive admonition, also, "to keep the law and the prophets," is not original, nor is the special stress which is laid upon the command to love one's neighbour; the latter, indeed, is an anticipation of the pericope Mk. xii. 28–34. But the allusion to the children of Abraham perishing in filth and hunger, who ought to be helped by the riches of the wealthy, but as a matter of fact are not helped, is certainly peculiar. In the Gospel of the Hebrews this narrative was immediately connected with another relating to a rich man; he is introduced as *alter divitum.*

The man with the withered hand of Mk. iii. 1–6 was called in the Gospel of the Hebrews a stone-mason (*cæmentarius*). He beseeches Jesus to heal him, so that he may not be compelled to beg his bread in shame. This is a picturesque touch;

[1] According to another translation, "I choose that which pleaseth me, and that which pleaseth me is what my Father in Heaven giveth unto me" (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 92). The difference turns essentially upon whether we retain or delete הנין after אנבא לי, and upon the punctuation.

it proves to us, however, that the Jewish-Christian Church held manual labour in high honour, even as the Jews in general did at that time.[1] The saying of the Lord, "And ye should never be glad save when ye have treated your brother kindly," and his stern condemnation of him who "hath clouded the spirit of his brother," convey earnest admonitions to the duty of brotherly love. Another passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews is, doubtless, more original than the corresponding passage in Mt. (xviii. 21 f.). It runs thus: "If thy brother sinneth in word and maketh amends to thee, then do thou forgive him seven times in the day. Simon his disciple said unto him, 'Seven times in the day?' The Lord answered and said unto him, 'Nay, I say unto thee, even unto seventy times seven; for even in the Prophets, after that they were anointed with the Holy Ghost, sinful speech has been found.'" Here not only is the opening of the incident more natural than in Mt.; the admonition of Jesus, the astonishment of Simon, and the heightening of the admonition which Simon's exclamation calls forth, as also the justification which is offered for it, are all admirably in harmony with the earnest character of Jesus' preaching (cp. Mk. x. 18). And how free, again, is the deeply serious observation as to the language of the Prophets! A later writer would not have put such a saying into the mouth of Jesus.

The parable of the money in trust has been retouched in the Gospel of the Hebrews, just as it is in Mt. (xxv. 14–30) as compared with the version of Lk. (xix. 11–27). There is no attempt made to preserve the historical character of the incident. Three types of servant are now distinguished. The first has increased his talent; he is accepted. The second has concealed his; he is reproved. The third has wasted his with evil women and flute-players; he is cast into prison. This amended version draws a distinction, therefore, between the demerit of him who leaves God's gifts unemployed and of him who squanders them wantonly.

In the fourth clause of the Lord's Prayer the Gospel of the Hebrews has "morrow" (מָחָר) instead of ἐπιούσιος. There can

[1] In the time when there was community of goods the idea had been different; the labour of earning one's daily bread had fallen quite into the background (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 32–35).

be no question that this was the original word, for the Jewish Christians used the same language as Jesus, and consequently would also repeat the Lord's Prayer in the form in which it had been handed down by Jesus himself.

One of the Lord's sayings in the Gospel of the Hebrews —"He who marvelleth, the same shall rule, and he who ruleth, the same shall find peace"—may possibly have had reference to the purposely quaint and strange similes sometimes employed by Jesus (the mote and the beam, the camel and the eye of the needle, and so forth). Jesus' words do indeed stir and stimulate, but they lead to the kingdom of God, and so to rest. The same saying is found in a somewhat fuller form: "He that seeketh will not stop until he findeth; and when he findeth, then will he marvel; and marvelling he shall rule; and ruling shall find peace." The sayings of Jesus cannot always be easily understood in their deeper meaning; yet he who ceaseth not to labour to understand, shall at length find the meaning that is wanted, shall then marvel at it, and so attain to God's kingdom and to peace.[1]

According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 39, 17), the Gospel of the Hebrews also contained an episode of a woman who was accused unto the Lord of having committed many sins. This was held as long ago as the time of Rufinus to refer to the woman taken in adultery (*mulier adultera*); the episode about her is told in the pericope of Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11, which has crept into the MSS. of the Johannine Gospel by error. In Eusebius' words we might very well also see a reference to the woman which was a sinner of Lk. vii. 36–49, were it not that the expression διαβληθεῖσα ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου presupposes the appeal to Jesus as the ultimate judge. Papias already gives an explanation of this pericope.

We know from what are otherwise unimportant references, that the Gospel of the Hebrews likewise contained Peter's confession, the entry into Jerusalem, the saying in Mt. xxiii. 25 (but with Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, = 2 Chron. xxiv. 20 f.), Peter's denial, and the putting up of Barabbas as an alternative for Jesus. Jesus' death is not signalised by the rending of the veil of the temple, the barrier which separated

[1] In respect of, at any rate, its matter, the saying belongs to the exposition in Mk. iv. 10–13.

the abode of God from the dwellings of men (Mk. xv. 38), but by the breaking of the great upper lintel of the temple —evidently as a fulfilment of Amos ix. 1.

Lastly, we find in the Gospel of the Hebrews two incidents relating to the resurrection. According to the first, the risen Lord gave his garment to the servant of the (high-) priest, who was watching beside the grave in the same way as in Mt. xxvii. 65–xxviii. 15 the Roman soldiers did. Jesus then appears to James the Just, who had vowed that from the hour when he drank of the Lord's cup he would eat nothing until he saw the Lord himself risen from amongst them which slept. Here it is obvious that James is regarded as being one of the Twelve who had partaken of the Supper with Jesus. And as Jesus himself had said that from that same hour until his second coming he would drink no more of the fruit of the vine (Mk. xiv. 25), so, according to this narrative, James also would partake of nothing more until the Lord's resurrection.[1] Accordingly, the risen Lord appears to him first, and blesses the bread and gives it to him, with the words, "Eat thy bread, my brother, because the Son of Man hath risen from amongst them that sleep." In respect of its religious and poetic truth, this narrative may justly claim comparison with any other incident of the resurrection that has come down to us. The second resurrection-incident preserved in the Gospel of the Hebrews forms a parallel to Lk. xxiv. 37–39 = Jn. xx. 20: "When he came to those that were round about Peter, he spake unto them, saying, 'Take me, handle me and see, for I am not a spirit that hath not flesh and bones'; and forthwith they touched him and believed."

Thus, the Gospel of the Hebrews is on the whole similar to our Synoptic Gospels, but at the same time completely independent of them, while yet possessed of an equal value. Lk. is the one it most clearly resembles. Compare, for example, in the story of the rich young man, "multi fratres tui, filii Abrahae"; also Lk. xiii. 16, xvi. 22, 24, xix. 9, and the

[1] This is not, of course, at all in agreement with what actually happened, for we may infer with the greatest probability from our Sources that this brother of Jesus was converted by the appearance of the risen Lord, and not before his death.

designation of Jesus as the Lord (Lk. vii. 13, 19, x. 1, xi. 39, xii. 42, xiii. 15, xvii. 5 f., xviii. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 61; and in the Gospel of the Hebrews *passim*).

THE GOSPEL OF PETER.—The Gospel of the Hebrews must certainly, then, be accounted one of the primary Sources we possess for the life of Jesus; the same cannot be said of the Gospel of Peter, a large fragment of which was discovered in the winter of 1886–87 in an ancient Christian tomb at Akhmîm in Upper Egypt, but was first published by Bouriant in 1892.[1] The text, which has repeatedly been printed, is given also by Nestle (*Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, pp. 68–72). Eusebius furnishes unmistakable evidence of its existence about the year 200 (*Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 12, 2), in the admonitory letter of Serapion, bishop of Antioch.[2] The extant fragment relates our Lord's condemnation, crucifixion, death, and two or three resurrection incidents. The book is distinctly stated to owe its existence to Simon Peter, one of the Twelve Apostles (*vv.* 26, 59 f.). But we are at once confronted by the following remarkable statements:—in *v.* 2 the crucifixion is commanded by king Herod; it is Pilate who begs from Herod the body of Jesus for Joseph of Arimathea (*v.* 3 f.); Herod who addresses Pilate (*v.* 5) as ἀδελφὲ Πειλᾶτε. When Jesus is mocked he is also taunted with being the judge of the world (*v.* 7)—a touch which occurs again in Justin (I. *Ap.*, 35); in fact, it is just possible that Justin borrowed it from the Gospel of Peter. Here, too, as in Lk. xxiii. 39–43, we find quoted what was said by those who were crucified along with Jesus; only here (*v.* 13) one of the thieves turns to the executioners and reproaches them with the injustice now being done to Jesus in a sentence which inevitably recalls Lk. xxiii. 41. In *v.* 16 we are told that gall mingled with vinegar was given to Jesus, in order that he might die the more quickly. This is manifestly a further development of Mt. xxvii. 34, which tells us that Jesus before his crucifixion was given wine to drink mingled with gall.[3]

[1] *Mémoires Publiés par les Membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire*, vol. ix. fasc. 1, pp. 137–142.

[2] Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, i. 10–12, ii. 622 f.

[3] The oldest tradition already mentions vinegar (ὄξος) in connection with the last kindness shown to Jesus (Mk. xv. 36).

The prayer from Ps. xxii. 2 becomes in the mouth of Jesus (*v.* 19), *ἡ δύναμίς μου, ἡ δύναμίς μου, κατέλειψάς με.* Like both Lk. and Jn., the writer will not represent Jesus as complaining that he has been deserted by God, and so he translates the word according to the form transmitted in Mt., *ἡλεὶ*, as though in Hebrew it were pronounced חֵילִי. The word used to describe Jesus' death in the same verse is *ἀνελήφθη* ("he was taken up"), a form of expression which agrees well with the Johannine point of view (Jn. xiv. 2). When Jesus' body touched the ground, we read (*v.* 21) that the earth trembled. The Jews were terrified; the disciples kept themselves hidden and fasted (*vv.* 25–27).[1] Then, at the request of the Pharisees, the sepulchre is watched by Pilate's soldiers; the stone before the door of the sepulchre is secured with seven seals; a tent is put up in front of it; the centurion Petronius is placed in command of the watch (*vv.* 28–34). All this is picturesque amplification of Mt. xxvii. 62–66. Then, during the night before the Lord's day (*κυριακή*), two angels come down from heaven; the stone rolls away of itself; the angels go into the sepulchre; then the watch awakens the centurion, and the elders who are also present at the sepulchre (*vv.* 35–38). This, again, is a further development of Mt. xxviii. 2–4. Then those who stand around the sepulchre see three men come forth out of it; a cross follows the man in the middle; the head of the one who leads reaches up to heaven, but the head of the one who is led reaches above the heaven; and from heaven ring out the words, "Hast thou preached to those who have fallen asleep?" And from the cross comes the answer, "Yea" (*vv.* 39–41). Here, then, it is assumed, as in 1 Pet. iii. 19 f., that Jesus had a mission in the underworld. This representation points to a certain relationship between the two Petrine writings. Then the soldiers see another angel go into the sepulchre, and they inform Pilate of everything. But Pilate, acting upon the desire of the leaders of the people, commands them to say nothing whatever about the matter (*vv.* 42–49). This is a not unfitting transformation of Mt. xxviii. 11–15. Early on the Sunday, Mary Magdalene comes to the sepulchre with her friends (*v.* 50 f.). A long-drawn discourse ensues as to

[1] A literal fulfilment of Mk. ii. 20.

the difficulty of gaining an entrance because of the heavy stone which has been placed against the door. However, they find the grave already open, and the angel who is within tells them of Jesus, that "He is gone to the place whence he was sent" (*vv.* 52–57). This message again is in harmony with the Johannine manner of thought (Jn. xvi. 28). We are then told how that at the end of the Passover feast the twelve disciples return to their own homes. Then Simon and Andrew go down to the lake to fish, and Levi also is with them (*vv.* 58–60); but at this point the fragment breaks off. The Levi here mentioned is evidently the publican converted by Jesus (Mk. ii. 14). It is clear that the Gospel went on to relate an appearance of the risen Lord beside the Lake of Gennesareth similar to that described in Jn. xxi.

The Gospel of Peter thus carries out further the narratives of Mt. and Lk., perhaps also of Jn. It contains utterly erroneous representations of the administration in Palestine at that time, particularly of the relations between Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch. At the same time, it gives much correct information as contrasted with later representations. It agrees with Jn., as against the Synoptists, in fixing very distinctly the day of Jesus' death as the day before the Passover (*v.* 5, *πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν ἀζύμων, τῆς ἑορτῆς αὐτῶν*). It agrees with Mk. and Mt., as against Lk. and Jn., in attributing but one saying to Jesus on the cross. Again, the first appearance of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection takes place in Galilee (Mk. xiv. 28, xvi. 7), and to Peter (1 Cor. xv. 5). The Gospel of Peter, however, has nothing *new* to tell us about the life of Jesus; not even when account is taken of the statement of Origen, that according to this book Jesus' brethren were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage (Origen on Mt. x. 17; Lomm., iii. 45). The value of this fragmentary gospel lies in the information it affords about Christianity in the second century.

AGRAPHA.—As regards what has been preserved to us in other Gospel writings—particularly accounts of the infancy of Jesus, *e.g.*, The Book of James, The History of Joseph, The Gospel of Thomas, Pseudo-Matthew, The Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, Concerning the Birth of Mary—it is universally admitted that this new matter possesses no authoritative value

for the life of Jesus. But the same does not hold good with respect to certain individual utterances of the Lord, which have not been preserved in the Canonical Gospels (cp. J. H. Ropes, Leipzig, 1896). Papias already, in the fourth book of his Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord, quoted a discourse of Jesus about the kingdom of God—a discourse also known to Irenæus (v. 33) from a tradition which could be traced back to John. According to this, the Lord said: "The days will come in which every vine shall produce ten thousand stems, and every stem shall give ten thousand branches, and every branch shall have ten thousand twigs, and on every twig shall be ten thousand grapes, and every grape when pressed shall yield 25 measures. And when a saint shall seize a grape, another shall cry, 'Lo, I am a better grape, take me, and through me bless the Lord!' And in like manner a grain of wheat shall produce ten thousand ears, and each grain shall yield five 'double pounds' of pure white flour; and so on, with all the other fruits and seeds and vegetables in like manner. And all the creatures that eat of the things which are thus brought forth by the earth shall become gentle and peaceful one towards another, and be obedient unto man in every respect." To this Papias added, "When the traitor Judas, disbelieving, asked how the Lord was to bring about such wonders, the latter answered and said, 'He that liveth to that day, the same shall see.'"

To later writers all this seemed mythical and fantastic.[1] And it cannot be denied that it is every whit as fantastic as many of the Messianic descriptions in the Old Testament and the Jewish Apocalypses. Moreover, a passage in the Apocalypse of Baruch (ch. xxviii.) can be cited, which gives *almost* the same description of the fruitfulness of the Messianic kingdom. But Jesus undeniably looked for a literal fulfilment of the Old Testament promises (ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται, Mt. v. 18). It is certain that he spoke of the drinking of a new fruit of the vine in the kingdom of God (Mk. xiv. 25); and he promised his disciples a hundred-fold compensation for all the earthly possessions they were then giving up (Mk. x. 30), and twelve thrones from which they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Mt. xix. 28–Lk. xxii. 30). We do not indeed

[1] Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39, 11—μυθικώτερα.

know for certain that Jesus did in fact utter the saying recorded by Papias and Irenæus; but it is not impossible that he did, for undoubtedly on many occasions his utterances connect themselves with Apocalyptic ideas.

It is remarkable that in the second century an ascetic order, the Encratites, appealed to a discourse of Jesus about the kingdom of God which was contained in the lost Gospel of the Egyptians.[1] In this discourse Salome inquires of the Lord how long death will retain its power. The Lord answered, saying, "As long as ye women bear children; for I came to abolish the functions of woman." Then said Salome unto him, "Then have I done well in that I have not borne children." The Lord answered her and said, "Eat of every plant save those which are bitter!" Then Salome inquired when that which she asks shall be revealed; and the Lord said, "When ye tread down the garment of shame, when the two become one, the male with the female, neither male nor female."

Here the first thing we notice is that Salome is *not* conceived to be the mother of James and John, as she is usually held to be in consequence of a harmonising of Mk. xv. 40 with Mt. xxvii. 56; for she is able to say, *καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα.* The answer which Jesus gives to the question of the Sadducees in Mk. xii. 18–27 may of course be pointed to as throwing light upon the meaning of this passage. In Mk., too, the life after the resurrection is represented as being one in which there is no marriage: where there is no death,

[1] Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 72; Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, i. 12–14, ii. 615. Quite recently a large fragment of this Gospel has been discovered, written in the Coptic language, and has been published by Adolf Jacobi (*Ein neues Evangelienfragment*, Strassburg, 1900). Unfortunately but few of its sentences are continuous, and the context must in almost every case be supplied by conjecture. It contains a prayer of Jesus, a conversation of Jesus with the disciples, apparently in Gethsemane, and, finally, the account of the conferring of Apostolic power upon the disciples. However important the discovery may be in itself, it adds no real contribution to our knowledge of the life of Jesus. Its principal importance lies in the fact that here the story of Jesus' life seems to have been edited with precisely the same autocratic freedom that we find in the Johannine Gospel. Whether there are other fragments which should be accounted as belonging to the Gospel of the Egyptians we do not attempt to decide here, as the question is indifferent for our immediate purpose.

there also there is no birth. It is from this standpoint that the whole dialogue is spoken: Jesus came to abolish the functions of woman precisely in so far as he came to prepare the way for the kingdom of God. The phrase, "Eat of every plant save only those which are bitter," is also to be referred to sexual intercourse, the point of the reference being specially directed to the Jewish application of the prohibition addressed to Adam on the subject.[1] The ideal state of things will be reached when every sexual desire has ceased, so that *τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα* becomes superfluous, and "man" and "woman" no longer come into question. This again is quite in keeping with the view of the Alexandrine Jew Philo. The passage we are considering says that the consummation will be reached, *ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἓν καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ*; precisely in the same way in Philo the ideal man is *ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ* (*De Mundi Opificio*, 24) and *οὔτ' ἄρρην οὔτε θῆλυς* (*ibid.*, 46). In this form the saying can scarcely have come from Jesus; above all, the mysterious allusion to the bitter plants cannot be reconciled with his usual manner of expressing himself.

A somewhat different version of the same utterance is given in the Second Epistle of Clement, xii. 2–6: "When the Lord himself was asked by a certain person when his kingdom would come, he answered, 'When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female. . . . These things if ye do, saith he, the kingdom of my Father shall come.'" Here then we have only the conclusion of the saying which is recorded in the Gospel of the Egyptians, but with an additional clause which does not occur there—*τὸ δὲ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω*. The allusion, as the Clementine Epistle conceives it, is to truthfulness, the inward thought being reflected in the outward utterance. That is to say, truthfulness and sexual purity might here be specified as the conditions of the coming of the kingdom of God. But the evidence is too slight to allow of this being accepted as a genuine saying of the Lord.

The same authority, the Second Epistle of Clement (v. 2–4), gives another saying of Jesus. Here the words are, "For the

[1] Cp. Philo, *De Mundi Opificio*, 53–60.

Lord said, 'Ye shall be like lambs in the midst of wolves.' But Peter answered and said, 'But what if the wolves should tear the sheep?' Jesus said to Peter, 'Let not the lambs, after they are dead, fear the wolves. And ye, in like manner, fear not ye those that kill you, and can do you no further hurt; fear rather him who after death has power over soul and body to cast them into the Gehenna of fire.'" Here we have two utterances, well-known from the Synoptists, woven together in a form which we cannot trace anywhere else—they are found in Mt. x. 16, 28, and Lk. x. 3, xii. 4 f. The position of the first of these two utterances in the Source known as the Collection of Discourses is doubtful; but not so that of the second, which is identical in both Mt. and Lk. (Mt. x. 27–31 = Lk. xii. 3–7). This circumstance alone casts doubt upon the genuineness of the conversation recorded in the Second Clementine Epistle. Ropes is pleased with the irony of Jesus, as displayed in the sentence, "Let not the lambs, after they are dead, fear the wolves." But this impresses us as being rather a last resource of perplexity. It is manifestly better to assume that we have here to deal with a free combination of sayings of the Lord, for which there existed no traditional authority.

On the other hand, we find Justin (*Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 47) quoting quite distinctly as an utterance of "our Lord Jesus Christ" the short sentence, *ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.* The same saying is also quoted in Clement the Alexandrine's *Quis Dives salv.* (40), and often by later writers. Its purport is that it is the last condition of a man which is decisive before the judgment-seat. The only reason which exists for doubting the genuineness of the utterance is the fact that Jesus is not accustomed to speak of himself in the first person as the judge of the world; the expression he uses in such cases is "the Son of Man." But, on the other hand, it may be pointed out that some of the sayings in Mt. are recast into the first person; compare, for example, Lk. xiii. 25–27 and Mt. vii. 21–23.

The saying, *Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται,* "Be ye skilful money-changers," is quoted not less than sixty-nine times.[1] We are tempted to think of the parable of the talents; in

[1] Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, i. 28, 177; Epiph., *Hær.*, 44, 2 [Apelles]; *Didasc.*, ii. 36; *Pistis Sophia*, 353; Clem., *Hom.*, ii. 51.

that case the meaning would be, "Employ your capital." But the interpretation favoured by the ancient Church is consistently, "Learn to distinguish between good and evil." On this view of it, the saying calls upon us to exercise the moral judgment. There exists no ground whatever for doubting its genuineness.

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, i. 24, 158) has another saying—on more than one occasion also quoted by Origen—which strongly reminds us of an utterance preserved by the Synoptists: "Ask for great things, and at the same time small things shall also be given unto you; ask for heavenly things, and earthly things shall also be given unto you." In point of meaning, the saying does not go beyond Mt. vi. 33 and Lk. xii. 31. Its genuineness does not admit of being determined.

TEXTUAL ADDITIONS.—The discussion of the addition in the Codex Cantabrigiensis D, in Φ, and in ancient versions, after Mt. xx. 28, as well as of the pericope of the woman taken in adultery in Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11, belongs to the province of textual criticism of the Gospels rather than to an investigation into the character of the sayings of the Lord which occur in old Christian literature. The addition after Mt. xx. 28 is especially valuable, because by its position it secures to us the correct interpretation of Lk. xiv. 8–11—that is to say, a well-known rule for a guest is applied to the case of the disciples when disputing about the places they are to occupy in the kingdom of Heaven. Moreover, a word is introduced by way of transition, in which the foolish ambition of the disciples is contrasted with the example of the Son of Man serving others and sacrificing himself for them: "Ye, however, in so far as ye crave the first places in the kingdom of Heaven, seek to grow from little to great; and ye seek to grow from greater to less"—*i.e.*, ye lose inwardly by such folly. The present writer believes the whole addition to be part of the original text.

It is certain that the pericope of the woman taken in adultery of Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11 does not belong to the Johannine Gospel. It is absent in ℵABCLTXΔ and in a great number of the Church Fathers. But Eusebius tells us (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39, 16) that this narrative was contained in the Gospel of the Hebrews. From its character as a whole it is, however, very probable that it belonged also to the text of

original Mk. Its very substance, too, makes it evident that it cannot belong to the Johannine Gospel, characterised as this is by such statements as that evil men cannot come to Christ (iii. 19–21); that God heareth not sinners (ix. 31); and that Christ prayeth not for the world (xvii. 9). It has been interpolated in the place where we find it for the purpose of throwing light upon the saying in Jn. viii. 15, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα. It is quite clear that this was the place where Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.*, 2, 17) read it. But, to judge by its substance and form, its proper place is in Mk. It represents one of those attempts which were made during the last days in Jerusalem to undermine Jesus' influence upon the people. And its object was, of course, to put him to the test in the matter of his love for sinners, which was well known since the incident of Mk. ii. 15–17. The only question that remains to be decided is the precise point in the context of Mk. xi. 27–xiii. 37 at which this pericope should be introduced. We may say with perfect safety that it is not in place before xii. 17, nor after xiii. 1; and xii. 18–34 (observe the parenthesis of *v.* 28) are closely connected. The most probable place is before xii. 35, the immediately preceding verse breaking off the discussion for *that day*. The designation of the place of the discussion, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (*v.* 35), corresponds to εἰς τὸ ἱερόν in Jn. viii. 2 (cp. Mk. xii. 41, xiii. 1). There can be no doubt that the narrative was expunged from Mk. as being likely to give offence.[1] But precisely for this reason, which is easy to understand, a later writer would, we may be sure, scarcely have invented it.

THE PAPYRUS LOGIA.—Finally, we may mention here the two papyrus fragments which also give us logia of Jesus. The first, a parallel to Mk. xiv. 26–30, was published in 1885 by Bickell from the papyrus-collection belonging to the Archduke Rainer.[2] The second was published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1897, and in the same year by Harnack;

[1] Here, then, we have one proof that the text of our Mk. does not altogether agree with the text of original Mk. But Mt. and Lk. give no hint whatever that they were acquainted with the older form. Yet from this no conclusion can be drawn, for the same reason which led later to the removal of the narrative from the text of Mk. might cause these writers also to pass it over.

[2] To be found in Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 67.

it has seven logia, though of the last only the first word is given. Three of these utterances are parallels to Lk. vi. 42, iv. 24, Mt. v. 14, but the last two have additions which are clearly not original. Three others are new and distinctive, but none the less spurious. In Harnack's restoration they run thus :—

1. "Unless ye hold aloof from the world, ye shall not find the kingdom of God, and if ye observe not the Sabbath strictly ye shall not behold the Father." *νηστεύειν τὸν κόσμον* certainly means "to renounce the world." But Jesus did not require this of his disciples; had he done so, the reproach which we find in Lk. vii. 34 would not have been made. And the admonition to keep the Sabbath holy is not altogether appropriate to what we elsewhere read of one who always demanded greater freedom in the use of the Sabbath (Mk. ii. 23–iii. 6).

2. "I came forth into the midst of the world, and appeared unto them in the flesh, and I found they all had drunken, and none amongst them found I thirsting; and my soul is heavy because of the children of men, for they are blind in their hearts, and see not their poverty." It is a complaint of the Son of God who has stepped forth into the world, that his travail for the sake of the children of men, ensnared in the pleasures of the world, is in vain. In the mouth of the historical Jesus the expression *ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς* is as inappropriate as is the incorrect phrase *οὐδένα εὗρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς*.

3. "Wheresoever they may be, there are they not without God, and whensoever one is alone, even in such wise am I with him. Lift up the stone, and there wilt thou find me; cleave the wood, and I am there." In all his labours, whether it be lifting stones or cleaving wood, God and Christ are with the believer. Certain as we may be that this was a precious thought to the faith of the Christian Church, we may be equally certain that it did not proceed from the mouth of Jesus. Great as he conceived his mission to be in the rôle of Messiah, he did not attribute to himself omnipresence.[1]

[1] The sayings in Mt., in which he does so, are peculiar to that Gospel; they are an expression of the actual experience of Christendom, but must not be regarded as words that were actually spoken by Jesus (Mt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20).

CHAPTER III

TURNING-POINTS IN THE LIFE OF JESUS

THE COLLECTION OF THE LORD'S DISCOURSES.—The Collection of Discourses, so far as we are able to gather from Mt. and Lk.,[1] already brought into prominence certain turning-points in the life of Jesus. It began with a discourse of the Baptist (Lk. iii. 7–17 = Mt. iii. 7–12), whose ministry Jesus thus makes the starting-point of his own. Then it related the Temptation of Jesus, and afterwards spoke of the sending of messengers by the Baptist to Jesus, to ask him whether he was the Messiah (Lk. vii. 18–35 = Mt. xi. 2–19). Then it gave Jesus' instructions to his disciples, whom he sent out to preach (Lk. x. 2–16 = Mt. x. 5–42). The next incident it contained was Jesus' lamentation over the places which had been the scenes of his labours—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum (Lk. x. 12–15 = Mt. xi. 20–24); this was followed, by way of contrast, with thanksgiving to God for having revealed himself to babes (Lk. x. 21–24 = Mt. xi. 25–27). Lastly, it gave the parable of the talents, which is represented as having been spoken shortly before Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Lk. xix. 12–27 = Mt. xxv. 14–30).

From these incidents we might form some such conception of Jesus' ministry as this. Jesus, continuing the preaching of the Baptist (as is clear also from Mt. xi. 12 f. = Lk. xvi. 16), after having triumphed over temptation, met with such signal success that the Baptist recognised him as the expected Messiah, although even thus early words of reproach were uttered against the man who eschewed fasting and consorted with publicans and sinners. Jesus, however, further extended

[1] For a description of their contents, see Chap. II., pp. 25, 26, above.

the field of his activity by sending out disciples, who were to preach even as he himself did. But he was rejected also by the places at the north-west corner of the Lake of Gennesareth where he had laboured longest and with the greatest zeal. The common people, however, and those who were of little account, acknowledged his claims, while the educated classes turned from him. This is brought out vividly in the discourse against the Scribes and Pharisees (Lk. xi. 39–52 = Mt. xxiii. 1–39), and in the words of encouragement addressed to his disciples (Lk. xii. 2–9 = Mt. x. 26–33; Lk. xii. 22–31 = Mt. vi. 25–33). From the introduction to the parable of the money in trust it might be inferred that Jesus made at least one visit to Jerusalem (Lk. xix. 11–27). Perhaps the lamentation over Jerusalem (Lk. xiii. 34 f. = Mt. xxiii. 37–39) would justify the conclusion that he laboured in that city either more frequently or for a longer period of time.[1]

This, it must be admitted, would be but a meagre outline of the life of Jesus. And this, the oldest of the Gospel narratives, failed to satisfy men, more especially because it furnished no definite statements about Jesus' belief in himself as the Messiah and about his Messianic preaching, and left the faithful in complete uncertainty as to how his ministry ended. In this latter respect also it resembled the prophetic books of the Old Testament.[2] But with these materials alone it would not be possible to construct a scientific narrative of the life of Jesus.

THE PROBLEM.—It is thus obvious how important is the question, whether the Gospel of Mk. is historically trustworthy, and how far it offers a well-articulated scheme, facilitating the admission of other sayings of the Lord into their right

[1] At the same time, it must always be borne in mind that the historical sequence of incidents as laid down even in this outline cannot be regarded as quite certain. The precise period *when* the Baptist sent his disciples to Jesus, *when* Jesus went up to Jerusalem, and at what period Jesus sent out his disciples, could not be determined from the Collection of Discourses.

[2] Jesus' belief in himself as the Messiah was given in the Collection of Discourses in the story of the Temptation; but it contained, it seems, no definite data about the origin of this belief, or about its gradual communication to others. The object was not to relate history but only to preserve the separate sayings of Jesus, something after the manner in which the Book of Jeremiah contains the utterances of that Prophet.

historical place. It may be said at the outset that many of Jesus' utterances are in a sense independent of time, and therefore might have been made equally well at the beginning of his ministry as at the end.[1] But the problem before us is precisely this, to show what possibly can belong to each period of his preaching and what can not. Should we be unable to discover any canon that will enable us to do this, all that would remain for us would be to examine the historicity of the information given in the narrative Sources in the best and fullest light available, and in that way determine the course of external events which make up the life of Jesus, and then put together the sayings of the Lord (after they have been similarly examined as to the genuineness of their subject-matter) in accordance with a certain general coherence. In this way we might eventually arrive at a total picture of the personality of Jesus calculated to present to the mind's eye its proper significance as measured by the Sources that bear witness to him.[2] Whether we shall be obliged to pursue this method or not can only be decided when we have arrived at a more precise idea of the outer sequence and inner development of the life of Jesus as set forth in the Gospel of Mk.

Jesus' Public Ministry according to Mk. — After giving a short description of the preaching of the Baptist, Mk. goes on to tell how Jesus comes from Nazareth to the Jordan, of the vision which he has at his baptism, and of the temptation which immediately follows upon it (i. 1–13). Then comes the account of Jesus' first preaching in Galilee after the Baptist is cast into prison. Jesus preaches repentance because the kingdom of God is at hand; but also

[1] It will be sufficient to recall the parable of Lazarus, or the series of parables in Jesus' sermon by the lake. These and similar utterances it will be possible to assign with some degree of probability to the places to which they historically belong only when we are acquainted with the complete course of the life of Jesus.

[2] Such a picture would, at any rate, be, in point of method, more correct than those fanciful representations which upon grounds of a higher inspiration—needing no further inquiry—mingle in such an edifying way the utterances of our Lord with the historical sections taken from Mk. To avoid this confusing treatment is not altogether easy, especially as both Mt. and Lk. have themselves gone to work in a way that is not very different.

confident trust in view of his message of salvation. Next he calls his first four disciples at the Sea of Galilee (i. 14–20). Then follows a graphic description of a Sabbath spent at Capernaum, from the worship in the synagogue down to the following morning, when Jesus tells his friends that he now proposes to preach also in the neighbouring villages (i. 21–38). All we are told about this ministry is contained in a single sentence (i. 39), and the episode is concluded by the healing of a leper. After this, Jesus is no longer willing to go into the villages, being kept back by the thronging about him of those who are in need of help (i. 40–45). But, outside the villages, too, the people come together to him from all sides. Then he returns to Capernaum, and heals the sick of the palsy at the house of Peter. This gives occasion to the reproach that he claims for himself that which belongs to God alone. He also teaches beside the lake, and he wins over Levi, the publican, and goes into his house, where he associates with many other publicans, and sits at meat with them, which affords cause for renewed complaint against him. On the Sabbath[1] his disciples pluck the ears of corn, and in the synagogue Jesus heals the man with the withered arm (ii. 1–iii. 6); and, even at this stage, men begin to take counsel together how they may destroy him.

But people flock to him from every quarter of Palestine, having heard of the things which he does. He preaches from a boat on the lake so as not to be interrupted whilst speaking. At the same time he heals many diseases; but the demoniacs must not say who he is (this as early as i. 25, 34).[2] Then he

[1] In Lk. vi. 1 this Sabbath is called δευτερόπρωτος, which can only designate the first Sabbath of a second series. The Sabbath on which Jesus made his first appearance in Capernaum (Mk. i. 21) may perhaps have been the very first Sabbath of his ministry (in Lk. iv. 16, 31, it is true, it was preceded by the Sabbath at Nazareth). The Sabbath which Lk. vi. 1 calls δευτερόπρωτος marks the beginning of the episodes of violations of the Sabbath. The epithet δευτερόπρωτος is therefore an indication of a division in the narratives of the life of Jesus which goes back to the very earliest days of Christianity.

[2] For the healing of demoniacs, see Chap. IX. The fact that the demoniacs are aware of the secret of Jesus' personality, but are forbidden to declare it, affords the Evangelist an opportunity several times to recall this secret, without its thereby losing its character as a secret.

chooses out twelve to be his usual companions and itinerant preachers. On the other hand, he holds himself aloof from his own kindred, who wish to fetch him back to Nazareth, saying 'he is beside himself' (iii. 7–35). Here *vv.* 22–30 are evidently misplaced; their proper place is after vii. 23, for the Scribes from Jerusalem do not appear upon the scene until vii. 1. The expression used by Jesus' family, ὅτι ἐξέστη, and that used by the Scribes, ὅτι βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει, are apparently equivalent. The later passage has been thus antedated in order that Jesus might at this early stage give an answer to such an aspersion.[1] Then follows an example of Jesus' habit, already alluded to in iii. 9, of preaching from a boat (iv. 1–34). The discourse contains the parable of the sower (iv. 3–9), the parable of the seed-corn, and the parable of the mustard seed (iv. 26–32). The interpretation of the parable of the sower is certainly interpolated (iv. 10–20); it really belongs to another connection. But the same is probably true of the saying about the proper place to put a candle, and also of the further saying, that God measures unto every man according to his own measure (iv. 21–25).[2] In close association with this discourse, we have the account of Jesus crossing the lake in stormy weather, on which occasion he commands the tempest (iv. 35–41). Arrived on the opposite shore, Jesus heals the Gerasene demoniac, whereby his name becomes known in the Decapolis (v. 1–20). On his return he raises Jairus' daughter (v. 21–43).

Then he returns once more to Nazareth, to his own country

[1] It is possible, however, that we have to do here with merely a marginal gloss, though indeed a very ancient one, which slipped into the text in the course of transcription. In any case, it was founded on the best tradition, and refers to the events narrated in Mk. vii. 1–23.

[2] One would naturally expect the interpretation of the parable of the sower to follow perhaps iv. 35 ff., as being a typical example of such explanations. The saying about the light whose proper place is in a candlestick, and the saying about the measures with which man metes and God metes, possess no clear inward connection with the parables; whereas the parables themselves do all really belong closely together. Here, and in the discourse in Mk. ix. 33-50, it might appear as though Mk. had simply taken over such fragments of discourses from some Source in which the text was transmitted in a very confused state. In that case, the passage does really belong to the original text of Mk., and precisely in its present form.

(πατρίς), accompanied by his disciples; and there he preaches again, though without any appreciable success (vi. 1–6). After that, he sends forth the twelve, two by two, that they may minister in like fashion with himself. By this means his fame is spread abroad to such an extent that even Herod the Tetrarch hears of him, and declares that in him the Baptist, who was beheaded, has come to life again. The gap in the story of Jesus' ministry between the sending forth of the disciples and their return is filled up with the account of the beheading of the Baptist.[1] After his disciples' return Jesus wishes to gather breath in quiet retirement, accompanied only by his own friends; but the people go after him in such numbers that he has to feed five thousand with five loaves and two fishes (vi. 7–44). Then he goes up into the mountain alone to pray, whilst his disciples cross over to Bethsaida. Jesus follows after them on the sea, and his stepping into the boat is the signal for the storm to cease (vi. 45–52). They land on the plain of Gennesareth, and all that are sick are brought hither; and in every town or village, where Jesus enters, whosoever has touched but the hem of his garment is immediately made whole (vi. 53–56). But this peaceful work comes to an end in an altercation with certain Scribes from Jerusalem, which leads to a declaration of Jesus against certain precepts of the law (vii. 1–23). There can be little question that this is really the proper place for the declaration made against Jesus by these Scribes from Jerusalem and for Jesus' reply to them (iii. 22–30).[2]

After that, Jesus leaves Jewish territory and comes into the region of Tyre, where he would much prefer to remain unknown; but a certain Syro-Phœnician woman, who speaks

[1] It is evident that all details as to the doings of Jesus himself during this period were lacking to the Evangelist. The disciples, who had gone forth preaching by themselves, knew nothing of their Master's experiences during this time. And the Evangelist had no wish to give a detailed account of the ministry of the disciples. Hence this gap makes us painfully sensible of a double loss; for the account of the death of the Baptist cannot compensate for the absence either of a treatment of this period of Jesus' life or of a more detailed narrative of the disciples' ministry. See again, pp. 77 f., below.

[2] See note 1, p. 66, above. Here Mt. (xv. 12–14), too, had before him a good traditional account over and above that which Mk. drew upon.

Greek as her mother-tongue, beseeches him to heal her daughter, and her prayer is granted. From the country of Tyre he goes to Sidon, and thence journeys across the region of the Decapolis back to the Sea of Galilee, healing on the way a deaf mute (vii. 24–37). Again he finds himself surrounded by a throng of people; then follows the feeding of the four thousand (viii. 1–9). Then Jesus once more sets foot on Jewish territory at Dalmanutha, and straightway the Pharisees come asking him for a sign of the truth of his message. Jesus turns angrily away from them, and journeys again to the opposite shore of the lake, warning his disciples on the way against the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod (viii. 10–21). Then for the second time he bends his steps towards the north. In Bethsaida he heals a blind man. In the villages of Cæsarea Philippi he talks with his disciples, asking them what the people think of him. Thereupon Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah. But this Jesus forbids him to mention to anybody, and prepares the disciples for his death, and at the same time for the speedy coming of the kingdom of God. Then follow the transfiguration in the presence of Peter, James, and John, and the healing of the epileptic boy, whom the disciples have not been able to heal (viii. 22–ix. 29). Next they journey through Galilee, Jesus at the same time not wishing that any should recognise him; and he talks to the disciples about his death and his resurrection. Once more they come to Capernaum, and there he discourses again to his disciples, but to them only.[1] After that he goes into the land of Judæa, crossing over to the other side of the Jordan, and there he again addresses the multitudes even as he had been wont to speak to them (ix. 30–x. 1). Thus, he talks about divorce; blesses the children; and when a rich man will not follow him, laments over the difficulty of a rich man being saved so as to enter the kingdom of God. Then he again tells the disciples about his approaching death, and, when the two sons of Zebedee ask him for the chief places of honour in God's kingdom, he reproves them for their ambition, and as he passes out of Jericho heals a blind man (x. 2–52).

[1] On this discourse, cp. note 2, p. 66, above, and Chap. XII.

He now enters into Jerusalem, riding on the ass's colt amid the triumphant shouts of those who accompany him; but in the evening he returns to Bethany. On the following morning he curses the barren fig-tree, proceeds to purify the temple in Jerusalem, and does not withdraw from the city until evening. The next day the fig-tree has withered up. Jesus sends back the emissaries of the Synedrium with the parable of the wicked vine-dressers, answers the questions about the tribute money and the resurrection, and declares which is the greatest of the commandments. After that, no man durst ask him any more questions (xi. 1–xii. 34). This is evidently the place from which the pericope of the woman taken in adultery (Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11) has dropped out.[1] Jesus has passed the night on the Mount of Olives, and in the morning the woman who has been taken in the act is brought before him. After he has also disposed of this difficult question, he teaches the people that the Messiah could not be David's son, warns them against the Scribes, praises the widow's mite, so small in its apparent, but so great in its true, value, and as he proceeds on his journey, speaks of the near destruction of the Temple, and once more, seated on the Mount of Olives, instructs his disciples about the last things (Mk. xii. 35–xiii. 37). Next after this follows in chaps. xiv. and xv. the story of the Passion properly so called, introduced by the plot of the Council, the anointing in Bethany, and the betrayal by Judas. Then follow the Passover meal with the institution of the Lord's Supper, the walk to Gethsemane, the Gethsemane prayer, the arrest, the trial before the Council, the denial of Peter, the proceedings before Pilate, the crucifixion, the death, and the burial. The first eight verses of chap. xvi.,[2] which originally were alone found in Mk., give the journey of the women to the sepulchre, the appearance of the young man who announces the Resurrection, and, in agreement with a saying of Jesus, as recorded in xiv. 28, name Galilee as the place where the risen Lord will show himself to his disciples.

PERIODS ACCORDING TO MK.—In this account of Mk.

[1] See Chap. II., pp. 59 f.

[2] See Tischendorf, *Novum Test. Græc.*, ed. oct. crit. major, i. pp. 403–407.

we may now with absolute certainty distinguish certain sharply-defined periods in the life of Jesus. The most important criterion for defining these periods is the attitude adopted with regard to the belief in the Messiah. The knowledge communicated to Jesus at his baptism by a revelation of God, that he is the Messiah (i. 11), forms the introduction to his public preaching; but he is silent about this belief until his disciples of their own accord recognise him as the Messiah (i. 25, 34, iii. 12, viii. 29 f.). Even now he will not permit them to call him the Messiah, until by his entry into Jerusalem, his purification of the Temple, and his defiant answer to the emissaries of the Council, he publicly announces himself to be such—a declaration which he finally confirms again in the most solemn way in the course of the hearing before the Council (xi. 10, xiv. 58, xv. 30, and compare Jn. ii. 19, xii. 6, xviii.).

These circumstances furnish an important rule for assigning the sayings of Jesus to their proper places in his life. It is this: utterances in which Jesus proclaims himself to be the Messiah can only have been spoken subsequent to Peter's avowal when they are addressed to the disciples, and only after the entry into Jerusalem when they are addressed to the multitude. But, besides the three decisive crises in Jesus' life here mentioned (his baptism, the avowal of Peter, and the entry into Jerusalem), there appears yet another event in Mk. as marking an epoch—namely, the controversy with the Scribes from Jerusalem (vii. 1–23). From that point down to the time when he goes up to Jerusalem, Jesus avoids showing himself publicly and avoids preaching; he lingers for a long time on heathen soil, and during his last journey through Galilee and his last stay in Capernaum devotes himself entirely to his disciples. The utterances during this period might also very well be detached from the rest. At the same time, it is expressly testified that Jesus did not explicitly foretell his Passion and death to his disciples until after Peter had made his avowal. Utterances, therefore, in which these are mentioned cannot have been spoken before this event took place.

Thus we get five principal periods in the life of Jesus, sharply and clearly separated from one another:

1. From the birth of Jesus to the perception of his Messiahship at his baptism.
2. The first ministry, down to the declaration against the laws of ceremonial purity.
3. From the flight of Jesus to Peter's confession.
4. From Peter's confession to the entry into Jerusalem.
5. From the entry into the capital to Jesus' death and resurrection.

But, further, the proper position of a series of narratives and sayings of Jesus which have been handed down by tradition elsewhere is fixed without further question by the connection of events in Mk. The advice given by Jesus to his disciples in the Collection of Sayings of the Lord is certainly a reproduction of the discourse transmitted to us, partly directly, partly indirectly, in Mk. vi. 7–11. The reply to those who sought a sign, in Mk. viii. 12, is clearly equivalent to the saying of the Lord about the sign of Jonah. Assuming that the story of Zacchæus (Lk. xix. 1–10) rests upon a historical foundation, it can only belong to Mk. x. 46; and so, if what is said about the Temple tribute in Mt. xvii. 24—27 is historical, it can only belong to Mk. ix. 33–50. On account both of its connecting links and its subject-matter, the parable of the good Samaritan (Lk. x. 25–37) must go with Mk. xii. 28–34. If this narrative in Lk. carries us to Jerusalem, the next just as certainly takes us to Bethany (Lk. x. 38–42), and consequently it also belongs to the last days of Jesus' life; and here the Johannine Gospel (xi. 1)[1] supplements in quite a correct way the information in Lk.

THE LORD'S SAYINGS AND MK.—Thus what we have adduced above shows that the picture in the Gospel of Mk. not only affords a view of the ministry of Jesus which is clear in itself, but also renders it possible to a considerable extent to group and arrange the sayings of the Lord which have been handed down to us elsewhere. Of course, it is only in rare cases that we are able to fix with absolute certainty the precise moment in which Jesus gave utterance to this or the other saying preserved by tradition. In most cases we have to content ourselves with indicating the period within his ministry to which with some degree of probability the particular utterance belongs. At the same time, we cannot

[1] See Chap. II., p. 46, note 1, and Chap. XIII.

altogether abandon the arrangement according to subject-matter. This method of arrangement will have to be resorted to wherever in the narrative of Mk. there appears an analogy for a particular saying without our being able to say, however, whether or not the matters, though agreeing in substance, coincide also in point of time. Thus, the feast at the house of Levi the publican (Mk. ii. 15), and the stay at the house of Zacchæus (Lk. xix. 1–10), admit of being historically recorded as occasions on which Jesus held converse with sinners. The sending of his disciples to Jesus by the Baptist, in connection with which Jesus speaks of his friendship with sinners as being made a reproach against him (Mt. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 34), also has its clearly defined place, in so far as it should obviously come before Mk. vi. 14–29, and consequently also before the sending forth of the disciples of Jesus. We have already pointed out the historical position of Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11 (the story of the woman taken in adultery). The incident of the sinful woman in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Lk. vii. 36–50) is really only another version of the story of the anointing in the house of Simon the leper (Mk. xiv. 3–9). In both cases the host is one named Simon; in both cases a woman enters the house and anoints Jesus; and on both occasions Jesus defends her, when she is blamed by the others.[1] To this extent, then, we are able to determine historically a whole series of narratives that have reference to Jesus' love for sinners. But the numerous parables in which Jesus sets forth the idea that God does not thrust sinners from him, and that he commits no wrong when he opens the doors of his kingdom even to a sinful man, are so deficient in chronological indications that it is no longer possible to determine on what occasions they were spoken. In such cases, it will be well to admit an arrangement according to subject-matter, commencing with the first instance in which, according to Mk., Jesus began to give expression to this idea. The method has also the advantage that at this point the remarkable procedure of Jesus is brought forward into the strong light of his own words. In like manner there are many other cases in which the arrangement according to

[1] For a detailed discussion of the incident, see Chap. XIII.

subject-matter ought to be taken into account side by side with the chronological sequence.[1]

THE CENTURION OF CAPERNAUM.—In Mt. and Lk. the story of the centurion of Capernaum follows the first great discourse of Jesus taken from the Sayings of the Lord (Mt. viii. 5–13, Lk. vii. 1–10). But in Mt. the healing of the leper (Mk. i. 40–44) is interpolated between the Sermon on the Mount and this episode of the centurion (Mt. viii. 1–4). In point of fact, there is quite evidently a gap between Mk. i. 45 and Mk. ii. 1. The former passage says that Jesus could no more openly enter into a city; the latter says that he came back to Capernaum. An adjustment might best be effected through the prayer of the centurion that Jesus should heal his servant. If Jesus was still outside the place when he spoke the word of healing, we can understand the transformation which the story has undergone in the Johannine Gospel, where the fact that the healing took place at a distance is made the salient feature (Jn. iv. 46–54). The story fits in well in this place, for this reason also that on the former occasion Jesus was in Capernaum only a few days, and consequently need not yet be acquainted with the circumstances of the place, small though it was (Lk. vii. 5). Accordingly, we follow Mt. in placing the story of the centurion after the healing of the leper.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.—Now we have to consider the question, whether Mt. and Lk. are also right in putting the Sermon on the Mount, or the Sermon on the Plain, before the incident we have just dealt with. In Mk. i. 45, indeed, what is first emphasised is the fact that Jesus kept at a distance from inhabited places, and that the people flocked to him from all sides. Therefore a sermon delivered in the open air to a great multitude of people is apparently very suitable at this point. But the beatitude, "Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you for the Gospel's sake" (Lk. vi. 22), may awaken doubt. This manifestly presupposes, not the situation in Mk. i. 45, but that in Mk. iii. 6 f. Hence we shall do better to give up the situation suggested by Mt. and Lk., and to suppose that this discourse was delivered, not before

[1] See, for example, the discussion of the question of the Sabbath, in Chap. IX.

the incident of the centurion, but rather at the moment indicated in Mk. iii. 7–19 (cp. Mt. iv. 24 f. and Lk. vi. 12–19), when Jesus is hated, and reviled, and his name cast out as evil, his adherents also sharing the same obloquy (Lk. vi. 22). The warning against the blind leaders of the blind (Lk. vi. 39) also suits this period well. The antedating of the discourse in Mt. may be explained by the amplification which the author has given it: out of a discourse spoken on a particular occasion he has made a "sermon," which is in some sense independent of time, setting forth the will of God in all aspects. But Lk., in determining the place at which to put the pericope of the centurion of Capernaum, may be supposed to have in some measure followed the order of Mt. The historical situation of the discourse is nevertheless still to be recognised by the fact that in both Evangelists (Mk. and Lk.) it is introduced by the words of Mk. iii. 7 f.[1]

CREDIBILITY OF MK.—Hitherto we have simply taken the credibility of Mk. for granted. But it can also to a certain extent be proved. Mk. is the only Gospel in which Jesus is consistently represented as being silent regarding his Messiahship down to Peter's confession. In Mt., as early as the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus speaks of his future office of judge of the world as being matter of common knowledge (vii. 22 f.). In Lk. the sermon of Jesus in Nazareth, which precedes the Sermon on the Mount, is also conceived as an announcement of Messiahship (cp. iv. 18, *ἔχρισέν με*, and iv. 21, *σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη*). At the same time, Mt. (xvi. 17) has preserved the blessing upon Simon Peter for recognising Jesus to be the Messiah although flesh and blood had not

[1] For the story of the centurion of Capernaum cannot very well be placed after Mk. iii. 6. At all events, in Lk.'s way of putting it the atmosphere of the incident is still throughout one of peace between Jesus and his countrymen; the centurion's leanings towards Judaism and his action in building a synagogue are represented as being recommendations even in the eyes of Jesus. But this is a different attitude of mind from that reflected in the Sermon on the Mount. We must therefore abandon the order given by Mt. and Lk.; the incident of the centurion belongs to an earlier place than the Sermon on the Mount. Here we can see how Lk., notwithstanding the many points of divergence, is yet sometimes dependent upon Mt.

revealed it unto him ; and in Lk., as in Mk. and Mt., we find also (ix. 21) Jesus' command to his disciples not to mention his Messiahship to anyone.

LATER ACCOUNTS ; FADING TRADITIONS.—It is evident that this represents the original form of the history, because in Mt. and Lk. we see clear indications of the gradual fading away of a recollection which in Mk. is still quite living, while in Jn. the last traces of it have disappeared.

As regards the dispute about the laws of ceremonial purity, and the flight of Jesus, immediately associated with it, the case is precisely the same. Even in Mt. many features have become effaced. True, he says that Jesus withdrew (*ἀνεχώρησεν*, xv. 21) into the region of Tyre and Sidon, even more clearly than Mk. ; but, on the other hand, afterwards he lets this aspect of the matter drop completely out of sight. Mt. xv. 29 relates that Jesus came to the Sea of Galilee ; but the Evangelist does not tell us that his route lay through the territory of the Decapolis, or that, before this, Jesus had travelled through the region of Sidon (cp. Mk. vii. 31). That the account of the journey into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi omits to mention Bethsaida, as Mk. viii. 22 (cp. *v.* 27) does, may pass without remark ; a more important circumstance is that in Mt. xvii. 22 the secrecy of the journey through Galilee (Mk. ix. 30 : *οὐκ ἤθελεν, ἵνα τις γνοῖ*) is altogether disregarded. So again in Mt. xix. 1 f. no emphasis is laid on the fact that it was not until he was journeying through Peraea that Jesus resumed his earlier practice of speaking to the people (Mk. x. 1). In Lk. all recollection of this flight has disappeared ; and it would only be in accordance with the Johannine method of dealing with the Synoptic material, if we chose to see in Jn. vi. 15 the last echo of this memory. Here again, then, the Gospel of Mk. vindicates its credibility in a remarkable way.

Its credibility admits of being to some extent established in the case of the resurrection-narratives also. Mk. is the only Evangelist who consistently maintains that it is in Galilee alone that Jesus appears to his disciples (Mk. xiv. 28, xvi. 7). Mt., notwithstanding the fact that he repeats two statements which Mk. also gives (Mt. xxvi. 32, xxviii. 7), nevertheless goes on to describe an appearance to the women as they were depart-

ing from the sepulchre (Mt. xxviii. 9 f.). In Lk., however, the recollection of the disciples' return to Galilee has entirely vanished, and all the appearances of the Lord take place in and near Jerusalem (Lk. xxiv. 6, 13–53, and especially 49, 53). Thus here again we are able to trace the gradual fading away of a correct recollection.

THE MIRACLES.—These considerations, however, do not exhaust the matter. All that they prove is that Mk. has preserved the remembrance of Jesus' activity on the whole more faithfully than the other Synoptists. But Mk. contains, further, accounts of a large number of miracles, the credibility of which cannot be proved by literary investigation. To dispose of this problem in a few words is a method of dealing with it as easy as it is false, even when by so doing the intention is to fulfil a conscientious duty.[1] Exact observation of certain phenomena that are perpetually recurring makes many things appear to us possible in the present day which in the "age of enlightenment"[2] would have been put down as quite inconceivable. In particular, the effects produced by the soul upon the condition of the body have in the last decennia received increased attention. This matter is one that requires consideration in its application to the powers of healing which emanated from Jesus. Many other occurrences in his life—such, for instance, as the stilling of the tempest—when regarded from the point of view of the natural sciences, may be conceived of as remarkable coincidences, without excluding a religious estimate as well. Other events, again—for instance, the two cases of feeding the multitude—are to be looked upon as popular exaggerations of occurrences which were felt to be wonderful. And, finally, certain fanciful narratives are found, in which a real occurrence is clothed

[1] The passage in the story of the temptation (Mt. iv. 5–7 = Lk. iv. 9–12), and the saying about the sign of Jonah (Mt. xii. 39–42 = Lk. xi. 29–32), only prove that Jesus did not regard the wonderful events of his life as "signs" of his Messiahship; in respect of the reality of the occurrences, they prove nothing.

[2] [*Zeitalter der Aufklärung* is in German literature and philosophy broadly synonymous with the eighteenth century, or rather the generation which learnt from Locke and the English deists, from Rousseau and the *Encyclopédie* in France, and from the rationalists and theologians of the Leibniz-Wolff school in Germany. (*J. T. B.*)]

in language which is poetically rather than historically true; to this class may belong the transfiguration, Jesus' walking on the sea, and the miracles connected with his death. Of course, it is perfectly obvious that the historical credibility of the Gospel of Mk. is not enhanced by tales of miracles belonging to either of the two last-mentioned categories. On the other hand, their peculiar character is so clearly impressed upon them that a cool historical judgment regarding them is not endangered. Thanks, however, to the early composition of the Gospel of Mk., they do mirror the sentiments which the infant Christian community entertained regarding Jesus, in a form as beautiful as it is transparent; and in so far they do contribute to the historical understanding of the personality of Jesus. They show clearly enough that even in the circles which specially preserved the historical memory of his life, the image of Jesus early outgrew all human measure; and that can only have been due to the impression which Jesus originally made.[1]

LACUNÆ IN MK.—But the lacunæ in the narrative of Mk., which we are now unable to fill up, represent a more regrettable loss. Amongst these are to be included the absence of a more exact account of the ministry of Jesus and of his apostles whilst the disciples were absent on their missionary journey, and the scanty nature of the information afforded as to the route followed by Jesus in his flight. The picture of the days

[1] From their peculiar character, the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of the Hebrews must be described as good "books for the common people (chap-books)." Thus, they accept all the elements of the marvellous in good faith, without troubling themselves with subtle inquiries, and, in virtue of the faith to which they owe their origin, scarce anything that can be recorded of their hero is too wonderful for the writers. It should, however, be pointed out that, in his relation to Mk., Mt. shows a double face in so far as he at one time heightens the miraculous character of a series of wonders, at another time sets aside, or at any rate reduces, the miraculous element. For example, twice he makes Jesus heal two blind men (Mt. ix. 27–31, xx. 29–34), where on both occasions Mk. speaks of only one blind man (Mk. viii. 22–26, x. 46–52); on the other hand, when describing how Jesus procured the ass's colt for his entry into Jerusalem (Mt. xxi. 1–3 = Mk. xi. 1–6), and when relating Peter's denial (Mt. xxvi. 34, 69–75 = Mk. xiv. 30, 66–72), he leaves out the element of the wonderful, or tones it down. Compare also the two versions of the preparation of the Passover (Mt. xxvi. 17–19 in contrast with Mk. xiv. 12–16).

in Jerusalem[1] is painted with graphic force and clearness; in contrast with it the pictures of Jesus' earlier activity are sketched in extremely faint outlines. The only event brought before us with almost equal clearness is the first Sabbath in Capernaum.

THE POSSIBILITY OF A LIFE OF JESUS.—What we have already said will serve in some measure as an answer to the question as to the possibility of writing a life of Jesus. For a biography in the modern sense materials are wholly wanting. All that the older Sources tell us is concerned with the public ministry of Jesus; and that embraces, it must be admitted, only a small portion of his life, whether we reckon him to have lived only thirty years, as Lk. does (iii. 23), or forty to fifty, as Jn. (viii. 57) does.[2] The duration of his ministry itself cannot be reliably fixed.[3] All this notwithstanding, historical science cannot refuse the task of investigating that part of Jesus' life which is knowable, and with which are bound up both our judgment respecting the personality of Jesus and our understanding of primitive Christianity; and the obligation which thus rests upon historical science is supported by the necessities of religious piety. It is obvious that in this inquiry, as in all others of a similar character, historical truth can be attained only in so far as the historical

[1] Yet this is true only if we are content to dispense with all those accessory details which we naturally look for in a complete narrative of the kind. Of the adversaries of Jesus in the arguments he had with the emissaries of the Council, with the Pharisees and Herodians, and with the Sadducees, not a single name has been handed down to us. Nor do we know where he stayed or how he was entertained whilst in Jerusalem. Such highly important events as the betrayal of Judas are handled with the utmost brevity. Thus, even with regard to this portion of Jesus' life, there are a number of questions still left open.

[2] Cp. Chap. IV., p. 88, "The Age of Jesus," and Chap. V., pp. 109–111, "Synchronistic Dates."

[3] According to Lk. iii. 1, it was in the year 28 A.D. that the Baptist made his public appearance, and it is evident that he was cast into prison in that same year. But if Jesus really was crucified on the Passover of 29, it is clear from Mk. ii. 23 that even before the Pentecost of 28 he was ministering in public for some length of time. Consequently, we shall have to assign the Baptist's public appearance to the first three months of the year 28. But, after all, these figures possess no great degree of certainty.

investigator has at his command the original Sources, a knowledge of contemporary history and some personal gift of judgment in historical matters. But we have already shown that a closer attention to the extant Sources will enable us to bring into sharper prominence again many features which in the course of time have faded or become effaced, and so make it possible for us to give historically a truer picture than has anywhere been so far presented. At the same time, it must be admitted, there still remain a great many points with respect to which we are compelled to content ourselves with nothing more definite than a greater or less degree of probability. Yet, even to have weighed probabilities and to have sought for the most satisfactory hypothesis is for the scientific worker neither a despicable nor an ungrateful task.

THE TITLE: THE LIFE OF JESUS.—It might be urged that a work of this description, dealing, as it does, with only a section of the life of Jesus, is not entitled to be called *The Life of Jesus*; but such an objection is idle. We have to discuss, in any case, all the material that is accessible to us and available for the construction of a complete life of Jesus. In the end, what is true of every other biography is true also of this; if new Sources should come to light, our materials would increase in bulk. It must be remembered, too, that the name of any special branch of scientific knowledge is not coined for the purpose of conveying an exhaustive theoretical conception of the subject of that branch, but simply with the object of providing a convenient label for a province of inquiry subservient to some useful practical purpose.[1] To change a name of this kind, then, once it has become current, would, in the opinion of the

[1] To object to a title of this description would be mere pedantry. What we now call by the name Physics indicates, in point of real fact, a very comprehensive field, and yet a much narrower one than the word suggests, meaning, as it does, simply "the science of nature." Philology, literally taken, means something quite different from that which the expression actually denotes. Mathematics is certainly not the only branch of knowledge in which students learn something (*μαθήματα—μανθάνειν*). And the term Music, strictly interpreted, must include, not merely the art which has to do with sound, but all the arts. It is only in Theology that people dispute about names, such as "New Testament Contemporary History" and "Life of Jesus."

present writer, be of very small utility. Moreover, in this particular case, the state of the matter is such that, while it is easy enough to marshal objections against the old name, it is hardly possible to discover another that is more suitable. But to renounce the work which is implied in this name, because the name itself and the thing it expresses are not exactly coincident, were surely unscientific.

CHAPTER IV

LIFE OF JESUS BEFORE HIS MINISTRY

NAME AND FAMILY.—The founder of Christianity was a working builder[1] of Nazareth in Galilee. Although his name Jesus (Jeshu) was not one of the commonest of Jewish names, it was by no means uncommon. Of twenty persons whom Josephus mentions as bearing it, no fewer than thirteen, or counting Christ himself, fourteen, belong to the period between the accession of Herod the Great and the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem. Jesus lived at Nazareth with his mother Mary and his brethren James, Joses, Judas, and Simon; and mention is also made of his sisters (Mk. vi. 3). At a later date his mother and his brethren wished to take him back to Nazareth (Mk. iii. 21, 32); but according to the Gospel of the Hebrews, it was they who had requested him to go with them to John the Baptist.[2] This would certainly point to the existence of an earnest religious life in his parents' household. In the Johannine Gospel also we find on one occasion his mother and brethren going for a short time to Capernaum (Jn. ii. 12); and, again, on another occasion, his brethren urging him to take a journey to Judæa (Jn. vii. 3–10).

On the other hand, his earthly father Joseph never interferes in the public life of Jesus. The most that we read of him is in Jn. vi. 42, when the Jews said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? In two other

[1] [In German, *Bauhandwerker*. In certain rural districts of England less than fifty years ago it was usual for the village carpenter to be also a builder. (*J. T. B.*).] See pp. 100–103 below.

[2] Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 76, to Mt. iii. 13.

places also—Lk. iv. 22 and Jn. i. 45—Christ is called Jesus, the son of Joseph, of Nazareth.

GENEALOGY.—In agreement with what has just been said is the fact of the two genealogies of Jesus recorded in Mt. i. 1–16 and Lk. iii. 23–38; they are certainly very divergent, but with all their differences, they have this in common, that both trace Jesus' descent through David, and as the last link in the chain immediately before Jesus name Joseph the husband of Mary. If Jesus was not the son of Joseph according to the flesh, both of them fall to the ground. For the essential purpose of a genealogical tree is to show blood-relationship. If, however, it were the case that Jesus grew up and was educated in the house of a son of David, without being really descended from him, then he might perhaps be popularly regarded as a son of David, although he was not really such. And yet it is the essential purpose of both genealogies to show that Joseph was descended from David. Mt. traces this descent through the whole line of the kings of Judah; Lk. carries the derivation of Joseph back to an unknown son of David, Nathan (Ναθάμ).[1]

The desire to trace Jesus' lineage back to David is easily understood: the Messiah was expected to spring from the seed of David (Mk. xii. 35); his kingdom is the re-establishment of the kingdom of David (Mk. xi. 10). So, wherever Jesus is recognised as the Messiah, he is also addressed as the Son of David (Mk. x. 48 f.). The surmise that Jesus is the

[1] The only particular in which the two genealogies are in agreement is in the names of David's ancestors; though here Lk. counts two members (Arni and Admin) between Hezron and Amminadab, whereas Mt. has but one (Aram). Both agree again in naming Zerubbabel the son of Shealthiel, and finally in naming Joseph the father of Jesus. The result of this is that not only is the pedigree of Jesus given quite differently in the two Sources, but also that of Shealthiel. Nor is any adjustment of these discrepancies possible. Were a choice to be made between the two pedigrees, we should be obliged to decide in favour of Lk., because Mt., in order to arrive at the number 14 desired by him (Mt. i. 17), leaves out certain links in the series of the kings of Judah. Between Joram and Uzziah we miss kings so important as Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah; and between Josiah and Jechoniah the name of Jehoiakim. And yet the genealogy of Lk. can hardly claim to be trustworthy with any greater degree of justice, because, as a matter of fact, the descent of Jesus from David is, to say the least, open to question.

Messiah is also doubtless involved in the question, "Is not this the Son of David?" (Mt. xii. 23). Jesus is spoken of as the Son of David still more frequently in Mt. than in Mk., but in all such cases he is thought of as the Messiah (Mt. xv. 22, xxi. 9, 15). Similarly Paul, when he says (Rom. i. 3) that the Son of God was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (*τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα*),[1] can hardly have had any special knowledge of the family circumstances of Jesus, but only formed the conclusion as to his descent from David from his own conviction that Jesus was the Messiah. Moreover, the words of the Apocalypse—"the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David" (v. 5), "the root and the offspring of David" (xxii. 16), and the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews—"our Lord hath sprung out of Judah" (vii. 14)—are not to be traced back to any special information, but are in each case only a distinct expression of the conviction that Jesus really was the promised Messiah. Besides, we find even Jesus himself affirming (Mk. xii. 35–37) that, according to the teaching of the Scribes, the Messiah was the Son of David. Yet, instead of showing that the condition named is fulfilled in himself, he goes on to show rather that the opinion of the Scribes is manifestly wrong, for David calls the Messiah his lord, a description which he would never apply to his own son. Jesus therefore can be the Messiah, even though he is not the son of David.[2] The Johannine Gospel says distinctly, that in Jerusalem exception was taken to Jesus' Galilean origin: "Doth the Messiah come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that the Messiah cometh of the seed of David, and out of Bethlehem, the village where David was?" Yet the Evangelist does not by so much as a single word say that Jesus really was descended from David or that he actually was born in Bethlehem. Of these things he knows nothing, or else he considers the

[1] If Paul had regarded Jesus merely as the adopted son of a descendant of David, as Mt. and Lk. do, he would not have used the expression in Rom. i. 3. In themselves, however, Paul's words prove nothing against the story of the virgin-birth. If Mary was of the house of David, Jesus also was of the seed of David according to the flesh, *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα*. But there is nowhere any evidence for the assumption.

[2] Compare the discussion of the passage in Chap. XIII.

tradition which relates it to be false (Jn. vii. 41 f.). It is clear that there existed no certain knowledge as to the descent of Jesus from the house of David.

JOSEPH THE FATHER OF JESUS.—The only value, then, which the two genealogies possess is that, with Lk. iv. 22 and Jn. i. 45, vi. 42, they point back to an older stratum of the tradition in which Joseph was accounted the father of Jesus according to the flesh. The expressions used by Lk. in the story of the boy Jesus when twelve years old ("his parents"—ii. 43; "thy father"—ii. 48) prove nothing, because the qualifying words "by adoption" would not of course always be added when speaking of Jesus' parents or father. On the other hand, Jn. vi. 42 actually makes a special point of his bodily descent from an earthly father as well as from an earthly mother. Jesus' adversaries maintain that he is not come down from Heaven, for he is, as a matter of fact, the son of Joseph; "we know his father as well as his mother." And there is this other point to be considered, that throughout Jesus' public life there is never any mention of his birth having been attended by a miracle. Mk. knows nothing about it, neither does the Gospel of the Hebrews, nor yet the Johannine Gospel. And here it must be expressly noted that the two passages which Nestle cites (*Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 76) in this connection from Jerome prove nothing, so far as the Gospel of the Hebrews is concerned. Both, in fact, refer to a Hebrew translation of Mt.; the second supplements the statement of Jerome, that he once had the opportunity to make a copy of this translation, by adding a note to the effect that in the Greek version of Mt. certain quotations from the Old Testament were drawn, not from the Septuagint, but from the original Hebrew text. But the fact that the Aramaic text of the Gospel of the Hebrews was not based upon the Septuagint hardly required to be specially emphasised

THE VIRGIN-BIRTH ACCORDING TO MT. AND LK.—According to Mt. i. 18–25, Mary is betrothed to Joseph. It is discovered that she is with child; whereupon Joseph wishes to annul the betrothal, though without creating any scandal (λάθρα). But it is revealed to him by an angel of the Lord in a dream, that Mary's condition is due to the influence

of the Holy Spirit. Thereupon Joseph marries Mary, but abstains from intercourse with her until she has given birth to Jesus. The name Jesus is given to the child by Joseph, in accordance with the direction of the angel who had appeared to him in the dream.

In Lk. the miracle of the virgin-birth is led up to by the miracle of John being born of aged parents who hitherto have been childless. First the birth of John is announced, and the certainty of its accomplishment made clear (Lk. i. 5–25); then follows the annunciation to the Virgin Mary, betrothed to one Joseph, a man of the house of David (Lk. i. 26–38). Mary then journeys with haste to Elizabeth, and remains with her three months (Lk. i. 39–56); so that during this period she is separated from her betrothed. Then she returns home, but accompanies her betrothed when he goes to Bethlehem to be taxed; and there Jesus is born. Here it is to Mary that the angel Gabriel gives the name (Lk. i. 31, 56, ii. 4–7).

Comparison of the two Narratives.—Between these two accounts of Mt. and Lk. no contradiction exists; even with regard to the localities there is no reason to suppose any. For Mt. ii. 1 says merely that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, and that is what Lk. ii. 6 f. also tells us. Mt. ii. 13–23, it is true, goes on to add that, in order to escape the impending massacre of the innocents, the Holy Family fled into Egypt, and that, on their return, out of fear of Archelaus, who was as cruel as his father, they journeyed to Galilee and went to the town of Nazareth. On the other hand, according to Lk., Mary (Lk. i. 26) and Joseph (ii. 4) both live in Nazareth even when they are as yet only betrothed, and it is only the law about taxing that takes them to Bethlehem (Lk. ii. 4), where, in consequence of the birth of Jesus, they then remain a month and a half (Lk. ii. 22–Lev. xii.). After that, they return home to the town of Nazareth in Galilee (Lk. ii. 39). Here, therefore, not a word is said about the flight into Egypt and their sojourn there.

Now if we had in Mt. an account absolutely above criticism, it would not be difficult to get over this gap in the narrative of Lk. We know from Galatians i. 17 that Paul immediately after his conversion was in Arabia; but about this journey

the Acts of the Apostles, which was written by the same author who wrote the Gospel of Lk., maintains complete silence (Acts ix. 19–26). The author who left out this journey of Paul to Arabia might well pass over also, in his other account, the journey of the Holy Family into Egypt. But the statement of Mt. does not in any way allow of comparison with a statement of the Epistle to the Galatians. Paul narrates things of which he has had personal experience; for the story about the Lord's childhood, the Gospel of Mt. seems to have drawn principally upon certain indications in the Old Testament (Mt. i. 23, ii. 6, 15, 18, 23).

Further, in Jn. vii. 42 it is expressly emphasised, that the Messiah was to spring from Bethlehem, the place where David was, and that consequently he could not come out of Galilee. And the Evangelist who records this objection does not in any part of his work indicate by so much as a single word that Jesus actually was born in Bethlehem. Yet the Johannine Gospel knew our three Synoptic Gospels, and makes use of them repeatedly, so that his silence on this point in no way means ignorance, but deliberate rejection of the tradition given by Mt. and Lk. In other words, the Fourth Gospel sets aside the story of the virgin-birth; it sets aside equally the story of the birth in Bethlehem.

DATE. HEROD I.—Mt. and Lk. both agree (Mt. ii. 1, Lk. i. 5, and cp. 26) in stating that Jesus was born in the days of King Herod; the king who is meant is certainly Herod I., the founder of the Idumæan dynasty (40 or 37 B.C.–4 B.C.).

CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS.—This, however, is very hard to reconcile with Lk.'s further statement, that Jesus was born at the time when the first fiscal census commanded by the Emperor Augustus was being carried out under Quirinius, the governor of Syria (Lk. ii. 1–7). For so long as "King" Herod was on the throne, the imperial governor of Syria had no direct administrative functions within the territory of that sovereign.[1] Josephus gives a full account of a census by a Syrian governor of the name of Quirinius which violently

[1] Schürer, *Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i. (1890), pp. 260–262, assumes indeed that P. Sulpicius Quirinius did hold a governorship in Syria before 6 A.D.; but he also supposes as the date 3–2 B.C.—that is to say, after the death of Herod I., which took place in 4 B.C.

agitated the whole Jewish people—the reason it stirred them so deeply being that it was the first act of its kind. But this census did not touch Galilee; it only affected Judæa and Samaria, the territory which on the death of Herod I. fell to his son Archelaus, and it did not take place until after the deposition of Archelaus (4 B.C.–6 A.D.). The reason for making it was that the territory of this prince was now apportioned to the province of Syria; and the procedure followed was in accordance with the settled forms of the Roman administration, which by no means required that every man who was to be taxed should go on a pilgrimage to the original dwelling-place of his family—not even should he happen to be living outside the territory apportioned to the province (Jos., *B. J.*, ii. 433, vii. 253; and *Ant.*, xviii. 1–10, xx. 102). In the first two and in the last of the four passages cited, Josephus is referring to the census under Quirinius, and it is perfectly clear that he means by it the one which was made after the deposition of Archelaus (6 A.D.); in *B. J.* (ii. 118) he reports the census, though without mentioning Quirinius. Thus it is perfectly plain that during the governorship of Quirinius this was the only assessment made. The Acts of the Apostles, also, speaks (v. 37) simply of what took place in the days of the census (*ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς*). Thus Lk. also knows of only this one occurrence of the kind, an occurrence which bit so deeply into the Jewish consciousness because it proclaimed for the first time, quite without disguise, the subjection of the Jews to the heathen sovereign. The insurrection which accompanied it is regarded by Josephus himself as the prelude to the Jews' last great struggle for freedom (*Ant.*, xviii. 4–10). There exists, therefore, no possible escape from this difficulty—if Jesus was born in the time of Herod I. (Mt. ii. 1, Lk. i. 5), then the statement that he was born at the time of the census of Quirinius (Lk. ii. 1–7) is erroneous, since this did not take place until after Herod's successor, having reigned ten years, had been deposed (Jos., *Ant.*, xvii. 342–344, 355).[1]

[1] Lk.'s purpose in introducing the census of Quirinius is, of course, perfectly plain. He knew that Jesus' parents belonged to Nazareth, and he is seeking for some reason which might occasion their making the journey to Bethlehem. But, in point of fact, he could use it for this

THE AGE OF JESUS.—Lk. gives yet another datum by which to fix the time of Jesus' birth: in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, that is to say, in 28 A.D.,[1] Jesus was some thirty years old (Lk. iii. 1 f., 23). Now as Herod I. died in 4 B.C., and the census of Quirinius certainly was not made until 6 A.D., this last indication of the date of Jesus' birth fits in neither with the one statement nor with the other, unless, indeed, in Lk. iii. 23 we are content to put an exaggerated value upon the qualifying word which comes before "thirty" (ὡσεὶ = "about"). And here again the Synoptic statement is opposed by a Johannine. In Jn. viii. 57 the Jews say to Jesus, "Thou art not yet fifty years old." True, fifty is a round number. Yet, if Jesus had been at the time of his public appearance not much over thirty, it would have been strange had they said to him, "Thou art not yet forty years old," but scarcely conceivable that they should have reminded him that he had not yet seen fifty years. Irenæus also describes (ii. 22, 5) it as a Johannine tradition, that Jesus continued his public ministry to a still more advanced age: "a quadragesimo autem et quinquagesimo anno declinat iam in ætatem seniorem, quam habens dominus noster docebat, sicut evangelium et omnes seniores testantur, qui in Asia apud Johannem discipulum domini convenerunt, id ipsum tradidisse eis Joannem." So we may fix upon the year 29 as that in which Jesus was put to death; for this is the result we get if (according to Lk. iii. 1 f.) he was baptised by John in the year 28, and yet (according to Mt. ii. 1, Lk. i. 5) was born in the time of Herod I.

NATIVITY—NARRATIVES.—If Jesus was not born in Bethlehem, there is of course an end to all the beautiful stories with which the birth of the Saviour of the World has been adorned by Christian imagination—such as the angel's announcement to the shepherds, the song of praise of the heavenly hosts, the greeting by Simeon and Anna, those two Israelites who were waiting for the redemption (Lk. ii. 8–39), also the adoration by the Magi from the east, who saw the star of the new-born king and followed it, together with the

purpose only because he associated with it an entirely false conception as to the course of Roman procedure on such occasions.

[1] See Chap. V., "Synchronistic Dates," pp. 109–111.

massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem and the flight into Egypt (Mt. ii. 1–23). To discuss the possibility or impossibility of these several incidents would betray a want of taste, of which we do not wish to be guilty.[1] One thing, however, is indubitably certain. All these open manifestations of joy at the birth of the Messiah would have betrayed to the world prematurely the secret which Jesus, at the time of Peter's confession, declares had never yet been uttered by human lips, and which even at that comparatively late period he still does not allow even his own disciples to mention to anyone (Mt. xvi. 17, 20, Mk. viii. 29 f.).

THE LITERAL FACTS.—Jesus, then, was born at Nazareth in Galilee, the son of Joseph and Mary, being the eldest of a family of five brothers and several sisters, and there he grew up. His birth took place (let us say) some time in the last decade (14–4 B.C.) of the reign of Herod I. When Jesus began his public ministry his father Joseph was, we may take it, already dead; this, at least, is the simplest way to explain the fact that Joseph is mentioned neither in the account of the journey to the Baptist, nor of that to Capernaum when Jesus' relatives purposed to fetch him back, nor on the occasion of Jesus' preaching in Nazareth,[2] when his mother and brethren are spoken of. Mt.'s transformation (xiii. 55) of the Nazarenes' question, "Is not this the carpenter (Mk. vi. 3)"? into "Is not this the carpenter's son?" possesses no historical value. It is an alteration which was obviously made because Mt. will not hear of a handicraft in connection with Jesus; he looks upon any occupation of the kind as unworthy of the Messiah. As a matter of fact, however, the keen eye for what is great as well as for what is small, which everywhere imparts

[1] The charm of these Nativity stories does not depend upon their historical truth, but upon their inner meaning; they express the joy of the divine world at the redemption of mankind; the longing for a Redeemer; the homage paid by the great ones of the earth to the man of poverty who first makes them all truly rich; and God's protection vouchsafed to the Holy One whom the world seeks to destroy. Since all these ideas are true, and remain true, we need not pronounce the Nativity stories untrue, even though they are at the same time historically incorrect.

[2] The Gospel of the Hebrews, in Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 76, to Mt. iii. 13, Mk. iii. 21, 32, Mk. vi. 3.

to Jesus' utterances their vivid freshness and truthfulness to life, was both acquired and brought to its fulness in the narrow circle in which he grew up and in which he originally pursued his earthly calling.[1]

NAZARETH.—Nazareth, or Nazara (this form is found only in Mt. iv. 13, Lk. iv. 16), was a small place in Galilee, which is mentioned neither in the Old Testament nor in late Jewish literature. The Fourth Gospel (Jn. i. 46) makes the Nathanael who figures in his story give expression to a sentiment common to many people: "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" The situation of the village is known with absolute certainty: there stands on the spot at the present day the pleasant little town of *En-Nasira*, a place of 6500 inhabitants. It is entirely surrounded by hills, and possesses an abundance of fig-trees and olive-trees.[2] At the highest point to the north-west of the district, towers the hill Jebel es-Sîh, commanding a view as far as Hermon on the north, to Mt. Carmel and the Bay of Acco or Akka on the west, and to the mountains on the other side of the Lake of Gennesareth on the east. The many gardens of the place, enclosed within cactus hedges, are dependent upon but one well, the Pool of Mary, at the east end of the town. The older Nazareth was doubtless smaller than the existing town; this conclusion cannot be altered by the fact that in the New Testament it is regularly described as πόλις, not as κώμη (Mt. ii. 23, Lk. i. 26, ii. 4, 39, iv. 29). The nearest town of any size was Sepphoris (*Saffûriyeh*), which can be seen towards the north from Jebel es-Sîh. An hour and a quarter's walking from the Pool of Mary eastwards brings one to the foot of Mt. Tabor; then, after a climb up its sides, which abound in trees and in game, the exposed summit is reached, whence is obtained an extensive view over the north of Palestine. Tabor rises 1845 feet above the Mediterranean. In the time of Jesus there would appear

[1] We are entirely ignorant as to what handicraft Joseph pursued; for the τέκτων, according to our oldest Source (Mk. vi. 3), is Jesus himself.

[2] According to Lk. iv. 29, the old Nazareth must, of course, have been situated on the high ground (τὸ ὄρος ἐφ' οὗ ἡ πόλις ᾠκοδόμητο αὐτῶν). But it is very questionable whether the writer had before his mind a living picture of the situation. Nevertheless, if the older Nazareth stood on the hill which stretches up from the Well of Mary to the Jebel es-Sîh, the expression in Lk. is justifiable.

to have been a little hamlet on the top; at least Josephus (*B. J.*, iv. 56, 61) alludes to the inhabitants of the mountain, who had only rain-water at their disposal.

THE SYNAGOGUE.—According to Mk. vi. 2, there was a synagogue in Nazareth. When Jesus came forward and began to teach in it on the Sabbath day, the multitude were amazed, and asked one another in astonishment whence he derived his wisdom. It is clear that it is to the peculiar purport of Jesus' preaching that reference is principally made; at the same time this also would obviously be a reason for their astonishment—the fact, we mean, that he comes forward at all to teach. It was unusual, if not forbidden, for a layman to preach; though the Jews were accustomed to hear the Scribes preach, and there would not have been wanting men of this class in Nazareth, as in other places.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCRIPTURES.—In any case, it would seem that Jesus had read the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament for himself; thus it was that he could ask his adversaries whether they had never read this or the other passage (Mk. ii. 25, xii. 10, 26; to which we may also add Mt. xii. 5, xix. 4, xxi. 16, and Lk. x. 26).[1] The study of the Holy Writings was, we cannot doubt, familiar to him even before his public appearance; and from the way in which he apprehended the Old Testament and from the application he makes of it in his discourses, we are able to form a clear idea of his peculiar cast of thought.

THE BIBLICAL HISTORY.—Jesus is acquainted with the Biblical history. The frivolity of the contemporaries of Noah, and of the inhabitants of Sodom, who calmly pursued their usual mode of life until the judgment of God broke upon them, might serve as a warning to Jesus' contemporaries, who were going forward to meet the judgment of the Messiah with equal levity of mind (Mt. xxiv. 37–39 = Lk. xvii. 26–30).[2] Jesus' pleasure in the beauty of the lilies, which blossom quickly in the spring, after the rainy season, but are soon scorched up by the heat of summer, finds expression in the saying that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one

[1] For the education of the Jews of Palestine, see pp. 98 f.

[2] The allusion to Lot's wife (Lk. xvii. 32), if it really was made by Jesus, is a warning to a convert against relapsing into an impenitent life.

of them (Mt. vi. 28 f. = Lk. xii. 27). And to Jesus the Biblical history is a guide for his whole conduct of life. When he is blamed for allowing his disciples to break the Sabbath, he replies, that David also transgressed the law, when in the Temple at Nob he took the shewbread for himself and his companions (Mk. ii. 25 f.).[1] Here the Old Testament narrative teaches Jesus freedom from the tyranny of the law. When he is obliged to flee into heathen territory, he finds consolation in the thought that Elijah also was sent to the Phœnician widow at Sarepta, notwithstanding that there were at the same time many poor widows in Israel; and that in the time of Elisha, although there were many lepers in Israel, none of them was healed, but only Naaman the Syrian (Lk. iv. 25–27). And when Jesus was asked for a sign of his mission, he declared that at the preaching of Jonah the inhabitants of Nineveh had repented without any special sign being vouchsafed unto them; also, the Queen of Sheba travelled out of a distant country, merely to hear the wisdom of Solomon. Let the generation which heard him, then, also be satisfied with his exhortation to repentance and his words of wisdom.[2] This is a manner of viewing the Biblical history which was suggested entirely by an independent exercise of judgment.

IMITATION.—In critical moments of his life, Jesus' recollection of the Old Testament influences him decisively. When, at the cleansing of the Temple, he proclaims the impending destruction of that house of God built by human hands, and in this announcement foresees also his own death, he is thinking of the prophet Jeremiah's appearing in the forecourt of the Temple, and announcing the destruction of God's house which had been profaned and made into a den of robbers,

[1] But, as a matter of fact, the officiating high-priest at Nob was not Abiathar, but his father Ahimelech, and David had no companions at all with him (1 S. xxi. 1–9). See Chap. II., p. 24 f., and for a full discussion, Chap. IX.

[2] The reference to Jonah's stay in the belly of the whale, which is inserted at Mt. xii. 40, is absent from Lk. xi. 29–32, and forms no part of the original substance of Jesus' discourse, as is proved by the concluding verses about the men of Nineveh and the Queen of the South. These instances are intended to show that the call to repentance and the words of wisdom can suffice apart from any sign.

whereupon in consequence he was judged worthy of death (Mk. xi. 17, xiv. 58—Jer. vii., xxvi.).[1] And when, on the following day, Jesus seeks to convey to the emissaries of the Synedrium, that they are indeed completing in his person the work they began in the killing of the prophets, but that God will on that account reject them and turn himself from them, he clothes his thoughts in Isaiah's figurative language about the vineyard, for which its owner did all that man could do, yet without avail, and which was then condemned to lie waste and stony, because, in spite of his efforts, it brought forth no good fruit (Mk. xii. 1–9—Is. v. 1–7). That is to say, when Jesus seeks for language in which to proclaim to the false guides of his people the doom of their rejection, he uses the most awful threat contained in the Old Testament—words in which no prospect whatever is held out of a future deliverance.

Biblical Language.—Thus Jesus lives in the Old Testament; this is also shown by the readiness with which he clothes his own experiences in Old Testament language. He observes, for instance, that many of the people listen readily to his parables, and find pleasure in having such stories told them, yet are unwilling to penetrate to their deeper meaning. In this he feels that he is experiencing exactly what Isaiah was destined to experience after the vision in which he received his call: they shall see with their eyes and shall not perceive, and shall hear with their ears and shall not understand (Mk. iv. 12, Is. vi. 9 f.). When it is brought against him as a sin, that his disciples do not wash their hands, whilst at the same time his own demand for a fundamental change of life is unheeded, he emphasises the exact parallel between what is happening now and what is described in Isaiah (xxix. 13), where we read that the people of Israel honour God indeed

[1] The saying about "a den of robbers" is expressly taken by Jesus from the Old Testament. That it was the destruction of the Temple that he had in view cannot be doubted (with Mk. xiv. 58 cp. xv. 29 f., and for the situation, Jn. ii. 19). That he believed his own death to be imminent is proved by the parable of the wicked vine-dressers, which was spoken with reference to this event (Mk. xii. 1–12). The conclusion is therefore inevitable that Jesus at that time was comparing his own fate with that of Jeremiah, especially as he, too, like the prophet, spoke in the forecourt of the Temple.

with their lips and in observances of their own devising, but in their hearts remain far from him (Mk. vii. 6 f.). And all through the lamentation over Capernaum (Mt. xi. 23 = Lk. x. 15), we clearly hear the echo of the words in Isaiah (xiv. 13–15). Even while he hangs on the cross, his prayer is couched in the opening words (*v.* 2) of the twenty-second Psalm (Mk. xv. 34).[1]

STUDY OF THE BIBLE.—Such use of the Bible presupposes zealous study of it. And it can be shown that at three points in his life the mind of Jesus was for some considerable time occupied with a particular text. According to the fragments of the Gospel of the Hebrews,[2] the story of the Temptation (Mt. iv. 1–11, Lk. iv. 1–13) was originally so arranged that the temptation on the mountain occupied the first place in the series, the temptation in Jerusalem the second, and the temptation in the wilderness the third. Internal evidence also is in favour of this being the original order of the series.[3] The words with which Jesus repels the tempter on the high mountain are the words of Dt. vi. 13 f.; in Jerusalem the words of Dt. vi. 16; and the temptation in the wilderness, as well as the manner of its rejection, are plainly modelled on Dt. viii. 2 f. It is clear, then, that after the revelation granted to him at his baptism, Jesus' mind was for some considerable time occupied with this portion of the Old Testament law, and that from it he adopted the rule to be followed in his subsequent conduct. After what we have just said, it cannot be in any way surprising that even the Temptation should have clothed itself for him in words of the Bible (Ps. xci. 11 f.).

The song which the pilgrims used to sing (Ps. cxviii. 25 f.) when entering Jerusalem is also used at Jesus' own entry into the city (Mk. xi. 9 f.). And two days later, after he has spoken to the emissaries of the Synedrium the parable of the wicked vine-dressers, he asks them whether they have never read the words preceding the salutation by the pilgrims, about the

[1] From this also it appears that the Biblical text with which Jesus was familiar was not the original Hebrew, but an Aramaic version. This, however, is by no means decisive as to the question whether he understood the original Hebrew text itself or not.

[2] Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77, to Mt. iv. 1, 8, and iv. 5.

[3] For further details, see Chap. VI., pp. 140, 145 f.

stone which the builders rejected, but which was afterwards set up as the head stone at the corner (Mk. xii. 10 f. = Ps. cxviii. 22 f.). The text was calculated to make a peculiar impression upon one who had once been a working builder.

Once more, on the last day of his public ministry Jesus, in the court of the Temple, discusses the question of the Messiah's descent from David, and denies it on the ground that David in Ps. cx. 1 calls the Messiah his Lord (Mk. xii. 35–37). On the following night Jesus stands as a prisoner before the Council and confesses that he does believe himself to be the Messiah. Then he cries aloud, that they shall see him sitting on the right hand of the Almighty—obviously thinking of a saying in the same Psalm (cx. 1): "The Lord hath said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand" (Mk. xiv. 62).

Biblical Quotation.—The argument adopted against the Davidic descent of the Messiah (Mk. xii. 35–37)—by quoting Ps. cx. 1—is entirely in the manner of the Scribes. Its force depends not only upon the presupposition, that Ps. cx. was composed by David, and upon the further assumption that he whom God is addressing is the Messiah, but also upon yet a third presupposition, namely, that David had a perfectly correct conception of his relation to the Messiah. Even with regard to the first two presuppositions it may still be asked, whether, precisely because of the incomparable importance of this descendant, a different estimate of the relative dignities of David the ancestor, and of the Messiah who was to spring from him, might not be allowed—different from that which is usually denoted by "father" and "son." But the Scribes always assumed the infallibility of the Biblical text and of the tradition which preserved each word of Scripture; and Jesus obtains what is for him an important proof by using the methods of his age. And the procedure is similar when Jesus cites Ex. iii. 2, 6 as a proof of the resurrection of the dead (Mk. xii. 26 f.). God there describes himself to Moses as the God of the patriarchs who at the time of speaking had long been dead. The infallible accuracy of the Biblical narrative is assumed. Then, upon purely religious grounds, this conclusion is drawn: Thus we see, then, that God did not forsake the patriarchs even in death; to him

they are not dead, for he still preserves his faithfulness towards them.[1] And this belief in the infallibility of the Old Testament Scripture Jesus shares with the Scribes of his own time.

THE LAW.—All this might strike some people as very strange, because when confronted with the Old Testament Law, Jesus preserves complete independence of judgment. We have already shown how in defence of this independence (Mk. ii. 25) he appeals to the precedent of King David. And although in Mk. vii. 10 he emphasises the inviolable sanctity of the law which enjoins honour to parents, he straightway proceeds to declare all the Mosaic precepts about cleanness and uncleanness to be null and void (Mk. vii. 14 f.). In consideration of the sinfulness of men, the divorce which Moses permitted (Dt. xxiv. 1) was with good reason decreed by the civil legislator, but, according to Gen. i. 27, ii. 24, the ordinance of God at the Creation was otherwise. Here too, then, a distinction is drawn as to the value of particular enactments in the law.[2] The contrasts drawn between the old law and the new in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 21–48) need not be quoted in this connection; they are plainly only elaborations of sayings of the Lord which were uttered in another connection. On the other hand, it is decisive for Jesus' opinion of the individual precepts of the Law, that on a level with the commandment to love God, which was recognised even by Judaism as the highest command, he places the little regarded commandment of love to one's neighbour (Mk. xii. 29–31). In doing so, he relegates the purely ceremonial laws of worship to a subordinate position, a valuation the truth of which is at once perceived by the Scribe who was questioning him (Mk. xii. 32 f.). So also, in his conversation with the rich man who desires to follow him, Jesus understands amongst the precepts which must be fulfilled the commandments relating to one's fellow-men (Mk. x. 19).[3]

[1] See Chap. XIII., "The Question of the Sadducees"—"The son of David."

[2] Mk. x. 1–12. Chap. XII., "Divorce."

[3] In this enumeration of the commandments, Jesus clearly follows the division of the Decalogue into two tables, to which Philo also (*De Decem Oraculis*, 12) bears witness. First he names the second πεντάς, and then proceeds to add to it the last commandment of the first table—the only one in that half which emphasises a duty towards our fellow-men.

THE PROMISES.—As regards the *legal precepts* of the Old Testament, therefore, Jesus does not go on the principle that all the words of Scripture are of equal value; on the other hand, in the case of the *promises* of the Old Testament, he expressly held fast to the literal fulfilment of every one of them. The saying recorded in Mt. v. 18, Lk. xvi. 17, "Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, there shall not pass from the law one jot or one tittle until all be fulfilled," at all events, was originally spoken in this connection. The concluding words of the quotation prove that the sentence refers, not to requirements of the Law, but to its promises. The requirements of the Law have to be fulfilled not once only, but again and again; they are therefore by no means abrogated when they have been fulfilled once. On the contrary, in the case of a promise the goal is reached as soon as the promise is once fulfilled. And that is the only sense in which we can reconcile the saying in question with Jesus' attitude of mind towards the precepts of the Law, and his freedom with regard to them.[1] The explanation might perhaps be found in some definite experience in the life of Jesus. Through the firm conviction that he himself is the Messiah, he believes that he has found the key to apparent contradictions in the promise. Thus, according to the promise in Dan. vii. 13, the Messiah is to appear on the clouds of heaven visible to all the world, and yet again, according to Zech. ix. 9, he is to enter into Jerusalem as the king of peace. This latter promise (Mk. xi. 1–10) Jesus fulfils, manifestly with deliberate intention, as a holy commission imposed upon him by God[2]; the fulfilment of the other promise, his appearance on the clouds of heaven (Mk. xiv. 62), he expects to be effected by God after his death. Again, the Messiah is indeed at the last to bring peace upon earth; but the picture of deadly enmity between the members of the same family-circle as given in Mic. vii. 6 was conceived as pourtraying

[1] That the saying quoted must bear a different meaning, when taken in the context of the Sermon on the Mount in the gospel of Mt., is evident; still, that does not alter the fact, that its original meaning in the mouth of Jesus was not the same as that which the Evangelist here gives it.

[2] The command which he has in his mind is taken from the passage in Isaiah (lxii. 11).

the evil times which should precede the dawn of the Messianic epoch. Jesus finds that, in the first instance and in the immediate future, it falls to him to bring a sword upon earth, and dissension amongst men (Mt. x. 34–36 = Lk. xii. 51–53). Along with these, he sees other promises also being fulfilled before his eyes. For example, the Baptist is the promised messenger of God, the Elijah who was to come again, and who before the great judgment was to prepare men's hearts for the Lord (Mt. xi. 10, 14, Lk. vii. 27, Mk. ix. 12 f. = Mal. iii. 1, 23). For Jesus himself the real significance of the institution of the Supper also lies in this, that he regards his approaching death as the bloody consecration (Mk. xiv. 24, 1 Cor. xi. 25) of the new covenant promised in Jer. xxxi. 31–34. Thus he understands even his own death too to be the fulfilment of an Old Testament promise.

First Study of Scripture.—An artisan possessed of so exact a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures must obviously have begun his acquaintance with them at quite an early age. As a matter of fact, Philo, the Jew of Alexandria, a contemporary of Jesus, tells us (*Leg. ad Gaium*, 31) that his people were instructed in the Law from the tenderest years of childhood; and Josephus, also, says (*Contra Apion.*, ii. 178), that as soon as the young Jew was able to apprehend at all, he learnt the laws, and was able to repeat them more easily than he could his own name. This might perhaps be taken as pointing merely to the oral repetition of sayings and narratives first recited by the teacher; only, against this we have the express statement of Josephus (*Contra Apion.*, ii. 204), that Moses commanded that the children should be brought up in the knowledge of those Scriptures which relate to the laws (*γράμματα παιδεύειν ἐκέλευσεν τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους*, if we accept Niese's conjecture). We find, moreover, in the Mishnah the presupposition that the minister of the synagogue may still superintend, even after the Sabbath has begun, the children's reading without reading with them himself; so that he would appear to have directed the first steps of their education (*Shabbath*, i. 3)[1]

[1] It is true that the Jews, according to Jn. vii. 15, speak of Jesus in a tone of wonder: *Πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς.* If we are to find any evidence of a historical reminiscence here, the only meaning we can attach to the saying is that Jesus had not been trained to be a *γραμματεύς*

We must of course distinguish between the mere existence of the opportunity of learning to read and write and the general use of the opportunity. For the time of Jesus the latter cannot yet be assumed; the former was certainly already present. Jesus doubtless knew also how to make calculations on paper; this he presupposes as a requisite to the pursuit of the builder's calling. In this way we may interpret Lk. xiv. 28.[1]

THE BOY OF TWELVE.—Of the events of Jesus' youth, one only has been recorded, and that by Lk. alone (ii. 41–51); the historicity of the fact as a whole at least is not to be doubted. Every year his parents went up to Jerusalem to the feast of the Passover; as a matter of fact, it was not possible for the pious Galilean to fulfil the precept of the Law strictly to the letter, for the law required him to appear before the Lord three times in the year (Ex. xxiii. 17; Dt. xvi. 16). On one of these occasions, Jesus, being then twelve years of age, when it is time to return home, remains behind in Jerusalem without the knowledge of his parents; we are not told that this was the first time he accompanied them. When his parents seek for him, they find him at length, after three days, in the Temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors of the law, listening to them and asking them questions in return. That he should be so occupied at this early age is easily intelligible. It is what perhaps any country boy, who was of a specially religious turn of mind, would naturally do as soon as he found an opportunity—in the holy city and in the holy place, seek to gain from the men of chief repute in the nation information upon important questions concerning the faith; how much more then is it natural in the case of Jesus, the pioneer of a new kind of piety which was destined to surpass all others. Nor is there anything to be astonished at in the answer which the boy gives to his mother, when she finds fault with him, saying that they have sought him sorrowing—"Knew ye not, that I must be about my Father's business?" The use of the word "Father" to indicate God was already

by any famous teacher; for of course he could read and write. Compare what is said in Acts iv. 13 about Peter and John: *ἀγράμματοί εἰσιν καὶ ἰδιῶται.*

[1] *Καθίσας ψηφίζει* ('sit down and count the cost'). Still, we may also suppose a sort of abacus, or method of calculating by means of movable pebbles, to be meant.

customary at that time in Israel (*e.g.*, *Pirkê Ābōth*, v. 20); it was readily employed owing to the reluctance which existed to use the term "God." The boy is alluding therefore to his predilection for religious questions—a predilection which must have been well known to his parents, and for this reason they might, he thinks, have come at once to God's house to look for him. In this story the growing boy Jesus is presented to us in a character quite consistent with his future activity; and the astonishment of all who heard him at the intelligence of his answers is also in harmony with this.[1]

His Handicraft, etc.—But there was another school, besides that of the Holy Scriptures, which produced its effect upon Jesus—namely, that in which he was trained for his trade. This trade is described in Mk. vi. 3 by the word τέκτων. Ever since the time of Homer the word has meant for the most part a carpenter, but often also a master-builder (for instance, in *Iliad*, vi. 315). A decisive light is, however, cast upon the meaning to be attached to the words in Mk. vi. 3 by the use in two eminently important crises of Jesus' life—namely, immediately after Peter's confession and when he purified the Temple—of a metaphor derived from the experiences of his former occupation. In the one case, he speaks of building upon a rock; in the other, of pulling down God's house and building it up again. In such cases it is not the carpenter who speaks, but, in a more general sense, the working builder (Mt. xvi. 18, Mk. xiv. 58, xv. 29—Jn. ii. 19). In a place like Nazareth it cannot be supposed that the principle of the division of labour into different handicrafts was carried out to any great extent. The erection and repair of the small houses of such a place was quite within the province, we may be sure, of Jesus' trade.[2]

[1] There is nothing at all in common between the perfect simplicity of Lk.'s narrative and the vain self-glorification of Josephus, who (in his *Vita*, 9) asserts that, when he was only fourteen, the high priests and leading men of the city always used to go and consult him when they wanted exact information about the law. Lk.'s description is of an extremely intelligent boy, consumed by a thirst for knowledge, but by no means a prodigy in the conventional sense of the word.

[2] Some writers, we know, have been disposed to attribute very different functions to the τέκτων. According to the *Evang. Thomae*, 13, and Justin, *Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 88, Jesus in his capacity of τέκτων made yokes

He is acquainted with the difficulties incident to his calling. He knows that a house will have to be placed upon firm ground, if it is not to be washed away in the season when the rains come (Mt. vii. 24–27 = Lk. vi. 48 f.); he knows that, before undertaking a building enterprise of any magnitude, the builder must first carefully reckon up the cost; and he regards it as a sore disgrace that people should be able to say of a builder, that he came to the end of his resources before he had finished his work (Lk. xiv. 28–30). The most we have by way of allusion to the work of a carpenter is the saying about the beam and the mote (Mt. vii. 3–5 = Lk. vi. 41 f.). On the other hand, Jesus also quotes from the Old Testament the saying about the builders who reject a stone which nevertheless is afterwards put to a very useful purpose (Ps. cxviii. 22 f.—Mk. xii. 10); and we are further told that, during his last visit to Jerusalem, he observed with the eye of an expert the solid structure of the Temple (Mk. xiii. 1 f.). It is possible that a metaphor founded upon Jesus' handicraft and drawn from his own vocabulary passed over into the language of the early Christians, and thence into that of Paul also; this would explain such phrases as "edify" (οἰκοδομεῖν) and "edification" (οἰκοδομή). (Cp. 1 Thess. v. 11; 1 Cor. viii. 1, 10, x. 23, xiv. 4, 17—1 Cor. xiv. 3, 5, 12, 26; 2 Cor. x. 8, xii. 19, xiii. 10; Rom. xiv. 19, xv. 2.)

The simple calling of a manual worker directed the attention of Jesus very forcibly to the things of earth, and his apprehension and grasp of the things of the external world around him was very rich and full. Although his native town of Nazareth lies hidden amidst the hill-country, the town which stands upon a hill cannot be hidden—obviously a reference to the houses on Mount Tabor[1] (Mt. v. 14). With the drudgery

(for oxen) and ploughs (see Chap. II., p. 18). But it is precisely in the face of statements like these that the striking metaphors used by Jesus in the two important moments of his life, alluded to above, are so decisive. Just as he makes the fishermen of the Lake of Gennesareth into fishers of men (Mk. i. 17), so also does he teach his disciples how to find the right foundation upon which to build a house, and himself both builds upon the rock, and does not shrink from building a new temple on the site of the one which has been desecrated. Metaphorical language like this shows Jesus to have been a working builder.

[1] See pp. 90 f.

and toil of human labour Jesus contrasts the toilless life of nature, in which God feeds the ravens and clothes the lilies (Mt. vi. 26–29 = Lk. xii. 24–27). He is pained by the thought that man often has no roof under which to lay his head, while the fox can find a hole, and the bird a nest, everywhere (Mt. viii. 20 = Lk. ix. 58). And yet, one can buy two sparrows for a farthing, or even five for two farthings (Mt. x. 29, Lk. xii. 6). The mother-bird, who spreads her wings over her young, supplies Jesus with a figure of faithful devotion (Mt. xxiii. 37 = Lk. xiii. 34). The horse is nowhere mentioned in Jesus' discourses; the ox, the sheep, and the ass are the domestic animals with which an Israelite household is provided (Mt. xii. 11 f., xviii. 12 f.; Lk. xiii. 15, xiv. 5, 19, xv. 4–6). Dogs[1] and swine are coupled together as unclean animals (Mt. vii. 6); the fact that swine were kept in Palestine at all is evidence that there were foreigners settled in the country. The camel is twice mentioned as being the largest of the animals (Mk. x. 25, Mt. xxiii. 24); it is an animal which cannot be put through the eye of a needle, and which a man should take care not to swallow, seeing that he does carefully remove a fly from his drinking-cup.[2]

We may well suppose that the artisan family at Nazareth possessed a piece of cultivated land and a garden. According to the tradition, Jesus found food for reflection in the size of the bush which grows up out of the tiny mustard seed (Mk. iv. 30–32)[3]; in the loss of much seed which occurs at the time of sowing it, while that which is not lost still yields thirty—sixty—a hundred-fold (Mk. iv. 1–9); and in the fact that the husbandman scatters his seed in the furrow and then has to wait until it ripens into fruit of itself, so that his labour is essentially different from that of the master-builder (Mk. iv. 26–29). Jesus also reflected upon the impossibility

[1] In the parable of Lazarus also (Lk. xvi. 21), and in the conversation with the Hellenistic Syro-Phœnician woman, the dog figures in Jesus' mind as unclean; the Syro-Phœnician woman, on the other hand, treats it as a domestic animal (Mk. vii. 27 f.).

[2] The crowing of the cock in the morning is a means of fixing time with which Jesus is familiar (Mk. xiii. 35, xiv. 30); according to the first of these passages, the ἀλεκτοροφωνία falls between midnight and daybreak (πρωί). Cocks and hens are nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament

[3] But here the tradition seems to be wrong. Cp. Chap. X.

of uprooting the tares in a corn-field before the harvest (Mt. xiii. 24–30); he is aware that the man who has his hand on the plough ought not to take his eyes off his work (Lk. ix. 62); he knows what strenuous effort a man requires to make when he still tries to obtain fruit from a seemingly barren fig-tree (Lk. xiii. 6–9)[1]; and he is quite familiar with the Palestinian peasant's signs of the weather (Lk. xii. 54 f.). As regards household affairs, he knows the rules for mending clothes: an old and worn-out garment cannot be repaired with perfectly new material, else it will make another rent; for new wine strong new skins are needed, since old skins are apt to burst when the wine ferments (Mk. ii. 21 f.); he knows that salt which has lost its savour is no longer fit for use of any kind (Mt. v. 13, Mk. ix. 50, Lk. xiv. 34 f.).

Popular Life.—He has also an accurate sense of all phases of popular life.[2] He speaks of the children who, having quarrelled over their play in the market-place, sit down face to face and sulk (Mt. xi. 16 f. = Lk. vii. 31 f.). He depicts how a friend, having had a guest arrive late at night, and having nothing to set before him, comes and knocks at a door, and how the father of the family, at the risk of waking up the little ones who are sleeping in the bed with him, is thereupon obliged to get up (Lk. xi. 5–8). He describes how a rich peasant makes plans for enlarging his barns and suddenly dies in the midst of his schemes (Lk. xii. 16–21). He rejoices with the poor woman who calls her neighbours and friends together to tell them how, having lost a tenth part of her money, she has at last succeeded, with the help of candle and broom, in finding that which was lost (Lk. xv. 8–10). And the picture which he draws of the bridal maidens going out with lamps burning to meet the bridegroom who comes from afar, that they may conduct him to the bride in the house where the wedding is to be celebrated, is very evidently taken direct from life (Mt. xxv. 1–13).

And it is likely that some of his experience was gathered

[1] Disease in the fruit points to disease in the tree (Mt. vii. 17 f. = Lk. vi. 43).

[2] What requires to be emphasised is the clearness and vividness of Jesus' apprehension of these, not any special fulness of experience.

on a wider field than Nazareth.[1] Jesus repeatedly speaks of the relations which existed between wealthy people and their slaves. The slaves wait at night with lanterns for their master to return home from the banquet (Lk. xii. 35–38); the master has appointed a chief servant to look after his other servants, both male and female (Mt. xxiv. 45–51); he settles his accounts with his servants, whereupon it is sometimes found that there are inaccuracies in the reckoning (Mt. xviii. 23–34). We are even told of a steward who bought popularity with his lord's debtors by cheating his master (Lk. xvi. 1–9); nor do we seek in vain for a description of a regular slave revolt (Mk. xii. 1–9). It often happens that the employer can hardly find a sufficient number of labourers, and, as there would be some difficulty in calculating the wages of each individual workman, the payment due to one and all is adjudged to be the same (Mt. xx. 1–16).[2] It is especially at the time of harvest that a greater number of labourers than usual is often wanted (Mt. ix. 37, Lk. x. 2). But Jesus is also able to put himself in the place of the household slave who, after working all day long in the field outside, has also to prepare his master's supper in the evening (Lk. xvii. 7–10). It is only from a distance, however, that he knows anything of the luxurious life of the rich, their soft raiment (Mt. xi. 8—Lk. vii. 25) of purple or fine linen (Lk. xvi. 19), their banquets, to which they invite none but people who are wealthy like them-

[1] Here again there is a noticeable hiatus in our knowledge of the life of Jesus. Whenever the wider sphere of his experiences is spoken of, it is customary to think of Jerusalem and of the journeys thither for the festivals prescribed by the law. But within the short period covered by Jesus' public ministry, we know that he also went to Sidon (Mk. vii. 31). Moreover, Acco-Ptolemais, Bethshean-Scythopolis, Tiberias, and Sepphoris, were towns of some importance, and they lay at no great distance from Nazareth. More extensive journeys are not excluded by the mere fact that we are never told anything about them; only let us be very earnestly warned against regarding them in the light of "scientific expeditions." If Jesus had it in mind to learn anything on such occasions, what he would wish to learn would be his handicraft.

[2] We must be on our guard against supposing that this phase of the parable is introduced merely for the sake of the fact to be illustrated. Jesus both learns and teaches simply from the book of life's actual experiences: he does not invent artistic forms to serve as frames for his thoughts.

selves (Lk. xiv. 12–24). He does, however, know of the poor cripples, who often lie at the gates of these rich men, and from whom none keeps away the very dogs (Lk. xvi. 20 f.). In the officers of justice Jesus has but little faith; at all events, litigants will be better advised to come to an agreement rather than bring their case before the judge (Mt. v. 25 f., Lk. xii. 58 f.). Often it is merely the consideration of his own comfort which makes a judge do justice to an annoyingly importunate suitor; apart from that, he neither troubles himself about God nor takes any interest in man (Lk. xviii. 2–5).

Yet Jesus also relates instances of compassion for the distresses of the poor.[1] We are told of a lender who forgave two of his debtors large sums of money which it was beyond their means to pay (Lk. vii. 41 f.). The good Samaritan, having in the first instance bound up the wounds of the half-dead traveller, does not rest content with conveying him to the nearest inn; he also gives him money, and pledges himself to be responsible for any further costs that may be incurred (Lk. x. 33–35). Jesus appreciates the self-sacrificing work of the physician, who must not be deterred from doing his duty even by the fear of infectious disease (Mk. ii. 17). But the business also of the merchant who seeks for pearls (Mt. xiii. 45 f.), the toil of the fishermen who draw their net to land and examine their catch (Mt. xiii. 47 f.), the conduct of the shepherd when one of his sheep has gone astray (Mt. xviii. 12–14, Lk. xv. 4–7) — from all these Jesus is able to draw lessons. He was also profoundly moved by the execution of criminals, whether drowned in the deepest part of the Lake of Galilee, with a heavy stone round their necks, doubtless by command of Herod Antipas (Mt. xviii. 6—Lk. xvii. 2), or whether he saw them—a premonition of his own fate—dragging their cross with them to the place of execution (Mk. viii. 34).

It is relatively but seldom that Jesus speaks of the rulers of

[1] It is not unimportant to call attention to the fact that the acts of kindness here cited were such as he might have observed in the lives of the people about him. Jesus by no means entertains the opinion that before he came there was no love in the world. Nor is that the opinion of the companion of Paul, who, *inter alia*, described the Apostle's journey from Cæsarea to Rome (Acts xxviii. 2).

the earth. He knows, however, that a kingdom divided against itself cannot endure (Mk. iii. 24). As a builder calculates the cost of a new building, so must a king count up the forces he will be able to put in battle array against the forces of the enemy (Lk. xiv. 31 f.). The members of the king's household are free of taxes (Mt. xvii. 25 f.). But Jesus condemns the supreme principle to which, so far as his experience went, the princes and mighty men of the world did homage everywhere in his day—whosoever will be accounted a ruler of the people let him keep them down, and let the great men amongst a people oppress them (Mk. x. 42). In opposition to this egoistic principle, Jesus sets up this new one—that real greatness is shown in serving (Mk. x. 43–45).[1]

His Relations to the Learning of the Scribes.—By his references to all these points in his subsequent discourses, and by his use of them for the purpose of illustrating his ideas, Jesus lets us see also that it was not without some profit that he had listened to the teaching of the Scribes in the synagogue. The business of the Scribes was to regulate the lives of the people of Israel, even to the minutest detail, according to the Law.[2] They determined how many paces a man might walk on the Sabbath day (Acts i. 12). They declared it to be a sin for any man to eat bread with unwashen hands (Mk. vii. 5). They took tithes even of mint, anise, and cummin, that God's command might be kept even to the smallest detail (Mt. xxiii. 23). Thus a man's whole life, with all its experiences and all its duties, was placed at the service of God; and with regard to even the most trivial event, the Jews of that day were wont to consult the will of God. Jesus, notwithstanding what he so emphatically says, that he who is faithful in the smallest things is also faithful in great, and he who is unrighteous in the smallest is unrighteous also in great (Lk. xvi. 10), thrust this legal point of view into the background. But he does, in common with the Scribal scholarship of his age, call attention to small things, and to the bearing of

[1] Only once does Jesus speak in detail of any political event, and then of one belonging to the period of his youth (Lk. xix. 12–27). Compare the last section of Chap. XII.

[2] Their chief aim was exactitude (ἀκρίβεια) in the interpretation and fulfilment of the law (Acts xxii. 3, xxvi. 5).

the things of the world, both great and small, upon the religious life. Only he does not regard every event which happens as a case that requires to be treated or decided according to this or the other prescript of the Law. To him every event that happens is, rather, a lesson from God to men, from which they are able to learn his will. The tares in the corn-field *teach* that evil cannot be rooted out before its time is fully come. The giving of the same wages for different amounts of labour *teaches* that it is quite consistent with God's justice that sinners should be accepted who have repented even at the eleventh hour. These figurative expressions show, then, that Jesus regarded human life in all its rich variety of manifestations as a continual revelation of God. And as Jesus alone understood this revelation, as he alone knew how to interpret the mysterious meaning of the manifold forms of life, so by all who draw the living truth from the full stream of these suggestions he is rightly regarded as the supreme mediator of the revelation of God to man.

CHAPTER V

JOHN THE BAPTIST

SOURCES.—1. *The Synoptics.* Mk. i. 2–8, 14, ii. 18, vi. 17–29, ix. 13, xi. 27–33; Mt. iii. 1–12, iv. 12, ix. 14, xi. 2–19, xiv. 3–12, xvii. 12 f., xxi. 23–27, 32; Lk. i. 5–25, 57–80, iii. 1–20, v. 33, vii. 18–35, ix. 9, xi. 1, xvi. 16, xx. 1–8. The story of John's birth (Lk. i. 5–25, 57–80) is a legend of late Christian times, which Jn. i. 31–34 contradicts. The synchronistic indications of date given in Lk. iii. 1 f. are valuable. The reference to Is. xl. 3, the description of John's success and of his manner of life (=Mt. iii. 1–6, Lk. iii. 3–6) are peculiar to Mk. (i. 2–6). His preaching (Lk. iii. 7–17, abbreviated in Mt. iii. 7–12, Mk. i. 7 f.), as well as the incident of his sending his disciples to Jesus (Mt. xi. 2–19, Lk. vii. 18–35—here also should be compared Mt. xi. 12=Lk. xvi. 16, and Lk. vii. 29 f.=Mt. xxi. 32), are both derived from the "Sayings of the Lord." The passage from Mal. iii. 1, which occurs in the text of Mk. i. 2, comes from Mt. xi. 10=Lk. vii. 27; these two Evangelists did not read it in Mk. The "Sayings of the Lord" have also supplied the allusion to the form of prayer used by the Baptist's disciples (Lk. xi. 1). All other details of the story are again derived from Mk.—such as the fasting of the Baptist's disciples (Mk. ii. 18=Mt. ix. 14, Lk. v. 33), his death (Mk. vi. 17–29=Mt. xiv. 3–12), the calling of him Elias (Mk. ix. 13=Mt. xvii. 12 f.; cp. Lk. i. 17), and the right to baptise (Mk. xi. 27–33=Mt. xxi. 23–27, Lk. xx. 1–8).

2. *The Acts of the Apostles.* i. 5, 22, x. 37, xi. 16, xiii. 24 f., xviii. 25, xix. 3 f. In i. 5, xi. 16, xiii. 25, xix. 4, there are allusions to the Baptist's preaching as given in the "Sayings of the Lord"; also to Mal. iii. 1 in xiii. 24 (Mt. xi. 10, Lk. vii. 27); i. 22 and x. 37 contain references to Mt. xi. 12, Lk. xvi. 16, and the later body of the Baptist's followers is mentioned in xviii. 25, xix. 3 f.

3. *The Gospel of Jn.* i. 6–8, 15, 19–40, iii. 22–36, iv. 1, v. 33–36, x. 40–42. The preaching of the Baptist from the "Sayings of the Lord" as incorporated in the text of Mk. is at the basis of i. 23, 26 f., 31, 33. In iii. 28 there is a reference to Mal. iii. 1. John is sent by God, but is in all respects subordinate to Christ—i. 6–8, 15, 31, iii. 27–36, v. 33–36, x. 40–42. John himself refers his disciples to Jesus (i. 35–39). As a historical Source, this Gospel is to be used with caution; cp. Chap. II., pp. 45 f.

4. *Josephus.*—*Ant.*, xviii. 116–119.

THE FORERUNNER OF JESUS.—Scarcely any great intellectual movement that the world has known has had a simpler and less pretentious beginning than Christianity. The man, with regard to whose name it was written a few decades later, that at the mention of it every knee must bow in Heaven and on the earth and in the regions under the earth (Phil. ii. 10), makes his first appearance as one amongst many who have been roused out of their everyday life and spurred on to earnest self-examination by the appearance of a great religious personality. And so true is this that once at least Jesus himself pointed, not to his own public appearance, but to the public appearance of the Baptist, as marking the great turning-point in the history of religion (Mt. xi. 12 f.—Lk. xvi. 16). After the death of the Baptist and of Jesus, moreover, there existed independently for some length of time a community of the disciples of the former by the side of the Christian community, and its absorption into the latter was only a gradual process (Acts xviii. 25, xix. 3 f.). The transformation of the religious movement which began with the Baptist into the Christian propaganda is one of the points of view from which the author of the Fourth Gospel composed his work.[1]

SYNCHRONISTIC DATES.—Lk. iii. 1 f. gives us a synchronistic date for the beginning of the Baptist's ministry. According to this, "The word of the Lord came to John, the son of Zecharias, in the wilderness," in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius. Now Tiberius began to reign on the 19th August 14 A.D., the day on which Augustus died, so that, strictly speaking, the fifteenth year of his reign would be the

[1] This appears in the opening sections of the Gospel, which tell us that (i. 8) John was not the Light, but witnessed to the Light; John bears witness to the priority of Jesus in point of time (i. 15); John again emphasises (i. 19–28) his own subordinate position with respect to the Messiah, points to Jesus, and even sends his disciples to him (i. 29–37)—we know that, in point of fact, the Baptist did send his disciples to Jesus as to one in whom he recognised the promised Messiah (Mt. xi. 2 f. = Lk. vii. 18 f.). The section Jn. iii. 22–36 also was really designed for the purpose of bringing out the fact that the Baptist's true position was only one of subjection to the Messiah. Emphasis is again laid on the superiority of Jesus to John, whose task only consisted in pointing out Jesus, in v. 33–36, x. 40–42. Here, certainly, we detect the desire to win over the disciples of John to the infant Christian Church; still, this must not be regarded as the chief purpose of the Gospel of Jn.

period from 19th August 28 to 19th August 29 A.D. As, however, the reckoning was always made according to the civil year, the only choice we have lies between 28 and 29. As a matter of fact, the reign of the Emperor was always reckoned in such a way that the year of his accession was counted as his first, in accordance with a usage which originated in Egypt (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, i. 501, etc., ii. (2), 756, etc.). John the Baptist, then, began his ministry in 28 A.D. And with this agrees the ancient Christian tradition that the death of Jesus took place in the consulship of Rubellius Geminus and Rufius Geminus,[1] which fell in the year 29 A.D. Clement of Alexandria also may be taken to mean (*Strom.*, i. 21, 144 f.) that Jesus lived fifteen complete years under Augustus and fifteen complete years under Tiberius. This again points to the year 29 A.D. as being the year of Jesus' death; and in that case, the Baptist's public appearance would be in the year 28 A.D. With this the other synchronistic data of Lk. also agree very well. Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judæa and Samaria during the years 27–37 A.D.: he was recalled shortly before the death of Tiberius (16th March 37), after having served ten years in Judæa (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 89).[2] At the same time Herod (Antipas) ruled over Galilee (and Peræa); he was the successor in these regions of Herod the Great, who died in 4 B.C.,[3] and was deposed by the Emperor Gaius (Caligula) in 39 or 40 A.D.[4] His brother Philip was tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis from 4 B.C. until his death in the twentieth year of Tiberius, that is to say, in 33 A.D., having reigned thirty-seven years (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 106). Lk. iii. 1 names as the third tetrarch, Lysanias of Abilene, whose tetrarchy was given by Caligula, on his accession, to Herod Agrippa I.[5] Lastly, Annas and Caiaphas are named as high-priests—apparently a remarkable indication of ignorance with regard to Jewish custom, which only permitted *one* high priest to rule at a time, but

[1] See Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.*, 8, and Hippolytus, *Commentary on Daniel* xix. 9.

[2] As to Pilate's not having been recalled as early as 36, and having taken a year to travel from Judæa to Rome, see O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 125–127.

[3] Compare the chronology of the birth of Jesus in Chap. IV., pp. 86–88.

[4] Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 238–255, xix. 351; cp. Philo, *In Flacc.*, 5.

[5] Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 237; cp. xix. 275 and xx. 138; *B. J.*, ii. 215, 247.

in reality a proof of accurate knowledge of the circumstances of the time, for Annas, after he was deposed by Valerius Gratus, contrived to secure that each of his five sons should be successively invested with the high priestly dignity during the lifetime of their father (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 26, 34, xx. 198). Joseph Caiaphas was appointed high-priest by the predecessor of Pontius Pilate, and before the latter began his administration, and was deposed after the recall of Pontius Pilate by the Syrian governor Vitellius (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 35, 95). According to Jn. xviii. 13, Caiaphas was a son-in-law of Annas; and both Jn. xviii. 13–24 and Acts iv. 6 presuppose that the two held office together. All these synchronistic data are in mutual agreement.

Further corroboration of the year 28 as that of the public appearance of the Baptist is afforded by the fact that, according to Mk. vi. 22–27, the death of John was brought about at the instance of the daughter of Herodias, who at the birthday feast of Herod Antipas danced before the guests of that potentate. This maiden became at a later date the wife of the tetrarch Philip (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 137). But Philip died as early as 33 A.D. (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 106). Even though we do not attach any importance to the fact that the maiden is described by the diminutive *κοράσιον* in Mk. vi. 22, 28, we would gladly suppose that an interval of some years elapsed between the maiden's dancing and the death of her husband, especially as the Evangelist evidently does not wish to attach any blame to her for the tragic request which he reports.[1] John, therefore, made his public appearance in the year 28 A.D.

PLACE OF HIS MINISTRY.—The Synoptists describe (Mk. i. 4, Mt. iii. 1, xi. 7, Lk. i. 80, iii. 2, vii. 24) the place of John's labours as simply "the wilderness" (*ἔρημος*). For *ἔρημος* it is not necessary to picture to ourselves a sandy desert, for there he would not have found the food upon which the Gospels tell us he lived, namely, locusts and wild honey

[1] On the other hand, we cannot from Josephus' account of the conflict between Antipas and the Nabatæan king Aretas deduce any certain conclusion as to either the date of the conflict itself or the date of the Baptist's execution (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 109–119). See *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 126.

—honey not produced under man's superintendence (Mk. i. 6). Jesus thinks of the wilderness as producing reeds at least (Mt. xi. 7, Lk. vii. 24); John indeed points to the barren stones lying round about him (Mt. iii. 9, Lk. iii. 8). Towards a more accurate indication of the locality we have the further statements, that John baptised in the Jordan, and that the country folk of Judæa and all Jerusalem streamed out to him, as we read in the certainly somewhat exaggerated language of Mk. i. 5. Yet even this is not enough for Mt.; he thinks he is relating a simple and obvious matter of fact when he represents that the inhabitants of all the region of the Jordan also came to John (Mt. iii. 5). This next becomes in Lk. iii. 3 the statement that John travelled about throughout all the regions of the Jordan. Finally, the Fourth Gospel names two places which we cannot now identify, in which John baptised — Bethany beyond Jordan (Jn. i. 28), and Ænon near to Salem in Judæa (iii. 22 f.). According to Mk., he would seem to have made his public appearance in Judæa by the lower Jordan. And there the country towards the Dead Sea, with the exception of the extremely fertile oasis of Jericho, is on the whole barren and infertile, though the banks of the river are overgrown with willows, poplars, and tamarisks.[1] But it would also appear that John preached in the country on the east side of Jordan, since in the end he fell into the hands of Herod Antipas, whose power extended over the southern regions which lay east of that river.[2] Further, from the fact that Antipas had John brought to Machærus (the modern *Mkaur*),

[1] Cp. Baedeker's *Palästina und Syrien*, 3rd ed., p. 172.

[2] The language in which the arrest of John is described does not afford a clear view of the matter—*μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην* (Mk. i. 14). It would be quite a mistake if we were to assume from this that John was handed over to Antipas by Pilate. *παραδίδοσθαι* is a very common expression in New Testament Greek for falling into the power of another person (cp Mk. iii. 19, ix. 31, x. 33, xiii. 9, 11 f., xiv. 10 f., 18, 21, 41 f., 44, xv. 1–10, 15). Mk. vi. 17 does give a somewhat clearer account of the Baptist's arrest: *ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ*—that is to say, John was seized by the servants of Antipas and by command of this prince. But it appears also from Josephus' description (xviii. 119)—*δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμφθείς*—that this did not take place actually at Machærus.

on the east of the Dead Sea, that is to say, to the southernmost stronghold of his kingdom (*Ant.*, xviii. 119, cp. iii.), it seems to follow that John kept himself and his work to the south of Palestine. The account of the Baptist's birth given by Lk. (i. 8 ff., 31, 65) would at all events seem to justify the inference that John was born in Judæa.[1]

THE ASCETIC.—When John withdrew into the wilderness beside the Jordan there can be no doubt that his object was to live as a hermit with God in solitude. The simplicity of his food and clothing is specially emphasised. He wears a garment of camel's hair—a material which, though highly prized in Europe at the present day, was plainly little valued in the age of John; it reminds us of the coarse rough mantle of the Old Testament prophet (Zech. xiii. 4). The leathern girdle, which, like John, the Prophet Elijah also wore (2 K. i. 8), is in contrast with the metal girdles which the ancients specially preferred. His food is locusts and wild honey—honey which has not been made by "domesticated" bees. Later writers, indeed, converted him into a vegetarian, by substituting (Epiph., *Hær.*, 30, 13) cakes of oil and honey (*ἐγκρίδες ἐν μέλιτι*) for the wild locusts (*ἀκρίδες*). Josephus tells us (*Vita*, 11) of a penitent of a precisely similar kind: "I had learned that one of the name of Bannus lived in solitude (*κατὰ τὴν ἐρημίαν διατρίβειν*), clothed himself with the leaves of trees, and ate no food but what was freely

[1] The story of the birth of the Baptist in Lk. i. presupposes an acquaintanceship, and even kinship, between John and Jesus, of which the oldest tradition knows nothing (Lk. i. 36, 39–56; contrast Mt. xi. 3 = Lk. vii. 20; Gospel of the Hebrews in Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, pp. 76 f.; Jn. i. 31, *κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν*). The narrative, however, even in the particulars which relate only to John himself, cannot have been simply taken over from the Baptist's followers, but must have undergone considerable redaction from the Christian point of view. At all events, the designation of the Baptist as the coming Elijah (Lk. i. 17) has its earliest historical place in Mk. ix. 12 f., and the conception of him as the messenger who is to prepare the way of the Lord (Lk. i. 76) is first found in the saying of Jesus in Mt. xi. 10 = Lk. vii. 27. The Psalm of Zacharias (Lk. i. 68–79), as well as that of Mary (i. 46–55), was from the first the property of the Christian Church, not of the Baptist's following. But, in the absence of historical Sources, it is not possible to determine how much of this whole narrative is history and how much is legend due to the free exercise of the poetical imagination.

produced, and often washed himself day and night with cold water for purity's sake (πρὸς ἁγνείαν); then I became a zealous follower (ζηλωτὴς ἐγενόμην αὐτοῦ), and remained with him three years." The resemblance between this man and John is seen both in his practice of ablution and in his power of attracting other people, to remain for some length of time beside him and seek to imitate his devout mode of life.[1]

JOHN'S PERSONAL ATTRACTION.—John's personal attraction, however, was by far the more remarkable. According to Jesus' own words (Lk. vii. 29 = Mt. xxi. 32), all the people flocked to him, and very particularly those who were dissolute and of ill-repute, publicans and harlots. Only, those who were the officially-recognised representatives of Jewish piety, the Pharisees and teachers of the law, refused to notice a man who had no connection with their guild. The source of Herod Antipas' fear was, according to Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii. 118), the extraordinary power which John had over men's hearts. He believed the people would do whatever John counselled them to do; this is explained in the preceding clause: "They rejoiced exceedingly to hear his words." The mind of Jesus also was exercised as to the secret which would explain John's great success, and in explanation he points to three circumstances—John was no reed shaken by the wind, but a man of decided and resolute character; he was not clothed in soft raiment, but was austere towards

[1] A peculiarity of such hermits as these is that any very strict regulation of their form of devotion by definite rules becomes hardly possible. In shunning every mode of life in public, they shunned also the services of the temple and of the synagogue. As they have no large amount of work to do, the sanctity of the Sabbath plays no special part in their life. Commands relating to work and harvest, food and clothing, and regulating social intercourse, have little bearing on a solitary life in the desert. All the more zealously, therefore, were ceremonial ablutions undertaken. Here, perhaps, we have the most remarkable example of the tendency of pious Jews of that time in so many respects to evade the law instead of fulfilling it. From fear of coming short of the law, when living in society, they fled away from social life altogether, that there might be no occasion for fulfilling the law. The various groups of the Essenes (see *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, § 26) held similar views.

himself; and further, more than being a prophet, he was the pioneer of the Messiah (Mt. xi. 7–10 = Lk. vii. 24–27). Thus behind the man's impressive preaching there stood a powerful personality.

JOHN'S PREACHING; EXPECTATION OF THE MESSIAH.—Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii. 117) sums up the purport of John's preaching as consisting in exhortations to virtue (ἀρετή), to righteousness as between man and man, and to piety towards God. Thus there would be nothing new in his scheme except the baptism of those who felt deeply moved by such preaching; and Josephus specially tells us that in this baptism the act was performed, not for the purpose of washing away any particular form of impurity, but as a dedication of the body, after the antecedent purification of the soul by righteousness.[1] In this description, however, we miss precisely the ruling idea which led John to adopt his penitential mode of life in abnegation of the world. What this was we can only gather from the Gospels.[2] In them John speaks to the people who flock to him of the judgment of the wrath to come (Lk. iii. 7, ἡ μέλλουσα ὀργή). He proclaims that the axe is already laid at the root of the tree, and that every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit shall very soon be hewn down and burnt (Lk. iii. 9). After him cometh the Strong One who shall divide men, even as the winnower separates the chaff from the wheat on the threshing-floor (Mt. iii. 11 f. = Lk. iii. 16 f.). And even after he is cast into prison, John continues to look for him who is to come (Mt. xi. 3 = Lk. vii. 20). Thus he lives entirely in the expectation of the coming of the

[1] Ἐφ' ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκκεκαθαρμένης. That is to say, Josephus does not regard the baptism as a symbol of spiritual purification, but as a complement of it. *After* that the soul has been made pure, the body also should be pure.

[2] Here again we have an illustration of Josephus' craze for clothing the religious ideas of Judaism in the language of Greek philosophy. The summary which he gives of the purport of John's preaching makes John appear as a philosophical teacher. The reason why John's preaching about the Messiah, about the judgment, and about the kingdom of God, is omitted was simply that it would have seemed too fantastical to cultured Græco-Roman society. In this way, however, Josephus has drawn a picture of the Baptist that is fundamentally wrong.

Messiah and his judgment.[1] The aim which John set before himself was the same as that which he set before all—to escape from the judgment of the wrath to come. And this it was that had driven him into the wilderness. He did not go there to preach. Had preaching been his object, he would have gone in quest of men; he would have entered into the towns and villages, and not retired into the desert. But he wanted to be alone with his God, he wanted to await the judgment of the Messiah in the attitude of one who was repentant. For John did not primarily look upon himself as being a prophet sent by God.[2]

PREACHING REPENTANCE TO THE CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM.—But if John did not regard himself as a prophet, his admirers soon made him into one. At first, no doubt, they came out of the towns and villages to gaze at him (ἰδεῖν—Mt. xi. 7–10, Lk. vii. 24–27). Thereupon he preached to them of the need of repentance. But they imagined they had already escaped from the judgment of the wrath to come, and did not share John's anxiety.[3] And yet they were a brood of serpents, children of the first tempter. In these circumstances, there was only one way of escape: they must prove their amendment by works of some value. It was a mistaken belief to suppose that all the children of Abraham

[1] It is this fear of the Messianic judgment that is the novel thing in the Baptist's appearance. The Messiah was, as a matter of fact, even before this conceived as judge (*Sibyll.*, iii. 286; Enoch xlv. 3, lv. 4, lxi. 8, lxii. 2, lxix. 27). But, while it is quite true that the passages in the Book of Enoch were already calculated to inspire fear of the coming of the Messiah, it is not less true that before the coming of the Baptist there was no thought of any such fear amongst any considerable section of the Jewish people. And the zeal in fulfilment of the requirements of the law was more a matter of hastening the coming of the kingdom of the Messiah than of the individual's concern lest he might not participate in that kingdom.

[2] This fact, which is a deduction from the Baptist's character, at once conflicts with the conception in the Johannine Gospel, according to which the Baptist regarded his real vocation as having been that of pointing men to the person of Jesus (Jn. i. 31). The ἔρημος would have been a very unsuitable place for any such purpose.

[3] Herein we have clear proof that the Baptist's anxiety with regard to the Messianic judgment was something quite new.

would necessarily come into the kingdom of the Messiah. God could create children of Abraham out of the stones of the desert by the Jordan, and in them he could fulfil his promise. But the hour of decision as to acceptance and rejection was immediately at hand (Lk. iii. 7–9).

PROMISE TO ABRAHAM.—As children of Abraham, then, the Jews believed they would escape the judgment. In New Testament times it was held that the sovereignty of the world was promised to Abraham and his seed (Rom. iv. 13): "*ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου.*" This so far agrees with the language of the Old Testament, that in Gen. xviii. 18, xxii. 17 f. the writer probably intended to hold out the prospect that the sovereignty of the world would belong to the people who were to descend from Abraham. Only, in these Old Testament passages there is no idea of a reawakening of those of Abraham's children who were already dead, to the end that they too might share in the sovereignty of the world. In the New Testament epoch, on the other hand, this is what is presupposed. Immediately after they die, Abraham takes his pious children into his bosom (Lk. xvi. 23), in order that later they may participate with him in the feast of the Messiah (Lk. xiii. 28). Now, what John the Baptist insists upon in the strongest possible manner is that it is only the true children of Abraham who enjoy this blessing; and should there happen to be none in existence, God does not lack the power of still making his promise good by means of a miracle.

JOHN'S DISCIPLES.—The hermit, who had fled from the world, became the powerful preacher of repentance. He gained over a number of those who came to him, to be his disciples. While he was in prison, these brought him news of what had happened in the Jewish world, and he was able to send two of his disciples to Jesus (Lk. vii. 18, Mt. xi. 2). In the end, after he was executed, his disciples looked after his burial (Mk. vi. 29). That these disciples of John should have practised rigorous fasting as a custom (Mk. ii. 18) is well-nigh a matter of course; at least Jesus says that their master neither ate bread nor drank wine (Lk. vii. 33, Mt. xi. 18).[1] It is a pity

[1] In a community which deliberately set itself to evade every duty contemplated by the law, fleeing through fear of violating any of its precepts,

that the prayer which John taught to his disciples (Lk. xi. 1) is now lost; it would doubtless have afforded us, better than anything else, an insight into the religious peculiarity of this society. According to Jn. i. 40, Andrew, who afterwards became a disciple of Jesus, had previously been a disciple of John (probably John and Peter had as well, Jn. i. 35–42); but the correctness of these statements cannot be more definitely ascertained.

PREACHING TO THE PEOPLE.—The number of those who went out to hear John, and, having heard him, returned to their ordinary way of life, was of course much greater than the number of his real disciples. But he is not content that they should merely gaze upon him with wondering curiosity; to every one who comes out to him must be communicated the same anxiety which has driven himself out into the desert. And in this connection it is noticeable that the demand made by John of the crowd which comes and goes is, not a life of repentance with separation from the world, but only charity, justice, and faithfulness in their calling.[1] When the multitude ask him how their amendment shall be shown, he answers their question, according to Lk. iii. 10–14, by a reference to the unequal distribution of worldly possessions: those who have should give to those who have not. He tells the publicans that they ought in their demands to abide by the tariff; and the soldiers, that they should not enrich themselves by extortion or false accusation, but be content with their pay. All this is in complete agreement with what Josephus says (*Ant.*, xviii. 117)—that John exhorted men to righteousness, to justice between man and man, and to piety towards God. But the real force of his preaching lay, without doubt, in his announcement of the nearness of the divine judgment.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.—Upon those who were inwardly changed

almost the only possible way open to its members of manifesting their piety was by ablutions, fasting, and prayer (see note 1, p. 114).

[1] We can hardly interpret this to mean that John was indifferent to a strict observance of the Law, for Josephus, who was a Pharisee, had no fault to find with him; and in Mk. ii. 17 the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees are both together contrasted with the disciples of Jesus. But we may presume John to have found that in Palestine in his day the duties which men owed to one another were more frequently disregarded than were the duties connected with worship.

by the force of his personality and the power of his words, John performed a figurative ceremony, obviously designed to strengthen the fugitive impression by means of the recollection of an experience quite personal to each individual: he baptised them, that is to say, he subjected them to a holy washing, such as was prescribed in the law for certain cases of uncleanness (Lev. xv. 6–8, 10 f., 16, 18, 21 f., 27, xvii. 16, xxii. 6). This outward purification was of course in the present case to be a symbol of the purification of the character, and of the life which the persons baptised had in consequence of John's preaching henceforth resolved to lead.[1] Notwithstanding the many ceremonial washings of Judaism, this practice of John's was nevertheless felt to be something of a peculiar nature, something uncommon. The popular name for John was *the* Baptist.[2] The washing, which was equivalent to a vow of purity of character, was really something essentially different from the washings which were performed with reference to definite kinds of uncleanness (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 117).

THE MESSIANIC HOPE.—Notwithstanding the magnetism of his whole manifestation and of his preaching, John felt that his own work was inadequate. But what produced this feeling in him was not that the Pharisees and teachers of the law abstained from coming to him because his piety was not in accordance with their own pattern (Lk. vii. 30), or that others declared that he was possessed of a devil because he neither ate bread nor drank wine, and to that extent deviated from the ways of ordinary men (Mt. xi. 18, Lk. vii. 33). As against this attitude towards him was to be set the fact that he was generally regarded as a prophet (Mk. xi. 32).[3]

[1] Josephus did not regard John's baptism as being symbolical (cp. note 1, p. 115).

[2] Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 116—Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου βαπτιστοῦ.

[3] Moreover, the man whose concern was to escape from the world did not interest himself about drawing crowds or winning honour amongst men. It was really a matter of indifference to him what people thought about him; but it was not a matter of indifference whether the people whom he sought to reform really were made better or not. Of course, in many instances, he had no opportunity of observing the result of his preaching; but he did not shut his eyes to the fact, that the transitory impression made upon the crowds who were always coming and going had in most cases no lasting effect.

John's experience was the same as that of every earnest preacher: the noblest enthusiasm of piety too often fails to last, and the most solemn resolutions are often only too quickly forgotten. Then he too found consolation in the thought of the coming Messiah: "I baptise you with water," he said (Lk. iii. 15–18); that is as much as to say, "I cannot forcibly transform the inward nature of mankind and exercise any abiding influence upon it." But in contrast with this feeling of helplessness is that belief of John's, so hopeful, so full of joy, which finds expression in the words: "There cometh a Stronger One after me whose shoe-latchet I am not worthy to unloose (Mt. iii. 11 says, "Whose shoes I am not worthy to carry after him"); He will baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." This is an article of faith, in which is expressed John's conviction that his own inadequate labours will speedily be supplemented in a signal fashion. The Strong One who cometh after him is the Messiah; and his strength is dwelt upon in contrast to the relatively small power which John is able to exercise over men's minds. The Messiah will steep in the Holy Ghost those who have been baptised by John; thereupon the power of sin in them will be broken; for where the Spirit of God is, there is evil overcome. It is expected as one of the gifts of the Messiah, that the Spirit of God will be poured out upon all flesh (Joel iii. 1). And this is also what is meant when it is said that the Messiah will baptise with fire. Fire consumes and purifies; the Messiah will remove from the hearts of men all that is reprehensible. This conception, too, was perfectly familiar to the Jewish people. The day when the Lord shall come is in Mal. iii. 2 *f.* compared to the refiner's fire, which purifies gold and silver; but in Mal. iii. 19 (iv. 1) it is compared to a burning furnace which consumes all that do wickedly. The first passage corresponds to John's hope that the sin which still clings to those whom he has baptised will be ultimately taken away by the Messiah. But as this presupposes on their part the earnest desire to be amended, John concludes with a warning picture of the Messianic judgment, in which fire is regarded, in agreement with Mal. iii. 19 (iv. 1), not as a purifying agent, but as an element of destruction: "The Messiah is like unto the man, who cleanses his threshing-floor with the

winnowing-shovel in his hand, he brings the wheat into the barn, but the chaff he burns with fire." John's preaching is consequently no gospel of salvation for light-minded or dissolute people, who will have no share in the Messiah's kingdom. But for the man who earnestly repents, and who, notwithstanding his earnest desire for self-betterment, yet knows how weak he is under the assaults of sin, it is an announcement full of hope. Such a one the Messiah will purify, and to him will he bring the Holy Spirit.[1]

NEW USE MADE OF THE EXPECTATION OF THE MESSIAH. —Fanciful, or even fantastic, descriptions of the Messianic kingdom and of its advent were at that period by no means uncommon.[2] The novel feature about John's preaching was, that he did not fly for refuge from trials of the moment to any anticipations of a blissful world to come in the future, or seek comfort and quickening in its pleasing images. Rather did the certainty of the nearness of the Messiah's advent act as an incentive to him to labour all the more diligently both in his own behalf and for the welfare of others. It is to this that Jesus alludes when he sums up the real importance of John in the words (Mt. xi. 12 f., Lk. xvi. 16): "From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent snatch it to themselves. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John; and if ye will receive it, this is the Elias which was to come." The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence; people no longer merely prophesy and dream dreams about it, but they press to win entrance into it. According to Mal. iii. 23 f. (iv. 5 f.), Elijah[3] is to go before

[1] Those who estimate the value of a religion by the dogmatic scheme on which it was originally founded will perceive no serious distinction between the Baptist's point of view and that of Jesus; even the words which Jesus spoke at the Lord's Supper hardly go beyond such a scheme as that indicated in the text. The real distinction between John and Jesus must be sought in the difference of their characters, and in the conceptions of the will of God, which corresponded to this difference.

[2] Cp. *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 19–31, 241–245.

[3] The reason why this function was assigned to Elijah was no doubt this, that he, the powerful preacher of repentance in the days of King Ahab, had gone up into heaven in a chariot of fire, that is to say, had gone to the place where, according to the late Jewish conception, all the treasures

the day of the Lord and prepare men's hearts to receive him. In the whole range of Jewish conceptions, none could be found better fitted to describe the preaching of the Baptist than that according to which it was a fulfilment of the duty expected of Elijah when that prophet should return to earth a second time.

GROUNDS FOR THE EXPECTATION OF THE MESSIAH.—Here we should be justified in introducing a question—to which, however, the Sources return no answer. All the prophets who proclaimed the nearness of the judgment of God derived their conviction from definite facts having relation to the circumstances of the age in which they lived. Hence it is highly probable that John also based his conviction, that the advent of the Messiah was nigh at hand, on the special circumstances of the age in which *he* lived. But neither the Synoptists nor Josephus tell us anything at all definite with regard to this. Both these authorities seem, however, to imply that John's expectation of the coming of the kingdom of God was not based upon the inference that the sway of the heathen, the Romans, over the people of God could not continue. Had that been the ground of his conviction, Pontius Pilate, not Herod Antipas, would have been the person to seize upon the inconvenient and dangerous prophet. We should also have heard something about political hopes being associated with the advent of the Baptist; but of this there is not a single word. On the contrary, this man who shunned the world accounted the sins of his people to be so grievous that the only hope for their salvation lay in the direct interposition of God.[1] Hence John describes the Messiah as being, above all things else, the judge of the world—which indeed was no unheard-of conception (see p. 116, n. 1). But in other quarters the Messianic judgment was brought into connection quite generally with the various powers which are hostile to God. The Baptist, it would seem, was the first to

of the Messianic kingdom, as well as the Messiah himself, were preserved against the day of his future coming into the world (2 K. ii. 11 f.).

[1] His stern wrath at the pretenders to greatest piety—if indeed Mt. iii. 7 belongs to the original tradition—as well as his apostrophe to the multitudes as γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (Lk. iii. 7), lend considerable support to this view, which is still further strengthened by analogous trains of thought in ancient and modern prophets.

proclaim that that judgment was to be dreaded by each individual man. And in this declaration we get a very plain indication of the extent to which John's preaching of repentance was new. The Messiah will come soon, for Israel's necessity is wrought to the highest pitch; but the distress is no outward one: it is the distress that comes of sin. And when the Messiah does come, he will give to those who repent the power to show forth good works; but those who do not repent shall be destroyed. The matter, then, is one of life and death for each individual. Here, therefore, the general moral task and the hope of moral perfection for each individual are closely knit together, yet freed from those extraneous elements which adhered to both in the earlier development of the religion of Israel. It is precisely in this peculiarity that John approves himself to be the forerunner of the Mightier One who followed after him.[1]

Denunciation of Antipas.—John's preaching of repentance, then, was coloured by no political motives. But, for all that, he spared not even the prince who offended the upright amongst his people. Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii. 118 f.) simply tells us that Herod Antipas feared the great influence of the Baptist and sought to prevent any possibility of his stirring up a revolt, and for that reason he had him carried to Machærus and put to death. The Synoptists relate the story in greater detail (Mk. vi. 14–29). According to them, John said to Herod: "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." Whether John uttered these words in a personal interview with Herod, or in a public address to the people, cannot be determined with certainty. The second alternative seems to fit in better with the text of Josephus and with the idea we are inclined to form of the two men. Yet Mk. vi. 20 also tells us that Herod was greatly exercised by the words of his prisoner, and heard him gladly; so that the supposition that Herod himself had at one time appealed to John and received from

[1] It must further be carefully observed that the political aspect of the Messianic hope plays no great part in the Jewish literature of the New Testament period that has come down to us. Far greater stress is laid upon the holiness of the Messiah. On the other hand, neither John nor Jesus ever doubted the kingship of the Messiah (*Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 248 f.).

him the decision that he must put away his brother's wife, is also not altogether excluded. A man to whom all Palestine flocked might be a person of some importance even to Herod Antipas.[1]

ANTIPAS' OFFENCE.—This prince's union with his niece Herodias had only been made possible by a twofold adultery. For Antipas' sake Herodias had deserted her first husband, a brother of Antipas and of her own father; but she had imposed upon him, at the same time, as the condition of her doing this, that *he* also should put away his own former wife, the daughter of King Aretas IV. of Arabia. This princess had fled to her father, a step which later on gave occasion for a war (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 109–112).[2] Now, according to Jewish views, a man was permitted to divorce himself from his wife at any time, provided he issued the prescribed document of divorcement (Dt. xxiv. 1); but he was forbidden to marry the wife of his brother whilst his brother was yet alive (Lev. xviii. 16), and for a woman to leave her husband in order to unite herself with another man was universally judged to be adultery (cp. Rom. vii. 3). So that John was merely giving expression to the universally accepted view. But it was precisely because there were everywhere men of like mind with himself that this candid and outspoken man was a source of danger. Accordingly, he was seized and thrown into prison.

JOHN'S IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH. — If Machærus (*Mkaur*, to the east of the Dead Sea) really was the place of John's captivity, Herod Antipas and his family (according to the narrative of Mk.) must have sojourned there for a considerable time.[3] Herodias hated the stern prophet who sought

[1] The Gospels also tell us that Herod Antipas was troubled about Jesus (Mk. vi. 14–16; still more pointedly Lk. xxiii. 8).

[2] See p. 111, n. 1.

[3] Machærus was not indeed at all well suited for the feast which Herod Antipas gave to the chief men of the region subject to him; it was altogether too remote for the purpose. Moreover, it would be far more easy to explain the mission of the Baptist's disciples to Jesus if John had been imprisoned in Tiberias, let us say, instead of in Machærus. Josephus, however, particularly names Machærus as the place in which John was imprisoned and executed; and the reasons we have brought forward against this identification are not sufficient to do more than cast a doubt upon the correctness of his statements.

to tear her from the arms of her new husband, and whose words, although he was a prisoner, made a great impression upon her husband. For some time, however, she was unable to effect anything against him. John, even in his imprisonment, hears of the works which are done by Jesus whom he has baptised. And what he hears makes such an impression upon him that he has this question addressed to Jesus—and he is the first to put it—"Art thou the Messiah"? We do not know whether Jesus' answer to this question ever reached John (Mt. xi. 2–6, Lk. vii. 18–23). Herod Antipas on his birthday gives a feast to the dignitaries of his kingdom. The daughter of Herodias dances on the occasion before Antipas' guests; this was Salome, who became at a later date the wife of the tetrarch Philip. Her stepfather is so pleased with Salome's dancing that he swears he will grant any request she may make, even though it be for the half of his kingdom. Thereupon she, instigated by her mother, asks for the head of John. And Antipas' guests, to be convinced that the oath was kept, must even be shown the head of the executed man (Mk. vi. 17–29).

Jesus' Judgment regarding John's Death.—Jesus subsequently said, with reference to the fate of John, "They did unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him" (Mk. ix. 13). Here he is obviously referring to the threats which were uttered against Elijah (1 K. xix. 2, 10), for he has just compared John to that prophet. But what is chiefly present in his mind is the observation that the preacher of repentance, even though sent by God, is not protected by God against the arbitrary power and caprice of men. It is not God's will that the happiness of a man on earth should correspond to his worth. From John's fate Jesus came to understand the fate which awaited himself.

Later Disciples of John.—The religious movement set in motion by John did not end with his death. His disciples, having buried him, carried his message further. More than twenty years after John's death, Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria, came to Ephesus and preached there in the synagogue, exactly as the Christians themselves did, that the advent of the Messiah was nigh at hand, and yet he knew only the baptism of John (Acts xviii. 25: ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ

was written from the Christian point of view; he taught accurately the things which belonged to Jesus—that is to say, the coming of the Messiah to judgment). Soon after this, Paul finds in Ephesus twelve disciples of John, who through him are brought to the conviction that the power of the Holy Ghost, which was absent in the baptism of John, is really present in Christianity (Acts xix. 1–7). Thus the Johannine Gospel, the origin of which is doubtless to be sought in Asia Minor, has sufficient grounds for maintaining the importance of John in relation to Jesus. He is the prophet sent of God who points out the Messiah; but his influence must wane in order that the influence of the Messiah may increase, and he himself sends his disciples to Jesus.[1] As a matter of fact, the community of John's disciples, in so far as they maintained their independence of Judaism, became completely absorbed in the Christian community.[2]

[1] Compare the authorities at the head of this chapter.

[2] The process was facilitated by the circumstance that Jesus himself and the earliest of his disciples were followers of John, and that to the very last Jesus had spoken of John with the greatest veneration. Moreover, the fundamental idea of the Baptist's preaching, "Repent because of the kingdom of God," recurs in the preaching of Jesus.

CHAPTER VI

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

SOURCES.—*The Synoptists.* Mk. i. 9–11, Mt. iii. 13–17, Lk. iii. 21 f. Lk. has transformed the Mk. narrative less than Mt. has. What Mk. describes as a vision of Jesus (εἶδεν) becomes in Lk.–Mt. an objective event; though what Lk. says (cp. the phrase καὶ προσευχομένου, which is peculiar to him) still admits of being understood in the sense of Mk. Lk. iii. 22 has, like Mk. i. 11, the form of address σὺ εἶ, whereas Mt. iii. 17 has οὗτός ἐστιν. The Baptist's protest (Mt. iii. 14 f.) unhistorically presupposes John to have been acquainted with Jesus. In *Acts* x. 38 it is said, God anointed (ἔχρισεν) Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power. *Jn.* i. 33 f. is a development along the line indicated by Mk.–Mt.: the Baptist recognises Jesus as the Messiah by means of a vision. This contradicts, not only Mk., but also Lk.'s story of Jesus' boyhood and Mt.'s account of the baptism.

Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, pp. 76 f.). Jesus' visit to the Baptist (Jerome, *Contra Pelag.*, 3, 2; cp. Cyprian, *De Rebaptismate*, 17, contained in *Prædicatio Pauli*, in Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 81) and his baptism (Jerome, *In Is.* xi. 2); in both cases the narratives seem to be superior to the account in Mk.

Justin, *Dial. contr. Tryph.*, 88. 315 D, while in general following Mt.'s account of the baptism, mentions an appearance of fire; but in 88, 316 D and 103, 331 B he has from Ps. ii. 7 the words, υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. The appearance of fire is also spoken of in the *Prædicatio Pauli;* see Cyprian, *De Rebapt.*, 17, ed. Hartel, iii. 90; the Gospel of the Ebionites, in Epiphanius, *Hær.*, 30, 13; *Oracula Sibyllina*, vii. 82–84, old Latin translations—cp. Tischendorf, *Nov. Test.*, viii. major to Mt. iii. 16 f. The words from Ps. ii. 7 also form part of the saying of God in Lk. iii. 22, according to the MSS. D a b c ff² l. The reading is also known to Augustine (*De Consensu Evang.*, ii. 14), and is found in the Gospel of the Ebionites, though as *an addition* to the traditional account (see Epiphanius, *Hær.*, 30, 13). It is likewise found in Clement of Alexandria (*Pædag.*, i. 6, 25), as also in the *Acta Petri et Pauli*, 29. The appearance of the fire or light no doubt belonged to the original conception of the vision; for without it it is hardly possible to imagine the heavens opening. On the other hand, Ps. ii. 7 preserves only the general import of the divine saying; in Acts xiii. 33 also it is only known as a quotation from the Psalms.

JESUS' VISIT TO THE BAPTIST.—The fame of the great preacher of repentance, who proclaimed that the judgment of God was immediately at hand, and by the act of baptism bound those who repented to be steadfast in self-amendment, drew many people also out of Galilee to the Jordan (Mt. xi. 7–9, Lk. vii. 24–26).[1] Amongst others Jesus, the working-builder of Nazareth, resolved to go and visit John. We possess only *one* at all detailed account of the way in which this resolve was formed in Him; this we derive from the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 76, to Mt. iii. 13), whence it has been incorporated in the *Prædicatio Pauli* (Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 81). The passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews reads thus: "Behold, the mother of the Lord and his brethren spake to him, saying, 'John the Baptist is baptising for the forgiveness of sins; we will go and be baptised of him.' But he said to them, 'What sins have I committed that I should go and be baptised of him? Anything that I have said must have been said in ignorance.'" Now, even though we did not possess explicit testimony to that effect, we might be sure that this story would readily prove objectionable to the Christian community of a later age. Jesus' refusal at first to accede to the request of his kinsfolk and to go to John appeared inconceivable to a community who, on the strength of the canonical Gospels, were accustomed to assume a close relation between the two from the very beginning of their histories (Lk. i. ii., Mt. iii. 14–15, Jn. i. 26 f., 29–34). It was held to be conduct not altogether worthy of the Saviour that he should decide to go to John, not of his own free impulse, but only at the request of others.[2] But that Jesus should even weigh the question

[1] The words of Jesus cited in the original authority were unquestionably addressed to the multitude in Galilee. Hence there cannot be a doubt that the Galilæans also flocked to the Baptist in crowds. It would of course be much easier to understand this if John preached not only in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea but also in that of the Lake of Gennesareth (see p. 124, n. 3).

[2] The suggestion that Jesus, in the course of his public life, was induced by others to perform certain actions might have been received with more equanimity; but what we are here dealing with is the decision which was the cause of the whole of his public ministry. That his resolve to go to the Baptist had to be suggested to him first by others could not be admitted by a

whether he had sinned was even more objectionable, especially when he did it in such a way that he denied, to start with, any particular sin, yet immediately spoiled that view of the matter ("quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo?") by expressing the doubt, whether what he has just said may not perhaps be said in ignorance, and whether after all he may not really have sinned without being aware of it. The opinion of Christians at a later date regarding this story is very well expressed in the tract *De Rebaptismate*, ch. 17, attributed to Cyprian: "Contra omnes scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptisma pæne invitum a matre sua esse compulsum."

JOHN'S FORGIVENESS OF SINS.—The answer which Jesus makes to his kinsfolk is closely connected with the information they give, that John the Baptist baptises for the forgiveness of sin. In a precisely similar way John's baptism is called in Mk. 1. 4 f. a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sin, and they who come to John confess their sins when they are baptised. This is explained by John's conviction, that the Messiah will complete and perfect the work of amendment which he himself has preached, and which those baptised by him have taken in hand. That is to say, the Messiah will not condemn because of their former sins those who have now repented, but he will admit them into his kingdom in spite of their sins, that is to say, by granting them forgiveness of the same.[1] In thus questioning for a moment whether he has need of the forgiveness of sin proffered by John, Jesus shares, at all events formally, for the time being, the standpoint of the Pharisees, which he himself subsequently reprehended: *they* refused to be baptised by John because they were in the right way already. But Jesus does not adhere to this standpoint, although he unquestionably has the greatest right to do so; for he adds that perhaps he does not know his own sins. At first he gives utterance to the sure consciousness of a continuous, unbroken development in righteousness; but the earnest conscientiousness

generation who ascribed to Jesus, even when a child, the conscious purpose of redeeming the world.

[1] See Chap. V., pp. 120 f.

which forms an integral part of that development allows at least a doubt to arise as to his perfect sinlessness, although at the same time no specific acts of wrong-doing are present to trouble his conscience. It is precisely in this spirit that Jesus disclaims (Mk. x. 18) the title of "Good Master," by the observation, "There is only one good, namely God." This saying, too, was repugnant to later Christian writers, and accordingly in the parallel passage of Mt. (xix. 16 f.) it is changed.[1]

CORRECTNESS OF THE TRADITION.—Now, it is a proof of the correctness of this tradition of the Gospel of the Hebrews, that later Christianity refused to tolerate the idea of Jesus having entertained any such doubt with regard to his sinlessness; consequently, the later Church certainly cannot have invented it. But the tradition preserved in the Canonical Gospels also seems to confirm the narrative of the Gospel of the Hebrews. In this connection the saying of our Lord as preserved by the Synoptists (Mt. xxi. 28–32) has to be considered. "A father had two sons. He said to the one, Go work to-day in my vineyard. He said, No; but repented him of it and went. The same request was made to the second, who answered and said, Yea, sir, but went not. Of these twain, the first only is he that doeth the will of God." It is true this does not agree with what Mt. goes on to add, "The publicans and harlots shall enter into the kingdom of God sooner than the unrepentant leaders of the people. The former did amend at the preaching of John, whereas the latter held aloof from him." For not only did the publicans and harlots at first say, No, but as a matter of fact they acted contrary to the will of God. In like manner the Pharisees did not merely say, Yes, in answer to God's demand, and then pay no further heed to it; on the contrary, they actually made the interpretation of the Law, and its fulfilment, erroneous though this often was, the chief purpose of their lives. The interpretation of the saying becomes still more difficult when it is applied to the Baptist; for the publicans did not answer with No, nor the Pharisees with Yes. The utterance might be intended to give greater vividness to the saying, that the Messiah will not take into his kingdom those who merely

[1] In like manner also the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 78, to Mt. xix. 16)—"Quid bonum faciens vivam?"

greet him as their Lord, but only those who in their acts fulfil the will of God (Mt. vii. 21). This saying, indeed, has really no parallel in the other Gospels, and seems to have been formed out of the saying of Jesus in Lk. xiii. 25–27, which occurs again in an easily recognisable recast in Mt. vii. 22 f. Certainly Mt. vii. 21 was not known to the Apostle Paul; if it had been, he could not have written 1 Cor. xii. 3, "No man can say, Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit."

Jesus' saying about the two sons was no doubt originally intended to refer to the attitude assumed towards the Baptist, in the way in which it is represented in Mt. xxi. 28–32. But Jesus was not thinking of the different classes of people who came or did not come to John; he was contrasting rather in this utterance, though of course on some definite occasion, his own attitude towards John with the attitude of his kinsfolk towards the Baptist. The relatives of Jesus said at first, Yes; in the beginning they were filled with enthusiasm on his behalf and promised him that they would reform, but afterwards they turned back into the old familiar ways. Jesus, on the other hand, said at first, No, but afterwards not only went to John, but, from the moment he did so, placed his whole life at the service of the Gospel which John was the first to preach. There can be little doubt that the occasion for making this comparison between his action and that of his kinsfolk was that on which his mother and brethren purposed to fetch him back to Nazareth because he was losing his senses; thereupon Jesus declared, that they who did the will of God, the same were his kinsfolk (Mk. iii. 21, 31–35). Now was the fitting moment to declare that they who were desirous of taking him back to Nazareth were the same who formerly had made him decide to go forth from thence. In Mk. iii. 35 we read that he reproached his family with not doing the will of God; so that he was disposed to draw pointed attention to the fact, that he who was at first reluctant, finally obeyed the Father's will more zealously than they who had in the beginning said, Yes.[1]

[1] Of course, this interpretation cannot lay claim to being certain; we can only claim for it a great degree of probability. But then no history, either old or new, can be written without, in this way, taking account of probabilities.

JN. VII. 1–10.—The Fourth Gospel also has preserved a recollection of Jesus' having at first set himself in opposition to his kinsfolk (Jn. vii. 1–10). Here also the occasion is a journey into Judæa for a religious object, just as Jesus had to journey from Nazareth to Judæa to come to the Baptist; and here also Jesus' brethren call upon him to go with them, and at first he refuses to comply with their request, though afterwards he does make the journey. True, in the Johannine Gospel the object of the journey is not to hear the Baptist, but to keep the feast of the tabernacles at Jerusalem. But it is this very circumstance that allows the Evangelist to put aside the vexatious problem of Jesus' sinlessness or sinfulness, a method of getting over historical difficulties of the use of which we encounter other instances in the same Gospel. What is unobjectionable is retained, but what is objectionable is brushed aside[1]; compare Mk. xv. 34–37 with Jn. xix. 28–30. Now it was felt to be objectionable that Jesus' first public appearance, namely, the visit to the Baptist, should have been due to the instigation of others; but for his kinsfolk to exhort him, on one occasion during his public ministry, to go on a journey to Judæa—this was not such a serious statement to make. Moreover, the Johannine Gospel is able to turn the affair about in such a way that Jesus by his refusal in the first instance is even made to assert his independence in relation to his family (Jn. vii. 6–8).

CONCLUSION.—The tradition of the Gospel of the Hebrews is then entitled to be believed. But it shows in the plainest possible way that Christianity was not ready-made but grew. It did not originate in the resolve of a single individual, but was born, as it were, of the wonderful dispensation of divine providence. As Luther had to be forced into the work of the Reformation, so Jesus was literally forced into his work. The reluctance of Jesus to meet the powerful preacher of repentance, whose message was to awaken to life the powers

[1] The author of the Acts of the Apostles proceeds in a precisely similar way, when, for example, he omits to speak of the dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch, or says nothing about the delivery of the alms which Paul at length brought to Jerusalem, because of its bad reception on the part of the Christians of Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 11–14, Acts xxi. 17–25, and compare xxiv. 17).

yet slumbering in him, showed a presentiment, as it were, of the persecution and martyrdom that lay before him.[1]

JOHN BAPTISES JESUS.—Jesus came to John (Mk. i. 9). It would almost seem as if he remained with him some time, for he does not return to Galilee until after the Baptist is seized and flung into prison (Mk. i. 14). At all events, the story of the Temptation comes between. Like so many others, Jesus allowed himself to be baptised; and he certainly understood the act in the sense in which John intended it. Jesus also was impelled to baptism by a resolve to live henceforth according to the will of God, and by the hope of thereby winning a place in the kingdom of God. It was only the "dogmatic" reflection of a later age which took offence that he who, according to the Baptist's own words, was to baptise with the Holy Ghost and with fire, should himself have been baptised with water by John. Accordingly, Mt. iii. 14 f. amplifies the text of Mk. by making John at first unwilling to baptise Jesus, saying, "I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me?" But Jesus brushes aside the objection with the words, "Suffer it now, for so it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."[2] The later Johannine Gospel, however, is able to tell us further, that John did not know Jesus before this visit (i. 31—*κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν*).

IMPRESSION MADE BY THE BAPTIST UPON JESUS.—At a still later date, after he had developed a great public ministry, Jesus praised the Baptist enthusiastically, declaring that he was not like a reed shaken to this side and to that by the wind, not a man clothed in soft raiment, but that he was more than a

[1] It is true that such a conception lays greater stress upon the human side of Jesus' nature than if he had entered upon his great life's work of his own free choice and without instigation from without. But it is just this human side of the Redeemer that brings him humanly near to us; and when we see that he was dependent, as we are, upon God's providence, we experience for the first time a true feeling of the overpowering greatness of his Godhead.

[2] Πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην, that is to say, to satisfy every requirement of piety. On other occasions, indeed, Jesus takes up a different attitude. He was *not* concerned to do all things whatsoever that were considered pious; if he had been, he would never have been at strife with the Pharisees. Rather it is his own peculiar conception of the will of God that determines for him what it is his duty to do and what not.

prophet—he was a pioneer of the Messiah (Mt. xi. 7–10, Lk. vii. 24–27). The steadfast character of John, who could not be moved from his path either by the wind which blew upon him, or by any regard for his own personal comfort, made a great impression upon Jesus, who was originally, we cannot doubt, of a tenderer character.[1] Jesus was, above all things, filled with the same thought which had called forth John's whole activity as a preacher, and which dominated it. The hinge upon which all the thoughts of John's followers turned was the *nearness of the kingdom of God.* With prayer and fasting his disciples prepared themselves for the coming of the Messiah.

THE REVELATION OF THE MESSIAH.—To what a large extent these thoughts did occupy Jesus' mind is proved by the event which happened at his baptism. The Gospel of Mk. relates (i. 10), "And straightway on coming up out of the water he saw the heavens rent open and the spirit coming down upon him like a dove, and a voice from heaven (cried), 'Thou art my beloved son, in thee am I well pleased.'" In the later Sources the description of what happened is so far supplemented that according to them a fire also, a bright light, was seen.[2] An appearance of this kind certainly suits in every respect a vision in which the Heavens open. Compare the story of the conversion of Paul in Acts xxvi. 13 (ix. 3, xxii. 6, and compare 2. Cor. iv. 6). In the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77) it is the fountain of the whole Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus, and resting upon him, which says to him, "My son, in all the prophets I waited Thee that Thou shouldst come, and that I should rest upon Thee. For Thou art my rest, Thou art my first-born Son, who reigneth eternally." This version of the words of God spoken on that occasion may be historically more correct than that which Mk. has handed

[1] But we must not look upon this tenderness as a chief trait in Jesus' peculiar character. In particular cases his firmness and assurance could even wear the appearance of harshness, as when he thrust aside his mother and his brethren who came with the idea of fetching him back to Nazareth (Mk. iii. 21, 31–35). Jesus is only tender in comparison with the Baptist, in so far as he cannot encounter any distress of man without helping, whereas the Baptist deliberately withdrew from his fellow-men.

[2] See the Sources at the head of this Chapter.

down. The words which were heard must of necessity have corresponded to what was seen. Jesus sees the Spirit descending upon him; next, the words which are spoken to him also declare that the Spirit rests upon him. In saying this, God vouchsafes to him the divine revelation that he is the promised *Messiah*. For according to Isa. xi. 2, the Spirit of the Lord *rests* upon the Messiah, and Jesus has just heard from the lips of the Baptist the promise that the Messiah will give God's spirit to his followers. But the real greatness of the moment is reflected in Jesus' recognition that the Holy Spirit, who indeed had spoken already by the mouth of all the prophets, has waited for *him* (Jesus), in order that it may rest upon him. Consequently he, Jesus, is the first-born Son of the Spirit of God, who shall reign eternally. Thus, the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus lifts him above all the prophets; by this divine gift he is qualified to be the ruler of the everlasting world of the future. It is important to recollect, that according to Mk. we have here not merely a declaration of the dignity that attaches to the person of Jesus; we are told at the same time that the Spirit of God comes and settles down upon him.[1] By this means he becomes for the first time endowed with the attributes which distinguish the Messiah from all other men: he becomes the first-born Son of the Spirit of God, because it is only through him that all other men are to participate in the Spirit of God. Jesus also calls himself the Son of the Holy Spirit in the story of the Temptation, as told in the Gospel of the Hebrews; indeed, he there calls the Holy Spirit his mother: the Semitic word for "spirit" is feminine.[2]

NATURE OF THE EVENT.—None of our Gospels sets forth

[1] In this way expression is also given to the idea that Jesus not only at this moment became clear as to the dignity of his person, but he also became conscious that from this moment onwards he possessed, in point of fact, a higher dignity than formerly. It is not indeed to be assumed that the special conception of the will of God which Jesus set forth underwent at that time any transformation. But this evangel, which had hitherto slumbered in him, required a special impulse in order that what was in his mind might be brought to birth, and so be made useful to the world. And this impulse was imparted to him in the inspiring revelation made to him beside the Jordan.

[2] Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77, to Mt. iv. 1, 8.

with perfect clearness what was the general nature of the event here described. In Mk. i. 10 f. it relates entirely to Jesus himself. Jesus sees the Heavens rent asunder and the Spirit hovering downwards; it is to him that the Heavenly voice is addressed—"Thou art my Son, my beloved; in Thee am I well pleased." In Lk. iii. 21 f. the opening of the Heavens, the descent of the Spirit, and the sound of the Heavenly voice are, it would appear, apprehended by all. In Mt. iii. 16 f. so much is this the case that the Heavenly voice appears to be no longer addressed to Jesus at all, but to others. And in this way it becomes possible for the Gospel of Jn. (i. 33 f.) even to construe the event as a vision of the Baptist. The other Sources describe an outward event.

PROPHETIC VISION.—And yet it would seem certain from the whole character of the event that it took place in the spiritual sphere, in the soul of Jesus, and that what we have to consider is a prophetic vision of Jesus, in which the Heavens are rent asunder, the Spirit of God descends upon him like a dove, and the voice of God is heard from the Heavens above. It is possible even to prove that all this was an event only in the spiritual life of Jesus. Down to the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi nobody, except Jesus himself, knew that he was the Messiah (Mk. viii. 29 f., Mt. xvi. 16–20, Lk. ix. 20 f.). A divine utterance sent down from Heaven to earth with fulness of power, as a word of guidance bestowed upon Jesus by the Spirit of God in the face of all the world—this would plainly have made it absolutely impossible to conceal Jesus' Messiahship.[1] Moreover, it is characteristic of all visionary perception, that it associates itself with the current conceptions of the age to which it belongs. Jesus sees the Spirit of God descending upon him in the form of a dove. Now, this comparison of the Spirit of God to a dove was a property of the Scribal erudition of that day; for instance, it compared the Spirit of God brooding over the waters of chaos in Gen. i. 2 to Noah's dove fluttering over the water of the deluge in Gen. viii. 8.[2] Jesus' baptismal

[1] Here, then, we have to face the same objection which was urged in the case of the annunciations in the story of Jesus' birth (Chap. IV., p. 88).

[2] Compare also Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, to Mt. iii. 16.

experience is thus the vision of his call, analogous to the visions which the Old Testament prophets had at their respective calls (Isa. vi., Jer. i., Ez. i., ii.). It may also be compared with the conversion of Paul, which was in fact equivalent also to a call to be the great apostle of the Gentiles (Acts xxvi. 12–18, ix. 3–6, xxii. 6–10). In all these cases the visionary perception is accompanied by a visionary hearing of a voice, and in each case alike the consequence for the person who has the vision is a complete transformation of his life.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VISION.—It is, then, a complete mistake to suppose that Jesus' experience at his baptism loses in value and significance when it is no longer understood as an objective occurrence in the outside world, but is regarded as an incident of his inner spiritual experience. The really important thing, from the point of view both of the history of the world and of the history of religion, is, after all, the awakening of Jesus' belief in himself as the Messiah. From the very beginning, Christianity has had its foundation on the confession that Jesus is the Messiah, and this belief was first implanted deep in his consciousness on the day he was baptised by John in the Jordan. So that even on the soberest conception of history this moment is one of the greatest turning-points in the world's development.

NOTHING UNHEALTHY IN IT.—But some refuse to admit any such visions as these, on the ground that they are marks of an imagination unhealthily excited. Against this view two facts can be urged. In the first place, in his subsequent public ministry Jesus gives such strong proofs of the clearness and certainty of his judgment, and of the strength with which his will is ever directed towards definite good ends, that it is quite impossible in his case to trace these visions to any mental affection. And in the second place, it requires to be emphasised that there never yet was a religion founded by a person who lacked the imagination to rise above the A B C of the ordinary course of life.[1]

[1] Unless we are prepared to pronounce every kind of excitation to be unhealthy, we had better put aside altogether the idea that visionary perception is a mark of unhealthy excitement. Neither Amos nor Isaiah give the impression of being men mentally unsound, and yet they did

CORRECTNESS OF THE MESSIANIC BELIEF.—Of course, from the fact that Jesus received his call in a vision, it by no means follows that his belief in himself as the Messiah was justified. Mohammed also in the night of the decision, as it is called, in 610, was without the least doubt called to be a prophet in a vision which he actually experienced. From the mere form of Jesus' vision it is as impossible to recognise the truth of its substance as it is from the form of Mohammed's vision to conclude that the substance of his was false.[1] Thus the real significance which both these personalities have for the history of mankind cannot be gleaned from the import of the vision which signalised the call of each respectively; it can only be judged from the measure of the beneficial effects which have taken their origin from each respectively.

CONTENTS OF THE MESSIANIC BELIEF.—Jesus believes himself to be the Messiah. He believes not merely that he will one day become a participator in the Messiah's kingdom —as the others believed who were baptized by John—but he believes that he himself is actually the man whose speedy coming is announced so earnestly by the Baptist, the man who is to baptise with the Holy Ghost and with fire, but who is also to consume the useless chaff in the fire. When he made up his mind to go to John, Jesus believed that he himself personally ought not altogether to dispense with John's forgiveness of sins. Now he is certain, not merely that he may look forward without anxiety to the day of judgment through the strength of God's pardoning favour, but that he himself will actually appear as judge at that judgment. And after the judgment he will be God's vicegerent on earth, the king in the eternal kingdom which belongs to the saints of the Most High. This is indeed such a stupendous uplifting of human self-esteem, that some strong counterbalance were certainly required if the Messianic belief is to present itself to us as a healthy manifestation.[2] And the objection which

certainly experience visions in a real sense. Ezekiel's case may stand on a different level, for he seems to have used the vision merely as a literary device for clothing his thoughts.

[1] Comp. Aug. Müller, *Der Islam*, i. pp. 52 ff., Berlin, 1885.

[2] Jesus cannot, of course, have drawn all at once all the conclusions

Jesus' Messianic claim must otherwise very justly raise only disappears if, independently of this belief, he was personally endowed with a worth of the highest kind. Without the possession of such worth, his Messianic belief could only be pronounced intolerable presumption.

A GLIMPSE AHEAD.—And Jesus does personally possess such worth; but it requires to be perceived and understood. When his belief was publicly proclaimed, there was not an individual of the Jewish people who would not understand the hopes which that belief involved for Jesus himself; but the capacity to estimate the real worth which lay in his personality, the capacity to appreciate the value of the new religion which he preached, was not possessed by everybody. Hence it was to be expected, as a matter of course, that the supreme exaltation of human self-esteem implied in the name of the Messiah would be felt by many to be offensive. And thus we are antecedently prepared for a tragic termination.

involved in his Messianic belief; and yet the force of the new revelation was so overpowering as assuredly to have left him no peace until he had reflected upon it and recognised it in all the fulness of its meaning. In view of the circumstances in which Jesus was placed at the time, one can fully understand how it was that the Spirit of God which had come upon him drove him into solitude, there to undergo trials of divers kinds (Mt. iv. 1–11, Lk. iv. 1–13, Mk. i. 12 f.).

CHAPTER VII

THE TEMPTATION

AUTHORITIES.—*The Synoptists*—from the "Sayings of the Lord," Mt. iv. 1-11, Lk. iv. 1-13; historical supplement in Mk. i. 12 f. Further, the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (see Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77, to Mt. iv. 1, 8 and Mt. iv. 5). The principal difference—Mt. iv. 5-7 = Lk. iv. 9-12; Mt. iv. 8-10 = Lk. iv. 5-8; in the Gospel of the Hebrews Mt. iv. 8-10 = Lk. iv. 5-8 even stood first, and the temptation by hunger occupied the second, or third, place. As the temptation on the mountain and the temptation in Jerusalem obviously have a close connection, the order of events in the Gospel of the Hebrews may well have been: mountain, Jerusalem, desert. And there is reason to suppose that this inversion of Mt.'s order was the actual order originally.[1] Later allusions to the temptation clearly go back to these Sources; for instance, that of Justin, *Dial. contr. Tryph.*, ch. 103, § 331 B, C.

---

[1] The temptation on the mountain and the temptation in Jerusalem belong together, because in both the Messiah's relations with other men are shown, whereas the temptation in the wilderness is concerned only with Jesus' Messianic beliefs. This arrangement of the temptations is supported again by the quotations from Deut. vi. 13, 16, viii. 2 f.; and further by the fact that in Mk. also the series is closed by the ministration of the angels, which suggests that the writer was thinking of ideas like that of the feeding of Elijah whilst on his way to Horeb and the strengthening of Jesus in Gethsemane (1 Kings xix. 5-7, Lk. xxii. 43), and was therefore, no doubt, indicating a strengthening of the body after physical exhaustion. The last in the series was therefore the temptation through hunger. The explanation of the reversal of the order in Mt. and Lk. is to be found in the fact that Jesus was staying in the wilderness with John; hence it seemed fitting to suppose that the temptation took place in the ἔρημος. All the other particulars Lk. allowed to remain in their original form; but Mt. attains a gradation as regards the localities, taking Jesus from the banks of the Jordan to the Temple of Jerusalem, and from there to the marvellous high mountain, and at the same time a climax as regards subject-matter by the three desires—satisfaction of hunger, miraculous action, and sovereignty of the world.

ELEMENTS OF TEMPTATION IN THE BAPTISMAL VISION.—Jesus had received the revelation that he was the Messiah at the moment of his baptism in the Jordan; and in that there lay a great temptation for him. How will the inner life of the man Jesus respond to the revelation of God, which promises him the office of judge of all men, the sovereignty of the world as finally perfected? There was a grave danger of the even balance of his personal life being disturbed by so august a revelation, of its causing him to plunge headlong into fantastic dreams of the future, and into acts of violence, with the object of realising his dreams. But so far as we can see, Jesus entirely avoided these dangers in the first period of his ministry.[1]

IDEAS OF THE FUTURE.—He is far from indulging in the diffuse descriptions of the blessings of God's kingdom, such as were customary in the Apocalyptic style of writing; and it is only in the last period of his life that we find more definite utterances regarding the things the future has in store. According to Mk. x. 29–31, the faithful followers of the Messiah are to be compensated a hundredfold for all the goods which they have given up for his sake. Mt. xix. 28 = Lk. xxii. 29 f. tells us that it was especially promised to the Twelve, that they should one day sit upon twelve thrones governing the twelve tribes of Israel. In Mk. xiv. 25 Jesus declares, quite unambiguously, that in the kingdom of God he will drink of the fruit of the vine. It may be that Papias' saying with regard to the marvellous fertility of God's kingdom (Irenæus, *Heræt.*, v. 33. 3 f.) is derived from a genuine saying of the Lord. But if so, Jesus really meant to express nothing more than what was a fixed idea in the Messianic hope (*Apoc. Baruch*, xxix. 5). In any case, it is a very remarkable fact that these descriptions of Messianic glory represent something quite sporadic in Jesus' preaching, and that

[1] It is true that Jesus' relatives looked upon even his abandonment of his home and of the pursuit of his calling as a kind of ill-regulated enthusiasm (Mk. iii. 21, ἔλεγον—ὅτι ἐξέστη). It is also possible that they suffered inconvenience by this. But the vigorous manner in which he at the same time took up the profession of a preacher shows that Jesus was far from giving evidence of being an enthusiast, while there is nothing at all fantastical in the substance of his preaching.

upon at least one occasion he quite definitely refuses to go into any particulars or details as to these things (Mk. x. 40). The belief that he is the Messiah does not induce him to draw from his imagination pictures of the future world more highly coloured or richer in promises than those drawn by his contemporaries. On the contrary, it is not difficult with regard to this point to perceive a strong degree of reticence on Jesus' part; and in this we may discern a victory over a temptation which grew up out of his Messianic belief.[1]

ENTHUSIAST CONDUCT.—Nor did the boundless hope which he shared beguile him into any fanatical course of conduct, at least not in the first period of his public ministry. To render all erroneous suppositions impossible in the very beginning, he maintained, down to the time of Peter's confession, an absolute silence with regard to the sublime revelation which had been vouchsafed to him; and even when he did announce himself to his disciples as the Messiah, he charged them to communicate the important truth to nobody (Mk. viii. 29 f., Mt. xvi. 16–20). The demand to give up all on account of the nearness of the kingdom of God—for so we must understand Mk. x. 21—a demand made on the way to Jerusalem, might for the first time cause doubts which were not unjustified. In this case a request is represented to have been made such as is not to be derived from Jesus' peculiar apprehension of God's will towards men, but from his particular expectations with regard to the immediate future. Down to that moment this expectation had merely served as the urgent *motive* for his preaching of repentance; but on this occasion it affects the substance of his demand. And unless we specially count the similar demand addressed to his disciples in Lk. xii. 33 f.,[2] it is the only instance of the kind. For his public appearance as the Messiah in Jerusalem was merely intended to reinforce the urgency of the preaching of repentance in view of the peril of death which was threatening Jesus apart from this.

[1] No trace of the idea of the Messiah's ante-mundane existence, which was a permanent belief of Judaism, can be discerned in Jesus' "sayings," and the idea does not seem to have further occupied his imagination.

[2] The appeal to his disciples preceded in point of time that which was made to the one rich man. Comp. Mk. x. 28.

OVERCOMING OF THE ENTHUSIAST.—Jesus consequently acted with conscious intention when he suffered the revelation which came to him at his baptism to incite him to the career of a preacher of repentance, without permitting it to force him into an excessively enthusiast line of conduct. And this conscious intention presupposes that antecedently an inner harmony had been arrived at between his keen sense of duty and the strong conviction which was awakened in him by a marvellous experience. And even if we had received no explicit tradition to this effect, we should have been obliged to infer that such harmony had been arrived at. But we do possess the tradition: Jesus himself told his disciples about it in the story of his temptation.

THE DESCRIPTION OF MK.—This incident also assumes the form of a story told by Jesus in the Gospel of the Hebrews. The Evangelist Mk. (1. 12 f.) wished to introduce the substance of it, in so far as it bore upon the outer events of Jesus' life. Thus it is that he tells us that Jesus was driven away into solitude by the Spirit of God which came to him at his baptism; and we can understand this even if Jesus was already with John in the wilderness.[1] In the desert Jesus remained forty days, was tempted by Satan, and was with the beasts; but the angels ministered unto him. The remark about the forty days and the ministration of the angels is found in the detailed narrative taken from the Sayings of the Lord (Mt. iv. 2, 11, Lk. iv. 2); but Lk. iv. 2 notwithstanding, the temptation did not begin, according to the original version of the narrative, until the end of the forty days (cp. Lk. iv. 2—*συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν ἐπείνασεν*, and Mt. iv. 2—*ὕστερον ἐπείνασεν*).[2] In Lk. the saying about the ministration of the angels is dropped; but Mk. i. 13 adds, "He was with the beasts." In old Israelitish times lions still inhabited the thickets beside the Jordan (Jer. xlix. 19); in the

[1] As a matter of fact, an internal conflict such as that of Jesus could only take place when he was in solitude by himself; it could not have happened when he was in close intercourse with others, especially as, prior to Peter's confession, he never told any man that he was the Messiah.

[2] The source of these "forty days" is Deut. viii. 2 ("these forty years"). Cp. also 1 Kings xix. 8 ("forty days and forty nights"). They belong to the setting of the narrative.

age of Jesus the chief beast of prey in Palestine was, as it still is to-day, the jackal. But Mk.'s sole object in making this addition would appear to have been the desire to bring into greater relief Jesus' complete severance from human society, with the idea of imparting more body to his description. But his account is drawn exclusively from the story of the temptation in the Sayings of the Lord.

TEMPTATION AND MESSIANIC BELIEF.—All our Sources are agreed that it was the newly-received Spirit of God which led Jesus to his temptation, so that the temptation is immediately connected with the great revelation which came to him at his baptism. This also follows from the fact that twice (Mt. iv. 3, 6, Lk. iv. 3, 9) the Tempter introduces his tempting utterances with the conditional sentence, "If thou art the Son of God." His object is to draw practical conclusions from this presupposition. The victory over the temptation consists in this: the conclusions drawn from Jesus' divine Sonship are shown to be false and unwarranted. And this is also just as true in the case of the Tempter's third attempt, which is not introduced by the conditional clause in Mt. iv. 8–10, Lk. iv. 5–8. Here the Tempter calls upon Jesus to win the sovereignty of the world by worshipping the Devil. Now the sovereignty of the world was promised to the Messiah. How, indeed, could the desire for the sovereignty of the world have been awakened in the artisan of Nazareth if the Messianic revelation had not suggested the idea to him?[1] But Jesus could not possibly let the Tempter say, "If thou art the Son of God, then make Thyself the Lord of this world; I will give it to Thee, if Thou wilt worship me." One who is requested to worship the Devil cannot in the same breath be reminded that he is the Son of God. Hence in this move the Tempter's conditional phrase is dropped; but, all the same, it remains in this case also the presupposition on which the temptation is based.

ORDER OF THE TEMPTATIONS.—Jesus, then, refuses certain practical conclusions from his Messianic belief; they can be briefly stated. Here *as the original* we may

[1] Certainly the desire for the sovereignty of the world might, as a fact, have manifested itself in the artisan of Nazareth as a desire to be the Messiah.

follow Mt.'s order of the separate temptations. The Messiah must not endure hunger; the Messiah must perform some great miracle as a sign; the Messiah must reach out after the sovereignty of the world. What is common to these three deductions is that they spring from Jesus' perception that his worldly circumstances are a direct contradiction of his Messianic faith. It is reasonable to assume, then, that this perception came to Jesus almost simultaneously with the conviction of his Messiahship. What, let us ask, would be Jesus' first thought after he heard the heavenly voice announcing to him that he was the Messiah? Assuredly not of hunger or of the privations of his life. He was always conscious that the soul is more than food (Mt. vi. 25, Lk. xii. 23). We may be sure that what most exercised him now in the depths of his soul was the great promise given to him along with the name of the Messiah: Thou wilt be the Lord of this world; all lands and the glory of them shall be subject unto Thee. If Jesus' mind was at all occupied with the revelation which had been vouchsafed to him by God, he must of absolute necessity have come to some understanding with himself regarding this idea.

ORIGINAL ELEMENTS IN THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS. —The words with which the Gospel of the Hebrews began the story of the Temptation sound very strange to our sober habits of thought: "Forthwith (ἄρτι, that is to say, after the baptism) my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of the hairs of my head and carried me away to the high mountain of Tabor."[1] It is with this that the story begins; for in the Synoptists also the Holy Spirit is represented as being the compelling force only at the first (Mt. iv. 1, Lk. iv. 1—Mk. i. 12). Moreover, the designation of the Holy Spirit as the mother of Jesus is immediately connected with the words which, according to the Gospel of the Hebrews, were heard along with the baptismal vision.[2] To us the idea of the Holy Spirit carrying Jesus away by a hair of his head seems grotesque. But the strangeness of the idea disappears when we think of the age in which Jesus lived, the figure already occurring in the originator of "Apocalyptic," the prophet

[1] Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77, to Mt. iv. 1, 8.
[2] Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 77, to Mt. iii. 16 f.

Ezekiel (viii. 3). And, after all, the phrase is not more strange than when Jesus himself illustrates God's providential care for the individual by saying that the hairs of his head are all numbered (Mt. x. 30, Lk. xii. 7). But in giving the name of Mount Tabor, the mountain of Jesus' home country, the Gospel of the Hebrews preserves a trait of marked fidelity and truth. Mt. iv. 8 leaves the name out altogether, and speaks only of an exceeding high mountain, from which Jesus is able to view all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.[1] The very existence of such a mountain might seem questionable in Lk. (iv. 5), who avoids all mention of the name, and says merely that the Tempter led Jesus 'up' and in a moment of time let him see all the kingdoms of the world. It is far more natural to suppose that Jesus, when reflecting upon the promise of the sovereignty of the world which had been made to him, would imagine himself carried by the Spirit of God to the top of Mount Tabor, the mountain which rose in the neighbourhood of Nazareth, where, in his childhood, the idea of the magnitude of the world had perhaps first dawned upon his consciousness. Here to the north Hermon looms mightily upon the view ; towards the south-east are seen the mountains of Gilead beyond Jordan ; in the south-west, on the other side of the great plain, the wooded height of Carmel. The summit of Mount Tabor is 1845 feet above the Mediterranean, or about 1050 feet above the level of the surrounding tableland.[2] It is to the top of this mountain, then, that Jesus pictures himself carried in the spirit, and from its summit he surveys the wide landscape.

THE MESSIAH'S SOVEREIGNTY OF THE WORLD.—The Messiah, the Lord of the world ! This belief becomes his temptation. All the wide regions which he scans from the

[1] The reason the Evangelist left out the name Tabor was that it seemed to him impossible for any one to see from this mountain—for it is only relatively a high mountain—all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. But what we have to deal with here is simply the standpoint of the child of Nazareth. It was one and the same motive that led Mt. to strike out the name Tabor, and Lk. to omit the mention of a mountain altogether. To a man destitute of imagination, no mountain would be high enough to enable him to survey the whole world.

[2] See Baedeker, *Palästina*, 3rd ed., 1891, p. 251.

top of Tabor are, according to God's holy revelation, one day to become his. Should he of his own accord make them his own? This is the tempting thought which grows up out of this highest religious experience itself. Any other person would have regarded this conclusion as, beyond doubt, just and right. But Jesus checks himself: he knows that the sovereignty of the world has been promised to him; but he is also aware that God has not bidden, or allowed him, to seize upon that sovereignty arbitrarily. The only path by which he could grasp it was the path of revolt and insurrection. All Israel was persuaded that when the Messiah came, he would destroy God's enemies, and that the capital of the new world would be not Rome, or any other city, but Jerusalem, whither the heathen were to resort to learn God's law of peace (Ps. ii. 9, Isa. ii. 2–4 = Micah iv. 1–3). When we reflect upon the hatred which the Jews bore to the Romans, the public appearance of a Messiah would unquestionably have at once drawn around him an enthusiastic band of followers, eager to fight for their freedom. True, according to all human judgment such a band would have been doomed to inevitable destruction. But, on several occasions already, this consideration had not, as a matter of fact, restrained the Jews from rising in revolt.[1] Besides, Jesus really believed that he was the Messiah; and, so believing, he might hope for a successful termination to an enterprise of the kind. But to come to a decision he did not require any lengthened deliberation or calculation. No sooner did the Messianic belief awaken in him the expectation of the sovereignty of the world, than the conviction also became his, that to reach out after the government of the world would be to worship the Devil. The mission

[1] We need only recall the war of Varus, or rather Sabinus, after the death of Herod (4 B.C.); the rising of Judas of Galilee in the time of the census (6 A.D.); the massacre of the Samaritans by Pilate, when a prophet proposed to show to them the holy things hidden on Mount Gerizim (36 A.D.); the annihilation of the troop of Theudas by Cuspius Fadus, when he proposed to bring it through the Jordan dryshod (about 45 A.D.); and the suppression by Antonius Felix (about 50 A.D.) of the wild enthusiasts to whom an Egyptian promised that by a word spoken on the Mount of Olives he would overthrow the walls of Jerusalem. Even the great Jewish war had no prospect of success.

entrusted to him by God was not forcibly to disturb the established political arrangements. For him to have consumed his life struggling for the sovereignty of the world would have been to sacrifice for the sake of earthly pleasure all that was holiest. Jesus' heart was set towards eternal things. Accordingly, he repels the Tempter with the words, "It is written (Deut. vi. 13), 'Thou shalt worship (fear) the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve'" (Mt. iv. 10, Lk. iv. 8).

PROVING THE MESSIAH.—As soon as he was convinced that he was the Messiah, it became necessary for Jesus to arrive at an understanding with himself with regard to the promise of the sovereignty of the world. Not necessary in the same degree, though at the same time very pressing, was the question whether he should proclaim the Messiahship to the world, and in what way. True, he desired to make no attempt to establish the kingdom of God without an explicit commission from God Himself. But, as already the Baptist had seen in the certainty of the nearness of the kingdom of God a reason for preaching repentance, so every man who had been brought up and trained in Jewish ideas, having arrived at the conviction that the Messiah was already living on earth, must at once consider the judgment of God and the establishment of the kingdom of the Messiah to be immediately impending. The event was one of such significance that it might only be kept secret for the most compelling reasons.[1] The realisation that "the Messiah is already come" would infallibly have operated as the very strongest incentive to a return from false paths. But who would believe in the announcement, that the Messiah was to be found in a simple craftsman of Nazareth, especially if, at the time the announcement was made, he did not advance to meet the political aspirations of his people? Then there awakens in Jesus the tempting idea of revealing himself to his people as the Messiah, by some great and wonderful deed which shall be manifest to all. He was still with John in the wilderness beside the lower Jordan. But the rallying-point of all Jewish

[1] At the time of his entry into Jerusalem, Jesus seems to have found in Isa. lxii. 11 a direct injunction not to keep his Messiahship hidden from that city.

life, especially in its religious aspect, was the holy temple in Jerusalem. That was the place, then, in which he could demonstrate his Messiahship, by (say) letting himself down from a lofty height without suffering any injury. Which particular part of the Temple Jesus had in his mind cannot now be determined. The expression chosen in Mt. iv. 5, Lk. iv. 9, τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, does not occur anywhere else. It seems to denote a side-building (the wing of an edifice). This would best suit the subsidiary structures on each side of the Temple building, although strictly these were not accessible to anyone who was not a Levite.[1] He may, however, have been thinking of the outer aisle of the royal portico on the south side of the forecourt of the temple, which was generally accessible to everybody. From this spot, according to the testimony of Josephus (*Ant.*, xv. 412), one could not look into the precipitous depths below without turning giddy. The general structure of the royal portico was threefold, the middle building being higher than those at the sides. These side-buildings might well be described as the wings.[2] It was, then, from this elevated position of the king's portico that Jesus thought to let himself down into the depth below. But the thought was doubtless merely a transient one, which was very quickly put aside. For all that, Jesus did for one moment at least defend the idea to himself. He was sure that God would protect His Messiah. Of the Messiah, above all others, are the words of Ps. xci. 11 f. true: "He will give his angels charge concerning thee, to watch over thee, and they shall bear thee in their hands, that thou strike not thy foot against a stone." Even before he began his public ministry, Jesus knew, through the revelation of his Messiahship, that a special protection on the part of God was assured to him; and this fact is of the first import-

[1] Jos., *Ant.*, xv. 393; *Bell. Jud.*, v. 207, where Josephus compares these supplementary structures to shoulders, ὥσπερ ὦμοι.

[2] It was possible to walk to and fro on the wooden roofing of this portico, as appears from the passage quoted (Jos., *Ant.*, xv. 412). We also have evidence that on the occasion of the great Jewish feasts, Roman sentries were wont to be stationed there (*Ant.*, xx. 106 f.; *Bell. Jud.*, in 224). Jesus was, therefore, so much at home in Jerusalem that definite impressions gained there now came back to him.

ance for forming an estimate of the whole of his subsequent career. It was this that imparted to his character that remarkable steadfastness which he also sought to communicate to his followers. But, sure though he is of God's help, he nevertheless repels the idea of arbitrarily invoking such a manifestation of it as would be involved in leaping from the height of the Temple. "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Mt. iv. 7, Lk. iv. 12).

JESUS AND DT. VI.–VIII.—That the temptations on Mount Tabor and in Jerusalem are closely connected in point of time is rendered probable by the fact that both are parried by quotations from the same section of Deuteronomy—the temptation on Mount Tabor by Dt. vi. 13, and the temptation in Jerusalem by Dt. vi. 16. This sixth chapter of Deuteronomy was especially familiar to the Jews, the first portion of their daily prayer being taken from the verses which immediately precede those quoted by Jesus (Dt. vi. 4–10, the *Shemá*, which was also well known to Jesus, Mk. xii. 29 f.). And if we add to this, that the form of the third temptation was taken entirely from Dt. viii. 2 f., there will be good reason for the supposition that Jesus, at the time he experienced these temptations, was engaged in a deep study of these portions of Deuteronomy.[1] In fact, when he came to consider these portions of the Scriptures, he manifestly brought with him his Messianic beliefs and the expectations which flowed out of them: first, the desire to seize upon the sovereignty of the world being quelled by reflection upon vi. 13; next, the expectation of divine help in making the experiment of a miracle by vi. 16; and, finally, the suggestion to improve his personal position by viii. 2 f. This being so, we have here again a proof of the correctness of the order in which the separate temptations were doubtless given by the Gospel of the Hebrews.

We have other proofs besides this, that Jesus was wont to ponder long and much upon certain texts of the Bible. One instance comes to light in the last days of his public ministry. The greetings which accompanied his entry into Jerusalem were taken from Ps. cxviii. This same Psalm was still in Jesus' mind on the following day (Mk. xi. 9 f. = Ps.

[1] Cp. Chap. IV., p. 94.

cxviii. 25 f.; Mk. xii. 10 f. = Ps. cxviii. 22 f.). So also on the last day of his teaching, before he was seized, he publicly discussed Ps. cx. 1 = Mk. xii. 36; and this same passage from the Psalms clearly suggested the form of answer he made on the night immediately following, when being examined by the high-priest (Mk. xiv. 62).

CONCEALMENT OF HIS MESSIANIC BELIEF. — Jesus refuses, then, to win the Messianic sovereignty of the world by any direct action of his own; that would have been serving the Devil. Next, he also refuses to proclaim himself the Messiah by a miracle; to do so, it would be necessary to tempt God. He would have to put God to the test, whether he really would help him; and he knew, from his training in the Law, that God does not sanction any such arbitrary proving of his help, but demands our confidence, even in those cases where there exist no outward proofs of his readiness to help. And with the rejection of this temptation coincided, we may be sure, the resolve to keep the secret of his Messianic faith locked in his own bosom. A claim to be the Messiah, unsupported by correspondent political action, and without the warranty of miracles, would simply not have been understood.[1] Jesus could not hope to meet with any credence; consequently, he preferred not to expose the holy gift which God had committed to him to the mockery of ignorant men (Mt. vii. 6, xvi. 17).

THE MESSIAH HUNGERS. — Jesus says nothing about his Messianic faith—a serious resolve which pre-supposes great self-command. But there still remains a temptation to be faced. The Messiah is subjected to the wants of life; he is hungry. Would it not therefore be better to renounce his Messianic faith altogether, seeing that it seems to bring him nothing—neither the sovereignty of the world, which was destined for the Messiah, nor the miracles by which he might proclaim his high destiny to the world, nor even so much as his daily bread, which yet is given to so many others without their moving a finger?[2] Must not the very stones in the

[1] Cp. further as to the miracles of Jesus, Chap. III., pp. 76 f.

[2] Nay more; the revelation to Jesus of his Messianic calling actually deprived him of his daily bread, since it caused him to give up his trade and to live solely as the preacher of repentance.

region of the Jordan—the stones out of which, according to a saying of the Baptist, God could create children of Abraham (Mt. iii. 9, Lk. iii. 8)—transform themselves into bread to appease the Messiah's hunger? In his hours of privation, the divine revelation at his baptism may well have appeared to Jesus an empty and deceptive vision, all those things with which the lavish imagination of the Apocalyptic prophets had endowed the Messiah being wanting to him. But he overcomes this temptation also. Although the revelation of God does not bestow upon him any kind of earthly possession, he knows well that out of it there is growing up strength for his inner life: the sure hope of the highest glory in the future transforms even the want and privations of the present. He comforts himself with the Scriptural saying: "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every single word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Dt. viii. 3). Jesus has heard God's declaration that he is the Messiah; and in the moment of privation it is this divine declaration that becomes a source of sustenance to him, giving him strength and courage.[1]

Form of the Story of the Temptation. — The passage in Dt. (viii. 2 f.) seems also to have been of further importance for the special form into which Jesus at a later period put his account of the Temptation. Moses is there reminding the people of Israel of their journey through the desert. God hath led his people forty years in the wilderness, that he might prove them. . . . He suffered them to hunger, ... that he might make them know that man doth not live by bread alone, etc. With this compare Mt. iv. 1 f., Lk. iv. 1 f. Jesus is led into the wilderness to be tempted. He fasts forty days and forty nights, and is then hungry (Mt.); or, Jesus is led about in the wilderness forty days, is tempted . . . . and in these days he eats

[1] This seems indeed the appropriate place for the saying handed down by the Gospel of the Hebrews (in Eusebius, *Theophania Syriace*, iv. 12, p. 234 twice): "I choose what is pleasing unto me; and that is pleasing unto me which my Father in heaven giveth unto me" (see Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 92)—an utterance, therefore, of humble self-submission. The reference to the angels, who in the end came forward to serve Jesus, doubtless formed the conclusion of the story of the Temptation (Mt. iv. 11, Mk. i. 13).

nothing, and after they are passed he hungers (Lk.). Both accounts then close with the word of Scripture, Dt. viii. 3, with which the temptation is rejected. Here it is abundantly plain that the number forty, the wilderness, the being tempted, the hungering, are borrowed from the Old Testament phraseology, just as much as the words which are quoted immediately afterwards. Now, since it is precisely with these words that Mk. (i., 12 f.) connects his picture which is concerned only with the facts of Jesus' outer life, the question at this point suggests itself with special force: What was Jesus' actual experience, and what was the nature of the event under consideration?

An Artistic Presentation of Inner Experiences. —There cannot be the least doubt as to the reality of the definite mental process which occupied Jesus—the process of arriving at an understanding between his sense of duty and the conviction, newly awakened in him, that he was the Messiah. We have just emphasised the fact that this inner reconciliation derived support from a particular portion of the Bible, namely, Dt. vi.–viii., with which Jesus' mind was evidently at that precise period much occupied. Besides this, a passage from Ps. xci. (*vv.* 11 f.) is employed to justify a thought which is afterwards put aside as involving a temptation. At the same time, local recollections come into play —Mount Tabor, the wing of the temple in Jerusalem. The expression "these stones" gives the impression of immediate presence, putting us in mind also of a similar expression used by the Baptist. In other respects, the whole of the last scene of the Temptation is copied from Dt. viii. 2 f. Several of the details are of such a nature that we might well think of a vision; for example, when, at the outset, the Spirit carries Jesus by one of the hairs of his head to the top of Mount Tabor. And the same observation holds good with regard to the appearance of the Tempter and the angels. But then this would still be essentially a different kind of vision from that which Jesus saw at his baptism. The latter was an event of brief duration, and quickly gone. The opening of the Heavens, the descent of the Spirit, the Heavenly voice, are all practically simultaneous. But in the story of the Temptation, not only is Jesus taken to three separate places,

but in each of these he has an appropriate answer to give to the Tempter's attack. He is by no means merely receptive. He judges with decision, and actively repels false assumptions. That is to say, the narrative contains a remarkable blending of imaginative pictures with calm and sober clearness of thought, giving an impression of conscious artistic treatment and finish. In particular, the evident imitation of Dt. viii. 2 f. can only have been due to deliberate intention. Thus, in the classic form of this narrative Jesus has imparted to his disciples the story of his inward struggles after he received the Messianic revelation, making use at the same time in the happiest manner of his recollections of certain actual experiences. That is to say, he has included in it the things which exercised his mind, at any rate for some few days, during which he abode with John. The weapon he used to overcome the Tempter, who sought to lead him astray by means of his Messianic faith, was the Law-book of Moses.[1]

[1] If obedience to the Law and the Messianic hope are the two poles of the Jewish conception of the world, we may say that in this episode obedience to the Law wins in Jesus the victory over the extravagances of the Messianic hope.

CHAPTER VIII

THE NEARNESS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

SOURCES.—Mk. i. 14 f. This fundamental passage has already been worked up in Mt. iv. 12–17; in Lk. iv. 14 f. the purport of Jesus' preaching is omitted. Of the "sayings of the Lord" transmitted to us, the following belong to the theme of Mk. i. 15: Sayings *concerning the signs of the time*, Lk. xii. 54–56 = Mt. xvi. 2 f. (in Mt. plainly an interpolation); Mk. xiii. 28–31 = Mt. xxiv. 32–35, Lk. xxi. 29–33; the remarkable *description of the last judgment*, Mt. xxv. 31–46; *the exhortations to repentance in view of the judgment*—(*a*) the slaves who wait for their lord, Lk. xii. 35–38, compare Mk. xiii. 32–37; (*b*) the virgins waiting for the bridegroom, Mt. xxv. 1–13; (*c*) the householder and the thief, Lk. xii. 39 f. = Mt. xxiv. 43 f.; (*d*) the faithful and the unfaithful chief servant, Lk. xii. 42–46 = Mt. xxiv. 45–51; (*e*) the steward who protects himself against the day of reckoning, Lk. xvi. 1–9; (*f*) one ought to be reconciled whilst on the way to the judge, Lk. xii. 58 f. = Mt. v. 25 f.; and (*g*) the parable of the fig-tree, Lk. xiii. 6–9; *prayer for the kingdom of God*—embracing (*a*) the unjust judge, Lk. xviii. 2–8; and (*b*) the friend who comes and knocks at midnight and the exhortation to prayer, Lk. xi. 5–13 = Mt. vii. 7–11.

JESUS' STAY WITH THE BAPTIST.—It was only after some reflection that Jesus had resolved to go to John. But the powerful personality of this man, and the wonderful experience which threw into a turmoil and transformed the whole of Jesus' inner life—we mean the revelation made to him by God at his baptism—prevented him from returning any more to follow his handicraft at Nazareth.[1] Jesus, it would

[1] Jesus' resolve finally to give up his trade in Nazareth was the decisive act by which he first manifested his belief in the truth of the revelation which had been made to him. His abandonment of the sure support of a fixed and regular calling, and also, it would appear, his renunciation of family life, might very well be interpreted as fanaticism. Jesus, however, in his own case, just as in that of his first disciples whom he converted from being fishermen into fishers of men (Mk. i. 17), is only

seem, remained with John until the latter was seized and flung into prison. We may not, however, suppose that this would be any very long period of time, for it is fair to assume that, after his Messianic revelation, Jesus did not long delay the beginning of his own mission.[1] According to the statements of the Johannine Gospel (i. 35–42), it was whilst he was in the neighbourhood of the Baptist that Jesus became acquainted with the two brothers Andrew and Simon, the latter of whom he afterwards called Peter, and also with yet a third among his disciples, who is generally supposed to have been John the son of Zebedee. And there is good ground for this supposition, because, as a matter of fact, the two sons of Zebedee were amongst the oldest friends and disciples of Jesus. And, indeed, there exists historical justification for believing that he became acquainted with these three whilst in the company of John. Unless Jesus, after the seizure of the Baptist, returned with these men to their home beside the Lake of Galilee, it is difficult to understand why he should have chosen at once and quite specially the west shore of that lake to be the scene of his first public activity.[2]

Necessity for Preaching Repentance.—Jesus was obliged to come forward publicly; his Messianic faith compelled him to do so. He had successfully overcome the temptation to reach out prematurely after the Messianic kingdom, to proclaim himself the Messiah, and to adjust his life smoothly to his lofty mission. But if the Messiah was actually dwelling on earth, then the kingdom of God also was immediately at hand, as indeed the Baptist had already announced. The Jews of that age knew nothing about a first and a second coming; at any rate, they did not assume an interval of centuries, or even millennia, between the first

enabled to undertake a higher calling by renouncing the craft he had hitherto pursued—this same higher calling nevertheless corresponding in a measure to the work renounced (Mt. vii. 24–27 = Lk. vi. 47–49).

[1] The difference which there was between Jesus and the disciples of John (Mk. ii. 19), as well as between Jesus and John himself (Mt. xi. 18 f., Lk. vii. 33 f.), makes it very unlikely that Jesus remained any length of time in the company of John, especially as that difference never led to any disagreement.

[2] See Chap. IX., pp. 185 ff.

and the second appearance of the Messiah. To every pious Jew, and more especially to Jesus, who knew himself to be the Messiah of the future, the nearness of the kingdom of God was at that time a source of purest joy. But it also signified the nearness of the judgment — that is to say, of a threatening danger of an awful character to the sinful. Hence Jesus feels it to be a sacred duty to call sinners to repentance, to amendment of their ways, before the judgment comes (Mk. ii. 17). That is a service which he must render to others (Mk. x. 45). By that means he will save what otherwise would be lost (Lk. xix. 10).[1]

First Preaching.—According to Mk. i. 14 f., after the Baptist is arrested, Jesus comes into Galilee, preaching the joyful message (gospel) of God, proclaiming that the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is nigh at hand: "Repent and believe in the tidings of joy (=the Gospel)." So far as their substance is concerned, the announcements of the Baptist and of Jesus express something almost identical; yet there is an essential difference. The chief motive of the Baptist was fear of the judgment. This fear drove him into the wilderness; this fear he communicated to his disciples. Strong of will though he is, stern though he appears towards himself, John, the man of power, is dismayed because he realises that he is still outside the kingdom of God. He does indeed hold fast to the hope that the Messiah will complete, by his baptism of the Spirit, what he himself by his baptism of water is unable to effect; but it is only a hope, it is not a certainty. Jesus, on the contrary, comes forward with a strong inner conviction that he is the Messiah, and hence that, in any case, he himself is sure of having a

[1] It is Jesus' zeal to save the lost for the kingdom of God that quite clearly distinguishes him from the Baptist, whose sole object for withdrawing into the wilderness was, we cannot doubt, solicitude for his own soul's salvation. Jesus, being convinced that he is himself the Messiah, is exempt from such care, and it is the joyful certainty of being himself the Lord of the future kingdom that sets his energies free for the service of others. And this agrees exactly with the experience of Luther, that the man who is readiest to humble himself joyfully for the service of others is the man who is secure in the belief in his own salvation, and who consequently has overcome the fear of the world.

part in the kingdom of God.[1] Joy in this certainty echoes of necessity through all his preaching of repentance; he knows also that God establishes his kingdom, not merely to punish sinners, but above all things to ensure to very many a life of blessedness. It is the special object of his labours to procure for as many as he can a share in the coming kingdom. And it is a work that he labours at with joy, because he desires to bring joy, and has no fear on his own account. We can thus understand how later on he could say of the Baptist, "Verily I say unto you, among all those that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John. Yet even he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Mt. xi. 11, Lk. vii. 28). Notwithstanding all the moral greatness of John, he is excelled by the man who is animated by the joyful certainty that he belongs to the kingdom of God.

THE TIME IS FULFILLED.—Jesus therefore preaches, as tidings of joy, that the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand. The happy days which God in his grace has destined for his people will soon dawn. The phrase, "the time is fulfilled," points back to the conviction, common to all the Jewish Apocalyptic writers, that the course of the world's history has been ordered by God on a definite plan, so that the Messianic era could only begin when all the events destined by God to precede it had actually run their course. This we meet with as a firmly-defined article of faith, as early as in the Book of Daniel—*e.g.* in the interpretation of the colossal image made of different kinds of metals (ii. 31–45), in the interpretation of the four beasts of the sea and the image of a man in the clouds of heaven (vii. 17–27), and further in the last chapters, where the time of the end

[1] How important this conviction must have been to him, we realise from the consideration that it must have been some feeling of his own insufficiency that made him go to John; that at a date much later still he refused to allow himself to be addressed as "good"; and that even in Gethsemane it was with difficulty that he subdued his own will in order to fulfil the will of God. Yet through it all he knew that he was the Messiah, and as such had no need to fear the Judgment of God, but was himself one day to conduct it. If anyone thinks this quite unintelligible, let him call to mind the case of the apostle Paul. He holds out to his Corinthians, who were certainly not faultless, the belief that even they are one day to participate as judges at the judgment of the world (1 Cor. vi. 2 f.).

of all things is fixed by very precise calculations (viii. 14, ix. 24–27, xii. 11 f.). In so far as the discourse in Mk. xiii. 6–27 was really derived from Jesus,[1] he even gave his disciples definite details of the occurrences which should precede the end; only, Jesus believes that these events will follow one another swiftly. Nor do these details contradict the tradition that Jesus began his public teaching with the announcement, "The time is fulfilled." For even though many events do intervene in quick succession between the death of Jesus and his second coming, the time when the kingdom of God should begin might on the whole have been already fulfilled when Jesus commenced to preach.

NEARNESS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—Down to the very last, that is to say, Jesus certainly looked for the establishment of the kingdom of God in the lifetime of his contemporaries. This idea is expressed in quite unambiguous language (Mk. ix. 1 = Mt. xvi. 28, Lk. ix. 27), "Verily I say unto you, that amongst those who stand here there be some that shall not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come with proofs of power." This, of course, does not mean that Jesus is promising any of his hearers an extraordinarily long life; it means that the kingdom of God will, Jesus believes, be established in the course of (say) the next few decades.[2] In Mk. xiii. 30 = Mt. xxiv. 34, Lk. xxi. 32, Jesus again declares in quite the same sense, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things are brought to pass"—that is to say, until the Messiah comes, and his judgment. And precisely the same thing is repeated in Mt. xxiii. 36 = Lk. xi. 51, "All the blood-guiltiness which has been accumulated by the slaying and persecution of the messengers of God since the beginning of

[1] See Chap. XII., "Discourse on the Second Coming," on the Mount of Olives—"Recasting of the Discourse."

[2] Within this period there was amply sufficient space for a sudden appearance of the Messiah (Mk. xiii. 32–37, Mt. xxiv. 36–44, Lk. xii. 39 f.). And when at a later date Jesus expects to rise again on the third day after his death, in accordance with Hos. vi. 2, he does not intend this note of time to be taken in its strictly literal meaning, any more than Hosea did; all he wants to convey is the idea of an interval of time which on the whole is of no great length. Paul also knows of a saying relating to the suddenness of the coming of the Messiah (1 Thess. v. 2).

time is to be visited upon this generation." Further, Jesus promises to his disciples (Mt. x. 23) that he will come before they have been driven by their Jewish persecutors out of all the cities of Israel; and in Mt. xxvi. 64 (=Lk. xxii. 69, Mt. xiv. 62) he cries to his judges that he will shortly (Mt. ἀπ' ἄρτι; Lk. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) come to sit in judgment upon them. It is true that in its original form the saying appears only in Mt. In Mk. the temporal particle (also vouched for by Lk.) was erased. But in Lk. the meaning of the passage was altered in the sense, that from that time onwards Jesus would be raised to the right hand of God. But no later writer would have put the saying into the form which Mt. gives; and it is very easy to understand that offence was taken at this saying, and that it was altered when it had not been fulfilled. The unusual circumstance that Mt. here affords a more original text than Mk. might be explained by supposing Mk.'s text to have been corrected by a later hand. At any rate, the words in question prove that Jesus did actually proclaim, "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mk. i. 15).[1]

Kingdom of God or Kingdom of Heaven.—In this connection there is still a question of terminology to be settled. With the exception of the First Evangelist, all the writers of the New Testament regularly call the kingdom of future bliss "the kingdom of God"; but in Mt. it is commonly called the kingdom of Heaven, only exceptionally (vi. 33, xii. 28, xix. 24, xxi. 31, 43) the kingdom of God. Before we can fix the form of expression employed by Jesus, we must decide the question whether the texts have been changed in Mt. or in Mk.–Lk. Here it is not prudent to

[1] The starting-point of Jesus' preaching is therefore to be found in its eschatology: "The end of the existing world is immediately at hand, therefore repent ye." In that case we must regard the eschatological discourses in the preaching of Jesus as being (to use a metaphor) not merely accidental offshoots, but the roots which support the trunk of the tree. It was, we cannot doubt, with eschatological discourses that Jesus came forward in the first instance. Whether it was precisely with those which have been handed down to us is indeed an open question; one of the traditional discourses of the kind certainly belongs only to the last period (Mk. xiii.); but the public activity of Jesus can only be understood by starting from his discourses regarding the Judgment.

decide *a priori* against Mt. because in other cases we have perceived the priority of Mk.; for the instance we have last discussed, the use of the word "shortly," proves that Mk. does not in every case supply us with the original text.[1] The only means, therefore, of deciding is to discover the reasons for the change which has been made in Mt. or in Mk.–Lk.

(*a*) NO APPROXIMATION OF MT. TO JN.—Some scholars have ventured to affirm that Mt's. phrase, "the kingdom of Heaven," is an approximation to the Johannine conception of the Father's house in heaven which the faithful enter into (Jn. xiv. 2, 4). Thus Mt. did not intend to say that Jesus announced that God would establish his kingdom on earth, but that God would take the pious up into his heaven. Did Mt. really intend to say this, he must have certainly misunderstood the preaching of Jesus, and the saying would be an indication that the original Christian range of conceptions was transformed by the Evangelist. But throughout the whole of the Gospel of Mt. there is not a single passage from which it would appear that Mt. had not formed precisely the same idea of "the kingdom of Heaven" as the rest of the New Testament writers had of "the kingdom of God."[2]

(*b*) HEAVEN AND KINGDOM OF PERFECTION.—Starting, then, from this conception which is present everywhere, we see that the kingdom of perfection, proclaimed by Jesus at the very beginning as being near at hand, has been prepared from the creation itself for those who enjoy the blessing of God (Mt. xxv. 34). One day it will become visible, descending from heaven in the fulness of its power, when the Messiah

[1] True, we have to distinguish between the case in which a particular passage has perhaps been better transmitted to us in Mt. than in Mk. and that in which an idea, though common in both, has been differently expressed. Yet, in the present instance, the state of the case might be this: the Sayings of the Lord furnished the expression "kingdom of heaven," while Mk. made use of the phrase "kingdom of God"; Mt. then decided on the whole for the expression "kingdom of heaven," while Lk. transferred the phrase "kingdom of God" even to the portions taken from the "Sayings of the Lord."

[2] Even in Jn. iii. 3, 5 we have βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. When describing the hearing before Pilate, it would have been natural enough for the same Evangelist (xviii. 33–37) to have used the expression βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν; but he simply makes Jesus say that his kingdom is not of this world.

appears on the clouds with the holy angels (Mk. ix. 1, xiv. 62). For in heaven are preserved the good works of the saints, who shall then meet with their reward (Mt. vi. 20 f. = Lk. xii. 33 f.). And God shall bring this reward with him when he sets up his kingdom (Isa. xl. 10, Rev. xxii. 12). Thus, the Messiah will bring a temple which has not been built by human hands (Mk. xiv. 58). Indeed, the entire new Jerusalem of the future is now in heaven above (Gal. iv. 26, Heb. xii. 22), but will in due time descend to earth all complete (Rev. xxi. 10). According to 2 Cor. v. 1, even the future body of the faithful is already prepared in Heaven as an eternal house which has not been built by human hands. In the light of these passages, the term "the kingdom of Heaven" may well be interpreted to mean the kingdom now already prepared in heaven and ready at the end of days to descend to a transfigured earth (Rev. xxi. 1). The only doubt as to the correctness of this interpretation arises out of the form of the expression and the use made of it in late Jewish literature.

(*c*) FORM OF THE EXPRESSION.—The genitival half of the expression "the kingdom of Heaven" would thus indicate the origin of the kingdom, and therewith at the same time also its peculiar character; it is the kingdom which is to come down from heaven, and which, in accordance with this origin, will introduce a heavenly state of things upon earth. This can indeed very well be indicated by the words "kingdom of Heaven"; but it is much more appropriate to interpret the genitive as either subjective or objective, and to take the phrase to mean either "the dominion of Heaven" or "the dominion over Heaven." The latter must from its very meaning be abandoned at once. The former is confirmed by the book of Daniel, where in iv. 26 it is expressly said, "Thy kingdom will remain to thee, because thou wilt perceive that *heaven* reigneth."

(*d*) THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IN JEWISH LITERATURE.—In agreement with this, we find that in Jewish literature the expression *malkūth shāmayim* (מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, "kingdom [rule] of Heaven") is repeated pretty often in the sense of the rule of God over Israel. On Mount Sinai Israel received the law, and with the law the sovereignty of God over themselves

(*Mekilta*, 73b). The passage from *Pesikta*, 51 a, to the Song of Solomon ii. 10, is especially noteworthy: "For the time of the kingdom of wickedness (מַלְכוּת הָרִשְׁעָה, *malkūth hārĕshā'āh*; the allusion is to Rome) is come, that it shall be rooted out from the world; and come also is the time of the kingdom of Heaven, that it shall be revealed." The statement made in the second clause is quite evidently the same announcement precisely as that in Jesus' preaching; the meaning is, "The wicked cease to rule, and Heaven begins to rule." Such passages therefore show us clearly the meaning of the expression "the kingdom of Heaven": it signifies "the rule of Heaven over men." They also make it clear that the expression was well-known to the Jews in the time of Christ, and that consequently it might very well have been used by Jesus. The motive for the other New Testament writers' (besides Mt.) habit of adopting the phrase "the kingdom of God," instead of "the kingdom of Heaven," was no doubt a regard for their non-Jewish readers, who were not accustomed to use the word "heaven" interchangeably for "God." The Gospel of the Hebrews has the "kingdom of Heaven." [1]

(*e*) SUBSTITUTE FOR THE NAME OF GOD.—The fact is that the Jews, not being permitted to utter the name of God, sought for all kinds of substitutes to use in its stead.[2] The Book of Esther purposely avoids speaking of God at all; *e.g.*, in iv. 14 "gain and deliverance will come to the Jews in another place." The Septuagint already translates the name of God as "the Lord." In the Book of Daniel, with the exception of Chap. ix., the Old Testament name for God, Yahwè, is avoided altogether; God is called "the Lord," "the Highest," "the King of Heaven," "the Lord of Heaven," "the Prince of the Heavenly Host" (i. 2, iv. 14, vii. 18, iv. 34, v. 23, viii. 11), and in the passage cited above (iv. 23) "Heaven." The Mishnah simply leaves out the name of God (*Aboda Zara*, iv. 7), or substitutes for it the

[1] Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 78, to Mt. xix. 16.

[2] If the question ever arises whether in any particular passage Jesus used the name of God or put in its place some substitute, the presumptive probability, in view of the custom of his countrymen in which he was trained and which he never once denounced, is that instead of using the Divine name he would employ a substitute.

word *mākōm* (מָקוֹם), or *shĕkīnāh* (שְׁכִינָה ; *Pirḳê Ābōth*, ii. 9, iii. 10, 14—iii. 2), or speaks of the Father in Heaven (*Pirḳê Ābōth*, v. 20 ; "Be strong like the panther, buoyant like the eagle, swift like the gazelle, courageous like the lion, that thou mayest gain the good-will of thy Father in Heaven"), or it simply uses the word "Heaven" (*Pirḳê Ābōth*, iv. 4 : "He who secretly profaneth the name of Heaven, from him shall it be demanded publicly").

Jesus, then, followed in this matter the usage of his countrymen. The avoidance of God's name in the proceedings before the Synedrium is in a sense official (Mk. xiv. 61 f.) : the high-priest calls God "the Blessed" (εὐλογητός ; compare *Pirḳê Ābōth*, iii. 2—הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא, 'the Holy One blessed is he'), and Jesus in his answer to the question calls God "the All-might" (ἡ δύναμις). This practice must also be borne in mind when in Lk. xv. 18, 21, the prodigal son says, "Father, I have sinned against Heaven," and when in the First Gospel Jesus is made to speak of God twenty-seven times as ὁ θεός, but forty-four times as ὁ πατήρ. The name for the kingdom of perfection in Mt. may therefore very well be correct in the sense that Jesus generally spoke of "the kingdom of Heaven," but frequently also said "the kingdom of God." It is, at any rate, scarcely credible that Mt. should have introduced it into his text only in an artificial manner.[1]

(*f*) SIGNS OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. — Jesus therefore believed that his contemporaries were to infer the rapid approach of the kingdom of God from certain peculiar signs.[2] He observes how the Jews inferred that it meant rain when clouds arose in the west, and that heat would follow the blowing of the south wind ; that is to say, they understood the signs of the weather. But they did not know how to appreciate the situation of the moment (Lk. xii. 54–56). When the fig-tree puts forth its leaves, it is an indication that

[1] We can discover no valid reason why he should have done so. It is, however, quite intelligible that Gentile Christians, who knew nothing of the Jewish reluctance to name the name of God, should have made out of "the kingdom of heaven" "the kingdom of God."

[2] The appearance of John and the revelation made to Jesus by God at his baptism were for Jesus the sign of the immediate nearness of God's kingdom.

summer is at hand. In like manner, Jesus' contemporaries ought to conclude, from what was actually taking place around them there and then, that the kingdom of God was at their doors, and that the generation then living was about to see it. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but the saying of Jesus will prove to be right (Mk. xiii. 28–31). Here, as indication of the nearness of the kingdom of God, Jesus must have meant precisely that actual announcement of its being close at hand, which had been made earlier by John and was now being made again by himself. In itself the appearance of prophets like John and himself might be regarded as a remarkable sign of great events; for, though there were teachers of the law in plenty, yet of prophets, who spoke of their own initiative, there had arisen none of long time past.[1] But Jesus' contemporaries failed to grasp the significance of the epoch in which they lived.

PRACTICAL DEDUCTIONS.—But practical deductions were to be drawn from the nearness of the kingdom of God: Repent ye, and believe the tidings of joy (Mk. i. 15). Here, too, we find, not only the resemblance between Jesus' message and that of the Baptist (Repent ye), but also the distinguishing feature of the latter (Believe the Gospel). Repent—yes, but at the same time do not forget that the kingdom of eternal bliss is a gift of God's grace. Hence, a cheerful confidence is the attitude to be adopted while the task of repentance and self-discipline is in progress. Jesus desires no haste, full of anxiety, even when the kingdom of God is knocking at the door; what he asks on the part of mankind is a quiet continuance in self-amendment, and this can only be attained where there is confidence. If he himself has faith in God's word to the effect that he is the Messiah, and consequently

[1] There would have been more reason for describing the authors of the so-called Apocalypses as prophets than for so describing the teachers of the law, for the figurative language of the Old Testament prophets was reproduced in their descriptions in a warmer and more vivid way than that used to set forth the Law in the expositions of the teachers of the Law. But these writers did not venture to put forward their opinions under their own names. They put what they had to say into the mouth now of Daniel, now of Enoch, now of Isaiah, or even of Baruch, the writer of Jeremiah, sooner than put forward such an incredible assertion as that there were prophets actually still living. Cp. 1 Macc. iv. 46.

belongs to God's kingdom, those to whom he preaches ought also to possess the faith that they will come into the kingdom of God. If they labour in hope of the kingdom of the Messiah, the Messiah will not reject them.

ESCHATOLOGICAL ADDRESSES.—The distinguishing characteristic of Jesus' conception of the conditions governing acceptance into God's kingdom, as well as of his preaching of repentance and judgment in general, is the graphic description of the Messianic judgment, which is preserved only in Mt. xxv. 31–46.[1] It is customary to assign these descriptions of the last things to the last days of Jesus, because Mt., already, following the precedent of Mk. xiii., places them just before the beginning of the story of the Passion. But to do so, obscures the fact that, according to the distinct testimony of Mk. i. 15, and agreeably to Jesus' relations towards John the Baptist, *his preaching was from the beginning of an eschatological character.* At the same time, we must be careful not to suppose that when Jesus spoke of the Messiah, he was understood to mean himself by it. An eschatological "sermon" which did not name the Messiah was scarcely conceivable; this is proved, for example, by the preaching of John. But Jesus' hearers, at all events at first, were very far from imagining that he who preached about the Messiah was the Messiah himself.[2]

SON OF MAN.—Before discussing the first of Jesus' larger discourses, however, we have still to dispose of a peculiarity in his use of language. Jesus frequently uses the expression "the Son of Man" or "the child of Man" (*υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*). Now Jesus spoke Aramaic. From the later developments of Palestinian Aramaic it may be concluded that as early as the

[1] There is no reason to doubt its genuineness. The parable of the good Samaritan also is only found in Lk. Jesus is not speaking of himself when he describes the judge of the world; he is speaking only of the judgment of the Messiah. And if Mk. i. 15 preserves correctly the thoughts underlying his original preaching, he was obliged to speak of it.

[2] Indeed we have no evidence whatever that even during Jesus' last visit in Jerusalem he was recognised as the Messiah by any who did not belong to the circle of his intimate disciples. The repetition of the disciples' cry by the children in the temple (Mt. xxi. 15 f.) can in this connection hardly weigh in the scale.

time of Jesus the expression "the son of man" was almost regularly employed to indicate the individual man, that is to say "*a* man," as distinct from the abstract "man." This is very clearly shown in Mk. ii. 27 f., where from the nature of the relations originally subsisting between mankind and the Sabbath (*v.* 27) a conclusion is drawn as to the relations between the individual man and the Sabbath (*v.* 28). In the former case, the writer employs simply *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, but in the latter the compound expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. On another occasion the individual member of the human race is contrasted with God (Mk. ii. 7, 10); on yet another with the foxes and the birds (Mt. viii. 20, Lk. ix. 58); and in Mk. iii. 28 individual men are said to receive pardon from God.

(*a*) JESUS' NAME FOR HIMSELF.—It cannot be questioned at all that on many occasions Jesus did apply to himself the expression "the son of man"; to deny it were pure arbitrariness. The comparison drawn by Jesus between himself and the Baptist makes the fact perfectly clear (Mt. xi. 18 f., Lk. vii. 33 f.): 'John the Baptist came, eating no bread and drinking no wine. . . . ; the Son of Man came eating and drinking. . . .' Here it is as plain that by the Son of Man Jesus means himself, as it is that he uses the general term because he wishes himself to be considered merely as one individual in the manifold complexity of mankind. John lived in such and such a way; another man lives in another way.[1]

The same mode of self-designation is found also in Sophocles, *Antigone* (750 [751]), where Hæmon cries to his father, *ἦδ' οὖν θανεῖται καὶ θανοῦσ' ὀλεῖ τινα!* By this, according to 761–764 [762–765], he can only mean himself. Hæmon describes himself by the indefinite *τις* (*τινα*) because he does

[1] We should of course understand the expression still more easily if the indefinite article had been used. "A son of man" or "one" is several times employed by a New Testament speaker to indicate himself. Compare 2 Cor. xii. 2, *οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ*, where Paul is speaking of himself. Other writers have called attention to a saying of Muhammed's, which he uttered shortly before his death: "God gave a man the choice between this world and the world to come, and he chose the world to come." (Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. 200.) All the same, the article before "Son of Man" has a "deictic" or demonstrative force—the (=this) son of man came. . . ."

not wish to emphasise the misfortune of its being *himself* who is to perish, but desires rather to dwell upon the fact that Antigone's death will involve the death of others also.[1] In a similar way, Jesus tells his disciples (Mk. x. 44 f.) that true greatness manifests itself in showing a readiness to serve others; "For the Son of Man also came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give up his life as a ransom for many." Were it not for the insertion of the last infinitive, Jesus might be speaking of the vocation of any individual man whatsoever; but the last clause is applicable to none but Jesus himself. It is easy to see that Jesus speaks thus generally, because he regards the task which is incumbent upon him personally as one which might well be committed to any member of the human race. The expression, "son of man," in Lk. xix. 10 (Mt. xviii. 11), is employed in precisely the same way. All that is meant by the sentence is, that "the individual man is called to save that which was lost"; and upon this principle Jesus also acts. When, therefore, Jesus says generally of "the son of man" what is true of himself personally, it is done from modest reserve.

(*b*) JESUS' DESCRIPTION OF HIMSELF AS THE MESSIAH.—The same motive operates with still greater force when Jesus speaks in a similar style of the future judge of the world, knowing well at the same time that others will of necessity apply what he says to himself. One instance we certainly have after Peter's confession (Mk. viii. 38), and another, just as certainly, in the proceedings before the Great Council (Mk. xiv. 62). The belief that he is the Messiah is, to Jesus personally, a holy secret; and it is because it is sacred in his eyes that, at all events formally, he is reluctant to declare it, although he has already actually avowed it. The feeling which actuates him is a sense of awe, similar to that which made his countrymen unwilling to utter the name of God. To a certain extent, he looks up with religious awe at the picture of hope in which he himself is destined to be the central figure. "The Son of Man will be ashamed of the unfaithful disciples, when he shall come in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mk. viii. 38)—"Ye shall

[1] Here, however, it is to be observed that the demonstrative article is again wanting, though its presence would have assisted the meaning.

see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of almighty power and coming on the clouds of Heaven" (Mk. xiv. 62). It is therefore a feeling of reserve that prevents Jesus in these passages from speaking of himself in the first person, and leads him to substitute instead the phrase, "the son of man," as though it were equivalent to an impersonal pronoun.[1] At the same time, the entire point of view is, without doubt, also coloured by the passage Dan. vii. 13, which represents the kingdom of God as coming down from heaven like a Son of Man, in contrast to the beasts which arose out of the sea and typified the kingdoms of the world which precede it.[2] But the view of the Messiah gained from this passage was one which Jesus had no doubt acquired from his childhood. It is not always necessary to suppose that the expression was intended to lay stress upon real humanity, as contrasted with animal savagery. On one occasion (Mt. viii. 20, Lk. ix. 58), when Jesus contrasts the "son of man" with fickle or treacherous animals, he means any man of noble sentiments, and not merely the Messiah.[3]

(*c*) THE SUFFERING SON OF MAN.—The experience of life which finds expression in the last-cited saying of the Lord —namely, that the man of noble sentiments often possesses no home on earth—explains why Jesus habitually chooses to speak of himself as the Son of Man when he is telling his disciples, who know that he is the Messiah, about his future

[1] This same mental attitude lies at the bottom of the words of Paul and Muhammed quoted on p. 167, n. 1. What prevents Paul from naming the recipient of the august revelation, and Muhammed from naming the man who has made the right choice, is modest reserve.

[2] It may now be held as established, that even in pre-Christian times this passage was understood as referring to the Messiah, and, consequently, that the Messiah was spoken of as the Son of Man before Jesus used the expression. In this connection, the figurative language of the Book of Enoch is especially noteworthy. See Beer's translation in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, p. 262, to Enoch xlvi. 1, 2.

[3] Man, it is true, mostly builds himself a better house than the foxes' holes or the birds' nests; but he also requires more materials for it, and it costs him more pains. Thus there are often homeless men, while it would very seldom appear that the creatures named cannot find a shelter. In this case, however, the contrast between man and the animals is typical of the contradiction which frequently exists between men's worth and their fortune.

sufferings (Mk. viii. 31, ix. 12, ix. 31, x. 33, xiv. 21, xiv. 41). In these several utterances also Jesus includes his own destiny under the universal lot of mankind. Yet a man is to him not so much one who wears a human countenance as one who fulfils the duty of a man towards his God. Men of this stamp have no home in the world and are obliged to suffer, "and so will also the Son of Man be obliged to suffer now."

(*d*) THE MESSIAH GENERALLY.—Assuming then that Jesus from the first pictured the appearance of the Messiah in accordance with the figure in Dan. vii. 13, he may very well, on every occasion, have described the Messiah as the Son of Man who comes in his glory, surrounded by all the angels (Mt. xxv. 31), or as the Son of Man, who, on his day, that is to say, when he appears, will be like the lightning that flashes from the one quarter of heaven to the other (Lk. xvii. 24). But this has in itself nothing whatever to do with Jesus' designation of himself as the Son of Man. They who did not already recognise him as the Messiah would not be able, from utterances like this, to infer that he himself set up a claim to be the Messiah, any more than they would when he described the Messiah by other names. And a similar interpretation ought to be applied to the many passages in which the coming, or the becoming manifest, of the Son of Man is spoken of. In all such cases, the context precludes all doubt as to Jesus' meaning; he does not mean any man you please, but *the* Son of Man foretold by Daniel (Mt. x. 23, xvi. 28, xix. 28, xxiv. 27–44, Mk. xiii. 26, Lk. xii. 40, xvii. 22–30, xviii. 8, xxi. 27, 36).

On the whole, *the Evangelists* have quite faithfully set forth the facts in the sense we have thus explained.[1] The passages in which the expression is due to the authors themselves are but few. One occurs in Mt. xii. 40, a verse interpolated by the Evangelist by way of explanation (cp. Lk. xi. 29–32); there is evidently another in the interpretation of the parables

[1] It is conceivable that they may of their own initiative have transferred the definite article from the passages in which the term is to be understood of the Messiah, as well as from those in which the "son of man" is conceived of as the representative of his species, to those passages also in which Jesus describes himself by this expression out of modest reserve.

in Mt. xiii. 37–41. On the other hand, the crucial question of Jesus (Mk. viii. 27) may certainly have been couched in the form in which it is put in Mt. xvi. 13, "Whom do men say that the Son of Man is?" At the very moment when Jesus may reasonably expect to hear high opinions about himself, he modestly merges himself in the general species of mankind. Conscientious investigation shows that here also the Synoptic Gospels have handed down the sayings of the Lord on the whole, and in essence, quite faithfully.[1]

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE JUDGMENT. — The nearness of the kingdom of Heaven means for Jesus, *as well as for the Baptist*, the nearness of the judgment. In his preaching of repentance, Jesus merely describes the future judgment; each of his hearers is left to deduce from it the accompanying warning for himself. In Mt. the description of the judgment forms the conclusion of the discourse put together by the Evangelist about the Messiah's second coming (Mt. xxv. 31–46). It begins by describing the great gathering to judgment: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all peoples." In Joel iv. [iii.] 2, 12, we already read of a judgment of the Lord upon "all the peoples round about," to be held in the valley of Jehoshaphat. At the time of Jesus there certainly existed a general belief in a last universal judgment, just as the Greeks, at any rate from the age of the great tragedians, expected that every individual would have to pass the bar of judgment in the lower world. And this general judgment is without doubt represented as the judgment of the Messiah in *Sibyll.*, iii. 286.[2] What Jesus specially points out is that it will be easy for the Messiah to separate those who are Blessed of God from those who are Accursed: "And he will separate them, the one from the other, as the shepherd separates the sheep

[1] That Paul in speaking of the Messiah never uses the expression Son of Man could only occasion difficulty if he followed Jesus' forms of speech closely in other instances; but he does nothing of the kind. See Chap. II. pp. 7–11.

[2] See *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 243; also Chap. V. above, p. 116, n. 1.

from the goats,[1] and the sheep he will place on his right hand, but the goats on his left." Thus the Messiah will not need to conduct a long and detailed trial of each individual; he sees through each person, and knows him for what he is, without long inquiry. In Isa. xi. 4 it is indeed said of the Messiah, that he will destroy the godless with the breath of his mouth. Were a painstaking and laborious investigation requisite, the judge would be drawn too much into the category of men who are fallible and liable to err. Thus far the introduction in Jesus' description. It contains nothing which differentiates Jesus' belief from the belief of his contemporaries. Next will come the *verdict of the judge*, and first upon those who are accepted. "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come ye that are blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom which was prepared for you since the creation of the world." The kingdom of heaven was indeed prepared from the beginning of things; but only at the last days does it become visible. Jesus knows nothing of the subtle speculation of later thinkers as to whether God's blessing has been the cause of the good deeds which afterwards stand to the credit of the elect, or whether that blessing[2] is subsequently imparted to those who have practised such good deeds of themselves. Here again he still adheres faithfully to the tradition. The important question is now, What are the deeds which are honourably credited to the elect? "For I was hungry and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty and ye gave me to drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; I was naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye tended me; I was in prison and ye came unto me." The enumeration is a list of pure *works of charity*; in every case it is relief of the distress of others that is pointed to. Not a word about prayer, or sacrifice, or fasting, or temple-service, or observance of laws about food or laws of purification. When we consider the special characteristics of the Judaism of the period, this is in the highest degree remarkable. There is no doubt that in the eyes of many distinguished representatives of Jewish piety, the merit of a man was measured by precisely the

[1] Ἐρίφιον, ἔριφος = αἴξ.

[2] Compare the expression οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου ("ye blessed of my Father.").

things as to which Jesus here preserves absolute silence. Nor does he say a word about the privileged position of the Jewish people. In the judgment of the Messiah, the son of Abraham enjoys no special privilege. This might have been intelligible to the Jewish mind, if only the Law, the pride of Israel, had been here also the standard by which the Messiah would frame his judgment. In this indirect way the people of the law would still have asserted their special privilege, even though it were circuitously. The Messiah, however, does not deal here with fulfilment of the Law, but simply with charity and the giving of help.[1] And yet Jesus' sermon has an antecedent preparation that reaches far back into the past.

"Not sacrifice nor visitation of the temple, but justice and charity!" Such was the purport of the preaching of repentance from at least the 8th century B.C. onwards. Thus Amos (v. 21–24) preaches, thus Hosea (vi. 6), thus Isaiah (i. 11–17); and after the sacrificial worship was restricted to one altar in Jerusalem, Jeremiah also finds reason to describe reliance upon the visitation of the temple as false, and to demand amendment in men's relations with their fellow-men (Jer. vii. 3–11). Nor did this tendency die out later. It lives on in the appendices to the Book of Isaiah, where (lviii. 4–7) the practice of charity is praised as true fasting in contradistinction to profitless self-torment. It lives on also in the Wisdom literature, in which, to say the least, the service of God and the fulfilment of the Law fall very much into the background, as compared with the demand for uprightness of dealing in intercourse with others. And these same thoughts are at work again in the literature of edification: compare, for example, the words of warning addressed by the father to his son in the Book of Tobit (Chap. iv.). Thence onwards down

[1] It is true the rejoinder does not find expression here; but it might indeed have done so. Those who are condemned might have justified themselves, saying, "Have we not sacrificed? Have we not observed the laws as to purification? Are we not the children of Abraham, the people of the circumcision?" But Jesus sets forth here the requirement of the Messiah only, and the antagonism to the popular idea of piety is only present *realiter*, whereas perhaps it was not even felt at the moment by Jesus himself.

to the time of Jesus the social duties are, it is true, dwelt upon with less and less emphasis. Judaism is even on the verge of perishing in the fantastic dreams which the Apocalyptic writers spun regarding the future and in the rigid formalism of the teachers of the law,[1] when Jesus comes forward and upholds the cause of ethical piety more energetically than any of his predecessors. In this respect, too, the Baptist seems to have paved the way for Jesus' preaching (Lk. iii. 10–14; comp. Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 117). But the preacher who shunned the world could not possibly exercise the same influence upon the social life of his fellow-men as Jesus, who sought the society of his contemporaries, and sat at meat, now with the Pharisees, now with the publicans. Therefore, in Jesus' description of the judgment, the Messiah is concerned only about works of charity such as relieve the distress of others. Those whom he invites into the kingdom of heaven are such as have on some occasion given help to him. "Then shall the righteous answer and say, 'Lord, when saw we thee hungry and gave thee to eat, or thirsty and gave thee to drink? When saw we thee a stranger and took thee in, or naked and clothed thee? When saw we thee sick and in prison and came to thee? And the king[2] will answer and say, Verily I say unto you, in so much as ye have ministered unto one of these the least of my brethren, ye have ministered unto me.'"

The Messiah therefore has brethren amongst all peoples,[3] and any good deeds done to them he counts as if they had been done to himself. In the passage just quoted it is above all remarkable that the Messiah does not appear to be

[1] Hillel, too, in spite of the high regard he had for the ethical commandments, did not combat this rigid formalism, but gave it his support. Cp. Chap. XIV.

[2] Here, therefore, the Messiah is not designated as in Mt. xxv. 31 according to his appearance as Son of Man, but in accordance with the position he occupies in the kingdom into which the blessed shall, according to Mt. xxv. 34, enter (*vv.* 34, 40).

[3] For all peoples are indeed, according to *v.* 32, gathered about him, and every member amongst them belongs either to the Blessed or to the Accursed. Consequently, one and all must have had opportunities of helping the brethren of the Messiah. This, it is true, is only a virtual presupposition; the rejoinder is nowhere explicitly stated in words.

in any wise peculiarly associated with the people of Israel. Wherever anyone is in distress, there help may be given to the Messiah himself. The Judaism of later ages does indeed elaborate the thought that the Messiah helps to bear the sorrows of his Jewish people (*Sanhedrin*, 93b, 98a); but nowhere within the Jewish domain do we again find the conception that every need of man is a need of the Messiah, and that every assistance rendered by one man to another is a service rendered to the Messiah. Nevertheless, this is but a forcible way of expressing the thought that a deed of love done to any other man wins the love of the Messiah for him who has done it; and that, consequently, he who serves others helpfully belongs to the Messiah and his kingdom. In thus emphasising the purely ethical duties of man, all narrow Judaic exclusiveness in religion disappears.

Accordingly, whether a man is a friend of the Messiah, and so may hope for a place in the kingdom of heaven, depends entirely upon the measure of assistance which he is prepared to render to others. And the rejection of all who might have rendered help, but have not done so, expresses the lesson still more forcibly. "Then shall he say also unto them on his left hand, Go from me, ye Cursed, into the everlasting fire, which is prepared for the Devil and his angels." Here again the language is in agreement with tradition. The earliest mention of the torture by fire in which the godless languish is in Judith xvi. 17, which is connected with Isa. lxvi. 24. (Comp. *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 239). Into this sea of fire the Devil is cast (Rev. xx. 10). We read about the angels of Satan also in 2 Cor. xi. 14, xii. 7, and Rev. xii. 9. Here, therefore, there is nothing which points to the distinctive peculiarity of Jesus. Then the Messiah proceeds to justify his sentence of condemnation: "I was hungry and ye gave me not to eat; I was thirsty and ye gave me not to drink; I was a stranger and ye took me not in; naked and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not." They had not understood that an opportunity was given them of helping the Messiah. But to their astonished question his answer is: "Verily I say unto you, in so far as ye have not ministered unto one of these the least of my brethren, ye have not ministered unto me."

It is therefore an imperative duty to give help wherever and whenever it is possible to help; every single *neglect* to render help where possible tears the individual away from the Messiah and at the same time from his everlasting salvation. Thus the entire worth, as well as the final happiness, of every individual depends upon the way in which he acts towards his fellow-men. To be inactive is punishable; to be active for oneself alone and those who belong to one is punishable; to omit rendering any help which one might render is punishable. From a preacher of views such as these we might therefore certainly expect a life of unwearied activity, not a life of quiet contemplation; and his activity will necessarily have been directed to the removal and alleviation of every form of distress which happened to come in his way. In accordance with the final intention of his ministry, he will become indeed a saviour of many.[1] The description of the judgment then concludes in a way which corresponds with the verdicts pronounced, and with an allusion to Dan. xii. 2, "And these shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

DUTY OF WATCHFULNESS, ETC.—Jesus, then, is convinced that a judgment of this nature threatens men in the near future. They who share this belief cannot help being anxious about their soul's salvation, and this anxiety impels them to amend their lives. Jesus warns his hearers to be continually on the out-look for the coming Messiah. This presupposes of course that the Messiah may not appear for some time yet. Had Jesus taken into account the centuries,

[1] In connection with the development of the teaching of the Church, which already at an early date came to look upon the death on the cross as the most important fact in the life of Jesus, in Church circles Jesus has been depicted as above all things the pattern of the quiet, patient, meek-spirited sufferer; or, following by preference the example of the Greek Church, he has been looked upon as the harmonious personality, in whom the divine and the human natures have been united together in continuous and eternal equipoise. These two conceptions cannot pass muster in the eyes of history. Jesus was a thoroughly active character, strong of will and daring of temperament. His greatness consists in the inflexible steadfastness with which he laboured for his people and his followers to the very last, and even at a time when he clearly saw that this labour would bring about his own destruction.

and even thousands of years, the world had required for its development, he would not, in the first place, have urged his contemporaries to wait for the Messiah, nor, secondly, could he have announced that the kingdom of heaven was nigh at hand. But if it were a matter of the lapse of merely weeks, or even years, before the Messiah should appear, this was sufficient to warrant Jesus in preaching that men should not be remiss in watching. And he makes his meaning plain by graphic illustrations. In a noble household the slaves wait with their loins girt even by night, and with lamps burning, against the return of their lord from the feast. He may come in the second watch, though perhaps not until the third—between ten and two o'clock, or even between two and six o'clock in the morning. How much to their advantage will it be if he finds them watching! Then, passing swiftly from the illustration to the real point at issue, he adds, "Yea, the Lord will gird up himself, and will make them to recline and will serve them." In other words, the Messiah will load with blessings those who for his sake have faithfully held out in their duty (Lk. xii. 35–38).[1] Another illustration Jesus draws from the marriage customs of Palestine (Mt. xxv. 1–13). Whilst the bride is already in the house where the marriage is to be celebrated, her friends go out with burning lamps to meet the bridegroom, who is expected in the evening, that they may conduct him into the festively decorated house where his bride is waiting. And all who come with him are admitted to the marriage feast. But the time of his coming grows longer than was expected: it is midnight. Then some of the maidens are obliged to go and fetch fresh oil for their lamps, and in that way miss the arrival of the bridegroom, who then refuses to admit them into the house because they were not present when he arrived.[2] Hence the advantage of being

[1] It seems not unnecessary to observe that no evidence whatever against the genuineness of a saying is supplied by any formal irregularities which may be noticed in the speech of Jesus. So in this case Jesus passes at once from the simple parable to allegory. It must not be imagined, however, that Jesus framed his metaphorical utterances in accordance with any inflexible theory which should be valid for all time.

[2] The picture describes a really quite exceptional case in so far as the bridegroom evidently does not dwell in the same or some quite neigh-

always ready for the advent of the Messiah. They who absent themselves from his path, though it be but for a short while, may lose him altogether. Consequently, these illustrations serve as warnings to be ever ready and attentive. The very uncertainty of the moment when the Messiah will come is a cogent reason for unceasing watchfulness. A thief could not break in if we knew the moment when he would come; the Messiah would find all ready if the hour of his appearance were known (Lk. xii. 39 f., Mt. xxiv. 43 f.). And, once again, the faithful fulfilment of one's duty towards one's fellow-men is described as the most sacred demand of the Messiah. In a large household the master of the house transfers the care of his servants to an overseer. If, when the Lord comes unexpectedly, he finds the overseer faithfully discharging his duty, he rewards him; but if, taking him by surprise, he finds him feasting and drinking, and being drunken, and beating the men-servants and the maid-servants, he will hew him in pieces and deal with him as with one that is unfaithful (Lk. xii. 42–46 = Mt. xxiv. 45–51).

Again, conformably to his fundamental idea that the first of all duties is to practise charity and give help to others, Jesus advises the man who is bowed down by the sense of his guilt to gain for himself admission into the eternal tabernacles by conferring benefits upon others (Lk. xvi. 1–9). The unjust steward, who has squandered his lord's possessions, naturally fears that he will be driven away from the house, and so lose both his situation and his daily bread; but even a bad man such as this is careful to win favour with his lord's debtors, by giving them such friendly assistance as lies in his power and so long as it it possible for him to do so.[1] He who spends ill-acquired property, which

bouring village, but, it would appear, comes from a distance, and so, after some delay, to the marriage. Nevertheless some *one* definite experience of the kind did afford Jesus his illustration for the expected, though delayed, advent of the Messiah.

[1] It is remarkable how ingeniously people go astray in their interpretation of this parable. The wicked man, who deserves to be driven away, but who, before the possibility of his fall becomes a reality, knows how to make sure of an asylum with his Lord's debtors, was to Jesus a striking example of the maxim, that the children of this world, that is to say, the people who do not concern themselves about a future world, are in their

can no longer be restored to its proper owners, in works of love and charity makes unto himself friends by means of the unrighteous Mammon, and these friends receive him, in spite of his guilt, into the everlasting tabernacles; in fact, in helping every man that is in need, he helps the Messiah himself, with whom the decision rests whether he shall be accepted or rejected (cp. Mt. xxv. 40). But hand in hand with a strenuous and active doing of good there must go too a patient, long-suffering, self-denying spirit of conciliation. All are on their way to the judge; but, instead of mutually accusing one another before him, they ought to agree together amicably whilst yet they are on the road, lest the accusations made against them by others bring down a long punishment upon them (Lk. xii. 58 f. = Mt. v. 25 f.). And if many people by the delay in the Messiah's appearance are betrayed into wantonness and a life of thoughtless self-indulgence, Jesus warns them by relating how the owner of a garden granted yet one more chance to the tree which had borne no fruit for three years, and took care that the ground in which it was planted should once more be thoroughly digged and cultivated. If it still failed to bring forth fruit, the measure of pity for it was at an end (Lk. xiii. 6–9).[1]

Hope of the Kingdom of God.—What Jesus desires indeed is earnest repentance, earnest amendment; but the work of repentance and the amendment must be supported by confidence: Repent and believe the tidings of joy (Mk. i. 15)! A confident belief in the nearness of the kingdom of God should give courage, especially to all who in the present world are called upon to suffer. Jesus declares that the passionate desire of their hearts, uttered day and night, for the renovation of the world, does not cry to God in vain. Even an unjust judge, who concerns himself neither for God

way often more prudent than the children of the light, that is to say, those who are called to inherit the bright world of God. Even these have reason to fear being condemned in God's judgment; even for them the indicated path of safety is to proffer help (to the brethren of the Messiah). Cp. Chap. IX., pp. 212 ff.

[1] Perhaps, however, this parable had another and a special reference. See the discussion on it in Chap. XIII.

nor man, does at last help the poor widow to her right, if only to secure peace from her unceasing supplication (Lk. xviii. 2–8). And the man at whose window a friend knocks in the night, begging bread for the guest who has journeyed to him, gives it to him for the sake of peace, in however unwelcome a fashion he has been disturbed (Lk. xi. 5–8). In these ways Jesus urges men to ask, seek, knock, until the kingdom of heaven opens to them. And open it will; God will not suffer the request for the Holy Spirit to go unheeded. Even an earthly father does not offer his child anything hurtful to it, when it desires something useful (Mt. vii. 7–11; Lk. xi. 9–13).

A Respite.—Thus, notwithstanding that the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand, it has to be watched for and prayed for.[1] Jesus believes that he is the Messiah. But he knows that when he introduces the kingdom of God, the Messiah will come on the clouds of heaven. Consequently, before he himself can thus appear in his glory, he must first be raised up to God. Whether he believed from the very beginning that this would be effected by his death we do not know. At any rate, the contrast between his situation at the moment of speaking and the future glory he hoped for must have been also instrumental in leading him to believe that the coming of the kingdom of God, despite its nearness, was not an event that would happen entirely without direct cause.

[1] In the Lord's Prayer the first real petition is that the kingdom of God may come. What is generally regarded as the first petition is not a petition, but an expression of praise.

CHAPTER IX

JESUS' PREACHING IN GALILEE DOWN TO THE CALLING OF THE TWELVE

SOURCES.—Mk. i. 16–iii. 35 (=Mt. iv. 18–22, vii. 28 f., viii. 14–17, iv. 23, viii. 2–4, ix. 1–17, xii. 1–16, x. 1–4, xii. 46–50; Lk. v. 1–11, iv. 31–42, v. 12–vi. 11, vi. 17–19, 12–16, viii. 19–21). Both by reason of its form (cp. Mk. vii. 1) and its contents, the section Mk. iii. 22–30 comes properly after Mk. vii. 23. The story of the centurion of Capernaum (Mt. viii. 5–13= Lk. vii. 1–10; cp. Jn. iv. 46–54) should be placed between Mk. i. 45 and Mk. ii. 1; for it smoothes away the contradiction between the two verses and gives a reason for Jesus' second coming to Capernaum. The sending of messengers by the Baptist (Mt. xi. 2–19=Lk. vii. 18–35) must be assigned, because of Mt. xi. 19=Lk. vii. 34 f., to a position after Mk. ii. 22 and before the dispute about the Law, which begins in Mk. ii. 23. For the choosing of the disciples (Mk. i. 16–20), compare Jn. i. 35–51; for the intercourse with publicans (Mk. ii. 17), compare the parables of the tares and the net (Mt. xiii. 24–30, 36–43, 47–50), of the lost sheep, etc. (Lk. xv. 1–32), the parable of the Pharisee and the publican (Lk. xviii. 10–14), of the labourers in the vineyard (Mt. xx. 1–16), the parable of the great supper (Lk. xiv. 12–24, Mt. xx. 2–14), the parable of the unjust steward (Lk. xvi. 1–9), and, besides these, the sayings about offences coming (Mk. ix. 42–50, Mt. v. 29, xviii. 7–9, Lk. xvii. 1 f.); for the dispute about the sanctity of the Sabbath (Mk. ii. 23–iii. 6), compare Mt. xii. 11, Lk. xiii. 10–17, xiv. 1–6, Jn. v. 9–17, vii. 22–24, ix. 16; compare also the pericope of Mk. iii. 1–6 with the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77). For the thronging of the people to Jesus (Mk. iii. 7 f.), compare Mt. iv. 24 f., Lk. vi. 17–19. Lists of the Apostles, besides that in Mk. iii. 16–19, are found in Mt. x. 2–4, Lk. vi. 13–16, Acts i. 13. The Twelve are mentioned indeed in 1 Cor. xv. 5, and the promise made to them in Mt. xix. 28, Lk. xxii. 30. The Sermon on the Mount (Lk. vi. 20–49=Mt. v.–vii.) belongs after Mk. iii. 7–13; cp. Mt. iv. 23–v. 1, Lk. vi. 12–19. With Lk. vi. 22 compare Mk. iii. 6 f. For the relations between Jesus and his family, Mk. iii. 21, 31–35, compare vi. 3, Lk. xi. 27 f., Gal. i. 19, 1 Cor. ix. 5, Jn. ii. 1, 12, vii. 5, xix. 25–27, Acts i. 14.

GEOGRAPHICAL FACTS. — Jesus preached first beside the Lake of Galilee (Mk. i. 16), Gennesareth (Lk. v. 1), or Tiberias

(Jn. vi. 1, xxi. 1). The lake derived all three names from its more hospitable western shore. Here it bordered westwards on the land of Galilee; here stretched north-westwards the plain of Gennesar, now *El Ruwêr*, a district which, in the time of Josephus, to judge by what he tells us (*Bell. Jud.*, iii. 516–521), was extremely fertile and well cultivated. Here on the west lay Tiberias, the capital of Galilee, founded by Herod Antipas, which gives its name *(Baḥr el-Ṭabariyeh)* to the lake at the present time.[1] The lake lies 680 feet below the level of the sea, and measures in its most extensive part 13 miles in length and nearly 6 miles in breadth. The mountains surrounding it are not very high. In spring its immediate shores are covered for a short time with a luxuriant subtropical vegetation. In its water, which is wholesome and commonly used for drinking purposes, are many edible fish. The scenes of Jesus' activity were confined, however, to the northern parts of its shore, principally to the district between *El Mejdel* (Magdala), where the lake is widest, and Bethsaida, which lay on the left bank of the Jordan about three quarters of an hour's journey above its entrance into the lake. In this district were the three places, all close together, upon which Jesus pronounced condemnation because they had witnessed his deeds and yet had rejected him—Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum (Mt. xi. 20–24 = Lk. x. 12–15). The name Chorazin has survived in *Kerâzeh*, a heap of ruins among the hills rising on the north-west corner of the lake. An hour's journey by a steep path along the bed of a stream leads from *Kerâzeh* down to *Tel Ḥum* on the lake side, a place which, beyond doubt, is identical with the *Kepharnaum*[2] (Capernaum) of the New Testament. From the latter a path winds south-westwards beside the lake, through the well-watered and fruitful plain of Gennesareth, and in somewhat more than two hours comes to *El-Mejdel* (Magdala, the home of Mary Magdalene, Lk. viii. 2; Mk. xv. 40, 47, xvi. 1; perhaps also Mk. viii. 10; Mt. xv. 39). The position

[1] On the east side of the lake there was *one* important town, the heathen Hippos or Susitha (*Sûsiyeh*), situated near the ruins now called *El-Hosn*. For *Geresa-Kursi*, see Chap. X.

[2] The name *Tel-Ḥum* (Hill of Ḥum) is also perhaps allied to the name *Kephar Naḥum* (Village of Nahum).

of the Bethsaida of the New Testament, a place converted from a village into a town by the Tetrarch Philip, is clearly indicated by the geographical background which it is necessary to assume as the scene of Jesus' activity in Mk. It stood, as already indicated, on the left bank of the Jordan, near the entrance of that river into the Lake of Gennesareth.[1]

In Mk. vi. 30 f. we read that the disciples whom Jesus had sent abroad had returned to him. He now desired to recover breath with them in the wilderness ; but the people flocked about him in such numbers that there arose the difficulty of feeding them. This happened, of course, near the places where Jesus habitually laboured, presumably therefore, actually between Magdala and Bethsaida ; for, after feeding the multitude, Jesus sends his disciples by ship *εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν*. The words *εἰς τὸ πέραν*, used also in iv. 35, v. 21, point to a voyage across the lake. Down to that moment, however, Jesus has clearly been on the west side of the lake; hence it was his purpose to sail across the mouth of the Jordan over to the eastern shore. True, the disciples, notwithstanding, afterwards land (vi. 53) on the plain of Gennesareth ; but we also learn (*v.* 48) that the wind was contrary, and obviously they had failed to make Bethsaida, the quarter they sailed for. If any doubt still remained on this point, we should be obliged to regard Mk. viii. 22 as decisive.

In the course of his voluntary banishment, Jesus once more came to the Lake of Gennesareth through the region of the Decapolis (vii. 31), and one short attempt was made to visit Jewish territory again, but with ill success (viii. 10–13). Then from the district which lies east of the Jordan he goes (viii. 13) northwards again, and arrives first at Bethsaida (viii. 22), and next at the villages of Caesarea Philippi (viii. 27). That is to say, he evidently travels up the valley of the Jordan. In such a journey he could not have gone through any place called Bethsaida on specifically Jewish territory. Now, at the date of Jesus' ministry, the official name of Bethsaida on the left bank of the Jordan was, as a matter of fact, Julias ; for, according to Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii. 2),

[1] Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 28 ; *Bell. Jud.*, iii. 515 ; *Vita*, 399 ; and *Bell. Jud.*, i. 168.

Philip gave this name to it in honour of Julia, the daughter of Augustus, who was disowned by her father as early as 2 B.C. Thus, the change of the name from Bethsaida to Julias must have been made between 4 and 2 B.C.[1] In Greek and Latin writers[2] the place bears no other name but that of Julias. It is, however, very questionable whether this name was in use amongst the Aramaic population. For centuries the town of Akko was known officially, and to Græco-Roman writers, as Ptolemais; and yet the original name persisted all through the Græco-Roman period, and since the Arab conquest has again come into general use. In like manner, the old name of Bethshean (*Besan*) has survived to the present day, although the place so named enjoyed its greatest fame during the time it bore the name Scythopolis. It is very probable that where a Semitic place-name was current amongst the Semitic population of Palestine, it was not displaced by the official Greek name. The mistake of the Johannine Gospel in counting Bethsaida to Galilee (Jn. xii. 21) is not surprising, considering how close Bethsaida lay to the boundary of the Galilean territory, and how slight was the topographical knowledge of the Fourth Evangelist. The statement that Simon Peter, his brother Andrew, and Philip, were natives of Bethsaida (Jn. i. 44, xii. 21) may very well be true; for we find Simon and Andrew living together in Capernaum with Simon's mother-in-law, and it is open to conjecture that Simon married into a Capernaum family (Mk. i. 29 f.). If the Johannine Gospel is right, it is by no means a mere chance that Andrew (Andreas) and Philip (Philippos) of Bethsaida bear Greek names. Although the Hellenisation of the place was doubtless, on the whole, only of the most superficial kind, still it may have led even the natives to

[1] Unless we may assume that Josephus is in error, and that the town was renamed after the widow of Augustus. But, as even she died in 29 A.D., the Hellenisation of Bethsaida would still have a date anterior to the Gospel story. But the new Greek city and the Jewish village (κώμη, Mk. viii. 23), notwithstanding their topographical proximity, may have remained strangers to one another, as regards their inner life, even though the villagers bore Greek names. In so far as Jesus' ministry is concerned, it is only the Jewish village that we have to consider.

[2] Pliny, v. 15, 71; Ptolemy, v. 16, 4; *Geogr. Ravennæ*, ed. Pinder and Parthey, p. 85.

choose Greek names as much as possible.[1] However that may be, the Johannine Gospel would seem to have had this Hellenisation of Bethsaida in mind, when it actually represents the two disciples of this place with Greek names as bringing Greeks to Jesus (Jn. xii. 20–22).

THE FIRST DISCIPLES.—It is a fact which demands explanation, that Jesus confined his public ministry essentially to this region at the north-west corner of the Lake of Gennesareth, although it is likewise true that he occasionally wandered about preaching in the interior of Galilee. We are told that, during the time he sojourned in Capernaum, he was a guest in the house of Simon and Andrew, in such a sense that it was, as it were, his home (Mk. i. 29 f., ii. 1, iii. 20, ix. 33). The friendship implied in this might very well have grown in the first instance out of a sermon preached by Jesus in or near Capernaum. But when the Johannine Gospel says explicitly that it was in the company of John that Jesus became acquainted not only with the un-named disciple who is presumably John, the son of Zebedee, as well as with Simon and Andrew, but also with Philip, and another disciple named Nathanael,[2] of whom we know nothing at all from other Sources (Jn. i. 35–51), there exists no serious reason (apart from the last-named, who perhaps only has an allegorical significance), for doubting the correctness of the statement. On the contrary, it affords the only really intelligible reason why it was precisely beside the Lake of Gennesareth that Jesus made his public appearance as a preacher. After the Baptist was cast into prison, Jesus went back, taking with him those of John's disciples who came from the shores of the Lake of Gennesareth, to their native place, and there began his own public ministry. Perhaps this may seem to be at

[1] This fact of course goes but a very little way towards proving the adoption of Greek civilisation in other respects. But a certain acquaintance with Greek may reasonably be assumed in a place where some Greek families settled as its proper masters.

[2] In the case of Philip (Jn. i. 43) and of Nathanael (Jn. i. 45), we cannot be at all sure whether they also are thought of as being disciples of John. Only in the case of Andrew and of the un-named disciple (Jn. i. 35–40) are we expressly told that this was so; never in that of Simon. Nevertheless, the whole situation seems to presuppose that all five were in attendance on the Baptist.

variance with what the Synoptists relate with regard to the calling of the first of the disciples. Mk. i. 16–20 tells us that Jesus saw the two brothers, Simon and Andrew, spreading their drag-net in the lake, and called them to come and follow him, promising that henceforward they should be fishers of men. Then he saw James and John with their father Zebedee, sitting in a boat along with hired servants, mending their nets; these two also he called to come and follow him. Lk. v. 1–11 gives a more detailed narrative. A large crowd has gathered about Jesus to hear him preach. He perceives two boats lying on the shore. The fishermen in this case are engaged in washing their nets. He requests Simon, to whom one of the boats belongs, to take him out a little from land. Thereupon, sitting in the boat, he teaches the multitude which stands on the shore. This manner of preaching is, it is true, one that has also been twice described by Mk. (iii. 9, iv. 1). When we are told that at the end of his discourse Jesus called Simon to put out into the lake once again with the nets, and that then, contrary to expectation, Simon made so great a catch that John and James had to come with the other boat to help him to draw the net to land, there is nothing at all improbable in the story; yet, for all that, it may have made a deep impression upon the fishermen who had just heard Jesus' preaching.[1] At any rate, the words of Jesus to Simon, or to Simon and Andrew, "I will make you fishers of men," or "Henceforward shalt thou catch men," were spoken after he had known them both for some length of time, and when he was appointing them to be associated with himself in his activity as a preacher. At first, indeed, there can hardly have been any idea of their abandoning their former calling entirely; yet, of course, as soon as Simon left Capernaum with Jesus, and began to take part in his preaching peregrinations, the exercise of his craft would have to be at times suspended.

Jesus, then, made the acquaintance of these fishermen while

[1] This impression is reflected throughout in the colouring of the Gospel account, and to some extent obscures the natural simplicity of the occurrence, because the writer is, all through, leading up to certain crises—two sayings of Peter (Lk. v. 5, 8) and a saying of Jesus (Lk. v. 10). But the definite point and purpose of the narrative ought not to have the effect of making the entire occurrence appear inconceivable.

he was with the followers of John, and afterwards returned with them to their homes. There, on one occasion, he set before Simon and Andrew their higher calling, that of winning men, instead of catching fish; on another occasion he summoned James and John out of their boat to come and preach the kingdom of God, and in consequence, for the time being, they abandoned their father, their fellow-workers, and their occupation, for Jesus' sake. In this there appears no contradiction between the Johannine and the Synoptic tradition, any more than there does between the narrative of Mk. and that of Lk.; though the tradition has been touched up, notably by Jn.[1] and Lk., but also by Mk. before them, so as to supply what was needed for the edification of the Church, as well as to present a self-contained narrative.

CAPERNAUM.—It is not until this point is reached that Mk. (i. 21) relates the coming of Jesus to Capernaum—another reflection of the faithfulness of the Johannine tradition, which tells us that Jesus knew the first of his disciples even before he came to this town. Mk.'s narrative (i. 16–20) of the special calling of the four, on the other hand, probably pre-supposes that Jesus has already been in Capernaum; so also with that of Lk. (Lk. iv. 31 [comp. 23]–41). By Capernaum (Καφαρναούμ), we are to understand the modern *Tel-Ḥum*. In Josephus (*Bell Jud.*, iii. 519–520) Καφαρναούμ is the name of a particularly copious spring in the plain of Gennesareth,[2] perhaps the so-called "Round Spring," about 25 minutes from *Mejdel*. In his *Vita* (403), Josephus tells us that once when he was wounded, beside the Lake of Gennesareth, he had himself carried into a village Κεφαρνακών. No doubt כְּפַר נַחוּם (*Kephar naḥum*) is again intended. The site of the ancient place is still occupied by a rather extensive heap of ruins. The buildings were constructed of basalt; but it is, to say the least, doubtful whether the large marble edifice, $75\frac{1}{2}$ feet in length by $55\frac{3}{4}$ feet in breadth, and adorned in the interior with Corinthian pillars, goes

[1] The account of John's sending two of his disciples to Jesus is a typical Johannine recasting of a much later event (Mt. xi. 2, Lk. vii. 19).

[2] It is one of the still unsolved riddles of Biblical geography how a spring situated at what must have been a considerable distance from Καφαρναούμ came to bear the name of the town.

back as far as the Herodian period. If it does, it will doubtless have been the very synagogue of Capernaum in which Jesus spoke. More likely, however, it was a Christian church, for, down to the epoch of the Arab conquest, Capernaum used frequently to be visited by Christian pilgrims. According to Lk. vii. 5, the synagogue of Capernaum was built by a heathen who was friendly-disposed towards the Jews, a centurion. This suggests that the community was too poor to provide such a building for themselves. And, highly as the generosity of the centurion is praised, yet the cost of an artistic edifice such as this marble building may well be supposed to have exceeded the means of this man, if we are to estimate these by his rank,[1] while at the same time it would have been out of keeping with the penurious condition of the community to which it was presented. On the other hand, the veneration of later generations may very well have prompted men to erect a sumptuous building on the spot where Jesus had taught and laboured.[2]

SABBATH WORSHIP.—The Gospel of Mk. tells of a first Sabbath spent by Jesus in Capernaum. He teaches in the synagogue. It is assumed throughout the New Testament that there was in that age no special body of professional preachers. The Scribes formed indeed at that time an exceptionally prominent class amongst the Jews. They claimed the first place in the synagogues (*πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς*—Mk. xii. 39). The people are accustomed to their methods of teaching. Nobody questions for one moment their right to discourse in the synagogue. But when anybody else comes forward as a teacher, the people at once ask one another whether the subject and manner of his discourse appear to warrant him in doing so (*ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων*), and whether he speaks in the same manner as the Scribes (*ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς*—Mk. i. 22). Strangely

[1] A centurion was a non-commissioned officer ; and though that is not a convincing proof that his means were small, still, wealth was a material help to promotion even in the Roman army. Compare Acts xxii. 28.

[2] There are, it is true, various other synagogue ruins in the region which lies west of the Ḥuleh and Tiberias lakes ; but the ruins of Tel-Ḥum seem to be the most considerable. See Schürer, *Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes*, ii. (3rd ed.) p. 445, note 59.

enough, according to the statement of Mk., the verdict upon the first synagogue address of Jesus was to the effect that he was very well warranted in speaking there and yet that he spoke quite differently from the Scribes. This was a new teaching ; but no one was ready to doubt Jesus' call to preach (Mk. 1. 22, 27—διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν). Nothing indeed is told us about the subject of this address.[1] But its striking and impressive character is proved by a very cogent instance. Whilst Jesus is speaking, a man, who, according to the views of that age, was possessed of an evil spirit, suddenly cries out, "What have we (here in Capernaum) to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Thou art come hither for our destruction. I know who thou art —the Holy One of God." Obviously we have here the case of a man who has lived an easy, untroubled life wedded to bad habits revolting inwardly against the preaching of repentance which has stirred and shaken him to the depths of his being. The expression ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Mk. 1. 24) need not necessarily mean the Messiah ; all that it is meant to emphasise, and that strongly, is the contrast between the holy earnestness of the preacher of repentance and the fashion of daily life in Capernaum. But Jesus bids the excited man have peace. He too regards sudden excitement of this kind as the symptom of an evil spirit in the man ; and in this he does not differ in his ideas from his contemporaries. He therefore speaks to the man, not in an agitated tone, we may be sure, but with the calmness and assurance which always prevail with one who is excited, and says, "Hold thy peace and depart out of him!" The commanding tone convulses the man once again, but the crisis is soon passed and he grows calm and collected. In all this there is nothing that might not have happened in many a similar case in other times.[2] It may be that Jesus paid no

[1] Its general purport may be inferred from Mk. i. 15.

[2] Possibly this explanation of Mk. i. 26 may be pronounced rationalistic. But as the evil spirit, as such, was of course invisible, it was only possible to see the man being convulsed and torn (σπαράξαν), and to hear the loud cry which proceeded out of his mouth. Then, when the evil spirit had forsaken him, he had peace. Thus, whatever the metaphysical explanation of the phenomena may be, the above picture is what is obviously presented to the observer.

particular attention to the incident; nevertheless it fixed itself in the memories of others. And the combination of this extraordinary power over the minds of men with a quite novel and impressive manner of preaching gave Jesus a great reputation, even though at first it was only in the little town of Capernaum.

JESUS AND THE SCRIBES.—The difference between Jesus' manner of preaching and the manner of preaching of the Scribes could, then, be readily perceived by his hearers. At the same time, there can be no question (or hardly any) of an inferior knowledge of the Scriptures on the part of Jesus; for Jesus has a command of the Scriptures in quite a remarkable way, and is able to convict the Pharisees in Capernaum (Mk. ii. 25), the emissaries of the Great Council, and the Sadducees in Jerusalem (Mk. xii. 16, 24), of at least a lack of skill in the interpretation of Scripture. Moreover, those who lay stress on the difference between Jesus and the Scribes acknowledge at the same time Jesus' call to preach in the synagogue. This admission they assuredly would not have been willing to make, had Jesus shown an inferior knowledge of Scripture. The difference must therefore be sought somewhere else. Now, in the case of preachers, the more powerful impression will always be produced by one whose mind is full of a great thought round which he is able to make all the details of his discourse revolve. This was the advantage which Jesus enjoyed as a preacher in comparison with the Scribes. Their work consisted essentially in interpreting and inculcating the precepts of the Law, in discussing difficult cases in the application of the Law, and not the least in demonstrating also the possibility of evading inconvenient precepts of the Law. Such preaching was dry and not very attractive.[1] Jesus, however, lived in the

[1] The stories of the lives of the great men of Israel's past—which Scribes were wont to draw upon continually for the sake of edification—would no doubt be more attractive; only, these heroes, too, were all measured by a legal standard which for the most part was foreign to them. No doubt, the future kingdom of the Messiah also, the future Jerusalem, was described with some warmth of enthusiasm, but the words of the preacher would hardly be without the warning that the kingdom of the Messiah would only be granted to the people who were faithful to the Law. Again, it occasionally happened that a preacher would expound the mysteries of

thought, that the kingdom of Heaven was nigh at hand. He preached repentance, though not in terms of the various sections of the Law, but on the ground of a great and unified conception of human duty. Like the Scribes, he finds occasion to deal with many of the common occurrences of life; yet he does not do so in order to show subtlety in the interpretation of the Law, but in order to deduce from a right judgment with regard to the simple incidents of daily life a right judgment also with regard to the general problems of man and man's relations to God, and to establish the same.[1] Such was the discourse of Jesus which people marvelled at, and ranked above that of the Scribes.

MIRACLES OF JESUS.—From the synagogue Jesus goes into the house of Simon and Andrew; James and John are also with him. There Simon's mother-in-law lies sick of a fever. Jesus goes to her and takes her by the hand; the fever leaves her, and she again goes about her household duties. In the evening, all that are sick and possessed of evil spirits in the town are brought before the house, and he heals many of both classes. But he does not permit the evil spirits whom he drives out to speak, because they know him (Mk. i. 29–34). In considering these miracles, it must be distinctly remembered that they are not meant to be a proclamation of the Messiah. It is, as a matter of fact, explicitly stated, that the evil spirits recognised Jesus (*i.e.*, as the Messiah); but precisely for this reason he forbids them to speak. Thus, these miracles in no sense run counter to the resolve which Jesus formed when he warded off his temptation (Mt. iv. 5–7, Lk. iv. 9–12). Jesus does not wish by these cures to make himself known as the Messiah; he does not in any sense regard this power as being a gift of grace which distinguishes him personally. A man who is perpetually urging that we must not go past any distress without relieving it, that we ought, everywhere, and at all times, to be active in

the world and of life in the mythological and fantastic style of the Book of Enoch. But all this was only so much seasoning; the real religious fare of the Jewish people consisted of the 613 commandments of the Law.

[1] Jesus learns from life to understand the will of God, and as he himself has understood it he teaches it to the disciples in his parables (Chap. iv. p. 106).

helping others—think only of the great description of the judgment (Mt. xxv. 45) and the parable of Lazarus (Lk. xvi. 19-31)—it will always be a point[1] in his favour that he has himself, on many occasions, intervened with effective assistance. The desire, then, to help wherever help was needed was certainly present with Jesus. The question in dispute is whether such help as, according to the testimony of the Gospels, Jesus rendered was possible. And here once more it is necessary to note the distinctive peculiarity of Jesus. One of the best attested of his sayings is that about faith which can move mountains. Paul already quotes it in 1 Cor. xiii. 2. It is an utterance belonging to the end of Jesus' life (Mk. xi. 23). In it he embodies a piece of his own life's experience ; namely, that whatever one undertakes or claims, in the full confidence that it will succeed, is bound to succeed. Herein, it is perfectly clear, we have a reflection of Jesus himself. He praised the Baptist, because he was no reed shaken to and fro by the wind, but a man of strong-willed character, conscious of his purpose in life (Mt. xi. 7 = Lk. vii. 24). He declared that the man who observes his (Jesus') words, is like the prudent builder who founds his house upon the rock, to make it secure against wind and weather (Mt. vii. 24–27 = Lk. vi. 47–49). So he is anxious to make his followers independent of all the storms of life, while again he attributes the greatest results to those who do not suffer their confidence of success to be disturbed by hindrances of any kind. Beyond doubt, then, Jesus held it to be the goal of human life, that a man should shape himself into a personality who should be independent of all outward happenings, and to that extent should be lifted above the world. And this was the goal to

[1] Inferences as to the character of a preacher drawn from the substance of his preaching may indeed often be unsafe. But the question we are now considering is not as to the preaching of an ideal commonly recognised (and therefore often familiar to the individual simply as a theory), but as to the advocacy of a new view of things, which hitherto has found no acceptance, by the person himself who has originated it. In this case, there is good ground to infer the character of the preacher from that which he preaches, not indeed in the sense that the preacher could never fall short of his ideal, but in the sense that for him the subject of his sermon really is the practical ideal of his life, which he strives as nearly as possible to reach.

which he desired to lead those who observed his words. Thus, he must have been conscious that he himself was thus strong and steadfast, thus free from all the anxieties of the world, and thus independent also of the laborious calculations as to what can or cannot be done in accordance with human standards.[1] Now, a person of this type, animated by a spirit of calm self-confidence, is, above all men, fitted to exercise an influence upon the physical condition of others by means of mental impressions. Experience has shown again and again that this firm assurance, coupled with the active will to help, is able to produce a healing effect upon the body of others, sometimes it may be for a short period only, sometimes, however, permanently. Physicians tell us that people can be cured by suggestion ; the term describes what has often been observed precisely in a quarter in which religious enthusiasm has been stirred. When the Holy Coat was displayed at Treves in the year 1891, the sight of the relic, seen with the eye of faith, did, as an actual fact, according to the perfectly trustworthy evidence of German physicians of unimpeachable reputation, effect in eleven cases cures for which no other medical reasons whatever could be offered, though in twenty-seven other cases another explanation of the cure did not seem to the physicians to be excluded.[2] The eleven cases for which no medical explanation could be offered, included atrophy of the optic nerve of many years' standing, lupus, paralysis of the arm as a consequence of dislocation, complete loss of the use of the arms and legs as a consequence of rheumatic gout, St. Vitus's dance, a serious abdominal complaint, blindness of one eye and paralysis of one arm as a consequence of brain fever, chronic intestinal disorder, a cancerous tumour, caries of the spine, and a chronic inflammation of the spinal

[1] In this case the inference as to the preacher's character is not drawn from any demand made by him. Jesus tells of a promise to be fulfilled by the man who lives in accordance with his demand. That is to say, he imparts an experience which he himself has undergone, that others may in the same manner find the blessing which has come to him.

[2] This instance is specially chosen because of the reliability of the data and their nearness in point of time. Here too it was not the inanimate object that was so effective, but the spiritual power of the (Roman) Catholic Church.

marrow.[1] Facts like these, which are not really open to question, will make Jesus' works of healing also seem not impossible.[2]

We cannot analyse further the several individual stories of healing wrought by Jesus; it is sufficient to establish the general point of view. Jesus *was able* to help by the power of a personality possessed of strong assurance and of unshaken confidence in its own success. And he *wished* to help, because he held it to be a sin, and condemned it as such, to pass by human distress without relieving it. The healing activity of Jesus is firmly established in the tradition. Paul counts the χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, "the gifts of healing," amongst the special gifts of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30). But Jesus attached no importance to the wonderful character of these healings; his great concern was simply the giving of help.

Healing of Demoniacs.—The contemporaries of Jesus were especially impressed by the fact that he was able to drive out evil spirits, and that his disciples also possessed the same gift (Mk. i. 27, 34, iii. 15, vi. 13, ix. 38, Mt. x. 8, Lk. x. 17, xiii. 32). In this case, however, it must be distinctly borne in mind that under the idea of possession by evil spirits the contemporaries of Jesus understood more than one very different thing. There were some who regarded the Baptist as possessed of a devil, because he withdrew into the wilderness, and was abstemious in eating and drinking (Mt. xi. 18, Lk. vii. 33). Here it is evident that it was the strangeness of the Baptist's manner of life which led people to infer that he suffered from a diseased condition of mind. In Mk. we have four detailed stories of the healing of demoniacs. The first of these we have already discussed; it is the case of the man in the synagogue at Capernaum who was healed by

[1] See Korum, *Wunder und göttliche Gnadenerweise bei der Ausstellung des heiligen Rockes zu Trier im Jahre 1891*, Trier, 1894.

[2] Although people are reluctant to associate Jesus with the nature-healers of the present day, his cures certainly remind us of those of such men rather than of those of the professional physicians. But historical inquiry must not be influenced in its work by feelings of reluctance or the reverse, and, at all events, the simple spiritual influence which Jesus exercised upon the sick stands immeasurably above the practice of the professional physicians of his time.

the word of Jesus (Mk. i. 23–26). In this case, it is clear, Jesus had to do simply with a man who was shaken to the profoundest depths of his spiritual nature. His impetuous and passionate interruption is traced back to a diseased condition of mind. From this case and that of the Baptist it is evident that the exhibition of even relatively slight symptoms were sufficient to stamp a man as one possessed by evil spirits. But the case of the sick man in Mk. v. 1–20 is different. It is impossible to bind him ; he is driven to and fro, shouting and beating himself with stones, and believes himself to be possessed by a legion of evil spirits. Clearly the man was insane. But the description of the symptoms of the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mk. vii. 24–30) are not so clear. All we can discern clearly is that the healing consists essentially in soothing and quieting the patient ; for after the evil spirit has left her, she lies upon her bed, where, it is evident, she could not be made to lie before. Finally, the sick boy who was healed after Jesus' transfiguration was unmistakably an epileptic (Mk. ix. 14–29). But we are distinctly told that the evil spirit which possessed him was dumb ; so that here it was the paralysis of the organs of speech, and the mental disturbance accompanying attacks of epilepsy, that led to a man of this description being regarded as possessed of a devil.

On the whole, therefore, it is anomalous conditions of mind that are attributed to possession by evil spirits ; and these may of course be associated with symptoms of bodily disease.[1] From another point of view, however, every impairment of health is referred to the Tempter, in so far as the afflicted person might be driven by his sufferings to murmur and complain against God. Thus, Paul says (2 Cor. xii. 7), that an angel of Satan buffeted him, lest he should think too highly of himself ; and in Lk. xiii. 10–17 we are told of a woman who was bowed down, that she had a "spirit of infirmity," and that she was bound of Satan. Neither of these cases (in Paul or in Lk.), however, is to be classified as an instance of possession by evil spirits. Possession presupposes a close relationship between the demoniacal spirit and

[1] Violent convulsions in nervous disorders especially seem to have been explained as due to pulling backwards and forwards by evil spirits.

the soul of the afflicted person, such as is not thought of as existing in these cases.

Now, it is a very well-known fact, that a calm, decided, serene temperament is capable of exercising the most highly beneficial effects upon people of an excitable and unstable disposition. And assurance and serenity were main characteristics of the mental constitution of Jesus. Hence it is easy indeed to understand that he should have possessed a power over the "demoniacs." In one of the sayings of the Lord, we are told about a demoniac, who had been healed, lapsing into his former condition (Mt. xii. 43–45 = Lk. xi. 24–26). "The unclean spirit, after being driven out of the man, wanders in waterless regions—it was an ancient and popular idea that the desert was the home of unclean spirits (Levit. xvi. 10, Isa. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 14)—and, when he finds there no rest, he resolves to return to his deserted house. And he is well pleased with it, because, in the meantime, the house has been swept and garnished. Then he brings in seven other spirits still worse than himself; and the end of such a man is worse than the beginning." This, then, is the description of an actual experience: the demoniac who seems to be cured often becomes at a later date worse than he was before the cure; this fact is explained in a popular mythological manner in its description. Jesus may in fact have uttered the saying attributed to him, upon learning that one whom he had cured had been severely attacked a second time. But it is not his habit to describe merely, without, at the same time, appealing to the will. If we take the saying entirely by itself, it breathes neither comfort nor warning, and it might be difficult to discover another saying of Jesus of a similar character. Moreover, neither Mt. nor Lk. introduces the saying in the context of any story of a sick man who has a relapse. In Mt. it is attached to the saying about the sign of Jonah; in Lk. to the defence which Jesus makes against the accusation of being in league with Beelzebul. In both cases it is clearly meant to be taken as a warning; that is to say, it is to be regarded as of importance here, not only medically, as regards the physical body, but also in the sphere of moral discipline. The evil spirits which have to be driven out of the man are the passions, the bad habits to which he is a prey.

If, after he has begun to be cured, he again relapses into them, they easily win a still greater power over him than they possessed before ; he will be in far worse plight than he was at first. If now we carry our thoughts back from this case to that of the man who was possessed in the synagogue at Capernaum, it is easy to see that it is by no means a long step from the passionate temperament he is described as possessing to really sinful passion (Mk. i. 23–26). Thus it is that Jesus can regard his preaching of repentance, as a whole, as closely connected with the task of driving out devils (Lk. xiii. 32) ; and when he sends forth his disciples, the power which he would especially confer upon them is power over the unclean spirits that tyrannise over men (Mk. vi. 7). In both these passages the commission to preach would not have been mentioned at all, had it not fallen under the category of a struggle against demons.[1]

JESUS DEPARTS FROM CAPERNAUM.—But, all the same, Jesus did not wish his work as a preacher to be eclipsed by healing labours, of whatsoever kind they might be. On the evening of this Sabbath in Capernaum, his energies were actually claimed for the work of the physician. This caused him, quite early on the following morning, to quit Capernaum unobserved by the inmates of Simon's household. He retires to a solitary place, and there he prays. What he desires is a moment in which to collect his thoughts (Mk. i. 35). Here Jesus is found by 'Simon, and they who were with him'—no doubt the two pairs of brothers, Simon and Andrew, John and James—and they inform him that all the people are seeking him. But Jesus does not return at once to Capernaum. He desires to visit with his companions the places in the immediate vicinity, in order to preach there also. It was for this end that he left Capernaum. The Gospel of Mk. adds, somewhat largely, that in the immediately succeeding period Jesus taught in the synagogues throughout Galilee. As a matter of fact, the places mentioned as being the scene of his activity in Galilee, when we put them all together, are : in

[1] The real significance of this conception of sin as the dominance of a demon over the man, lies in the vivid picture it gives of the bondage in which that man is bound who is enslaved by his sin, thus bringing home to us the sinner's need of deliverance.

the interior, besides Nazareth, also Cana and Nain ; on the Lake of Gennesareth, besides Capernaum, also Chorazin, the plain of Gennesareth, and a place called Magadan, or Magdala, or Dalmanutha (Mt. xi. 21, xiv. 34, xv. 39, Mk. vi. 53, viii. 10, Lk. vii. 11, x. 13, Jn. ii. 1, 11, iv. 46, xxi. 2). But Jesus did not go to Nazareth, at any rate until later (Mk. vi. 1). Nain is still situated an hour and a half's journey south of Nazareth, and may have been eleven or twelve hours' journey from Capernaum. In the course of this, his first preaching tour, Jesus would be likely, as a matter of fact, to have confined himself to the immediate neighbourhood of Capernaum, in accordance with his own proposal (Mk. i. 38 —εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις) ; for his disciples also went with him, without in any way preparing themselves for a journey of any length. But this extended activity of Jesus in Galilee also came to an end in consequence of a remarkable cure, just as he quitted Capernaum, as soon as the danger arose that his mission as a preacher of repentance was likely to be considered less important than his work as a physician who could heal all manner of bodily diseases.

THE LEPER.—A leper was relieved of his terrible affliction by Jesus' words, "I will ; be thou clean," accompanied by his touch. How this can be understood medicinally, need not be discussed here ; though amongst the cases of healing at Treves in 1891, mentioned above, a cure of lupus was noted. Jesus insistently forbids the man who has been healed to say a word as to the manner in which his cure was effected ; but he tells him that he ought to proceed in all respects according to the precepts of the Law, that is to say, go and show himself to the priest for examination, and present the offering for his cleansing, as appointed in Lev. xiv. 1–32. If he went and faithfully carried out all the precepts there enjoined, all sensation would doubtless be avoided. So, here again we perceive that Jesus does not wish to use his healing powers as a means for revealing that he is the Messiah, or indeed for making any revelation whatsoever about himself : his one desire is to relieve distress wheresoever he encounters it. But, in spite of Jesus' injunction, the leper does not preserve silence ; and the cure creates such a profound sensation that for some time Jesus avoids inhabited places.

He[1] could no more openly enter into any city, but was without, in solitary places" (Mk. i. 45). However, he now learns by experience that he cannot any longer withdraw from public notice. The people flock to him from all sides, whether it be to hear his preaching or to claim his help for their afflictions.

THE CAPTAIN OF CAPERNAUM.—One day there also came to him certain elders of Capernaum, with a request (Lk. vii. 2–10 = Mt. viii. 5–13). By these elders we are no doubt to understand the members of the governing body of the synagogue. We know that in Capernaum there were, as elsewhere, several managers ("rulers") of the synagogue (Mk. v. 22—*εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων*; cp. Acts xiii. 15). These men, then, come to Jesus with a petition on behalf of a Gentile dwelling in Capernaum, who, Gentile though he was, had conferred a lasting favour upon the Jewish community by building them a synagogue. The man is a non-commissioned officer, a centurion, in the service of the Jewish tetrarch, Herod Antipas. His petition is made for a servant,[2] on whom he sets an especial value, and who is sick unto death. Jesus is at once ready to go to Capernaum. But before he can even reach the house, he is surprised by a fresh message from the centurion. The man sends his friends to keep Jesus from entering his house. He is an unclean Gentile; it was for this reason he did not himself come to Jesus. It will suffice if Jesus will speak the

[1] After what has been said earlier, it may appear strange that Jesus should seek to withdraw himself from the works of healing, seeing that he nevertheless conceived it to be a duty to render help wherever help was possible. The limitation, however, to which the statement is here subjected is a real and important one. Jesus does not wish to be, and may not be, turned aside from his mission as a preacher of repentance by his labours as a healer. This he emphasises the first time he forsakes Capernaum (Mk. i. 38—*ἵνα κἀκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον*). Although he now abides (Mk. i. 45) "without in solitary places," he soon perceives that even here the people come from all sides seeking him. Yet here his preaching is less likely to be hindered by people bringing their sick to be healed.

[2] Lk. says *δοῦλος ὅς ἦν αὐτῷ ἔντιμος* (vii. 2). In verse 8 the centurion calls him *ὁ παῖς μου*; in verse 10 he is again called *δοῦλος*. In Mt. *παῖς* occurs throughout (Mt. viii. 6, 8, 13). The redacted version of the Johannine Gospel (iv. 46–54) speaks of him as *παῖς* in verse 51 and as *παιδίον* in verse 49, but everywhere else as *υἱός* (46, 47, 49, 53).

word that his servant become whole. Jesus will be able to work at a distance by means of his powers of healing, just as the centurion can by means of his soldiers. The message is obviously to be explained as due to the man's modesty and embarrassment. Capernaum becomes full of excitement when Jesus again comes back to the city. Everybody is convinced that he will bring help; in the house of the centurion, too, they are quite certain of it. The centurion then becomes unwilling to put the holy man to any further trouble. Jesus' readiness to help is above all question, for Jesus is already on the way to his house. Accordingly, he believes that all that is required now to effect the healing of the lad is a word from Jesus. Jesus himself is astonished at the mighty faith of the man, and is certain that, where faith exists to such an extent, help will not be denied. "I say unto you, I have not found such faith, no, not in Israel." Jesus knows that faith and conviction can move mountains. Accordingly, he sends the messengers home with a comforting answer. And when they reach home, lo, the centurion's strong faith has already wrought the miracle! The cure of the servant has come to pass. His master's confident hope has been transferred to himself, and has effected his cure.[1]

SECOND STAY IN CAPERNAUM. — Jesus is therefore in Capernaum a second time; and now for the first time he definitely takes up his abode there. Hence it is here that people first learn rightly to know him. No sooner is it bruited abroad that the powerful preacher, who is able to banish even bodily ailments, is come again, than all Capernaum gathers in and about the house where he is. And now Jesus preaches inside the house.

(*a*) THE PARALYTIC.—Then come four persons bearing on a stretcher a man who is paralysed on one side. In order to be able to get the man to Jesus, they go up to the low roof, partly uncover it, and let down the sick man on his stretcher to Jesus' feet. By this procedure Jesus is interrupted in his preaching. Here again the subject of his address was doubt-

[1] This explanation may perhaps appear too simple. But complicated explanations are not always the best; and in this particular case indeed are not called for, since we do not know what was the nature of the illness. Lk.'s account gives entirely the impression of historical truth.

less the coming judgment and the need for amendment. Then this picture of suffering and helplessness is laid at his feet. At once he rejoices in the confidence shown in himself personally, for he might well infer it from this unusual occurrence. Yet in the first moments his thoughts still continue to move within the sphere defined by the subject of his preaching. The judgment of God is at hand for all, and no man is guiltless. But for one in such a pitiable state as this sufferer the only thing is to hope and have faith ; and, while Jesus warns the rest of his hearers to be active in self-amendment against the coming of the Messiah, he comforts the helpless paralytic by saying, "My son, thy sins are forgiven thee"—in other words, you need not fear the advent of the Messiah or his judgment. In saying these words, Jesus is animated by the same feeling which in the parable of Lazarus (Lk. xvi. 19–31) caused him to refrain from mentioning any virtues of the sick beggar. The man's misfortune is sufficiently great to render his pardon by God comprehensible. But Jesus' simple words, perfectly explicable by the circumstances, give offence. There are Scribes present. It is fair to suppose that even before this they were none too favourably disposed towards the man to whom all the people were flocking, because his preaching was different from theirs. To their feelings, such freedom of speech with regard to divine things was altogether objectionable. They were wont to demand a more rigid adherence to the Law and to the authorised Holy Writings. But Jesus' conduct, in promising a definite individual forgiveness of sins, without at the same time imposing any conditions or restrictions, seemed to them to overstep all permissible bounds. It was anticipating the judgment of God; and for a mere man, in spite of the natural limitations of his knowledge, to presume to know beforehand what God's judgment will be seemed to be blasphemy: Jesus blasphemed against God, because he did not esteem God's judgment higher than his own.[1] The opposition of the Scribes could

[1] Forgiveness of sins was indeed declared in the Jewish worship (cp. especially Lev. iv., v., xvi.), but in this case it was bound up with certain definite acts of religious observance ordained by God. The priest was governed by God's word as laid down in the Law. Jesus had no support of this kind for his decision.

not, of course, be concealed. From the looks and gestures of his hearers Jesus reads at once what is passing in their minds. In this again he proves himself the keen observer that his vivid parabolic discourses represent him to have been. At the same time, he sees that the words which he addressed to the paralytic do not give satisfaction, because, although he has promised the man forgiveness of sins, he has not healed him—a circumstance calculated to astonish, and to a certain extent disappoint, the sick man and those who brought him. To promise forgiveness of sins seemed to be a very easy thing to do, far easier than to heal the paralytic. And yet the invalid had been brought to Jesus for the very purpose of being healed. Then Jesus declares that the cure, which he now proceeds to effect upon the sick man, is a proof granted by God, that he has also a right to pronounce forgiveness of sins. The reproach has been made against him, whether audibly or not, that he, a son of man, has arrogated to himself a power which belongs to God alone. Then he says, "That ye may see that the Son of Man hath the right to forgive sins on earth, I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go away home." And the wonder is accomplished: the paralytic arises, and, in obedience to Jesus' command, takes up his bed, and goes out through the throng. In this province of investigation, in which we are wrapped in such dense darkness, it is one of the best-known circumstances that lameness is, as a matter of fact, often cured by suggestion.[1]

That an event of this character would make a sensation is self-evident. On the other hand, the story shows also that it is quite impossible to eliminate these wonders of healing from Jesus' life-history without at the same time impoverishing the account of his preaching. The promise of forgiveness of sins, and the offence taken thereat, are here interwoven with the healing of the lame man in the closest manner. And both, the promise and the healing, are, in the end, to be traced back to the same inner steadfastness and freedom of Jesus, which contrast so markedly with the timorous and anxious character of the Scribes and their excessive care

[1] Of the thirty-eight cases of healing at Treves in 1891 about one-third were cures of lame persons. See pp. 193 f., above.

lest the law should be contravened. They may have been pleased with Jesus' preaching of repentance; but when he dares to forgive sins, they cannot but be filled with secret horror at the mere mention of it. In all this, the important point to notice is, that Jesus does not pronounce forgiveness of sins because he knows that he is the Messiah to whom will one day be assigned the task of exercising judgment upon men. What he desires to show to those who are scandalised by the claim, on the ground that they acknowledge this right to belong to none save God, is that the "son of man" may forgive sins on earth. This is essentially a quite general proposition, and one which positively nobody could apply to the Messiah alone. At the same time, Jesus does not here in any sense enter into the individual cases in which a man may forgive sins.[1]

(*b*) LEVI THE PUBLICAN.—To this offence there is soon added another. The Lake of Galilee formed the boundary between the territory of Herod Antipas and that of his brother Philip; on the east side it was also bordered by the Decapolis, which owed allegiance direct to Rome. At Capernaum on the lake side there was a station for the receipt of customs, and the customs-officer (publican) whose duty it was to levy the customs of import and export across the lake was called Levi,[2] the son of Alphaeus. Now all the publicans, as a class, were in ill repute; they were said by means of bribery or over-exaction to appropriate dishonest gain; even conscientiousness in the case of the publican was readily set down to

[1] The question we are considering is not that of forgiving, as a duty, an injustice done to ourselves, but only that of the assurance of divine forgiveness to the sinner. We have examples of the same kind of freedom, when Jesus upholds his own conception of God's will in opposition to the Law, and when he assures of forgiveness of sins in accordance with a principle consistent with this same will of God. And Jesus desires to communicate the same freedom to his disciples.

[2] In the first Gospel he is called Matthew (Mt. ix. 9, x. 3), though no satisfactory explanation of the varying name can be given. Perhaps the Evangelist was only desirous of securing for the publican, who was placed on an equality with the first four disciples by reason of his being called by Jesus and his prompt obedience to the call, a sure place in the tradition of the Church, and at the same time for one of the twelve Apostles a position in the Evangelical narrative.

sycophancy (Lk. iii. 13, xix. 8). Jesus only proceeds in accordance with the estimation in which they were popularly held, when he couples them with the harlots (Mt. xxi. 31 f.), or when in another passage they are ranked in the same category with the heathen (Mt. xviii. 17). The publicans constitute the one chief class of the population which was shunned by the strictly orthodox Jews as sinful; hence several times we meet with the phrase 'publicans and sinners' (Mk. ii. 15 f., Mt. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 34).[1]

(*c*) SEPARATION FROM SINNERS. — One of the leading features of orthodox Judaism was separation from sinners, the holding aloof from them (פְּרִישׁוּת, *pĕrīshūth*) being regarded as a leading mark of piety. It was made a matter of regret that purification and segregation died out with Gamaliel the Elder, the teacher of the Apostle Paul (*Soṭa*, ix. 15). In the same passage of the Mishnah there is a saying of Rabban Pinḥas, the son of Jair, to the effect that, "Purification leads to separation, and separation leads to holiness." The name "Pharisee" may originally have had a political reference, indicating perhaps those who separated themselves from the Zadokite (high-priestly) princely house because they disapproved[2] of the union of the priestly office with the dignity of prince. In New Testament times the union no longer existed, and the name "Pharisees" designated the great party who held that the holiest duty was purification according to the law and aloofness from every form of sinfulness which was contrary to the law. Even in Sirach it is said (xii. 4), "Give to the pious, and advocate not the part of the sinner." In the same spirit the aged Tobit concludes the advice as to doing good, imparted to his son Tobias on his journey, with these words, "But give not to sinners" (Tobit, iv. 16 f.). At a later period the separation from sinners was reduced even to fixed rules and precepts. Hillel says (*Ābōth*, ii. 3), "The people in the land are not pious"; and the reason why they were not so is given by Pinḥas ben Jair (*Soṭa*, ix. 15) in the words, "Fear of sin begets piety." For this cause,

[1] In the Talmud the publicans are in several passages associated with robbers—*e.g.* in *Baba Kamma*, x. 2; *Nedarim*, iii. 4; *Shebuoth*, xxxix*a*.

[2] We might conclude this from their first appearance, Jos., *Ant.*, xiii. 288–298.

according to *Demai*, ii. 3, nothing should be sold to "the people in the land" and nothing bought from them: no man may lodge with them, and none may take one of them in to lodge with him wearing his unclean garment. And, according to *Bikkurim*, iii. 12, the priest may only give the first-fruits which are brought to him to a comrade ("the separated one," the Pharisee), not to any from among "the people of the land." The Babylonian Talmud even forbids a man to occupy himself with the Law in the sight of "the people in the land," or to give them help in times of scarcity (*Pesachim*, xlix. b, *Baba Bathra*, viii. b). From all this we may be able to understand how great was the offence given by Jesus when he called the publican Levi to be one of his more intimate followers (Mk. ii. 14).

(*d*) THE LAWS AS TO EATING AND DRINKING.—Again, amongst the Jews there were no acts in which they were so careful to insist strongly upon due observance of the formalities of the Law as in those of eating and drinking. The Mishnah quite seriously enumerates (*Berakhoth*, viii. 1–4) the differences distinguishing the two Scribal schools, those of Hillel and Shammai, which flourished in the time of Jesus, in the matter of meals on feast-days. The school of Shammai began with the Blessing for the day, and then blessed the wine; the followers of Hillel blessed the wine first, and then repeated the Blessing for the feast-day. The school of Shammai next washed their hands and filled the cup; the school of Hillel first filled the cup, and afterwards washed their hands. The followers of Shammai laid their napkin on the table; those of Hillel placed it on the cushion. After the meal was done, the school of Shammai purified the room, and ended by washing their hands; the school of Hillel first washed their hands, and then purified the room. It was on the due observance of such acts as these that, according to the Pharisees, true piety depended. But "the people in the land,"[1] the publicans and sinners, troubled themselves not at all about these practices.

[1] The expression 'people in [of] the land,' *'am hā 'āreṣ* (עַם־הָאָרֶץ), was used by the later Jews to designate the individual Israelite who was not pious according to Pharisaic notions (*Demai*, ii. 3, 6, 9, 12; *Shebiith*, v. 9 = *Gittin*, v. 9; *Bikkurim*, iii. 12; *Tohoroth*, vii. 4, viii. 5).

Jesus eats with his disciples in the house of Levi the publican, and many of the man's professional colleagues and acquaintances are present as guests. And now the new prophet, whose original style of preaching has such great power of attraction, seems to have revealed himself in his true character. The Scribes, who alone have hitherto expounded the Law in the synagogue, and who profess the well-known piety of the Pharisees, are quick to point out the scandal, and take the disciples to task for it, deeming that they still possess a means of bringing these misled ones back in due time to the better path. But Jesus hears of the reproof and defends himself against it with cogent clearness: "The physician must go to the sick, not to him that is whole; so must I also call, not the righteous,[1] but sinners, to repentance" (Mk. ii. 17). It is the duty of the preacher of repentance to occupy himself with sinners; he is bound to associate with them. To this the Scribes might indeed have answered: To preach repentance to sinners is perfectly right; we also do it in the synagogue; but it is another thing to associate with them as one does with one's good friends. The hymn-book of the Jewish communion, the Psalter of David, at its very commencement warns against sitting at meat with sinners (Ps. i. 1).

(*e*) REASONS FOR ASSOCIATING WITH SINNERS.—But Jesus was convinced that preaching alone cannot bring the sinner back to the right way, that nothing but continual association with him is able to overcome his sinful nature. Notwithstanding the high value attached by the Pharisees to the duty of separation, Jesus declared that the time for such separation will not arrive until the day of judgment. And he spoke the parable of the tares among the wheat, and of the net (Mt. xiii. 24–30, 36–43, 47–50). As the wheat is not separated from the tares until the harvest comes, and as, in fishing, both good and useless fish are taken into the net, only to be sorted when the boat comes to land, so must good and wicked men go on living together until the day of judgment. Then, however,

[1] That is to say, of course, relatively speaking. In the case of those who are perfect, the preaching of repentance is unnecessary. Whether any such there be is not discussed. In any case, by using this word, Jesus addresses himself to the Pharisees as well.

the Messiah will separate the citizens of God's kingdom from the reprobate ; man ought not of his own initiative to undertake any such division or separation. Such is Jesus' sharp repudiation of the prevailing tendency, Pharisaism.[1]

(*f*) THE DUTY OF LOVE.—But Jesus has a still deeper reason for this repudiation. His fundamental conception of the duty of mutual support and assistance did not allow him to disregard the need of any sinner. For him it was a sin not to feed a man who was hungry (Mt. xxv. 41–46), to leave a poor Lazarus lying in his misery (Lk. xvi. 19–21) ; and he could not but regard it as a sin also not to save a man who was going to meet the judgment of God without the desire to amend his ways. The Pharisees indeed imagined that God himself turns away from the sinner, even as they deemed it right that the devout Jew should also turn away from the sinner; Jesus judges man's duty differently, and consequently thinks differently of God.

(*g*) PARABLES OF THINGS LOST.—Nevertheless, he seeks to prove to the Pharisees the correctness of his own point of view, by arguments drawn from their own consciousness of duty. Every shepherd must seek his lost sheep, even though he may possess ninety and nine others, and he rejoices when he brings the strayed one back home on his shoulder. A careful woman, when she has lost one of her thirty drachmae, searches all through her house with a light ; and, when she has found her lost piece of money, she communicates her joy to the whole neighbourhood. If, then, we expect a good shepherd, a good

[1] According to Mt. xiii. 24, 47, both these parables refer to the kingdom of Heaven. But if we interpret this as meaning that the good and the wicked are to be allowed to remain for a time in the kingdom of Heaven unseparated, we shall be labouring under a mistake. That is the Catholic interpretation, whereby the kingdom of Heaven is understood to be the present kingdom of Christ on earth, that is to say, the Church. But to the contemporaries of Jesus the idea of a kingdom of Heaven, in which wicked men were also to be found, would have been simply inconceivable. And yet, in spite of this, Jesus may very well have described both parables as having reference to the kingdom of Heaven. They describe *the reception into the kingdom of God, and accentuate the fact, that this is not dependent upon the judgment of men, but solely upon the result of the divine judgment.* But a vital understanding of these parables can only be obtained by duly taking into consideration the circumstances of the time in which they were spoken.

housewife, to behave in this way, may we not also believe that God will go after a man and save him when he has gone astray from the right path (Lk. xv. 1–10)?[1]

(*h*) NEED OF DELIVERANCE.—Jesus often found amongst the classes of people who were rejected by the Pharisees a burning longing for salvation, whereas the gloom of the Pharisaical piety was repulsive to him. How graphically does he describe (Lk. xviii. 10–14) how the Pharisee and the publican come to the temple! The Pharisee, who thanks God only for his own excellence, through which, in virtue of his abundant fastings and his scrupulous giving of tithes, he thinks he is raised above all other men, goes out of the temple neither richer nor poorer than he entered it. But the publican finds profit in his prayer, because, out of the needs which his conscience brings home to him, he struggles upwards to faith in God's favour and compassion. The greater success of his prayer proves also that God does have regard for the sinner. God will certainly not let such a cry for forgiveness go unheard.

(*i*) THE PRODIGAL SON.—Once more Jesus appeals to the general ethical consciousness of his people. He hopes to win general approval for his description of the father who receives[2] with truly exuberant demonstrations of joy his lost son, when, after sinking into sin, disgrace, and bitter need, he returns home repentant. Here, however, we may presume, Jesus encountered opposition even at the first relation of the parable, and consequently, he adds the con-

[1] Here then from the duty of man Jesus draws an inference as to the nature of God; he maintains that there is a contradiction between the Pharisees' conception of duty and their idea of God. The basis of his reasoning is the idea, which for Judaism cannot be traced farther back than to the Hellenistic period, that God is the type of all perfection (see Mk. x. 18).

[2] Certainly the bounds of duty are far exceeded when the father places on the returning prodigal the best garment and a ring, and, what is more, has the fatted calf slain, and orders a feast with music and dancing (Lk. xv. 22 f., 25). This excess is the more strikingly emphasised when we are told that the elder son had not been allowed so much as a goat (Lk. xv. 29). Yet in this exuberance what we have to see is only the excess of a father's joy coming as a reaction upon the deep sorrow which had preceded it.

cluding words, in which the father justifies his joy to his son who has remained faithful (Lk. xv. 11–32). A man's joy is surely right when he exults because a kinsman that was lost is found again, or because one that was dead is again raised to life. But in this conclusion of the parable of the lost son there is still an objection to be met. After the idea of a covenant between God and his people had arisen, the relation between God and man was often measured in Judaic conceptions by the standard of human right. If the return of the sinner calls forth such great joy, while he who has been constant in right-doing receives only the reward of his righteousness, there arises the question whether the justice of God is evenly balanced. But this objection also Jesus is able to rebut by another picture drawn from the abundant store of graphic observations, which he had at all times so amply at his command. He relates the parable of the labourers in the vineyard (Mt. xx. 1–16).

(*j*) THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD.—The owner of the vineyard hires labourers for his vineyard at six o'clock in the morning, at nine o'clock, at noon, at three o'clock, and at five o'clock. With the first he agreed what should be the wages for the day; to the others he has promised to give whatsoever is right. In the end they all receive the full daily wage.[1] At this they who have worked all day long murmur; but they are reproved for doing so. No injustice is done to them, provided they receive what was promised to them. If the employer grants the same wage to the other labourers, it is simply a mark of his kindness. It would be better to rejoice at this kindness than to murmur at it. In a similar way, in the parable of the lost son, the father says to his son who was faithful, "Thou art always with me, and all that I have is thine." Was not the faithful son, then, fortunate, in that he never fell into sin, disgrace, and destitution, as his brother did, and were not those labourers who were engaged in the beginning of the day fortunate, in that from early in the morning they were sure of their full day's wage? Therefore, no injustice is done the righteous when God is also mindful of the sinner.

[1] Such a method of payment is often followed in large businesses, if only for the sake of simplicity in calculation.

(*k*) INVITATION TO BEGGARS.—The Pharisaic exclusiveness seems to Jesus to be utterly loveless. A rich man, he thinks, ought not to prepare a feast only for his friends and relatives and rich neighbours, who can repay him in the same coin. He would do better to invite the poor, the deformed, the lame, and the blind. He ought to find pleasure in making happy those who cannot repay him for it; that is worthy conduct for which he will be rewarded at the resurrection of the just (Lk. xiv. 12–14). This also is quite as much a parable, even though it be certain that Jesus thinks the injunction contained in it, as literally interpreted, to be good, and prefers the feeding of the beggars to the entertaining of the rich. But the proper way of understanding the injunction which we find here is no doubt this: it is better for the pious that they should not merely associate one with another, but that they should share their good things with sinners, so that these too may derive advantage from the riches of piety which the others possess. It is only thus that the saying throws light upon an important question in the life of Jesus.[1]

(*l*) THE FEAST.—Further, we possess a detailed parable of Jesus which comes into very close relation with this saying (Lk. xiv. 16–24 = Mt. xxii. 2–14). A great feast is to be given. Many are invited; but instead of coming, they send excuses, although they have accepted the invitation previously. Then the beggars, the deformed, the blind, and the lame are called in, first from the streets and lanes of the town, and after that from the country highway, that they may partake of the feast. This is plainly a defence by Jesus for having preached amongst the outcast classes of his countrymen. He was also, no doubt, desirous of labouring amongst those who

[1] The same observations apply with regard to this saying as have been made (pp. 196 f.) in the case of the relapsed demoniac. To have laid down a rule for the invitations to be issued by rich people would have been at variance with the general character of Jesus' preaching. He may well have had his own thoughts about the matter; but, if he ever gave utterance to them, he certainly at the same time replied to questions which touched him more closely. The saying about the places at a feast, which in Lk. precedes this (xiv. 7–11), was originally placed in Mt., at all events according to Codex D and the ancient VSS., after Mt. xx. 28, thus proving incontestably that it should be interpreted as a parable (cp. p. 59).

professed that they desired to be pious and upright; but experience taught him that they nevertheless would not listen to his cry urging them to repent. Even in Mt., it is true, the parable is applied to the calling in of the Gentiles after Israel's rejection of the invitation; but the antithesis is one that plays no part at all within the lifetime of Jesus.[1]

At a later date the Church, inclined to take offence at Jesus' love for sinners, also interpreted the parables of the things lost as referring to the calling in of the Gentiles. And to the same category belongs, too, the interpretation of the parable of the shepherd (Lk. xv. 4–7) in Jn. x. 16; but the Johannine Gospel assumes it to be a recognised truth that God does not give ear to the sinner (Jn. ix. 31), and that none but the good come to the light (Jn. iii. 20 f.).[2]

(*m*) TEMPTATION BY SINNERS.—When Jesus associates with the outcast classes of his countrymen, and allows his disciples to associate with them too, his desire is that by such intercourse an amendment may be effected in those who have hitherto been outcasts, but by no means that those who are engaged in the task of amendment may be deteriorated thereby. Here again he counts upon the steadfastness which he will impart to his disciples (Mt. vii. 24–27 = Lk. vi. 47–49), the same steadfastness which he values so highly in the Baptist (Mt. xi. 7 = Lk. vii. 24), and which, in the form of a faith that knows no discouragement, can remove mountains (Mk. xi. 23). He expects of his disciples that they will rather part with an eye, a hand, a foot, than suffer one of their members to lead them into sin. They ought to realise that they are called to act in a helpful way upon other people like savour-giving salt. But when salt loses its savour, all that can be done with it is to throw it away; it is no longer good for anything. So, if a disciple suffers himself to be led astray

[1] Mt. xxii. 7 contains a clear allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem (τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἐνέπρησεν). With this agrees the interpretation that the people from the highway are the Gentiles, and the amplification (Mt. xxii. 11–14) carefully emphasises the fact that the Gentiles also may only share in the wedding feast if they wear the wedding garment, that is to say, in a penitent spirit. But so far as we can see, Jesus never contemplated the rejection of his countrymen as a whole.

[2] Tertullian, *De Pudic.*, 7–9, gives a detailed justification of his interpretation of these parables of the things lost as referring to the Gentiles.

to evil, his virtue is gone from him (Mk. ix. 43–50).[1] And Jesus likewise speaks earnestly to those whom he leads back into better society. The danger to which the disciples were exposed was increased by the circumstance that the publicans, as compared with the simple fishermen, were well-to-do or even rich folk, who occasionally looked down upon the common people, or were desirous of lifting up the lowly-placed man to their own more refined manner of life. Jesus tells them, therefore, that it were better for them to be drowned in the lake, with a mill-stone fastened to their neck, than that they should lead astray one of these humble but trusting people. It cannot be but that there will be temptations in life; but woe unto the man through whom temptation comes (Mt. xviii. 6 f., Mk. ix. 42, Lk. xvii. 1 f.)!

(*n*) THE UNJUST STEWARD.—Not only did Jesus give warning such as this to the publicans with whom he associated, but he also gave them spiritual advice. His preaching of the nearness of the judgment may well have made them tremble at what they had to answer for. They might actually be conscious that they had a great deal of unjustly acquired property in their hands; yet, considering the nature of their calling, there could be no thought of restoring it to its original owners. The people upon whose goods they had levied excessive duties were in many cases no longer to be found; nor was it now possible in the majority of cases to calculate the amount charged in excess at each payment. So that this unjustly acquired property now weighed like a heavy debt upon its possessor. What shall he do to escape from the punishment of God on the day of judgment?[2] Then Jesus relates the parable of the unjust steward, who, having squandered his lord's property, fears that, when the day of reckoning comes, he will be driven from house and home, and there will be nothing left for him but the life of a day-labourer or a beggar, neither of which is to his taste. But he knows of a way of helping himself. He goes in a friendly

[1] Compare the discussion of this passage in Chap. xii.

[2] We have definite evidence that such thoughts did actually occur with regard to the publicans. In *Baba Kamma*, 94 b, it is said: "Publicans can hardly make good the injustice they have done, because they do not know all the people to whom they owe reparation."

manner to his master's debtors, and inquires of them the amount of their debts, and in one case reduces the sum by one-half in another case by one-fifth. By this means he wins to himself good friends, who will help him in the hour of need. Then his lord discovers the whole of the fraud; but he is so pleased with the astute cunning which his steward has employed to protect himself, that he does not deprive him of his office. He knows that he is clever, and, if he be properly supervised, is capable of doing good service.

This is manifestly a story drawn from actual life; and Jesus tells it in order that his followers may learn a lesson from it. At the same time, he emphasises, that in matters of prudence we may often learn from the children of this world, that is to say, from the men who refuse to concern themselves with higher questions than those of the present world. Where, now, are we to seek the application of the parable? This at any rate is clear, that the steward, who was not in a position to give his master a satisfactory account of his doings, will have many companions in distress when the question is one of giving an account to God. It behoves these, therefore, to consider how they may nevertheless face it. But now it appears that the steward, in making unto himself friends against the day of adversity, acted prudently. And this is precisely what, according to Jesus' conception of the inviolable duty of helpful love, every man who is laden with guilt must do for himself. He has to win friends to himself. For this purpose even the unjustly acquired property which he has in his hands, and which weighs upon his conscience, may be useful to the publican.[1] Yet even so, his former debt will not become less; but as in the parable the master does not thrust away his fraudulent but clever steward, because he sees that he can still make use of him, so God will not thrust from him the man who is ready to help, since he perceives that the

[1] The rigid character of Pharisaic piety can hardly be more forcibly illustrated than by contrasting with this advice, given by Jesus to the publicans, the statement in the Mishnah (*Baba Kamma*, x. 1): "They take no alms from the publicans (אין נוטלין מהם צדקה; that is to say, from כוּתִּים and גַּבָּאין); we ought not to contaminate ourselves with the gold of impure men." Nevertheless the poor folk of Palestine rightly thought very differently (Lk. xix. 8).

same is now striving to do God's will. This, then, is the lesson the publicans are to draw from the story: "Make unto yourselves friends of the unjust Mammon, to the end that, when he forsakes you, they may receive you into the everlasting tabernacles" (Lk. xvi. 1–9). As regards the framing of this last sentence, it is further to be observed that, according to Mt. xxv. 40, every good deed is a service done to the Messiah, and it is the Messiah who receives into the kingdom of God, into the everlasting tabernacles (Mt. xxv. 34). Hence it may even be said that they to whom the service is rendered are they who receive into the everlasting tabernacles.[1]

(*o*) FASTING.—In the eyes of the traditional piety it was a scandal that Jesus should associate with sinners and should sit at meat with them. Hence it could scarcely occasion further surprise, when the practices of the pious were outraged in other ways as well by the same set of people. But the impression produced by the earnest preacher of repentance, who warned men that the kingdom of God was at hand, suffered when it was observed that he and his disciples laid no stress on fasting; for at that period regular fasting was one of the distinguishing marks of piety. In the parable (Lk. xviii. 12), the Pharisee prays quite complacently, "I fast twice in the week"—that is to say, I observe throughout the year the practice of fasting appointed for the two weekdays on which, when public fasts are proclaimed, the quantity of food and nourishment must be restricted (*Taanith*, ii. 9).[2] Now, both the Baptist and his disciples fasted (Mt. xi. 19, Lk. vii. 33—Mk. ii. 18). Hence Jesus is called upon to explain why he does not practise fasting like the Pharisees and John (Mk. ii. 18). This accentuation of the difference between his disciples and the disciples of John seems to have affected Jesus painfully. To him it is intelligible that the disciples of John should fast: their master lies in prison.[3] And here we meet

[1] Cp. also Chap. viii. p. 178.

[2] These days were Monday and Thursday. During a less rigorous fast eating and drinking were allowed on the evening preceding the fast day, and, of course, again on the evening after it was over; but during a rigorous fast eating was forbidden on the evening before, after darkness set in (*Taanith*, i. 4–6).

[3] John's disciples did, it is true, fast earlier (see Chap. v. p. 117); now, however, they have the best of reasons for doing so.

for the first time with an allusion to a future separation of Jesus from his disciples: Do men even thus early take so much offence at him? Hence he answers, "For my disciples the present is a time of joy, just as there is joy so long as the bridegroom abides amongst the marriage guests; but there will be a time when the bridegroom will be taken from them, and then shall they fast." But even in this there is no Messianic announcement. No one, starting from these words, could by any possibility arrive at the opinion that Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah, especially as he plainly intimates that he is to be taken away by violence, an event that will bring a time of sorrow for his disciples (Mk. ii. 20—*ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος*).[1]

Jesus, however, refuses to impose fasting upon his friends. Fasting is out of harmony with the spirit of joy in which they live, having with them the great prophet, the earnest preacher of repentance, who is yet a friend of sinners and proclaims God's grace towards sinners. He is unwilling to curtail this joy of theirs by any melancholy ordinance of fasting. The atmosphere which prevails where Jesus lives is one of gladness. He is the sinners' physician, and at the same time the healer of so many bodily evils; he will not have people about him who are plunged in sorrow. Jesus could not have expressed his view more plainly, that repentance is not necessarily equivalent to pain and broken-heartedness. Luther was certainly right when in his first thesis of 1517 he declared, that Jesus desired that the life of the faithful should be one continued repentance; but both in the opinion of Jesus and in the estimation of the Reformer this unceasing task of amendment thrives much better in a glad trust in God than in melancholy self-torture and never-ending disquiet of conscience.

(*p*) THE OLD AND THE NEW PIETY.—But Jesus also justifies himself and his disciples for not fasting, in yet another way. Such devout practices as fasting are not adapted to the

[1] There is really no reason to doubt that Jesus derived the figurative language which he uses of the Messiah from his own Messianic faith. And he is able to do it without the least restraint, knowing well that from this generally understood figure nobody will divine his secret, more particularly since he here indicates as in store for himself a destiny such as nobody ever associated with the Messiah.

character which the Master desires his disciples to form; and he makes his meaning plain by two graphic pictures. He who mends an old coat does ill to make a patch on it with a new and stiff piece of material; that will make another rent. In the same way, it would be foolish to graft the new kind of piety upon the old practices and observances. It would not retain these, but would very soon cast them off; just as the new, unfulled patch makes the rent in the old coat still worse. The other picture is this: for new wine one requires strong new skins; old skins burst when the wine ferments. In like manner, the new kind of piety preached by Jesus requires new forms in which to manifest itself. For it the forms which have hitherto been in use are not suitable (Mk. ii. 21 f.). Nowhere has Jesus so sharply, as in this saying, emphasised the contrast between the old and the new form of piety.[1] He is combating observances which are hallowed by long usage, but which, from his point of view, must perish.

Lk. adds in this connection a conciliatory saying, addressed to those who cling to the old accustomed forms: "And no man," we read, "who has drunk old wine desires new, for he saith 'the old wine is mild.'" But, however readily the insertion of the saying in this place suggested itself to the Evangelist, owing to the similarity of the figure (new wine), we may with good reason doubt whether this saying belongs to that which precedes it; for it not merely excuses: it actually defends. He who has drunk old wine is quite right in not wishing for new; but he who cleaves to old and decaying forms of piety is not right, even though his habituation to them renders his fault excusable. It is conceivable that Jesus uttered this saying (Lk. v. 39) as a contrast to the relatively new practices of the Pharisees—practices rejected also by the party of the Sadducees—when we compare *this* new form of piety with his own idea of ancient Israelite piety, based upon the Old Testament. Then, the meaning will be: "He who has steeped himself in the knowledge of what ancient Israel

[1] This does not prove that the saying represents a culmination in his activity, such as was only attained later. On the contrary, we might rather say that it breathes the fresh courage which distinguishes the glad beginning of an enterprise, that has not yet lost the buoyancy of its youth in the course of continual struggles.

was will decline to have anything to do with this new-fangled piety of the Pharisees, for he finds that the older fashion is the better."[1] In this sense, the saying harmonises much better with Jesus' line of thought. Moreover, in the context in Lk. the rapid change of tone, the leap from the words of controversy in v. 36–38 to the words of peace in v. 39, is altogether abrupt.

(*q*) ALMSGIVING, PRAYER, FASTING. — Jesus, therefore, refuses absolutely to hear of his disciples fasting; the utmost he will concede is that they shall lose the inclination to eat when the time comes for him to be taken from them. In addition to this, we possess a detailed discourse[2] of Jesus upon the chief exercises of piety amongst his contemporaries—almsgiving, prayer, and fasting (Mt. vi. 1–6, 16–18). In this discourse Jesus does not forbid fasting, but desires that, in this, as in their almsgiving and praying, men shall know how to avoid all parade of piety. Nobody should know when you give an alms, nobody when you pray, nobody when you fast. Piety has another object than that of making you famous in the eyes of men; it is intended to preserve the proper relations between the individual and God. Jesus also condemns the habit of casting furtive glances upon the fame which men confer, if only on the ground of its being detri-

[1] On many occasions Jesus may, as a matter of fact, have started from the Old Testament idea of piety—as, for example, when he ranks the duties towards our fellow-men above all regulations as regards cultus; cp. Chap. viii. p. 173. At the same time, it must never be forgotten that a revival of the Prophetic form of piety was, within the specifically Judaic world, really only possible in a very modified form, because of the great widening of the mental horizon, because of the importance which each individual was admitted to have precisely in consequence of his liability to the Law, and because of the belief, so closely bound up with this estimation of the individual, that all the pious were called to participate in the kingdom of God.

[2] This clearly breaks up into three well-defined strophes; the first part of each ends with the verdict on the hypocrites (*ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν*); the second part contains a demand that a certain thing, when it is done, shall be done *ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ* (*κρυφαίῳ*); and this is accompanied by the concluding promise—*καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ* (*κρυφαίῳ*) *ἀποδώσει σοι* (cp. Mt. vi. 2, 5, 16; 4, 6, 18). From this we may with certainty conclude that verses 7–15 did not originally belong to this discourse.

mental to the independence, self-reliance, and steadfastness of the Christian character. He illustrates, by way of contrast, from the popular life of the Jews. Thus, one man has it proclaimed after the custom of his locality, to the sound of the trumpet, that he is about to distribute alms, so that the poor may gather together. Another, when he wants to pray, stations himself in the much-frequented synagogues, or at the corner of the street, where he may be seen from many sides at once. And a third, when he fasts, disfigures himself purposely, to the intent that everybody may see with what severity he deals with himself. Piety of such an external nature does not amend the heart; for this reason it will not be rewarded when the Messiah comes to judgment. But for whatsover a man does in secret by way of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, God will reward him publicly on the day of the Messiah, by admitting him into his kingdom. But though Jesus' disciples do fast in this wise, it will of course profit them nothing in the eyes of his adversaries; for they will hold that this sort of fasting, as distinguished from the fasting of the Pharisees and the fasting of John's disciples, is not fasting at all. But Jesus really intends that they shall not know when his disciples actually do fast.[1]

(*r*) MISSION FROM THE BAPTIST.—While many therefore take offence at these peculiarities of Jesus—intercourse with sinners, refusal to fast—he himself is from another quarter for the first time confronted with the question whether he is the Messiah. The Baptist is still kept in prison; but he has heard of the activity of Jesus, for John's disciples are still able to communicate with him. So, he sends two of them to Jesus, with the question, "Art thou He that should come, or are we to look for another?" (Mt. xi. 2–19, Lk. vii. 18–35). But Jesus is unwilling to betray his secret even to the Baptist, especially as the question is put to him, not by John himself, but by the mouth of his messengers. John's disciples may

[1] According to *Taanith*, i. 6, washing and anointing were forbidden in the most rigorous fast, while, according to *Taanith*, i. 4 f., they were allowed in the less severe fast. The three religious practices we have just been discussing constitute in a sense a well-connected whole—almsgiving regulating man's relations towards his fellow-men, prayer his relations towards God, and fasting his discipline of himself.

describe[1] to their master the things which are done in the sight of all men; how that the blind see, the lame walk, lepers are made clean, the deaf hear, the dead are awakened, joy is announced to the poor, and blessed is he that is not offended in Jesus. It is an old subject of dispute, how the miracles here enumerated are to be understood, whether the language is descriptive of what actually took place or is symbolical. It is a fact that Jesus healed all manner of sick people; but it is also a fact that he spoke of the blindness of the Scribes and of the people who were led by them (Lk. vi. 39), and that when speaking of the return of the prodigal son he used the words, "He was dead and is alive again" (Lk. xv. 32). What meaning Jesus really attached to his words, when he thus alluded to his wonders, cannot now be decided with certainty; but, since the literal meaning may certainly not be entirely put aside, the most natural thing to do is to rest satisfied with it. John at any rate ought to gain an insight into Jesus' healing ministry as a whole, that he may become convinced that the kingdom of God is now not merely knocking at the gate, but is really come already. And this is what Jesus really wishes to say. He does not speak of himself personally, but of the condition of things which has been brought about by him. He moves in an atmosphere of hymeneal joy, as he himself expressed it when replying to the people who demanded that his disciples should fast (Mk. ii. 19). So far as the world is concerned, then, the kingdom of God may still be a matter of the future; but Jesus is convinced that God will introduce it immediately. To the eyes, however, which are able to see, God's kingdom is already present through the work of Jesus and in the blessings emanating from him. True, Jesus' joy in his success is even now already to some extent clouded; many are offended in him, at his love of sinners, at his gladness in the present world, while they themselves look upon godliness

[1] The report of John's disciples is only intended to furnish the prisoner with what, owing to his imprisonment, he cannot see for himself. There was in it, however, something calculated to awaken a bitter feeling in his mind: Where the dead arise and the lepers are cleansed, cannot the prisoners also be made free? But Jesus strengthens the Baptist's hope in the nearness of the Messiah's kingdom, in which all chains shall be loosened.

as consisting in fasting and mortification. Accordingly, he rejoices all the more in those who are not for this reason made to lose their faith in him; for it is only these who can enjoy with unaffected gladness the blessings which radiate from him. Hence it is that he adds, "And blessed is he who is not offended in me."[1] In this case, then, Jesus actually cites his wonderful cures as signs of the kingdom of God—a circumstance that might occasion some surprise, because, according to other sayings of his, resting on the best authority, he did not desire to reveal himself as the Messiah by means of miracles (Mt. iv. 5–7, xii. 38–42, Lk. iv. 9–13, xi. 29–32). It is, however, one thing to perform a miracle for the purpose of drawing attention to oneself personally, and quite another thing subsequently to interpret one's wonderfully successful acts of helpful love as signs of God's kingdom. Besides, what Jesus does here is only to strengthen the observation made by John for himself. In answer to the Baptist's question, he says neither "Yes" nor "No"; but John's messengers can now go back to their imprisoned master, and confirm, from their own observation, what the Baptist has been told about the ministry of Jesus, and, in view of the growing opposition encountered by Jesus, the warning which he adds, not to be offended in him, as one might be disposed to be, fits in admirably with the circumstances of the moment.[2]

Then, after the Baptist's messengers have departed, Jesus seizes the opportunity to sharpen the memories of the people who surround him as to what manner of man that powerful individual was—not a person dressed in soft clothing, not a reed shaken by the wind. There was nothing effeminate about him, no trace of indecision or vacillation. He possessed the strength of character so highly valued by Jesus. Therefore it is that he is the forerunner of the Messiah, and prepares

[1] Perhaps by adding these words Jesus meant to warn the Baptist. For immediately afterwards he lays emphasis on the distinction between himself and John. This very difference might cause the Baptist to fall into error regarding him.

[2] At the same time, the passage shows that, in the opinion of Jesus, an attentive observer of his works might very well conclude from them that he was the Messiah. Whence we may again infer what he means by the signs of the times which his countrymen do not understand. See Chap. viii. pp. 164 f.

the way for him. This strong personality has shown what can be accomplished by earnest self-discipline. It is with these facts in his mind that Jesus goes on to say that John was the greatest of those born of woman—a saying which faithfully reflects the powerful impression once made upon him by the figure of the Baptist. Nevertheless, Jesus is not blinded by this as to one shortcoming which the Baptist has. When Jesus tells his disciples in what way their greatness should manifest itself, not only does he demand of them strength of character and an undismayed steadfastness, but he also requires faithful service towards their fellow-men (Mk. x. 43 f). The Baptist, however, withdrew into the wilderness, and not for the purpose of serving men. This the most valuable of all great qualities—greatness in serving others—was wanting to the man who fled from the world. But he who is called to the kingdom of God must not lack this kind of greatness. Hence Jesus goes on to add, "But greater than John is he who is least in the kingdom of God."[1] Jesus does not, however, dwell upon this thought now: he has no wish in any way to disparage in the eyes of his countrymen the powerful preacher of repentance, to whom he himself owes so much. For with John assuredly began a new epoch in the history of religion, and, as Jesus conceives, in the history also of mankind. From the moment of John's appearance, the kingdom of God is taken by force, and the impatient snatch it for themselves. All the earlier men of God, the prophets and the Law, only prophesied salvation; John, however, is the expected Elijah, who actively prepares the way for that salvation. Hence, John, in relation to the Apocalyptic literature, with its prophecies of the future and its pictures of manifold form and colour, steps upon the scene as one who forcibly compels fulfilment of these prefigurations of the future. In this saying once more we have a striking expression of the deep impression made by the earnest, austere personality of John upon Jesus and his contemporaries; also of the value attached by Jesus to the

[1] Cp. Chap. viii. p. 158. In that place the matter was discussed from another point of view, from which also the truth of Jesus' word is made evident. Jesus knows that he himself as the future Messiah, with his followers as the friends of the Messiah, is certain of participating in the kingdom of God; John lacks this certainty.

effect thus produced by the Baptist. They who have learned at the feet of the Baptist have gained a rich heritage to themselves from his strength of character, a heritage which is part of the welfare of the kingdom of God. According to Mal. iii. 23, Elijah was expected to return again from heaven before the great judgment day of God, that he might by his preaching of repentance safeguard Israel from the crushing condemnation of God.[1] But, seeing that the Baptist himself announced, as Jesus does now, the immediate approach of the kingdom of God, and for that reason exhorted men to repent, and seeing also that even the outward aspect of John (the leathern girdle and hairy garment) was reminiscent of the great prophets of a previous age (Mk. i. 6; 2 Kings i. 8), Jesus' description of the Baptist, as that same Elias returned to earth again, was hardly likely to excite any great degree of astonishment. So far as Jesus himself was concerned, there was a two-fold reason why he should hold the Baptist to be the promised Elias, for he also held himself to be the promised Messiah. True, the Baptist also had met in part with hard hearts. In his case also, the despised mass of the people, and especially the ill-reputed publicans, had shown themselves more accessible and open to new religious impulses than the Pharisees and Scribes, the men who were so proud of their piety. And Jesus is at once forcibly impressed by the fact that he and John alike, notwithstanding the essential difference between their attitudes with regard to the conduct of life, and the difference between their associates, are both rejected by men. So that Jesus says, not without a certain degree of bitterness: This generation ask for but one thing, namely, that people shall conduct themselves exactly according to their fickle tempers, just as the children of the street grow sulky[2] towards their playmates when they will not join in their games. But neither John nor Jesus has conformed to the ruling of the world. John ate no bread and drank no wine; he was pronounced to be a man possessed, because he thus held aloof from the general practice of the world. Then came a "son

[1] Comp. Chap. v. pp. 121 f.

[2] Observe the contrast between the picture of steadfastness and strength of character in the Baptist and the figure suggested by these small children (παιδία).

of man," both eating and drinking; they call him a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, because he does not show forth his piety in accordance with accepted fashions. Hence, Jesus concludes this speech with the observation, 'But wisdom found her justification far from all her children,' that is to say, amongst quite other people than those who gave themselves out to be her children—amongst the publicans and sinners, and not amongst the Scribes. Thus, Lk. vii. 35 reproduces Jesus' saying correctly. Mt., however, no longer understood the phrase ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, and emended it into ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς: Wisdom found her justification in her works. True, a very simple thought, and easily intelligible, but much less appropriate in this context.[1]

(*s*) JESUS AND THE LAW.—Even thus early, notwithstanding all the joy in Jesus' healing power, and the admiration excited by his preaching, there existed a very active opposition to the manner of his public appearance. A man who encroached upon the prerogatives of God, and assured forgiveness of sins to definite individuals; who associated with sinners that were shunned by all the pious; who neither fasted himself nor enjoined fasting upon his disciples, nay, who designated this pious practice an obsolete form which need no longer be observed—such a man was regarded by very many, we may be sure, as being himself not pious. It is easy to estimate how far these people of Capernaum were from recognising in Jesus the Messiah, even after the Baptist had let drop the suggestion from within his prison walls.[2] But Jesus seemed

[1] The proper interpretation depends upon the correct translation of ἀπὸ. In Mt.'s version it is equal to ἐκ, and explains the grounds of the δικαιοῦσθαι; in Lk.'s it indicates separation in space, and consequently excludes the idea of a wrong subject for the active verb.

[2] Strange to say, the later Church very speedily lost all comprehension of these contrasts. Even in the preliminary narrative of the Gospel of Lk. all appreciation of the difference between piety according to the Jewish dispensation and piety according to the Christian dispensation seems to have entirely disappeared. And when the Johannine Christ asks the Jews, "Who amongst you can convince me of sin?" (viii. 46) it is obviously presupposed that there is a resemblance between the Jewish and the Christian standard of piety. Accordingly, the dogmatists of later centuries conceived that they were giving a correct and complete description of the merit of Christ, when they declared emphatically that Christ fulfilled the whole of the Old Testament Law.

to give the direst offence of all when he neglected the express requirements of the Law, and knowingly suffered his disciples to neglect them—nay, actually defended them for doing so. But this disobedience towards the Law does not begin until after the Baptist's messengers have been sent back to him; otherwise, Jesus in his discourse about John would not have passed over in silence this offence in the eyes of his contemporaries. On the other hand, these same contemporaries naturally pay redoubled attention to the doings of Jesus; their eyes had been attracted to what, according to the Pharisaical standards, was ungodly behaviour on his part, and they now hate him, looking upon him, because of his great popularity with the masses, as a dangerous person.

(*t*) PLUCKING THE EARS OF CORN.—One Sabbath day Jesus is walking through the corn—a circumstance of importance even for determining the chronology of his life, owing to the fact that in Palestine the corn does not remain in the fields after the middle of June; since Jesus was crucified on the day before the Passover, we must suppose that there was an interval of about three-quarters of a year between the incident here recorded and his death. Jesus' disciples, no doubt for the purpose of shortening the way, make a path for themselves through the middle of the corn-field, and, in doing so, pluck the ears of corn. The circumstances must not be conceived as resembling those of modern Europe, with its strict police regulations. The plucking of ears of corn in a corn-field is expressly permitted by the Old Testament (Deut. xxiii. 25 f.); but one might not use a sickle in another man's field. Thus the complaint raised by the Pharisees against the disciples amounts only to this: "See, they do what is not permitted on the Sabbath!" (Mk. ii. 23 f.)[1]

(*u*) THE LAW AS TO THE SABBATH.—The precepts of the Law relating to the Sabbath are extremely strict. For any

[1] That is to say, they violate the ordinances as to the Sabbath. The words in Mk. ii. 23, ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας, do not mean, "They began to set out on their journey, during which they plucked the ears of corn." Apart from the question whether ὁδὸν ποιεῖν can be taken as equivalent to *iter facere* at all, the phrase would be an intolerable repetition after the preceding παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, and we should expect simply ἤρξαντο τίλλειν τοὺς στάχυας. The phrase must therefore bear the meaning we have given to it above.

kind of work done on the Sabbath the punishment is death (Ex. xxxi. 14 f., xxxv. 2); a man who had gathered wood outside the camp of the Israelites on the Sabbath day (Num. xv. 32–36) was by God's command stoned. The following kinds of work are distinctly and expressly mentioned as forbidden by the Law—baking and cooking, leaving one's abode (Ex. xvi. 23–30), ploughing and reaping (Ex. xxxiv. 21), and kindling a fire (Ex. xxxv. 2). The prohibition against leaving one's abode is, however, again modified by the injunction to meet together for the worship of God (Levit. xxiii. 3).[1] Even in the time of Amos no business might be done on the Sabbath (Amos viii. 5). Jeremiah forbids that any kind of burden shall be carried through the streets and gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath (Jer. xvii. 21–24). In the time of Nehemiah, trading between the heathen inhabitants of the country and the Jews on the Sabbath is forbidden, and indeed is rendered impossible by closing and watching the gates of Jerusalem. And Nehemiah even endeavours to prevent wine from being pressed, and fruit from being brought in, on the Sabbath (Neh. x. 32, xiii. 15–22). 1 Macc. ii. 29–41 tells us that in the beginning of the Maccabean revolt the faithful observers of the Law allowed themselves to be massacred without opposition rather than violate the Sabbath; though at a later period they were driven by necessity to defend themselves against attack even on the Sabbath. Josephus testifies that this last rule still remained in force in his time (*Ant.*, xii. 277); the besieged Jews did not, however, interfere with Pompey's construction of earthworks on the Sabbath (*Ant.*, xiv. 63). John of Gisḥala explained to Titus, that he could not conclude any agreement with him on the Sabbath (Jos., *Bell.*, iv. 99). From all this we perceive how deeply rooted was the custom of complete rest on the Sabbath amongst the Jewish people, and how great an amount of inner freedom and independence was requisite for venturing to criticise, however well warranted

[1] How intolerable a burden these Sabbath precepts were is seen most clearly in the casuistry which, from this permission to attend the public worship of God, deduced a large number of pretexts for travelling a greater distance on the Sabbath day without violating the Law. The subject is specially dealt with in the treatise *Erubin* in the Mishnah.

the criticism, this ancient practice, sanctified as it was by religion.

(*v*) BREACH WITH THE LAW.—But Jesus did criticise it. When the Pharisees reprove him because his disciples pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath, he refers them to a story in Holy Writ, though it was one which on the face of it has nothing to do with the sanctity of the Sabbath. "Have ye not read," says he, "what David did when he was in need, and was an hungered with his followers, how he entered into the house of God in the time of Abiathar the high-priest, and ate the shewbread, which none may eat except the priests, and how he gave of it to those who were with him?" (Mk. ii. 25 f.) The reference is to the story told in 1 Sam. xxi. 2–7. Jesus, however, presupposes the unity of the temple as having been already accomplished in the time of king Saul, and also a high-priesthood organised like that of a later date; he also errs as to the name of the chief priest of Nob, confounding Ahimelech, the father, with Abiathar, the son (*εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως*).[1] Now, neither did David violate any precept of the Sabbath, nor did Jesus' disciples eat of the shewbread. In order to secure a closer resemblance between the act of the disciples and the act of David, even Mt., who in this case is followed by Lk., deemed it necessary at least to say something as to the disciples being hungry and eating the ears of corn which they plucked (Mt. xii. 1, Lk. vi. 1). But of this Mk. knows nothing; and Jesus' only concern in thus alluding to David's having eaten the shewbread was to point out that even David, and, as Jesus wrongly adds, David's followers, violated the law, just as it is made a reproach against him and his disciples, that they now violated it. Here, however, certainly no reference is intended to the general existence of human guilt—a matter which did indeed exercise Jesus on other occasions. Compare the fragment of the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 78 to Mt. xviii. 22), "Also in the prophets was sinful speech found after that they had been anointed with the Holy Ghost." But in the narrative we are discussing, David's guilt

[1] See Chap. II. p. 24. We may of course set these slips down to the account of Mk.; but if so, where shall we draw the line between faithful and faulty tradition?

cannot be adduced as an extenuating circumstance in judging of the fault of Jesus' disciples; for Jesus refuses to admit that his disciples have committed any fault at all, as is perfectly clear from the accompanying explanation of man's duty as to the Sabbath.[1] Consequently, he also refuses to admit that David was guilty when he ate the shewbread in God's house. Rather, the act of David, contrary though it was to the Law, ought to enlighten the assailants of Jesus as to a rule of correct conduct which he and his disciples do observe. The rule is: a man may be very well conducted, and yet under certain circumstances trespass against a precept of the Law—a proposition which to the strict, law-abiding Jews is nothing less than outrageous, for Jewish views with regard to piety were based entirely upon the Law. The teacher of Paul (Gal. iii. 10) was by no means the only person who inculcated upon his pupils, as the supreme rule of conduct, the sentence in Deut. xxvii. 26, "Cursed be every one that abideth not by all that standeth written in the book of the Law, to fulfil it." If, however, as Jesus thought, David's piety was not impaired by his trespass against the Law, it seemed difficult to say where was to be found the criterion for deciding as to what is pious and what is not.[2]

(*v*) SIGNIFICATION OF THE SABBATH.—But with a sure and steady insight, which is not to be turned aside from the truth, once it is distinctly perceived, by any regard for secondary considerations, Jesus decides the question, at least in so far as the immediate case of Sabbath violation is concerned. He goes back to the original meaning underlying the institution of the Sabbath. And in doing so, he is not at all embarrassed by the passage in Genesis (ii. 2 f.), which was generally authoritative for the Jews, and according to which the seventh day was hallowed by the Sabbath rest of God. Jesus says, with

[1] Moreover, we must have a very poor understanding of Jesus indeed, if we are inclined to suppose that he excuses the fault of one person by pointing to that of another. The passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews suggests that the general sinfulness ought to induce individuals to forgive one another because each needs forgiveness himself. Jesus does not discharge the conscience of its burden, but makes it more sensitive.

[2] A mere appeal to popular custom was no longer possible, seeing that it had been deprived of its originality by the Law; and the era of the creative and prophetic spirits was regarded as closed.

perfect correctness from the historical point of view, "The Sabbath was made for man" (τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο). Rest and recreation are necessary for man, and the keeping of the Sabbath is intended to meet this necessity. But, adds Jesus, man does not exist for the sake of the Sabbath. What was intended for a blessing must not be allowed to become a burden and a yoke. Man must not be degraded into becoming a slave to the Sabbath; which, however, he does become when the Sabbath prescribes to him what he may do and what not do. This compulsion Jesus refuses to tolerate. And it is because the Sabbath exists for man, and because man must not be made the slave of this otherwise beneficial institution, that—thus Jesus concludes—the Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath. Restricted and confined as he so frequently is on other days of the week by the labours of his calling, the Sabbath ought to be the one day which every man may be free to dispose of as he thinks fit.[1] Now, Jesus' view was nothing less than monstrous to Jewish ears; for if it was sound, then every kind of labour on the Sabbath could not possibly deserve death. But it was also a public contradiction of the Law (Mk. ii. 27 f.); and that Jesus himself so conceived it is proved by the prefixed appeal to the violation of the Law by King David—the king who was regarded as a pattern.

(*x*) THE PARALYSED ARM.—A declaration of this character, that in certain circumstances a pious man was not bound by what were otherwise regarded as the inviolable precepts of the Law, and this saying with regard to the Sabbath, which ran directly counter to a whole series of the Law's utterances, were assuredly not put forth without some degree of excitement, and beyond doubt caused great commotion. It is, therefore, only in accordance with what we should expect, when Mk. (iii. 1–6) goes on to relate, in close connection with the narrative we have just discussed, how that, when a

[1] This decision catches the original meaning of the sanctification of the Sabbath, just as surely as it conflicts in the sharpest manner with the entire Jewish conception of that sanctification. Perhaps in this instance we may see, more clearly than in any other, how Jesus goes back to the original form of the Old Testament piety as contrasted with the Pharisaic metamorphosis of the same.

man with a paralysed arm presented himself before Jesus in a synagogue on the Sabbath, the Jews watched closely to see whether Jesus would heal him, that they might frame an accusation against him.[1] According to the narrative in the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 77 to Mt. xii. 13), the paralytic's appeal ran thus: "I was a hewer of stone and gained my bread by the work of my hands. I beseech Thee, Jesus, make me whole, that I may not be forced to beg my food in shame." This may, indeed, be a late addition by way of embellishment, intended to set the blessedness of the cure in the right light—that is to say, the cure rendered the man again fit to work and capable of earning his living. But Mk. is above all things concerned with Jesus' attitude with regard to Sabbath duty. According to his version, Jesus calls upon the man to step into the middle of the assembly; he will not do apart and in secret a thing which he conceives to be right though others condemn the action. And then he puts to these opponents what is for him the decisive question, "May we on the Sabbath do good or evil, save a life or kill?" To this question the Jews had of course an answer: "We should do nothing on the Sabbath, neither good nor evil; we ought not to save a life, nor ought we to kill."[2] That is to say, they might have been able to reprove Jesus with the fault of confounding contrary (good and evil, saving and killing) with contradictory conceptions (doing good or not, saving or not). But Jesus knows why he puts the question in the way he does. In his view, the man who sees before him a human being in need, and does not help him, commits a sin that deserves to be punished (Mt. xxv. 45, Lk. x. 31 f., xvi. 21 f., 25). Consequently, he who does not

[1] It was now, however, Jesus himself who was to offend. In the incident of plucking the ears of corn, the blame was attached *in the first place* to the disciples only, although Jesus was certainly regarded as equally blameworthy when he proceeded to defend this trespass against the Law.

[2] According to the ideas of the Mishnah, the Sabbath may certainly be violated when life is in danger (*Yoma*, viii. 6); for example, a heap of rubbish may be removed for the purpose of seeing whether one who is buried underneath is still alive (*Yoma*, viii. 7). But one may not set a broken limb; and he who sprains either hand or foot may not bathe it with cold water (*Shabbath*, xxii. 6). Thus a paralysed arm might certainly not be healed on the Sabbath.

do good, does evil; he who does not save life, kills. May we do evil on the Sabbath by refusing help to one that is in need of it? It is evident that Jesus answers in the negative. But in so saying, he even goes beyond his former declaration regarding the Sabbath (Mk. ii. 27 f.). If the Sabbath is at man's free disposal as a day of recreation, he may not be forbidden to perform any action on that day; but if man is called upon to render help in every case of need which comes under his eyes, then he *must* often enough take action even on the Sabbath. No Sabbath law can abrogate the sacred duty of giving help. But Jesus observes with anger and sorrow that, amongst those who rule their lives by law and by convention, one will seek in vain for a comprehension of views such as these. Then he effects the cure of the lame man—the same point of view finding expression here as in the healing of the paralytic; but the Pharisees at once leave the synagogue, as though it were defiled by this labour done on the Sabbath day, and when they come outside, they appeal to the Herodians—that is to say, strictly speaking, the party, here no doubt the officials, of the ruler of the land, Herod Antipas.[1]

The Pharisees cast about for a means of fully vindicating the literal interpretation of the Law, which threatens with death every kind of work done on the Sabbath. The Law being such, how much more does it concern him who declares that the Sabbath is a free day, every man being permitted to dispose of himself according to the dictates of his own necessities, nay, who even dares to assert that there are many kinds of work which must be done on the Sabbath. The two stories in Mk. ii. 23–iii. 6 are so closely connected the one with the other, that it seems as if they were intended to describe two events which happened on the same Sabbath. In the second story we are not specially told that it was a Sabbath when Jesus went into the synagogue. That is assumed in verse 2 as already known; and the assumption will be best explained by simply supposing that the second narrative is an immediate continuation of Mk. ii. 23–28, so that

[1] The designation Ἡρωδιανός is only found in Mk. iii. 6, xii. 13, Mt. xxii. 16. But in Josephus (*Bell. Jud.*, i. 319) we have Ἡρωδεῖος (as against Ἀντιγόνειος) as a synonym. This party, however, never played any great part in public affairs.

both incidents occurred on *one* Sabbath. It is also readily conceivable that Jesus may have advanced from the more moderate, but still fundamental, declaration of ii. 27 f. to the sharper utterance of iii. 4 on the same day on which he courageously pointed out that, even for the men who were the recognised patterns of Jewish piety, the Law by no means always possessed inviolable obligation. True, many might now find it very difficult to understand him. Here is a preacher of repentance proclaiming the nearness of the divine judgment, and yet at the same time deliberately setting on one side the holy law of God, the standard of piety which Israel valued so highly, in favour of another and higher kind of piety; this apparent contradiction they could not reconcile.[1]

(*γ*) OTHER DISPUTES AS TO THE SABBATH.—The later Evangelists, Mt., Lk., and Jn., give us yet another series of sayings of Jesus, in which he defends the works he did on the Sabbath; but it is not altogether easy to distinguish which of them are genuine and which are not. Two of the narratives—very closely related to that of the healing of the man with the paralysed arm—are those of the healing of the woman who was bowed with infirmity (Lk. xiii. 10–17), and of the man with the dropsy (Lk. xiv. 1–6)—both on the Sabbath. The cure of the former takes place, like the healing of the man with the paralysed arm (Mk. iii. 1–6), in a synagogue, and the ruler of the synagogue wishes to forbid it being done on the Sabbath. According to Lk. xiv. 1, the dropsical man was in the house of a leader of the Pharisees; though whether the Evangelist associates a historically correct idea with the phrase *ἄρχων τῶν Φαρισαίων*, or whether, as John[2] certainly does, he looks upon the Pharisees as being a class of officials, need not be discussed here. On this occasion, too, Jesus is watched, to see whether he will carry

[1] This explains how it was that sincere upholders of the old piety hated Jesus so intensely. To be a despiser of the Law was bad enough; but a successful preacher of repentance who esteemed the Law lightly was a dangerous corrupter of morals against whom the people could not be sufficiently warned.

[2] The Johannine Gospel regards the Pharisees as judicial officials; see *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 163, note 3.

out the cure, just as he is in Mk. iii. 1–6. The justifications offered by Jesus for healing these two sufferers on the Sabbath are so far alike, that on both occasions he shows that, on his opponents' view, what may be done for the sake of an animal on the Sabbath may not be done for the sake of a man. According to Lk. xiii. 15, every man leads his domestic animal to water even on the Sabbath, and to that end unlooses it from its manger; and, according to Lk. xiv. 5, everyone whose ox (in Mt. xii. 11, sheep) falls into a pit draws it out on the Sabbath. In Lk. xiv. 5, indeed, the son is also mentioned as having fallen into the pit. Here then more emphasis seems to be laid on the contrast: one ought indeed to be permitted to rescue on the Sabbath a creature that has fallen, but not one that is seriously ill.[1] In all these cases the conclusion at which Jesus arrives is based upon the proposition, that an absolute prohibition of all labour on the Sabbath is, as a matter of fact, not practicable. And the same thought suggests itself when it is noted that the priests, ostensibly in agreement with the Law, but in reality in accordance with ideas of the Scribes, based upon the precepts of the Law, in the temple violate the Sabbath without committing sin (Mt. xii. 5), or that, according to Jn. vii. 22, circumcision was permitted on the Sabbath.

In the Johannine Gospel are found fundamental utterances of great clearness on the question of the Sabbath. When Jesus has healed the sick man beside the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath, and is taken to task for it, he, entirely ignoring Gen. ii. 2 f., appeals to the example of his Father : My Father worketh even now, and therefore do I also work (Jn. vii. 17, *ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι*). That is to say, the example of the ever-working God is an incentive to uninterrupted activity.[2] Here the principle Jesus lays down goes beyond anything said in the Synoptic Gospels, in which, nevertheless, the blessing of a day of rest and refreshment is recognised. We have another argument in Jn. ix. 14–34.

[1] True, the Mishnah knows nothing of any such distinction. But see p. 229, n. 2.

[2] This idea of God's never-resting activity is not of Jewish origin ; compare, on the other hand, Aristotle's *De Cœlo*, ii. 3 286 *A* 9—*θεοῦ δ'ἐνέργεια ἀθανασία· τοῦτο δ'ἐστι ζωὴ ἀίδιος.*

The marvellous success of Jesus' healing proves that in God's eyes it is no sin if, in the course of his work as a healer, Jesus violates the Sabbath.

In any case, all these passages reflect the deep interest already shown by the earliest Christians in this dispute regarding the Sabbath.[1] In it we have Jesus' first incisive utterance against the definitive precepts of the Mosaic Law, and in point of significance it amounted to nothing less than an open breach with the hereditary religion. For the essence of Jewish piety was reverence for the Law ; and the fundamental requirement of the Jewish religion was recognition of the holy Book of the Law both in general and in detail.

JESUS WITHDRAWS.—In the opinion of those who represented the prevailing form of piety amongst the Jews, Jesus had been guilty of a crime deserving the punishment of death. Not only had he transgressed the commandment of the Sabbath—for that alone he deserved to die—but he had actually spoken publicly against both the law and the Sabbath commandment. This was sufficient to make it impossible for Jesus for some time to dwell in Capernaum. He withdraws to the lake, taking his disciples with him (Mk. iii. 7). Yet this was very different from his first retirement, when he kept at a distance from inhabited places, to avoid being gazed at as a worker of miraculous cures (Mk. i. 45). On the present occasion his retirement is not a consequence of wonder, but of enmity. In spite of that, however, it is not possible for him to remain in solitude; for people, having heard of him, come to him from all the regions of Palestine, so that often his only way of escaping from the throng is to put out into the lake. For this purpose his disciples procured him a boat.

THE MULTITUDE COMES TO JESUS.—The statements of the three Synoptic Evangelists, as to where the people came from who thronged about Jesus, are not quite identical. Lk. vi. 17

[1] The refusai of the non-Jewish Christians to observe the Sabbath was in the eyes of the heathen a very evident mark of the peculiarity of the Christian, as compared with the Jewish, communities ; for the Sabbath rest of the Jews was a subject of continual vexation and ridicule to the heathen. (Cp. Seneca's fragment in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, vi. 10 ; Persius, *Sat.*, v. 179–184 ; Martial, *Epigr.*, iv. 4 ; Juvenal, *Sat.*, xiv. 96–106, and many other passages.)

names only Judæa, meaning clearly in this case the entire country inhabited by the Jews in the wider sense, Jerusalem the capital, and the Phœnician coast—practically equivalent altogether to Palestine. Mt. iv. 24 f. speaks at first of all Syria, naming especially Galilee in the north-west, the Decapolis in the north-east, Judæa with Jerusalem in the south-west, and Peræa in the east, or rather south-east. Mk.'s enumeration again differs from this. He speaks first of a great multitude out of Galilee; then he adds that a great multitude also came to Jesus out of Judæa, Jerusalem, and Idumæa (in the south-west), from Peræa, and from Tyre and Sidon (Mk. iii. 7 f.). It is highly probable, though it cannot now be proved, that the sentence in the text of Mk. which tells that non-Galilean people came to Jesus, is a later interpolation. For the Evangelist it was sufficient that a great throng from Galilee followed Jesus; but some later writer wished to have a still greater multitude gathered about him. This is made probable by the wording of the passage —the double πολὺ πλῆθος. If any apparent difference is indicated by the different verbs ἠκολούθησεν and ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν, it requires but little reflection to perceive in both cases that practically the same thing is meant. Again, in the enumeration we are struck by the fact that the nearest country on the opposite side of the lake is grouped with the entire east-Jordan territory under the name of πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, and is only mentioned after Judæa, Jerusalem, and Idumæa. We do not indeed mean to question the statement, that, as a matter of fact, non-Galileans did every now and again come to Jesus, even as Jesus himself once went down from Nazareth to John at the Jordan, and as subsequently, too, there can be no doubt (Mk. vii. 1), Scribes from Jerusalem certainly argued with Jesus. The only point which can reasonably be questioned is whether the sentence in Mk. iii. 7 f., καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας . . . . ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν, belonged originally to the text of Mk. But what these thronging crowds still really sought was the worker of miracles, the healer of the sick and those that were possessed by devils.

Choosing the Apostles.—In proportion as the number of people increases who come to Jesus, remain a while with

him, and then return to their ordinary manner of life, the keener grows in him the desire to have about him always a small, exclusive band of men whom he may initiate into his peculiar world of thought more fully than he can the crowd of hearers who are constantly coming and going.[1] And, naturally enough, with this idea was joined at once the intention and the hope that his disciples might afterwards, like Jesus himself, preach the gospel of the nearness of the kingdom of heaven. Accordingly, Jesus chooses the Twelve (Mk. iii. 13–16)—the numeral designation which Paul also gives to them (1. Cor. xv. 5).[2] Jesus' reason for fixing upon twelve as the number of the select company of his disciples seems to be somehow connected with the number (twelve) of the tribes of Israel; at all events, the declaration of the Lord in Mt. xix. 28 = Lk. xxii. 30 emphasises this relation—the Twelve are to judge the twelve tribes of Israel.

NAMES OF THE TWELVE.—The names of the Twelve are recorded in Mk. iii. 16–19, Mt. x. 2–4, Lk. vi. 14–16, Acts i. 13.[3]

[1] Perhaps Jesus was also influenced by the precedent of John. But in fixing the number of this inner circle, he may well have been concerned to restrict rather than increase, the decision as to remaining permanently with Jesus obviously resting with each of the disciples personally.

[2] Paul even uses the name in a connection where, strictly speaking, he should have spoken of eleven at most. To him the idea of ἀπόστολος is more comprehensive (1 Cor. xv. 5, 7); for example, he counts Barnabas also amongst the ἀπόστολοι (1 Cor. ix. 5, 6). And yet the word ἀπόστολος signifies to him the highest position within the Christian community (1 Cor. xii. 28); nor, according to the remarkable principle which he lays down in Gal. ii. 6, does he attribute any higher dignity to the Twelve than to the Apostles.

[3] The four lists are as follows :—

Mk.—(1) Simon Peter; (2) James the son of Zebedee; (3) John; (4) Andrew; (5) Philip; (6) Bartholomew; (7) Matthew; (8) Thomas; (9) James the son of Alphæus; (10) Thaddæus; (11) Simon Cananæus; (12) Judas Iscariot.

Mt.—(1) Simon Peter; (2) Andrew; (3) James the son of Zebedee; (4) John; (5) Philip; (6) Bartholomew; (7) Thomas; (8) Matthew; (9) James son of Alphæus; (10) Thaddæus; (11) Simon Cananæus; (12) Judas Iscariot.

Lk.—(1) Simon Peter; (2) Andrew; (3) James the son of Zebedee; (4) John; (5) Philip; (6) Bartholomew; (7) Matthew; (8) Thomas; (9)

These four lists agree on the whole, even in the order of the names. All begin with Simon (Peter), and all end with Judas Iscariot. The last-mentioned name is absent in Acts i. 13 for reasons explained in the narrative. And not only does Peter come first in all the lists, but also the two pairs of brothers (Simon and Andrew, John and James), who were the first group of friends Jesus had in Capernaum. Of these four, Andrew was certainly the least conspicuous. Accordingly, Mk. and Acts put the two sons of Zebedee between Simon and Andrew, while Mt. and Lk. couple the brothers together. In all the lists alike, the next name after these first four disciples is Philip. The order of the remaining names is almost exactly the same in both Mt. and Mk., except that Thomas and Matthew dispute the seventh and eighth places. On the other hand, although Lk. agrees with Mk. in enumerating Bartholomew after Philip, then Matthew and Thomas, and in the ninth place James the son of Alphæus, he associates with the latter, not Thaddæus, as Mt. and Mk. do, but the second Simon, whose other name, ὁ Καναναῖος, Lk. translates, and perhaps correctly, ὁ ζηλωτής (קַנָּא, *ḳannā*). Instead of Thaddæus, however, Lk. names a second Judas (the son of James), whom he couples with the last in the list, Judas Iscariot. And whereas Thomas precedes Matthew in the Gospel of Mt., in Acts he follows immediately after Philip, and thus advances to the sixth place, as compared with the eighth in Mk. Apart from this, Acts follows Mk.'s order in the opening of the list (Peter, John, James, Andrew), but follows Lk.'s nomenclature, as well as order, at the end—James son of Alphæus, Simon Zelotes, Judas son of James.[1]

James the son of Alphæus; (10) Simon Zelotes; (11) Judas the son of James; (12) Judas Iscariot.

Acts.—(1) Peter; (2) John; (3) James; (4) Andrew; (5) Philip; (6) Thomas; (7) Bartholomew; (8) Matthew; (9) James the son of Alphæus; (10) Simon Zelotes; (11) Judas the son of James; (12) ——.

[1] The fixed points in the four enumerations are therefore these: (1) Simon Peter; (5) Philip; (9) James the son of Alphæus; (12) Judas Iscariot. Besides this, in the case of the remaining disciples the position only varies to the extent that while the names between Peter and Philip, between Philip and James the son of Alphæus, and between James the son of Alphæus and Judas Iscariot, are exactly the same in all four lists, the

In Mt. and in Acts, the Twelve are clearly arranged in pairs. We may infer that this order agreed on the whole with that of Jesus when he subsequently sent them out two by two (Mk. vi. 7, ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο). The Johannine Gospel contains no enumeration of the Apostles; but it so far agrees with Acts, in that it assigns a more important part to Thomas along with Philip and Andrew, and, besides Judas Iscariot, mentions a second Judas (Thomas, xi. 16, xiv. 5, xx. 24–29, xxi. 2; Judas, xiv. 22; Philip, i. 44–49, vi. 5, 7, xii. 21 f., xiv. 8 f.; Andrew, i. 41, 45, vi. 8, xii. 22). Of the majority of these men we know nothing more than their names.[1]

PETER.—Historically the most tangible figure is, of course, Simon Peter. Not only did he live on the most intimate footing with Jesus, seeing that his house in Capernaum was also Jesus' home; but he knew Jesus best, stood by him the most faithfully, was the one to whom after Jesus' death the risen Lord appeared first, and who gathered the disciples together again, and was regarded as a pillar of the early Christian Church and its most important missionary, and, simple Galilean fisherman though he was, undertook distant journeys in the service of the Gospel, not only to Antioch, in itself a considerable distance away, but also, it would seem, as far as to Greece and Italy (Mk. i. 29, ii. 1, viii. 29, xiv. 54, 1 Cor. xv. 5, Lk. xxii. 31 f., Gal. ii. 6–9, 11; 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5; cp. 2 Cor. xi. 4 f., 22 f., and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 25). Yet valuable though the whole of this information is, it does not suffice to give us even a tolerably trustworthy historical picture of the man Peter. There were many contradictions in his character. We find resolution and vacillation, boldness and despondency, intimately associated, as is shown by the story of his avowal that Jesus is the Messiah, by his denial of his Master, by his behaviour in Antioch (Mk. viii. 27–33, xiv. 54, 66–72, Gal. ii. 11–14). But in the case of a man like this, whom Jesus designates in quick succession a rock and a tempter, and Paul describes

order of the names within these limits is different. Also the Thaddæus of Mk. and Mt. is in Lk. and Acts called Judas the son of James.

[1] It is a serious defect in our Gospels, that, as compared with Jesus, all the other personages of the story fall quite into the background.

as a pillar of the early Christian Church, and yet as a dissembler (Mt. xvi. 18, 23, Gal. ii. 9, 13), we should require very much better materials than we possess in our present Sources before we could distribute light and shade in a just and proper manner. At the same time, there is no other[1] amongst the Twelve of whom we are able to draw a portrait that in point of distinctness would in any degree approximate to even the blurred picture which we have of Peter.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.—It is to this period, when Jesus was threatened with death because of his opposition to the Law, and had for this reason retired from inhabited places into the open country, where, however, the people flocked to him in multitudes from every quarter, that the great discourse is to be traced which is mostly described as the Sermon on the Mount, from the place where, according to Mt., it was delivered, although Lk. makes it to have been spoken in the plain after the choosing of the disciples. As a matter of fact, Mt. iv. 24–v. 1 = Mk. iii. 7 f., 13. The mountain from which, according to Mt., Jesus addressed the throng, is the mountain on which the choosing of the Twelve took place. But Lk. (vi. 12–17) says that, after choosing the Twelve, Jesus went down into the plain again; this statement is, however, connected with the transposition of the two Mk. passages, iii. 13–19 and iii. 7–12, in Lk. vi. 12–19. It will, therefore, be labour thrown away to seek for the place where Jesus delivered this discourse. One thing only is certain: it was in the vicinity of the Lake of Gennesareth.[2] The discourse, which in both Evangelists begins with the beatitudes and ends with the parable of the prudent and the foolish builder, is in Mt. interspersed with a great number of sayings of the Lord, which Lk. gives in other parts of his Gospel; and even what is peculiar to Mt. in the discourse may have been

[1] In later ages the Church created for itself a quite fixed picture of John in particular, principally upon the lines of the Johannine Gospel. But in doing so, it gave to him, as it gave to the Lord himself, traits too gentle, nay almost feminine, traits which do not fit in at all with the only reliable tradition we have regarding the kind of character he possessed—namely, Jesus' description of him and his brother as "sons of thunder" (Mk. iii. 17).

[2] And we may certainly seek the place near the north-west shore, where Jesus principally laboured.

taken from another setting. Hence it is imperative that we should make the tradition in Lk. vi. 20–49 the basis of our exposition.

(*a*) THE BEATITUDES.—Here then at the beginning we have four beatitudes over against four denunciations of woe (vi. 20–26). The poor are blessed, because to them belongs the kingdom of God; those that hunger now, because they shall be satisfied; those that weep now, because they shall laugh; and those that hear Jesus, when men hate them, and hold aloof from them, and despise them, and cast them out for the Son of Man's sake, for even so did their fathers unto the prophets—a great reward is prepared in Heaven for those who have endured such contumely. Thus, they for whom these promises are valid are the band of people gathered around Jesus. It is from them that men hold aloof (*ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς*) as though they were sinners, and they do it because of the Son of Man,[1] this title being here a self-designation used out of modesty, as on the occasion when John sent his messengers (Mt. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 34). The reason why people separate themselves from Jesus' followers is, therefore, that they are adherents of a man who is held to be a reprobate, and the hatred which is excited against Jesus' adherents is, in the first place, directed against Jesus himself. But when Jesus comforts them by reminding them that formerly the prophets fared no better than they, we see clearly with what class of men he ranks himself. He is now the prophet of his people—a view in no sense at variance with his secret conviction that he is the Messiah. On another occasion Jesus said, according to Mt. x. 41: "He that receives a prophet because he is a prophet will receive a prophet's reward; and he that receives a righteous man because he is a righteous man will receive a righteous man's reward." Thus, he here promises to those who hold by him a great reward, which is already prepared for them in Heaven; what he has in his mind are the good things of the future world, now, according to the

[1] In its generality, the expression indicates that originally no special ties bound the disciples to Jesus, neither that of blood-relationship, nor the fact of their belonging to the same locality, nor a common handicraft. But such a contrast is neither intensely felt nor strongly emphasised; the sentiment has simply coloured the expression.

current Jewish belief, stored up there.[1] Now, the people who are gathered around Jesus are characterised beforehand as poor, as hungering, and as weeping; in other words, they are people who in their sorrow and distress have been attracted by Jesus' preaching of the nearness of the kingdom of God which shall bring satisfaction and gladness into their troubled hearts. Jesus sent a similar message to the Baptist (Mt. xi. 5, Lk. vii. 22): tidings of joy are communicated to the poor. It would, however, be a fundamental mistake so to understand these words as if Jesus imposed no moral conditions for admission into the kingdom of God. If that were the case, the whole of the sermon which follows would have been without meaning; or rather Jesus certainly could not have uttered such sentiments as Lk. makes him express. For the words would be in glaring contradiction to all the rest of his preaching of repentance.

(*b*) THE BEATITUDES IN MT.—For this reason, then, Mt. (v. 3–12) has made radical alterations in the beatitudes. The hungry of Lk. become in Mt. (v. 6) hungry and thirsty after righteousness. The poor who are blessed become in Mt. (v. 3) πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι—which certainly is intended to indicate a virtue, not an economic condition. Even with regard to the blessing of those that are cast out for Jesus's sake, Mt. (v. 21) adds cautiously that it only holds good in the event of the accusations being falsely made (ψευδόμενοι). And, accordingly, Mt. finds that the enumeration of the virtues in consequence of which a blessing accrues is too short; he adds the meek (v. 5), the merciful (v. 7), the pure in heart (v. 8), the peacemakers (v. 9), and those that are persecuted for righteousness' sake (v. 10). In this way he entirely alters Jesus' original point of view in uttering these beatitudes. Jesus begins purposely in a paradoxical[2] form; he proclaims those people to be happy whom nobody else esteems so. And he asserts that they are happy precisely because they are poor, precisely because they are hungry, precisely because they are sorrowful. For it is their poverty, their hunger, their sorrow-

[1] Compare the great discourse on the judgment in Mt. xxv. 34; the βασιλεία is already prepared from the foundation of the world.

[2] Jesus shows a fondness for paradox in other places also; *e.g.*, in Mk. viii. 35 he says that a man must lose his life in order to preserve it.

fulness which impel them to listen gladly to the preaching that the kingdom of Heaven is near, and to prepare themselves for that kingdom. He also esteems them happy in that they are rejected and cast out for his sake; for they who belong to him shall receive the reward of a prophet. All this is very easy to understand, if only we take the trouble to try to understand it.

(*c*) EVIDENCE AGAINST MT.—Apart from this, Mt. has left standing a clear indication that he has altered the original wording: in v. 4 those that mourn are blessed, exactly as in Lk., without any allusion to their sinfulness being added. Thus, it is not any virtue that is the reason of their being blessed, but distress, which teaches them to reach out wistfully and believingly after the promise of the kingdom of heaven. This does not at all fit in with Mt. version of the beatitudes, but it *is* a clear proof that Mt. had the beatitudes before him in the form in which they occur in Lk., and that he altered them for the purpose of getting rid of what seemed to him to be open to objection in them.[1]

(*d*) DENUNCIATIONS OF WOE.—Corresponding to the four blessings upon those who are poor, those who hunger, those who weep, and those who are hated, we have four annunciations of woe, over the rich, those that are full, those that laugh, and those that are praised by everybody. The rich have already that which consoles them ; those that are full shall some day hunger; those that laugh shall one day be sad and weep; the false prophets were also once praised by the fathers of the present generation (Lk. vi. 24–26). In the case of the people in the last category, Jesus is without doubt thinking of the piety of the Pharisees, which is everywhere praised ; and he may be comparing the Scribal leaders of the party with the false prophets of olden time. And if he cries

[1] In this case the proof of Mt.'s alteration is such that we are also led to inquire what were his motives for making it. It is quite conceivable that he attributed Lk.'s version, which he found open to objection, to a misunderstanding of Jesus' original discourse, and endeavoured to remove the misunderstanding by the form of text which he himself adopted. On the other hand, the transformation of Mt.'s text into that of Lk. would show an incredible want of respect, especially if we were to conceive it to be due to the Evangelist's hatred of the rich.

woe upon the rich, who are now full and glad of heart, yet at the same time wealth, sense of satisfaction, and joy are in his eyes just as far from being sins as poverty, hunger, and sorrow are certainly far from being virtues. But the persons who already have their consolation, who want for nothing, and upon whom nothing weighs heavily, do not long for the kingdom of God; accordingly, they do not prepare themselves for it, and the judgment of the Messiah will overtake them before they have come to an understanding with themselves with regard to the earnest duty of amendment.[1] Not all those over whom Jesus pours out his lamentations are actually present while he is preaching; thus, he can continue (Lk. vi. 27), Ἀλλα ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. Still, it is implied that the rich, those that are full, those who laugh, and those who are praised, do not hear his preaching; and it is precisely because they will not hear what he says as to the nearness of the kingdom of God, and consequently are going to face the judgment unprepared, that Jesus cries woe upon them.

(*e*) THE INJUNCTION TO LOVE OUR ENEMIES.—After this introduction, the fundamental law which is binding upon those who fear the judgment of God and long for the kingdom of God is proclaimed—namely, that they who look for compassion must exercise compassion. Jesus begins by demanding that we shall love our enemies; and he explains very clearly what he means by this. "Do good to them that hate you; bless them that curse you; pray for those that execrate you; after the first blow on the face, be ready to receive a second; if any man take from you your mantle, prevent him not from taking off your coat also; if any man compels you to go a thousand paces with him, go with him two thousand. Give to every one that asketh of thee, and if any man takes from thee what is thine, ask it not again from him. As thou desirest that people should deal with thee, even so deal thou with them" (Lk. vi. 27–31; cp. Mt. v. 39–44, vii. 12). In explaining these words, it must not be forgotten that what we have here is not a scientific exposition of an academic character; it is popular language, in which everything is said as vividly and clearly as possible. If there were then gathered

[1] Jesus is here speaking as the result of an experience—a fact by no means attested only by Lk., but also by Mk. (x. 23–27).

around Jesus those that were poor and hungry, those that wept, and those that were outcast (Lk. vi. 20–23), it was to be feared that they might recompense hatred to those that hated them, that they might resist those who robbed and oppressed them, that they might press their just claims by force. But Jesus will not hear of anything of the kind. Patience is, he says, better than fighting; to do good and wish good to one's enemies is better than to repay evil with evil or to long ardently for a day of vengeance.[1]

Now, a discourse of this character is, just as much as (let us say) a letter, addressed to a quite definite community. Jesus is speaking to the Galilean people of his own time, and he is speaking in the expectation of the nearness of the kingdom of heaven. So he admonishes his hearers to reconcile themselves to the existing circumstances—though, indeed, these will not much longer remain as they are—and under the pressure of these circumstances bids them not to forget the special duty of love. This duty is finally defined thus: we should behave towards others as we would wish them to behave towards us, that is to say, be ever ready to help, friendly disposed, obliging. Even this, again, must not be taken as scientific definition, valid for all cases; for there are, of course, people capable of desiring wrong things from others. If Jesus thinks indeed of this class of individuals at all, he assumes there are none. It would certainly amount to a total misconception of Jesus' preaching, to imagine that its essential meaning was embraced in a formula like this, and then to point to the Book of Tobit (iv. 15—ὃ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς) and to Hillel,[2] as having transmitted similar sayings. Taking Jesus' saying in the context of the discourse, its meaning is: Show your enemies by your own behaviour towards them how they ought to behave towards you. Instead of letting yourself be led astray into evil ways by them, try to win them over by your example to what is good and right. Such an attitude, even towards those who are unfriendly and hostile, is the only one

[1] The enemies to whom love is to be shown are therefore unquestionably to be sought amongst the subjects of Jesus' lamentations. This is as much as to say that the lamentations must not be understood as curses or imprecations, but rather as warnings. They express facts, not wishes.

[2] See Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, i., 7; and see further Chap. XIV.

that gives special worth to a man. Love for love, a good deed for a good deed, lending where one hopes to receive —this is the way of the sinful world, and confers no merit; but love towards your enemy, doing good and lending without hope of a corresponding service in return, gains the rich reward of the children of God, namely, the kingdom of heaven. For God causes his benefits, rain and sunshine, to be shared equally by the ungrateful and the wicked as by the good (Lk. vi. 32–36 = Mt. v. 44–48). The unshakable steadfastness of soul which we have already so often pointed to as so strongly characteristic of Jesus himself, and of the ideal he preached, here again stands out plainly as the basis of his demands: no man ought to allow himself to be deterred from doing his own duty by the ill conduct of another. The duty of love persists, whether he to whom it is paid proves himself grateful or not. We should not allow any other person by his conduct to disturb the well settled order of our own life.[1]

Again, there are people standing around Jesus who would gladly learn from him how to escape the coming judgment of God. These he exhorts to be merciful; not to judge and not to condemn, for then will they also not be judged nor condemned; but, on the contrary, to acquit and give away, for then will they also be acquitted, then will it also be given unto them, and that in a measure overflowing—in return for the sacrifice of earthly joys they shall win the kingdom of heaven. If the opening of the discourse might indeed seem to suggest that no moral conditions would be demanded for entrance into the kingdom of God, such a mistaken idea is here most unmistakably controverted. He who hopes for the grace of God, he who does not wish to be condemned or judged, but to be

[1] Herein is shown also the greatness of the Christian character. Even as God is too great to distribute his benefits, rain and sunshine, only in a niggardly way, according to the measure of human merit, so ought Jesus' disciple to be too great to let his good-will be checked by the ill-will of others, when his good-will may possibly benefit all. Lk. has manifestly curtailed vi. 35, as compared with Mt. v. 45; but his tradition is likely to be correct to the extent that Jesus in this place does not describe God as the Father in heaven, as in Mt., but as the Highest or Greatest (ὕψιστος). The term is certainly in admirable agreement with the thoughts to which Jesus gives utterance.

set free and rewarded with the gift of the kingdom of heaven, must act towards his fellow-men according to that same principle on which he hopes that the same things will be done unto him : "According to the measure by which ye measure, even so will it be measured to you again" (Lk. vi. 36–38, Mt. vii. 1 f.). He must, therefore, forgive, and must on his part cheerfully give even to the unworthy. With these words Jesus further seeks to prevent an outbreak of hatred against the ruling class on the part of the poor, the hungry, the sorrowful, and the outcast.[1]

(*f*) THE FALSE PERISHES.—Next, Jesus turns aside in his discourse to consider a danger with which his cause is threatened through the enmity of the Pharisees. And once again he is able to allay anxiety and alarm. "Can one blind man show the way to another blind man? Will they not both fall into a ditch?" In these words expression is given to the solemn conviction that what is false never prevails permanently in the world. There is no need to contend against it : it digs its own grave. True, the disciples have first to suffer along with their Master ; but Jesus hopes, at the same time, that each of them will be prepared, even as his Master is—in other words, will not suffer himself to be disconcerted by this rejection and by all the distress involved in it (Lk. vi. 39 f.).

(*g*) AMEND THYSELF.—Up to this point the entire discourse has had reference to the proper attitude of the community, rejected by the world, towards its enemies. The latter have hitherto appeared in the character of wicked men, who should be forgiven, and to whom love should be shown in return for their want of love. Now Jesus exhorts his disciples seriously to ask themselves, whether, when compared with these same enemies, they really may describe

[1] The principle laid down in Lk. vi. 31 ("Act towards every man as ye wish *him* to act towards you") is more exactly defined in Lk. vi. 37 f. ("Act towards every man as ye wish *God* to act towards you"). The latter form of the principle rests upon the conviction that no conception regarding God ever holds its ground permanently, if it does not answer to a man's own ethical ideal. The man who looks upon forgiveness as a foolish display of weakness will never sincerely believe that God forgives him his own sins.

themselves as good. Using extremely grotesque metaphor, he says that, while they perceive the splinter in the eye of a stranger, they do not see the beam in their own eye; and while with apparent lovingness they are ready to remove the splinter from the stranger's eye, they forget to take the beam out of their own. He exhorts everyone, therefore, to think first of his own faults, instead of thinking of the faults of others.[1] And when those who are gathered about him appeal with satisfaction to their good heart and good-will, Jesus explains that upright sentiments must be recognised from upright deeds; just as from bramble-bushes we cannot gather figs and grapes, so a good man brings forth good deeds, a bad man bad deeds. Jesus, then, does indeed hear them continually calling him their Lord, but he does not observe that they do his will (Lk. vi. 41–46). An earnest exhortation such as this connects very well with the preceding part of the discourse. Thus far he has exhorted to the fulfilment of the duty of love even towards one's enemy, one's oppressor and robber; after this, he reminds his listeners that a false view is not able to maintain itself permanently; in both admonitions, the oppressed community is called upon to persevere in patience and in the uninterrupted faithful fulfilment of duty. And to this is very appropriately added an explicit reminder of the difficult moral problem which each individual in this community has to solve for himself. This too will serve to recall each from the hateful striving with others to the fulfilment of his own duty.

(*h*) THE TWO BUILDERS.—Once more Jesus seeks to win them to this task by the fine parable of the wise and foolish builders.[2] He who fulfils Jesus' word builds his house upon the rock, where it stands firm against wind and weather. He who hears only, but does not do accordingly, builds upon

[1] Jesus certainly does not wish to forbid people to labour for the improvement of others. He himself always preached repentance, and he sent out his disciples that they too should preach it. He who would perfect himself first, before beginning to improve others, would never be able to fulfil the duty of love. Yet he who proposes to improve others ought not to forget his own shortcomings; the recollection of them will have a very beneficial influence upon the character of his work as a whole.

[2] This figure Jesus has drawn from his former handicraft. Cp. Chap. IV., p. 101.

sand ; the rain undermines his house and it collapses. Thus, steadfastness in face of all the experiences of life, an inward power of resistance to both joy and sorrow, reconciliation to one's lot, and a calm resoluteness—these are the qualities Jesus hopes to impart to those who live according to his word. It is easy to see that here we have presented to us an end in life which is entirely independent of the Messianic expectation of the future. The whole of the discourse, with its beatitudes and its denunciations of woe, with its emphasising of a rich reward falling to those who practise love towards their enemies, with its promises of not being judged and not being condemned, but acquitted, with its description of the overflowing measure of the gifts of grace to be granted to the charitable—is based throughout upon the hope that the kingdom of heaven is already knocking at the gate. Yet, at the same time, it is inspired throughout by enthusiastic admiration of a character sure of itself amid all the vicissitudes of life, and independent of the world. We get an early glimpse of this view in the precept, not to let the wrong of others exercise a determining influence upon one's own actions (Lk. vi. 27–36). The peculiarity of this character ought really to be complete goodness towards others, whether for the time being they are good or bad. The man who acquires this unvarying readiness to render help to others Jesus regards as a son of the Highest (Lk. vi. 35) ; but such a disposition can only be acquired by strict self-discipline (Lk. vi. 41–46) in accordance with Jesus' words (Lk. vi. 47–49). The ideal is one that could not be derived from the Judaic hopes of the future or from their law ; it is quite a peculiar possession of Jesus.[1] And Jesus lives in his ideal. Hence, the rapturous certainty of being the Messiah cannot entice him to leave the quiet path of duty to embark upon fantastic adventures ; hence he dispenses his helping love on all sides, the helping love which can call to its aid the victorious faith that removes mountains and heals also the sick ; hence, having once recognised the thing that is good, he defends it fearlessly and un-

[1] Jesus' own assurance and steadfastness of character may be due to his certainty that he is the Messiah ; the ideal of active helpful love, on the other hand, cannot have grown out of the hope of the kingdom of heaven.

dismayed, in spite of all prejudices sanctioned by custom or law.

And in this new ideal we find the justification of Jesus' public appearance. He might have been deceived in the vision he had at his baptism; false prophets also have had their visions. And we should have been obliged to set down his certainty of being the Messiah, the future judge and ruler of the world, to an unhealthy presumption, had not this man actually possessed a power of salvation—a power which kept him to the right path, too, in spite of the sublime revelation that had been made to him. Jesus was indeed mistaken in expecting the kingdom of God to appear during the life-time of his own generation (Mk. ix. 1, xiii. 30); that was a human touch. But the power of salvation brought by him is of eternal value, converting man, the sport of chance, into a being raised above the world and all its vicissitudes and, at the same time, possessed of unspeakable value to humanity by reason of his unceasing helpfulness.[1]

Jesus' Family in Capernaum.—In this discourse, Jesus exhorted his hearers to practise love, in spite of the enmities of others. Hence it cannot surprise us to find him shortly afterwards making a third sojourn in Capernaum. Great though the hostility of the Pharisees is, it is not powerful enough to keep the multitude away from the doors. Mk. iii. 20 tells us, that the throng made it scarcely possible for Jesus to eat his daily bread along with the inmates of the house. When he is thus sitting surrounded by a crowd of eager listeners, so dense that nobody can gain entrance through the door, a message is delivered to him that his mother and his brethren are standing without. They had heard in Nazareth of his ever-increasing activity. At an earlier date they were, we may suppose, annoyed that Jesus, when he left John, did not return home and resume his handi-

[1] It is always a mistake to try to sum up the effect produced by a great historical personality, in a brief formula. It is not merely in the creation of this ideal that the originality of Jesus' character is seen; the way also in which he upholds and champions it against other ideals, the entire struggle of his life, in fact, is so largely sustained by his personal character that its effect within the field of the history of religion is reflected on the very broadest scale.

craft. They may indeed have been gratified with the great success of his preaching, perhaps also with his work of healing; but when he caused offence and ill-will by forgiving sins, by associating with outcasts, by disregard of pious custom, and, still worse, by openly scorning the Law, we can easily understand that his family suffered by it and were ready to believe that Jesus had taken leave of his senses (ὅτι ἐξέστη, Mk. iii. 20 f.). When therefore Jesus hears that his mother and his brethren stand before the door, he at once divines that their purpose is to fetch him home (ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν).[1] Jesus, however, refuses to allow himself to be disturbed in his sacred calling by his relatives. 'Who is my mother and my brethren?' he asks; and pointing to the company gathered about him, he adds, "Behold, these are my mother, these are my brethren. He that doeth the will of God is my brother, my sister, my mother." Steadfastness of character is not conceivable apart from a certain measure of sternness. Jesus durst not let himself be torn away from his God-given mission. In our tradition the entire narrative leads up to this one saying of Jesus. What form the further discussion between him and his family took, we do not know.[2] But what we can say with certainty is that Jesus did not at the time go with them to Nazareth (Mk. iii. 31–35), and that neither his mother nor his brethren nor his sisters attached themselves to his following during his lifetime. It sounds like repudiation when, in answer to the blessing pronounced upon his mother (Lk. xi. 27– "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck"), Jesus utters the solemn words, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear God's word and keep it." The Synoptic tradition knows nothing of Jesus' mother having stood beside his cross, although it does name certain women of Galilee who had accompanied him to Jerusalem

[1] The words used point plainly to forcible measures (cp. Mk. xii. 12, xiv. 1, 44, 46, 49, 51, Jesus being taken prisoner; so also John, in Mk. vi. 17). It is evident that force was not used simply and solely because Jesus was surrounded by his adherents. The intention of his family, however, explains Jesus' seemingly blunt refusal.

[2] Though this would seem to be the occasion on which Jesus recounted how they once requested him to go to the Baptist, and uttered the parable preserved in Mt. xxi. 28–32. Cp. Chap. VI., p. 128.

(Mk. xv. 40 f., Lk. viii. 2 f.). The Johannine Gospel is the first to give us this information regarding her (Jn. xix. 24–27); but it also records that Jesus' mother and brethren went with him in the beginning to Capernaum (Jn. ii. 12). The fact is that his brethren, and James in particular, espoused the cause of the Gospel after Jesus' death[1] (Gal. i. 19, 1 Cor. ix. 5; for his mother see Acts i. 14?).

[1] James, in fact, did not attach himself to the Christian community until after the Risen Lord had appeared to him (1 Cor. xv. 7).

CHAPTER X

PREACHING IN GALILEE DOWN TO THE DISPUTE ABOUT THE PRECEPTS OF CEREMONIAL PURITY

SOURCES.—Mk. iv. 1–vii. 23, iii. 22–30 (=Mt. xiii. 1–23, v. 15, x. 26, vii. 2, xiii. 12, 31 f., 34, viii. 18, 23 f., ix. 18–26, xiii. 53–58, x. 1, 9–15, xiv. 1–36, xv. 1–20. Lk. viii. 4–18, xiii. 18 f., viii. 22–ix. 17). Mk. iv. 1–33 has to be taken into account for the parables concerning the kingdom of God : Mk. iv. 30–32 (=Mt. xiii. 31 f., Lk. xiii. 18 f.) belongs necessarily to Mt. xiii. 33, Lk. xiii. 20 f. (the parable of the mustard seed). Here, too, belong the parables of the treasure hid in the field, and of the pearl (Mt. xiii. 44 f.). The presence of the kingdom of God is proclaimed in Lk. xvii. 20 f., Mt. xii. 28=Lk. xi. 20 ; compare Mt. xi. 5=Lk. vii. 22. The Lord's Prayer, Lk. xi. 1–4 (=Mt. vi. 9–13), goes with the teaching of the disciples, Mk. iv. 34 ; here also belongs Mt. vi. 7 f. Lk. xii. 2–7=Mt. x. 26–31, also, is to be regarded as a special exhortation to the Twelve belonging to this period ; Mt. v. 14–16 must be regarded as the introduction to this discourse—compare Mk. iv. 21 f., rightly attached to the section beginning with Mk. iv. 16. To the conclusion of the same discourse we ought no doubt to add Lk. xii. 11 f.=Mt. x. 19 f. ; these sayings were of course spoken before the sending forth of the Twelve. Mt. xiii. 52 gives the instructions to the Twelve as to the correct form of preaching. For the healing of the man of Gerasa (Mk. v. 1–20), compare the healing of Mary Magdalene, Lk. viii. 2 ; for the resuscitation of the daughter of Jairus, v. 41–43, compare that of the youth of Nain, Lk. vii. 11–17, and that of Lazarus, Jn. xi. 1–46 ; also that of Tabitha, Acts ix. 36–43, and the reanimation of Eutychus, Acts xx. 8–12. Along with the sayings of the Lord regarding his want of success in Nazareth, Mk. vi. 4, see also Jn. iv. 44. The address when sending forth the Twelve, composed of sayings of the Lord, is preserved in Lk. x. 2–12, 16=Mt. ix. 37 f., x. 7–16, as well as in Mk. vi. 7–13=Mt. x. 1, 9, 11–14, Lk. ix. 1–6. The return of the disciples is in Lk. x. 17–24 recounted in greater detail than in Mk. vi. 30 ; the latter portion of Lk.=Mt. xi. 25–30. For the feeding of the Five Thousand, compare Jn. vi. 1–13 ; for the walking on the lake, Jn. vi. 15–21. The answer of the Jerusalem Scribes to Jesus' words, Mk. vii.

6–16, is contained in Mk. iii. 22, and Jesus' retort in Mk. iii. 23–30; compare Mt. xii. 22–37 and Lk. xi. 15–23.

Presence of the Kingdom of God.—When Jesus was asked why his disciples did not fast, he answered by pointing to the marriage-joy about him, with which the practice of fasting would be out of harmony (Mk. ii. 19). When the messengers of John asked him whether he was the Messiah, he pointed to the blessings flowing from his activity; the blind saw, the lame walked, the lepers became clean, the deaf heard, the dead were awakened, and the poor received glad tidings (Mt. xi. 5 = Lk. vii. 22).[1] By making these answer, he at once intimates that the chief gifts of the kingdom of God are round about him in visible and tangible shape. And out of this a fact emerges which is in the highest degree surprising to Jesus himself as well as to his contemporaries; it is this: The kingdom of God is not only knocking at the door, it has already become a present reality; it is in some way or other already in existence now, even if its full manifestation is certainly reserved only for the future. For Jesus himself this result follows from the close connection subsisting between the kingdom of God and the Messiah. Since the Messiah himself belongs to the eternal world of the future, it is impossible for him to sojourn upon earth without even now communicating and dispensing to his surroundings some of the blessings of that future world. And when Jesus beholds such gifts as evidently belong to the Messianic world emanating from his own person even now, he at once perceives in them clear proofs of the truth of the revelation he has received, namely, that he is himself the Messiah. So, in particular, his power of healing demoniacs seems to him a sure sign that God's kingdom has already come in advance to those who behold such fruits of his public work (Mt. xii. 28 = Lk. xi. 20). And on one occasion, when replying to the Pharisees' question, "When will the kingdom of God come?" he says, in the full consciousness of the salvation then actually present and brought about by himself, "The kingdom of God will not come in such wise that it can be observed. Men will not say, 'Lo, here!' or 'There

[1] See Chap. IX., pp. 218–220.

it is;' for, behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you."[1]

The blessings proceeding from Jesus are by no means difficult to perceive; but they who are ever on the look-out for the great events which are to shake heaven and earth, and so, as it were, announce to the world the advent of the new era with the sound of a trumpet—such have no presentiment that the kingdom of God is actually already present and existent in these same blessings (Lk. xvii. 20 f.). Instead of looking about them in every direction, expecting these great events to happen, let them give heed to what is taking place in their own immediate neighbourhood, and in the midst of them (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν).

PREACHING FROM THE LAKE.—Of this presence of the kingdom of God Jesus spoke also in three pairs of parables; according to Mk. iv. 1–35 = Mt. xiii. 1–52, he seems to have uttered them in the course of a single discourse, the discourse itself being delivered from a boat whilst the people stood on the shore of the lake. It would be easy enough to understand that Jesus on one day may have been particularly absorbed by this thought, and explained its different aspects in figure after figure.[2] At the same time, the tradition preserved with

[1] Taken quite literally, ἐντὸς ὑμων may mean "within you" = "inwardly" or "in the midst of you." The context in Lk. xvii. 20 f. would seem to show that the phrase points to the imperceptible nature of the advent of the kingdom of God: the kingdom of God will not come in such a way as to be perceived, nor will it become manifest in any definite place; it is rather ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. Yet even this antithesis is not decisive for either of the alternative interpretations; for the kingdom of God must be invisible, whether it is to be a spiritual gift within a man, or whether, without being perceived by them, it is now present in the midst of Jesus' contemporaries. We might describe "in the midst of you" as the more likely meaning, because the question in Lk. xvii. 20 is put to Jesus by the Pharisees, and in *their* hearts, in Jesus' opinion, the kingdom of God cannot be thought of as being already present. But even this objection is not decisive, for in the sense of "within you inwardly" the saying may well have been a conditional one.

[2] We must be on our guard, however, against supposing that any such conception as this of the actual presence of the kingdom of God is to be regarded as a doctrine that constituted an integral part of a fully co-ordinated system of thought. Jesus' Jewish training had of course given him a very definite conception of the world as a whole, though he had in certain respects changed this in accordance with his own experiences. Yet the thought of the actual presence of the kingdom of God remains

regard to this Sermon on the Lake is, it must be admitted, in many respects imperfect. Even in Mk. there is interpolated into it an instruction of the disciples which certainly belongs to another situation (Mk. iv. 10–25; in this passage verses 21–25 have no real connection whatever with the parable). Thus the first pair of parables in Mk. are torn asunder (Mk. iv. 1–9, 24–29). Of the second pair, Mk. gives only one (iv. 30–32), while from Mt. and Lk. it appears that there was a parallel parable (Mt. xiii. 33, Lk. xiii. 20 f.). The third pair of parables, which also clearly belonged to this place, are given only by Mt. (xiii. 44–46). On the other hand, Mt. has again created confusion by putting in the place of the parable in Mk. iv. 24–29 the parable of the tares amongst the wheat (Mt. xiii. 24–30), which does not belong here at all, and which has obliged him, not only to insert a further exposition addressed to the disciples (xiii. 36–43), but also his original parallel, the parable of the net (xiii. 47–50). The subject of the parable of the tares and of the parable of the net is the choice of men for the future kingdom of God. Had Jesus said, however, that the kingdom of God is now already present in a community of both good and evil, a community which, for a time, must still continue to exist as it is, the statement would have been regarded, not as a surprising truth, but as one involving an incredible contradiction. Jesus' object in delivering these two parables was to take up an opposite position to the exclusiveness of the Pharisees, and accordingly he speaks of an evil incidental to this world, not of the projection of the world of the future into the world[1] of the present.

(*a*) SUCCESS AND VALUE OF THE PREACHING.—Jesus, therefore, tells the story of the sower, whose seed falls partly by the wayside, partly on stony ground, partly amongst the thorns, and yet for the most part upon good ground, where it yields thirty, sixty, or even a hundred fold. This is manifestly a source of consolation to the preacher; his words may

fairly independent, side by side with the idea of the sudden dawn of the future kingdom of God; hence it might at one time become more prominent and at another fade more into the background of Jesus' conceptions. Of the two ideas, that of the sudden dawn of the future kingdom of God is rooted much more firmly in his mind.

[1] Cp. Chap. IX., p. 207.

yet be crowned with great success, even though he so often preaches to many that have deaf ears.[1]

Then Jesus describes how the husbandman, after sowing, quietly waits until the earth brings forth fruit from the seed of its own energy (αὐτομάτη). Here again the virtue of patience is inculcated if the fruits of preaching do not at once appear; they must slowly ripen of themselves.[2]

The parable of the mustard seed (Mk. iv. 30–32) was evidently handed down incorrectly from the first. The little mustard seed does not grow into a very large bush, nor is the mustard seed smaller than all the seeds of the earth. But the parallel of the leaven shows clearly what the original version was. As leaven leavens a great quantity of flour, so the little mustard seed has a very sharp and pungent taste; in like manner, a short exhortation by a preacher may produce a powerful revolution in the hearer.[3]

Finally, Jesus describes how a man discovers a treasure in his field, and how a merchant who is a seeker of pearls finds

[1] So interpreted, the parable is of course no longer an exhortation to repentance addressed to the people, but a reflective meditation on his own work. Nevertheless, Jesus may very well have spoken it to a larger audience, as hinted in the opening and closing words (ἀκούετε) of Mk.'s tradition (Mk. iv. 9). For, after all, it does contain an exhortation to right apprehension of the word that blesses, and with it a justification of Jesus in view of any allusion to the many hearers who have derived no permanent benefit from listening to his words.

[2] This parable is therefore the complement of that of the sower. While the latter declares that many may hear a sermon and yet derive no benefit from it, the parable of the seed of corn lays special stress on the fact that the effect of good words does not usually show itself at once. Jesus' observation further possesses the force of a justification, so that it may have been addressed to the people, though, strictly speaking, the monitory note has disappeared.

[3] In the present condition of our texts the correctness of this theory of an early alteration in the original parable cannot of course be proved, and will no doubt meet with but little acceptance. At the same time, it seems to the present writer to be correct, especially in view of the bold attempt to make the mustard seed as small as possible and the grown plant as large as possible. The motive for the alteration is to be found in the saying of the Lord in Mt. xvii. 20 = Lk. vii. 6, where the mustard seed is contrasted with a mountain or a mulberry-tree (συκάμινος). As far as Western ideas are concerned, a nut or an apple-pip would have served the purpose of the figure equally well.

a pearl of extraordinary value. Both men sacrifice their whole fortune in order to possess themselves of what they have found. These parables are manifestly an appeal to the hearer, uttered at a time when Jesus is encountering so much hostility, to lay hold upon the blessing contained in his words, let the cost be what it may.[1]

(*b*) JESUS' PREACHING AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—In this discourse, therefore, Jesus is speaking of the success and value of his preaching. But, remarkably enough, he declares that he is speaking about the kingdom of God (Mk. iv. 26, 30, Lk. xiii. 20, Mt. xiii. 33, 44 f.). What he means by this, is best understood from the last pair of parables: a possession for the sake of which a man will rightly give his all must belong to the kingdom of God, or be necessary in order to participate in the same. If, then, the blessing proceeding from Jesus' words may justly require such a sacrifice, it must confer a share in the last and highest good, the kingdom of God. Jesus knows that to the man of intelligence who listens to him the kingdom of God is already present—present, not only in the blessings flowing from his healing powers, but, above all, in the blessings accruing from the preaching itself.

[1] The parable of the treasure in the field shows very clearly how absurd it is to regard every possible element in the reported narrative as resting upon something in the teaching of Jesus. The man who gives his entire fortune to buy a field containing treasure, which is, of course, of far greater value, but the existence of which is not known to the present owner, by so doing defrauds the seller, since he pays him for the field only, not for the treasure concealed in it. According to the German Civil Code (section 984) the finder of a treasure and the owner of the field are each entitled to one-half of the treasure. If, therefore, the finder buys the field without saying anything about the treasure he has found in it, according to German legal ideas he unlawfully deprives the owner of his half of the treasure. But legal points like this were very far from Jesus' thoughts when he uttered the parable. [The conception of the German Civil Code is that of the Roman law generally. In England, however, treasure trove that is really hidden *in* the ground falls entirely to the crown (which, however, in practice usually gives a monetary equivalent for it), but falls entirely to the finder if he finds it not *in*, but *on*, the earth, and consequently not hidden; that is, assuming that the owner cannot be discovered, to whom, of course, it otherwise belongs. In the United States treasure trove is regarded as the property of the State in which it is found, except in Louisiana, where the practice of the Roman law obtains (*J. T. B.*).]

Thus, he brings the kingdom of God by the sowing of his word ; again, the more the hearer lives himself into Jesus' words, the riper grows the kingdom of God for him ; furthermore, this great, this highest good, is given to him by an insignificant means, a human discourse. Jesus believes, therefore, that through the effect of his words so happy a change is accomplished in the inner life of a man, that thenceforth he can live fully content in the present as though he were in the kingdom of God already.[1] One side of this ideal to be attained from following Jesus was pointed out in the parable of the two builders, at the end of the Sermon on the Mount—an unshaken assurance and steadfastness. But we must not forget the other side, which is emphasised in Jesus' preaching, at least, just as strongly—a faithful self-surrender in helpful ministering love.[2] Where these attributes of character are conjoined, a measure of inner happiness is attained such as cannot be surpassed. The man who is thus endowed lives already, in Jesus' conception, in the kingdom of God. This does not, of course, preclude Jesus from still being ever on the look-out for the final transformation of the world, the visible manifestation of the kingdom of God, the judgment of the Messiah, and the rising again of the pious to an eternal life of bliss in the near future.[3]

Narrower and Wider Circles of Hearers. — The Gospel of Mk. tells us that Jesus reserved the interpretation of these publicly delivered parables for the more intimate group he had gathered around him, and especially for the Twelve. Those who were in his immediate company should understand the secrets of the kingdom of God, though the general public must rest satisfied with the parabolic discourse itself. Now, it is, in any case, fundamentally wrong to suppose that Jesus spoke any of his parables with the idea of

[1] Whence it results that the principal hortatory value of the Sermon on the Lake lies in the particular fact, that those who heard the preaching could appropriate to themselves the blessed kingdom of God. If we obliterate from these six figurative narratives all reference to the kingdom of God, they lose their value.

[2] Cp. the command to love one's enemies in the Sermon on the Mount, Chap. IX., pp. 242–245.

[3] See p. 253, n. 2.

disguising his thoughts; that he purposely talked in riddles not meant to be understood by some amongst his hearers. That would be utterly at variance with the character of the man who, in spite of the sharply opposed custom of his people, does not shun even the company of sinners, to the end that he may help them on the right way. Even Mk., notwithstanding the quotation of Isa. vi. 9 f., is not of this opinion, for the passage ("they shall see and yet not perceive, they shall hear and yet not understand, that they may not be converted and forgiven") is intended as a Scriptural quotation, which explains the unavoidable necessity under which Jesus found himself placed.[1]

He cannot expound the meaning of his sermon to the entire concourse of his hearers in the manner in which he does to his closest disciples; it is for that very reason that he chooses out a group of friends from the great multitude, in order that to them at least he may be more than he can be to the many. When he speaks to the multitude in pictures and parables, he is illustrating and explaining his thoughts by the daily occurrences of popular life, familiar and intelligible to everybody. But it is not of course his fault, if the thoughts of many amongst his listeners remain fixed on the beautiful stories, and fail to penetrate to their deeper meaning. And even if his listeners did understand that in his sermon by the lake Jesus was speaking about the effect of his own words, it by no means follows that it would be clear to their minds even then, that in these same words was given already by anticipation the highest conceivable good, in other words, the kingdom of God. At the same time, Jesus knows that the form of the parable—that is to say, its connection with daily life, and the varied pictures it supplies—is in every way suitable for religious discourses of a popular character.[2] Jesus'

[1] The Johannine Gospel, however, does present this view. Jesus himself here puts λαλεῖν ἐν παροιμίαις in antithesis to παρρησίᾳ ἀναγγέλλειν (Jn. xvi. 25, 29). The parable of the shepherd is in Jn. x. 6 defined as a παροιμία, and we are told immediately afterwards that it was not understood.

[2] The reasons for this are easy to find. A picture drawn from daily life impresses itself upon the memory without any trouble, whereas often a new religious idea, put in an abstract form, is not understood, or not perfectly appreciated, and consequently is soon forgotten. But everybody

saying in Mt. xiii. 52, "Every Scribe that is won for the kingdom of heaven is like unto the master of a household, who brings forth new and old out of his treasures," also forms part of the special teaching imparted by him to his disciples. It evidently means that he who desires to labour as a teacher, after being won over to preach of the kingdom of heaven, must possess a rich store of experiences, which he can draw upon whenever occasion requires.

TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATIONS.—Mk. gives an explanation of the parable of the sower (iv. 13–26); Mt. also gives an explanation of the parable of the tares amongst the wheat (xiii. 37–43). In both cases, the same method is followed: each individual feature is explained separately. The objection to this is, that too little importance is attached to the principal thought, and that features in the picture, which are only so many accessory ornaments, have each to be interpreted, whereas, in the thought the parable is designed to illustrate there is really nothing analogous to them. But when Jesus described how, in sowing, some of the seeds of corn fall by the way, some on rocky ground, and some amongst thorns, it was very natural that, if he did proceed to enlarge upon the parable at all, he should also have indicated the reasons why the preaching often fails to produce any effect upon this or the other hearer, and should illustrate these reasons by the images to be found in the parable.[1] So, on another occasion, having graphically described how the weeds are allowed to grow up in the wheat field until the harvest, when he came to explain his discourse he was almost obliged, not only to say what he meant by the tares and what by the wheat, but also to add that the judgment of the Messiah will one day come like the day of harvest, and the angels of God will then undertake the separation between good and bad like the reapers at

can glean for himself the religious idea contained in a parable, and in this way its truth is more fully recognised. Besides, while pictures and graphic descriptions give pleasure, abstract judgments and conclusions weary.

[1] In general, therefore, it is very important to realise that each parable teaches only one definite thought, and that every feature of the story is by no means necessarily of significance. Still, we must not, while recognising this, make it a rule that is valid for all cases, for Jesus' method in constructing his parables was not to act on any cut-and-dried theory.

the harvest. We may question, however, whether the phrase "son of man" originally occurred twice (Mt. xiii. 37, 41), in this last explanation (Mt. xiii. 37–43). In the first case it is the son of man who sows the good seed, that is to say, the preacher. In the second, the son of man sends out his angels to separate the good from the wicked; here, he is the Messiah. When we consider the almost colourless nature of the Semitic term ("the man"), it is not at all impossible that the phrase is in both cases original; yet it would also be quite conceivable that the Evangelist may, in particular cases, have altered the term.[1] On the other hand, as regards the two cases under discussion, the present writer does not think there is any reason to reject the explanations as not having been derived from Jesus; though this must by no means be considered to justify the bad taste and want of tact so often displayed by later commentators in their explanation of the parables—such as, for instance, when, in the parable of the leaven, the three measures of meal are made to denote the three divisions of the world known to the ancients.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.—The piety in which Jesus trained up his group of disciples in particular finds further expression in the short form of prayer given to them at their own request. A special form of prayer was used likewise by John and his followers; that was the reason why Jesus' disciples also wished to have something of the same kind (Lk. xi. 1).

JEWISH FORMULÆ OF PRAYER.—It is characteristic of the crystallisation of the Jewish religion about externals that by the time of Jesus not only had fixed times of prayer (Dan. vi. 11, 14, Judith ix. 1, xiii. 3, Acts iii. 1, x. 30) been long in use, but there were even settled formulæ; for instance, the so-called *shema'*, which Josephus (*Ant.*, iv. 212) represents

[1] This would in that case be an instance of the expression "the son of man" being used by Jesus in the first place to indicate himself, and afterwards as a means of designating the Messiah without leading any of his hearers to look upon the speaker as the future Messiah. In the present writer's view, the very fact that the same designation served for the two persons must have brought into consciousness the distinction between them, just as when we expressly differentiate one man from another man in our speech.

Moses as enjoining as morning and evening prayer, and which was certainly still in use in the time of Jesus, since the custom—closely associated with it—of wearing phylacteries (תְּפִלִּין, *tĕphillīn* = *φυλακτήρια*) and blue and white tassels (צִיצִית, *ṣīṣīth* = *κράσπεδα*) is presupposed in Mt. xxiii. 5, and Mt. ix. 20, xiv. 36, xxiii. 5, Mk. vi. 56, Lk. viii. 44 respectively. The prayer in question consists of the words of Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21, and Numb. xv. 37–41, with the addition of appropriate expressions of praise.[1] And since to this prayer, used morning and evening, a third also is certainly to be added, which was repeated three times a day (Dan. vi. 11, 14; Judith ix. 1, and Acts iii. 1, also presuppose a prayer to be repeated in the afternoon, about 3 o'clock), it seems natural to trace the prayer of eighteen petitions, used later and repeated three times a day, if only in its kernel, back to the time of the composition of the book of Daniel, that is to say, to the era of the Maccabees. Neither prayer was certainly distinguished for brevity, and Judaism attached importance to the length of a prayer (*μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι*, Mk. xii. 40). Even in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, the prayer of the former is prolix and long, that of the latter merely a short ejaculation, yet sufficient to ease the burdened conscience (Lk. xviii. 11–13).

BREVITY IN PRAYER.—Jesus therefore insists upon the avoidance in prayer of unmeaning babble,[2] a multitude of words: Even before ye ask him, your heavenly Father knows what it is ye need (Mt. vi. 7 f.). Hence, the use of prayer to man is not that he may thereby convey information to God, but that he may strengthen himself by lifting himself up to God in his ordinary daily life or in some special stress of circumstances. Jesus then proceeds to give what was in point of actual fact, in its original form,

[1] Whether these latter are as old as the words of the prayer does not require to be determined; the older evidence relates to the shema' itself.

[2] The expression *μὴ βατταλογήσητε* is explained by the other word employed to express the same idea, *πολυλογία*. And, in using this word, Jesus not only finds fault with the length of heathen prayers, but also with the idea that virtue lay only in the number, not in the meaning, of the words used. Thus *βατταλογεῖν* is really equivalent to our "meaningless babble."

a very short *formula of prayer* (Lk. xi. 2–4): "Father, hallowed be thy name! Thy kingdom come. Give us daily (to-day) our bread for the coming day (to-morrow); and forgive us our sins, as we forgive everyone that is guilty towards us; and lead us not into temptation."

RELATION TO MT.—Although in Lk. it consists of these words only, the prayer is certainly not an arbitrary curtailment; in no part of Christendom would any abridgment of this prayer have ever been tolerated. On the other hand, we do actually find that the text of Mt. vi. 9–13, amplified though it already is, has received in the later MSS a doxological addition—a fact which shows that the endeavour to expand the Lord's Prayer continued for some length of time.[1]

(i.) MODE OF ADDRESS.—Of all the modes of address to God customary amongst the Jews, the most heartfelt is certainly the apostrophe "Father." It is employed in the regular Jewish prayers in which God's compassion and forgiveness are praised or prayed for. In the fifth of the Eighteen Petitions it is said, "Lead us back, our Father, to Thy Law"; in the sixth, "Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned"; in the eighteenth, "Bless us, our Father, each and all, with the light of Thy countenance." In the second prayer, which is meant to precede the *shema'* in the morning, it is said, "With great and exceeding mercy hast Thou spared us, our Father and our King"; and, after an intervening sentence, the prayer continues, "Our Father, Thou merciful Father, Thou that pitiest, have pity upon us." The same form of address occurs also in the Jewish grace before and after meals (בּוֹנֵה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, *bōneh Yĕrūshālayim*, "Our God, our Father, feed us, nourish us, care for us, and preserve us"). Jesus, therefore, in preferring this before the other names of God very clearly suggests that for him the most important attributes of God are grace and compassion. But in cherishing, as he does, a preference for this divine name, he is not carried beyond the compass of his hereditary faith.[2]

[1] This is connected with its use in public worship. At a later date no further enlargement of the Lord's Prayer was permissible, but long church prayers were introduced, closing with the Lord's Prayer as a kind of appendix.

[2] See also Chap. VIII., p. 164.

(ii.) HALLOWING OF GOD'S NAME.—To the apostrophe "Father" are added the words, "Hallowed be Thy name"; but they are hardly meant as a petition. They correspond to the third of the eighteen petitions of the Jewish prayer, which clearly expresses a resolution on the part of the petitioner: "Let us hallow Thy name in the world, as the same is hallowed in the high heaven . . . . We will hallow Thee, and Thy praise shall never depart out of our mouths to eternity. For Thou, God, art an everlasting and holy king. Praised be Thou, Lord, Thou holy God. Thou art holy, and Thy name is holy, and the holy ones praise Thee daily. Praised be Thou, Lord, Thou holy God!" The sense of the word "hallowed" is, indeed, scarcely stronger than "praised," "blessed." If the address "Father" betokens familiarity, the addition, "hallowed be Thy name," expresses reverence for God. This addition gives indeed the first indication as to which father it is to whom the petitions that follow are addressed. In the fuller formula of Mt., where the address is worded, "Our Father in Heaven," the addition "Hallowed be Thy name," still possesses precisely the same justification, though no longer the same necessity, for its use as in the original brief formula of Lk.[1]

(iii.) THY KINGDOM COME.—The first real petition, that which follows next, was the one which most deeply interested the community that was waiting for the Messiah—"Thy kingdom come." The pious long to depart from this present world of sin and evil, and to enter the future world of justice and bliss, a world such as indeed, according to Jesus' preaching, is on the point of appearing. When God's kingdom has come, then are all desires fulfilled; thus the petition for the kingdom of God is the first and most important prayer.

(iv.) DAILY BREAD.—But so long as the present world continues, every man has to struggle for his own maintenance and against sin. Hence there comes next a modest petition for protection against external want: "Give us daily our bread for the coming day." The Greek phrase τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον had already become unintelligible to the Fathers of

[1] That the term 'Father' is used as a name of God is indicated by the addition 'in Heaven,' and also by the following clause, 'Whose name be hallowed.'

the Church (cp. Tischendorf, on Mt. vi. 11). But the derivation of the term ἐπιούσιος from ἡ ἐπιοῦσα "the following day" (cp., for instance, Acts vii. 26, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18) is definitely settled by the statement of Jerome, that the Gospel of the Hebrews had instead of it *maḥar* (מָחָר) "to-morrow." And the Gospel of the Hebrews, we may be sure, preserves the formula in the precise form of words given to it by Jesus.[1] The only possible point in question, then, is whether the σήμερον of Mt. does not reproduce the end of the petition more correctly than Lk.'s τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. The definite "to-day" would correspond to the definite "to-morrow," just as the indefinite ἐπιοῦσα corresponds to the indefinite τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. But the difference is not of any importance. True, Jesus does on one occasion warn his disciples not to be anxious for the morrow: the morrow will bring with it its own anxieties and needs; it is sufficient that each day has its own troubles (Mt. vi. 34). Yet nothing could be more perverse than to try to infer from this, that the petition in the Lord's Prayer does not venture to pray to-day for bread for the morrow. The petition is in fact meant to be the means of dispelling anxiety about the morrow. The two words, therefore, so far as their meaning is concerned, are very well matched. And Jesus' warning against being anxious for the morrow shows that the idea ἡ αὔριον = ἡ ἐπιοῦσα did, as a matter of fact, belong to his vocabulary, and therefore furnishes a further confirmation of Jerome's statement about the form of the words in the Gospel of the Hebrews.

(v.) SINS COMMITTED.—But the distress of sin, which severs and shuts off the people of the Messiah from God's kingdom, must of necessity be more serious to the community of the

[1] Indeed, being intended for the Christians of Palestine and written in their tongue, on the whole this Gospel retained throughout the original form of the expressions used by Jesus in his discourses. (See Chap. II., pp. 46 ff.)

[2] In the petition for bread we find the first indication that in the original form of words several people repeated the prayer at the same time, or that the one who repeated the prayer looked upon himself as representing a number of worshippers (ἡμῶν——ἡμῖν). Jesus, therefore, regards the Lord's Prayer as the prayer of the community of those disciples who continue to be united.

Messiah than external distress. Accordingly, there follow two other petitions praying for victory over this evil. One looks back into the past; the other forward into the future. Looking backwards, Jesus makes his disciples pray "Forgive us our trespass." No man can undo sins once committed, and Jesus takes it for granted that every one prays daily for forgiveness of his sins. But, although the petitioner cannot alter what has once been done, Jesus will not have him weakly and inertly forget all his duties, even though by prayer he does grasp God's favour. He only may crave forgiveness who himself forgives others; he who is conscious of his own fault dare not be resentful against others because of their faults. Thus, the disciple who asks forgiveness of his own sins ought, at the same time, to forgive those that trespass against him: "Forgive us our sins; we also forgive every one that trespasseth against us." The same thought was already present in the Sermon on the Mount (Lk. vi. 36–38 = Mt. vii. 1 f.).[1]

(vi.) FUTURE SINS.—Looking forward to the future, Jesus makes his disciples pray thus: "Lead us not into temptation"—that is to say, preserve us against sin in the future. In teaching his disciples this petition, he assuredly had no intention of laying before them any definite theory as to the origin of sin. But he knew that temptation comes to men without their desiring it, attaining its consummation when the incitement to sinful action overcomes man's weak will; and he believes that God possesses the power of keeping temptation from his disciples, either by strengthening their will or by weakening the allurements of sin. By the insertion of this petition, the petitioner is again enjoined to cherish an earnest moral feeling, such as he is already, of course, assumed to possess.

RETROSPECT.—If now we compare this prayer of Jesus with the eighteen-petitions prayer of the Jews, the result is that we find its subject-matter recurring in its entirety in the latter, except that the duty of forgiving sins oneself is not included in the eighteen petitions. Apart from this, the rest is found in petitions 3, 5, 6, 9, 15 of the Jewish prayer—that is to say, in five out of the eighteen (or nineteen) petitions,

[1] See Chap. IX., p. 245.

each of which alone, however, is of about the same length as the original Lord's Prayer. Jesus' calm and decisive temperament was entirely averse to every kind of liturgical verbosity.[1] The fact that the disciples' prayer in its original form was not found long enough shows how the later Christian Church lagged behind the master. It was augmented liturgically by amplifying the exordium into "Our Father in Heaven"; by adding the so-called third and seventh petitions—"Thy will be done on earth as in heaven" and "Deliver us from evil";[2] and by appending a doxological conclusion—"For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever." The additions, however, introduce no new thoughts into the prayer. With the exception of the concluding words of praise, they are all found already in Mt. The concise brevity of the original formula failed, then, to satisfy even the earliest generations of the Christian Church.

Exhortation and Encouragement of the Disciples. —It would seem as though the views of Jesus, contradicting, as they so often did, the traditional piety, had, by this time, engendered feelings of uneasiness and alarm even amongst his group of disciples. The disciples thought they might perhaps hold such opinions quietly and keep them to themselves; they might also communicate them to their closest friends; but it was not advisable to talk of them publicly, because, by so

[1] Here, again, there is a noteworthy difference between the picture of Christ as drawn by the Synoptists and that of the Johannine Gospel. For while in the former Jesus blames βατταλογεῖν and πολυλογία in prayer in Mt. vi. 7, and in Mk. xii. 40 repudiates μακρὰ προσεύχεσθαι, the Johannine Jesus does not pray for himself, but διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα (Jn. xi. 42); and brevity, to say the least, is not the merit of the so-called high-priestly prayer in Jn. xvii.

[2] The petition in Mt. vi. 13b, ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, is most assuredly *not* intended to be a last all-embracing request so that τὸ πονηρόν would mean 'evil' in the widest sense of the word. If this had been intended, the adjectival form of πονηρός would scarcely have been chosen to express the idea, its neuter substantival form being regularly employed elsewhere for evil=sin (cp. Rom. xii. 9, ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ). But it remains doubtful whether the masculine ὁ πονηρός was not the nominative in the mind of the writer, since this certainly does occur in several other passages—*e.g.* Mt. xiii. 19, 1 Jn. ii. 13 f., v. 18. This petition of the Lord's Prayer seems to have been known to the Johannine Gospel (xvii. 15).

doing, they might draw upon themselves nothing but hatred and persecution. But of such secrecy Jesus entirely disapproves. "The city," he says, "which stands on a hill cannot be hidden" (Mt. v. 14); so also a truly great conception refuses to be kept secret. "Is the candle then to be placed under a measure or under a bed, and not to be put into a candlestick? What is concealed shall be made manifest; what is secret shall come to the light" (Mk. iv. 21 f.). Jesus therefore is convinced that the recognised truth (the burning candle), cannot be hidden away or remain unspoken; it is God's will that it should be revealed. He knows, too, that the new idea of piety will enforce itself publicly, even though the disciples promulgate it only in secret. "What ye have said in secret shall be heard in the light; what ye have spoken in your chambers shall nevertheless be preached from the house-tops" (Lk. xii. 3). The demand of Jesus, that the convictions which he has arrived at shall be manfully and publicly championed, answers to the inner freedom and steadfastness of his character; and in keeping with it also is the encouragement to his disciples here appended: "But I say unto you, my friends, fear not those that kill the body and after that are unable to do anything further. I will tell you whom ye ought to fear. Fear those who, after they have killed you, are able also to fling you into Gehenna.[1] Yea, verily, I say unto you, them should ye fear" (Lk. xii. 4 f.). The lofty courage ringing through these words is all the more astonishing because the man who exhibits it is himself actually threatened with death (Mk. iii. 6), and seems to be surrounded by faint-hearted friends. But, furthermore, we see here that Jesus looks upon the public advocacy of his views as a matter of conscience, a duty enjoined by God, which neither he nor his disciples dare leave unfulfilled without fear of God's punishment.[2] And what makes Jesus so steadfast, and ought to make his disciples steadfast, is confidence in God's protection. "Do not men sell five sparrows for two farthings? And yet not one

[1] Literally the valley of Hinnom; then, in consequence of Jer. vii. 31–33, xix., the place of punishment for criminals. See *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 239, 240.

[2] This indeed is the burden which rests upon every man who claims to be a prophet (cp. Amos iii. 8 and Jer. xx. 9).

of them falls to the ground without your Father (knowing it). Yea, the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not; ye are of more value than many sparrows" (Lk. xii. 6 f. = Mt. x. 29–31). From God's care for things of the smallest value and significance — a sparrow, a single hair — Jesus here infers God's care for his disciples also. It is not unimportant to note that the view of God's providence now proclaimed by Jesus found expression only in the latest portions of the Old Testament (Pss. viii., civ., and Job xxxviii.–xli.), in which Hellenistic influences are discernible. It is not in accord with the conceptions of ancient Israel, though it is with the Stoic idea of things, which in the early days of Imperial sway was widely disseminated throughout the whole territory of the Roman empire—the idea that even things of the smallest value and importance are willed thus and thus by God's providence, and not otherwise. (See *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 229). In the time of Jesus this originally Stoic thought had, as the passages cited from the Old Testament show, long been conjoined with thoughts originally Israelitic; and in speaking to his disciples as he does, Jesus is only using the language of ideas imparted to him and them in their Jewish education.[1]

Jesus further adverts to the special anxiety felt by his disciples lest they should be publicly accused of having trespassed against the sacred customs of Israel. "And when they arraign you in the synagogues, and before officers and rulers, then be ye not anxious how or what ye ought to plead or say in your own defence; for the Holy Ghost Himself will teach you in that same hour what ye must speak" (Lk. xii. 11 f.). As the disciples stand everywhere under God's protection, and thus ought not to fear any man, so also they ought not to be anxious about their defence. The Holy Ghost, a God-given inspiration, will put the right words into their

[1] As gross misconceptions with regard to this point recur again and again, it should be distinctly pointed out that Jesus certainly never did breathe, in any sense, a purely Greek atmosphere, and probably never heard anything whatever either of Plato or of the Stoa. This would not prevent him from being influenced in his purely Jewish training by ideas which were not found in ancient Israel, but were brought to the notice of the Jews by the Greeks.

mouths in the hour of need. Clearly Jesus is here speaking from an actual experience of his own. He, too, had already rejoiced in the help of God when, in a moment of mental embarrassment, he had been inspired with the right judgment at the right time.[1]

In the Storm on the Lake. — These parables of the kingdom of God in the present Jesus had spoken from a boat, in order to be less incommoded by the multitude. Accordingly, in the evening, he puts over with his disciples to the opposite shore. We are expressly told that there were several boats. Whilst they are on the way, a violent storm arises—no uncommon occurrence on the Lake of Gennesareth.[2] And while the waves go over the little vessel and gradually fill it with water, Jesus lies asleep on a cushion in the aft part of it. He was fatigued by the labour of the day and has grown weary; indeed, that was the reason he wished to escape from the multitude thronging about him; and now he is enjoying a refreshing sleep. Suddenly his anxious disciples awaken him, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" Yet even in the midst of the howling storm Jesus preserves his calmness, his steadfastness. And, as the child of nature sees a living person at work in everything, so to Jesus this fiercely raging storm is a living being, to whom he cries with mighty voice, "Peace, be still!" In this there can be nothing surprising, for the man who says it believed that a word spoken in firm faith could cast a mountain into the sea. The only wonderful circumstance is that the lake actually did become calmer. Yet, such coincidences may sometimes happen.[3] Be

[1] No doubt this has a very human ring now. But when Jesus is again and again obliged to reply to attacks made upon him, even while we admire the readiness with which he defends himself, we can at the same time understand readily enough that even he on one occasion or another may have felt embarrassed as to the right answer.

[2] See Baedeker's *Palästina*, 3rd ed., p. 255.

[3] That is to say, it was not the word spoken by Jesus which compelled the storm to subside; yet the tempest might very well have been stilled in the regular course of things shortly after Jesus had given his word of command. Since a tempest is not an animate being, Jesus' command could not act upon it as a motive to be still. But the religious point of view might easily take what was seemingly a chance coincidence to be a specially-planned divine arrangement.

that as it may, Jesus' courageous words greatly occupied the minds of the disciples; as did also the words of reproach to them for their cowardice and want of confidence, which have also been handed down to us. There is nothing here that transcends Jesus' well-known manner. Yet it is not surprising that the disciples should have regarded with reverential awe the master who commanded the angry waves. What really excites their astonishment is, however, here again at bottom the character of Jesus—the character that makes him at once sure of himself and independent of the world (Mk. iv. 35–41).

In the Decapolis.—The boats come to land on the opposite shore in heathen territory—namely, in the region of Decapolis (Mk. v. 20), a league of ten cities, dating back pretty certainly to the time of Pompey. Decapolis embraced a series of cities of Hellenistic culture from Damascus to Philadelphia (*Rabbat-Ammon*), not always limited to ten in number. On the west side of the Jordan there was but one city, Scythopolis (Bethshean). Enumerations of the particular cities of the league are given by the Elder Pliny (v. 18, 74) and by Ptolemy (v. 15, 22 f.), but while Pliny names precisely ten cities, Ptolemy, on the other hand, mentions eighteen. Of these cities, the only one that lay on the east shore of the Lake of Gennesareth was Hippos (*Sûsiyeh*).[1] The landing, however, does not take place actually in a city, but in a burial-ground in wild, hilly country (Mk. v. 2 f., 5). The district belonged to a heathen town at no great distance away (Mk. v. 14 f.). There was a herd of swine[2] grazing there—a fact which would hardly be conceivable in Jewish territory. The tradition in the text varies as to the name of the city. Origen (see Tischendorf to Mt. viii. 28), we know, found Gerasa in the MSS., though Gadara in a few ; but neither of these cities seemed to him to suit the story, on account of their distance from the Lake of Gennesareth. The town of Gerasa (*Jerash*), a very important place, especially in later

[1] See Chap. IX., p. 182, n. 1.

[2] Swine (χοῖροι) are mentioned in Jesus' figurative discourses in Mt. vii. 6 and Lk. xv. 15 f.; but in the latter passage we are distinctly told that the scene of the story was in non-Jewish territory (Lk. xv. 13, χώρα μακρά).

Imperial times, stood in point of fact a little to the north of the upper course of the Jabbok, and consequently at a very considerable distance to the south-east of the southern extremity of the Lake of Gennesareth. Rapid intercourse between the city and the lake is therefore quite out of the question ; and, extensive though the territory of Gerasa subsequently became, it is *very* questionable whether it ever extended to the Lake of Gennesareth. It is easier to believe that the territory of the town of Gadara, which had always lain south of the Yarmuk (ruins of *Mukês*), did reach it ; we also know that there were villages of the Gadarenes (Josephus, *Vita*, 42). Whether the design of a ship figuring on the coins of Gadara may be taken to be any proof that the territory of the town extended to the lake need not be decided. Vessels could be plied even upon the Yarmuk. The scene of a naval battle could once be presented on the great pool of the watering-place Hamatha, some three miles north of Gadara (cp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3rd ed., ii. p. 126)—if there was really no amphitheatre in a town that possessed two theatres. Anyhow, the territory of Gadara must certainly have extended to the south-east shore of the lake. Now, Jesus set out from Capernaum in the evening ; but, unless there is special necessity for doing so, it is preferable to assume that Jesus did not sail right across the lake in a diagonal course, a journey of at least 9¼ miles. One would more naturally expect him to land on the north-east shore. Origen held that the original reading of Γερασηνῶν or Γαδαρηνῶν was Γεργεσηνῶν, and describes *Gergesa* as "an old city on the Lake of Tiberias, near which a rocky promontory juts out into the lake." However that may be, one is strongly disposed to identify the extensive ruins of *Kursi*,[1] at the mouth of the *Wâdy es-Samak*, opposite to *Mejdel*, and a good distance north of *Sûsiyeh*, as the town upon whose territory Jesus at that time landed (see Buhl, *Geogr. des Alten Palästina*, p. 243). The territory belonging to this city at that time bordered no doubt on the north upon that of Bethsaida. Here steep descents into the lake occur frequently and at no great distance. (See Baedeker, *Palästina*, 3rd ed., p. 256).

[1] The name *Kursi* approximates in sound more nearly to Gerasa than to Gergesa.

HEALING OF THE DEMONIAC.—Here Jesus next heals an unfortunate man who called himself Legion, because, as he believed, a legion of evil spirits dwelt[1] in him; no chain would bind him, were it ever so strong, and day and night he wandered about amongst the tombs and in the mountains, screaming, and beating himself with stones, a melancholy picture of insane frenzy (Mk. v. 1–20). Jesus' restoration of the man to his right mind establishes his fame in the Decapolis. One of the features in the original setting of the story was certainly the fact that, when the demoniac was healed, a herd of swine was drowned. The historical truth of this feature in the tradition cannot be questioned, because the local colouring is so true; Jesus is on heathen soil. How precisely the events occurred cannot of course be ascertained now. The most natural theory is, that the madman in the last onset of his disease drove the animals down into the water, and that then Jesus healed him, and not before. Afterwards it might be said that the evil spirits were drowned along with the swine.

THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS.—Jesus journeys back again—that is to say, of course, to Capernaum, where, since the choosing of the Twelve, he has again regularly dwelt (Mk. iii. 20). He remains, however, on the shore, where the four most intimate amongst his disciples are led by their calling, and where he preferred to address from a boat the multitude which thronged about him. Then a certain ruler of the synagogue, named Jairus, cries out to him, beseeching him to heal his little daughter, for she lies at the very point of death. In response, Jesus leaves the boat, and, surrounded by a throng of people, proceeds towards the house in which the sick child lies.

THE WOMAN WITH THE FLUX.—But suddenly he feels a hand laying a powerful grasp upon his mantle. He turns and asks who did it, for he is easily able to distinguish between an intentional grasp and an accidental touch by the throng.[2] Then a woman comes forward, trembling and full

[1] The idea of a man being possessed by more evil spirits than one is also found elsewhere. According to Lk. viii. 2 (Mk. xvi. 9) seven evil spirits had gone forth out of Mary Magdalene.

[2] It is a sign of the Evangelist's inclination to see wonders everywhere, when even in this very conceivable event Mk. (v. 30–32) perceives something of an extraordinary and unusual nature.

of fear, who for twelve years has suffered from an issue of blood. She throws herself down before him and apologises for her obtrusiveness; she thought she would be healed as soon as she merely touched Jesus' garment, and now behold the wonder has actually happened! This is a very clear case of auto-suggestion.[1] Jesus thought so too, for he says, "Daughter, thy faith hath saved thee." An experience of the kind was, we may be sure, valuable to Jesus himself; it confirmed the opinion, always maintained by him, that unfaltering confidence is able to accomplish even the most difficult things on earth. And in this confident frame of mind he now continues his journey towards the house of Jairus.

Reanimation of the Girl.—But even before they reach the house, the father is informed that his child is dead. Nevertheless, Jesus, bidding him be of good courage, enters the house in company with his closest friends (Peter and the two sons of Zebedee); here he finds a noisy company inside, weeping and lamenting, but, driving them all out, he declares, "The child is not dead, but sleepeth." Those who just before were weeping and lamenting now laugh. But Jesus, with the parents and his own friends, steps to the bedside of the child, who is apparently dead, and, taking her by the hand, lifts her up with a kindly word (the Greek narrator has been pleased to preserve the Aramaic sound, *ταλιθά κούμ*). And now what was held to be impossible happens: the child stands up and makes efforts to walk. Jesus forbids the people to say much about the matter, and orders food to be offered to the sick girl (Mk. v. 21–43).

Criticism of the Story.—Here again we lack an accurate medical account of the form of the disease—apparent death, and return to life. All that we can assert is, that if the event had happened amongst us, no physician would have admitted afterwards that death had already taken place. And Jesus' words, "The child is not dead, but sleepeth," bear a remarkable resemblance to Paul's in Acts xx. 10, "Make ye no noise, for his life is in him." The words occur in the account given by Paul's companion, who was himself present

[1] That is to say, the cure, in accordance with a rule observed in other cases, was due to the effect produced upon the bodily condition of the sufferer by an idea which had grown up and become a force within her.

when the young man Eutychus in Troas, being overcome by sleep in the night, fell headlong from a window in the third story (Acts xx. 7–12). And yet the words of verse 9 are καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός ("and he was taken up dead"; not ὡς νεκρός, "as dead," or "for dead"). Evidently the author of the account in Acts thinks himself in a position to record that a resurrection from the dead was wrought by Paul. And as in this case Paul's companion was pleased to believe that a miracle was brought to pass by his greatly esteemed master—describing, as he does, how Paul cast himself upon the young man and embraced him, and afterwards feeling called upon to tell us how that 'they brought the lad alive' (*v.* 12, ἤγαγον δὲ τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα); so, here again, the happy parents and the disciples, inspired as they were by the belief in the greatness of Jesus, were certainly ready to believe that he had performed the greatest of miracles. Moreover, the act performed by Jesus on this occasion was unquestionably greater than Paul's, who, having evidently satisfied himself that life was still present in the young man, left the further treatment of him to others. Jesus' calmness and serenity, as contrasted with the excitement and despair of the others, saved the life which was ebbing away. But once more Jesus does not seek by his intervention to create a sensation; he only seeks to help.[1]

Other Instances of Awakening from the Dead.—The other two instances of awakening from the dead by Jesus recorded in the Gospels—that of the youth at Nain (Lk. vii. 11–17) and that of Lazarus (Jn. xi. 1–46)—are both of an essentially different character from the incident we have just considered. The evidence of their historicity is at once shown to be unsatisfactory by the fact that both miracles are performed in the presence of a gaping crowd (Lk. vii. 11—with Jesus ὄχλος πολύς; vii. 12—with the widow ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανός; Jn. xi. 42—διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα), and yet are not found to be recorded in the oldest Gospel. Moreover, in the Johannine account of the reawakening of Lazarus there

[1] It is obvious that in such a short account of so highly remarkable an occurrence many other questions remain. Yet this affords no ground whatever for rejecting the entire story as mythical, especially as it has been handed down in a Source which is otherwise trustworthy.

are two other circumstances to be taken into account. The tradition preserved by Mk. in regard to Jesus' last sojourn in Jerusalem, especially, is extremely minute, and narrates the events of each single day, thereby excluding the correctness, both in general and in particular, of the certainly later representation in Jn. There exists therefore no historical niche for the awakening of Lazarus. But in the parable of the poor man Lazarus the effect of his eventual resurrection is discussed (Lk. xvi. 27–31). This, doubtless, was what ultimately induced the writer to give the picture of the awakening from the dead as presented in Jn., for when we keep in view the conception of redemption contained in the Fourth Gospel, this could hardly have been passed over.[1]

The story of the youth at Nain is indeed far more unpretentiously told than that of the awakening of Lazarus; but a miracle such as this—the dead youth is carried out on a bier to the city gate, where Jesus awakens him in the presence of all the people and gives him to his mother, the lonely widow—could not be so readily forgotten as, let us say, a proverb or a parable, and yet Lk. is the only Evangelist who tells the story. How the story could have originated, it is difficult to say. In the Gospel of Lk. it takes its place before the story of the Baptist's message, because Jesus, in his answer to John, actually points to his awakening of the dead (Lk. vii. 22—*νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*). Still, an explanation of this reference might also be found in Lk. xv. 32, where it is said of the prodigal son, "Thy brother was dead and is alive again (*νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἔζησεν*)."[2]

In Nazareth.—After the resuscitation of Jairus' little daughter, Jesus goes away from Capernaum, actuated again by the same feeling which had caused him to depart early on the morning following his first Sabbath in the same city (Mk. i. 35–39). He had no wish to be a mere worker of miracles, and cause himself to be gazed at in wonder. He had a holier duty—that of preaching the need for repentance because of the nearness of the Kingdom of God; this duty

[1] Jn. xi. 25 f. indicates the subject illustrated by the story of the raising of Lazarus, more especially the sentence, *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται.*

[2] See Chap. IX., p. 219.

he owed, not only to the people beside the Lake of Gennesareth, but to the whole of his countrymen. Accordingly, he now sets out with his disciples and first wends his way to his native place Nazareth. If his kinsmen had tried in vain to tear him away from his new form of activity in Capernaum, and to induce him to resume his former handicraft, we can all the more readily understand that now, after having by his preaching and healing carried help and blessing to many at a distance from his native place, he should be desirous of labouring in Nazareth as well.

One Sabbath day he speaks there in the synagogue. It is evident that, when in his day the Evangelist Luke looked in the Mk. text for some indication of the contents of this same sermon, he was disappointed. To him it seemed the most natural thing that Jesus should make this public appearance in Nazareth the very first beginning of his ministry—though what seems the most obvious thing to human apprehension is not always the historically true state of the case. Accordingly, Lk. moves forward this sermon in Nazareth in advance of Jesus' first visit to Capernaum (Lk. iv. 31), and into immediate juxtaposition to the temptation (iv. 16–30), though, when this is done, it so happens that the people in Nazareth already remember what Jesus has wrought in Capernaum (iv. 23).[1] Lk. further communicates to his readers Jesus' discourse in Nazareth, together with the Prophetic passage which he at the same time expounded—namely, Isaiah lxi. 1 f.: "The Spirit of the Lord resteth upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me, to carry joyful tidings unto the wretched; because he hath sent me to bind those that are broken-hearted, to announce their liberation to the prisoners and a bright prospect to those that lie in chains, and to proclaim a year of good-will from the Lord." Such is the Old Testament text which Lk. quotes (iv. 18 f.) with not quite verbal accuracy. It is, indeed, very likely that Jesus did choose this passage, which he would certainly understand in

[1] At the same time, this very allusion to what has been done in Capernaum proves that, in his circumstantial account of the sermon in Nazareth, Lk. does not merely follow his own free play of fancy, but has before him a copy in which the proper chronological position of the narrative was still preserved.

a Messianic sense, as the text of his sermon. In his answer to the messengers of the Baptist, he had already made this very passage refer to his own labours (εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς). So he might very well declare, perhaps even with an allusion to what had taken place in Capernaum, "To-day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears."[1] Lk. may have taken this (iv. 16–21) from a good tradition.

On the other hand, the saying of the Lord in Lk. iv. 24–27 — undoubtedly genuine — alluding to the help rendered by Elijah and Elisha to the heathen at a time when there was great distress in Israel, does not belong to the synagogue of Nazareth. Jesus does indeed wish to help the people of Nazareth. He is, in fact, sent to them; but they will not accept his help. Jesus spoke the saying about Elijah and Elisha after he—the Messiah—had quitted Jewish territory, and was obliged to acquiesce in God's will as thus made known to him.

Possibly it was in Nazareth that Jesus heard the hard words "Physician, heal thyself" (Lk. iv. 23). Had not his own relatives in Nazareth at an earlier date announced it as their opinion, that he was not in his right mind (Mk. iii. 21—ὅτι ἐξέστη)? Accordingly, in Nazareth there came no throng of people about him seeking to be cured; and he laid his hands upon only a few sick folk and healed them (Mk. vi. 5). The principal hindrance to his success was that people in Nazareth remembered how he had laboured amongst them as a working builder, and knew all the many members of his house—his mother, his five brethren, and several sisters—and, it would appear, had not been specially impressed by them. They do indeed ask themselves whence it is Jesus derives this wisdom and these marvellous powers of healing. But they refuse to believe that he has a divine mission. They know perchance that whilst he laboured as a handicraftsman he now and then made mistakes.[2] Perhaps too they are able

[1] The allusion is, of course, to what people could both see and hear, just as in the answer given to the Baptist's disciples (Mt. xi. 4 = Lk. vii. 22).

[2] The infallible skill of Jesus in his handicraft is neither attested by history nor is it a fact which can be inferred from the nature of Christian faith. It is not well to be like the people of Nazareth and take offence at Jesus for such things as did belong to his handicraft, though not indeed to his real calling.

to tell this or the other story about his family that is not very edifying. Jesus gathers up the fruits of his experience in Nazareth in words to this effect: "If a prophet meets with recognition in his own home, amongst his own relatives, and in his own house, he will lack recognition nowhere." This lot then has not befallen him. Even his own kinsmen always refuse to admit his call as a prophet.

THE SENDING FORTH OF THE DISCIPLES.—Nazareth was only a stage in the continually expanding activity of Jesus. He travels about teaching in the villages (Mk. vi. 7). It may have been at this time that he went to Nain, on the south of Nazareth, and to Cana (*Kafr Kenna*), on the north (Lk. vii. 11, Jn. ii. 2, iv. 46). But it is during this same work of preaching that he perceives the necessity of winning people to help him. Accordingly, he resolves to send out the Twelve two by two (Mk. vi. 7)—in pairs, for then they might take counsel together and support one another.[1] Jesus is well aware that he is sending his disciples like sheep amongst wolves. Everywhere they will encounter hostility because of the peculiar nature of their preaching of repentance, which does not accord with the prevailing form of piety. Jesus therefore exhorts them to be knowing like serpents and guileless (pure, simply ἀκέραιοι — *integri*) like doves.[2] The disciples' task, then, is to preserve their own peculiar character purely and guilelessly in the midst of a hostile world (Mt. x. 16 = Lk. x. 3). It is necessary for him to send them forth, for the harvest is rich and the labourers are few. They must pray the Lord of the harvest to send labourers into his harvest (Mt. ix. 37 f. = Lk. x. 2). How pressing is the work of preaching is shown by Jesus' advice to his disciples to avoid the cities of the Samaritans and of the heathen. The lost sheep of the House of Israel are to be sought out before all others, and persuaded to return from their false paths. The disciples are not to tarry long in a town in which they suffer persecution, but are to flee into another. Nevertheless, Jesus declares, they will not have come to the end of all the cities

[1] This was no doubt the occasion on which Jesus spoke the Johannine parable of the shepherd. For its reconstruction, see Chap. II., pp. 37–39.

[2] As the dove is typical of the Holy Spirit (Gen. i. 2, viii. 8; and cp. Chap. VI., pp. 136 f.), so also it typifies the guileless pious mind.

of Israel before the Son of man comes—that is to say, the Son of man in the clouds (Dan. vii. 13). It is obviously a mistake here, from the prohibition to visit the towns of the Samaritans and the heathen, to infer that Jesus took a narrow Jewish view of things. He knows there can no longer be time to preach repentance in a sufficient manner to his own people before the day of judgment comes; accordingly, all the time that is left ought to be devoted to this ancient people of God (Mt. x. 5 f., 23).[1]

The equipment of the disciples for their journey was to be as simple as possible; they were to set out, having only one coat, with sandals on their feet, their staff in their hand, but without bread, without wallet, without the copper money in their girdle (no other coins were struck in Palestine).[2] For though they do not proclaim the Gospel for the sake of money—they have received it for nothing, and give it again for nothing[3]—the labourer is worth his keep, and they may boldly accept food and lodging (Mk. vi. 8, Mt. x. 8 f.). Beyond this, Jesus gives them very special instructions. Wheresoever they enter in, be it town or village, they are to look about for a house worthy to receive them. They are not to go from house to house begging; but, as Jesus himself dwelt continuously in Peter's house in Capernaum, so, in every place

[1] It might, of course, be objected, that the idea of the universality of the judgment leaves no sufficient reason for restricting the disciples' work to the Jewish people, and that the heathen were perhaps even in more urgent need of the disciples' preaching than the Jews, since to the latter had been given the Law and the Prophets. The justness of the objection may be granted. But against it we have to set the belief in the election of Israel, the home-feeling of the disciples, and the fact that their language would only be intelligible on their native soil. These may well have been the reasons by which Jesus was influenced.

[2] Mark vi. 8 is therefore right in giving only μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν; whereas the local colour is lost when Lk. (ix. 3) has ἀργύριον instead of χαλκὸς, and in Mt. x. 9 all three are mentioned—χρυσός, ἄργυρος, and χαλκός. This, of course, is not to say that no gold and silver could have been in circulation in Palestine at the time; though indeed these coins were relatively scarce.

[3] The instruction given by the Scribes ought also to be free (*Pirkê Ābōth*, i. 13, iv. 5). Paul lays great stress upon his never having taken anything, at least from the churches of Achæa (1 Cor. ix. 6–18, 2 Cor. xi. 7–11; and compare also 1 Thess. ii. 9).

they come to, his disciples ought also to abide in one particular house all the time they remain in that place, and they should have no scruple in claiming the hospitality of the host. Their greeting of peace will bring blessing to the house. Then again, they are to heal the sick, as Jesus did, and to proclaim the nearness of the Kingdom of God. If, however, they are not received, then shall they proclaim publicly in the streets of the town or village, that they do not wish to carry with them out of such an inhospitable place even the dust that cleaves to their feet. But let the inhabitants bear in mind that the Kingdom of God is knocking at their doors! Jesus declares that on that day (the day of Judgment) it will be more tolerable for Sodom than for such a place. Perchance this saying may have sounded too presumptuous in the ears of the disciples; so Jesus adds, "He that hears you, hears me, and he that depreciates you, depreciates me, and he that depreciates me, depreciates Him that sent me." A prophet's words are not ignored with impunity (Mk. vi. 10 f., Mt. x. 7. f, 11–15, 40, Lk. x. 5–12, 16).[1]

Impression in Galilee.—At this point we find a serious lacuna in our tradition that is greatly to be regretted. We are told nothing about the duration or geographical extent of the disciples' work as preachers; nor do we learn anything more about Jesus' own activity during the same period. Mk. says merely, that Jesus' name now became so well known that even the ruler of Galilee, Herod Antipas, was concerned about him. But, whereas others made up their minds that Jesus was either as much a prophet as the prophets of former times, or, it might even be, the Elijah who was to go before the Messiah (Mal. iii. 23 f.)—a rôle which Jesus himself assigned to the Baptist (Mk. ix. 12 f., Mt. xi. 14)[2]—Herod Antipas declares that Jesus is the beheaded Baptist himself, returned again from the realms of death, and thus

[1] Here again Jesus does not in any sense proclaim himself as the Messiah; the self-consciousness of the prophet would alone be sufficient to enable him to make such a declaration. Besides, this same prophet has the nearness of the divine judgment proclaimed by the mouth of his disciples; and such as do not believe their preaching are not preparing themselves for God's judgment.

[2] Cp. pp. 121 f. and 221.

become endowed with special powers of healing (Mk. vi. 14–16). It was, of course, very natural to compare the two men; both preached repentance for the sake of the nearness of the heavenly kingdom, and in a form entirely alien to the preaching of the Scribes. It was the ruler's uneasy conscience, and the accounts of Jesus' miraculous cures, that led him in the end to look upon Jesus as none other than the Baptist risen from the dead.[1]

At all events, this seems to have been the happiest moment in the public career of Jesus. Great though the hostility is which he encounters, yet highly also is he honoured. His disciples proclaim, in his name and by his command, repentance for the sake of the coming of the kingdom of Heaven; and he transfers to them, in a high degree of potency, his own peculiar character—a fact which is, above all, proved by the circumstance, that they also, through their own personal influence, effect cures.

RETURN OF THE DISCIPLES.—The day on which Jesus' disciples met him again was a day of great joy for him. This again no doubt happened in the vicinity of Capernaum, probably in Capernaum itself (according to Mk. vi. 31 f., it was in an inhabited place beside the Lake of Gennesareth). The disciples reported to him all they had done and all they had taught (Mk. vi. 30). They themselves are astonished and delighted at their success; "Lord, even the evil spirits obey us in thy name," says one of them (Lk. x. 17). And Jesus has, of course, so far as he possibly could, attentively followed their labours all the time, and rejoiced too in that activity of theirs which was so full of blessing. In the figurative language of the Jewish Apocalyptic—language familiar to him from his youth—he says to them, "I saw Satan hurled like lightning out of heaven" (Lk. x. 18). This is an allusion to an ancient myth, well-known to both

[1] He cannot, of course, have had any clear idea of Jesus' ministry, else he could not fail to have been struck with the simultaneity in the beginning of Jesus' labours and the conclusion of the Baptist's. It is, however, open to question whether Antipas spoke only figuratively, meaning "Jesus continues the work of John, who was beheaded"; only, this view of the case seems to break down in view of an explanation such as Antipas gives of Jesus' miraculous cures.

the Semitic and Indo-Germanic races ; according to this, the enemy of the gods climbs up the mountain of the gods, but is thence ignominiously flung back into the abyss (cp., in the Old Testament, Isa. xiii. 12–15 ; and, in the New Testament, Rev. xii. 7–9). In this imagery, Jesus points, of course, to the success of his disciples in their work of preaching repentance : in other words, through them the rule of Satan is broken. Here we again perceive that under the idea of driving out demons is embraced the healing of physical and moral afflictions. In making their report, the disciples no doubt have especially in mind those unsettled and distraught spirits who, through their instrumentality, have been reclaimed to an orderly manner of life ; Jesus, when he uses the expression, is thinking, above all, of the amendment and conversion of the masses[1] who have been stirred by his disciples' preaching. Yet, greatly as he rejoices with them in their success, Jesus warns his disciples not to let their pride in these good deeds outweigh their joy at belonging themselves to the kingdom of Heaven. "Behold," he says to them (Lk. x. 19 f.), "I have given you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, power over every force of the enemy, and nothing shall hurt you. Nevertheless, do not rejoice that the spirits are obedient unto you, but rejoice that your names are inscribed in heaven." The opening words of this utterance breathe again the steadfastness and security with which Jesus would also have his followers be equipped. They need have no anxiety, even though they are obliged to pass over serpents and scorpions ; nothing will harm them. Let them therefore at all times have good confidence.[2] Yet, though they are now able to look back upon such great success in the service of the coming kingdom of God, the greatest good which they can point to as resulting from their labours is, not the wonderful power now become immanent in them, but the assurance that they themselves

[1] Cp. Chap. IX., pp. 194 ff.

[2] Jesus speaks to them in this way, because he knows that they belong even now to the future kingdom of God, as he himself does—and that in consequence of his own influence upon them. Therefore, no permanent harm can come to them, though they may indeed encounter passing afflictions. Cp. Mk. xvi. 18.

belong to the kingdom of God. They who labour in such blessed wise for the kingdom of God may be sure, at the same time, that their names are inscribed in heaven—that is to say, in the Book of Life (Rev. xx. 12, 15).

Thus, to the great joy with which they are already filled Jesus adds another and higher matter of congratulation—the fact that for his disciples the judgment possesses no terrors. And, in this same moment, Jesus feels certain that he, the Messiah, has already won on earth a community of followers, who in the future epoch soon about to dawn upon the world shall not be torn away from him.[1] Then, on his own part, he bursts forth into words of thanks to God—"I praise Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast concealed these things from the wise and discerning, but hast revealed them unto babes; yea, Father, for so it appeared good unto thee" (Lk. x. 21 f. = Mt. xi. 25 f.). Jesus, it appears, is thankful that, of all people, those who are simple and inexperienced gladly listen to his preaching and the preaching of his disciples, whereas the wise and discerning, that is to say, the scholars of the Scribes, despise it. He would, of course, have preferred it, had all without exception allowed his preaching to rouse them to the same degree of enthusiasm. But if it is ever to be a question whether the Scribes or the laity accept his sayings, he thanks God when the great multitude of the unlearned is for him, let the proud company of the Scribes turn away from him as they will.[2] And in the joyful assurance of the truth and justness of his cause, he adds, "Everything"—that is to say, everything that the un-

[1] Jesus makes no exceptions whatever. That is to say, at this period he met with every confidence even the disciple who afterwards betrayed him, including him also in the group of those whose names are inscribed in heaven. The presupposition made in Jn. vi. 70 f., that Jesus at quite an early date recognised who it was that should betray him, finds no support in the Synoptic tradition. Cp. also Mt. xix. 28 = Lk. xxii. 30.

[2] The "wise and discerning" had not therefore been won by the preaching of the disciples. The manner of the Scribes would not accord well with the natural, unconventional manner of the prophets. And, as both the Scribes and the disciples were bent upon winning the multitude, a conflict now threatened to arise; this, however, is not able at the present moment to detract from his joy.

learned understand, but which the wise do not grasp—has been delivered[1] to me by my Father"—in other words, I have received this tradition, not from the Scribes, but from God—"and no man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, nor who the Father is but the Son and he to whom the Son shall reveal it" (Lk. x. 22 = Mt. xi. 27). When he says, "No one knoweth who the Son is but the Father," Jesus is manifestly struggling with himself. Ought he not now, in this the moment of such great success, when, filled as he is with gratitude to his disciples, he has just assured them of their participation in the kingdom of God, to confide to them his long-concealed secret, and proclaim it publicly? But, as though he had already said too much in the first part of his sentence, he adds a second clause ("nor who the Father is but the Son and he to whom the Son shall reveal it"); from this addition his disciples are led to infer that his reason for calling himself the Son of God is to be found in the singular character of his understanding of God—a singularity which is indeed evident to all. The concluding words suggest a lofty degree of self-confidence. Jesus realises that *he* alone knows God. This, notwithstanding Israel's ancient belief, that it had received a revelation of him in the Law and in the Prophets. He realises that in his preaching he goes beyond this Old Testament revelation. And then, that he may show forthwith who it is to whom the Son will reveal God's nature, he cries, "Come unto me all ye that are wretched and burdened. I will comfort you. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light" (Mt. xi. 28–30). The same people who have just been called unlearned ("babes") on account of their lack of education are now, because of the place they occupy in

[1] Παρεδόθη is certainly to be understood to mean the handing over of the doctrine, and not the delivering over of a vicegerency in the world-sovereignty of God, to which the Messiah has indeed a claim. The πάντα of Lk. x. 22 can only refer back to the ταῦτα of *v.* 21, and γινώσκει in what follows corresponds to the preceding μοι παρεδόθη. Besides, it would have been an unambiguous proclamation of Messiahship, had Jesus declared, "The world is delivered over to me by my Father." But Jesus did not thus early announce himself to be the Messiah (Mt. xvi. 17).

the social scale, called wretched and burdened; they are the poor, to whom is brought the glad tidings of the kingdom of God (Lk. iv. 18, vi. 20, vii. 22; Mt. xi. 5). To these depressed and oppressed ones Jesus promises inward comfort, if only they will come to him and take upon them his yoke, that is to say, God's will as he (Jesus) preaches it, and will learn from him gentleness and humble resignation.[1] True, it *is* a yoke they are to take in addition to their present load; they are to add a burden to the burden they already bear. But this yoke is easy, and this burden is light. Jesus, we are to infer, knows God's will better than all who have preceded him; he realises that they who live according to the will of God will not be heavily oppressed by it, but, on the contrary, will find in it a source of comfort in every affliction of life. And Jesus chooses just this moment, when such comfort has been brought by him and his disciples to many who were in affliction, to express the wish, that he may be able to convey this same comfort to *all* who have need of it. Yet to-day the conviction is again forced upon him, when he hears the reports of his disciples, more than ever before, that the kingdom of God is not merely to be established around him in the future, but is already actually in existence in the present. Then he turns once again to his disciples, who are so full of joy and yet really have at the most a premonition of the greatest, the most glorious thing that can happen, namely, the actual presence of the kingdom of God round about them, without their, as yet, properly understanding what it means. "Blessed," he cries to them, "are the eyes which see what ye see, and the ears which hear what ye hear! For I say unto you, many prophets and kings wished to behold what ye behold, and yet saw it not, and to hear what ye hear, and yet heard it not." This is equivalent to saying: The hopes of a David, of an Isaiah—as these hopes were understood by the Jewish people in the time of Jesus—are fulfilled in your midst; the

[1] To suppose that these traits, πραύς καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, may be taken by themselves as exhaustively describing the peculiar character of Jesus is, however, a mistake. All that Jesus intends by these words is to set himself forth as a pattern of proper submission to God's will. We are not told what features his character assumes through this submission.

kingdom of God is already come; it is not merely about to come immediately (Lk. xiii. 23 f. = Mt. xiii. 16 f.).

JESUS IN THE EYES OF HIS DISCIPLES.—To one who reflects and looks back, it may seem strange that the disciples could thus believe in Jesus' unique knowledge of God, and could also believe in the presence of the kingdom of God, without looking upon Jesus as the Messiah. And it may seem stranger still that Jesus should designate himself in their hearing as the son who alone knows the Father, without one of them being prompted to exclaim, "Art thou then the Son of God, the Messiah?" Yet upon a closer investigation all grounds for astonishment disappear. Jesus owed his fame to his preaching and his healing. Both were practised in a remote region of Galilee. The people who were gathered about him were publicans, fishermen, and perhaps also peasants. The Messiah was not expected either to preach or to heal; at least, that was not the kind of activity[1] he was expected primarily to exhibit. But it was expected that, as king of peace, he would rule over his eternal kingdom. His appearance was not looked for in Galilee (cp. Jn. vii. 41), but in Jerusalem, the spiritual and political capital of the Jewish people. Besides, what Jesus described as the presence of the kingdom of God may have seemed to the majority of people merely a slight foretaste of the great glory of the future; so that even the person who brought these good things may not have appeared to them to be more than a forerunner of the Messiah. Greatly as the people valued the truth which Jesus brought, and by which he founded a type of piety antagonistic to that of the Pharisees, and highly as they thought of his work as a healer, yet there was a vast gap between such an attitude of veneration for the Master and the full consciousness that Jesus was the future Messiah. And to most people the gap was no doubt rendered impassable by Jesus himself, for he spoke constantly of the approaching dawn of the kingdom of God, and, when so speaking, described the Messiah as the

[1] True, Jn. iv. 25 speaks of a teaching mission on the part of the Messiah. But it is doubtful whether what is there reproduced is the popular idea (of the Samaritans, moreover). Enoch xlv. 3 and similar passages refer to the wisdom of the Messiah as ruler and judge.

Son of Man who was coming from Heaven.[1] It was, of course, very difficult to identify the preacher of repentance, living in very humble circumstances, with the king of the future world, who had his dwelling in the immediate presence of God. Hence, when Jesus said that none but the son knows the Father, they may have been content to marvel at his lofty self-confidence, without drawing further inferences from the fact.

LEGENDS ABOUT JESUS.—The disciples, then, have not yet recognised that Jesus is the Messiah. At the same time, his figure seems to have gradually begun to grow upon their vision, until it assumed the dimensions of the wonderful and the supernatural. We now enter upon the period of great miracles—miracles performed for the purpose not merely of alleviating human distress, but also in a special way of exhibiting the greatness of Jesus. While in many cases, no doubt, enthusiasm for Jesus personally contributed towards an exaggeration of the miracle, now even the best tradition begins to embellish, and at the same time obscure, Jesus' public work with legendary narratives.

FEEDING THE MULTITUDE.—After the reunion at Capernaum with his disciples who had been sent forth (cp. pp. 281 f.), Jesus withdraws with them into an uninhabited district, in order to obtain a short respite. His sole object was no doubt to be alone with them, before they were again separated. But Jesus and his disciples find that solitude is no longer attainable. In Capernaum itself, amid the pressure of the crowd of people constantly coming and going, they found no time even to eat (Mk. vi. 31, and compare iii. 20). When they embark and seek a lonely place, their course is observed from the shore, and at once a multitude of people from all quarters flock to the place they are making for. And, although what Jesus was seeking was rest in the company of his own followers, nevertheless he has compassion upon the people, who seem to him, since he is unable to

[1] In his preaching of repentance Jesus assumed that his contemporaries would live to see the coming of the kingdom of God (see Chap. VIII., pp. 159 f.). The other side to this picture was that he himself was expected to be still dwelling on earth when the Messiah should come from Heaven. This precluded any idea that perhaps Jesus himself was the Messiah.

regard the Scribal preachers as their destined pastors, like a flock without a shepherd. He teaches them, and to such an extent do they hang upon his words that, in the meantime, they forget to eat and drink. In consequence of this, there arises for Jesus a new duty, a task such as he has not so far been confronted with. Down to the present moment his helpful love has been manifested, apart from the evidence of it in his preaching, principally by his work as a healer. Now, however, he finds himself constrained not to let these people, mostly poor folk, and some of them living at a distance, depart from him without food of some kind. When he communicates his resolve to the disciples, the smallness of their own stores and the great number of those who are in need of food awaken misgivings in them. Yet here again Jesus maintains that cheerful, unfaltering confidence of his. The task is accomplished in such a manner that all are satisfied.

In Mk. vi. 35–44 we read that Jesus fed five thousand people with five loaves and two fishes. Later on Mk. (viii. 1–10) relates a second event of a precisely similar character; in this case the hunger of four thousand persons is satisfied with seven loaves and a few fishes. Having once succeeded in feeding a multitude in this way, it was, of course, only natural that Jesus should come forward and help in the same way on another occasion. Such a person as he, knowing all the needs and exigencies of life, never forgetting the man who stood or sat before him, may well have felt really heartfelt joy in thus feeding the hungry. On the other hand, the numbers given cannot be accepted as historical. On the one occasion, twelve baskets of fragments are afterwards gathered up from the five loaves; on the other, seven baskets from the seven loaves. So, on both occasions there are actually more fragments after the feeding than there was bread before it. We are to understand that the bread increased whilst passing through Jesus' hand. But if this were so, it would mean the accomplishment of an extremely remarkable interference with Nature for a relatively slight purpose; the only effect of it would probably have been to divert attention from Jesus' preaching of repentance and direct it towards the great miracle-worker. No; in these,

as in other cases, Jesus simply desired to help; he had, in fact, long ago made up his mind that he would not evoke belief in himself personally by the performance of miracles (Mt. iv. 5–7, Lk. iv. 9–12).[1]

WALKING ON THE LAKE.—With the first story of the feeding of the multitude Mk. (vi. 45–52) connects the account of Jesus walking on the lake. The disciples set sail across the lake towards Bethsaida, situated on the east side of the embouchure of the Jordan into the Lake of Gennesareth. Jesus has remained behind. Then, after he has dismissed the multitude, he goes up into the mountain to pray. During their passage, the disciples encounter a violent tempest. This Jesus perceives from the shore. Then, about the fourth watch of the night, he comes to them walking over the lake. He is about to go on past them. They all see him, and are terrified, being unable to believe that it is he, and they cry out aloud; but Jesus steps into the vessel, and immediately the wind ceases.

This is a heightening of what took place when Jesus, during the storm on the lake, bade the wind be still. The story cannot be true historically. This is shown even by the time data, from which we learn that Jesus came to the disciples about the fourth watch of the night, that is, between three and six o'clock in the morning. Now, the greatest length of the lake is only thirteen miles. None of our accounts, however, leads us at all to suppose that Jesus with his disciples was either south of Tiberias on the west shore or south of Hippos (*Sûsiyeh*) on the east shore. And as the greatest breadth of the lake does not exceed seven miles, a voyage of four hours' duration would, even in bad weather, have been extraordinarily long. And no one will venture to suppose that the disciples did not leave Jesus until eleven o'clock at

[1] If the stories of feeding the multitudes are thus divested of their wonderful character, they lose, of course, at the same time all force as evidence of Jesus' omnipotence; and it is difficult to understand why this omnipotence in every case only affords help of such a transitory nature. On the other hand, the story, even as we have it, affords another instance of Jesus' thoughtful love, and, in exchange for the omnipotence hitherto admired, we have a fresh and vigorous courage of faith, which succeeds in accomplishing even what is apparently impossible, because it is bold enough to attempt it.

night, and that Jesus did not until that late hour take leave of the throng which was gathered about him. Consequently, the story lacks historical foundation. But, on the other hand, it becomes quite intelligible as soon as we interpret it allegorically.[1] In their distress, the disciples are utterly at their wits' end, and their helplessness continues "on into the night and again into the morning." But when their need is at the sorest, their Saviour comes to them: the eye that is looking eagerly for deliverance believes that it sees divine help in the moment of its peril; yet it fancies that what it sees is an illusion soon to vanish; it does not at first dare to believe that it is the Saviour who is actually near. It is only when the heart lays firm hold upon these ideas of God's help that calmness ensues, just as in the story the tempest ceases as soon as Jesus has stepped into the vessel.

If Jesus had actually walked over the waves of the tumultuous lake to his disciples, if the storm had suddenly passed away as he stepped into the boat, it would no longer have been possible for anyone who took part in that voyage to have any doubt at all as to Jesus' supernatural character. But, so far as we are able to gather, none of them was at that time definitely persuaded that Jesus was possessed of supernatural attributes. At any rate, none of them openly confessed that he had arrived at any such conviction; the later story of the avowal of Peter shows this (Mk. viii. 27–36, Mt. xvi. 13–20).

Last Works of Healing.—The Evangelist Mk. closes these stories of the miraculous feeding of the multitude and of Jesus' walking across the lake with an allusion to a vast number of healing acts, which also were now, it would seem, performed by Jesus in the plain of Gennesareth and in its towns and villages (Mk. vi. 53–56). The object of Mk. is evidently to signalise the culminating point of Jesus' public ministry. But this activity, so rich and so abounding in blessings, is suddenly brought to a close by an apparently trivial cause.

[1] The question as to who was the author of the allegory cannot be answered. But, of the whole of the New Testament writings, there are only very few that we can safely trace back to their actual authors. Hence, to require the name of the originator of an individual Gospel story is really to ask too much.

SCRIBES FROM JERUSALEM.—Those members of the great party of the Pharisees, belonging to that part of the Lake of Gennesareth which Jesus made the scene of his activity, come to him with Scribes from Jerusalem. It is not clear whether these Scribes had been summoned by the Pharisees of the district, or whether they had come of their own accord, or whether, again, they had travelled thither at the request of the Synedrium of Jerusalem, to inquire into this new religious movement which was creating so much excitement. At any rate, the Scribes from the capital might expect to be received with special honour in the villages beside the lake; and the Pharisees no doubt counted upon the opinion of these distinguished men making an impression upon the populace.[1] Now, there were many grounds of complaint against Jesus. He had promised forgiveness of sins; he did not fast; in his intercourse with men he did not hold aloof from the "people of the country"; but, besides this, he had actually permitted the ordinance of the Sabbath, sanctified as it was by the Law, to be transgressed, and above all had in his public discourse defended his new kind of piety as against the religious practices hitherto in vogue. Yet the Jerusalem Scribes do not attack Jesus on the ground of matters of this kind, which had come to their knowledge by hearsay; they grapple with him on the very first occasion that offers itself to them when they are themselves eye-witnesses.

(*a*) WASHING OF HANDS.—They observe that Jesus' disciples do not wash their hands before eating. From a religious point of view, one might imagine this to be a quite unimportant matter. But Jewish custom had placed upon even the most external acts the sanction of a sacred duty; and though the washing of hands before meat was not prescribed by the Law, yet it had a place in the tradition of the elders, and was one of those sacred customs (*Halakhah*) which later

[1] A special deputation from the Synedrium of Jerusalem would not be inconceivable. The Fourth Gospel presupposes that the Baptist was questioned by a similar deputation concerning his right to baptise (Jn. i. 19–28). The sending forth of the twelve disciples two by two had, to say the least, made it possible for a great impression to be made upon the whole country. And if the Synedrium had heard of this, it might conceive it to be its duty to inquire into the matter, and, if need were, to intervene.

Judaism ranked as quite equal to the Law; it was the Synedrium that ordained it, and the duty of guarding such customs, and of handing them on from generation to generation, had been committed to these very Scribes.[1]

(*b*) JESUS AGAINST TRADITION.—Jesus now declares point-blank that he refuses absolutely to have anything to do with the tradition of the elders, and pronounces upon it a harsh judgment. These requirements, which are declared to be obligatory, and which even now the Jerusalem magnates sought to enforce anew, seem to him to be arbitrary enactments of men, and, while they are receiving attention, God's holy commandments are neglected. Such pious zeal in matters having nothing to do with real piety Jesus describes as a kind of hypocrisy, and to the representatives of it he applies the words of Isaiah (xxix. 13), "This people honour me indeed with their lips, but their heart is far from me; vainly do they serve me while they teach only the precepts of men." Here we certainly have another case of brusque denunciation of the customs pronounced holy by Jerusalem, just as on earlier occasions Jesus had set himself against the exclusiveness of the Pharisees, against the conventional fasts, and against the ordinance of the Sabbath. But Jesus shows as clearly as possible that he draws a sharp line of distinction between this officious justification by works, which claims to be the one and only right way, and the true fear of God. "Ye have abandoned God's command and hold fast to the tradition of men."

It was one of the characteristic traits of Jewish Scribal

[1] The phrase *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* admits of a double interpretation. *Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* is the title of the elders of the people (Mk. viii. 31, xi. 27, xiv. 43, 53, xv. 1, similarly in the parallel passages in Mt. and Lk.; Lk., too, has the alternative *τὸ πρεσβυτέριον*—Lk. xxii. 66 and Acts xxii. 5). According to this, the *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβύτερων* would mean the custom recommended, or enjoined, by the elders (the nobles) of the people. It was called *παράδοσις* because it rested on tradition, and was not based on arbitrary regulations. This explanation is better than that which would make *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* equivalent to *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι* (Mt. v. 21, 33, "the men of antiquity"), for though the latter suits the idea of *παράδοσις* very well, it is in conflict with the sense in which *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* is so often used. What the Scribes from Jerusalem therefore call attention to is Jesus' contradiction of the canons issued from Jerusalem. This further makes it probable that their action was the result of a commission officially entrusted to them.

learning, that the pupil was expected to take hold of his teacher's words with the most scrupulous and careful exactitude—"he should be like a well-plastered well, which lets no water escape" (*Pirkê Ābōth*, ii. 8). In other words, submission to the school was absolute; and what Jesus perceives to be missing is submission of the school to the command of God.[1] And he illustrates his meaning by giving a particularly clear instance; he points to the commandment that one should honour one's father and mother, and to the threat of punishment by death against anyone who curses his father and mother—a threat contained in the Law (Exod. x. 12, Deut. v. 16—Exod. xxi. 17). In contrast with this he places a precept of the Scribes, "But ye say" (ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε)—meaning, of course, that here again they refer for their authority to what has become their tradition; at all events, he does not anticipate any contradiction when he declares that what he is about to say is the view of the Scribes. Jesus then proceeds to quote a piece of Scribal teaching, which permits a son to convert the means that ought properly to support his parents into a bequest to the temple. A donation to the temple takes precedence over the duty of supporting a man's parents; this is quite contrary to what Jesus considers to be right. On another occasion he said that it is more important to be reconciled with one's brother than to make an offering (Mt. v. 23 f.). Again, while he thinks the Law is too severe with regard to the Sabbath, he holds that it is too lenient on the question of divorce (Mk. ii. 23—iii. 6, x. 5). When he enumerates those commandments of God obedience to which secures participation in the life eternal, he cites from the ten precisely those which deal with man's social relations (Mk. x. 19). By the side of the acknowledged highest commandment, to love God—a commandment repeated daily by the Jew in his morning and evening prayers (see pp. 260 f.)—Jesus places, for the purpose of explaining it, the little-known commandment, to love one's neighbour (Mk. xii. 29–31). Thus, in every case Jesus esteems the duty of divine worship as of less account, compared with that which is owing to

[1] This was an astonishing thing to say, in so far as Scribal erudition knew apparently no higher goal than absolute obedience to God's law.

our fellow-men.[1] So also in the present case he condemns the advice of the Scribes; he feels that the support of one's parents is far too sacred a duty to be supplanted by a donation to the temple. Hence he cries to the Scribes who have challenged his words, "So of a truth ye make God's commandment of none effect, in order to safeguard your tradition." And now they actually wish to be looked upon as faithful guardians of pious custom!

(*c*) CLEAN AND UNCLEAN.—Jesus' words amounted to a point-blank declaration of war against the whole of the current system of piety. But he is obliged to say something more to the Jerusalem Scribes; now it is on the question of purity, for they have noted the omission of his disciples to wash their hands before meat. However, he no longer addresses himself to them. Since he does not acknowledge their authority, the tradition of the elders, he stands condemned in their eyes, and all further dispute seems profitless. Hence he turns[2] to the crowd about him, and says, "Hear me, all ye, and understand!" He is fully conscious, therefore, that he is now about to give utterance to important words—words of far-reaching consequence. "There is nothing outside a man that defileth him by simply coming near to him; but what goeth out of a man, this it is that defileth him." We have here, just as in the question of the Sabbath, not merely a breach with the Pharisaic tradition, but a breach with the Law, only in this case it is of a far more radical kind. If a man is not made impure by anything that approaches him from without, he cannot well be made impure in a religious sense by a reputedly leprous garment or leprous house (Lev. xiii. 47–58, xiv. 35–53). Jesus has, of course, no idea of disputing the fact that things from without may come to a man and defile him physically; but by "impure"

[1] This again exhibits, though from another side, the value attached by Jesus to the duty of love, which figures so prominently in the great discourse on the judgment (see Chap. VIII., pp. 171 ff.). If at God's judgment the criterion for judging the individual is simply the practical help and encouragement which he has shown to his fellow-men, it necessarily follows that purely ceremonial duties must yield to moral obligations.

[2] The Evangelist describes the situation in strong terms, *προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* (Mk. vii. 14). The crowd comes nearer; this action paves the way for an important declaration.

the Jews understand "blameworthy in the sight of God." According to the explanation given to his disciples immediately afterwards, Jesus was thinking also of those external things which a man consciously, and of deliberate purpose, takes to himself, above all of "impure" food; he may further also have had in mind the disease which comes upon a man against his will, as well as contact with the sick, the dead, and with other forms of reputed uncleanness. He disavows, then, altogether the Mosaic legislation as to purity, to which such extreme importance was attached by the Jews, particularly as laid down in Lev. xi.–xv., Num. v. 1–4, xix.[1] The reason the Jews laid so much stress upon these commandments was that they regarded them as marking the wall of division between Israel and the heathen. But in Jesus' opinion the real worth of a man in God's eyes is determined solely by what may be considered to be the expression of his inner nature. The worth of a man in God's eyes depends solely upon his character.

(*d*) EXPLANATION TO HIS DISCIPLES.—The idea is one which was no less completely subversive of Jewish thought than it was vitally important for the history of religion. But that Jesus really did mean this, by the words he addressed to the crowd, is shown by the conversation he had with his disciples, a conversation appended to this utterance. The disciples inform Jesus that the Pharisees are grievously offended at his exposition. Then he says, referring to the reputation of his adversaries, "Every plant which my Father has not planted shall be rooted up. Let them be; they are blind leaders of the blind, and when one blind man leads another, they will both fall into the pit." Jesus, then, has no fear of his adversaries, notwithstanding the number of their adherents. He lives in the confident conviction that what is inwardly false cannot endure for ever. He will not, there-

[1] This was even a far more thorough-going repudiation of the Law than that contained in the explanation about the Sabbath (Mk. ii. 23–28). The widespread habit, due to the old dogmatic writers, of showing Jesus, as far as possible, to be in harmony with the Law is often an obstacle to the understanding of this saying, though it is one which, taken as it stands, it is hardly possible to misapprehend.

fore, contend further against these blind persons who are incapable of seeing the will of God, well knowing that they and their followers must, without further struggle on his part, lose the battle in the end.[1] Then the disciples themselves ask him the meaning of this brief saying. Accordingly, he makes it clear to them by the example of the foods which are taken and voided by men without affecting the heart—the heart being, according to ancient ideas, the centre of intellectual life. What thus, in a sense, passes by the innermost *being* of a man has no influence upon his personal merit. On the other hand, from within, from the heart, proceed the evil thoughts which defile a man and lower his moral worth.[2]

(*e*) LEAGUE WITH BEELZEBUL.—Jesus did not fear his adversaries; but he speedily found himself compelled once more to confront them. He heard that the Jerusalem Scribes, whose position was, as they realised, appreciably strengthened since his blunt declaration against the Law, were publicly warning the people against himself, saying that though he did indeed drive out evil spirits, he did so through the power of Beelzebul. This name is not, of course, to be taken as a variant of the name of the old Philistine god Baal-zebub of Ekron, whose oracle Ahaziah, King of Israel, sent to consult when his messengers were met on their way by the prophet Elijah (2 Ki. i. 1–8); but is one of the very many names of spirits, freely invented by later Judaism, and means "Lord of the Dwelling." If Beelzebul is the lord of the demons, he can give Jesus power over the demons. True, this was to admit that works rich in blessing did flow from Jesus; but the idea, that good was scattered abroad by an evil power to the intent that it might in the end rule men all the more surely, was by no means

[1] It is the nearness of the kingdom of God that makes him so certain of this. He might have been expected to endeavour to save these blind people; but he knows human nature, and is aware that in cases like these the person who makes advances is more likely to repel than to attract.

[2] This is equivalent to saying, that a will ever set to do what is good is the truly pious individual's highest end. It is in this, and not in the observance of usages hallowed by some kind of convention, that the real merit of a man consists. Goodness of character is the one thing required of a man by God.

uncommon in that age.[1] Paul also is aware that Satan often changes himself and appears in the form of an angel of light (2 Cor. xi. 14). A similar idea was now made to tell against Jesus. Nor need it be wondered at; for did not all the good proceeding from him seem to serve what, in the eyes of a Jew, was the most pernicious of purposes, the destruction of the holy treasure of Israel, to wit, the Law? This assertion of the Scribes, that Jesus drove out devils as a minister of the devil, without doubt produced a great effect.

Jesus' answer to the accusation is this: "If Satan fought against Satan, then the kingdom of the evil one would be divided against itself, and his dominion would fall to pieces." The driving-out of the demons would thus be a good sign, if Beelzebul really had given him the power to drive away evil spirits. The overcoming of evil is therefore under all circumstances a good thing. Jesus then goes on to say, "He who forces his way into a strong man's house, and plunders his goods, must first have bound the strong man." Jesus cannot drive out evil spirits, if he himself is under the spell of an evil spirit. No one can become master over unclean spirits who is not himself inwardly clean. Consequently, it is through the help of God (literally through the finger of God; ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, Lk. xi. 20), that he drives out evil spirits; and this ought to be a sign that the kingdom of God is already come in anticipation. So, then, Jesus meets the accusation, that he owes to unclean spirits his power over unclean spirits, by opposing to it the idea that the highest degree of blessing, the kingdom of God, is already anticipated in his own works. And it is the joyful certainty of this that gives him courage and strength to meet such an outrageous slander.[2]

[1] This is the only way in which the accusation in Mk. iii. 22 is intelligible: "He hath Beelzebul, and by the Lord of the demons he driveth demons out." That is to say, Jesus himself is thought of as being possessed by Beelzebul; βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει is, of course, equivalent to δαιμόνιον ἔχει in Mt. xi. 18, Lk. vii. 33, viii. 27, Jn. vii. 20, viii. 48–52. The accusation is put most clearly in Mk. iii. 30—πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει. But this evil spirit in him at first does good, in order that it may totally destroy those who are thus misled by it.

[2] That is to say, Jesus opposes to the calumny, that he is in the power of an evil spirit, the suggestion that he must himself have overcome evil, else he could not drive out evil spirits. This is, of course, only an explanation

(*f*) UNPARDONABLE SIN.—Yet one other serious word of warning does he speak ; let these calumniators take note of it. He declares that all sins and all calumnies may be forgiven to the sons of men with one single exception: he who utters slander against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven ; he saddles himself with an eternal load of guilt. Jesus knows that ever since his baptism he has been impelled by the holy spirit of God ; but his adversaries say he is possessed of Beelzebul. A slander such as this, Jesus holds, cannot be forgiven. That is to say, they who see the good clearly before their eyes, and yet are able to ascribe it to the influence of the devil—such are beyond redemption. Goodness can but show itself and reveal its beauty ; at the same time one must have an eye for this beauty to be able to recognise and understand it.

(*g*) ISSUE OF THE DISPUTE.—For the time being, Jesus had been beaten in the struggle. His declaration against the commandments as to purity contained in the Law was made so unmistakably, and then again so clearly brought home to the people by his adversaries, that everyone was compelled to choose between the new religion and the old.[1] No wonder, then, that the multitude who had continued to follow Jesus, gladly listening to his words and deriving welcome benefit from his powers of healing, now, with few exceptions, turned away from him in a body. He realises that he cannot do any further work amongst the Jews ; he is cast out and rejected. Accordingly, he resolves to forsake Jewish territory.

of his view of the matter, not a refutation of his adversaries, who actually see in his power to drive out demons through Beelzebul a piece of mischief on the part of Satan. But Jesus possesses a corroboration of his explanation, the force of which he knows he may rely upon to carry weight, at any rate with his disciples : it is his whole personal character, as it has been manifested to them down to that present moment.

[1] For Jesus' preaching now assumed the character of a new religion, and was not, as it were, simply another form of the old. The Mosaic Law was the very heart of the Jewish faith. Any demarcation between what was important and what unimportant, between what was transitory and what was abiding in it, was quite inconceivable without a breach with Judaism (cp. Deut. xxvii. 26, Gal. iii. 10).

CHAPTER XI

AMONGST THE HEATHEN

SOURCES.—Mk. vii. 24–ix. 29 (= Mt. xv. 24–xvii. 21, Lk. ix. 18–42, Mk. viii. 15 = Lk. xii. 1). For the departure from Galilee and the lament over Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, Mt. xi. 21–23 = Lk. x. 13–15; Jesus' companions, Lk. ix. 57–62 = Mt. viii. 19–22, also Lk. xiv. 25–33 (Mt. x. 37 f.); and their subsistence, Lk. xii. 22–32 = Mt. vi. 25–34. For the story of the Syro-Phœnician woman, see Lk. iv. 25–27. Mt. (ix. 32 f.) already gives the healing of the κωφός (Mk. vii. 32–36) in a shorter and altered form. For the excursion to Dalmanutha, Mt. xv. 39, Μαγαδάν; for the demand for a sign—the sign of Jonah, Lk. xi. 29–32 = Mt. xii. 38–42, Lk. xvii. 20 f., Lk. xii. 54–56 (Mt. xvi. 2 f.), Lk. xiii. 1–5. For the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, 1 Cor. v. 6 f., Gal. v. 9. Mt. has also placed earlier, as well as altered (two blind men, ix. 27–31), the healing of the blind man of Bethsaida, Mk. viii. 22–26. For the opinions about Jesus, see Mk. vi. 14–16; note also Mt. xvi. 14, Jeremiah. For the conferring of the name Peter, Mt. xvi. 18, and compare Jn. i. 42, Mk. iii. 16. As regards the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, Mt. xvi. 19, compare the word "keys" in Rev. i. 18, iii. 7, ix. 20, and Lk. xi. 52; otherwise, Mt. xviii. 18. The reason for the command not to reveal the secret, Mk. viii. 30, is given in Mt. vii. 6. The three days before the resurrection, Hos. vi. 1 f. For the transfiguration, 2 Pet. i. 17. For Mk. ix. 13 (Elijah = the Baptist) compare Mt. xi. 14. The healing of the epileptic seems to be in a wrong place, on account of the γραμματεῖς, Mk. ix. 14.

JESUS AMONGST THE HEATHEN.—It is a fact, vouched for as absolutely certain by the account in the Gospel of Mk., that Jesus, after his dispute with the Scribes from Jerusalem, and after his open breach, not only with the Pharisaic tradition, but also with the entire system of Judaic piety according to the Law, kept for a considerable time outside the boundaries of actual Jewish territory. In the first instance, we find him turning his steps towards the regions of Phœnicia, and

travelling as far as Sidon. Afterwards, however, he returns to the Lake of Gennesareth; but makes for the heathen eastern shore in the region of the Decapolis. Thence he ventures once again to show himself on Jewish soil, but quickly returns, and again moves away from the lake, travelling northwards as far as the villages of Cæsarea Philippi (*Paneas*, *Baniyas*). Here, however, he resolves, in defiance of death, to return once more to his own country; and he is not content now to return to Capernaum: he will journey to the very centre of Jewish national life, to Jerusalem itself (Mk. vii. 24, 31, viii. 10, 22, 27, ix. 30, 33, x. 1, 32).

TRADITION REGARDING THIS.—Yet, in spite of this explicit tradition in Mk., Jesus' sojourn amongst the Gentiles soon vanished entirely from the memory of Christendom. In Mt. xv. 21, it is true, we are still told that after the dispute with the Jerusalem Scribes Jesus withdrew into the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon. But as early as Mt. xv. 29, we hear that he is again by the Lake of Galilee, healing all the sick that are brought to him; and nothing is now said concerning his being on the heathen or eastern shore. Nor is there any mention in Lk. ix. 18 of the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi being the scene of Peter's avowal; there is really nothing at all to indicate that Jesus tarried for a time on heathen soil. In the Gospel of Jn., the question which the Jews put to one another, "Whither then will he go that we shall not find him? Will he perhaps go amongst the Diaspora among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?" (Jn. vii. 35) is even regarded as a foolish misunderstanding of an enigmatical saying of Jesus.[1]

JESUS IS COMPELLED TO FLEE.—Jesus felt that to have to go away into heathen territory was a bitter trial, and he looked upon it as an untimely crippling of his activity. We may infer this from his having expressly forbidden his disciples,

[1] Jesus' flight into heathen territory might easily have been forgotten, because during this time, so long as he was away from the Lake of Gennesareth, he had no public ministry. During this period of his life, popular discourses and acts of healing are not in evidence, and for obvious reasons. But his teaching of the disciples, unlike his popular addresses and his healings, was not restricted to any definite locality; the words spoken to his disciples could be preserved, even when the places where they were spoken had been forgotten.

when he was sending them forth, to go into the paths of the Gentiles (Mt. x. 5), for the special reason that, the divine judgment being near at hand (Mt. x. 23), the time seemed all too short for preaching repentance even in the cities of Israel. Hence it can only have been the pressure of stern necessity that made him resolve to abandon the territory of his own people. And it was just this that later Christians could not reconcile themselves to. Jesus' last cruel fate, his execution on the cross, was made intelligible to them by his own words and by the preaching of Paul; this dark period of voluntary yet involuntary banishment, on the other hand, did not fit in with their idea of the Son of God, whose life on earth people were more and more inclined to think of as a continuous revelation of the Godhead. The reason that Jesus' temporary absence from Jewish territory was forgotten, is the same as that which induced Lk. to omit the prayer on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" and the Fourth Gospel to say nothing whatever about the temptation of Jesus, or about his agony in Gethsemane.[1]

LAMENTATION OVER THE CITIES.—But we have other sayings of Jesus in which his feelings at departing from the places which had so far been the scene of his labours are very clearly expressed; we have his lament over Chorazin and Bethsaida, and a lament over Capernaum (Mt. xi. 21–24 = Lk. x. 13–15). The road from Capernaum to Tyre, whether Jesus

[1] The question, of course, suggests itself: How could Jesus flee after he had so earnestly insisted, at the time he sent forth his disciples, on the need of labouring in Israel, and seeing that he, being the Messiah, must in a special degree have felt sure of divine protection? Still, he does not flee alone; he takes with him a company of men upon whom his influence only becomes properly effective after they have been torn away from their native soil, and then it works, as the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi shows, with far-reaching results. Jesus' answer to Peter (Mt. xvi. 18) proves clearly that he desired to strengthen the views of this little band before he himself perished. Subsequently, he calls them the salt of the earth; if the salt loses its power, wherewith can one season (Mk. ix. 50)? Hence, Jesus may well have held it to be his duty first to separate his own followers from a population that was excited against him, in order fully and finally to declare himself to them, even though this was really contrary to his original intention. In sending forth the Twelve, his desire had been to extend and intensify his own activity, and now for the present *this* activity is crippled.

chose the route viâ *Tibnin* (the longer journey; 15 hours) or that viâ *Yatir* (not much shorter; about 14½ hours), would lead Jesus past Chorazin (*Kerâzeh*). From this place he would command a fine view of the Lake of Gennesareth, so that this would be a very suitable spot from which to take leave of it. The fact, too, that he was bound for the land of Phœnicia would naturally suggest the comparison between the guilt of the places which rejected his preaching and the guilt of Tyre and Sidon. Hence he exclaims, "Woe unto thee, Chorazin, woe unto thee, Bethsaida; for had such powers been shown forth in Tyre and Sidon as have been shown forth in you, they would long ago have repented in sackcloth and ashes! Yet I say unto you, it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, oughtest thou not to be lifted up to heaven? Thou shalt be brought down to Hell; for had such powers been shown forth in Sodom as have been shown forth in thee, it would still be standing this day. But I say unto you, it will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee" (Mt. xi. 21–24, Lk. x. 12–15, abbreviated). Such words as these betray deep pain and the bitterness of a heart filled with indignation. Jesus complains that he has laboured in vain.[1] In the opinion of Jesus, then, things had been done in these places which, had they happened in Gentile cities or in places steeped in vice, would have roused the inhabitants to amend their ways; here they had produced no effect.[2] For this reason, he declares, it will be worse for these places at the judgment of God than for the Gentile cities of Tyre and

[1] On other occasions he had preserved a calmer frame of mind in face of a like experience. The parables of the sower and of the grain of mustard seed (see Chap. X., pp. 254 ff.) compromise the matter in such a way as to accentuate the rich blessing which results from a partial or late success. And Jesus still has with him the disciples whom he has gained over by his labours in these places. But unless we are willing, for the sake of maintaining Jesus' divinity, to attenuate him to the mere shadow of a man, we must ascribe to him those emotions without which a human heart cannot live on earth.

[2] In Amos (iii. 9–11) there are similar views (which may be compared) with regard to Israelitic and heathen cities. Very similar, too, is Jesus' saying about the sign of Jonah (Lk. xi. 29–32, Mt. xii. 38–42).

Sidon, and for Sodom, blotted out because of its vices. For Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum had under their own eyes, in Jesus' works, the effects of the Holy Ghost; and yet they calumniated and rejected Jesus. Thus, according to Jesus' last word to his adversaries, their guilt could not be forgiven (Mk. iii. 28–30).[1] Jesus' procedure in delivering these discourses is really the same as on another occasion, when he assured a man of the forgiveness of his sins: he anticipates in a sense the judgment of God or of the Messiah (Mk. ii. 7). But it is a further mark of the self-confidence and inner freedom of his character, that he is always sure that his clear judgment is in agreement with God's judgment. And none but a person thus persuaded would have prevailed upon himself to oppose his own ideas of good and evil to a tradition, many centuries old, and regarded by the whole of his own people as holy.[2]

JESUS' COMPANIONS.—Jesus did not go into banishment alone. We cannot say exactly how large the number of his companions was. But the Twelve were no doubt of the company. The later Gospels knew that the Twelve, at all events, held fast to Jesus in the hours of his trial—at a time, that is to say, when, because of his ill-success, he might have doubted his God-given mission (Lk. xxii. 28), or when others deserted him (Jn. vi. 66–71). Lk. relates three instances, Mt. two, of decisive moments in which adherents of Jesus had to face the question, whether they would remain longer with their Master or cleave to their own friends and their own people (Lk. ix. 57–62 = Mt. viii. 19–22). A certain man in a fit of enthusiasm came to Jesus, and said, "I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest."

[1] Cp. Chap. X., p. 298.

[2] It has been nothing less than disastrous for the Christian Church that the image of Christ, as handed down from generation to generation, should have been adorned with such characteristics as gentleness, sensibility, compassion, and patience, while his steadfastness, energy, and manly vigour almost disappear from view. And yet it is simply the historical truth that Jesus recognised the greatness of his disciple, as well as the greatness of God Himself, to consist in an unfaltering perseverance in unselfish labour for others (see Chap. IX., p. 244). But perseverance, such as this, presupposes, that manly courage which repudiates falsehood wheresoever it is met with.

Jesus said to him, "The foxes have holes, the birds of heaven have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where he may lay his head." On other occasions Jesus is at pains to make men believe that God cares for them, by arguing from the more insignificant to the more important, and pointing to God's care for such valueless birds as sparrows and ravens (Lk. xii. 6, 24). Now he is dominated by an entirely different feeling: for foxes and birds provision is made throughout the world, but not for man. Yet the same thought underlies what is said here—that man is of far greater value than foxes and birds. But as man's needs are greater, he more frequently finds his wants unsatisfied. In any case, Jesus' saying calls this enthusiast's attention to the serious character of his resolve: If thou art willing to follow me everywhere, then shalt thou suffer privations with me.[1]

Another man, one who has already for some time belonged to the more intimate circle of Jesus' adherents, proposes to accompany him. But he craves a little further delay, and for an extremely cogent reason: his father is dead, and he wishes to bury him before he goes away. Jesus, however, cannot grant any delay. The parting of a relative by death does not appear to him so great an evil, now that God's kingdom is at the door—involving, as it does, a rising again, and consequently a reunion with the dead. The disciple who is leaving his dead father will scarcely be separated from him for a longer time than another who shall tear himself away from his living parents. Such is the meaning of Jesus' saying, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and proclaim the kingdom of God." What people are here meant by the dead who may bury their dead is clear. They are those who do not possess the Gospel of the nearness of the kingdom of God, and, consequently, are without the hope of a speedy reunion of all the pious in a life eternal. Paul gives utterance to the same idea in 1 Thess. iv. 13, when he says, "Ye should not be troubled like the others who have no hope." The saying of Jesus sounds harsh. But they have a narrow

[1] Cp. Chap. VIII., p. 169, n. 3. Here the "son of man" is evidently the man who is conscious of his purpose, as contrasted with frivolous and rapacious men who grasp at everything they see.

acquaintance with life who think that there can be no cause sufficient to prevent a man from taking part in the burial of his own father. Moreover, when Jesus left his native soil with his adherents, he certainly did so in a moment of pressing danger; so that what were otherwise sacred duties had necessarily to be put aside.[1]

After the refusal of this second request, it is not surprising that yet a third petitioner fails to get his request granted; here a man desires to follow Jesus, but wishes first to take leave of his own household. Jesus declares, "No one that looketh back, after he hath once put his hand to the plough, is ready for the kingdom of God."

Jesus' adherents feel, therefore, that they are the community of the future kingdom of God. Everyone who belongs to their company may be presumed to be ready for that kingdom. But, in addition to this, everyone should be able to tear himself away from all things that belong merely to the present world. Everyone must devote himself entirely to preparation for entering into God's kingdom, just as the plougher has to keep his eyes riveted upon his work. Jesus again put this thought before the entire body of his disciples in clear-cut language. The man who does not hate father and mother, wife and child, brother and sister, and even his own life, let it be added, cannot be his disciple; the man who is not ready to look upon himself as one condemned, and already dragging his cross to the place of execution, cannot be Jesus' disciple (Mt. x. 37 f., Lk. xiv. 26 f.). This is equivalent to saying: They who go with Jesus must understand that they are taking a step which means absolute estrangement from their nearest relatives, and are putting their own lives at stake. Jesus is therefore aware that he himself is condemned as a criminal deserving of death, even though no court of law has deliberately pronounced sentence upon him, and that they who now remain with him are

[1] The peril which threatened was, of course, risk to Jesus' life (cp. Mk. iii. 6); but the danger was still more pressing, in that it menaced the continuance of the Gospel in the world (Mt. xvi. 18, Mk. ix. 50, and compare p. 301, n.). Jesus himself put a sacred duty aside; being at a distance from his homeland, he will no longer be able to preach repentance to his own people.

likewise doomed to death. This explains his hurried flight from Jewish territory.[1]

Here, too, we have the first distinct allusion to the death on the cross, and the carrying of the cross to the place of execution, as awaiting Jesus and his disciples. And there is nothing remarkable in the fact. If crucifixion had not been the customary method of execution at that time in Palestine, Jesus would not later on have died on the cross. It was a very common thing, therefore, to meet a doomed criminal making his last solemn journey and carrying his cross himself. The disciples ought to realise that they must now tear themselves away from their own people and be prepared for death. But, at the same time, Jesus exhorts them to question themselves seriously as to whether they will be able to carry through the work they are now prepared to embark upon. And he conveys his exhortation by means of two parables. When a builder wishes to build a tower, he has first to reckon the cost of the building, lest the work remain unfinished and he be laughed to scorn.[2] And when a king goes to war, he takes counsel with himself before setting out, whether with his small army he is a match for the forces of the enemy. So, in like manner, everyone who goes with Jesus must carefully test his powers, and see whether he is strong enough to break with all that hitherto has been dear to him, and to hold fast to Jesus through tribulation and death (Lk. xiv. 28–33). The Twelve seem, therefore, to have shown that they had this courage, though they may have done so in different degrees;

[1] The verdict upon Jesus was based on Deut. xv. 20, xxvii. 26; the verdict upon his disciples on the latter passage, if not upon both. Jn. ix. 22, xii. 42, might lead us to suppose that Jesus' disciples were next excommunicated from the synagogue. But against these passages we may set another passage in the same Gospel, Jn. xvi. 2, in which Jesus, in his parting addresses, foretells to his disciples their exclusion from the synagogue in the future only. Moreover, in Jerusalem he experienced no difficulty in entering the temple with his disciples (Mk. xi. 15, 27, etc.); even at the time when Paul was taken prisoner, the Christians of Jerusalem were in the habit of visiting the temple quite freely (Acts xxi. 26). Hence, there was no formal exclusion from the synagogue. Compare also the story of the tribute paid to the temple (Mt. xvii. 24–27), and the discussion of the same in Chap. XII.

[2] See Chap. IV., pp. 100 ff. The parable was suggested by Jesus' own handicraft.

for, besides Simon, the man of rock, Jesus was accompanied by the future traitor. What is more, the Twelve were even now personally in jeopardy. Like Jesus, they too had preached; and they were known to the people to be the most intimate disciples of Jesus. If, therefore, Jesus went away from them, the hatred of the zealots of the Law might easily be launched against them. Yet a historical reflection of this kind should not certainly detract from the glory due to them for having shown so much courage and fidelity.

It is not unlikely, however, that, besides the Twelve, there were women in the company of those who went with Jesus. The gospel of Lk. gives the names of three who had already accompanied Jesus in Galilee—Mary of Magdala, out of whom Jesus had driven seven demons (cp. Chap. X., p. 272, n. 1), Johanna the wife of an ἐπίτροπος, that is to say, a financial or administrative official of Herod (Antipas), and a certain Susanna (Lk. viii. 2 f.). In Mk. (xv. 40 f.), also, three women are named, who followed Jesus even in Galilee, and ministered unto him. Here again Mary of Magdala has the first place; then follow: a certain Mary, the mother of the younger James—doubtless the second apostle of this name, namely, James, the son of Alphæus (Mk. iii. 18)—and of (the unknown) Joses;[1] and, thirdly, a certain Salome. They are the same women who came to the grave after the resurrection (Mk. xvi. 1). But we are told in both Mk. and Lk. that these were by no means the only women who were amongst the company of Jesus. It may fittingly be pointed out that there could hardly be a more beautiful testimony to the deep impression produced by the earnest, holy bearing of this body of people, disowned by their own nation, than the fact that no offence was taken, so far as we know, by anyone of their many contemporary enemies at the consorting together of these men and women in a band that was now ceaselessly moving about from place to place; and the fact deserves to be emphasised. True, we have no evidence that these

[1] The mention of these persons—otherwise unknown to us (compare also the sons of Simon of Cyrene, Alexander and Rufus, in Mk. xv. 21)—shows that the Gospel of Mk. assumes some further acquaintance with the men of the New Testament epoch on the part of its readers (a matter of great value in judging the credibility of the Gospel).

women formed part of the band which went with Jesus into Gentile territory. But it is fair to assume that they did, because they had already moved about with him in Galilee, and afterwards accompanied him on his fatal journey to Jerusalem. If they had remained behind at this crisis, it would have meant a falling away from him; besides, their subsequent journey to Jerusalem was not a whit less dangerous than their present withdrawal into Gentile territory.

CARE FOR THEIR SUBSISTENCE.—Luke viii. 3 tells us that these women ministered of their substance (ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς) unto Jesus and his disciples. When the Twelve left their homes, they necessarily abandoned their ordinary callings[1] at the same time, and yet they were no longer able to claim the assistance and hospitality which they earned by their preaching and healing—such hospitality as Jesus enjoyed in Peter's house in Capernaum, or as the Twelve accepted, on the advice of Jesus, when they were sent forth two by two. Now, therefore, the care for supplying their daily wants naturally pressed heavily upon them. And very soon the questions, "What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewith shall we clothe ourselves?" would seem to have reached Jesus' ears. But he seeks to allay their anxiety by exhorting them to trust in God. As it had already been made manifest to Jesus himself, in the hour of hunger and privation, that man can also live by the word of God, he now tells his disciples that life is sustained by other things than food, and the body protected by other things than clothing (Lk. xii. 23—Mt. vi. 25): "Life is more than food, the body is more than clothing."[2] At the same time he points to the ravens; they neither sow nor reap, have neither barns nor storehouses, and yet God feeds

[1] We know that Simon, Andrew, John, and James were fishermen (Mk. i. 16–20). Whether Matthew is to be identified with Levi the publican is doubtful (Mk. ii. 14 = Mt. ix. 9).

[2] Here Jesus opposes a teleological to a materialistic point of view. A being's length of life is determined, not by its external means of subsistence, but by its intrinsic worth. This is the faith of the man whose experience has taught him that often the son of man cannot find a shelter, whereas foxes and birds have their holes and their nests. And faith like this demands courage.

them. But his disciples are of far greater value than these birds.[1] The lilies, too, grow without toiling and spinning, and yet every one of them can be more beautifully clad than Solomon in all his glory. Thus does God adorn the flower of the field, which does not last beyond a day; and since he does this, he will not forget the disciples.

True, Jesus' observations are graphic pictures rather than proofs. In winter numbers of ravens perish of hunger. The adornment of the lily might be compared with the beauty of the human body rather than with what we call clothing. Ravens and lilies cannot work for bread and clothing; but to men powers have been given for that object. It is, however, doing an injustice to Jesus' words strictly to examine them in such a matter-of-fact and prosaic way. It is precisely these everlasting scruples and broodings that Jesus wishes to banish from the minds of his disciples. What he blames in them is want of confidence (ὀλιγόπιστοι —Mt. vi. 30, Lk. xii. 28). The beauty of Nature, as he views it, consists in just this: it is essentially free from any such care for the morrow.[2] It is precisely the great advantages which man has over animals and flowers that, as a general rule, deprives him of this happy state of independence. He would be truly in a sad plight, were he not to look ahead and make arrangements for the future. What Jesus would in reality like to banish is simply the feeling of anxiety, the bitter presentiment of future want. Freedom from this is indeed a blessing, because premature anxiety cripples the power of labouring calmly and deliberately for the future. Then Jesus shows, by

[1] Indeed, it is these disciples who are preparing themselves, according to Jesus' will, for the coming kingdom of Heaven; what is more, in virtue of the happy peculiarity which they have received from Jesus, they are even now already living in the kingdom of Heaven. Moreover, Jesus knows that they are the friends and associates of the Messiah, and consequently that they are under God's special protection.

[2] Jesus' idea of Nature is, of course, essentially different from that of the Apostle Paul as represented by his statement that the whole creation sighs and groans under the yoke of the transitoriness of earthly things (Rom. viii. 19–22). Perhaps we may rightly infer that in this passage the town-born Paul has in view the servitude of animals, these being made to minister to man; while Jesus, who was born in the country, contrasts Nature's simplicity with the brooding tendencies of the human mind.

an unexceptionable illustration, how little human care is able to accomplish: no man can increase his stature by even an inch. He may perhaps make himself taller to all appearances by suitable dress, but he cannot really increase his height.

The conclusion is then drawn from the entire argument—"Ask not therefore what ye are to eat and drink, and waver not to and fro (μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε)." What displeases Jesus here again is want of confidence; it seems to him to be a heathen characteristic. "All this the peoples of the world seek after; but your Father knoweth that ye need it." The bliss of having a right knowledge of God consists, therefore, in the peace and confidence which it brings to the heart.[1] And now Jesus directs his disciples' gaze to the higher good, the possession of which carries in its train the possession of all the minor blessings of life: "But seek ye His kingdom, and this also shall be given unto you." "To seek God's kingdom" here means, of course, "Work that ye may be received into it." This labour, the task of amendment and self-discipline in preparation for the judgment-day of God, must claim the undivided thoughts and efforts of the disciples. It might appear from this that Jesus' aim was to banish from his disciples' minds the petty cares of the day by filling them with a great and terrible anxiety. But such was not his intention. These same disciples, who have given up home, occupation, and family for the sake of the kingdom of God, who have carried to others the news of the coming of that kingdom, and preached the necessity of repentance, are, Jesus is convinced, called to share in this kingdom. With the same confidence with which he assured the paralytic man of the forgiveness of his sins, and pronounced the doom of the divine judgment upon the places of his former labours, with that same confidence Jesus now promises the kingdom of God to his little band of followers. "Fear thou not, thou

[1] This comparison with the heathen would naturally occur to one who was journeying through heathen territory. But Jesus here mentions, in the simplest way, the one principal feature that distinguished Israelitic piety from the piety of the Gentiles. The Gentiles seek the protection of their gods, standing in awe of their power; the people of Israel know that their God does and will help them. In other words, the Gentiles *seek* that unshaken confidence which the Israelites in their faith already *have*.

little flock, for it is your Father's pleasure to give you the kingdom." He had already told the Twelve, when they returned from their preaching mission, that their names were written in heaven (Lk. x. 20; cp. Chap. X., pp. 282 ff.).

THE SYRO-PHŒNICIAN WOMAN.—The Gospel of Mk. is able to record only one instance of healing in connection with Jesus' sojourn in the land of Phœnicia (Mk. vii. 24-30). It points out that Jesus really wished to remain hidden there. Now that his ministry amongst his own people was cut short, he would have preferred to remain in complete solitude along with his disciples.[1] But even in Phœnicia his name is already so well known that the people come to seek him. According to Mk. iii. 8, people had come to him from the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, when he was still beside the Lake of Gennesareth. And so, even now, a woman beseeches him to help her little daughter, who is grievously tormented by an unclean spirit. It would seem that this spirit drove the girl restlessly from place to place; for after the recovery she lay restfully stretched out on her bed (Mk. vii. 30). The woman is a Hellenist of Syro-Phœnician descent. She was therefore accustomed to speak Greek; but she no doubt communicated her request to Jesus in the Semitic idiom. At first Jesus curtly refuses her petition, saying, "The children must first be satisfied. It is not right to take the bread from the children and throw it to the dogs." This was a hard answer, and was clearly the outcome of bitterness and dissatisfaction. When he sent forth his disciples, Jesus had impressed upon them that they were not to address themselves to the Gentiles and Samaritans, because the near approach of God's kingdom and of the judgment must above all be announced to the people of God. And from this principle he will not depart even now, when he is cut off from the possibility of labouring amongst his own people. Shall he indeed help this heathen woman when there is still so much distress to be ministered to amongst the people of God? The bread has been taken from

[1] He had no idea of a mission to the heathen, because it was important for him to give his attention to his own disciples. As soon as the disciples seem to him to be sufficiently matured in right judgment, he resolves to return to Jewish territory (Mt. xvi. 17–21; and cp. also pp. 338 ff.).

the children; shall it now be given to the dogs?[1] How severe a paralysing of his activity Jesus felt this banishment from his native land to be, could not well be more clearly expressed.

The woman hears Jesus' hard saying, but does not allow herself to be turned aside by it. We may well assume that she is acquainted with his grief and understands it. Accordingly, catching up the metaphor chosen by Jesus, full of contempt for her and her people though it seems to be, she knows how to use it for her own purpose; "Yea, Lord," she says, "and the dogs under the table eat up the children's crumbs." What falls from the table is, of course, no good to the children; why, then, should the dogs not have it? While Jesus abides in heathen territory, naturally he cannot help his own people; but why should not the heathen get some advantage from this? Jesus recognises that the woman is right, and promises to heal her child. Again we lack all the details requisite for enabling us to determine to any extent the nature and duration of the cure.[2] But Jesus, reflecting upon the strange fate, that he is obliged to help a heathen woman at a time when there are so many Israelites in need, calls to mind the similar experience on the part of Elijah and Elisha. At this moment he says to his disciples, "Of a truth I say unto you, there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heavens were shut up for three and a half years, so that famine prevailed throughout all the land, and to none of them was Elijah sent, save only to a widow of Zarepath (*Sarepta*) in the land of Sidon. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha, and none of them was made clean, save only Naaman the Syrian." Thus Jesus' work on heathen soil, or on behalf

[1] The word selected, at any rate in the Greek text of the Synoptics (Mk. vii. 27, Mt. xv. 26), *τοῖς κυναρίοις*, is decidedly less harsh than the *τοῖς κυσίν*, which is used in what is, at any rate formally, the similar saying in Mt. vii. 6; for the diminutive is a term of endearment. But the point of comparison still remains the same; the relationship between Jews and Gentiles is likened to that of the children and the dogs in a house. The idea of the incomparably higher value of Israel remains unshaken.

[2] The curious may think this an unsatisfactory statement; but it is not the business or duty of science to satisfy everybody's curiosity.

of Gentiles, certainly affords no evidence against his prophetic calling (Lk. iv. 25–27).[1]

On the East of the Lake.—Jesus, however, deems it desirable to come into touch again with his people soon. He proceeds northwards through Phœnicia as far as Sidon, a journey of about seven hours from Tyre. Of course, he travels but slowly, perhaps often without any definite plan. It may be that the fishermen of Gennesareth had at one time some thoughts of being able to resume their calling in a fishing village on the Mediterranean. But, at all events, Jesus did not remain any length of time in Phœnician territory; and the suggestion that, if they must perforce sojourn in a heathen country, they should at least confine themselves to the heathen towns on the lake, as near as possible to their home, no doubt met with the ready acquiescence of all.[2] So the fugitives wander back from Sidon in a south-eastern direction, through the high mountain-country over into the region of the Decapolis, and arrive on the east shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, a journey of more than twenty hours. We are informed of all this in a single verse of the Gospel of Mk. (vii. 31). But we are given no particulars at all about the conversations which Jesus had at this time with his disciples, nor as to what he taught them, though teaching them was now his sole occupation. No doubt, many of the Sayings of the Lord handed down to us may belong to this period, but we can of course no longer prove that it was so.[3]

[1] True, he means to say more than this here; he points to the element of the incalculable in God's rendering of help. God's help does not ensue where people think it might certainly be expected; it does ensue where nobody would have hoped for it. The saying is one that denotes resignation to the mysterious ways of God. While we are not told that even here any wisdom for a higher comprehension of God was discernible, this is nevertheless presupposed.

[2] With regard to all this, owing to the scantiness of our information, we are restricted to conjectures, which derive such support as they possess, not from any tradition, but from the inherent probabilities of the case.

[3] Here, then, we have the second great lacuna in our tradition with regard to the public ministry of Jesus. The first coincides with the period during which the disciples were absent on their preaching mission (see Chap. X., pp. 278 ff.). The existence of a lacuna in the present case is obviously due to the extremely little interest taken by Mk. in all those experiences of Jesus which did not immediately bear upon his work of salvation.

Our information with regard to the period which followed is also extremely scanty. The Gospel of Mk. tells us of the healing of a deaf-mute (ix. 32–37). And, relative as the credibility of such isolated instances of healing always is, the present case raises more serious doubts than usual, because the mere curing of deafness does not guarantee simultaneously a correct manner of speaking; proper pronunciation presupposes that a person has repeatedly heard people speak. After this comes the description of the marvellous feeding of some four thousand persons—an event which is to be regarded in exactly the same light as the (already discussed) feeding of the five thousand. We are thus obliged to assume that Jesus' presence on the eastern shore of the lake speedily became known by reason of his renewed works of healing, and that, consequently, large crowds of people once more gathered about him. At the same time, the numbers on this occasion had decreased as compared with the earlier throng; for, whereas on the first occasion he fed five thousand, now he feeds only four thousand.[1] At any rate, this renewed success gladdens Jesus to such an extent that he no longer considers himself isolated and an outcast. He feels that he may count upon a people's enthusiasm when it praises him and says, "He hath done all things well; he giveth ears to the deaf and speech again to him that was dumb" (Mk. vii. 37), whether the language is intended to be taken literally or whether it is meant metaphorically. Jesus therefore once more ventures to set foot on Jewish soil.

Excursion to the West Shore.—As to the place where this happened, our authorities are not agreed. Mk. (viii. 10) speaks of the region of Dalmanutha (*εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά*); Mt. (xv. 39), on the other hand, of the region of Magadan (*εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγαδάν*). So far as we are concerned, both statements possess equal value, inasmuch as the situation of neither of these places can now be ascertained. The fact that Pharisees came out of the place to Jesus suggests that it was

[1] We have already pointed out (Chap. X., pp. 287 f.) that these numbers are not reliable. Still, there are good historical grounds for a decrease in the number fed on the second occasion, instead of an increase, as compared with that on the first. Had the repetition of the miracle been arbitrary, the case would have been different.

really a place on Jewish territory.[1] Their sole object was to expose him to the crowd. Accordingly, they begin a disputation with him, openly casting doubt upon the near approach of the kingdom of God; they will believe, if Jesus will show them a sign from heaven. If God Himself will visibly intervene on Jesus' behalf, they will grant him perfect liberty to preach. The challenge proves, at any rate, that Jesus' works of healing and the cures wrought by his disciples were not attributed by them to miraculous powers, nor so regarded by his adversaries. We must not, of course, fasten upon the words: The Pharisees wished to see a sign "from heaven" (*ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*). The phrase "from heaven" merely indicates whence the wonder is to originate. Here, as in so many other passages, we have God's dwelling-place used as a substitute for the name of God. Jesus, then, hears again from the mouths of his adversaries the same demand which, so far as its substance was concerned, had already come to him as a temptation: "If thou art the Son of God, show a sign, that we may believe thee" (Mt. iv. 5–7, Lk. iv. 9–13). But he puts aside the thought now, just as he did before. "Why seeketh this generation after a sign? Verily I say unto you, shall there be a sign given to this generation?" In so far as Jesus refuses to give *now* a sign such as is demanded, his answer amounts to a refusal. But the sentence asserts at the same time that this generation *will* receive an unmistakable sign of the truth of Jesus' words.[2] As an explanation of this saying, we may apply another saying of Jesus (of course, not spoken until a later date): "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things come to pass. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Mk. xiii. 30 f.). Thus, the fulfilment of Jesus' prophecy regarding the future, the destruction of the old heaven and the old earth, will make clear even to this generation the truth of his preaching. If, however, this

[1] Neither Mk. nor Mt. says that Jesus entered into the town itself (Mk.—*εἰς τὰ μέρη*; Mt.—*εἰς τὰ ὅρια*)—a circumstance which is significant as regards Jesus' position; and only Mk. says distinctly that the Pharisees came out to him (Mk. viii. 11—*καὶ ἐξῆλθον*; Mt. xvi. 1—*καὶ προσελθόντες*).

[2] That is to say, when the Messiah appears. Cp., on the other hand, Chap. VIII., pp. 164 f.

generation demands a sign now, Jesus declares that no sign shall be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. As Jonah was a sign to the people of Nineveh, so the Son of Man ought also to be a sign to this generation. And by way of explaining this enigmatical saying, he continues: "At the judgment upon the men of this generation, the Queen of the South shall rise up, and shall condemn them; for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and behold a greater than Solomon is here. The people of Nineveh shall appear at the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and, behold, a greater than Jonah is here" (Lk. xi. 29–32 = Mt. xii. 32–42). That is to say, the fame of the wisdom of Solomon induced the Queen of Sheba to undertake the long journey to Jerusalem; the preaching of Jonah induced the men of Nineveh to resolve thoroughly to amend their lives, and led them to accomplish their purpose; therefore, let this generation also rest satisfied with the words of wisdom and the preaching of repentance which a son of man offers them here and now, and let them not await a sign from heaven. And what a spirit of lofty self-consciousness breathes through the words of Jesus when he says to his adversaries, Here is a greater than Solomon and Jonah! But he knows that his preaching surpasses the preaching of the men of the Old Testament.[1]

The reason for Jesus' confidence is that he knows himself to be the Messiah. But his contemporaries do not understand the value of his preaching; this alone explains their demand for a further sign. Then Jesus reproaches them because they do understand the signs of the weather, but not the signs of the times which would lead them to see the importance of the present moment (Lk. xii. 54–56, Mt. xvi. 2 f., Mk. xiii.

[1] As the prophet Jonah does not count amongst the most favoured prophets of the Old Testament, Jesus' comparison of himself with Jonah might be listened to with patience, even by the Pharisees; but his self-esteem in placing his own wisdom above the wisdom, so highly extolled, of the heaven-gifted Solomon, must surely have sounded to them outrageous. Yet, in refusing to let his judgment be fettered or overawed by the authority of tradition, Jesus is only giving once more a proof of the clearness and unprejudiced freedom of his mind. Only under such an impulse could he oppose his own ideal to that of the Law.

28 f.).[1] But whatever Jesus might say, the Pharisees in their demand for a sign had hit upon something just to the fancy of the crowd; and Jesus' refusal was, of course, interpreted as a confession of his inability to comply with the request. The Apostle Paul showed his knowledge of the Jewish people when he wrote subsequently to Corinth, "The Jews require a sign" (I Cor. i. 22).

Jesus returns to the east shore dissatisfied (Mk. viii. 12 f.); he had been disappointed in the hope with which he had again trodden Jewish soil. On the way back, he warns his disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees. This demand for a sign may have made an impression upon them too; accordingly, he feels that they ought not to allow themselves to be led astray by the false ideas of the Pharisees. And when he at the same time warns them against the leaven of Herod, we are inevitably led to reflect, that in the dispute about the Sabbath the Pharisees had already allied themselves with the Herodians; this meant that the ruler of the country lent the power of the secular arm to the guardians of the traditional system of piety. Jesus' observation amounts, therefore, to this: Do not let yourselves be turned aside by the demand of the Pharisees, and by the condition laid down by Herod for our labouring in his country. The family of Herod were, as a matter of fact, the representatives in Palestine of a particular intellectual movement, an attachment to Græco-Roman culture. We cannot, however, assume that Jesus' disciples required to be specially warned against this influence.[2] When Jesus thus speaks of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, the disciples are greatly concerned that they should be again going amongst strangers, and have no bread. Jesus tries to comfort them, by recalling to their memories how little it took to satisfy vast crowds. So they come, on the north-east shore of the lake, to Bethsaida, lying a little inland on the left bank

[1] The signs alluded to by Jesus are the public appearance of the Baptist and his followers, of Jesus and his followers, and also the works of healing he himself has performed, small though the value is which he attaches to their miraculous character (cp. Chap. VIII., pp. 164 f.).

[2] The utmost we could suppose is that, in the course of their restless wandering life, the good order and comfort of the towns arranged according to Greek fashion may have pleased them and may have seemed attractive.

of the Jordan, shortly above its entrance into the Lake of Gennesareth. In this place Jesus had already laboured at an earlier date; he had also uttered his lament over it. The village, which had been converted into the town of Julias, was in the domains of Philip the Tetrarch, and both Gentile and Jewish populations were no doubt to be found dwelling there side by side (Mk. viii. 14–22).[1]

In the Villages of Cæsarea Philippi.—There is no record of a stay of any length at Bethsaida. If we may judge by Jesus' lament over it, he had already been rejected there. Mk. tells us, it is true, of the healing of a blind man (Mk. viii. 22–26); but Jesus effects the cure outside the place.[2]

Then Jesus once more travels northwards with his disciples, ascending the steep valley of the Jordan until he reaches the villages belonging to the jurisdiction of the town of Cæsarea Philippi (*Paneas, Baniyas*), where he is once more on heathen ground. The first Herod had built a splendid temple to Cæsar at Paneas, above a source of the Jordan, which bursts in a stream out of the limestone rock. His son Philip[3] rebuilt the town, called it Cæsarea, and made it his capital; the temple of Cæsar is figured on his coins. The town lies 1150 feet above the level of the sea; the Lake of Gennesareth 680 feet below it. The whole district around Baniyas on the slopes of the Hermon range is extraordinarily fertile, a mountainous country with plenty of water and luxuriant vegetation. How far the territory of Baniyas extended cannot now be determined, though southwards it must have bordered upon the territory of Bethsaida-Julias. All that the Gospel of Mk. says is, that Jesus came into the villages belonging to Cæsarea Philippi (Mk. viii. 27).

Opinions about Jesus.—Whilst travelling along the road in this district, it occurs to Jesus to ask his disciples what opinions the people hold regarding him. It may very well be

[1] Cp. Chap. IX., pp. 183 ff.

[2] Mk.: ἔξω τῆς κώμης. The account in Mk. represents Jesus as anointing the eyes of the afflicted man with his spittle. And there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that both Jesus and the blind man looked upon this as a means of cure; the latter may have looked upon it in a special light as a means by which Jesus communicated his own power to him. Several cures of blindness figured amongst the cures at Treves in 1891.

[3] Cp. Chap. V., pp. 110 f.

that before this they had sought to comfort him by pointing to the high opinion in which he was held by the multitude. Jesus now wishes to learn further particulars. "What do men take the Son of Man to be?" he asked; so at least Mt. (xvi. 13) has it, following in this section a good separate tradition.[1] The disciples now tell him that many think he is John the Baptist; according to Mk. vi. 14, 16, an opinion also held by Herod Antipas. Others think he is Elijah; and from Mk. ix. 11 it is to be inferred that this may originally have been the opinion even of some of the disciples. One who preached repentance because the kingdom of God was at hand might very well be taken to be the forerunner of the Messiah.

According to what is said in Mt. xvi. 14, in contradistinction to Mk. viii. 28, Jeremiah was also named as one of the men for whom Jesus might be taken; and, as a matter of fact, the prophet Jeremiah did play a part in the Jewish expectations regarding the future, as we gather more particularly from 2 Macc. ii. 4–8. We read in 2 Macc. that Jeremiah hid the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense in a cave on Mount Nebo, and stopped up the entrance so that nobody could find the way in. These holy things will not become visible again until God gathers his people together and shows Himself gracious unto them. True, there is nothing said in this passage about Jeremiah's returning to earth some day.

[1] In several details, Mt. xvi. 13–19 goes beyond Mk. viii. 27–30. Here we have a true historical tradition. For in Jesus' answer to Simon the observation, that this disciple has not derived his knowledge from flesh and blood, but simply from his Father in Heaven, corresponds to a true reminiscence, which completely faded away at a later date. Further, the name of Cephas-Peter (cp., *e.g.*, Gal. ii. 7–9)—certainly given to Simon as a surname—requires as a complement the metaphor of building upon a rock (used in Mt. xvi. 18). That this metaphor, drawn from Jesus' former handicraft, is one that comes quite readily to his tongue, we see also from the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. vii. 24–27 = Lk. vi. 47–49). See Chap. IV., pp. 100 ff. It might, however, be questioned whether the Christian community (ἐκκλησία) was the object originally thought of as that which was to be built, seeing that the word occurs again in the mouth of Jesus in only one other place (Mt. xviii. 17), and in a saying of his which is somewhat uncertain; besides, it does not fit in with the picture. But if the language actually handed down is not acknowledged to be genuine, it would be difficult to discover now with any degree of certainty the metaphor that was originally chosen by Jesus (cp. p. 327, n.).

But elsewhere in the Second Book of Maccabees (xv. 13–15) we hear of the prophet praying for his people and the holy city; and he appears to Judas the Maccabee as a figure distinguished by grey hair and noble form, irradiated by a marvellous majesty and sublime glory. This proves that later Judaism was keenly interested in the prophet. The idea that Jesus was Jeremiah may no doubt have been closely connected with the thought of the nearness of the kingdom of Heaven; Jeremiah would in that case seem to have been looked upon as the forerunner of the Messiah.

When, after these names have been mentioned, it is added, "Some take thee for one of the prophets," the meaning may really be, One of the old prophets who in our days has come to life again; the words may, however, only mean, "People rank thee with the earlier prophets." The question can no longer be decided. Mk. obviously understood the words in the latter sense, for the statements of the disciples in viii. 28 point back to vi. 14–16, where the identification runs, "A prophet as one of the (old) prophets" (*προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν*). These utterances are not, however, what Jesus' adversaries say of him. Herod Antipas' words even show some appreciation of him. But we know that the Pharisees were of a different way of thinking; they declared that what caused astonishment in the works of Jesus was simply due to the fact that he was possessed of an evil spirit (Mk. iii. 22).[1] It is evident that it afforded pleasure to the disciples to comfort their homeless, wandering master, by telling him of these complimentary opinions which people had formed of him. And yet down to that moment no one had given utterance to the belief which had dominated Jesus' thoughts since his baptism by John. People did, it is true, take him for a forerunner of the Messiah; indeed, if they believed, as he did, in the nearness of the kingdom of God, they *must* take him for such. They even took him for one of the greatest of those who were to precede the Messiah —Elijah or Jeremiah; but no one had yet said that Jesus was the Messiah himself.

Opinion of the Disciples.—It was in a moment of high-wrought enthusiasm that the disciples told Jesus,

[1] Cp. Chap. X., pp. 296 f.

"People say thou art the Baptist—Elijah—Jeremiah—one of the prophets." Jesus asks further, "And ye—whom do *ye* take me to be?" He had long ago made himself familiar with the idea of a Messiah who was to suffer hunger and privation; but now, in this period of restless wandering to and fro, when he was, as it were, banished and outlawed by the leaders of his countrymen, he may well have longed in his heart to be at last recognised and understood by at least his own band of followers. At the time when his disciples returned from their preaching mission, filled with joy at the success of their labours, Jesus had still felt it to be a source of great happiness, that the profoundest secret as to his nature was known only to his heavenly Father (Lk. x. 22—Mt. xi. 27). Now, however, when even those who held aloof from him expressed high opinions of him, at the very time when exile and tribulation were assailing him with their temptations and making his Messianic faith appear in his own eyes a foolish delusion — subsequently Jesus himself calls this period the time of his trials (Lk. xxii. 28)—he longs to receive confirmation of his own belief in the belief of his disciples, and we can imagine with what anxiety he awaits their answer.[1]

PETER'S AVOWAL.—But we can hardly suppose that at this time all the disciples held the same conviction about him. They were not of one mind to such an extent that, having been educated to hold certain definite views, they were bound to arrive at the same judgment about their Master, with the stringent necessity that one deduces the final conclusion in a chain of mathematical reasoning. They had been attracted to Jesus by the overpowering mastery of his personality, by his inner freedom, his steadfastness, his readiness to help, as well as by the vividness and brilliant clearness of his language. From such characteristics, they knew they had to deal with an earnest and holy man, even

[1] Though it is certainly beyond question that Jesus would have been as much depressed by any other answer to his question than that which is now given as he was afterwards uplifted and strengthened by Peter's avowal. What he really desires to hear from his disciples is the correct answer. The question he puts to them is, in a manner, a test of the result of the labour he has bestowed on them down to this time.

though he was one who sat at meat with publicans, attached little weight to fasting, and declared that many of the precepts of the Law were of no importance and their observance a matter of indifference. Beyond doubt, they all reverenced him as they did their great prophets; for, popular preacher though he was, he could not be grouped with the Scribes. Yet there was nothing even in his gifts of healing that required them to rank him higher than the prophets,[1] especially as they themselves had acquired from him the same powers. Only occasionally, as in the storm on the lake, would the thought have flashed upon them that there was something supernatural in this man's nature. On the other hand, they were a body of men who, in consequence of Jesus' preaching, lived in constant expectation of the Messiah and his kingdom. Indeed, Jesus had several times declared to them that the kingdom of God was really present already in the blessings flowing from himself. Moreover, they had positive experience of this, in the happy transformation which had taken place within themselves. Through Jesus they had been transformed into cheerful, self-confident, but, withal, humble-minded and charitable men; though not of course all in the same degree. Yet it would assuredly never have occurred to anyone amongst them to draw from this further conclusions as to the real intrinsic nature of Jesus' personality. To have recognised the ideal figure of the Messiah in this man, highly though they esteemed him, a man poor in worldly possessions and an outcast from his own people, required a considerable amount of courage.[2] It meant an absolute breaking away from the traditional authority, in the same way as Jesus had broken away from traditional authority in both law and custom. True, the tradition as to practice (*Halakhah*) was held to be

[1] No minor miracles are told of Elisha and Elijah—1 Ki. xvii.–xix., 2 Ki. iv.–viii.

[2] Some may perhaps have hoped that the Messiah would give relief from the oppressive burden of legal regulations, since, according to Jer. xxxi. 31–34, in the kingdom of the Messiah, God's will is fulfilled by all. But to the Jewish mind it was unintelligible that the Messiah should pronounce definite precepts of the Law to be wrong, and consequently, for the future, invalid; this Jesus had actually done in the case of the precepts with regard to purity and impurity (see Chap. X., pp. 294 f.).

holier than the tradition as to theoretical belief (*Haggadah*). But it was precisely in the latter domain that the guidance of authority had, up to that time, scarcely ever been disputed. Though opinions often differed very much in matters of detail, certain fundamental doctrines were all the more firmly rooted.

A Messiah who was rejected by those countrymen of his who were most esteemed for piety, who wandered about with his small band of followers as a fugitive on heathen soil, did not assuredly in any wise answer to the usual picture which men had formed of the coming of the Messiah. Yet, notwithstanding, one of the disciples did find the courage to give, in reply to Jesus' question as to who they themselves held him to be, the resolute answer, "Thou art the Messiah" (Mk. viii. 29), or "Thou art the Messiah, the son of the living God" (Mt. xvi. 16). That disciple was Simon, the son of John or Jonas—the friend of Jesus, the man in whose house he had dwelt at Capernaum. In Simon's case, therefore, household intimacy with Jesus had not, as it had in Nazareth, lessened his esteem for his Master.[1]

Importance of this Avowal.—Thus Jesus hears for the first time, from the mouth of one of his disciples, what he had heard concerning himself, as if from a heavenly voice, at his baptism in Jordan. Now, for the first time, a man, roused to enthusiasm by the character of Jesus, makes the avowal which was to become subsequently the religious creed of the peoples of the Roman world-empire, and which has remained down to the present day the religious creed of all the races sharing directly or indirectly in the intellectual heritage of that empire, in the civilisation of the Græco-Roman world. In the strictly historical sense, the confession "Jesus Christ" (=Jesus the Messiah) denotes at one and the same time an attachment to Judaism and a breach with Judaism. The man who is declared by one of his disciples to be the Messiah is repudiated by his countrymen as an enemy to their religious law and customs: in other words, in the eyes of his own people Jesus was no longer a Jew. Notwithstanding,

[1] Cp. Chap. X., pp. 275 ff. The basis of the friendship between the two was no doubt their common belief in the nearness of the judgment.

Jesus does still feel himself to be a member of his own race. The hopes which find characteristic expression in the Messiah's name are hopes of the Jewish people; in fact, Jesus' whole religious thought is undoubtedly built entirely upon the Judaic-Israelitic foundation. The important crisis in the history of religion indicated by Peter's avowal may therefore be understood to mean the appearance of a new religious community (church), which was from the very beginning sure of its conquest of the world, which had grown up about a great personality, which in its ideas and conceptions was in all respects a continuation of the religious development of the Jewish people, but which at the same time turned away from all such restrictive ordinances as were calculated to hamper the free development of men into cheerful, self-confident individuals, ready at all times to help. Simon, in saying to his Master in this hour of tribulation, "Thou art the Messiah," had, it is evident, in spite of the Pharisees' verdict upon Jesus, not the least doubt about Jesus having the right on his side in his struggle against law and custom. But through this avowal there also rings the victorious confidence, that the little band of men who are now fugitives are destined one day to win the mastery over the world, that Jesus' idea of piety is that which shall alone assert itself in the kingdom of God in the blissful time of perfection. And it is just this sure note of victory, manifested at a moment when no external guarantees of future triumph were discernible, but when everything seemed rather to point to a speedy and disastrous ending—it is this which stamps Peter's avowal as an act of undoubted greatness.[1]

JESUS' REPLY.—And it was as an act of undoubted greatness that Jesus regarded Peter's answer. What he himself replied is only preserved to us in Mt.; but the genuineness of

[1] In this moment Christianity was a realised fact. It consisted of a society (church) which had separated from Judaism and was now grouped about a new ideal; and in the faith that they had the Messiah amongst them, the members of this society had absorbed the glad sureness of victory which belonged to Judaism. Notwithstanding all his greatness as a thinker, Paul, whom people even in those days often wished to set up as the real founder of Christianity, did not in any way alter the foundation thus laid already.

the words is guaranteed by their import (Mt. xvi. 17–19). Mt. begins thus, "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas, for flesh and blood have not revealed it to thee, but my Father in Heaven!" This is, in the first place, a solemn confirmation of the truth of what Simon had said; in these words, Jesus tells his disciples, in the most unmistakable terms, that he *is* the Messiah. If it was God who revealed the fact to Simon, it must of course be true. But at the same time a new light is also thrown upon the expression, "My Father in Heaven." It is not used here in the same sense in which Jesus uses it when he teaches his disciples to pray to God as their Father (Lk. xi. 2). In his character of the Messiah, Jesus stands in a closer relationship to God than do all other men. In the future kingdom he is to be God's vicegerent upon earth, and therefore, in point of origin, he belongs already to the higher world of light.[1]

The excitement that must have been created amongst the disciples by this confirmation of Simon's daring words can scarcely be described. There were, it is true, none but faithful adherents gathered about Jesus at the time, so that most of them no doubt joined him in blessing the recipient of so august a revelation; though it may remain an open question whether they all shared at once in the belief manifested by Peter, or shared it with the same degree of certainty.[2] For the idea was new to them all. Simon did not simply give expression to something which had been previously discussed by the disciples amongst themselves; it was not flesh and blood, it was not the mouth of man, that revealed this secret to him. It is in this sentence that we find a proof of the genuineness of Jesus' answer as preserved in Mt. For the Christians of a later time failed to understand that Jesus had kept the belief in his Messiahship locked up so long within his own bosom. In particular, the Gospel of Mt., in which

[1] Jesus seems to have been so fully occupied with the duties of the present that he does not dwell, it would appear, upon the pre-existence of the Messiah, though the later writers of the New Testament are fond of emphasising it—*e.g.*, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Philipp. ii. 5–11, Col. i. 15, Rev. iii. 14, and several other passages.

[2] This requires to be pointed out, because later on, at any rate, the traitor Judas did not believe Jesus to be the Messiah. See Chap. XIII., pp. 446 ff.

Jesus' answer to Peter is preserved, makes him speak of himself, both to the people and to the disciples, as being the Messiah (Mt. vii. 21–23, x. 32–35), long before this; it also makes the disciples worship Jesus at an earlier date than this, and confess, "Truly thou art the Son of God" (Mt. xiv. 33). Thus, Jesus' answer contradicts the point of view represented in other passages of the Gospel which records it. But it does correspond with the account (for the most part the most historical) of the Gospel of Mk., which down to this particular point of time shows no knowledge of any Messianic preaching on the part of Jesus. It is easy to explain why later Christians forgot Jesus' silence with regard to his Messiahship. But it is not possible to discover any convincing reason why a later writer should have woven this incident of the long silence of Jesus into his picture, if Jesus had, in point of fact, from the very beginning, declared himself in his preaching to be the Messiah. The answer made by Jesus to Simon has therefore been faithfully preserved.

SIMON-PETER.—Jesus further signalises the greatness of the moment by conferring a new name upon the disciple who made the avowal and by giving him a great promise (Mt. xvi. 18 f.): "And I say unto thee, thou art the rock, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of Hell shall not prove stronger . . . ." In the Greek text we have the verb *κατισχύσουσιν* coupled with a genitive *αὐτῆς*, the reference of which is not quite clear; it may be regarded as standing either for *ταύτης τῆς πέτρας* or for *τῆς ἐκκλησίας μου*. The figure of building on a rock occurs again at the end of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. vii. 24, Lk. vi. 48). We could not very well have a clearer proof of the earnestness with which Jesus pursued his craft before going to John, than in his thus using in this critical moment of his life an image derived from that calling.[1] Simon has shown himself to be

[1] In another aspect, the allusion to his former handicraft is a guarantee of the genuineness of this saying of the Lord. In Jn. (i. 42) the bestowal of the new name upon Simon is, it is true, widely separated from Peter's avowal (vi. 68 f.). But the state of the case requires that the name of the man of rock should have been given to the disciple at a moment when he was put to the proof in a special way, and not until then; nor is this inference contradicted by Mk. iii. 16.

like a rock, in that he has not only held fast to his belief in Jesus in the face of the apparent contradiction of all the external circumstances, but has actually developed his thoughts in the right direction, in defiance of the same. It is upon this rock, then, that Jesus wishes to build his Church;[1] this can only mean that Jesus desires his community to attach itself closely to Peter. He does not demand, let us say, that his disciples shall one and all adopt in any way the avowal of Peter; any such compulsion to believe was quite alien to his Jewish training, as well as to that of his disciples. He prefers to ask that the other disciples shall hold fast to this proved one amongst them, and look upon him as their mainstay. This, of course, presupposes a thought which may very easily have occupied Jesus' mind in these days of all days, these days of restless wandering, although it is apparently, it must be admitted, in harsh contrast with the sublime character of his consciousness that he is the Messiah—the thought, that is to say, of his separation from his disciples, the thought of his death. Jesus builds his Church upon the rock Simon, "and the gates of Hell shall not prove stronger . . . ." It is really a matter of indifference whether, in order to complete the sentence, we add the words "than he" (the rock) or "than it" (the church). For neither the one nor the other, neither "Petros" nor the Church, is to allow itself to be shaken by the gates of Hell. These gates are accounted

[1] In now calling his little band of followers his "church" (ἐκκλησία)—the same band which, in the words of comfort addressed by him to the disciples, in Lk. xii. 32 he calls τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον—Jesus is using a quite appropriate term. The title of ἐκκλησία confers upon the community, as far as externals are concerned, the succession to the Old Testament congregation of God, which in the Septuagint is described by this term (Deut. xviii. 16, xxiii. 1–3); as the community of the Messiah, it has a right to this succession. Besides this, Paul, too, regularly uses the expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ to indicate the unity of the Christian Church (1. Cor. xi. 22, xii. 28, xv. 9, Gal. i. 13, Philipp. iii. 6). Although, where the building upon a rock is spoken of, we might expect a metaphorical style of speech, yet in this particular instance the solemnity of the moment would really seem to have impaired the usual graphic force of Jesus' language. For even the immediately following image of the strong gates of Hell does not properly harmonise with the idea of the building on a rock. Similar instances of the heaping up of heterogeneous metaphors occur in Isa. xxviii. 15, Heb. vi. 19.

to be particularly strong, because none upon whom they have once closed is able to open them again[1]—this being, of course, the popular idea. And Jesus foresees that, in the event of his death, use might be made of this conception: "He is dead; consequently he will not return again; therefore, he is not the Messiah." Against this conclusion the Church of Jesus is to be protected by the steadfastness of Peter. The disciple who, in spite of exile and privation, has recognised Jesus as the Messiah will also hold fast to him as the Messiah when Jesus is destined to die.

This, again, would seem to be the proper place for a saying of the Lord to Peter, preserved in Lk. only (xxii. 31 f.); at any rate, the nature of its contents makes it fit in appropriately here: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath craved thee for himself, that he may sift thee as wheat is sifted; but I prayed for thee, that thy confidence may not slacken. In time to come mayest thou restore steadfastness to thy brethren!" Here again we have an undoubted allusion to Jesus' death as being a severe test of the disciples' faith; and here, too, Jesus relies upon the strength of Peter's faith and upon Peter's help in strengthening the other disciples. We may even say that Jesus at the moment of Peter's avowal was less concerned about his Messiahship being made known to his disciples — although that, too, was of sufficient importance in his eyes—than about the fact that he had discovered amongst his disciples a man who, in spite of Jesus' pitiful situation, has yet found the heart to designate him the Messiah beloved of God. For Jesus foresees that his Church will in the immediate future have need of such a man (cp. pp. 332 ff.).

THE POWER OF THE KEYS.—And, still with the thought of his death in his mind, Jesus in another figure of speech appoints Peter steward of the kingdom of Heaven: "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; what thou bindest on earth shall be bound in Heaven; what thou loosest on earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (Mt. xvi. 19). This saying became extraordinarily popular; so much so that in

[1] The same idea leads up to the image in the Apocalypse of the key of Hell or the bottomless pit (Rev. i. 18, ix. 1, xx. 1).

the Middle Ages Peter was held to be the porter at the gate of heaven, admitting and excluding people, according to the dictates of his own judgment. But Jesus is not speaking of the admission or exclusion of individuals. In the language of the Scribes, which Jesus is unquestionably following here, the words "bind" and "loose" are virtually equivalent to "forbid" and "permit."[1] Thus, Peter is to open for the disciples with his keys the doors through which they should go ("loose") and to close the doors through which they would go astray ("bind"). According to the tradition, indeed, there is another reference to these two doors, or, at any rate, to one of them, in a later discourse of Jesus (Lk. xiii. 24 = Mt. vii. 13 f.). Hence, after Jesus' death, Peter is to keep the disciples in the right path by prohibiting them from doing this, and by granting them permission to do that; he is therefore to tell them what to do and what to leave undone. And Jesus confers this right upon him, because he recognises in him a man of judgment and, at the same time, strength of will. What Peter permits and what he forbids will also be permitted and forbidden in Heaven, and so by God. Just as Jesus himself proclaims the will of God, even in opposition to the traditionary Law, confidently and without reserve, and with the right of a man who is perfectly agreed within himself, so, he hopes, will Simon Peter one day be a guide and leader to his followers, when he himself shall have been taken from them. However, we have no right thus laboriously to analyse and speculate upon a word spoken in a moment of the highest enthusiasm. Jesus had just been speaking of the gates of the under-world; it is natural that he should go on to speak of the gate through which entrance is had into the kingdom of Heaven. So, after Jesus' death, Peter is to show the Christian community the way, by closing false roads and opening the right path for them. At the same time, it may still be expedient to point out that, in spite of his promise to Peter, Jesus was at this moment very far from instituting the office of a vicar of Christ on earth, and an office that should be transmissible also to others. Any such institution was as far as possible from Jesus' thoughts, if only because he

[1] אסר, *'āsar*, and התיר, *hittīr*. For the proof, see B. Weiss on the passage.

expected the kingdom of God to come with the shortest delay after his death.[1]

JESUS FORBIDS ANNOUNCEMENT OF MESSIAHSHIP.—The blessing which Jesus pronounced upon Peter, and the promise or commission he gave to him, were certainly very important for the other disciples also, though at the moment they may have felt that the words were a digression from the main point. For it is upon Jesus, not upon Peter, that their thoughts are fixed. The announcement, that their Master is the Messiah, seemed to them an event of an overwhelming nature. Two questions now of necessity forced themselves to their lips—"How does Jesus know that he is the Messiah?" and "What will be the further fate of this Messiah?" Jesus answered both questions; he went on to speak of the revelation made to him by God at his baptism. It was then he learned that he was the Messiah. And doubtless he would immediately proceed to relate to them, in this connection, the story of his temptation, making them understand at the same time that he could not do anything to help on the fulfilment of the promise given to him as the Messiah, but must humbly wait until God made his word come true. He may not himself reach out after the sovereignty over the kingdoms of the world; he may not claim for himself God's miraculous power; he may not, to avoid suffering, flee from the privations of life (cp. Chap. VII., pp. 144 ff.). But if he also, like everyone else, has to wait for the dawn of the kingdom of God, and receive it as though it were a gift from the hand of his Father, it becomes intelligible why he kept silent so long about this sublime revelation. Nobody lost anything

[1] Nor had he at all in mind the idea of any official power being conferred upon Peter in a legal way. All that he maintains is that Peter, through force of moral judgment, is able to point out the right path to the Christian community. He does not for one moment say that others do not possess, or cannot acquire, the same force of judgment. And in this connection it is important to note that, according to Mt. xviii. 18, the same power is imparted to the community as a whole. Each individual shall reach such a stage that he will be able to determine, by his own judgment, what is good and what is evil in God's kingdom. The only advantage, therefore, enjoyed by Peter was, that he was the first to receive the promise. All other Christians shall become just as steadfast, just as capable in judgment, as he was.

through his silence, and he and others were preserved from temptations; for had the secret been known, people would have been only too ready to force the Messiah to abandon his attitude of expectation, and to urge him to seize by some bold stroke the promised sovereignty of the world. Jesus, therefore, once again forbids his disciples to speak of him to others as the Messiah (Mk. viii. 30). Were the multitude to be told, "Jesus is the Messiah," they would look to him to lead them in revolt against Rome; they would look for signs from heaven, and for earthly prosperity. And if he should fail to fulfil these expectations, they would hate him and despise him because of his Messianic claim. Accordingly, Jesus now admonishes his disciples, "Ye shall not give holy things to the dogs, nor throw pearls before swine, lest they tread them under foot, and then turn and rend you" (Mt. vii. 6).[1]

EXPECTATION OF DEATH.—The last clause in the text of Mt. vii. 6 is really intended simply to suggest that destruction threatens the disciples, *as well* as himself, when they proclaim their Master to be the Messiah, because, while doing so, they will not be able to meet the wishes of the multitude. For, notwithstanding his Messianic belief, Jesus quite distinctly foresees, in addition to his own death, serious danger, if not worse, for his disciples. Now for a long time past he has had in view his eventual destruction by his enemies. Even when challenged because his disciples did not fast, he spoke of the day on which the glad hymeneal joy of his disciples must come to an end, because the bridegroom would be taken away (and clearly by force) from them (*ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ'αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος*, Mk. ii. 20). After that, the Pharisees

[1] In the eyes of people brought up in Jewish ways of thinking, dogs and swine are unclean animals. In using these terms to designate the inhabitants of the country who do not belong to his community, Jesus seems to approximate very closely to the Pharisaic opinion of the "people in the land" (see Chap. IX., p. 205, n. 1). And truly he does condemn the sins of his people with no less sternness than the Pharisees do. But he does not at the same time cut himself off from intercourse with them; he only declines to cast to them the holy secret of the special revelation made to him by God, for that would do harm to himself and those who followed him, without being of any advantage to his people. He will not allow that which is his holiest possession to be profaned by others.

and Herodians had conspired together to bring about his destruction, and for the first time he had given way before them (Mk. iii. 6 f.). Once again it seemed as though there would be peace. But, after this, his dispute with the Jerusalem Scribes drove him to the bitter course of going into heathen territory (Mk. vii. 24). And the last attempt that he made to continue his ministry amongst his own people (Mk. viii. 10–21) had also ended in failure. Jesus had already been publicly rejected by the men of authority amongst the Jews. The people had been warned against him as a corrupter of morals, and one who was all the more dangerous because he pretended to labour for the good. He drives out evil spirits, but does it through the power of the most powerful of all evil spirits, Beelzebul (Mk. iii. 22). Jesus himself was aware that, in the light of the Mosaic Law then in force, he deserved to die, since, both in the matter of the Sabbath and in the question of the precepts relating to purity, he has publicly taught against the Law (Mk. ii. 23—iii. 6, vii. 1–23). Hence, in presupposing that somebody would be found to take in hand and carry out the legal sentence (Deut. xxvii. 26), he does nothing more than make his reckoning with existing circumstances.[1]

First Announcement of his Passion.—It was with the thought of his death clearly in his mind, then, that Jesus gave his promise to Peter; in this man his community was to find a support when it should be deeply shaken on learning that the gates of the under-world had closed behind its Master. And now we read, "And he began to teach them, that the Son of Man must suffer much, be rejected of the elders, the

[1] Anyone who weighs Jesus' position strictly in accordance with the historical Sources will be bound to come to this conclusion. The Evangelists, it is true, regarded Jesus' announcements of his passion as marvellous instances of prophecy, and saw in them a proof of his greatness. But if it was through knowledge divinely imparted to him that Jesus foresaw with equal clearness his Passion and his future glory, then, he also foresaw that the suffering of a few brief hours would be amply outweighed by the future glory (Rom. viii. 18). Yet he is even greater if he simply knows that in the light of all human calculations his death is sure, and yet holds fast in faith to the belief that his heavenly Father will not desert him in the hour of death, but will, in spite of all, fulfil the glorious promise which he has made to him.

high-priests, and the Scribes, be put to death, and on the third day rise again. And he spoke thereof freely" (Mk. viii, 31). This is the first real announcement of the Passion in the Gospels. In contrast with the high-wrought expectations of his disciples, who now know that they have amongst them the Son of God, the Messiah, the future judge and ruler of the world, Jesus places his own expectation that he, the Son of Man,[1] will be obliged to suffer the stern lot of all men: judgment will be passed upon him; he will be rejected, and put to death. He then indicates "the elders, the high-priests, and the Scribes" as his judges. Elders and Scribes there were everywhere throughout the land of the Jews,[2] but high-priests, that is to say, priests of the High Council or Synedrium, were found only in Jerusalem.[3] Jesus already, therefore, in this passage clearly contemplates his condemnation by the Synedrium in Jerusalem; for this was the only body in which the high-priests were associated with the elders and the Scribes. His words might indeed be interpreted to mean that the High Council would pronounce a special sentence of condemnation upon him, even in his absence, and that, being an outlaw at the time, he would be murdered by some Jewish zealot. But in all probability Jesus does not mean this; for, as a matter of fact, he immediately afterwards sets out for Jerusalem. Hitherto he had avoided the danger; now he courageously goes to meet it. This is undoubtedly, as far as he is concerned, the most important result that flows from the avowal of his disciple. He feels himself inwardly strengthened by the strength of Peter's faith.

[1] Down to the time of Peter's avowal the disciples could only regard Jesus' description of himself, "the Son of Man," as being an expression dictated by modesty and reserve; from the time of the avowal it gradually acquired a new meaning for them. In the course of the conversation which immediately follows, Jesus, taking the suggestion from Dan. vii. 13, still uses the phrase as a description of the Messiah coming from Heaven. Now that the disciples have recognised Jesus as the Messiah, it can hardly have been possible any longer for them to hear Jesus use the term without thinking of this glorious picture of the future.

[2] Compare the elders of Capernaum in Lk. vii. 3; also Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. (3rd ed.) pp. 176–179.

[3] See *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 176.

Hitherto he had been afraid his death would scatter completely the little band of the faithful; now he hopes that Peter will keep them together even when he himself is gone. Let this purposeless wandering up and down foreign regions have an end therefore! As formerly in Galilee, so now in Jerusalem, the centre of Jewish life, Jesus resolves to preach repentance and the nearness of the kingdom of Heaven.

PASSION AND DEATH OF THE MESSIAH.—But Jesus is the Messiah, the bringer of the judgment, the king of the heavenly kingdom. How can he now look for his own death? As yet Judaism, in the time of Jesus, knew nothing of a suffering Messiah, a Messiah rejected by his people. The later Jewish conception is that the Messiah will suffer *along with* his suffering people; but even later Judaism is ignorant of a Messiah suffering *through* his people.[1] Jesus, however, had learned from actual experience, that the Messiah was rejected by his people, by his family, and even in places in which he had long laboured to the blessing of many, and that he has to endure all the miseries and privations of the life of a fugitive. Hence, it might seem to be quite in accordance with such dispensation of God that the Messiah should also die.[2] Even now it was evident enough, that it was only through grievous suffering that the Messiah could attain to his glory; it might therefore be God's will that this suffering should further culminate in an ignominious death, to the end that against this dark background the brightness of the future glory might be reflected all the more vividly.

And now Jesus felt drawn, impelled, to leave the solitude of the mountains, and plunge once again into public life. Now it is that he cries to his disciples (Lk. xii. 49–53, Mt. x. 34–36), "I came to hurl a fire upon the earth, and how I wish it were burning already! But I must be baptised with a baptism, and how I pant until it be completed! Think ye I came to bring peace upon earth? Nay, I tell

[1] See the passages quoted in Wünsche, *Leiden des Messias*, 1870.

[2] The Fourth Book of Esdras (vii. 29) can speak of the death of the Messiah, but it is a peaceful death at the end of four hundred years' rule, and is represented as being necessary in order to bring the world of perfection to pass. This is, according to Jesus also, the object of the death of the Messiah.

you, but discord. From now, henceforward there shall be five in one house at variance together, three against two, and two against three—father against son, and son against father, mother against daughter, and daughter against mother, the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law!" In these words we can detect a yearning for effective action on a large scale. And yet Jesus foresees that his appearance publicly as the Messiah will not bring forthwith the peace of the Messianic kingdom.[1] On the contrary, the opposition, which has now driven Jesus outside the boundaries of Jewish territory, will inevitably divide every family into parties, some for him, some against him. Like a consuming fire, his preaching will sow unrest and confusion amongst his people. But he knows this cannot be altered; it is God's will. And from this standpoint we are able to understand how it is that he goes to meet his death without any feeling of painful disappointment. His passion is his necessary share in the tribulations he is to bring upon the world. Here (Lk. xii. 50), and, later, in his conversation with the sons of Zebedee (Mk. x. 38), he calls it a baptism. He knows that, though the waters do close over his head for a moment, he will rise above them again.

Hope of Resurrection.—But there is one requirement of Jesus' Messianic faith, in the event of his death; it is that he shall not remain in the realms of death. He must appear on the day of judgment as the lord of the future kingdom, surrounded by the holy angels; thus he has always depicted the advent of the Messiah (Mt. xxv. 31). Accordingly, Jesus now announces to his disciples his death and coming again (Lk. xvii. 22–37, and compare Mt. xxiv.): "The time will come when ye shall long to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and shall not see it." The words are reminiscent of his saying in the dispute about fasting, that the hymeneal joy of the disciples will be ended by the taking away of the bridegroom (Mk. ii. 20); "And they will say unto you, See here, see there! Go not thither

[1] And herein lurks a temptation for himself and his disciples: the promised king of peace shall bring dispute and strife. However, the Messiah was constantly conceived as a fighter and conqueror, who establishes peace by force (cp. 1. Cor. xv. 24 f., and Rev. xix. 11–21).

and run not after them." It is necessarily presupposed that the disciples look for the return of Jesus; to them also it is quite a matter of course that the Messiah will not remain in the realms of death. "For as the lightning flasheth, shining from one end of the heaven unto another, so shall the Son of Man be on his day. But first he must suffer much and be rejected of this generation." Jesus, therefore, expects that the sufferings heaped upon him will be further increased; yet he also looks forward to an exceeding great glory such as cannot be hidden.[1] Thus, what he means by "the day of the Son of Man" is the day on which justice will be signally done in the sight of all the world to this homeless, rejected, and outcast man. In that day the present careless generation, which thinks only of the petty concerns of life, will be as terribly taken by surprise as were the contemporaries of Noah and the people of Sodom in the time of Lot. Here again Jesus undoubtedly assumes that his contemporaries will live to see the judgment of the Messiah. When the glory of the Messiah appears, nobody will care to trouble any more about his fine things at home. Like Lot's wife, everyone who looks longingly back to what is behind him will be overtaken by punishment, for the world behind perisheth. Men will be divided amongst themselves in an appalling fashion. Bed-fellows, fellow-labourers, will be torn asunder; and nowhere will any escape the judgment, just as, where the carrion is, the vultures are always gathered together. Thus, Jesus will die, to come again in the glory granted him by his Father (Mk. viii. 38): his Father will awaken him from death, and this will happen after three days (Mk. viii. 31).

In this precise indication of time we see a quite unmistakable reference to a saying of the prophet Hosea—one which was without doubt a comfort to Jesus during this period: "Come then, let us return unto Yahwè. He hath smitten us, he will heal us. He maketh us alive after two days; on the third day he awakeneth us so that we live again before him" (Hos. vi. 1 f.). The same hand of God which leads to death is therefore able to free from death; and this thought was

[1] Here the reference to Dan. vii. 13 is quite obvious.

present with Jesus when he awaited his death without despairing. The temporal expressions, "after two days," "on the third day," are of course intended by the prophet to mean simply quite a short interval. Jesus, too, can hardly have understood them in any other sense, when applying them to his own fate.[1] Moreover, Mk. (viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34) interpreted the expression *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* in exactly the same sense as Mt., Lk., and Paul use *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* (Mt. xvi. 21, xx. 19, xxvii. 64; Lk. ix. 22, xviii. 33, xxiv. 7, 21, 46; 1 Cor. xv. 4). But in a different context (Mk. xiv. 58, xv. 29, Jn. ii. 19) Jesus again uses the words "three days" to indicate a brief interval.

We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that Jesus looks upon his resurrection simply as the indispensable condition of his return, if we are to free ourselves from erroneous ideas which grew out of the later course of events. To him the third day is not merely the day of resurrection, but also, at one and the same time, the day of judgment. When his disciples shall see him again after his death, then will the day of the Son of Man be really come (Lk. xvii. 22-25, Mk. viii. 38).[2] This conviction, that it is only by suffering death that he can attain to his glory, stamps the picture of Jesus with a distinctive feature, which must not be overlooked. The idea of the attainment of the God-promised goal being only possible at the cost of severe suffering furnishes a solemn background to the glad, clear decision and confidence with

[1] Hence, he was not thinking of the short period from Friday to Sunday; that would, for one thing, have rendered unintelligible the words addressed to Peter: Jesus said, that this disciple was to become the mainstay and support of the other disciples after their Master's death (Mt. xvi. 18, Lk. xxii. 31 f.). The injunction of a repeated observance of the Lord's Supper, too, points to a longer interval between Jesus' death and his coming again (1 Cor. xi. 25—*ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε*).

[2] It is absolutely necessary to recognise this fact if we are to understand Jesus' preaching. What Jesus looks for is, not a resurrection, followed by an ascension into Heaven, but a resurrection which shall manifest itself in a descent from Heaven. The event dwelt upon, from the beginning of his preaching, as being immediately impending in the world, was the glorious appearing of the Messiah to hold the judgment which is to establish his kingdom (see Chap. VIII., pp. 171 ff.), the rising again from the dead being only a means to the attainment of this end (cp. Mk. xiv. 62 = Mt. xxvi. 64).

which he meets all the vicissitudes of life, as well as to his constant readiness to minister to the needs of others.

PETER'S REMONSTRANCE.—But this anticipation of suffering and death did not at all fit in with the picture of the future as it presented itself to the mind of Simon Peter, whom Jesus has just praised so highly. The Messiah must not die. That would be the greatest misfortune that could happen to the world. With the death of the Messiah, the hopes of Israel, the hopes of humanity, would perish. Such may have been the thought which led Peter to draw his Master aside and expostulate with him (Mk. viii. 32). He desired to dissuade him (Mt. xvi. 22). Jesus had quite definitely resolved to return to Jewish territory and go up even to Jerusalem; this is what Peter is thinking of. Jesus must not venture to do that; being the Messiah, he must spare himself. But Jesus turns away, and, with the utmost resolution and firmness, reproves the disciple whom just before he has praised. "Get thee behind me, Satan," he cries, "for thou thinkest not what God desireth, but what men desire" (Mk. viii. 33). The Messianic revelation imparted to Jesus at his baptism had already—immediately afterwards—become a temptation to him, suggesting that he should thrust aside suffering and privations as being unworthy of the Messiah. Once again that same temptation comes to him in his friend's warning. It proves to Jesus that his friend has not yet risen to the same height as himself in his knowledge of the will of God; and one might almost say that Jesus withdraws a portion of the great promise just made to Simon, when he actually describes the man of rock as the tempter (Satan) and reproaches him with putting man's wishes above God's will. It is certain, he had not expected this remonstrance from Peter.[1]

THE DISCIPLES CALLED UPON TO MAKE THE FATAL JOURNEY.—After this dialogue with Peter, who had led him apart (Mk. viii. 32—*προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτόν*), Jesus once more turns to "the multitude together with his disciples,"

[1] This is proved by the contradiction between Mt. xvi. 19 and Mt. xvi. 23. But this contradiction shows, further, that by the words of the former passage Jesus certainly had no intention of laying down a law for Christianity.

as it is said in Mk. viii. 34. By this expression, *τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς*, is evidently meant the entire company of Jesus' companions, including not merely the Twelve whom he had sent forth to preach, but many others besides—compare, for instance, Acts i. 21–23, Joseph Barsabbas, surnamed Justus, and Matthias—and, especially, several women. Jesus now calls upon this band in a solemn manner to take a step which will expose them to deadly danger, but at the same time will, by the very fact of their taking it, ensure their life. This step is the journey to Jerusalem (Mk. viii. 34–ix. 1). He now declares again, as he formerly declared when he resolved to flee from Jewish territory (see pp. 305 f.), that they who follow him must look upon themselves as condemned men, who, their crosses on their shoulders, are being led on the last sad journey. "He that will go with me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." The demand for self-denial or self-abnegation (*ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν*) is Jesus' answer to the remonstrance of Peter, when he opposed man's wishes to God's will. The duty of obedience to God cannot be more forcibly impressed upon a man than by calling him to deny his own *ego* (self), with its longing for life and happiness.[1] It seems quite possible that the law acknowledged by Jesus as governing his own life—that he must die in order to enter into his glory—may also prove to be an obligation binding upon his disciples. If they wish to share with him in the kingdom of Heaven, they, too, must face death along with him. "He that will save his (present) life shall lose it (for the kingdom of God); he that loses it for my sake and because of the glad tidings (of the nearness of the kingdom of God) shall save it." It is obviously the duty of those who hope for the kingdom of God to hold fast faithfully to the Messiah. Their fidelity may lead them to death; but such a death ensures them life in the kingdom of God. This is truly a serious justification for the visionary thoughts we may, without further question, assume to have been held by a society that expected in the immediate future

[1] The conception of self-abnegation was created by Jesus, and is explained by him in the words that follow. As so explained, the demand that one should renounce one's own wishes is thought of as simply a means of proper self-maintenance, being in fact the fundamental law of all human labour: no gain without a sacrifice.

the overthrow of all things and the dawn of an eternal state of perfection. By the communication just made, the announcement that he is the Messiah, Jesus had given a fresh impetus to this visionary tendency. In his resolve to go to his death at Jerusalem there is certainly no trace of a cool, calculating worldly prudence. That temper of mind is altogether foreign to the nature of men of prophetic genius. But Jesus' character is nevertheless lifted high above the imaginative temperament of restless visionaries by his steadfastness and by his clearness of thought. He knows that his own death is certain, that the deaths of his disciples are likely. But he goes up to Jerusalem because God has laid upon him the task of once more preaching repentance to his people before the judgment.[1] That is the path which he and his disciples must follow in order to share in the Messianic kingdom. Thus shall they save their lives eternal even at the cost of their present lives. For what profiteth it a man to win the whole world, if at the same time he loses his own life? And what will a man not give to recover the life which he has lost! No price is too high, then, to pay for the life of the Messianic kingdom, not even the price of the present life; for without life nothing can be enjoyed. Yet he may not expect to share in the life of the Messianic kingdom who shall permit himself to be so overawed now by the authority and learning of the great men in Jerusalem as to be ashamed of the words of his humble Galilean master. We can quite believe that thoughts like these were murmured aloud when Jesus announced his intention of going to Jerusalem.[2] "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this sinful and adulterous generation, of him shall the Son of Man also be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy Angels" (Mk. viii. 38). It is a sinful and adulterous generation to which repentance must be preached. Evidently, the preacher of repentance must expect to be received with scorn and mockery. Here it is natural to recall Jesus' lament over the rich, those

[1] Cp. Chap. XII., pp. 347 f.

[2] The disciples' awe of Jerusalem is to be understood in precisely the same way as the awe of Rome attributed to the Apostle Paul (Rom. i. 15 f.). In both cases the idea is that many things may be said in the provinces which would have to be kept secret in the capital.

who are full, those who laugh, and those who are praised by all men (Lk. vi. 24–26). His words have been listened to only with indifference and apathy by these classes. Yet, in Jerusalem it is precisely with these rich and distinguished people that he expects to have to deal. He knows that it will require courage for any of these to hold fast to the humble prophet from Nazareth, and to his teaching, condemned as it has been long ago by the Scribes. But Jesus now points out to his disciples that a different day will come, when the Son of Man shall appear in the glory which his Father gives him, with the holy angels. In that day they who are now fain to deny him through fear of the authority of his enemies will throng around him. But he will reject them, even as they now turn away from him. Here it almost looks as if strong objection had been raised by some of the disciples to the dangerous journey to Jerusalem. Jesus positively constrains them to accompany him along the road of suffering, by reminding them of the nearness of the Messiah's judgment and of the possibility that the Messiah will deny those who now deny him. But when he perceives that at the prospect of death and ruin the disciples are seized with anxiety and faintheartedness, and yet, this danger notwithstanding, are on the whole ready to go with him, he comforts them with this saying, "Verily I say unto you, there be some amongst those now standing here that shall not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come in full realisation." Thus, they will not all die, and they who do die will not remain long in death. Therefore, be ye not faint-hearted, but stake your life on the issue; ye shall win in its place life eternal.[1]

TRANSFIGURATION.—The Gospel of Mk. follows up this narrative of Peter's avowal, of Jesus' first announcement of his Passion, and of his demand of the disciples to tread the same path of suffering as himself, with the description of Jesus' transfiguration on a high mountain in the presence of his three disciples, Peter, James, and John. On this occasion

[1] Thus, in his expectations of the future, Jesus deceived himself doubly. Not one of his disciples perished when he did; nor did one of them live to see, before his own death, the revelation of the glory of the Messiah. Yet the new life brought by Jesus is more important than these expectations of the future, and the real merit of Jesus is entirely independent of their fulfilment or non-fulfilment.

they behold their master in a radiance of light standing between Elijah and Moses, the great prophet and the great lawgiver of antiquity, and hear a voice crying out of the cloud which overshadowed them, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him." And on the way down from the mountain Jesus forbids the three disciples to speak to anyone of the vision they have seen, until after his resurrection. But they do not understand what he means by his resurrection. They ask him whether, as the Scribes teach, Elijah must not first come. Jesus admits this; but also calls special attention to the circumstance that, according to the Scriptures, much suffering and much shame awaited him. "Elias has indeed appeared, and men have done unto him whatsoever they wished, even as it is said concerning him in the Scriptures" (Mk. ix. 2–13).

The best way to arrive at an understanding of this story of Jesus' transfiguration is to start from the conversation which ensued on the way down from the mountain. The command to say nothing to any man about this wonderful vision, until after the resurrection, strongly reminds us of the similar injunction to the disciples after Peter's avowal—that they shall not say anything to any man about their belief that Jesus is the Messiah. True, Jesus himself subsequently, after his entry into Jerusalem, publicly proclaimed himself to be the Messiah. Yet it is quite probable that in the beginning he did not intend to do so, but desired not to be called the Messiah before he appeared in that character. For it is hardly possible to discover any reason why this announcement should be made at that time in Jerusalem when it had been deliberately withheld everywhere on Jewish territory.[1]

Again, according to Mk. ix. 10, the disciples do not understand what Jesus means by his resurrection. The statement that he would rise again was, of course, particularly puzzling to them when it was first made. They call to mind the idea of the Scribes that Elijah must first come; "We know," they

[1] At the latter period it is the certain and imminent peril of death, in particular, that compels him not to leave untried this means also of preaching repentance. Cp. Chap. XIII.: "Resolve to announce himself as the Messiah."

say, "that Elias must come before the Messiah appears." It is not, as a matter of fact, easy to perceive what this question has to do with the transfiguration of Jesus, though Elijah is, it is true, made manifest in it.[1] Jesus goes on to speak of his suffering and of his being rejected, just as he had done after Peter's avowal; and adds that Elijah is already come. We know from Mt. xi. 14 that by Elijah Jesus means the Baptist. He says that with him also men have dealt in the most arbitrary manner, even as they are now about to deal with the Messiah; and in both cases the treatment corresponds to the words of Scripture. What words of Scripture Jesus has in his mind as applicable to each respectively it is difficult to say, in view of the allegorical interpretation, as generally applied. But here, again, he seems to be telling his disciples about his sufferings for the first time. If to these observations we add further that Peters' avowal took place on a high mountain in the region of Baniyas; that, simultaneously with the information imparted by Jesus to his disciples in connection with it, their Master did undoubtedly seem to them to be placed on a brightly illuminated summit, and as close as possible to the greatest men of antiquity; and that from this moment onwards they looked upon him as the Son of God, whose words they must hear and heed; it becomes clear that what is here represented is not an actual experience of Jesus and his disciples, an experience such as might claim a special place in his history by the side of Peter's avowal, but, rather, a description of an inner experience felt by the disciples during the outward manifestation of Peter's belief that Jesus was the Messiah.[2]

[1] At the most, we might suppose (wrong as the supposition would be), that the disciples thought that this antecedent condition was now fulfilled—that is to say, after the transfiguration. But in that case, Jesus' answer, with its allusion to the Baptist, is certainly surprising.

[2] Or, at any rate, it is the experience of one of the disciples, who knew how to clothe his recollection of it in this form, much in the same way as Jesus told the story of the temptation to the disciples. And it is natural to think that Peter was that disciple. It was he who made the all-important avowal, he who, according to Papias, was the authority for the Gospel of Mk. (see Chap. II., p. 30), and was the reputed author of the Epistle in which the story of the transfiguration is first mentioned (2 Peter i. 17).

It is true that the Gospel of Mk. puts the story of the transfiguration six days after the avowal of Peter (Mk. ix. 2, *μετὰ ἡμέρας ἓξ*). The same chronology is found again in Mt. xvii. 1; while Lk. (ix. 28) has, instead of it, *ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ*. In Lk.'s case, the expression was no doubt determined by the exigencies of public worship and the use made therein of the Gospel narratives. The pericope of the transfiguration was appointed to be read in the Sunday service just one week after the Sunday on which the account of Peter's avowal had been similarly read. We find similar considerations for the use of certain pericopes on Sunday having weight in the Gospel of Jn.; for example, in xx. 1, 19, the passages appointed to be read at the morning and evening services on Easter Sunday are unmistakably separated from each other, and the appearance of Jesus, when Thomas also is present, is distinctly placed eight days later, that is to say, on the Sunday after Easter (*μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ*—Jn. xx. 26). It is not, however, inconceivable that even Mk., notwithstanding the difference in the number, held the same view as to the chronology (*μετὰ ἡμέρας ἓξ*) of the transfiguration as Lk., only he reckoned "six clear days between." In that case, it was doubtless Mk.'s idea that the treatment of the story of the transfiguration in public worship might be followed by an after-celebration also of the great event in the early history of the Christian Church, when Jesus announced his Messiahship to his disciples.[1]

If now we look upon the story of the transfiguration as a parallel account to the avowal of Peter, we may conclude that the all-important conversation, in the course of which Peter came to make his avowal, was originally carried on between Jesus, Simon, and the two sons of Zebedee. It is, of course, self-evident that all the twelve disciples would not be conversing with Jesus at the same time whilst they were on the way (Mk. viii. 27—*ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*). Further, we no doubt have a true historical reminiscence in the question which one of them put, after the Messianic avowal, whether Elijah must

[1] This, of course, presupposes that the arrangements for public worship were already well-developed; but we possess no valid grounds for disputing the existence of such arrangements in particular communities at the date of the composition of the Gospel of Mk.

not precede the Messiah; evidently, this disciple had hitherto looked upon Jesus as being this same Elijah. It would also seem to be a fact that Jesus clothed his command, not to speak of him as the Messiah, in the words, "Say nothing of it until the Son of Man is risen from the dead." In this way he leads on the conversation to his sufferings, just as he does when he declares that the gates of the under-world shall not prove to be stronger than the rocky foundation upon which he will build his Church. The fact of his disciples not understanding the saying about his resurrection serves as an occasion for giving them still further instruction.

HEALING OF THE EPILEPTIC.—In Mk. an effective contrast to the bright vision on the high mountain is afforded by the inability of the disciples who remained below at its foot to heal a poor epileptic boy, whom his father had brought to them. This cure, which to others is impossible, Jesus alone is able to effect when he gets down from the mountain (Mk. ix. 14–29). No less a person than Raphael has shown, in his famous picture, now in the Vatican, the inner connection between this narrative and the story of the transfiguration. The figure of Christ hovering in divine radiance between Elijah and Moses might well fill the chosen disciples with wonder and amazement; but love for him is only evoked by the Saviour's conduct, when he has compassion upon those who in the depth of their human need stretch out their arms to him, and lifts them up. It is of course quite possible that the story of the healing of the epileptic boy is associated with an actual occurrence, and that this took place after Peter's avowal. Such an act of compassionate love may have completed, in the eyes of those first observers, the picture of their Master, who had been transfigured on high in the mountain and was now going with unshaken resolution to meet grievous suffering. But the presence of Jewish Scribes (Mk. ix. 14) affords reason for believing, that, at the time when Jesus effected this cure, he had already once more left the territory of the heathen.[1]

[1] The circumstance mentioned is not, of course, a conclusive proof that he had, because, no doubt, there also existed isolated Jewish communities in the territory ruled over by Philip.

CHAPTER XII

JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

SOURCES.—Mk. ix. 30–x. 32. Beside Mk. ix. 30–32, Mt. xvii. 22 f., Lk. ix. 43–45. Verse 30 of Mk. ix., which is of the utmost importance for an understanding of the situation, has almost disappeared in the two parallel texts. To the sojourn in Capernaum (Mk. ix. 33–50) Mt. adds the narrative in xvii. 24–27. Mt. also expands the teaching of the disciples by various additions from other authorities, Mt. xviii. Mk.'s group of passages is little better than an ill-arranged portion from the Source for the discourses. Lk. has only the conversation about which should be greatest, and John's question, ix. 46–50, but does not name Capernaum. The narrative which follows next, Lk. ix. 51–56, may very well belong to the same point of time, but in a somewhat different setting; perhaps it was occasioned by the giving of the surname to James and John, Mk. iii. 17. As a parallel to Mt. xviii. 6–35, Lk. gives his xvii. 1–4 as well. Lk. xvii. 7–10 may also belong to the conversation about the precedence of the disciples. There is a parallel to Mt. xviii. 22, Lk. xvii. 4 in the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Græc. Suppl.*, p. 78). Mt. has, xix. 1–9, only one parallel, using a special Source, to Mk. x. 1–12. To the following sections—blessing the children, approach of the rich man, announcement of the passion, Mk. x. 13–34—there are parallels in Mt. xix. 13–30, xx. 17–19, and Lk. xviii. 15–34. The parable of the labourers in the vineyard, which is intercalated here (Mt. xx. 1–16) is intended to illustrate Mk. x. 31, but does not fit in with this context. The *Gospel of the Hebrews* has (Nestle, p. 78) a parallel to the story of the rich man. Parallels, as far as the subject is concerned, are :—the warning to the rich in the Sermon on the Mount, Lk. vi. 20, 24; the story of the rich husbandman, Lk. xii. 13–21; and the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Lk. xvi. 19–31. Lk. xii. 33 f. = Mt. vi. 19–21 belongs to verse 28 of Mk. x., which refers back to x. 1, ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστάς. But it may be historically correct to connect with these verses, as Mt. does, the saying about the inner light and the serving of two masters (Mt. vi. 22–24 = Lk. xi. 34–36, xvi. 13). With Mt. xix. 28, which is rightly placed here, compare Lk. xxii. 30. Mt. alone, xx. 20–28, gives the petition of the sons

of Zebedee, in addition to Mk. x. 35–45; though Lk., also (xxii. 25–27; cp. also p. 59, above), has the important moral application. The remarks addressed to the disciples in Lk. xiii. 22–30, presupposing that the latter hold Jesus to be the future judge, seem also to belong to the time of this journey up to Jerusalem. They do not belong to the period of Jesus' stay in Jerusalem, because the disciples were then certain of participating in the kingdom of God—a certainty in which they were confirmed by Jesus. The story in Lk. xiii. 31–33 belongs to the journey through Peræa; it presupposes a last public activity in the course of Jesus' journey up to Jerusalem. The blind beggar near Jericho in Mk. x. 46–52, also Mt. xx. 29–34, though in the latter there are two blind men (cp. similar duplications in the two Gerasenes of Mt. viii. 28, and in Mt. ix. 27 = Mk. viii. 22) and Lk. xviii. 35–43. Lk. gives also here the story of Zacchæus, Lk. xix. 1–10, and the parable of the trust goods, Lk. xix. 11–27, but in a more original form and a more correct chronological arrangement. It is also found, though in redacted form, in Mt. xxv. 14–30; and yet a third version is given in the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (Nestle, p. 78).

SETTING OUT.—In connection with his reply to Peter's avowal, Jesus had told his disciples that he would be rejected and put to death by the elders, high-priests, and Scribes; and had called upon them to make the last fatal journey with him (Mk. viii. 31, 34–ix. 1). Accordingly, no sooner does he find in Simon the rock upon which the edifice of his church, already rejected by the dominant Jewish party, will be able to stand firm, even in the event of his death, than he forms the resolution to go up to Jerusalem.[1] This wish to have done with his restless wanderings, and to preach once more to his people, shows clearly how painful it was to him to be precluded from carrying out his ministry. But his reason for wishing to appear publicly in Jerusalem, and not in Galilee, is closely connected with his clear anticipation and firm conviction that a violent death threatened him, as well as with his desire to bring his preaching of repentance, as far as possible, to the ears of the whole of his countrymen. Even when he sent forth the Twelve, he was convinced that they would not be able to go through all the cities of Israel before the day of judgment dawned (Mt. x. 23). Now, as things are, he cannot help concluding that but a very brief space of time will be granted him in which he will be able to carry on his ministry. Hence he resolves to do, at any rate, all that is still

[1] We gather this from his mention of the high-priests. Cp. Chap. XI., pp. 332 ff.

possible in a place where his work will be visible to the greatest possible distance.[1]

THROUGH GALILEE.—But it is a long way from the villages about Cæsarea Philippi to the capital of Judæa. The nearest course, from Baniyas to Jerusalem, makes a journey of some fifty hours; and, besides this, Jesus felt conscientiously bound to travel through (what was for him) the dangerous territory of Herod Antipas. From a geographical point of view, of course, he could have followed the route which in the first instance led southwards through the dominions of Philip and the Decapolis, and then have crossed over the Jordan at about the mouth of the Yarmuk, and, traversing the region of Scythopolis into Samaria, have so reached the division of Palestine which was in the hands of the Roman administration. By adopting that route, he would not have set foot within the domain of Herod Antipas. But neither Jesus nor his disciples wished to go to Jerusalem in that way. If they were at length to expose themselves to the peril of death, it was but natural that they should like once more to visit the Lake of Gennesareth, and especially the well-known localities on its north-west shore, where most of them had their homes, and which had been quite the most important scene of Jesus' public ministry. We may reasonably suppose, too, from what Jesus said later, that several of the disciples were now anxious, before confronting the danger of the journey to Jerusalem, to return home and dispose of the property they had left behind them there (compare pp. 357 ff.).

TEACHING THE DISCIPLES.—Thus, they again depart from the villages about Cæsarea Philippi, and proceed on their journey through Galilee (*παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, Mk. ix. 30). Here Jesus desires still to remain unknown. For firmly resolved, as he is, to face death, he does not wish to die here, where his death might easily pass almost unnoticed, and where, if he were to take up his ministry anew, he could hardly hope for a greater success than he had already enjoyed. Hence, during this short journey through Galilee, Jesus again devotes himself entirely to his disciples. He shows them that the violent death which he, as a man, is about to suffer at

[1] That is to say, preaching in Jerusalem is to take the place of preaching in many isolated places in Palestine (see pp. 363 ff.).

the hands of men (Mk. ix. 31—*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων*) should not destroy their hopes of the kingdom of God, but that it is to be the means by which he will become invested with the Messianic glory. And when we are further told that the disciples did not understand this saying, and were reluctant to ask him for more information, the statement may be in accordance with additional information which the disciples believed they had acquired, when, after Jesus' death, things turned out differently from what their Master's words had led them to expect (Mk. ix. 31 f.).[1] At all events, they did know that Jesus was journeying to meet his death, and that they themselves would suffer some risk with him; for men in their position it needed no great amount of foresight to perceive this. And it is at this point that the observation of Thomas may have been made, which is preserved in the Fourth Gospel (though manifestly in a wrong place, and for that very reason it is a saying derived no doubt from an older tradition), "Let us also go that we may die with him" (*ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ*, Jn. xi. 16).[2]

The conversation in Lk. xiii. 22–30, too, belongs really to this same period. One of the disciples asks Jesus, "Lord, will there indeed be only a few that are saved?"—a question rendered inevitable by his earnest exhortation to repentance. But it is a question dictated by curiosity, and Jesus' only answer to it is an imperative. His concern is not to describe a future state of things, but to prepare men's hearts for entering into the kingdom of God. Accordingly, he answers, "Strive ye to come in through the narrow door, for I say

[1] That is to say, the disciples were unable to distinguish, from what Jesus said, between the resurrection and Jesus' coming again, and it was only later experience that taught them the difference. See Chap. XI., p. 337, n. 2.

[2] The Johannine Gospel, it is true, also tells us that the Jews made attempts to stone Jesus (Jn. viii. 59, x. 31). After the last of these attempts, Jesus went from Jerusalem into Peræa (x. 40); whence, after the death of Lazarus, he again proposes to return into Judæa. But, notwithstanding the anxious words of the disciples (Jn. xi. 8), the Johannine Gospel allows of no doubt that there was no question of any real danger to Jesus before his hour was come (xiii. 1, xvii. 1). This observation of Thomas therefore appears strange; it looks very much as though it were a true historical reminiscence embedded in an unhistorical narrative.

unto you, that as soon as the lord of the house shall have risen up and closed the door, many shall seek to force themselves in and shall not be able." This picture of a narrow door, through which many are anxious to force a way at one and the same time, but which is closed at a fixed moment, whether they are inside or out, may very well have been suggested by actual observation, whether of a public festival, to which only a limited number of visitors were admitted, or of the opening of a palace for inspection, entrance to which was granted only to such persons as arrived within a strictly defined limit of time.[1] The points of comparison are found in the shortness of the interval and the difficulty of gaining entrance. In the case of the kingdom of God, the difficulty does not, of course, lie in the entrance being so narrow as to prevent a large number from going in simultaneously. Jesus' idea is not that the entrance of one could be a hindrance to the entrance of another. What makes it difficult to get into the kingdom of God is the judgment; and people must hasten, too, because the judgment is nigh at hand.

Thus far Jesus' answer might well have been given at any time. But he now goes on to describe how those that are shut out endeavour to force their way in; and in this part of his reply it is clear that they who are questioning him know already that he is the Messiah. "Then will ye begin to stand without, and to knock, and say, 'Lord, open unto us.' And he will answer and say unto you, 'I know you not whence ye come.' Then will ye begin to say, 'We have eaten and drunk before thee, and thou hast taught in our

[1] These are only instances taken out of a great number of possible suggestions. But they present instructive points of resemblance to the conversation between the bridegroom and the foolish virgins who are shut out of the house where the wedding is celebrated—Mt. xxv. 11 f. It by no means follows from this, however, that the saying of the Lord in Lk. xiii. 25–27 is a further development of the parable, and is due to later Christians; for the words of Lk. xiii. 26 f. are not appropriate in the mouth of the later Church. The later Church could not apply this saying to its own circumstances at all, because none of its members had eaten and drunk in Jesus' presence or heard him speak in their streets. For this reason it subsequently adapted the saying to suit the requirements of its own case (Mt. vii. 22 f.), applying it to such as in Jesus' name preach, cast out demons, and do many wondrous works. Put in this way, the saying might serve as a warning to later ages.

streets.' And he will say, 'I say unto you, I know not whence ye are. Keep far away from me, all ye workers of iniquity.'" Here, as in nearly all of Jesus' sayings, it must not be overlooked that the words were spoken on and for a definite occasion.[1] Yet they were not spoken, we may be sure, to the narrowest circle of disciples—not, that is to say, to Peter or to the sons of Zebedee alone. If this were so, it would certainly appear strange that nothing else is referred to but association at meals and preaching in the street. But the mere fact that we find such words addressed to people who have shared danger and tribulation with Jesus far from home is in itself remarkable. Nor, again, can we fittingly suppose that they were addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to whom Jesus does, as a matter of fact, announce himself as the Messiah. So far as we are able to gather from the Gospel of Mk., Jesus put forward his claim to be the Messiah in figurative language only; whereas he is here speaking of himself as the future judge in language that is not at all figurative. That he spoke thus in the ears of the people in Jerusalem is even more than doubtful. If, however, he spoke to the disciples, it would follow that with one or other of them he was not at all satisfied, though this would be true only of this one definite occasion—of which, however, we know nothing further—when he spoke thus earnestly. If we knew more precisely the occasion which called forth the utterance, we should probably understand why Jesus makes reference only to their sitting at meat with himself and his preaching in their streets. Presumably he uttered the saying whilst he was actually sitting at meat, wishing to remind the disciple of the first flush of enthusiasm which had come upon

[1] It may be owing to this circumstance that the discourse fluctuates in such a singular manner between the literal and the figurative senses. Verses 24 and 25 convey a picture distinct in itself; everybody is pressing on through a narrow door into a magnificent mansion, when the master of the house rises, shuts the doors, and lets nobody else come in. Verses 26 to 29 are not, however, couched in figurative language, but are a vivid representation of a conversation between the Messiah in the act of judging and those who were his associates and scholars when he was on earth. This, of course, presupposes that Jesus is known to be the Messiah. Hence, the discourse itself must have been spoken to the disciples after Peter's avowal, or else to the people in Jerusalem.

him when he heard Jesus preaching in the broad street of his village. This was the time when he resolved to follow Jesus; but his zeal for amendment not having proved permanent, the future judge cannot be influenced by the recollection of his temporary enthusiasm.[1] "Then will ye weep and gnash your teeth when ye see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, but you yourselves thrust out. And they will come from the east and the west, the north and the south, and take their places at table in the kingdom of God. And behold, people that are now in the last place shall then be in the first, and people that are now in the first shall then descend to the last." These words show clearly how greatly Jesus himself rejoiced in the thought of his future companionship with the patriarchs and all the prophets. Union with them appears to him to be the chief happiness of the future.[2] On the other hand, the misery of the rejected evidently consists in the sight of the happiness they have forfeited. We find something similar in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. xvi. 19–31), and there is a corresponding passage as early as in the *Wisdom of Solomon* (iv. 16–v. 16). Moreover, the emphasis laid upon the gathering of the citizens of God's kingdom from all the ends of the earth, and upon the fact that those who are now first shall finally in many cases be last, is a particularly severe warning to the disciples, who, as the most intimate friends of the Messiah, with every confidence consoled themselves with the thought that they were sure of their salvation.[3]

All through the journey up to Jerusalem the disciples were

[1] During Jesus' long intercourse with his disciples in heathen territory, in particular, he may often enough have seen and heard things which would not please him, and may every now and then have felt called upon to utter similar remonstrances.

[2] This also proves how much his thoughts were fixed upon Israel's glorious past, and to what an extent the happiness of his life consisted in being occupied with great religious questions. Incidentally, we may add, the passage shows, too, that Jesus expected to recognise again those who have been glorified; and, in so thinking, he is entirely at one with his people. Cp. the passages cited above, Wisdom of Sol., iv. 16–v. 16; Lk. xvi. 19–31.

[3] In so doing, they might appeal to Lk. xii. 32 and xxii. 29 f.

particularly occupied, beyond doubt, with the thought that special honour would fall to them in the kingdom of the Messiah. They spoke of this before their last visit to Capernaum (Mk. ix. 34); and, later on, the two sons of Zebedee submit to Jesus a request relating to this matter (Mk. x. 37). Jesus always insists that every such craving for places of honour in the kingdom of God must be repressed.[1] Accordingly, when Jesus points here to the possibility that those who are apparently the first will perhaps one day be the last, we can feel no surprise. The necessity of explaining the sentence in Lk. xiii. 30, *εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι*, by the self-defence of the rejected in verse 26, *ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας*, is another proof that the entire discourse was addressed to the disciples; for they alone could hope to be the first in the kingdom of God, on the ground of having sat at meat with Jesus and heard his preaching in their streets.

Capernaum.—Thus, Jesus comes once more to Capernaum, and once more dwells in the house of Peter. However, the Gospel of Mk. no longer speaks of a great concourse of people forcing themselves into the house, but only of divers exhortations to the disciples. The populace evidently shun the man who has been rejected by their leaders (Mk. ix. 33–50).[2] The footing upon which Jesus now stood with regard to his countrymen is very clearly illustrated by a story in Mt. (xvii. 24–27).

The Temple Dues.—It was the last month before the Passover, and the temple dues were being collected throughout the whole of Palestine. The contributions of the foreign Jews were brought to Jerusalem by solemn processions of pilgrims. For, according to the custom in vogue, every Israelite who had passed his twentieth year had to pay a

[1] In this we may also see a proof that no legitimate preference is assigned to Simon over the other disciples in Mt. xvi. 18 f.; otherwise there would subsequently have been no question as to who was the first amongst them.

[2] Cp. Mk. ii. 2, iii. 20, ix. 33. It is therefore an undoubted fact that, in going away from Galilee (Mk. vii. 24), Jesus had actually lost his hold upon the mass of the people; and his sojourn on the east side of the lake (Mk. vii. 31–viii. 26) had in no way altered the state of affairs.

two-drachma piece, the half-shekel or half-stater, to the temple (Exod. xxx. 11–16; *Shekalim*, 1). The collectors of these monies come in due course to Peter, and inquire whether his master does not pay the temple dues. It is evident that Jesus is looked upon as disloyal, and so as one who may be expected to repudiate even this holy obligation. And Jesus does explain to Peter that kings' sons are naturally free of taxes, so that he, the Messiah, has no need to acknowledge any such obligation.[1] But as he does not wish to give unnecessary offence, Peter may once more exercise his fisherman's calling, and the first fish he catches will bear in its mouth the piece of money required for Jesus and for Peter—that is to say, the money obtained by the sale of the first fish he catches will probably be enough to satisfy the collectors, though, it is true, the amount required was a relatively large sum (equivalent to about 2s. 4d.).[2]

Jesus was at this point, then, about to draw a practical conclusion from his Messianic faith, and only abstains from doing so out of regard for the Jews, who know nothing, and are intended to know nothing, of this peculiar Messianic belief. Hence, we are justified in expecting that he will not refrain from drawing similar practical conclusions where he can do so without being likely to give offence to others. Apart

[1] According to *Shekalim*, the temple dues are not to be exacted from the heathen and from the Cuthæans, or Samaritans (i. 5), and the priests are not compelled to pay (i. 3 f.). Thus, although the Jews had doubts as to whether Jesus and his followers would be willing to pay the due, they did not as yet regard them as being on the same footing as the heathen or the Samaritans. But Jesus' view is that he and his disciples should be ranked in, at any rate, the same category as the priests. Yet he could not make this claim good without betraying the secret of his Messianic faith.

[2] The words in Mt. xvii. 27, ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εὑρήσεις στατῆρα, point to a miracle which is in every way singular, though it is equally certain that the discourse out of which it has grown is couched in figurative language such as everyone can readily understand. Accordingly, we cannot properly relegate the entire story to the domain of fable, since it reflects as clearly as possible the situation in which Jesus then found himself. The suggestion that we probably have here a problem of the later Jewish-Christian community transferred back to the life of Jesus is ingenious; but neither the incorrectness of the actual wording nor yet the satisfaction of the Jewish-Christian church (*circa* Domitian's reign) with this answer to their problem can be demonstrated.

from this, the story shows very clearly that Jesus was even at that time looked upon in Capernaum as an outcast, even though the collectors still accepted from him payment of the temple due.

THE CHILD AND THE DISCIPLES.—Accordingly, Jesus finds himself confined to the society of his disciples. And the fact of their being rejected by their contemporaries led the disciples to cherish all the more eagerly their hopes of future glory. So they fall to disputing amongst themselves, whilst they are on the way, the question of precedence in the future Messianic kingdom. When Jesus perceives it, he places a child in the midst of them, and cries to them, "Unless ye become like children again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven." In other words, If ye would fit yourselves for the kingdom of God, ye must begin your life over again from the beginning; ye must break with all your acquired failings and prejudices.[1]

The presence of a child in the midst of his disciples then gives Jesus a pretext for speaking of the duties towards children. Children, too, require help, quite as much as the poor, the sick, the strangers, the prisoners; through them, also, one can serve the Messiah. "He that receiveth one such child, and doeth it in my name and for my sake, the same receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me." The most heinous sin that a man can commit is to lead astray a child who, in harmless innocence, puts its trust in him. "He that bringeth to ruin one of these little ones, who are full of serene trust, is in worse plight than those unhappy beings who for some offence or other are sunk in the deepest part of the lake, with a heavy stone tied round their neck." Obviously the method of execution[2] alluded to was one commonly practised in the towns along the shores of the lake. Having taken the child up in his arms, the thought

[1] This, moreover, is the oldest interpretation, as may be recognised from the fact that at quite an early period this saying of the Lord was held to lay down the necessity of a second birth; compare the form given to it in Justin (1 *Apol.*, 61), *ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.* "Being born again" means, however, "breaking completely with one's past and beginning one's life over again."

[2] In addition to crucifixion, which was also practised, as Jesus well knew even while he was in his Galilean home. See Chap. IV., p. 105.

that this child too would not be spared temptation and sin forces from him the cry of lamentation, "Woe unto the world because of offences! Offences must indeed come (it is not inconceivable but that this child also shall be led astray);[1] but woe to the man through whom offence cometh! Take care that ye despise not one of these little ones; I say unto you, their angels look ever upon the countenance of my Father in Heaven" (Mt. xviii. 1–7, 10; Mk. ix. 33–37, 42; Lk. ix. 46–48, xvii. 1. f.).

EXHORTATION TO DUTY.—Jesus, therefore, calls upon his disciples to break completely with the past and to begin a new life. Thereupon they represent to him how they have proved faithful in time of tribulation; consequently, they cannot well be forgotten in the sight of God. But Jesus shows, by means of the picture of the slave, who, after toiling hard all day long in the field, has in the evening to prepare and serve his lord's supper, that human duty is of unending continuance (Lk. xvii. 7–10). And now, when everybody turns away from them, their most effectual justification of themselves to the world must be their own goodness. They are the light of the world. The excellence of their character must manifest itself in all their acts, to the end that men may praise their Father in Heaven, who has made them such perfected characters. They are the salt of the earth, and if they lose their power, then the power which is intended to pass from them to others is lost to all. But no man can become such a perfected character, inwardly steadfast, outwardly energetic and ready to help, without a struggle—"Everyone must be seasoned in the fire." "Rather lose hand, foot, eye, than let hand, foot, eye prevent you from attaining the goal" (Mk. ix. 43–50, Mt. v. 13–16).[2]

ADHERENTS OUTSIDE THE COMMUNITY.—While they

[1] This is one of the sayings in which Jesus dwells upon the universality of human sin. Cp. also Mk. x. 18, Lk. xi. 4, 13.

[2] It is characteristic of Jesus' fresh and energetic nature, that he does not allow himself to be deterred from using vivid terms to express his meaning, through any fear of possible abuse. He who deprives himself of his hand, his foot, his eye without the best of reasons does not, by so doing, fulfil Jesus' word, but actually suffers himself to be led into sin by hand, foot, or eye, as the case may be; and it is against this that Jesus protests.

were on heathen territory, the disciples may not have felt themselves so isolated as they are now in their own home, where everybody turns away from them. On one occasion John says that he and others of the disciples had seen a man casting out evil spirits in Jesus' name—that is to say, by precisely the same formula as the disciples themselves had used in their works of healing since the time they were sent forth—and yet he did not follow Jesus, and therefore did not belong to the community. And they had forbidden him to do such things. But John was deceived when he thought that, in so doing, he was acting according to the mind of Jesus, for Jesus replies, "A man who works in my name will in any case not speak ill of me, and whosoever is not against me and my disciples must be considered a friend"[1] (Mk. ix. 38–40). A decision of this nature was admirably suited to the situation of the moment. Now when everybody is turning away from Jesus, it requires courage to be working anywhere in his name.[2]

Giving away of One's Possessions.—When he took leave of Capernaum and the Lake of Gennesareth, Jesus knew that he would not return there again; nor did he anticipate that his disciples would go back to their old accustomed way of life. He assumed but the briefest interval between his death, which he expected to take place in

[1] According to Mt. xii. 30 and Lk. xi. 23, Jesus repelled the accusation that he cast out demons through Beelzebul, by referring also to the admitted truth, *ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.* This is a proverbial saying to which Jesus alludes, and it is always particularly pertinent in times of strife. At such times, we are well pleased with every man who does not work against us; at such times we may also look upon every man as an enemy who will not embrace our cause. The first clause expresses the feeling of the man who sees enemies around him on all sides; the second, the feeling of the man who is in dire straits and sadly needs help. The application made of this saying in Lk. xi. 23 sets forth that Jesus is already fighting against the powers of evil simply when he does not enter the lists on their behalf. This sentence is wanting, however, in Mk. iii. 22–30.

[2] The instance in question is evidently that of a man whose enthusiasm, fired by Jesus' preaching, has roused him to go and do things similar to those done by the disciples, but who has refused to accompany Jesus when he went into heathen territory. The body of Jesus' Galilean adherents, of course, far exceeded the number of his companions in flight. Cp. Chap. XIV., on 1 Cor. xv. 6.

Jerusalem, and the dawn of the glorious epoch of perfection. Accordingly, the disciples begin to consider what they ought to do with the possessions left behind in their homes.[1] Some of them thought they would sell these things and take the money with them. But Jesus will not hear of this. They may sell their possessions if they like, but it will be better to give the money to the poor than to keep it for themselves. Hitherto they have managed to do without such help during their wanderings, and what they have done in the past they can do also in the future. "Sell your goods and give them away as alms. Make for yourselves purses that grow not old, a treasure inexhaustible in Heaven, where no thief approacheth and no moth eateth; for where your treasure is, there is your heart also" (Lk. xii. 33 f. = Mt. vi. 20 f.). Kindness shown to the poor is an imperishable treasure which a man gathers for himself in heaven, where the goods of the future world are even now collected together. Every act of kindness shown to the poor is a service rendered to the Messiah, and therefore wins a share in the goods of the future world.[2] Jesus' reason for bidding the disciples give away all their property is that, if they retain it, their thoughts, which ought to be directed to the kingdom of Heaven, will be constantly riveted upon the things of earth. This apparently was not calculated to satisfy all of them; for some of them thought that preparation for the approaching kingdom of Heaven, and care for the preservation of their earthly possessions, could receive attention at one and the same time. But Jesus points to the difficulties which arise when a slave belongs to two masters. Experience has taught him that in such cases of common possession one of the masters is

[1] They were not, of course, wealthy people, so that several could now afford to smile disdainfully at this anxiety. But, for all that, the plastered cottage in which they dwelt, the fisher-boats and the nets by means of which they earned their livelihood, and the patch of land on which they reaped their little harvest, made up, in their eyes, a property that was not to be despised. Cp. Mk. x. 29, *οἰκία*—*ἀγροί*.

[2] The idea that the good deeds of the pious are treasured up in Heaven against the day of judgment, and that then the accumulated treasure will be bestowed upon each, and be for his profit, is one that was quite familiar to the Jews (see Tobit, iv. 9; 4 Esdras, vii. 77, viii. 33, 36; Apoc. Baruch Syr., xiv. 12 f., xxiv. 1).

always less well served than the other—namely, the one who cannot interest the slave in his favour. And to Jesus it is equally inconceivable that a man can with the same care prepare for the coming kingdom of God and devote himself to the task of looking after his earthly property (Mt. vi. 24, Lk. xvi. 13). Then he describes the folly of the rich husbandman, who after a good harvest thought only of increasing his storehouses, and of the future enjoyment of these possessions of his, but suddenly dies in the night, and is obliged to leave all he possesses behind him (Lk. xii. 16–21). And when the disciples objected, that they were protected from similar folly by the constant expectation of the judgment, Jesus points out that it is only in the eye which is healthy and limpid that the world is reflected. When the inner light of a man is extinguished, when he loses his sense of what is truly noble, then his whole being becomes gloomy and dark (Mt. vi. 22 f. = Lk xi. 34–36). Anxiety about earthly possessions may cause us to lose the eye for the highest possessions, and yet the sight of the latter is able to illumine a man's whole nature.[1] The disciples did, as a matter of fact, give their property away when they left their homes, without thinking of any return under the existing conditions of the world.

Not a Festival Journey.—Jesus' journey to Jerusalem took place shortly before the Passover; but it is incorrect to call it a journey for the purpose of celebrating that festival in Jerusalem. Lk. may indeed be right in insisting that Jesus had been accustomed to go to Jerusalem every year with his parents for the feast of the Passover (Lk. ii. 41).[2] But on

[1] In Mt. this saying is placed in connection with a discussion of the value of earthly property. It is equivalent to a declaration that it is the Gospel which first puts all things in the right light, which first makes their value or valuelessness properly known. The negative form of this observation is that a diseased eye either sees nothing at all, or sees wrongly and with a blurred vision. Consequently, they to whom earthly property is the highest good do not estimate things correctly. The meaning of Lk. xi. 35, too, is no doubt similar. The difficult verse, Lk. xi. 36, at any rate, praises the perspicacity of the man who through the Gospel has won the proper standard for estimating the worth of things.

[2] The verse in which this practice is specially mentioned and approved shows how far people at that time were from expecting from a pious Galilean complete fulfilment of legal obligations (Exod. xxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23, Deut. xvi. 16). But the Law did not calculate that Jews would be

this present occasion Jesus is actuated by a greater thought, the thought that he will be obliged to suffer death in Jerusalem; yet he goes to meet even death in obedience to God. Sacrifice and the celebration of festivals play so small a part in his conception of religion that it was not assuredly for their sakes that he sought danger. As regards sacrifice, whenever he mentions it, it is with the idea of emphasising its slight value as compared with the act of being reconciled with one's brother (Mt. v. 23 f.), or of supporting one's parents (Mk. vii. 10–13); and he declares that an oath by the sacrifice is not more holy than an oath by the altar on which the sacrifice is offered (Mt. xxiii. 18–20). We shall search in vain through his utterances for words recommending the celebration of any religious festival.[1] Thus, the motive which impels Jesus to go to Jerusalem at the present time is not any desire to join in the celebration of the Passover feast. The very most we can say is, that he chose this particular time because it was quite the most favourable for the fulfilment of his intention of speaking, as far as possible, to the whole mass of his countrymen. His real object was, we may be sure, to preach once more, in the very centre of Jewish life, the nearness of the judgment and the necessity of repentance. What takes him to his death, therefore, is his sense of duty towards his people.[2]

Rejection in Samaria.—From an incidental notice in Josephus (*Ant.*, xx. 118) we learn that when the Galileans went up to Jerusalem for the feasts they generally travelled through the land of Samaria; in the course of this journey, we gather further from the same passage, they became involved in open disputes, and even on some occasions in bloody frays with the Samaritans, who were excluded from the temple at

dwelling at a great distance from the site of the temple. The Law knew nothing of synagogues, a regular frequenting of which was amply compensated for by an occasional pilgrimage to the temple. Lastly, even the women now take part in this pilgrimage—a thing the Law does not require. Thus we see that the most rigid obedience to the Law could not obliterate the differences introduced in the course of ages.

[1] Even the observance of the Supper cannot be so regarded. Cp. what is said in Chap. XIII., p. 464, n. 1.

[2] As indeed he himself tells us in the course of this very journey (Mk. x. 45; and cp. p. 387 below).

Jerusalem. Lk. tells us that in one Samaritan village Jesus and his company were refused quarters because they were journeying to Jerusalem. James and John, indignant at this refusal of their Master, addressed themselves to Jesus and said, "Lord, shall we not bid fire fall down[1] from Heaven and destroy them?" But Jesus rebuked them for it (Lk. ix. 51–56). This story has, we may be sure, a real historical foundation, in that it corresponds perfectly with the hot-blooded, enthusiastic character of these two sons of Zebedee, of which we soon have further evidence in yet another petition (Mk. x. 35–45). In the second petition we can again recognise the same firm faith of the men in the overwhelming importance of their Master as revealed to us in their wish for vengeance. And the impetuous and forcible nature of the two men finds expression in the surname given to them, according to Mk. iii. 17, by Jesus, "sons of thunder" (Βοανηργές, υἱοὶ βροντῆς no doubt = בְּנֵי רֹגֶז, *bᵉnē rōgez*, or בְּנֵי רַעַשׁ, *bᵉnē raʿash*).[2] It is difficult to understand what could have induced the later Christian Church to place in the mouth of the two disciples so objectionable a wish as this, especially as James subsequently acquired great importance, owing to his being the first martyr amongst the disciples (Acts xii. 2); and John, owing to the gentleness which distinguished his old age, became a favourite figure in the Gospel narrative (Jn. xxi. 20–24). We are therefore obliged to conclude that Jesus only resolved to make the journey through Peræa, now actually in progress, after the disciples whom he had sent on in advance had come back and told him that it would be impossible for him to journey through Samaria. These disciples (see Lk. ix. 52), whom he had sent on first, were no doubt James and John, and the desire they express is a mark of the great anger and pain in which they returned to Jesus. It may also be noted that the Evangelist Lk., the narrator of this incident, on other occasions actually

[1] Elijah is said to have called down fire from Heaven by way of punishment (2 Ki. i. 10–12); twice it consumes the messengers of King Ahaziah. The fire which falls, in response to Elijah's prayer, upon the altar (1 Ki. xviii. 38) is of a different character. According to Rev. xiii. 13, a false prophet makes fire fall from Heaven. For the fame of Elijah's act, cp. Sirach xlviii. 3.

[2] Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, I. (1898; ET 1903), thinks that the form Βοανηργές is probably corrupt, and conjectures Βανηρογές or Βονηρογές.

dwells on the friendly relations between Jesus and the Samaritans. He alone has Jesus' parable of the good Samaritan (Lk. x. 30–37), and he alone adds the pericope of the grateful Samaritan (Lk. xvii. 11–19), which supplements this parable, although its historical character is doubtful.[1] On the other hand, Lk. omits from the instructions given to the disciples when Jesus sent them forth to preach, the command not to enter into any Samaritan town (Mt. x. 5). Thus, he was no doubt far from repeating anything to the detriment of the Samaritans, unless he found sufficient support for it in his Sources. Under any circumstances, however, we should have to seek for a reason why Jesus, instead of following the shorter, and therefore the more commonly chosen, pilgrim road on the west side of the Jordan, took the far longer way which goes through the regions east of Jordan, and necessitates crossing the river twice. At first the western road through Samaria seemed to Jesus less dangerous, precisely because it did not lead through Jewish territory; while the southern districts on the east side of the Jordan, through which Jesus actually journeyed, in so far as they were Jewish at all and did not belong to the Greek cities of the Decapolis, were governed by Herod Antipas, the ruler of Galilee. Antipas' people had long before formed a league with the Pharisees to destroy Jesus (Mk. iii. 6), and, accordingly, we now hear that Herod was seeking to kill Jesus (Lk. xiii. 31).

Preaching to the People.—Jesus therefore journeys into the territory of Judæa, and does so on the other side of the Jordan (Mk. x. 1). It is expressly emphasised that in the course of this journey Jesus was again, as formerly, sought out, and surrounded by the mass of the people, and that he taught them after his former habit. In saying this, it is the intention of Mk.'s Gospel to repeat once more that since Jesus' strife with the Jerusalem Scribes (Mk. vii. 1–23) the great labours of his ministry had been subjected to a long

[1] The narrative is introduced by the extraordinary sentence which tells that Jesus on his way to Jerusalem went through the midst of Samaria and Galilee; it is geographically quite wanting in precision, and appears to be an imitation of Mk. i. 40–45, added with a definite view to edification.

interruption, but were now being resumed.[1] And this is quite intelligible. In Capernaum Jesus had been long known, and now, from the moment when the Jerusalem authorities declared against him, and, what is more, had warned the people against him, he was shunned as a false prophet. In Peræa, however, the curiosity to see and hear him outweighed any fear that his preaching might perchance prove objectionable. And evidently Jesus no longer avoids the Jewish inhabited places, but, in spite of the danger threatening him, continues to preach to his countrymen the nearness of the judgment and the necessity of repentance. He is, of course, upheld by the confident belief that God will not suffer him to perish before he reaches Jerusalem and has there completed his work. It is to this period, in which Jesus is again publicly carrying on his ministry, as he did formerly, that the warning against Herod Antipas no doubt belongs (Lk. xiii. 31–33).

WARNING AGAINST ANTIPAS.—It is the Pharisees who call upon Jesus to leave the dominions of this ruler; "Depart and get thee gone from here," they say, "for Herod purposes to kill thee." The Pharisees and Herodians had really long ago resolved upon his destruction (Mk. iii. 6). At the same time Herod has taken up a hostile attitude towards Jesus simply because he is anxious to satisfy the wishes of the prominent leaders of the people.[2] But Jesus warned his disciples, even on the way back from Dalmanutha, against a danger which threatened them simultaneously from the Pharisees and from Herod (Mk. viii. 15).[3] He does not, however, allow

[1] In particular, Mk. x. 1 points back to ix. 30 f., for, as a matter of fact, Mk. viii. 1, 34 and ix. 14 also spoke of Jesus being surrounded by a crowd (ὄχλος); yet, in spite of this, his activity has since vii. 24 been very much narrowed in comparison with what it was formerly.

[2] He had no personal reason for proceeding against Jesus, as he had in the case of John (Mk. vi. 17 f.). The most we can suppose is that it may have been inconvenient to the easy-going ruler, with his Hellenistic tastes, to have people's consciences roused by Jesus, and at the same time the thoughts of his subjects directed to their sovereign's manner of life. To that degree Herod might compare Jesus with John (Mk. vi. 14, 16). But it is perhaps more probable that Herod was unwilling to incur the enmity of the powerful party of the Pharisees, and for this reason willingly proceeded against a man whose character and aims were, to say the least, alien to his own.

[3] See Chap. XI., pp. 317 f.

himself to be deterred now by such danger. The answer he gives to the hypocritical warning of the Pharisees—for in truth it was they who wished him far away—is this: "Tell this fox, 'Behold I drive out demons to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day I shall make an end. But to-day and to-morrow and the day after I must journey on; for it is not fitting that a prophet should perish outside Jerusalem.'" In calling Herod a fox, Jesus uses the same image as he employed when he contrasted the homeless "son of man" with the foxes and the birds that find a home or shelter everywhere (Mt. viii. 20, Lk. ix. 58). The Semites regard the fox, not as a cunning animal, but as rapacious and bloodthirsty (Cant. ii. 15; Ps. lxiii. 10 [11]; Nehemiah iv. 3 [iii. 35]). The name must therefore have been given to Herod because he was inimical, yet, not daring to make any open attack, timidly prowled about until he found an opportunity to murder in secret. In describing his own works to Herod, Jesus says, that he drives out evil spirits, and effects cures of diseases. The former statement is here clearly meant to embrace the whole of his preaching of repentance.[1] But he will not do these things for long—to-day, to-morrow, and on the third day they will come to an end. Three days are here again equivalent in round numbers to a short period, just as the third day is said to be the day of the resurrection. Herod, then, has nothing to fear from either the manner of Jesus' ministry or its duration. Why, then, does he lie in wait for him? Let him suffer Jesus to go on but three days; for it is not fitting that a prophet should perish anywhere else but in Jerusalem. The term ἀπολέσθαι ("perish") in Lk. xiii. 33 tells us how the τελειοῦμαι ("come to an end"), used in verse 32, is to be understood.[2] This time Herod has no need to stain his hands with blood; Jesus is going to meet his death without that, but it will take place in Jerusalem. Jesus knows quite well that there have been prophets who have

[1] So also in Mk. vi. 7. Cp. Chap. IX., pp. 194 ff.

[2] τελειοῦμαι does not mean, "I shall be finished with my healings and driving out of demons," for both kinds of work are by nature such as Jesus will one day be done with, though they will not then be finished with altogether. Such works must be interrupted when he comes to an end (=dies). Thus also the ancient commentators and translators have understood the words.

perished in other places besides Jerusalem. The great prophet, his own contemporary, John the Baptist, perished in a dungeon belonging to this very Herod Antipas. But, although Jesus knows that it is quite possible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem, he believes that Jerusalem has been indicated as the place of his own death. The phrase, "It is not fitting that a prophet should perish outside of Jerusalem," means therefore, "It profits God's cause little when a prophet perishes outside of Jerusalem." When, however, a prophet is put to death, and that by violence, in Jerusalem, it may, as a public event perceptible to a great distance, serve to awaken a feeling of guilt in wide circles, and to stir men to repentance. The execution of a prophet in a quiet corner of a secluded prison can have an effect, at most, only upon the persons immediately concerned; thus, for instance, Herod Antipas was perhaps tormented by his conscience after the execution of John (Mk. vi. 16); but such a deed does not reveal so plainly the guiltiness of the entire community.[1] For this reason, then, Jesus considers it necessary for a prophet to die in Jerusalem. We do not read that he was exposed to any further danger during the course of his journey.

Road and Time.—But of this journey itself we do not possess a picture that is in any sense clear; not a single station is named between Capernaum in the north and Jericho in the south. It is only from an intercalated clause that we learn further that Jesus journeyed on the other side of the Jordan (*καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, "and on the other side of Jordan"); though we might indeed infer as much, because the route taken was by Jericho, and the road down the valley of the Jordan was not commonly chosen. Nor is it very likely that Jesus would have drawn crowds of any size about him in the valley of the Jordan; he had not really any fixed station there, like the Baptist, but was merely on his way up to

[1] At the same time, the thought that success might attend a last effort at preaching in the capital comes, of course, into play as well. A prophet's cause becomes better known when he perishes in Jerusalem, when he has last preached in such a prominent place, and when his trial has been conducted there. Thus, in the case of Jesus, the journey to Jerusalem and his death there are entirely subordinated to the purpose of preaching repentance, the purpose to which he had dedicated his life.

Jerusalem. Nor is anything told us as to the duration of the journey. It can hardly be supposed to have lasted longer than two weeks. Yet nothing definite can be affirmed, because, on the one hand, Jesus stops to preach on the way, and, on the other, we do not know which route he followed in Peræa. At the same time, the Gospel of Mk. does give us a series of experiences of Jesus during this period.

DIVORCE.—It relates how on one occasion the Pharisees put to him the question whether divorce is permitted (Mk. x. 2–12 = Mt. xix. 3–12). This, it may be presumed, was a question meant to tempt him; the Pharisees must certainly have had some special object in view when they addressed such an inquiry to him, for the point was one which to them admitted of no question. The decision of the Law with regard to the matter was quite explicit, and all that was required therefore was obedience, not discussion. Plainly, then, their object was to tempt Jesus, to put him to the test (*πειράζειν*), questioning either his knowledge of the Law or his obedient submission to it. No doubt, he had afforded a pretext for the question by something he had said before. It is natural to suppose that he had inculcated more sharply the keeping of a promise, faith in men's dealings with one another. On one occasion he declared that, in giving a promise, one should eschew all mental reservation; every yea must really mean yea, and every nay really nay.[1]

[1] As regards the original form of Jesus' direction (Mt. v. 37) the language in 2 Cor. i. 15–20 is quite conclusive. The Apostle has been reproached with not keeping his word, with ordering his journeys in a different way from what he had promised. This was evidently expressed in such a way that an appeal was made to Jesus' saying: the Apostle said with regard to the same thing both yea and nay—that is to say, he first promised what he afterwards refused (2 Cor. i. 18—*ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ καὶ οὔ*). Thus, what Jesus on his part said was that his disciples' yea must always remain yea, and their nay always nay: the word which they had given must be kept. And to this corresponds the quotation in the Epistle of James (v. 12—*ἤτω—ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναί καὶ τὸ οὐ οὔ*). Consequently, the text of Mt. v. 37 does not give an accurate report of this saying of the Lord. The additional clause, "but whatsoever is more than these is of evil" (or "of the evil one"), which is no doubt original, does not refer to any superabundance of words over and above the simple yea and nay, but to after-thoughts which men couple with their yea and nay.

The Pharisees, on the other hand, did not consider every oath binding (Mt. v. 34–37, xxiii. 16–22).[1]

Jesus always ranked highest the duties which a man owes to his fellow-men. He puts the support of parents and a conciliatory spirit above sacrifices, and the rendering of help to those in distress above the precept regarding the Sabbath (Mk. iii. 4, vii. 10–13, Mt. v. 23 f.). Hence, he may well have enforced the lesson that the promise of fidelity mutually made by husband and wife must be regarded as inviolable. On his doing so, the Pharisees ask him whether in that case a man may or may not separate himself from his wife. Jesus, of course, was well acquainted with what the Law decided in the case, for divorces were by no means infrequent amongst the Jews. But he has no desire to shun the dispute, and much less to repudiate his own conception of human duty. Accordingly, he asks the Pharisees to tell him what Moses commanded with regard to marriage. They are not embarrassed by his answer. Moses did allow divorce; only, the man must give to the woman a deed setting forth that the divorce had been effected. Such is the decision in Deut. xxiv. 1. But Jesus shows that his knowledge of the Law is superior to that of the Pharisees. He is not satisfied with the citation of this one decision only, for it was given them out of consideration for the fact that their hearts were hardened in sin. According, however, to the story of the Creation (Gen. i. 27, ii. 24), placed at the beginning of the Mosaic legislation, man and woman were created for one another, that they might form *one* flesh and *one* person. Man has no right to undertake to loosen the union which

[1] According to Mt. xxiii. 16, 18, the Scribes taught that an oath by the temple and by the altar was not binding, but that an oath by the gold of the temple and by the sacrifice on the altar was. Similarly, according to Mt. v. 34, xxiii. 22, they seem to have held that an oath by Heaven was not binding, nor, according to Mt. v. 35 f. an oath by the earth or by Jerusalem or by the head. If oaths such as these were not considered binding, they could only serve for purposes of deception. Hence, we can understand why Jesus forbade every kind of oath, and enjoined upon his disciples that they should regard their yea and their nay as absolutely binding. Cp. *Shebuoth*, iv. 13, "If any man saith, 'I swear to you, I command you by oath, I bind you by oath,' then are they liable; but if he saith, 'By Heaven and earth,' then are they free." *Nedarim*, i. 3, is more stringent.

God has thus instituted. Jesus, therefore, shows the Pharisees that his view of the indissolubility of marriage is likewise well founded in the Law.[1]

IDEAL AND LAW.—But it is significant that the Mosaic Law, according to Jesus' conception of it, does likewise set up an ideal, when it gives the particular decision which takes into account, at one and the same time, both the ideal and the hardness (impenitence) of men's hearts. We should go astray were we disposed to read in Jesus' words any blame of the permission to grant divorce, as expressed in Deut. xxiv. 1. All that he desires is that, alongside of the legal enactment, the original creative purpose of God shall likewise receive its due, as this also is included in the book of the Law. According to what Jesus says, both are valid. Seeing that men are sinful, the possibility of divorce must be allowed to them; the legislator does not do wrong when he takes the callousness of men into account. Nevertheless, it is God's will, and the duty of each person individually, that marriage should be regarded as indissoluble. The vows of fidelity exchanged in marriage must be kept to the end of life. Hence, it is intended that the Pharisees should realise that, with respect to this question, they had only understood half of the Law.[2]

CELIBACY.—The conversation about the indissolubility of

[1] He does, however, give indications of his non-legal habits of thought, in that he does not rest content with simply grouping together the decisions of the Law in order to maintain their validity without distinction, but weighs them one against another by dwelling upon the original meaning of the institution he is discussing. He pursued precisely the same method when he considered the precept regarding the Sabbath in the light of the original purpose which governed its institution as a day of rest (Mk. ii. 27; cp. Chap. IX., pp. 227 f.).

[2] Whether in saying πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην (Mk. x. 5) Jesus intended to blame the legislator or not, must depend upon our decision of the question whether Jesus regarded the Old Testament Law simply as a moral code, or whether also as a legal code. If it was set up as a moral code, no concession whatever could be made to the hard-heartedness of men; if, on the other hand, it was a legal code, it was absolutely necessary that the legislator should take men's actual natures into account. But Jesus must have regarded the Law of Moses as being the legal code of his people, for, notwithstanding the supremacy of Rome, the Mosaic Law actually retained its full legal validity.

marriage is continued by Jesus in the narrower circle of his disciples, by his emphasising to them that for a man to put away his wife and woo another, and for a woman to separate from her husband in order to wed another man is equivalent to committing adultery. Yet this had been done at any rate, by the women of the princely house of the Herods, although it was felt to be illegal (Jos., *Ant.*, xv. 259). Now, Mt. (xix. 10–12) gives us a continuation of this conversation with the disciples, which is not reported by Mk.[1] The disciples imagine that, if this is the case, it would be better for a man not to marry. Jesus' lofty conception of the institution of marriage is therefore new and strange to them also. If marriage is indissoluble, it seems to them to be an intolerable yoke. Jesus then intentionally speaks in enigmatical language. He declares that "Not everyone comprehends this saying, but only those to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs who have been so from their birth; there are eunuchs who have been made so by men; and there are eunuchs who have made themselves so for the sake of the kingdom of Heaven. Whosoever can comprehend, let him comprehend!" By these words, Jesus draws his disciples' attention to the fact that it is not only marriage that has its duties; celibacy has them also. If the disciples think it is so easy to renounce marriage, Jesus replies by pointing out emphatically that "to be celibate" is, in his view, equivalent to "suppressing the instincts of nature."[2] The unmarried man who associates with harlots and binds himself to no woman remains quite outside his range of vision. Whosoever desires to lead a celibate life must be an eunuch, that is to say, abstain entirely from sexual intercourse. To many men that occasions no difficulty, because of their inherent nature; they are born to be eunuchs. Others are forced into celibacy by men, that is to say, by the special circumstances of their lives. Others have made themselves

[1] Here, then, Mt. had at his disposal a special and more detailed tradition, similar to that which he had for Peter's avowal (Mt. xvi. 13–20). And here again the truth of the tradition is demonstrated by its contents; Jesus' words are a warning against the temptations of a celibate life—the goal to which these words lead being a different one from that which the later Church set before itself.

[2] Cp. 1 Cor. vii. 25–35.

eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of Heaven; here Jesus is thinking of his disciples, who have been obliged to renounce domestic life because they have followed him on account of the nearness of the kingdom of God. Whoso feels the nearness of the judgment pressing upon his soul should not marry or be given in marriage, as the people did in the time of Noah until the deluge burst over them (Lk. xvii. 27). Thus, there do really exist reasons which make the contracting of a marriage impossible or, at any rate, inadvisable. But, on the whole, Jesus must be regarded as saying: "He who finds that it is inconvenient to keep faith with one woman all his life long may well reflect whether it will not be harder still for him to remain celibate all his life, and yet keep free from sin." Thus, Jesus does not require marriage as a duty, but he does regard it as the course dictated by nature for the majority of people. In purposely clothing his sentiments in the form of an enigma,[1] he may have been actuated by a consideration for the younger members of his community. His words are not meant to be understood by everybody; they are only adapted to those who possess the requisite amount of experience.

Blessing the Children.—The story of Jesus blessing the children (Mk. x. 13–16), following immediately afterwards in Mk., may be regarded as a supplement to this conversation about the fidelity which man and woman must observe one towards the other. Jesus would not have the little ones kept at a distance from him; "Of such," he says, "is the kingdom of God. Whoso does not accept the kingdom of God like a child shall never enter therein." Jesus finds that the greatest hindrance to the success of his preaching is caused by the fact that almost everybody has been led by the Scribal school into the false paths of an external form of piety, which resolves the whole of life into a string of mere observances of the Law, and now experiences considerable difficulty in overcoming the false views in which he has been

[1] The saying is stamped as an enigma by the introduction (οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον) and the conclusion (ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω). The reference, also, to eunuchs who are so from their birth shows that Jesus does not intend his words to be taken literally, but as an allegory, requiring an explanation which it is not possible perhaps for everybody to find.

brought up. Jesus rejoices all the more in the children who come to him trustfully and are not disturbed by any sort of prejudice whatever. In contrast with the incessant opposition now encountered everywhere, this does him good. But the incident, like the similar incident which happened shortly before in Capernaum, when Jesus placed a child in the midst of his disciples (cp. pp. 355 f.), shows unmistakably that he had a natural and warm love for children, as would necessarily be expected in one so deeply impressed by the glory of a lily and by the glad unconcern of the raven.[1] And this love of Jesus for children also throws light upon his view of the indissolubility of the marriage tie. The obligation of spouses to keep their plighted troth he does not regard as an oppressive bond; life with wife and child is to him a happy life.

CONVERSION OF RICH MEN.—One thing this story of Jesus blessing the children does demonstrate, namely, that he was not simply gazed at with curiosity as the great heretic by grown people; for some there were who suffered him to touch and bless what was dearest to them, their children. His preaching of repentance finds again and again open hearts, even in those quarters where he has had to complain most of indifference. The rich had troubled themselves little about his preaching in Galilee; and in the Sermon on the Mount he had uttered his lament over them (Lk. vi. 24). On the way to Jerusalem he finds on one occasion that there are wealthy people amongst his hearers.

(*a*) THE PARABLE OF LAZARUS.—Accordingly, he gladly takes the opportunity of putting a parable before them suggested by their own conduct. He tells of the rich man who clothes himself in the most costly stuffs (purple and byssus) and lives all his days in magnificence and joy. Then he gives, in bold contrast to this picture, a description of the poor man Lazarus—this, let it be added, is the one case in which Jesus introduces a personal name into a parable.[2] Lazarus lies,

[1] Compare also Chap. XI., pp. 308 ff. These same two attributes of Nature, harmlessness and absence of care, which Jesus holds up before his disciples when anxious about food and clothing, might also be regarded as the typical characteristics of the child.

[2] Eleazar (= Lazarus) means "God helps" (*Gotthilf*). It may be that the name was actually chosen for this parable as being one which fittingly describes the unfortunate man whom men do not help. But Jesus'

covered with running sores, at the gate of the rich man's house, waiting longingly for the broken crumbs which fall from the rich man's table. But he has to struggle for them with the dogs, who approach him and lick his sores. The rich man has no idea of rendering him any help. Now both men die, and Lazarus is carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, where he finds a refuge from the sorrows and hardships of life. There is no need to look for reasons for the favour shown to him; his life spent in wretchedness and misery is quite enough to give him a claim to a better lot.[1] The rich man also dies and is buried; and it is at once taken for granted, without any special reasons being given, that he goes to suffer torment in Hades. This is a very intelligible illustration of the idea which is again clearly and decisively expressed in the great discourse on the judgment (Mt. xxv. 31–46)—that, to be condemned by God, it is not necessary to commit acts of sin, and that even the omission to render help where possible is a punishable sin.[2] And now the effect of the contrast between man's lot on earth and beyond the grave is accentuated, when the rich man in the under-world desires help from Lazarus, whom he has formerly treated with such utter neglect, and his prayer is refused. Here we are shown a more friendly side of the character of the rich man, who had had nothing to spare for a poor beggar. He is anxious to help his brothers, his social equals. We see from this that Jesus was well acquainted with the amiability, willingness to oblige, and readiness to help, shown by such

parables are not inventions; they are actual experiences from which he at one and the same time draws and gives lessons (see Chap. IV., p. 107). So, in all other places he refrains from introducing personal names from motives of delicacy. But by means of this parable he has conferred earthly immortality upon the name of the poor beggar about whom no man concerned himself whilst he was on earth.

[1] Jesus decided in a precisely similar way when the paralytic was laid at his feet in Capernaum. See Chap. IX., pp. 200 ff.

[2] This parable does not therefore by any means presuppose an unreasoning hatred of the rich, nor does it preach that the possession of riches *per se* is punishable. The rich man in this parable is guilty, not because he has led the life of pleasure which his fortune enabled him to do, but because of his indifference to the poor man who lay so helpless at his door.

people to one another;[1] but he condemns the narrow-mindedness of such love as this, in that it does not extend beyond its own narrow circle. He also condemns the arrogance ringing through the demand of the rich man, tormented in the agonies of hell, that a special and extraordinary miracle shall be wrought for the sake of his five brothers, namely, that Lazarus shall be again awakened from the dead in order that they may be converted. But they are referred to the common highroad: "They have Moses and the prophets." And, strong in the support of an experience repeated again and again, Jesus dwells with emphasis upon the inefficacy of all such extraordinary events in the case of people who are wedded to fixed habits in all their thoughts and actions. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they hear if one rises from the dead." This was an extremely impressive sermon for rich people; Jesus meant to hold up to them the guilt of their sins of omission, and the one-sided and exclusive character of their concern for those who were their social equals.

(*b*) THE RICH MAN'S QUESTION.—This or a similar discourse Jesus no doubt spoke when a rich man fell on his knees before him and besought him, "Good master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" He fears the fate of the rich man in the parable.[2] But the form of address "good master" was by no means customary. It has not been found again in Jewish writings, and therefore has, with some degree of boldness, been pronounced impossible here. The extraordinary character of the expression merely shows that the rich man felt he was in the presence of an extraordinary man; and in paying homage to this Master, he is really honouring the good man.

(*c*) GOD ALONE IS GOOD.—But Jesus does not desire this extraordinary mode of address, and reproves the man: "Why

[1] Cp. also the advice in Lk. xiv. 12–14, that a rich man should not invite into his house "good society" only—a parable for promoting intercourse with sinners. See Chap. IX., p. 210.

[2] The manner in which he comes to Jesus shows plainly that he had been thoroughly stirred by his preaching. Thus, Jesus would seem to have spoken directly to the consciences of people of this stamp. In the Gospel of the Hebrews (Nestle, p. 78, to Mt. xix. 16: *alter divitum*), this incident was preceded by another, and about another rich man.

callest thou me good? None is good save God alone." Now especially, when he has been describing the solemn nature of the judgment and the duty incumbent upon every individual in face of this judgment, he is very far indeed from wishing to separate himself from the company of those who will only be saved by God's grace. In a measure, we can feel trembling through these words the solemnity of the preaching of repentance which Jesus has just uttered. He himself takes no account of his own sinless perfection; but looks upon his call to be the Messiah simply as a great gift of God's grace. The words, "None is good save God alone," mean, then: We must all without exception labour unceasingly to make ourselves good with a goodness similar to that which is in God. No man is ever done with himself, with the great and difficult labour of self-education.[1] But Jesus' words also convey friendly consolation to the petitioner, who seems now to have an eye only for the great distance separating him from his master. Jesus says to him, "All we, as thou thyself art, are still on the way to the goal." What that way is, the petitioner knows already. "Thou knowest the commandments," says Jesus to him.

(*d*) JESUS AND THE COMMANDMENTS.—Now, in this connection it is very noticeable that of the Ten Commandments Jesus enumerates those, in particular, which regulate the social life of man, and obviously adheres to the division, at that time customary, into two tables. First, he mentions the commandments of the second table: Thou shalt not (1) kill, (2) commit adultery, (3) steal, (4) bear false witness, (5) rob another of his property. Next, he adds the last commandment of the first table, the only one it contains bearing upon the social side of human life—Honour thy father and mother. On the other hand, he omits the commandments which forbid (1) the worship of false gods, (2) the worship of idols, (3) the abuse of God's name, (4) working on the day of rest. This is fully in harmony with the value he attaches on other occasions, on the

[1] Here Jesus is acting up to his own saying about the mote and the beam (Mt. vii. 3-5). Although he is labouring to amend others, he does not forget the task peculiar to himself. The sermon which has brought one of his listeners to his knees has profoundly moved the preacher as well. Thus, this saying grows out of the situation, just as does the first saying, which was spoken to the paralytic (Chap. IX., pp. 201 f.).

one hand, to the ceremonies of worship, and, on the other, to moral duty. He always considered the right ordering of life between man and man as more important than the fulfilment of conventional acts of piety (cp. p. 360). This, of course, places him again in manifest antagonism with the views of his countrymen. Philo, for example, declares distinctly that the first five commandments are the most important, and the second five of less consequence (*De Decem Oraculis*, 12: *ἡ μὲν προτέρα πεντὰς τὰ πρωτεῖα ἔλαχεν, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα τῶν ἡσσόνων ἠξιοῦτο*). What Jesus requires of the rich man is therefore fulfilment of the commandments which enjoin love for one's neighbour. But this dry enumeration of commandments, long ago imprinted upon his memory, is a bitter disappointment to the enthusiastic and excited petitioner. He did not expect to be directed by Jesus to this old and familiar highway of life; he would like to hear of some new and peculiar way—just as to the five brothers of the rich man in the parable Moses and the prophets are not enough; the preaching of repentance must be enforced by the return of one from the dead. When Jesus has enumerated the commandments, the rich man says in reply, "All these have I kept from my youth up." He looks upon the fulfilment of these commandments as quite an easy matter, even after Jesus has told him that no one is good save God alone, and that, consequently, no one fulfils them completely. Nevertheless, Jesus is pleased with the answer; it shows him that it has always been the man's real endeavour to be upright; all his life long he has kept within respectable bounds, and yet has been conscious that this respectability falls a long way short of the highest ideal.[1]

(*e*) THE SPECIAL REQUIREMENT.—Then Jesus believes he can fulfil the man's wish. True, it is an extraordinary course he requires him to take, but it is a course by which he may

[1] Were it otherwise, he would not now be praying so earnestly for better instruction. It is very probable that he longed to have one comprehensive formula for the duty of life, instead of a great number of co-ordinate commandments. Jesus, by the manner in which he enumerates the commandments, prepared the way for such a unity of conception. But the rich man could not at once grasp his meaning; his eye was directed only to the several individual acts that are forbidden, and he did not ask himself whether he had always done his duty to his fellow-men.

penetrate the more deeply into the comprehension of God's will. Let the rich man join the company of Jesus under the same conditions as the other disciples, and come and follow him. "One thing there still remaineth for thee to do," says Jesus to him, "sell what thou hast and give to the poor, so wilt thou have a treasure in Heaven, and then come and follow me." All that Jesus requires of this rich man, then, is simply what he had required of his disciples when he took leave of Capernaum. On that occasion, too, he had spoken of the disciples being able, by such good deeds done to the poor, to win for themselves an imperishable treasure in Heaven (Lk. xii. 33 f. = Mt. vi. 20 f.). He urged them to give away their possessions in view of the nearness of the kingdom of God, He is convinced that he and his disciples have started on a journey from which, in the existing conditions of the world. they will nevermore return.[1] The new disciple must therefore conform to these rules which are binding upon all alike. Jesus would fain have exerted his influence further upon this man. But he who in the fulness of his enthusiasm was anxious to do some specially great thing, he to whom the fulfilment of the universal commandments was not enough, draws shyly back when Jesus requires that he shall give away all his possessions to the poor. When he entertained the wish to do something special, he had no thought of this great sacrifice; he no doubt thought principally of such things as might display and reflect his riches.[2] He cannot give away all he possesses, even when his eternal life is in question. Jesus' requirement was unquestionably harder for him than for the disciples; they had not indeed very much to give away, and their manner of life can scarcely have been greatly altered by the giving away of what they had. This man has many possessions; if he gives them away, the foundations of the whole of his former standard

[1] Jesus considers the journey to Jerusalem to be a fatal journey for the majority of his disciples as well as for himself (Mk. viii. 31–34, as well as ix. 1, x. 39); and between their death and resurrection, that is to say, the regeneration of the world, he assumes but a short interval.

[2] This imputation is not so serious as it might appear at the first glance. The man knows that there are obligations binding upon the aristocracy, and upon the plutocracy as well; he has no doubt learnt early to take a prominent place in acts of sacrificing love. Another similar act now would be in accordance with his education and his own taste.

of living will be destroyed. So he departs from Jesus in gloom and sadness.

(*f*) CRITICISM.—At the present day it is not easy to arrive at a correct judgment with regard to such an episode as this. Jesus makes his requirement of the man, in the expectation of the nearness of the kingdom of God—that is to say, under the conviction that the distribution of earthly property will be entirely altered and transferred, even in the lifetime of the generation then alive. But history has not shown that Jesus was right in his expectation. Had the man at that time given away his possessions, he would, it is true, have relieved the distress of many poor people; but he would in his own person have added one more to the number of the poor in Palestine. And the number of these was already great. The picture of the day-labourers standing idly in the market from early in the morning until the evening, vainly seeking for work and livelihood (Mt. xx. 6 f.), was drawn by Jesus from life. Thus, the observer who looks back down the stream of time might allow that the man who refused to go and sell his possessions straightway was right, had not this been the condition of his belonging to Jesus' society and abiding in his immediate company. No renunciation can ever appear too great to win such a reward. Nor may it be forgotten that it was the belief in the nearness of the kingdom of God that impelled this rich man, amongst others, to ask Jesus the way to eternal life. And what prevents him now from taking the road indicated is not any well-founded doubt of this belief, but a real weakness of will, deserving of condemnation, since it will not let him dare to gain what he acknowledges to be the higher good—even though its realisation is reserved for the future—at the cost of the sacrifice of a less valuable, but present, possession. He cannot prevail upon himself to risk his life in order that he may gain it.[1]

[1] It may, however, still be pointed out, that neither in the demand upon this rich man, nor in his corresponding demand upon the disciples (see pp. 357–359), do we detect at all any condemnation of property in general or any preference for voluntary poverty. Jesus only demands that they *who are going with him to Jerusalem*, in the faith that the world is soon to be transformed, shall relinquish their goods; and they are to give up their possessions simply because these can be of no further use to

(*g*) PARTING WORDS TO THE RICH MAN.—The Gospel of the Hebrews tells us further (Nestle, p. 78) that Jesus reminded the man in earnest words, as he angrily drew his hand across his brow, of his remissness up to that time. "How canst thou say, 'I have fulfilled the Law and the Prophets?' For it says in the Law, 'Love thy neighbour as thyself.' And, behold, many brethren of thine, sons of Abraham, are dying of hunger in the midst of dirt, and though thy house is rich in many goods, nothing of all these goeth forth to them." These words are very appropriate in the mouth of Jesus, corresponding as they do in every respect to the parable of the rich man and poor Lazarus. We might even suppose that by these words Jesus intended now to tell the rich man, who is just leaving him, that the parable was directly meant for him.[1] That Jesus did so intend it is not indeed impossible, if we assume (let us say) that the great prophet spoke this discourse in a miserable village close by the extensive landed estates of the rich man. If this were the case, it would throw the whole story into bolder relief.

DANGER OF RICHES.—Jesus was deeply distressed, we may be sure, at the rich man's departure when he seemed to be so near to the earnest amendment of his life. As the man turns and goes away, Jesus looks upon his disciples and cries to them, "How reluctantly (πῶς δυσκόλως) will they who have money come into the kingdom of God!" And when the disciples are amazed at the words, he repeats the saying in a slightly different form, "How difficult (πῶς δύσκολον) it is to come into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to come into God's kingdom." The first two sentences simply point out that to tread the path that leads into the kingdom of Heaven demands sacrifices such as a man accustomed to live at his ease will feel it extremely hard to make, and, this being so, the last sentence clearly expresses the impossibility of getting a rich man into the kingdom of God. For Jesus

them in the present world. And in place of them, they are promised the amplest measure of earthly possessions in the kingdom of the Messiah.

[1] This is another reason for representing the parable of Lazarus as having preceded this story.

could have no idea that scholars at a later date might be pleased, by availing themselves of an artificial interpretation, to convert a palpable impossibility into what would be merely a slight difficulty. Earlier commentators found in the camel an anchor rope; later commentators see in the eye of the needle the wicket-gate in the great gate of the courtyard. But Jesus actually tells his disciples immediately afterwards, without using any figure, that, humanly speaking, it is impossible to save a rich man.[1] Jesus' saying is indicative of a certain degree of despondency; he is depressed by his want of success. He would so much like to save these rich people too, and here was one who was on the very verge of being saved; yet, when the same sacrifice is asked of him which the disciples have already made, he refuses to make it. Jesus, however, is at once lifted again to the full height of his faith in God by the consternation of his disciples at his stern saying. The words cut off from every rich man all possibility of coming into God's kingdom. They ask one another, "Who then can be saved?" Jesus replies, "For men it is impossible, but not for God; for with God everything is possible." The love he is really able to feel even for these rich people (Mk. x. 21—ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν) will not permit him to believe that they are finally lost. Although he sees no human means of saving them, yet God's wisdom is superior to man's, and by His almighty power He accomplishes what the strength of man cannot effect.[2] Thus, Jesus recovers his steadfastness of faith, which this painful interlude was able for one moment to shake.

Renunciation will be Rewarded.—Thereupon Peter, with a certain amount of pride, but principally with the idea of helping Jesus over his bitter experience, points to the circumstance that he and the other companions of Jesus have

[1] Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον (Mk. x. 27); that is to say, the psychological difficulties which hinder a rich man from being converted are described as, to judge by experience, insuperable. These difficulties do not, of course, lie in the mere possession of money *per se*, but in the habits which go with the possession of money.

[2] At the same time, Jesus now ranks himself as entirely on a level with men; he could not save the rich man when he would so gladly have done so. But he trusts in the superior power of God; that power is able to bring to pass what is denied to the Son of Man.

actually given up all in order to follow him; and Jesus is strengthened by this reminder. With the same assurance which he showed, for example, when he promised the paralytic man forgiveness of his sins (Mk. ii. 5), he now says again, having in view the judgment of the Messiah and the reception of individuals into the kingdom of God, that whosoever has given up any possession for his sake, and because of the glad tidings of the nearness of the kingdom of God, the same shall win it back again now in this time (*νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ*), a hundredfold, and, besides, eternal life in the world to come (*ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ*). The saying is, it is true, reported differently in the different Gospels (Mk. x. 29 f.; Mt. xix. 29; Lk. xviii. 29 f.). In Mk. a hundredfold return is promised for what a man has given up, in Mt. and Lk. a manifold return only. The definite number in Mk. is more in accordance with the graphic style of Jesus than is the indefinite expression in Mt. and Lk. Amongst the things thus given up Mk. enumerates house, brothers, sisters, mother, father, children, lands; and the list is the same in Mt. Lk. mentions house, wife, brothers, parents, children—on the whole, an abbreviated list. But one thing strikes us at once, namely, that in both Mk. and Mt. the wife is not mentioned. The reason for the omission can, of course, easily be understood. It is obviously desirable to avoid the thought of winning back to a manifold (hundredfold) degree the wife who has been abandoned. But if this gives offence, we might also find offence in the hundredfold substitution of the children who have been forsaken. Apart from this, moreover, it is remarkable to find that father and mother are to be multiplied a hundredfold. Mt. and Lk. are content with pointing briefly to the multiplicity of the compensation; in Mk. the individual items which go to make up the compensation are enumerated separately; the omission of the word "fathers" before "mothers" in the older MSS. is manifestly due simply to a clerical error.

At the same time, however, there is a remarkable addition to this enumeration—*μετὰ διωγμῶν*, "together with persecutions." That is to say, the disciples are to receive again in the present world all these goods multiplied a hundred-

fold, but the possession of them will be accompanied by divers sufferings at the hands of hostile men; yet, in the world to come, they are to receive eternal life. Now, as regards this saying, it is abundantly clear, from all the concomitant circumstances, that it is in the time of the Messiah that Jesus promises his disciples this hundredfold compensation for what they have lost. So that the time of the Messiah would here be intended by the expression *νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ*, and be distinguished from the *αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος*, the perfection of the world, to follow upon the days of the Messiah. Now, a division of this kind as applied to the expectations of the future, according to which the kingdom of the Messiah still belongs to this world, is found as a matter of fact, not only in the Jewish Scriptures (Apoc. Baruch, xl. 3; 4 Esdras, vii. 28), but also in 1 Cor. xv. 23–28, Rev. xx., xxi.

We also read frequently of the hostile powers being overthrown by the Messiah (Sibyll., iii. 652 *et seq.*; Philo, *De Præm. et Pœn.*, 16; Bar., lxxii. 6). Paul, in particular (1 Cor. xv. 25), regards it as the real object of the sovereign rule of the Messiah to overcome all enemies. Hence, Jesus might be supposed to be representing to his disciples that there is a prospect of persecutions still awaiting them in the days of the Messianic kingdom. But we find nothing similar to this anywhere else within the range of Jesus' thoughts, and this passing mention of future persecutions fits in so ill with the splendid promise of a hundredfold compensation for all that has been sacrificed for Jesus and the Gospel, that we may well be disposed to look upon the addition as a mistake in the tradition.[1] On the other hand, it is very probable that this was the occasion on which Jesus promised the Twelve that in the regeneration of the world, "when the Son of Man sitteth upon his glorious royal throne," they too should sit upon twelve royal thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Mt. xix. 28, Lk. xxii. 30). But obviously here again it does not look as if Jesus contemplated any persecution of his disciples at this period. The promise of hundredfold compensation, as well as this prospect of royal dignity for his

[1] *μετὰ διωγμῶν* might stand for *μετὰ διωγμούς* or, as the later MSS. have it, *μετὰ διωγμόν*. The proper time for the persecution is, of course, before the advent of the Messiah.

disciples, does, however, show clearly how much Jesus' own mind was now occupied with pictures of future glory. And the promise of houses and lands in superabundance will not allow us to say that his conception of the kingdom of God was purely spiritual. If the saying of the Lord transmitted by Papias, about the wonderful fertility in the kingdom of God, is genuine, its proper place in the life of Jesus might be during this journey to Jerusalem (Iren., v. 33, 3 f.; Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39). In Mk. x. 31 the promise to the disciples concludes with the sentence, "And many that are first shall be last, and the last first," an observation which fits in very well with this point of time. The rich who are not disposed to part with their goods now, even when it is a question of winning eternal life by so doing, will in God's kingdom be poor; and the disciples, who have possessed but little at any time, and have now sacrificed even that little for the sake of Jesus and the Gospel, will hereafter be like rich kings. And yet, amongst these same disciples, who are deemed worthy of such a promise, is included the betrayer of Jesus.[1]

Fresh Announcement of the Passion.—But with these pictures of future glory there is always mingled in Jesus' mind the solemn thought of the death he looks for in Jerusalem. The Gospel of Mk. (x. 32–34) depicts very graphically how Jesus, filled with this idea, hastens on with eager steps in advance of his companions, while they follow after him in anxiety and amazement. Then he assembles the Twelve about him again, and speaks to them, in greater detail than he has ever done before, about the experiences which await him in Jerusalem—how he will be delivered up to the high-priests and Scribes, will be condemned to death, handed over to the heathen authorities, will be mocked, spit upon, scourged, and put to death. But even now he does not completely finish the picture; for he knows that all these sufferings are but the dark road leading to the brightness of the glory: after three days he will rise again,[2] and God will

[1] Up to the present, therefore, Jesus has found no cause of offence in him. Similarly, later still he tells the two sons of Zebedee that they will die with him (Mk. x. 39). A life without mistakes would not be a human life.

[2] See Chap. XI., pp. 335 ff.

give him the glory promised to His Messiah. It is by no means improbable that Jesus did foresee all these particulars of his future sufferings. For, unless the action of the law was accelerated by a sudden murder, this was the usual routine which the course of things must follow; even the indignities of being mocked and spit upon might be counted as part of the regular and customary procedure. In describing all these things so precisely beforehand, Jesus gives another instance of the power of his imagination in moulding all his thoughts into distinct pictures, and implies that he was free from other distracting occupation during the journey.

PETITION OF THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE.—But in spite of this solemn warning, the disciples are far more vividly impressed by the brilliant pictures of future glory than by the imminent doom of their master. And the peculiar request with which the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, approach him on the way, shows how fond they were of dreaming of this brilliant future (Mk. x. 35–45). They draw near to Jesus with diffidence, for their petition is a presumptuous one. At first they are unwilling to say what it is, unless Jesus promises beforehand to fulfil it. But Jesus will not acquiesce in this arrangement. Their request is that, when he is enthroned in glory they may one day have their places immediately beside him, one on his right hand, the other on his left. This was certainly a bold request, because, according to all our information, Simon Peter was placed, to say the least, on an equality with them.[1] Mt. has toned down the incident by putting the petition in the mouth of the mother of the two disciples; but even then the conversation is at once continued as though the two men had themselves made the request, and Mt. stands alone in mentioning their mother as being amongst the women who accompanied Jesus (Mt. xx. 20 f., xxvii. 56). In Jesus' answer it may seem remarkable that he should refuse altogether to determine anything with regard to the places of honour by his side, since only a short time before he had promised to the Twelve twelve royal thrones

[1] It was he who made the Messianic avowal, for which he was honoured with a special promise (Mt. xvi. 17–20); and in the earliest days at Capernaum he already seems to have been the leader of the disciples (Mk. i. 36—*Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*).

and power to judge the twelve tribes of the people of God. But what he promised in Mt. xix. 28 (=Lk. xxii. 30), as the reward of moral conduct, he now also wishes very particularly to show to be dependent upon moral considerations. When the request is at length put to him, he declares that the two brothers do not understand what they ask—that is to say, they are not clear as to the meaning of their request. And so, instead of granting it, he questions them as to the measure of their spiritual strength.[1] "Can ye drink the cup which I drink, and be baptised with the baptism with which I am baptised?" Jesus' language is figurative, but the disciples understand it without difficulty. The metaphor of the baptism of suffering we have already met with in earlier sayings (Lk. xii. 50); and the figure of drinking the cup of suffering occurs again in the prayer in Gethsemane (Mk. xiv. 36). Both figures are already found in the Old Testament: sufferings flow over men like water (Ps. xviii. 17, lxvi. 12, lxix. 2 f., 15, cxxiv. 4 f.); they are like the cup of poison which is offered to a man (Jer. xxv. 15, etc.; Ps. lxxiv. 9). The two disciples declare, full of confident courage, that they really could share Jesus' suffering. Thereupon Jesus says, it is indeed likely that they will be obliged to drink of the cup he drinks of and undergo the baptism he is baptised with. And when he says this, he is certainly not thinking of martyrdom many years after his death, such as we know James did suffer (about 44 A.D.—Acts xii. 2). He means that he will suffer and die at the same time as they. But that was not the case; according to ancient tradition, John even outlived all the other apostles (Jn. xxi. 20–23).[2] But the prophecy of death was intended to bring fully home to the two ambitious disciples the real truth about their

[1] The point of the question is whether they can observe the fundamental rule for the life of a disciple (Mk. viii. 34 f.), namely, that the glory of the Messianic kingdom can be won only through suffering—a rule applying both to the Messiah and to those who belong to him.

[2] Christian legend does, however, make the prophecy to be fulfilled, at least in the case of John, for it affirms that whilst in Rome he was given a cup of poison to drink without its injuring him, and was plunged into boiling oil without being hurt (Tertullian, *De Præscript. Hæret.*, 36; *Acta Johan.*, ed. Tischendorf, p. 266, etc.). Yet this was neither the cup nor the baptism that Jesus meant.

position; Jesus does not approve of their proud wishes; "The sitting at my right hand and at my left is not mine to give, but belongs to those for whom it is reserved." Thus, although he is sure of his ground when he announces to the paralytic man forgiveness of his sins (Mk. ii. 5), or when he promises kings' thrones to the Twelve who have held faithfully by him (Mt. xix. 28, Lk. xxii. 30), Jesus is anything but sure when he is asked to appoint two out of his most intimate friends to be above all the others. He had once praised Simon very highly, but immediately afterwards had been compelled to reprove him earnestly (Mt. xvi. 17–19, 23). The question he puts to these two, whether they will be able to suffer with him, shows a certain degree of doubt as to their firmness, in spite of their very close intimacy with him.[1] The very fact of his not being sure of his ground in this case convinces Jesus that God has not committed this matter to his charge; consequently, he keeps humbly and obediently within the bounds which God has prescribed for him. When a decision is not directly clear he feels that God has not spoken to him.

Greatness in God's Kingdom. — The question as between Jesus and the two sons of Zebedee was accordingly disposed of; but not so the question between the other ten disciples and the two. It is quite easy to understand that the other disciples were offended at this presumptuous request, and did not fail to remonstrate with their two ambitious friends. Jesus hears the dispute, calls them to him, and reproaches them with the words, "Ye know that they who are looked upon as the rulers of the peoples oppress them, and that their great ones do violence upon them. Amongst you it is not so; but he who would be great amongst you shall be your servant. And he who would be first among you, shall be a slave to all. For the Son of Man is not come to be served, but to serve, and to give up his life as a ransom for many." Nowhere perhaps so well as at this point in the life of Jesus can we observe in how rare a way his hopes,

[1] He had already, in the case of Peter, seen an instance of a rapid change from firmness to vacillation (Mt. xvi. 18, 23), and anticipates that before his arrest there will be a general falling away of his disciples (Lk. xxii. 31 f., Mk. xiv. 27–30).

fantastic though they may possibly appear, are interwoven with a new and great conception of moral duty. Jesus declares here what will be (ἔσται) in time to come the position of him who desires to be great or the first amongst his disciples. Here, therefore, he is speaking, not merely of preliminary duties, the fulfilment of which precedes the future glory, but of a permanent obligation continuing on into the kingdom of the Messiah. In that kingdom there will be a different law from that which obtains in the present conditions of the world. What the disciples know as earthly greatness is commonly characterised by the oppression and impoverishment of the peoples. Such is the attitude of the princes of the Herodian dynasty, such is the attitude of the great administrative officials amongst the Romans.[1] Jesus' opinion of this self-interested and pitiless method of government is expressed in the words, "But it is not so amongst you." The law of helpful love, which since the great discourse on the judgment has been the one standard for admittance into the kingdom of God (Mt. xxv. 31–46), will also hold good in this kingdom. Those that are great will be the ministers of the community, and those that are first will stand forth as servants of all the rest; that is to say, the individual will be placed high according as he is serviceable to the whole community, and the value of every man will depend upon the measure of his achievement. He who is placed highest must do most work for others.[2]

Jesus as a Pattern.—And Jesus shows how this law holds good as regards his own destiny; "The Son of Man is not come to be served, but to serve." The disciples know that this Son of Man, despised and threatened though he is, is

[1] That theory was, in part, different from practice is very finely shown by Lk. (xxii. 25), when he points out that these potentates were fond of being styled benefactors. But this is clearly felt here to be ironical.

[2] Jesus' thought continues to be operative in the claim which since Gregory I. the pope has made as head and ruler of the Church to bear the title of a servant of the servants of the Lord, and in the principle of Frederick the Great of Prussia, that the king is the first servant of the State. But Jesus merely found an expression for the measure by which historical greatness has always been judged. When history confers the title of Great upon a man, that man has in some way or other on his part promoted the welfare of mankind.

yet the future Messiah. From his earthly lot they were able to perceive that greatness in the kingdom of God wears essentially different features from those of worldly greatness. Jesus *serves* by his preaching, by his acts of healing; by that means he puts an end to human distress. And he knows that at the last he will even give up his life in the service and for the advantage of others: his life will be sacrificed in order that the lives of many may be preserved (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν; compare λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv. 107).[1] When he dies, then will God's kingdom come, in which nobody shall die any more. Thus we arrive at a new conception of the death of Jesus. Jesus did not rest content with looking upon his death as the God-ordained means of his own glorification; he hopes also through his death to be helpful still to his own followers. And he is reconciled to his expected fate, for he knows that his death, like his life, will bring good to many. The idea that the happiness and value of a man's life consist in helpful love could not be more clearly expressed. The entire discourse is an enlargement of the brief principle, preserved in the journey-record of the Acts of the Apostles (xx. 35) as a saying of Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."[2]

PLACES AT A FEAST.—Jesus did not indeed allow the matter to drop without administering a further serious rebuke to the two ambitious disciples. For the parable preserved in Lk. xiv. 7–11 (verse 7, εἶπεν δὲ . . . . παραβολήν) no doubt belongs to this incident, whether it was appended to Mt. xx.

[1] When Crassus, in his expedition against the Parthians, plundered the temple at Jerusalem, the treasurer Eleazar gave up to him the massive gold beam from which hung the costly curtains of the temple: δείσας περὶ τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ τοῦ ναοῦ τὴν δοκὸν αὐτῷ τὴν χρυσῆν λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων ἔδωκεν, ὅρκους παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβὼν μηδὲν ἄλλο κινήσειν τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, μόνῳ δὲ ἀρκεσθήσεσθαι τῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δοθησομένῳ πολλῶν ὄντι μυριάδων ἀξίῳ. So Jesus gives his life that many may preserve theirs.

[2] This same principle also explains Jesus' saying about the greatest amongst the disciples. He who is active in giving and helping in every direction is happier in so doing than he who is always receiving and enjoying. Not only do other men esteem him more highly, but he himself lives a richer life, a life corresponding more nearly to the original constitution of human nature. Thus, the greatest is he who is inwardly the most happy. If the maxim μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν were not true, nobody could be called upon to strive after greatness by serving others.

28 simply through a happy conjecture on the part of a later writer, or whether it belonged to the original form of the text of this Gospel.[1] Jesus pointed out how unseemly it is, when one is invited to a feast, to take unasked the place of honour, and how humiliating to be afterwards assigned an inferior place by the host; it is equally unbecoming in the two disciples to crave for themselves the chief places of honour in the kingdom of God. It is only in some such context as this that the saying acquires meaning in Jesus' preaching; for it was not his business to lay down rules of etiquette for banquets.[2]

JERICHO; ZACCHÆUS.—Jesus crosses the Jordan a second time at the ford of Jericho. This place, a broad oasis in the midst of the generally infertile desert beside the lower Jordan, was widely famed for its date-palms and balsam shrubs, which it yielded in great abundance.[3] The produce of both plants, in part the result of artificial cultivation, was exported in every direction. Besides this, Jericho was a Jewish frontier-station on the road from Jerusalem to the country on the east of the Jordan, which was not directly under Roman rule; and here, therefore, was stationed a chief collector of customs (ἀρχιτελώνης—Lk. xix. 2). The holder of the office at this time had grown rich by his calling, and for this reason was not held in the best repute by the population (Lk. xix. 7). He was, however, like the publican Levi in Capernaum (Mk. ii. 14), a Jew, a son of Abraham (Lk. xix. 9), and his name was Zachariah, abbreviated to Zakkai (Zacchæus). Now, when Jesus passed through Jericho, a crowd of people, by no means small, assembled.[4] For Jesus was now at least as well known as the Baptist had been. It

[1] See Tischendorf on the passage.

[2] Exactly the same observation applies to the rules about issuing invitations to feasts (Lk. xiv. 12–14; cp. Chap. IX., p. 210), and to the saying about the relapse of the demoniac who had been healed (Mt. xii. 43–45 = Lk. xi. 24–26). All these utterances must be supposed to have a metaphorical reference to Jesus' real sphere of activity.

[3] See Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.*, I. 311, 36; ET. *Hist. of the Jewish People*, 1890, etc.

[4] A proof that he was travelling so slowly that the rumour of his coming was able to precede him. The people of Jericho knew who it was that was coming, and waited for him.

is easy to understand why the chief collector of customs should take a special interest in this prophet, for he was everywhere spoken of with astonishment, and generally also with censure, as being a friend of publicans (Lk. vii. 34). But as Zacchæus was a short man, he climbs into a sycamore by the roadside in order to see the company of Jesus as it goes past. Jesus observes him, and, either from some chance word of those about him or from some outward token, may have recognised the man's calling, as from his whole attire he might have inferred his affluence. Quickly making up his mind, he calls to him, asking whether he and all his company with him can be received at his house; more than this, he tells him that he must abide with him to-day.[1] Zacchæus acquiesces gladly. But as a consequence the people in Jericho are shocked at the prophet's seeking shelter in this robber's cave—for the publicans were looked upon as robbers (*Baba Kamma*, x. 2; *Nedarim*, iii. 4). Jesus, however, attains his object with Zacchæus; the publican, moved by the friendliness of his saintly guest, is driven to make reparation, as far as possible, for the wrong which weighs upon his conscience. "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have deceitfully informed against any man, I restore it fourfold" (Lk. xix. 8—the phrase *τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα* refers to the evidence given as regards goods subject to duty). In this result Jesus greatly rejoices; to-day this house has been saved. This child of Abraham is no longer lost; for the Son of Man is here to seek and to save that which was lost (Lk. xix. 9 f.).

BARTIMÆUS.—The story of Zacchæus is preserved in Lk. alone. But Mk. (x. 46–52) informs us that, as he went out of Jericho, Jesus healed a blind beggar named Bartimæus. One feels tempted to regard this again as a symbolical representation of the conversion of Zacchæus.[2]

[1] It was necessary to spend the night in Jericho on account of the hour of Jesus' arrival there, and necessary also to seek accommodation in the house of Zacchæus on account of the special vocation of Jesus (Lk. xix. 10).

[2] In that case, the two narratives would be related to one another in the same way as the story of Peter's avowal is related to the account of the transfiguration. See Chap. XI., pp. 342 f. This, however, is only a probability; there exists no actual proof of it.

To Jerusalem.—Jesus spent the night also in Jericho (Lk. xix. 5). Jerusalem stands some 3600 feet higher than Jericho, and a steep road, estimated at six hours long, leads up to it through a desolate and barren region. This is the scene of the parable of the good Samaritan, spoken by Jesus shortly afterwards in Jerusalem (Lk. x. 30). The road was sufficiently near to the capital to offer the prospect of booty to robbers, and so well was it provided with caves and ravines that they could ply their calling with impunity. Even at the present day it is considered an unsafe road. But the companions of Jesus were now quite full of the thought of the approaching glory.

Parable of the Money Entrusted.—Jesus himself compares, not so much his approaching entry into Jerusalem, as his near coming to act as judge and to establish the kingdom of God, with the arrival in the same city of the last of the royal line of Herod, Archelaus, who reigned in Jerusalem from 4 B.C. to 6 A.D., before Judæa was given over to the Roman procurators. With this royal entrance of Archelaus in his mind, Jesus now relates the parable of the trust property or talents (Lk. xix. 11–27; cp. also Jos., *Ant.*, xvii. 299–317; *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 80–93). After the death of his father, Archelaus had been obliged to journey to Rome, to be confirmed as Lord over Judæa and Samaria by Augustus. But at the same time a Jewish embassy also went to Rome to oppose his confirmation. So, Jesus tells of a nobleman who went into a distant land, wishing to take over the rule of his kingdom, but his citizens sent an embassy after him to say, "We do not wish that this man should reign over us." Then Jesus shows how, after Archelaus' return, this potentate appoints the administrators of his property to be his officials according to the industry they have shown, whilst others he even dismisses from his private service; and how he causes those citizens to be massacred who were opposed to his rule. All this is actual historical reminiscence; but it is intended as a lesson to the disciples.[1] Jesus also goes into a distant

[1] In this case, then, we are able to prove that Jesus did not invent his parable, but drew it from real life. And it is highly probable that it was so in the case of most of his other parables. The interpretation of this parable again is not given; the disciples themselves were, no doubt,

country to take over his sovereignty, and will return in possession of it. Then will he too reward those that have administered faithfully the property entrusted to them,[1] but will turn away those who have not employed what was committed to them, as well as punish those who have been opposed to his sovereignty.

Thus Jesus prepares the disciples for his death. He exhorts them to be, after his death, faithful and steadfast as he himself has been. He speaks of reward and punishment when he shall return again. Later commentators have interpreted the trust property as being the natural gifts bestowed by God on each individual for use (even as early as Mt. xxv. 14–30, and the Gospel of the Hebrews [Nestle, *Nov. Test. Gr. Suppl.*, pp. 78 f.]), but this is not what is spoken of here.[2]

accustomed to draw lessons from actual life. And here the entire narrative is so framed as to suggest to them of itself, without difficulty, the analogy which Jesus desired to convey.

[1] By this, Jesus can only mean the Gospel, which has been entrusted to them, the Gospel which his followers are to maintain, and by which they are to shape their lives.

[2] For he nowhere says that the natural gifts of his disciples were derived from himself; but the goods, for the administration of which he here demands a reckoning, are given by him.

CHAPTER XIII

APPEARANCE AS THE MESSIAH, AND DEATH.

SOURCES: Mk. xi. 1–xv. 47. Jesus' entry, Mk. xi. 1–10 = Mt. xxi. 1–9 (with a special conclusion in verses 10 f.) = Lk. xix. 28–38 (here again there is a different ending in verses 39 f.); Lk. xix. 38 gives the exact place. The pericope in Lk. xix. 41–44, the lament of Jesus over Jerusalem, is peculiar to that Gospel; it is akin to the address to the daughters of Jerusalem, Lk. xxiii. 28–31, and the recast of the discourse about the *parousia*, Lk. xxi. 20. All these sections were written down in presence of the destruction of Jerusalem, and do not come from Jesus. There are no parallels to the historically important verse 11 of Mk. xi. At the same time, the incident of the cursing of the fig-tree, which in Mk. is spread over two days (Mk. xi. 12–14, 20–25), is compressed into one day in Mt. (xxi. 18–22); and Mt. puts (certainly without justification) the crucial saying of Jesus in another place (xvii. 20). Lk. does not give the incident, but he does give the saying, though in an altered form, which is sufficiently accounted for by the original situation (Lk. xvii. 6). Lk. has also given us (xiii. 1–9) a discourse delivered by Jesus in Jerusalem, the last portion of which was doubtless framed in connection with this occurrence, and the discourse itself delivered on the day on which Jesus cleansed the temple, thus forming a continuation of the words accompanying that action. The cleansing of the temple, Mk. xi. 15–19, is also told in Mt. xxi. 12–17, Lk. xix. 45 f., Jn. ii. 13–22. The crucial saying in Jn. ii. 19 is also found in Mk. xiv. 58. xv. 29 = Mt. xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40. Mt. (xxi. 23–27, 33–46) and Lk. (xx. 1–19) both relate the questioning of Jesus as to his right to come forward publicly, and the parable of the wicked vinedressers (Mk. xi. 27–xii. 12). Mt., in his usual manner, interpolates a fragment of a discourse (xxi. 28–32) into the first part. The great disputation in Mk. xii. 13–34 is given in precisely the same way in Mt. xxii. 15–40, except that the further conversation with the Scribes, after Jesus had decided the question as to the greatest commandment, is absent. In Lk. xx. 20–40 the latter question is entirely wanting; Lk. has placed the conversation, though in an altered form, at an earlier place (x. 25–37), but combines with it the parable of the good Samaritan, which certainly is germane to it. The scene of the story of

Mary and Martha (Lk. x. 38–42) was in Bethany, as we know from the tradition in Jn.; consequently, this too belongs to the same time. Compare Jn. xi. 1, which shows that Bethany was known to the Christian community as the village of Mary and Martha, while Lazarus is introduced merely as an unknown (τις) person. Now Mk. xi. 27–xii. 34 forms a connected narrative; so also does xii. 35–xiii. 3. But as the original Synoptic pericope of Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11 requires to be inserted somewhere in this context as a whole, the gap perceptible between Mk. xii. 34 and xii. 35 suggests itself as the best place for it. The saying about the Messiah's descent from David is given in pretty much the same form in Mk. xii. 35–37, Mt. xxii. 41–45, Lk. xx. 41–44. The discourse against the Scribes is related in the same way in Mk. xii. 38–40 and Lk. xx. 45–47. Mt. treats it as he treated Jesus' discourse at the sending forth of the Twelve—he works it up with the help of the other Source for our Lord's discourses, Lk. xi. 39–52; moreover, yet other sayings are added to it (Mt. xxiii.). But in Mt. between this discourse and the (equally remodelled) discourse about the second coming of Christ the pericope of the poor widow's gift has dropped out (Mk. xii. 41–44 = Lk. xxi. 1–4). The discourse about the second coming (Mk. xiii.) is found in Mt. xxiv. 1–36, 42, associated with other fragments of speeches (Mt. xxiv., xxv.); in Lk. xxi. 5–36 a good many alterations have been made. Lk. concludes this section with general statements about Jesus' sojourn in Jerusalem.

The story of the Passion is contained in Mk. xiv., xv. = Mt. xxvi., xxvii. = Lk. xxii., xxiii.; compare Jn. xii.–xix. The Johannine tradition places the death of Jesus, quite correctly, on the day before the Passover (14th Nisan); but this makes it difficult to adjust the story of the anointing and the narrative of the Last Supper. For the last day before Jesus' death must have been that on which the discourses preserved in Mk. xii. 35–xiii. 37 were delivered; it is inconceivable that the tradition would have omitted to tell us what happened on that day of all days. Now, Jesus spent the previous night, not in Bethany, but on the Mount of Olives (Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11). What is said about the night before that (Mk. xi. 19) points to its having been passed in the open air—ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως. Thus, the only night spent at Bethany was the first after Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem. Consequently, the anointing took place on Monday, the 10th Nisan, or, according to the ancient mode of reckoning, to speak correctly, πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jn. xii. 1), since Jesus died on the παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα (Jn. xix. 14). The relation of the narrative in Mk. xii. 3–9 to Lk. vii. 36–50 requires special examination; compare also Mt. xxvi. 6–13, Jn. xi. 2, xii. 1–8. The amplification in Mt. (xxvi. 1–5) of the words which introduce the period of the Passion (Mk. xiv. 1 f. = Lk. xxii. 1 f.) possesses no historical value, any more than does the information (Mt. xxvi. 14–16, 47–49, xxvii. 3–10; Lk. xxii. 3–6, 47 f.; Acts i. 16–20; Jn. xii. 4–6, xiii. 2, 26–30, xviii. 2–5) about Judas and his act, which goes beyond what is related in Mk. xiv. 10 f, 43–45. For a tradition of Papias, concerning the end of Judas, handed down by Œcumenius, see Nestle, *Nov. Test. Gr. Suppl.*, p. 87. The account of Jesus' Last Supper,

Mk. xiv. 12–25, 1 Cor. xi. 23–25; Mt. xxvi. 17–30 follows Mk. entirely; but Lk. xxii. 7–39 is far more detailed. In xxii. 24–38, Lk. gives the farewell speeches; in Jn. xiii.–xvii. these occupy a very large space: the testament of Jesus forms the "Gospel" of this Evangelist. The events which happened on the Mount of Olives (Mk. xiv. 26–52) are simply amplified in Mt. xxvi. 31–56, Lk. xxii. 39–53, Jn. xviii. 1–11; they are not derived from any independent authority. Mt. agrees with Mk. (xiv. 53–72 = Mt. xxvi. 57–75) as to what occurred within the palace of the high-priest; but Lk. here, as in the case of the Last Supper, approximates more to Jn., in so far as he makes Jesus defend himself (Lk. xxii. 54–71). It is peculiar to Lk. that the Synedrium does not come together until the morning (*v.* 66); this, however, is just as inaccurate as it is to make the mockery of Jesus precede his condemnation (Lk. xxii. 63–65). On the other hand, the ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν of verse 69 = ἀπάρτι of Mt. xxvi. 64, which is absent from the text of Mk., is correct. The Gospel of Jn. also represents the proceedings before Caiaphas as not taking place until the morning. The hearing before Annas suggests the possibility that Jesus did defend himself (Jn. xviii. 12–27). The pericope of Pilate (Mk. xv. 1–20a) is expanded in Mt. xxvii. 1 f., 11–39 (*e.g.*, Mt. xxvii. 19, 24 f.). In Lk. xxiii. 1–25 we have further additions—the sending of Jesus to Herod; and the triple declaration of Pilate, that he found no fault in him (Lk. xxiii. 4, 14, 22). In Jn. xviii. 28–xix. 16 this pericope fills a very large space, though there is hardly any new tradition (except Jn. xviii. 28) beyond the information given by Mk. But with this should also be compared the fragment of the Gospel of Peter, verses 1–9 (Nestle, *Nov. Test. Gr. Suppl.*, p. 68). Mk. xv. 20 b–41 and Mt. xxvii. 32–56 relate the crucifixion and death in almost identical language; but Lk. places here (xxiii. 26–49) Jesus' words to the daughters of Jerusalem (xxiii. 28–32), his prayer to God for his executioners (xxiii. 34), his words to the penitent thief, and his prayer commending his soul to God (xxiii. 46). On the other hand, the prayer of Jesus when forsaken by God is absent. Similarly, Jn. xix. 17–37—a word of love (xix. 26 f.), of complaint (xix. 28), of victory (xix. 30). The statements as to the inscription over the cross being in three languages (xix. 20), and as to the piercing of Jesus' side with a spear (xix. 31–37), are also new. Compare verses 10–20 in the Gospel of Peter. The burial (Mk. xv. 42–47 = Mt. xxvii. 57–61 = Lk. xxiii. 50–56) is further embellished, first in the Johannine Gospel (xix. 38–42), and also in the Gospel of Peter (*vv.* 3–6, 21–24).

Exact Tradition.—The history of the few days during which Jesus ministered publicly in Jerusalem has been more faithfully preserved by tradition than the story of any earlier period of his life. These were the last days the disciples spent with him. The work which he did in the capital was greater than his labours in the small villages of Galilee. It was a time of the greatest anxiety, yet, withal, a time of the

greatest hope; for all Jesus' followers expected his death, though they looked forward at the same time to the advent of the kingdom of God. These few days are chiefly remarkable for two circumstances: (i.) Jesus came forward publicly as the Messiah and (ii.) we no longer hear of his healing the sick.[1] The two things are closely connected. In the hurry of these last days it is no longer possible to exercise a tranquil influence upon the sick; the preaching of repentance, Jesus' defence of himself, and his disputations, fill completely the rapidly fleeting hours.[2]

DAY OF JESUS' DEATH.—Despite the accuracy of the tradition on the whole, we must first clear up a chronological difficulty which has arisen through a mistake in the tradition from which the Synoptists drew. It is quite certain that Jesus died on a *Friday*. In Mk. xv. 42 it is said, *ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστιν προσάββατον*. In Mt. xxvii. 62 the day after is described as *ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν*; and xxviii. 1 is still clearer, the same day being designated simply as the Sabbath. In Lk. xxiii. 54, too, it is quite evident that what is spoken of is the evening before the Sabbath—*ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν*.[3] And, finally, the same thing is true of Jn. xix. 31 (*παρασκευὴ ἦν . . . . . ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ*

[1] In Mt. xxi. 14 we do indeed read that Jesus healed the blind and the lame in the temple. Yet not only does this statement lack parallels in Mk. and Lk., but in its general and indefinite character it also forms a very singular contrast to the clearness which distinguishes all the other accounts of these Jerusalem days. Obviously the Evangelist Mt. was not able to reconcile himself to the idea that this special manifestation of Jesus' power was entirely dormant during this period.

[2] Yet it would be wrong to say that in Jerusalem his practical love was quiescent, for there his ministry consisted entirely in an attempt to save his countrymen from destruction; the magnitude of this task necessarily made the work of rendering assistance in small ways and to single individuals a secondary consideration.

[3] *Ἐπιφώσκει* means "it is growing dusk." In the Græco-Judaic usage (cp. the passages quoted above in the text, Lk. xxiii. 54, Gosp. of Peter 5 and 35; also Mt. xxviii. 1—*ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*) the term is regularly employed to indicate the evening which, according to the calendar, is reckoned as belonging to the following day. That is to say, it is used to denote the twilight; and this, according to the Jewish way of reckoning, marks the advent of a new day. The etymological explanation, "shining forth," would only mislead us here.

τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ) and of the Gospel of Peter (verse 5, *σάββατον ἐπιφώσκει*). It is also an established fact that Jesus was crucified at the time of the feast of the Passover, and at the beginning of the feast. Paul seems to allude to this in 1 Cor. v. 7—*ἐστὲ ἄζυμοι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός*. But the day of Jesus' crucifixion is not settled in the tradition. Mk. (and with him Mt. and Lk.) represents Jesus as eating the Passover lamb on the evening before his death; and it is distinctly pointed out that Jesus took this meal on the day prescribed by custom—Mk. xiv. 12, 17, *τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον . . . . καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης*—Mt. xxvi. 17, 20; Lk. xxii. 7, 14. Jesus is then brought up for trial before the Synedrium, and condemned on the very night of the festival at the beginning of which the sacred meal was solemnly eaten throughout Jerusalem by each family in its own house. On the morning of the first day of the great festival, he is accused before the Gentile Pilate, who, after sitting in judgment upon him, not only pronounces sentence of death, but causes it to be forthwith carried into execution; and, what is more, he has two other condemned criminals executed along with Jesus. There is, of course, no need to prove that all this is out of harmony with the customs of the Jewish feast. But it is expressly said in the Mishnah, that "everything which the sages have forbidden to be done on the Sabbath day is also forbidden on the feast-day"; and it is particularly stated that "no court is held" (*Yom Tob*, v. 2). And with regard to the customs of the festival of the Passover, the Mishnah says, "In those places in which it is customary to work until noon on the day before the Passover, it may be done; where it is not customary, work may not be done" (*Pesachim*, iv. 1). "Tailors, barbers, and fullers may work until noon on the day before the Passover" (*Pesachim*, iv. 6). From this it may safely be inferred that all work was to be suspended on the afternoon of the 14th Nisan, and still more, therefore, on the actual feast-day. In addition to this, it is unlikely that the people of Jerusalem were wont to treat with Pilate on the feast-day itself for the release of a prisoner, and that the soldiers, who were dragging Jesus to his execution, would have met on the way a man returning from the

fields.[1] Thus, the internal evidence argues with convincing force against Jesus' execution having taken place on the 15th Nisan. Pilate would not perhaps have scrupled in the least to violate the customs of the Jews by carrying out an execution on their feast-day; but the high-priests and Synedrium would certainly have been careful not to give such offence, on account of the great number of idle holiday-makers.[2] The Synoptic Gospels actually begin the history of the Passion by stating the resolve of the Synedrium not to seize Jesus in the middle of the festival, in order that disturbances might not arise—*ἔλεγον γάρ· μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μή ποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ* (Mk. xiv. 2). And, such being the case, they would also be careful not to make the execution of Jesus take place on the feast-day itself.

On the Day before the Festival.—The Synoptic tradition is contradicted by the Johannine; and the latter has lately received support in the Gospel of Peter. The Gospel of Peter says that Jesus was delivered over to be crucified *πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν ἀζύμων τῆς ἑορτῆς αὐτῶν* (verse 5); and it is quite clear that the Johannine Gospel reckons in precisely the same way. The time of the Last Supper is fixed (Jn. xiii. 1) as being *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*; and xiii. 29 assumes, further, that it took place before the beginning of the festival, for the disciples think that Judas should now go and buy what is required for the feast (*ἀγόρασον ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν*). On the following morning, his accusers do not go into the prætorium, "that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover"—*ἵνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν, ἀλλὰ φάγωσιν τὸ πάσχα*, where *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* can only refer to the eating of the paschal lamb on the evening of the 14th Nisan, not to the eating of the unleavened bread. Compare 1 Cor. v. 7—*τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη*, corresponding to *θύσατε τὸ πάσχα* of Exod. xii. 21; also Exod. xii. 43–49. On the other hand, compare Exod. xiii. 6 f.—*φαγεῖν ἄζυμα*. One of the rules to

[1] A simple morning walk across the fields would not be described in the language of Mk. xv. 21—*Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ*.

[2] Jesus is arrested at night under cover of the darkness, and outside the city, in order to avoid making a stir. Hence, we may be sure, he would not be executed on a day on which absolutely none of the native population would be debarred from being present at the spectacle.

be observed in slaying the paschal lamb (Exod. xii. 46, Numb. ix. 12) is interpreted as applying to Jesus' death (Jn. xix. 36), because the paschal lamb was sacrificed on the evening of the day on which Jesus died. The immediately following Sabbath is called a great Sabbath, because it fell on the first feast-day, that is to say, the 15th Nisan (Jn. xix. 31). Now, there can be no question that in this matter the Gospel of Jn. and the Gospel of Peter are right, as compared with the Synoptic tradition. And, however freely the Fourth Gospel deals with its Sources, it can be shown that, with regard to the chronology of these last days at least, it drew upon a good Source.[1]

ANOINTING IN BETHANY ON MONDAY.—For fixing the date of the anointing in Bethany, the Johannine Gospel uses the same Latin method of computation which seems to be employed in the 5th verse of the Gospel of Peter (*πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν ἀζύμων τῆς ἑορτῆς αὐτῶν*)—*πρὸ ἕξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα*; in other words, it includes both the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* and gives the 10th Nisan. Consequently, if the Passover (15th Nisan) was celebrated on the Saturday, the anointing took place on the previous Monday. Now, the Gospel of Mk. mentions in order the day of the entry into Jerusalem, the day of the cleansing of the temple, the day of many discourses, the day of the Last Supper, the day of Jesus' death (Mk. xi. 11, 19, xiv. 1, 12, xv. 1). Counting from Friday, this again brings us back to Monday. Nor is this conclusion in any way altered if we regard—indeed, it is absolutely necessary to do so—the story of the woman taken in adultery (Jn. vii. 53–viii. 11) as forming an original portion of the Gospel of Mk., and insert it in the only gap discernible here—before Mk. xii.

[1] Nor is this by any means the only case in which the Johannine Gospel furnishes good and trustworthy information beyond that given by the Synoptists: cp. Jn. i. 40 f. concerning the disciples of John; ii. 19, the saying which accompanied the cleansing of the temple; vi. 42, vii. 42, the descent and parentage of Jesus; vii. 1–10, Jesus constrained by his brethren to journey to Judæa; x. 1–5, the parable of the shepherds; xi. 1, Bethany, the village of Mary and Martha; xix. 13, the tribunal of Pilate; xix. 31–35, the breaking of the bones. At the same time, the occurrence of these trustworthy statements does not prevent us from being obliged to stamp as generally unhistorical the whole outline of the life of Jesus contained in this Gospel.

35. Jesus' verdict upon this sinning woman, then, marks the opening of the day on which in the evening he ate his last meal in company with his disciples, and the close of which witnessed his seizure in Gethsemane, the prelude to the last scene of all. For, as neither Jesus nor his disciples can have been busy with preparations for the Passover meal, by eliminating Mk. xiv. 12–16 we should lose our only tradition concerning this day down to the Last Supper; and to suppose that there was no such tradition is out of the question.[1] Now, from Mk. xi. 11 f. we gather that on the first evening after his entry into Jerusalem (the night from Monday to Tuesday) Jesus went to Bethany, and there stayed until the morning. On the second evening, after the cleansing of the temple (the night from Tuesday to Wednesday), he went, according to Mk. xiv. 19, ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, and consequently not to Bethany: he spent the night in the open air. The third night (from Wednesday to Thursday), after his disputations, he spent on the Mount of Olives (Jn. viii. 1). He intended to spend the last night (Thursday to Friday) again on the Mount of Olives in Gethsemane (Mk. xiv. 32). If, then, Jesus was anointed during a meal in Bethany, there is every probability that this happened on Monday evening, the 10th Nisan. Consequently, this chronological note in the Johannine Gospel may well be correct.[2]

Decision to Proclaim Himself the Messiah.—Although none of our Sources makes any mention of it, Jesus, whilst yet on the road to Jerusalem, arrived at an extremely important decision. From the very first, he assumes in Jerusalem the character of the Messiah. Thus, he departs from the principle which he himself had maintained since his baptism by John, and which he had enjoined upon his disciples after Peter made his avowal. Previous to his entry into Jerusalem, he had kept his Messianic

[1] The disciples were certainly not likely to forget the last day of Jesus' ministry, the last day they spent in his society.

[2] It is also very likely to be accurate for this reason: no other motive can be discovered, except that of historical truth, for the statement that the anointing took place in Bethany on the Monday. Had the statement been that it took place on Sunday, the case would have been very different, for then we should have been led to suspect a pericope introductory to the week of the Passion. But this is not so.

vocation secret from the public, the reason being that the announcement of the fact seemed to promise him nothing, or at any rate nothing desirable. He feared it would strengthen his countrymen's dangerous longing for freedom. He shrank from the idea of signs and wonders being demanded from him, for he could not attempt to give them without tempting God. He suspected, further, that his poverty and lowliness of station would give offence, and that the people would refuse to hear of such a person being the Messiah. Then the ideas which had exercised his mind after the Messianic revelation made to him at his baptism would be continually intruding themselves upon him, and proving a source of temptation to others.[1] But now all these scruples give way: Jesus in Jerusalem openly calls himself the Messiah. We can infer, at all events, what were the reasons which determined him to do this. In the parable of the trust goods, related on the way from Jericho to Jerusalem, he uses his approaching entry into Jerusalem as an occasion for speaking of the entry of the last of its former Jewish rulers into the same capital. It was therefore only natural that the disciples and Jesus himself should search the Scriptures for passages applying to the Messiah's entry into Jerusalem. Two would at once occur to them—the two which are blended together in Mt. xxi. 5. One, Isa. lxii. 11, runs thus, "*Say ye to the daughter of Zion*, Behold thy salvation (יְשׁוּעֶךָ, *yish'ēk*; LXX. ὁ σωτήρ) cometh! His reward (cometh) with him and his recompense (marcheth) before him!" The opening words of this passage would no doubt suggest to the Messianic community that it was God's will that the Messiah *should not keep his future calling secret* in Jerusalem.[2] Here the Messiah seems also to be

[1] See Chap. VII., pp. 151 f.

[2] Before the entry of the Messiah into Jerusalem, which was unquestionably felt to be an event of very great importance, the disciples, and even Jesus himself, were necessarily reminded of these Old Testament passages; for, in the current opinion of the time, they had reference to this entry. And, in view of the LXX. translation, there can be no question that Isa. lxii. 11 was one of these passages. It was originally written with a Messianic purpose. And the imperative "Tell ye the daughter of Zion" is still further strengthened by the introductory words, "Behold Yahwè

called the future judge who distributes rewards and retribution. Jesus may have hoped that he would be able to produce a stronger impression upon the people of Jerusalem by revealing himself to them as the future judge. After all that had already happened, he could but expect his death in the capital; hence, this divine injunction revealed to him a last means of making his preaching impressive to the people of Jerusalem. These particular words of Scripture, then, expressly called upon men to declare to the daughter of Zion that her salvation was coming; but there was another passage which defined in what manner the Messiah must make his entry into the capital. In Zech. ix. 9, we read, "Rejoice aloud, O daughter of Zion! Exult for joy, O daughter of Jerusalem! Verily, thy king will make his entry into thee. He is just and victorious. He is humble, and rideth upon an ass, upon a colt, the foal of an ass!" According to Jesus' own view, this could not refer to the last glorious coming of the Messiah; for he will then flash forth like the lightning, and be visible from the one end of the heavens to the other (Lk. xvii. 24). It could only refer to the present entry into Jerusalem. And, accordingly, Jesus deliberately arranges his entrance in conformity with these words of Scripture.[1]

JESUS' ACQUAINTANCE WITH JERUSALEM.—Jesus had been long acquainted with the holy city. The demand of the Law, indeed, that every man of Israelitish birth should appear three times a year in the temple at Jerusalem, was, owing to the wide dispersion of the Jews, impossible of fulfilment (Deut. xvi. 16, Exod. xxiii. 17). Devout Galileans, however, might have come regularly to one or other of the great feasts, as we are told the parents of Jesus did to the feast of the Passover (Lk. ii. 41). In any case, we may assume that the man who

causes it to be heard to the end of the earth." The Messiah himself may not be deaf to such an exhortation of the Lord.

[1] Nobody can object to this, except the person who fails to reflect that Jesus knew himself to be the Messiah and was acquainted with the passages of Scripture which were interpreted to bear upon the Messiah. Accepting these presuppositions, Jesus had no alternative but to act as he did. It was not that he looked upon the directions contained in these passages as happy suggestions merely; he believed that they imposed upon him a sacred duty.

travelled from Nazareth to the Baptist in the wilderness would not shrink from making the pilgrimage to Jerusalem required by the Law. Moreover, Jesus had acquaintances living near the city. Mk., it is true, speaks precisely only of the house of one Simon, a leper, situated in Bethany on the Mount of Olives, where Jesus was once a guest (Mk. xiv. 3—*κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ*). But in both Lk. and Jn. we find mention of the sisters Mary and Martha, who dwelt in Bethany (so at any rate Jn. xi. 1 says, though Lk. x. 38 speaks only of *κώμη τις*). Yet the narrative which immediately precedes (Lk. x. 25–37) belongs to the period of Jesus' activity in Jerusalem. Hence, the statement in the Johannine Gospel as to the place where Mary and Martha lived may be correct.

In Bethany.—On the Monday, therefore, before the Passover, which was to begin on the following Friday evening with the eating of the paschal lamb, Jesus came up from Jericho, and betook himself in the first instance to Bethany, hidden amidst its pleasant gardens. Good water, an abundance of fig, olive, almond, and carob trees are still to be found in the otherwise poor village of *El-Azarîyeh*.[1] Thence it is about three-quarters of an hour's journey to Jerusalem.

Jesus' Associates.—The companions of Jesus now numbered at least twenty. The Twelve were hardly the only disciples who came with him, for the epoch marked by the choosing and sending forth of these men had long been eclipsed by other events of greater magnitude.[2] Besides these, there were also among his followers women who had come with him from Galilee to Jerusalem. Mk. xv. 40 f. tells us the names of three—Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James the Less and of Joses, and Salome—but it is expressly said that "many other women came up with him to Jerusalem" (*ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ*

[1] Baedeker, *Palästina*, 3rd. ed. p. 164.

[2] In this connection, we must think especially of the sojourn in heathen territory (Mk. vii. 24). No doubt, those who were with Jesus on this occasion accompanied him also to Jerusalem. We are distinctly told (Mk. x. 41, xi. 11, xiv. 17), however, that the Twelve still formed, as it were, the kernel of the new community. Compare, also, in particular, the promise in Mt. xix. 28 = Lk. xxii. 30, and the fact of the speedy reunion of the disciples (Judas, of course, excepted) after Jesus' death (1 Cor. xv. 5).

εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα). Lk. viii. 3 describes two other women as disciples—Joanna, the wife of Chuza, a Herodian official, and Susanna. When Jesus arrived in Bethany, it would seem to have been already afternoon, so he claimed the hospitality of the sisters Mary and Martha.[1]

MARY AND MARTHA.—How many of Jesus' companions may have found shelter in the house of the sisters we do not know; but Martha at any rate seems to have been somewhat agitated by the visit. While she is bestirring herself to entertain their guests, Mary seats herself at Jesus' feet and listens to his words. As the great prophet—she has perhaps already heard him called "the coming Messiah"—was only to be with them for a short while, she wished to derive the greatest possible benefit from his sojourn in her home. Martha, however, does not approve of her sister's conduct in thus sitting still and listening; she even complains to Jesus, "Lord, carest thou not that my sister leaveth me to serve alone? Bid her help me." But, in accordance with that serenity of nature which we have so frequently had occasion to notice, Jesus is unable to take any pleasure in Martha's bustle and excitement, and she receives, instead of praise, a gentle reproach. "Martha, Martha," says Jesus, "thou art anxious and troublest thyself about many things, and yet one thing only is needful." Jesus is undoubtedly referring to the refreshment which has to be provided for himself and his companions. One thing would be enough; but Martha cannot be satisfied unless she keeps on serving up one new dish after another.[2] At any rate, Jesus refuses to bid Mary devote herself to such service. "Mary," he says, "has chosen the good part which shall not be taken from her." This little story shows once again the serenity and stead-

[1] Since this was the only occasion during the course of his public ministry on which he came into the vicinity of Jerusalem, and since Bethany was the village of Mary and Martha (see p. 392), the visit mentioned in Lk. x. 38 must belong to this time. But the narrative in Lk. x. 38–42 presupposes that this is simply the first visit after a long absence; this, too, only suits this particular Monday on which Jesus again comes to Bethany.

[2] The deeply allegorical conception of this "one thing only is needful" in the well-known hymn of Schröder goes beyond the historical meaning of the phrase.

fastness of Jesus' character, as well as his good-natured determination, as compared with the unexhilarating bustle and agitation even of good people who are anxious to render service. In view of the struggles awaiting him in Jerusalem, Jesus derives greater pleasure from Mary's quiet listening than from the anxious stir and worry of Martha (Lk. x. 38–42).

ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.—It was whilst he was in the house of these two sisters that Jesus made the preparations for his entry into Jerusalem. He was informed that a young ass, on which no man had ever yet sat,[1] was to be had at Bethphage, on the way from Bethany to Jerusalem. Two of the disciples, therefore, go on in advance and bring the ass's colt to Jesus. A mantle is spread over the beast and Jesus sits upon it. This moment, that of the entry of the Messiah into his future capital, was both for him and his disciples great and inspiring, as well as decisive. The enthusiasm of his attendants is seen in their spreading their garments, or green straw (*στιβάδας*) cut from the fields, along the road in place of carpets—an ancient form of homage of which we have an early instance when Jehu was made king (2 Ki. ix. 13). But the green straw or reed was displeasing to the later Evangelists. Lk. (xix. 36) simply leaves it out. Mt. (xx. 8) converts it into branches of trees; while Jn. (xii. 13) thinks to do justice to the dignity of Jesus by making the people of Jerusalem come out of the city to meet him, carrying palm-branches in their hands. This, however, is a later embellishment.[2] On the

[1] An animal of this kind is not pleasant to ride, *ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὔπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισε* (Mk. xi. 2). But Jesus did not concern himself about comfort. It cannot be denied, however, that throughout this story of the way in which the ass was procured there is something mysterious and wonderful (Mk. xi. 1–6), which can hardly be founded upon historical facts. Whether the detail just mentioned belongs to this category need not be discussed here. We may be inclined to believe that it does, when we reflect that Jesus' grave is described in Mk. xv. 46 simply as a rock-grave, in Mt. xxvii. 60 as a new rock-grave, in Lk. xxiii. 53 as a rock-grave in which nobody had yet lain (*οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὔπω κείμενος*). The dignity of the Messiah requires that he shall use only what has not been used by any man before. And yet this thought may have been in Jesus' own mind when he selected the animal upon which to ride.

[2] At that time, as also at the present day, the essential condition, a forest which could yield the palm-branches, was wanting in the vicinity of Jerusalem. True, these branches were used at the Feast of Tabernacles,

other hand, we are told, further, that those who went before him and those that followed after him interwove with the supplications of the 118th Psalm words which lauded the speedy advent of the kingdom of the Messiah and implored God for help. This prayer was, of course, known to every Jew, from its being recited at the Feast of Tabernacles—"Hosanna! Praised be he that cometh in the name of Yahwè" (Ps. cxviii. 25 f., הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא׃ בָּרוּךְ הַבָּא בְּשֵׁם יַהְוֶה).[1] To this the disciples add, "Praised be the kingdom of our father David that is about to come!" It is significant that they should have chosen this title for the Messianic kingdom at this particular time. For David had made Jerusalem the capital of his country (2 Sam. v. 6–9); and his reign was with perfect justice looked upon as the most brilliant epoch of the Israelitish State. Hence, since the time of Amos the hopes of the prophets had been fixed upon the raising again of the fallen tabernacle of David (Amos ix. 11). The disciples would not have been good patriots if, on their entry into the venerable capital, Galileans as they were, their hearts had not leapt with joy at the glory about to be shed upon Jerusalem by the coming kingdom of God, or had not looked forward with eager hope to the political greatness of their people, soon to dawn.[2] Jesus himself, it is true, entirely rejected such ideas. In the course of the next few days, he contends

and the Mishnah speaks of (*Sukka* iii. 1) an (otherwise unknown) "Iron Mountain" (הַר הַבַּרְזֶל, *har habbarzel*) as the place whence they were obtained; but Jesus' entry was not prepared for to the same extent as the Feast of Tabernacles. Still, the narrative in the Fourth Gospel is certainly coloured by recollection of the Feast of Tabernacles, for its author was well acquainted with the customs of that festival (even on the evidence of Jn. vii. 37). On that occasion the people waved branches of palm, myrtle, and willow, whilst they recited the words of the 118th Psalm (אָנָּה הַשֵּׁם הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא); *Sukka*, iii. 9).

[1] Compare *Sukka*, iii. 9, iv. 5 (see note above).

[2] The words "The kingdom of our father David that is about to come," recited by a band of pilgrims as they entered the city, then in the hands of the Romans, would certainly have been understood by everybody, in the first instance, as an aspiration for the freedom of the people of God from the yoke of the stranger. True, the hopes of the Jews were concerned with the spiritual and moral possessions of the kingdom of God; but the fundamental condition of all other Messianic blessings seems to have been the establishment of an independent Israelitish State.

against the view that the Messiah is to be considered a son of David (Mk. xii. 37). But, for the present, he does not wish to interfere with his disciples' joy. The disciples' triumphal cry, as reported in Mk. (xi. 9 f.), concludes with the prayer, "Help in the heights." Jerome gives us, in addition to this, the words of the Gospel of the Hebrews, "*Osanna barrama!*" (Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 78), that is to say, הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא בְּרָמָה, *hoshiʿah nā bārāmāh.* "In the heights" is, of course, a name for the dwelling-place of God, and therefore for God himself, "who dwelleth on high."

Participation of the People.—Unless we accept the free version of the Johannine Gospel as historical, we are not told that the population of Jerusalem took any part in these acclamations and demonstrations of homage. On the contrary, Mt. and Lk. seek to describe the effect which this peculiar procession of pilgrims had upon the people of the city. The former tells us (xxi. 10 f.) that "the entire city was in commotion." People asked one another, "Who is this coming?" and were told, "It is the prophet Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee." The words *ἐσείσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις* may be regarded as somewhat of an exaggeration.[1] It is true that even in Jericho Zacchæus, because of the press of the multitude, climbed up into a sycamore tree in order to be able to see Jesus. In so far, therefore, as any idea got abroad in Jerusalem of the approaching entry of Jesus, we may well suppose that people were anxious to see the great Galilean prophet, or, perhaps, even the notorious false teacher of Galilee. We are not told that the populace understood the entrance upon the foal of an ass to be a Messianic announcement in accordance with Zech. ix. 9; consequently, we may well assume that they did not so understand it.[2] The remark in the Johannine Gospel (xii. 16), that the disciples them-

[1] Compare the arrival of the Magi in Jerusalem—*Ἡρώδης ἐταράχθη καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ' αὐτοῦ* (Mt. ii. 3).

[2] According to Mt. xxi. 15 f., the children in the temple cried "Hosanna to (Help) the son of David!" But, seeing that the disciples did not acclaim Jesus as the son of David (Mk. xi. 9 f. as against Mt. xxi. 9), it is very unlikely that the children did so either. Indeed, Mk. xii. 37 tells us that Jesus forbade his disciples to address him as the son of David. For the healing of the blind and the lame, recorded in the same context, see p. 395, n. 1.

selves did not think of interpreting Jesus' action as a fulfilment of Zech. ix. 9, may certainly be true of some of them, if not of all. But Lk. gives a very different version of the acclamations of the disciples (xix. 38, ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεύς instead of ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ; compare Jn. xii. 13). In Mt. xxi. 9, we have "Hosanna to the son of David!" According to Lk., the Pharisees in the crowd accompanying Jesus called upon him to impose silence upon his disciples. But he answers, "I say unto you, that if these are silent, the stones will cry out!" It is therefore God's will that this great moment shall not pass by silently. True, the event was of greater importance for those who were entering the city than for the city itself. Yet the inhabitants soon knew that the Galilean prophet had come; his solemn entry was equivalent to an announcement of his future activity.

In the House of Simon the Leper.—By this time it was evening. Jesus contents himself with a visit to the temple courts, of course leaving the colt outside.[1] When he and his followers had "looked round about upon all things," he returned with the Twelve to Bethany, where it was arranged that he should take supper in the house of Simon the leper. We are not told that he healed this man. Lev. xiii. 45 f. shows that the Law laid down very strict regulations for persons afflicted with leprosy—"The leper, in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and the hair of his head shall go loose, and he shall cover his upper lip and shall cry, 'Unclean! unclean!' . . . . He must dwell apart; he shall keep himself outside the encampment" (Lev. xiii. 45 f.). But since leprosy is hereditary, though not infectious, the Law's injunctions would hardly be observed in all cases. In the present instance, the afflicted man may have heard how little fear Jesus had of the unclean, and so may have summoned up courage to invite him into his house. And Jesus does not refuse to go, for a man suffering from such an affliction as

[1] This was in accordance with the custom of the sanctuary, and is also to be inferred, in the case of Jesus, from Mk. xi. 16: if he refused to allow anything to be carried across the holy enclosure, he certainly would not, contrary to traditional observance, ride across it upon an animal.

leprosy, with its accompanying isolation, had double need of his consolation.[1]

Mk. goes on to tell us (xiv. 3–9)—and Mt. (xxvi. 6–13) agrees with him—that, whilst Jesus sat at supper, a woman came in and poured over his head ointment of spikenard, so very precious that the disciples were aghast at her extravagance, for with the money required to purchase the ointment (over 300 denarii [about £12]) they could have ministered to the wants of many poor people. Jesus reproves them for finding fault. Charity can at all times be shown to the poor; but not so love to himself, for he is about to die. The present act is an anticipation of his anointing for the grave. The saying itself suggests that, in view of his approaching death, the woman's token of love does him good, just as a gift of money benefits a poor man. As, moreover, Jesus' principle with regard to almsgiving is that the left hand should not know what the right hand does (Mt. vi. 3), he would not have his disciples calculate in hard figures the material value of a benefit conferred upon him out of pure good feeling, and appraise its worth by that standard.[2]

(*a*) ACCORDING TO LK. AND JN.—Lk. has omitted this incident, but gives in another part of his Gospel a story in which, as in this case, the host is called Simon, and Jesus is anointed by a woman who enters the house from without. Since Lk. undoubtedly had the text of Mk. before him, he must have left out the section dealing with the anointing in Bethany because he considered his own narrative to be another version of the same event. The Gospel of Jn., also, took Lk.'s narrative to be equivalent to Mk.'s; it follows Mk. on the whole, but introduces certain features from Lk.—amongst other things representing the supper to have taken place in the house of Mary and Martha, whose brother Lazarus

[1] Even Judaism sympathised with such visits to lepers. Job, for instance, is visited by his friends, who come for the purpose of consoling him, remaining with him over a week (Job. ii. 11–13). And we must remember that Job and his friends, notwithstanding their Edomite origin (Uz, Teman, Eliphaz, Zophar; Job i. 1, ii. 11 = Gen. xxxvi. 11, 15, 28), are regarded as models of Jewish piety.

[2] Money matters were always regarded by Jesus as of minor importance (see pp. 429 ff.); indeed, he looked upon the possession of money as a serious peril (Mk. x. 23).

(known to this Gospel only) takes the place of Simon the leper. In this case, Martha serves at table, Mary anoints Jesus, and it is the traitor Judas who objects to the waste (Jn. xii. 1–8). We must, however, keep the house of Simon the leper and the house of the sisters Mary and Martha distinct (Lk. vii. 36–50, x. 38–42). And to take Mary for the woman who anointed Jesus would be to cast an undeserved stigma upon her. For it was well known that Jesus was no stranger in the house of the two sisters; but Simon, his host, in Lk., thinks Jesus is unacquainted with the woman who anoints him (Lk. vii. 39). Hence, we have good reason to assume that the two narratives in Lk. vii. 36–50 and Mk. xiv. 3–11 describe the same event—that which happened on the Monday evening of the week in which Jesus' death took place. Yet the passage about Mary and Martha (Lk. x. 38–42) must be kept entirely separate from both narratives. All we can say with safety is that these two sisters dwelt in Bethany, and that the episode in which they figure (Jn. xi. 1) took place on this same day.[1]

(*b*) LEPER AND PHARISEE.—Objection might possibly be taken to Simon the leper being described as a Pharisee (Lk. vii. 36 f.), and yet as observing the Law so little as, contrary to its injunctions, to receive guests into his house. The fact is certainly strange, but it is not inconceivable. Both the New Testament (Mt. xxiii. 3 f.) and the Mishnah (*Berakhoth*, ii. 6), tell us that the Pharisees were fond of making exceptions in their own favour; and in this instance it was not the Pharisee, but Jesus, who offended, by entering Simon's house. In any case, as far as possible the precepts of the Law would no doubt be fulfilled in every respect.[2]

(*c*) WHAT HAPPENED.—Whilst they are at supper, the woman enters the apartment. The Pharisee knows that she is a sinful woman. On her part, it required no small amount of

[1] See p. 403, n. 1. Wendt, *Joh.-Ev.*, 1900, pp. 37–39, tries to find a way out of the difficulty, by suggesting that Lk. in the first instance inserted in his Source certain particulars from Mk—such, for instance, as the name Simon, and the anointing. This is certainly a possible solution. But it is in Lk. alone that we find a satisfactory motive for the love made manifest in the act of anointing.

[2] See p. 408, n. 1, the reference to Job.

courage to enter this house; for though many people might avoid it because of the affliction of its master, it would also be well known that the master of the house held himself scrupulously aloof from contact with sinners, and refused to have any intercourse with all such as were not earnestly pious. The woman does not heed this: she enters the room, places herself by the feet of Jesus as he reclines on the couch, and, weeping so bitterly that the tears fall down upon his feet, she stoops, wipes away the tears with her hair, and anoints Jesus with the ointment. In this procedure the company sitting at meat with Jesus are shocked at two things. First, the disciples find fault with the extravagance. Jesus, however, praises this as a token of heartfelt love. At the same time, he reads a still more serious reproof in the countenance of his host; "If this man were a prophet, he would know who and what sort of a woman she is who touches him, namely, a sinner." Jesus answers this second reproof by means of a parable. "A lender had two debtors. The one owed him five hundred denarii, the other fifty. Neither was able to pay. The lender forgave the debt in both cases. Which of the two loved him the most?" Simon thinks, "Of course, the one to whom he forgave most." Thereupon Jesus shows the application of the parable. "Behold, then, which of you twain loveth me most? Thou gavest me no water for my feet, no oil for my head, no kiss of greeting. This woman hath wet me with her tears, anointed my feet, and pressed many kisses upon them." We may reasonably question whether Jesus really did enumerate such failures of friendliness on the part of his host. The story was evidently to some extent touched up before it came into the hands of the Evangelist Lk.[1]

Jesus at any rate pointed to the great love shown to him by the woman. "Therefore I say unto thee," he continues, "because she hath shown much love, her many sins are forgiven her. They to whom little is forgiven also love little." Thus, as in the parable the debtor to whom the larger debt was

[1] If, however, the host was at one and the same time a Pharisee and a leper, his apparent lapse in hospitality might in certain respects be judged more leniently. But, in that case, Jesus' own words must appear all the more surprising.

forgiven cherished the greater love for his creditor, so also this woman shows the greater love for Jesus precisely because the most sins are forgiven to her. Thrust out, though she was, from the pious society of Israel, she had heard of the prophet of Nazareth, who proclaimed God's love even to those that are lost—who indeed makes this the fundamental principle of his life. Accordingly, she summons up fresh courage; in spite of her sins, she may yet be saved; and it is gratitude for this new and blissful thought that impels her to enter the house of the Pharisee, though it has always been closed to her hitherto, and she herself has never before thought of crossing its threshold. She takes with her perhaps the most costly thing she possesses, the precious spikenard, which assuredly was not originally intended for this purpose. Such deep love as this the Pharisee cannot show. He has not derived from Jesus' preaching a benefit equal to that of the woman. So, Jesus bestows upon her, in return for her token of love, a great gift when he exclaims, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." Where the Gospel of God's searching love is so gratefully received, all anxiety with regard to the judgment disappears. There is such complete certainty of forgiveness that no amount of subsequent brooding can undermine it. And it is precisely this ultimate danger that Jesus would like to remove.[1] Here again we, of course, hear of the same objections as were raised against him in the house of Peter at Capernaum, when he assured the paralytic that his sins were forgiven him. But now Jesus is not deterred by such objections. He says to the woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee." In other words, Through thy faith in the truth of my preaching thou art freed from anxiety about the judgment of God. "Go in peace": or, Let not the peace of soul, which thou hast now won, be disturbed by tempting thoughts.

CURSING THE FIG-TREE.—Jesus spends the night from Monday to Tuesday in Bethany. On the latter day he returns

[1] It is only an ultimate danger that is here in question; for the motive which has led the woman into the Pharisee's house is overflowing gratitude for her peace of soul, for the glad certainty of the forgiveness of her sins. This feeling she has derived from the holy prophet of God, because he is not prevented by his piety from associating in a friendly way with sinners, and is able to tell of the love of God that seeks out those who are lost.

with his disciples to Jerusalem. Feeling hungry, and seeing a fig-tree in full leaf near the roadside, he looks for fruit on it, but finds none. Mk. adds (xi. 13) naïvely, "It was not the season for figs" (*ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων*). As a matter of fact, early figs are ripe in Palestine about the end of June; summer figs may be had ripe from August onwards. Fruit which has not ripened is left on the tree through the winter and ripens in the sunshine of the following spring. Josephus expressly says (*Bell. Jud.*, iii. 519), that in his time grapes and figs were found in ripe condition for ten months in the year on the plain of Gennesareth, beside the lake of Tiberias. This will explain how it was that Jesus came to look for fruit on this seemingly vigorous tree at the time of the feast of the Passover.[1] When he finds none, he turns abruptly away, and curses it, "Let no man ever after eat fruit of thee!" This is really nothing more than a strong expression of the disquiet of his hunger. Indeed, the whole episode reveals the human side of Jesus. He is hungry; he makes a mistake; he curses a tree. If it be sympathisingly urged that the tree was, after all, innocent, neither should it be forgotten that it was a tree, and not a human being, that was cursed. We might even go further, and urge that it is a human being from whom the fruit of the tree is withheld. This saying of Jesus with regard to the fig-tree may, then, be compared with the words spoken on the evening before as to the waste of precious ointment: "The poor ye have with you always, but me ye have not always." It is now, at the moment when he is going to face death with full consciousness of it, that he feels his own personal worth. No harm will be done if for once in a way something is withheld from the poor for his sake; no harm will be done if no man ever eats of the fig-tree which has denied him its fruit.[2]

[1] It is wrong, however, simply because it is possible to explain Jesus' mistaken supposition, to make this a pretext for asserting that he would have a perfect right to expect fruit on the tree. It is not usual for fruit to remain on the tree from the previous year. The brief remark in Mk. xi. 13 is in every way happier than such unfortunate attempts as this to escape from the difficulties.

[2] It should not be forgotten that in the age of Jesus the exploiting of Nature was not carried out in the thoroughgoing fashion with which we are familiar. A nation whose laws permitted any stranger to gather

The entire occurrence would unquestionably have been lost sight of in the tradition, had not words spoken by Jesus subsequently been connected with it. It shows, however, very clearly how difficult it was for the disciples to hold fast to the idea of their Master being the Messiah; precisely because, besides sharing great and inspiring experiences with Jesus, they also participated in all the small and trivial circumstances which bound him to the world, for he was a real denizen of it, and not one who belonged to it merely in outward seeming. But his cursing of the fig-tree also reveals to us the spirit in which he approached the cleansing of the temple in Jerusalem. There is, after all, something very harsh in the words spoken to the tree. It may be that Jesus was not satisfied with the small success which had attended his entry into the city the day before. Jerusalem had not recognised in him the king of peace spoken of by the prophet.

THE MARKET IN THE TEMPLE.—Just before the Passover, the court of the temple, with its spacious porticoes on every side, presented a very busy scene. The sellers of doves are here offering for sale the cheapest of sacrifices.[1] Money-changers are exchanging the money of the heathen Roman for the holy coinage now used only for the temple; this bore no image of living thing stamped upon it, and dated from the time when Israel could still coin her own gold and silver money. For in Palestine, in the time of the Romans, only copper coins were struck.[2] Finally, the manifold requirements of the approaching festival necessitated the carrying or dragging to and fro of all sorts of utensils and implements across the court of the temple. All this bustle and activity is displeasing to Jesus.

JESUS' ANGER.—With an unerring eye he detects the deep-rooted evil in this place of pilgrimage, as in every other in

grapes off the vine and wheat from the cornfield, provided neither basket nor sickle was used (Deut. xxiii. 25 f.), would not be seriously concerned about the preservation of a solitary fruit-tree.

[1] Cp. Lev. v. 7–11; though the sacrifice of fine meal was even cheaper still (Lev. v. 11 f.; and, without any indication of relative value, in Lev. i. 14–17).

[2] The coins of Herod and the Herodians are always copper coins. In Mk. xii. 15–17 Jesus expects to see the image of the emperor on a denarius.

both earlier and later times. Jerusalem draws money out of the pockets of the pious pilgrims; it trades upon the piety of the stranger. Sacrifice and festival observance are really just as little the central features of Jesus' religion as the sanctity of the Sabbath and the precepts of ceremonial purity. But, in so thinking, what he is opposed to is the hypocrisy of those who pretend to minister to piety, while they are in reality thinking only of their own gain. What he contends against is avarice hiding under the cloak of piety. And he recalls that great day in the religious history of ancient Israel[1] when Jeremiah stood in the gate of the temple at Jerusalem and represented to the faithful who thronged thither, believing fully in the sanctity and indestructibility of this chosen house of God, that God had destroyed his temple at Shiloh, and would also destroy the temple at Jerusalem, if thieving, murder, adultery, the bearing of false witness, and the worship of idols did not cease (Jer. vii. 1–28, xxvi. 1–24). It is in this address of Jeremiah that the phrase occurs—"Is then the house which is called after my (God's) name become in your eyes a robber's den?" (Jer. vii. 11). So, also, the court of the temple, where so much trade and barter is carried on, appears to Jesus to be like a robber's den.

Cleansing of the Temple.—Then Jesus, assisted by his disciples, puts his hand to a deed of violence; for it is not to be supposed that the buyers and sellers could be driven out, the money-changers' tables overturned, and the wares and animals offered for sale removed, without strong measures being taken, without forcible compulsion and personal collision. It was, in fact, a formal battle, a conquest of the court of the temple by Jesus' company. The Fourth Gospel says that Jesus had a scourge in his hand when he did the deed (Jn. ii. 15, *ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων*). In any case, he did not wage the fight alone; his disciples must have taken part in it with zeal equal to his own. The court of the temple is captured. Jesus holds it all day long, and will not permit

[1] Proof that this day of Jeremiah really was in Jesus' mind is to be found, not only in the direct quotation of Jer. vii. 11, but also in his referring to the immediate destruction of the temple (Jn. ii. 19, Mk. xiv. 58 f., xv. 29), just as Jeremiah had in view the destruction of the temple of his day (Jer. vii. 14).

any vessel to be carried across it; which, of course, necessitated keeping a strict watch upon the gates.[1]

His Accompanying Sayings.—Jesus accompanied this deed of violence with two sayings, one defending the act, the other describing it as but a small thing compared with the greater act which was to follow. He defends his right to act thus on the ground that the original purpose in the building of the temple was disregarded. "Is it not written," he cries, with Isa. lvi. 7 in his mind, that "my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples? But ye have made it a den of thieves." In this last phrase, therefore, he repeats the indictment of Jeremiah (vii. 11). There were many persons who would not dispute the fact that these disgraceful conditions required to be radically altered; but the initiative should come from those whose special business it was to regulate these matters—from the high-priest and the Synedrium, not from the Galilean prophet. Jesus next declares, in words the form of which could not be accurately determined even two days later, that within three days, when this earthly temple made by human hands shall have been destroyed, he will, in place of it, set up a temple not built by human hands. But whether he regarded the destruction of the existing temple as about to be brought about by himself or by the act of his enemies is a matter upon which people were very soon at variance (Mk. xiv. 58 f., xv. 29, Jn. ii. 19).[2]

Announcement of the Messiah.—At any rate, Jesus made a very remarkable declaration, tantamount to the public announcement that he was the Messiah, and following upon a most remarkable action. For it was an established belief amongst the Jews that some day an eternal and holy city would descend from heaven to take the place of the Jerusalem which had been built by the hands of men; and

[1] Here, again, it is to be regretted that our tradition, in the desire to preserve the picture of Jesus as free as possible from impressions liable to confuse it, mentions the disciples and all other characters in the Evangelical story only where their mention cannot really be avoided. Hence, the cleansing of the temple is not described in the Gospel story with as much graphic and vivid clearness as we could wish.

[2] Cp. p. 475. If it be thought of as the act of his enemies, the destruction of the temple would seem to be a sequel to its desecration.

one of the features in this eternal holy city would be—at all events according to *one* view—a temple not built by the hand of man (Rev. xxi. 2, 10, but cp. 22; on the other hand, Enoch liii. 6, xc. 28 f.; or differently again in Sibyll. iii. 290–294). If this temple is not to be built by men, nor directly sent by God either, the bringer of it can only be the Messiah (so also Enoch liii. 6). So, when Jesus says that he himself will bring the temple not made by human hands, he distinctly designates himself the Messiah.[1] True, our only evidence that this saying was *spoken on the occasion of the cleansing of the temple* is Jn. ii. 19. But it *was* spoken in Jerusalem, for two days afterwards the Synedrium had witnesses ready to hand who declared that they had heard it spoken; moreover, its import suggests that it must have been uttered in sight of the earthly sanctuary. Apart from the question of the original wording, it fits in every way excellently into the context which deals with the cleansing of the temple. This latter act is merely preparatory; the renovation will follow immediately afterwards. The beginning of the saying may have been either as Jn. gives it, or as Mk. gives it. According to the former, the antithesis is, "Ye have profaned the temple; I will sanctify it. Break it down; I will build it up again." According to Mk., on the other hand, Jesus said, "I will now cleanse this temple; but I will break it down and in the briefest space will replace it by a better." Jesus might have said either. But the utterance of the words makes the whole proceeding more significant; as was no doubt intended by Jesus. The people of Jerusalem have paid but little heed to his entry into the city. His present act, the cleansing of the temple, is one that could not fail to arrest the attention of Jews throughout the Jewish world; and the saying which accompanied it announced clearly enough Jesus' Messianic claim. Thus, the act was similar in conception to the miracle which the Messiah was to perform in the story of the temptation, that of

[1] And it is in the highest degree significant that he should thus publicly designate himself the Messiah. By his so doing, it is very evident that the revolution contemplated by him was merely religious, not political. Accordingly, we do not hear of anyone having reposed false hopes in him. The question as to the tribute money (pp. 429 ff.) was intended to test him in this direction.

letting himself down from a pinnacle of the temple without being hurt. The idea now was to draw the attention of the world to Jesus, and to proclaim to it his peculiar belief that he was the Messiah. The only advantage the present act has over the miracle suggested to him at the temptation, is that it serves as a most powerful exhortation to repentance, without at the same time involving any tempting appeal to divine help. Jesus' principal object, however, in employing this kind of exhortation, was to draw the eyes of the people of Jerusalem upon himself.

THE AUTHORITIES DO NOT INTERFERE.—The custody of the temple was entrusted, in the first place, to the highest Jewish authority, the Synedrium, and, in the second, to the Roman soldiery, whose barracks, the castle of Antonia, adjoined the court of the temple at its north-west corner, being connected with it by two flights of steps (Acts xxi. 31–37; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, v. 238–247, and *Ant.*, xv. 403). The promptitude with which the Roman soldiery intervened on several occasions when disturbances arose in the court of the temple is illustrated by the story of Paul's being taken prisoner (Acts xxi. 31–37).[1] Accordingly, we might well wonder why no action was taken by the Romans in the tumult that arose when Jesus and his disciples cleansed the temple, for the disturbance would assuredly not be less than on the other occasion. Mk. tells us that the high-priests and Scribes—that is to say, the Synedrium of Jerusalem—heard of the occurrence, and considered how they might destroy Jesus; but it appeared difficult to bring about his destruction, because he had profoundly impressed the masses by his personality and by his words. In fact, the inactivity of the Roman and Jewish guardians of the temple can only be accounted for on the supposition that the storm was merely temporary, being very speedily followed by unmistakable evidence of better order—an effect which can only be ascribed to the strong personality

[1] True, the period during which Pilate held office was much quieter than that of the procurator Felix, so that Pilate may have let many things pass unnoticed which Felix dare not tolerate (*Ant.*, xx. 160–181). Josephus tells us that Felix seized and put to death daily (καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν) many deceivers who led the people astray, as well as many robbers.

of Jesus and his power of soothing the excited minds of the multitude.[1]

PREACHING ON THIS DAY.—Thus, on this day also Jesus spoke to the people, after he had cleansed the temple; though Mk. has preserved no specific saying which should properly be placed here (Mk. xi. 18). In Lk., however, we find a discourse delivered by Jesus in Jerusalem, and this is best assigned to this day, not only because we possess an abundance of material for the two following days, but also because, besides being connected with events well known to the people of Jerusalem, it relates to the episode which had happened on his way to the city that same morning (Lk. xiii. 1–9). Jesus has heard that Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator of Judæa and Samaria, had murdered[2] pilgrims who came up to Jerusalem from Galilee for the feast, whilst they were engaged in sacrificing. He has also been told of a great misfortune which happened at the pool of Siloah in Jerusalem; a tower collapsed and buried eighteen people under its ruins. Both these occurrences he regards as warnings to the living generation; "Think ye," he asks first, "that these Galileans were more sinful than all other men, because this fate overtook them? I say unto you, No. But if ye do not amend your ways, ye shall all likewise perish!" We have here a fine touch of delicate feeling: Jesus the Galilean begins his preaching of repentance in Jerusalem by alluding to the guilt of his fellow-Galileans. The words were spoken in Jerusalem; it was within its bounds that the evil deed took place. The second misfortune mentioned by Jesus likewise occurred

[1] The feeling of the great majority of the population of Jerusalem was friendly to Jesus, we may be sure. It was not in opposition to their will, but in agreement with it, that he carried this struggle through. And possibly even the Romans were pleased with the man who had broken up the great Jerusalem bourse, and driven it away from such a very unsuitable position.

[2] What grounds Pilate imagined he had for acting thus, we are unable to discover. Evidently Jesus regards the act as a murder, and does not believe that the victims entertained rebellious intentions. The language of Lk. xiii. 1—*ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πειλᾶτος ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν*—shows that the event took place within the precints of the temple; for *θυσία* does not mean the animal appointed for sacrifice, but primarily the act of sacrifice, and secondarily the object offered up. This is true notwithstanding Luc., *De Sacrif.*, chap. xii., and Plut., *Mor.*, 301 E.

within the bounds of the city. "Or those eighteen whom the tower of Siloah fell upon and killed—think ye they were more guilty than all the other inhabitants of Jerusalem? I say, No. But if ye do not amend your ways, ye shall all likewise perish." Thus, Jesus is still preaching of the nearness of the judgment. Every misfortune suffered by the individual is a warning to the whole population. Then, in the same frame of mind, starting from his experience of that morning, he relates the parable of the fig-tree. For three years in succession it has yielded its owner no fruit, so that he is now minded to remove it. He is induced by his gardener, however, to wait yet another year: he will once more dig the ground and put manure on it; perchance the tree will yet improve. The application is clear. A last chance is given for amendment. If the opportunity is not made use of, condemnation can but follow at the Messiah's judgment.[1] It is quite possible that many of the words spoken on this day are specially preserved in Jesus' discourses about the judgment; yet this cannot of course be proved with any degree even of probability.

Late in the evening Jesus goes with his disciples outside the city, intending to spend the night in the open air.[2] The place he chose for the purpose was evidently on the Mount of Olives. On the following day he re-entered the city by the road leading from Jericho and Bethany. The two following nights he again passed on the Mount of Olives (Jn. viii. 1, Mk. xiv. 26). The Gospel of Lk. says with the utmost distinctness that Jesus was wont to spend the night here in the open air, whilst during the day he taught in the temple (Lk. xxi. 37).

THE FIG-TREE WITHERS.—As Jesus and his disciples are on their way back to the city on Wednesday morning, they pass the fig-tree which had been cursed on the day before, and Peter is astonished to observe that the tree is withered.

[1] Consequently, this parable starts from the experience of the morning, being perhaps also led up to by subsequent conversation with his disciples. In reply to the saying of Jesus in Mk. xi. 14, we might suppose that one of the disciples suggested, that if the soil round the tree were well cultivated, then the tree, though so near dying, might yet revive. This might then seem to Jesus to be typical of his own activity in Jerusalem.

[2] The words ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως show clearly that he did not seek out any of the surrounding villages (compare Mk. xi. 19 with xi. 11).

This seemed to him an indication of the supernatural greatness of Jesus, like that other marvel, the stilling of the storm on the lake of Gennesareth at his Master's command. To Jesus, on the other hand, the wonderful occurrence is a revelation of the truth, of which he has seen such abundant confirmation already, that nothing is impossible to the man who is full of confidence, but that, on the contrary, everything succeeds. "Have trust in God!" he cries. "Verily I say unto you, whosoever saith to this mountain, Lift thyself up and cast thyself into the sea, and doubteth not in his heart, but believeth that what he saith shall come to pass, to him it shall be granted." The words were spoken on the Mount of Olives. Seen from the top of it, the Dead Sea, lying at a depth of over 4000 feet below, appears to be quite near. Hence, Jesus says, that he who confidently[1] called upon the mountain to move could overturn it into the salt sea. Now, from ancient times the Israelites held that there was nothing in the world more securely fixed than the mountains (Isa. liv. 10; Ps. xxxvi. 7, lxv. 7, xc. 2, civ. 32, cxliv. 5; Job ix. 5). Jesus' present saying reveals the special peculiarity of his nature—an unshakeable confidence, such as absolutely nothing in the world can make to falter, neither the brooding of doubt nor fear of the power of fate; in other words, the quality of steadfastness, the quality which Jesus esteemed so highly in the Baptist, the quality which, if we may judge by the concluding parables in the Sermon on the Mount, he was anxious to implant in his disciples, the quality for which he praised Peter, the quality which enabled him to command the storm, and heal the sick after others had given them up, the quality which enabled him to uphold his own conception of the will of God against the prestige of the Jewish Law, the quality which enabled him even on earth to forgive the sins of the paralytic and of the penitent woman. This saying about the faith that removes mountains made a deep impression upon his disciples, and was never forgotten. The Apostle Paul, who

[1] This, of course, presupposes a degree of simplicity and freedom from all prejudices due to training and experience, such that its presence might be considered as great a miracle as if someone were actually able by a mere word to hurl the Mount of Olives into the Dead Sea. Jesus, however, holds that such simplicity is specially worth striving for.

quotes but few of the sayings of Jesus, both knows and makes use of this one—ἐὰν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάναι . . . . (1 Cor. xiii. 2). And it is important to remember, further, that the saying was uttered during the last critical days. In spite of the danger surrounding him, Jesus does not lose heart; on the contrary, he is filled with the joyful confidence of victory. The withered fig-tree is a God-given pledge that, even in the great task of his life, his faith will not be destroyed.

Message of the Synedrium.—On this day, as on the days preceding, Jesus again occupies the court of the temple, assisted by his disciples. For the question, now finally put to him with due formality by the Synedrium, "By what right doest thou these things?" or "Who hath given thee the right to do these things?" can only relate to this. It is a solemn deputation from the Synedrium which comes to Jesus. The chief priests, the Scribes, the elders, are all mentioned, as though the entire Synedrium had come (Mk. xi. 27 f.).[1] The question addressed to him does not refer to his preaching of repentance; for anyone was allowed to preach in the temple as well as in the synagogue. Nor does it refer to any action belonging to the past—the cleansing of the temple on the day preceding; it refers to Jesus' actual conduct at the moment. And it is quite obvious that to-day again Jesus is intent on maintaining the good order which he brought about yesterday. To-day, however, his authority is not to be so meekly acquiesced in as on the day before. True, the mere fact of their seeking information by asking him a question shows that the man of confidence has to deal with adversaries who possess little of this attribute. For there can be no doubt that they are in a serious predicament. For years they have tolerated an abuse which everybody knows to be such; now they feel obliged to punish the man who, without permission, has forcibly abolished the abuse, though everybody secretly acknowledges that he has done what was right. If they do not punish him, their prestige will suffer; for Jesus and his disciples have no chartered right of superintendence over the

[1] The three classes constituted the Synedrium or advising body of the reigning high-priest (see *Neutestl. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 175–177); though it was only a deputation that came to Jesus on the present occasion.

sanctuary, this being a charge professionally laid upon themselves. And yet, on the other hand, they dare not punish him; for Jesus' conduct was clearly approved of by the multitude. Hence they ask him a question affecting an action about which their position did enable them to say: Thou shalt not do this. They hope that they will thus be able, at all events for the future, to assert their claim to be the masters of the court of the temple. The timidity of his adversaries does but prove to Jesus that his cause is really right. Accordingly, he does not feel himself bound by the timidly expressed prohibition of the highest dignitaries of his people.

JESUS' COUNTER-QUESTION.—By way of reply, he asks them another question:[1] "Whence did John derive his right to baptise? From Heaven or from men?" The correct answer to Jesus' question is obvious—the Baptist was sent by God, Heaven being here again used metonymically to mean God. This answer is, of course, what Jesus expects, and he is prepared to draw from it the conclusion: God has also given me a charge, and that suffices me. His adversaries might indeed have rejoined that John's baptism had done no harm to anyone. The Baptist had not arrogated to himself any other person's right; he had not spoiled any other man's livelihood, nor caused any obstruction to traffic. But Jesus had done what the Synedrium alone had the right to do. Here are traders and money-changers complaining of heavy losses, and on the very days when they were wont to make the greatest gains. Moreover, even the service of God in the temple was hampered by the demand that no man should carry utensils and other articles across the holy place.[2]

[1] The method of reply adopted by Jesus shows very clearly the deplorable weakness of will which characterised his adversaries. It was easy enough for them to put a question; what they then required was a definite answer from Jesus. But they allow him to put a counter-question, and are then anxious to answer it; this shows that they were unable to prevail upon themselves to assert their official position as against the victorious prophet.

[2] It is evident that the good order established by Jesus and his disciples required to be supplemented in many ways, if it was to be maintained permanently. So long as the temple used its own peculiar money, there must be somewhere a place for exchanging the current money for it.

Thus, Jesus' action would not be free from objection, even if it were admitted that the Baptist was sent by God. But the messengers from the Synedrium knew well enough what Jesus would say in answer to such representations. He would reply that, however long a wrong has continued, it cannot on the strength of its long existence be converted into a right, and that when they, whose duty it is under the existing circumstances to put an end to it, refuse to undertake the task, it then becomes the duty of any or every man to take the work in hand. The deputation are unwilling to expose themselves to such a retort as this, and consequently present the pitiful spectacle of people who know no other way out of a difficulty but that of denying what they know perfectly well to be true. They protest, "We do not know whether John derived his right to baptise from God or from men." They might, of course, plead in justification of their ignorance the scrupulousness and punctiliousness of Scribes who would only believe what was self-evident when it was ciphered out and proved for them, and were therefore horrified at the many bold words spoken by Jesus—as, for instance, when he forgave the paralytic his sins. But this untruthful answer, dictated by embarrassment and fear, fills Jesus with profound contempt for these highest dignitaries amongst his countrymen. With a fresh access of boldness he cries to them, "Then neither will I tell you from whom I get my right to come forward publicly!" The words were not spoken without some measure of heat; and their angry and contemptuous tone could not but provoke wrath and hatred in return. Here is a Galilean workman who dares to scoff at the high-priest and his counsellors![1]

So long as sacrifices were offered on the altar, sacrificial victims and other suitable offerings must somewhere be on sale. There must likewise exist a possibility of getting utensils and implements in and out of the temple. Jesus simply desires that this shall not disturb the quiet of the sanctuary.

[1] Jesus had, as a matter of fact, in the dispute about the laws of ceremonial purity (to judge by Mk. vii. 6–13), already expressed his opinion pretty sharply regarding the views and ordinances of the Synedrium (see Chap. X., pp. 291 ff.), and personal contact with the deputation from the Synedrium does not modify his opinion of these officials.

THE WICKED VINEDRESSERS. — On perceiving their threatening attitude, Jesus relates to them yet another story, that they may lay it to heart. It is very seldom that we have one of Jesus' parables growing so clearly out of a precisely defined situation; but in the present instance we see how quickly and easily he could frame these figurative discourses.[1] Yet in this parable he intentionally starts from a parable of Isaiah, one well known to the Scribes who stood before him. Amongst Isaiah's denunciations the sternest, that in which there is no mention of salvation for even so much as a remnant of Israel, is the parable of his friend's vineyard (Isa. v. 1–7). The owner laid out his vineyard with due care, put a fence about it, provided it with a winepress and a watch-tower, and specially planted it with good vines. Yet, in spite of all this, it produced nothing but sour grapes. Its owner therefore has it destroyed and laid waste; and, in so doing, he does well. Isaiah himself gave an *allegorical* interpretation of this parable. The vineyard is the people of Israel. God has done everything for his people; but they fail to practise justice and righteousness. Finally, God abandons them altogether. Echoing unmistakably this awe-inspiring threat of Isaiah, Jesus now relates the story of a vineyard, which was surrounded with a fence, and supplied with a winepress and watch-tower. Next, having by this introduction made it plain that a grave denunciation is about to follow, after the manner of Isaiah, he proceeds on absolutely independent lines. *His* vineyard is cultivated by hired vinedressers, who have agreed to hand over a part only of the yield; so, in the autumn the lord desires his slaves to fetch his share of the fruit. But some of the slaves are beaten and sent back home, some of them are beaten to death. There is still one person the lord can send, namely, his son, who is very dear to him; *him*, he hopes, the vinedressers will respect. When, however, the son comes, the vinedressers reflect that, if he were no more, the vineyard would come entirely into their possession; they therefore kill

[1] The parable of the fig-tree (p. 419) was not spoken until several hours after the event which suggested it; in this case, however, the parable is evidently composed on the spur of the moment, without any interval for reflection.

him. Then the owner of the vineyard comes, puts the vinedressers on their trial, punishes them severely, and lets the vineyard to other tenants.

Here, then, we have the story of a unique occurrence, such as does not happen every day. It must also be admitted, without further question, that the wicked vinedressers do not act very prudently. Whether, however, an occurrence such as this was or was not possible under the conditions of slavery existing at that period it is difficult to decide.[1] The parable was at all events understood. The same punishment which befell these wicked people, who, instead of giving up the fruit of the vineyard, killed the messengers of their lord, and at last even slew his son, will now overtake the leaders of Israel, who have insulted or murdered the earlier messengers of God, and will now kill the last of them, who stands as near to God as a beloved son does to his father. In speaking of the earlier messengers of God, Jesus is thinking of the Baptist, whom he has just mentioned (Mk. xi. 30), and whose rejection by his contemporaries has often given him occasion for thought (Mk. ix. 13, Mt. xi. 18 = Lk. vii. 33). But it was an established fact in Jewish tradition that a similar reception had been given to the earlier prophets (Mt. xxiii. 29–38, Acts vii. 52). Thus, instead of explaining to the deputation of the Synedrium whence it was that he derived his right to come forward publicly as he did, Jesus earnestly preaches repentance to the Synedrium itself, in view of the coming judgment of God. He perceives clearly enough how deeply he has offended these powerful and high-placed persons, and he tells them what will happen to them if they lay violent hands upon him; their leadership in Israel will be at an end.[2]

[1] The folly of the vinedressers in apparently forgetting to think of punishment when they kill their lord's son is like that of the Synedrium forgetting the punishment of God when they kill Jesus. It may be presumed that Jesus imagined further that the rebellious slaves thought of acting towards the master in precisely the same way as they had acted towards his son and his servants. Whether in the end the master will win the day is a question of strength.

[2] This threat is the reverse of the promise made by Jesus to his disciples (Mt. xix. 28 = Lk. xxii. 30). The kingdom of the Messiah, as he conceived it, requires an organised administration quite as much as the kingdoms of the present world. In so far its character is earthly.

Thus, it seems clear from the form of this story that Jesus regarded himself as the last of the messengers of God, and as being as close to God as a beloved son is to his father. By this analogy he indicates, to say the least, that he knows himself to be the Messiah. He lays still greater emphasis on this thought, that he himself will some day be the person who shall pronounce judgment, by quoting a passage of the 118th Psalm, the very psalm his disciples had used two days before in their acclamations at his entry into Jerusalem. The disciples had used verses 25 and 26; but there are two other verses shortly before them which Jesus would particularly bear in mind because of his former occupation. A stone has been set aside by the builders as worthless (we are told in verses 22 f.), but subsequently this same stone is set up as a corner-stone, where it, of course, serves an important purpose. Jesus cites these verses because the emissaries of the Synedrium will not admit that he, the artisan and the prophet, who not only sets himself in opposition to the Law, but also makes himself the friend of sinners, stands closer to God than any of God's earlier messengers. He says in effect: Ye indeed reject me now; but see what a position God will one day assign me![1] True, Jesus did not attain the object he had in view when he uttered the warning in this parable. His adversaries, instead of letting his earnest words sink into their minds, now feel a downright bitter hatred against him, for they perceive that he sees through them, and their own evil consciences tell them, against their own will and desire, that Jesus is right. Accordingly, they depart in eloquent silence; and, as they do so, their manner shows Jesus unmistakably that they have broken with him for ever.

LAMENT OVER JERUSALEM.—It is at this moment that Jesus, still full of the historic picture which he had just sketched in his parable, and of the psalm from which he had

But he is convinced that the highest officers of that kingdom will consist of different persons from the existing members of the Synedrium; God's vineyard will be taken from these wicked vinedressers and given to others.

[1] The simile must not be carried further. The guard-stone at the corner of a building is not typical of the Messiah's relations to the Messianic community.

just drawn his saying about the builders, speaks directly in the name of God, after the manner of the ancient prophets, and cries, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest those who are sent to thee, how often have I been fain to gather together thy children, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; and ye would not! Behold, your house shall be left to you uninhabited. I say unto you, ye shall not see me again, until ye say, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!'" The substantial agreement betweeen Mt. xxiii. 37 and Mk. xii. 2–8, as well as the derivation of Mt. xxiii. 39 from the psalm which is likewise quoted in Mk. xii. 10 f., establishes conclusively the historical moment in which this saying was uttered (Mt. xxiii. 37–39 = Lk. xiii. 34 f.). Moreover, the reference to God's house fits in best with a discourse delivered in immediate view of the temple.[1] But, if we are to understand the saying properly, it is particularly important to settle the meaning of Mt. xxiii. 38, *ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος*. It cannot be, "This house will be destroyed," but simply, "Your house shall be empty, uninhabited, deserted." The thought is therefore this—God will desert this temple which is held to be His house. The concluding sentence is also spoken in the name of God. It is God whom Jerusalem will not see again, until it greets with praise him that cometh in the name of God—that is to say, until the day of the Messiah, when he (Jesus) will be better appreciated by the city that murders the prophets of God than he has been on the occasion of his present entry. Jesus, then, is not speaking in his own name when in his introductory words he exclaims, "How often would I have gathered thy children together!" This would mean that he had already appeared publicly in Jerusalem on many occasions, or that he called the Israelites of Galilee "the children of Jerusalem"—which a Greek or a Roman,

[1] *ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν* is, in that case, the temple of Jerusalem. Philologically, it might also mean the existing generation of the people of Jerusalem; but the subject-matter is against this, because the conclusion does not suggest the idea of the extinction of the people of Jerusalem. The meaning would be the same if we took *ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν* to be "your dwelling." In Jer. vii. 1–28 and xxvi. 1–24 the word employed to designate the temple is *οἶκος* throughout.

but in no case a Galilean, might perhaps be supposed to have done.[1] Jesus is here speaking, rather, in the name of God, the God who repeatedly sent His prophets to Jerusalem, but only to be stoned and slain. The idea that God would for a time desert His temple at Jerusalem was generally prevalent amongst the Israelites at the beginning of the Babylonian captivity (Ezek. viii. 12, ix. 9). But in the present case the meaning is, of course, that on the death of Jesus prophecy in Israel, or God's speaking to his people, will come to an end, and that there will then remain nothing but the impending judgment of the Messiah.[2] Thus, the word on which special emphasis is laid here is ἔσχατον (Mk. xii. 6). It must be admitted that in Jesus' discourses it is unusual for him to speak directly in the name of God. Perhaps a few words of introduction have dropped out, owing to the fact that both Mk. and Lk. attached this lament over Jerusalem, just as it was, to other discourses of Jesus. Possibly the beginning of the discourse ran thus, "Hearken, what the Lord saith to Jerusalem!" or simply, "Hear the word of the Lord!" It does not seem to the present writer possible to doubt the genuineness of the saying or its interpretation, any more than it does to doubt its historical place in the life of Jesus.

THE ROMANS TO JUDGE.—The Synedrium did not dare to proceed openly against Jesus for fear of creating a disturbance. The Galilean prophet had won many adherents by his cleansing of the temple and by his discourses; and the vigour and courage with which he sent back the ceremonious embassy of the Synedrium had drawn many people over to his side, for the victor may always count upon applause. In this dispute the simple man, who could not show any legal title for what he did except his call by God, had gained the victory, and the vanquished party were the aristocracy

[1] The Jews were not accustomed to large municipal corporations, as the Greeks were. Greek municipal constitutions, of course, existed in Palestine in the Hellenistic era, but Galilee never belonged to the administrative district of Jerusalem. The only adjuncts of an Israelitish town were its villages; these were called its "daughters" (Nu. xxi. 25).

[2] That is to say, God will desert the temple before the Messiah brings the new temple for the new Jerusalem (Jn. ii. 19, Mk. xiv. 58 f., xv. 29). Similarly, according to Ezek. viii. 12, ix. 9, God had deserted the land before its conquest by the Chaldæans.

amongst the people. Divine right had conquered human right. But now that the members of the Synedrium themselves were no longer able to contend against Jesus, they hoped to induce others to exert themselves against him. Considering the great uproar which the cleansing of the temple must undoubtedly have occasioned, at all events for a short space, the Roman soldiers had kept remarkably quiet. Had they interfered with swift, resolute action, the Synedrium would certainly have been delighted. Their passive attitude in face of the conduct of Jesus' adherents can only be explained by supposing that they secretly approved of this violent method of establishing order (see p. 418, n. 1). In these circumstances, the Synedrium had two courses open to them. They could slanderously accuse Jesus of being the open friend of their Roman oppressors; this would be an excellent means of robbing him of the affection of the people. Perhaps, however, a shorter way of getting rid of him would be to beguile him into making some imprudent declaration against the Roman supremacy. Pilate might then seize and condemn him, and the Synedrium would have nothing to do with the matter; moreover, in view of the increase in his following, it might perhaps be expedient publicly to express regret for his death.

THE TRIBUTE MONEY.—The Church from a very early period had the suspicion that it was again the Synedrium, so deeply wounded by Jesus, that, not very long after the return of its emissaries, sent yet others to Jesus to catch him in his talk, to entice from him some imprudent word (Mk. xii. 13). They are called certain *Pharisees and Herodians*, that is to say, certain men who aimed at the utmost possible exactitude in the fulfilment of the Law, and others who were dissatisfied that their own Jewish dynasty, the dynasty of the house of Herod, should have been set aside in 6 A.D. For, since the banishment of Archelaus, Judæa and Samaria had been under the direct administration of Rome. The Herodians in these parts were not the same, therefore, as the Herodians of Galilee, where Herod Antipas still reigned (Mk. iii. 6).[1] These

[1] Both parties were alike adherents of the royal Idumæan line; but whilst in Galilee they were supporters of the government, in Judæa they

Pharisees and Herodians, then, are clearly agreed that Judaism ought to develop along independent lines, in obedience to its own law. Consequently, in their own minds they are convinced that the people of God would be far better if they were free from the yoke of Rome; they are also aware that a preponderating majority of the people are of the same mind. But they have learnt the wisdom of silence, and of showing themselves, against their better judgment, amenable to those in power. They imagine that, in this matter, Jesus also shares the general sentiment of the Jews; they assume, moreover, that he will publicly express his opinion. As he has shown that he is not afraid of the emissaries of the Synedrium, he will not shrink, any the less, from speaking boldly against Rome. In any case, even though he does not say anything against the supremacy of Rome—and that is unlikely—his popularity would seem bound to be seriously damaged.

THE TAX QUESTION.—The conduct of these men is nothing short of loathsome. They come to Jesus and praise in him a quality which, welcome as it is for their own purpose, is one they would like to make the direct means of his destruction. They praise his frank outspokenness, showing no respect of persons; he teaches truthfully the way of God, that is to say, the manner in which a man should direct his life in accordance with God's will. The words, of course, refer to Jesus' pronouncements as to what things ought to be done, and what left undone; these have frequently been in contradiction of their sacred tradition.[1] After this introduction, they ask Jesus whether it is lawful to pay tribute (*census*) to Cæsar or not. This was a specifically Jewish question. Since the year 6 A.D., Judæa and Samaria had been included in the district which paid taxes directly to Rome. In the domains of Herod Antipas and his brother Philip taxes were not paid directly to Rome. The people were indignant, not so much at the greatness of

were its opponents, and it was as such that they came to Jesus (see Chap. IX., p. 230, n. 1).

[1] It is in these decisions that they discern his ἀλήθεια (Mk. xii. 14—οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ)—that openness which to cunning characters always appears foolish.

the demands made upon them by Rome, as at the simple fact that the people of God had to hand over a portion of their income to a heathen and foreign master. And it was only with repugnance, at first even with active opposition, that the people of Judæa had submitted to this mark of subjection.[1] Jesus is now asked to lift up his voice against this disgrace to Israel. This was once more to entice him to tread the path which had opened itself before him in the tempting thoughts that came to him immediately after his Messianic revelation—to put himself at the head of his rebellious countrymen, and boldly seek to win the kingdoms of the world and all their glory. But he had long ago overcome this temptation, which would have made him the slave of the powers of evil.[2]

THE HEATHEN COIN.—Jesus, therefore, sees through the malicious purpose underlying this question. "Why put ye me to the test, whether I can escape your cunning?" he exclaims. "Bring me a denarius, that I may see it" (Mk. xii. 15)—the request was the result of rapid reflection on Jesus' part. Copper coins were certainly struck in Palestine; but, in accordance with the precept in the Jewish Law, as a rule no image of living creature was to be seen on them. On the other hand, the current silver money, and particularly the denarius, came from the great mints of the Roman empire, and bore the image of the emperor, with his inscription around it. Accordingly, Jesus desires them to show him a denarius, that he may point out to them its specifically heathen impress. "Whose image is this," he asks, "and superscription?" This was, to say the least, a bitter question for the Pharisees. They are carrying images of living beings about with them, in violation of the Law! The money constantly paid and received by them is un-Jewish in character; it was a violation of a precept of the Law which in those days was still upheld with the utmost rigour. The reply, of course, is that the image and its inscription are those of the emperor; and Jesus is expected to declare this state of

[1] For instance, it was at this time that the Galilean Judas rose in revolt in Judæa against the introduction of taxes (Acts v. 37; see also Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 4; *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 118, vii. 253).

[2] See Chap. VII., pp. 146 ff., and Chap. XIII., pp. 405 f.

things to be unworthy of his people, calling upon them to shake off the yoke of carrying about with them money that is contrary to the Law.[1]

JESUS' DECISION.—But, instead of doing as his enemies expect, Jesus gives them back the money, with the words, "Then, give to the emperor what is the emperor's, and to God what is God's." This is no maxim of high politics to the effect, let us say, that the two powers, the State and the Church, should exist side by side, without either being oppressed by the rule of the other. That would hardly be in agreement with Jesus' ideas, and would even be foreign to the thought of his age. His real meaning is suggested by the form into which the sentence is cast. The money question is put on one side in order to emphasise something of more importance. "If this money belongs to the emperor" —and its heathen impress proves that it does—"then give it to him; but remember at the same time to serve God in the right way." Jesus finds in the character of his people something so evil that it must be got rid of. The men who are now questioning him are filled with cunning and malice, and it is their sacred duty to put these things away from them. In comparison with this duty, Jesus thinks it of very little moment to whom the taxes are paid.[2] He desires that the proper duty shall be done to the emperor. If it is not possible to live in peace without using heathen money, there can be no sin in paying the taxes of their heathen master with his own coin. Thus, Jesus' answer offers them no pretext for accusing him to the Romans. Nor, again, does it in any way wound the pride of the people of God. The words reveal, rather, a proud contempt for this "heathen" money. When Jesus says, "Give to the emperor what belongs to the emperor," after he has pointed to the heathen

[1] Rev. xiii. 17 shows how irksome this yoke was felt to be; "No man can buy or sell unless he bear the mark or the name of the beast (monster)." In its *original* meaning this refers to the coins.

[2] The dispute is fundamentally the same as when Jesus explains the washing of his disciples' hands to be a matter of indifference as compared with the duty of purifying the heart, Mk. vii. 1–23. The obligation to pay taxes is, similarly, in the opinion of Jesus, one of those things which, according to Mk. vii. 15, touch men outwardly, without affecting their estimation in the sight of God.

portrait stamped upon the metal, this is almost as much as to say, "Give to the heathen what belongs to him!" His contempt for the heathen money, and his depreciation of the tax question as a whole, are due to his having learnt, from living in the midst of a people who delighted in gain, to look upon money as a terrible danger. The maxim found in Mk. x. 23—*πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται*—is reflected again here. Jesus is standing in the place from which he has forcibly driven away the avaricious pursuit of gain. He feels that this question as to the obligation to pay taxes is not fitted to kindle zeal in the cause of God.[1] Lastly, we must bear in mind his own expectations regarding the future—his hope that the promise of the Messianic kingdom would be immediately fulfilled. When this comes to pass, when the transformation of the world takes place, the present question will be superfluous Thus, out of the answer made by Jesus no weapon could be forged against him.

THE SADDUCEES' QUESTION.—Here we may fittingly admire the acuteness and penetration which enabled Jesus to see through his adversaries, and to overcome all the difficulties they placed in his way. His decision might well entice other sharp-witted men, men who prided themselves upon the keenness of their understanding, to try an intellectual passage at arms with him. The Pharisees and Herodians had come off badly; the Sadducees thought they would have better success.

(*a*) THE SADDUCEES AND JESUS.—The sect of the Sadducees was no longer the great patriotic party amongst the people, such as it had been under the Hasmonæan royal house—the party which upheld the banner of the high-priestly king against the men of the Law (who chose to stand apart), believing that the striving after worldly power and greatness was not incompatible with piety. It was only an insignificant remnant that was now left of this once great popular party; in the privacy of their own chambers they cherish and discuss their ideas of enlightening the people, and only on

[1] The followers of the Galilean Judas did indeed call themselves zealots for God's cause (*ζηλωτής*—Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, iv. 160). But apparently Jesus failed to find in them a right apprehension of the will of God.

very rare occasions venture to proclaim their ideas in public[1] (see *Neutestl. Zeitg.*, § 25). Yet, whenever they imagine they have a chance of pointing out evil consequences as having flowed from Pharisaical conceptions, they are ready to champion the views of their own party (see Acts xxiii. 6–9). To the Sadducees, who did not believe in the resurrection, or in angels and spirits, Jesus' preaching of the nearness of the Messiah's day was naturally repugnant. The idea that the Messiah would appear flashing like lightning from one end of the heavens to the other, and surrounded by the angels, and the idea of the dead being awakened for the judgment (cp. the saying of the Lord in 1 Thess. iv. 15), were both opposed to their matter-of-fact conception of the world. Accordingly, they try to embarrass Jesus, to make him the laughing-stock of those who are admiringly standing around. At any rate, they would like to see whether they could not bring this clear-thinking prophet to confusion by exhibiting the inherent difficulties of his views.[2]

(*b*) THE DIFFICULTY.—Deut. xxv. 5 enjoins that, when a man dies childless, his brother shall marry his widow. Upon this the Sadducees build an extraordinary story. "Seven brethren die one after the other, all childless, and the widow of the eldest becomes eventually the widow of the youngest. In the resurrection of the dead, which of these seven men will be the woman's husband?" The story was apparently framed for the special purpose of showing the impossibility of coexistence in eternity for those who have lived after one another in time. It is a proof, then, of the unfailing intellectual alertness of Jesus

[1] This was the attitude that prevailed among members of the old nobility of Jerusalem, who dated back, at any rate in part, to the Hasmonæan epoch. The adherents of the Sadducees were principally found amongst the members of the high-priestly families, not because of their priestly office, but because the heads of the Hasmonæan royal house formerly united in themselves the priesthood as well (Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 17). The Sadducees in this present instance, therefore, were no doubt members of the Synedrium.

[2] On setting out for Jerusalem, Jesus had warned his disciples not to be ashamed of him and his words (Mk. viii. 38). The trial questions now being put to him in Jerusalem indicate what he had in his mind at that time. The capital, with its more active intellectual life, demands investigations such as had not been required in Galilee. Hence the clearness with which Jesus explains all these difficulties seems the more astonishing.

that he is ready to repulse his adversaries with the right answer at once; for they certainly did not allow him much time.

(*c*) JESUS' ANSWER.—In reply, he points out to these people, so proud of their own enlightenment, that they have not taken into account all the facts appertaining to their question. "Do ye not err?" he cries to them, "simply because ye know neither the Scripture nor the power of God?" He does not for one moment question the shrewdness on which they pride themselves so highly. But shrewdness alone is not sufficient for arriving at a right apprehension of the case. It is necessary to understand and keep in view the entire connection of ideas of which the idea in question is but a part. Jesus shows, in the first place, that the Sadducees do not properly understand the power of God.

THIS WORLD AND THE WORLD BEYOND THE GRAVE.—God can arrange the world beyond the grave in a different way from the present world. "The children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but they who are worthy of participating in the world beyond and in the resurrection of the dead do not marry, neither are they given in marriage any more.[1] For they cannot any longer die, but are like the angels and the children of God, in that they are children of the resurrection" (Lk. xx. 34–36). Lk., following his special tradition, gives this saying in somewhat greater detail than Mk., although Mk. preserves its chief points: "When they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Mk. xii. 25). What Jesus here dwells upon is the inadequacy of human powers for the apprehension of a world which cannot be compared with the present. Those who rise from the dead belong to a higher world; this world man, with all his penetration and learning, does not understand. Yet God's power is sufficiently great to arrange the other world also, as

[1] Here rising from the dead is regarded as a privilege of the chosen ones. It may be that Jesus did not contemplate at all the rising at the judgment of those who had been rejected, for in Lk. xvi. 23 he seems to think of the punishment of the reprobate as beginning immediately after death. That the dead arise for the judgment of the Messiah is not stated in Mt. xxv. 32, nor is it otherwise anywhere indicated.

it has been able to arrange the present. They who fail to comprehend this, imagine that God can only measure with man's petty measuring-rod; consequently, they do not understand God's power. In Lk's. text we have, in particular, the important indication that those who rise from the dead shall not die again. A world that knows not death cannot[1] obviously know anything of being born, or of growing up, or of marrying and giving in marriage. And, in laying such strong emphasis on the contrasts between this world and the world to come, and in so dwelling upon the likeness between those that rise from the dead and the angels, and upon their position as the children of God, Jesus desires to call attention to the unfruitfulness of all such speculations about the future. By this means he cuts away every possibility of throwing ridicule on the belief in the resurrection; and with that he could rest content.

(*d*) THE QUOTATION FROM SCRIPTURE.—Nevertheless, he would gladly do more than simply protect his belief against ridicule: he wishes to prove that there is good reason for such belief. For that purpose he appeals to the Scriptures; the standard authority of these was not disputed by the Sadducees. He tells them they have an imperfect acquaintance with the Scriptures. Yet he does not on the present occasion search for a passage that treats directly of the rising of the dead, although he might certainly have found passages suitable for this purpose in Isa. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19, and Dan. xii. 2 f., to say nothing of Ezek xxxvii. 1–14. It is not sufficient simply to show that this belief is expressed in the Old Testament; he would demonstrate, beyond this, its most intimate connection with the fundamental ideas of the Old Testament religion.[2]

[1] Strictly speaking, we are, of course, precluded from making any categorical statement about what is possible, when dealing with a world that transcends all human experience. The categories of possibility and impossibility simply imply what can and what cannot form part of the world of which we have experience.

[2] Thus, he does not prove the doctrine of the resurrection in the traditional way of Scriptural proof, which merely tells us that a passage of Scripture held to be binding contains this belief; Jesus goes nearer to the heart of the matter, by showing the close connection between the Israelitish conception of God and the belief in the resurrection. The Old Testament passage merely provides the opportunity for giving his own proof.

In proof of this, he refers to a passage which apparently has nothing whatever to do with the resurrection of the dead, namely, the passage dealing with God's appearance to Moses in the burning bush (Exod. iii. 2–6). God there says to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." Jesus quotes the words and comments thus: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. How greatly then do ye err!"

(*e*) GOD'S ALMIGHTY POWER AND FAITHFULNESS.—This simple Bible text acts upon Jesus like a revelation. In Moses' day the patriarchs had long been buried, but God remains always their God. His faithfulness towards them cannot cease with their death; and since He is always able to confer life upon them, His almighty power and faithfulness are, to those to whom He has once promised his favour, a pledge of eternal life. Thus, the belief in the resurrection of the dead is here associated with attributes of God's nature which were well known to every Israelite. This belief, accordingly, being, as it is, of a religious character, rests upon a very different foundation from the doubtful meditations of (let us say) a Plato about the nature of man and the human soul. The certainty of a continuance of life after death is not founded upon the original indestructibility and immortality of the human soul.[1] The Biblical belief is, rather, that God, having created the soul, can also destroy it (Mt. x. 28). But God's faithfulness and almighty power, once they have laid hold upon a man, never afterwards forsake him; and an important side of the trust in God which rests upon this is the hope of a continuance of our personality beyond the grave. He who is of God knows that he will not "die"; for God will always be his God, and God is not the God of the dead.[2]

THE GREATEST COMMANDMENT.—Thus, the Sadducees in turn meet with no better success than the Pharisees and Herodians. It was vain to think of beguiling this prophet

[1] Cp. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, II. 1 (4th ed.), pp. 825–834 [or Dr. Eduard Zeller's *Plato and the Older Academy*, translated by S. F. Alleyne and A. Goodwin, London, 1876, pp. 388–406.—J. T. B.].

[2] Those who demand proof from Natural Science for the belief in the resurrection of the dead will seek in vain for it here. But to such as have learned to distinguish clearly between the teaching of Natural Science and the teaching of religion, Jesus' answer will commend itself as a short, yet complete, explanation and justification of the belief in the resurrection.

into imprudence of speech by means of captious questions. Accordingly, no further attempt of the kind is made on this day. When, later, a Scribe, who has been pleased by Jesus' clear answers, comes and addresses a request to him, he does so[1] without any hostile intention. He asks Jesus to tell him which of all the commandments of the Law he considers to be the first and the most important. The question was one of special importance for Judaism. Since the life of the Jews from the cradle to the grave had to be regulated by the Law, two commandments might easily clash, both requiring to be fulfilled on one and the same occasion, whereas only one or the other could be obeyed. The general opinion was that the order of the Decalogue must be followed as a standard, and further, that every separate injunction of the Law could be arranged under one or other of the rubrics of the ten chief commandments. Philo, for instance, explained the entire Mosaic legislation in this way (*Neutestl. Zeitgesch.*, pp. 198–203). The same principle suggested the decree of the elders, quoted by Jesus, with regard to sacrifice and the duty of children (Mk. vii. 10–13). The Scribe may have thought it very important for him to hear Jesus' opinion as to which was the greatest commandment, hoping by this means to understand better the essential nature of Jesus' preaching in general. But Jesus answers by quoting, not merely one commandment, but two. First, he repeats a sentence, very familiar to every Israelite from early childhood, "*Hear, O Israel*, the Lord thy God is one God, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" (Deut. vi. 4 f.). This sentence of the law was contained in the cases on the two phylacteries or prayer-straps (תְּפִלִּין, *tĕphillīn* = *φυλακτήρια*, Mt. xxiii. 5); one of these was worn on the upper part of the left arm, the other across the forehead. It was also written

[1] Mk. xii. 28 gives no indication of any unfriendly purpose. On the contrary, we are there told that the man recognised that Jesus had answered the Sadducees well (καλῶς). And, in accordance with this, Mk. xii. 34 says that in the end Jesus himself praised the man. Both Mt. (xxii. 35) and Lk. (x. 25), however, treat this question also as one that was meant to tempt Jesus; and consequently both these later Evangelists omit the words of praise.

on the roll of parchment that was placed in a little casket above the right-hand doorpost of the doors of houses and rooms.[1] Finally, it was part of the customary morning and evening prayers.[2] When, therefore, Jesus points without reserve to this commandment as the first, he shows that there is an essential agreement between his own conception of human duty and the conception of his countrymen. For him, too, that personal devotion to the one God, which is seen in the fulfilment of the several commandments, is the fundamental obligation. The emphasis laid upon this commandment, therefore, does not show any marked difference between Jesus and the Judaism of the time. For this reason Jesus adds a second; and for this he claims an equal respect. "The second is this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is no greater commandment than this" (Mk. xii. 31).

(*a*) LOVE OF ONE'S NEIGHBOUR.—The commandment to love one's neighbour (Lev. xix. 18) received no special prominence in Judaism. The novel feature in Jesus' answer, accordingly, consisted in his calling particular attention to this law. He is not content to regard an undiscriminating observance of all the commandments sanctified by law and custom as constituting devotion to God. By ranking the commandment to love one's neighbour on the same level with the commandment to love God, Jesus attaches minor importance to the commandments dealing with religious worship, ceremonial purity, sitting at meat, and similar observances.[3] The answer is in fact tantamount to a short formula summing up his whole work and teaching down to that moment, as contrasted

[1] *Aristeas*, 158, 159, ed. Wendland.

[2] See Josephus, *Ant.*, iv. 212, 213. Although Josephus does not expressly mention the commandment to love God, he certainly reproduces the substance of the שְׁמַע, *shĕmaʿ*.

[3] This, indeed, need not have been involved in the decision of Jesus. He might have held all the regulations for religious worship to be so many ways of interpreting the commandment to love God, and, summing them up under the comprehensive injunction to love one's neighbour, might have put the moral command on a footing of equality with the religious ones. But the Scribe, without further explanation, understands Jesus to mean that love for God must display itself not so much in sacrifices as rather in deeds of love towards one's neighbour; and it is because he does so understand his meaning that Jesus praises him.

with law and tradition. Fasting, Sabbath observance, precepts of purity—all these he has brushed aside. His life has been one of helpfulness and compassion. For, surprised as the Scribe is at Jesus' decision, it is nevertheless one in which he concurs. He is at once sensible of the difference between Jesus' position and the predominant attitude, and distinctly agrees that love of God and love of one's neighbour do certainly rank above all burnt-offerings and similar sacrifices. Jesus is pleased at this; "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God," he says to him. That is as much as to say, "If thou livest according to these principles, thou hast no need to fear the judgment of the Messiah."

(*b*) PARABLE OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN.—The Scribe, however, begs for an explanation of the commandment of love for one's neighbour, with which he is not so familiar.[1] He asks, assuming that the idea admits of a certain limitation, "Who then is the neighbour that I ought to love?" It, of course, seems quite natural that the duty of showing practical love should be graduated according to social distinctions. The members of one's own family take precedence of strangers; one's own countryman and one's co-religionist come before a heathen belonging to another nation; "Where now is the precise point," thinks the Scribe, "at which a man's duty towards his neighbour ceases altogether?" In reply, Jesus relates the parable of the good Samaritan (Lk. x. 29–37).

THE STORY.—Jesus starts from the dangers of the ill-famed road leading from Jerusalem down to Jericho, which he himself had traversed only two days before. The caves and ravines, which abound beside this mountainous highway, afforded a lurking place for all sorts of dangerous characters, who lay in wait for travellers. A man chanced to fall into the hands of these robbers; they felled him to the ground, plundered him, and left him half dead. Who the man was, whether Jew or non-Jew, is not stated; it is quite sufficient

[1] This commandment becomes, of course, the first and most important commandment as soon as it is recognised that the fulfilment of it involves also fulfilment of the commandment to love God. This is not indeed equivalent to denying that there exists room for the latter commandment outside and above the sphere of the former; for more than once Jesus exhorts people to trust in God (*e.g.* Mk. xi. 22, ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ).

that he was a man (ἄνθρωπός τις). Certain holy men passed along the road—a priest, a Levite—people whose business it is to deal exclusively with sacrifices and the service of God, and who resort to Israel's most holy place more often than laymen do. They have not been trained, however, in the practice of charity and helpfulness.[1] Although they see the unfortunate man lying on the road, they go past him, either fearing lest they may be overtaken by a similar fate, or else deterred from effective interference by fastidiousness, indifference, or indolence. The most likely explanation is doubtless that, their sacred calling requiring their presence in Jerusalem as speedily as possible, they could not on any account linger by the way. Fortunately, however, a third traveller now comes along the road, a man who is manifestly less overwhelmed with business. He is a half-Jew, a Samaritan, one who is not permitted to participate in the divine service of the Jews, and is despised by them as unclean in the sight of God. This traveller likewise sees the wounded man lying by the wayside, and has compassion upon him. Going up to him, he bathes his wounds with oil and wine, bandages them as best he can, and lifts the helpless man upon his own beast, and in this way brings him to an inn by the wayside.[2] In consequence of all these services, he is himself unable to travel any farther that day. So, he tends his patient further, and on the following morning commends him to the care of the host, at the same time giving him money to cover additional expenses, and pledging himself for any further outlay.

(*c*) MEANING.—Thus far the parable is intended to illustrate the thought given utterance to already by the Scribe in his conversation with Jesus, namely, that love for one's neighbour is worth more than burnt-offerings and all other sacrifices. In spite of the holy functions they perform at the altar, the

[1] Here we are shown an aspect of their character similar to that noted when Jesus reproved the Pharisees, telling them that they displayed the most punctilious conscientiousness in the payment of tithes, yet concerned themselves very little about justice, mercy, and faithfulness (Mt. xxiii. 23, and compare p. 452).

[2] There are still two solitary inns (*khans*) on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho.

priest and the Levite are inferior to the Samaritan, unclean though he is accounted to be, because they do not render help, while the Samaritan does. But Jesus also means the parable to be an answer to the question, Who is the neighbour whom one must help?

(*d*) ONE'S NEIGHBOUR.—Now, since the term "neighbour" (ὁ πλησίον = רֵעַ, *rēa'*) conveys from its very nature a reciprocal idea, Jesus can turn the question about and ask, Which of these people showed himself the friend and neighbour of the wounded man?[1] There can, of course, be no difficulty about the answer. He only was a friend and neighbour to the wounded man who helped him. "Go thou and do likewise"—such is Jesus' last exhortation to the Scribe. Instead of asking, "Who is so close to me that I must help him?" or, taking a particular case, "Is this unhappy man so close to me that I am under an obligation to help him?" it is better to proceed to render help at once. It will be seen in the issue, that help so rendered actually makes men friends and neighbours to one another. The reasons why it is one's duty to give help are not to be sought in the relations already existing between man and man; but, rather, in the possibility of a man's drawing close through active love to such as were strangers before. Here, then, Jesus is laying down a principle of conduct calculated to bind and knit close together men who go through life side by side as strangers one to another. A love full of helpfulness is to be the means of converting humanity from being a mere aggregate of individuals living for themselves into a really united community conscious of its organic oneness.[2] After the Scribe's question had been thus disposed of, Jesus' labour for this day was finished. "After that none durst ask him any other question" (Mk. xii. 34).

PROPITIATION AND SACRIFICE.—Perhaps it was by way

[1] This is, of course, an anticipation of the answer. The question shows that Jesus is not concerned with a friendship that existed previous to the giving of help, but with a friendship created by that kindly act.

[2] Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God, and this idea of humanity being bound together by helpful love, are by no means co-extensive. But the latter is the natural complement of his thought, though he himself nowhere explicitly infers that the uniting of humanity into one in the kingdom of God will be a realisation of this conception.

of still further illustrating the statement about the higher value of practical love as compared with sacrifice, that Jesus spoke the words in which he instructs his disciples to leave their sacrifice by the altar unoffered if they have not fulfilled the duty of being reconciled with their brother (Mt. v. 23 f.); for the words were evidently spoken in Jerusalem. They must have been spoken there, for that was the only place where there existed an altar on which offerings were made. The conversation with the Scribe would furnish the opportunity for such an utterance. Since, however, according to Mk. xii. 34, no man durst ask Jesus any further questions, all the people went away, each to his own home (Jn. vii. 53). Jesus himself again passed the night on the Mount of Olives.

THURSDAY.—Early on Thursday morning he once more betakes himself to the holy place, and is soon sitting in the midst of a vast concourse of people, teaching them. His enemies now make one more attempt to destroy his reputation with the multitude. It was well known in Jerusalem that Jesus was the friend of publicans and sinners (Mt. xi. 19, Lk. vii. 34). Even if there had not been numbers of Galileans in the city keeping the festival, who might have proclaimed the fact, it would certainly be common knowledge that Jesus had spent the night with Zacchæus in Jericho, and had been anointed by the sinful woman in Bethany.

THE ADULTERESS.—Indeed, it seems to have been this last event that served as the immediate pretext for the further attempt now made by certain Scribal Pharisees to brand the prophet who so greatly excites the people's wonder as a really abandoned character. His love for sinners shall prove his ruin. Jesus promised forgiveness of sins to a woman of bad reputation in the house of Simon; accordingly, they now bring before him in the court of the temple a woman found in the act of adultery. This was a sin regarding which the Law spoke in a way that could not possibly be misunderstood. Lev. xx. 10 and Deut. xxii. 22 both lay it down that a woman so convicted must be stoned to death. But, seeing that the great prophet is now within the walls of

Jerusalem, these Pharisees deem it expedient to hear his opinion first.[1]

Contrary to his usual practice, Jesus in the present instance pauses before answering. Bending meditatively forward, as he sits on the ground, he makes certain signs on the pavement with his finger. Then he looks up for a moment and says, "Let him amongst you that is guiltless cast the first stone at her;" then, bending forward a second time, he again traces certain signs on the ground. His decision is therefore this: "The woman has deserved death; but they that are not free from guilt themselves ought not to judge others." The point at issue was not a sentence of death that admitted of being carried out. Such could be pronounced neither by Jesus nor by the woman's accusers. The decision as to life and death rested with the Roman procurator alone. The question was the theoretical one: "Is the Mosaic law right in making death the penalty for such a crime?" The guilty woman's presence there was in itself a severe punishment, and at the same time served as a living demonstration of the matter in dispute.[2] Jesus, however, settles the question, not by attempting to minimise the woman's guilt, but by calling attention to the universality of human sin. "If every person were punished as he deserves, who indeed would escape punishment?" Having pronounced this decision, Jesus immediately afterwards bends towards the ground again, being unwilling to destroy the effect of his words, or have them destroyed for him, by further reply and counter-reply. And his words do produce an effect. For, when he looks up again, not one of the accusers is to be seen; the woman alone is left standing in the midst of the throng of spectators round

[1] The word of a well-known Scribe carried the weight of law, even though he filled no sort of public office; and this was true even of later Judaism. Akibah, for instance, condemned a certain man to pay a heavy fine for having removed a woman's head-dress in the street (*Baba Kamma*, viii., 6).

[2] At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the people of Jerusalem did not always consult the procurator (cp. Acts vii. 58), and, besides, that the procurator in such cases of palpable guilt was not unwilling to leave the punishment of the offender to the popular jurisdiction. Hence, it is doubtful whether the verdict of a prophet, invalid though it was in point of law, might not after all have been actually carried out.

about him. One after the other her accusers had slunk silently away. Jesus assures himself of the fact; "Where are thy accusers?" he asks the woman. "Hath no man condemned thee?" She answers, "None." Then Jesus dismisses her with the words, "Neither do I condemn thee. Go and sin no more." Thus, he settles matters in such a way that he himself cannot be reproached with showing any weak indulgence to sin, and yet there can be no mistake about the duty of forgiveness, which he both practises himself and requires of others.[1] The attack had failed.

RESOLVE TO SEIZE JESUS.—Thus, every attack upon Jesus of an intellectual kind had been tried in vain. The attempt to call him to account for his violent proceedings in the court of the temple had failed. So also had the attempt to bring him into fatal collision with the Roman ruler, the attempt to make his creed appear ridiculous, and the attempt to stamp him as a protector of crime. He had succeeded in warding off all these well-aimed blows. And yet the Synedrium felt it to be absolutely necessary to do away with him, and that speedily. The feast of the Passover was to begin on Friday evening. It was now Thursday morning, and the court of the temple was still held by Jesus' adherents in a manner that was intolerable. They resolved therefore to seize upon him in a way least calculated to excite attention. This could not, of course, be done whilst he was in the midst of the throng which always swarmed about him, without occasioning a great commotion; such an attempt might easily have led to a dangerous disturbance (Mk. xiv. 1 f.). The obvious alternative, therefore, was to seize him by night. For regularly every evening Jesus went out of the city, accompanied by a relatively small number of followers, to spend the night somewhere in the open air. Their principal aim, therefore, should be to find out where he spent

[1] Jesus' decision rests upon that same acknowledgment of universal sinfulness which he called attention to when discussing the slain Galileans and the tower by the Pool of Siloah (cp. pp. 418 f., and Lk. xiii. 1–9). The woman has been caught in actual sin; but none of her accusers is entirely exempt from sin. And sinners, over whom hangs the fear of God's judgment, ought not to condemn one another. Cp. also, in the Sermon on the Mount, Lk. vi. 37, 41 f. = Mt. vii. 1–5.

his nights, and then proceed to the place with a band of armed men. No serious opposition need be reckoned upon on the part of his disciples; they were, on the whole, without weapons.[1]

TREACHERY OF JUDAS.—No doubt, even without outside assistance, the Synedrium would have had little difficulty in ascertaining where Jesus went to spend the next night; for he went away quite openly and might have been observed by anybody. But Paul (1. Cor. xi. 23) and Mk. (xiv. 10 f.) are both agreed that Jesus was betrayed into the hands of his enemies. Even Mk. relates that it was the disciple Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve, who deliberately, and not through mere carelessness or mistake, betrayed the retreat of Jesus. He went to the high-priests, Jesus' enemies, and offered to deliver Jesus up to them;[2] and he made them promise him a sum of money. On this occasion, even, he would seem to have definitely arranged the time at which he would come for their servants and guide them to seize Jesus. If the trial was to be finished before the feast, the seizure must be made on the immediately following night.

HIS MOTIVES.—In the absence of the necessary information in the Sources, it will never be possible to elucidate quite satisfactorily Judas' motives in betraying Jesus. Nevertheless, such facts as we have allow us to draw at least a few safe inferences. The idea of the later Evangelists, that Judas was simply an avaricious man and betrayed Jesus for the mere sake of obtaining money for the deed, is manifestly erroneous (Mt. xxvi. 15, *τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι*; toned down by Mt. xxvii. 3–10 and Jn. xii. 6). This same Judas, like the rest of the disciples, had once travelled through the villages of Galilee, preaching repentance and the nearness of the kingdom of

[1] There was no need to be disconcerted by the violent cleansing of the temple; for on that occasion Jesus and his followers had the people of Jerusalem on their side. Still, when his enemies went to seize him, their armed followers would necessarily have to be equal in point of numbers to the followers of Jesus.

[2] Mk. xiv. 12, *ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδοῖ αὐτοῖς.* The Gospel of Jn. assumes that the traitor only went once to the enemies of Jesus, and that direct from the Last Supper (John xiii. 2–27, 30). But the Synoptic representation deserves preference, because time was required for the arming of the servants and the convening of the Synedrium.

God. Subsequently, he had shared with Jesus the privations of his wanderings when he fled into heathen territory. He, too, had left all and followed Jesus. Such a man might indeed accept money for his services subsequent to the deed which earned them; but he would not have betrayed Jesus merely for the sake of money, any more than Jesus would have made a thief the guardian of the common purse (though the Johannine Gospel is our only authority for this; Jn. xii. 6, xiii. 29). Moreover, when we reflect upon the matter, we see that at the time of the betrayal Judas did not really hold Jesus to be the Messiah. To hand over the Messiah to his enemies would have been the greatest folly, since the Messiah was actually to be the future judge of the world. Consequently, Judas did not share the belief held by Jesus and the other disciples. In fact, the only reliable instances we have of disciples being convinced of the fact of Jesus' Messiahship are those of Peter (Mk. viii. 29) and the two sons of Zebedee (Mk. x. 37), that is to say, of the disciples who had witnessed the transfiguration of their Master, and to whom his glory was brilliantly displayed on the summit of Hermon (Mk. ix. 2–8). Of course, there were others of the disciples also who, no doubt, shared this belief; but that they did not all do so is proved by Judas' act of betrayal.[1] Yet even those who doubted found sufficient in Jesus to bind them to him permanently; first and foremost, his conception of human duty, so often utterly opposed to the Pharisaic conception, and, in general, his open and steadfast character. So long as Jesus himself, in his public preaching, said nothing about his Messianic faith, the disciples, including, of course, Judas, may have felt it to be a singular idea possessed of no great importance. But now, in Jerusalem, the case was different.[2] By entering Jerusalem in the manner described in the prophecy of Zech. ix. 9, Jesus meant to proclaim himself

[1] Cp. Chap. XI., p. 325. The majority of the disciples were no doubt ready to embrace Jesus' Messianic hope as a cheering prospect in time of trouble. But the reasons for their clinging so steadfastly to him, even unto death, were not derived from this Messianic hope, but from the ties which, before the confession of Peter, bound each of them individually to Jesus.

[2] On the reasons for this change of front, see pp. 399 ff.

the Messiah. His cleansing of the temple by force appeared to inaugurate quite a new kind of activity on his part. Hitherto he had worked simply through the power of his preaching, not by the strength of his arms; though, in conjunction with this, he had made the statement, so very irritating, we cannot doubt, to Jewish minds, concerning his being about to replace the temple which had been made by the hands of man by another not built in human fashion. And those who disapproved of the stormy proceedings in the court of the temple would scarcely be better pleased with his defiant repulse of the deputation of the Synedrium. Judas, be it observed, was a witness of Jesus' struggle against the recognised chiefs of his people. It was at a time when the Passover was close at hand, and large crowds of pilgrims were coming to Jerusalem. On all sides people were rejoicing at being associated with the temple and its guardians; Jesus' followers were the only people who struck out a line of their own. Accordingly, Judas was shocked by Jesus' annunciation of his Messiahship; the majesty of the holy places in Jerusalem had attracted and overpowered him. Let it be remembered that even Paul, after twenty-four years of successful work on behalf of a Gospel freed from the trammels of the Law, condescended, whilst on a visit to the city, and at a time when it was decorated for the Feast of Weeks, to appear publicly as a faithful son of the Judaism of the Law, even though he did so with the object of appeasing his Jewish Christian co-religionists (Acts xxi. 21–26; and cp. Gal. v. 4). Yet what we have said will only explain how Judas came to separate himself from Jesus in Jerusalem; it does not explain why he betrayed him to his enemies.[1] Jesus' personal charm had once exercised a great influence over Judas. We must also bear in mind that Jesus himself repeatedly prophesied his death, and from the manner of his dispute with the

[1] We are not, of course, endeavouring to "save" the character of the traitor; but it is the duty of the historian to explain such a remarkable event as Judas' betrayal. For it certainly is remarkable that, after preaching repentance and the kingdom of Heaven in the name of Jesus, after subsequently sharing in all the privations of his Master's wanderings in heathen territory, and, finally, after even venturing upon the perilous journey to Jerusalem, he should in the end have betrayed his Master there.

Synedrium would even seem to have been bent on accelerating his fate; besides, it was impossible to say whether some of those who were counted amongst his disciples might not be entangled in his doom—indeed, Jesus himself had predicted this for certain (Mk. x. 39). If, then, Judas did really look upon the death of Jesus as inevitable—and more than one of Jesus' adversaries would assuredly not have failed to assure him of its great likelihood—he may possibly have hoped that, by himself betraying Jesus into the hands of his enemies, he might save from certain destruction, not only his own life, but the lives of his other friends as well. In the present condition of our Sources, there is no direct evidence that Judas was actuated by these motives; but our inferences, resting as they do upon sure facts, lead us at all events somewhere near the truth.

THE SON OF DAVID.—Jesus is still teaching in the court of the temple. He now gives his attention to an objection raised against his Messiahship by certain people versed in the Scriptures. The Gospel of Jn. gives us the objection, but without quoting Jesus' reply to it (Jn. vii. 41 f.).[1] It was this: "Can the Messiah come out of Galilee, then? Does not the Scripture say that the Messiah cometh of the seed of David and out of Bethlehem, the village where David was?" It was certainly a very natural objection to make; for of the facts associated with the idea of the Messiah one of the most certain was the descent of the Messiah from the house of David (2 Sam. vii. 16, Isa. xi. 1–9, Mic. v. 1). The objection received greater force from the fact that it was made on Jewish soil and was levelled against the Galileans, and because the Jews were proud to think of David as of their tribe. Jesus, in answer, does not attempt to prove his descent either from David or out of Bethlehem; but seeks rather to show, by means of a quotation from Scripture, that it is a mistake to look for the Messiah amongst the descendants of David.[2] He directs attention to the opening words

[1] The Synoptists give Jesus' answer only. The objection which drew forth this answer must have been raised against Jesus in Jerusalem; and this would be true even if the Fourth Evangelist had not supported his information by facts drawn from a tradition of his own.

[2] The really important point is not that Jesus looked upon the Messiah

of the 110th Psalm—again quoted by him later in the day, which shows how prominent a place it occupied in his mind at this period. After the heading of the psalm has distinctly assigned it to David, we read, "Yahwè says to my lord, 'Sit thou at my right hand until I lay thy enemies as a footstool beneath thy feet.'" Since both our Hebrew text and the Septuagint distinctly trace the psalm to David, and any doubts as to the correctness of such assertions were at that time, and especially amongst the Jews, quite unheard of, Jesus, intellectually alert as he was, could not fail, while assuming the Davidic authorship, to detect a difficulty in these words. "David's lord" was certainly intended to mean the Messiah; for what other lord of David will God allow to sit at His right hand, even though it be to carry on the struggle against the enemies of the highly-favoured one? But, if this be the meaning, David is not the father or ancestor of the Messiah; for it would be entirely opposed to all Jewish ideas for the son ever to be described as the lord of his father.[1] The realisation of this truth meant for Jesus the removal of a doubt that was always possible for him. Had he known, as a fact, that he was descended from the house of David, he would assuredly not have spoken doubtfully, in the presence of a large multitude (ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος), of the Messiah's Davidic descent. The discovery which later commentators imagined they made when they tried to associate these words of Jesus with the assumption that he was perfectly certain of his, the Messiah's, descent, from David, testifies to greater reverence for what they felt to be sacred tradition than for the character of Jesus himself. No one who heard him give this explanation could fail to draw from it any other inference than that Jesus, with the help of a Scriptural quotation, was showing that the Messiah was in truth not the son of David.

as being not *merely* the son, but *also* the lord, of David. According to Mk. xii. 37, Jesus' thought is rather this: since the Messiah is David's lord he *cannot* be his son. Cp. Chap. IV., pp. 83 f.

[1] Though, it is true, when Solomon ascended the throne, we read of David, "and the king did homage (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ) upon his bed." But David's immediately following words are addressed to God. And yet an act of homage paid by David to Solomon at this moment would only mean a recognition of the royal dignity conferred by David upon his son, and not, properly speaking, a subordination of the father to the son (1 Ki. i. 47 f.).

Against Scribes and Pharisees.—In this way Jesus silences the objection raised by Scribes against his Messiahship; and, at the same time, he seizes the opportunity to warn the people of Jerusalem more explicitly against the sect or guild of the Scribes. His words necessarily involve a warning against the Pharisees as well, the learning of the Scribes being the principal source, as well as the chief armour, of Pharisaic piety.[1] The utterance is preserved by Mk. in an abstract only, but in Mt. and Lk. at full length, their authority being the Collection of the Sayings of the Lord. But while Mt. works up this collection together with Mk. into a great discourse, Lk. keeps the two Sources distinct and apart. According to Mk. xii. 38–40, Jesus reproaches the Scribes with vanity and avarice—with vanity, since they wear long robes (στολαί), love to be greeted in the market-places, and claim to occupy the first places in the synagogues and at meals. Mt. xxiii. 5 adds that they loved to have their phylacteries broad and their tassels, worn as a distinguishing mark of piety, long. Their vanity was shown again in their religious observances; they wished their very appearance to suggest their piety. Besides this, Mk. mentions only the reproach of avarice combined with hypocrisy. They devour widows' houses, and, by way of pretext, make long prayers. In other words, they quartered themselves in the houses of widows, under pretence of praying with them, but really in order to take from them their property.[2]

But even more important than Jesus' notice of various defects such as these, which, of course, varied in the different members of the guild itself, is his objection to the entire conception of duty taught by the Scribes, as well as by the Pharisees, following in their footsteps. He tells them that,

[1] As an ἀκριβεστάτη αἵρεσις (Acts xxvi. 5), the Pharisees in their traditions as to both theory and practice appealed in every case to the Scriptures for support, searching them through after the fashion of the Scribes for this very purpose. See *Neutestl. Zeitgesch.*, p. 162, 2 b.

[2] We may conjecture, besides, that they would make long prayers for other people, on the understanding that they were paid for them, in much the same way that masses are said and paid for in the Roman Catholic Church. Jas. v. 16–18, also, teaches that the earnest intercession of pious men can do a great deal to move the Almighty, and points, as an example of this, to Elijah praying successfully for drought and for rain

while they attach great value to petty externalities, they often disregard really important matters. They are very punctilious in the payment of tithes to the temple, exacting the tenth part of even the tiniest pot-herb that grew in their gardens; and consider the duties of justice, of compassion, and of fidelity[1] of less importance. Moreover, it was a matter of indifference to the Scribes and Pharisees whether their food and drink were stolen or unjustly come by, or whether they were taken in excess; yet they were very strict in requiring that the vessels in which their food was brought to the table should be clean in the eyes of the Law. It is, however, principally in their treatment of oaths that Jesus perceives their shallowness with regard to serious matters in spite of their show of exactitude in the fulfilment of the Law. An oath by God's house or by the altar will count for nothing, but an oath by the gold of God's house or by the offering on the altar must be considered binding. Originally, no doubt, Mt. v. 34–37 also formed part of this exposition (Mt. xxiii. 16–22). Jesus would, of course, insist upon the sanctity of all oaths, for all derive their ultimate sanction from God. But he thinks it would be better to refrain from the swearing of many oaths, and always to observe strictly the obligation of a simple yea or nay. Of course, the oaths required for the purposes of the State are not taken into consideration at all here. Jesus was evidently thinking only of daily intercommunication and the usual conventionalities of social intercourse.[2] He feels, therefore, that the Pharisees, with their punctilious piety, are like men who use a sieve to remove a gnat from their drinking-cup, but —he pungently adds—swallow a camel without taking any notice. So, he holds their piety to be rotten to the core: these Pharisees are like the beautifully whitewashed sepulchres of Palestine, which conceal within them nothing but corruption and dead men's bones. He accordingly concludes that

[1] Here, again, Jesus puts the obligations bound up with love for one's neighbour above the duties of divine worship (cp. p. 439). Consequently, κρίσις is equivalent to justice, and πίστις to fidelity. Judaism, too, spoke (*Ābōth*, ii. 1, iv. 2) of "important" (βαρύς) and "easy" (that is to say, less important) commandments.

[2] See Chap. XII., p. 367, n.

their preaching is wholly perverse: instead of opening the door of the kingdom of God, they close it. Similarly, he condemns the missionary activity that is prosecuted with such great zeal by the Pharisees; for instead of converting into children of God the heathen whom in their journeyings over land and sea they win to Judaism, they make them children of Hell, worse than they were before.[1]

In spite of all this, the Pharisees look upon themselves as pious. They erect handsome tombs to the prophets murdered by their fathers, and assert that, had they lived in the time of their fathers, they would not have participated in the murder. Jesus says, "It is good that they keep alive the recollection of these deeds of blood, for by so doing they will complete their fathers' work, and upon this generation will be fulfilled the denunciation contained in a certain Book of Wisdom (no longer extant) which declares that the blood of all the prophets shall finally be avenged." In the course of his discourse, Jesus adds that the Scribes themselves will not touch the burdens which in their learning and, consequently, their preaching, they seek to lay upon the shoulders of the people.[2] In so saying, Jesus again reproaches them with the essential falseness of their labours.

Unfortunately, this discourse has been completely mangled in the tradition. It may be that the careful writer to whom we owe the first record of Jesus' discourses paused in his work during the immediately succeeding days of excitement, and that when he again resumed his task he found he had lost the recollection of the threads which linked the separate parts together.[3] Jesus, at all events, here sets forth once

[1] This is a very hard saying, when we remember that the Jewish missionaries, besides propagating monotheism, endeavoured to teach their converts the morality required by the prophets (compare, for example, *Sibyll.*, iii. 218–247). Yet there is a close affinity between this opinion of Jesus and that of a heathen of such high moral tone as Tacitus (*Hist.*, v. 5).

[2] This again is a hard saying; it may be in accordance with Jesus' personal experience, but could not apply to all the Pharisees. Paul, who had been a Jew and even a Pharisee, holds a different view (Phil. iii. 5 f., Rom. x. 2 f., Gal. i. 14).

[3] The disciple of whom we must think is Matthew (cp. Chap. II., p. 30). A similar fate befell the discourse about the second coming, which we are about to discuss (see pp. 455–457 below).

again, as clearly as possible, the difference between the piety he taught and the piety of the Pharisees. It almost seems as if he wished to compress into a single address to the people of Jerusalem all the lessons derived from his many discussions in Galilee about the prevalent system of piety. But the bitter tone in which he speaks of these false prophets of Israel suggests that he regards them as his mortal enemies, as indeed he plainly enough intimates that they are.

THE WIDOW'S GIFT.—On this day Jesus seems to have kept to the inner court of the temple, which was accessible to none save the Jews. Here he sat over against the temple treasury, and observed the people making their offerings, dropping them through funnel-shaped openings in the wall into boxes fastened on the inside (*Shekalim*, vi., 1–5). It is useless now to try to ascertain how Jesus could possibly perceive the amounts of the several offerings. Perhaps what we read is only a later embellishment. At any rate, Jesus did notice that a poor widow woman approached and cast in some very small contribution—Mk. says two *lepta*, and makes their value equal to a *quadrans* or quarter *as*, the *as* being approximately worth (say) a halfpenny.[1] On seeing this, he calls his disciples' attention to the poor woman, and says, "She hath given more than all the others: she hath given away absolutely everything she possessed, whereas all the rest have offered but a small portion of their superfluity" (Mk. xii. 41–44). Unmistakable internal evidence makes the connection between this saying and the immediately preceding discourse against the Pharisees obvious. In the latter, the disciples are not to let themselves be deceived by the outward show of piety on the part of the Scribes and Pharisees; but must distinguish between the true nature of things and deceptive appearances. In the former, Jesus makes precisely the same demand: it is not the numerical proportion of a gift that determines its worth, but solely the relation borne by this proportion to the giver's possessions as a whole. Measured by this standard, a gift of the value of only half-a-farthing may really amount to a larger offering than a thousandfold greater gift. The calculation is one of no great difficulty. But the story is important; it shows that Jesus is not really concerned about

[1] See *Neutestl. Zeitgesch.*, pp. 114, 115.

the deed in itself, but solely in its relation to the means and effort of the person who performs it.[1]

PROPHECY OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE.—After this, Jesus quits the temple, being anxious to go once more by daylight to the Mount of Olives. As he leaves, one of his disciples calls his attention to the mighty foundations of the temple court—"Behold, what great stones and what magnificent buildings!" The great artificial substructure at the south-west corner of the temple court is a particular object of admiration even at the present day. What is now known as the Jews' place of mourning was constructed of blocks of stone measuring 12 to 16 feet in length.[2] And, owing to his occupation at an earlier period, Jesus would no doubt be able fully to appreciate such a building. But he replies, "Seest thou this great building? There shall not remain one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down!" All this apparent splendour of Jerusalem, made subservient as it is to the current religion, does not favourably impress Jesus.[3] His thoughts turn to God's judgment, which shall sweep this consecrated building away.

DISCOURSE ON THE SECOND COMING.—According to the story in the Gospel of Mk., Jesus, whilst sitting, on this same day, on the Mount of Olives, gave the four senior disciples, the two pairs of brothers, Simon and Andrew, John and James, at their request, more exact information about the coming transformation of the world, and the Messianic judgment, which was to strike even the temple standing in the distance before their eyes (Mk. xiii. 3 f.). And we shall be quite safe in assuming that his ideas regarding the last things did not travel very far beyond the range of contemporary

[1] The saying also warns us against the danger of allowing ourselves to be dazzled by outward appearances. The man who was despised and rejected by the people of Israel as being ungodly, and yet, notwithstanding this, believed himself to be the Messiah, knew that outward appearances are often misleading, and praised his friend Simon, because in the face of these he was able to perceive the truth (Mt. xvi. 17). Here again he shows and requires clearness and firmness in judgment.

[2] Baedeker, *Palästina*, 3rd ed., pp. 53–63.

[3] We are reminded of the impression made upon Luther during his journey to Rome. Only, Luther still had his struggle before him; whereas Jesus in Jerusalem was drawing near the close of his.

"apocalyptic." Consequently, like others, he would no doubt represent the advent of the Messiah as about to be preceded by a period of several trials—war, earthquake, famine, domestic strife, afflictions for the disciples, distress the like of which had never been heard of since the world began; and, in addition to this, the appearance of tempters of every description. By the gracious will of God, however, this adversity will last only for a short space.[1] Then shall come the end when the sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall deviate from their courses; and then, too, the Son of Man shall appear on the clouds, as Dan. vii. 13 prefigures, with great power and splendour, and his angels shall bring together the elect from all the ends of the earth. And when the first of these things begins, then shall the last also be not far distant. It was a settled conviction with Jesus, from first to last, that the generation then living would witness this overthrow of all things. The destruction of all that was beautiful and, from an earthly point of view, great might indeed be lamented; but Jesus knows that the holiest possession of all will still remain—the words he has spoken to his disciples. The disciples are anxious to learn more precisely when the end will come. But Jesus declines to fix the time more exactly now, just as he did in the case of the earlier request of the two sons of Zebedee. The day and the hour are known to the Father alone. And as the former conversation with the sons of Zebedee ends in an earnest exhortation of an ethical nature, so also here Jesus once more exhorts his disciples each to do his duty faithfully down to the day of the Messiah, just as slaves are expected to do their duty when their lord is absent on a journey.[2]

Recasting of the Discourse.—In its essential features, therefore, this discourse of Jesus (Mk. xiii. 6–37) may be thoroughly genuine, even though in certain parts it has been very much recast. We are told (Mk. xiii. 10) that the gospel of the nearness of God's kingdom must first be carried to all nations. Yet this is not in harmony with Jesus' statement

[1] It is, however, clear that the "three days," which are mentioned elsewhere in this connection, are not to be taken literally (Mk. viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34, xiv. 50, xv. 29).

[2] Cp. for this Chap. VIII., pp. 176 ff.

when he sent forth his disciples, that, as they would not have finished visiting all the cities of Israel before the day of the Lord, they ought to confine themselves to the people of Israel, and ignore the Samaritans and the heathen. It is, of course, possible that Jesus himself may have changed his opinion. At any rate, we could not describe this as impossible; but against any such supposition we have the fact that, at least seventeen years after his death, Peter and John explicitly declined mission work among the heathen (Gal. ii. 9). True, they only declined personally to undertake the mission, leaving the work to Paul and Barnabas, who seemed to them to have been called to it. Still, during all these (at the least) seventeen years they evidently made no serious attempt to labour on any large scale amongst the heathen. And, in view of the expectation of the nearness of the parusia, this must appear very remarkable, if they had before them a saying of the Lord such as this, for, seeing that it was uttered just before the beginning of his passion, it was to some extent the Lord's last will and testament.[1] Further, neither the recommendation to flee into the mountains at the moment when the abomination of desolation stands where it ought not to stand, nor the exhortation to pray God that this flight might not take place in the winter (Mk. xiii. 14–18), belongs, it is certain, to Jesus' discourse. They are of far too precise a nature to fit well into the framework of the general sketch of the tribulation during the last days. Moreover, the words *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω* of verse 14 contain a clear proof that what we have here is not an original utterance of Jesus, but a purely literary production. If, however, we excise the verses mentioned, as being additions from another hand, all the rest of the discourse would fit in very well with the point of time at which Mk. xiii. 3–5 represents it to have been spoken.

THE LAST SUPPER: (*a*) INDICATION OF TRAITOR.—That

[1] In a case like this, the silence of Paul, too, is very significant. Had he known that Jesus' second coming could not take place until the Gospel had first been carried to all nations, he would have been able, despite what he says in Rom. i. 8, Col. i. 6, to quiet the Thessalonians, when they had become uneasy on account of the nearness of Jesus' second coming, by referring to this saying of Jesus. Yet he chooses another way of calming them (1 Thess. v. 1–11); this, to say the least of it, is striking.

same evening Jesus took his principal meal[1] in Jerusalem in the midst of his disciples. Whilst sitting at meat, Jesus notices marks of agitation in the countenance of Judas. It may be that he had been observing him for some time before. Having a keen eye for the smallest occurrences of daily life, he now realises the presence of a traitor amongst his disciples. Nothing could be more at variance with his own character than such insincerity as was indicated by a man sitting at table with him when he had already come to an arrangement with his enemies to betray him. Hence, he speaks his mind clearly and unmistakably, "Verily I say unto you, one of you who is now eating with me shall betray me." The words naturally threw the disciples generally into a state of profound agitation. Each was anxious to have Jesus' assurance that he was not the one intended. Jesus, however, will not go beyond the general statement, "One of the Twelve who now dips with me into the dish." This means that the disciples are all reclining with Jesus round one common dish, dipping bread into it. In both sentences, but more emphatically in the second than in the first, Jesus accentuates the deceitful and treacherous conduct of his betrayer in still pretending to be one of his intimate friends, and feigning a bond of fellow-feeling which he has really severed. And the words in which Jesus represents to him the gravity of his offence breathe deep pity for the traitor. "The Son of Man goeth indeed hence, as it is written of him, but woe unto the man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it would have been better if *that* man had never been born!" From this we see that Jesus is reconciled to his approaching fate: it is the dispensation of God.[2] Yet this in no wise extenuates

[1] Cp. Jn. xiii. 2, δείπνου γινομένου. Mk. xiv. 17 fixes the hour as ὀψίας λενομένης; Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23) gives ἐν τῇ νυκτί. The fact of its being already night may be explained by the previous visit to the Mount of Olives, for Jesus was not wont to leave the temple precincts until late (Mk. xi. 11, 19).

[2] In point of fact, it was not Judas who brought about the downfall of Jesus; the Synedrium could have dispensed with his service. The reason Jesus perished was that in his person a new form of piety was set in opposition to the traditional form, while the latter had the power at its back. In the struggle between the two, both parties contended in good faith.

the guilt of the man who betrays the Messiah into the hands of his enemies. The Gospel of Jn. tells us that Judas retired at the express desire of Jesus in order to carry out his intention speedily. It is not impossible that Jesus expressed this wish, seeing that he perceived his doom to be in a measure already sealed, and was only awaiting the last dread stroke. In any case, the traitor must now have gone away; for it is hardly conceivable that Jesus would have allowed him to participate in the symbolical action which immediately followed. Indeed, the ceremony itself presupposes on Jesus' part such a degree of certainty that the pain of death awaited him immediately as can only be explained if Judas had already gone away. We might perhaps wonder why Jesus did not take greater pains to prevent Judas from carrying out his unhappy project. Two circumstances may have kept him from doing so—firstly, he felt certain that it was God's will that he must die, in order to attain unto the glory of the Messiah; and, secondly, he was convinced that words of exhortation would make no impression upon a disciple who is now bent on betraying him, although he has lived with his Master for a long time on terms of the closest intimacy.[1] Judas, then, withdraws; he is unable to remain any longer in the society of Jesus and his fellow-disciples. What was passing in his mind at the time no man knows. He could still have fled away by himself into Galilee; but he does not do this: he keeps his word (Jn. xiii. 27–30).

(*b*) THE SINFUL DISCIPLES AS CITIZENS OF GOD'S KINGDOM. —Accordingly, Jesus anticipates that he will be seized within the next few hours. How profoundly he was moved by this expectation is shown by his subsequent struggle in Gethsemane. He is at the same time deeply stirred by the faithlessness of his disciple. He can no longer believe that any of them will be able in the long run to continue faithful; he even suspects that his beloved Peter will deny him (Mk. xiv. 29–31). And yet he cherishes the hope that his death will render possible the appearance of the kingdom of God,

[1] Moreover, it would hardly be possible for Jesus to use words of more solemn warning than those quoted, and we can hardly suppose that after these words Judas would have waited to hear more; the fact, too, of his going away may have put an end to all further attempts at exhortation.

into which he would certainly like to receive his nearest friends, as he has frequently promised them (Lk. xii. 32, xxii. 28–30, Mt. xix. 28).[1] None, however, may come into God's kingdom but pure and holy men, and these disciples have not yet been approved faithful through all temptations. Nevertheless, Jesus holds firmly to his belief. God will not reject the friends of Jesus, sinful though they be, so long as he himself holds out obediently unto death. God will recompense the great sacrifice which he is offering to the Father, by receiving his friends into the kingdom of the Messiah. He that is a friend of Jesus will not be lost, despite his sins, because Jesus through his faithful obedience unto death acquires a claim upon the love of his Father, and will intercede with him on behalf of his friends.

(*c*) THE SACRED RITE.—Jesus gives expression to all this in a symbolical ceremony. Whilst the meal was still in progress, he took the bread, and, after giving thanks, broke it in a way that was evidently peculiar and striking, saying as he did so, "This is my body which (is broken) for you. Do this in remembrance of me." Such at least is Paul's version, based upon the best Source.[2] We have a further indication of the peculiar importance attached to the breaking of the bread on this occasion, in the fact that the expression "breaking of bread" actually became in the first Christian community a technical expression (Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7, 11, xxvii. 35), and that, according to Lk. xxiv. 30–35, the manner in which Jesus broke the bread was a special sign by which the disciples of Emmaus recognised their risen Lord. An apparently trivial circumstance, such as the accidental crumbling of the bread to pieces in Jesus' hands, might easily have occasioned him to utter these words. In that case, the breaking of the

[1] Thus, Jesus' love prevails over his sense of justice—a sense of justice which is still unaffected by this feeling in the admonitions of Mk. viii. 38, Lk. xiii. 24–30. Jesus does not wish to have to deny those who in the hour of temptation will deny him. Nor does he wish to have to reject those who have belonged to him, even though the stain of wrong-doing still cleaves to them, even though they are to be considered *ἐργάται ἀδικίας*.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 23, *Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου*. It is very probable that his authority was Peter, with whom Paul spent fourteen days, three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18). Previous to that, he had talked with none of the leaders of the Church.

bread would have seemed to him to be a sign of his approaching death.[1] Mk. xiv. 22 goes beyond Paul, when it speaks of the handing of the bread to the disciples and at the same time adds appropriate words to accompany the action (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς . . . . λάβετε). But the only interpretation given is, "This is my body," without the addition, "which (is broken) for you," and without any desire being expressed that they should repeat the ceremony. This is not the place to bring forward proof of the correctness or incorrectness of either of these two traditions; but we may express the opinion that in uttering words suggested by an accident, while Jesus may very well have said that his body was broken for his disciples, he would hardly at the same time have ordered a repetition of the act. Jesus would not have commanded a repetition of the whole procedure until after the second ceremony, which was no doubt performed deliberately. Paul here says simply and briefly, "Likewise also the cup after the meal, with the words, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood; do this, as often as ye drink, in remembrance of me!'" In the introductory sentence it will be observed that the verb is wanting. The adverb ὡσαύτως refers back to ἔλαβεν, because naturally the cup was not broken as the bread was. Mk.'s tradition reads in a similar way (Mk. xiv. 23): "And he took a cup, returned thanks, gave it to them, and they all drank out of it." The words given by Mk. (Mk. xiv. 24) as accompanying this ceremony read somewhat differently from the version preserved by Paul: "This is the blood of my covenant that is poured out for many." Here the expression τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν must have been particularly precious to the earliest Church. This seems indeed to be shown by the Gospel of Lk., which, whilst following Paul entirely instead of Mk. in all other particulars of the description of the Last Supper, has nevertheless retained these words, though they do not appear in the least to fit into his construction. Lk. xxii. 20, for instance, runs thus, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι (thus far entirely in agreement with Paul) τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον (here in agreement with Mk.). Now, in Mk.'s version τὸ

[1] In the same way, the anointing in Bethany was an anticipation of the anointing of his dead body (p. 408).

ἐκχυννόμενον is to be taken with αἷμα. But we are at once arrested by the fact that the writer of Lk., who as a rule writes good Greek, has not put the dative τῷ ἐκχυννομένῳ in agreement with the immediately preceding τῷ αἵματι. It is true that his text, taken as it stands, does yield a very good sense: "This cup, which is poured out for you, is the new covenant in my blood." This, at any rate, is some evidence in favour of the custom as known to the Evangelist. He is aware that a cup was poured out at the Supper; this was the usual manner of making a libation in ancient times.[1] Now, the act of pouring out the cup may certainly be traced back to Jesus; some of the contents of the cup would be poured out on the ground and the rest divided amongst the guests at the Supper. Jesus himself, however, made ἐκχύννεσθαι refer to his own blood; as the contents of this cup are poured out, so will his blood be poured out, and in this the new covenant, that is to say, the covenant promised in Jer. xxxi. 31–34, was inaugurated.[2] According to the Prophet's words, this new covenant between God and his people is destined to ensure both forgiveness of sins and the complete fulfilment of God's will. And both will be required by all such as have hitherto led the lives of sinful men, and now wish to enter into God's kingdom. Their former sins must be forgiven, and they must appear well armed against all future temptations. Both these results Jesus looks forward to as the effects of his death. God will forgive the friends of the Messiah, the Messiah who is obedient unto death, and will protect them against further

[1] The reason this practice fell into disuse at a later date was that people were reluctant to speak of shedding Christ's blood. Even by the time of Justin, 1 *Ap.*, 65, 66, and the *Didache*, 9, 10, 14, the relation between the Lord's Supper and Christ's death had been entirely forgotten.

[2] The Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 8–12) refers explicitly to this passage in Jeremiah. In fact, that epistle makes more use than any other book in the New Testament of this idea of Jesus: Jesus is the surety of a better covenant (vii. 22), or the mediator of a better covenant, of a covenant founded upon better promises (viii. 6); as the mediator of a new covenant, he has brought forgiveness and a share in the eternal inheritance (ix. 15). Besides καινὴ διαθήκη, we read of διαθήκη νέα (xii. 24) and διαθήκη αἰώνιος (xiii. 20). Paul, also, recognises himself to be a servant of the new covenant (2 Cor. iii. 6), with an evident allusion to Jeremiah (γράμμα—πνεῦμα), and in Gal. iv. 24 he speaks of the two διαθῆκαι.

sins.[1] He thus compares his death to the offering made in accordance with the instructions in Exod. xxiv. 1–8. In that rite a portion of the blood of the covenant is sprinkled on the altar, and a portion over the associates in the covenant; in like manner, Jesus pours out a portion of the wine on the earth, but offers the rest to his disciples to drink. His words, accordingly, are connected with Deut. xxiv. 8 as well, where Moses says, "This is the blood of the covenant."

We can very well understand that a discourse of Jesus such as this would at first produce dismay amongst the disciples. True, they had just heard what he said about their having a traitor in their midst; and Judas' departure may have caused one or other of them to feel uneasy. Yet Jesus was still free. The people of Jerusalem had been as eager to hear his preaching as those who dwelt beside the Lake of Gennesareth. By the victorious clearness of his intellect he had repelled the many attempts which had been made to entrap him. Hence, his disciples might even at the present juncture refuse to believe in the nearness of his death. But he repeats his prediction in unmistakable terms, "Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until the day when I shall drink it again new in the kingdom of God." In other words, he knows definitely that he will not taste wine again before he dies: his death is immediately at hand.[2] Yet Jesus does certainly look forward to his return to a renewed earth in which new vines will bear new fruit. His present saying shows plainly that he did not think of the kingdom of God as being purely spiritual. And with the thought of his departure in his mind, he bids them repeat the present ceremony as often as they drink (ὅταν πίνητε). Every

[1] Both promises will, of course, be fulfilled on the day of judgment. Until that day comes—and in Jesus' expectation it will appear very soon—the existing warfare against sin, with its victories and its defeats, will continue. In particular, Jesus expects that his death will expose his disciples to sore temptations, to which they will all succumb (Mk. xiv. 27, Lk. xxii. 31 f.).

[2] On the other hand, we must also remember that Jesus was hardly accustomed to drink wine every day. But on the following evening the Passover supper was taken, and at this there were, according to Jewish custom, four cups of wine (*Pesachim*, x. 1 f., 4, 7).

time they drink[1] they are in this way to commemorate his death, confident that God will accept them in spite of their sins, because they are friends of the Messiah, who died for their good. By means of this observance at every meal, the disciples are to maintain vital relations with their master, to the end that at the judgment he may duly recognise them as his own and intercede for them.

REJECTED INTERPRETATIONS.—The institution of the Supper has, consequently, nothing whatever to do with the customs at the Feast of the Passover; for the observance was founded by Jesus on the 13th Nisan, the day before the beginning of the Passover (cp. pp. 395 ff.). Not one word that he says bears the least reference to the Passover. The saying in Lk. xxii. 15 f. is manifestly a late copy of the saying about the fruit of the vine (Lk. xxii. 18). Nor, on the other hand, is the institution of the Supper an anticipation of the Messianic meal, which is referred to in the Rabbinical phrase "to eat the Messiah." For in the oldest tradition the eating of his body and the drinking of his blood are of less significance than the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine.[2] Paul, too, makes the observance refer explicitly to Jesus' death (1 Cor. xi. 26).

VALUE OF THE DEATH OF JESUS.—This ceremony is the last and highest interpretation Jesus permits himself to give of his terrible fate. Ever since Peter's avowal at Cæsarea Philippi, he has looked upon his death as simply the unavoidable path leading to his future glory. In the conversation that ensues upon the petition of the sons of Zebedee, his death appears to him to be the means of saving many from the same fate, in so far as it actually renders possible the kingdom of God. At the institution of the

[1] Hence, it is apparent that Jesus did not intend this observance to be a ceremonial of worship on the part of the Christian community, but as a domestic celebration at the regular meal. Accordingly, even in this act he did not wish to give to his community any institution of a liturgical character.

[2] As early, indeed, as the Gospel of Jn. we find the oldest tradition abandoned, for there, as also in Justin and the *Didache*, the utterances at the Last Supper are no longer made to refer to Jesus' death; according to Jn. vi. 52-63, they demand the spiritual appropriation of the person of Christ through the acceptance of his words.

Supper Jesus regards his doom of death, immediately to happen, as the precious deed through which the possessions of the new covenant, forgiveness of sin and the overcoming of sin, will be permanently bequeathed to his community (Mk. viii. 31–ix. 1, x. 45, xiv. 24 = 1 Cor. xi. 25). Thus, we see that as time went on Jesus familiarised himself more and more with the thought of his death, and was able to invest it with a deeper and deeper meaning.[1]

JESUS GOES TO THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.—The meal at an end, the disciples, after singing the song of praise—no doubt a psalm—all went out to the Mount of Olives, as they had become accustomed to do, to spend the night there in the open air (Mk. xiv. 26). Jesus' mind was entirely occupied with the thought of his impending fate; what most depressed him was the untrustworthiness of his disciples. The discovery that one of the Twelve was the traitor robbed him of his confidence in the fidelity and steadfastness of the others. On the way, therefore, he says to them, "Ye all will be offended in me, as it is written, 'I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered'" (Zech. xiii. 7: literally, "Smite the shepherd that the sheep may be scattered"). Yet, even under these circumstances, Jesus clings fast to the hope that God will soon awaken him from the dead and bring him to earth again. Before the disciples have even had time to return to Galilee, his glory will be revealed. Some such idea as this must have been intended by the saying which Mk. xiv. 28 has handed down thus—"When I am raised, I will go before you into Galilee;" since Jesus did not imagine the transfigured Messiah would be bound to appear in any definite place; indeed, he distinctly refused to

[1] Here, then, we have a point at which we can clearly trace a development in his ideas. From the time antecedent to Peter's confession we possess only one allusion to Jesus' impending death: the disciples will fast when the bridegroom is taken from them. Cp. Chap. IX., p. 215. And, in seeking at this same period to avoid death, Jesus is clearly actuated by the thought expressed in his words to Peter, that a Church which is built upon a rock cannot be overpowered even by the gates of Hades (Mt. xvi. 18). Previous to that, Jesus had feared that his Church would fall to pieces upon the death of their Master. But from that moment onwards he contemplates his death with equanimity, and, as has been indicated above, gains an ever deeper apprehension of its meaning.

say anything explicit on this point (Lk. xvii. 22 f.). So, he hopes the time of trial for the disciples will not last very long.[1] And as Peter's avowal had inspired Jesus with the hope that this disciple would some day be a support to his Church, after the gates of death had closed behind himself (Mt. xvi. 18), so he still continues to hope that the same disciple will soon, if not immediately, recover himself, and then strengthen the others. "Simon, Simon," he says to him, "behold Satan hath asked that he may sift thee as wheat is sifted.[2] But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and when thou hast returned to thyself, strengthen thou thy brethren." We see from this that Jesus still assumes at any rate a momentary desertion even on the part of Peter. Peter, however, refuses to hear of any wavering on his own part; "Even though they should all fail thee, yet shall I not fail thee!" he says. Jesus replies, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day, this night, before the second cockcrow, thou wilt deny me thrice." It is a very bitter feeling that has come over Jesus—the premonition that he will be deserted by all his followers. Peter again refuses to accept this gloomy foreboding as a prophecy of the truth. "Even though I should be obliged to die with thee, yet will I not deny thee!" he insists. The other disciples, too, gathering more closely about their Master, troubled as he is with premonitions of a darksome future, vow that they will not desert him. But now he takes thought for their provision (Lk. xxii. 35–38). Formerly he had sent them forth cheerfully without purse, without wallet, without shoes; and yet they had suffered no want, finding everywhere hospitable people who gladly ministered to their needs. On the present occasion, however, he counsels them to take purse and wallet, and procure themselves a sword, which they will have need of, in place of their outer robe, which they can really

[1] At the same time, the disciples believed they saw in these words a hint that they were to await their Master's appearance in Galilee, not in Judæa. The recollection of this, however, completely escaped the later Christian Church (Lk. xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4).

[2] The idea is the same as that in the prologue of the Book of Job (i. 6–12, ii. 1–6). Jesus' death separates the faithful disciples from the waverers, and shows each man's measure of faithfulness. The metaphor of sifting wheat had already been used by Amos (ix. 9). Compare also the words of the Baptist, Mt. iii. 12 = Lk. iii. 17.

dispense with.[1] For now he himself is looked upon as a criminal; his influence is now at an end, and the disciples are living in the midst of an unfriendly and hostile world. Accordingly, it is only natural that the disciples, on hearing these words, should look about to see what they possess; they inform Jesus that they have with them two swords. Jesus was not seriously thinking of offering any opposition, so he replies, "It is enough."

GETHSEMANE.—Conversing thus, they come again to-day to the same place where they no doubt passed the preceding nights. Jesus might, of course, have avoided this spot, and spent the night elsewhere; more than this, he might possibly have had time to escape from Jerusalem altogether. But, holding the idea of God's will which he did when he set out on his journey to Jerusalem, to do so would have been to act in opposition to God's guidance and his own destiny. The spot where they intended to pass the night was known as "the oil-press" (Gethsemane). We cannot be surprised that it is still pointed out on the other side of the brook Kidron, at the foot of the Mount of Olives; but there is no certainty as to the accuracy of this particular tradition. Arrived at this place, Jesus told the other disciples to stay behind, as he wished to pray; Peter, James, and John, however, remain near him.[2] To these three he now speaks of the sore anguish weighing upon him; "My soul is grievously afflicted even unto death;" and he begs them to remain with him and keep watch. Then, going forward a short distance from them, he sinks to the ground, and cries aloud in prayer. The Evangelist preserves for us, it is true, the mere import of

[1] This means that, in the disciples' present situation, they must take care to provide for themselves. Consequently, Jesus no longer shows such bold and cheerful courage as that which inspired him when he bade his disciples, on their quitting Galilee, give away their earthly possessions, and when, whilst on the way up to Jerusalem, he urged the rich man to go and do likewise. Nor did he at that earlier period calculate, as he does now, upon the return of the disciples into Galilee.

[2] These are the same disciples who figure in the story of the transfiguration; and, if we add to them Andrew, the brother of Peter, they are the oldest of the disciples (Mk. i. 14–20). These same four were with Jesus when, on the Mount of Olives, he spoke of his second coming (Mk. xiii. 3).

the prayer. How the later Church learned even this much, no one has tried to explain, seeing that after praying Jesus comes to the three, who should be keeping watch, and finds them asleep. Yet, no doubt, they were able subsequently to recall the opening words of the prayer—and that indeed is all we possess. We are further told (and the statement is in perfect harmony with the situation) that Jesus continued to reiterate the same words; and that three times successively, in his uneasiness and anguish of soul, coming back to his disciples only to find them slumbering, he went away again to pray. Steadfast though he still proved himself, yet even Jesus himself is not spared the anguish of death. So, he has recourse to prayer to gain strength to meet this, the hardest struggle of all, when he is compelling his own will, the joy of life and the power of life within him both strong as ever, to bow to the will of God, by whom his death is required; "Abba! to Thee all things are possible. Let this cup pass by me. Yet not as I will, but as thou wilt!" Thus, he first opposes his confidence in God's almighty power to the danger which threatens; then the human will bends to the divine. First, we witness a wrestling with God for the satisfying of his own desire; then humble and resigned submission to the will of God. The result is a model prayer for every need of man, far though it was from Jesus' mind at the time to frame a model.

We, no doubt, owe the description of this scene to one of the three disciples, probably to Peter.[1] The narrator was evidently very unhappy at being unable to overcome his sleep at this important hour. Jesus, too, exhorts Peter by name to watch; "Simon, sleepest thou? Hadst thou not strength to watch even *one* hour? Watch and pray, that ye come not into temptation. The will is indeed there, but the bodily power fails." The disciples had lived through some exciting days; it was but natural that exhaustion and weariness should follow.[2] And yet, just now, it was so requisite

[1] Peter is really the authority for the Gospel of Mk. Cp. Chap. II., p. 30.

[2] The meagreness of the tradition, so often lamented already, might easily suggest that the only occasions on which the disciples were supposed to have played any active part in the drama of Jesus' life were when he

that the disciples should pray with Jesus. They have been warned and are assured that his Passion threatens them with a severe temptation. Yet they sleep whilst Jesus keeps watch alone. And now as he watches, he hears in the stillness of the night the approaching steps of the band of men sent to seize him. At once, with a cry of alarm, he arouses, not the three only, but all the disciples who were sleeping in the vicinity. "Sleep and rest another time. It is over. The moment has come. The Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners! Awake! Arise! Behold, he is here who betrayeth me!" The words of exclamation reflect the passion of the hour (Mk. xiv. 41 f.).

DEATH-AGONY OF JESUS.—Only those who have failed to observe how constantly the thought of death has occupied Jesus ever since Peter made his confession, and with how many new interpretations he has continually explained to himself the meaning of his death, can be surprised at his shaking and trembling, now that the destiny so long foreseen is actually approaching and near fulfilment. There can, of course, be no question of cowardice. Jesus had come to the place where Judas would seek him. He might have fled, and, had he done so, it is very doubtful whether the Synedrium would have done him any harm, since his influence would then have perished along with his reputation. It is not cowardice that fills him, but anguish, not merely because he must die, but because the man who is about to betray him to his enemies is one of his own friends. He is overcome with anguish because his disciples are about to prove themselves weak. He is overcome with anguish because his countrymen, for whom he has laboured ever since he began his public ministry, the ancient people of God, the nation to which he himself belongs, are capable of killing him as a criminal. A cup of

entered Jerusalem and when he cleansed the temple. At other times they are represented as being merely Jesus' followers, and we can trace no sign of independent life in them. But such a representation is wrong. The men who themselves preached repentance for the kingdom of Heaven nigh at hand would not have stood passively behind Jesus' back at this juncture. Their association with him would inevitably expose them to inquisitorial inquiries; and attempts would certainly be set on foot to make them disloyal to Jesus. We must bear this in mind when we reflect upon the treachery of Judas.

suffering such as this is one that he is justified, on the grounds of a higher morality, in wishing he might not have to drink. Besides all this, there was the mental strain which always accompanies the certain expectation of a great and critical experience. From the very first moment when he began to speak of his approaching death, Jesus felt it to be the great crisis which alone would render possible the coming of the world of the promise. A prize so great demands a great sacrifice; this again makes Jesus tremble.[1]

SEIZURE OF JESUS.—The seizure of Jesus was, relatively speaking, speedily accomplished. Even whilst he is in the act of calling to his disciples Judas is upon him, with a band of men armed by the Synedrium with weapons and clubs. The Synedrium, be it observed, possessed no troops of its own. Police duty within the temple had to be undertaken by the Levites, and their chief was often called the captain of the temple; yet we are nowhere told that they were subject to any sort of military training. Nor does Mk. say that the band sent to seize Jesus had any other leader besides Judas. The number of men, and the weapons they carried, were no doubt suggested by the fear of resistance on the part of Jesus and his disciples; and reason enough for their expecting a powerful resistance to their act of violence was supplied by Jesus' forcible cleansing of the temple.[2] But there was no idea of resistance of any kind. Even Mk. tells us that Judas now greeted Jesus with a kiss, thus pointing out to the men who were with him the person they should seize (Mk. xiv. 44 f.). It was a hateful piece of treachery, and deserves our severest condemnation. Jesus is quickly secured. Resistance on the part of the disciples is confined to one of them striking a slave of the high-priest and cutting off his

[1] The absence in him of the passionless composure and imperturbability of a Greek sage might be pointed to in this scene in Gethsemane. But a Socrates would not have possessed enough religious force to impel him to believe himself to be the Messiah in spite of the witness of all experience. And, notwithstanding his anguish, the steadfastness of character we have so often admired in Jesus again asserts itself here. In spite of the violent tumult of his mind, he goes the way which he perceives God has appointed for him.

[2] Hence, it was necessary to be superior to the disciples both in numbers and in weapons. But cp. p. 446, n. 1.

ear. Despite this, nobody else is seized besides Jesus; the rest are dispersed. Evidently this was done of set purpose. We may assume that Judas had insisted upon it as a condition of his betrayal. Jesus says little; he simply remarks that his assailants need not have armed themselves against him as though he were a robber. He had taught daily in the temple, without any man laying hands upon him. Yet he believes that what has happened is in fulfilment of certain words of Scripture.[1] We know that the authorities wished to avoid a public arrest, because of the uproar it would have produced; and they had armed their myrmidons, because they could not foresee that the disciples would be so spiritless. It would seem as if the sight of their former colleague at the head of a hostile and armed band had utterly deprived them of all presence of mind and power to act. Moreover, they were still heavy with sleep, and the whole business was carried out with the greatest swiftness. As an example of the sudden terror which seized them, Mk. cites the case of a young man who, being clothed in nothing but a slight linen cloth, in his fear left behind in the hands of the Synedrium's servants even this his only garment and fled away naked (Mk. xiv. 51 f.).

Before the Synedrium.—Jesus is led away into the house of the high-priest—by whom is meant, of course, Caiaphas, the high-priest then reigning[2] (Mt. xxvi. 3, 57, Jn. xi. 49, xviii. 13). Here the entire Synedrium assembles, that is to say, all the chief priests, elders, and Scribes (Mk. xiv. 53, 55). We cannot say for certain whether the high-priest's house was the regular meeting-place of the Synedrium; but Mt. xxvi. 3, 57 evidently assumes that it was. We learn from Josephus (*Bell. Jud.*, ii. 144) that the βουλή was situated close to that part of the oldest of the city walls which connected the *xystos* square in the upper city with the western portico of the court of the temple, that is to say, near one or other of the two steep declivities, or in the deep valley of the Tyropœum.

[1] It cannot be ascertained what passage Jesus had in his mind. However, he looks upon the fulfilment of Scripture as a pledge that the course of his destiny generally is being ordered strictly in accordance with God's good will.

[2] Cp. Chap. V., p. 110 f.

The same authority tells us elsewhere (*Bell. Jud.*, vi. 354) that the Romans burnt the βουλευτήριον after they had destroyed the temple and its dependent buildings, and before they captured the upper city. The buildings and precincts burnt at the same time as the βουλευτήριον are particularly stated to have belonged to the πόλις, but not to the ἱερόν. The language of Acts xxii. 30, xxiii. 10, 15 (κατάγειν, καταβαίνειν) necessarily leads us to conclude that the house of assembly was situated at a low level. The statements in the Mishnah, which would suggest that the place of meeting was in the inner court, are, we may be sure, incorrect, for non-Jews frequently took part in the deliberations.[1]

PURPOSE OF THE SYNEDRIUM.—The Synedrium had plainly a double purpose—firstly, to have Jesus condemned without delay, and, secondly, to have it done according to the forms of law. The entire procedure was to be accelerated as much as possible, lest anything should intervene (and some intervention might of course be anticipated, seeing that Jesus had won a great reputation) to hinder their purpose. It was deemed particularly dangerous to keep him in custody in Jerusalem over the approaching feast-days. Yet it was entirely contrary to sacred custom, so strictly observed by the Synedrium in particular, to carry out an execution during the feast. Thus, the only alternative open to them was to get the deed done on the one day which still remained before the feast began, or, at any rate, to deliver the prisoner into the strong hands of the Romans. The Romans, in face of the popularity enjoyed by Jesus, would be able to guard him better than would the Synedrium. The more speedily they settled the matter, the better it would be. Contrary to all custom,[2] therefore, the Synedrium met together in solemn session while it was still night. At the same time, it certainly attached great importance to the pronouncement of a regular legal judgment. Jews and Romans being at enmity, it was in

[1] Cp., for example, Acts xxii. 30–xxiii. 10, the presence of the Roman tribune at a sitting of the Synedrium.

[2] It was very late, for Paul, no doubt basing his information upon the exact intelligence of Peter, says that the hour of the Last Supper was ἐν τῇ νυκτί (1 Cor. xi. 23); some hours would, of course, have elapsed between that and the seizure of Jesus.

itself an odious thing to deliver up any Jew to the Roman procurator. In Jesus' case it would not be forgotten that his preaching had made a great impression in Jerusalem itself; nor was the Synedrium by any means in such a position as to be able to disregard popular opinion. It was only to a limited extent that its power was supported by any outward show of force. The jealousy of the Roman sovereign took care of that. But in the present case the Synedrium undoubtedly believed that it had good reason for passing a sentence of condemnation.

RIGHT TO CONDEMN.—Its members knew of utterances by Jesus in which their holy Law had been called in question. And the offence was all the greater because he preached repentance at the same time. In other words, in place of the pious customs revealed to the lawgiver on Mount Sinai by God himself, and then handed down to these men by their forefathers, he was so bold as to preach a new form of piety. The peculiarity of this would appear to be that he observed neither the fasts nor the Sabbath rest, that he associated with reprobate and sinful men, and that on some occasions he assured them on his own authority of forgiveness of their sins.[1] There can be no doubt that, in the eyes of the upholders of the ancient form of piety, nothing further was needed to show that this person was deserving of death. For the leaders of Judaism had no idea of subjecting their own fundamental conceptions to any scrutiny: they were all too much under the spell of their traditions to do that. While, however, the Synedrium held thus strongly this general opinion with regard to Jesus, it seems to have found it more difficult to discover a tangible and particular *legal reason* for condemning him. The cleansing of the temple was certainly a trespass against the Law; but that was too small a matter to justify a sentence of death. And there was another reason why they would not wish to touch upon that subject. It was this: in the opinion of many he had acted

[1] Jesus himself tells us (Mt. xi. 19 = Lk. vii. 34) that this was really the judgment pronounced upon him in many quarters; but, in addition to the charge expressed in these words, that he does not fast and associates with sinners, he had given many fresh causes of offence—*e.g.*, his decision with regard to the Sabbath and the question of ceremonial purity.

quite rightly, and had only done what ought to have been done by the Synedrium itself long ago.[1] Yet it was this very point in the affair, together with the unmistakable parable of the wicked vinedressers who had to be deprived of the custody of the vineyard, that had given such dire offence; so that this, after all, was the event on which the thoughts of Jesus' judges were chiefly fixed. And though the act itself might be unassailable, the words accompanying it, the words about the destruction of the temple and its restoration, were not. Jeremiah, too, had been brought up for judgment on a capital charge when he predicted the destruction of the temple on the ground that his people had made it into a den of thieves; though indeed the trial did not result in the death of the prophet (Jer. vii. 1–15, xxvi. 1–24). In the case of Jesus, the offence against the temple was aggravated by a foolish pretension, the promise to erect in the shortest possible space of time, in place of the temple that was destroyed, another not made by human hands. Now, the legality of the entire proceeding is indicated by the fact that the Synedrium ultimately declined to consider a conviction on this ground—the condition required by the law, the agreement of two witnesses, not being forthcoming. The fact of the matter would seem to have been this: the two witnesses who were brought forward remembered the general tenor of Jesus' saying, but could no longer recollect the precise words he used sufficiently well to admit of their both repeating them in precisely the same form. In all probability the question at issue was: Did Jesus' original words mean that he himself would destroy the temple, or did he expect it to be destroyed by others? (Mk. xiv. 58, Jn. ii. 19.)[2] To all the questions addressed to him Jesus answered nothing. He knew that his condemnation was a foregone conclusion; consequently, it seemed useless to say anything in his own defence. This put the Synedrium in a dilemma, for it began to seem impossible to conform as speedily as they wished to the rule in Deut. xix. 15, forbidding a condemnation on the

[1] The attitude of the populace (Mk. xi. 18, xii. 12, 37), the abstention of the Romans from interference, and the belated and half-hearted defence of the Synedrium (Mk. xi. 27), all show that this was the general opinion.

[2] Cp. p. 415, n. 2.

testimony of a single witness. And since even the Gospel of Mk. does not shrink from accusing all the witnesses who came forward to speak against Jesus of giving false evidence (πολλοὶ . . . . ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, Mk. xiv. 56), we are obliged to emphasise the fact that evidently nobody would consent to support the one witness by concocting and putting forward a false story, and nobody, it is clear, even considered the possibility of doing so.[1]

CURTAILMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS.—But the high-priest hit upon a means of finding reason for a conviction which was unquestionably admissible in point of law. Rising from his seat, he places himself immediately in front of Jesus, and asks him, firstly, what he has to say in answer to the testimony of the witnesses. Then, as Jesus still preserves silence, the high-priest questions him a second time, clearly connecting his question with the second part of the statement put into Jesus' mouth by the witnesses ("In three days I will build up another that shall be no human work"), "Art thou then the Messiah, the son of the Most Blessed?" It is a question full of disdain and contempt. No contrast could be greater than that between this insignificant Galilean and the vast claim set up by him. It is a strong point in favour of the soundness of our tradition that both the high-priest in his question, and Jesus in his answer, avoid using the name of God. This was in accordance with the common Jewish practice,[2] and the custom was certain to be observed in that assembly of all others with particular strictness. Now, in the answer Jesus makes he has no idea of defending himself. Indeed, he cannot defend himself; his form of piety is, as a matter of fact, different from that approved by the Law and the sacred traditions of Judaism. But he can no longer keep silent when an attack is made upon his holiest possession. No amount of faintheartedness will permit him to withhold the admission which expressed the intrinsic meaning of his

[1] Hence, the expression ψευδομαρτυρεῖν (Mk. xiv. 56), if true, must be so in the sense that the witnesses put a wrong interpretation upon statements which Jesus had actually made. Their testimony was misleading, because they represented the facts as they conceived them. They were not false witnesses in the ordinary sense of the term.

[2] See Chap. VIII., p. 164.

life, now when he is questioned point-blank. Formerly, when nobody suspected that he was the Messiah, he might keep the secret of his Messianic faith or not, just as he himself saw fit. Now, however, it is different; since his entry into Jerusalem he has himself broken silence. It would, thus, be a denial of the truth, as well as a deplorable exhibition of weakness, if he simply remained silent when the high-priest put to him this scornful question. Accordingly, in the strain and tension which rend his heart, he delivers himself once for all from the oppressive anxiety of these proceedings by answering the high-priest with a loud "Yea."[1] And, being well aware that his affirmation will not be believed, he goes on to announce that his apparently rash statement will very soon be confirmed by God. "I am," he cries, "and very soon ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Almighty and coming with the clouds of heaven!" The important words "very soon" are not indeed found in Mk. xiv. 62; but both Mt. (xxvi. 64, ἀπ' ἄρτι) and Lk. (xxii. 69, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) preserve them. Jesus declares that the men who are now judging him will very soon behold him descending from heaven as the Son of Man spoken of by Daniel—Dan. vii. 13 is the passage which he has in his mind—to sit in judgment upon them. His words are also coloured by the beginning of the 110th Psalm; Jesus had used the same psalm the morning before in the temple when discussing the Messiah's descent.

THE SENTENCE.—Jesus' enthusiastic utterance, showing the faith in which he went to his death better than any lengthy explanation could have done, produces nothing but horror and dismay in the high-priest and his council. In the passionate manner of his people, the high-priest, rending his garments,[2] cries, "What further evidence do we need?

[1] The following words possessed for Jesus the force and value of a prayer. He lifts himself out of the gloomy present into the joyful certainty of his faith in God; now God will soon give him the glory promised to him. Thus, he may have been almost thankful to the high-priest for the question which relieved the tension of his mind.

[2] Compare 1 Macc. xi. 71, where the princely high-priest Jonathan rends his garments during a battle which is going against him, and, by so doing, spurs on his flying people to victory.

Ye have heard the blasphemy!" In this way the members of the Synedrium themselves become witnesses of a crime worthy of death. All that now remains is for them to pronounce sentence; and they unanimously condemn Jesus to death.

FORMAL CORRECTNESS.—In point of form this sentence was not indeed strictly legal. The belief that the Messiah sits at the right hand of God may or may not have been widely prevalent; it certainly was not punishable so long as the 110th Psalm was included in the hymn-book of the Jewish community. Jesus' belief, that he was himself the Messiah, might be attributed to insanity or to foolish fancy; it could not be considered blasphemous so long as it was the general opinion that a man born of woman would some day stand forth as the Messiah. There can be no question that this opinion *was* held, for the Scribes designated the Messiah a son of David.

DEEPER REASONS.—The sentence of the Synedrium was, however, decisively influenced by the general recollection of Jesus' public activity; it was these reminiscences that coloured his apparently strange and unseemly presumption, and converted it into blasphemy. This person, a friend of sinners, an enemy of the Law, presumes to claim the place at the right hand of God, and asserts that God has committed to him the office of future judge. This it was that they regarded as blasphemy. For, in speaking as he did, Jesus virtually declared that even God does not reject sinners, and that the law of Israel, held to be the epitome of all that is good and right, will not be the standard of judgment at God's tribunal. Erroneous and detestable as Jesus' opinions were considered to be, it was obvious now that he expected them to be speedily ratified by God. A man who did evil was declared guilty of blasphemy when he claimed that God would grant him the place at his right hand, and would confer upon him the office of future judge of the world. And for blasphemy the punishment prescribed by the Law was death (Levit. xxiv. 16). True, Leviticus requires that the whole community shall stone the blasphemer; yet in Palestine that was now forbidden by the existing political conditions. The right of inflicting capital punishment in Judæa and Samaria belonged

to the Roman procurator (Jn. xviii. 31, ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα). This is true even if it was not always necessary to be scrupulous with reference to this privilege; as happened in the case of Stephen, who was subsequently stoned without the procurator's sanction being obtained (Acts vii. 57–60).[1] But on the particular occasion with which we are dealing, the procurator was present in Jerusalem, though he usually dwelt in the seaport town of Cæsarea. Besides this, the Synedrium could not know what attitude the people of Jerusalem would take up with regard to their decision; they could not be sure that considerable disturbances might not follow upon Jesus' execution. Lastly, Jesus' Messianic claim provided such a convenient charge against him—a charge to which the procurator was necessarily bound to listen—that the Synedrium willingly agreed to transfer to the Gentile the opprobrium of carrying out the sentence of death which they themselves had pronounced.

MOCKING HIM AS PROPHET.—While the Synedrium was waiting for the proper time to deliver Jesus over to the procurator, Jesus was abandoned to the brutality of the servants belonging to the high-priest's palace; these amused themselves by beating and mocking the much-admired prophet. Flinging a cloth over his head, they called upon him to show his prophetic skill by indicating, as they struck him one after another, which of them it was that aimed the blow.

DENIAL OF PETER.—Here, again, we might ask the same question as we did in the case of the Gethsemane scene, "How do we know all this?" But here again we can determine the Source. One of the group of scattered disciples had the courage to follow the band of hirelings and venture into the court of the high-priest's house.[2]

[1] Considering the sensation he had created in Jerusalem during the last few days, his stoning might easily have been followed by grave disorders; consequently, it was dangerous to proceed further without the consent of Pilate, even though Pilate generally attached no very great value to the life of a single provincial.

[2] The Fourth Evangelist, wondering how Peter was able to enter the house, represents him as being introduced by another disciple, who was known to the high-priest (Jn. xviii. 15 f.). But if Peter was already known, it would be almost impossible for him to deny his master. The difficulty felt by the Evangelist might be overcome in this way: we might

Having entered the house, he sat amongst the servants, beside a charcoal fire, and warmed himself. Everyone, of course, was anxious to get as accurate an account as possible of what was taking place inside the house. Now a female slave comes forth and recounts what has been done. As she speaks, she cannot help noticing that one of her hearers shows profound emotion at her words; nor does he laugh when she and all the others laugh, but involuntarily expresses by his demeanour sorrow and compassion for the prisoner. Then, looking in his face, she says to him, "Thou also wast with the man of Nazareth, with Jesus." The stranger is startled, but declares he does not understand what the woman means. Shortly afterwards he retires into the passage which connected the courtyard of the house with the street. Suddenly he hears a cock crow, and his heart begins to beat quickly. The sound makes him stay where he is; he will be brave, and tarry until he knows all that is to be known of Jesus' fate. It may be that he even asks himself whether it is really no longer possible to help. But whilst he is standing thus, the slave woman sees him again. She must have felt it strange that he had gone away from the others, and yet had not left the house. Then, pointing him out, she cries, "This man is one of them!" The stranger denies what she says. But now the others come forward and press the charge, "Yea, indeed, thou dost belong to him; thou also art a Galilean." In reply he protests with an oath that he does not know Jesus. But no sooner has he spoken the words than the cock crows, and Simon, the disciple of rock, steals away weeping. He has indeed kept his word; he has remained faithful to Jesus longer than any of the others; but Jesus' word, too, is fulfilled; "Verily I say unto thee . . . . before the cock crow twice, [thou] shalt deny me thrice." In this there is nothing extraordinarily wonderful; it is merely a remarkable coincidence such as often occurs in life. The fact, too, that Peter went away unhindered shows that there was really no intention of proceeding against the

conjecture that a crowd of curious street loafers attached itself to the band of hirelings, and with it pressed into the courtyard of the high-priest's house. Without companions of this kind, Peter could hardly have dared to enter.

disciples of Jesus; had there been any, Peter would no doubt have been secured now.[1]

HANDING HIM OVER TO PILATE.—It was still very early in the morning when Jesus was led away out of the high-priest's house to the palace of Herod, in which the procurator was accustomed to take up his quarters when in Jerusalem. The palace stood to the south of the modern *Jaffa* gate, against the western wall of the city, where the citadel now stands. Consequently, Jesus must have been led out of the Tyropœon through the whole extent of the upper city (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, v. 161–181). We have a fragment of the good tradition preserved in the Johannine Gospel, when we are told that the chief men of the Jews refused to enter the house of the heathen, lest, according to Jewish ideas, they should defile themselves before the approaching feast. Such defilement would have prevented them from partaking of the Passover lamb on the following evening (Jn. xviii. 28). Hence, they had to rest content with sending some sort of agent to convey the prisoner to the procurator, and hand him over in the name of the high-priest and the Synedrium, together with a report of the charge against him.

ACCUSED TO PILATE.—The Synedrium had condemned Jesus to death as being a blasphemer. Now it assumed the rôle of accuser before the procurator. It could not, of course, put forward a charge of blasphemy before the heathen judge; for it was questionable whether Pilate would have recognised in Jesus' words any blasphemy at all against the God of Israel, and whether, further, since very likely he was quite indifferent to the Jewish religion, he would have punished with death even a genuine case of blasphemy against their God. On the other hand, they had found (and were very glad to have done so) in Jesus' Messianic claim an instrument that might easily be used to secure his condemnation by Pilate. Jesus' hope was to appear almost immediately as the Messiah on the clouds of heaven; consequently, he also expected to be enthroned almost immediately as the king of the kingdom of God in Jerusalem. This, then, was the accusation decided upon: Jesus asserts that he is the future

[1] Cp. pp. 449 and 471. The Synedrium hoped that his community, after their Messiah had been removed, would fall to pieces of itself.

king of the Jews. Such a claim would amount to high treason against emperor and empire, and would beyond question have to be punished with death. True, it was not possible to point to any act of high treason on the part of Jesus. Yet, for all that, it would be a hazardous thing for the procurator to set free a man who had been delivered into his hands by his own countrymen as being a traitor against Rome. More than that, they only required to put an ingenious interpretation upon the solemn entry into Jerusalem and upon the cleansing of the temple, they only required to turn to wise account Jesus' power of attraction as a preacher, in order to show him in anything but a harmless light.[1]

Mk. simply tells us that Pilate asked the prisoner whether it was correct that he proclaimed himself the king of the Jews, and that Jesus answered in the affirmative. Subsequently, the high-priests brought many accusations against him; but Jesus made no attempt to defend himself against them. No useful object would have been served by expounding to the heathen the peculiarities of his Messianic faith, even if we assume that Pilate would have listened to him; and, as a matter of fact, Jesus undoubtedly did expect the fulfilment of his hopes to be accompanied by a collapse of the Roman empire. Such an eventuality seemed to him, holding the beliefs he did, merely an incident of no importance, necessitated by the future reorganisation of the universe. These convictions, though only held in secret, and not ostentatiously intruding themselves, might well arrest the attention of the representative of Roman rule in Judæa.

PROCEEDINGS WITH REGARD TO JESUS.—The trial of Jesus seems to have been conducted in the open air in front of the palace of Herod where there was a raised platform adapted for judicial proceedings, called, it would seem, because of its stone floor, Gabbatha (Jn. xix. 17). Pilate condemns Jesus to death. The many embellishments in the

[1] By so doing, they would also get over the objection that Pilate had no jurisdiction over a Galilean. They could make it seem likely that Jesus had intended to set on foot a revolt in Jerusalem itself. Jesus would then be punishable in that city, though on another occasion Pilate did not hesitate to put certain Galileans to death (Lk. xiii. 1).

Gospels, becoming richer and richer as we turn from Mt. to Lk., from Lk. to Jn., and from Jn. to the Gospel of Peter, do not form part of the historical presentation of these events.[1]

RELEASE OF BARABBAS.—The Gospel of Mk., on the other hand, is informed that the Jerusalem friends of Jesus, who were following his destiny with the greatest dismay and apprehension, saw the glimmer of a ray of hope even now. From ancient times it had been customary on the day before the Passover to release a prisoner; because the Passover was celebrated to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from their bondage in Egypt. And so on the present occasion, as on others, the populace came up out of the city itself to this the highest point of the upper city (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, v. 172 f.), with the object of reminding the Romans of the established custom, and of requesting the release of a prisoner. Pilate was still engaged upon the trial of Jesus. In reply to the request, perhaps simply for the purpose of testing the sentiments of the populace towards Jesus, he offers to release to them this prisoner, this king of the Jews, as he put it—not without a touch of scorn. If his offer was greeted with enthusiastic delight, it would show that Jesus was dangerous, and he could then consider what further

[1] In Mt. xxvii. 19 Pilate's wife warns her husband not to pronounce condemnation upon Jesus, because she has had a bad dream about him. Mt. xxvii. 24 f. tells us that Pilate washed his hands in the presence of the people, indicating that he laid upon them the blame for Jesus' blood, the Jews accepting the burden for themselves and their children. According to Lk. xxiii. 2, the accusers falsely stated that Jesus had said there was no need to pay taxes to the emperor. In Lk. xxiii. 4, 15, 22, Pilate three times successively pronounces Jesus to be innocent; then he sends him to Herod (Antipas), who is present in Jerusalem; and Herod, after mocking him and arraying him in a gorgeous robe, sends him back to Pilate (Lk. xxiii. 6-12). As regards the historical truth of this statement, it may be said to be improbable, if only because one cannot see when time could be found for sending the prisoner to and fro in this manner. In Jn.'s artificial description (xix. 4 f.) there is a new feature; Pilate brings Jesus forth crowned with thorns (this, apart from the numerous discourses). The fragment of the Gospel of Peter begins by stating that the Jews would not wash their hands, neither Herod nor one of Jesus' judges; their consciences compelled them to confess that in this fearful deed of blood they were not free from guilt (Gosp. Peter, *vv.* 1 f.).

action to take. But it was not so received. The people of Jerusalem were not pleased at the Galilean prophet being called their king.[1] They did not wish Jesus to be set free. Of course, the Synedrium itself may have persuaded the people to take up this attitude. It was necessarily of the utmost importance to its members that the work of the past night should not be thrown away through the complaisance of the Roman viceroy. However that may be, the people asked for the release of one Barabbas, who had committed murder in some public disturbance. If ever Pilate entertained any doubt as to the guilt of Jesus, it must have been at this moment. The Jews were consumed with a great passion for freedom. For them thus calmly to abandon a rebel against Rome was indeed surprising. It is easy, therefore, to understand Pilate's further question, "What, then, shall I do with him whom you call the king of the Jews?" To this they cry out, "Crucify him!" Such conduct must have led Pilate to think there was some other cause, unknown to him, for their hatred. "Why, what evil hath he done?" he asks again. And again the same words are shouted back, "Crucify him!" At this season in particular Pilate did not wish to dismiss the people in discontent; nor could he close his eyes to the fact that the highest authority amongst the Jews, the Synedrium, had delivered the man up to him as being a rebel, and that the people of Jerusalem demanded his death. Even though in the present instance legal grounds for a condemnation might perhaps be wanting, yet the prudence characteristic of an administrative official dictated that it would be better for a single provincial to die than for the entire province to be thrown into an uproar.[2] So, while

[1] Nor can we be surprised at this. Jesus was a stranger to them, a certain preacher of repentance, a man whose alertness of mind and graphic language afforded them pleasure. At the same time, this preacher of repentance was considered to be a false teacher, and his mental readiness made him enemies. Lastly, the most fervent hopes of the Jews, the hopes of political independence, were now scoffed at in his person. For it was well known to everybody that Jesus, so far from fulfilling these hopes, would not even so much as raise a finger on their behalf.

[2] Pilate knew what a tempest could be raised amongst this people by religious questions (Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 55-62; Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium*, 38).

Barabbas is set at liberty, and led away by his friends with loud demonstrations of joy, Jesus is scourged—scourging being at this time a punishment which preceded capital punishment by crucifixion, just as in the ancient Roman practice it had preceded execution by the sword.

MOCKING BY THE SOLDIERS.—Herod's palace was a very extensive castle-like stronghold, embracing within its precincts many separate buildings. Whenever it was occupied by Pilate, he had a detachment of soldiers with him to keep guard. Jesus was now handed over to their tender mercies; it was they, too, who were to carry out the crucifixion. In the high-priest's house Jesus had been mocked as a prophet; now he is mocked as king of the Jews by being arrayed in hastily improvised royal insignia, to wit, a purple cloak and a crown of thorns,[1] and by ridiculous words and gestures. The soldiers strike him with a pretended sceptre, and greet him with the royal greeting of the Orient. Meanwhile, others are busy making preparations for the execution. The cross is fetched, as well as cords and nails, and certain of the soldiery are chosen to carry out the sentence of death. All this takes but a short time.

DEATH BY CRUCIFIXION.—The word σταυρός denotes the upright stake on which a criminal was impaled or to which he was nailed. Death on the σταυρός involved, at any rate, a piercing of the flesh. From Jesus' own words (Mk. viii. 34) we learn that in Palestine at this period every criminal had himself to drag to the place of execution the beam of wood, certainly of considerable weight, which was afterwards to support his body. Apart from this, we are not able to give many very definite details regarding a barbarous custom of this kind. In Rome, as early as the time of the Second Punic War, it was usual for the crucified criminal's head to be forced into a wooden fork, and for his hands to be stretched out along a cross-beam and fastened with cords and nails, so that, together with the cross-beam, he could be raised up on to the upright post after it had been driven into the ground.

[1] The later legendary description asserts that the putting on of this ἀκάνθινος στέφανος caused Jesus a special degree of bodily pain; but of this there is no evidence in our Sources.

But obviously this practice was not suited to every country; in Palestine we do not read of the fork or the cross-beam being carried, but always of the bearing of the beam of the cross, and we are even told that another person could be compelled, as in the case of Jesus, to carry the cross.[1]

So far as we can see, Jesus was not fastened to any part of the cross on his way to Golgotha. It is possible that in Palestine the punishment of crucifixion, which had been introduced under the Hasmonæan kings, was retained in the simpler form in vogue at that time. Accordingly, it is impossible to determine whether the criminal was bound and nailed to the cross as he lay on the ground, or whether the upright beam was set up before he was affixed to it. A difference in practice would no doubt be suggested by the kind of cross used. It is equally impossible to say whether the hands only, or both hands and feet, were nailed (the hands in Jn. xx. 25). All that can be said with certainty is that, in accordance with the strict forms of the Roman law, a statement of the offence of the crucified was fastened to the cross—though this would hardly have been in three languages, as Jn. xix. 20 tells us, but in the Greek tongue, the language exclusively used by officials in their intercourse with the people. It depended entirely upon the form of the cross, again, whether this inscription was put above the head of the crucified (Mt. xxvii. 37, ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς). Very often there was no room for it there, especially when the old Roman custom of putting the cross-beam on the top of the upright was followed. We also know for certain that Jesus' cross was relatively high; the only means of giving him something to drink was to fasten a sponge to the end of a reed, and so reach it up to him (Mk. xv. 36).

CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS.—Pilate must have concluded his judicial hearing very early. The three men who have been

[1] The Greek phrase, moreover, is always σταυρὸν ἐκφέρειν, φέρειν, βαστάζειν; similarly the Latin is *patibulum ferre*. In the latter, *patibulum* is certainly the cross-beam, since the arms were stretched out along it (Plautus, *Miles Glor.*, 2, 4, 7; and Seneca, *Ad Marc.*, 20), and it would be strange if this beam were afterwards employed as the upright stake and the hands had to be fastened a second time to another piece of wood. But we must be careful not to assume that many of these customs were fixed. For the references, see Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 397 f.

condemned to death are led away to execution before nine o'clock in the morning.[1] A centurion was appointed to superintend the work, the execution itself being carried out by the soldiers (Mk. xv. 25, 39). The place of execution is called Γολγοθᾶ, "the skull" (גֻלְגֹלְתָּא, *gulgolta*). It seems to have been at some distance from the Palace of Herod, the road thither leading outside the city. These two circumstances explain how it was that a man coming from the fields was constrained by the soldiers to carry the cross for Jesus, who was evidently exhausted. Now that his doom was sealed, Jesus himself was overcome by weariness, just as his disciples had been in Gethsemane. The trying days of strife had been followed by a terrible night. Mk. has preserved the name of the man who carried Jesus' cross; he was one of the many Jews who had returned to Jerusalem from foreign parts. His name was Simon, and he had come from Cyrene in North Africa. The same Gospel is able to give the names of two of his sons, Alexander and Rufus (Mk. xv. 21).[2] Before the execution, it was usual to offer the condemned man a narcotic drink, spiced wine (ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον, Mk. xv. 23). This Jesus refused, and they did not, it would seem, force him to take it. He wished to retain his consciousness to the last, and his executioners had no fear of his offering any serious resistance. His clothing was now taken off him, and he was crucified. *How* this brutal and bloody deed was performed is not described (Mk. xv. 24 f.). The inscription which was placed on his cross read simply, "The King of the Jews." The punishment of crucifixion was intended to be a sort of public exhibition of the dying torments of a criminal, and to serve as

[1] According to Mk. xv. 25, Jesus was crucified at nine o'clock, and, according to Mk. xv. 34, he died at three o'clock; though the Johannine Gospel (xix. 14) puts the condemnation as late as twelve o'clock in the day. There are difficulties in both accounts. The difficulty in Mk. is the early sitting of Pilate; though he may conceivably have sat early, because the nearness of the feast compelled him to settle the matter speedily; in the case of Jn., we have three persons executed on the afternoon of the 14th Nisan, when all business was at an end (p. 396); and here we have to bear in mind that Simon of Cyrene was returning home. Mk.'s tradition, however, seems to the present writer to be preferable.

[2] It assumes that the readers will know who they are—a certain indication of the early composition of the Gospel of Mk.

a warning. In view of this, it was essential, besides, that the reasons for the execution should be legibly given on the cross. The soldiers divided amongst themselves the clothes of the crucified; they then had to keep watch by the cross, lest his sympathising friends should come to the help of the tortured man.

Now, such executions were certainly not uncommon in Jerusalem; we have evidence of this in the two condemned men who were crucified with Jesus. Still, a crowd of curious onlookers never fails to assemble for such spectacles, and in the case of Jesus it was not forgotten that his public appearance had created great excitement in Jerusalem. So, a large concourse of people had gathered round his cross. And it may be taken for granted that many opinions were expressed amongst them. But the Gospel of Mk. is doubtless not far from the truth, when it says that the really prevailing sentiment was one of satisfaction that the judgment of God had been thus fulfilled.[1] Jesus cannot free himself from the cross and come down; this is taken by the crowd to be a sufficient proof that he was guilty of gross exaggeration, when he declared that in three days he would erect a temple not made by man. And the same practical proof fully convinces the representatives of the Synedrium that Jesus is not the Messiah, the promised king of Israel. So they mock at him who helped others, but cannot help himself. It does not occur to them that they are under a very special obligation to help such a man. Even the men who were crucified with Jesus joined in mocking him (according to Mk. xv. 32).[2] There seemed to be a tremendous

[1] The words from Deut. xxi. 23 (קִלְלַת אֱלֹהִים תָּלוּי, "he that is hanged is the curse of God"), quoted later by Paul (Gal. iii. 13), were no doubt the catchwords immediately circulated by the Scribes against Jesus.

[2] These invectives pay a compliment to Jesus: the malefactors do not look upon him as being on the same level with themselves. They jeer at him because he is put to death in spite of his innocence, while they know well why they are suffering the punishment of death. Had Jesus assumed the rôle of king of the Jews and raised the standard of revolt, he would have stood high in their estimation. Lk. xxiii. 39–43 distinguishes between the repentant and the unrepentant malefactors. The former becomes the recipient of a promise. In the Gospel of Peter (13 f.) the repentant malefactor reproaches those who are standing by the cross with the sin of crucifying Jesus; on this account he is made to suffer longer than his fellow whose limbs are broken. These are later embellishments.

contradiction between Jesus' present plight and his announcement of the nearness of the kingdom of God! Hence, we cannot be surprised that even in Mk. the account of Jesus' death is adorned with many details of a fabulous character. Amongst these we may perhaps include the darkness over the whole land from twelve to three o'clock (Mk. xv. 33); at any rate, this not unnatural occurrence—not an eclipse of the sun, but a heavily clouded sky—is looked upon as an expression of the world's sympathy with Jesus' sufferings. The statement subsequently made in the story of his death, as to the great curtain separating the holy from the most holy place in the temple being rent, is certainly untrue from a historical point of view, and is drawn from legend (Mk. xv. 38). An event of such significance would undoubtedly have led to very special expiations and other measures, of which nothing is known. The rending of the temple curtain is typical of the access to God opened out by Jesus' death; it is the means of expressing a thought impressed by Paul upon the Christian community at a later date (*e.g.*, Rom. v. 10). And we need not attach great importance to the statement, that the centurion of the watch was (according to Mk. xv. 39) moved by the sight of Jesus' death to exclaim, "Verily this man was the Son of God!" The most that he could observe was a pious and resigned death. Besides, being a Gentile—for the Jews were exempt from military service—we cannot, to say the least, determine for certain what he would mean by a "son of God."

JESUS' DEATH.—On the other hand, Mk. gives us several particulars about the last moments of Jesus, both precise in character and at the same time historically true. At three o'clock in the afternoon he cried with a loud voice, in the familiar Aramaic dialect, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?"—these being the opening words of the 22nd Psalm, itself a prayer uttered in an hour of the direst distress. That Jesus should use the words of this psalm as his dying prayer shows how deeply rooted within him was the faith of Israel, and how closely he was bound to his God. But the prayer did not please the later Evangelists. It is absent in Lk. and in Jn.; and the Gospel of Peter alters the meaning of the words, interpreting them as a dying complaint

that his strength is vanishing.[1] Obviously Jesus' words might be interpreted as the cry of a person in despair, the exclamation of a disappointed man; God has deserted him. But as against this let it be remembered that long ago Jesus had certainly made up his mind that he was to suffer a shameful death; and he never had any idea of avoiding his doom, but soon after Peter's avowal (even thus early) he declared such a wish to be human, and opposed to God's will (Mk. viii. 33). So, however excruciating the torture of his death may have been, we certainly have no right to speak of his being disillusioned. It would be truer to say that scarcely any other man has ever so long and so consciously foreseen the issue of his life as Jesus did, and so completely reconciled himself beforehand to his coming fate. When Jesus uses as his prayer the words of the 22nd Psalm, he is quoting from the hymn-book of his people a song which prompts the despairing soul to recover its trust in God, as every other prayer does at a time of great distress. It is in order to help him to cling to this trust in God that Jesus now appropriates the words of another. Besides, to put it mildly, it is carrying scholarly thoroughness to excess to examine the theological and dogmatic correctness of the words of prayer to God which burst from a heart in the last stage of distress.[2]

The Aramaic words, as they were gasped forth audibly, were not understood by many of those who stood near. This does not apply to the soldiers alone; for the words, "Eloi! Eloi!" were interpreted by some to be a call to Elijah, and, of course, none but Jews would know anything of Elijah. There were many Jews in Jerusalem who, like

[1] Their historical truth is evinced by the fact that at an early date people objected to these details and tried to remove them. Lk. and Jn. do not give the prayer from Ps. xxii.; the Gospel of Peter has converted the words, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" into the less offensive exclamation, "My strength, my strength, why hast thou abandoned me?" Cp. Chap. II., p. 53.

[2] An inquiry of this kind is like that dealing with the sinlessness of Jesus; it shows the risk of being led astray through a one-sided dogmatic way of thinking, for it is wrong, when speaking of Jesus himself, roughly to brush aside his own words (Mt. vii. 1 = Lk. vi. 37). This is not to raise Jesus above the standard by which other men are measured; it is to refuse him what must, in accordance with his wish, be granted to all men.

Simon of Cyrene, had been born abroad, and no longer understood the language of their own country. Such were the so-called Hellenists (Acts vi. 1, 9). They were, of course, well aware that Elijah must go before the Messiah. They now knew of Jesus' belief that he would one day appear as the Messiah. Hence, they imagined his words of prayer to be a call upon Elijah to appear (cp. Mk. ix. 11 f.). This supplies another pretext for making what was apparently cruel sport of the dying man. Let a deed of kindness be done him! One of the bystanders runs and fills a sponge with vinegar, and, fastening it on a reed, offers it to Jesus to drink. But this was contrary to custom; the crucified must be left to languish. Accordingly, others of the bystanders wish to hold the man back. But, pushing them aside, he cries out, "Let me be! We will see whether Elijah will come and help him." What he means is, "We must not let Jesus die yet. Elijah must have time to come and rescue him." It may be that the brutal speech was only a cover for love towards one whom the man would like to keep alive. But with a loud cry Jesus dies.

BURIAL.—Jesus died unusually soon. As a rule, people who were crucified often lived for days. But since he was dead it became necessary to attend to his burial before the beginning of the Passover. The Law prescribed that a man who was hanged must be buried on the same day (Deut. xxi. 22 f.). The Gospel of Jn. is therefore certainly correct in stating that the limbs of the other two crucified men were violently broken, so that they too might be taken down from the cross before the Passover (Jn. xix. 31). But the last event in Jesus' life, his death, was not to be allowed to pass without an indication that his public work in Jerusalem had not been entirely fruitless. A distinguished member of the council, Joseph of Haramathaim (1. Sam. i. 1, Septuagint Ἀρμαθαίμ = Ἀριμαθαία, Mk. xv. 43), had the boldness[1] to go to Pilate and ask for the body of Jesus. Joseph had, no doubt, on the night preceding been one of the members of

[1] "Had the boldness" that is to say, from the point of view of those faint-hearted adherents of Jesus who would gladly have addressed the same request to Pilate, but could not summon up the courage to do so. But the chief result that Joseph had to fear from addressing the request was that he might be sneered at by the people of his own circle.

the Synedrium who condemned Jesus to death for seemingly blaspheming God. Yet this did not prevent him, after the execution, from wishing to give the mighty Galilean a better grave than was generally assigned to a man who had died by crucifixion. The Gospel of Mk does not tell us that Joseph had in any sense been counted amongst the disciples of Jesus; but it does say that he, like others, was looking for the kingdom of God, and thus cherished the hopes and promises of Israel (Mk. xv. 43). Thus, he considered Jesus to be more a mistaken enthusiast than a criminal.

Amongst those who stood around the cross the friends of Jesus were not altogether lacking. As one of these we might include the man who offered him drink at the last, even though the act was accompanied by words which were purposely brutal. Special reference, however, is made to the women; they had come with Jesus out of Galilee, and were now spectators from a distance—Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and a certain Salome, besides many others (see p. 402). These women, as they stood at a distance, saw Jesus taken down from the cross, wrapped in a linen cloth, and laid in a sepulchre of rock. The manner of interment shows that Joseph can have had no intention of paying any special honour to the dead. He wished to give him a decent burial; but he did not do any of the things the Jews were wont to do when they buried those who were dear to them. The women from Galilee determined to repair the omission.

CHAPTER XIV

RESURRECTION AND CONTINUED LIFE

INFLUENCE IN HISTORY.—The story of a historical hero's work usually ends with his death. The Christian believes in a continued existence beyond the grave; but this belief affords no help to the biographer whose task is to describe his hero's life on earth. The best proof of the real historical greatness of a celebrity is the persistence of his influence for hundreds, or even for thousands, of years. Before we can sum up finally the measure of such a person's services to the world, it is essential to separate the transitory from the permanent elements in his life's work. But the task of describing the historical influence of a hero, and determining the permanent results of his life, will never form anything more than an appendix to the actual biography.[1]

There is really a vast difference whether a man's after-influence rests upon several important achievements, such as can easily be recognised, or whether it flows from the peculiarity of his personal character. To his own followers Pythagoras was a holy man, and it was the duty of his school to live up to his words and example; but to the present age Pythagoras is no longer a person of the same importance. Yet, notwithstanding this, the discovery of the geometrical theorem known by his name is a service of abiding value,

[1] In saying this, we do not insist that every biography ought to end with such an appendix. In most cases, the life-story itself will supply sufficient opportunity for determining the duration and extent of the results produced by particular successes. But, after all, there are various types of biography, and each of them may well be allowed to be right in its own way.

though it has, of course, nothing to do with his moral greatness. On the other hand, Jesus' influence, being due to the character of his personality viewed as a whole, has unquestionably continued to grow richer and stronger from the moment of his first public appearance down to the present day. And ever since his death on the cross at Golgotha it has been the chief aim in the lives of untold thousands to reproduce in themselves the most essential characteristics of this personality. Nor has the present work any higher purpose than that of depicting his personality in its faithful historical outlines as graphically and distinctly as possible, in the hope that that aim may be shown to be the highest conceivable goal in life for all times and amongst all peoples. In this way apparently, even without the special Easter message, it would be possible to speak of a continuance of the life of the personality of Jesus into the latest ages and among the most distant races. However, the early and enthusiastic proclamation that, in spite of having died, the Crucified is still alive, was so essentially a condition of the whole subsequent influence of Jesus' character, that in this, as in other cases, the question must be decided from a purely historical standpoint. For his biographer, Jesus' life did not end with his death: it only ended with the appearances of the risen Lord to his disciples.[1] Only so could his character and person have exercised such a determining influence upon the whole subsequent history of mankind.

Hope of Resurrection.—Since the avowal of Peter, Jesus in discourse with his disciples had continually reverted to the subject of his approaching death; but he had never broached it without adding that he would soon rise again from the dead (Mk. viii. 31, ix. 9 f., 31, x. 33 f.). In other words,

[1] Here two points must be kept in mind. On those occasions when Jesus spoke about the issues of his life, he himself never looked upon it as ending in his death, but always in his resurrection (see the passages adduced above). This being so, the death of Jesus, historically considered, cannot be properly estimated, if his resurrection is not also taken into account. His death seems to bring his work hopelessly to an end, and it is only his appearances after he has risen again that make the continuance of his life-work intelligible. A life of Jesus which should omit to speak of his resurrection would leave a historically false impression.

he must die and rise again, in order to attain to the promised glory of the Messiah (Mk. viii. 31, 38, ix. 1., x. 37–40, xiv. 24 f.). Hence, the disciples were not unprepared for their Master's crucifixion, heavily though the blow fell upon them when it actually came; long before, Jesus himself had given a definite impulse to their thoughts about his death. As soon as they awoke from their stupor, they could not fail to call his prediction to mind; and when they did so, they would see in its fulfilment a guarantee of his speedy resurrection to glory. Jesus had died, just as he had foreseen; hence their assured hope that, agreeably to his promise, he would rise again on the third day, that is to say, after a very short interval.[1] It is true that everything had not happened exactly as Jesus had foreseen. None of his disciples had suffered death with him. Not even the two sons of Zebedee; they were still alive, and had neither drunk of Jesus' cup, nor been baptised with his baptism of death; and yet, immediately after Jesus had revealed his Passion to his disciples for the first time, he had called upon them to be prepared to die with him. He had unquestionably expected the death of John and of James (Mk. viii. 34—ix. 1, x. 39), though the expectation had grown weaker on the last evening of his life (Mk. xiv. 27 f.).[2] And to the disciples whose death Jesus prophesied it seemed almost a minor consideration, whether they died with him or not, seeing that in the fact of his death having taken place as he had foretold they had a pledge of the nearness of the eternal kingdom of God.

Accounts of the Resurrection.—The accounts of Jesus' resurrection are widely divergent. And the dependence of the Evangelists upon one another does not prevent their narratives of the resurrection from being in many respects

[1] Of course, every disciple would not argue in the same way. Most of them were no doubt so shaken by Jesus' death, that, despite the fact that their minds had already been prepared for it, they were scarcely capable any longer of entertaining hope with regard to the future. Lk.'s story (xxiv. 18–21) of the disciples at Emmaus would seem faithfully to reproduce the sentiments that prevailed amongst the disciples in general after Jesus' death.

[2] Perhaps this was connected with the fact that one of his disciples had become his betrayer. Cp. Chap. XIII. pp. 449 and 470.

contradictory.[1] To the Gospels must be added the oldest account of the resurrection, which is undoubtedly original, that of Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 3–8, though, taken as it stands, it does not agree with any of the Gospel narratives. Hence, we must follow Paul's account, and with it the account of the Gospel of Mk., as being the oldest of the Gospels.

MK.'S VERSION OF THE RESURRECTION.—The whole of the original account of the resurrection in the Gospel of Mk. is included in Mk. xvi. 1–8.[2] The three women, Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome, who have been expressly mentioned as eye-witnesses of Jesus' death and burial, after the Sabbath was over,[3] bought spices, and early on the Sunday morning, after sunrise, set out with the idea of embalming the body of Jesus. It was evident from the incident of the anointing in Bethany[4] that Jesus attached importance to this act of love. The women went early in the morning, because, as they thought, there would be the least likelihood then of their being disturbed in their act of piety by a spy. But the entrance to the tomb was closed by a large stone, and they are debating among themselves how they shall roll it away when they discover that it actually *is* rolled away. They enter in great astonishment, and find that the place where the body lay is empty.

[1] For instance, in Mk. xvi. 2 the women go to the sepulchre λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, that is to say, during the earliest hours of the Sunday morning; in Mt. xxviii. 1, ὀψὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, that is to say, on the evening after the Sabbath was over—the evening before the Sunday—Saturday evening. In Lk. xxiv. 4 the women see two men in shining raiment, instead of the one man of Mk. xvi. 5 and Mt. xxviii. 2–5. These two angels of Lk. do not explain that Jesus will appear to the disciples in Galilee (as Mk. xvi. 7, Mt. xxviii. 7); but they remind the women that he spoke of his resurrectien whilst he was still in Galilee (Lk. xxiv. 6). Once more, the third woman, in addition to the two Maries, is called Salome in Mk. xvi. 1, and Johanna in Lk. xxiv. 10; while Mt. xxviii. 1 speaks of the two Maries alone coming to the sepulchre. Other discrepancies will be discussed later.

[2] See Tischendorf (8), maj. i., pp. 403–407.

[3] According to Lk. xxiv. 56, the ointments were already prepared on the Friday evening, after Jesus had been buried, that they might be taken to the grave early on the Sunday. Mt., however, entirely suppresses all mention of the intention to anoint Jesus.

[4] See Chap. XIII., p. 408.

Then they behold a youth clothed in white; he tells them that Jesus is risen from the dead, and suggests to them the hope of his appearing to his disciples in Galilee, referring them to words of Jesus himself spoken whilst on the way to Gethsemane (Mk. xiv. 28). We are told that the women were in a state of the greatest astonishment, trepidation, and ecstasy (ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, Mk. xvi. 5; τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις, Mk. xvi. 8). Strong emphasis is laid on the fact that they were afraid to tell anyone anything about what had happened.

PECULIARITY OF THIS ACCOUNT.—In this account we have no description of any appearance of the risen Lord. All we hear of is the appearance of an angel in the empty grave, and his suggesting that in a saying of Jesus spoken at an earlier date there was a promise of future appearances in Galilee. The very fact that Jesus himself does not appear on this occasion lends a high degree of probability to Mk.'s account.[1] The later stories of the resurrection, from Mt. onwards, gratify the natural desire of making Jesus appear to his faithful followers in the vicinity of his grave (Mt. xxviii. 9, Lk. xxiv. 13–51, Jn. xx. 14–29). It is for this reason[2]

[1] In this story of the women's visit to the grave we can, of course, discern the first somewhat shy attempt at legend-making, which from Mt. onwards grows gradually bolder. Mk. was prevented from saying anything about an appearance of Jesus, because at the time when his Gospel was composed it was too well known that the disciples did not see him until they returned to Galilee. Therefore, he speaks of an angel appearing to the women disciples. But, otherwise, the Gospel of Mk. gives on the whole a thoroughly trustworthy testimony. The Evangelist might very well have concluded his Gospel by referring to the risen Lord's appearance in Galilee; but he closes with the women's visit to the grave—to him just as much a historical fact as Jesus' appearances in Galilee. Besides this, his readers were acquainted with the sons of Simon of Cyrene (Mk. xv. 21), and knew who the younger James and Joses were, the sons of one of the Maries who came to the grave on that Easter morning.

[2] Their journey back to Galilee might easily escape historical recollection, because it was in Jerusalem that the disciples subsequently reappeared and resumed their work. But in Lk. the words of the angel, given in their original form by Mt. and Mk., have obviously been altered (Lk. xxiv. 6 = Mt. xxviii. 7, Mk. xvi. 7), the disciples being distinctly advised to remain in Jerusalem (Lk. xxiv. 49; comp. Acts i. 4). In other words, the Evangelist has preferred what appeared to him the natural sequence of historical events to following faithfully the statements contained in his authorities.

that Lk. and Jn. transfer the predicted appearances of Jesus from Galilee (Mk. and Mt.) to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood. (A portion of the older tradition is preserved in Jn. xxi.) Consequently, Lk. entirely omits the return of the disciples to Galilee (Lk. xxiv. 52 f., Acts i. 4 f.).

TRUTH OF THIS ACCOUNT.—That the women should wish to embalm the body of Jesus is quite intelligible, as the Jews attached great importance to the act,[1] and Jesus himself had anticipated the anointing of his body at some future date. Of course, the assumption is that the body had not been very well cared for in this respect when it was first laid in the grave. But Jn. alone mentions this; for which reason he at the same time says nothing about the women's intention later (Jn. xix. 39 f.). And there is no reason to doubt that the women could not carry out their purpose, simply because they found the grave empty. Even before making such a discovery, they certainly expected the resurrection of Jesus, he himself having always predicted that this would happen after his death. This astounding fact, the emptiness of the grave, may well have excited them to such a degree that they imagined they could see an angel and hear his message. Both the seeing and the hearing possess precisely the same degree of actuality as the vision seen by Jesus at his baptism,[2] and as the appearances of Jesus himself which now follow swiftly one after the other. If it be objected that such visions could only come to one individual at a time, we need only point to the indisputable witness of Paul, who says that on one occasion the risen Jesus was beheld by over five hundred persons at once (1 Cor. xv. 6). If predisposing conditions are necessary for prophetic vision, they were certainly all present in this particular case; for we have a high-strung religious enthusiasm and expectation, accompanied by the deepest grief, and a sudden terror, howbeit of such a kind that it could easily change all at once into the liveliest joy. Besides, this was the very day, the third, which Jesus had always indicated as the time of his resurrection; and even though the words had been understood figuratively,

[1] Cp. Jn. xix. 40, ἔδησαν (τὸ σῶμα) ὀθονίοις μετὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐνταφιάζειν.

[2] Cp. Chap. VI., pp. 136 f.

a literal interpretation was not, it might seem, entirely excluded.[1] Now, the sudden transition from terror to joy, for which their hearts were well prepared, is not what might reasonably be termed the effect of sober thought, but is the result of a vivid image. An angel enters the empty grave, and announces what is to follow next in accordance with the saying of Jesus and what the empty grave itself seems to prove. When the women come to the grave, they are still stricken with sorrow at Jesus' death. They find it open and empty. But what fills them at the first glance with terror is immediately afterwards recognised to be a pledge that Jesus is risen again, and that his disciples will see him in Galilee. The transition from terror to joy is brought about by the vision of the angel. That is the fact of Easter Sunday.

THE EMPTY GRAVE.—According to Mt. xxviii. 16, afterwards a report was spread in Jewish circles that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus. There was scarcely anything to prevent them from doing so; for the story of the grave being watched by Roman soldiers (Mt. xxvii. 62–xxviii. 15, Gosp. Peter, 28–49), or by a servant of the high-priest,[2] is certainly unhistorical. Had the grave been so watched, the women would never have thought of removing the stone and anointing the body. But that the body was stolen by the disciples is utterly out of the question. Jewish calumniators suggested that they might have done it for the purpose of creating a false belief in the resurrection of Jesus (Mt. xxvii. 64). But Jesus had not spoken of his speedy awakening from the dead to anybody else but the disciples. All he had said to the people of Jerusalem was that after the destruction of the earthly temple made by men he would within three days erect a temple not built by human hands, while he had told his judges that they would speedily see

[1] The "figure" here is only one out of many possible instances, but one which made Jesus' idea particularly clear. By "the third day" he meant "a short interval"; and the nearer the facts agreed with the figurative language, the truer the figure became.

[2] Gospel of the Hebrews, in Nestle, *Nov. Test. Gr. Suppl.*, p. 79 to Mt. xxvii. 62—"dominus autem, cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei." The "sacerdos" is no doubt the high-priest.

him coming to sit in judgment upon them. Such promises as these, however, were greater promises than could seem to be fulfilled by the removal of the body from the grave. It would certainly be more reasonable to suppose that when the disciples fled from Jerusalem they had taken the body of Jesus with them as a sacred relic, to guard against its falling into the hands of their enemies. But even this is improbable. For, in the first place, the three women knew nothing of it.[1] In the second place, such a mark of faithful devotion would hardly have been lost sight of by the later tradition; and Jesus' final burial-place would certainly have continued to be known to Christians. Hence, it was not the disciples who removed Jesus' body; the removal must have taken place in some other way. It is very likely that the distinguished member of the Synedrium, who had in the first instance afforded the body a resting-place in his rock-sepulchre, was not disposed to permit a crucified man to lie permanently beside the dead of his own family. As soon as the Sabbath was at an end, he must have been careful to have the body quietly buried in some other place. Such seems to be the simplest explanation of this secret transaction.[2] And it is mistaken to argue, on the other hand, that the possession of the body of Jesus by the people of Jerusalem would necessarily have been evidence against the Christian announcement of the resurrection of the crucified one. In the same chapter (1 Cor. xv. 5–8) in which Paul enumerates the appearances of the risen one, he says, as distinctly as possible, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, and that corruption cannot attain unto incorruption (1 Cor. xv. 50). Thus, in Paul's view, the disappearance of the body destined to corruption is not connected of absolute necessity with the resurrection. In the further statement contained in 2 Cor. v. 1–4, we are told that the dying man lays aside the garment of corruptibility in order, in place of it, to put on the robe of immortality. The fact, therefore, of the body being in the grave is no proof against the awakening to glory. The disciples, who preached the resurrection of Jesus, pointed in

[1] Nor did they, it is evident, hear anything of such a proceeding later, any more than the authority who relates the women's experience.

[2] Cp. Jn. xx. 1–10, which is perhaps based on a good tradition.

like manner, not, so far as we can see, to the empty grave, but to the appearance of the risen Lord to themselves.[1] It is only as an after-thought that importance seems to have been attached to the women's report about the open and empty grave; according to Mk. xvi. 8, the women did not recount their experience until after the risen Lord had appeared.

PAUL'S ACCOUNT.—In the case of a person so extraordinary as Jesus, even the greatest miracle might be accepted as an actual occurrence, and it might not seem incredible that the dead body, after having been laid in the rock-grave, was resuscitated and restored to life by God. The facts, however, are against this asssumption. The reanimation of Jesus' earthly body could only have been important if he was to continue his life on earth.[2] Yet the oldest and most trustworthy account of these appearances knows nothing of a renewal of the earthly life of him who had been crucified. In 1 Cor. xv. 5–8 Paul tells us what he had learned concerning the resurrection of Jesus. And it must not be forgotten that he was acquainted, at any rate, with Peter and James, and was indebted to them for what lay outside his own experience. According to Paul, then, the risen Lord was seen on six occasions. He appeared to Cephas (Simon Peter), to the Twelve (Judas Iscariot being of course excepted), then to more than five hundred brethren at once, as regards whom Paul accentuates the fact that for the most part they were still alive when the First Epistle to the Corinthians was

[1] In 1 Cor. xv. 3–8 Paul does not mention the empty grave, although his purpose is to cite facts which support the belief in the resurrection of Jesus. The case is indeed different in Peter's speech in Acts ii. 29–31, where (*v.* 31) it is expressly emphasised that Christ's flesh did not see corruption, in this differing from that of David, whose grave (*v.* 29) was still shown in Jerusalem. But, in the first place, a speech from this portion of the Acts of the Apostles is no proof of what was the original Christian report; and, in the second place, strange to say, there is even here no allusion whatever to the empty grave.

[2] This conclusion accords at least with our modern sentiments, although, owing to the complete "unknowableness" of the future world, it cannot be put on any surer foundation. On the other hand, what is about to be said will supply convincing evidence that nothing of the gross matter which belongs to life on earth was associated with the appearances of the risen Lord.

written; fourthly, Jesus appeared to his brother James; fifthly, to a fellowship described by Paul as "all the Apostles"; and, lastly, to Paul himself. In all and each of these cases all Paul says is that Jesus was *seen*; there is no mention of any lengthened intercourse with him, of conversations of any length, of a touching of his body, of a coming and going, of participation in any meal. Nor is anything of the kind even so much as thought of. For if any man had the strongest possible reasons for adducing tangible proofs of the reality of the resurrection such as these it was Paul; since it was his set purpose to remove all doubts as to the possibility of any resurrection such as he found existing at Corinth.[1]

Appearance to Paul.—Of the six appearances of Jesus enumerated by Paul, we possess particulars of only one, that which he himself experienced. The Epistles of Paul, it is true, give us but a very imperfect idea of this, for, although alluding to the occurrence often, they never describe it in detail (Gal. i. 1, 12, 15 f., 2 Cor. iv. 6).[2] The Acts of the

[1] The appearances of the risen Lord, as given in the Gospel of Mt., are still free from all such earthly admixture (Mt. xxviii. 9 f., 16–20), though the act of holding him by the feet (Mt. xxviii. 9) forms a transition to the later conception. In Lk. the risen Jesus walks with the disciples to Emmaus, becomes deeply engaged in a conversation of some length with them, enters into a house with them, breaks the bread for them; then, in Jerusalem, he shows the disciples his hands and his feet, allows them to touch him, partakes of a fish, and finally walks with them from Jerusalem to Bethany (Lk. xxiv. 15–51). The Acts of the Apostles speaks (i. 3) of an appearance to his disciples extending over forty days; in x. 41 prominence is given to the fact that the risen Lord did not reveal himself to all people, but only to such as were chosen of God to be witnesses to him, and had eaten and drunken with him after the resurrection (*συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*). According to Jn. xx. 17, Jesus does not allow himself to be touched by Mary Magdalene; on the other hand, according to xx. 20, he shows his disciples the wounds in his hands and in his side, and, according to xx. 27, allows Thomas to touch both. In the addition, Chap. xxi., Jesus eats bread and fish for breakfast with seven of his disciples (xxi. 13–15).

[2] These passages yield no information as to what happened objectively. The statement that it pleased God to reveal His Son *in* Paul (*ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί*, Gal. i. 16) carries no weight in the case of a purely subjective experience, for every conversion is of course the result of an inner experience, even though external causes have played a part in the revolution. Moreover, all that 2 Cor. iv. 6 does is to indicate the inward change which took place in Paul.

Apostles, on the other hand, contains three accounts of the event; one is the description proper (Acts ix. 3–8), and two others are found in Paul's speeches (Acts xxii. 6–11, xxvi. 12–18). These three descriptions, though differing from one another in many respects, go back to one common Source, which in some cases has been interpreted somewhat freely. We shall have to regard the account derived from the "We"-source (Acts xxvi. 12–18) as being at the foundation of the two others.[1] It alone is in harmony with Paul's words in Gal. i. 15 f. (cp. also i. 1, 12), to the effect that no man had any part in his conversion—and so not even Ananias, to whom Paul is referred in Acts ix. 6, xxii. 10, and who afterwards assumes an active part. Moreover, it is only in Acts xxvi. 16–18 that the future call of Paul to be the Apostle of the Gentiles is mentioned—and that in the vision itself, as Gal. i. 16 would lead us to expect. However, the differences between the several accounts do not affect the manner of the risen Lord's appearance. We learn from Acts xxvi. 13 that Paul saw, as it were, a light shining round about him brighter than the radiance of the sun; and Acts ix. 3, xxii. 6, speak of this flood of light as an objective thing. Not one of the three passages says a word about any precisely outlined figure. Paul simply hears a voice proceeding from the light and proclaiming that he who is appearing to him in all this glory is that Jesus of Nazareth whom he is persecuting (Acts ix. 4–6, xxii. 7–10, xxvi. 14–18). If we are to gain a proper understanding of this occurrence, it is essential to bear in mind that the Scribes also supposed God's presence to be manifested as a bright light (זיו, *zīv*), so bright indeed that it exceeds the brilliance of the sun.[2] Hence, the apparition is recognised as belonging to the divine world by its flashing brightness; and if

[1] The present writer does not doubt that the whole account in the Acts of the Apostles from xx. 4 onwards is derived essentially from the "We"-narrative; the address in Acts xxii. 1–21, however, being excepted, as the allusion to Ananias and the prayer in the temple at Jerusalem are in hopeless contradiction with the statement in the epistle to the Galatians (i. 16 f.). For this reason it cannot have been a companion of Paul who reproduced the Apostle's words. It is possible that the author of the "We"-narrative was not able to say anything at all about this speech, which was delivered in Aramaic (Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2).

[2] Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, p. 160.

Jesus appeared thus in a flood of light, the crucified one was shown by this very fact to be the glorious Son of God.[1] An appearance of this kind, described in Acts. xxvi. 19 as *οὐράνιος ὀπτασία*, is, of course, quite a different thing from Jesus returning in the bodily frame he had before his death, as described in the later Evangelists (Mt., Lk., Jn.). Yet Paul was not aware that the risen Lord's appearance to him differed in any respect from his appearance at an earlier date to others. He was the last to see Jesus, because before this he persecuted the Church of God; but he beheld him in a form in no way different from that in which he had appeared to Peter.

ORDER OF THE APPEARANCES.—Paul's enumeration of the risen Lord's appearances possesses a certain intrinsic consecutiveness; and this helps us considerably to understand these remarkable occurrences. The first appearance is vouchsafed to Peter, Jesus' oldest friend, the first to believe in his Messiahship, the disciple to whom the Christian Church was to cling in the event of his death, the disciple who was to raise them up again. If, after the crucifixion, there was still any one of the disciples in particular who believed in the fulfilment of Jesus' words concerning his resurrection and second coming, assuredly it was Simon Peter. Accordingly, his mind was well prepared for a vision of his risen Lord in Galilee.[2] In the inner tension and tumult of his soul a certain idea possesses Peter unceasingly; in a moment of supreme excitement the same idea presents itself to his mind objectively also. Even thus, this same vision of the risen Lord became a further pledge of the reliability of their hopes for the future. If Jesus was already transfigured with the glory of God, apparently the kingdom of God could not be delayed much longer. After this, Peter took the path Jesus had pointed out to him. Sure of his own faith, he now set to

[1] Cp. Rom. i. 4: Jesus is proved to be the Son of God in glory by the resurrection from the dead.

[2] The words of Mk. xiv. 28, xvi. 7 would certainly not have come down to us, had they not coincided with what subsequently came to pass. They are not to be ranked with Jesus' conception of the nearness of the kingdom of God, which was clung to so persistently, but only to be cast, in the end, into the mould of a new interpretation. In fact, the words were not written down until after they were actually proved to be true.

work to encourage the other disciples (Lk. xxii. 31 f.). So, the band of the Twelve, with the single exception of the traitor, gather about him. According to the tradition preserved in Mt. xxvii. 3–9 and Acts i. 16–20 (though we do not find, indeed, complete agreement on the subject), Judas shortly afterwards died. In spite of this, however, "the Twelve" was still retained as the designation of the innermost circle of disciples.[1] Peter tells the other disciples that he has seen their risen Lord, and, as has often been noticed in similar cases, the story infects those who hear it, so that now the Twelve also see their risen Lord. After this, the disciples resume their preaching in Galilee. Crowds like those which were wont to follow Jesus along the shores of the Lake of Gennesareth now assemble about his disciples to hear them preach of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection. Moreover, their preaching of repentance for the sake of the kingdom of God now becomes invested with real urgency; for the judgment of God is at the very door. Consequently, on one occasion, when over five hundred brethren[2] are gathered together in one place, they are all convinced at one and the same time that they see the risen Lord. Thereupon the tidings of these appearances spread, we may be sure, throughout the whole region of Galilee where Jesus had laboured. And we can very readily understand that such tidings must have engaged the attention of Jesus' own family in a very special way, for, as we have already seen (Chap. IX , pp. 248 ff.), these persons did not approve of his public work. James, one of the brothers of the risen Lord, is won over to the Church by one of these appearances, and soon takes a leading position in it (Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 11, Acts xv. 13–21, xxi. 18, and see also 1 Cor. ix. 5).

But the disciples are no longer disposed to confine them-

[1] Cp. Rev. xxi. 14. In the Acts of the Apostles we are told of the subsequent election of Matthias, but what justification there may have been for this account we cannot tell. The narrator evidently avails himself of the form used at a later date in the election of bishops.

[2] The name "brethren" (ἀδελφοί) shows that they belonged to the company of the disciples. How far the body formed at this early stage a close association it is of course difficult to say. We do perceive, however, that the permanent effects of Jesus' preaching in Galilee extended far beyond the immediate circle of his personal followers.

selves to Galilee; they must go to the very city which crucified Jesus, and there proclaim his resurrection as a last incitement to repentance. The return to Jerusalem was made more imperative still by another appearance of the risen Lord; a command accompanied this vision which impelled all who heard it to set forth as messengers of the Messiah. Thus, Jesus' preaching in the capital was resumed by his apostles, and the Church which arose there was looked up to as the mother congregation of Christendom. As might have been expected, a persecution immediately broke out in Jerusalem; for the disciples publicly announced that the crucified prophet, whom the Synedrium and Pilate had condemned to death, was the Messiah, and would appear without delay. Then the risen Lord appeared for the last time, and converted one of the most violent enemies of the infant Church, the young Saul or Paul, into so very enthusiastic and successful a champion, that the spread of the gospel of the nearness of the kingdom of God, and of the crucified and risen Messiah, throughout the wide region stretching from Jerusalem to Rome, perhaps even as far as Spain, was due mainly to his efforts.[1]

RESURRECTION AND RETURN.—It is to these appearances of the risen Lord that Christianity owes so much; to these is due its existence at the present day as a great religious community. After the disciples had been dispersed, it was the belief in Jesus' resurrection that knit them together again, and impelled them to continue their Master's preaching and extend it over a vast region. Without this belief, Jesus' sayings might perhaps have been collected after his death as the utterances of a wise man, and, as such, might have persistently exercised an influence over a few minds down to the present day; but they would never have established a great Christian community ramifying into every part of the world. And the belief in Jesus' resurrection possessed this impelling, this stimulating force, simply because it seemed to be a pledge of the nearness of the kingdom of God, an impressive reminder of the speedy coming of the divine judg-

[1] From Jerusalem to Illyricum, Rom. xv. 19; preaching in Rome, Acts xxviii. 30 f.; intention to go to Spain, Rom. xv. 24, 28; perhaps the intention was carried out, *Can. Muratori*, l. 38 f.

ment. "The Lord is near" (ὁ Κύριος ἐγγύς, μαραναθά—Phil. iv. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, *Didache*, x. 6)—this was the keynote of the first Christian mission.[1] This it was that led the Jerusalem Christians to give up work, thinking that with the means they already possessed they could hold out until Jesus came again (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 32–v. 11, vi. 1–6, and cp. Gal. ii. 10). Of the same kind are the ideas which Paul combats in Thessalonica, where the Christian Church is at a loss to understand why certain of their members should have died before Jesus' second coming (1 Thess. iv. 9–18, v. 14). Paul himself regards it as a punishment that many have died in Corinth before Jesus' return (1 Cor. xi. 30). It is quite certain that for a long time he himself hoped, along with the majority of his converts, to survive till Jesus' return (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17, 1 Cor. xv. 51 f.). And after the death of Paul and all the rest, the Church still continued to hope that John, the son of Zebedee, would live to see the return of Christ. "This disciple will not die!" said the Christians one to another (Jn. xxi. 20–23). As a matter of fact, Jesus had told him that he would have to partake of his Lord's cup and his baptism of suffering (Mk. x. 39).

Transitory and Permanent Elements.—The passing away of Jesus' contemporaries not only proved that he had been mistaken in certain of his sayings;[2] it proved more than this, because the motive force of his preaching had been the thought of the speedy coming of the judgment, of the nearness of the kingdom of God. The expectation had been the determining factor in his own preaching of repentance, as well as in that of his apostles. Hence, the succeeding generation was driven to ask, "Where is the promise of his coming? Since our fathers fell asleep all things remain even as they have continued since the beginning of the world" (2 Pet. iii. 4). Yet even thus early it was shown that this scaffolding, so necessary for the building up of the

[1] In this it is only the fundamental thought of Jesus' preaching (Mk. i. 15) that is taken up again, except that the joyful side of the Gospel is more strongly emphasised, the reappearance of the Messiah involving a reunion with the Lord of the Church.

[2] See Chap. VIII., pp. 159 f.

Christian Church, might tumble to pieces or be taken down without the Church itself collapsing or even suffering appreciable damage. The certainty of belonging to the Messiah, and of participating with him in an eternal and blissful life in the future, and the duty of living, for the sake of this hope, a pure and holy life in the footsteps of Jesus, confident that God would one day both remove the taint of sin from the members of the Messianic community, and bestow upon them the holiness of perfection—these were the permanent ideas which survived the disappointment of the first Messianic hopes. And it is to be counted as part of the great life-work of the Apostle Paul that he fully recognised the abiding value of these thoughts, and impressed them again and again upon his congregations.[1] Jesus, therefore, stands out before us as one who trusted in God with unreserving boldness, as one who laboured with unceasing and unfaltering faithfulness in the service of others, as one who, in regal freedom, recognised no limitations anywhere, and regarded none but those imposed upon him by the special conditions of his own will. In like manner, the belief which his community had in him as the Messiah not only taught them the duty of striving after the same end in life, but was a pledge to all its members that, by the grace of God, each and everyone who belonged to the Messiah might some day win eternal happiness in the holiness of perfection; and this becomes a further incentive to them to labour for their own perfecting in the footsteps of Jesus. The formula which sums up the historical significance of Jesus Christ's appearance is this: The highest moral end in life combined with the joyful assurance of eternal salvation.[2]

[1] Although Paul held fast to the last the idea of the nearness of the parusia (Phil. iv. 5), he emphasises it less and less strongly as time goes on. For instance, in the Epistle to the Galatians, the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the Epistle to the Romans, there is not a word about the nearness of Jesus' second coming. On the other hand, all the Pauline Epistles are founded upon this thought: The belief in communion with the Messiah obliges men to live a holy life, and is at the same time a pledge that they will participate in the future kingdom of God, the most important possession of which will be sinless perfection.

[2] Thus, the permanent value of his teaching for his Church lay, not only in his new ideal, but also in his conviction that he was the Messiah.

Comparison with the Baptist.—If we compare Jesus with other great men of history, who have likewise set up each his peculiar ethico-religious ideal, we shall see that the moral end advocated by Jesus was really the highest. Every historical personage, to be properly understood, requires to be set against the large background of the national life of which he is a member. At about the beginning of our era, the Jewish race in Palestine produced two men of importance in the religious world who may in some respects be compared with Jesus; these were John the Baptist and Hillel the Scribe. The former we have already had to deal with at some length. Jesus praised him for his firmness of character and personal austerity. Yet we miss in him the joyful confidence, the sureness of victory, which we find in Jesus. Jesus *knows* that he is a member of the kingdom of God; and his disciples imbibe comfort from the assurance that they are members with him. From this they derive courage and strength to dedicate themselves to the cheerful and unselfish service of others. John, on the contrary, evinced an inclination to shun the world altogether; it was in solitude that he prepared himself and his disciples by prayer and fasting for the imminent judgment of God. The idea that activity is an indispensable duty, and that the failure to render help wherever possible is a sin deserving of punishment, does not enter the mind of the Baptist. Furthermore, the recognition of the obligation to work, which lifts Jesus above John, is associated with a far wider survey of all the relations of life, and with a ripeness of moral judgment such as was not to be expected of John, living the retired life that he did. Hence, Jesus is greater than John, whether we take as our standard the satisfaction produced in the individual disciple, or the

Even if its members no longer anticipate an Israelitish sovereignty of the world, with a new Jerusalem, and neither long for, nor yet fear, the actual descent of the Messiah and his accompanying angels from the heavens above, yet they do continue to cling to the belief that the ends in life taught by Jesus are unsurpassable, and by God's grace will yet be achieved, so that humanity, now stricken and laden with sin, shall some day be freed from its burden, and as God's holy child be permitted to see the end towards which it is now vaguely striving. Hence, the Church of Jesus still regards him as the Messiah; it still, with perfect justice, in acknowledgment of this, says "Jesus Christ."

services rendered by the two men respectively to mankind at large.[1]

HILLEL.—Hillel the Scribe was somewhat older than either the Baptist or Jesus; he would seem to have died at an advanced age in the year 10 A.D. (*Soṭa*, 48; *Tos. Soṭa*, 13). Leaving his Babylonian home for Jerusalem very early in life, he returned to Babylon only once at most, and then for but a very short period (*Soṭa*, 21).[2] It is not easy to separate fact from fiction in the accounts of his life. Yet, in spite of this, his character is revealed clearly enough in a large number of sayings, the authenticity of which cannot be doubted. Hillel was a Pharisee. He was persuaded that a man who is ignorant does not fear sin, that the "people in the land" are not pious (*Ābōth*, ii. 5). Consequently, he feels that those who will not learn deserve to die; they who do not go on learning are losers (*Aboth*, i. 13); and those who are too shy learn nothing (*Aboth*, ii. 5). The learning he alludes to is knowledge of the Jewish Law, as expressly stated in *Aboth*, ii. 7; he does not mean all the other knowledge of vast range ascribed by Jewish tradition to Hillel (*Sanhedrin*, 16). Further, he lays down a number of directions for the teaching of the Law. A choleric man is not fit to be a teacher (*Aboth*, ii. 5). Do not say, what I do not understand now, I shall understand in the end. Do not say, I will explain it when I have leisure, for perhaps you will never find the time (*Aboth*, ii. 4). He who exploits his crown (that is to say, makes the teaching of the Law a source of gain) passes thereby out of life (*Aboth*, i. 13, iv. 5). Hillel exhorts teachers to seize the right time for teaching. When they gather in (that is to say, are ready to hear), do thou scatter. When they scatter (that is to say, have not collected their thoughts), do thou gather (them) in. If thou seest a family that loveth learning, then do thou scatter; but if thou

[1] See, further, Chap. V.

[2] *Jer. Pesachim*, vi. 1, only agrees with this, if Hillel twice made the journey from Babylon to Jerusalem. Thus, if all the stories about Hillel are to be taken historically, we must assume two journeys from Babylon to Jerusalem. But the narrator in *Pesachim*, vi. 1 hardly seems to have been aware that Hillel made two journeys. It lies outside the scope of the present work to relate or examine the numerous legends about Hillel.

observest that learning is irksome to them, do thou hold back (*Berakhoth*, 63 a).[1] Such sayings suffice to show plainly Hillel's lofty conscientiousness. The same quality is more fully revealed in other sayings—Raise not thyself above others;[2] Do not rely upon thyself until the day of thy death; Judge not another until thou hast come into his place (*Aboth*, ii. 4).

Now, this mildness in judgment of others—a quality dependent upon the feeling of sinfulness in oneself, was precisely one which Jesus himself recommended (Mt. vii. 1–5 = Lk. vi. 37 f., 41 f.). And Hillel approaches Jesus closer still when he says to a proselyte, "What thou likest not thyself, that do not thou to another!" This is the whole of the Law; all else is but an amplification (*Shabbath*, 31 a). He also inculcates the duty of taking energetic action; "If I do not help myself, who else will help me? But if I only help myself, what am I? And if not now, when?" (*Aboth*, i. 14). "If thou art where no men are, show thyself a man" (*Aboth*, ii. 5). Thus, this Scribe was by no means wanting in force of character. He also knows how to infuse a deeper meaning into purely external requirements; "As the images of the king in the theatre and in the circus have to be washed and kept clean by those into whose care they are given, even so it is the duty of men to bathe the body created in the image of the almighty King" (Lev. r. 34). In his capacity of Scribe, Hillel introduced certain principles of law, which testify to his sound and sober judgment. The Law enjoined the cancelling of all debts every seventh year. The consequence was that nobody would lend money until Hillel proposed that the creditor should be enabled by means of a special deed (*prosbol*) to preserve his claim even beyond the seventh year (*Shebiith*, x. 3). The law prescribed that the sale of a house might be declared null and void within the first year

[1] Here the imagery of seed-sowing is used just as Jesus uses it in Mk. iv. 3–9.

[2] אל־תִּפְרוֹשׁ מִן־הַצִּבּוּר might, taken literally, be understood as a direct renunciation of Pharisaism. But, in the light of all other information about Hillel, it certainly was not so intended; for Hillel, like others, held aloof from the "people in the land." Yet the saying does show that he was able to put himself in another man's place, and consequently was free from overweening self-conceit.

after the transaction. In order to safeguard this benevolent arrangement, Hillel decreed that, in case the buyer could not be discovered within the appointed time, the seller might deposit the money for repurchase in the temple (*Arakhin*, ix. 4). Moreover, he laid it down that when provisions were lent, their price should be estimated, so that in the event of a rise or fall in the price neither party might gain an unfair advantage (*Baba Meṣia*, v. 9). As throwing further light upon Hillel's conception of life, it is important to note that every day when he left his pupils he used to depart with these words on his lips, "I have a guest at home and must hasten to entertain him." The guest in question was his soul, the welfare of which he felt called upon to foster in quiet self-communion (Lev. r. 34).[1] When he saw a skull floating on the water, he said, "Because thou madest (others) to swim, thou art now made to swim; and they that made thee swim shall swim in turn," seeing in the fact a sign of divine retribution (*Aboth*, ii. 6). But his greatest maxim is contained in the saying, "Be amongst the pupils of Aaron, who loved peace and pursued peace, who loved all creatures and guided them to the Law" (*Aboth*, i. 12).

There can be no question that of all the Scribes of Judaism Hillel comes nearest to Jesus. It may be urged that the commandment, not to do to another what is displeasing to oneself, is to be found in Tobit, iv. 15, and is only a prohibition, not a positive counsel for the guidance of life. Still, the main thing is that the sum of God's commandments is comprised in an injunction which regulates a man's relations to his neighbour.[2] Accordingly, Jesus might have said to Hillel what he said to the Scribe who admitted the justice of his

[1] In this connection, he is very emphatic as to the necessity of devoting to this guest all the time at one's disposal, for "The guest is our soul, which to-day is within us, but to-morrow perhaps is so no more."

[2] When later teachers, like Akibah, describe the pronouncement in Lev. xix. 18 as the great summary of the Law (see Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, i., p. 7), it is not Hillel they are copying, but Jesus, however little they would be disposed to admit it. Jesus may have been acquainted with Hillel's apothegm; but it was he who first declared the *positive* injunction contained in this *dictum* of the Law to be the greatest of the commandments. Furthermore, the sayings of Paul in Rom. xiii. 10, Gal. v. 14, certainly attach themselves to words of Jesus, not of Hillel.

decision, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" (Mk. xii. 34). Hillel's exhortation not to judge others in an unfriendly spirit also approximates very closely to the main purport of Jesus' declaration; and the further exhortation to industry, both on one's own behalf and for the benefit of others, bears witness to a trend of thought akin to that of Jesus. But in the case of Hillel such thought does not become a motive to action. It is true that he realises the necessity of playing the man where men are wanting; but it is very evident that he has not felt the contradiction between the sum of the Law, as he conceives it, and the purely ritualistic decrees and commandments which restrict a free and active service of love. He has no wish to judge others; but we still hear the ring of Pharisaic pride in the *dictum*, "The people in the land are not pious." He is well aware that he is nothing so long as he cares only for himself. Yet his soul does not find the nourishment it requires in conversation with his pupils; if he is to entertain this guest, he must withdraw from the society of his friends. Here we discover a touch of world-weariness, and an inclination to avoid the world. In Hillel we seek in vain that fresh, strong trust in God which was possessed by Jesus, that confidence which did not shrink even when it had to face strife. The only distinctly religious thought preserved by tradition as emanating from Hillel is the belief in a retribution unfolding itself from generation to generation. The peace which he strives to gain, as a pupil of Aaron, is wanting in energy.[1] Hence, it is by no means the result of chance, but springs from the deepest natures of the two men, that, while Hillel merely became the founder of a particular school within the bounds of Jewish Scribal erudition, from Jesus sprang a new faith which carries with it the promise of one day converting the whole world.

THE PROPHETS OF ANCIENT ISRAEL.—The great prophets of ancient Israel, the creators of the Jewish religion—that religion which ranks so high—out of the popular belief of

[1] According to *Shabbath*, 31 a, Hillel exhibited his patience by answering again and again very foolish questions put to him by an impudent questioner, such as: why the Babylonians are round-headed, why the people of Palmyra have small eye-slits, and why the Africans have broad soles to their feet.

the Israelites, are far better suited for comparison with Jesus than Hillel is. Out of the more or less well-known characters amongst these there are only five who stand forth in the clear light of history—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. In making comparisons with Jesus, however, we must at once dismiss the prophet Ezekiel. He was the pastor of his people in a time of adversity; he did not introduce any new conception of the will of God.[1] On the other hand, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah all agree in preaching a new system of piety, in opposition to the religion prevailing amongst the people—a form of piety which expresses itself, not in sacrifice, but in mercy and justice (Am. ii. 7 f., iv. 4 f., v. 4–7, 21–24; Hos. vi. 6, viii. 11; Isa. i. 11–15; Jer. vii. 7–15). And while doing so, they are firmly convinced that the weal or woe of their people depends upon their acceptance or rejection of the new teaching (Am. v. 4–7, 21–24; Hos. viii. 14; Isa. i. 27–31; Jer. xi. 12–14). It is in these men that we see the actual precursors of Jesus. From the standpoint of Christianity, these men were truly prophets, not merely in the sense that, in contradistinction to other prophets, they proclaimed the true will of God, but also because by their preaching, and their influence, which had by no means been lost in the lapse of the centuries, they actually paved the way for the preaching of Jesus.[2] The law of Israel by which the community was dominated as a result of the efforts of these prophets, though modified by concessions to tradition and the popular religion, especially after the Babylonian captivity, prepared the minds of the Israelites for the Gospel which followed, since this incorporated within itself, at any rate in part, the thoughts of these great men.[3] Yet none of these prophets

[1] Cp. the ideal picture of the pious man in Ezek. xviii. 5–9, where there is no opposition to the traditional piety, and consequently no further development of the ideal.

[2] For instance, in the discussion about the laws of ceremonial purity, Jesus appeals (Mk. vii. 6 f.) expressly to Isa. xxix. 13; at the cleansing of the temple (Mk. xi. 17), to Jer. vii. 11; at the denunciation of the Synedrium (Mk. xii. 1–9), to Isa. v. 1–7; and in Mt., on the occasion of the meal in the publican's house (Mt. ix. 13), and when defending the plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath (Mt. xii. 7), he appeals to Hos. vi. 6.

[3] As an illustration, compare the Decalogue, which, dating from about

reached such a height as Jesus; this was natural, considering the age in which they lived. Their outlook is neither so wide nor so comprehensive. It is true that we do find in Hosea and Isaiah a high-spirited trust in God, yet its object is not the welfare of the individual, but in Hosea's case the ultimate winning back and blessing of the people of Israel (Hos. ii. 14–23, iii. 5, xiv. 6–8), and in Isaiah's the deliverance of Jerusalem out of the hand of the Assyrians and the enrolling of Israel in the ranks of the great kingdoms of the world (Isa. x. 24–27, 33 f., xix. 23–25, xxxvii. 29, 33–35). It is not as the sheet-anchor of salvation for the individual that they regard trust in God; and, however much and however often these prophets exhort to mercy and justice, to mutual regard and helpfulness, they treat the prevalent greed, callousness, and injustice, more as a public injury to the national life, calculated to entail the ruin of their people, than as guilt weighing upon each individual, and consequently needing to be removed by repentance.[1] It was not until the individual was solemnly put under the obligation of the Law that the idea of his personal guilt became possible. In any case, the prophets still lack that exact conscientiousness which brands every individual omission as a sin deserving of punishment. The prophets are content to express their requirements in broad outlines; in them we find nothing like that tranquil exposition of God's will which is contained, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount.[2] Hence, Jesus is also greater than the prophets.

Greek Philosophers.—But we must not measure Jesus

the time of Jehu (Exod. xxxiv. 14–28), contains no sort of moral requirements, with the Decalogue which was alone in force at a later date (Exod. xx. 2–17 = Deut. v. 6–21), and from which Jesus in turn, after first emphasising the unique perfection of the one God (Mk. x. 18), selected only those commands with a moral bearing as being still valid (Mk. x. 19).

[1] It is difficult at the present time to transport oneself into this region of thought; but in the ancient world the individual was generally considered of little importance. In the case of the ancient Israelites, this idea of the single man is a survival from the time when the tribes still led a nomadic life. In such circumstances, the individual is counted merely as a constituent member of the community as a whole.

[2] The whole object of the prophets' interest was the welfare of the people, not the happiness or the perfection of the individual. To compare them with Jesus is, therefore, almost to do them an injustice.

by the standards of his own people only. The Græco-Roman world came under the sway of Christianity. The defenders of the new religion are fond of laying stress upon the great agreement between it and the teaching of the philosophers. It amounts to this: what has hitherto been the special possession of a few cultured persons is now offered to all.[1] Above all, it has been asserted again and again that there is a close affinity between the Platonic and Stoic conceptions of the world and the Christian; and there can be no doubt or question that the dogmatic structure of Christianity has down to our days been essentially based upon the work of these philosophers.

(*a*) JESUS AND PLATO.—When we attempt to compare Jesus and Plato, it does not seem easy at first to meet the requirements of a proper comparison, that is to say, to find ground common to them both. Much that appears to indicate a resemblance between the Platonic conception of the world and Christianity is, in fact, a resemblance between the Platonic conception of the world and the popular belief of Pharisaic Judaism; for instance, the belief in a better world beyond the grave, which has hitherto been invisible to the eye, but of which the godly shall some day be members, and the idea of a single Creator of the world, who is at the same time conceived to be the Highest Good. Apart from these features, however, Plato seems to possess none of the characteristic traits of Jesus' religion. He knows no more about a faith that can remove mountains than he does about a love that is ever instant in practical help. For Plato the first and last task in life is not unwearied labour for men, but thoughtful observation of the things of the world, a continuous endeavour to discover the beautiful in all worldly things, great or small, to appropriate it to oneself, and from the narrow boundaries of this earthly life to look beyond into the world of ideals, from which the soul springs, and into which it must one day return; compared with this task, all regulations of social life by custom and law take an entirely subordinate place.[2] Plato

[1] See Justin, *II. Apol.*, 10.

[2] Cp. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, (4) ii. 1, pp. 633–643 [or Zeller's *Plato and the Older Academy*, trans. by Alleyne and Goodwin (1876), pp. 271–292].

despises agriculture, industry, and trade. He looks upon slavery as an institution rooted in the differences of men's natures. He has no notion of the indissolubility of the marriage tie. In certain special cases he even recommends abortion and the exposure of infants. And even to the service of the State, which should have for its object the training of the citizens to virtue, in Plato's view the best citizens only dedicate themselves unwillingly and under compulsion.[1] Still, as a matter of fact, Plato's philosophic-æsthetic contemplation of the world does reveal to him God's care for men in every direction. The good man finds his reward in his own goodness; the evil man his punishment in his own wickedness. Plato realises, too, that it is much better to suffer injustice than to do injustice. A good man should do nothing but good even to the wicked, that the harmony of his own soul may not be disturbed by the wicked man,[2] this harmony constituting the greatest happiness of men, and being attained and preserved by the four fundamental virtues—wisdom, courage, prudence, and justice. The purpose of these virtues is not so much to regulate the life of the individual in relation to other men, as to secure the reasonable development of the powers inherent in the soul-life of the individual himself.[3]

Here we have in Plato a series of conceptions closely related to the ideas of Jesus. With Jesus, too, it is a familiar idea, that the man who lives in accordance with his words will enjoy in anticipation the bliss of God's kingdom. Moreover, the struggle after a harmony of soul incapable of being disturbed, and fortified by the belief in a divine Providence careful for even the smallest things, bears an undeniable resemblance to Jesus' trust in God. The obligation to do good even to the wicked man is insisted upon in the same way in the words of the Sermon on the Mount. And these ethical demands are in no sense casual

[1] Cp. Plato, *Republic*, v. 457 C—461 E; iv. 421 A; v. 469 B; vii. 316 C ff., 579 ff.

[2] See Zeller, *op. cit.*, pp. 928 f.; 876; 603 [or Alleyne and Goodwin, pp. 444, etc., 413, etc., 261, etc.].

[3] One of the chief defects of the philosophical ethic of the Greeks is its exclusive individualism. Even when reflecting upon the State and its duties, they conceive the Highest Good to consist in the perfection and welfare of the individual man. See Plato, *Republic*, vii. 519 C *et seq.*

utterances of Plato, which cling as it were only to the outer fringe of his ideas, but express in a way the great philosopher's conception of life. Yet the emphasis laid by Jesus and Plato upon these demands is not the same. In Plato's eyes the highest aim and goal is the quiet life of a scholar, who, if he must of necessity come in contact with other men, refuses to allow them to prescribe his rule of conduct. In Jesus' eyes, on the other hand, unceasing activity on behalf of others is an imperative obligation; the neglect of it amounts to a grave fault. Jesus' trust in God pulsates far more warmly than Plato's serene harmony of soul, and it does so precisely because Jesus wishes to be active in the midst of men, while Plato loves most to devote himself to the contemplation of the eternal Idea of the Universe at a distance from the noise of the streets.[1] And herein we have the measure of the two men, in so far as history at least is concerned.

Plato's ideal, of course, still possesses great magic power of attraction, and in numberless ways continues to influence the conduct of our contemporaries. The Catholic monks, Spinoza, Schleiermacher, all have agreed to take Plato for their guide. But if we are to measure a man's historical greatness by the service which he has rendered to humanity at large, it may truly be said that to Plato belongs the glory of having shown men, again and again, the way from the particular to the general, from the narrow to the broad, from the perishable to the imperishable; but as for an all-sided advancement of the general task of humanity—an advancement, too, that is continually in progress—this was set in motion by the simple thesis of Jesus, that helpfulness and service are the duty of every individual, and a duty upon the fulfilment of which the personal worth of each man depends. Plato, then, may have made valuable and permanent discoveries in certain of the sciences, as, for instance, in the theory of mental perception and in mathematics, in which matters a comparison between him and Jesus is not possible, for these things lay quite outside Jesus' range of vision, at all events

[1] Plato is, of course, at the same time well aware that he does not work for the community, but only for the ruling classes. No man who despises the slave, the peasant, and the artisan, as beings of a lower order, can bring a Gospel to them.

during the course of his public preaching. Plato's Dialogues must take high rank, both on account of their literary form and their subject-matter, and the author must be admired for the keenness of his thought and the wealth of his imagination. Jesus wrote nothing, and yet, on a comparison, Jesus, the popular orator, must be admitted to fall little or nothing short of Plato, the philosophical writer. He, too, is distinguished for the wealth of his observation an d the lucid clearness of his thought.[1] The point upon which they must be compared, however, is the conception of life and of the world, which emanated from each, and here Jesus is beyond question superior to the Greek philosopher. A State modelled as Plato would have it would be a prison to its subjects and would afford no pleasure to its rulers, the man who was trained up on the philosophic lines of Plato preferring much rather to live quietly for himself than to live a public life. On the other hand, in a community in which Jesus' law of life was generally and actually given full sway, every individual man would know that he was secure in his trust in God, every individual man would himself help others forward and would feel that on all sides he was being helped forward by others, so that not only would the general welfare be continually developed, but each individual would, according to all human calculation, be, at any rate as far as possible, contented. Hence, we see that Jesus is with good reason ranked higher than Plato.[2]

(*b*) JESUS AND THE STOA.—But, besides Plato's philosophy, the teaching of the Stoa offered, according to Zeller,[3] "to the best and most cultured people, wherever the influence of Greek civilisation had extended, a substitute for the ancient national religions in the days of their decay, a means of satisfying the

[1] See Chap. IV., pp. 101 ff.; Chap. XIII., pp. 421–442.

[2] In view of the high estimation (only in part well founded) in which Greek culture is held, it is not unimportant to insist strongly here, that Plato's influence must be pronounced a hindrance rather than a furtherance of the work of culture in general. His philosophy is the most beautiful amongst the dreams of humanity's youth; but Jesus' faith alone is adapted to humanity's mature age.

[3] *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 1, p. 311 [or Zeller's *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, trans. by O. J. Reichel (London, 1870), pp. 21–23, 120, etc.].

requirements of faith, a stay to the moral life." Stoicism is essentially distinguished from Plato's conception of the world by its sobriety and sanity, and by its original antagonism to extravagance of every shape and form. Every man ought to live according to Nature. Nature's order is the inviolable and holy order of God, for God works not above, but only in, the world. The Stoic regards resignation to his destiny as a pious duty. By accommodating himself voluntarily, he preserves the independence of his inner self. Circumstances may, of course, arise which constrain him to assert his independence even by putting an end by suicide to the intolerable conditions of his life.[1] But as a rule he ought to fortify himself equally against sorrow as against joy behind an absolutely passionless nature. In so doing, he attains not only inward peace and happiness, but also love for men, a love embracing with a sense of brotherhood all beings who are endowed with reason and are subject to the same fate.[2] And to this end he ought to be unceasingly active. Such at least is the view of Seneca (*De Otio*, i. 4): "Our Stoics say, 'We shall be active to the very end of our life. We shall not cease to care for the common good, to help individual men, even to render assistance to our enemies. Before death none of our powers is idle, nay, we are active even in death so far as the case will admit of it.'" In Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* (vii. 13) we are told that love for men ought to proceed from the heart, that doing good ought to give pleasure, that good ought to be done, not merely because it is seemly, but because it conduces to one's own welfare. In the face of this obligation, there is no longer any appreciable difference between slave and free. "Wheresoever one man is, there is the place to do a good deed."[3] Stoicism, as a matter of fact, displays here a remarkable double aspect. Zeno thought that, where there was nothing to hinder it,[4] the

[1] Zeller, *op. cit.*, (3) iii. 1, pp. 305–309 [or Reichel, p. 316].

[2] Zeller, *op. cit.*, (3) iii. 1, pp. 287 f. [or Reichel, pp. 293, etc.].

[3] "Ubicumque homo est, ibi beneficii locus est"—Seneca, *De Vita Beata*, xxiv. 3.

[4] Compare Seneca, *Epist.*, lxviii. 2: "Cum sapienti rempublicam ipso dignam dedimus, id est mundum, non est extra rempublicam, etiamsi recesserit; immo fortasse relicto uno angulo in majora atque ampliora transit."

wise man ought to concern himself with affairs of state.[1] Chrysippus declared that a life of idleness was as useless as a life given up to pleasure.[2] Yet Seneca thought[3] there was not one existing form of State of which a wise man could really approve. Moreover, none of the masters of the school in ancient times either held or sought for public office.[4]

After what we have said, it will not be denied that the ideal of Stoicism is very closely akin to that of Christianity. Yet at the very outset it is not free from contradictions. The duty of rendering unceasing help, the duty of living for others (Seneca, *Epist.*, xlvii. 3), can hardly be reconciled with the consciously repeated defence of suicide, nor does the latter harmonise with the requirement to acquiesce quietly in one's destiny.[5] Again, the demand to be unceasingly active in love is little better suited to that calm devotion to philosophy which the Stoics also felt to be the noblest occupation, except that in studying philosophy they deemed they were at the same time rendering the greatest service to the human race.[6] But the contradictions are still more fundamental; they are rooted in the very heart of their teaching. To the Stoic the conception of duty is less important than the idea of the wise man's freedom and independence.[7] Passionless placidity of soul is to raise him above fear and joy. Active labour on behalf of others must not be detrimental to his freedom. Accordingly, he may quit the world whensoever he pleases, and withdraw from the society of men as soon as they become too wicked for him. The religious positiveness of the Stoic conception of the world, which refers back to God everything that exists and everything that happens, does not suffice to fill the heart with lively joy, of a kind that has courage to do great things, or to hold fast to the acknowledged good as an inviolable law of life under all circum-

[1] Seneca, *De Otio*, iii. 2.

[2] Plutarch, *Sto. Rep.*, ii. 3.

[3] Si percensere singulas voluero, nullam inveniam quae sapientem aut quam sapiens pati possit (*De Otio*, viii. 1).

[4] Zeller, *op. cit.*, iii. 1, p. 297.

[5] Zeller, iii. 1, p. 305–309.

[6] Epictetus, *Diss.*, iii. 22, 83 *et seq.*; Seneca, *De Otio*, 4; Id., *Epist.*, lxviii. 2.

[7] Zeller, (3) iii. 1, p. 250.

stances. We shall not be wrong in saying that the weakness of Stoicism was that by teaching such passionlessness it stifled all enthusiasm, and, although it had no lack of industrious workers from the beginning, it felt very much the need of really great characters.[1] As compared with the spirit which emanated from Jesus, Stoicism reveals an absence of lively joy and real energy. The disposition to regard everything external to oneself as of inferior worth encouraged the man who was a sufferer to rise superior to his suffering by means of his inward strength, but it did not at the same time stimulate him boldly to undertake the abolition of external evil.

Hence we can readily understand how the Græco-Roman world was prepared by Platonism and Stoicism for the reception of Christianity; and yet at the same time how Christianity, owing ultimately to the superior worth of Jesus' personal character, was able to secure the victory over these ambitious philosophies. The victory over heathenism in the fourth century, however, was certainly won with weapons forged and put into the hands of Christianity by these philosophies. Our comparison of Platonism and Stoicism with the ideas of Jesus was not uncalled for; in view of the continued influence exercised by classic antiquity upon the Christianity of the present day, neither of those philosophies can be said to be yet defunct: on the contrary, they are, often enough, consciously used by those in authority as instruments for the education of the young.

Founders of Religions.—Whenever doubt is thrown upon the final victory of Christianity over the great religions of the East, we should remember the experience which Christianity reaped in its victory over the "high-souled" civilisation of the Græco-Roman world. And, in spite of this doubt, the only founder of an Oriental religion who really admits of comparison with Jesus is Gautama-Buddha. Kongtse (Confucius) and Muhammed are both too closely hemmed in by the limitations of their race for the effects of their teaching to have been altogether favourable to the peoples subjected to their faith. It is characteristic of the very essence of Jesus' view of life that

[1] Zeller, (3) iii. 1, pp. 26–48.

he instituted no act of a purely ritual nature. He lays down no commandments with regard to sacrifice, regular prayers, ablutions, and festivals. He did not determine how often the Lord's Prayer was to be repeated.[1] There exists no command of Jesus as to baptism; even Paul does not seem to be aware of any (1 Cor. i. 17), although he certainly allowed baptism to be administered everywhere.[2] And the institution of the Lord's Supper was not intended to be the inauguration of a ceremony which was necessary from the religious point of view. It was not conceived as an obligatory law, but as a useful regulation, which the disciples might discontinue of their own free will, intended to keep the significance of Jesus' death before their minds. It is only after these, let us say, duties of worship have been brushed aside, that it becomes possible for a man to devote himself in the fulness of his being, under all conditions of life, solely and singly to his ideal. This is one advantage which Christianity has over Judaism and Islam; as well as over the religion of Kongtse, which has often been appreciated far above its deserts.

(*a*) KONGTSE (CONFUCIUS).—Certainly Kongtse recognised a lofty moral ideal. A man who directs his actions according to the ordinances of heaven cannot expect immediate advantages to flow from them; nor will he do to anyone what he himself would not like to suffer at the hand of others; and, even when he is not observed, he lives strictly in accordance with his duty.[3] But, however beautiful and full of deep meaning many of the truths deduced from the ordinances of heaven are, the morality preached by Kongtse is nothing

[1] The petition for daily bread contains the word "to-day"; cp. Chap. X., p. 264. This certainly presupposes, but does not require, a daily repetition of the Prayer. The *Didache* prescribes (viii. 3) that the Lord's Prayer shall be said three times daily (*τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτως προσεύχεσθε*); this, however, was a custom in vogue at a much later date.

[2] What the Church interprets as a command relating to baptism (Mt. xxviii. 19, Mk. xvi. 16) cannot be accepted as such, for in both passages the custom is assumed to be already in existence. It is, however, very probable that the first community, when instituting the practice, appealed to some instructions of their risen Lord. By way of supplement, the Gospel of Jn. gave an account of the institution of baptism in the story of the washing of the disciples' feet (see xiii. 8—*ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε, οὐκ ἔχεις μέρος μετ' ἐμοῦ*).

[3] Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Religionsgeschichte*, i. p. 63.

more than a renovation of the law which had already obtained in China: the son obeys his father, the younger brother his elder brother, the wife her husband, the subject his superior, and the friend observes faithfulness towards his friend. This demand, that the younger brother shall obey the elder, corresponds to a very definite stage of civilisation; and Kongtse seeks to keep his adherents perpetually at this same level. At the same time, he inculcated, besides, the exact observance of the three hundred ceremonial commandments, and of the three thousand rules of behaviour. He required that sacrifices should be made to the spirits, who are present everywhere.[1] Moreover, it is impossible to separate these borrowed elements from Kongste's general conception of life, because he has made no provision for satisfying men's religious needs. The object aimed at in ceremonies is independence of the world—an object which, after all, every religion seeks to secure. But this is equivalent to saying that Jesus is able to deliver Kongste's disciples from the terrors of their superstition and from the burdensome pressure of the rules which restrict their life, this coercion being certainly the striking feature of Chinese social existence. Whether under the pressure of these habits — and it has continued for a thousand years—all life has not been numbed and destroyed, the future alone can decide. Still, it must never be forgotten that Christianity, besides supplying a stimulus to the active work of civilisation, is capable of removing many hindrances to such work.

(*b*) MUHAMMED.—Similar results arise from a comparison of Jesus with Muhammed. Muhammed's first public appearance undoubtedly bears a great resemblance to that of Jesus. Like Jesus, he too begins his prophetic calling in consequence of a vision; he too proclaims the nearness of divine judgment. And we discover in his nature now a soaring imagination, now a clear and simple method of exposition, such as we perceive in Jesus. The chief difference between them, however, is this: Jesus' preaching (as well as his whole personal

[1] His failure to abolish the worship of spirits, and, in particular, of ancestors, has certainly proved most prejudicial to his own life's work. The continuance of the ancient worship of the gods made impossible a free development of the ethical system required by his principles.

character) is inspired by a lofty moral ideal, to which he is never unfaithful in the demands that he makes upon his adherents, whereas in Muhammed's preaching we sadly feel a want of unity. The so-called five pillars of Islam stand side by side as of almost equal value ; they are : the recognition of the unity of God and of the mission of Muhammed ; prayer five times a day, with exactly defined attitudes for each clause of the prayer; the holy tax; the fasts, particularly that of Ramadan; and the pilgrimage to Mecca. These five obligations which Muhammed ranks highest, have scarcely any bearing on the general social life of men.[1] In addition to these, there are many ritual ablutions, a number of commandments about food, the prohibition against making images of any living creature, the commandment about circumcision and other matters, often customs borrowed from the Jews. Besides these, there are of course the moral commandments. As early as the year 622, Muhammed commanded the faithful of Medina not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to kill their children, not to invent and disseminate slanders. The decree bidding women to keep within doors, and to veil themselves in the presence of strange men, was intended to preserve propriety of conduct within the house. The permission to have four wives at a time was regarded as a restriction, to which Muhammed himself did not submit. Muhammed also did much to alleviate the lot of slaves. Yet, for all this, he will not bear comparison with Jesus. A religion which established the calendar once for all on an erroneous basis,[2] which paralyses art by the prohibition to make images, which robs woman of all idea of equality with man, which through its five long daily prayers claims a large part of the day for divine worship—such a religion cannot compete with the faith which, with a cheerful trust in God, shows itself unceasingly active in the service of men.

[1] The holy tax was at first looked upon as a form of almsgiving, but afterwards as the main resource of the State treasury (A. Müller, *Islam*, i. pp. 101, 203 *et seq.*).

[2] Muhammed ordained even in 632, shortly before his death, that the year was to be reckoned as consisting of twelve lunar months. The consequence is that, according to the Muhammedan calendar, in the course of about thirty-three years each month travels through all the seasons.

(*c*) GAUTAMA-BUDDHA. — The Indian Gautama-Buddha possessed a far stronger character than Muhammed's, and of all the founders of religions will best bear comparison with Jesus. There is at the outset a certain similarity in the relation of both to the hereditary religion of their people. Gautama, too, does not break with the traditional faith, but declares that a Buddha has appeared in it, just as Jesus considered himself to be the promised Messiah. But Buddhism was as little able to regard the Indians as the most important representatives of its views, as Christianity was at a later date to look upon the Jews as the parent-stock of its community. The first appearance of Gautama, again, is akin to that of Jesus, for he, too, repudiated as an error, which did not conduce to their welfare, the kind of piety so highly prized by his countrymen, Indian asceticism, exactly in the same way as Jesus rejected the Pharisaic piety.[1] The four fundamental truths which Gautama first announced in Benares, and through which he imagined he had found deliverance from death,[2] are the holy truths of suffering, of the origin of suffering, of the abolition of suffering, and of the way to the abolition of suffering. This enumeration alone is sufficient to show that Buddha's teaching was cast in a more philosophic mould than that of Jesus; and this accords with the nationality of the two men. Purely speculative philosophy, however, is rejected. There should be no discussion as to whether the world is finite or infinite, whether there is an eternity or not. This does not lead to a holy life, to estrangement from the world, to peace, to enlightenment, to Nirvana. But the holy truth of suffering is to be inculcated. Birth means suffering. Age means suffering. To be joined with those one does not love means suffering. To be separated from those one does love means suffering. In short, the fivefold attachment (to life) means suffering. It will be seen that there is no mention here of trust in God, of a confident feeling that everything tends to promote the ultimate welfare of men. Man is, rather, plunged even by his birth into a

[1] But as in Christianity the Messiah partly rescinds the Jewish law, so in Buddhism the Buddha contradicts the ascetism practised by the Brahmans.

[2] A. Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 129.

stream of suffering, from which he cannot escape until he is permitted to enter into Nirvana. And the holy truth of the origin of suffering says: it is thirst which leads from new birth to new birth, together with pleasure, and desire which here and there finds its pleasure—thirst for pleasure, thirst for being, thirst for power. In other words, the deepest impulse of life is at the same time the source of all suffering. The struggle of every healthy man to maintain his existence, to enjoy it and to turn it to the best account, is considered to be the fundamental evil from which all other troubles proceed.[1] The third holy truth, therefore, of the abolition of suffering, can only promote the abolition of thirst by completely annihilating desire, by relinquishing it, stripping oneself of it, cutting oneself loose from it, allowing it no foothold. But, of course, everything depends upon the way in which this impulse towards life is to be put aside. Buddha saw that the right way was not in self-torture, not in leading the life of enjoyment, but in keeping a middle path between the two. The fourth holy truth of the way to the abolition of suffering describes it as the holy, eightfold path; it consists of the following: right faith, right resolve, right speaking, right doing, right living, right striving, right thinking, right meditation. True, all this does not tell us what is the meaning of "right" in these cases. Yet Buddhism does give an answer to the question, true to its fundamental character. It demands sympathy with everything that lives—men, animals, and plants.[2] With this is associated a highly elaborated system of ethics, the details of which do not concern us here. Only, it may be pointed out that it is accounted a merit in Buddha himself, that he did not, in accordance with his

[1] Hence energetic action, joy in understanding the world and in prevailing over it, cheerful labour for the progress of mankind, are only possible for the Buddhist at the cost of denying his ancestral faith or putting a new interpretation upon it. The idea that life means suffering keeps continually recurring in Europe down to the present day; but only where it is overcome are great achievements to be thought of.

[2] The Apostle Paul is also aware of a travailing of Nature because of her transitoriness; but his Christian trust at the same time gives him hope that Nature will free herself from this bond (Rom. viii. 19–21). Thus, the mark of Christianity is joyful strength; the mark of Buddhism suffering weakness.

knowledge of the way of release, enter into Nirvana at once, but out of pure compassion remained upon earth until he had imparted his knowledge to others. Here, then, we have a religion which, precisely like Christianity, requires originally no ritual observances, but only asks that life shall be lived in accordance with a defined ideal, as a means of attaining release from all evil. Like Christianity, Buddhism is inspired throughout by the personality of its founder; and, like Christianity, it enjoins the alleviation of the distress of others. And yet the result of any serious comparison between the two can here again only be in favour of Christianity. Without joy in life a prolonged and strenuous activity in the world is inconceivable. It is only when the individual is able to devote himself entirely, heart and soul, to the duties of life, that man wins that victory over the world by which life is permanently made easier, beautified, and enriched. And this is more than Buddhism can accomplish,[1] holding, as it does, that the fundamental evil of life is life itself. But Jesus' conception of the world and of life does accomplish it, through its faith that can move mountains and its appreciation of the worth of the individual by the standard of the services rendered to the many.

CHRISTIAN CONFESSIONS.—The Christian Church of the present day is, as a matter of fact, represented by such a multiplicity of creeds and religious tendencies, that the only discernible point of union common to them all is the wish to belong to Jesus Christ, and the remembrance, cherished in some fashion or other by every sect, of Jesus and his apostles. The sole object of Christianity, however, can only be this: to be vigilantly active in seeing that the personal character of Jesus continues to be a living force amongst his Churches. And that ecclesiastical community will, we cannot doubt, be able to claim a pre-eminence over all others which guides its members nearest to a historical understanding of primitive Christianity, with a view to renewing within itself the primitive Christian ideal of life. From this point of view, the Churches of the Reformation era must unquestionably be

[1] Nor does it desire to accomplish it. Yet by taking up this attitude, it condemns the races which profess it as a creed to fall behind the Christian nations as regards the work of civilisation.

ranked above the older ecclesiastical organisations, especially as it can be clearly shown that all sections of the Catholic Church have developed a vast number of sacred usages, out of all proportion to the low value attached by Jesus to such external practices, and quite hiding by their growth the gospel of his personal character; and that throughout the Catholic Church monachism cultivates a form of piety which, to say the least of it, is, through its innate aversion to the world,[1] the exact contradiction of the end put before his disciples by Jesus, namely, service on behalf of others.

But it can also be shown, without much difficulty, that Luther, at least, in falling back upon the Holy Scriptures, showed, as a matter of fact, a perfectly right appreciation of the original Christian conception of life. In his own language the complete summary of a Christian life is contained in his work on the Freedom of a Christian; the first part of this demonstrates how a Christian through his faith is the unfettered lord of all things and subject to none; and the second part how the self-same Christian makes himself, of his own free will, the submissive servant of others, and becomes subject to every man in helpful love. But ceremonies, he says, are valuable and useful only in so far as they preach this gospel and bring it home to the individual.[2]

CONCLUSION.—Both the Gospel of Jesus and the Reformation impose upon Christianity the duty of striving to obtain an ever clearer grasp of the history of the primitive Christian society; and, instead of shaping its ecclesiastical institutions on the Catholic model, of adapting them more and more to the simple Gospel of Jesus. The more perfectly it does this,

[1] The broad and useful activity of monasticism in missions, education, care of the poor and of the sick does but afford evidence that the anchorite's aversion to the world possesses no permanent place within the Christian society. Even the monk is forced into the service of love for one's neighbour.

[2] To be sure, Luther derived his gospel from the Epistles of Paul more than from the Synoptic account of Jesus' life, and he interpreted the Johannine Gospel in the light of these Epistles. It is to be regarded as one of the best results of the historical labours of the last century, that the complete agreement between the Reformation ideal of life and the picture afforded by history of the personal character of Jesus can be shown to us with absolute clearness.

and the more distinctly it learns to perceive the historical Jesus, the more completely will it grasp the deep truth of the legend of Christophorus. Its image of Jesus will grow; and in proportion as Christianity strips away the tinsel trappings with which the love of earlier ages thought to adorn it, but which are really incongruous with its inmost nature, to that extent it will stand out more and more nobly. Religion offers to man in the person of Jesus quite the sublimest gift it is within its nature to offer. In other words, it makes him completely independent of the world, by teaching him ever to place his trust in the absolute Lord of this world as in a faithful friend. And it gives him as his object in the world something that alone makes life rich, happy, and of worth, namely, unceasing labour for the general welfare. He who proclaimed this faith, not merely by preaching it, but by showing it forth in the first instance in his own person and realising it in his own life, necessarily seems, to the man who is gladdened by his Gospel, to have moved into immediate proximity to God, and to be exalted beyond comparison high above all other men. The inference is so inevitable that it is impossible for even the most dispassionate intelligence to reject it. Hence, the Christian Church will in each and every age join in the confession of the first generations, as set down in the Johannine Gospel (i. 14)—"We beheld his glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

INDEX OF PASSAGES QUOTED

(The numerals in heavy type indicate the chapter of book quoted, the small numerals the verse or paragraph, and the ordinary numerals the page of this book.)

I. Old Testament.

Genesis.

1 2 136 ; 27 96, 278, 367.
2 2 3 227, 232 ; 24 96, 367.
8 8 136, 278.
18 18 117.
22 17 18 117.
36 11 15 28 408.
49 11 18.

Exodus.

3 2–6 437 ; 2 6 95.
10 12 293.
12 21 397 ; 43–49 397 ; 46 398.
13 6 7 397.
20 2–17 514.
21 17 293.
23 17 99, 359, 401.
24 1–8 463.
30 11–16 354.
31 14 15 225.
34 14–28 514 ; 21 225 ; 23 359.
35 2 225.

Leviticus.

1 14–17 413.
4 201.
5 201. 7–11 413.
11–15 295.
12 85.
13 45 46 407 ; 47–58 294.
14 1–32 198 ; 33–53 294.
15 6 7 8 10 11 16 18 21 22 27 119.
16 201 ; 10 196.
17 16 119.
18 16 124.
19 18 439, 511.
20 10 443.
22 6 119.
23 3 225.
24 16 477.

Numbers.

5 1–4 295.
9 12 398.
15 32–36 225 ; 37–41 261.
19 295.
21 25 428.

Deuteronomy.

5 6–21 514 ; 16 293.
6–8 153.
6 4–10 150 ; 4–9 261 ; 4 5 438 ; 13 140, 148, 150 ; 13 14 94 ; 16 94, 140, 150.
8 2 143 ; 2 3 94, 140, 150, 153.
11 13–21 261.
15 20 306.
16 16 99, 359, 401.
18 16 327.
19 15 474.
21 22 23 490 ; 23 14, 487.
22 22 443.
23 1–3 327 ; 25 26 224, 413.
24 1 96, 124, 367, 368 ; 8 463.
25 4 11 ; 5 434.
27 26 227, 298, 306, 332.

1 Samuel.

1 1 490.
21 1–9 92 ; 2–7 226.

2 Samuel.

5 6–9 405.
7 16 449.

1 Kings.

1 47 48 450.
17-19 322.
18 38 361.
19 2 125 ; 5–7 140 ; 8 143 ; 10 125.

2 Kings.

1 1–8 296 ; 8 113, 222 ; 10–12 361.
2 11 12 122.
4–8 322.
9 13 404.

2 Chronicles.

24 20 21 50.

Nehemiah.

3 35 364.
10 32 225.
13 15–22 225.

Esther.

4 14 163.

Job.

1 1 408 ; 6–12 466.
2 1–6 466 ; 11–13 408.
9 5 420 ; 38–41 268.

Psalms.

1 1 206.
2 7 127 ; 9 147.
8 268.
18 17 384.
22 2 44, 53, 94, 489.
36 7 420.
63 11 364.
65 7 420.
66 12 384.
69 2 3 15 384.
74 9 384.
90 2 420.
91 11 12 94, 149, 153.
104 268 ; 32 420.
110 1 95, 151, 450, 476.
118 22 23 95, 101, 150, 426 ; 25 26 94, 151, 405, 426.
124 4 5 384.
144 5 420.

Song of Sol.

2 15 364.

Isaiah.

1 11–15 513 ; 11–17 173 ; 27–31 513.
2 2–4 147.
5 1–7 93, 424, 513.
6 137 ; 9 10 93, 258.
10 24–27 514 ; 33 34 514.
11 1–9 449 ; 2 135 ; 4 172.
13 12–15 282 ; 21 196.
14 13–15 94.
19 23–25 514.
25 8 436.
26 19 436.
28 15 327.
29 13 93, 292, 513.
34 14 196.
37 29 33–35 514.
40 3 108 ; 10 162.
53 5–9 11.
54 10 420.
56 7 415.
58 4–7 173.
61 1 2 276.
62 11 148, 400.
66 24 175.

Jeremiah.

1 137.
7 93 ; 1–15 474, 513 ; 1–28 414, 427 ; 3–11 173 ; 11 414, 415, 513 ; 14 414 ; 31–33 267.
11 12–14 513.
17 21–24 225.
19 267.
20 9 267.
25 15 384.
26 93 ; 1–24 414, 427, 474.
31 31–34 98, 322, 462.
49 19 143.

Ezekiel.

1 2 137.
8 3 146 ; 12 428.
9 9 428.
18 5–9 513.
37 1–14 436.

Daniel.

1 2 163.
2 31–45 158.
4 14 163 ; 26 162, 163 ; 34 163.
5 23 163.
6 11 260 ; 14 260.
7 13 97, 169, 279, 333, 336, 456, 476 ; 17–27 158 ; 18 163.
8 11 163 ; 14 159.
9 163 ; 24–27 159.
12 2 176 ; 2 3 436 ; 11 12 159.

Hosea.

2 14–23 514.
3 5 514.
6 1 2 299, 336 ; 2 159 ; 6 24, 173, 513.
8 11 513 ; 14 513.
14 6–8 514.

Joel.

4 2 12 171.

Amos.

2 7 8 513.
3 8 267 ; 9–11 302.
4 4 5 513.
5 4–7 513 ; 21–24 173, 513.
8 5 225.
9 1 51 ; 9 466 ; 11 405.

Micah.

4 1–3 147.
5 1 449.
7 6 97.

Zechariah.

9 9 97, 401, 406, 447.
13 4 113 ; 7 465.

Malachi.

3 1 98, 108 ; 2 3 19 120 ; 23 98 ; 23 24 121, 280, 222.

Apocrypha.

Judith.

9 1 260.
13 3 260.
16 17 175.

Wisd. of Sol.

4 16–5 16 352.

Tobit.

4 173 ; 9 358 ; 15 243, 511 ; 16 17 204.

Sirach.

12 4 204.
48 3 361.

1 Macc.

2 29–41 225.
4 46 165.
11 71 476.

2 Macc.

2 4–8 319.
15 13–15 320.

II. Apocalyptic Books.

Sibyll.

III 218–247 453; 286 116; 290–294 416; 652 ff. 381.
VII 82–84 127.

Enoch.

45 3 116, 286.
46 1 2 169.
53 6 416.
55 4 116.
61 8 116.
62 9 116.
69 27 116.
90 28 29 416.

Apoc. Baruch (Syr.).

14 12 13 358.
24 1 358.

Apoc. Baruch (Gk.).

28 55.
29 5 141.
40 3 381.
72 6 381.

4 Esdras.

7 28 381; 29 334; 77 358.
8 33 36 358.

III. Later Jewish Literature.

Philo.

De Mundi Opificio.
24 57.
46 57.
53–60 57.
De Decem Oraculis.
12 96, 375.
De Præm. et Pœnis.
16 381.
In Flaccum.
5 110.
Leg. ad Gaium.
31 98.
38 483.

Josephus.

(a) *De Bello Judaico.*
I. 168 183; 319 230.
II. 80–93 390; 118 87, 431; 144 471; 215 110; 224 149; 247 110; 433 87.
III. 515 183; 516–521 182; 519 412; 519 520 187.
IV. 56 91; 61 91; 99 225; 160 433.
V. 161–181 480; 172 173 482; 207 149; 238–247 417.
VI. 354 472.
VII. 253 182, 431.

(b) *Antiquitates.*
IV. 212 260; 212 213 439.
XII. 277 225.
XIII. 288–298 204.
XIV. 63 225; 107 387.
XV. 259 369; 393 149; 403 317; 412 149.
XVII. 299–317 390; 342–344 87; 355 87.
XVIII. 1–10 87; 2 183; 4–10 87; 4 431; 17 434; 26 111; 28 183; 34 111; 35 111; 55–62 483; 63 64 15 f.; 89 95 110 f.; 106 110 f.; 109–112 124; 109–119 111; 111 113; 116 117 118 f.; 117 118; 117 118 114; 118 119 123; 119 112 f.; 137 111; 237 110; 238–255 110.
XIX. 275 351 110.
XX. 102 87; 106 107 149; 118 360; 138 110; 160–181 417; 198 111; 199 14; 200 14, 16.

(c) *Vita.*
11 113; 42 271; 399 183; 403 187.

(d) *Contr. Apion.*
II. 178 98; 204 98.

Mishnah.

Berakhoth.
2 6 409.
8 1–4 205.

Demai.
2 3 205; 6 205; 9 12 205

Shebiith.
5 9 205.
10 3 510.

Bikkurim.

3 12 205.

Shabbath.

1 3 98.
22 6 229.

Pesachim.

4 1 6 396.
10 1 2 4 7 463.

Shekalim.

1 3–5 354.
6 1 5 454.

Yoma.

8 6 7 229.

Sukka.

3 1 9 405.
4 5 405.

Yom Tob.

5 2 396.

Taanith.

1 4–6 214, 218.
2 9 214.

Soṭa.

9 15 204.

Giṭṭin.

5 9 205.

Nedarim.

1 3 367.
3 4 204, 389.

Baba Kamma.

8 6 444.
10 1 213; 2 204, 389. 94[b] 212.

Baba meṣia.

5 9 511.

Shebuoth.

4 13 367. 39[a] 204.

Aboda zara.

4 7 163.

Pirke Aboth.

1 12 511; 13 279, 509; 14 510.
2 1 452; 3 204; 4 5 509; 6 511; 7 509; 8 293; 9 164.
3 2 164; 10 164; 14 164.
4 2 452; 4 164; 5 279, 509.
5 20 100, 164.

Arakhin.

9 4 511.

Ṭohoroth.

7 4 205.
8 5 205.

IV. New Testament.

Matthew.

1 1–16 82; 17 82; 18–25 84; 23 86.
2 1–23 89; 1 85, 86, 87; 3 406; 5 46; 6 86; 13–23 85; 15 18 86; 23 46, 86, 90.
3 1–6 108; 1–12 108; 1 5 111 f.; 7–12 26, 62, 108; 7 122; 9 111, 152; 10 40; 11 26, 120; 11 12 115; 12 466; 13 81; 13–15 46; 13–17 127; 14 15 133.
4 1–11 26, 94, 140; 1 47, 139, 145; 1 2 152; 2 3 144; 5 149; 5–7 76, 191, 220, 289, 315; 6 144; 7 150; 8 47, 145; 8–10 140, 144; 10 148; 11 143, 152; 12–17 140; 13 90; 18–22 181; 23 181; 24 25 74, 181, 234; 24–5 1 181, 238.
5 3–7 27 25, 27, 181.
5 3–12 240; 4 241; 13–16 356; 13 103; 14 101, 267; 14–16 251; 15 251; 18 26, 55, 97; 21–48 96; 21 292; 23 24 293, 360, 367, 443; 25 26 26, 105, 155, 179; 33 292; 34–37 366, 367, 452; 39–44 242; 44–48 244.
6 1–6 217; 3 408; 7 266; 7 8 251; 7–15 217; 9–13 25, 251, 262; 13[b] 266; 16–18 217; 19–21 26, 346; 20 21 162, 358, 376; 22 23 25, 359; 22–24 346; 24 26, 359; 25 145, 308; 25–33 26, 63, 299; 26–29 102; 28 29 92; 30 309; 33 59, 160; 34 264.
7 1–5 445, 510; 1 489; 1 2 245, 265; 2 251; 3–5 101, 374; 6 102, 151, 270, 299, 312, 331; 7–11 25, 155, 180; 12 242; 13 14 26, 329; 17 18 103; 21–23 326; 21 131; 22 23 26, 30, 58, 74, 131, 350; 24 326; 24–27 101, 156, 192, 211, 319; 28 30; 28 29 22, 181.
8 1–4 73; 2–4 181; 5–13 26, 73, 181, 199; 11 28; 11 12 26; 14–17 24, 181; 18 251; 19–22 25, 299, 303; 20 102, 167, 169, 364; 28 347.
9 1–17 181; 9 203, 308; 13 24, 513; 14 108; 18–26 251; 20 261;

27 347; 27–33 24; 27–31, 77, 299; 32 33 299; 37 104; 37 38 251, 278.
10 1 251; 1–4 181; 2–4 235; 3 203; 5 301, 362; 5 6 279; 5–42 25, 27, 62; 7–8 280; 7–16 251; 8 194; 8 9 279; 9 251, 279; 9–15 251; 9 10 10; 11–15 251, 279, 280; 16 58, 278; 17 54; 19 20 251; 23 160, 170, 279, 301, 347; 24–36 26; 26 251; 26–31 251; 26–33 26, 63; 27–31 58; 28 58, 437; 29 102; 29–31 268; 30 146; 32–35 326; 34–36 98, 334; 37 38 26, 299, 305; 40 280; 41 239.
11 2 117, 187; 2–6 125; 2–19 25, 62, 108, 181, 218; 2 3 109; 3 113, 115; 4 277; 5 240, 251 f., 285; 7 112, 192, 211; 7–10 116, 128, 134; 8 104; 10 98, 108, 113; 11 158; 12 108; 12 13 26, 62, 109, 121; 14 98, 280, 299, 343; 16 f. 103; 18 117, 119, 194, 297, 425; 18 19 156, 167; 19 72 181, 204, 214, 239, 443, 473; 20–24 25, 62, 182; 21 198; 21–23 299; 21–24 301, 302; 23 94; 25 26 283; 25–27 25, 62; 25–30 251; 27 284, 321; 28–30 284; 29 18.
12 1–16 181; 1–8 24; 1 226; 5 91, 232; 7 513; 11 26, 102, 181, 232; 22–37 252; 23 83; 28 160, 251 f.; 30 357; 32–42 316; 37 450; 38–42 25, 76, 220, 299, 302; 40 92, 170; 43–45 25, 196, 388; 46–50 181.
13 1–52 253; 1–23 251; 12 251, 286; 19 266; 24 207; 24–30 103, 181, 206, 254; 31 32 251; 31–33 26; 33 251, 254, 256; 34 251; 36–43 38, 181, 206, 254; 37 171, 260; 33–43 259 f.; 41 171, 260; 44 45 251, 256; 44–46 254; 45 46 105; 47 206; 47 48 105; 47–50 36, 181, 206, 254; 52 251, 259; 53–58 251.
14 3–12 108; 33 326; 34 198; 36 261.
15 1–20 251; 12–14 67; 13 40; 21 75, 300; 22 83; 24–17 21 299; 26 312; 29 75, 300; 39 182, 198, 299, 314.
16 1 315; 2 3 26, 155, 299, 316; 13 171, 319; 13–19 319; 13–20 290, 369; 14 299, 319; 16 30, 323; 16–20 136, 142; 17 74, 89, 151, 284, 455; 17–19 325, 385; 17–20 383; 17–21 311; 18 100, 238, 299, 301, 305, 319, 337, 385, 465, 466; 18 19 326, 353; 19 299, 328, 338; 20 89; 21 337; 22 338; 23 44, 238, 338, 385; 28 159, 170.
17 1 344; 12 13 108; 20 26, 255, 392; 22 75; 22 23 346; 24–27 71, 306, 346, 353; 25 26 106; 27 354.
18 346; 1–7 356; 3 33; 6 105; 6 7 212; 6–35 346; 7 26; 7–9 181; 10 356; 11 168; 12 13 102; 12–14 26, 27, 105; 15 26; 17 204, 319; 18 299, 330; 20 40, 61; 21 22 26, 49; 22 346; 23–34 104.
19 1 2 75; 1–9 346; 3–12 366; 4 91; 10–12 369; 13–30 346; 16 17 130; 24 160; 28 26, 55, 141, 170, 181, 235, 283, 346, 373, 381, 384, 385, 402, 425, 460; 29 380; 30 26.
20 1–16 104, 181, 209, 346; 2–14 181; 6 7 377; 8 404; 17–19 346; 19 337; 20 21 383; 20–28 346; 28 59, 210, 388; 29–34 77, 347.
21 1–3 77; 1–9 392; 5 400; 9 83, 406, 407; 10 11 392, 406; 12–17 392; 14 395; 15 83; 15 16 166, 406; 16 91; 18–22 392; 21 26; 23–27 108, 392; 28–32 130, 249, 392; 31 160; 31 32 204; 32 108; 33–46 392; 43 160.
22 1–14 26, 210; 7 11–14 210; 15–40 392; 16 230; 35 438; 41–45 393.
23 393 1–39 26, 27, 63; 3 4 409; 5 261, 438, 451; 12 26; 16–22 367, 452; 18–20 360; 23 106, 441; 24 102; 25 50; 29–38 425; 36 159; 37 102; 37–39 26, 427; 38 427.
24 335, 393; 1–36 393; 5–25 46 27; 8 40; 26–28 26; 27–44 170; 32–35 155; 34 159; 36–44 159; 37–39 91; 37–41 26; 42 393; 43 10; 43 44 26, 155, 178; 45–51 26, 104, 155, 178.
25 393; 1–13 103, 155, 177; 11 12 350; 14–30 26, 49, 62, 347, 391; 31 170, 174, 335; 31–46 35, 155, 166, 171, 372, 385; 32 174, 435; 34 161, 174, 214, 240; 40 174, 179, 214; 41–46 207; 45 192, 229.
26 27 393; 1–5 393; 3

471 ; 6–13 393, 408 ; 14–16 393 ; 15 446 ; 17 396 ; 17–19 77 ; 17–30 394 ; 20 396 ; 31–56 394 ; 32 75 ; 34 77 ; 47–49 393 ; 55 44 ; 57 471 ; 57–75 394 ; 61 392 ; 64 160, 337, 394, 476 ; 69–75 77.
27 1 2 394 ; 3–9 504 ; 3–10 393, 446 ; 11–39 394 ; 19 24 25 394, 482 ; 32–56 394 ; 34 52 ; 37 485 ; 40 392 ; 56 56, 383 ; 57–61 394 ; 60 404 ; 62 395 ; 62–66 52 ; 62–**28** 15 498 ; 64 337, 498 ; 65–**28** 15 51.
28 1 395, 495 ; 2–4 52 ; 2–5 495 ; 7 75, 495, 496 ; 9 496 ; 9 10 76, 501 ; 11–15 53 ; 16 498 ; 16–20 501 ; 19 522 ; 20 40 ; 20 61.

Mark.

1–16 64–69.
1 2 108 ; 2–8 108 ; 4 111 ; 4 5 129 ; 5 6 112, 222 ; 7 8 31, 108 ; 9 133 ; 9–11 127 ; 10 134 ; 10 11 136 ; 11 70 ; 12 47, 145 ; 12 13 139, 143, 153 ; 13 143, 152 ; 14 108, 112, 133 ; 14 15 155, 157 ; 14–20 467 ; 15 160, 166, 179, 189, 506 ; 16 181 ; 16–20 181, 186, 187, 308 ; 16–**3** 35 181 ; 17 101, 155 ; 19 219 ; 21 187 ; 21–28 22, 23 ; 21–**5** 43 29 ; 22 22, 188 ; 23–26 195, 197 ; 24 189, 25 70 ; 26 189 ; 27 189, 194 ; 29 237 ; 29 30 185 ; 29–34 191 ; 34 70, 194 ; 35 197 ; 35–39 22, 23, 275 ; 36 383 ; 38 198, 199 ; 40–44 73 ; 40–45 362 ; 45 73, 181, 199, 233 ; 45–**2** 1 73.
2 1 181, 185, 237 ; 2 353 ; 5 380, 385 ; 7 167, 303 ; 10 167 ; 14 54, 205, 308, 388 ; 15–17 60 ; 17 105, 118, 157, 181, 206 ; 18 108, 117, 214 ; 19 156, 252 ; 20 53, 215, 331, 335 ; 21 36 ; 21 22 103, 216 ; 22 181 ; 23 78, 181, 224 ; 23 24 224 ; 23–28 24, 230, 295 ; 23–**3** 6 60, 181, 230, 293, 332 ; 25 92, 96, 190 ; 25 26 92, 226 ; 27 368 ; 27 28 167, 228, 230, 231.
3 1–6 48, 181, 228, 230, 231, 232 ; 4 367 ; 6 74, 230, 267, 305, 362, 363, 429 ; 6 7 73, 181, 332 ; 7 233 ; 7 8 31, 74, 181, 234, 238 ; 7–12 238 ; 7–13 181 ; 7–19 74 ; 8 311 ; 9 186 ; 12 70 ; 13 238 ; 13–16 234 ; 13–19 238 ; 15 194 ; 16 299, 326 ; 16–19 181, 239 ; 17 29, 238, 346, 361 ; 18 307 ; 19 112 ; 20 185, 248, 272, 287, 353 ; 20 21 249 ; 21 81, 89, 131, 134, 141, 181, 277 ; 22 19, 252, 297, 320, 332 ; 22–30 181, 252, 357 ; 24 106 ; 28 167 ; 28–30 303 ; 30 297 ; 31–35 131, 134, 181, 249 ; 32 81, 89 ; 35 131.
4 1 186 ; 1–9 102, 254 ; 1–35 253 ; 1–**7** 23 251 ; 3–9 510 ; 9 255 ; 10–13 50 ; 10–25 254 ; 12 93 ; 13–26 259 ; 14–20 37 ; 16 251 ; 21 22 251, 267 ; 24–29 254 ; 26 256 ; 26–29 22, 36, 102 ; 30 256 ; 30–32 102, 251, 254, 255 ; 34 251 ; 35 183 ; 35–41 270.
5 1–20 134, 251, 272 ; 2 3 5 14 15 20 270 ; 21 183 ; 21–43 273 ; 22 199 ; 22–40 24 ; 30–32 272 ; 41 29 ; 41–43 251.
6 1 198 ; 2 91 ; 3 18, 81, 89, 90, 100, 181 ; 4 251 ; 5 277 ; 7 197, 237, 278, 364 ; 7–11 71 ; 7–13 251 ; 8 279 ; 8–10 10 ; 8–11 25 ; 10 11 280 ; 13 194 ; 14 319, 363 ; 14–16 124, 281, 299, 319, 320 ; 14–29 72, 123 ; 16 319, 363, 365 ; 17 112, 249 ; 17 18 363 ; 17–29 108, 125 ; 20 123 ; 21 183 ; 22 111 ; 22–27 111 ; 28 111 ; 29 117 ; 30 251, 281 ; 30 31 22, 23, 183 ; 31 287 ; 31 32 281 ; 35–44 288 ; 45–52 289 ; 45–8 22 22 ; 48 183 ; 53 183, 198 ; 53–56 290 ; 56 261.
7 1–23 23, 30, 70, 332, 362, 432 ; 1–24 23 ; 1 181, 234 ; 3 4 29 ; 5 106 ; 6 7 94, 513 ; 6–13 423 ; 6–16 252 ; 10 96 ; 10–13 360, 367, 438 ; 11 29 ; 14 294 ; 14 15 96 ; 15 432 ; 23 181 ; 24 30, 300, 332, 353, 363, 402 ; 24–30 134, 311 ; 24–**9** 29 299 ; 27 312 ; 27 28 102 ; 30 311 ; 31 75, 104, 183, 300, 313 ; 31–**8** 26 353 ; 32–37 22, 24, 299 ; 34 29 ; 37 314.
8 1–10 288 ; 1 363 ; 10 182, 198, 300, 314 ; 10–13 183 ; 10–21 332 ; 11 315 ; 12 71 ; 12 13 317 ; 14–22 318 ; 15 299, 363 ; 22 75, 183, 300, 347 ; 22–26 22, 24, 77, 299, 318 ; 27 170, 183, 300, 318, 344 ; 27–30 319 ; 27–33 237 ; 27–36 290 ; 28 320 ; 29 30, 237, 323, 447 ; 29 30 70, 89, 136, 142 ; 30 299 ; 31 170, 292, 331, 333, 336, 337, 347, 456, 493, 494 ; 31–34 376 ; 31–**9** 1 465 ; 32 33 338;

33 489 ; 34 105, 339, 363, 484 ; 34 35 384 ; 34–9 1 339, 347, 494 ; 35 240 ; 38 168, 336, 337, 434, 460, 494.
9 1 159, 162, 248, 376, 494 ; 2 344, 467 ; 2–8 447 ; 2–13 342 ; 9 10 493 ; 10 342 ; 11 319; 11 12 490 ; 12 170 ; 12 13 98, 113, 280 ; 13 108, 125, 299, 425 ; 14 299, 345, 363 ; 14–29 134, 345 ; 30–10 32 346 ; 30 75, 300, 346, 348 ; 30 31 349, 363 ; 31 112, 170, 337, 456, 493 ; 31 32 349 ; 32–37 314 ; 33 185, 300, 353 ; 33–37 356 ; 33–50 71, 346, 353 ; 34 353 ; 38 134 ; 38–40 357; 42 212, 356 ; 42–50 181 ; 43–50 212, 356 ; 50 103, 301, 305.
10 1 75, 300, 346, 362, 363 ; 1–12 96, 346 ; 2–12 366 ; 5 293, 362, 368 ; 11 12 10 ; 13–16 370 ; 13–34 346 ; 17–27 48 ; 18 48, 49, 130, 208, 356, 514 ; 19 96, 293, 514 ; 21 142, 379 ; 23 408, 433 ; 23–27 242 ; 25 102 ; 27 379 ; 28 142, 346 ; 29 358 ; 29 30 380 ; 29–31 141 ; 30 55 ; 31 346, 382 ; 32 300 ; 32–34 382 ; 33 112, 170 ; 33 34 493 ; 34 337, 456 ; 35–45 347, 361, 383; 37 353, 447 ; 37–40 494 ; 38 335; 39 10, 376, 382, 449, 494, 506 ; 40 142 ; 41 402 ; 42 106; 43 44 221 ; 43–45 106 ; 44 45 168 ; 45 157, 360, 465 ; 46 71 ; 46–52 77 ; 347, 389 ; 48 49 82.
11 1–6 77, 404 ; 1–10 97, 392 ; 1–15 47 392 ; 2 404 ; 2–19 108 ; 9 10 94, 150, 406 ; 10 70, 82 ; 11 392, 398, 402, 419, 458 ; 11 12 399 ; 12–14 392 ; 13 412 ; 14 419 ; 15 306 ; 15–18 41 ; 15–19 392 ; 16 407 ; 17 93, 513 ; 18 418, 474 ; 19 393, 398, 419, 458 ; 20–25 392 ; 22 440 ; 23 10, 26, 192, 211 ; 25 22 ; 27 292, 306, 474 ; 27 28 421 ; 27–33 108 ; 27–12 12 42, 392 ; 27–12 34 393 ; 27–13 37 41, 60 ; 30 425 ; 32 119.
12 1–9 93, 104, 513 ; 1–12 93 ; 2–8 427 ; 3–9 393 ; 6 428 ; 10 91, 101 ; 10 11 95, 150, 427 ; 12 249, 474 ; 13 230, 429 ; 13–34 392 ; 14 430 ; 15 431 ; 15–17 413 ; 16 190 ; 17 60 ; 18–27 56 ; 18–34 60 ; 24 190 ; 25 435 ; 26 91 ; 26 27 95; 28 60, 438 ; 28–34 48, 71 ; 29 30 150 ; 29–31 10, 96, 293 ; 31 439 ; 32 33 96 ; 34 60, 393, 438, 442, 443, 512 ; 35 60, 82, 393, 398 ; 35–37 83, 95, 393 ; 35–13 3 393 ; 36 151 ; 37 406, 450, 474 ; 38–40 393, 451 ; 39 188 ; 40 261, 266 ; 41 60 ; 41–44 22, 23, 393, 454.
13 124, 166, 393 ; 1 60 ; 1 2 101 ; 3 467 ; 3 4 455 ; 3–5 457 ; 6–37 159, 456 ; 8 40 ; 9 112 ; 10 456 ; 11 12 112 ; 14–18 457 ; 26 170 ; 28–31 155, 165 ; 28 29 316 ; 30 159, 248 ; 30 31 315 ; 32–37 155, 159 ; 35 102.
14 393 ; 1 41, 249, 398 ; 1 2 393, 445 ; 2 397 ; 3 402 ; 3–9 72, 408 ; 3–11 409 ; 10 11 112, 393, 446 ; 12 396, 398, 446 ; 12–16 77, 399 ; 12–25 394 ; 17 396, 402, 458 ; 18 112 ; 19 399 ; 21 112, 170 ; 22 23 461 ; 22–25 42 ; 24 98, 461, 465 ; 24 25 494 ; 25 51, 55, 141 ; 26 419, 465 ; 26–30 60 ; 26–52 394 ; 27 19, 463 ; 27 28 494 ; 27–30 385 ; 28 54, 75, 465, 496, 503; 29–31 459; 30 77, 102 ; 32 399 ; 36 29, 384 ; 41 170 ; 41 42 112, 469; 43 292; 43–45 393 ; 44 112, 249 ; 44 45 470 ; 46 249 ; 49 249 ; 50 456 ; 51 249 ; 51 52 22, 471 ; 53 292, 471 ; 53–72 394 ; 54 237 ; 55 471 ; 56 475 ; 58 42, 45, 70, 93, 100, 162, 337, 392, 474 ; 58 59 414, 415, 428; 59 42; 61 62 164 ; 62 19, 97, 151, 160, 162, 168, 337, 476 ; 65 19 ; 66–72 77, 237.
15 393 ; 1 292, 398 ; 1–5 44 ; 1–10 112 ; 1–20a 394 ; 15 112 ; 16–19 19 ; 20 21 12 ; 20b–41 394 ; 21 307, 397, 486, 496 ; 23 486 ; 24 25 486 ; 25 486 ; 29 100, 337, 392, 414, 415, 428, 456 ; 29 30 42, 93 ; 30 45, 70 ; 32 487 ; 33 488 ; 34 29, 94, 486 ; 34–37 132 ; 35 29 ; 36 52, 485 ; 38 51, 488 ; 39 486, 488 ; 40 56, 182; 40 41 250, 307, 402 ; 42 395 ; 42–47 394 ; 43 490, 491 ; 46 404 ; 47 182.
16 1 182, 307, 495 ; 1–8 495 ; 2 495 ; 5 495, 496 ; 7 54, 75, 495, 496, 503 ; 8 496, 500 ; 16 522 ; 18 282.

Luke.

1 1 2 17; 5 86, 87, 88; 5–25 85, 108; 8 113; 17 108, 113; 26 85, 90; 26–38 85; 31 85, 113; 36 113; 39–56 85, 113; 46–55 113; 56 85; 57–80 108, 113; 65 113; 68–79 113; 76 113; 80 111.
2 1–7 86; 4 85, 90; 4–7 85; 7 18; 8–39 88; 22 85; 39 85, 90; 41 359, 401; 41–51 99; 43 84; 48 84.
3 1 78, 110; 1 2 88, 108, 109; 1–20 108; 2 111; 3 112; 3–6 108; 7 115, 122; 7–9 26, 117; 7–17 62, 108; 8 112, 152; 9 115; 10–14 118, 174; 13 204; 15–18 120; 16 26; 16 17 26, 115; 17 466; 21 22 127, 136; 23 78, 88; 23–38 82.
4 1 47, 145; 1 2 152; 1–13 26, 94, 139, 140; 2 3 143, 144; 5 146; 5–8 140, 144; 8 148; 9 144, 149; 9–12 76, 140, 191, 289; 9–13 220, 315; 12 150; 14 15 155; 16 65, 90; 16–21 277; 16–30 276; 18 74, 285; 21 74; 22 82, 84; 23 276, 277; 24 61; 25–27 23, 92, 277, 299, 313; 29 90; 31 65, 276; 31–41 187; 31–42 181.
5 1 181; 1–11 181, 186; 5 8 10 186; 12–6 11 181; 33 108; 39 216, 217.
6 1 65, 226; 12–16 181; 12–17 238; 12–19 74, 181, 238; 13–16 181; 14–16 235; 17 233; 17–19 181; 20 285, 346; 20–23 243; 20–26 239; 20–49 25, 27, 181, 239; 20–8 3 25; 22 74, 181; 24 346, 371; 24–26 241, 341; 27 242; 27–31 242; 27–36 247; 31 245; 32–36 244; 35 247; 36–38 245, 265; 37 445, 489; 37 38 245, 510; 39 74, 219; 39 40 245; 41 42 101; 41–46 246, 247; 41 42 445, 510; 42 61; 43 103; 47–49 156, 192, 211, 247, 319; 48 326; 48 49 101.
7 1–10 73, 181; 2–10 26, 199; 2 199; 3 333; 4 5 28; 5 73, 188; 6 255; 8 199; 10 199; 11 198, 278; 11–17 251, 274; 13 52; 18 117; 18 19 109; 18–23 125; 18–35 25, 62, 108, 181, 218; 19 52, 187; 20 113, 115; 22 240, 251, 252, 275, 277, 285; 24 111, 112, 192, 211; 24–26 128; 24–27 115, 116, 134; 25 104; 27 98, 108, 113; 28 158; 29 114; 29 30 108; 30 119; 31 32 103; 33 117, 119, 194, 214, 297, 425; 33 34 156, 167; 34 61, 72, 204, 239, 389, 443, 473; 34 35 181; 35 223; 36–49 50; 36–50 72, 393, 409; 36 f. 489; 39 409; 41 f. 105.
8 2 182, 251, 272; 2 3 250, 307; 3 308, 403; 4–18 251; 19–21 181; 22–9 17 251; 27 297; 44 261.
9 1–6 25, 27, 251; 3 279; 9 108; 10–22 43; 18 300; 18–42 299; 20 21 136; 21 75; 22 337; 27 159; 28 344; 43–56 346, 361; 46–48 356; 51–18 14 25; 52 361; 57–60 25; 57–62 299, 303; 58 23, 102, 167, 169, 364; 62 18, 103.
10 1 52; 2 104, 278; 2–12 251; 2–16 25, 27, 62; 3 58, 278; 5–7 10; 5–12 280; 7 11; 12–15 25, 62, 182, 302; 13 198; 13–15 299, 301; 15 94; 16 251, 280; 17 194; 17 18 281; 17–24 251; 19 20 282; 20 311; 21 284; 21 22 283; 21–24 25, 62; 22 284, 321; 25 438; 25–37 71, 392, 402; 26 91; 29–37 440; 30–37 35, 362; 30 390; 31 32 229; 33–35 105; 38 402, 403; 38–42 71, 393, 403, 404, 409.
11 1 108, 118, 260; 1–4 25, 27, 251; 2 325; 2–4 262; 4 356; 5–8 103, 180; 5–13 155; 9–13 25, 27, 180; 13 356; 15–23 252; 20 251, 252, 297; 23 357; 24–26 196, 388; 24–28 25; 27 249; 27 28 181; 29–32 25, 76, 92, 170, 220, 299, 302, 316; 29–52 25; 34–36 25, 27, 346, 359; 35 36 359; 37–41 23; 39 52; 39–52 26, 27, 63, 393; 51 159; 52 299.
12 1 299; 2–7 251; 2–9 26, 63; 3 267; 3–7 58; 4 5 58, 267; 6 102, 304; 6 7 268; 7 146; 11 12 251, 268; 13–21 346; 16–21 103, 359; 22–31 26, 27, 63; 22–32 299; 23 145, 308; 24 304; 24–27 102; 27 92; 28 309; 31 59; 32 327, 352, 460; 33 34 26, 27, 142, 162, 346, 358, 376; 35–38 104, 155, 177; 39 10; 39 40 26, 155, 159, 178; 40 170; 42 52; 42–46 26, 155, 178; 49–53 334; 50 335, 384; 51–53 26, 98; 54 55

103 ; 54–56 26, 155, 164, 299, 316 ; 58 59 26, 27, 105, 155, 179.
13 1 418, 481 ; 1–5 299 ; 1–9 392, 418, 445 ; 6–9 103, 155, 179 ; 10–17 181, 195, 231 ; 15 26, 52, 102, 232 ; 16 51 ; 18 19 251 ; 18–21 26 ; 20 21 251, 254 ; 20 256 ; 22–30 347, 349 ; 23 24 286 ; 24–30 26, 27, 460 ; 24 329 ; 24 25 351 ; 25–27 58, 131, 350 ; 26 353 ; 26–29 351 ; 28 117 ; 28 29 28 ; 30 353 ; 31 362 ; 31–33 347, 363 ; 32 194, 197 ; 32 33 364 ; 34 102 ; 34 35 26, 63, 427.
14 1 231 ; 1–6 181, 231 ; 5 26, 102, 232 ; 7–11 210, 387 ; 8–11 59 ; 11 26 ; 12–14 210, 373, 388 ; 12–24 105, 181 ; 15–24 26 ; 16–24 210 ; 19 102 ; 25–33 299 ; 26 27 26, 305 ; 28 99 ; 28–30 101 ; 28–33 306 ; 31 32 106 ; 34 35 103.
15 27, 181 ; 1–10 208 ; 4–7 26, 102, 105, 211 ; 8–10 103 ; 11–32 209 ; 13 15 16 270 ; 18 164 ; 21 164 ; 32 219, 275.
16 1–9 104, 155, 178, 181, 214 ; 10 106 ; 13 26, 27, 346, 359 ; 16 26, 62, 108, 109, 121 ; 17 26, 27, 97 ; 19 104 ; 19–21 207 ; 19–31 192, 201, 346, 352 ; 20 21 105 ; 21 22 229 ; 21 102 ; 22 51 ; 23 117, 435 ; 24 51 ; 25 229 ; 27–31 275.
17 1 2 26, 181, 212 ; 1–4 346 ; 2 105 ; 3 4 26 ; 5 6 26, 52 ; 6 392 ; 7–10 104, 346, 356 ; 11–19 362 ; 20 21 251, 253, 299 ; 22 23 466 ; 22–25 337 ; 22–30 170 ; 22–37 26, 27, 335 ; 24 170, 401 ; 26–30 91 ; 27 370 ; 32 91.
18 2–5 105 ; 2–8 155, 180 ; 6 52 ; 8 170 ; 10–14 181, 208 ; 11–13 261 ; 12 214 ; 14 26 ; 15–34 346 ; 18 48 ; 29 30 380 ; 33 337 ; 35–43 347.
19 1–10 71, 72, 347 ; 2 388 ; 5 390 ; 7 388 ; 8 52, 204, 213, 389 ; 9 51, 388 ; 9 10 388 ; 10 157, 168, 389 ; 11 –27 49, 62, 63, 347, 390 ; 12–26 26 ; 12–27 62, 106 ; 28–38 392 ; 36 404 ; 38 407 ; 39 40 392 ; 41–44 392 ; 45 46 392.
20 1–8 108 ; 1–19 392 ; 20 –40 392 ; 34–36 435 ; 41–44 393 ; 45–47 27, 393.
21 1–4 5–36 393 ; 8–36 27 ; 20 392 ; 27 170 ; 29–33 155 ; 31–32 19 ; 32 159 ; 36 170 ; 37 419.
22 23 393 ; 1 2 393 ; 3–6 393 ; 7 396 ; 7–39 394 ; 14 396 ; 15 16 464 ; 18 464 ; 20 461 ; 24–38 394 ; 25 386 ; 25–27 347 ; 28 303, 321 ; 28–30 460 ; 29 30 26, 141, 352 ; 30 55, 181, 235, 283, 346, 381, 384, 385, 402, 425 ; 31 32 237, 328, 337, 385, 467, 504 ; 35–38 466 ; 39–53 394 ; 43 140 ; 47–48 54–71 393, 394 ; 61 52 ; 63–65 394 ; 66 292, 394 ; 69 160, 394, 476.
23 1–25 394 ; 2 482 ; 4 394, 482 ; 6–12 482 ; 8 124 ; 14 394 ; 15 482 ; 22 394, 482 ; 26–49 394 ; 28–31 392 ; 28–32 394 ; 34 394 ; 39–43 52, 487 ; 41 52 ; 46 394 ; 50–56 394 ; 53 404 ; 54 395.
24 4 495 ; 6 76, 495, 496 ; 7 337 ; 10 495 ; 13–51 76, 496 ; 15–51 501 ; 18–21 494 ; 21 337 ; 30–35 460 ; 37–39 51 ; 46 337 ; 49 76, 466, 496 ; 52 53 497 ; 53 76 ; 56 389.

John.

1 6–8 45, 108 ; 8 109 ; 14 529 ; 15 108, 109 ; 19–28 109, 291 ; 19–37 45 ; 19–40 108 ; 19–51 40 ; 19–2 12 41 ; 23 26 27 108, 128 ; 28 112 ; 29–34 128 ; 29–37 109 ; 31 108, 116, 133 ; 33 108 ; 33 34 127, 136 ; 35–39 108 ; 35–42 118, 156 ; 35–51 185 ; 35–40 185 ; 40 118 ; 40 41 398 ; 41 33, 237 ; 42 299, 326 ; 43 185 ; 44 184 ; 44–49 237 ; 45 82, 84, 185, 237 ; 46 90 ; 48–50 33.
2 1–12 41 ; 1 181, 198 ; 2 278 ; 11 33, 198 ; 12 81, 181, 250 ; 13–22 41, 392 ; 13 41 ; 15 414 ; 19 41, 45, 70, 93, 100, 337, 392, 398, 414, 415, 416, 428, 474.
3 1 2 33 ; 3 33, 161 ; 5 161 ; 10 33 ; 12 13 33 ; 14 15 39 ; 19–21 34, 60 ; 20 21 211 ; 22 42 ; 22–36 108, 109 ; 22 23 112 ; 26 42 ; 27–36 45, 108 ; 28 108.
4 1–54 41 ; 1 42, 108 ; 2 42 ; 17 18 34 ; 25 286 ; 26 33, 198 ; 43–54 40, 41 ; 44 251 ; 46 198, 278 ; 46–54 73, 181, 199.
5 1 5–18 40, 41 ; 9–17 40, 181 ; 14 17 34 ; 18–47 33 ; 33–36 108, 109.
6 1–7 10 41 ; 1–21 40 ; 1–13 43, 251 ; 1 182 ; 4 41 ; 5 7 8 237 ; 15

75 ; 15–21 251 ; 25–59 33 ; 26–59 43 ; 42 46, 81, 84, 398 ; 52 53 43; 52–63 464 ; 60–71 33 ; 66–71 303 ; 68 69 326 ; 70 71 44, 283.
7 1–10 46, 132, 398; 2 41; 3–10 81 ; 5 181 ; 6–8 132 ; 12–14 34 ; 15 98; 17 232 ; 19 34 ; 20 297 ; 22 232 ; 22 23 40 ; 22–24 181 ; 35 300 ; 37 405 ; 41 286 ; 41 42 84 ; 42 46, 86, 398, 449 ; 50 33 ; 53 443 ; 53–8 11 50, 59, 72, 393, 394, 398.
8 1 399, 419 ; 2 60 ; 11 34 ; 15 60 ; 24 35 ; 31–36 35 ; 35 36 ; 46 47, 223 ; 48–52 297 ; 57 78, 88 ; 59 349.
9 1–7 40 ; 14–34 282 ; 16 40, 181 ; 22 306 ; 31 60, 211.
10 1–5 398 ; 1–6 37, 45 ; 1–16 37 ; 6 258 ; 7–9 38 ; 7–16 37, 38 ; 9 38 ; 11–15 38 ; 14 15 39 ; 16 39, 211 ; 16 17 39 ; 31 40 349 ; 40–42 108, 109 ; 40–11 16 41 ; 41 45.
11 1 46, 71, 393, 398, 402, 409 ; 1–46 251, 274 ; 2 393 ; 8 349 ; 16 46, 237, 349 ; 17–44 40 ; 25 26 275 ; 42 266 ; 47–19 42 41 ; 49 471 ; 52 39 ; 55 41.
12 1 45, 393 ; 1–8 393, 409 ; 4–6 393 ; 6 70, 446, 447 ; 13 404, 407 ; 16 406 ; 20–22 185 ; 21 184 ; 21 22 237 ; 22 237 ; 27 28 44 ; 30 44 ; 32 39 ; 42 306.
13 1 349, 397 ; 2–27 446 ; 2 393, 458 ; 4–10 42 ; 8 522 ; 14 35 ; 26–30 393 ; 27–30 458, 459 ; 29 397, 447 ; 30 446 ; 34 35 35.
14 2 53, 161 ; 4 161 ; 5 8 9 22 237 ; 18 20 23 28 40.
15 1–6 39 ; 12 17 35.
16 2 306 ; 8–11 40 ; 21 40 ; 25 258 ; 28 54 ; 29 258.
17 266 ; 1 349 ; 9 35, 60; 15 266.
18 1–11 394 ; 2–5 393 ; 11 12 13 44 ; 12–27 394 ; 13 111, 471 ; 13–24 111 ; 15 16 478 ; 19–23 44 ; 28 394, 480 ; 28–19 16 394 ; 31 478 ; 33–37 44, 161.
19 4 5 482 ; 8–11 44 ; 9 44 ; 13 398 ; 14 393, 486 ; 17 481 ; 17–37 394 ; 20 394, 485 ; 24–27 250 ; 25–27 181 ; 26 27 394 ; 28 394 ; 28–30 132 ; 30 394 ; 31 395, 398, 490 ; 31–35 398 ; 31–37 394 ; 36 398 ; 38–42 394 ; 39 40 497 ; 40 497.
20 1 344 ; 1–10 499 ; 14–29 496 ; 17 501 ; 19 344 ; 20 501 ; 24–29 237; 25 485; 26 344 ; 27 501.
21 497 ; 1 182 ; 2 198, 237 ; 13–15 501 ; 20–23 384, 506 ; 20–24 361.

Acts.

1 1 12 ; 3 501 ; 4 466, 496 ; 4 5 497 ; 5 108 ; 12 106 ; 13 181, 235 ; 14 181, 250 ; 16–20 393, 504 ; 20–26 504 ; 21–23 339 ; 22 12, 28, 108.
2 29–31 500 ; 42 460 ; 44 45 49, 506 ; 46 460.
3 1 260, 261.
4 6 111 ; 13 99 ; 32–35 49 ; 32–5 11 506.
5 37 431.
6 1 490 ; 1–6 506 ; 4 5 391 ; 9 490.
7 26 264 ; 52 425 ; 57–60 478 ; 58 444.
9 3 134, 502 ; 3–6 137 ; 3–8 502 ; 4–6 502 ; 6 502 ; 19–26 86 ; 36–43 251.
10 30 260 ; 37 28, 108 ; 37–43 12 ; 38 127 ; 40 501.
11 16 108.
12 2 361, 384.
13 15 199 ; 22–31 12 ; 24 25 108 ; 33 127.
15 13–21 504.
16 11 264.
18 25 108, 109, 125.
19 1–7 126 ; 3 4 108, 109.
20 4 502 ; 7 460 ; 7–12 274 ; 8–12 251 ; 10 273 ; 11 460 ; 15 264; 35 12, 387.
21 17–25 132; 18 264, 504; 18–25 14 ; 21–26 448 ; 26 306 ; 31–37 417 ; 40 502.
22 1–21 502 ; 2 29, 502 ; 3 106 ; 5 292 ; 6 134, 502 ; 6–10 137 ; 6–11 502 ; 7–10 502 ; 10 502 ; 28 188 ; 30 472 ; 30–23 10 472.
23 6–9 434 ; 10 15 472.
24 5 16 ; 14 16 ; 17 132.
26 5 106, 451; 12–18 137, 502 ; 13 134, 502 ; 14–18 502 ; 19 503.
27 35 460.
28 2 105 ; 22 16 ; 30 31 505.

Romans.

1 3 8, 83 ; 4 503 ; 8 457 ; 15 16 340.
4 13 117.
5 10 488 ; 19 8.
8 18 332 ; 19–22 309.
10 2 3 453.
12 9 266.
13 9 10, 11 ; 10 511.
14 19 101.
15 2 101 ; 19 24 28 505.

1 Corinthians.

1 12 9, 237 ; 17 522 ; 22 317.
2 2 8, 17 ; 8 11.
3 22 9, 237.
5 6 7 299 ; 7 396, 397.

6 2 3 158.
7 10 11 10, 11 ; 15 11 ; 25–35 369.
8 1 101 ; 10 101.
9 1 7, 9, 17 ; 4 11 ; 5 9, 181, 237, 250, 504 ; 5 6 235 ; 6–18 279 ; 9 11 ; 14 10, 11 ; 15 11.
10 23 101.
11 22 327 ; 23 446, 458, 460, 472 ; 23–25 10, 11, 42, 394 ; 25 337, 465 ; 26 464 ; 30 506.
12 3 131 ; 9 194 ; 28 194, 235, 327 ; 30 194.
13 2 10, 11, 421.
14 3 4 5 12 17 26 101.
15 3–8 10, 495, 500 ; 4 337 ; 5 54, 181, 235, 237, 402 ; 5–8 499, 500 ; 6 10, 497 ; 7 235, 250 ; 9 327 ; 23–28 381 ; 24 25 335 ; 25 381 ; 50 499 ; 51 52 506.
16 22 506.

2 Corinthians.

1 15–20 366.
3 6 462.
4 6 134, 501.
5 1 162 ; 1–4 499 ; 16 7, 17 ; 21 8.
8 9 8, 325.
10 8 101.
11 4 5 237 ; 7–11 279 ; 14 175, 297 ; 22 17 ; 22 23 237.
12 2 167 ; 7 175, 195 ; 19 101.
13 10 101.

Galatians.

1 1 501, 502 ; 12 501, 502 ; 13 327 ; 13–24 7 ; 14 453 ; 15 16 501, 502 ; 16 501 ; 16 17 502 ; 17 85 ; 18 9, 460 ; 19 9, 181, 250, 504.
2 6 235 ; 6–9 237 ; 7 8 9 ; 9 9 ; 7–9 319 ; 9 238, 457, 504 ; 10 506 ; 11–14 132, 237 ; 11 237, 504 ; 12 9, 14 ; 13 238 ; 14 9 ; 15–18 14.
3 10 227, 298 ; 13 487.
4 4 8 ; 24 462 ; 26 162 ; 30 36.
5 4 448 ; 9 299 ; 14 10, 11, 511.

Philippians.

2 5–11 8, 325 ; 10 109.
3 5 6 453 ; 6 327.
4 5 506, 507.

Colossians.

1 6 457 ; 15 325.

1 Thessalonians.

2 9 279 ; 15 11.
4 9–18 506 ; 13 304 ; 15 9, 11, 434, 506 ; 16 17 10 ; 17 106.
5 1–11 457 ; 2 10, 11, 159 ; 3 40 ; 11 101 ; 14 506.

1 Timothy.

5 18 11.
6 13 11.

1 Peter.

2 21–25 11.
3 19 20 53.

2 Peter.

1 16–18 11 ; 17 299 343.
3 4 12, 506.

1 John.

2 13 14 266.
5 18 266.

Hebrews.

2 16 18 12.
3 2 12.
4 15 12.
5 7 8 12.
6 19 327.
7 14 12, 83 ; 22 462.
8 6 8–12 462.
9 15 462.
12 2 3 12 ; 22 162 ; 24 462.
13 12 12 ; 20 462.

James.

5 12 366 ; 16–18 451.

Rev. of John.

1 18 299, 328.
3 7 299 ; 14 325.
5 5 12, 83.
9 1 328 ; 20 299.
12 2 40 ; 7–9 282 ; 9 175.
13 13 361 ; 17 432.
19 11–21 335.
20 21 381.
20 1 328 ; 10 175 ; 12 283 ; 15 283.
21 1 162 ; 2 416 ; 10 162, 175, 416 ; 14 504 ; 22 416.
22 12 162 ; 16 12, 83.

V. Non-Canonical Gospels.

Gospel of the Hebrews.

Pp. 46, 52, 81, 84, 94, 113, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 134, 135, 140, 145, 150, 152, 163, 181, 226, 227, 264, 346, 347, 373, 378, 391, 406, 498.

Gospel of Peter.

52–54 1–9 394 ; 1 2 482 ; 3–6 394 ; 5 395, 396, 397, 398 ; 7 19 ; 9 10–20 394 ; 13 14 487 ; 19 488, 489 ; 21–24 394 ; 28–49 498 ; 35 395.

VI. Church Fathers.

Justin.

I. Apol. 32 18.
61 18, 33, 355.
65 66 462.
66 67 17.
66 17.
II. Apol. 10 515.
Trypho 47 58.
69 19.
77 78 19.
78 18.
88 18, 100, 127.
102 19.
103 127, 140.
106 19.

2 Clement.

5 2–4 57.
12 2–6 57.

Irenæus.

II. 22 5 88.
III. 11 8 20.
V. 33 3 4 55, 141, 382.

Clement Alexand.

Strom. I. 24 59.
28 58.
158 59.
177 58.
Quis dives salv. 40 58.

Tertullian.

Adv. Jud. 8 110.
Apol. 7 13.
Præscript. Hæret. 36 384.
Pudic. 7–9 211.

Origen.

Cels. I. 47 15.
51 18.
in Mt. 10 17 15, 54.

Eusebius.

Hist. Eccl. I. 11 15.
III. 39 30.
III. 39 30.
III. 39 50.
III. 39 55.
III. 39 59.
III. 39 382.
VI. 12 52.

Dem. Ev.
III. 5 15.
105 106 15.

Theoph. pp. 233 f., 48.

Augustine.

De Consens. Evang.
1 2 4 23.
3 4 13 21.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

WORKS BY THE LATE

W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE IN EARLY ARABIA . . .

POST 8vo
Price 10/6

New and Enlarged Edition, with Additional Notes by the Author and Prof. Goldziher. Edited by Stanley A. Cook.

Not the least of Professor Robertson Smith's services to biblical knowledge was his epoch-making study of early society in Arabia, with its bearing upon the primitive organisation of the Israelites, and at the time of his death he had made preparations for a new edition of "Kinship and Marriage." Fresh material had been collected and sifted, and he had marked out for himself fresh lines of investigation. This material has now been incorporated, together with a number of notes by Professor Goldziher, Professor Bevan, and the Editor, Mr Stanley A. Cook, who also contributes a short introduction.

LECTURES ON

THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES . . . . . .

THE FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTIONS

DEMY 8vo
Price 15/-
net.

New Edition, Revised throughout by the Author.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE JEWISH CHURCH .

A COURSE OF LECTURES ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM

DEMY 8vo
Price 10/6

Second Edition, Revised and much Enlarged.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL

AND THEIR PLACE IN HISTORY TO THE CLOSE OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C.

POST 8vo
Price 10/6

With Introduction and Additional Notes by the Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.Litt., D.D. New Edition.

PUBLISHED BY

ADAM & CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON

ENCYCLOPÆDIA BIBLICA

EDITED BY THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT., D.D.

AND

J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D.

Assisted by many Contributors in Great Britain, Europe, and America

The Various Styles in which the Work is issued.

IN FOUR VOLS.

VOL. I.	VOL. II.	VOL. III.	VOL. IV.
A-D	E-K	L-P	Q-Z

EACH VOLUME MEASURES 11 × 8 INCHES, AND ABOUT 2 INCHES THICK.

Net Prices per Volume.

CLOTH.	HALF LEATHER.	FULL LEATHER.	PAPER BOARDS.
20s.	25s.	30s.	20s.

IN TWO VOLS.

THIS EDITION IS PRINTED ON THIN BIBLE PAPER WHICH PERMITS OF THE COMPLETE WORK BEING BOUND UP IN TWO HANDY VOLUMES, EACH MEASURING 11 × 8 AND ABOUT 1¾ INCHES THICK.

	CLOTH.	HALF LEATHER.
Net Prices per Volume	40s.	50s.

IN ONE VOL.

THIS EDITION IS PRINTED ON THIN BIBLE PAPER IDENTICAL WITH THE TWO-VOLUME EDITION, AND THE COMPLETE WORK MAKES ONE VOLUME, MEASURING 11 × 8 INCHES, AND ABOUT 3¼ INCHES THICK.

	CLOTH.	HALF LEATHER.
Net Prices . . .	80s.	100s.

IN SIXTEEN PARTS.

THIS EDITION IS THE SAME AS THE FOUR-VOLUME EDITION. EACH VOLUME IS DIVIDED INTO FOUR PARTS, EACH MEASURING 10¾ × 7¾, AND ABOUT ¾-INCH THICK.

Net Price of each Part, **5s.**

Cloth Covers for binding up the Parts in 4 Vols. may be obtained through any Bookseller. Price 1s. 6d. net each.

Volumes in all the above Styles, and the Parts, may be obtained separately.

A Detailed Prospectus will be sent on application to

A. & C. BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

fig. 51. 193. 89. 272. 37. 314
227. 405. 442 121 457. 493

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

JAN 27 1948

DEC 13 1965 99

RET'D TO ART-
ANTHRO LIBRARY
JUN 14 1969

JUN 14 '66 14 RCD

JUL 9 1975

LD 21-100m-9,'47(A5702s16)476

H63

Holtzmann, O.
The life of Jesus

DEC 19 1941 DEC 19 1941

UG 31 1943 Kundt OCT 6 1943

m-9,'14