

Class F

No.

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS

•The M Co. •

THE
STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS

BY

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT, PH.D., D.D.

IOWA PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND
INTERPRETATION IN CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

AUTHOR OF "THE REVELATION OF JESUS" AND
"THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF PAUL"

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1900

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

COPYRIGHT, 1900,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

TO
ALL EARNEST STUDENTS
OF
The Immortal Theme

“As for me, my archive is Jesus Christ. The indestructible archive is His cross, and His death, and His resurrection, and the faith through Him.”

IGNATIUS, 115 A.D.

PREFACE

OF THE FIRST EDITION

THE aim of this volume is different from that of the great lives of Christ which enrich and adorn the Christian literature of our century. For, first, it does not seek to discuss the *teaching* of Jesus in detail. This is regarded as a distinct theme, and is considered only in so far as seemed necessary to a clear account of the character and life of Jesus. The reader is asked to bear this fact in mind, and not to hold the book responsible for a full explanation of all the words of Jesus.

Second, the aim of this volume is also peculiar in that it seeks to present the subject in a form suited to *students* in particular. Persons who take the life of Jesus so seriously that they wish to get at the very facts, do not desire that these facts should be woven into a romance, or set forth together with the thousand devotional lessons that may be quite legitimately drawn from them, or presented with such elaboration and fulness of reference to many writers and many opinions that the outlines of the life itself become blurred and indistinct. The student wishes to be made

acquainted with the facts as directly and clearly as possible. That is the service which the present volume seeks to render.

This aim makes the book compact and predominantly critical. By critical we mean seeking the truth in a scientific manner. One who thus seeks endeavors to prove all things, whatever the claims which they make for themselves or which others make for them. This method is always truly conservative, for the more clearly truth is seen the more surely it is conserved. To remove error is to promote truth, and to show that beliefs have a rational basis is to increase their power.

And, further, this book is written with the conviction that a believer in Christianity may investigate the life of Jesus as scientifically as an unbeliever. One fact, among others, which justifies this conviction, and which is sometimes overlooked, is this, that, for the Christian, the risen and reigning Lord, who is actually conquering the world, is infinitely greater than the written Gospel. The power of Christianity is His spiritual presence, and not the inspiration or infallibility of the story of His earthly life. Our faith does not stand or fall with these things. The essential claims of the Gospel are daily established by the deepest experiences of millions of souls. So the Christian, whose life rests not upon any alleged quality of the Gospel, nor even on the written Gospel itself, but whose life consists rather in a personal relation to the living Lord, is, to say the least, as well able to investigate the documents

of Christianity impartially as is the unbeliever. May the time be hastened when all investigators in this field shall loose their shoes from their feet before the central Figure of the Gospels, and recognize in Him the final expression of divine wisdom and divine love. Surely the outcome of all the critical research of our waning century is a deepening sense of the inviolable historic value of the Gospels, and now, as ever in the past, the Church awaits with undimmed hope and unceasing effort the consummation of the kingdom by the revelation and power of Jesus Christ its King.

G. H. G.

MARCH 24, 1896.

PREFATORY NOTE

FOR THE THIRD EDITION

GRATEFUL for the kind reception given to this book in its earlier editions, I have endeavored to make this new issue somewhat more worthy the regard of students. To this end a sharper discrimination has been made between material that is biographical and that which is doctrinal only; large sections of the book have been entirely rewritten in the interest of clearness and of fidelity to the sources; arguments for and against conclusions on difficult points have been weighed anew, not to confirm positions once taken, but rather, if possible, to get at the facts; and finally, an attempt has been made not only to rectify the errors of the First Edition, but also to supply what it lacked, especially by fuller references to the text and to the literature of the subject, and by an index of the passages from the Gospels.

The *Introduction* of the First Edition becomes the *Appendix* in this, not because I think it less important than I did at first, but because, from the nature of the case, it is somewhat technical and abstruse, and, therefore, in the view of some readers, not a thing to be grappled with at the outset.

G. H. G.

MARCH 13, 1900.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. OVERSHADOWED BY THE MOST HIGH	I
II. THE BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS	12
III. THE EDUCATION OF JESUS	33
IV. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS	45
V. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS	57
VI. A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS	67
VII. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MINISTRY	80
VIII. THE EARLY JUDEAN MINISTRY	92
IX. TWO DAYS IN SYCHAR	104
X. THE EARLY GALILEAN MINISTRY	110
XI. AT THE FEAST OF PURIM	156
XII. THE LATER GALILEAN MINISTRY	163
XIII. LAST LABORS FOR JERUSALEM	204
XIV. THE PEREAN MINISTRY	216
XV. IN BETHANY AND EPHRAIM	225
XVI. THE LAST EIGHT DAYS	233
XVII. THE RESURRECTION AND THE RISEN CHRIST	314
—————	
APPENDIX: THE SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JESUS	335
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	407
INDEX OF PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS	409

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

OVERSHADOWED BY THE MOST HIGH

Introduction.

IN regard to the early life of the Founder of Christianity two facts strike the reader of the New Testament: first, the scantiness of material regarding the thirty years preceding His brief ministry; and second, the somewhat peculiar character of much of this material. Not a thirtieth part of the Gospel narrative is devoted to the private life of Jesus, though this extended through about thirty years, while His ministry continued only two or three. The Apocryphal Gospels, late in origin and wholly unhistorical, give their chief attention to the early private life of Jesus; but the trustworthy documents scarcely lift the veil which hides that life from our view. The Jesus whom we know is Jesus the Messiah, not Jesus the private citizen of Nazareth. On His ministry there shines a clear light, but of what lies behind this we have the most meagre, though significant, details.

These details, when compared with the Gospel narrative in general, are seen to have a character of their

own. Thus there is a remarkable prominence of angels in the brief narrative concerning the early life of Jesus. Three times an angel speaks to Joseph in a dream, and three times angels speak to those who are awake. Again, when Joseph was "warned" in a dream (Matt. ii. 22), the narrator probably thought of this warning as communicated by an angel, though this is not explicitly said. In the entire record of Jesus' public ministry angels are represented as appearing on two occasions only, and on one of these the reference is quite incidental (Mark i. 13). Then this material regarding the early life of Jesus, when compared with that regarding His ministry, has a relatively large number of difficult problems, Matthew's narrative having more in proportion to its length than Luke's. Part of this material is of such a character that it has been regarded by some Christian scholars as poetry rather than history. This fact also marks it off from the bulk of the Gospel narrative.

With these general remarks on the scantiness and the character of our information regarding the early life of Jesus, we pass at once to the mystery of His origin.

The Data.

And first the data. The story of the supernatural conception of Jesus is found only in Matthew and Luke (Matt. i. 18-25; Luke i. 26-38). The other evangelists make no allusion to it, nor is it referred to in the remaining books of the New Testament. Paul speaks of Jesus as "born of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4), but

it is impossible to hold that this expression implies a miraculous origin. It is just an ordinary way of stating the fact of human birth (Matt. xi. 11). Neither can we find the supernatural conception in Paul's words regarding the "second man," that he is "of heaven," in contrast to the "first man," who is "of the earth" (1 Cor. xv. 47). The entire passage has to do with the natural and the spiritual body, but it has no suggestion of a contrast between natural and miraculous birth. It is said that allusions to the real and ideal elements in the birth of Christ are common to the New Testament books beside the first and third Gospels.¹ "The fourth evangelist conceives the coming of Christ as the becoming incarnate of the Divine and Eternal Word, while Paul in many a form expresses and emphasizes his belief in a Christ, who 'being in the form of God, did not think equality with God a thing to be snatched at, but emptied Himself by taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.'" But these passages cannot be said to imply a supernatural conception. Before they can be thus used it is necessary to prove that John and Paul did not think of an incarnation as *possible* except by way of a virgin-birth. It is plain that they believed in the divine origin of Christ, but that is quite different from believing in His miraculous conception. It remains, therefore, that our only data regarding the supernatural conception of Jesus are those of the first and third Gospels.

¹ See Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 37 and 331.

The story in Matthew is quite different from that in Luke. Both agree that there was something supernatural in the origin of Jesus, but beyond this the narrative of each evangelist is peculiar to himself. Matthew relates how Joseph was induced by a dream to take Mary after he knew her condition. Luke says nothing of Joseph, but tells of the annunciation to Mary. In Matthew the supernatural conception is made known to Joseph in a dream a considerable time after its realization; in Luke it is announced to Mary as something yet to be, and, as far as the story goes, it is announced to her while she is awake.

In both narratives the name of the child is made known, in Matthew to Joseph, in Luke to Mary. More is said to Mary than to Joseph of the mission of the coming child. In Matthew this mission is to save His people from their sins; in Luke it is to reign forever over the house of Jacob. But all these differences are not important. The only serious question presented by the data is the question whether the two narratives, each taken as a whole, are consistent. Schleiermacher¹ held that they are not, and many scholars have followed him in this view. It is said that Mary would surely have communicated to Joseph what she had heard from the angel; and if she had done so, Joseph would have had no suspicion regarding her faithfulness, and consequently would not have needed the angelic communication which Matthew gives. We agree with Beyschlag²

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 51 f.

² *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 149.

that every motive of shrewdness, of honor, and of duty would have constrained Mary to tell her betrothed at once what the angel had announced to her, but does it surely follow that Joseph would be satisfied? Would he be likely to credit her word and to believe that a stupendous miracle had been wrought upon her? The test of his confidence in Mary was altogether extraordinary, and it seems less improbable that he needed a divine assurance of her faithfulness, such as Matthew records, than that he at once accepted Mary's story. Therefore it is not at all plain that the historical character of the data is discredited at this point.

Difficulties.

There are some facts in the Gospels that may be regarded as unfavorable to the supernatural conception. Thus it is said, first,¹ that an earlier and correct view of the matter appears in Luke (ii. 27, 33, 41, 43, 48), where the *parents* of Jesus are mentioned, where a father is referred to even as a mother, and where Mary herself is represented as saying, "Thy *father* and I sought thee sorrowing." But it is not probable that Luke regarded this language as conflicting with the supernatural conception, for he was writing to confirm the faith of Theophilus (i. 4), and it is not likely that he would begin his story with palpable contradictions. The language of Luke in the above passages is natural

¹ Keim, *The History of Jesus of Nazara*, II. 39-68, Engl. Translation, Williams and Norgate.

when we consider, first, that Joseph was at any rate the *legal* father of Jesus; and when we consider, second, that such a fact as the supernatural conception would be instinctively kept from public knowledge. To have made it known during the life of Jesus would have been to invite calumny.

In the second place, it is held that the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke (Matt. i. 1-16; Luke iii. 23-38) presuppose *paternal* parentage. It must, indeed, be admitted that both lists give the genealogy of Joseph. The view that Luke gives the genealogy of Mary lacks support. It is indeed held by some¹ that it would manifestly be without sense to give the genealogy of a man who was not the real father of Jesus, but only His supposed father, and that Luke's genealogy must therefore be the genealogy of Mary. But it may be said in reply to this argument that Matthew plainly does what is here declared to be without sense. For he gives the genealogy of Joseph (Matt. i. 16), and then says that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit (Matt. i. 18). Luke may do the same thing. Then, too, if he wished to give the genealogy of Mary, why did he not say so clearly? Certainly the reader naturally thinks that he gives the genealogy of Joseph. It is only by violence that it is taken from Joseph and given to Mary.

The fact that Luke and Matthew give the genealogy of Joseph rather than that of Mary is perhaps unfavor-

¹ *E.g.*, Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 211.

able to the supernatural conception of Jesus, but it can hardly be said to preclude that conception. Jesus was the legal son of Joseph, if not his physical son, and the evangelists therefore regarded Him as heir to Joseph's genealogy. This is plain from Matthew i. 18, where, at the close of the genealogy of Joseph, it is indicated that Jesus was *not* Joseph's child. It is also plain from the fact that Matthew and Luke give these genealogical lists side by side with their teaching of a supernatural birth. Therefore we must admit that the evangelists, at least, did not regard the genealogies as conflicting with the supernatural conception of Jesus.

Again, it is said that the unbelief of the brothers of Jesus shows that the story of His supernatural conception is not historical. This argument implies that they would have believed in Him as the Messiah if they had known of His miraculous birth. But this is not valid. Miracles did not lead to faith in Jesus as the Messiah. The men who crucified Him admitted that He did many signs, even that He raised Lazarus from the dead. So we might readily believe that the brothers of Jesus, even if they had known the circumstances of His birth, would not have been spiritually impressed by them. *If* they had known! But we can scarcely assume that Mary disclosed to her other children the facts concerning the birth of Jesus. It is more natural to think that she regarded these as holy secrets, to be pondered in her own heart rather than to be imparted to others.

Evidence of Historicity.

Over against these facts which are thought to be unfavorable to the historical character of the narrative regarding the supernatural conception there are certain other facts which rather support its historicity. There is, first of all, the suggestion that Luke's narrative came originally from Mary herself. It is said that she kept all the words which she heard from the shepherds, pondering them in her heart (Luke ii. 19), and also that she kept in her heart the words spoken by the boy Jesus in the temple (Luke ii. 51). It seems natural to suppose that she herself was authority for the statement that she treasured the story of the shepherds and the words which Jesus spoke to her in the temple. And if that be the case, it is equally natural to suppose that she was the source of information in regard to these events out of the early life of Jesus, which she is said to have kept in her heart. It is possible that Luke, in making these references to Mary's preservation of incidents out of the early life of Jesus, wishes his readers to understand that he regards her as the source of the material which he gives.¹

Again, the fact that there is in the Apostolic Church no trace of opposition to the narrative of the supernatural conception is, to some extent, confirmatory of its historical character.

James and Jude, the brothers of Jesus who lived

¹ Ramsay, in his book, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* speaks in very positive terms on this point.

through the period in which the Synoptic material took form, were qualified to pass judgment on this narrative. Their silence must be allowed some weight. So, too, the silence of John is significant. It was in his house that the mother of Jesus lived after the crucifixion, and hence he had the best of opportunities for knowing the facts. If the stories of Matthew and Luke had been regarded by him as unhistorical, it seems probable that he would have opposed their acceptance by the churches, and that we should find some trace of that opposition either in his Gospel or elsewhere.

Finally, the historical character of the narrative is favored by the fact that it cannot well be explained as a myth.¹ Since the doctrinal teaching of Christianity did not require the supernatural conception of Jesus, there was no occasion for the formation of a legend.

The narrative in Matthew and Luke is admitted to be of Jewish-Christian origin, and there is evidence that the Messiah's birth from a virgin was foreign to the thought of the Jews.² They believed that the Messiah would have a purely human origin, that His father would belong to the tribe of Judah, and His mother to the tribe of Dan. The passage in Isaiah vii. 14, even if it be regarded as a prediction of the supernatural birth of the Messiah, was not so understood among the Jews of the first century, and apart

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 219; Neander, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 10.

² Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, 1897, pp. 354-358.

from Matthew i. 22-23 there is no evidence that the Christians of the first century regarded it in this way. Since, then, neither the Jewish nor the Jewish-Christian doctrines required the supernatural conception of the Messiah, it does not seem possible to regard the narrative as mythical, unless indeed we look upon it as having a poetical motive.

Unscriptural Claims.

It has just been intimated that there is in the New Testament no *doctrinal* argument for the supernatural conception of Jesus. If it is accepted as historical, it must be on the authority of the Gospels which we have considered. We cannot argue on the basis of the New Testament that the *sinlessness* of Jesus required the supernatural conception. It teaches indeed that He was without sin, but never suggests that this fact was due to a supernatural conception. On the contrary, it represents His sinless character as the victorious development of a true man.

Moreover, this view that the sinlessness of Jesus required a supernatural conception assumes — what it manifestly has no right to assume — that if Jesus had but one human parent, His human nature would have been morally unique. This idea lacks support, not only in the New Testament, but also in reason, for Jesus as the true child of Mary must inherit her nature. It was the recognition of this fact which led one branch of the Church to declare that Mary herself “from the

first instant of her conception was preserved free from all stain of original sin.”¹

Again, we cannot argue on the basis of the New Testament that the divinity of Christ required the supernatural conception.

John and Paul, the writers who make the clearest references to the divine nature of Jesus, do not suggest that it was conditioned upon a supernatural conception. Whatever significance the supernatural conception may have had for them, it plainly was not this. They neither inferred the divinity of Jesus from His supernatural conception, nor held this to be a necessary accompaniment of His divinity. Hence if the supernatural conception of Jesus is accepted, it must be on the testimony of Matthew and Luke, as far as the New Testament is concerned. There is no doctrinal argument in the New Testament to support the historical. The Church, in teaching that the supernatural conception is necessary in order to an explanation of the character and work of Christ, has undoubtedly gone “beyond what is written.” We may hold that there is a strong argument for the historical character of the narrative in Matthew and Luke, but in estimating the significance of this narrative for Christianity we must never forget that no doctrinal use is made of it in the writings of the New Testament. In this point, therefore, the supernatural conception is not to be even distantly associated with the miracle of the resurrection.

¹ *Decretum Pii IX de immaculata conceptione beate virginis Mariae.*

CHAPTER II

THE BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS

The Place.

THE narratives in Matthew and Luke, though seeming to differ in regard to the *home* of Mary and Joseph, agree that Jesus was born in Bethlehem (Luke ii. 4; Matt. ii. 1). The difference in the narratives is this. According to Luke, Nazareth was plainly the home of Mary. She went to Bethlehem with Joseph in consequence of an enrolment, and soon after the presentation of Jesus in the temple the parents returned to Nazareth, their own city. But according to Matthew, the parents fled from Bethlehem, where Jesus had been born, to Egypt, and on their return from Egypt they would have gone into Judea, presumably to Bethlehem, but being divinely warned against this they withdrew into Galilee, and came and dwelt in Nazareth. Now if we had the narrative of Matthew only, we should think that Bethlehem was the original home of Mary, and that, when the parents went to Nazareth, they went to a strange city, where they had not lived before.¹ This impression is deepened by the circumstance that,

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 239.

according to Matthew (ii. 16), there seems to have been an interval of about two years between the birth of Jesus and the flight into Egypt, and that this interval was spent in Bethlehem. He says that Herod, in order to destroy Jesus, slew the children of Bethlehem "from two years old and under." Plainly he thought that Jesus might be as much as two years old, and the evangelist does not suggest that Herod's calculation was wrong. Therefore the narrative seems to imply that Bethlehem was the home of Joseph and Mary. In this point we are doubtless to follow the more detailed account of Luke, which makes Nazareth their home. But since Jesus was *born* in Bethlehem, and since on the basis of Micah's words (v. 2), the Jews expected the Messiah would come from Bethlehem (John vii. 42), it would have been easy for the view to arise that Bethlehem was indeed His home. No one, however, would have thought of representing Nazareth as the home of the parents of the Messiah, had there not been a reliable tradition to that effect.¹ The fact that Matthew and Luke, while differing in other points, agree that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, indicates that there was in the early Church only one tradition regarding His birthplace.

According to Luke (ii. 1-3), the fact which led to

¹ The author of the first Gospel saw a fulfilment of prophecy in the fact that Jesus was called a *Nazarene* (ii. 23). He was perhaps led to this view by the similarity in sound between the word *Nazarene* and the Hebrew word for *branch* (Isa. xi. 1). See Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, pp. 12-16; Böhl, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate im N.T.*, pp. 15-18.

the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem was an enrolment that had been ordered by Augustus. He says this was the first enrolment, made when Quirinius was governor of Syria. Over this statement of Luke there has been a long controversy, some scholars affirming, and some denying, its historical character.¹ The question is complex and the data are scanty. No fewer than five serious objections are made to Luke's statement.² It is said that history, apart from Luke, knows nothing of a universal census made in the time of Augustus; that a Roman census could not have caused Joseph to go to Bethlehem, taking Mary with him; that a Roman census could not have been made in Palestine while Herod was king; that Josephus knows nothing of a Roman census in Palestine in the time of Herod, but speaks of the census in 6 A.D. (or 7) as something new; and, finally, that a census under Quirinius could not have occurred in the time of Herod because Quirinius was not governor of Syria until after Herod's death.

These objections, however, cannot be at once accepted as decisive. They are plainly very unequal in value, and it may be doubted whether their total force is sufficient to invalidate Luke's testimony.

History, it is said, apart from Luke, knows nothing of a universal census made in the time of Augustus.

¹ For Literature see Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, I. 426, 427.

² Schürer, I. 433-455.

But it is important to notice that the language of Luke does not necessarily imply that the decree of Augustus was *realized* at one particular time. He says that Augustus sent out a decree, and says also that a census was accordingly taken in Palestine. Hence it may be held¹ that Luke's language refers simply to the *initiation* of an imperial policy, not to the taking of a single census. And further, it is admitted that the institution of the census in the provinces of Rome does date from the time of Augustus,² and that Augustus also revived the census of Roman citizens.³ Therefore it is manifest that there is some support for the statement of Luke, couched as it is in very general, even indefinite, terms.

Secondly, the objection is made that a Roman census could not have caused Joseph and Mary to go to Bethlehem. Joseph must, on the contrary, have made his report in Nazareth, his home, and it was not necessary for Mary to appear. But it is quite plain that a Roman decree for a census does not necessarily imply that the census is to be taken in the Roman manner. Luke says the first census under Quirinius was tribal in character. Such a concession to Jewish sentiment accords with the policy of the emperors, and especially when we consider that the enrolment in question was prob-

¹ Ramsay, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* pp. 123, 124. Also Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, p. 148.

² Marquardt, *Königliche Staatsverwaltung*, II. 213, 214, puts the edict 27 B.C. Luke's indefinite expression may allow this date (ii. 1).

³ Zumpt, pp. 116-129.

ably a census of persons,¹ rather than of property. Moreover, it receives confirmation from the fact that the second census under Quirinius, made in 6 A.D.,² which, according to Josephus, was a census of property,³ was accompanied with excitement and bloodshed.⁴ It follows from this that the first enrolment was of a different character from the second. Luke's statement that it was according to Jewish ideas is confirmed, as also the view that it was not a census of property. Why Mary went with Joseph is not plain. It seems hardly probable that she would take a long journey, exposing herself to hardships at such a time, unless it was legally required,⁵ or was prompted by some strong religious motive, such as regard for the prophecy concerning the Messiah (Mic. v. 2).

The third objection to Luke's statement is that a Roman census could not have been made in Palestine while Herod was king. This objection loses much of its force when we remember that the enrolment of which Luke speaks was *Jewish* in method, though Roman in origin, and that the only tax which it can have contemplated was a poll-tax, which may or may not have been sent to Rome.

The fourth objection is that Josephus knows nothing of a Roman census in Palestine in the time of Herod, but speaks of the census in 7 A.D. as of something new

¹ Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, pp. 196, 197.

² Marquardt, II. 213.

⁴ Acts v. 37; *Antiquities*, xviii. I. I.

³ *Antiquities*, xviii. I. I.

⁵ Zumpt, pp. 203, 204.

and hitherto unknown. This objection has much or little weight according as one estimates the historical trustworthiness of Luke and Josephus. The fact that Josephus does not mention a census under Herod ought not, in my judgment, to weigh against Luke's statement Luke *does* mention one, and as a historian, he is, to say the least, as free from errors as Josephus.

The fifth and last objection to Luke is that a census under Quirinius could not have occurred under Herod, for Quirinius was not governor of Syria in Herod's lifetime. This argument is the strongest of all which Schürer brings against Luke. Zumpt,¹ however, maintains the historical character of Luke, though holding that Quirinius did not become governor of Syria until shortly after the death of Herod. Luke, it is said, does not teach that Jesus was born while Quirinius was governor, but only that his birth occurred in the period of the first enrolment under Quirinius. This enrolment, however, according to Zumpt, was begun by another governor, Sentius Saturninus (9-6 B.C.). And now Ramsay² argues that Quirinius conducted the war against the Homonadenses in the period 7-5 B.C., and that, as the commanding officer in Syria, Luke would naturally call him, in Greek, ἡγεμόν, which is rendered *governor* in the Revised Version. Neither of these arguments is wholly satisfactory. If Luke knew that Saturninus was governor of Syria, would he have given

¹ *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, pp. 62-71.

² *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* pp. 227-248.

this title to Quirinius? And if he knew that Quirinius was carrying on a war against the Homonadenses, while Saturninus was in charge of the ordinary affairs of the province, would it not have been natural to use the name Saturninus rather than Quirinius?

As regards the explanation by Zumpt, it hardly accords with the language of Luke, for that seems to imply that the enrolment as a whole belonged in the time of Quirinius' governorship, and not simply that it was completed under him. Thus, there are points in Luke's statement on which one could wish further information, but I do not see sufficient evidence for the charge that it is unhistorical. Therefore, I think of Joseph and Mary as journeying from Nazareth to Bethlehem, Joseph at least to be enrolled, and of this enrolment as a part of a general policy of Augustus, with the realization of which in Syria Quirinius was associated.

Regarding the exact spot where Jesus was born, we have a tradition mentioned by Justin Martyr, which was adopted by Origen, to the effect that Jesus was born in a cave near the village of Bethlehem. If Jesus was born in a cave, it was at least one which had been used (perhaps was still used) as a stable, as the word *manger* indicates (Luke ii. 7).

The extreme lowliness of Christ's birth is a pledge of the historical character of the narrative. The Jewish Christians would not have invented such a story, for the common belief, based on Old Testament prophecy,

was that the Christ would come in glory. No one thought, before He came, that He would come in poverty; and after He had come and lived His life, no Christian would have ventured to represent Him as having been born in a stable if there had not been a reliable tradition which affirmed this.

The Date.

The exact year of Jesus' birth is unknown. Dionysius the Little, a Scythian by race, abbot of a monastery in Rome where he died about 556 A.D., introduced the present Christian reckoning, according to which the year of Christ's incarnation and birth was the year 754 of Rome.¹ As Dionysius began his era with the incarnation, he thought of the birth of Jesus as belonging to the latter part of the year 1. In the ninth century it became customary to begin the year 1 with the *birth* of Christ, rather than with the incarnation.²

It is now known that the reckoning of Dionysius was wrong, and that Jesus was born some years earlier than he thought, but how many years earlier is still a disputed question. The data that fix the approximate year are the following: (1) Jesus was born before the death of Herod the Great (Matt. ii. 1), and Herod died shortly before the Passover of the year 750 of Rome.³

¹ This date was held a century before Dionysius by the Egyptian monk Panodorus, but the Roman abbot first brought it into general use.

² Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, I. 70.

³ Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii. 8. 1; 9. 3; Caspari, *Introduction to the Life of Christ*, pp. 28-34, puts Herod's death two or three years later.

The Gospels, however, do not indicate what interval elapsed between the birth of Jesus and the death of Herod. Weiss¹ assumes that Jesus was about a year old when the Magi came, and therefore somewhat more than a year old when Herod died; Keim² thinks He was about four years old when Herod died, and about two years old when the Magi came. (2) According to Luke iii. 1-23, Jesus began His ministry when He was about thirty years old, and this was in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. Both these statements however are somewhat indefinite. It might be said of a man whose age was anywhere between twenty-nine and thirty-one that he was *about* thirty (*ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*), but it does not seem probable that Luke's expression allows us to think that Jesus was *from two to five years* more than thirty when He began His ministry.³ Then, as to the other statement, it is not certain how the fifteenth year of Tiberius is to be reckoned, whether from the time when he became sole head of the government⁴ (14 A.D.), or from the time when he became co-regent with Augustus⁵ (11 A.D.). In the latter case, the beginning of Christ's ministry fell in the year 26; in the former case, in 29. It is to be conceded that Luke, writing in a province and for provin-

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 262.

² *Jesus of Nazara*, II. 110.

³ O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 123.

⁴ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, I. 369; Holtzmann, p. 121; Caspari, *Introduction*, pp. 41-45.

⁵ Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, p. 301; Ramsay, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* p. 200.

cial readers, may have reckoned from 11 A.D., when Tiberius received equal authority with Augustus over the provinces. This is favored by the fact that Jesus was born before the Passover of 750 (4 B.C.), and therefore, in 26 A.D., He may have been, as Luke says, about thirty years old. But if we count the years of Tiberius from 14 A.D., then, in His fifteenth year, Jesus must have been at least thirty-two years old, which would scarcely accord with Luke's statement. And further, if Jesus was born in the days of the first enrolment under Quirinius, then, whether with Ramsay, we assign that enrolment to the year 6 B.C., or with Zumpt, suppose it to have been extended over a period of several years, terminating in 4 B.C., we cannot come down later than the year 26 for the beginning of Jesus' ministry without putting a severe strain upon Luke's expression that, when His ministry began, He was about thirty years old. If then Luke's data are harmonized by the hypothesis that he counted the years of Tiberius from 11 A.D., this fact makes that hypothesis reasonable. (3) A third datum which has a bearing on the question is John ii. 20. When Jesus spoke the enigmatic word about destroying the temple and building it in three days, the Jews said that the temple had been forty and six years in building. Now Josephus¹ tells us that Herod began the temple in the eighteenth year of his reign, probably 20 B.C. By adding to this forty-six years we are brought, approximately, to the year 26 A.D., as

¹ *Antiquities*, xv. 11. 1.

the year of the first Passover in Christ's ministry. If He was then about thirty years old, He must have been born about 5 B.C., and hence this datum supports the last. (4) The fact that there was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 747 of Rome (May 29, recurring October 1 and December 5), and of three planets, Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars, in 748 of Rome, has no independent value for the determination of the exact year of Jesus' birth. For, first, it may be doubted whether a conjunction of planets would have been called a *star* (ἀστήρ), the term used in Matthew; and second, the text does not indicate that the appearance of the star was believed to coincide with the birth of the Messiah. For Herod slew all the children in Bethlehem who were two years old or less than that (Matt. ii. 16). This shows that Herod did not believe the child to be *more* than two years old, his confidence resting upon the statement of the Magi; and it also shows that he thought the child *might* be of any age under two years. In other words, he thought the star of the Magi might have *foretold* the birth of Jesus as just at hand, rather than coincided with it.

It seems on the whole not unlikely that the conjunctions of 7 B.C. and 6 B.C. stood in some causal connection with the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem, but they have no scientific and independent value.

These are the data in the Gospels which bear upon the year of Jesus' birth. They fix the time approximately but not exactly. They plainly allow differences

in computation up to at least three years, from 4 to 7 B.C. Luke's two more specific designations seem to point to the year 26 A.D. as the year of the beginning of Christ's ministry, and hence to the year 5 B.C. as the year of his birth, but the question must still remain open.¹

As regards the month and day of Christ's birth, the Gospels leave us in complete ignorance. The fact that Zacharias was of the course of Abijah (Luke i. 5), the eighth of the twenty-four courses of priests, gives us no help. For even if we admit that this course ministered in the months of April and October in the year 749 of Rome, that circumstance is of no value, since it is not known what time elapsed between the sojourn of Zacharias in Jerusalem and the birth of the Baptist. But if the reference to Abijah's course does not fix the month of John's birth, it plainly has no significance with regard to the month of the birth of Jesus. Clement of Alexandria (died 220 A.D.) says that some people thought that Jesus was born on the 19th or 20th of April, others that He was born on the 20th of May. He himself wisely regarded the question as an unprofitable one. In Egypt, in the third century, some Christians observed the 6th of January as the date of Christ's birth. The present observance of December 25 is not mentioned earlier than the fourth century.

¹ Turner in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I., puts the birth of Jesus 7-6 B.C., His baptism in 26 (26-27), and holds a ministry of 2-3 years.

There is no evidence that there was a trustworthy tradition in support of this date. Neander¹ thinks the observance may have sprung from some apocryphal document, and that its introduction into the Church may have been favored by the proximity of certain heathen festivals, which Christians were inclined to attend. He thinks that the Church, in order to keep its members away from these heathen feasts, established a festival at home for the same week, and perhaps for the same day. Against December as the month of Jesus' birth, and against the winter season in general, some weight must be given to the fact that the shepherds were out with their flocks.² Most critical scholars agree that the month and day of Christ's birth are wholly unknown.

The Shepherds.

The story that the birth of Jesus was first announced to *shepherds* who were keeping watch by night over their flock (Luke ii. 8-10) is in accord with the lowliness of that birth. Yet it was not announced to them because they were poor and lowly. These men are represented as belonging to the little circle who had a living faith, and who were longing for the Messiah. Therefore they were qualified, as others were not, to receive heavenly communications about the Messiah's birth. They did not take offence at the mean sur-

¹ *Kirchengeschichte*, III. 438, 4th ed.

² Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, ii. 96-100.

roundings of Jesus, but glorified God that they had seen Him, and straightway became heralds of the glad tidings to others.

The exact place from which the shepherds came is not indicated. Luke only says that they were "of the same country" to which Bethlehem belonged. The language of Luke ii. 15, 20, where the shepherds speak of going to Bethlehem and then of returning, *i.e.* to their homes, suggests that they were *not* men of Bethlehem itself, but lived at some distance.

The message of the angels was a divine response to the longing of these pious souls. Some response was sure to be made in due season, for God does not leave human longings for His salvation unanswered. The particular response of Luke's narrative, which is in the form of a glorious vision, was in keeping with the importance of the event for which they had been longing.

The essential claim of the story is that the birth of Jesus was divinely made known to a company of men who were fitted to receive and appreciate the tidings. It is a matter of secondary importance whether the communication was made in an external way, with visible accompaniments, or, as is more probable, in a purely spiritual manner.

The shepherds at once proved the truth of the heavenly message by searching until they found the child in the manger. By this discovery their faith was confirmed, and they become heralds of the angelic word

(Luke ii. 17). It is natural to suppose that their visit tended to confirm the faith of the parents in the future of their child, and to deepen their sense of responsibility for His care.

Circumcision and Presentation.

Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day after birth, according to the law (Lev. xii. 3; Luke ii. 21). By this rite He became a child of the covenant which had been made with Abraham. It was the beginning of His subjection to the law which, the apostle says, was necessary if He was to deliver those who were under the law (Gal. iv. 4-5). At this time He received the name *Jesus*, which, though in common use, was given to Him in view of His mission (Luke i. 31). It fitted Him in a perfect manner, because He was, as the name signifies, *the help or deliverance of Jehovah*.

Jesus was presented to the Lord in the temple on the forty-first day after His birth (Lev. xii. 1-4; Luke ii. 22-24). Before this time the mother was ceremonially unclean, and could not appear in the temple. The presentation was an acknowledgment that the first-born son belonged in a peculiar way to the Lord, to be exclusively His for service. But after the tribe of Levi was chosen for the service of the Lord (Num. viii), the first-born sons of other tribes were redeemed by the payment of five sacred shekels (this shekel variously estimated at from fifty to eighty cents). Such a redemption of course took place in the case of Jesus. It has

been pointed out that this narrative, by its very nature, commends itself as historical. Christian legend would not have represented Jesus as being redeemed from the service of the Lord, who yet was held to be divinely appointed to that service.

The other ceremony associated with this visit to the temple was that of purification. Mary brought the offering of the poor, either two doves or two pigeons. One of these was for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering. One was in view of the ceremonial defilement which had kept her from the temple, the other to restore fellowship with the Lord (Lev. xii. 8).

While the parents were in the temple, an event transpired which was akin to the visit of the shepherds. As these had been informed of the birth of Jesus and had come to see Him, so Simeon, described as a man of genuine piety like Zacharias, came into the temple under the influence of the Spirit, and by the Spirit recognized Jesus as the Messiah (Luke ii. 25-35). He took Him in his arms, and blessed God for the sight. From the words of praise that he uttered, two things appear. First, he had been assured that he should not die until he had seen the promised Messiah. And, second, his conception of the work of the Messiah was more catholic and spiritual than that of the religious leaders of the day. He thought that Gentiles no less than Jews were to share in the Messianic glory, and he thought of the Messiah as a sufferer, one spoken against. Opposition to Him would be carried so far

that it would be like a sword in the mother's heart. The child was not to be the Messiah of the popular expectation, but one over whom many would stumble (Isa. viii. 14-15).

Simeon's praise was continued by Anna, an aged widow, who like Mary was of Galilean origin (Luke ii. 36-38). As far as the narrative informs us, she was led by Simeon's words to accept Jesus as the Messiah. She seems immediately to have begun telling of Jesus to those who were waiting for the redemption of Israel, and deserves to be classed with the shepherds as one of the first evangelists.

After the presentation of Jesus in the temple the parents returned, according to Luke, to Nazareth (ii. 39). At this point, however, we must depart from his narrative, if we regard the events of Matthew ii. as historical, and must suppose that the parents remained in Bethlehem. It was there that the wise men found them when Jesus was perhaps a year old.

The Magi.

We know from Matthew (ii. 1-12) that the Magi were from the East and were Gentiles, but here positive knowledge ends. Whether they came from Arabia (so the Fathers, Edersheim, Keim, etc.), or from Media or Persia (Weiss), is wholly uncertain. Astrologers were common all through the Orient, and the gifts which the Magi brought to Bethlehem, though produced largely in Arabia, could doubtless be obtained in any of the

great markets of the East. There is no suggestion as to the number or rank of the Magi. The view that they were kings, three in number (Caspar, Melchior, Balthasar), has of course no basis whatever. It may be inferred from Matthew's narrative that they were astrologers, and also that they had some idea of the spiritual significance which was wrapped up in the promised King of the Jews. It is not probable that they came to pay homage to one who in their thought was to become a great political ruler and nothing more. Their knowledge of a promised King of the Jews, and of His significance for the Gentiles, had doubtless been received from the writings of the Jews, who for several centuries had been scattered through the East.

The Magi read the birth of the coming King in the appearance of a *star*. What this star was cannot be determined. Since Kepler showed that there was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 747 of Rome, some students have believed that this conjunction at least *awakened* the attention of the Magi; others that it was the very star of the Magi; and still others that the bright star which appeared in 1604 in close proximity to these planets had also appeared in 747 of Rome, and was the star of the Magi. But the appearance of this star at that time is an assumption, and it may be questioned whether a conjunction of planets meets the requirements of the narrative.

The account in Matthew does not require that we should think of a *supernatural* star. The statement

that the star "went before them" from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, and that it "stood" over the place where the child was, is consistent with the view that it was one of the heavenly bodies moving in obedience to its divinely appointed laws. The thought of the narrative is that as they journeyed toward Bethlehem, whither they had been directed from Jerusalem, they again saw the star which they had seen in the East, and which afterward they had apparently not seen for a time; and when they reached Bethlehem it seemed to be directly over them. This reappearance of the star, as they looked southward toward Bethlehem, naturally gave them confidence in the word of the scribes, and they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. It was therefore some natural phenomenon in the sky which the wise men saw while in the East, and again as they journeyed from Jerusalem to Bethlehem. Their belief that it heralded the birth of the King of the Jews was a part of their astrological superstition, but a superstition by which, in the providence of God, they were led to the truth.

In regard to the time of the appearance of the star, nothing definite can be ascertained. It may be inferred from Matthew ii. 16 that it had appeared not more than two years before the Magi reached Jerusalem. How old Jesus was when the Magi came, is also uncertain. We do not know that the Magi thought the appearance of the star was coincident with the birth of Jesus, and do not know how long the Magi had been on their journey.

The significance of the story of the Magi lies in the fact that, while Herod and most of the Jews did not know of the birth of Jesus, and when they did know it refused to accept Him, there were Gentiles from afar who knew of His birth and who paid Him reverence. Thus it was a symbol of what was to take place on a large scale in the centuries to come. Israel has rejected the Messiah, and the Gentiles have received Him.

Herod Baffled.

We can readily believe that Joseph and Mary, knowing the suspicious and cruel character of Herod, besought the wise men not to return to Jerusalem; and it is also natural to suppose that the visit of the wise men at the court of Herod, together with the scribes' announcement to the king that the Messiah should be born in Bethlehem, awakened the fears of Joseph and Mary, and so led to the flight into Egypt.

The plan by which Herod hoped to get possession of the new-born King of the Jews was in keeping with his shrewdness; and his act, when this plan was proven futile, was in keeping with his usual cruelty (Matt. ii. 7-8; 16-18); for, according to Josephus, he put to death numbers of his own family circle, among them three of his sons and his beloved Mariamne, and stained himself with numerous murders outside his own family. When baffled by the Magi, he slew the male children in Bethlehem and in all its borders who were two years old or less. How many were slain is quite uncertain, for

we do not know what population Bethlehem had at that time. The estimate of Farrar, adopted by Edersheim,¹ is that the number of the slain did not exceed twenty.

The flight into Egypt involved a journey of at least 225 miles, and, considering the circumstances of Joseph, and the haste of his departure, it is probable that it involved a good deal of hardship for the parents and their child. There were many Jews in Egypt,² and among them Joseph could doubtless find shelter and support. How long he remained is not exactly known. Herod died shortly before the Passover of 750 of Rome, and apparently Joseph returned soon after that event. If, then, Jesus was born in 749 of Rome, the sojourn in Egypt cannot well have extended beyond a few months.

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, I. 214.

² Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv. 7. 2.

CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATION OF JESUS

The Home Circle.

WE know the most essential things about the home of Jesus, for we know the character of Joseph and Mary, and we also know something about the brothers and sisters. Joseph and Mary belonged to that small circle of Jews who, even in the time when Pharisaism dominated the life of the people, maintained a spiritual religion. To this circle belonged John the Baptist with his parents, and also Simeon and Anna. Joseph was a righteous man (Matt. i. 19), and obedient to the will of the Lord as that was made known to him (Matt. i. 24; ii. 14, 21-22). Like Abraham, he had a heart that was open to receive heavenly messages, and he was not slow to respond to them. He appears in the Gospel narrative as having implicit trust in Mary, and the tenderest regard for her (Matt. i. 19-21). He seems to have taught Jesus his own trade of carpenter (Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiii. 55), thus fitting his child to support Himself. He lived until Jesus was twelve years old (Luke ii. 42), and perhaps considerably longer,¹ but he seems to have

¹ See Delitzsch, *Ein Tag in Capernaum*, 1886, p. 67.

died before the public ministry of Jesus began (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). Jesus never refers in a direct manner to His earthly father, but it seems natural to suppose that the fatherhood which He had known in the home in Nazareth was to him a stepping-stone to the conception and the experience of the heavenly fatherhood; and if so, it must have been rich in love and wisdom. Again, it may be allowable to think that Jesus' appreciation of childhood, His love for children, and His sympathy with them, argue sweet memories of His own childhood, and hence throw a gracious light upon Joseph and Mary (Mark x. 13-16; ix. 36; Matt. xviii. 10). From the glimpses which we have into the early life of Jesus, and from His work as a teacher, we derive the impression that the development of His inner life had been normal, an even and beautiful growth; and this, especially when we think of the childhood of Jesus, is most easily understood if the influence of Joseph and Mary was even and beautiful, and the home life in Nazareth a normal home life.

Of Mary's mental and moral character we have somewhat fuller traces than we have regarding Joseph's character. The high favor bestowed upon her in making her the mother of the Messiah, however we judge of the circumstances of Jesus' birth, implies exceptional purity of heart and obedience to the will of God.

It may be inferred from the song of Mary¹ (Luke i.

¹ There is no good reason apparent why Mary may not have been the author of this song. She surely had ample reason for singing, and the

46-55) that she had an intimate acquaintance with the Old Testament, for her deepest feelings express themselves easily in Old Testament language. Her attendance on the temple services at seasons when her presence was not required by law indicates that she found delight in those services (Luke ii. 22, 41). Mary was of a thoughtful and contemplative spirit, as is indicated by the statements that she kept the various incidents regarding Jesus, pondering them in her heart (Luke ii. 19, 51). The fact that Mary did not fully realize what Jesus was, either in His childhood or in His ministry (Luke ii. 33; Mark iii. 21, 31; John ii. 3, 4), is not strange, but perfectly natural. In the long years spent in Nazareth, Jesus had appeared to her as one of her other children, except in His spotless purity. There was no other indication of His Messianic character and mission. This failure to realize fully what Jesus was, made it possible for the mother to treat Him in a natural way. Nor is it strange that Mary did not fully understand Jesus after He began His Messianic work. His ideal of the Messiahship was widely different from the popular thought, and so, doubtless, from her thought; and even the disciples, who were constantly with Him, came but slowly to understand Him. Therefore Mary's attitude toward Jesus is neither an indication of intellectual poverty or of spiritual narrowness.

Beside Joseph and Mary, there were in the home

hymn admirably suits the occasion. The fact that it is largely an echo of Hannah's song is nothing against its historical character.

of Jesus four brothers¹ and at least two sisters, all younger than He (Mark vi. 3; Luke ii. 7; Matt. i. 25). Two of His brothers were men of ability and became influential in the early Christian church. James was highly esteemed even by the unbelieving Jews. Together with Peter and John he was a "pillar" of the church in Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9). Both James and Jude have the imperishable honor of being among the authors of the New Testament. These brothers, even as their mother, did not believe that Jesus was the Messiah (Mark iii. 21; John vii. 5), but this fact does not imply that, prior to the baptism of Jesus, there had been a schism in the family. The household was divided, not by anything in the personal character of Jesus, but by His Messianic claim.

The family of Joseph and Mary were poor but not dependent. The prayer of Agur was fulfilled in their case: "Give me neither poverty nor riches" (Prov. xxx. 8). Joseph was a carpenter (Matt. xiii. 55) and supported his family by the labor of his hands, but labor was held in high honor among the Jews. Even boys who were set apart to the life of scribes learned some trade.² "Love work" was the motto of Rabbi Shemaiah, and another teacher said, "Great is work, for it honors its master."³

¹ Modern critics are generally agreed that the *brothers* of Jesus were not cousins (so Hegesippus, second century), nor half-brothers (so Origen, third century), but children of Joseph and Mary.

² Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 160.

³ See Delitzsch, *Jüdisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu*, p. 27.

Such was the home of which Jesus was a member until about thirty years of age. All that we know suggests that it was a pure and noble family, in which were manifest the best spiritual characteristics of an ancestral line that included some of the greatest names in Israel's history. Both Joseph and Mary, according to tradition, belonged to the lineage of David (Matt. i. 20; Luke i. 27, 32, 69).

The Study of the Law.

Jesus grew in wisdom as He grew in stature (Luke ii. 40, 52). He had a child's knowledge of the law when He was a child, and that was followed by a youth's knowledge, and that in turn by the mature knowledge of a man. In a home like that of Joseph and Mary a child began to learn the law as soon as it began to speak. This was in accord with the word of Scripture (Deut. vi. 6, 7), which commands parents to teach the law diligently to their children. "Whomsoever of us," says Josephus, "one asks regarding the laws, he would more easily say them all than his own name. Since from our earliest consciousness we learn them, we have them in our souls as though engraven."¹ Paul says that Timothy knew the sacred writings from his *infancy* (2 Tim. iii. 15). So it may well have been with the children of Joseph and Mary. It is probable that the parents taught Jesus verses out of the law long before He had learned to read. It is probable that He learned to read at home, but uncertain

¹ *Apion*, ii. 18.

whether He learned to read the law in Hebrew or in Aramaic. If He knew Hebrew, which seems probable in view of the fact that it was cherished as the sacred tongue and studied by all the rabbis, then He doubtless learned it as a child at home and as an attendant on the services of the synagogue. There is no evidence that He ever attended a school; indeed, it is quite uncertain whether there were village schools in the time of Jesus. Keim thinks the first were established about 64 A.D.,¹ while Schürer² is of the opinion that they may have existed in the time of Christ. But there was a synagogue in Nazareth which Jesus doubtless attended, and where through many years He heard the law read (Mark vi. 2), first in Hebrew, then in Aramaic,³ and where He heard the sacred language also in certain parts of the liturgical service. When Jesus at the age of twelve was in the temple, He entered into conversation with the scribes, and they were amazed at His understanding and His answers. From this incident it seems allowable to infer that the scribes in Nazareth were interested in Jesus, and that He had discussed the law with them. It is not improbable that some Nazarene scribe helped Him to learn Hebrew. How much help He may have received from the synagogue in understanding the Old Testament, we cannot say. Certain it is that His accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the law implies that He studied it long and patiently for

¹ *Jesus of Nazara*, II. 151.

³ Schürer, II. 20.

² *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 424.

Himself. It is possible that there was a copy of the Old Testament in His home, or at least of the chief parts of the Old Testament. His spiritual understanding of the law was doubtless due in the main to His own purity and spirituality, yet as a child He may have been greatly helped by His parents to a true apprehension of the meaning of Scripture. They had a vital piety, and that piety must have been sustained by their feeding on the word of God. So their teaching would naturally lead their children into the inner sense of Scripture. As Jesus probably had a certain knowledge of Hebrew, so also of Greek. There were many Greek-speaking people throughout Galilee, as through all Syria; and further, Jesus seems to have spoken with certain Gentiles, without an interpreter, as with Pilate, with the centurion of Capernaum, and with the Canaanitish woman, and in such cases Greek was doubtless the vehicle of communication. Yet this cannot be positively affirmed.

Though Jesus in His childhood and youth may have been helped by the scribes in Nazareth, it is certain that He did not take up a formal course of study with them, or attend a rabbinical school elsewhere. His townspeople knew Him only as a carpenter, and were surprised that He should come forward in the synagogue as a teacher (Mark vi. 2, 3). In Jerusalem it seems to have been well known that Jesus had not learned the law from the recognized teachers (John vii. 15). He was called *rabbi*, but this does not imply that He had received

rabbinical ordination. It was simply an expression of His disciples' reverence for Him as their teacher, called forth by His surpassing knowledge of the law.

The Study of Nature.

The development of Jesus was influenced by the world around Him as well as by the record of God's revelation contained in the Old Testament. It is plain from the Gospels that Jesus was a close observer of nature, and had pondered much on the meaning of natural phenomena. This is shown by the aptness of His many illustrations drawn from nature, and also by the fact that a large number of His parables are based on natural phenomena. He saw an analogy between the visible world and the invisible, and taught truths of His kingdom from what He observed in the field and by the wayside. To Him, nature was full of spiritual meaning. It spoke to Him of the goodness of God and the minuteness of His tender care. He admired the beauty of the lilies, but the thought that especially impressed Him was that *God* had clothed them, *God* had given them this raiment which surpassed in glory the raiment of Solomon (Matt. vi. 28-30). He watched the birds of the air, and thought how the heavenly Father fed them, and how not one of the least of them could fall to the ground without His notice (Matt. vi. 26; x. 29). When the sun arose and shined on the evil and the good, and when the rain came down upon the just and the unjust, it was

to Him a parable of the divine love (Matt. v. 44, 45). The tares in the wheat were like the children of the evil one, and the birds catching away the seed before it sprouted were like Satan who takes away the good word from the heart (Matt. xiii. 19, 38). The book of nature had its mystery for Jesus as it has for every thoughtful observer. He recognized that a man cannot tell whence the wind comes and whither it goes (John iii. 8); and cannot tell how the seed germinates, and grows until the full corn appears in the ear (Mark iv. 27).

The fact that Jesus, in His teaching, drew so constantly and widely from the treasury of nature, and always with wondrous propriety, shows that He had looked upon the earth and the heaven with an observant, sympathetic eye. His reading of nature, like His reading of the Old Testament, was altogether different from that of the scribes of His day. It was deeply spiritual, and full of hope because full of the thought of the heavenly Father.

The Study of Man.

But Jesus, while studying in the book of nature and in the Old Testament, surely did not keep aloof from men or ignore any human interest. What characterized His ministry we may suppose characterized also His earlier years in the quiet of Nazareth, namely, a genuine sympathy with men. He was no Essene, withdrawing from His fellow-men to live a narrow self-centred life.

He may have loved the solitude of the mountain top, but only that He might there commune with God, and receive wisdom and grace for the service of men. With the common life of the peasant and artisan He had such familiarity as can have been gained only by close observation. He was acquainted with the work of the tailor (Mark ii. 21) and the vine dresser (Mark ii. 22; Matt. xx. 1-16; John xv. 1-10), the gardener and the carpenter (Matt. vii. 16-21; 24-26; Luke viii. 6-9), the housewife and the pearl-merchant (Matt. xiii. 33, 44), the shepherd and the fisherman (Matt. vii. 15; Luke xv. 3-7; Matt. xxv. 31-46; John x. 1-16; Matt. xiii. 47-50; Luke v. 1-11). He was acquainted also with current history, at least as far as could be expected of one who lived in a small provincial town. He knew of the embassy that had been sent after Archelaus (Luke xix. 12), and the mode of capital punishment followed by the Romans in dealing with the Galilean Zealots (Mark ix. 42); He knew of the high-handed acts of Pilate (Luke xiii. 1), and the tragedy in Siloam (Luke xiii. 4); He had thought of the relation of the Jews to Rome, and had reached conclusions widely different from those of the Pharisees (Mark xii. 16-17; Luke xix. 1-10); He knew that those who had been condemned to be crucified bore their crosses to the place of execution (Mark viii. 34), and He knew the character and life of the Pharisees through and through (Matt. xxiii., etc.).

In His contact with men He discovered good where others saw only evil, as in publicans, profligates, and

the robber on the cross. Since it was true in His ministry, that He came close to the lowest and the worst, we may think that in His earlier life also He had felt a genuine sympathy with these classes and had seen that there was hope for them. He doubtless saw the wretchedness of their estate as no one else, but He did not despair. While His own inner purity made Him uniquely appreciative of the sinfulness of men, His sense of the fatherliness of God and of God's power made Him uniquely hopeful. What He said on a certain occasion in defence of His Sabbath miracle, we may suppose that He had long seen and felt, namely, that the Father is constantly at work among men in their behalf.

Jesus then, we remark in conclusion, when He went forth from Nazareth to His brief public ministry, knew the nature and needs of man with whom He was to deal. He was also enriched by the possession of the deepest truths of the word of God, and by an intimate acquaintance with the world of nature, not such as is had by a man of science, but rather that of a poet and prophet. It was the religious meaning and value of history and life which He, as no other, saw and interpreted.

It is needful to say but few words in regard to the personal appearance of Jesus. All representations are purely imaginary, and express the ideas, artistic or religious, of the various ages in which they have been produced. At one time, under the influence of the

fifty-third of Isaiah, He has been thought of as without form or comeliness, having no beauty that we should desire Him; and again, the words of the Psalmist have been applied to Him and understood literally, "Thou art fairer than the children of men." We have no definite knowledge, and inferences which seem valid to one, another may question. The Jews once said to Jesus, "Thou art not yet *fifty* years old" (John viii. 57); and it may perhaps be inferred from this that He looked somewhat older than He really was. It is natural, in view both of His holiness and of the unparalleled physical strain that He endured, to think that He was free from disease, full of physical vigor, and that all the faculties of body as of mind were unimpaired. It is natural also to think that the majesty and greatness and gentleness of His spirit were reflected on His features and in His bearing. When He passed through the midst of His enraged townspeople, the force that awed them and made them for the moment powerless against Him may have been naught but the outflashing of His mighty will (Luke iv. 30). We can hardly believe otherwise than that His features were capable of expressing in a remarkable degree the tenderness of His love, and that thus there was manifested a power which drew outcasts to His feet and broke the heart of Peter in the midst of his denials.

CHAPTER IV

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

John and His Work.

THE event which terminated the private life of Jesus and ushered Him into His Messianic work was His baptism in the Jordan by John. Of this man and his work we have not a few definite and significant data. He was born a few months before Jesus (Luke i. 26), to parents who represented the purest religious life of the time (Luke i. 6, 67-79), one of whom was a relative of Mary (Luke i. 36). His parents, like Simeon, believed that the Messiah was soon to appear, and they also believed that their son was to prepare the Messiah's way (Luke i. 17, 76). John grew up in the hill country of Judea as an ascetic (Luke i. 39, 80). He wore a mantle of hair, bound about him with a leather girdle, and lived on the plainest fare (Mark i. 6; Matt. xi. 18). His soul was filled with the thought that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and that the world was not ready for it. Josephus¹ mentions John as a good man and as a preacher of great power, but says nothing of his Messianic hope, which is necessary to the explana-

¹ *Antiquities*, xviii. 5. 2.

tion of his immediate and mighty influence. Simply as a preacher of morals he could not have moved Jerusalem and Judea as he did, for the Pharisees, the dominant party in the land, would have ignored such a preacher. The note that aroused the Jews of all classes was the announcement of the nearness of the Kingdom of Heaven, for the centre of religious hope, and also of political aspiration, was the long-expected Messiah.¹ With this announcement John associated a preaching of repentance (Mark i. 4), with very specific application to different classes among his hearers (Luke iii. 10-14). The vigor of his preaching of righteousness, and its effect as well, owed much to the conviction that the Messiah, at His coming, would sift Israel (Matt. iii. 12; Luke iii. 9).

Of the depth and extent of John's influence various facts bear witness. Thus we are told that he made such an impression that men asked whether he might not be the Messiah (Luke iii. 15), and a formal embassy was sent from Jerusalem to find out, if possible, who he was (John i. 19-27). His power was so great that Herod became jealous and imprisoned him, if we follow the account of Josephus, which is not at variance with the Gospels. Even after he was dead his memory had such a hold on the people that they thought Jesus was only a reincarnation of the spirit of John (Matt. xvi. 14).

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 496-556; Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 348-351.

Again, as late as the close of Christ's ministry, John was so highly revered in Jerusalem that the priests and scribes dared not speak disparagingly of him in public (Mark xi. 27-33). Finally, a quarter of a century after John's death we find his disciples in distant Asia Minor (Acts xviii. 25; xix. 3). These facts are evidence that his preaching and his personality made a deep impression.

The relation of John to Jesus is in the main clear and what one might have expected. He seems to have had no personal acquaintance with Jesus before His baptism (John i. 26, 33), but to have been deeply impressed by Him at their first meeting (Matt. iii. 14). And even in the Synoptists the hour of Jesus' baptism seems not to have passed without an assurance coming into the soul of John that He was the Messiah (Matt. iii. 17). It is plain, however, that this faith was not maintained. When in prison, and shortly before his death, he sought from Jesus an open declaration of His Messiahship (Matt. xi. 2-6), he was certainly in doubt, notwithstanding all that he had seen and heard. The testimony of Jesus concerning John shows that he had not accepted, or, at least, did not then accept, Jesus as the Messiah. Jesus said that he was a great prophet, none greater than he, but still he was less than the least in the Kingdom of Jesus (Matt. xi. 11). This must mean that, unlike the least in the Kingdom, he did not fully accept Jesus as the Messiah. As a prophet of righteousness, John was an Elijah, and Jesus could say

that the prophecy of Elijah's return was fulfilled in him (Matt. xi. 14); but as herald of the Messiah, he was not prepared for the conceptions of Jesus regarding Messiahship. In this respect he was practically on a level with his generation. At first he could welcome Jesus as the Messiah, and even suggest to his own disciples that they should follow Jesus (John i. 29, 36, 37), because he did not then foresee how widely the Messianic work of Jesus was to differ from his own ideal. As the months passed, however, and Jesus did not do the things that were expected of the Messiah, doubt succeeded the early confidence, though perhaps with intervals of hope (John iii. 27-30). But ever after the early days of the public life of Jesus the disciples of John seem to have remained faithful to him. They did not leave him and follow Jesus, as would probably have been the case had John been confident that Jesus was indeed the Messiah.

Such was the man whose announcement of the Kingdom of Heaven drew Jesus from the private life of Nazareth, and led to His being made manifest to Israel.

Data of Jesus' Baptism.

The Synoptists agree in saying that Jesus was baptized by John in the Jordan, that the Spirit of God descended upon Him, and that a voice came out of heaven (Mark i. 9-11; Matt. iii. 13-17; Luke iii. 21-22). Their narrative implies that John's work had continued some time before Jesus came to be baptized. They have no suggestion as to the place of the baptism, but

from John we may infer with some probability that it was on the east side of the Jordan (John i. 28). Matthew alone records any conversation between Jesus and the Baptist. According to Mark and Luke, the heavenly voice spoke *to* Jesus; according to Matthew it spoke *of* Him.

John does not record the baptism of Jesus, but only speaks of the descent of the Spirit upon Him (John i. 32-33). It is said that the Baptist beheld the Spirit descending, and that this descent was a *sign* to him that the one on whom the Spirit descended was the Messiah.

Jesus Himself recognized the baptism of John as being *from heaven*, that is, as divinely appointed (Mark xi. 30); and hence submission to this baptism was a requirement of righteousness (Matt. iii. 15). During the early part of His ministry Jesus practised the same baptism (John iii. 22-26; iv. 2), that is, he allowed His disciples to perform the rite.

Significance of the Baptism.

If the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan had any reference to sin, then it must have been to the sin of others, for He had no sin of His own to confess. So some have held that the baptism of Jesus was representative. But this view is improbable for the reason that the people themselves were coming with one accord to John's baptism, and so did not need a representative. And further, it is improbable because Jesus had not yet

received the divine call to the Messianic work, and so could not act representatively for men.

If, then, the baptism of Jesus was not symbolic of a putting away of sin, either His own or that of others, it may best be regarded as an act of *consecration*. This was one side of the meaning of baptism in the case of all whom John baptized. There was not only a turning away from sin, but there was also an expectation of the approaching Kingdom and an implicit devotement of one's self to its service. In the case of Jesus consecration did not have reference to holiness, for His life had always been holy, but it was a public consecration to the Kingdom of God, which the Baptist was announcing as near at hand. It was a part of the fulfilment of righteousness (Matt. iii. 15). For all Israel were called upon to prepare for the coming Kingdom of God, the best as well as the worst; and Jesus, as an Israelite, though without sin, could not refrain from a public acknowledgment of His desire for that Kingdom, or from consecration to it. The meaning of the act was unique in His case only in so far as He was unique.

The Dove and the Voice.

The event which followed the baptism in the Jordan occurred, Luke tells us, while Jesus was praying (Luke iii. 21). The heavens were opened, the Spirit came upon Jesus, and a voice was heard—the voice of God. This language is materialistic, but there are very grave objections to the view that the dove was visible to

eyes of flesh and the voice audible to ears of flesh. (1) The Holy Spirit is represented as abiding permanently upon Jesus, which is inconceivable if the Spirit was in a visible form, unless, indeed, we suppose that, having descended in a visible form, the Spirit then became invisible (John i. 32, 33). But of this the text has no hint. (2) If the voice be thought of as physical, there is a plain conflict between Matthew and Mark. One version would have to be omitted, for we could not suppose that the voice uttered both sayings, speaking now in the second person and then in the third. And which would be rejected as unhistorical? (3) It is difficult to believe that the Holy Spirit would actually assume an animal form, or that Jewish-Christian writers with their conception of the incomparable exaltation of Jehovah would have thought of His Spirit as assuming such a form.¹ (4) In the case of John, and certainly in that of Jesus, we cannot assume that there was a need of visible and audible phenomena in order to the reception of communications from God.

In view of these objections, and in keeping with the spiritual and inward character of all New Testament revelation, the phenomena which accompanied the baptism of Jesus must be understood as spiritual in character. The underlying reality may be thought of in

¹ Luke is the only one of the Synoptists who speaks of a *bodily* form, but of course even this language does not require us to think that he had a physical phenomenon in mind. The description may have been from the standpoint of the inner organ of vision.

this way. In the hour of baptism, the conviction was divinely borne in upon the soul of John that the man before him was the Messiah, and that the Holy Spirit was communicated to Him without measure. This conviction may have come through a vision, and *in the vision* John may have seen the heavens opened, and may have seen the form of a dove, and may have heard a heavenly voice, just as Peter in a vision saw a sheet full of all sorts of living creatures let down out of heaven (Acts x. 11, 12), and as John in a vision saw Jesus under the form of a lamb (Rev. v. 6). The Baptist had previously received the assurance that the Messiah would be pointed out to him by the descent of the Spirit (John i. 33).

Jesus also as well as John saw and heard spiritually, not physically. But since He was in perfect fellowship with God, and since nothing had ever dulled His inner ear to the divine voice, we may best think that the truth which was made known to Him in the hour of His baptism was made known by an immediate revelation to His spirit. This is certainly what we should infer from the record of the ministry of Jesus, in which no visions are said to have been granted to Him, but where there are claims of a unique, direct intercourse with God (*e.g.* John v. 19, 30). It is natural that what was an inner and spiritual event in the experience of Jesus should have been set forth by Him, or by the Baptist, in the concrete symbolism of our narrative.

Significance of the Spiritual Phenomenon.

But what now is the meaning of this experience by the Jordan? Plainly it had a meaning which was of transcendent importance to Jesus, for from this hour His Messianic work began. He did not go back to the quiet life of Nazareth, but came forth in Israel to found the Kingdom of Heaven.

It is said that the Spirit came down upon Him. But Jesus had possessed the Spirit all His life. Early tradition represented Him as a child of the Spirit (Luke i. 35). He had had undisturbed communion with God, and had known Him as His Father (Luke ii. 49). If then He was already obedient to the Spirit, or filled with the Spirit, what is meant by the statement that He received the Spirit by the Jordan? Its meaning is suggested, in the first place, by the words which accompanied the descent of the Spirit: "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." These words come from God, and therefore Jesus is here virtually called *Son of God*. This title, based on the second Psalm, was a synonym of *Messiah*.¹ It was so understood by Jesus and His contemporaries. Therefore it is natural to hold that the gift of the Spirit had reference to the Messiah's work. Jesus is no sooner conscious of being invested with the office of Messiah than He is conscious of being equipped for that office by the presence of the Spirit of God. And this view of the gift of the Spirit and of the significance of the

¹ Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 179-185.

heavenly voice is confirmed by the fact that Jesus was at once impelled by the Spirit to go into the wilderness, to ponder the career now opened before Him (Mark i. 12), and by the fact that from this hour forward all His movements were determined by the Messianic purpose. This gift of the Spirit therefore was the necessary accompaniment of the revelation of Messiahship. It was the unique equipment for the unique service. Henceforth when the work of Jesus called for special manifestations of wisdom or of power, He was conscious that through His dependence upon the Spirit of God even these manifestations would be granted as need should arise.

There is a pretty general agreement of recent scholars that the Messianic consciousness of Jesus arose in the hour of His baptism. The only word which seems to lend support to the view that Jesus came to the Jordan with a clear consciousness of Messiahship is that found in Matthew, "Suffer it to be so *now*" (iii. 15). Here it is implied, according to some scholars,¹ that Jesus, in subordinating Himself to John, *knew* that in the future He would not be in such a relation to him; in other words, knew that He was the Messiah. But this is a large inference to draw from this single particle, and by no means a necessary one. It is wrongly assumed that one who receives baptism at the hands of another thereby confesses his own inferiority. This is true in no sense. Jesus regarded John's baptism as

¹ *E.g.*, Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 309.

from heaven, divinely appointed, and He must have regarded John simply as the providential instrument which God used in the accomplishment of His purpose. The words of Jesus therefore imply no comparison between Himself and John, either moral or official. The inference which is drawn from Matthew's expression, "Suffer it to be so now," cannot be allowed to stand in view of the varied evidence against the possession of Messianic consciousness by Jesus prior to His baptism. This evidence is as follows: (1) If Jesus had been conscious of His Messianic character when He came to His baptism, there was no need of the divine assurance of this fact which was given in the words, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." (2) If Jesus had been conscious of His Messiahship before His baptism, why should the baptism introduce Him to temptation regarding His Messiahship? If His Messianic consciousness antedated the baptism, then there is no reason why the temptation followed immediately upon the baptism. Had He known Himself as the Messiah long before this hour by the Jordan, then it is natural to suppose that He must have been tempted as Messiah long before. (3) In addition to all this, there is in the Gospels no indication whatever that Jesus had Messianic consciousness prior to His baptism, excepting the doubtful word of Matthew iii. 15, which is surely too slight to sustain the inference drawn from it.

The word of the boy Jesus in the temple (Luke ii.

49) witnesses to a consciousness of *moral* harmony with God, but of nothing beyond this. It is quite natural on the lips of one whom no sin had alienated from God. To Jesus, being such an one, the Old Testament itself gave ample justification when He called God His *Father*.

In view of these things we hold therefore that, though Jesus' consciousness of the presence of the Father with Him had been unique even before His baptism by John, He had not then possessed the consciousness of being the Messianic Son of God. This came in the hour of baptismal consecration when, praying by the Jordan, a heavenly voice spoke to His spirit, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."

It is manifest that this revelation, vital though it was, stood in fundamental harmony with the past life of Jesus. Through all the years of His private life He had been moving toward this very experience; and while it involved a divine element, it was also the natural, and we may perhaps say the inevitable, culmination of His hidden development. He had lived the life of a perfect child of God, and therefore was prepared for the Messianic revelation and the anointing of the Spirit which He received in the hour of His baptism, through which the Father called and consecrated Him unto the office of Redeemer of the world.

CHAPTER V

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

The Data.

JOHN says nothing of the temptation, Mark has only a brief statement in two verses (i. 12, 13); but Matthew and Luke have full accounts (Matt. iv. 1-11; Luke iv. 1-13). The chief differences between Matthew and Luke are (1) that Matthew puts the temptation at the *close* of the forty days, while Luke represents the *entire period of forty days* as one of temptation (so also Mark). And yet Luke puts the *particular* temptation which is described in full, at the close of the forty days, and thus agrees with Matthew in this point while differing from him in another. However, Matthew's statement does not exclude that of Luke and Mark, namely, that the entire period spent in the wilderness was one of temptation, which is intrinsically probable. Since Matthew puts the temptation at the end of the forty days, he puts there also the ministry of angels, which in Mark continues through the whole period, and which is omitted by Luke. (2) Luke does not agree with Matthew in the order of the second and third temptations. He puts the temple scene last, while Matthew puts the mountain scene last. This is of course a difference in form

merely, and does not affect the substance of the narrative. (3) Luke represents Jesus as being led about by the Spirit during the forty days, that is, He did not pass this time in one place but in various places. This statement that Jesus moved about in the wilderness from one spot to another *suggests* an inward agitation which was reflected in a certain outward restlessness. This may be regarded as inherently probable.

According to Mark, Jesus went into the wilderness *immediately* after His baptism (i. 12). There is no trace of any conference with John, though, according to the fourth Gospel, when Jesus returned to the Jordan from the wilderness He remained at least two days in the vicinity of the Baptist (John i. 29-35). Mark's representation that, after the baptism, Jesus went into the wilderness *at once*, accords fully with the fact of the Messianic revelation which accompanied that baptism. If a Paul, when brought suddenly to the knowledge of Christ, conferred not with flesh and blood but straightway sought solitude for meditation (Gal. i. 15, 16), much more may Jesus in the initial hour of His Messianic experience have felt Himself driven from the presence of men to the quiet of the wilderness. The statement in Matthew iv. 1, that Jesus went into the wilderness *to be* tempted of the devil is to be regarded as the evangelist's inference from what actually happened in the wilderness. It is not to be supposed that Jesus knew beforehand what was to befall Him in the wilderness, and so purposely walked into temptation contrary

to His own instruction to His disciples (Matt. vi. 13). The power of the temptation would have been largely taken away had Jesus known that it was coming and just what it was. It would not then have been true that He was tempted in all points *like as we are* (Heb. iv. 15). The aim of His retirement into the wilderness was to contemplate His Messianic work, and as He contemplated that He was tempted.

The time spent in the wilderness is given by the Synoptists as *forty days*, but it is uncertain whether this is to be understood literally or figuratively. A figurative use of the number is favored by the general parabolic character of the narrative, which will be considered later. On the other hand, it seems inherently probable that Jesus, at this great crisis of His life, spent a long time in solitary thought. There is nothing improbable in the statement of the Synoptists that He was in the wilderness forty days, though of course this particular number, rather than thirty-five or forty-five, suggests an intentional parallelism with the experience of Moses and Elijah (Ex. xxxiv. 28; 1 Kings xix. 8).

The place of temptation is located indefinitely in the *wilderness*, a name given especially to the wild region of Judea on the west side of the Dead Sea (Num. xxi. 20; xxiii. 28). Somewhere in this region the Baptist began his preaching (Matt. iii. 1). Luke says that Jesus *returned* from the Jordan (iv. 1), and so seems to have thought of the place of the temptation as somewhere along the route which Jesus took from the Jordan

to His home in Nazareth. The traditional site is a mountain (Quarantania) about seven miles northwest from Jericho.

There was *some* food to be had in the wilderness, such as locusts and wild honey (Matt. iii. 4), and some suppose that Jesus ate these as the Baptist had done. The narrative of Mark allows this, while those of Matthew and Luke, since they imply that the hunger of Jesus was the occasion of the temptation to turn stones into bread, teach that even if Jesus partook at times of locusts and wild honey, His physical need was not satisfied.

Nothing is said in regard to the *reason* why Jesus fasted. It may be supposed that He was so absorbed in contemplation of His Messianic work that He was not conscious of the need of His body. When the period of intense thought and emotion was past, He became aware of hunger. There is certainly no reason for supposing that Jesus *purposely* fasted for some special end, as though He hoped thereby to have a clearer mind or a more perfect fellowship with the Spirit. The physical was simply forgotten, not forcibly suppressed.

The Form of the Temptation.

The *form* in which the temptation came to Jesus is of secondary importance. The historical *fact* of a temptation is conceded even by such writers as Keim,¹ and the essential thought of the narrative in Matthew

¹ *The History of Jesus of Nazara*, II. 319, 320.

and Luke, is in the main at least, intelligible. This being the case, it is not of primary importance to know *how* Jesus was tempted, and yet this question is directly suggested by the form of the narrative in the Synoptists, and is not without a certain interest. Of one thing we may be reasonably certain, namely, that the narrative is symbolic. Taken literally, it is not, as Keim says, in keeping with the moral character of Jesus, for He would have recognized Satan at least after the first temptation, and could have had no further parley with him. Taken literally, the third temptation would cease to be a temptation to Jesus, it is so gross. Even an ordinarily good man would recoil with horror from a proposition to worship the devil, this proposition being made by the devil in person. Further, it is preposterous to suppose that the devil actually carried Jesus to the top of the temple and again to the top of some high mountain. If this is taken literally, we must suppose either that the devil forced Him to go, which is inconceivable, since the devil had never had any power in or over Jesus; or we must suppose that Jesus went voluntarily with the devil, which is an impossible supposition, for to have gone voluntarily with the devil would have been sin. The literal interpretation of the story therefore is not to be seriously considered.

The narrative is not a historical description of outward situations and spoken words, but a poetical representation of inward, spiritual, experiences. To

understand it in this way is in keeping with the method of Jesus, for He frequently personified spiritual truth and set it forth in a dramatic concrete form (*e.g.* Luke x. 18; John i. 51; xiv. 30). The temptation was a spiritual struggle. Thoughts were presented to the mind of Jesus, and courses of action were suggested, which He recognized as Satanic in character. To follow out the suggestions would be to follow Satan. When Jesus told His disciples about His struggle in the wilderness, He put the spiritual reality in a popular and comprehensible form. But to hold that the narrative of the temptation is symbolic is by no means to deny the reality of the temptation itself. On the contrary, it is the only way in which we can vindicate for the narrative a historical content.

Content of the Temptation.

What now is contained in these symbols? What was the spiritual struggle which Jesus passed through in the wilderness? Plainly it was concerned with the Messianic career which had just been opened before Him, and more particularly with the method of realizing the Messianic ideal. The narrative consists of three scenes, each presenting a specific temptation. In the first scene, Jesus is tempted to prove His Messiahship by working a miracle to supply His hunger (Matt. iv. 3, 4; Luke iv. 3, 4). The tempter used Christ's physical need as a ground for the miracle. Thus he approached Christ along the line of His physical desire; but the

temptation itself arose out of the violent contrast between the divine assurance of Messiahship, which Jesus had received at the Jordan, and His present extreme need. This contrast gave force to the tempter's subtle insinuation, when he said, "*If* thou art the Son of God." So it was in reality a temptation to doubt the spiritual assurance which had been given to Him in the hour of His baptism, when God had said to Him, "Thou art my beloved Son." If He were the Messiah, the helper of Israel and the whole world, would He be Himself helpless here in the wilderness, unable to procure food for His hunger? Must He not doubt the assurance of His Messiahship, or take steps to satisfy His immediate need by drawing on the power which that Messiahship involves? This temptation was met with the truth drawn from Israel's experience in the wilderness, that there is something more important than bread, and that is obedience to God (Deut. viii. 3). Jesus felt that He was in the wilderness under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, but the Spirit did not bid Him turn stones into bread. Therefore, to attempt to do that would be to exalt bread above obedience. He is hungry, it is true, and needs bread, but He is not to think that because He is the Messiah He may supply His table miraculously. So Jesus, though conscious of Messiahship, saw that He was to depend upon God as He had always done.

The second temptation was a temptation to prove His Messiahship by some act which would call out the prom-

ised aid of God (Matt. iv. 5-7; Luke iv. 9-12). It is as though the tempter had said, "I see that you trust in the word of God which you have just quoted. Cast yourself upon it, then, and put God to the test. Go and throw yourself from the temple, for it is written, 'He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways'" (Ps. xci. 11).

The fair-sounding suggestion of the tempter was that Jesus should test the word of God. As the Messiah, when in peril, He should no longer by the exercise of judgment and caution seek to care for Himself, but should cast Himself into danger, trusting to the supernatural intervention of God. But Jesus recognized that such a testing of the word of God would really be a tempting of God, and so be sinful (Deut. vi. 16). For it would involve an audacious violation of certain plain laws of God, and that for the avowed purpose of *forcing* God to prove His faithfulness to His promises. It would be a sin against humility and faith, qualities which should be perfect in the Messiah. It would be a sin against reason to risk His life for an ocular proof of God's care, when He had received the clearest assurance of it in His own soul but a few days before. So Jesus, in rejecting this suggestion of the tempter, laid down for Himself the principle that, though conscious of Messiahship, He was still to use the reason which God had given Him, and not to expect that divine power would be manifested in His case, except as He gave heed to divine laws.

The third temptation was a temptation to fall in with the popular idea of the Messianic kingdom (Matt. iv. 8-10; Luke iv. 5-8), that the Messiah should be a greater David, and should establish an external political sway over all the nations of the earth. The temptation in this instance was primarily along the line of Jewish patriotism. The conception of the kingdom which it involved seemed to be supported by many Old Testament passages which refer to the kingdom of the Messiah as outward and material. Herein lay the force of the suggestion.

In this third temptation there is no question about the Messianic character of Jesus. The tempter no longer says, "If thou art the Son of God." The Messiahship of Jesus is granted. The temptation now concerns the *method* of realizing the Messianic ideal. Shall this be the method of physical force, which was bound up with the popular conception of the kingdom, or shall it be a spiritual method? Jesus saw that to fall in with the popular conception, however attractively that might be presented, would virtually be to worship Satan, and therefore this method of seeking to establish the Messianic kingdom was rejected once for all.

Subsequent Temptations.

These three scenes, we are to suppose, exhausted the possibilities of tempting Jesus at this time in regard to His Messianic work. But His temptation was not limited to the wilderness. The statement of Luke (iv. 13)

that the tempter left Jesus *for a time* is in accord with words spoken by Jesus Himself. On one occasion, looking back over His entire ministry, He said to His disciples, "Ye are they who have continued with me in my temptations"¹ (Luke xxii. 28). We have in Mark viii. 33 a suggestion as to the character of these temptations, when Jesus calls Peter *Satan*, because Peter had sought to turn Him from His course of suffering. We are probably not to think that the clear positions at which Jesus arrived while in the wilderness were subsequently obscured. The word which He spoke in Mark iii. 27 implies that He had bound the "strong man," that is, Satan, and therefore He was able to "spoil his goods," that is, to cast out demons. But while this passage, and also the narrative of the temptation, suggest that the victory of Jesus in the wilderness was decisive, they do not imply that He was henceforth free from temptation, and the word in Mark to the effect that Satan was bound, that is, as related to Jesus, cannot be taken without modification (Mark viii. 33; John xiv. 30). Jesus doubtless came from the wilderness with certain clear and unalterable conceptions in regard to the Messiah's work, but it is difficult to believe that the maintenance of these conceptions brought no real trials to His spirit, for all men, even His nearest friends, were opposed to His conceptions of Messiahship, and adherence to His views brought what appeared to be general and irretrievable defeat.

¹ πειρασμοῖς.

CHAPTER VI

A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS

Introduction.

THE evangelists plainly did not attach such value to the external setting of the ministry of Jesus and to the sequence of events as these things often have in the eyes of modern scholars. We can get from their narratives a general view of the movements of Jesus, also of important dates, but we must confess that this view is only general and approximate. Our information regarding times and places and the detail of His journeys is seldom exact. After all the investigation devoted to these points most of the statements that can be made might appropriately be followed by marks of interrogation. Thus there have been, and still are, wide differences in regard to the time that elapsed between the baptism and the crucifixion.

Length of the Ministry of Jesus. Extreme Views.

Clement of Alexandria and some other early writers held that the public ministry of Jesus continued only one year. This view was based on Luke iv. 19, "the acceptable year of the Lord." Some modern writers,

as Keim, adopt this view, but base it upon the fact that the Synoptists mention only one Passover in the ministry of Jesus. Neither of these arguments is valid. It is plainly unsafe to take the symbolic language which Luke quotes from Isaiah, as an exact chronological statement:—

“He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim *the acceptable year* of the Lord.”

And the fact that the Synoptists mention only one Passover has little weight when it is remembered that they manifestly do not aim to give a chronological outline of Christ's life. Further, while the Synoptists make explicit mention of only one Passover in the public ministry of Jesus, they yet seem to imply that there was more than one when they represent Jesus as saying to Jerusalem, “How *often* would I have gathered thy children together” (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34). This word was spoken *before* the last Passover, and plainly implies earlier visits. But Jesus seems to have visited Jerusalem chiefly, if not exclusively, at the times of the feasts, and therefore the plurality of visits implied in the passage just cited can scarcely be brought within a single year.

Moreover, the view that the ministry of Jesus continued only one year or one year and a fraction, has against it the great difficulty of crowding into so brief

a space all the events that are recorded by the Synop-
tists. They know of extended sojourns in Capernaum,
of several tours through Galilee, of periods of with-
drawal into solitude with the disciples; they know of
the gradual growth of a band of followers, from whom
at length twelve apostles were chosen, and they know
of a somewhat protracted training of these apostles.
They know of a period of increasing popularity that
was long enough for people living in Idumea and in
the region of Tyre and Sidon to bring their sick to
Jesus; and they know of the decline of that popularity,
and of a train of events leading at last to the death of
Jesus. It seems to me impossible to bring all these
events, some of which require not a little time, within
the compass of a single year.

A second extreme view is that of Irenæus, who held
that Jesus attained the age of more than forty years,
and taught more than ten years. He found Scripture
support for this in John viii. 57, where the Jews say,
"Thou art not yet *fifty* years old," and he also appealed
to tradition. This view has a recent advocate in Delff,¹
who thinks Jesus was more than forty years old when
His ministry began. He bases this upon the remark
of the Jews (John viii. 57), and finds confirmation in
the circumstance that, when Jesus began His ministry,
His brothers and sisters, at least six in number, all
appear to have been mature men and women. But it
is manifest that neither of these facts furnishes any

¹ *Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, 1889, pp. 50, 251.

solid ground for the view that the ministry of Jesus was ten years in length.

The Probable View.

The Synoptists give no definite information on the length of Christ's ministry, but, as has been said, the character and amount of their material point to a ministry of more than *one* year. The Gospel of John, however, refers certainly to three Passovers in the period of Christ's public work (ii. 13; vi. 4; xii. 1), and therefore implies a ministry of at least *two* full years. In another passage (v. 1) he refers to a feast which some believe to have been a Passover. If this view were established John would witness for a public ministry of three¹ full years. But the objections to finding a Passover in John v. 1 seem to be conclusive. First, the preponderance of manuscript authority is for the reading *a* feast, not *the* feast.² It is, however, wholly unlikely that John would refer to the great feast of the Passover simply as *a* feast of the Jews. In every other case he calls it by its name, the *Passover*, and when he adds to this the word *feast*, he says *the* feast (vi. 4). Second, if the feast of v. 1 is a Passover, then out of an entire year of Christ's ministry John records only a single incident, namely, the

¹ It is manifestly unsafe to find support for this view in the words of the parable, "Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree" (Luke xiii. 7).

² Wescott and Hort read *ἐορτή*, not *ἡ ἐορτή*. See Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, editio octavo critica major, for the various readings.

healing of a sick man in Jerusalem, for chapter vi. 4 brings us to another Passover. But it is highly improbable that John records only a single event for a whole year of the ministry of Jesus. Third, the reference in vii. 23 to the man who had been healed in chapter v. is against taking the feast of v. 1 as a Passover, since in that case a year and a half had elapsed between the healing and the reference to it, for this reference is made at the feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2), and one Passover had intervened between this and the feast of John v. 1 (John vi. 4). But this reference is more easily understood if the case of healing was still fresh in the minds of the hearers.

Hence we conclude that John v. 1 does not refer to a Passover, and consequently that John witnesses for a public ministry of two full years. This time must be slightly extended, since the public life of Jesus dates from His baptism, and between the baptism and the first Passover fell the temptation, the tarrying by the Jordan, the sojourn in Cana, and the visit in Capernaum. If the forty days of the temptation be understood literally, then this interval between the baptism and the Passover may have been seven or eight weeks in length. If then Jesus was thirty years old at the time of His baptism, He was a little more than thirty-two when He was crucified. Thus He died and rose again in the early prime of manhood. The disproportion between the brevity of His ministry and its vast results is wholly without a parallel in history.

A Chronological Outline.

The fourth Gospel is the only one that has a chronological framework. The Synoptic narratives have no definite articulation. Their incidents and sayings are loosely connected, and frequently not located. With the exception of the events that belong in the first days of the ministry, in the days spent near Cæsarea Philippi, and in the last week, the Synoptists differ widely in the order of their arrangement of common material.¹ They agree, however, in presenting a ministry that began in Galilee after the imprisonment of the Baptist, that was mainly passed in Galilee in various tours of indefinite duration, and that terminated in Jerusalem at a Passover which is not chronologically located with reference to the beginning of the ministry. John, on the other hand, presents a narrative which is anchored to definite places and divided by fixed dates. As his material is almost entirely different from that of the Synoptists, he does not give us direct aid in the arrangement of their material. However, his chronological outline affords the only working hypothesis that we have for the disposition of the content of the Synoptists, and it is an outline which appears to be adequate and satisfactory.² It does not enable one to locate all the events of the Synoptic narrative, but one may readily admit that all these events *might* consistently be located within it, if we had fuller information in regard to their setting.

¹ See *Appendix*, pp. 369-371.

² Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 250 ; Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 110.

According to John's chronological outline we have eight milestones in the ministry of Jesus, not all, however, fixed with equal definiteness.

1. The first of these eight milestones is the first Passover (John ii. 13).

The time required by the narrative of John up to this point is indefinite. It includes "not many days in Capernaum" (John ii. 12); a visit in Cana (John ii. 1); three days between this visit and the hour when the Baptist pointed Jesus out to his disciples (John i. 29; ii. 1); and a preceding period in which John had become so famous that a commission was sent to him from Jerusalem to make personal investigation (John i. 19). In this indefinite period belong the baptism and the temptation of Jesus, events which, on a literal interpretation of the "forty days," cover about six weeks. How long John had preached before Jesus came to be baptized does not appear from the Synoptic narrative. However, John and Jesus are represented as beginning their ministry in the same year (Luke iii. 1-23).

2. The second milestone is found in the words of Jesus at the well of Sychar (John iv. 35). He said to His disciples, "Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then cometh harvest?" Now the harvest began to be gathered about the first of April. Four months prior to that would be the first of December.¹ Some writers² have thought that this

¹ Comp. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 420.

² E.g., Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 134.

statement might be regarded as a proverb, and thus have no bearing on the time of year when Jesus was in Samaria. But it is difficult to regard this as a designation of the interval between sowing and reaping, since that interval was six months rather than four. Then the word *yet*, — “There are *yet* four months,” seems to indicate plainly that the statement is chronological. The view of this passage is surely unexegetical which inverts the order of the clauses, and puts the reference to “white fields” first.¹ For the words of Christ introducing this statement presuppose just such a thought as has gone before. Christ’s emphatic “*I say*” is plainly the antithesis of what *they* were saying, and presupposes it.

And further, if this inversion is made, the other statement about there being yet four months before harvest seems unintelligible. Edersheim thinks the disciples were at this time discouraged by the apparent remoteness of the Messianic kingdom. But apart from the difficulty of attributing to them such a thought at this early day, before the ministry of Christ had really begun, there is no ground for this figurative interpretation of the words: “There are yet four months and the harvest comes.”

Of this period which Jesus spent in Judea, the Synoptists have no trace. Their narrative puts the beginning of the Galilean ministry immediately after the temptation in the wilderness (Luke iv. 14), or

¹ Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II. Appendix xv.

after the imprisonment of the Baptist (Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 12).

3. The third milestone is the unnamed feast of John v. 1, which, since it came shortly before the Passover (John vi. 4), we identify with the feast of Purim, which, according to Josephus,¹ came on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar.² In this period of approximately three months the Synoptic material up to the appointment of the twelve apostles is to be placed. This view that Jesus, after He had sent out the twelve, went up to Jerusalem to the Purim feast is strongly favored by two circumstances: first, in John's account of Jesus' visit in Jerusalem at the feast of Purim, there is no trace of the presence of His disciples (John v. 1-47); and second, when Jesus left Jerusalem, John says He went to the other side of the Sea of Galilee (John vi. 1). Here, moreover, he falls in with the Synoptic narrative, which relates that straightway after the return of the twelve from their mission Jesus took them across to the east side of the lake (Mark vi. 30-32; Luke ix. 10). Thus the fourth Gospel affords what appears to be solid ground for the chronological location of the Synoptic material that precedes the mission of the twelve.

4. The fourth milestone is the Passover of John vi. 4,³ one month after the feast of Purim. This Pass-

¹ *Antiquities*, xi. 6. 13.

² Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse*, pp. 211-223.

³ The fact that some of the Fathers seem not to have had τὸ πάσχα in their texts of this passage does not neutralize the witness of all extant Mss. and Versions. Yet see Wescott and Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, pp. 77-81.

over Jesus appears not to have attended (John vii. 1). Shortly before this Passover occurred the feeding of the five thousand on the northeast of the Lake of Galilee (John vi. 4).

5. The fifth milestone is the feast of Tabernacles mentioned in John vii. 2, 10. This occurred on the 15th of the seventh month (Tisri), that is, about the middle of October.¹ This fourth period therefore was one of just six months. In it is to be placed at least the greater part of the Synoptic material which is included between the feeding of the five thousand and the final departure from Galilee (Mark x. 1).²

6. The sixth milestone is the feast of Dedication (John x. 22). This was an eight-day festival, and began on the 25th of the month Kislev³ (December), somewhat more than two months after the feast of Tabernacles. Where Jesus spent this period is not indicated. From John's references to the hostility of the leaders in Jerusalem we may perhaps infer that Jesus did not spend much of the time there (John vii. 19, 30, 32, 44; viii. 20, 59).

7. The seventh milestone is the raising of Lazarus. This brought Jesus from Perea to Bethany, in Judea, not long before the last Passover (John x. 40; xi. 7, 17, 55). The length of this period therefore

¹ Lev. xxiii. 34.

² Comp. Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse*, pp. 316-319; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. pp. 272, 273; Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 379.

³ 1 Maccabees iv. 56-59.

is approximately three months. According to John this period was spent in Perea, and the work of Jesus was fruitful (John x. 40-42). In this period we are to place the Perean material of the Synoptists, little in Mark and Matthew (Mark x. 1-45; Matt. xix.), more in Luke, but uncertain just how much. He seems to have regarded the Galilean ministry of Jesus as practically ended when He set His face to go up to Jerusalem (Luke ix. 51), and accordingly we may suppose that most of the incidents related before xviii. 31 were thought by him to have occurred in Samaria and Perea. The story of Mary and Martha (Luke x. 38-42) of course takes us to Bethany, in Judea, and the incident regarding Herod must have transpired when Jesus was in the territory over which Herod ruled (Luke xiii. 31-33), and as it was not long before the death of Jesus, we must think of Perea, rather than Galilee, as the scene of the event. The incidents which follow this, with the exception of the passage concerning the ten lepers (Luke xvii. 11-19), may all belong to the Perean ministry.

8. The eighth and last milestone in John is the Passover at which Jesus was crucified (John xii. 1; xix. 18). The time between this and the seventh is indefinite. Jesus came to Bethany six days before the Passover, and from John xi. 55 we may judge that the stay in Ephraim was short—perhaps a couple of weeks.

9. This chronological outline of the life of Jesus is completed by adding the period between the

resurrection and the ascension, which Luke gives as a period of forty days (Acts i. 3).

A Topographical Outline.

The scenes of Jesus' ministry are no more definitely fixed than the times. We have data for an approximate topographical outline, but at many points the Gospels leave us in uncertainty or in absolute ignorance. Prior to the first Passover Jesus was at the Jordan (Mark i. 9), then in the wilderness (Mark i. 12), a second time at the Jordan (John i. 29), then in Cana (John ii. 1) and Capernaum (John ii. 12). From the first Passover to December of the same year He was in Judea (John iii. 22), having at first spent a few days in Jerusalem (John ii. 23). From December to March He was in Galilee with the exception of a brief sojourn in Samaria (John iv. 3, 43; Mark i. 14). From the Purim feast to the second Passover He was in Jerusalem for a time (John v. 1), and then in Galilee (John vi. 1; Mark vi. 30-32). Between the second Passover and the feast of Tabernacles of the same year Jesus was in Galilee most of the time (John vii. 1), though He visited the region of Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 24; Matt. xv. 21), and spent some time in Decapolis (Mark vii. 31; viii. 22). Between the feast of Tabernacles and the following December Jesus made a visit in Jerusalem (John vii. 10), but for most of the time was probably elsewhere, either in Judea or Perea. From the feast of Dedication (December) to the raising of Lazarus He

was in Perea (John x. 40-42; xi. 7). From the raising of Lazarus until a week before the last Passover He was in Ephraim (John xi. 54; xii. 1); the last week was passed in Bethany and in Jerusalem. After His resurrection the Lord appeared to His disciples chiefly in Jerusalem and its vicinity, though He also appeared by the lake of Galilee and on an unknown Galilean mountain.

CHAPTER VII

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MINISTRY

Winning the First Disciples.

AFTER the temptation, Jesus and John saw each other again at the Jordan, and the meeting was for both important. For John, because it gave him repeated opportunity to bear public testimony that Jesus was the Messiah (John i. 29-34); and for Jesus, because it gave Him His first disciples. The testimony of the Baptist has been denied to him wholly¹ or in part,² and has been attributed to the evangelist, in the thought that it is too spiritual and universalistic to fit the forerunner. It is doubtless to be admitted that the testimony of the Baptist is not given in his own words but in the evangelist's, and also that the evangelist may have read into the words of the Baptist more than their author clearly intended; but it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that even in the Synoptists we find that the Baptist was deeply impressed by the personality of the Messiah (Matt. iii. 14), and that the Messiah bore witness to the greatness of the Baptist (Matt. xi. 9-11). If

¹ *E.g.*, Holtzmann, *Johanneisches Evangelium*, pp. 38, 39.

² *E.g.*, Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 349, 350.

Jesus regarded him as the Elijah who should precede the Messiah, it would certainly be remarkable if he had no appreciation at all of the spiritual and fundamental side of the Messiah's work as sketched, for example, by Isaiah. So the testimony of the Synoptists stands in the way of a sweeping denial of the historical character of the words which John ascribes to the Baptist.

Moreover, the minutely circumstantial character of the entire passage regarding the Baptist (John i. 19-39) is an argument that the words attributed to the Baptist have some historical basis. Yet it is difficult to suppose that John the Baptist spoke of the death of Jesus, and that he put it in the forefront of His services for mankind. For, according to the Synoptists, he thought that the Messiah would at once separate the wheat from the chaff, and set up His Kingdom (Matt. iii. 12; Luke iii. 17). But this view seems to leave no place in his thought for the death of the Messiah. Moreover, the disciples of Jesus, even those who came from the school of the Baptist, were never able to associate the thought of death with their Messiah (Mark viii. 32; ix. 32; Luke xviii. 34). How, then, can this thought have been part of the teaching of John?

This second meeting with John was important for Jesus, as just observed, because it gave Him His first disciples. There is no indication that the Baptist directly suggested to his disciples that they should leave him and follow Jesus. All that he did was to *testify* that Jesus was the Messiah. This, of course,

implied that it was their duty to follow Him; and when the Baptist pointed to Jesus a second time with words of Messianic significance, two of his disciples, Andrew and John,¹ went after Jesus. They had a long interview with Him in His lodging, and were convinced that He was the Messiah. More than a half century later, John remembered the exact hour of this meeting with Jesus (John i. 39). Simon, Philip, and Nathanael were soon won by Jesus, making five in the first circle of disciples. There can be no doubt that these three were also disciples of the Baptist, for they lived at a distance from the scene of the baptism (Simon and Philip in Bethsaida, John i. 44, and Nathanael in Cana, John xxi. 2), and we must suppose that they had been drawn thither by the call of the Baptist. Thus four, probably five (if Nathanael and Bartholomew were names of the same person), of the subsequent twelve apostles had been under the tuition of the Baptist. Others *may* have been. This group of four included the chief apostles, Peter, James, and John. All the five were Galileans, which is remarkable in view of the fact that all the Gospels speak of John's influence upon *Judea*, but no one mentions Galilee.

In connection with the call of these men two incidents are especially noteworthy. In the case of

¹ The evangelist identifies himself with the beloved disciple (xix. 26, 35). He does not name this disciple; but since he names Peter (i. 41, 42), and since the brother of John was martyred in 44 A.D. (Acts xii. 2), he evidently claims to be John, for according to the Synoptists the three intimate disciples were Peter, James, and John.

Nathanael, Jesus seems to have been given a more than human knowledge. He not only read his character as he approached, but He also declared that He had seen him under the fig tree (John i. 47, 48). This seeing impressed Nathanael as supernatural, and is so presented by the evangelist (John i. 49). Whether the fig tree was in distant Cana, or elsewhere, cannot be certainly determined, even as we do not know the time when Nathanael was under the fig tree. If the tree was not beyond the range of mortal vision,¹ then Nathanael must have been impressed by the thought that, while he was under the fig tree, Jesus had looked into his heart. It is to be noticed, however, that what impressed Nathanael so deeply was not regarded by Jesus as the highest evidence of His Messiahship. He told him that in the future he should see more striking proof than was contained in the fact that He had seen him under the fig tree (John i. 50, 51). With regard to Peter the narrative does not require us to think of supernatural knowledge. Jesus gave to Simon a new name, which implied that He saw to the centre of his character (John i. 42)². For Simon was an impulsive man, and, superficially judged, was not a *petros*, a rock. And yet this deep insight of Jesus does not transcend the limits of human knowledge. If sinful men have often had remarkable insight into the character of their

¹ Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 130, note.

² The scene at Caesarea Philippi shows that Jesus had made no mistake in giving to Simon the name *Petros* (Matt. xvi. 18).

fellows, much more may Jesus, whose faculties had not been dulled and obscured by sin.

When the knowledge of Jesus transcended all human limitations, it must be regarded as a part of His Messianic equipment, a gift from the Father, justified by the needs of His work. For He Himself teaches that, in the parallel case of supernatural power, He is dependent upon God, working His miracles by a power not inherent in Himself (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20).¹

The Wedding in Cana.

On the third day after leaving the **Jordan**, Jesus with His five disciples² attended a wedding in Cana of Galilee (John ii. 1). This place, if identified with the modern *Kefr Kenna*,³ as it probably should be, was between three and four miles northeast from Nazareth on the road to Capernaum. Jesus seems to have been asked to the wedding because His mother was there, and His disciples were probably asked out of respect to Him. There is some evidence that Cana was at this time the home of Mary. Thus in John iv. 46, when Jesus returns to Galilee after the early Judean ministry, He goes at once to Cana, which is natural if His mother was there. Again, when Jesus visited Nazareth, His townspeople said, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and

¹ Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 167-174.

² Or six, if John i. 41 implies that, as Andrew found his *own* brother first, so John found his brother James also, but later than Andrew.

³ Bädcker, *Palästina und Syrien*, pp. 243, 252.

Simon? and are not his *sisters here with us?*" (Mark vi. 3). This passage suggests that the mother and brothers had left Nazareth, while the sisters had remained. Then, in John ii. 12, we read that the brothers of Jesus went with Him to Capernaum, after the wedding in Cana, though no mention of them had been made in connection with the feast.

The contrast between the Baptist's mission and that of Jesus is brought out vividly by this wedding in Cana. John went into the wilderness, Jesus into the home. John ate only locusts and wild honey, Jesus partook of a marriage feast. John pointed forward to the Messianic kingdom as that which would bring joy to the righteous; Jesus in the fulness of His Messianic power *gives* joy.

This wedding marks the beginning of the wondrous works of Jesus. Here first He manifested His Messianic "glory" (John ii. 11). It is not altogether clear what His mother expected of Him when she came and announced to Him that the wine had failed. It seems probable, however, on the whole, that she had at least a trembling hope that Jesus would help in a wondrous manner befitting Him as the Messiah. It is true that Jesus had as yet wrought no miracle, and that we can not safely base an expectation of supernatural help upon the events connected with His birth.¹ But the events of the past few weeks must have been known to Mary. It is incredible that the disciples who had come

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 365.

with Jesus, who were full of the thought of His Messiahship, had not told of the occurrences at the Jordan, and of the testimony of John the Baptist, and of their belief. No other subject of conversation could be for a moment compared with that. Knowing then what His disciples knew about her Son, she may well have come to Him with the thought that, if He knew of the embarrassment of the hosts, He would relieve them in a way accordant with the recent revelations (John ii. 3).

The answer of Jesus involves two points: first, that He had entered upon a work in which He received directions from God, not from earthly friends; and second, that the hour for Him to act, that is, as appears from the following verses, the hour for Him to give help, had not yet come. When at last it came, in what way did He meet the emergency?

Beyschlag thinks the miracle was wholly in Christ's power over the minds of the company.¹ He thinks Jesus had opened the treasure of His heart and spoken words of eternal life, and that all hung upon His lips entranced. While in this condition, Mary presented the need of wine, and Jesus after a moment saw that His Father would glorify Him here. "He feels in Himself the momentary power to extend even to the senses of the guests that fascination over the spirit which at the hour streams from Him, and to create for them out of the simplest elements new and better wedding wine. He will set before them simple, clear water, and

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 132-135.

by virtue of His will, which controls them psychologically, it will taste like the most precious wine. So by a wondrous law which the latest science has established, and not by a transubstantiation which mocks all natural laws, we must explain the miracle at Cana, without lessening its genuinely miraculous character, its derivation from the nature-controlling, holy will-power of Jesus."

But it seems impossible to hold this view without doing violence to the text. Thus the narrative does not say a word about Jesus' teaching on this occasion. Had He taught so as to produce the effect which this view supposes, it is remarkable that the evangelist has no allusion to it. Then the narrative locates the conversation between Mary and Jesus, not in the feasting hall, but in the room where the water-pots stood, perhaps the vestibule. Further, the recorded *effect* of the miracle seems to be against the view that it consisted in a wondrous influence which Jesus exercised over the minds of the guests. For if the entire company had been so impressed by Christ's words that the water which He gave them seemed like the best of wine, then it is remarkable that only the five disciples who had followed Him from the Jordan believed on Him (John ii. 11). And to mention yet one point more, the event is no longer a miracle, in the sense in which that word is used in the Gospels, if the water was changed to wine only in the imagination of those who drank it.

Another view of the event is this.¹ Jesus promised to help, believing that God would provide the means. He turned to the circle of His disciples for assistance, which they could not render. Then in a way unforeseen, but natural, the means of relief presented themselves. It was a miracle of divine providence, and in later times, after the details of the event had faded from memory, it appeared as a miracle of divine power. The real significance of the event is the same on either view.

Now in the way of this explanation there seem to be some very serious obstacles. There is no evidence, in the first place, that Jesus ever promised to help those in need while Himself ignorant whence the help would come. On the contrary, we must believe that when God prompted Him to render assistance, He at the same time showed Him how it was to be rendered. Christ is never perplexed in regard to means. His promise to help is followed by the fulfilment just as though He clearly saw the fulfilment when He made the promise. The story of the raising of Lazarus illustrates this point. In the hour when the messenger came to Jesus, He said, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby" (John xi. 4). Now it is evident from the later narrative (John xi. 41) that Jesus was assured, probably in the very hour when the messenger came, that God would grant Him power to raise Lazarus. There is

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 369, 370.

nothing in the life of Jesus to suggest that what was true in this case was not also true in all other cases.

Again, it is difficult to believe that men who saw Jesus heal the sick and raise the dead could, either at the time or later, have regarded a merely providential supply of wine as a miracle to be placed by the side of the raising of Lazarus. If the wine came in an unforeseen but wholly natural manner, then the event, though it may have been very significant, was not a *sign* (σημείον), as that word is used in John; and to call it "an undoubted miracle of divine providence" is to introduce obscurity into the explanation.

If, then, in conclusion, we accept the narrative as historical, we must hold that power was given to Jesus to change water into wine, an act no more difficult of explanation than any of the miracles, for the inner process is in every case alike inexplicable.

The evangelist treats the event at Cana as he does the other miracles of Jesus. It is to him a *sign*, an index finger, pointing to a deep, divine truth. The miracle itself is incidental; the fact of primary importance is behind the miracle, something personal and spiritual. It is the glorious character and power of the Messiah. He appears as the gracious and bountiful¹ helper. Without doubt Jesus regarded the event as a parable, as did the evangelist in calling it a *sign*. For Jesus had not come to supply the physical needs of

¹ John's estimate of the amount of wine is from 108 to 162 gallons (John ii. 6).

man by miraculous means, nor to raise the dead. He had come to establish the rule of God in the hearts of men, and His signs were primarily intended to legitimate Him as God's messenger for this spiritual work.

In Capernaum.

From Cana Jesus went down to Capernaum, some eighteen miles away. This town was on the northwest shore of Lake Galilee, and probably on the great road from Jerusalem to Damascus; but no discovery has yet certainly fixed its exact site, though it is to be found either at Khan Minyeh, toward the southern end of the plain of Gennesaret, or, more probably, at Tell Hūm, at the north end of the plain.¹

It is natural to think that Jesus went to Capernaum because several of His disciples lived there. This was the home of John and James (Mark i. 19, 20), and probably also of Peter and Andrew. We know that Peter had a home in Capernaum a few months later than this (Mark i. 29), and we may suppose that it was already there. His native place was Bethsaida (John i. 44), whose site, save that it was in the plain of Gennesaret, is unidentified (Mark vi. 45, 53). The homes and friends of these disciples would present a favorable opening for Jesus. He might hope to find other disciples among the friends of those whom He had already won.

The fact that the mother and brothers of Jesus went

¹ See Bäder, *Palästina und Syrien*, p. 258; Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, II. 182-190.

with Him to Capernaum may be regarded as a consequence of His miracle in Cana (John ii. 12). They were impressed by this, and wished to be near Him. However, they do not seem to have continued with Him long, for early in the Galilean ministry, Mark tells us that they *came forth*, *i.e.* from Nazareth, or Cana, to lay hold on Him, thinking that He was out of His mind (Mark iii. 21, 31). We may suppose that they went up to the feast with Him, and then, when He retired into Judea without setting up the Messianic standard, they returned, disappointed, to their home in Galilee.

Jesus did not remain long in Capernaum, perhaps a week or two (John ii. 12). There is no evidence that He taught publicly or worked miracles; we may perhaps think of Him as remaining quietly in the homes of His disciples, attaching them more and more closely to Himself, and awaiting from His Father a signal for the next step.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EARLY JUDEAN MINISTRY

The Data.

IT is from the fourth Gospel alone that we learn of an early ministry in Jerusalem and Judea (John ii. 13-iv. 3). There is no trace of it in the Synoptists. According to Luke there is no place for it. After saying that the devil left Jesus for a season, he continues, "And Jesus *returned* in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (Luke iv. 13, 14). Evidently, in his thought, Jesus went from the wilderness directly to Galilee and at once began His great work there. Yet in Mark and Matthew there is a break between the wilderness and the beginning of the Galilean ministry. The text is not consecutive. Mark follows the temptation with the words, "Now after John was imprisoned Jesus came into Galilee" (Mark i. 13, 14); and Matthew says, "Having heard that John had been delivered up, he withdrew into Galilee" (Matt. iv. 12). But it is not likely that these evangelists thought of Jesus as having heard of John's imprisonment *while He was still in the wilderness*. Thus their narrative implies an interval between the temptation and the beginning of public work in Galilee.

One cannot say why the Synoptists thus omit the early Judean ministry, but it is no more strange than their omission of all subsequent visits to Jerusalem and Judea prior to the last Passover. The fact that no one of the Synoptists has any trace of the early ministry in Judea seems to indicate that there was no tradition of this period current in the Church when they wrote.

The First Public Act.

During the few weeks since Jesus left the Jordan with His first disciples He seems not to have worked or preached openly. The one sign which He had wrought had been in a private house. It was fitting that His first public act should be in Jerusalem and in the temple, for this was the centre of the national and religious life — fitting, though probably not *planned* by Him, for He seems to have had no plan, unless we so designate His purpose to do the Messianic work as it should be made known to Him by God day by day. This centre, however, was defiled both by traffic and by the gross deceit of the traffickers (John ii. 14-16; Matt. xxi. 13). The act of Jesus in putting away this profanation from the temple has various aspects which are here to be noticed.

And first, the act itself was not a miracle, did not transcend human power. We can think of an Elijah or an Isaiah as accomplishing it in his zeal for Jehovah. Jesus knew that He was right in driving the traders out, and therefore knew that God was with Him. Those

who were defiling the sacred place may well have had in their secret heart some sense of wrong-doing, and this would naturally be strengthened by the outflashing of Christ's righteous indignation, and by His scriptural condemnation of their doings. So they quailed before the pure and majestic presence of Jesus, as did the noisy mourners in the house of Jairus at a later day (Mark v. 40).

Second, the act of Jesus was in its nature *reformatory* rather than Messianic. There is no suggestion that His disciples regarded it as indicating a claim to Messianic authority. As they reflected upon it, they saw in it a fulfilment of Psalm lxix. 9, "The zeal of thine house shall eat me up" (John ii. 17), a passage suggested by the intense moral earnestness of Jesus. They did not see in it a fulfilment of Malachi's words, "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple" (Mal. iii. 1). Further, there is no indication that any one outside the circle of disciples regarded the act as Messianic. All that the more thoughtful ones saw in this, or in the signs which Jesus did in the next days, was an evidence that He had come from God as a *teacher* (John iii. 2). The cleansing of the temple, then, was simply reformatory, and as such was in line with Christ's subsequent protests against the evil practices of the scribes and Pharisees (*e.g.* Matt. xxiii; Mark ii. 23-28). Hence the act was not typical of the work of Jesus as a whole. For His work was positive in character rather than negative; not the removal of

abuses, primarily, but the establishment of a divine kingdom.

We may suppose that the purpose of God in the cleansing of the temple was to call general attention to Jesus, and to establish His right to be heard as a prophet sent from heaven.

The Challenge of the Jews.

The officials¹ came to Jesus after He had cleansed the temple and demanded a sign in justification of His bold act (John ii. 18). The fact that they did not lay violent hands upon Him may indicate that there was a manifest popular sympathy with the act of Jesus.

Jesus replied to their demand for a sign with a saying which neither they nor His own disciples understood at the time (John ii. 19). "Destroy this temple," He said, "and in three days I will raise it up." The officials thought that He referred to the great temple in which they were gathered, and that seems to have been the idea which people in general came to hold. Two years later, when Jesus was on trial, false witnesses testified that He had said, "I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days," or, "I will destroy this temple made with hands and in three

¹ The fourth Gospel frequently uses the term *the Jews* in a narrow sense, to denote those Jews who were hostile toward Jesus, and hence, especially, the religious leaders. Comp. John ix. 22; xi. 8, 31, 33, 54; xiii. 33. This usage was natural at a time long subsequent to the final separation of Christianity from Judaism.

days I will build another not made with hands." The evangelists say that this was false witness, but do not indicate wherein it was false. According to Mark the witnesses said that Jesus spoke of a wondrous new temple, not made with hands, though He also said that He would destroy the material temple; but according to Matthew's version of the false testimony the stress falls upon the power which Jesus claimed. In both cases, however, He is thought to have made a reference of some kind to the material temple.¹

Thus the Synoptists contain varied evidence that the saying of Jesus was popularly understood as referring to the temple of stone which He had cleansed.

But it was differently understood by the author of the fourth Gospel. He says that Jesus spake of the temple of His body (John ii. 21). This meaning, however, was not given to the word of Jesus until after His resurrection (John ii. 22)—an evidence that it was a dark saying to the disciples no less than to others who heard it (Matt. xxvi. 60, 61; Mark xiv. 57, 58). When Christ was on the cross, men said to Him in mockery, "Ha, thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days" (Mark xv. 29; Matt. xxvii. 40).

Such being the data, it is manifestly difficult to hold that either the earlier or the later view of Christ's word is demonstrably the right one. The text, if it identifies the temple that is destroyed with that which is to be built, plainly supports John's interpretation; but

¹ Comp. Acts vi. 13, 14.

such identification appears doubtful in view of Mark viii. 35. A serious objection to the view that Jesus alluded at this time to His death and resurrection is the fact that nothing in the situation suggested such an allusion, while the situation did suggest a reference to the destruction of the temple of God. The Jews had profaned the sanctuary by making it a house of merchandise (John ii. 16). They had indeed gone far toward its destruction as a place of worship. Jesus said that the sign of His authority to cleanse the temple as He had just done, would be His reconstruction of it, when destroyed. It is obvious that He could not have meant a rebuilding of the temple of stone, for His mission was to establish a spiritual kingdom and a spiritual worship; but He could promise to rebuild the temple, meaning thereby that the great truths for which the temple stood were to have their true and final realization through Him (Matt. xii. 6; John iv. 21).¹ This work, then, which He was yet to do would be a justification of His recent act in cleansing the temple.

Signs in Jerusalem.

The opposition created by Jesus' bold deed in the temple does not appear to have led to an immediate departure. He remained long enough to create a favorable impression even upon certain members of the Sanhedrin. He is said to have wrought signs, but we

¹ Comp. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 394; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 148.

are not told what (John ii. 23). It is explicitly stated that these signs were wrought "during the feast," and this suggests that Jesus did not prolong His ministry in Jerusalem much, if any, beyond the close of the eight days of the feast. The probable reason of this lies in the fact that, while the signs of Jesus made a deep impression, His teaching did not reach the hearts of the people. In Jerusalem, more than elsewhere, men were under the dominion of the scribes and Pharisees, and there was less receptivity for spiritual truths. A deep-seated hatred toward Jesus had been created in the hearts of the leaders by the cleansing of the temple, and their sentiment was so positive and well known that Nicodemus, one of their number (John iii. 1), dared not visit Jesus openly, but came by night (John iii. 2).

The Nicodemus Incident.

This Nicodemus was one of the few men in whom the words and deeds of Jesus had awakened a desire to know more about Him. He was not wholly alone in recognizing Jesus as a divinely-sent teacher, for he says "*We* know," which implies that there were others who had at least a deep respect for Jesus. The conversation with Nicodemus is important in several particulars for the biography of Jesus. And first, it shows that Jesus, at the very beginning of His ministry, took a radical, spiritual view of the way in which men could enter the Kingdom of God. This is in accord with the

view of that Kingdom which He reached in the wilderness. Of descent from Abraham and observance of the law He takes no account, but only of a certain attitude of the spirit, which viewed from one aspect, is a putting away of sin, and from another, is consecration to God (John iii. 5).¹

Again, this conversation with Nicodemus, like the earliest teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists, shows that from the beginning of His ministry He felt that His mission was to reveal the love of God (John iii. 16). Therefore He could not meet the expectation of the people, shared even by the Baptist (Matt. iii. 11, 12), that the Messiah would *judge* the world immediately after His appearance.² Judgment would not have manifested the love of God for sinners, and had Jesus instituted a judgment, He could not have saved that which was lost. Finally, the conversation with Nicodemus, if we assume a historical basis, shows that there was, at least on some occasions, an element of personal disclosure even at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. Nicodemus came to Jesus with a query in his heart whether this teacher might not be the Messiah, and the narrative of John certainly implies that Jesus spoke to Nicodemus words which would help him to answer the query for himself (*e.g.* John iii. 13-15). Other incidents from the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, which are recorded by John, support the view that in

¹ Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 84-87.

² Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 364-371.

His thought Jesus virtually answered the query of Nicodemus and answered it in the affirmative. Thus he represents Andrew as telling Simon that he had found the Messiah (John i. 41). The next day Philip bears the same witness regarding Jesus (John i. 45), and Nathanael addresses Him as King of Israel (John i. 49). These events imply that Jesus gave assurance of His Messiahship to Andrew and the rest. They did not believe on the strength of the Baptist's testimony, but on the basis of their own intercourse with Jesus. This intercourse, however, could hardly have convinced them unless Jesus practically told them that He was the Messiah, as He later told the woman of Samaria (John iv. 26).

Now this representation of the fourth Gospel seems to be widely different from that of the Synoptists. According to this, Jesus studiously avoided Messianic claims (Mark i. 34; iii. 12; v. 40). Not until the last week of the ministry did He make an explicit public claim to be the Messiah (Mark xiv. 62). Two facts concerning this difference between John and the Synoptists should not be overlooked. The personal disclosure in John is to individuals who are seeking the Messiah; the reticence of Jesus which the Synoptists affirm is manifest on public occasions, before mixed audiences. Then, in the Synoptists no less than in John, Jesus *lives* and *acts* like the Messiah, though making no explicit Messianic claim. The claim is implied both in private and in public.

The Synoptic representation of the matter is in general the historical one. When the Baptist sent messengers to Jesus for an answer to the question whether He was the Messiah, Jesus simply pointed them to what He was doing (Matt. xi. 4, 5). John must draw his own inference. And this was typical of the method of Jesus throughout His ministry, and in keeping with His spiritual conception of the Messianic office. He sought no recognition on the mere ground of verbal claims. He sought rather so to act and to speak that men should be constrained to confess Him the Messiah. But it is at the same time credible that there were such partial exceptions to this rule as are recorded in John—partial, for even in John, Jesus is never represented as approaching any one with the bald claim of Messiahship. There is always some significant intercourse before the claim, and of which the claim is hardly more than the natural culmination.

Work of Preparation.

The short period of work in Jerusalem, in which for the most part only a superficial impression was made (John ii. 23–25), was followed by a long period of activity in Judea, of which we have but a meagre account. This period continued about eight months, as has already been shown. Of the place or places where Jesus tarried during these months, we have no certain knowledge. We only know that He was in Judea. John was still baptizing, now at Ænon near Salim

(John iii. 23), but it is not known where Ænon was, though the language of John iii. 26, when taken in connection with John i. 28, shows that the author put it on the west of the Jordan. It is probable that it was in or near the territory of Herod Antipas, for he arrested John soon after the close of this period of eight months, and the jurisdiction of Antipas was over Galilee and Perea, not over Judea. If, then, the Baptist was near the border of Herod's domain, it is probable that Jesus was not far away (John iii. 25). Of the period spent in the vicinity of John we know only that the disciples of Jesus baptized, and that many came to their baptism (John iii. 22 ; iv. 1, 2).

The narrative in John implies that baptism by the disciples of Jesus was not different from John's baptism. It was, accordingly, a baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. It was not that baptism with the Holy Spirit which, according to John, was to characterize the ministry of the Messiah (Mark i. 8 ; Matt. iii. 11). It is manifest that Jesus must be recognized as the Messiah before this baptism by Him or His representatives would be possible.

If, now, the baptism which the disciples of Jesus performed under His direction was the same as John's baptism, we must regard the work of Jesus at this time as virtually a work of preparation. He was making straight His own paths (Mark i. 3), a work which His recent experience in Jerusalem had shown Him was needed.

The effect of this preparatory work, if we may judge from the numbers who came to His baptism, was very great. The movement of people to Him became greater than that to John (John iii. 26; iv. 1). What the real spiritual result of the work was cannot be said. The language of Jesus' brothers just before the feast of Tabernacles suggests that, in their thought, most of His disciples, or those of most importance, were in Judea (John vii. 3). If this was even approximately true, then it implies that the early Judean work had been fruitful, for since that time Jesus had not labored in the land of Judea, and had made but one brief visit in Jerusalem.

Just what part Jesus took in this work does not appear. It is certain that He did not personally administer baptism. Had He done so, it might have given the impression that He regarded Himself as a second John the Baptist. Of signs such as marked His Galilean ministry from its beginning there is no trace.

It is significant that Jesus, even after His baptism by the Spirit for Messianic work, had this time of waiting. Its cause can only be conjectured. According to Mark and Matthew, the imprisonment of the Baptist seemed to be a signal to Jesus that His hour had come (Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 12), and the statement of John, that Jesus left Judea because of the Pharisees (John iv. 1), does not necessarily lessen the significance of the Synoptic representation. But why Jesus should wait until the Baptist's work was done is not indicated.

CHAPTER IX

TWO DAYS IN SYCHAR

Departure from Judea.

ACCORDING to John iv. 1, Jesus left Judea because the Pharisees were taking cognizance of His work. They had heard that He was more successful than the Baptist. It seems probable that Jesus apprehended hostility from the Pharisees, and so thought best to change the scene of His work. When He left Judea, the Baptist was still at liberty (John iv. 1); and therefore, with the Synoptists before us, we are led to think that Jesus, on leaving Judea, had not yet the purpose to enter upon Messianic work in Galilee. For, according to the Synoptists, the signal for the beginning of that work was the imprisonment of the Baptist. We hold therefore that Jesus left Judea and turned His face northward, still awaiting from His Father a sign that the time had come for Him to enter upon a new phase of his career. This sign came very soon; the Baptist was seized by Herod and imprisoned (Mark vi. 17). The place of imprisonment and execution, according to Josephus,¹ was the fortress of Machærus at the northeast of the Dead Sea.²

¹ *Antiquities*, xviii. 5. 2.

² Bäderer, *Palästina und Syrien*, p. 192.

John does not give any direct intimation regarding the time of the Baptist's arrest, yet his narrative implies that it was soon after the departure of Jesus. For when Jesus was again in Jerusalem, about three months after leaving Judea, He referred to the Baptist as one who belonged to the past (John v. 35). We may assume therefore that the Baptist was arrested and that Jesus heard of his arrest either while He was on His way to Galilee, which is favored by the language of Matt. iv. 12, or soon after His arrival there. The Synoptists assume that the work of the Baptist was ended before the Galilean work of Jesus began, and the narrative of John does not oppose this view.

At Jacob's Well.

Jesus left Judea by a road which led through Samaria, just as in the following year, when He was leaving Galilee, He took a Samaritan road (Luke ix. 52). He did not share the Jewish prejudice against the Samaritans, and, according to Josephus,¹ the Galileans as a rule were so free from this prejudice that they travelled through Samaria without scruples. About noon He reached Jacob's well, probably the same that has borne that name since the fourth century.² It is located near the foot of Mt. Gerizim, on its northeast side, on the main highway from Jerusalem to Samaria. The neighboring town of Sychar, to which the disciples went to

¹ *Antiquities*, xx. 6. 1.

² Bädeler, *Palästina und Syrien*, p. 218.

buy food (John iv. 8), is now believed to have occupied the site of the modern 'Asker, twenty-five minutes' walk southeast from Nablous. 'Asker is about three-quarters of a mile from the well. It appears that Jesus did not expect to stop in Samaria, for He did not turn aside from the highway to the town, but sent His disciples to procure food. So the welcome which He received from the Samaritans was wholly a providential surprise.

The conversation with the Samaritan woman has a varied interest for the life of Jesus. First, it shows that Jesus, unlike the religious teachers of the time, was free from prejudice against Samaritans and women. While the Pharisees thought that all Samaritans were possessed by demons (John viii. 48), for they had Gentile blood in their veins,¹ Jesus mingled freely with them; and while His own disciples *marvelled* that He spoke with a woman (John iv. 27), He seems to have done so without the slightest scruple. He not only mingled with Samaritans, but when He wished to teach the duty of neighborliness, He chose a Samaritan to illustrate this virtue (Luke x. 33). His disciples *marvelled* that He talked with a woman in public because they had been taught that such an act was unbecoming to a rabbi, if not to any respectable man. The rabbis held that a man should not talk with a woman in the street, not even with his own wife.² But Jesus was

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 14, 15.

² Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, III. 287; Wünsche, *Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 515.

free from the influence of the scribes, and ranked womanhood as high as manhood. In offering His salvation, He made no distinction between male and female. According to John, His earliest notable disclosure regarding Himself was made to a woman. Women accompanied Him when He finally left Galilee, and He allowed them to minister unto Him (Matt. xxvii. 55). His first two appearances after He rose from the dead were to women (Matt. xxviii. 9; John xx. 16). Thus His treatment of woman laid the foundation for the full recognition and development of womanhood among His disciples. Again, the conversation with the woman, as also the account of the sojourn in Sychar, shows that Jesus wrought no miracle where He could lead souls to God by His word. Here in Samaria He had greater success than previously, and yet He wrought no sign.

The conversation with the woman at the well, like the earlier experience at the Jordan, also shows that supernatural knowledge was granted to Jesus for the needs of His Messianic work. For, although He may have read in the woman's face the fact that she had lived a dissolute life, it cannot be supposed that He read there the fact of her having been married exactly *five* times, and that she was now living in unlawful relation with a man. He knew these things only by the gift of God at the moment. Once more, this conversation with the Samaritan woman shows that Jesus anticipated the doing away of the old economy by means of His

teaching and work. He declared the approach of an hour when worship of the Father would not be bound, for the Samaritans, to Gerizim, nor for the Jews, to Jerusalem (John iv. 21). The coming of such an hour would necessarily bring the abrogation of the priesthood and of sacrifices, *i.e.*, the abrogation of the entire old dispensation. This thought is contained implicitly in the Synoptic word of Jesus, that He came to *fulfil the law* (Matt. v. 17). For since His fulfilment of the spiritual teaching of the law by a living embodiment of the ideal contained in the Old Testament was vastly more vital and forcible than the ceremonial fulfilment, to which Jews had hitherto been bound, it was sure to take precedence of that formal fulfilment in a church that was taught by His Spirit. This was Jesus' method of emancipating His disciples from the law. It is the method of life, not of outward statute. The force of His life was to bring a gradual and natural deliverance from the law, as the pressure of life in the branches and twigs of trees in the spring pushes off the old leaves, whose mission is ended. Finally, this conversation, like that with Nicodemus, indicates that Jesus from the beginning of His ministry, when the occasion was fitting, gave explicit assurance of His Messiahship (John iv. 26). Here among the Samaritans, He might the more freely do so because the Samaritan conception of the Messiah seems not to have been *political*¹ (John iv. 25), as was the Jewish, and

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 522.

the Samaritans were entirely isolated from the Jews, so that His announcement of Himself among them would have no influence upon His further work among the Jews.

In Sychar.

The sojourn in 'Asker was a time of seed-sowing and also of harvest. The villagers who had confidence enough in the woman's word to go forth where Jesus was, besought Him to abide with them. They must have recognized Him to be a Jew, as the woman had done (John iv. 9), but their regard for the prophet was stronger than their prejudice against the Jew. Many heard His word and believed that he was the Messiah. As He had revealed Himself to the Samaritan woman, so we must suppose that He did to those villagers who were drawn to Him. He trusted Himself to these half-Gentiles as He had refused to trust Himself to the Jews of Jerusalem a few months before (John ii. 24). Yet it was not God's purpose that Jesus should prosecute this Samaritan mission. After two days He continued His journey into Galilee (John iv. 43), and did not again in person preach the kingdom to Samaritan hearers. When He sent out His disciples on their first mission, He forbade their entering Samaria (Matt. x. 5). Their work was at home, as was His; the children must first be fed. When that had at last been done, and the Gospel was sent freely to Samaritan and Gentile, it is recorded that the Samaritans received it with marked readiness of mind (Acts viii. 6, 8, 25).

CHAPTER X

THE EARLY GALILEAN MINISTRY

General View.

THE early Galilean ministry extended from the arrest of the Baptist to the feast of Purim in the middle of the following March. With this ministry, with which the Synoptic Gospels begin, Jesus entered on continuous public Messianic work. The baptism of preparation which His disciples had been administering in Judea was dropped, never to be resumed. Instead of isolated miracles, as in the previous eight months, the early Galilean ministry was rich in them. Now for the first time Jesus appeared in the synagogue, and later in the midst of great throngs in the open country, as a teacher and preacher of the Kingdom of God. He made His headquarters in the most thickly settled portion of Galilee, in the town of Capernaum. From this centre He made several tours throughout the province, and once at least appeared on the eastern side of the lake. In this period He formed a circle of disciples, twelve of whom, at its close, He sent forth to announce Him far and near through the province. We cannot follow Jesus from day to day, or even from week to week, through this Galilean ministry, nor indeed through any

period of His life. Minute data of time and place are usually wanting. The Synoptists simply present to us certain great features of the Galilean ministry, salient facts which were supposed adequately to represent the work of Jesus, and with these we must be satisfied.

In Cana a Second Time.

Leaving Sychar in Samaria, Jesus went north into Galilee and came to the Cana which He had visited eight months before (John iv. 46). His fame had preceded Him, and the Galileans who had seen what He did in Jerusalem at the Passover welcomed Him now as He appeared in His own province (John iv. 45).¹ By the time that He reached Cana, the report of His return had travelled to Capernaum, and had brought thence to Cana a man who sought the help of Jesus. This was an officer of a king (*βασιλικός*), presumably of Herod Antipas, and is treated by Jesus as a Jew (John iv. 48). The man sought healing for his son, and would have Jesus come at once to Capernaum. Met thus on His return to Galilee by the request for a miracle of healing, and welcomed by people because of His signs in Jerusalem, Jesus uttered a word of rebuke for the Jews in general, because they relied upon signs and wonders (John iv. 48). When Jesus saw that the noble-

¹ One objection to the view that Jesus went at once to Nazareth on His return to Galilee is the fact that the people of Nazareth did *not* receive Him (Luke iv. 16-30). We must follow Mark and put the visit to Nazareth much later.

man had faith that He could heal, He sent him home with the assurance that his request was granted (John iv. 50). On his way to Capernaum he was met by his servants, who told him that his son began to improve about the seventh hour of the day previous (John iv. 52); and since the distance from Cana to Capernaum is only eight hours, it seems probable that the servants did not start as soon as the son's improvement was noticed, for in that case they and the father would have met on the very day of the cure.

The Call of the Four.

It seems likely that Jesus soon left Cana for Capernaum. Four of the men whom He had attached to Himself by the Jordan, and to whom, as He entered upon the Galilean ministry, He would naturally turn for assistance, were in Capernaum at this time. How long they had been there, and why they had left Judea before Jesus, are questions to which only conjectural answers can be given. The oldest Gospel puts the beginning of the second chapter of their discipleship at the very opening of the Galilean ministry. Simon and Andrew were fishing (Mark i. 16), and James and John were mending their nets not far away (Mark i. 19). They apparently had not expected Jesus just at this time, and it is not unlikely that Jesus sought them out, as He did not find them in the village. His word that they should become fishers of men through Him (Mark i. 17), while it presupposes such a previous acquaintance as is reported in the

fourth Gospel, indicates also that the work of Jesus stood before Him at this time in clear and definite outline.

The narrative which Luke associates with the call of Simon can scarcely be understood in that connection (Luke v. 1-11). Jesus is in the midst of the Galilean activity, and on a certain occasion uses Simon's boat as a convenient seat from which to address the multitudes. At the close of His address He bade Simon put out into the deep and let down the nets for a draught. The catch was so great that both Simon's boat and that of James and John, which was near, were loaded until they began to sink. Simon was so deeply impressed by the event that, in his amazement and conscious sinfulness, he besought Jesus to depart from him. The similarity between this narrative and that of John xxi; the fact that Mark, whose chief source was Peter, has no trace of it; the fact that Simon and Andrew and James and John had long known Jesus and believed in Him, and consequently did not *need* a miracle to induce them to follow Him; and the fact that Simon, conscious of sinfulness, prayed Jesus to depart from him,—all these facts give support to the view that Luke's narrative is a duplicate version of the same event which John describes.¹ The last point—Simon's prayer that Jesus should depart from him—would be intelligible as part of a narrative whose content was subsequent to Peter's denial of Jesus, but it is difficult

¹ Comp. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 436, 437; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 304, 305.

to understand at the beginning of the Galilean ministry. However, there are difficulties connected with this identification, notably the fact that, in Luke, Simon prayed Jesus to depart, while, in John, he jumped into the lake in his eagerness to get near to Jesus.

IN THE SYNAGOGUE IN CAPERNAUM.

Jesus as a Teacher.

On the following Sabbath Jesus entered the synagogue in Capernaum and taught (Mark i. 21). The result was that people were amazed at His doctrine, especially by the authority which characterized Him. His teaching was like that of the scribes in some particulars. Thus He went to the synagogue, the place where they also taught. When in Jerusalem, it was the practice of Jesus to teach in the courts of the temple (Matt. xxi. 23; John x. 23), but in Galilee He went into the synagogue. Like the scribes, Jesus also stood when reading the Scriptures (Luke iv. 16, 20), and sat when expounding them (Matt. xiii. 1; xv. 29; John vi. 3). He allowed questions to be asked (Matt. xii. 9, 10), and John describes an occasion when a long dialogue took place between Him and those present in the synagogue (John vi. 25-59). In this too His teaching was like that of the scribes. But apart from these formal resemblances the teaching of Jesus was wondrously unlike that of the rabbis. *He* spoke with authority (Mark i. 22).

The scribe said over what some scribe of the past

had said. His teaching was mechanical. The highest praise for a scribe was that he resembled a cemented cistern which lost no drop of the water put into it. He was bound never to teach otherwise than as he had been taught.¹ Christ as a teacher was not a cistern, but a spring, clear, abundant, and perennial.

The form of Christ's teaching, at least in Galilee, was eminently *popular*. His addresses had this quality because, in the first place, they were concrete, never abstract. He does not speak of the *summum bonum*, but of the pearl of great price. He does not speak of providence, but says that the hairs of our heads are all numbered. He does not speak of the divine attribute of love, but pictures a father embracing his lost son, and covering him with kisses. Instead of speaking of divine beneficence, He says that God sends rain on the just and the unjust. Again, Christ's words were largely *proverbial* in character, and hence easily remembered. He did not formally develop the truths that He presented, but He gave rather a series of short, pointed sayings, each of which had a certain completeness in itself. The logical relation of these sentences to each other must often be learned from the general theme. These proverb-like sayings of Jesus are akin, in form, to the wisdom-literature of the Old Testament. They abound in parallelisms, by which they fix themselves in the memory more readily (Matt. x. 24, 27, 32, 33, etc.). It is characteristic of the proverb that while it pre-

¹ Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 91-99.

sents thought in a pointed way, it presents only one phase of a truth. Thus Jesus says, "Every one that asketh receiveth" (Matt. vii. 8). Taken by itself, this gives a very imperfect idea of Jesus' thought regarding prayer. It makes no reference to the conditions of prayer; it also passes over the exceptions to the rule that what is asked is granted. Hence it is important, in the interpretation of these sayings of Jesus, to study the separate saying in the light of the whole.

In the third place, Christ's words were largely figurative, symbolic, poetical. They contained the highest truth, but it was winged and breathing. Nature and common life enriched every discourse with apt and forcible illustrations. Every parable is a miniature in speech and can be readily transferred to canvas. After the lapse of centuries, and after passing from Aramaic to Greek, and then from Greek into English, the words of Jesus have a simplicity and a beauty, a force and a majesty, which worthily accord with their unique content.

These are some of the literary characteristics of the teaching of Jesus that made it singularly attractive. Of course the personality of the speaker—the gentleness and grace of His manner, the love that spoke from His eyes, the sympathy that expressed itself in His voice, the authority that belonged to a spiritual experience which was perfectly real and perfectly clear on the great concerns of the soul—this personality was far greater than the spoken word, and may well have made a more abiding impression.

Demoniac Possession.

The teaching of Jesus in the synagogue in Capernaum made a deep impression upon the ordinary hearers, and led them to put Him in a class by Himself, far removed from the scribes. But it also had a remarkable effect upon a man who was in the power of an unclean spirit, or was possessed by a demon (Mark i. 23; Luke iv. 33). This man addressed Jesus in a loud voice, and assumed to be spokesman for others, either men or demons. "What had they to do with Jesus, or Jesus with them? Had He come to destroy them? They knew who He was, the Holy One of God," that is, the Messiah. Jesus charged the demon to come out; the man was thrown into paroxysms; the demon came out with a great cry; all men marvelled; and the report of what had taken place was spread abroad through all the surrounding region.

Occasions and Terms.

This first case of demoniac possession is typical of all the cases found in the Gospels. The phenomenon is met only in the Synoptists, and hence is connected chiefly with Galilee. Six cases of demoniac possession are described in detail (Mark i. 23; v. 2; vii. 25; ix. 25; Matt. ix. 32; xii. 22), and there is a reference to another individual case, that of Mary Magdalene, which is not described (Luke viii. 2). There are also three *general* references to the cure of demonized ones (Mark i. 34, 39; iii. 11). These ten references, par-

ticular and general, are all connected with the ministry of Jesus. In addition to these references, it is said that the twelve apostles cast out many demons, when they were sent forth by Jesus on the Galilean mission (Mark vi. 13). The seventy disciples also reported to Jesus that the demons had been subject to them (Luke x. 17). There is also reference to an unknown man whom the disciples found casting out demons (Mark ix. 38).

The terms used for the foreign power which was said to possess the man are *demon* (Mark i. 34; Matt. viii. 31), *spirit* (Mark ix. 20, etc.), *unclean spirit* (Mark i. 23, etc.), and *evil spirit* (Luke vii. 21).

A man is never said to have *the devil*, or *a devil*, or *Satan*.

John makes no mention of demoniac possession as that is understood by the Synoptists. On one occasion he says that the multitude charged Jesus with having a demon, because He had said that they were seeking to kill Him (John vii. 20). Again, when Jesus told the Jews that they were not of God, they retorted that He had a demon (John viii. 48); and when He said that a man who kept His word should never die, they made the same charge (John viii. 52). Finally, when He had presented Himself as the good shepherd, who had authority to lay down His life and take it again, they told Him that He had a demon and was mad (John x. 20). In all these passages Jesus is charged with having a demon because of certain statements which He

made concerning Himself and the Jews. This charge is a form of abusive language. To say that He had a demon was equivalent to calling Him a Samaritan, and to saying that He was mad (John viii. 48; x. 20). This Johannean usage implies that people in Judea, no less than those of Galilee, believed in the reality of demoniac possession. Otherwise there would have been no force in the abusive language when they said that Jesus had a demon.¹

Demoniac Possession and Physical Disease.

As a rule, the Synoptists distinguish between demoniac possession and physical disease (*e.g.* Mark i. 34; vi. 13). In His commission to the twelve, Jesus distinguishes between them (Matt. x. 1). Sometimes physical affections are associated with demoniac possession, as deafness, dumbness, and epilepsy (Matt. ix. 32; xii. 22; Mark ix. 18), but they are by no means identified. In these cases the physical ailment is regarded as the work of the demon, and when the demon is cast out, the ailment is removed. As a rule, however, possession by demons is regarded by the writers as wholly distinct from physical disease. It is conceivable, perhaps, that the evangelists were mistaken in their view of the matter, but such was at least their view.

Demoniac Possession and Sin.

There is no indication that demoniacs were regarded as especially wicked either by Jesus or by others. The

¹ Analogous to the Johannean usage is Mark iii. 22.

view that in the demoniac the sinful state had reached a climax, where the man no longer had sin, but sin had the man, and that this dominance of sin was traced to a superhuman power,¹ is without support in the Gospels. The case of a boy who had a demon from *childhood* shows that Jesus cannot have attributed demoniac possession to special sinfulness (Mark ix. 21). But the same thing may be surely inferred from the total absence of any allusion by Jesus or by others to the sinfulness of demoniacs. In two instances the demonized are apprehensive that Jesus has come to destroy or to torment them (Mark i. 24; v. 7), and this language suggests a sense of guilt somewhere. It is, however, the demons themselves to whom the narrative attributes this sense of guilt, and therefore these passages have no necessary bearing on the moral state of the afflicted man.

Demoniac Recognition of Jesus.

It seemed to be characteristic of the demoniacs that they recognized Jesus as the Messiah.² Thus the man in the synagogue in Capernaum addressed Him as the Consecrated One of God (Mark i. 24). Again we have a general statement that the unclean spirits, whenever they beheld Jesus, cried out, saying, "Thou art the Son of God" (Mark iii. 11). The Gadarene demoniac is also said to have addressed similar words to Jesus (Mark v. 7).

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 459.

² Yet see Mark ix. 25; Matt. ix. 32; xii. 22.

Now if it be a historical fact that demoniacs, when they confronted Jesus, recognized Him directly as the Messiah, apart from anything that they may have heard regarding Him, it seems psychologically impossible to harmonize this fact with the view that demoniacs were simply insane persons, and morally impossible to explain it if the demoniacs were simply very wicked persons. Surely sin would not clarify the vision for the recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus, and we cannot believe that any physical ailment would have given the demoniacs a clearer insight into the character of Jesus than His own friends and disciples had. But it may be questioned whether the demoniac recognition of Jesus as Messiah was *direct*, or whether it may not rather have been due to rumors regarding Jesus. Even the Gadarene, though living in a region which Jesus had not visited, may conceivably have heard about Him, and may have sprung to the conclusion, which many wanted to hold, that He was the Messiah.¹ We must remember that the Messianic hope was the burning centre of Jewish life, whether religious or political, and that consequently rumors regarding any great character like the Baptist or Jesus would fly with electrical rapidity to the most distant corners of the land.

Treatment of Demoniacs by Jesus.

Jesus treated the demoniacs as though they were really possessed by evil spirits. He called upon the

¹ Against this see Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 463.

unclean spirit to come out of the Gadarene (Mark v. 8). In like manner He addressed the spirit which possessed a certain boy, summoning it forth and forbidding it to enter him again (Mark ix. 25). He charged the unclean spirits not to make Him known (Mark iii. 12). Now it might perhaps be thought possible that in these cases Jesus momentarily accommodated Himself to the delusions of the possessed ones in order to heal them. But He treated the matter in the same way when discoursing with His disciples and with other Jews. Thus He commissioned His apostles to cast out demons (Mark vi. 7), and He tells the seventy not to rejoice that the spirits were subject to them, but rather in the fact that their names were written in heaven (Luke x. 20). Had Jesus known that demoniacs were not controlled by evil spirits, that this was a mere superstition, we should certainly expect that, when speaking with His disciples, He would have told them this. The view, therefore, that He accommodated Himself to a popular superstition cannot be entertained.

Some scholars hold that the phenomenon in question was insanity, but that Jesus shared the view of His countrymen in regard to it.¹ The general ignorance of the time in regard to disease, and the widespread belief in the existence of demons whose joy it was to injure men, make it possible to suppose that what was really

¹ Schwartzkopff, *Zeitschrift für Theol. und Kirche*, 1897, viertes Heft; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, II. 121; Gould, *Commentary on Mark*, p. 23; substantially also Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 293-295.

a mental disease was regarded as demoniac possession. It is not so easy, however, to believe that Jesus shared this popular error. Manifestly, if He did share it, we may hold that it did not affect His qualification to be the Messiah. He did not come to give medical or psychological information, but to reveal God and to found His Kingdom among men. It may be doubted whether this mission required that He should have a scientific knowledge of demoniac possession. The most significant point after all is that Jesus healed the demoniacs. Whether the demon was some form of mental disease or a foreign spirit, Jesus was its master and banished it with a word.

At Peter's Home. Healing the Sick.

From the synagogue where Jesus began His public Galilean preaching, and where for the first time He had healed a demoniac, He went to the house of Peter and wrought His first cure of ordinary disease (Mark i. 29-31; Luke iv. 38, 39; Matt. viii. 14, 15). This was the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, who had a fever. At the evening of the same day, either in the house of Peter or at the door, He healed many who were sick with divers diseases (Mark i. 32-34; Matt. viii. 16-17; Luke iv. 40-41). From this day forward, especially through the early Galilean ministry, Jesus frequently yielded to the requests for physical healing, and restored the sick. There are at least seventeen specific cases recorded.

Extent and Variety of the Cures.

Besides the specific cases of healing, there are at least *three* general statements, which involve the cure of many sick persons at different times (Mark i. 34; iii. 10; vi. 56, compared with Matt. viii. 16; Luke iv. 40; vi. 19). Two of these general statements seem to involve the healing of many sick, not in one place as Capernaum, but in many places throughout Galilee.

The different diseases and physical defects which Jesus is said to have healed are fever (Mark i. 30), leprosy (Mark i. 42), palsy (Mark ii. 10), withered hand (Mark iii. 1), issue of blood (Mark v. 25), deafness (Mark vii. 32), dumbness (Matt. xv. 30), blindness (Mark viii. 22), dropsy (Luke xiv. 2), deformity (Luke xiii. 11), and lameness (Luke vii. 22).¹ It cannot be affirmed that each of these diseases is surely different from the others, nor can it be affirmed that all together exhaust the cases which Jesus healed. Matthew twice speaks of *all manner* of sickness and *all manner* of disease as cured by Jesus (Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35).

Method of Healing.

It was common for Jesus to lay His hand on the sick as He healed them, or to come into some sort of physical contact with them, but about as common not to do so (Mark i. 41; viii. 23; Luke xiii. 13; Matt. xiv. 36; Mark ii. 11; iii. 5; x. 52; Matt. viii. 13; Luke xvii. 14).

¹ The restoration of the ear of Malchus (Luke xxii. 51), which Peter had cut off, may be added, if the narrative of Luke is regarded as historical.

For this reason, if for no other, it cannot be said that His cures were wrought by virtue of the touch, as though by some sort of animal magnetism. It seems to have been the belief of some who sought healing from Jesus, that to touch His body or even His garments would bring the desired help, and even though Jesus was unaware of their touch (Mark v. 27; vi. 56). This, however, was surely a superstitious belief. Jesus healed, as He also cast out demons and raised the dead, by the Spirit of God, or by the finger of God (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20; Mark vii. 33, 34; John xi. 41, 42). It was by an act of His will, in dependence upon God. When Jesus touched a sick person or laid His hands upon him, the act was not *necessary*, for, as we have seen, in about half the instances, there was no touch; but it was an act expressive of sympathy and so would tend to awaken confidence.

As a rule, whether accompanied by a touch or not, Jesus spoke some word to the sick, which was followed by immediate or gradual recovery (Mark i. 42; iii. 5, etc.). In a single instance, He is represented as addressing the disease itself (Luke iv. 39), as He addressed the wind and the sea.

In one case, probably in two, Jesus wrought a cure in the distance (John iv. 46-53; Matt. viii. 5-13).¹

¹ It seems very difficult to identify these incidents. In Matthew, it is a Gentile who comes to Jesus; in John, apparently, a Jew. In Matthew, the man is *commended* for his great faith; in John, he is rather *rebuked* for lack of faith. Then there is the difference in place, Jesus being in Capernaum according to Matthew, but in Cana according to John.

It was not Jesus' method to make use of any physical means in healing the sick. He did so in but three cases, one of deafness and two of blindness (Mark vii. 32 ; viii. 22 ; John ix. 6). Once He put spittle on the tongue and twice He put it on the eyes, in one case mingled with clay. The spittle in these cases cannot be regarded as a medicinal agent that effected the cure. One man whose eyes Jesus anointed was *born* blind (John ix. 1). Now although spittle was a medicine for ophthalmia, it surely could not give sight to one born blind. Therefore the means sometimes employed by Jesus must be otherwise explained. We should probably regard them in the same way that we regard His touch. Neither was necessary, but either may have aided weak faith. It is sometimes thought that the healing, in these cases, was miraculously *begun*, but was then aided by the physical means.¹ This view, however, is not tenable, for though in two instances the healing wrought by Jesus was gradual (Mark viii. 22-25 ; Luke xvii. 14), in most cases it was immediate.

As to the *condition* on which miracles of healing were wrought it may be said that, as a rule, faith was required. Jesus could not do mighty works in Nazareth because of the unbelief of the people (Mark vi. 5). He asked the blind men if they *believed* that He could heal them (Matt. ix. 28). In several cases He said, after the cure, "Thy faith has saved thee" (Mark v. 34 ; x. 52 ; Luke xvii. 19). The faith which Jesus rewarded with a miracle

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 475.

of healing was not always exercised by the sick person. In some cases the faith of the sick person's friends is said to condition the cure (Mark ii. 5; John iv. 46). It perhaps cannot be said that faith was *absolutely* necessary to a miracle of healing. As Jesus raised the dead when there was apparently no belief that He could do so, He may also have healed the sick, if He chose, even when faith was wanting. We are not, however, at liberty to suppose that Jesus did work miracles of any sort where there was no confidence in Him.

In many cases of healing, no explicit reference is made to faith as in any wise conditioning the cure, though it does not necessarily follow that no faith was exercised.

The faith in Jesus which is sometimes said to have conditioned His cures was simply faith in Him as one sent from God who was able to work the desired cure. It was not faith in His Messiahship. He did not ask the blind men if they believed Him to be the Messiah, but only if they believed that He could heal them (Matt. ix. 28). And He never conditioned the gift of healing on the acceptance of Him as the Messiah.

Purpose of the Cures.

The cures of Jesus were wrought to lead men to faith in Him as the Christ of God, not *because* they already had that faith. When John the Baptist sent from his prison to learn whether Jesus was really the Messiah, Jesus replied in words borrowed from Isaiah (xxxv. 5, 6; lxi. 1), which referred to physical blessings and preach-

ing to the poor (Matt. xi. 5). According to this passage Jesus regarded His cure of the sick, no less than His proclamation of good tidings to the poor, as an evidence of Messiahship foretold in the Old Testament.

Yet miracles by themselves did not prove the Messiahship of Jesus, and He did not affirm that they did. Old Testament prophets had wrought similar miracles. The Messianic significance of the signs was nothing apart from the Messianic *claim* made by Jesus. But since He claimed to be the Messiah sent from God, the signs which God granted Him power to do were a divine indorsement of His claim. Plainly then the force of the signs was by no means irresistible. A certain moral earnestness and spiritual insight were needful if men were to accept the signs as evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus. This is involved, for example, in the answer which Jesus sent to the Baptist, which has already been cited. The last word of that answer was, "Blessed is he whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me." He would not have spoken thus had not the witness of His miracles needed to be confirmed by the apprehension of Himself. So again He *exhorts* the Jews to believe His works, which shows that the acceptance of the works was not like the acceptance of mathematical evidence (John x. 38). One might refuse to accept this evidence, and most people did refuse. In general they regarded the signs of Jesus as proving that He was a teacher come from God, or a great prophet, but nothing more (John iii. 2; ix. 33;

xiv. 11; Matt. xvi. 14). Some of His enemies even attributed them to Satanic power (Mark iii. 22).

Tour of Galilee.

Jesus was never satisfied to heal the bodies of men if His influence over them stopped with the physical blessing. If it was all that people wanted, it was more than Jesus desired to give; yet it was the least He had to give to the one who wanted more.

It may have been the importunate desire of the people of Capernaum to be healed, and their lack of desire for the things of the Kingdom, that led Jesus forth to pray in a solitary place early on the day after His numerous miracles (Mark i. 35). When His disciples had found Him, they reported that all were seeking Him (Mark i. 37). Jesus, however, knew why they were seeking Him, and summoned His disciples to go with Him to other cities, that He might preach there. The people who sought Him wished healing; He wished to preach (Mark i. 38).

Thus He went forth on a tour of Galilee, of which, though Matthew and Mark say it was comprehensive (Mark i. 39; Matt. iv. 23), we have practically no specific information. That He preached in the synagogues and healed the sick, as he had done in Capernaum, we may well believe. It is with this tour that Mark connects the incident of a leper whom Jesus healed (Mark i. 40-45), and as Mark gives this incident in a fuller and clearer form than either Matthew or

Luke,¹ his chronological disposition of it is to be preferred.

We may well believe that this incident of the first Galilean tour has survived because of its exceptional significance. The cure of leprosy was a new and striking manifestation of the power of Jesus; the stern way in which Jesus put the healed man out of the house and commanded him to observe the Mosaic ordinance, defined His attitude toward the Law; the injunction of silence was typical of the method of Jesus throughout His subsequent Galilean ministry; the man's disobedience of Jesus' word illustrates the general fact that the miracles of healing bore little spiritual fruit; and the excitement produced by the cure interfered seriously with the preaching of Jesus — the first of several experiences of this sort. He was for a time obliged to discontinue work in the towns, and was in solitary places, where, however, many sought Him out.

Again in Capernaum.

This first tour, of indefinite length,² was followed, according to Mark,³ by a period of work in and near Capernaum (ii. 1–iii. 12). As soon as it was known that Jesus was at home, for so Peter's house seems to have been regarded (Mark ii. 1; comp. iii. 20), crowds

¹ Comp. Luke v. 15, 16 with Mark i. 45. Matthew omits the important consequences of the miracle because he puts it in a different connection.

² *δὲ ἡμερῶν* (Mark ii. 1).

³ Mark's order is followed in preference to Matthew's because he gives a clear motive for Jesus' retirement to the east side of the lake, iv. 35, 38.

gathered, and Jesus spoke to them, until interrupted by an appeal for physical aid. The circumstances connected with the cure of the paralytic marked it off from other cures, and gave it a singular interest. The device for getting the sick man into the presence of Jesus was only less remarkable than the word which Jesus spoke to him, for here, for the first time in our record, Jesus declared the forgiveness of sins (Mark ii. 5). Called to account by the scribes for this act, Jesus, to prove that He had authority to do what men would call the easier, did what they would call the harder, that is, healed the man. And in this connection He used for the first time what we must call His own peculiar self-designation, *the Son of Man*. The investigation of this name belongs to the teaching of Jesus,¹ whence it appears to have been a synonym of *Messiah*. Its appearance in the narrative of the Galilean ministry may mark an increase of emphasis on the personal claim of Jesus.

The call of Levi-Matthew, which all the Synoptists associate with this visit in Capernaum (Mark ii. 14; Matt. ix. 9; Luke v. 27), has unique significance as defining Jesus' attitude toward tax-gatherers. He called this man, as He had previously called the two pairs of brothers, to accompany Him in His work. He is the fifth and last disciple of whose call the Synoptists give us any details. His call may have led to the extension of the influence of Jesus among the tax-gatherers, for Levi made a feast for Jesus, at which many publicans

¹ Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 185-189.

were present (Mark ii. 15; Luke v. 29); and Jesus, in reply to the criticism of the scribes and Pharisees, said that this was the sort of people in whom He was especially interested (Mark ii. 17). The "sinners" who at this time appear, and in association with the tax-gatherers, are people who did not observe the law in the scrupulous manner of scribes and Pharisees.¹ It is at this time, therefore, that we see the beginning of the attachment to Jesus of those who were socially outcast; and with this, naturally, the intensification of the hostility of scribes and Pharisees. They complain because He, who assumes to be a rabbi, eats with disreputable people (Mark ii. 16); they complain because He does not regard the fasts which even the disciples of John observe (Mark ii. 18; Matt. ix. 14; Luke v. 33); they charge Him with violation of the Sabbath because He allows His disciples to pluck heads of grain on that day to satisfy hunger (Mark ii. 24; Matt. xii. 2; Luke vi. 2); and they are driven to take counsel with their enemies, the Herodians,² how they may destroy Jesus, because He heals on the Sabbath³ (Mark iii. 2, 6; Matt. xii. 9-14; Luke vi. 6-13).

It is here, in His answer to the question about fasting, that we hear from Jesus the first allusion to His death, veiled and probably unnoticed at the time, but

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 400, 3d ed.

² Supporters of the Herod family and hence friendly toward Rome.

³ There are other instances of healing on the Sabbath which seem to have been later, Luke xiii. 10-17; xiv. 1-6.

later unmistakable (Mark ii. 19; Matt. ix. 15; Luke v. 35). This allusion is general in character and contains no suggestion in regard to the nature of His death.

The Sabbath incidents are biographically important because they mark the inception of the purpose to kill Jesus, and because they illustrate His methods of arguing with the scribes. In defence of His Sabbath ministries, He appeals, in one case to Scripture (Mark ii. 25), again to the moral sense of His hearers (Mark iii. 4), and then to their own practices (Luke xiii. 15). His claim to be lord of the Sabbath (Mark ii. 28), like His claim to have authority to forgive sin (Mark ii. 10), illustrates the manner in which, at this time, His Messianic consciousness expressed itself.

Following Mark, we associate with this period of work in Capernaum and its vicinity that scene which shows us the height of the popularity of Jesus as a healer of diseases (Mark iii. 7-12). It appears that He had been in Capernaum long enough to have attracted people thither from the most distant parts of the land; from Idumea on the south to the regions of Tyre and Sidon on the north, and also from the east of the Jordan (Mark iii. 8). This is the most comprehensive geographical statement in the Gospels regarding the influence of the cures wrought by Jesus. For it was His miracles, as Mark says, not His teaching, that drew people from the ends of the land (Mark iii. 8). The press of those who desired to touch Jesus was so great that He was obliged to take refuge in a boat (Mark iii. 9).

The Appointment of the Twelve.

It was at this time, according to Mark and Luke, that Jesus, having retired to a mountain with His disciples, appointed the twelve (Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13). And this is intrinsically probable. The fact that people were coming from distant parts of the land indicated the arrival of the hour when He should multiply His influence, both as a healer and a preacher of the Kingdom, by sending forth those of His disciples who were best qualified for the work.

The beginnings of the apostolate, as we have seen, were made by the Jordan, when Jesus returned from the temptation, and attached to Himself five of the disciples of the Baptist. During the eight months of the Judean ministry, it seems probable that John was with Jesus, because of the information regarding this period which he gives. Whether all the others were with Him, and if so, how long they were with Him, cannot be said. The absence of any reference to the Judean ministry in the Gospel of Mark, which was based on the preaching of Peter, lends some color to the view that Peter was not with Jesus during these months. The best and well-nigh the only evidence we have of the spiritual effect of the teaching of Jesus during the early ministry in Galilee is the fact that He had won a number of disciples from whom He could select six or seven who were, in a measure, fitted to represent Him. There is no indication how large the number was from which these were chosen (Mark iii. 13; Luke vi. 13).

The statement in Luke that Jesus spent the night in prayer (Luke vi. 12), which preceded the day of the appointment of the twelve, accords with the spirit of the entire life of Jesus.

The Number and the Men.

The choice of exactly *twelve* disciples, while it may have been influenced somewhat by the amount of work to be done, and by the number of available men, was doubtless chiefly due to the mission for which Christ chose them. They were not to go into any way of the Gentiles, but to the lost sheep of *Israel* (Matt. x. 5-6). As destined primarily for the twelve-fold people they were twelve.

The twelve were probably for the most part Galileans, perhaps exclusively so. It was in Galilee that the continuous public Messianic work of Jesus began, and in Galilee that He made the deepest spiritual impression. Peter, Andrew, and Philip were natives of Bethsaida (John i. 44); James and John were at home in Capernaum (Mark i. 19). Bartholomew-Nathanael was from Cana (John xxi. 2). Matthew seems to have lived in Capernaum (Mark ii. 14). If James, the son of Alphæus, and Thomas were brothers of Matthew, as Weiss¹ thinks, then five of the twelve apostles were from Capernaum. Simon the Cananæan was probably a Galilean, for it was in Galilee that the leader of this

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 85.

party of Zealots arose.¹ The only one of the twelve whose name points away from Galilee is Judas *Iscariot*, *Iscariot* meaning man of Kerioth, and Kerioth was in Judea. But too much weight must not be given to this circumstance, for John twice attaches the word *Iscariot* to the *father* of Judas (John vi. 71 ; xiii. 26). In accordance with this, Judas himself may well have been a Galilean.

The choice of Judas was as the choice of the others. Jesus hoped he would be a useful disciple. He doubtless knew his weakness and peril, as He knew the weaknesses of the other disciples, but He anticipated that Judas would be loyal to Him. At the time of the crisis in Capernaum Jesus saw that Judas was being alienated from Him, and, according to John, alluded to this defection of Judas when He said, "Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a *devil*?" (John vi. 70). But it cannot be inferred that He gave up hope of winning Judas even then. He referred to him, without calling his name, as a *devil*, but He called Peter *Satan* to his face, and yet won him to permanent loyalty (Matt. xvi. 23).

As regards the education and social position of the twelve, it is sometimes underestimated.² Four only were fishermen, as far as the record informs us, and of these James and John belonged to a family of means and of high social standing. Their father had

¹ Acts v. 37 ; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, I. 509.

² Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 354.

hired servants (Mark i. 20). Their mother was one of the women who supported Jesus (Mark xv. 41), and John seems to have had a home in Jerusalem after the crucifixion, to which he took the mother of Jesus (John xix. 27). As to social standing, John was acquainted with the high priest, so that he not only had admission to the palace himself, but was able also to bring Peter in at the time of the trial of Jesus (John xviii. 15).

Matthew must have been a man of some education and business ability in order to occupy the position of tax-gatherer.

Purpose of the Appointment.

The immediate purpose of the appointment of the twelve was plain within a short time after it was made. Jesus called them unto Him, gave them authority to cast out demons and to heal the sick, and sent them forth to preach the Kingdom (Luke ix. 1, 2; Mark vi. 7). The immediate end in view therefore was the increasing of His own influence. His apostles were to spread the news of the Kingdom where He had not published it, and where perhaps He might not be able to come; and as evidence that they were indeed representatives of Jesus and His Kingdom, they were to cast out demons and heal the sick.

The *ultimate* purpose of the appointment was that these men, having received special training from Jesus, might carry on His work in the remoter future, after He should have left them (Mark iii. 14; Acts i. 8).

Consequently in the remainder of the ministry of Jesus, we find Him giving more and more time to the twelve. He took two somewhat extensive tours with them, one to Tyre and Sidon, thence over Lebanon and through Decapolis to the east side of Lake Galilee (Mark vii. 24), and the other to the region of Cæsarea Philippi (Mark viii. 27). Much of the last few weeks was devoted to the twelve, and the appearances of the risen Lord were largely to the apostles, together or individually.

Sermon on the Mount.

About the time of the appointment of the twelve, Jesus gave His disciples an address on the general principles of His Kingdom and its relation to the law, (Matt. v-vii.; Luke vi. 20-49). Matthew puts this on a mountain (v. 1), Luke at the foot of a mountain (vi. 17). Luke's version is a little more than a quarter as long as that of Matthew, though elsewhere in his Gospel, scattered through several chapters, he has material that is parallel to Matthew's sermon on the mount. The historical discourse was probably a good deal unlike both the version of Matthew and that of Luke. We are not here concerned either with the exact limits of the original discourse or with the content of our versions of it; but simply with the event as an important moment in the early Galilean ministry. Jesus had before Him a company of disciples, whom He regarded as the nucleus of the divine Kingdom (Matt. v. 13, 14). His words were to be their law (Luke vi. 47), in place

of the law given unto the fathers. He is sure that one who does these words will be as a house built upon a rock (Matt. vii. 24), for in Him and His words the law and the prophets are fulfilled (Matt. v. 17). Thus, though Jesus did not declare His Messiahship explicitly, His speech constantly implied it. Again, it was plain to Jesus at this time that the way of His disciples, like His own, was to be a way beset with manifold trials (*e.g.* Luke vi. 27-29), but leading at last to victory both for the individual and for the Kingdom (*e.g.* Luke vi. 20-23; Matt. v. 13, 14).

The Proselyte Centurion.

Both Matthew and Luke attribute to this period, spent in or near Capernaum, the healing of a centurion's servant (Matt. viii. 5-13; Luke vii. 2-10),¹ a narrative of special interest because it records the first instance of a Gentile petitioning Jesus for help. It is not unlikely that he was a proselyte, for the messengers speak of him as loving the Jews and as having built the synagogue (Luke vii. 5). This latter statement suggests that Capernaum had but one synagogue and also that the centurion was a man of means. The incident is noteworthy in this respect also, that according to Jesus, the centurion had a greater faith than He had found in Israel (Matt. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9). He

¹ The narrative of Luke, being fuller than Matthew's and abounding in details which bear the stamp of genuineness, is to be placed before Matthew's.

thought it unnecessary for Jesus to come to his house¹; a simple word of command would be sufficient. Such faith in a Gentile seemed significant to Jesus, and led to His first recorded utterance regarding the share which the Gentiles were to have in His Kingdom (Matt. viii. 11, 12). Luke does not record that Jesus spoke the desired word, but his narrative implies it in saying that the messengers of the centurion, on their return to his house, found the servant well (Luke vii. 10).

Opposition from Jerusalem.

The work of Jesus, which had drawn people from the distant parts of the land for help, drew from Jerusalem the sharpest opposition which had thus far been manifest. Jesus was again in a house (Mark iii. 20), presumably that of Peter, engaged as usual in teaching and working cures (Luke xi. 1; Matt. xii. 22). The scribes said that He wrought his cures by connivance with Beelzebub (Mark iii. 22), thereby hoping to alienate the people from Him. Jesus, having heard of the charge, called the scribes to Him (Mark iii. 23), showed them the absurdity of their charge (Mark iii. 23-26; Matt. xii. 27), and then intimated that the wickedness of their accusation came dangerously near the limit of human sinfulness (Mark iii. 28-30). They were attributing to Satan what they knew to be kindly, beneficent deeds.

Jesus also told them that His cures, instead of argu-

¹ Comp. John iv. 47, 49.

ing coöperation with Satan, argued that Satan himself had been overcome by Him (Mark iii. 27), and said plainly that He wrought His miracles by the Spirit, or the finger, of God (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20). It is intrinsically probable that Jesus, at this time, uttered the severe words of judgment over that generation, which Matthew and Luke record (Matt. xii. 38-45; Luke xi. 24-26, 29-32), with which was associated an obscure reference to His death and resurrection under the parallelism between His fate and that of Jonah.

Opposition from His Mother and Brothers.

In this period belongs also the attempt of Mary and the brothers of Jesus to draw Him away from His course of public action (Mark iii. 21, 31-35; Matt. xii. 46-50; Luke viii. 19-21). They thought He was out of His mind (ἐξέστη). In Cana or Nazareth they had heard of His words and deeds, and to them these were not evidence of Messiahship, but rather of loss of mental balance. In their minds, the course of Jesus was wholly at variance with His claim; and their judgment was not unlike that of the Baptist and of the great majority of the people. The popular conception of Messiah could not find its hero in Jesus. He was simply an itinerant prophet, and the intimations which He gave of His Messiahship were utterly incongruous with His outward life.

Whether Jesus saw His mother and brothers on this occasion, we are not told; but He declared that His

most sacred relationship was with those who were doing the will of God (Mark iii. 35).

Biographical Hints in the Parables.

The impression made by the Synoptists is that Jesus began to speak in parables near the close of the early Galilean ministry. According to Mark, He spoke the parable of the sower and many others on the very day on which, at evening, He crossed to the country of the Gerasenes (Mark iv. 35). What Jesus said of the fulfilment of *judgment* through the parables (Mark iv. 11, 12) accords well with this view that He spoke them toward the end of His visit in Capernaum. Another fact which points the same way is that the parables were intended to sift the hearers, to find out those who were spiritually receptive and to bring them into closer relation to Jesus. This function of the parable suggests that they were spoken toward the end of the work in Capernaum rather than at its beginning. We may say that Jesus probably intended to sift His hearers by means of the parables, because that is what actually took place (Mark iv. 10). Some out of the multitude remained with Jesus for an explanation of the lesson of the story, and Mark makes the general statement that Jesus interpreted all the parables to His disciples (Mark iv. 34). Many heard the parables (Mark iv. 13); few learned from Jesus the spiritual meaning.

The experience of Jesus during the period spent in Capernaum is perhaps reflected in some of the parables

that He spoke at its close. He Himself as sower of the seed had found hard soil, shallow soil, and impure soil, but also some good soil from which He was getting a harvest (Mark iv. 13-20). He may also have had His own recent experience in mind when He likened the Kingdom to a net that takes both good and bad fish (Matt. xiii. 47-50).

Asleep in the Storm.

The early Galilean ministry was practically at an end when, on a certain evening, Jesus summoned His disciples to go across the lake to the east side (Mark iv. 35), for though He soon returned to Capernaum (Mark v. 21), He seems to have gone, after a little, to Jerusalem (John v. 1). It appears that Jesus started for the east side of the lake for rest. At any rate He was so weary that He slept during the terrible storm that came down upon the boat (Mark iv. 38), and He does not seem to have gone to any town or city on the east side. It is possible that He returned to the west side the day after the storm (Mark v. 17, 18).

According to Mark other boats had started with Jesus, but they seem to have returned before the storm. They may have accompanied Him for a distance as a sort of honorary escort. When the storm arose, Jesus was asleep, and not until the last moment did His disciples awake Him. Then, arising, He rebuked the wind and the sea, saying, according to Mark, "Peace: be still." We may suppose that He thus addressed the elements,

not as though He thought them hostile powers that could hear and obey, but because in this way He could most easily make it manifest to His disciples that He, by virtue of God's aid, could still the storm. It was like His rebuking the fever which held Peter's mother-in-law (Luke iv. 39). The act was symbolical.

It is of course to be held that this miracle, like all the mighty works of Jesus, was wrought by virtue of His dependence upon God (Matt. xii. 28). The fact that He *speaks* to wind and sea surely does not imply that He is acting independently of God; and the circumstance that no prayer is here mentioned does not justify us in supposing that the evangelists thought of the miracle as different from the others wrought by Jesus. The objection to this narrative, that it represents Jesus as taking the matter of His personal safety into His own hands instead of trusting wholly in the Father, might be allowed to have force if Jesus had been *alone* in the boat. In that case had He wrought the miracle, it would look as though He had yielded to the temptation which He had successfully withstood in the wilderness; but that is not the case. As far as Jesus Himself was concerned, *He would apparently have slept through the storm.* But He had His apostles with Him, and His act is intelligible as a lesson to them.

The Gerasene.

The storm passed, and the boat reached the eastern shore at a point not far from a city (Mark v. 14), which

with much probability has been identified with Gerza,¹ which lies north of the middle of the east shore, directly opposite Magdala. Jesus seems not to have visited the city (Mark v. 17, 18).

The narrative of the demoniac² has two features that distinguish it from all other instances of the healing of demonized people, and it may have been preserved on account of these. In the first place, the cure of the man was in some way associated with the loss of a large herd of swine, according to Mark about two thousand (Mark v. 13). From the standpoint of the evangelists this destruction was occasioned by the demons who had come out of the man, and with the permission of Jesus had entered the swine (Mark v. 13; Matt. viii. 32; Luke viii. 32). If demoniac possession be regarded as a form of mental disease, then the most natural hypothesis is that the man, in the paroxysm that preceded the cure and in the belief that the demons in him might be given over to the swine, sprang into the herd, and thus caused a fatal stampede.³ If Jesus be held responsible for the destruction of the swine, — which position assumes, without ground, that He knew what effect would be produced upon the swine by His granting the request of the demoniac, — then an apology

¹ Thompson, *Central Palestine and Phœnicia*, pp. 353–355; also Merrill, in *East of the Jordan*.

² Mark and Luke plainly had independent sources, which do not always agree in detail.

³ Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 193.

for the act is found in the healed man himself. How much is a man better than swine!

A second unique feature of this cure is the fact that Jesus sent the man to publish among his people what the Lord had done for him (Mark v. 19). On the west of the lake He had repeatedly sought to avoid publicity in the working of miracles of healing (Mark i. 44; iii. 12). The explanation of this difference in policy is probably to be found in the character of the population on the east side of the lake. As the Gentile element was very large,¹ and as the region on the east of the lake was sparsely settled, it may well have been that Jesus apprehended no political demonstration in consequence of His Messianic work. It is possible, however, that Jesus spoke to the man as He did because He did not contemplate working in this region. If He Himself were out of the land, a single miracle that He had wrought there could hardly have serious consequences.

The Daughter of Jairus.

The departure of Jesus from the east side of the lake may have been hastened by the request of the Gerasenes that He should leave their borders (Mark v. 17). The great crowd who gathered around Jesus on His arrival at the west side of the lake, who, according to Luke, were expecting Him (Luke viii. 40), points to the neighborhood of Capernaum. Yet Jesus does not

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 11-14.

seem to have remained here and to have resumed the work which He had dropped a little before, when He went to the east side of the lake. One great event, however, is to be connected with this brief visit, according to Mark and Luke, namely, the first instance of the raising of a dead person by Jesus (Mark v. 21-43; Luke viii. 40-56; Matt. ix. 18-26). The healing of a woman, which is narrated in the midst of the account regarding Jairus' daughter (Mark v. 25-34) probably did not differ essentially from other cures wrought by Jesus, though the Synoptists appear to have regarded it as wrought without His conscious volition (Mark v. 30; Luke viii. 46). This is the way it *seemed* to the bystanders, and the word of Jesus, "Who touched my garments?" might easily be supposed to confirm their impression. Then, since people were continually crowding against Him (Mark v. 24), it was natural to explain His question by the supposition that He must have perceived the outgoing of healing power in the particular case of the woman's touch.¹ But if there was a miracle wrought in the woman, then, according to the analogy of all the mighty works of Jesus, we must hold that it was with the knowledge and will of Jesus. His question is not unfavorable to this view, for He might have had knowledge that one was touching Him in faith, and yet not be able, on turning, to recognize the individual who had touched Him. The narrative gives no support to the view that the miracle was

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 554-556.

wrought by God without the participation of Jesus; and we should give to the words of Jesus, "Thy faith hath saved thee," an unusual meaning if we should hold that He thereby confessed that He had no part in her cure.

The daughter of Jairus was not dead when he came to Jesus, but was nigh to death (Mark v. 23; Luke viii. 42).¹ Jairus asked for a cure, not for a resurrection. No one ever asked Jesus to raise the dead. But before the house of Jairus was reached, the child expired (Mark v. 35), and when Jesus came a crowd were weeping and wailing (Mark v. 38). He had heard on the way that the child was dead, and, since after that He told Jairus not to fear, He must have been confident that God had granted Him power to raise her from death (Mark v. 36). It is in this confidence that He can speak of her as *sleeping* (Mark v. 39). For Him she had not departed forever, but at His touch, as though she were in sleep, she would rise. Having put out the noisy throng, and with the parents and three of His disciples as witnesses, He took the child's hand and bade her rise (Mark v. 40, 41). She rose immediately and walked about the room (Mark v. 42).

This miracle was wrought as simply and with as great ease as though the child had only been ill. There is no reason to suppose that it was more difficult for Jesus than were His other signs. All were alike to the infinite power of God, on which He depended.

¹ Matthew's narrative by greatly condensing the story has obscured this point.

The Mission of the Twelve.

Both Mark and Matthew refer to a second tour in Galilee before the mission of the twelve (Mark vi. 6; Matt. ix. 35); but of its extent and character and special incidents we have no certain knowledge.¹ We have, in Matthew (ix. 37), the suggestion that Jesus was moved to send out the apostles by the plenteousness of the harvest which He saw.

On this second tour of Galilee we may, with Mark, put the visit of Jesus in Nazareth, of which Luke gives a graphic picture (Luke iv. 16-30).² The brief references of Mark and Matthew to a visit in Nazareth (Mark vi. 1-6; Matt. xiii. 53-58) are in essential accord with Luke, and must be assigned to the same visit. In the narrative of Luke, Jesus, applying to Himself Isaiah's words concerning his own ministry (Isa. lxi. 1, 2), began His address with words of grace at which all marvelled (Luke iv. 22); and then, interrupted by remarks full of narrow prejudice (Mark vi. 2, 3; Luke iv. 22, last clause), He closed His address with words of warning (Luke iv. 23-27). He likened His experience to that of Elijah and Elisha. As they found but few whom they could help, so had He; and He intimates that these few were from the ranks of the lowly and the outcast. This suggestion that the Nazarenes

¹ The incident at Nain (Luke vii. 11-17) may have occurred at this time.

² This location of the incident is preferred to the view of the earlier editions because it is associated with a preaching tour, and this suits the end of the earlier Galilean period better than the end of the later. Comp. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 245.

were not worthy of the help of Jesus led to an attempt upon His life (Luke iv. 29), which, however, for some unknown reason, was ineffectual.

The Mission of the Twelve and that of the Seventy.

Some writers¹ identify the mission of the twelve apostles and the mission of the seventy disciples. The grounds for this identification are, first, that the address to the seventy in Luke x is the same in substance and often in expression as that which in Mark and Matthew is directed to the twelve; and second, the address given in Luke x presupposes that the disciples were to work permanently and independently, which does not agree with the view that they were, as Luke says, messengers to announce the approach of Jesus, but does accord with the mission of the twelve; and third, since the mission of the disciples was to *all* Israel, it would require the seventy messengers mentioned by Luke. Twelve would scarcely have been sufficient.

It is supposed that Luke found a second and modified report of the mission of the twelve, and thought it the report of an independent mission. Jesus may indeed have sent out disciples to the number of seventy, but they were all sent on one occasion. He began by sending the twelve, and then perhaps on the next day sent the rest.

There are, however, some objections to this view. It is true that the instructions which Luke says Jesus gave

¹ *E.g.*, Weiss and Beyschlag.

to the seventy are substantially the same which, according to Matthew, are found in the address to the twelve. But the importance of this fact may be overestimated. If Jesus sent out disciples on two different occasions, to do essentially the same work, we should not be surprised if He gave them practically the same instructions. This fact of itself would not prove that the mission of the seventy was identical with that of the twelve. Then it is easier to assume that Luke's address to the seventy is out of its original place, is really the address to the twelve, than to hold that the mission of the seventy is not independent.

In regard to the second point, that the address in Luke x presupposes a permanent and independent work of the disciples, which does not suit the connection in which the address stands, it must be said, first, that this argument has no force unless we assume that Jesus intended to go rapidly to Jerusalem. But we have no right to make such an assumption. It was yet six months before Jesus entered Jerusalem for the last time, going to the feast of the Passover. Part of this interval He spent in Jerusalem and Judea, and part in Perea. The idea of Luke (ix. 51) seems to have been that when the Galilean work was done and Jesus left Galilee forever, He henceforth had His death in Jerusalem constantly in view. But Luke may have had this thought while knowing that there were yet several months of the public ministry of Jesus. But further, it must be remembered that the mission of the twelve

in Galilee was not permanent, but quite temporary. Probably it was accomplished in much less than a month.

As to the remaining point, that twelve were too few for the mission, and seventy a more probable number, it cannot be regarded as having great force, for it seems most likely that the mission was confined to Galilee. It is not probable that Jesus would have sent these inexperienced disciples to Judea and Jerusalem, where even He Himself had thus far been unable to make any salutary impression; and certainly it is unlikely that the Synoptists, who say nothing of a Judean ministry of Jesus, thought that He sent His disciples to Judea. But we cannot say that twelve disciples were too few to accomplish what Jesus wished to have done in the little province of Galilee. These grounds, therefore, for the identification of the two missions, though having force, do not appear conclusive. On the other hand, there are various circumstances in connection with the mission of the seventy which seem to point plainly to an event different from the mission of the twelve. Thus, in the first place, Luke puts the mission of the seventy at the final departure of Jesus from Galilee, but the mission of the twelve was in the midst of the Galilean work (Luke vi. 13; Mark vi. 7). Again, Luke says that the Lord sent forth the seventy before His face, whither He was about to come; but there is no indication in connection with the mission of the twelve that Jesus expected to visit the places whither they went.

It is pretty certain that He did *not* visit many of them. Third, it is not easy to account for the change from twelve to seventy if the same mission is referred to. If the mission of the seventy was eminently successful, as Luke relates, then it is the more remarkable that Mark and Matthew, when speaking of the same mission, make no allusion to more than twelve messengers. Finally, according to Mark and Matthew (Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1), when Jesus came into Perea, great multitudes followed Him. Now, since Jesus had not worked in this region, their statement, if it does not clearly presuppose some such mission as Luke x records, at least *favors* the historical character of Luke's narrative.

Instructions to the Twelve.

Mark and Luke give a brief account of Jesus' instructions to the twelve; Matthew gives a long account (Mark vi. 7-13; Luke ix. 1-6; Matt. x). But Matthew's account cannot be regarded as wholly suiting the occasion. Some parts of it must have been spoken by Jesus at other times than when the apostles were sent out in Galilee. So, for example, the passage in which it is said that the disciples shall be brought before governors and kings, also that they shall be persecuted in one city and flee into another. These statements concern the future and independent work of the disciples, and not their tour in Galilee. They were not brought before kings, nor persecuted from city to city, nor beaten in synagogues. They were not at that time as

sheep in the midst of wolves. When they went through Galilee healing the sick and casting out demons, they must have been welcome and popular, as Jesus always was when He dispensed physical blessings.

In the original instructions to the twelve, Jesus seems to have emphasized two points. First, they were to go in *dependence on God*. They were not to take bread or money with them (Mark vi. 8). The laborer was worthy of his hire (Matt. x. 10). It was thought possible that some towns would not receive their message, but even in such cases there might be individuals who would be friendly toward them, and who would provide for their bodily needs. Second, they were to *go in haste*. They must not burden themselves with two coats (Mark vi. 9). They must stay in the first friendly house which they should enter till their work in a particular town was done (Mark vi. 10). Thus they were to regard their mission as an urgent one.

The Tour.

It is probable, as we have seen, that the twelve went forth only through Galilee. The time spent on this mission can have been only a few weeks. For the disciples were back again with Jesus before He fed the multitudes at the northeast corner of the lake, which, as we know, occurred just before the Passover (Mark vi. 34; John vi. 4). The feast of Purim, which Jesus attended, or during which He was in Jerusalem (John v. 1), came a month before the Passover. Since now

we know that Jesus was for a time separated from the twelve just before the miracle of the loaves (Mark vi. 30), and since there is no evidence that they were with Him in Jerusalem at the feast of Purim, it seems most likely that He sent the twelve forth just before He went up to Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XI

AT THE FEAST OF PURIM

In General.

It seems probable, as has been said, that Jesus went up to Jerusalem while His disciples were absent on their mission in Galilee, and that this visit was the one to which we have a reference in John v. The reasons for thinking of the Purim feast have already been stated. There is no indication that Jesus went to Jerusalem in order to attend the feast of Purim, which moreover is intrinsically improbable. This was not a feast enjoined by the law, but was of late origin, in celebration of the deliverance of the Jews by Esther. It was celebrated on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar with general rejoicing. But the fact that the Jewish people were refusing the greater deliverance which Jesus was offering them must have made these days to Jesus a time of sorrow rather than joy. However, the circumstance that Jesus would find no pleasure in this feast is no proof that He did not go to Jerusalem at this time. It may well have been a favorable opportunity to go to Jerusalem, even though He had no interest in the feast. This moreover lasted only two

days, and the probability is that Jesus was in Jerusalem considerably longer than two days, perhaps as many weeks.

Jesus went to Jerusalem at the feast of Purim, after an absence of some months, presumably to continue His Messianic work. The few days which He had spent there at the last Passover seem to have been nearly fruitless, but now, preceded by the fame of His Galilean ministry, He might expect better things. He cannot have remained in Jerusalem or in Judea very long, for before the Passover, which came a month later than the Purim feast, He was again in Galilee (John vi. 1-4). John tells of one miracle which Jesus wrought at this time, and from the controversy that it occasioned we can infer what the relation was between Him and the religious leaders.

The Bethesda Sign.

Both in itself and in its consequences the miracle wrought upon the man who had been nearly helpless for thirty-eight years is notable (John v. 2-9). Jesus here singled out one from a multitude who were sick, blind, halt, and withered, and healed him. Nothing like this is recorded by the Synoptists. They represent Him as healing great numbers of sick people. Here the exercise of miraculous power is more plainly for a *sign*, and for this end the healing of one person might be as good as would be the healing of several. However, as in Nazareth He could not do many mighty

works because of unbelief (Mark vi. 5), so in Jerusalem the exercise of His beneficent power may have been limited by the same fact.

It is noticeable also that this man at the pool was healed by one who was a total stranger to him. He did not know that it was Jesus (John v. 13). Plainly then, if he had a faith which at all conditioned his cure, it was a faith in Jesus without knowing that it *was* Jesus, a trust in the manifest kindness of a stranger. The interest which the unknown man took in him perhaps awakened some degree of expectancy, so that when Jesus told him to rise, he was ready to try.

The miracle was wrought on a Sabbath (John v. 10), and this fact led at once to the persecution of Jesus, as His healing the withered hand in Galilee led the Pharisees and Herodians to plot His death (Mark iii. 6). Hostility toward Jesus was increased by His saying that God was His Father (John v. 18). After this the Jews sought to *kill* Him. Yet now, as at a later time, they were apparently hindered from openly proceeding against Him by fear of the common people (Mark xiv. 2), and He was able to remonstrate against their actions in public and to defend His own course (John v. 19-47).

In the record of His words spoken on this occasion, the prominent thought is His Messianic claim. He said that God was His Father, and that what the Father did He also did (John v. 17, 19). He claimed power to quicken the dead, and authority to judge all men (John v. 21, 22). He said that He had life

in Himself, and that those who believed in Him also had eternal life (John v. 24-26). In support of this Messianic claim, He appealed to the witness of John the Baptist (John v. 33), to His own works which the Father had given Him to do (John v. 36), to the witness of the Father, perhaps referring to the divine voice at His baptism (John v. 37), and to the Scriptures (John v. 39, 40, 45-47).

When Jesus said that God was His Father, the Jews at once inferred that He made Himself *equal with God* (John v. 18). It is very noteworthy that Jesus repudiated this inference. Instead of making Himself equal with God, as they understood that word, He declares that He is wholly *dependent* upon God. "The Son can do nothing of Himself" (John v. 19). But if He is thus dependent on God, then the Jews' inference that He made Himself equal with God is false. The claim that God is His Father, and His Father even in a unique sense that separates Him from all other men, is not a claim to absolute equality with God. It involves a claim to Messiahship, as does the parallel title *Son of God* (John v. 25), but that is plainly different from the claim which they thought He made for Himself. Indeed, Jesus says in this address that one of His Messianic prerogatives, that of judging men, is given Him because He is a *son of man* (John v. 27), that is, on the ground, not of *divinity*, but of *humanity*, an attribute which the Jews thought He repudiated when He said that God was His Father. Then, further, He says that

His authority to judge has been *given* Him by the Father, and also His ability to communicate life (John v. 22, 26). Had the inference of the Jews been correct, these prerogatives would have belonged to Jesus by virtue of His very being.

The polemical part of the words of Jesus to the Jews on this occasion (John v. 37 b-47) throws a clear light on His view of the Messianic element in the Old Testament. He claims, in the first place, that the Scriptures in general bear witness of Him (John v. 39), and also that Moses in particular wrote of Him (John v. 46). He accordingly saw a Messianic element in the law as well as in the prophets. Further, He claimed that if the Jews had believed Moses, they must have believed Him also. In other words, He was conscious of being the counterpart of the prophetic element in the law. Of course, the Jews supposed that they believed Moses, and they did in a way; but Jesus denied that they truly believed him. From this it follows that *believing*, as He used the term, contains an element of *spiritual perception*. The Jews did not really believe Moses, because they did not see the spiritual aim of his teaching. They did not understand him. In like manner, men could not truly believe in Jesus as the Messiah unless they spiritually perceived that His character and work *were* Messianic.

With Pharisees at Meat.

It is possible, though not probable, that the Synop-
tists contain material which belongs in the visit to

Jerusalem at the feast of Purim. If any Synoptic narratives are to be assigned to this period, it must be those of Luke which depict Jesus as the guest of Pharisees.¹ In Jerusalem, rather than in Galilee, He would come in contact with Pharisees, for Jerusalem was their chief residence (Mark vii. 1); and it is easier to think that Jesus was received into the homes of Pharisees at the close of the first year of His ministry than in the latter part of the second year, when hostility toward Him had grown more intense.

It is possible, therefore, that the anointing of Jesus' feet in the house of Simon, a Pharisee, and His attendance at a feast made by another prominent Pharisee, are to be associated with this visit (Luke vii. 36-50; xiv. 1-24).

We hold that Jesus was twice anointed, for it is impossible to identify the event in Bethany with the scene described by Luke (vii. 36-50).² It is a remarkable coincidence that the host in both cases bore the name *Simon* (Mark xiv. 3; Luke vii. 40); that in both cases it was a *woman* who anointed Jesus; and that both women brought an *alabaster* box of ointment. But over against these coincidences are numerous and varied and great differences. Thus, in one case, the anointing is among friends (John xii. 1, 2); in the other, it is in the house of a Pharisee, who had no real sympathy with Jesus; and the guests at the table are offended that Jesus should assume to forgive sin (Luke

¹ Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 263; II. 232.

² Holtzmann, *Johanneisches Evangelium*, p. 143.

vii. 39-49). In one case, the woman is an intimate friend of Jesus (John xii. 3 ; xi. 5), in the other she is a notorious sinner, who, in the hour of the anointing, first experiences forgiveness of sins (Luke vii. 37, 47). In the one case, the act is defended by Jesus as a preparation for His burial (Mark xiv. 8) ; in the other, it is the expression of a love and faith which secure forgiveness of sins (Luke vii. 47, 50). The situations and motives are too diverse to allow room for the theory of identification.

These two occasions when Jesus accepted the hospitality of Pharisees, like the wedding in Cana and the dinner given by Simon (Mark xiv. 3-9), show that Jesus was ready to accept invitations to social feasts. He was no wilderness-prophet, no recluse or ascetic. Yet He did not attend these feasts for pleasure. They were opportunities for instruction in the things of the Kingdom, and were so used by Jesus. They illustrate how quickly Jesus perceived the spiritual meaning of passing incidents, and with what ease He could express and apply that meaning. The tears and kisses and ointment bestowed upon Him by the sinful woman were proof of her "much love," and so were proof that she felt in her heart that her many sins were forgiven (Luke vii. 38, 47). Her love and sacrifice argue that she had received help from Him ; and this help must have been such as always came to sinners who believed His gracious word. Simon, on the other hand, had shown Him little love, and so must have had little sense of indebtedness to Him.

CHAPTER XII

THE LATER GALILEAN MINISTRY

General View.

THE second part of the Galilean ministry extended from shortly before the second Passover to the feast of Tabernacles (John vi. 1–vii. 10); in round numbers about six months. The Gospels of Mark and Matthew have preserved much more material concerning this period than is found in Luke and John.

Jesus still wrought miracles, but fewer, comparatively, than in the first part of the Galilean ministry. Popular enthusiasm reached its height at the very beginning of this period, when an attempt was made to force Jesus to become a king. This was the turning-point of the Galilean ministry as a whole. From this time forward Jesus devoted Himself more and more to His disciples. Hence the second part of the Galilean ministry contained a larger element of private *teaching* than the first. It was also in the second part of the Galilean ministry that Jesus began to teach His disciples in regard to His death and resurrection.

Return of the Twelve.

Soon after Jesus had come back from Jerusalem to Galilee, His disciples returned from their mission, and

met Him at some place on Lake Galilee, probably Capernaum (Mark vi. 30, 33). They reported what they had done and taught, apparently dwelling on the miracles which they had wrought in Jesus' name (Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 10). But there was little opportunity for Him to talk with them about their work, for He seems to have been thronged by the sick as soon as it was known that He had returned to Capernaum, and as in the earlier days He still healed them (John vi. 2; Mark vi. 31).

Two circumstances led Him to withdraw from Capernaum and from the multitudes who thronged Him. First, He wished that His disciples might have a little rest (Mark vi. 31). They had refreshed others; now they in turn should be refreshed. A second circumstance which may have influenced Jesus to withdraw from Capernaum was of a political nature (Matt. xiv. 13). Herod had heard reports concerning Jesus, and in the last weeks had probably heard much of His name by reason of the miracles and words of the twelve disciples (Mark vi. 14; Luke ix. 7). It is possible that some of the disciples had visited Tiberias, one of the two capitals of Herod Antipas. At any rate, Herod was much perplexed, and sought to see Jesus (Luke ix. 9). When Jesus learned of this, He withdrew to a place outside the jurisdiction of Herod, namely, Bethsaida Julias (Luke ix. 10). This was in the domain of Philip. We may well believe that Jesus had no desire to meet the man who had just murdered His forerunner (Matt. xiv. 1-12).

Feeding of the Multitude.

Jesus and His disciples had no sooner started by boat for the eastern side of the lake than the people perceived it; and judging of their destination from the course they had taken, many set out from Capernaum on foot, determined that the worker of miracles should not escape from them (Mark vi. 33). As the crowd moved along the thickly populated northwest shore of the lake it rapidly increased. Mark says that people joined it from all the cities (Mark vi. 33). Some went with such speed that they reached the point toward which the boat of Jesus was directed before it came to land (Mark vi. 33). Others must have gone more slowly, for they took their sick with them (Matt. xiv. 14). When Jesus and His disciples had reached the high ground on the east side of the lake (John vi. 3), a great multitude were soon gathered before Him. This seems to have been early in the day, for He taught them *many* things (Mark vi. 34), and healed their sick (Matt. xiv. 14), before evening had come. When it began to grow dark, the disciples wished Jesus to send the throngs away that they might get themselves food. But He had a different thought for the multitude; and although it was a thought of love, it had very grave consequences.

All four evangelists agree that the provision which was put into the hands of Jesus was five loaves of bread and two fishes (John vi. 9; Luke ix. 13; Mark vi. 38; Matt. xiv. 17). According to John the disciples procured these loaves and fish of a boy who chanced to be present

(John vi. 9). They had left Capernaum in haste, and seem to have taken nothing with them. All the evangelists agree that there were about five thousand men who ate of the loaves and fishes, and Matthew says there were also women and children. Mark and Luke say that the multitudes were seated in a methodical way, though they do not agree as to the size of the different companies. Luke says there were about fifty in each group, Mark says they were seated by hundreds and by fifties. This, however, is an unimportant detail. The estimate of the total number, for it was only an *estimate*, was five thousand.

All the evangelists agree that when the multitudes had eaten until they were satisfied, the disciples took up the fragments, at Jesus' direction (John), and found that there were twelve baskets of these. Each disciple filled his basket. Mark is particular to notice that there were fragments of the *fish* left as well as of the bread (Mark vi. 43).

The meaning of the miracle was the same as the meaning of all the miracles. It presented Jesus as the divine helper of men who are in need. It concerned the physical man directly, like the miracles of healing; but those who were spiritually hungry might draw from it the easy inference that this Jesus could feed their souls as well as their bodies.¹

Some writers, though admitting the supernatural in

¹ John seems to have regarded the miracle as a counterpart of the Passover. Force of *οὐ* in John vi. 5.

the work of Jesus, do not find a miracle of creation in this narrative of the feeding of a great multitude.¹ We cannot suppose that cooked bread and roasted fish increased in the hands of Jesus. He began to feed the multitude with the five loaves and two fishes, believing that God in some way would provide for the entire company, and His generous example opened the hearts of those who had provisions, and they brought them to His feet. This act, it is said, was as much to the glory of God and of Jesus as though He had miraculously increased the loaves in His hands. The narratives do not speak of a miracle of creation, and therefore we are at liberty to think that the miracle was one of providence.

Now it is conceivable that the example of Jesus might influence men in the way which this explanation supposes, but is it possible to reconcile the text with this explanation? The evangelists know of only five loaves and two fishes. If an indefinite amount of provisions had been furnished in addition to this, we should expect some reference to it in one or the other of the four narratives. John says that the twelve baskets of fragments were taken up from the *five* barley loaves, thus seeming to exclude any other original provision. Again, the evangelists plainly regard the act of Jesus as a great miracle. That is the reason why they relate it at length. But if we reduce the event to the influence

¹ Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 310; Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 193; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, IV. 194.

of Jesus' example, however beautiful and significant that might be, then it is no longer a miracle in the New Testament sense of that word. Then, further, it is doubtful whether we can assume that there were many in the multitude who had provision. They who do assume this think that the multitude included a large number of persons who were on their way to Jerusalem to the Passover. But even if we assume this, can we suppose that they would have carried their baskets of provision aside into this desert region east of the lake? Finally, it is not conceivable that these Galilean multitudes who had seen many miracles of Jesus should have been roused to an unparalleled enthusiasm on this occasion, as they were, if the act of Jesus was nothing more than a generous example. The Jews of Jesus' time were stirred by miracles, but they were not of such a spiritual character that they would see evidence of Messiahship in a self-denying deed.

When the people realized what Jesus had done, they said, "This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world" (John vi. 14), thus giving a Messianic interpretation to Deut. xviii. 15. Jesus saw that they would attempt to take Him by force and make Him king, and therefore He withdrew from them alone to the mountain that rose above them (John vi. 15). There must have been intense excitement. The people knew Jesus well enough to be certain that He would not willingly head an insurrection after the manner of

Judas the Zealot, and allow Himself to be proclaimed as the political deliverer of His people; but still they fancied that they might constrain Him even against His will to carry out their Messianic ideal.

In this hour of excitement Jesus sent His disciples away, manifestly against their wish (Mark vi. 45). He could deal more easily with the multitude if no complications arose in connection with His disciples. It is not at all improbable that some of them were in danger of being swept away by the enthusiasm of the crowd, for they were Galileans and one of them a Zealot. It is one of the highest proofs of the remarkable power which Jesus possessed to control men, that He was able to send these multitudes away (Matt. xiv. 23), or quietly to withdraw from them (John vi. 15), when their hearts were set on Him, and when they were ready to resort to force to accomplish their wish.

Walking on the Lake.

The Synoptists say that Jesus withdrew to the mountain to pray (Mark. vi. 46; Matt. xiv. 23), and we may well suppose that it was the carnal desire of the multitude, their lack of spiritual receptivity, which drove Jesus to solitary communion with the Father.

The disciples had embarked on the east side of the lake, at evening, and started for Capernaum (John vi. 17), perhaps intending to go from there to Bethsaida (Mark vi. 45). The distance in a straight course was

about four miles. The night was relatively light, for Jesus could see the boat from the eminence where He was praying (Mark vi. 48). There was no storm, but a contrary wind. Instead of reaching their destination in an hour or two, they were on the lake about nine hours and not yet at land. John estimates that they had rowed from twenty-five to thirty furlongs, that is three to three and a half miles (John vi. 19).

Sometime between three and six o'clock they saw Jesus walking on the lake (Mark vi. 48). It seems probable from John vi. 17 that it was His plan to overtake His disciples in some way, either by boat or by following along the shore until they could row in and take Him aboard. John at least was wondering why the Lord did not come. The language that he uses, "Jesus had *not yet* come to them," is difficult of explanation unless Jesus had an understanding with His disciples that He would join them on their way to Capernaum (John vi. 17). This view is strengthened by the circumstance that they had been on the lake from evening until the fourth watch, for it is scarcely probable that they had rowed all that time. We are rather to suppose that, having embarked, they waited for the Lord, even as a large part of the multitude waited through the entire night in the hope of intercepting Jesus when He should come down from the mountain (John vi. 22).

When at last the disciples saw Jesus, they thought they saw a spectre, and their cry of terror led Him to

speak and to reassure them. According to John (vi. 19), when they saw Jesus, He seemed to be drawing near to the boat, and according to Mark (vi. 48), it looked as though He was passing by them. It is certain, however, that He was coming to their relief, for otherwise His walking on the lake would be unintelligible; and if He was passing by, this must be understood, not as showing a settled purpose to leave them, but as a temporary expedient designed in some way for their good. It is possible that Jesus refrained from coming directly toward the ship because that would have frightened the disciples more than His merely passing by. When near enough to speak, He reassured them by His calm words, and entered into the boat. The wind soon ceased, and according to John they were straightway at the land.

Some writers¹ feel that there was no adequate purpose for this miracle, and therefore reduce the historical basis to a providential appearance of Jesus on the shore. Just when the disciples saw Jesus, they reached the land, and so it *seemed* as though His presence saved them; and later what seemed to them miraculous actually assumed the *form* of a miracle.

But is it probable that fishermen like Peter, accustomed for years to this lake, should not have known in a moonlight night² whether they were near the shore; and is it probable that *all* should have been convinced

¹ E.g., Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 211-213.

² For the moon was full when the Passover was observed.

that Jesus was on the water when in reality He was on the land?

Then it may perhaps be held that this miracle has as plain and adequate an aim as has any one of the miracles of Jesus. For in a signal and impressive way it showed Him as the divine deliverer. It is true that the lives of the disciples are not said to have been in peril, and it is altogether probable that they would have come safely to the shore, even had not Jesus come to them; but they were certainly in a condition to *appreciate* help, and that was reason enough for Jesus to help them. If there was not adequate reason for this miracle, then there was not adequate reason for the miracle of feeding the five thousand. It was not a matter of life and death that they should have bread that evening when Jesus fed them.

Of course Peter did not walk on the water to Jesus and then back to the boat with Him, if Jesus Himself was not on the lake but on the shore, and therefore some¹ regard this narrative as an allegory (Matt. xiv. 28-31). If historical, we might have expected to find it in Mark, for Mark's Gospel is based on the preaching of Peter; and yet we cannot assume that Peter related everything about himself, or that Mark recorded everything that he heard from Peter. So we can hardly urge against the historicity of the passage that it is not found in Mark. Nor can we say that the narrative of John leaves no room for the incident recorded in Matthew.

¹ *E.g.*, Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 214, note.

For Peter's experiment belongs at the end of John vi. 20, and itself constituted a part of the reason why the disciples were willing to take Jesus into the boat, for it reassured them that what they saw was really the Lord. The following statement that they were *immediately at land* after Jesus entered the boat, cannot possibly be construed to mean that, before He entered it, they were so near to land that there was no room for Peter's act. For, on the one hand, six rods of lake would amply meet the requirements of the narrative, and on the other, the statement of John that they were immediately at land, would be natural enough even if they rowed fifty or a hundred rods. After hours of conflict with the waves, a quiet row of fifty or a hundred rods, *with Jesus on board*, would seem as nothing.

The narrative certainly has this in its favor that it accords with the character of Peter. It was like him to try to walk on the water, but it is doubtful whether any one would have thought of inventing such a daring deed of faith.¹

In the Capernaum Synagogue.

The day following the miracle at Bethsaida, Jesus was in the synagogue at Capernaum, and spoke to some of the people who had wished to take Him by force and make Him king (John vi. 25-58). His words

¹ Matt. xiv. 33 seems to be at variance with Mark vi. 51, 52. Inward amazement, due to a failure to understand the act of Jesus, does not agree with outward recognition of Him as Messiah.

now dampened their enthusiasm as much as His miracle on the day before had aroused it. He represented Himself as the bread out of heaven, better than the manna of Moses. When the Jews murmured because He said that He had come down out of heaven, He went on and expressed His thought more explicitly, saying that His *flesh* was the true bread, and that unless a man ate it he could not have eternal life. As they had no spiritual apprehension of Christ's meaning, they were yet more offended by this word. Many of those who had been His disciples left Him in consequence of this address in the synagogue (John vi. 66). He was not at all the Messiah of their hopes, but seemed rather as a dreamer.

The turning from Jesus at this time was so general that He asked the twelve whether they, also, would go away (John vi. 66, 67). He was determined to know who, if any one, was still true to Him. It must have been very plain to Jesus at this time that He could not hope to win the Galileans in large numbers. With few exceptions, they had no hunger for the bread that He offered, and He could not awaken this hunger. Yet He did not at once withdraw wholly from public work in Galilee.

Last Public Work in Galilee.

There was a short interval between the critical day in Capernaum and Jesus' retirement from Galilee to the north (Mark vii. 24), and in it He continued His

public Messianic work, though this was mingled now with words of judgment. In this interval we have the last public cures which were wrought in Galilee. The isolated miracles of the later weeks were in private.

Mark seems to epitomize a tour of Jesus through the plain of Gennesaret, and perhaps beyond its borders (Mark vi. 53-56). He speaks of His visiting villages and cities and country seats. The memorable feature of the tour was the healing of the sick. The impression is that Jesus met the multitudinous calls for physical help in the same bountiful manner that had characterized His earlier Galilean ministry. The cry of His heart, now as then, must have been that the eyes of people might be opened to see what His signs really meant, and that they might come to Him for soul rest as well as for bodily healing (Matt. xi. 28).

This last tour is touched very briefly by Mark and Matthew (Mark vi. 53-56; Matt. xiv. 34-36). It seems to have begun at least on the northwest shore of the lake, but the language of Mark suggests, as we have seen, that it was continued elsewhere. Wherever Jesus went, people had one desire only, as had been the case with the masses all along, and that desire was for material help. They brought Him their sick, but no one ever asked Him for forgiveness of sins.

In the days of this last public tour in Galilee we may most probably put the words of condemnation over the

lake cities (Matt. xi. 20-24; Luke x. 13-16), and perhaps, also, the stern words which Jesus spoke to His disciples about the cost of following Him (Matt. x. 17-38; Luke xiv. 28-33). These words suit this time.

Of the cities mentioned, Chorazin appears here and nowhere else in the Gospels. Its site has been identified with the ruins of Kerazeh, two and a half miles north from Tell H̄um.¹ Mighty works had been done there by Jesus, but what they were, or when they were wrought, we do not know. The woes spoken by Jesus over Chorazin, Capernaum, and Bethsaida contain His estimate of the value of His labors in these unrepentant cities. Capernaum had been, as it were, exalted to heaven in privilege. Bethsaida and Chorazin had closed their eyes to deeds so manifestly Messianic that they had made their sin greater than that of the heathen Tyre and Sidon.

In these last days before Jesus retired from Galilee we are to place, also, a meeting between Him and certain Pharisees and scribes who came down from Jerusalem (Mark vii. 1-23; Matt. xv. 1-20). The place of this encounter is not indicated. These men had plainly come from Jerusalem with hostile intent, and from their coming we may infer that the recent visit of Jesus in Jerusalem at the feast of Purim had stirred up the adversaries afresh, and impressed them anew with the dangerous character of their Galilean rival.

The point on which they challenged Jesus was the

¹ Wilson and Warren, *The Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 270.

non-observance by His disciples of the traditional rules of purification (Mark vii. 5). As at an early day they had neglected the Pharisaic fasts (Mark ii. 18-22), so now they neglect the ceremonial washing of the hands before eating, on which the Pharisees laid great stress. Under the influence of Jesus, but apparently without any positive command from Him, the disciples dropped Pharisaic ceremonialism, as at a later day, under the influence of the Spirit, they gradually dropped the ceremonialism of the Old Testament itself.

Jesus in His reply to the Pharisees declared that their traditions were in direct violation of the law of God. This required, for example, that children should honor their parents; but tradition allowed children to dishonor father and mother by giving to the temple what belonged of right to them (Mark vii. 10-13). These traditions of the scribes were plants which His heavenly Father had not planted (Matt. xv. 13), and it was His purpose that they should be rooted up. Then, in the hearing of the multitude, He declared that nothing from without could defile a man, but only the things from within. It followed from this, of course, that a man could not be defiled who ate food which he had touched with unwashed hands. This saying scandalized the scribes and Pharisees, and perplexed even the disciples (Matt. xv. 12; Mark vii. 17). It was a sort of riddle to them, which He afterward explained. He said that He meant defilement of the *heart*, that nothing from without could defile this. He did not, therefore,

put Himself in antagonism with the Levitical law, for this law did not prohibit certain kinds of food, on the ground that they defiled the heart.¹

Alone with the Disciples.

The experience of Jesus with the multitude whom He had fed and His experience the next day in Capernaum made it painfully clear that the Galileans, for whom He had wrought and taught during several months, would not accept Him. His ministry for them was practically ended. He knew well that He could hope for little from any future work in Judea, where the Jews had already sought to kill Him (John v. 18), and whence they had sent emissaries to thwart and if possible ruin Him in Galilee (Mark vii. 1). So the thought of the outcome of His own personal ministry must have become more and more definite, and at the same time the thought of the continuation of His work by His disciples must have assumed increasing prominence in His mind. And, indeed, from this time on we find that He devotes Himself much more than formerly to His disciples. Hence we are to hold that the chief purpose of His present retirement to Gentile soil was that He might be alone with His disciples. This is confirmed by the remark of the second evangelist that when Jesus came into the borders of Tyre He did not wish to have it known (Mark vii. 24).

¹ It is possible, though not certain, that the author of the second Gospel thought that Jesus, by His words on this occasion, abolished Levitical ordinances (Mark vii. 19).

Jesus passed through some part of the territory of Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 31), then probably took some Damascus route over or around the southern end of the Lebanon range, and then followed some southerly road which brought Him at last to the east coast of Lake Galilee (Mark vii. 31). This tour, reckoning from Capernaum, may have been one hundred and fifty miles in length, and must of necessity have occupied several days, and may have occupied weeks.

On the border of Gentile territory Jesus wrought the first miracle in behalf of a heathen (Mark vii. 24-30; Matt. xv. 21-28). He had healed the servant of the centurion in Capernaum (Matt. viii. 5), but it is quite probable that this centurion was a proselyte. Now a Syrophœnician woman implored Him to heal her daughter. Jesus was not inclined to hear the woman's prayer, but her faith and humility prevailed with Him, and He granted her request. In His saying that it was not meet to take children's bread and cast it to dogs, He did not lower Himself to the level of Jewish prejudice and call the woman a Gentile dog. This interpretation of the words would be wholly contrary to the gentleness and breadth of Jesus' sympathy. But He declared in a figurative manner that it would be inappropriate for Him to enter on Messianic activity among the heathen. He was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. xv. 24). Therefore, were He to work miracles of healing for the Gentiles, as this woman requested, it would be as much out of order as for a man to

take his children's bread and cast it to dogs. The time had not yet come to give the Gospel to the Gentiles.

Work in the Decapolis.

Arrived on the east of the lake, in the territory of Philip, in a region where He had not been, unless indeed it was the region of Gerza, where He had healed the demonized one (Mark v. 1-20), Jesus now tarried some time after His northern tour. At first He may have had comparative quiet with His disciples, but later He engaged again in public activity. His desire for privacy is seen in the circumstances of His healing a deaf and dumb man (Mark vii. 32-36). He took him away by himself — though the disciples may well have been present — and, having healed the man, He enjoined those who knew of the miracle not to tell any one. But, as at the beginning of His ministry, so now, His injunction was disregarded, the cure was proclaimed through that region, and we next see Jesus surrounded by crowds of people (Mark vii. 36; viii. 1; Matt. xv. 30). According to Matthew, He wrought many cures (xv. 30, 31). We are not to suppose that Jesus was forced into activity against His will, but that He was moved by the condition of the people to minister unto them in word and deed, and that He did this in hope of winning disciples.

Matthew and Mark put into these days of the Decapolis sojourn the miracle of feeding four thousand (Mark

viii. 1-10; Matt. xv. 32-39). Some writers¹ identify this miracle with the feeding of five thousand which is recorded by all the evangelists. It is said that the divergencies are incidental, that the disciples could not have been so helpless a second time, if Jesus had already wrought one miracle of feeding, and that the consequences of the first miracle would have deterred Jesus from repeating it. But are the divergencies incidental? Some are, as the differences in the number of loaves and the number of the people present, but some are not. Thus the story of feeding four thousand implies a *different place* from that where the five thousand had been fed. In the record of the first miracle of feeding, it is intimated that the disciples could get food if they had money; while in the second story the difficulty is said to be that the place was desert, and that consequently they could not readily *find* food even if they had money (Mark viii. 2). Difference of place is also favored by the fact that in the story of the second miracle both evangelists use a word for *basket* different from that which is used alike by all four evangelists in the account of the feeding of five thousand. This is a very curious circumstance. In the story of the first miracle all the evangelists use a particular Greek word for *basket* (*κόφινος*), and in the story of the second both writers who give it use another word (*σπυρίς*). Later, when Jesus refers to the two miracles and asks how many

¹ *E.g.*, Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 191; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 310, 311.

baskets of fragments the disciples took up, He is represented as using both words as they had been used in the two stories (Mark viii. 19, 20; Matt. xvi. 9, 10). The explanation of this fact, which I offer, is that the two miracles were wrought in different localities, each of which had its own peculiar name for basket, and that these local names clung to the accounts of the respective miracles from the first. Such a local difference may readily be assumed to have existed between the speech of the Galileans from the region of Capernaum and the people who lived on the eastern side of the lake.

This difference of scene, of which we have spoken, removes the objection that the consequence of the first miracle would have deterred Jesus from working a second one like it. The five thousand were Galileans from the west side of the lake, while the four thousand were natives of Decapolis on the east side. Because the miracle by Bethsaida Julias had caused intense excitement, in which the people wished to take Jesus by force and make Him king, it did not follow that a similar miracle would have the same effect upon the people of Decapolis.

The objection that the disciples could not have been so helpless in a second time of need is refuted by their experience in general. Immediately after the first miracle of feeding, when Jesus wrought the sign of walking on the lake, it is explicitly said that the disciples were amazed and *understood* not concerning

the loaves (Mark vi. 52). With them also, as with men of all times, it was easy to forget past deliverances, and hard to believe in divine interposition in their behalf. Hence, while admitting the possibility that two widely varying versions of one historical event might have been adopted by the Synoptists, I see no adequate reason for the view that these are duplicates. And it is just as easy to suppose that Jesus on two occasions would feed the hungry as that He would twice heal the sick.

Matthew and Mark agree that Jesus embarked after the feeding of the four thousand, but Matthew says He came into the borders of Magadan (Matt. xv. 39), while Mark says that He came into the parts of Dalmanutha (Mark viii. 10). The site of Magadan is wholly unknown, since it is manifestly not to be identified with Magdala, which was on the west side of the lake. Dalmanutha is located by Robinson, Thompson, and others, on the south side of Lake Galilee, about one mile north of the Jarmuk River.¹ The village which now bears the name *Delhemija* is supposed to occupy the site of the ancient Dalmanutha. There may have been a Magadan in the same district, and, as Weiss suggests, Matthew may have chosen this name as more familiar to his readers.

That the place to which Jesus went after the miracle was on the east side of the lake may have confirmation in the incidental statement of Mark viii. 11, that the Pharisees came *forth* to meet Jesus. This may be

¹ Henderson, *Palestine*, p. 160.

explained as coming forth from what they considered to be the holy land west of the Jordan, into the semi-Gentile region of Decapolis. There is also positive evidence in Mark's narrative that he did not put Dalmanutha on the west side of the lake. In Mark viii. 13, after the sojourn at Dalmanutha, it is said that Jesus and His disciples went to *the other side*. Now, if Dalmanutha was on the *west* side of the lake, this transit must have been to the east side. But this is impossible. For in Mark viii. 22, while Jesus and His disciples are on this *other side*, they come to a *Bethsaida*, and He heals a blind man, but in as *private* a manner as possible (Mark viii. 23, 26). Now such privacy is not intelligible if Jesus was on the east side of the lake, for He had just wrought miracles there in the most public way. But it is wholly intelligible if the Bethsaida in question was the western Bethsaida, for Jesus had finished His public Messianic work in Galilee, and had spoken the doom of this very Bethsaida (Matt. xi. 20-24).

The Pharisees who came forth to meet Jesus (Mark viii. 11), may have been from Jerusalem, like those who had recently followed Him to Galilee (Mark vii. 1). In this case we must suppose that Jesus had been on the east side of the lake long enough for the Pharisees in Jerusalem to locate Him. It is plain that they came with evil intent. They wanted a sign from heaven, naturally a sign that should prove beyond a doubt that Jesus was the Messiah. Of course they did not believe

that He could give such a sign, and they hoped to use against Him His failure to comply with their request. This demand of the Pharisees, made in the face of all the great miracles of Jesus, and in the face of His divine teaching, showed their irremediable spiritual blindness, and called forth from Jesus severe words regarding them and the generation in general. He refused the sign which they sought, a sign to convince hostile unbelief, but intimated that a sign would be given at some future day, even the sign of Jonah (Matt. xii. 38-42; xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29-32).

But although Jesus refused the desired sign, He did not leave His hearers without intimating who He was and how vital was a right relation to Him. In their midst, He said, was one greater than Jonah and greater than Solomon. Hence the Ninevites who repented at the preaching of Jonah, and the Queen of the South who profited by the wisdom of Solomon, would rise up in the judgment against them.

From Dalmanutha to Cæsarea Philippi.

When Jesus left the parts of Dalmanutha and came to the west side of the lake (Mark viii. 13), it was not with the purpose of resuming work in Galilee. Apparently He remained but a short time before leaving for the north. He wrought a miracle near Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22), but did it with the utmost secrecy. He did not wish to have His presence known, for He regarded His public work in Galilee as ended.

On the way across the lake, as Jesus came from the Decapolis, He warned His disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod (Matt. xvi. 5-12; Mark viii. 14-21). This warning seems to have been occasioned by the embarrassment of the disciples, who had forgotten to provide food for their journey (Mark viii. 14). Jesus wanted to speak a word of warning to them, and the circumstance that they were without bread furnished the desired opportunity, and also suggested the figure in which He put His thought. He speaks of the *leaven* of the Pharisees and of Herod, and according to Matthew the disciples understood that leaven signified *teaching* (Matt. xvi. 12). Yet we do not know of any formal teaching of the Pharisees which the disciples were in danger of accepting, and in the case of Herod we cannot think of anything like formal teaching. The word *leaven* is therefore to be taken in the sense of controlling spirit. The leaven of the Pharisees is their unbelief, strikingly illustrated in the recent days spent near Dalmanutha; the leaven of Herod also may be thought of as the spirit of unbelief. Herod had not come in contact with Jesus, but he had met the forerunner of Jesus and had put him to death. We learn later that he sought the death of Jesus (Luke xiii. 31). The warning of Jesus suggests that there was danger lest some of the twelve disciples should become unbelieving. The recent experiences in Capernaum (John vi. 66-71), when many disciples forsook Jesus, and when, according to John, the alienation of Judas

began, and the patent fact that the Galileans as a whole found in Jesus great reason of stumbling (Matt. xi. 6),—these things gave ample ground for the warning to the twelve.

NEAR CÆSAREA PHILIPPI.

The Test Question.

In the next days, when Jesus had come into the region of Cæsarea Philippi—about twenty-five miles due north from Capernaum—He followed up His warning with a test-question (Mark viii. 27, 29; Matt. xvi. 13, 15). He led up to this question by asking what people in general were thinking and saying about Him (Mark viii. 27; Matt. xvi. 13; Luke ix. 18). The answer of the disciples is most instructive, and shows how Jesus fell below the popular expectation regarding the Messiah. Some said that He was the Baptist, others Elijah, others Jeremiah, and still others, whose estimate of Him was less exalted, said that He was one of the prophets (Mark viii. 28; Matt. xvi. 14). The popular idea seems to have been that the spirit of one of these worthies had returned to earth and was working in Jesus (comp. Mark vi. 14). But in any case the answers show that people regarded Jesus only as the forerunner of the Messiah, not as the Messiah Himself.

Then came the test question to the disciples. This was not for the purpose of bringing out a hitherto unexpressed belief in His Messiahship, for their belief that He was the Messiah had already had varied expression;

but to ascertain whether they *still* believed in Him. In the recent weeks, it had become plain that the Galileans as a whole would not accept Him, and many even of His disciples had turned away from Him. People who had previously thought that He might be the Messiah were now saying that He was John the Baptist, or Elijah, or one of the prophets. Jesus wished to know whether the twelve were losing faith in Him, and the confession of Peter, who acted as spokesman of the twelve, simply meant that he *still* held Jesus to be the Messiah. It is not a confession of a new faith, but of loyalty to an old one. This does not imply that their conception of the Messiah had remained unchanged from the first. That was surely not the case. If they now believed Him to be the Messiah, they must have given up their early Jewish conception in some respects, and must have admitted into their picture of the Messiah some new and strange features. But the main fact which the question of Jesus brings out is this, that while others are leaving Him, they *still* believe in Him.

The name *Peter*, which Jesus had early given to Simon (John i. 42), is by Peter's confession shown to have been rightly given. He has remained firm as a rock while others have been as sand. Jesus recognized that this firmness of faith was from God (Matt. xvi. 17). For it rested upon a spiritual apprehension of Jesus, not upon any evidence that He would yet fulfil the *popular* conception of the Messiah. It was a faith in *Him*, as one sent from God, and love for *Him*; and because it

rested wholly upon the *person* of Jesus, it endured in the face of outward failure.

This rock-man, not as an individual, but as a type, Jesus says shall be the basis of His church¹ (Matt. xvi. 18). The narrative implies that the other apostles, no less than Peter, still held to Jesus, and what Jesus addressed to Peter was therefore addressed to the Peter-spirit in all. This is perfectly confirmed by the subsequent narrative and by the apostolic history. For Peter was not recognized subsequently as having any official primacy. He was treated by Jesus exactly as were the other apostles. For him, as for all, there was one law of greatness in the Kingdom of God, the law of service (Mark ix. 35). And later he was not the head of the church, but only one of *three* pillars (Gal. ii. 9). What is promised him by Jesus is promised him as the first representative of those who should have the same rock-faith in Jesus. He and they, as Christ's representatives, should bear His Gospel to men, and thus have the key of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xvi. 19). He and they, as the representatives of Jesus, should have power to loose and bind (Matt. xvi. 19),² that is, they should be authoritative teachers of the Gospel of Jesus. It is apparently this same authority which Jesus, after His resurrection, assured to all His disciples, not to the eleven merely, but to others as well (Luke xxiv. 33 ;

¹ On this word see Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 51, 52.

² Wünsche, *Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, pp. 196, 197.

John xx. 23). They all, as far as they have His spirit (John xx. 22), are the norm of truth, and declare with authority the conditions of forgiveness of sin.

The Announcement of Death and Resurrection.

The disciples' confession of loyalty to Jesus prepared the way for Him to speak to them openly of His approaching death (Mark viii. 31-32; Matt. xvi. 21; Luke ix. 22). Their personal attachment to Him had become so strong that this terrible announcement could be made without causing them to stumble. Jesus did not refer to His death for the first time at Cæsarea Philippi. He had alluded to it before in more or less obscure terms. He had spoken of the removal of the bridegroom (Mark ii. 20), of the destruction of the temple of His body (John ii. 19), and of the sign of Jonah (Matt. xii. 39, 40).¹ But not until the days at Cæsarea Philippi did He speak plainly and unmistakably of His death. It may well be that while He had hitherto known that His way would be one of suffering, He had not Himself seen clearly, as He did now, that He was to be put to death. The unfolding of this thought may have come gradually with the experiences of the Messianic work. Galilee had rejected Him. Jerusalem had rejected Him. The Son of man must now suffer many things, and be officially rejected by the Sanhedrin, and be put to death.

The announcement by Jesus of His death disclosed

¹ John iii. 14; vi. 51 are perhaps to be added.

the fact that, although Peter was loyal, he was still ignorant. If he had risen somewhat above the narrow Jewish conception of the Messiah, he had not yet reached Jesus' conception. He could not yet associate death with his Messiah; and that was doubtless equally true of the other disciples. Therefore from this time forward Jesus spoke with them again and again concerning His death. Two other occasions are specified in which He made substantially the same announcement (Mark ix. 30-32; x. 32-34; Matt. xvii. 22, 23; xx. 17-19; Luke ix. 43-45; xviii. 31-34). The second of the three was just before leaving Galilee, and the third was in Perea.

Every time that Jesus formally announced His death to His disciples, He announced also His resurrection, thus binding up with hope the hearts that He had wounded. He had referred to His resurrection before this time, but only in dark sayings (John ii. 19; Luke xi. 30). The certainty of resurrection, and so of triumph over the enemy, was involved in the very consciousness that He was the Messiah. He saw clearly that He was to be put to death, and that His cause would apparently fail, but He knew in His inmost soul that He should yet overcome, because He knew that He was the Messiah. As such He must yet see the pleasure of the Lord prospering in His hand, and be satisfied by seeing the justification of many as a fruit of the travail of His soul (Isa. liii. 10, 11). When He announced the suffering of His own way, He also announced that

the way of his disciples would be one of suffering (Mark viii. 34, 35; Matt. xvi. 24, 25; Luke ix. 23, 24). Discipleship meant self-denial, the bearing by each one of his own cross, the willingness to lose life for Christ's sake. In the meantime they should be sustained in the loss of all things, and deterred from endangering the welfare of their souls, by the prospect of His returning in glory, when He would own the faithful and disown the unfaithful (Mark viii. 38). But before that, some of them at least would witness a powerful establishment of His kingdom, whose fortunes were now at so low an ebb (Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27).

The Transfiguration.

The first announcement by Jesus of His death was deeply stamped on the memory of the disciples, likewise the transfiguration, which was known to have occurred six days later.¹ No importance attaches to the earthly scene of the transfiguration, yet it is a matter of interest. The connection in which it occurs suggests that it transpired in the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi, and this is confirmed by Mark ix. 30-33. From the mount of transfiguration they went to Capernaum, and this journey took them *through Galilee*. This language excludes the traditional view that the transfiguration was upon Mount Tabor, west of the lower part of the lake.

¹ Luke seems not to have learned from his source either the place or the exact time of the transfiguration (Luke ix. 18, 28).

The place of the transfiguration in the life of Jesus is far more important than its geographical location. It came in connection with the first explicit announcement of His suffering and death, that is, it came in connection with the thought which, more than any other uttered by Jesus, perplexed the disciples. This fact has a bearing on the interpretation of the event.

Mark and Matthew say that Jesus was transfigured (*μετεμορφώθη*), which means for them that His garments, or His garments and His face, became very bright. Elias and Moses appeared to the three disciples, talking with Jesus, and the subject of conversation was His approaching death (Luke ix. 31). Peter, impressed by the scene and yet not knowing what to say, exclaimed that they should make three tabernacles there on the mountain, which suggests that he was thinking of a protracted stay (Mark ix. 5, 6). According to Luke, this remark seems to have been occasioned by the departure of Moses and Elijah (Luke ix. 33), and was a suggestion that they should remain. Then a cloud came over them (Mark ix. 7), or settled down upon them (Luke ix. 34), and a voice was heard witnessing of Jesus, "This is my beloved Son: hear him." This word was manifestly for the disciples, and not addressed to Jesus. After the voice the disciples *looked around*, and saw Jesus only (Mark ix. 8), or they *lifted up their eyes*, when Jesus touched them and spoke a reassuring word (Matt. xvii. 7, 8). It seems easier, on the whole, to regard the transfigura-

tion as a vision than as an objective reality. The verb which describes the appearance of Moses and Elijah is regularly used of visionary phenomena ($\acute{\omega}\phi\theta\eta$; see, *e.g.*, Luke xxiv. 34). Further, it is not easy to suppose that departed spirits could speak to ears of flesh, or that eyes of flesh could see the heavenly glory of Jesus. The voice out of the cloud may best be understood as was the voice which came at the baptism of Jesus. The statement that the disciples looked around *suddenly*, and saw no one but Jesus, is natural if at this moment they came out of the visionary state. Still further evidence for regarding the transfiguration as a vision is found in the fact that there seems to be no adequate reason for the manifold miracle which is involved in the view that the transfiguration was an objective reality. What adequate ground is there for calling the spirits of Moses and Elijah back to earth? Jesus did not need anything which they could give. He understood the Old Testament better than they did. What adequate ground is there, again, for a miraculous change in the corporeality of Jesus? If such a change took place, it must apparently have been for the sake of the disciples. Jesus certainly did not need it in order that He might be sure of His future glory. But again, it was not *necessary* on the disciples' behalf, for a vision might convey to them the very same assurance in regard to Jesus. We may suppose, then, that the disciples watched long with Jesus, and that they saw His face covered with unusual light while He prayed.

Then as their eyes were heavy (Luke ix. 32), they fell asleep, and a divine vision was granted unto them. In this they saw Jesus glorified, and Moses and Elijah conversing with Him. When they came out of the vision in which they had seen the Lord with the Old Testament saints, they saw Jesus only. The words of Peter about making tabernacles for Moses, Elijah, and Jesus, belonged to this visionary state, just as the words which he spoke at a later day on a roof in Joppa (Acts x. 9-16). These were a part of the *trance*. Likewise the *cloud* in the transfiguration scene belonged to the vision.

It is not, however, of vital importance to determine whether the transfiguration was something objective, or was a vision. The significance of it for the disciples remains the same in either case. We may suppose that it was designed to teach them, first, that the death of the Messiah was in line with the law and the prophets; and second, that it was designed to be a new confirmation that this Jesus with whom they had come up to the mountain top was the Son of God. They heard Moses and Elijah speaking with Jesus about His death, which was soon to be accomplished in Jerusalem, and thus they were taught that what Jesus had recently said about dying was a part of the Old Testament picture of the Messiah. They beheld Jesus glorified, which may have been to them a pledge of the fulfilment of His recent word to them about coming again in the glory of the Father. The voice

out of the cloud gave them new assurance of the Messiahship of Jesus (2 Pet. i. 17-18), and reminded them of their supreme obligation to hear Him.

If the transfiguration was a vision granted to the three disciples, then naturally the meaning of the hour was for them rather than for Jesus. Yet the disciples did not see its significance at that time, or saw it only imperfectly. They all thought that Elijah's appearance was the fulfilment of Malachi iv. 5 (Mark ix. 11), and they were surprised that he had not come *before*. Jesus corrected this misapprehension as they came down from the mountain. He told them that the Elijah of whom *they* were thinking had already come (Matt. xvii. 12, 13). He had not *restored* all things because the people had hindered him, and had finally done to him what they listed. But in consequence of this very thing, the other Scriptures regarding the suffering of the Son of man would now be fulfilled (Mark ix. 12). Had *all* things been restored, the Messiah would not have needed to suffer. But though they did not at the time fully understand the vision, and apparently could not fully understand it till after the resurrection (Mark ix. 9), it must have had a permanent influence upon them, helping them toward an apprehension of the meaning of Christ's death, and helping to sustain their personal confidence in Him through the days of awful suspense, in which He was crucified, dead, and buried.

At the Foot of the Mountain.

Coming down from the mountain of transfiguration, Jesus found His disciples surrounded by a throng of people and confronted by a case of illness which they were unable to cure (Mark ix. 14-29; Matt. xvii. 14-20; Luke ix. 37-43). The crowd welcomed Him, surprised and glad that He had come so opportunely. On inquiry, Jesus learned from the father of the boy what the case was, and after drawing the father on to a confession of his little faith and a prayer for more, He healed the child with a word. The paroxysm that followed this word left the boy completely exhausted, so that the bystanders said he was dead, but Jesus, taking his hand, raised him up, and he stood.

The case was unique in this respect that the disciples were unable to effect a cure. Jesus afterward explained their failure as due to a lack of prayer (Mark ix. 29). His words imply, what is elsewhere indicated, that it was only by prayer that He Himself was able to effect cures and cast out demons.

LAST INCIDENTS IN GALILEE.

Second Announcement of His Death.

A secret journey through Galilee as far as Capernaum followed close upon the transfiguration (Mark ix. 30, 33). During this journey, perhaps on successive days,¹ the theme of Jesus' words was His approaching death. The disciples were still unable to understand the say-

¹ Note the imperfects *έδιδασκεν*, *έλεγεν* (Mark ix. 31).

ing, and it is said that they were afraid to ask for an explanation. The reason of their fear is not indicated. Perhaps they thought it would bring a rebuke from Jesus for their dulness; more likely, however, they were convinced that something dreadful was impending, and shrank from a clearer view of it.

The Coin in the Fish's Mouth.

On their arrival in Capernaum, according to Matthew, Peter was accosted by the tax-gatherers and asked whether Jesus was not going to pay the usual temple tax (Matt. xvii. 24). Peter at once replied affirmatively. This indicates either that Peter knew of Jesus' having paid the temple tax on former occasions, or that he felt perfectly sure from Jesus' general observance of the law that He would in this particular instance meet its requirement. The form of the question implies that this tax was then overdue, and it is possible, as Ederheim¹ holds, that it was the tax for the last Passover. Jesus was not in Jerusalem at that time, and may not have been at His adopted home in Capernaum, so the payment had not yet been made. Jesus appears to have overheard the conversation, which may have been at the door of Peter's house, and so when Peter came in, Jesus did not wait for him to introduce the subject (Matt. xvii. 25).

Jesus put His payment of the tax on the ground that He would not give offence. In one sense He was not

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II. 113.

under obligation to pay it, even as the son of a king is not taxed to support the king. These are such words as we might expect from one who knew that He was greater than the temple (Matt. xii. 6).

The way in which, according to Matthew, the needed money was procured is not parallel with the other signs of Jesus, and is open to objection. It reads more like the tales of the Apocryphal Gospels than like the narratives of the genuine ones. Peter was to go to the lake, take up the first fish that should bite his hook, and he would find a *stater* in its mouth (a silver coin worth four drachmas, or about sixty-six cents). It is objected by some scholars¹ that in supplying the needed money in this miraculous manner Jesus would have appeared to be doing exactly what in the wilderness He had refused to do, and had regarded as a temptation of Satan (Matt. iv. 3). In Capernaum, where He had friends, it seems probable that He could have easily obtained the small amount which was required, without a miracle. It cannot be objected that He would thus be dependent on others, for we know that He received gifts from friends, and was indeed entirely supported by them during His ministry. He accepted the gifts of love.

Then, too, the miracle as recorded seems to have no great *lesson* as have the miracles of Jesus in general. As a sign it seems to have no adequate significance. It would of course show that Jesus had supernatural

¹ *E.g.*, Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 304.

knowledge; but why did this need to be shown? There is no reason to think that Peter was in doubt. He had seen many proofs of the supernatural knowledge and power of Jesus. In this case, however, such knowledge does not appear to be necessary for His Messianic work. And finally, as has been pointed out, the narrative says nothing of the *result* of the word of Jesus to Peter. If Jesus had really promised a miracle, we should have expected some reference to the success of Peter. There is no other case in the Gospels where Jesus is said to have promised a miracle, and where nevertheless the miracle is not recorded. But here we are not told whether Peter found the money.

Edersheim, however, sees in the act a vindication of Christ's "royal title." Jesus pays the tax "miraculously, as heaven's King." There is one obvious objection to this view, namely, that Jesus did not manifest His kingly glory chiefly in working miracles. The prophets also wrought miracles. But He manifested His glory in His divine character, in His grace and truth. Miracles were incidental to this manifestation. Hence this narrative of a coin in a fish's mouth remains a stranger and a foreigner in the circle of the great works of Jesus.

Who is Greatest?

A second incident belonging to the last days in Capernaum and Galilee was the address in regard to true greatness (Mark ix. 33-50; Matt. xviii. 1-14; Luke

ix. 46-48). This, like the first reference by Jesus to His forgiveness of sins and the first use of the self-designation *Son of man*, seems to have been in the house of Peter, for since Jesus was seeking to keep out of the public eye (Mark ix. 30), He would naturally lodge in Capernaum with His most intimate friends.

The words of Jesus regarding the way to greatness were suggested by something that had occurred as they were coming to Capernaum. Some of the disciples had contended with each other regarding their relative rank in the kingdom, supposedly without the knowledge of Jesus (Mark ix. 34). It is not improbable that the disturbing question arose because of the favor shown by Jesus to three of His disciples, or by the words of praise spoken to Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, or by both these events together. An intimation from Peter or John or James that he belonged to an inner circle and so expected something above the common lot in the Kingdom of the Messiah would have been quite sufficient to precipitate a controversy.

Jesus, however, had learned of the trouble in some way, and when in the house proceeded to answer the question. He told the disciples, in substance, that there was only one road to greatness and that was the road of service (Mark ix. 35). Hence the favored disciples should build no hopes for future promotion on the fact that they had been chosen to go up to the mountain top with Jesus, and Peter must beware lest he draw false inferences from the word which Jesus had spoken to him.

We have in this connection an illustration of the estimate which Jesus placed upon childhood. He set a little child in the midst of the twelve as their teacher, and then, having embraced it, He said that to receive such an one in His name, that is, to receive and love for Jesus' sake what the little child stands for, was the same as receiving Him. He also set forth the preciousness of the child under the symbol that the angels of children are especially near to the heavenly Father (Matt. xviii. 10).

It was on this occasion in Peter's house that John, touched perhaps by what Jesus had said about humility, reported the case of an unnamed man whom the disciples had found casting out demons in the name of Jesus (Mark ix. 38-41; Luke ix. 49, 50). They sought to restrain him because he did not follow them. We are not here concerned with this incident further than to note it as an illustration of the influence of Jesus' name. The man who was casting out demons must at least have believed in Jesus as a great prophet, if not as the Messiah, and something in the word or the example of Jesus had set him at work. Jesus seems to have thought it a matter of slight importance that the man did not follow His disciples; he was seeking to do good in the name of Jesus, and that was the great thing.

A third incident belonging to the last days in Galilee was the conversation between Jesus and His brothers (John vii. 3-9). It seems probable that Jesus had

sought out His mother and brothers before He should leave Galilee forever. The brothers' words show that Jesus had recently avoided publicity, a circumstance which points to the last weeks in Galilee. His brothers wished Him to go to Jerusalem, and manifest Himself *openly*. This seems to indicate that they no longer regarded Him as being out of His mind, as they had done at an earlier day (Mark iii. 21). They had not yet a true faith in Him, as John says, and yet they seem to have regarded Him as equipped with *some* special authority. As Jesus had avoided publicity during the last weeks, so He departed from Galilee and went up to the feast of Tabernacles in a private manner (John vii. 10). But He seems not to have departed until He had received an intimation from the Father that His time had come (John vii. 6, 8; v. 19).

CHAPTER XIII

LAST LABORS FOR JERUSALEM

The Data.

THE data for the third period of Messianic activity in Jerusalem are found in John exclusively (John vii. 10-x. 40). The Synoptists omit this as they omit the visit to Jerusalem at the first Passover, the early labors in Judea, and the visit at the feast of Purim. Matthew and Mark pass at once from the Galilean ministry to the ministry in Perea (Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1), and from Perea to the last Passover (Matt. xx. 17, 29; Mark x. 32, 46). Luke also omits this Jerusalem period. When he says that Jesus, at the close of the Galilean ministry, set His face to go to Jerusalem, it is not probable that he has in mind the journey to the feast of Tabernacles, which John records (Luke ix. 51). He makes no reference to Jesus' being *in* Jerusalem until the last week of His life.¹ He seems to regard Christ's departure from Galilee as the beginning of the end. From this time till the last Passover, he represents Jesus as journeying and teaching, His face always *toward* Jerusalem.²

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 381.

² Accordingly Luke ix. 51; xiii. 22; xviii. 31 are references to successive stages in one journey, and not references to three distinct journeys. Comp. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II. 127.

To the Feast of Tabernacles.

As Jesus avoided going to Jerusalem with the multitudes who went up to the feast, so He may have avoided the ordinary route down the Jordan valley on the eastern side. He seems at least to have started by the Samaritan route. For Luke speaks of a journey through Samaria, or at any rate *into* Samaria (Luke ix. 52), and it is easier to identify this with the trip to the feast of Tabernacles, than to think that it refers to the journey in March to the feast of Purim. At that time His disciples were in Galilee; now they are with Him (Luke ix. 52, 54). The fact that messengers were sent before Him to find lodging is not in conflict with John's statement that Jesus went up to the feast as it were in secret (John vii. 10). John simply contrasts the way in which Jesus went with the going in the regular caravan of pilgrims, but does not imply that He went absolutely alone.

The first Samaritan village where the messengers sought lodging for Jesus refused to receive Him because it was manifest that He was going to Jerusalem to the feast (Luke ix. 53). Now since it was the sphere of religion where Jews and Samaritans were especially hostile toward each other, the journey of Jesus and His disciples to a feast afforded an excellent opportunity for the Samaritans to pay off their ancient score. Repulsed in one village, Jesus went to another (Luke ix. 56). Some suppose that this second village was Jewish, and that Jesus turned back across the border into Galilee,

but there seems to be no evidence for this other than the assumption that if one village rejected Him, all villages would.¹ This, however, is not probable. Indeed, there was one village in Samaria where Jesus would have been welcomed as no other man of the whole earth (John iv. 39-42). And in other villages, where He was not known as the Messiah, it is likely that good Roman money would, as a rule, overcome Samaritan prejudice. Moreover, Jesus and His disciples would not have started through Samaria unless they had been reasonably sure of finding entertainment.

It may have been on this journey that Jesus met the ten lepers as recorded in Luke xvii. 11-19. The fact that one of these was a Samaritan makes it probable that they were near the border of Samaria, and the statement of Luke that He was between Samaria and Galilee points in the same direction. This is the only case on record where Jesus wrought a miracle in behalf of a Samaritan.

The incident is noteworthy because the cure wrought by Jesus was gradual (Luke xvii. 14), and also as suggesting, together with some other facts, that the Samaritan nature was more responsive to the kindness of Jesus than was the nature of the Jews (comp. Luke x. 33; John iv. 40).

Jesus had not been in Jerusalem at the last Passover, though He had been there at the Purim feast a month earlier (John v. 1), and therefore when the feast of

¹ Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II. 131.

Tabernacles came there was a general expectation that He would attend it (John vii. 11). He was sought among the pilgrims, and there was a common interest in His appearance. What was said about Him openly was unfavorable; but some persons, when not in the hearing of the leaders, held that He was a good man (John vii. 12). They went no farther than this. Even those who were friendly toward Him apparently did not believe Him to be the Messiah. Those who were hostile said that He led the multitude astray (John vii. 12). This charge was probably due to the fact that while His works raised their expectations, and made them think that He might be the Messiah, He utterly refused to conform to the popular Messianic rôle. The signal incident in mind when it was charged that He led the multitude astray, may have been the experience at Bethsaida Julias, when the multitude, roused by the miracle of Jesus, sought in vain to make Him king.

General View of this Period.

Jesus went to Jerusalem to the feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2, 10), and went away into Perea after the feast of Dedication (John x. 22), two and half or three months later. But it is not certain that He spent all this time in Jerusalem. The hostility of the Jews, who sent officers to take Jesus (John vii. 32), and who on two occasions sought to stone Him (John viii. 59; x. 31), and again tried to take Him prisoner (John x. 39), seems unfavorable to the view that He was

there three months. On the other hand, there is evidence that He made a deep impression on many people. Some said at the first of His visit that He was a good man (John vii. 12), and later it is twice said that many believed on Him (John vii. 31; viii. 30). The officers were so moved by His words that they did not execute the order of the leaders (John vii. 46). Nicodemus is represented as having dared to champion His cause (John vii. 51), and there is yet other proof that prominent Pharisees and officials were divided in their estimate of Him (John ix. 16; x. 21). It is not possible, therefore, to say that Jesus may not have spent the time between the feast of Tabernacles and the feast of Dedication in Jerusalem and the neighboring Bethany. During this period more stress seems to have been laid on teaching than on miracles. There is no trace of the multitudinous cures which we find in the Galilean ministry. John records only one miracle as wrought at this time, but he represents Jesus as speaking of *many* good works which He had showed the Jews from the Father, which may imply miracles that are not described (John x. 32).

As far as our record of this visit to Jerusalem informs us, Jesus came into contact with the Pharisees and high officers of the Sanhedrin much more than in any previous part of His ministry. The disciples of Jesus, the twelve, drop almost entirely out of sight. They are only once referred to, and then incidentally (John ix. 2).

What John records out of this period is rather the controversies growing out of Christ's teaching in the temple than the teaching itself; and yet the points on which the controversies turned were probably also the vital points of His teaching. These points are so intensely *personal* that, although the present work does not include the teaching of Jesus in detail, they may be briefly enumerated. Thus He claims a unique knowledge of the Father (John vii. 16; viii. 38, 55, etc.), a unique mission from the Father (John vii. 28; viii. 16, 18, 23, 26, 28, 42; x. 36), and a unique union with the Father (John viii. 16; x. 30, 38). All these claims are but different aspects of the one Messianic claim, which seems to have been as prominent in this period as was the preaching of the Kingdom of God in the early Galilean ministry. He refers again and again to His approaching death, and regards it as an act of self-revelation. It will show Him to be the Messiah (John viii. 28); it will prove that He is the good shepherd (John x. 11, 15, 17, 18). Out of His Messianic consciousness, which is brought forward so prominently, comes the urgent statement of man's need of Him. His hearers shall die in their sins unless they believe that He is the Christ (John viii. 24). He alone gives freedom, light, life (John viii. 12, 36; x. 10).

Such is the fulness of the personal Messianic claim which according to John characterized the teaching of Jesus in this period. Not only is there a remarkable fulness, but the teaching is urgent. Jesus called for

immediate acceptance of His message on the ground that the time of His being with them was short. In a little while they would seek Him, but then it would be too late. They could not come whither He was about to go.

Testing the Jerusalem Disciples.

The words of Jesus in the temple on a certain occasion won many disciples (John vii. 31). Some were ready to accept Him as the prophet who should precede the Messiah, and some as the Messiah Himself (John vii. 41). Even the officers of the Pharisees were deeply impressed by His words. But the impression was, at least in most cases, like that which Jesus had produced at the first Passover (John ii. 23). He had many disciples around Him, but He had not their hearts. They accepted Him because they thought He was *their* Messiah, but when they understood His teaching better they rejected Him.

The words of Jesus to these ostensible disciples seem very severe, but it appears in the sequel that they are true. He promised His hearers freedom through the truth and must then explain that He meant freedom from *sin* (John viii. 31, 32, 34). His hearers need this freedom, for though they are descended from Abraham they are hostile to Him. They have the spirit of the devil, who is a murderer and a liar (John viii. 44). When Jesus spoke this word, those who a little before had been, at least outwardly, His disciples called

Him a Samaritan, possessed with a demon, and a few minutes later they took up stones to stone Him (John viii. 48, 59). Thus it became plain that these disciples were such only so long as they thought that Jesus was the Messiah of their hopes. At heart they were as far from Him as were the rulers. One hour they accepted Him, the next hour they were ready to stone Him. This controversy is a notable illustration of Jesus' faithfulness to truth in dealing with men. Jerusalem was the very place where He needed the support of a strong band of disciples, and now at last He seemed to be gaining such support. There were many who professed belief in Him. But instead of encouraging them in their superficial faith, He brought them at once to the rigorous test of truth, and would have none of their discipleship unless it was genuine. He would sooner have them stone Him for telling them the truth than have them accept Him as a worldly Messiah.

The Man born Blind.

When those who had been disciples of Jesus took up stones to stone Him, it seemed as though nothing more could be done in Jerusalem. But John relates how Jesus yet won a true disciple, and how at the same time He intensified the spirit of opposition, which soon drove Him from the capital. Passing along the street on the Sabbath He saw a beggar who had been blind from his birth (ix. 1, 8). The disciples, without apparent concern

for the man's wretched state, raised the theoretical question whether the blindness was due to the man's own sin or the sin of his parents (ix. 2). Jesus, denying both these alternatives and saying that here was an opportunity to do the work of God, anointed the man's eyes with clay, sent him to the pool of Siloam to wash the clay off, and when he had done this he saw (ix. 3-7). Through the man's neighbors the matter came to the knowledge of the Pharisees, and then the man himself was brought before them (ix. 8, 13). In their investigation of the case, the parents of the man were summoned (ix. 18-21); and afterward, as the man had the better of the Pharisees in the argument, they reviled him and then cast him out (ix. 28, 34). Jesus learned of their action, sought the man out, and led him to a fuller faith (ix. 35-38).

This narrative is biographically important in several particulars. First, it caused a division even among the Pharisees, some of whom would not admit that Jesus was a sinner even though He had cured the man on the Sabbath (ix. 16). Second, it brings out the fact that the Jews had taken stringent *ecclesiastical* action against any who should accept Jesus. Such persons were to be excommunicated, *i. e.* put out of the synagogue (John ix. 22). This was the severest form of spiritual punishment which could be inflicted. In consequence of it a man was cast out from all intercourse with his countrymen, and was accursed. He was as a dead man. This punishment could be inflicted upon one who disre-

garded the statutes of the Sanhedrin,¹ and so could be inflicted in the case of this man, for he had virtually confessed Christ (see John ix. 27, 31-33), and the Sanhedrin had declared the ban on any who should be guilty of that act. This extreme measure shows that the rulers considered Jesus a dangerous enemy even in Jerusalem, the centre and stronghold of their power. Third, this narrative shows in a striking manner the regard of Jesus for the individual. In a time when His mind was filled with the crisis just before Him, and when His life was hourly in danger, He found the man who had been excommunicated, probably not without seeking for him, and by personal conversation led him to believe. The treatment which this man had received from the acknowledged religious leaders and His own treatment of him may have suggested His talk about the good shepherd and the hireling. Fourth, the account shows clearly the *animus* of the opposition to Jesus. He healed the man on the *Sabbath*. This was proof to the Pharisees that He was not from God. It confirmed them in the belief that He was a sinner. Thus they strained out the gnat and swallowed the camel. Jesus' violation of their unauthorized statute regarding the Sabbath made them blind to His divinely-good and gracious deed. On the contrary, the man who was healed argued that one who could do such a great and kind work must be from God.

¹ Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, I. 183.

In Solomon's Porch.

The miracle on the blind man and the subsequent words of Jesus seem to have won temporary security for Him. He appeared in the temple again as a teacher. This was at the feast of Dedication in December (John x. 22). The leaders again sought to entrap Him in speech, for it is manifest that in asking Him to tell them plainly whether He was the Messiah, they were not moved by a sincere desire for the truth. If this had been their spirit, and if they had thought there was a possibility that Jesus was the Messiah, they would not in the next minute have taken up stones to stone Him (John x. 31). How they hoped to profit by His answer to their question we are not told.

Jesus in His reply to their question said it had already been answered both in words and in works. There was no lack of evidence on His part, but of faith on their part (John x. 25, 26). In speaking of the security of His sheep, He used language which His enemies regarded as blasphemy (John x. 33).

Once they took up stones to stone Him, but for some unknown reason desisted, perhaps because there were too many around who sympathized with Jesus. Jesus referred them to the Scriptures and to His own works for proof that His language was not blasphemy when He claimed to be the Son of God (John x. 32, 34-36). If in their own unbreakable Scriptures earthly rulers, because of their office, are called gods (Ps. lxxxii. 6), then certainly it is not blasphemy for Him, whom the

Father consecrated to the Messianic office, to call Himself the Son of God (John x. 35, 36).

Then, as Jesus again referred to His union with the Father, the Jews were roused to a fresh assault upon Him, and He deemed it best to make His escape from them. Thus closed His longest ministry in Jerusalem, and He left the city a fugitive (John x. 39, 40).

CHAPTER XIV

THE PEREAN MINISTRY

General View.

A MINISTRY in Perea toward the close of the last year of Jesus' life is attested by all the evangelists, but it is not possible to give a detailed picture of it. Luke has more material which seems to belong in this period than have the other evangelists, yet it is not always possible to say with certainty that particular events and discourses of his narrative do belong in these months. His view of Jesus' activity from the end of the Galilean ministry till the last week is that of a journeying toward Jerusalem, and it is not possible to determine in every case whether a passage belongs to the Jerusalem period or to the Peraan.

Neither of the evangelists mentions a single place in Perea by name, though the fourth Gospel says that Jesus abode in the place where John was at the first baptizing (John x. 40).

Jesus went into Perea toward the end of December, after the feast of Dedication (John x. 22, 39), and continued till shortly before the last Passover, that is, about three months (John xi. 17, 54, 55). A certain preparation for work in this district had been made by John the Baptist, who had preached on its border (John x.

40), and whose martyrdom was probably within its limits. Jesus also had twice been in Perea, and the second time had become widely known (Mark v. 1-20; vii. 31-viii. 12). In general, the ministry of Jesus in Perea was like that in Galilee. He taught the multitudes regarding the Kingdom of God and wrought beneficent signs (Mark x. 1; Luke x. 17; xiii. 32), and gathered some fruit (John x. 42). There seems to be in the teaching of this period a more continuous and stern note of judgment than is found in the earlier ministry. If this be true, it would accord with the fact of His rejection in Galilee and Jerusalem (Luke xii. 49-53; xiii. 6-9, 24-30; xiv. 24, etc.).

The Seventy.

The mission of the seventy may most easily be explained as a part of the ministry in Perea. It cannot have been in connection with the journey of Jesus to the feast of Tabernacles, for that was semi-private (John vii. 10); and there seems to be no place for it in the Galilean ministry.

It is intrinsically probable that Jesus, in the brief time that remained, wished to spread the knowledge of His kingdom as broadly as possible among the Jews of the large Perea region. The pressure arising from the nearness of the end may have led to the sending of seventy instead of twelve. This mission of the seventy disciples may very probably have been from that place where Jesus, according to John, abode on

going into Perea (John x. 40). If this mission was indeed in Perea, then it implies that Jesus visited a considerable number of towns (Luke x. 1).

The seventy were sent out, according to Luke, with about the same instructions which had been given to the twelve (Luke x. 1-12). There are, however, certain details in his report of the words of Jesus that accord better with the Perean than with the early Galilean ministry. Emphasis on the *urgency* of their work points to the later time, when the shadow of the cross was growing more and more distinct to the eye of Jesus (Luke x. 4, last clause; x. 7, last clause). Also the word that they go forth as lambs in the midst of wolves (Luke x. 3). On the other hand, the saying that the harvest is plenteous better suits the early Galilean ministry than it does that in Perea (Luke x. 2). It is possible that the instructions in Luke are a blending of two addresses.

The mission of the seventy was successful, at least in its work of healing (Luke x. 17). They came back, perhaps to the place near the Jordan whither Jesus had gone from Jerusalem, and reported to their Master that even the demon had been subject to them in His name.

PEREAN INCIDENTS.

The Question of Divorce.

If the period of three months spent in Perea was filled with Messianic activity, as we may infer that it was, then tradition seems to have preserved but little

out of those days and weeks, even as we have very little information regarding the preceding period in Jerusalem. We cannot say why the data are so scant. It may have been due in part to the fact that the early Church had fewer roots in Perea than in Galilee; and, possibly, it may have been partly due to the character of the Perea work of Jesus. There may not have been much that presented new aspects of the Messiah's teaching.

On one occasion, Pharisees came to Jesus and sought to involve Him in trouble regarding the subject of divorce (Mark x. 2-12; Matt. xix. 3-12). It is most probable that the Pharisees hoped to get an expression from Jesus which would arouse Herod Antipas against Him. John the Baptist had been arrested because he condemned Herod's marriage with Herodias, and the Pharisees knew well that Jesus would condemn the lax views of marriage which the court of Herod and many of the common people held. The liberal view, which was the popular one, went so far as to hold that a man might put his wife away if she burnt his dinner, or if he saw a woman he liked better.¹ We need not suppose that the practice was often as bad as this extreme view, but without doubt the liberalism of Hillel's school had exerted an evil influence. The attempt of the Pharisees, however, was not successful, for though Jesus held to the indissolubleness of the marriage bond, and so virtually condemned the lax view on the subject,

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 493, 494.

he did so in the plain language of Scripture, which they could not gainsay (Mark x. 6-8; Matt. xix. 4, 5). He set aside the legislation of Moses on the subject as imperfect, a legislation that made concessions to the hardness of man's heart; and put in its place the ideal of the primitive revelation. His inference from that ideal is that man may not separate husband and wife (Mark x. 9). Either of them may destroy the bond, and then human law may recognize that fact (Matt. xix. 9); but the bond cannot otherwise be dissolved.

Blessing the Children.

An illustration of the esteem in which Jesus was held in this region of Perea was furnished by the fact that mothers brought their little children to Him, that He should bless them (Mark x. 13-16; Matt. xix. 13-15; Luke xviii. 15-17). Behind this act there was surely a belief that He was a holy man, and that He was kindly disposed and ready to speak words of blessing. The incident suggests that Jesus had been some time in the neighborhood, so that people had come to feel acquainted with Him; otherwise the mothers would hardly have brought their babes to Him for His touch and word of benediction. This event also illustrates how imperfectly the disciples of Jesus understood Him, for they presumed to rebuke the mothers, perhaps with the thought that their Master had more important work than blessing young children. But the prompt indignation of Jesus must have shown them that His estimate

of the importance of the occasion was totally different from theirs. He welcomed the children, both for their own sakes and as a type of the material of which the kingdom of heaven consists. He not only blessed them, but blessed them *fervently*, thus, as it were, making ample reparation to the mothers for the rebuke they had received from His disciples.

The Rich Young Ruler.

On a certain occasion, as Jesus was just setting out on His journey, a young man of blameless morality of the legal sort came to Him to learn how he might obtain eternal life (Mark x. 17-27; Matt. xix. 16-26; Luke xviii. 18-30). The incident is interesting biographically because, first, in the ensuing conversation, Jesus declined the predicate *good*, saying that it belonged to God alone. He as a man subject to change could not accept the term in an absolute sense.

This saying seems to have been early regarded as difficult, for in Matthew it is modified and reads, "Why askest thou me concerning the good?" (Matt. xix. 17). And yet it is not strange that Jesus rejected the epithet. It is rather in keeping with His entire character that He did decline it. It is true, He was conscious of having done always the things that were pleasing to God. He was conscious that He had not sinned. But He was conscious also that He had been tempted and was still tempted; that He was a man free to choose, and that instead of being sufficient unto Himself, He

depended constantly upon God (John v. 19). Since He looked up to God as *His* God (John xx. 17), so He must regard Him as the only absolutely good one.¹ And second, this incident shows the insight which Jesus had into the hearts of men. He saw deep down beneath the surface the dangerous point in the young man's character, namely, his attachment to his wealth. Therefore He tested him at this point. He loved him and would have been glad to have him as a disciple, but on one condition. The young man must put Him first, and be willing to give up all for His sake. The correctness of Jesus' estimate of the young man is shown by the result. He went away with a downcast and sorrowful face, and lost his divine opportunity (Mark x. 22). In the subsequent remark of Jesus on the difficulty which rich men have in entering the Kingdom of God we may perhaps see the generalized experience of His previous ministry as a whole, as regards the rich.

A glimpse into the experience of those who followed Jesus is perhaps afforded by His words to Peter, spoken in connection with the incident of the rich young man. Abundant reward shall be given to every one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields for His sake (Mark x. 29, 30). This refers to the past and seems to reflect what had been true of the disciples. One had been separated from nearest friends, perhaps disowned by them, another had given up house and fields.

¹ Compare the remark of Socrates in the *Phædrus*: "Wise I may not call them; for that is a great name, which belongs to God alone."

Candidates for Discipleship.

It may well have been in the Perea days that Jesus compared His lot with that of the foxes and birds. A scribe declared his readiness to follow Jesus whithersoever He should go (Matt. viii. 19; Luke ix. 57), and Jesus, desiring that the man should count the cost of discipleship, replied that the Son of man had not a place to lay His head, while even the foxes have holes and the birds have nests (Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58). Jesus would scarcely have spoken in this wise while in Galilee, where Peter's home was always open to Him, and the homes of numerous disciples, nor yet while in Jerusalem, near to the home of Lazarus. The language suits the time after His rejection by the people of Galilee and Jerusalem.

Likewise the word which He spoke to another disciple who asked leave to go and bury his father (Matt. viii. 21, 22; Luke ix. 59, 60). Jesus said, "Let the dead bury their own dead." This saying suggests a time when Jesus looked without much hope upon His generation; and so points toward the latter part of His ministry.¹

Jesus and Herod.

It was probably while Jesus was in Perea that the Pharisees reported to Him Herod's desire to kill Him

¹ Huck in his *Synopse* puts in the Perea period the parables of The Unjust Steward (Luke xvi. 1-12), The Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19-31), and The Laborers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16). They may have been spoken then, but they contain nothing that indicates the time of their origin.

(Luke xiii. 31). From the fact that Jesus sent a message to Herod, a message showing that He understood his crafty character (Luke xiii. 32), and was not afraid of his power, we may infer that Herod was really seeking to destroy Jesus, and that the report was not simply a device of the Pharisees to entangle Jesus. On what grounds Herod sought to kill Jesus we are not told. He may have feared lest Jesus should become a political leader and rob him of his power.

Jesus had left Jerusalem because men sought His life (John x. 31, 39), and now in Perea the ruler of the province wished to kill Him. It is not strange that He spoke words on this occasion which showed that He regarded the end as very near. But He felt secure from the plot of Herod while the time appointed Him was yet unfulfilled. "I cast out demons and perform cures to-day and to-morrow." "I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow" (Luke xiii. 32, 33). He felt sure that no Herod could prevent this. Not in Perea at Herod's hand, but in Jerusalem, and by the leaders of His own people, He was to die, and thus be *perfected*. This will be on the *third day*, that is, in the immediate future.

The Pharisees who told Jesus of Herod's purpose may have hoped that He would leave Perea and return to Judea, where He might the more easily be destroyed by the leaders. There is no reason to suppose that they told Him as friends, solicitous for His safety.

CHAPTER XV

IN BETHANY AND EPHRAIM

The Return to Bethany.

JESUS was summoned from Perea by the death of Lazarus (John xi. 15). This cannot have been long before the last Passover, perhaps two or three weeks. We do not know when Jesus became acquainted with the family of Lazarus in Bethany. Luke records an incident that transpired in this home, and puts it subsequent to the final departure of Jesus from Galilee (Luke x. 38-42). But it is not plain that Jesus' acquaintance with Mary and Martha began at this time. The story rather suggests that they had known Jesus before, for they received Him into their house, as they would hardly have done had He been a stranger. Mary sits at His feet, apparently from His entrance into the house, and Martha does not accost Him as though she had had no previous acquaintance with Him. But though we cannot mark the beginning of Jesus' acquaintance with Lazarus and his two sisters, we know that He was especially attached to them (John xi. 5). It was perhaps because of the close relationship between them that the family knew where Jesus was, and so could send a messenger to Him when Lazarus was sick.

According to John, Jesus had supernatural knowledge regarding the course of events in Bethany. He knew before setting out for Judea that Lazarus was dead, and that He should raise him to life (John xi. 4, 11). There is a manifest reason why such knowledge was given to Jesus, and why Jesus tarried in Perea as He did. God purposed that He should work a great miracle, not in *healing* Lazarus, but in raising him from the dead, and this miracle was to be for the strengthening of the faith of the disciples, and to be a last mighty call to Jerusalem (John xi. 15, 45; xii. 9-11).

The disciples were opposed to Jesus' return into Judea. They reminded Him of the recent attempt to take His life, and seemed surprised that He should think of going back among His enemies (John xi. 8). They regarded it as extremely dangerous, and Thomas at least thought the journey would issue in the death of Jesus (John xi. 16).

The Raising of Lazarus.

It appears that Jesus stopped outside the village of Bethany of His own accord, for, after talking with Martha who had come forth to meet Him, He sent her to call Mary (John xi. 28). If He preferred to meet Mary outside the village, it is natural to think that it was His plan also to summon Martha, and that He had done this by sending to her one of His disciples. He may well have anticipated that there would be a throng of friends in the house of mourning, and may have wished to avoid meeting them.

Jesus was unusually moved when He saw Mary and her friends weeping (John xi. 33). His manner evinced a deep inner emotion, as it did also when He put the healed leper forth out of the house (Mark i. 43). The word suggests that the emotion was one of indignation (*ἐμβριμᾶσθαι*). A moment later He wept, and still later, perhaps as they neared the tomb of Lazarus, the inward emotion was again manifest (John xi. 36, 38). On one other occasion Jesus is said to have wept, and the cause was the unbelief of Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41-44). Pity and sorrow were expressed in the tears that He shed. In like manner we may hold that it was sorrow and pity which made Jesus weep when outside Bethany, this sorrow and pity being due to unbelief just as they were when He wept over Jerusalem. Unbelief was manifest in the weeping of Mary and the Jews. Had they believed, as Jesus did, in the love of the Father, they would not have thus given themselves over to sorrow and tears, because the Father had taken one of their number to Himself. Moreover, this view of the weeping of Jesus is confirmed by the fact that it accords with the foregoing statement of John that the manner of Jesus expressed an inner emotion of indignation. Tears of sorrow and pity might naturally accompany the deep feeling of indignation at the unbelief of the people around Him. Unbelief in God was at the same time unbelief in Jesus who had been seeking to reveal God, and therefore He could say at the tomb that He spoke as He did to awaken belief in those who stood around (John xi. 42).

The scene at the tomb gives prominence to one fact, namely, that Jesus wrought His miracles in conscious dependence upon God, or that God gave Him authority to work miracles in answer to prayer and as a proof of His Messiahship. Jesus thanked God that He had heard Him (John xi. 41, 42), from which it is plain that He had *previously* prayed to God. The situation requires us to think that He had prayed for power to raise Lazarus. Both the prayer and the assurance that it was granted may have belonged to the hour in which the messenger had come from Bethany with tidings of the sickness of Lazarus (John xi. 4). What was true at the raising of Lazarus we assume to have been true in all the miracles of Jesus, there being no evidence whatever to the contrary (comp. Luke xi. 20; Matt. xii. 28).

The raising of Lazarus led to a fresh and more decided activity of the enemies of Jesus. A council was gathered, the high priest advised the death of Jesus, and from that day forth the leaders plotted how they might destroy Him (John xi. 47-53). Thus, whether formally or informally, the Sanhedrin decreed the death of Jesus. The ground of their action, according to John, was political and national. They feared that Jesus, by means of His unquestionable signs, would secure such a following as to attract the attention of Rome, and that Rome, to be free forever from these uprisings against her authority, would take from the Jews the last vestige of independence.

If the raising of Lazarus stimulated the opposition to

Jesus, it also led many to believe on Him (John xi. 45). One hesitates, however, to attach great significance to this statement, for John indicates elsewhere that the faith which rested upon signs was only superficial (John ii. 23-25).

In Ephraim.

Shortly after the raising of Lazarus, Jesus withdrew from the neighborhood of Jerusalem to avoid the plots of the Jews. The city called *Ephraim*, near to the wilderness (John xi. 54), is identified by some scholars with Taiyibeh, a village among the mountains five miles northeast from Bethel.¹ It is plain that Jesus retired to the place to escape from the Jews, and it is not likely that His place of retirement was known. Of the sojourn in Ephraim we know nothing. It was probably a time of quiet and of preparation for the end.

The Last Journey to Jerusalem.

When the Passover drew near and the caravans of pilgrims were moving up to Jerusalem, Jesus joined a Galilean caravan at some point before they reached Jericho (Luke xviii. 35). Thus it appears that He made a journey of some considerable length for the sake — as far as we can see — of going to Jerusalem in company with His Galilean countrymen.

Jesus stopped in Jericho over night (Luke xix. 5), and owed His entertainment to the chance acquaintance which He made with a rich tax-gatherer by the name

¹ Henderson, *Palestine*, pp. 131, 161.

of Zacchæus (Luke xix. 1-10). He saw this man in a tree as He was passing through the town, and noticing the unusual interest which Zacchæus had in Him, He at once responded to it by giving Zacchæus an opportunity to entertain Him. This opportunity was gladly embraced, and Zacchæus took Jesus to his home. The act of Jesus was widely criticised (Luke xix. 7). Some people felt that it was wrong for Jesus to lodge with a sinner. Just as, at the beginning of the ministry in Galilee, scribes and Pharisees arraigned Him before His disciples because He ate with tax-gatherers and sinners (Mark ii. 16, 17). And although Jesus had manifested this spirit of love for the outcast and despised during His entire ministry, here, near its close all those around Him, chiefly Galileans, murmured at His conduct. They could not reconcile it with His claim, which shows how poorly they appreciated the claim itself. They did not know that the great work of the Messiah was to deliver men from sin. Hence the strange fact that no one, as far as our records inform us, ever asked Jesus to forgive his sin. But the act of Jesus in lodging with Zacchæus was amply justified by the result. Before He left the house, Zacchæus, under a new impulse begotten by the presence of the Lord, declared that he would give half of his goods to the poor, and would restore four-fold, if in any case he had collected larger taxes than were right. Thus salvation had come to his house, and was already manifesting itself in the outward life.

As Jesus left¹ Jericho in the morning, a blind man who seems to have heard of Him before, and to have believed Him to be the Son of David (Mark x. 47, 48), called on Him for mercy, and at the word of Jesus received his sight (Mark x. 52).

Third Announcement of Death and Resurrection.

Somewhere on this last journey to Jerusalem, Jesus for the third time told His disciples what was about to befall Him (Mark x. 32-34; Matt. xx. 17-19; Luke xviii. 31-34). Just before this, and perhaps at such a juncture of roads as made it manifest that He was going to Jerusalem, Jesus seems to have led the caravan (Mark x. 32). Those with Him were amazed, perhaps at His manifest purpose to go back to the city from which He had so recently fled for His life (comp. John xi. 8, 16), and those who followed Him were afraid, perhaps for *His* safety, perhaps for their own, if they should be found with Him in Jerusalem. At this time, taking the twelve apart, He told them that the journey they were making to Jerusalem would terminate in His death, a shameful death, in which both Jews and Gentiles would be involved, and that after three² days He should rise (Mark x. 33, 34).

¹ Luke puts this incident *before* the entry into Jericho, and Matthew speaks of *two* men. Mark's version of the incident is commended by its fulness of details.

² On the difference between the Synoptists as to the time of the resurrection, see Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 287, 288.

Request of James and John.

This word about a resurrection, though doubtless not understood (comp. Mark ix. 10), may have conveyed to the disciples the idea of a victory for Jesus, and so too of the establishment of His Kingdom. Such a suggestion may have brought to utterance the secret wish of James and John, aided, we may suppose, by the ambition of their mother, Salome, who was probably in the Galilean caravan (Matt. xx. 20; Mark x. 35). They at first hesitated to let Jesus know what they wished, — an evidence that they inwardly doubted whether they ought to make the request, — but then, as He refused to promise in the dark, they told their wish (Mark x. 35–37). Jesus replied that the request was made in ignorance; it implied that they were able to share His sufferings. Then, when they boldly said they could share these, He promised that they should indeed share them, as He had repeatedly said in substance to all His disciples, but that it was not in His power to grant their request for the first places in His Kingdom (Mark x. 38–40). The indignation of the other apostles was very naturally aroused by the attempt of James and John, and so Jesus, almost in the shadow of His own cross, must go back to the lesson which He had impressed upon them in Capernaum (Mark ix. 33), and tell them again that the only way to greatness was the way of service, in which way they were to follow Him to the end.

CHAPTER XVI

THE LAST EIGHT DAYS

The Data.

ABOUT thirty-six per cent of the combined narrative of the four Gospels is concerned with the last eight days of Jesus' life and with His resurrection. The percentage is largest in the Gospel of John and smallest in the Gospel of Luke. Various circumstances help to explain the large amount of space given to the narrative of these days. First, Jesus seems to have filled the closing days with intense activity, both as regards the Jews, whom He sought to save, and as regards His disciples, whom He sought to prepare for His death. Second, the events and words of the last days of Jesus would naturally impress themselves most deeply on the minds and hearts of the disciples, and so when the time to write of them came, a fuller narrative could be produced than could be written of other periods of His life. Third, the apostolic church from the beginning regarded the death of Jesus as of fundamental importance, and for this reason dwelt with peculiar interest on the events immediately connected with it.

The Arrival in Bethany.

The Synoptists make no break in the journey from Jericho to Jerusalem (Mark x. 46-xi. 1; Matt. xxi. 1;

Luke xix. 28, 29). They narrate the triumphal entry in immediate connection with the journey from Jericho, as though it fell on the same day and were the close of the journey. But John says explicitly that Jesus came to Bethany six days before the Passover, and it is plain from his narrative that Jesus tarried there a little while (John xii. 2, 12). The sixth day before the Passover began on Friday evening of the preceding week, and at this time, perhaps just at evening, Jesus and His disciples reached Bethany.

The Last Sabbath.

The supper which was made for Jesus in the house of Simon "the leper" (Mark xiv. 3) is probably to be placed on the Jewish Sabbath, that is, according to our mode of speech, the day after His arrival in Bethany. For the triumphal entry fell on the day following that of the supper (John xii. 12), and therefore the supper cannot have been on Friday, for in that case the triumphal entry would have come on the Jewish Sabbath. On the other hand, since the arrival of Jesus in Bethany must have been known on the Sabbath, we cannot suppose that His enthusiastic friends would postpone their reception of Him any longer than the close of that sacred day. On this last Sabbath, then, a supper was made for Jesus in the house of a certain Simon, who had once been a leper, and whom Jesus may have healed. Of this supper, the narrative in John is fuller than that of Mark and Matthew (Mark xiv. 3-9; Matt.

xxvi. 6-13), and is probably to be followed in points where it differs from theirs.

The event that made the supper memorable was the act of Mary. Taking a pound of very precious ointment, she anointed the feet of Jesus, afterward wiping them with her hair (John xii. 3). The fragrance of the spikenard filled the whole house. The ointment used was valued at about fifty dollars, and some of the disciples, perhaps only Judas (John xii. 4), murmured at what they thought wasteful extravagance. Jesus, however, rebuked them, and justified Mary's act. He said it was a beautiful deed and should be her memorial in all the earth (Mark xiv. 6, 9; Matt. xxvi. 10, 13). If it seemed extravagant, it was yet fitting as a farewell service to Him. They would have frequent opportunities to give to the poor, but not to give to Him.

He made a still more pointed reference to His death, saying, according to John, that Mary should be allowed to keep the ointment, naturally that which had not been used — keep it for the day of His burial (John xii. 7). According to the Synoptists, Jesus said that in anointing His body, she had done it for His burial. Thus, in either case, He intimated that His death was near. The suggestion that the ointment may have been purchased to anoint Lazarus, but was not needed as Jesus raised him from the dead, has against it that such anointing of the body would surely not have been left until the fourth day. Further, it is not probable that so large an amount of ointment remained after the body

had been anointed. It is therefore to be regarded as purchased especially for the anointing of Jesus.

It may well have been on this Sabbath that Judas bargained with the chief priests to betray Jesus (Mark xiv. 10, 11; Matt. xxvi. 14-16; Luke xxii. 3-6). The Synoptists mention this in connection with the supper in Simon's house; and the statement that Judas *was seeking* (ἐζήτει) to deliver Jesus to them is favorable to the view that he had the plot in mind at least so long as from the Sabbath until Thursday. The rebuke which he with others, perhaps he alone, had received from Jesus at Simon's house, and the explicit reference by Jesus to His own burial, may have been the last influences which sent him to the high priests. It must have been growing more and more plain to him since the crisis in Capernaum that Jesus was not the Messiah of the popular expectation, which expectation Judas may well have shared. He saw that the fate of Jesus was settled, and he might argue that his own action would not alter matters. At the same time, Jesus' extremity was his opportunity. If the fate of Jesus was settled beyond a peradventure, he might as well turn it to his own account if he could.

The Day of the Triumphal Entry.

The great question in the days just before the last Passover, as people met in the temple, was whether Jesus would come to the feast (John xi. 56). The raising of Lazarus two or three weeks before had

created the deepest interest, both friendly and hostile. There were many among the pilgrims and some of the Jerusalemites who, though little understanding the spirit of Jesus, were ready to hail him as the Son of David; but the dominant elements in Jerusalem were organized to kill Him. The leaders issued an order before the Passover, probably while Jesus was still hiding in Ephraim, that if any man knew where Jesus was he should make it known (John xi. 57).

The Escort from Jerusalem.

With the morning of the first day of the week a great multitude took palm branches and went forth from Jerusalem to meet Jesus (John xii. 12-19). They had heard of the great sign which He had wrought; they knew that He had come to Bethany, and had heard that He was coming to Jerusalem. So they went forth ready to welcome Him as the King of Israel. The palm branches in their hands were probably a symbol of gladness (Lev. xxiii. 40; Rev. vii. 9).

The Synoptists do not mention this escort from the city, but their language *implies* it when they speak of throngs going *before* Jesus as well as of throngs who followed Him (Mark xi. 9; Matt. xxi. 9). Those *going before* are the multitude who, according to John, came forth to meet Jesus. On meeting Him, they turned about and formed the head of the procession. Jesus was then in the midst, His disciples and friends from Bethany following.

The Messianic Entry.

Jesus left Bethany on foot, but at some point, perhaps on reaching the brow of Olivet whence He saw the multitudes with palm branches coming to meet Him, He halted, and sent two of His disciples to bring a young ass (Mark xi. 1; Matt. xxi. 1; Luke xix. 29). It is possible that Jesus adopted this mode of entering Jerusalem in memory of the words of Zechariah, of which in this hour He saw a fulfilment (Zech. ix. 9). The disciples, however, saw no special significance in it until a later day (John xii. 16).

It is the opinion of some writers¹ that the Synoptists represent Jesus as *miraculously* procuring the ass, an idea which is certainly not found in John's narrative. But the Synoptic narrative allows us to suppose that the village "over against you" was Bethany, which they had just left; and when Jesus tells His disciples to say to the owner that "the Lord has need of it," it is implied that the owner would know who was meant by this designation; in other words it is implied that he was a friend of Jesus (Mark xi. 3; Matt. xxi. 3; Luke xix. 31). Jesus may have seen the ass as He came out from Bethany, therefore it is not necessary to hold that the Synoptists regarded the securing of the ass as miraculous.

Matthew's representation that there was an ass, and also its colt, and that Jesus sat upon *them* (Matt. xxi. 7), seems to be a modification of the narrative due to a

¹ *E.g.*, Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 374.

misunderstanding of the prophetic passage which the disciples afterward saw fulfilled in the triumphal entry (John xii. 16). Zechariah manifestly speaks of but one ass, which was all that was needed for one person to ride, but he speaks of this *twice* in the parallelism of his joyful words:—

“Lowly and riding upon an ass,
Even upon a colt the foal of an ass.”

Seated on the ass, Jesus moved toward Jerusalem, preceded and followed by excited and jubilant throngs. He was hailed as the Son of David and the King of Israel (Matt. xxi. 9; John xii. 13). Mention was made of His mighty works, and the kingdom of David was hailed as now at hand (Luke xix. 37; Mark xi. 10). For one hour the multitudes verily thought that they had the Messiah of their long and fond hopes. The scene was somewhat parallel to that by Lake Galilee, when, after the feeding of the five thousand, the people wanted to make Jesus their king (John vi. 15).

But really the Messiah of their hopes should have entered the city on a fiery *horse*, the animal used in war, and not on an ass, the symbol rather of peace.

This entry was not without its sharp contrasts, as was the life of Jesus throughout. For here, in the midst of the jubilation, Jesus wept (Luke xix. 41-44). He well knew that the city which He was entering in triumph was at heart opposed to Him, and He saw what this

opposition would bring upon it in coming days. Jerusalem was more to Him, as to every true Jew, than any other city. It was the city of His fathers, the city of Jehovah, the city of many holy memories, and therefore at the thought of its persistent unbelief and its swiftly approaching destruction He wept.

Another contrast was presented when Pharisees spoke to Jesus, and asked Him to silence the shouting of His disciples, who were hailing Him as the Messiah (Luke xix. 39, 40). Jesus replied that the praise was fitting, that it was His due, an obligation so imperative that, were it not met, the stones might cry out.

When Jesus entered the city and moved toward the temple, the city was greatly stirred. The question was heard on every hand, "Who is this?" (Matt. xxi. 10). And the answer came, "This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee." It was perfectly manifest that the accompanying throngs believed Him to be more than a prophet, but they gave this personal and local designation because that was just what the questioners wanted to know. They wanted to find out who was being hailed as Messiah.

It may well have been on this first day of the week that Jesus, who had entered the city as the Messiah, wrought the cures which Matthew records (Matt. xxi. 14). The blind and the lame came to Him, and He healed them. These were the last acts of healing, and the only ones which the record puts in the temple.

The chief priests and scribes, who could not openly

seize Jesus when He was surrounded by such throngs of enthusiastic followers, rebuked Him for allowing the children to salute Him as the Son of David (Matt. xxi. 15, 16). *They* did not consider Him the Son of David, and thought He had no right to consider Himself in that light. His answer was a justification of the children from the Eighth Psalm, where, in highly poetical language, it is said : —

“Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou established strength,
Because of Thine adversaries,
That Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.”

But if even babes and sucklings contribute to the glory of God so that His enemies are discomfited, much more is He glorified in the praises rendered to His Son by these children, who are old enough to shout intelligent hosannas to the Son of David.

At evening Jesus with the twelve returned to Bethany, where He lodged (Mark xi. 11).

From Monday to Wednesday.

It seems plain that Jesus spent Thursday of the last week outside the city (Mark xiv. 12–17), but it is not certain whether Tuesday or Wednesday was the last day of public activity in Jerusalem. It seems on the whole probable that He continued His teaching until Wednesday, which He certainly could do as far as the hostility of the Pharisees was concerned, because the common people were so largely in sympathy with Him.

The leaders feared to seize Him during the feast, lest there should be a tumult (Mark xiv. 2).

Of the incidents which belong in these three days, a few are definitely located (Mark xi. 12; xiv. 1), but the exact time of most is not determinable.

The Barren Fig Tree.

It was on Monday morning, as Jesus with His disciples was going into the city from Bethany, that He spoke significant words regarding a fig tree (Mark xi. 12; Matt. xxi. 18). The tree stood at a little distance from the road, and since it promised fruit, Jesus turned aside and came to it (Mark xi. 13). But as it had no fruit, He solemnly declared that no one should ever eat fruit from it (Mark xi. 14). It was not then the season for figs, but one might expect them, since this particular tree had put forth leaves, and in the fig tree there should be fruit when there are leaves.

As on another occasion (Luke xiii. 6), so here, the fig tree seems to have symbolized the Jewish nation. This also had put forth leaves, in that it had at first accepted Jesus; but it had borne no fruit of repentance and spiritual faith in Him. Hence in declaring the doom of the tree, He declared the doom of the nation, or rather of that generation of the Jewish people.

On the morning after this incident (Mark xi. 20), as Jesus and His disciples went to the city, the fig tree was dry and withered.¹

¹ The narrative of Matthew appears to put the withering of the tree in the moment when Jesus spoke its doom. The disciples marvelled because

If the withering of the tree was miraculously caused, then, in analogy with the miracles of the Gospel in general, we must suppose that it was caused by the will of Jesus, and not that it was wrought by God,¹ apart from Jesus. But Jesus did not say that it should wither away. The fate which He announced was permanent barrenness (Mark xi. 14; Matt. xxi. 19). The fact that the tree had leaves at so early a day, and also that it had no fruit, suggests that its life was not normal, but in some wise diseased. It is possible then that its withering away was due to some natural cause. If so, then its fate was a providential confirmation of the word of Jesus.

In line with the lesson of the fig tree are certain parables of judgment which seem to belong in the last three days. These are the parables of The Vineyard (Mark xii. 1-12; Matt. xxi. 33-46; Luke xx. 9-18), The King's Marriage Feast (Matt. xxii. 1-14; Luke xiv. 15-24), and that of The Unlike Sons (Matt. xxi. 28-32). These were spoken in the hearing of Pharisees and priests, and were primarily for them. All reflect the near doom of the Jewish people, which was coming upon them because they had refused the invitation of Jesus, and were about to put Him to death. The parable of The Unlike Sons sets forth just the thought which was illustrated by the fig tree that promised well the tree withered so soon, and not, as in Mark, because of the simple fact of its withering. Matthew's narrative is condensed, and perhaps its variation from Mark is more or less due to this circumstance.

¹ Comp. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 458.

but gave no fruit. For the Jewish people are here likened to the son who said he would go but went not. They had welcomed Jesus as the Messiah, but it was only with their lips.

Last Public Teaching.

All the evangelists have traces of public teaching by Jesus that belonged in these last days. According to Luke Jesus taught daily in the temple, and people hung upon Him in rapt attention (Luke xix. 48). They came early in the morning to hear Him (Luke xxi. 38). Mark says that the chief priests and scribes feared Jesus because the multitude were deeply impressed by His teaching (Mark xi. 18), and his statement does not refer to one single occasion, but is general in character. Luke does not give the content of one of these last sermons to the people, neither does Matthew nor Mark; yet we are doubtless right in holding that Jesus preached the Gospel of His Kingdom even as He had been doing for two years. John preserves the substance of one of these addresses, in which Jesus declared His peculiar relation to God, as one sent by Him with power to save the world (John xii. 44-50). His word is God's word, and to reject it now means that one must be judged by it hereafter.

The words spoken by Jesus when certain Greeks came to see Him may also be taken as expressing thoughts that filled His heart during these days (John xii. 20-36). He spoke of Himself as the light of the

world, and called on men to walk in this light. His words were full of allusions to His near death, though in symbolical form. Now, for the first time, He speaks of the hour of His death as the hour of His *glorification* (John xii. 23, 28). He is as the kernel of grain which through death bears a harvest (John xii. 24). Yet He cannot contemplate this way to the consummation without inward struggle. His soul was troubled (John xii. 27). Should He ask to be saved from the hour? The query was human and natural. But He recognized that His course had all along been tending to this very end, and therefore He would not ask to be saved from it. His prayer is rather that through it God would glorify His own name.

It was at this time that Jesus' hopefulness for the future of His cause found its sublimest expression. By the side of His own glorification, and due to the same cause, that is, His death, He sees the judgment of the prince of the world, the casting him out of his dominion. But in proportion as this is accomplished, all men will be drawn unto Jesus (John xii. 31, 32).

THE OPPOSITION.

Question of Authority.

The easy superiority of Jesus over the combined shrewdness of scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, and priests, as well as the vigor with which the enemies sought to compass His ruin in these last days, appears in the series of questions put to Him by the leaders.

A concerted effort was made by priests, scribes, and elders to destroy Jesus' influence with the people by showing that He had no *authority* for His course (Mark xi. 27-33; Matt. xxi. 23-27; Luke xx. 1-8). They came upon Him suddenly in the temple, and challenged Him to produce His credentials, knowing well that He could produce no credentials of rabbinic and ecclesiastical ordination. Jesus silenced them with a counter question to which they could not answer *yes* or *no*, without either stultifying themselves or bringing upon them the hostility of the people. He asked after the source of John's baptism. Their own hostile attitude toward John did not allow them to say that his baptism was from heaven. They saw that if they admitted this, Jesus might turn upon them, and ask why they had not received him. And their fear of the people who held John to be a true prophet prevented their saying that his baptism was of human origin, as in their hearts they would have liked to do. When Jesus had silenced them, He declared that the publicans and harlots would be saved sooner than they. For the publicans and harlots had been moved to repentance by John, while *they* had not believed him (Matt. xxi. 31, 32). There is a saying of Luke which may belong here (vii. 29, 30), and if so, then some of the people, even some of the publicans whom John had baptized, were present and heard how Jesus silenced the Pharisees and scribes. Naturally they were pleased, and glorified God.

Question of Tribute.

A second attempt to gain advantage over Jesus was made on one of these three days by disciples of the Pharisees and by Herodians (Mark xii. 13-17; Matt. xxii. 15-22; Luke xx. 20-26). These were mutual enemies, but they were united by a greater common enemy. They first sought by flattery of Jesus to establish a friendly feeling toward themselves, and then they put the question whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar. They hoped to catch Him howsoever He might answer. If He said *yes*, the Pharisees might charge Him with being a traitor to His people; and if He said *no*, the Herodians might bring a political accusation against Him. So in either case He would be entrapped. This time also He silenced His enemies, and did it with an answer which recognized the claims both of Jehovah and Cæsar. The coins in their pockets were evidence that they owed something to Cæsar; and the payment of their dues to Cæsar did not conflict with their duty to render to Jehovah what they owe unto Him. They have two masters, but not in the same sphere; hence they can serve both.

Of course this answer did not satisfy the Pharisees. Their deep religious hatred of foreign rule could not be overcome by a mere declaration of their enemy; but at the same time, this declaration thwarted them. There were Cæsar's image and inscription on their money. They confess it, and hence they cannot deny that Cæsar has certain well-grounded claims upon them.

It is manifest that, in answering as He did, Jesus did not indorse the Roman government, neither did He intimate that He was satisfied to have the Jews ruled by a foreign power. He simply recognized that, at present, the Jews had certain obligations to Cæsar, and that the fulfilment of these obligations did not interfere with the worship and service of God.

Question of Resurrection.

The Sadducees sought to entangle Jesus by showing the inconsistency of the doctrine of the resurrection, which they knew that He held in common with the Pharisees (Mark xii. 18-27; Matt. xxii. 23-33; Luke xx. 27-38). They laid before Him the case of a woman who had had seven legal husbands, and asked to which of them she would belong in the resurrection. They thought this simple case reduced the doctrine of the resurrection to an absurdity. They assume that she cannot belong to all of the seven, for that would be contrary to the law of Moses, which law they supposed to be binding in eternity;¹ and they assume that she must belong to one of them. Jesus met the case with the statement that in the resurrection the old earthly relations are discontinued. People no longer marry nor are given in marriage, but they are as angels. The Sadducees had assumed that if there be a future world, the same order of things must obtain there as in the present. Thus they had limited the power of God

¹ Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 18.

(Mark xii. 24). Jesus simply denied the truth of their premise, and their case fell to the ground.

He then proceeded to give a Scripture proof that the dead are raised. He took His text from the law, which they also claimed to believe, though they denied the doctrine of the resurrection. He referred them to Jehovah's words spoken to Moses out of the bush, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Ex. iii. 6). Now Jesus lays down as a self-evident truth that God is not God of dead men, but of living men. This is virtually His argument. His conception of God is such that He can in no circumstances speak of Him as God of the dead. But if He is God of living ones only, and if He says that He is God of Abraham, then Abraham is living, that is to say, he has arisen from the dead.

But the argument of Jesus is general. He does not say, concerning the *good*, that they rise; but "concerning the dead, that they rise," that is, the bad no less than the good. Therefore His argument seems to be that God is in Himself such an one that He cannot enter into personal relation with a being who is not immortal like Himself.

The Greatest Commandment.

Yet another question was propounded to Jesus, but it is not plain that there was any hostile thought behind it. According to Matthew it was brought forward by a lawyer to tempt Jesus (Matt. xxii. 34, 35); but accord-

ing to Mark the scribe was drawn to ask his question by the manner in which Jesus had answered other questions (Mark xii. 28). Here is no suggestion of hostility. The reply of Jesus, who tells the scribe that he is not far from the Kingdom of God (Mark xii. 34), is unfavorable to the view that he had come with hostile intent. It is, however, possible that, though friendly himself, he was sent by those who were hostile.

His question regarded the first, or greatest, of the commandments, not the first of the ten, but the first of the 613 which the Jews counted. The answer of Jesus was a comprehensive summing up of the Old Testament in two commandments, first, to love God with all the heart, and second, to love the neighbor as one's self. It gave no room for controversy and subtle hair-splitting, for which the enemies were watching.

A Counter Question.

When Jesus had answered the questions of scribes and Pharisees and Sadduces, He in turn asked them a question, not, as it appears, that He might learn from them, and surely not that He might gain a victory over them, but that He might give them new light in regard to Himself. He asked whose Son the Messiah was, and they promptly replied, "David's" (Matt. xxii. 41). This answer was just what He expected, and served as an introduction to the real question in His mind. If the Messiah is David's son, as they say, how then is it that David calls him *Lord*, as he does in Psalm cx? No

one could answer the question. But any serious hearer might readily infer that, in the thought of Jesus, the Messiah was of far higher dignity than David. And since they knew that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, they would not miss the significant intimation of the words which He had quoted, that Jehovah would put His enemies under His feet. Here then is an undertone of warning to the men who are seeking His destruction, as well as an implied claim of more than Davidic authority.

Mark, at the conclusion of the narrative which records Jesus' superiority to all the proud religious leaders, says that the great throng (ὁ πῶλος ὄχλος) heard Him gladly, that is, the crowd of people who were present were glad to hear Jesus silence these men who claimed to have so much knowledge, and who demanded the highest honors from the common people (Mark xii. 37).

Warnings against Scribes and Pharisees.

Because of the crowd of people who heard Jesus gladly during these last days, the leaders dared not attempt His arrest and destruction, even though He denounced them in scathing terms. Mark says that Jesus warned the people against the scribes and Pharisees, who were proud and avaricious and hypocritical (Mark xii. 38-40). Matthew has not only a warning against scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 1-12), but also a comprehensive denunciation of the spirit and life of scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 13-31), an an-

nouncement of judgment (Matt. xxiii. 32-36), and a parting word to Jerusalem in which tender love blends with the thought of a desolate and dark future (Matt. xxiii. 37-39; Luke xiii. 34, 35). It is quite probable that some of these words were spoken at other times in the life of Jesus, and, it may be, far from the temple and from Jerusalem. It is well known that the first evangelist arranges the sayings of Jesus topically rather than chronologically. But it seems plain that Jesus, perhaps on the last day of His teaching in the temple, spoke some severe words of condemnation and warning to the religious leaders of Israel. This is analogous to the woes which He pronounced over the lake cities of Galilee as He was about to depart from them never to return.

To the last day in the temple may also belong the incident of the poor widow who cast a farthing into the treasury; if so, it illustrates how, even in a time of great excitement and great personal peril, Jesus could serenely observe the details of human life about Him, and make them contribute to the instruction of His disciples (Mark xii. 41-44; Luke xxi. 1-4).

Departure from the Temple.

As Jesus went forth from the temple the last time, one of His disciples called His attention to its great stones and wondrous buildings (Mark xiii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 1; Luke xxi. 5). No special occasion for the remark of the disciple need be sought. The beauty of Herod's

temple was proverbial, and must have called forth frequent exclamations of wonder and delight, especially from the Jews who lived in distant parts of the land and who consequently saw the temple but seldom. Josephus says that the stones of which the temple was built were twenty-five cubits long (approximately thirty-eight feet), eight cubits high, and about twelve cubits wide.¹ Jesus replied to the disciples' word of wonder at the magnificence of the temple, that one stone of it should not be left upon another. A little later, on the Mount of Olives, the disciples asked Jesus when this prophecy which they had just heard would be fulfilled. Jesus then spoke at some length of the future — the future of His Kingdom, the future of Jerusalem, and the future of His disciples (Mark xiii. 5-32; Matt. xxiv-xxv; Luke xxi. 8-36).² With His teaching here, as elsewhere, we are not now concerned, except as it has some definite bearing upon His biography.

The disciples asked when the temple should be destroyed, and, according to Matthew, what should be the sign of the coming of Jesus and of the end of the age. The stress of the reply of Jesus was, Take heed: be watchful; be ready (Mark xiii. 5, 9, 13, 23, etc.). Their question was more curious than important: His answer was practical. He not only laid stress on their personal readiness for great events of the future, but He

¹ *Antiquities*, xv. 11. 3.

² It is probable that some of Matthew's material belongs elsewhere, e.g. the parable of The Pounds (Matt. xxv. 14-30).

gave no precise answers to their chronological questions. One question, He said, He could not answer, namely, the question of the time of His coming (Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxiv. 36). That is known to the Father only. If it was not important that Jesus should know it, surely His disciples needed not to trouble themselves in regard to it. But while it is thus plain that the knowledge of Jesus was limited, it is also equally clear that in regard to His future, as in regard to some other questions in His life, He was given supernatural knowledge. He foresaw that the temple would be utterly destroyed, apparently within that generation (Mark xiii. 2, 30). He foresaw also that He should come again in glory to gather His people to Himself and to judge the wicked (Mark xiii. 24-27; Matt. xxiv. 29-31, etc.).

It is thought by some scholars that Jesus regarded His coming as much nearer than it really was, and there are words in the narrative which seem to give some support to this view (*e.g.* Mark xiii. 24, 30; Matt. xxiv. 39, 42; Luke xxi. 28). On the other hand, there are not a few words of Jesus which plainly teach that He put the end of this age at a vast remove from the present.¹ It seems, therefore, more probable that the early Christians misunderstood the references of Jesus to the nearness of His coming, than that He Himself was mistaken.

¹ Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 274 f.

THE LAST THURSDAY.

The Chronological Problem.

John and the Synoptists seem to be at variance regarding the date of the Last Supper. The first three Gospels agree that it occurred on the 15th of Nisan, the time fixed by the law for the feast of the Passover (Ex. xii. 6). The legal expression is "the fourteenth day of the month at even," but at sunset of the 14th, according to Jewish reckoning, the 15th day began. Hence the first three Gospels teach that the Last Supper, which they put on the same evening with the Passover, was on the evening of Thursday and the crucifixion on Friday, but both on the 15th of the month (*e.g.* Mark xiv. 12, 18, 26, 43; xv. 1, 24, 42).

John's statement seems to be in conflict with this. In xiii. 1 he places *before* the Passover that final proof of Jesus' love, His washing of the disciples' feet, and, on the same evening, the announcement, by Jesus, that one of the twelve should betray Him, which, according to the Synoptists, was made on the evening when that Supper was instituted (John xiii. 21-30). In xiii. 27-29 there is a reference to the purchase of things which were needful for the feast. This is said to indicate plainly that the Supper was not celebrated on the same night with the Passover. Again, in xviii. 28, after Jesus had been arrested, it is said that the Jews would not go into the palace of Pilate lest they should be defiled so that they could not eat the Pass-

over. This is said to show that Jesus was crucified on the 14th of Nisan, and hence that the Last Supper was one day earlier than the legal Passover. Finally, in xix. 14, the day of the crucifixion is called the *Preparation of the Passover*. In addition to these difficulties from John, much stress is laid on the fact that the Synoptists speak of various things as being done on the day of the crucifixion, which would not be done on the sacred day of the Passover. Three points are specified:¹ Joseph buys linen on the day of the crucifixion (Mark xv. 46); the women prepare ointment (Luke xxiii. 56); and Simon comes from the field, as though from work (Mark xv. 21). In view of all these difficulties, some writers hold that there is an irreconcilable contradiction between John and the Synoptists,² one regarding the Synoptic order as historical, another that of John. This conclusion, however, has not a little against it. First of all, there is presumptive evidence. Thus it is to be presumed that Matthew and Peter (the latter being Mark's chief source) had not forgotten the day on which Jesus ate the Last Supper with His disciples. The events of the last twenty-four hours of Jesus' life must have remained in especially vivid remembrance in the minds of the disciples. Second, there is a presumption that if John had known that the Synoptists were mistaken in putting the crucifixion on the first feast day, and if he had intended to correct this

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 494.

² *E.g.*, Neander, Hase, Weiss, Beyschlag, and Hort.

error, he would have done so in an unmistakable manner. Third, there is a presumption that Jesus, who was made under the law, and who habitually kept the law, would not celebrate the Passover a day before the legal time. Taken together this presumptive evidence is exceedingly strong.

Let us look now at the passages which are said to prove a conflict between John and the earlier Gospels. According to John xiii. 1, the culminating proof of Jesus' love, which the evangelist saw in His washing the feet of His disciples, is said to have come *before* the Passover. In close connection with this incident Jesus announced the treachery of one of His disciples, which according to the Synoptists came on the same evening with the Passover. Two points are here to be noticed: first, that John's language puts only the symbolic act of washing the disciples' feet *before* the Passover; it allows us to think that the supper of verses 21-30 was on the Passover evening. Second, the word *before* is indefinite, and might quite as properly have been used if the washing of the disciples' feet preceded the observance of the Passover by an hour, as it could have been if this act came one day or two days before the Passover. This expression, therefore, does not at all suggest that the Passover evening has not yet arrived. Again, it is said that John xiii. 27-29 implies that the Passover was not until the following day, for when Judas went out some of the disciples *thought* he had gone to buy things for the feast. But are we quite sure that he could not

have been supposed to be going after things for their use on that very evening? Have we such accurate knowledge of the Passover customs of that time, that we are warranted in denying this possibility? Moreover, the word of Jesus to Judas, "What thou doest, do *quickly*," would not have suggested to them that their Master had in mind certain purchases which would be needed on the *following* evening. How could they have thought that Jesus would send one of their number out in haste — send him from the supper table — to buy things which they could procure at any time the next day? This is quite as incredible as the view that, if it had been the evening of the Passover, no one could have supposed that Jesus had sent for aught for the feast.

Another objection is found in John xviii. 28. Here it is said that the Jews entered not into the palace of Pilate on the morning of the day of the crucifixion, lest they should be defiled so that they could not eat the Passover. If the word *Passover* here means paschal lamb, then John puts the crucifixion the day before the feast, and is at variance with the Synoptists. But the expressions *Passover* and *eating the Passover* cannot be limited to the 15th of Nisan and the one memorial meal which celebrated Israel's deliverance out of Egypt. John himself uses the word *Passover* to cover the entire feast (ii. 23), as indeed it is used in the law (Deut. xvi. 2); and accordingly *to eat the Passover*, in this broader sense, means to eat the various sacrificial and festal

meals of the Passover week, especially the *chagigah* which was eaten on the day after the paschal supper.¹ Again, the defilement of entering the prætorium would have continued till the evening only, and hence would not have interfered with their eating the paschal lamb, for this was eaten in the night.

There remains the passage, John xix. 14. The day on which Jesus was crucified is called the *Preparation of the Passover* (παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα). Now there is ample evidence that the term *preparation* was commonly used to designate the sixth day of the Jewish week. Mark says it denotes the day before the Sabbath² (xv. 42), and John uses the word twice without any modifier to designate a day of the week (xix. 31, 42). Hence Preparation of the Passover, means simply Friday of the Passover week, and has no reference to the Passover supper.

Finally, as regards the various forms of work or activity which the Synoptists put on the day of the crucifixion, we cannot affirm that they may not all have occurred on the feast day. Travelling was allowed within certain limits, and hence the reference to Simon causes no difficulty (Mark xv. 21). The text does not say that he was coming from *work*, but only that he was coming from the *country*. Joseph bought a linen

¹ Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse*, pp. 381-385; Friedlieb *Archäologie der Leidensgeschichte*, p. 102; Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II. 568; Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, II. 525-527.

² Comp. Judith viii. 6, where *προσάββατον* is used in the same way.

cloth to wrap the body of Jesus in, and the women, according to Luke, prepared ointment, but no law has been shown to have existed among the Jews which prohibited such pious rites being performed on the feast day (Mark xv. 46; Luke xxiii. 56).

In view, therefore, of these arguments, I think we must hold that both John and the Synoptists represent Jesus as having kept the Passover at the appointed time. The difficulties of this position seem to be far less than those which are encountered when we put the Johannean observance one day before the legal time.

Arrangements for the Passover.

Jesus spent Thursday, at least, outside the city, doubtless with His friends in Bethany (Mark xiv. 12, 13). Sometime during this day His disciples asked where He would keep the Passover, that they might make the needful preparations (Mark xiv. 12; Matt. xxvi. 17; Luke xxii. 9). They did not know that He had already arranged with some friend for a room. This, however, appears to have been the case.

It is manifest in the directions given to Peter and John, who were sent to purchase the lamb and other necessary articles (Luke xxii. 8). He tells them that they will meet a man with a pitcher of water, and that he will lead them to a house in which a guest chamber is made ready for Him and His disciples (Mark xiv. 13-15; Matt. xxvi. 18; Luke xxii. 10-12). They are simply to say to the householder, "The Teacher saith,

Where is my guest chamber?" It is taken for granted that the householder knows who "the teacher" is, and the expression "*my* guest chamber" also points to a previous arrangement for a room. In line with this is also the statement of Jesus that the disciples would find the room *strewn* and *ready*. The word *strewn* refers to the reclining couches, and that, together with the word *ready*, seems to imply that the room was prepared for thirteen people.

The peculiar form of the direction given to the disciples was probably due to the wish of Jesus that Judas should not know beforehand of the place. For it was doubtless plain to Jesus that this disciple was alienated from Him and liable to betray Him to His foes, though there is no reason to suppose that He knew of the contract which Judas had already made with the leaders (Mark xiv. 10, 11; Matt. xxvi. 14-16; Luke xxii. 3-6).

We may suppose that Jesus had previously arranged for the room, partly, perhaps, that there might be no confusion when the time should come for the feast, and partly that Judas might not find out where they were to keep the Passover, and so be able to arrest Him before He had kept the feast with His disciples, and had said His parting words to them.

Washing the Disciples' Feet.

Jesus and the twelve came into the city toward evening, and went to the place which had been prepared for them (Mark xiv. 17; Matt. xxvi. 20; Luke xxii. 14).

In that large upper room Jesus spent His last quiet hours with the disciples. It *may* have been in the home of Mary, the mother of Mark. If the young man who narrowly escaped arrest with Jesus in Gethsemane was Mark himself (Mark xiv. 51, 52), which seems very probable, then it is further probable that he came from the house where Jesus had spent the evening, and whither the soldiers doubtless went at first in the hope of finding Jesus. He would naturally be awakened by the coming of the soldiers, and when the soldiers hastily departed, not having found Jesus, he quickly followed them without stopping to dress, but simply throwing a cloth around him. If, moreover, the Passover was celebrated in the house of this Mary, then it is not improbable that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was in the same room (Acts i. 13), which may well have seemed to the disciples a most holy place, and a place in which to wait for the fulfilment of Jesus' promise. We know also that it was in the house of Mary that many gathered to pray for the release of Peter from prison, and this may well have been in the same upper room (Acts xii. 12).

The first event to be considered which certainly took place in this upper room was the washing of the disciples' feet (John xiii. 1-20). It is manifest that this act of Jesus was *symbolical*, and not in the interest of cleanliness, or to fulfil a Pharisaic ordinance, for He did not undertake it until they had reclined and begun their supper (John xiii. 2-4). The occasion of it is not given,

for the strife as to who was greatest, which Luke records in connection with the supper (Luke xxii. 24-26), is probably the same strife which we know took place in Capernaum before the close of the Galilean ministry (Mark ix. 33). The occasion *may* have been some feeling of jealousy caused by the positions occupied at the table, for John reclined on the Lord's bosom (John xiii. 25), and Judas seems to have been next to Jesus on the other side (John xiii. 26-29; Mark xiv. 20; Matt. xxvi. 23). If such feelings arose, Jesus might easily notice them, and this may have led to the symbolic act.

As the service itself was one usually performed by slaves, Jesus attired Himself as a slave, thus making the lesson of the act the more plain and impressive. This lesson was that of *service*. The washing of the disciples' feet was saying in the language of action that the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and that the law of His Kingdom was the law of helpfulness (Mark x. 43-45). In the mind of John, this act was a culminating illustration of the *love* of Jesus (John xiii. 1), and it is doubtless true that Jesus did not think of the law of service as capable of fulfilment except in love (John xiii. 34, 35; xiv. 23).

It was thoroughly characteristic of Peter that he at first refused to let Jesus wash his feet, feeling his unworthiness of such a service, and then when Jesus made Peter's fellowship with Him depend upon his acceptance of the service which was offered, he craved that

his hands and his head also might be washed. With his whole soul he desired to have a part with Christ. In answering Peter's request, Jesus disclosed, as Weiss¹ says, the deepest meaning of the act. As one who is bathed needs only the washing of the feet, when they have become dusty from the way, so the disciples have been *bathed* in their fellowship with Jesus, and need only a washing from the pride which would keep them from the performance of the humblest service for each other. Thus there was a thought of *comfort* associated with the rebuke which was involved in the washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus. The disciples are clean through the word which Jesus has spoken to them, all but one (John xv. 3).

Departure of Judas.

According to Luke, Judas remained at the table through the institution of the Lord's Supper (Luke xxii. 21), but according to John, he went out straight-way after he had received a sop from Jesus, which was given him while they were reclining, and also before the closing words of comfort which Jesus spoke to His disciples (John xiii. 30). In Mark and Matthew, the sop was given to Judas *before* the institution of the Lord's Supper. Therefore if he went out immediately after receiving it, as John says, then of course he did not partake of the symbolical bread and wine. And we may say that this course of events, which is best sup-

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 507.

ported by the text, is also intrinsically probable. Jesus would naturally desire that Judas, whose heart was now hopelessly alienated from Him, should not by his presence break the sympathetic circle to which He was about to give His last tender words of farewell and of hope.

The *occasion* of the departure of Judas was his discovery that Jesus knew his treachery, and the Lord's summons to do quickly what he purposed (John xiii. 26, 27). The *purpose* to betray Jesus had been formed at least two days before (Mark xiv. 1, 10), and probably longer than that; the action and word of Jesus only sent him forth on his dark mission a little earlier than he might otherwise have gone. Judas may well have suspected that Jesus was doubtful of his loyalty before this hour, but now the Lord makes it plain that He knows his plot, and tells him to carry it out at once. The chief object which Jesus had in mind when He told His disciples that one of them should betray Him, may have been to bring about the departure of Judas, so that in an atmosphere of mutual love He might speak His closing words (Mark xiv. 18; Matt. xxvi. 21; Luke xxii. 21).

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Data.

There are four accounts of the institution of the Supper, the earliest being by Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23-26), the other three being by the Synoptists (Mark xiv.

22-25; Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Luke xxii. 15-20). John says nothing of the Supper, but the fundamental truth which the Supper teaches is found oftener in John's Gospel than in either of the others (*e.g.* John vi).

The four accounts of the institution of the Supper fall into two groups, those of Luke and Paul forming one, and those of Matthew and Mark the other. The differences between the two groups and also between the two members of each group are significant, but need not here be examined in detail. In Paul and Luke the *memorial* character of the Supper is expressly stated, while in Mark and Matthew it does not appear. Yet this thought is surely involved in the observance itself. The broken bread and the wine symbolizing the body and the blood of Jesus, as all four accounts teach, inevitably turn the thought to Him, and so the Supper must of necessity be a memorial. Mark and Matthew say that the blood is shed for *many*, Matthew adding to this the words *unto remission of sins*. Both these thoughts are wanting in the narratives of Paul and Luke. In Paul and Luke the Lord is represented as saying to His disciples that His *body* is for *them*. In Mark and Matthew the horizon is broadened, and though it is not said for whom the body is destined, it *is* said that the blood is shed for *many*.

Biographical Significance.

The Lord's Supper is biographically important because, *first*, it is the clearest expression in the Synop-

tists of the significance claimed by Jesus for His own person. The bread was a symbol of His body, and the wine a symbol of His blood. The *broken* bread pointed not only to His body, but also to His body *given for you* (Luke xxii. 19), and the wine symbolized blood that was *shed for many* (Mark xiv. 24), and *unto remission of sins* (Matt. xxvi. 28). Thus the thought of *Him*, in His self-devotion for the good of men, was to be central in the observance. *Second*, because Jesus seems to have regarded the Supper as in some sense parallel with the old Passover. This is involved in the institution of the Supper immediately after the observance of the Passover. Jesus puts it side by side with the most solemn rite of the Old Covenant. He could hardly have done this had He not considered it as of equal significance. And we may suppose that He regarded its fundamental idea as similar to that of the Passover. That was the memorial of a great deliverance; so also was the Supper. In one case the deliverance was from outward bondage and by outward means; in the other it was from spiritual bondage and by spiritual means. For the Supper was a memorial of Jesus (Luke xxii. 19), but the one great work of Jesus was a work of deliverance from sin. So John in the Apocalypse couples Jesus with Moses, and calls the song of redemption by their joint names, because the work of both was alike a work of deliverance (Rev. xv. 3). The Lord's Supper, however, differed from the Passover in that while it was a feast of deliverance, it gave promi-

nence to the Deliverer. Deliverance is here inseparably associated with Jesus. The Passover gave no such prominence to the person of the deliverer. It was, rather, a memorial of the deliverance itself.

Third, the Supper is biographically important because it associates brotherly *fellowship* with the disciples' remembrance of the Lord. It is, in parable, the truth expressed in John: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one toward another" (John xiii. 35). By the Lord's Supper the disciples were to make known the death of Jesus (1 Cor. xi. 26), and they could not observe that Supper except as they came together in brotherly fellowship. The religious memorial of Him was to be a *social* feast, where the one loaf was to be divided among all, and the wine cup passed from one to another. Thus it involved the great principle of the ethics of Jesus, the love of His disciples for each other, as it also involves the love of God, inasmuch as it presents Jesus in the act of *giving* Himself for men.

Fourth, the Supper is biographically important because it contains the hope of Jesus for a heavenly reunion with His disciples. Mark and Matthew report that Jesus, before leaving the table, spoke of drinking wine with His disciples in the Kingdom of His Father. Luke has a similar word, but connects it with the observance of the Passover (Luke xxii. 18). In this, however, the thought of reunion is wanting. Jesus sim-

ply says that He will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes. The saying of Mark and Matthew suggests the end of an earthly fellowship, but also points to a fellowship in the future. If the Supper looks backward, it also looks forward. Herein it transcends the Passover, which was wholly concerned with a great deliverance in the past.

The Closing Words of Jesus.

The Synoptists bridge the interval between the institution of the Supper and Gethsemane with a few words in which Jesus announces that His disciples will leave Him, that later He will go before them into Galilee, and with the short dialogue between Jesus and Peter (Mark xiv. 26-31; Matt. xxvi. 30-35; Luke xxii. 31-34). In this interval John puts a long farewell address of Jesus, and a prayer by Him (John xiii. 31-xvi. 33; xvii). In John xiv. 30, Jesus says that He will not speak much more with His disciples; and in xiv. 31, summons them to rise and go forth. Then, without suggestion of change of place, two chapters follow just as though Jesus had not spoken the words of xiv. 30, 31. Again, it is not until xviii. 1 that John records the departure of Jesus and His disciples across the brook Kidron. In view of these facts, it seems not improbable that the original order of the material has been interrupted.¹ The farewell words and the prayer of Jesus belong

¹ Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, I. 168-172.

entirely in the upper chamber. These parting words of Jesus are to be considered here only in a brief manner, as they are significant for the record of His life and the portrait of His character. The so-called high-priestly prayer of Jesus, though it may not give His very words, is doubtless historical in this respect, that it represents Him as conscious to the last of dependence upon the Father. He prayed. He prayed for Himself (John xvii. 1, 5); He prayed for His disciples who were with Him (John xvii. 9-19); He prayed for those who should believe on Him in coming time (John xvii. 20, 21). He looked to the Father for His own glorification, and for the preservation, sanctification, union, success, and glory of His disciples.

Again, these closing words show that Jesus had what no other man ever had, the consciousness of having perfectly accomplished the work which the Father had given Him to do (John xvii. 4); and this work which He had perfectly accomplished was nothing less than manifesting the character of God to men (John xvii. 6), and giving to His disciples a new and eternal life (John xvii. 2).

Again, the relation of Jesus to His disciples appears in a clear light in these farewell moments. The tenderness and generosity of His love for them are manifest again and again. He wishes them to share not only in His work, but to share equally with Him in the Father's love, and to share in His own glory (John xiv. 21, 23, 27; xv. 9; xvii. 23, 24, 26). He sees an earthly glorifi-

cation of Himself in His disciples (John xvii. 10). They are not His servants, but His *friends* (John xv. 15). He has taken them into His confidence and told them all that He knows of the Father. On them rests the same honor that rests on Him, for He declares that they are sent into the world even as He had been sent (John xvii. 18). They are capable of becoming one, even as He and the Father are one (John xvii. 20-23). They are loved of the Father, even as He Himself is (John xvii. 23), and His future aim is that the Father's love may be in them (John xvii. 26). He will have them with Him hereafter (John xiv. 3), and have them behold His glory (John xvii. 24). He refers to the Father's house and says that if there were not many mansions there *He would have told them* (John xiv. 2). Thus all through these closing words of Jesus runs a love for His disciples that is full of divine tenderness and magnanimity.

But here also more clearly than elsewhere appears the thought of the *union* of Jesus with His disciples. He is one with them in their common *knowledge* of the Father, a knowledge which He has imparted to them (John xvii. 11, 22); and one with them in the *love* of the Father, which He has revealed to them (John xv. 3; xvii. 26). In consequence of this union, His disciples will bear fruit (John xv. 5), will be united with each other (John xvii. 11, 20), and will be able to pray in the name of Jesus (John xv. 7; xiv. 13, 14; xv. 16; xvi. 23, 24, 26).

In connection with the thought of Jesus' union with

His disciples, which was so prominent in the words of the last evening, we have to notice what He says of His Successor, the *Spirit*, the *Spirit of truth*, the *Holy Spirit*, or the *Paraclete* (John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7-11, 13-15). His own vital relation to His disciples was to be continued through the agency of this Successor. When the Spirit comes to the disciples and abides in them, it is as though Jesus Himself abode in them. The Spirit is His *alter ego*. Thus when looking forward to the coming of the Spirit, He says, "I will come to you" (John xiv. 18), and when manifestly thinking of the fellowship of the Spirit, He says, "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest *myself* to him" (John xiv. 21). The Spirit will continue to do for the disciples what Jesus has done. He will *teach* them, and in this will sustain the same relation to Jesus that Jesus in His teaching has sustained to the Father (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13, 14; xvii. 4). He does not speak of Himself, but speaks what He hears. His work is most comprehensively described when He is spoken of by the side of Jesus as *another* Paraclete (John xiv. 16). That is, Jesus thought the mission of the Spirit essentially the same as His own. He had been a helper, a *paraclete*, and now the Spirit will take His place with them, and be their helper as variously as Jesus Himself had ever been, though not necessarily in the same ways. This language of course implies the personality of the Spirit, and also implies that He has

essentially the same character as Jesus — the same love for the disciples, the same purpose, the same understanding of their needs, and the same ability to help them.

The conviction of Jesus that His Successor would carry on His work even better than He could do if present in the flesh (John xvi. 7), may account in some measure for the serenity of His mind and heart in view of His violent separation from His disciples, and in view of the terrible sorrow and disappointment which would for a time be theirs.

GETHSEMANE.

The Place.

Gethsemane was an enclosed garden across the Kidron brook, on the slope of Olivet (John xviii. 1). Jesus had often been there with His disciples, perhaps for quiet and refreshment (John xviii. 2). Therefore, Judas knew of the resort, and, after going to the house where he had left Jesus and failing to find Him there, he bethought him of this place. There is no evidence that he knew beforehand that Jesus intended to go to Gethsemane, or indeed that Jesus Himself had planned it previously.

The reason why Jesus withdrew to Gethsemane may have been twofold. He may have wished a secluded spot for prayer, and He may have feared that, if He remained in the upper chamber, His friends might be involved in trouble when Judas and the Jews came to seize Him.

The Prayer.

Jesus took Peter, James, and John with Him to a distance from the others, for the sake of having human sympathy. This appears from the narrative. He wished them to *watch* with Him (Mark xiv. 37; Matt. xxvi. 40); and at last, when the struggle was ended, He said to them, "It is enough" (Mark xiv. 41), that is to say, He had no longer need of their sympathy.

Luke speaks of one prayer only (Luke xxii. 39-46), Mark of two (Mark xiv. 35-42), and Matthew of three (Matt. xxvi. 39-46); yet Mark *implies* a *third* retirement of Jesus, and so virtually a third prayer.

Mark and Matthew relate that as Jesus withdrew from the eight disciples with the three chosen ones, He appeared to be terrified (*ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*), or full of sorrow (*λυπεῖσθαι*), and distressed (*ἀδημονεῖν*) (Mark xiv. 33, 34; Matt. xxvi. 37, 38). He said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even to the point of death." We should doubtless judge of His state by this word rather than by what the disciples say of His appearance, and accordingly His anguish was that of extreme sorrow, not of terror. This anguish is referred to later under the symbol of a *cup*. The text of Luke xxii. 43, 44, which refers to the strengthening angel and to the bloody sweat, is probably an interpolation.¹ It is characteristic of Jesus that on His first return to His disciples, when He found them sleeping, He turned from

¹ Not found in Mss. AB Alephs, etc. See Wescott and Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, Appendix, pp. 64-67.

His own suffering and need of sympathy to speak a helpful word to them. They needed to watch and pray just then, when weary and tired, lest they should suddenly come into temptation (Mark xiv. 38; Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 46). The wisdom of His words was apparent a little later, when one of their number did an act of violence in defence of Jesus (Mark xiv. 47), and when they all left their Master alone and fled (Mark xiv. 50).

Mark first reports a prayer of Jesus in the third person (xiv. 35). Jesus prayed that, if it was possible, the hour might pass from Him. Then follows a prayer in the words of Jesus: "Abba, Father, all things are possible to Thee; cause this cup to pass from me; nevertheless not what I will, but what Thou wilt" (xiv. 36).

The narrative contains no suggestion as to the object of the prayer of Jesus, unless it be in the words *hour* and *cup*. Of these, Jesus used the former, according to John, in a prayer offered earlier in the last week. Then, when plainly contemplating His death, He said: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name" (John xii. 27, 28). A little earlier still, in a significant passage, Jesus used the other word, *cup*, when He said to James and John, "Can ye drink of the cup which I drink?" (Mark x. 38). It is there parallel to the word *baptism*, which Jesus employed on another occasion also, when apparently referring to His death (Luke xii.

50). The author of *Hebrews*, referring to the hour in Gethsemane, says that Jesus offered prayers and supplications to Him who was able to save Him from death (Heb. v. 7). Accordingly, in keeping with all these suggestions regarding the object of Jesus' prayer, we may take the cup as a symbol of His approaching suffering and death. When Jesus prayed that the cup might pass away from Him, we must suppose that for the moment at least it seemed to Him *possible* that His Father, who had all power, could grant the petition, and lead Him to the goal of His Messianic labor by some other way than that of the cross. This prayer is in contrast with the certainty and serenity of words which Jesus had spoken about His death during the past six months. Again and again He had taught His disciples that He was to be put to death. In the upper chamber, He had spoken calmly of His death, and had given His disciples a memorial of it in the bread and wine. He had had the assurance in His soul that the hour of His death was to be the hour of His glorification. He bade His disciples to be of good cheer because He had overcome the world. But while the hour in Gethsemane presents a sharp contrast to previous hours in which Jesus had spoken of His death, this contrast is by no means inexplicable. Jesus had come now to the last hour. The sufferings which He had contemplated at a greater or less remove from Him were now at hand. His enemies were coming nearer and nearer through the darkness. If He had a sensitive human

spirit, if He had not steeled His heart to stoic indifference toward sorrow and suffering, then we cannot well imagine how these last dark hours of suspense could end without His meeting at least one overwhelming wave of distress and anguish. This would have been natural had He faced the ordinary fate of criminals in His day, and had He faced it sustained by the sympathy of one or more friends; but He was entering a day of agony unparalleled in history; and He was entering it alone. No being ever faced such a day, for no being ever loved as Jesus loved the people who were about to crucify Him; no one had ever offered to men what He had offered, only to be rejected; and no one had ever had such a knowledge and abhorrence of sin, or had seen how it pains and dishonors the Father; and it was sin in its extremest manifestation that He was about to meet and before which He was to fall and die. And He was treading the wine press alone. His nearest disciples slept while He prayed. No one in the Church of God sympathized with His conception of the Messiah. The very people to whom God had most clearly revealed His will were about to cast Jesus out as a dangerous fanatic. The truth which He had seen He must still cherish alone; not one human being to look with approval upon His course.

But the hour in Gethsemane, while presenting contrasts to previous hours in which Jesus had contemplated His death, was yet in fundamental points in deep accord with the principles of His life. He had anguish of soul;

He took it to God. He shrank from the horror of blackness before Him; but He remained true to the Divine Will. His soul was sorrowful unto death; but He found in God a calm that death itself was powerless to disturb.

THE DAY OF THE CRUCIFIXION.¹

The Arrest.

The force sent to arrest Jesus was large. There was not only a company from the chief priests, but also a Roman cohort,² the particular one which was stationed in the tower of Antonia near the temple, or part of it in Antonia and part in the palace (Mark xiv. 43; Matt. xxvi. 47; Luke xxii. 47; John xviii. 3). This, if full, numbered from three to six hundred men.³ Yet the large force was no larger than the circumstances seemed to require. The priests had feared to make an attempt to arrest Jesus during the feast, lest there should be a tumult of the people (Mark xiv. 2). There were many among the pilgrims at the feast, and some of the people of Jerusalem, who had at least a superficial enthusiasm for Jesus, and if He should put Himself at their head, as their Messiah, their force would be most dangerous.

The Synoptists all agree that Judas kissed Jesus, and

¹ It is not unlikely that the hour in Gethsemane was after midnight, and so belonged to the day of the crucifixion, as we reckon time; but it is convenient to begin the day with the first of the proceedings against Jesus.

² Beyschlag thinks that the cohort (*σπεῖρα*) was simply the Jewish temple watch, but gives no proof that this military term was ever thus used.

³ Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, II. 437.

Mark says that he kissed Him *effusively* (Mark xiv. 44, 45; Matt. xxvi. 48-50; Luke xxii. 47, 48). The first two evangelists infer that this kiss was a *sign* agreed upon between Judas and the soldiers, which seems to be supposed by Luke's narrative (Luke xxii. 48), for Jesus is there represented as saying, "*Betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?*"

Judas may have chosen this sign as the one likely to cause the least disturbance. It indicates that he did not expect any resistance either on the part of Jesus or of His disciples.

The incident related by John (xviii. 4-9), that when Jesus confronted the arresting force with the question, "Whom seek ye?" they went backward and fell to the ground, is intrinsically credible. All the circumstances conspired to overawe superstitious men. First, it was in the dead of night, when men are especially susceptible to fear. Then, Jesus was known as possessed of wonderful power. He who could raise the dead, as Jesus had recently done near Jerusalem, might He not also be able to smite with death? So may the superstitious men have reasoned who came to arrest Jesus. Then when Jesus came forward and asked whom they sought, and said that He was Jesus, there may well have been in His appearance a kingly boldness which struck terror into the hearts both of the Jews and the Gentiles.

After Jesus had told them a second time that He was the one whom they sought, and asked that His disciples might be allowed to go their way, the soldiers

may have recovered themselves, and have seen that He would offer no resistance (John xviii. 8).

At this point, as the servants of the priests drew near to Jesus, Peter drew his sword and delivered a blow at the head of a man by the name of Malchus, cutting off his right ear (Mark xiv. 47; Matt. xxvi. 51; Luke xxii. 50; John xviii. 10). Jesus charged him to put up his sword, intimating that what He was about to suffer was in accordance with the will of His Father (John xviii. 11). Otherwise He might summon to His help more than twelve legions of angels (Matt. xxvi. 53). He has ample sources of deliverance, but deliverance is not God's thought for Him. Only Luke, who was not an eye-witness, records the healing of Malchus (Luke xxii. 51).

Mark and Matthew expressly say that all the disciples at last fled from Jesus, and the same is implied in Luke and John (Mark xiv. 50; Matt. xxvi. 56). The disciples may have been the more ready to flee because of the word which Jesus had just spoken in their hearing, "Let these go their way" (John xviii. 8); and also because He had prohibited their doing anything in His defence. It would be very hard to remain passive when their Lord was being bound and led away by His foes. Two of the disciples did not flee far, and after a little turned and followed the band who were leading Jesus away (John xviii. 15; Mark xiv. 54; Matt. xxvi. 58; Luke xxii. 54).

Before Annas.

The fact that Annas was an ex-high priest,¹ of great influence and wealth, also father-in-law of Joseph Caiaphas,² together with the probable fact that the Sanhedrin could not be at once assembled, may explain why Jesus was taken directly to his palace (John xviii. 13).

The Synoptists say nothing of this appearance before Annas. Jesus is brought at once before the Sanhedrin (Mark xiv. 53). John, on the other hand, says nothing of the trial of Jesus by Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, unless we suppose the passage John xviii. 19-23 to refer to such a trial. But it is difficult to refer this passage to Caiaphas because at its close we read, in vs. 24, "Annas therefore sent Him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." It does not help the case to render the verb as a pluperfect, and say, "Annas therefore *had* sent Him bound to Caiaphas the high priest." This makes the logical particle *therefore* (*οὖν*) unintelligible. But it is perfectly clear if the preceding verses refer to Annas. If, however, John meant his readers to understand that the high priest of vs. 19 was Caiaphas, we must say that he was very successful in veiling his thought.

We gain nothing by connecting vs. 19 with vs. 14,³ for if Caiaphas was the man before whom Jesus stood

¹ Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii. 2. 1, 2 ; xx. 9. 1. Annas was high priest from 6-15 A.D.

² High priest, according to Schürer, from 18-36 A.D.

³ Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, p. 158 f.

in verses 19-23, how then at the close of this hearing could Annas send Jesus to Caiaphas? Had Caiaphas been in the house of Annas during this first hearing, if we may call it such, and if Caiaphas had then gone to his own palace to meet the Sanhedrin, we should expect that his officers, the officers who had arrested Jesus, would conduct Him to the place of trial. There would be no occasion whatever for Annas to send his servants.

We conclude, then, that Jesus was not only led to the house of Annas but also that the dialogue of verses 19-23 was between Jesus and Annas. He is called high priest, for this title was retained by any one who had once held the office and was given even to members of the families of the high priests who had not held the office;¹ hence the New Testament often speaks of *several* men who bear the title contemporaneously (*e.g.* Matt. ii. 4; xxi. 23, etc.).

The reason why John makes no reference to the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin may be that this had been so fully related by the Synoptists; more probably because he did not regard it as adapted to further the specific purpose which he had in mind (John xx. 31). He says that Jesus was sent to Caiaphas, remarking that this was the man who had counselled the Jews to put Him to death (John xviii. 14, 24), and then he passes to the palace of Pilate (xviii. 28). His narrative of course implies that the Sanhedrin condemned Jesus to death.

The fact that Annas asked Jesus about His disciples

¹ Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II. 171-174.

and His teaching — assuming the honesty of the questions — shows that it was possible to live in Jerusalem during the ministry of Jesus and yet be practically ignorant of its character and results. Jesus did not answer the questions of Annas, but referred him to the multitudes who in synagogue and in temple had heard His words. This reply seemed to one of the officers who stood by disrespectful, and he struck Jesus a blow with his hand. This was the first of the long line of physical indignities and sufferings to which Jesus was subjected during His trial.

The Synoptists tell us that Simon Peter followed Jesus and entered into the court of the high priest (*e.g.* Mark xiv. 54); John says that the unnamed disciple was also present, and indeed that it was only through his agency that Peter gained admittance to the palace (John xviii. 15).

Peter's Denial.

The four narratives of Peter's denial agree in their main statements, but differ in numerous details. Thus they differ as to the persons who occasion the different denials, also in regard to the words they speak, and in regard to the replies of Peter, and, most important of all, they differ as to the place where the denial occurred. While there are no two reports which do not present numerous points of difference, it is to be noticed that the four accounts fall into two groups, Mark and Matthew forming one, and Luke and John the other. As

Peter and John were the only disciples present at the trial of Jesus, we must trace all the narratives back to their versions of what occurred.

The two groups — Mark and Matthew forming one, Luke and John the other — differ from each other more noticeably than do the members of either group. One important difference is that Peter appears in a somewhat more favorable light in the second group than in the first. In the second it is not said that he swore or cursed. He simply denied that he was a disciple, and denied that he knew Jesus, and denied that he was in the garden. But the most noticeable difference between the two groups, and one which cannot yet be explained in a wholly satisfactory manner, is that of place. According to Mark and Matthew, Peter's denial is to be associated with the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin. They show us Peter sitting by the fire with the officers, before they proceed to the trial (Mark xiv. 54; Matt. xxvi. 58). They narrate the three denials after the narrative of the trial, but they may have done this even if the denials had taken place while the trial was going on.

Luke says nothing of an assembly of the Sanhedrin until morning (Luke xxii. 66), and narrates Peter's denial as having occurred before this, in the house of the high priest (Luke xxii. 54).

John narrates the incident in two sections, and between these he puts the transfer of Jesus in bonds from Annas to Caiaphas (John xviii. 15-18, 25-27). But

though he presents the incident in two sections, it is plain that he did not think of it as transpiring in two places, for all the time Peter is standing by one and the same fire of coals (John xviii. 18, 25). Of these two representations, that of John and Luke is probably to be preferred. For, in the first place, John's account of the entire last day of Jesus' life shows a more accurate acquaintance with the events than does the Synoptic narrative. Moreover, there are two points in connection with the narrative of Peter's denial which favor the view that it was in the house of Annas. First, the representation that Peter and the officers were sitting by the fire in the court suits the period of waiting in the house of Annas better than it does the time of trial by the Sanhedrin. At the latter time, the disciples, if not the officers, must have been intent on the course of the trial of Jesus. And, further, the statement in Luke that Jesus looked upon Peter (Luke xxii. 61) can be more readily understood if they were in the house of Annas, where relatively few were gathered and where there was no formal trial, than it can if Jesus was in the midst of the high court of the Sanhedrin on trial for His life. It has been suggested that Jesus looked upon Peter just as He was being sent from Annas to Caiaphas.¹

The narratives of Peter's denial, while presenting

¹ The hypothesis that Annas and Caiaphas occupied the same house is not favored by John's statement that Annas *sent* Jesus to Caiaphas, nor does it remove the difficulty in locating the scene of Peter's denial.

these differences, are in essential agreement. They all say that Peter was three times charged with being a disciple of Jesus, that he three times denied the charge, and that about the time of the third denial the cock crew, reminding Peter of Jesus' prediction regarding him. All but John record how the true Peter was awakened by the crowing of the cock and went out of the house to weep. From Annas Jesus was sent bound to Caiaphas (John xviii. 24), to be tried by the Sanhedrin over which Caiaphas as acting high priest presided.

Tried by the Sanhedrin.

The regular place of meeting for the Sanhedrin is thought to have been on the temple mount, but that may not have been available for the trial of Jesus, since the gates of the temple were closed at night.¹ So the trial of Jesus took place in the high priest's house. At what hour it began we cannot definitely say, neither can we determine how long it continued. This, however, is plain, that it was all over and Jesus was led away to Pilate while it was still early morning (Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1; John xviii. 28).² From the narrative of Mark we infer that the proceedings of the Sanhedrin and the subsequent ill-treatment of Jesus occupied considerable time, possibly two or three hours. *Many*

¹ Schürer, II. 210-213,

² Luke puts the trial in the morning, identifying it apparently with the early gathering of the Sanhedrin to consult on the course to be pursued before Pilate, and to take Jesus to Pilate's palace (Luke xxii. 66; Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1, 2.

false witnesses were heard and their testimony discussed; there was the dialogue between Jesus and Caiaphas; then the formal voting of the Sanhedrin, and after that the varied abuse of Jesus. There was probably all possible haste, for the leaders were apprehensive of a tumult in favor of Jesus, and yet the period allowed for these events must not be too much compressed.

Of the seventy-one¹ members composing the Sanhedrin, the evangelists imply that at least the greater part were present at the trial of Jesus. The trial of a false prophet required, according to law, the full Sanhedrin,² but the trial of Jesus was not wholly according to the Jewish law, as that is known to us, and we need not think that every member was present.

In the trial of Jesus, as reported by the evangelists, three points are made prominent. First, the plan to condemn Jesus on the evidence of witnesses against Him failed. Many witnesses appeared, but their testimony was not accepted even by a jury who had long purposed to kill the prisoner. The only charge against Jesus, which is specified in our narrative, is that He had spoken slightingly of the temple; but the testimony of the witnesses did not agree.

Then, in the second place, having failed to secure testimony against Jesus, the high priest demanded that

¹ Or seventy-one, exclusive of the presiding officer and secretaries. Weber, p. 140.

² So Weber, p. 140. Authorities, however, differ on this point.

He should tell, under oath, whether He was the Messiah. To this question Jesus answered affirmatively. According to the Synoptists, He had not hitherto made a verbal claim to Messiahship in public. The reason for the solemn and explicit claim on the present occasion may have been the desire that the leaders should act with the fullest possible knowledge of what they were doing. And the third memorable feature of the trial was the declaration which Jesus made about a glorious vindication that His words and cause should have in the future. In strongest contrast with His present position as a prisoner, waiting the sentence of the Sanhedrin, He places a future scene where the prisoner of the present will be seated on the clouds as Supreme Judge. This word of Jesus, an echo of Daniel vii. 13, may be regarded as a further warning to the Sanhedrin against the course they were pursuing, and as a further affirmation by Jesus of His Messiahship. This claim of Jesus, doubtless not anticipated by Caiaphas, at least in such explicit terms, was most acceptable to him and the court. They did not longer need to search for witnesses. Rending his garments in testimony of his abhorrence of the blasphemy, he called for the judgment of the Sanhedrin; and all condemned Jesus to be worthy of death¹ (Mark xiv. 64). The sentence of death once passed, Jesus was shamefully treated, first by members of the Sanhedrin itself,

¹ If Joseph and Nicodemus were present (John iii. 1; xix. 38), they were of course utterly powerless.

who spat upon Him and mocked Him, and then by the officers to whom He was delivered (Mark xiv. 65).

First Appearance before Pilate.

The Sanhedrin could pass a sentence of death, but could not proceed to its execution without the consent of the Roman government (John xviii. 31). Therefore, the next step on the part of the Jews was to secure from Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator, the execution of their will. To this end the members of the Sanhedrin went in a body to Pilate, having taken counsel together as to the method of procedure (Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1; Luke xxiii. 1). They took Jesus with them bound.

The prætorium of Pilate is identified by some scholars¹ with the palace of Herod, on the west side of the city, and by others with the fortress Antonia, at the northwest corner of the temple area.² According to Josephus,³ the Roman procurator Florus (64–66 A.D.) resided in Herod's palace, but this fact is hardly proof that Pilate also resided there, thirty years before the time of Florus. However, since Antonia was a military barrack rather than a residence, and since Pilate's wife was in Jerusalem with him (Matt. xxvii. 19), it is probable that he abode in this palace.⁴

¹ Schürer, I. 382; Edersheim, II. 566.

² Wieseler, pp. 407, 408; Bäckker, p. 81.

³ *Jewish War*, II. 14. 8; 15. 5.

⁴ Mark xv. 16 speaks as though the soldiers of the cohort took part in

At His first appearance before Pilate, the charge against Jesus seems to have been wholly political. All the evangelists represent Pilate as asking Him if He was King of the Jews, which, of course, implies that His enemies had preferred against Him this charge. But in John this was not the first step. When Pilate asks what accusation the Jews bring, they reply that they should not have delivered Jesus up if He had not been an evil-doer (John xviii. 29, 30). They evidently wish to have Pilate take their judgment of the case without particular specifications. And the reason of this may well have been the fact that the ground on which they had condemned Jesus to death, namely, the ground of blasphemy, would not avail, as they knew, with Pilate. His reply that they should take Jesus and judge Him themselves, is equivalent to saying that if they wish any action on his part, they must bring forward some definite accusation.

Balked in this plan, the Jews charged that Jesus claimed to be a king, and that He accordingly refused tribute to Cæsar, and stirred up the people (Luke xxiii. 2). There was a grain of truth in this charge, as the Jews looked at it. Jesus had declared before the Sanhedrin that He was the Messiah, which was the same as claiming to be the king foretold in the prophets. But the charge against Jesus, as Pilate would understand it, was false, and the Jews knew that it was.

the scourging of Jesus, but it is not unlikely that Pilate would have part of the cohort in his immediate vicinity, while part would be in Antonia.

Jesus had steadily refused to fall in with the popular conception of the Messiah; all His work had been moral and spiritual.

The hearing thus far had taken place outside the palace on account of the scruples of the Jews (John xviii. 28). But at this point Pilate entered the palace, and had Jesus brought in also, presumably that he might have some quiet talk with the prisoner, and satisfy himself whether there was aught in the charge against Him. When Jesus saw that Pilate had a real desire to know the truth or falsity of the charge, He admitted that He was a King, but said that His Kingdom was not of this world. His mission was to witness to the truth (John xviii. 34-37). Pilate was satisfied by this interview that there was no ground for criminal procedure against Jesus, and having come out of the palace he so declared to the Jews (John xviii. 38). But the chief priests reiterated the accusation that Jesus stirred up the people, and declared that His influence extended from Galilee throughout all Judea (Luke xxiii. 5).

Before Herod Antipas.

The way in which Pilate caught the word *Galilee* in the charge of the Jews, and hastened to send Jesus to Herod, the ruler of Galilee, whose subject Jesus was, shows how desirous he was of getting rid of the responsibility of settling the case. He saw that he could not release Jesus without incurring the deadly hostility of

the rulers, and yet he saw no ground of condemning Him.

Only Luke speaks of Jesus' being before Herod (Luke xxiii. 8-12). It seems that Herod's one interest in Jesus was that he might see Him perform a miracle. He questioned Him, but we are not told what questions he asked. He evidently had no desire to accept the duty of settling the case, which Pilate had committed to him. Yet he had authority to condemn and execute Jesus, at least by taking Him to Galilee or across the Jordan into his own jurisdiction (Mark vi. 27, 28). For some reason he shrank from the exercise of this authority, though the chief priests and scribes vehemently accused Jesus. Perhaps the memory of John the Baptist, whose innocent blood he had shed, still troubled his conscience, and perhaps, also, his sense of justice made him loath to accede to the wishes of the prosecutors. Yet he could not refrain from taking vengeance upon Jesus for having refused to work a miracle before him, and for having refused even to answer a single question; and so, through his soldiers, he set Jesus at naught, and indulged in cruel mockery of Him (Luke xxiii. 11). Then he sent Jesus back to Pilate, having first arrayed Him in a gaudy robe as a would-be king. His return of the prisoner to Pilate seems to have been regarded as a flattering recognition of the superior wisdom or authority of the latter, and so served to bring the two rulers into a friendly relation to each other.

Second Appearance before Pilate.

When Pilate saw that he had the prisoner again on his hands, he sought earnestly to secure His release. His desire to do this may naturally have been intensified by the entreaty which had come from his wife that he would have nothing to do with "that righteous man" (Matt. xxvii. 19). Her solicitude was based upon a dream which she had had in the past night. This dream naturally implies that she had heard about Jesus and had been deeply impressed by what she had heard.

The first move of Pilate was to propose the release of Jesus according to the custom to set one prisoner at liberty at the feast of the Passover (John xviii. 39).¹ This proposition was made of course to the people in general, not to the accusers (Mark xv. 11), and Pilate might hope that it would be gladly accepted because he saw that it was the jealousy of the leaders which caused the persecution of Jesus (Mark xv. 10). But Pilate's aim was thwarted by the members of the Sanhedrin, who moved the people to ask for Barabbas (Mark xv. 11).

The procurator's next move was to satisfy the enemies of Jesus by having Him scourged (Mark xv. 15; Matt. xxvii. 26; John xix. 1-5). The Synoptists here condense the story to such an extent that we could not get a clear view of the course of the trial were it not

¹ According to Mark, the crowd who had gathered took the initiative in asking the release of a prisoner, and Pilate then asked if they would have Jesus (Mark xv. 8, 9).

for John's fuller narrative. From this it is plain that the scourging — for which there was of course no legal ground, for Pilate nowhere indicates that he thought Jesus was concealing facts from him which might be extorted by torture — this scourging was a device by which Pilate hoped to deliver Jesus. In the terrible suffering which it caused, the scourging was only a step removed from the crucifixion itself. After the scourging, Pilate came forth with Jesus and again declared that he found no crime in Him (John xix. 4). But the chief priests and other foes of Jesus would not stop half-way. Their persistent cry was that Jesus should be crucified (John xix. 6). Pilate, angry that he was balked again in his desire to free Jesus, told the Jews to take Jesus themselves and crucify Him. *He* acquitted Him.

The next step was brought about by the Jewish accusation that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God (John xix. 7). That was the ground on which the Sanhedrin had sentenced Him to death, and now despairing of getting a sentence on the political charges, they ask for one on this religious charge. They seek a judgment according to Jewish law, having failed to get one according to the laws of Rome. But the immediate effect of their accusation was quite the contrary of that which they desired. It made Pilate the more afraid to proceed against Jesus (John xix. 8). Pilate's fear may have been inferred from the fact that he again retired with Jesus into the palace (John xix. 9). The accusers who, in the first part of

the trial before Pilate, had refused to enter the heathen palace lest they should be defiled (John xviii. 28), seem now to have laid aside their scruples in their thirst for the death of Jesus, and to have followed Pilate into the palace (John xix. 12, 13). Here Pilate, impressed anew with the innocence of Jesus, sought again to release Him (John xix. 12), but was met with a political threat, which at last turned the scale against Jesus. The prosecutors declared that he was not Cæsar's friend if he released this pretender to kingly power (John xix. 12). This motive was strengthened by the fear of a tumult (Matt. xxvii. 24), which might easily create distrust against him at the seat of government. So Pilate at last decided to condemn Jesus in order to save his own political future. Yet there was still a struggle within him. He confessed that Jesus was innocent in the very moment when he condemned Him. He washed his hands and vainly tried to throw the responsibility of his act upon the Jews (Matt. xxvii. 24). Even when on the judgment seat, which was erected out of doors, at a place called *the Pavement*, in Hebrew *Gabbatha*, and when about to pronounce sentence, he halted and asked the Jews if he should crucify their king (John xix. 15). These words may be regarded rather as a mockery of the Jews than as spoken with any thought of awakening pity in their hearts, and leading them to desist from the demand that Jesus be put to death. Thus at last the persistence of the Jews in their bitter religious hatred prevailed against Pilate's sense of righteousness,

and drove him to pronounce the sentence of death (comp. Acts iii. 13).

At this juncture, if not earlier, Judas was overcome by the consequences of his treachery, and sought to clear himself in a measure by the return of the money which he had received from the priests and elders.

The End of Judas.

Both Matthew and Luke, the only writers who refer to the fate of Judas, agree that there was a lot in Jerusalem which bore the name *field of blood* (Matt. xxvii. 8; Acts i. 19), and that this field was in some way associated with Judas. According to Matthew it was called the field of blood because it was bought with the blood-money which Judas received for betraying Jesus to death; while according to Luke this name was given to it because the blood of Judas himself was shed there. But they agree as to the name of the field, and that it was bought with the money which the chief priests gave to Judas. In all other points they differ. According to Matthew, the priests bought the lot as a burial place for strangers; according to Luke, Judas himself bought it, presumably to enjoy. The first Gospel says that Judas committed suicide by hanging; according to Luke, he was killed by a fall. It appears from these statements that the circumstances of the death of Judas were not positively ascertainable when the evangelists composed their Gospels. It was known that he had met a violent death, but it may be sup-

posed that early believers had gladly dropped the tragic details from memory.

To Golgotha.

Jesus went forth from the place of judgment bearing His own cross (John xix. 17), but at some point on the way to Golgotha, Simon of Cyrene, father of Alexander and Rufus, who were, perhaps, known in the Roman church when Mark wrote his Gospel (Mark xv. 21 ; Matt. xxvii. 32 ; Luke xxiii. 26), was compelled to bear the cross. The reason of this is not indicated, but it may well be that the strength of Jesus had been so reduced by the cruel scourging and by the exhausting incidents of the past night, that He was not able to carry the cross all the way.

As the procession moved toward Golgotha, a great throng of people followed Jesus, and certain women smote upon their breasts and wept (Luke xxiii. 27). Jesus, in response to this sympathy, said nothing of His own sufferings, but pointed to those which would come upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem. He alluded figuratively to His own fate, but only to heighten the doom of the Jews (Luke xxiii. 28-31). He did not feel that He was to be compassionated, for He was doing the will of God, as He had always done ; but they were those for whom there should be wailing and beating of the breasts.

The traditional site of Golgotha is about a quarter of a mile west from the northwest corner of the temple, and within the walls of Jerusalem. Recent scholars

generally agree that this place is not the site of the crucifixion. The narrative calls for a place without the city (John xix. 20), but near to it, and near also to a highway (Mark xv. 29). The place now quite commonly accepted as the site lies on the north of the city, near the Damascus gate, and hence near a highway. If Jesus was tried in the tower of Antonia, or in its immediate vicinity, the distance which He walked to the place of crucifixion may have been about a third of a mile, but if His trial was at Herod's palace this distance must be somewhat more than doubled.

The Execution.

In regard to the hour of the crucifixion, the narratives are not at one. The oldest Gospel says it was the *third* hour (Mark xv. 25); John says it was about the *sixth* hour when Pilate sat on the judgment seat and gave sentence (John xix. 14, 15). Accordingly the crucifixion must have been somewhat after the sixth hour. This estimate by John better accords with the probabilities of the case than does that by Mark. It was early morning when Jesus was brought before the Roman governor for trial. After some time He was sent to Herod Antipas, where the priests brought many accusations against Him, and where He was mocked and abused. Then back again to Pilate, who made repeated attempts to secure the release of Jesus, among these the scourging which must have occupied not a little time. Then came the sentence, which Pilate put

off as long as he could, then the preparations for the execution of three persons, and the slow journey to Golgotha. It seems doubtful whether all this could have been accomplished before the third hour. The fact that John was present at the crucifixion is also a reason why we should accept his estimate. It is not probable that any one was particular to observe the exact time of the execution, if indeed those interested had any means of accurate observation;¹ but John's estimate that it was about noon is probably to be accepted as a correct approximation.²

Jesus was crucified by four Roman soldiers, and two robbers were crucified with Him (John xix. 18, 23). It may have been at the instigation of the priests that Jesus was placed between the robbers.

The shape of the cross used is unknown, but the fact that the superscription was placed *above* Jesus favors the so-called *crux immissa*, which is the traditional form of the cross (Matt. xxvii. 37). A suggestion as to the height of the cross is found in the circumstance that the man who offered Jesus the sponge filled with vinegar, first attached the sponge to a reed (Mark xv. 36; Matt. xxvii. 48). Manifestly he could not reach the lips of Jesus without this aid. Mark and Matthew say that a mixture of wine and myrrh³ was

¹ See W. M. Ramsay, *Expositor*, Vol. VII. 1893.

² Weiss and Beyschlag both follow John.

³ Matthew's expression — *δξος μετὰ χολῆς* — is more general than Mark's, but not necessarily divergent from that.

offered to Jesus before He was crucified, and that He refused it. The Jews had a custom of giving to criminals a strong drink that rendered them more or less unconscious.¹ This was not received by Jesus, for He wished to endure His fate consciously. It was a cup which His Father had given Him to drink.

John tells us that the garments of Jesus were divided into four parts, one for each of the four soldiers who executed Him, and that they cast lots for His seamless tunic, thus in John's thought fulfilling Psalm xxii. 18. The hate of the Jews was not quenched by the blood that flowed from the wounds of Jesus. They sought to heighten His sufferings by mockery. People passing by in the road mocked Jesus, asking Him to come down from the cross if He was the Son of God, — He who had boasted that He could destroy the temple and build it again in three days (Mark xv. 29, 30; Matt. xxvii. 40). The chief priests and scribes improved the opportunity of taking revenge on Jesus for His scathing denunciations of them in the temple. They taunted Him with claiming to be the king of Israel and the Son of God, and said they would believe His claim if He would come down from the cross (Mark xv. 31, 32; Matt. xxvii. 41-43; Luke xxiii. 35). One at least of the robbers joined in the insults (Mark xv. 32; Luke xxiii. 39).

¹ Friedlieb, *Archäologie der Leidensgeschichte*, pp. 140-142.

The Last Words of Jesus.

Seven utterances of Jesus upon the cross are given by the evangelists, namely, one by Mark and one by Matthew, three by Luke and three by John. The probable order of the words, doubtful in one or two cases, is as follows:—

(1) "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." Luke xxiii. 34.

(2) "Woman, behold thy son!" Then saith He to the disciple, "Behold, thy mother!" John xix. 26, 27.

(3) "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke xxiii. 43.

(4) "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Mark xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 46.

(5) "I thirst." John xix. 28.

(6) "It is finished." John xix. 30.

(7) "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." Luke xxiii. 46.

The first of these sayings is sometimes regarded as unhistorical on the ground that no friend could have been near enough to hear a prayer of Jesus had there been one to hear.¹ But the narrative nowhere suggests that people were kept at any great distance from the cross. On the contrary, the fourth Gospel relates that its author and several women were near to Jesus and did hear His words (John xix. 25).

The Synoptic statement that many women were beholding from afar when Jesus expired, does not at

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, II. 578, 579.

all prove that they had been far off during all the hours in which Jesus had hung on the cross (Mark xv. 40; Matt. xxvii. 55-56). Hence we see no reason to question the genuineness of this saying which Luke preserves. Those for whom Jesus prayed were, naturally, the executioners. Of them, but not of the Jewish leaders, could it be said that they knew not what they were doing.

The thoughtful and filial love of Jesus is illustrated in His committal of His mother to John. His Messianic consciousness appears in the promise to the penitent robber. In the midst of His agony He is serenely conscious that He can bestow eternal life. On the verge of the grave, when the powers of darkness were celebrating their triumph over Him, He was as confident of the future as He had been on the brightest day of His divine ministry.

The fourth saying may mark the extremity of physical and spiritual suffering, and doubtless covers a depth which no one can fathom.

The Synoptic narrative regarding the consequence of this fourth word of Jesus is exceedingly obscure (Mark xv. 35, 36; Matt. xxvii. 47-49). Mark and Matthew represent the giving of drink to Jesus as occasioned by His cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Some thought that Jesus was summoning Elias, because the Aramaic word which is translated *my God* resembled in sound the name *Elias*. But from this point Mark and Matthew are at variance, for according

to Mark the man who gives drink to Jesus says to the others, "Let us see if Elias comes to take Him down"; while according to Matthew, the bystanders say this to the man who gave Jesus drink. The words are unintelligible in Mark. The Synoptic confusion is partly removed when we suppose that the fifth word, the "I thirst" of John xix. 28, was spoken immediately after the "My God." This expressed wish of Jesus for something to drink was what led a certain man to put a sponge filled with sour wine to His lips. This man, who understood Jesus' request for drink, probably did not misunderstand His previous word; but some others, who *had* misunderstood it, called to the man that he should not give drink to Jesus, but wait and see whether Elias would come and relieve Him, as Matthew says.

The sixth word, "It is finished," naturally refers to the suffering on the cross, not to Jesus' earthly work. His earthly work certainly included the resurrection. This was the culminating proof which He gave of His Messiahship, and this was not yet *finished*. What was finished was the cup which He had received, the agony of the cross. This was now forever past, and with the loud shout of a victor the seventh word is uttered, in which Jesus commits His spirit into the hands of the Father (Mark xv. 37; Matt. xxvii. 50; Luke xxiii. 46). Here again is blessed and close fellowship, even that fellowship which Jesus had always had with the Father, unless we except that part of the time on the cross when He had made the words of the Psalmist (xxii. 1)

His own, and cried in the unutterable agony of His spirit, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Portents.

The Synoptists agree in reporting an uncommon darkness which was over the land from about noon till about three o'clock (Mark xv. 33; Matt. xxvii. 45; Luke xxiii. 44, 45). The statement is that this darkness covered *all the land*, by which is probably meant all the region around Jerusalem, far and wide. There is no indication that the evangelists regarded the darkness as a miraculous event. Yet it could not have been an eclipse of the sun, for the Passover came at the time of the full moon. Luke's statement that the sun's light failed does not require us to suppose that he thought of an eclipse. We are probably to think of an exceptional darkness caused by thick clouds, providential, but not miraculous.

The Synoptists also speak of a rending of the great veil of the sanctuary, which together with a door shut off the Holy of Holies; and they associate this event closely with the death of Jesus (Mark xv. 38; Matt. xxvii. 51; Luke xxiii. 45). Yet it is doubtful whether their language can be taken literally. If the veil was rent in twain without a rending of the temple itself, it was apparently a miracle; but there seems to be no adequate ground for such a miracle. There was then, and was ever to be, far better evidence for believers

that they had access into the very presence of the Father, than the fact of a rent veil in the temple would be. Moreover such a miracle could scarcely have occurred in the very centre of the Jewish ritual without leaving traces on Jewish literature. It certainly is not probable that the veil was miraculously rent to betoken the impending destruction of the temple, and so to be a sign for the Jews. The word of Jesus announcing that destruction, needed no physical confirmation; and it is not in keeping with the method of Jesus to suppose that He gave such a miraculous sign to the unbelieving Jews (comp. Mark viii. 12). The evidence cited by Edersheim¹ to prove that something remarkable happened in the temple about this time is wholly unsatisfactory. The prodigies of which Tacitus² and Josephus³ speak are associated with the destruction of Jerusalem, and in no wise concern the death of Jesus. Jerome thinks the veil was rent by the breaking of the lintel of the temple, but his only authority for the breaking of the lintel is the corrupted Gospel according to the Hebrews.

But while it is difficult to regard this statement as strictly historical, it is also difficult to suppose that the evangelist used this language figuratively, in keeping with Hebrews x. 19-20; for it is in the midst of a historical narrative.

Another portent is found in Matthew only (Matt.

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, II. 610.

² *History*, v. 13.

³ *Jewish War*, vi. 5. 3.

xxvii. 51-53). He speaks of an earthquake in connection with the death of Jesus, and in consequence of the earthquake rocks were rent and tombs (which were frequently rock-hewn) were opened. Many bodies of saints were raised, and coming out of the tombs *after* the resurrection of Jesus they entered into Jerusalem and appeared to many. Numerous and grave difficulties beset the view that these statements are strictly historical. The idea that it was necessary to open the grave in order that the departed might appear, presupposes a material resurrection, which also seems to be implied in the statement that *bodies* of saints arose. But when it is said that these appeared to many people in Jerusalem, the verb employed (*ἐμφανίζειν*) is one which, when used of appearances, denotes only those of a spiritual sort (John xiv. 21, 22; Heb. ix. 24). But if it was spirits that appeared, then of course it was not necessary that the tombs should be opened. Further, the tombs are represented as being opened on the day of the crucifixion, but the bodies of the saints did not come forth until after the resurrection of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 53). It is possible that this narrative is an attempt to put into historical and objective form the great thought that the resurrection of Jesus stood in a vital relation to the resurrection of all the saints, and that, as Paul says, Christ was the firstfruits of them that slept (1 Cor. xv. 20). One item which singularly confirms this view is that Matthew speaks of the resurrection of *many* of the saints. Had the narrative been dealing

with a historical fact, then we should be justified in asking why *all* the saints were not raised. If the resurrection of Jesus brought with it the resurrection of the saints who were buried about Jerusalem, then why not the quickening of all the saints?

The Death of Jesus.

Jesus expired after He had been on the cross only about three hours.¹ It was usual for the sufferings of a crucified one to last much longer than this. Pilate was surprised when he heard, toward evening, that Jesus was already dead, and seemed scarcely willing to believe it until he had called the centurion and inquired of him (Mark xv. 44). According to John xix. 31, Pilate gave permission during the afternoon that the legs of the crucified ones should be broken, that death might thus be hastened, and that the bodies might be taken away before the beginning of the Sabbath. We may suppose that he gave this permission shortly before Joseph of Arimathea told him that Jesus was dead.

All the Synoptists say that Jesus died as a strong man, or as a victor, with a loud shout (Mark xv. 37; Matt. xxvii. 50; Luke xxiii. 46). It is natural to bring this fact into connection with the word of Jesus in John, that He had authority to lay down His life and authority to take it again (John x. 18). This suggests that the manner of His death was as truly Messianic

¹ According to Mark, about six hours.

as was His resurrection. But there is nothing supernatural in the way in which Jesus laid down His life unless it be found in the statement that He expired with a great shout. We may, therefore, suppose that after Jesus had tasted all the bitterness of death, God intervened in His behalf and gave Him authority to lay down His life by a supreme act of His will. So His death was in the fullest possible sense voluntary.

According to Mark and Luke, it was this most remarkable death which led the centurion to exclaim, "truly this man was a son of a god" (Mark xv. 39; Luke xxiii. 47),¹ that is, a superhuman and divine being.

John says that a soldier pierced the side of Jesus with a lance, when it was seen that He was dead, and says that water and blood came forth (John xix. 34). If John attached any special significance to this fact, as he seems to have done, that significance cannot now be made out with certainty. He saw a fulfilment of Scripture in the fact that the legs of Jesus were not broken and also in the fact that His side was pierced (John xix. 36, 37), but he does not suggest what meaning he saw in the issue of blood and water.²

¹ ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ, not *the Son of God*, nor *the son of God*, but *a son of a god*. For we have no right to assume that this centurion had any knowledge of the Jewish Messiah or of the true God.

² There seems to be no good reason for finding in 1 John v. 6 an allusion to the event of John xix. 34.

The Burial of Jesus.

According to the Jewish law (Deut. xxi. 23), the body of one who had been hung was not to remain on the tree over night, the reason being that such an one was accursed of God, and the exposure of the body over night would defile the land. In the case of the body of Jesus and the bodies of the robbers there was special urgency that they should be taken down and buried before dark, because the next day was Sabbath, and being in the Passover week was a high or doubly sacred Sabbath (John xix. 31).

According to John (xix. 31), the religious leaders asked Pilate that the bodies might be taken away, death having first been produced by breaking the limbs. This request he granted; but before the body of Jesus had been removed, Joseph of Arimathea secured Pilate's permission to take it away for burial (John xix. 38).

This Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrin, but secretly a disciple of Jesus; and therefore he had not consented to the counsel of the Jews (Mark xv. 43; Matt. xxvii. 57; Luke xxiii. 50, 51). With him Nicodemus was associated in the burial of the body of Jesus—the same one who had come to the Lord by night at His first visit to Jerusalem (John xix. 38, 39; iii. 1, 2). He also was a member of the Sanhedrin.

Joseph procured linen with which to enswathe the body, and he also furnished a tomb (Mark xv. 46), while Nicodemus brought a hundred pounds of myrrh

and aloes (John xix. 39). The tomb of Joseph was in a garden near Golgotha, and was new (John xix. 41).

According to Jewish law, the bodies of those who had been executed could not be interred in the ordinary burial places, but must be buried apart.¹ It is remarkable that no one of the eleven disciples, not even John, had any part in the burial of Jesus. It may be that John had gone to take Mary to his home, and so was absent when the body of Jesus was buried. Of the other ten apostles, no one, as far as the record goes, witnessed the crucifixion. Two women, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses, beheld the tomb from a distance (Mark xv. 47; Matt. xxvii. 61), but seem not to have known that Joseph and Nicodemus had embalmed the body, and fully prepared it for burial (Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiii. 56-xxiv. 1).

The Tomb Sealed.

According to Matthew, the chief priests and Pharisees went to Pilate on the Sabbath, and asked that the sepulchre of Jesus be made sure till the third day (xxvii. 62-66). The ground of this was their fear that His disciples would steal the body, and so be able to make people believe that the word of Jesus about His rising after three days was fulfilled.

Many scholars doubt the historical character of this narrative.² It is said that the oldest tradition knows noth-

¹ Wünsche, *Erläuterung der Evangelien*, etc., p. 561.

² *E.g.*, Meyer, Weiss, Beyschlag.

ing of such a guard, and, indeed, excludes the possibility of one. For it represents the women as coming to the tomb on the morning of the resurrection, thinking only how the *stone* should be rolled away, but not solicitous about a Roman guard (Mark xvi. 3). It is consequently assumed that both they and the author of the Gospel did not know of the incident which Matthew relates. There is manifestly much force in this objection, but can it be regarded as conclusive? Matthew represents the sealing of the tomb as taking place on the Jewish *Sabbath*, that is, the day after the crucifixion, and it was done by the enemies of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 62). Hence it is easy to suppose that the women had learned nothing of it, since they did not visit the tomb on the Sabbath. They observed the tomb after the body of Jesus had been put into it (Mark xv. 47), and the next time they saw it was on the morning of the resurrection.

The fact that Mark represents the women as coming with no thought of a Roman watch does, indeed, favor the view that he was ignorant of that watch; but we cannot argue that, because he was ignorant of the watch, therefore there was no watch.

Again, it is said to be incredible that the priests should have been so well acquainted with Jesus' prophecy concerning His resurrection, which even His disciples had not understood. But there is a difference between the knowledge that Jesus had prophesied His resurrection, and a comprehension of what this word

meant. It does not appear incredible that members of the Sanhedrin should have heard of this strange utterance of Jesus, and especially as some of the members were inwardly drawn to Him. Then it must be remembered that one of the apostles of Jesus had been for days in close communication with the priests. But having heard of the prophecy, the priests surely would not neglect any precaution which might now be suggested to guard against a renewal of the influence of their dead rival.

Further, it is said to be incredible that the priests would at once believe the report of the soldiers who told them of the occurrences at the tomb, when Jesus' own disciples refused to believe until they had seen the risen One, and had had other proof of the reality of the event. But in reply to this objection, we must notice that Matthew does not say, or imply, that the chief priests believed in the *resurrection* of Jesus on the report of the soldiers. It is not even said that the soldiers reported that Jesus had *risen*. They had been struck with amazement by some strange sight or sound, and knew that the tomb had been opened, but there is no evidence that they knew of Jesus' resurrection. They certainly had not seen Him come forth from the tomb, and the message which came to the Jewish women at the tomb, they, as Roman soldiers, could not understand. Therefore, whatever they may have reported to the chief priests, they did not report the resurrection of Jesus. If they reported that the

tomb had been suddenly and wondrously opened, and even if they reported that it was empty, it is not incredible that the priests believed their report. If they had been in any doubt, they could easily have satisfied themselves that the tomb was empty. Perhaps they did this. And then it is objected further that Roman soldiers would not have risked their lives by allowing the story to go abroad that they had slept at their post (Matt. xxviii. 13). But it is not so certain that they *did* risk their lives. They had the Sanhedrin on their side, and it had been seen in the last days that the Sanhedrin was able to bend Pilate to its will. And then, even if there was some risk, there was also *large money*, and men have never been wanting who would risk their lives for money. We must conclude, therefore, that we find no sufficient reason for rejecting the historicity of this narrative.

CHAPTER XVII

THE RESURRECTION AND THE RISEN CHRIST

The Women with Spices.

MATTHEW, Mark, and John agree that Mary Magdalene came early to the tomb of Jesus (Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1; John xx. 1). John mentions no one else, though at least one other is *implied* (John xx. 2). Matthew mentions also Mary the mother of James and Joses (Matt. xxvii. 56, 61; xxviii. 1), and Mark mentions both these and Salome (Mark xvi. 1). Luke mentions Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Joanna—thus in all four women are mentioned by name (Luke xxiv. 10).

According to Mark and Luke, these women had come to the tomb to anoint the body of the Lord (Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 1), while Matthew speaks only of their coming to behold the tomb (Matt. xxviii. 1).¹ This mission of the women, according to Mark and Luke, is in accord with what the Synoptists say concerning the burial of Jesus. They do not speak of an embalming of the body, but only say that it was wrapped in a linen

¹ As to the *time* when they bought the spices, Mark and Luke, who alone refer to it, seem to differ (Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiii. 56). Mark places it after the Jewish Sabbath, and Luke puts it before the Sabbath.

cloth and laid in the tomb. Luke's statement that as they laid the body in the tomb, the Sabbath drew on, suggests that there was not time to embalm it (Luke xxiii. 54). But John informs us that Joseph and Nicodemus embalmed the body of Jesus, using about a hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes (John xix. 39, 40), and his narrative seems to imply that the burial custom of the Jews was wholly observed.

Now since John was present at the crucifixion (John xix. 26, 27), it is not impossible that he also saw the burial, though his presence is not mentioned. There is no indication that any other one of the apostles was present at the crucifixion. They fled at the time of the arrest of Jesus (Mark xiv. 50), and with the exception of Peter, do not appear again on the scene till after the resurrection. Moreover, as John was acquainted with the high priest, it is easy to suppose that he might learn what had been done by members of the Sanhedrin, even if he had no personal knowledge of the circumstances of the burial. Further, it is intrinsically probable that friends of Jesus, like Joseph and Nicodemus, embalmed the body of their Master, even if the Sabbath was just drawing on. They could scarcely have entertained the thought of leaving the embalmment two nights and a day until the Sabbath should be past. Therefore we accept John's narrative of the burial, and hold that the women did not know what had been done by Joseph and Nicodemus. Nor should this ignorance of the women be thought strange. It is not likely that they

were acquainted with these high officials, or had on the Sabbath any opportunity to learn what had been done at the burial of their Master.

It was still dark when the women reached the tomb in Joseph's garden (John xx. 1), though the sunlight may already have been visible on the mountain tops (Mark xvi. 2). All the evangelists agree that they found the tomb open, but only Matthew attempts to say how it was opened.

The Earthquake and the Angel.

As Matthew has an earthquake at the death of Jesus, so also at His resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 2); and this earthquake is thought of as caused (*γάρ*) by the rolling away of the stone through an angel. Matthew seems to have thought that the stone was rolled away just as the women drew near. The angel was still sitting upon the stone, and the guards were prostrate through great fear (Matt. xxviii. 2-4).

It is remarkable that the other evangelists say nothing of these events. John and Peter, who were first at the tomb, after the women, would have learned these facts, we may naturally suppose; yet the Gospel of Mark, which rests on Peter's preaching, and the Gospel of John do not refer to these things. Further, it is not manifest what the earthquake was for, since an *angel* removed the stone.

It is possible that Matthew's description is an attempt to set forth concretely the *majesty* of the great

event; or it is conceivable that this part of the account of the resurrection was a tradition which the author found and adopted because he thought it was in keeping with the majesty of the event.

But however the stone was removed, the narratives agree, as has been said, that the women found the tomb open.

The Resurrection.

It is noticeable that no one of the evangelists alludes to the act of Jesus' coming forth from the tomb. At what hour He came forth, in what manner He came forth, in what dress — all this is hidden from us. But if the accounts of the resurrection were simply the inventions of men, we should look for information on these very points. The *Gospel of Peter*, which is ascribed to the middle of the second century, professes to give information in regard to the very act of resurrection.¹ Having described how two youths descended from the opened heavens and entered the tomb in the sight of the soldiers, it continues: "They see three men come forth from the grave, and the two support the One, and a cross follows them; and the heads of the two reach to the heaven, but the head of the One whom they lead rises above the heaven. And they heard a voice out of heaven, which said, 'Hast thou proclaimed to those who were asleep?' And there came from the cross as answer, *Yes.*" How far below the

¹ Swete, *The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, pp. xlv-xlv.

soberness and propriety of the Gospels does such a fiction fall!

The Synoptists agree that the women found the tomb empty; the body of Jesus was not there (Mark xvi. 5, 6; Matt. xxviii. 5, 6; Luke xxiv. 5, 6). Matthew and Luke report that the women went away *to tell* the disciples what they had experienced (Matt. xxviii. 8), or that they went away and actually *did* tell the eleven and all the rest (Luke xxiv. 9). The original of Mark's Gospel closes with the statement that the women fled from the tomb, and in their terror said nothing to any one (Mark xvi. 8). According to the fourth Gospel, Mary Magdalene did not enter the tomb, but seeing the stone rolled away, she ran and told Peter and John that the body of Jesus had been removed (John xx. 2). Thereupon Peter and John ran toward the tomb. When John reached it he looked in, saw the linen cloths lying, but did not enter (John xx. 4, 5). Peter came up presently, entered the tomb, saw the linen cloths which John had seen, and the face napkin, rolled up, lying apart (xx. 6, 7). Then John entered, saw, and believed, — that is, believed that Jesus had risen (xx. 8). Both then returned to their homes.

The inference which Mary Magdalene had drawn from the fact that the tomb was open, was not correct. The body had *not* been removed, for the linen cloths were in the tomb, and the napkin was rolled up and laid by itself. The condition of the place was evidence to John that Jesus had indeed risen from the dead.

We have seen that there were other women with Mary Magdalene. According to the Synoptists, — who, however, do not separate Mary Magdalene from the other women, — those who came to the tomb had a strange experience, quite unlike that of Peter and John. For, having entered the tomb, they saw an angel sitting on the right hand (that is, their right hand as they entered the door, and presumably where the body of Jesus had lain), and this angel spoke to them. He told them that Jesus was risen, that they should go and announce to His disciples that He would precede them into Galilee, and that according to His word they should see Him there (Mark xvi. 6, 7). In Matthew, the message of the angel is substantially the same as in Mark, though here the angel is *without* the tomb. He, however, summons the women to enter the tomb and see the place where Jesus had lain (Matt. xxviii. 6), and it may be supposed that they followed this summons. The one notable divergence of Matthew's angelic message from Mark's is in the last clause. In Mark, the angel refers to the appearance of Jesus in Galilee, as being in accordance with His (Jesus') word, while in Matthew it rests upon the assurance of the angel himself, "Lo, I have told you." In Luke, the message of the angels is somewhat unique. It agrees with that of Mark and Matthew in one point, namely, that Jesus is not in the tomb but is risen. The rest of the message is a reminder of what Jesus had said while still in Galilee, His announcement of betrayal, crucifixion, and res-

urrection on the third day (Luke xxiv. 6, 7). The women remember these words of Jesus, and go away to the disciples (Luke xxiv. 8, 9).

It will be noticed that in all the Synoptists the angel, or in Luke the two angels, simply voice what the women could see with their eyes, or what they could easily remember of the word of their Master, or what they might infer from what they saw. They were seeking Jesus who had been crucified, and they could see that He was not there in the tomb. They might infer that He had risen, as readily as John did when he saw the condition of the tomb. Then what more natural than that the promise which Jesus had made on the last evening before His crucifixion should come into their minds (Mark xiv. 28), and that they should look forward to a meeting with Him in Galilee? What the women learned at the tomb, and what John learned, was indeed a heavenly message — no less heavenly in the case of John, who inferred the resurrection from the condition of the tomb, than in the case of the women, with whom an angel spoke. It is possible, therefore, to regard the Synoptic type of representation as designed to express the greatness and gladness of the truth which dawned upon the minds of the women as they contemplated the empty tomb.

THE RISEN LORD.

His Appearance to Several Women.

Both John and Matthew relate that the women had not gone far from the tomb before they saw the risen

Lord Himself — in John it is Mary Magdalene who saw Him, in Matthew it is the women who had come to the tomb. He mentions only Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, — that is, Mary the mother of James ; but to these we add Salome and Joanna from Mark and Luke. If, now, Mary Magdalene left the other women when she saw that the stone was rolled away from the door of the tomb, there were three women who met Jesus somewhere between the tomb and their homes. When Jesus greeted them, they recognized Him, clasped His feet, and did Him reverence (Matt. xxviii. 9). Jesus quieted their fears, and bade them tell His brethren to go into Galilee, where they should see Him (Matt. xxviii. 10). This was in accord with the word which He had spoken before His crucifixion (Mark xiv. 28 ; Matt. xxvi. 32).

To Mary Magdalene.

Mary Magdalene followed Peter and John back to the tomb, and when they returned home, she remained behind (John xx. 11). It is possible that they had left the garden before she arrived, for had she seen John and conversed with him, she could hardly have remained in so hopeless a state of mind. She still believed that the body of Jesus had been taken away (John xx. 13). Turning from the tomb, she saw a man whom she took to be the gardener. To Him, when He asked why she wept, she told her sorrow ; and then, as He called her by name, she recognized that it was Jesus. She sought to touch Him, perhaps to assure herself of the

reality of what she thought she saw; but Jesus restrained her with the mysterious words, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended unto the Father" (John xx. 17). He had allowed the other women to clasp His feet (Matt. xxviii. 9), but He does not give this privilege to Mary Magdalene. We are probably to find the reason of this in her. She may have thought that the old intercourse was to be renewed, and that her sorrowful heart was to be gladdened by the fellowship of the visible Lord. Jesus knew that this was not to be the case, and that what she craved she would not receive until He had ascended to the Father. Then He would send to His disciples that other Helper who would fulfil their joy (John xiv. 16). The message to Mary was strikingly unlike that which, according to Matthew, Jesus had given to the other women. She is to go to His brethren and say from Him, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God" (John xx. 17), while the others were to say that Jesus would precede the disciples into Galilee. Yet both sayings were for encouragement, one by the prospect of meeting Jesus again in the homeland of Galilee, the other by the thought, that, though Jesus is separated from His disciples, they together with Him have one God, one Father.

To the Emmaus Disciples.

A third appearance of Jesus on the resurrection day was to two disciples, one of whom was Cleopas, as they

journeyed to Emmaus, a village about eight miles northwest from Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 13-31). These disciples, like Mary Magdalene, did not at first recognize Jesus. He found, on inquiry, that they were talking of their disappointment because Jesus had not proved to be the redeemer of Israel. But though disappointed, there is something akin to hope in their hearts by reason of what the women had reported, who were early at the tomb, this report being partly confirmed by a subsequent visit which some of the disciples had made to the tomb. Then Jesus showed at length from the Scriptures that the Messiah should enter into His glory through suffering. When the group reached Emmaus, Cleopas and his fellow-disciple urged the Stranger to stop with them. They all went into the house, sat down to meat, and when Jesus, after giving thanks, broke the bread, they recognized Him, and immediately He vanished. Their conviction that it was Jesus was strengthened by the impression which His words had made upon their hearts, and which, now that He has gone, they confess one to the other (Luke xxiv. 32). Straightway the two went back to Jerusalem, full of joy at what they had seen.

To Simon.

When the two disciples reached the city, they found the eleven and others gathered together, who greeted them with the joyful words, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon" (Luke xxiv. 33, 34). Of this appearance to Simon, we have no further trace in the

Gospels, but it is probably to be identified with the appearance of which Paul speaks, and which is first in his list of the appearances of the risen Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5).

This utterance of the disciples in Jerusalem is noteworthy. Their faith that Jesus is risen seems to rest on His appearance to Simon. But had they not heard of His appearance to Mary Magdalene and the other women? Or was there something peculiarly convincing in His appearance to Simon, so that this alone should be put forward? It is noticeable that this appearance to Simon, which according to Luke seems to have had so great an effect upon the disciples, is the first appearance of the risen Saviour of which Paul makes mention.

To Apostles and Other Disciples.

Yet again on the day of His resurrection did Jesus appear to some of His disciples.¹ Both John and Luke record this appearance, the former with greater circumstantiality than the latter (John xx. 19-23; Luke xxiv. 36-43). Both agree that it was evening, and both agree that Jesus sought to convince the disciples of His identity by showing the marks of His crucifixion. Both also agree that the disciples were convinced of the presence of Jesus, for both speak of their *gladness*. Beyond these points, the matter of each narrative is

¹ Luke's expression *the eleven* (xxiv. 33), like Paul's *the twelve* (1 Cor. xv. 5), means the apostolic circle, and is consistent with John's representation that only ten of the apostles were present (John xx. 24).

peculiar to itself. Luke says that the disciples were terrified, supposing that they beheld a spirit, just as was the case when Jesus came to the disciples on the lake (Luke xxiv. 37). In Luke, also, the materialistic evidence of the identity of Jesus is emphasized. He is represented as having flesh and bones (xxiv. 39) and as eating a piece of broiled fish (xxiv. 42). Peculiar to John are the statements that Jesus appeared in the room though the doors were shut (xx. 19); that He breathed upon the disciples, His breath upon them symbolizing the impartation of the Holy Spirit (xx. 22), and that He recognized them as the authoritative continuators of His work (xx. 23). This actual impartation of the Spirit, which John records, is said to be in conflict with Luke's statement,¹ where the Spirit is *promised*, but is not to be received until Jesus has returned to the Father (Luke xxiv. 49). But is that necessarily the case? The act of Jesus, according to John, is to qualify His disciples to forgive or retain sins, to be the norm of truth in the earth, to represent Jesus as the revealer of the Father, — authority to be the incarnate law regarding holy and unholy. But this is certainly different from the equipment with power to preach the Gospel, which is the promise in Luke, a promise confirmed at Pentecost.

To Disciples a Week after the Resurrection.

The sixth appearance of Jesus was separated from the first five by an interval of one week (John xx. 26). It

¹ *E.g.*, Keim, VI. 374.

was in Jerusalem, to those who are called by Jesus His *brethren* (John xx. 17) and who are also spoken of simply as *disciples* (xx. 19, 26). If the representation of Luke (xxiv. 33) is allowed an influence in the interpretation of John xx. 19, then we have no ground to limit the number to whom Jesus appeared, to the eleven apostles. On this occasion also Jesus appeared suddenly in a room whose doors were shut (John xx. 26). The appearance was especially on account of Thomas, who had not been present when Jesus appeared to the disciples the week before. They had told him of seeing the Lord, but he declared that he could not believe without certain material tests (John xx. 25). When Jesus appeared, He offered Thomas the very proofs which he had said he must have. It is not said that Thomas handled Jesus, when summoned to do so, but he was convinced that Jesus stood before him (John xx. 27).

To Seven by the Lake of Galilee.

A seventh appearance of the risen Lord is described in the Supplement to John's Gospel (John xxi. 1-22). The time of it is not definitely fixed, nor its order in the list of appearances, as contained in all the sources. It may have been the seventh of the recorded appearances, and it may not. There were seven disciples together, and the names of five of these are given — Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, James, and John; the other two are unknown. They had spent the night fishing, but without success. In the morning Jesus stood on the beach

and talked with them from a distance. They did not recognize Him, but became convinced of His identity by the wonderful draught of fish which they took when they cast the net as He directed (John xxi. 7). When they reached the shore, they found a fire on which fish were cooking, and there was also bread near by. It is, of course, implied that Jesus had prepared these things. But possibly the fish which were being cooked were not enough for all the seven disciples, and therefore they were bidden to bring some of those which they had just caught. When this was done, Jesus served the seven men with bread and fish. Then after the conversation with Peter, in which Jesus drew from His apostle a thrice-repeated confession of love, in allusion probably to the three denials, and in which also He three times laid upon His apostle the obligation to feed His lambs and tend His sheep, — after this, Jesus moved away from the scene of their breakfast, asking Peter to follow. Peter saw that John also was following, and asked Jesus what should be to him. The answer of Jesus, “If I will that he tarry till I come,” was understood by some of the disciples to mean that John should not die (John xxi. 23). But when this supplemental twenty-first chapter was added to the fourth Gospel, John seems to have been dead.

Whither Jesus went at this time, when He summoned Peter to follow Him; what His purpose was, and how He at last departed from Peter, are questions which must remain unanswered.

To the Apostles on a Mountain in Galilee.

Another appearance of Jesus in Galilee is recorded by Matthew (xxviii. 16-20). He says that Jesus had appointed a particular mountain, where He would meet His disciples (xxviii. 16). Here He appeared to the eleven apostles, and probably at the same time to the large company of more than five hundred believers, which is reported only by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6). This is probable, for, first, it was doubtless in Galilee only that so large a number of disciples could be found; second, there are only two appearances of Jesus in Galilee, and the scene on the mountain is the only one of these with which the five hundred disciples can be associated; and, third, even Matthew's narrative *implies* the presence of others besides the eleven apostles, for he says that *some* doubted, that is, doubted whether Jesus who had been crucified was really there. But it is impossible to think that any of the eleven doubted, for even Thomas had been convinced that Jesus had risen. For these reasons we hold it probable that when Jesus appeared on the mountain in Galilee, He appeared not to the eleven alone, but practically to the entire company of Galilean disciples. To all these, accordingly, the commission was given to go and disciple all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20).

If we are justified in associating the appearance to five hundred with the appearance to the apostles on a mountain in Galilee, then we have at least a partial explanation of that otherwise unexplained fact, that,

after Jesus had told His disciples that He would go before them into Galilee, and that there they should see Him (Mark xiv. 28; Matt. xxvi. 32), not referring to appearances to them elsewhere, and after the angel at the tomb on the morning of the resurrection had sent word to the disciples that they should see Jesus in Galilee (Mark xvi. 7; Matt. xxviii. 7), He yet appeared at least six times in and near Jerusalem before He appeared in Galilee at all, and then appeared there but twice. But those appearances in Jerusalem were to individuals, while that on the Galilean mountain was, as it were, to the entire Church. It had, therefore, unique significance, and in view of this we can understand the unique reference of Jesus to His appearance to His disciples in Galilee.

To Disciples on Olivet.

The ninth and last appearance of the risen Lord, exclusive of the later appearance to Paul, and also of an appearance to James, which Paul mentions (1 Cor. xv. 7), but about which we know nothing, was on the Mount of Olives, or, more exactly, in Jerusalem and on the Mount of Olives (Luke xxiv. 50-53). According to Luke in the Acts, this appearance was to the apostles, and the time was forty days after the resurrection (Acts i. 2, 3). We may infer from Luke that they had returned from Galilee in order to receive in Jerusalem the fulfilment of the promise which Jesus had made (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4). Here, then, they beheld Him for the

last time. In His parting words, He spoke of their equipment with the Spirit for service, and said that they should be His witnesses to all men (Acts i. 8). Then, on the Mount of Olives, He blessed them, parted from them, and a cloud received Him out of their sight (Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 9).

The Objective Reality of the Resurrection.

The narrative of the evangelists treats the resurrection of Jesus as a historical fact, demonstrable to the senses. The tomb was found empty, but in an orderly condition, the napkin which had been around the head of Jesus being folded and lying by itself. Not less than six disciples visited the tomb early in the morning of the day in which Jesus arose. Certain women clasped the feet of the Lord. He proved His identity by pointing to hands, feet, and side, all of which had been pierced. He ate a piece of broiled fish. He gave the seven disciples a miraculous draught of fish. He seems to have kindled a fire on the beach, and to have partially prepared a breakfast for His disciples. He was recognized on one occasion by His voice, and again by His breaking of bread. It is certain that the evangelists were convinced that the risen Lord was seen with eyes of flesh and heard with ears of flesh.

The force of these facts is not destroyed by the other class of facts which indicate that the body of the risen Lord was no longer wholly subject, if subject at all, to the known laws of matter. To this class belong the

sudden vanishing of Jesus from the house in Emmaus, where He had broken bread for the two disciples; His appearance in the midst of the disciples on two occasions when the doors were locked; and His separation from the disciples on Olivet. These facts seem to prove that the body of the risen Jesus was not in every respect the same body which had been laid in the tomb, but they do not argue against its objective reality. It had been sown a natural body; it seems to have been raised, in some measure, at least, a spiritual body (1 Cor. xv. 44).

The theory that the disciples had a *vision* of Jesus, but that He was not objectively present, is irreconcilable with the narrative. This declares that the grave of Jesus was found empty on the morning of the third day. Therefore, the body must either have risen, or have been removed with intent to deceive; but this latter alternative is simply impossible. The enemies cannot have taken the body away, for in that case they would have been able to stop the mouths of the disciples when they came forward, after Pentecost, preaching a risen Jesus, and they would certainly have done so. Nor can the disciples have removed the body of Jesus; for (1) Matthew says that the tomb was guarded (xxvii. 65, 66); (2) it is incredible that the disciples, who did not fully believe that their Master would rise from the dead, should at once, while smitten and despondent, have conceived the colossal fraud of stealing the body and deceiving the world; and (3) the narrative shows us the disciples changed from a state of sorrow to one

of joy, from a state of weakness to one of strength, from being scattered to being together as a world-conquering power; and this change cannot be traced to a vision which itself rested on a lie. But if Jesus actually rose from the grave to a new and immortal life, it is far easier to suppose that He manifested Himself sensibly to His disciples, as He had promised to do (Mark xiv. 28; Matt. xxvi. 32), and as the evangelists affirm that He did, than to suppose that He returned at once to God, and that a miraculous vision was given to the disciples.

The Ascension.

Luke alone refers to the ascension, and that not in his Gospel, but in the Acts (Acts i. 9).¹ According to the passage in Acts, Jesus was seen, apparently by eyes of flesh, ascending into the air, and at last was hidden by a cloud. In his Gospel, Luke simply says that Jesus was *separated* from His disciples, but makes no reference to His return to heaven. This separation from His disciples we should understand as a simple vanishing from them, like that of Luke xxiv. 31. Matthew closes his Gospel with the scene in Galilee where Jesus was surrounded by a great number of disciples, and with the promise that He would be with them to the end of the age. How Mark concluded his Gospel we do not know. The present conclusion, xvi. 9-20, is

¹ The leading text-critics omit from Luke xxiv. 51 the words, "and was carried up into heaven."

almost unanimously admitted to be an interpolation. We cannot say, therefore, whether the second evangelist made any allusion to the ascension.

The Appendix to the Gospel of John gives us, as the last glimpse of the risen Lord, the scene on the lake shore, where, after the breakfast, Jesus moved away, followed by Peter and John. Whither He went, we are not told, or how He was at last separated from the disciples. But while the Gospels do not refer to the ascension of Jesus as an accomplished fact, John reports that Jesus spoke of His ascension as something about to be realized (John xx. 17). Thus we have, in unquestionable words of Jesus Himself, a distinct reference to His ascension to the Father. This, therefore, is confirmatory of Luke's narrative in Acts, though of course it has no bearing on the *form* in which the truth of the ascension is there presented.

The ascension in Acts is not presented as something miraculous. Jesus now had a body which was not conditioned by laws of matter as known to us. He could appear among the disciples when the doors were locked. He could vanish from sight instantly. That such a spiritual body should move heavenward at will, is as natural, as far as we can say, as that a material body should cling to the earth.

While, as we have seen, there is very little said in the New Testament about the ascension, and that little not by an eye-witness, the belief that Jesus, shortly after His resurrection, returned to the Father and sat

down at His right hand in glory, is everywhere involved and not infrequently expressed.¹

Nothing was more certain to the faith of the apostolic age, and nothing should be more certain to our faith after eighteen centuries of Christian experience, than that the Lord Jesus is seated at the right hand of God, exalted far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.

¹ *E.g.*, Rom. viii. 34 ; Col. iii. 1 ; Rev. iii. 21 ; xxii. 1.

Unto Him be glory through all ages.

APPENDIX

THE SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

I. CRITICISM OF THE SOURCES

A SCIENTIFIC study of the life of Jesus presupposes a critical examination of the sources which furnish us information of that life. Only by such investigation can one arrive at a satisfactory view of the historical facts. For these sources are as manifestly human as their message is divine. Their sacredness is in *what* they report, not in the *way* they report. It is far from the spirit of the writers to claim infallibility for their narratives. The utmost that they claim is, in one case, to be an honest witness of the facts recorded (John i. 14; xix. 35), and in another case, to be a careful and thorough historian, who had access to full sources of information (Luke i. 1-4). The first and second Gospels, anonymous like the others, make no claim whatever for themselves, but they were doubtless originally put into circulation by men who believed and claimed that they had reliable information in regard to the life and teaching of the Lord Jesus, and that they had faithfully presented it in these narratives. No

other claims than these are in any wise involved. If these writers were acquainted with the facts of Christ's life, and were honest witnesses, that is all we could expect, and all that we need. They have sometimes been wounded in the house of their friends, by the fact that these friends have claimed for them what they do not claim for themselves, and what their narratives do not warrant. Criticism of the sources is not only justified by the absence of any claims to exemption from criticism on the part of the authors of the Gospels, but it is plainly required by numerous phenomena in the writings themselves. Thus, for example, the order of events in the life of Jesus is not always the same in the different Gospels, and the student must decide which order is the true one. Peter's denial of his Lord preceded the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin, according to Luke (xxii. 54-62, 66-71), but according to Mark, it followed that trial (xiv. 53-65, 66-72). In Luke, the spices and ointment are prepared by the women *before* the Sabbath (xxiii. 56), but in Mark *after* the Sabbath (xvi. 1). Many similar examples might be given. Again, the material which constitutes the Sermon on the Mount in the first Gospel is partly found in Luke, but is there scattered over a long period, and the words were spoken on a variety of occasions. Or to take the words of Jesus in general. We find that they are often differently reported by the different writers, and while the differences are, as a rule, slight, they are sometimes considerable; but whether slight or considerable, they

all are important in documents so immeasurably precious as are the Gospels, and demand scientific investigation. We have an even more striking illustration of the need of criticism when we pass from the Synoptic Gospels to John. This transition discloses wide and varied differences, both in regard to the facts of the life of Jesus, and in regard to His words.

Such, briefly, are some of the phenomena in the Gospels which show the need of subjecting them to careful investigation, if they are to be used in a scientific attempt to establish the facts of Jesus' life. This critical study of the sources, carried on now for more than a century, has been justified by its fruits, and needs no other defence than these. Like the recently discovered Röntgen rays, by which the invisible structure of different substances can be photographed, criticism has to some extent discovered the inner structure, origin, and interrelation of the Gospels, which had hitherto been as a sealed book. It should be honored for what it has done, and cultivated for what remains to be done. It is not a foe, but a friend, to the truth, and so to intelligent faith.

2. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

The Literary Problem.

A comparative analysis of the Synoptic¹ Gospels reveals the twofold fact that in a multitude of details they are remarkably alike, and in a multitude of details

¹ So called by Griesbach (†1812), because their family resemblance makes it possible to view them together.

they are remarkably unlike. The correspondence amounts in some cases to identity, and the disagreement in some cases amounts to contradiction. In many cases, also, where the narratives are plainly dealing with the same event or saying of Jesus, the reports are neither identical nor contradictory, but simply different from each other. Thus, to illustrate the last phenomenon first, each of the evangelists has his own peculiar version of the words uttered by the disciples when they feared their boat was about to sink in Lake Galilee. "Teacher, is it nothing to thee that we perish?" says the second Gospel, with an accent of reproach. "Lord save: we perish!" is the urgent prayer of the disciples according to Matthew. In the third Gospel the cry is rather one of despair: "Master, Master, we perish!" (Mark iv. 38; Matt. viii. 25; Luke viii. 24). These versions are quite different, but not contradictory. It is as easy to hold them all to be historical as to hold the historicity of either one.

Frequently, also, the difference between the three narratives is verbal only, each giving the same thought. Thus all the Synoptists represent Jesus as saying that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven; but each one has his own peculiar Greek word for *eye*, and one differs from the other two in his word for *needle* (Mark x. 25; Matt. xix. 24; Luke xviii. 25). Sometimes the differences of this class may have a literary or even historical interest, as in the narratives

of feeding five thousand and four thousand people, where the same word for *basket* is used by the four writers who describe the first miracle (Mark. vi. 43; Matt. xiv. 20; Luke ix. 17; John vi. 13), and a different word is used by the two who recount the second miracle (Mark viii. 8; Matt. xv. 37). Here the two different words may point to different localities, and so the difference may have an important bearing upon the question whether these two narratives do really concern two different works of our Lord, or are simply different versions of one and the same event. But in many cases these verbal differences have no further value than to remind us that between the Aramaic words of Jesus and our Greek reproduction of them, also in the Greek reproduction itself, there was liberty in the choice of words; and that the same liberty was exercised in the narrative portions of the Gospels, whether in the translation of these from the Aramaic, if they ever existed in the Aramaic in a written form, or in the oral and written moulding which they underwent before taking final shape in our canonical Gospels.

It was said above that the correspondences between the Synoptic Gospels amount in some cases to identity. This is true both of the words of Jesus and of the narrative itself, but as might have been expected, is more extensive in the former than in the latter. In the language of Jesus, we have absolute agreement in all three Gospels through *eight* words (Mark viii. 35; Matt. xvi. 25; Luke ix. 24), but there are not a half-dozen instances

where absolute agreement is found through five consecutive words.¹ The identity reaches through *fifteen* words in the case of one Old Testament quotation common to all the Synoptists (Mark xii. 36; Matt. xxii. 44; Luke xx. 42, 43). In the narrative part of the Gospel, absolute verbal identity, including the order of the words in the sentence, does not extend, so far as I have been able to find, beyond *twelve* consecutive words (Mark vi. 41; Matt. xiv. 19; Luke ix. 16); and passages are very rare where verbal identity runs through one-half or even one-quarter of this number of words. If we take but *two* of the three Gospels, we find the identical passages somewhat longer and more frequent. The longest passage in which two evangelists perfectly agree is in the Sermon on the Mount, where there is identity through twenty-six words (Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13). There are two other cases where the absolute agreement reaches through more than twenty words. But there are very few passages in any two of the Synoptists where, even in the report of what Jesus said, there is agreement through six or eight words. The longest is in the report of the Baptist's sermon (Matt. iii. 7-10; Luke iii. 7-9), where there is absolute identity through thirty-seven words. There are, however, very few passages in any two of the Synoptists where the perfect agreement reaches one-half or one-quarter of this extent. But it is a fact requiring explanation that

¹ See the Greek text in Huck's *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien*, 1892, or in the *Synopticon* of W. G. Rushbrooke.

we have complete verbal agreement even in such a measure. When, however, we set up a less exalted standard, and inquire after passages common to all the Synoptists which show *close* verbal agreement, the number of passages found is large. And there are all degrees of agreement, from the very remote to the very close. In the matter common to all the Synoptists, the verbal relationship between the first and second Gospels is, as a rule, closer than between either of these and the third.

But, as has been said, the comparative analysis of the Gospels reveals a dissonance by the side of the agreement, and this dissonance amounts in some instances to contradiction. Thus, in the second Gospel, the twelve disciples when sent out on their first mission are allowed to take a staff, while in the first and third they are *not* allowed to take one (Mark vi. 8; Matt x. 10; Luke ix. 3). Again, according to the second Gospel, Jairus tells Jesus that his little daughter is at the *point* of death, while according to the first Gospel he says she is already *dead* (Mark v. 23; Matt. ix. 18). Once more, Matthew tells us that the centurion of Capernaum, who desired that Jesus should heal his servant, came to Jesus in *person*, while according to Luke he did *not* come in person, but sent messengers (Matt. viii. 5-13; Luke vii. 1-10). There are other cases as decided as these, though the number is small, and then there are all degrees of difference shading off to zero. These are the phe-

nomena that constitute the literary problem in the Synoptic Gospels.

Present State of the Discussion.

This problem is not yet solved, though it has probably received more attention than any other problem to be found in the history of literature. The labors of the past have not been fruitless. Much has been accomplished both negatively and positively, and yet there is still a great diversity of views on various aspects of the problem. A German writer has recently said¹ that we are further than ever from agreement even in the most fundamental points, while an eminent English scholar is hopeful that a final solution will be reached early in the approaching century.² The latest and most exhaustive writer on New Testament *Introduction*³ has taken the ground that Mark depended upon Matthew, not upon our Greek Matthew, but upon the Aramaic Gospel in substantial agreement with it. It is incredible, he says, that a Gospel for the Jews of Palestine—the traditional view of Matthew's Gospel—was dependent upon a writing for Gentile Christians outside of Palestine—the traditional view of Mark's Gospel. He thinks the greater originality is on the side of Matthew, while others hold that the greater originality of

¹ J. Weiss in the *Theologische Rundschau*, April, 1899.

² Dr. Sanday in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, Article *Gospels*, 1893.

³ Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, *Zweiter Band*, 1899; Comp. Hols-ten, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, 1885.

Mark has been triumphantly vindicated.¹ Holtzmann admits that "it is still a burning question whether we have the primitive representation and the root of the other Synoptic texts in Matthew or in Mark."² This means that the interdependence between Mark and Matthew (or the Logia, a document which many think to have been the basis of our Matthew, though Zahn speaks of it as *mythical*) is inconclusive. Holtzmann also says that it is doubtful whether Matthew and Luke are independent. But if the relation of Mark to Matthew is still a burning question, it can scarcely be affirmed that the dependence of Luke upon Mark is settled. The question of Luke's relation to Matthew is still wholly undecided. Some say there is no direct connection between them,³ others that Luke borrowed from Matthew,⁴ and others that Matthew depended upon Luke.⁵

Wright⁶ seeks to explain the various phenomena of our Synoptists by the hypothesis that they were catechists, who represent three cycles of the oral Gospel. Hence his explanation does away with all dependence of our canonical writers upon each other, and does not

¹ E.g. Sanday, in the Article mentioned above.

² *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1886.

³ E.g. Rogers, *The Life and Teachings of Jesus*, 1894; Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1899.

⁴ E.g. Schläger in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1896.

⁵ E.g. Pfeleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*; J. Weiss in Meyer's *Kommentar*.

⁶ *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890.

presuppose any documentary source, except for the history of the birth and childhood of Jesus and of John the Baptist. And Salmon¹ thinks we can assert with confidence that the sayings which Matthew and Luke have in common were *not* drawn from any documentary record containing only our Lord's discourses (the favorite view in Germany), but must have reached the authors as independent fragments of an oral tradition. Marshall,² on the other hand, finds the solution of the problem in a primitive Aramaic Gospel translated into Greek by the different evangelists. But this view is now vigorously opposed by Dalman,³ who holds that we have no proof of the existence of an Aramaic Gospel. Thus it appears that we cannot yet speak of a consensus of scholarship on the solution of the Synoptic problem. The popular theory of to-day may be set aside to-morrow, and the satisfactory solution, if such ever be attained, may prove quite unlike any one of the solutions hitherto proposed.

Probable Elements in the Solution.

The general view of the Synoptic problem, which was presented in outline in the first edition of this book,

¹ *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the N. T.*, 2d ed., 1886. Compare also V. H. Stanton in *Expositor*, 1893.

Among eminent advocates of the oral theory, mention may be made here of Godet, *Expositor*, 1889, and Westcott, *Introduction to the Gospels*, 6th ed., 1881.

² See articles in *Expositor*, 1891, Vols. III, IV. Comp. Alfred Resch, *Agrapha*, 1889.

³ *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898.

still appears to me more satisfactory than any other. I therefore leave it essentially unchanged.

The first element in the solution of the problem is the recognition of *the mutual independence of our Synoptic Gospels*. This conclusion is supported by the analysis of the text; it must, of course, rest wholly upon this. Yet it receives confirmation from the fact that it helps us to give the most satisfactory explanation of the differences between the three Gospels. This will be illustrated after the question of mutual independence has been discussed. By the mutual independence of the Gospels, we mean that neither of the three writers had a copy of both or of either of the other Gospels before him as he wrote, or in his memory.

This independence is admitted by many scholars in the case of Matthew and Luke, and those who think that one of these evangelists was acquainted with the writing of the other are not agreed as to the side on which dependence is found. Therefore, in this brief discussion of the Synoptic problem, we need not give further attention to the interrelation of Matthew and Luke. We will consider, in the first place Luke's independence of Mark, for it is now generally admitted, though denied by some earlier writers,¹ that if either was dependent upon the other, the dependent one was Luke, and not Mark. What, now, are the principal facts in the case? It may be noticed at the outset that Luke has not less than thirty passages regarding the public

¹ So, *e.g.* Bleek, *Einleitung*, 1875, p. 290.

ministry of Jesus, each of considerable length, that are not found in Mark. These include miracles, parables, and narratives of events that belong to a large part of the public life of Jesus. This peculiar matter would make a book almost half as long as the second Gospel. It is plain, then, that Luke had copious sources entirely apart from Mark. But what of the matter which they have in common? There are five short sections which they have as their peculiar property,¹ and two sections in which they both give much fuller information regarding particular events than does Matthew (Mark v. 1-20; Luke viii. 26-39; Mark v. 21-43; Luke viii. 46-56). Of these seven passages, only two are favorable to the theory of Luke's dependence upon Mark (Luke iv. 31-37; Mark i. 21-28; Luke xxi. 1-4; Mark xii. 41-44). In the remaining five passages the evidence *against* dependence is more positive than is the evidence *for* dependence in the two cases. Thus, for example, in the story of the Gerasene demoniac (Mark v. 1-20; Luke viii. 26-39), each evangelist has his own peculiar name for the region, Mark calling it the country of the *Gerasenes*, and Luke the country of the *Gergesenes*. In Mark the demoniac comes out of *the tombs*; in Luke out of *the city*. In Mark the demoniac, when healed, published the fact though the entire region of

¹ Mark i. 21-28; Luke iv. 31-37.

Mark i. 35-38; Luke iv. 42, 43.

Mark iv. 21-25; Luke viii. 16-18.

Mark ix. 38-41; Luke ix. 49, 50.

Mark xii. 41-44; Luke xxi. 1-4.

Decapolis, in Luke he published it through the *city*. In this instance a dependence of Luke upon Mark seems wholly improbable. Or, take the narrative of the raising to life of the daughter of Jairus (Mark v. 21-24, 35-43; Luke viii. 40-42, 49-56). Luke tells us that this was an only child. In Mark *several* messengers come to Jesus, in Luke but *one*. In Mark Jesus says to the throngs, "Why do ye weep?" in Luke He says, "Weep not." In Mark it is plain that the miracle was wrought in the presence of only five people—the parents of the child, and Peter, James, and John; but Luke's account is not clear on this point. Mark gives the impression that *all* who beheld the miracle were amazed, and that secrecy was enjoined on all, which was probably the case, while Luke says that the *parents* were amazed, and that *they* were commanded not to tell what had happened. These differences are not favorable to a dependence of Luke upon Mark.

If, now, we examine the larger class of passages which are common to Luke and Mark with Matthew, out of about sixty-three sections there are some forty-two where there is evidence, I think, against the dependence of Luke on Mark, and only twenty-one of which it may be said that Luke *might* have drawn his material from Mark. As a rule, the evidence for dependence in these cases is less decided than the evidence for independence in the other cases. In support of this statement, we will first examine a number of passages which allow the hypothesis that Luke was dependent upon

Mark. This may be claimed for his account of the healing of the paralytic in Capernaum (Mark ii. 1-12; Luke v. 17-26), though he has some items not found in Mark. In the narrative of the call of Levi, there are details that are not favorable to Luke's dependence (Mark ii. 13-17; Luke v. 27-32). Thus while Mark puts the call of Levi by the lake-side, Luke is not more definite than that it was outside the house of Peter. Is it probable that if he had been dependent upon a definite statement, he would have changed it for an indefinite one? Again, Luke alone has the circumstances that Levi left all, that the meal which Jesus shared in Levi's house was a great feast made in His honor, and that the Pharisees reproached the disciples of Jesus, as well as Jesus Himself, because they ate with publicans and sinners. If Mark was here a source for Luke, it is certain that he was not the only source.

In the report of Jesus' reply to the Pharisees in regard to fasting (Mark ii. 18-22; Luke v. 33-39), and in the account of the first conflict in regard to the Sabbath (Mark ii. 23-28; Luke vi. 1-5), we might hold that Luke drew his material from Mark. In the parables of the sower and the mustard (Mark iv. 1-9; 30-32; Luke viii. 4-8; xiii. 18, 19), Mark may be considered as the source of Luke's account. The variations of the third Gospel are formal, as when it is said that the good ground bears a hundred-fold instead of thirty, sixty, and a hundred. The words which Jesus spoke at Cæsarea Philippi in regard to suffering are given by Mark and

Luke in such close agreement that a dependence of one narrative upon the other is possible (Mark viii. 34-ix. 1; Luke ix. 23-27). But if Luke drew his material from Mark, it is singular that in the following section — the account of the transfiguration — he should have departed from Mark so widely as he does. The departure suggests that we may better assume a common source for Luke and Mark in the section where they agree, than to regard Luke as dependent upon Mark. In the story of the unnamed worker of miracles (Mark ix. 38-41; Luke ix. 49, 50); in that of the young man who wanted to know how to earn eternal life (Mark x. 17-27; Luke xviii. 18-30); in the account of the cleansing of the temple, where Luke is very brief (Mark xi. 15-17; Luke xix. 45, 46); in the question regarding John the Baptist (Mark xi. 27-33; Luke xx. 1-8); in the Pharisees' question regarding the payment of taxes to Cæsar (Mark xii. 13-17; Luke xx. 20-26); in the passage regarding the greatest commandment (Mark xii. 28-34; Luke x. 25-28); in that concerning Christ's relation to David (Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44); in the sayings about the fig tree, and the time of the parousia (Mark xiii. 28-32; Luke xxi. 29-33); and finally, in the account of the treachery of Judas (Mark xiv. 10, 11; Luke xxii. 3-6), it is possible to regard Mark as the source from which Luke obtained his material. To this list we may, perhaps, add the section regarding *the abomination of desolation* (Mark xiii. 14-20; Luke xxi. 20-24. Luke represents Jesus as saying,

“When ye see Jerusalem surrounded by armies.” This language takes the place of Mark’s “abomination of desolation standing where it ought not,” and may easily be regarded as an interpretation of this Jewish figure, in the light of the historical fact of the destruction of Jerusalem. In Mark the appearance of the “abomination” is to be, to believers, the signal for flight; the compassing of Jerusalem by armies has this significance also, but first it is to indicate to believers that the destruction of Jerusalem is at hand. This must be regarded as a free modification, if Luke is dependent on Mark. Again, in Mark Jesus says that when the “abomination” shall appear, then he who is on the housetop is not to come down, neither enter in to take aught from the house. If this language is taken literally, and not as simple figure of precipitate flight, it applies with greater force to Jerusalem than to any other city of Judea. However, since Luke begins with the siege of Jerusalem, it is of course too late for persons to flee from the city, and accordingly this part of Mark’s words is dropped by Luke. It may be doubted whether Luke’s divergence from Mark is most easily accounted for by the theory of his dependence upon Mark, but we will grant that it *might* be so explained.

Here, then, we have about a score of passages, most of them brief, in regard to which it is possible to hold that Luke depended upon Mark. Whether this possible relationship is also *probable*, is a question which we shall be in a better condition to answer

after we have considered those passages, common to the two Gospels, where Luke's independence of Mark is to be held, though with varying degrees of positiveness.

There is a group of six passages in which Luke differs from Mark chiefly in his setting of an event or a word in the life of Jesus. Thus, in Mark, Jesus and His earliest disciples enter Capernaum from the lake-side, while in Luke they come down from Nazareth (Mark i. 21, 22; Luke iv. 31, 32). In introducing the narrative of feeding the five thousand, Mark says that Jesus withdrew to a desert place on account of His disciples. This is not mentioned in Luke, but we have the suggestion that the withdrawal was in order to keep out of the way of Herod. Mark does not name the place to which Jesus withdrew; Luke calls it Bethsaida (Mark vi. 31, 32; Luke ix. 9, 10). Again, according to Mark, the dialogue which led to Peter's confession took place in the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi, but Luke mentions no place. In the former Gospel, it is while Jesus is journeying that He asks the disciples what men are thinking in regard to Him; in the latter, it is after a season of solitary prayer, when the disciples rejoin Jesus, that He asks this question (Mark viii. 27; Luke ix. 18). The second announcement which Jesus made in regard to His death was made, according to Mark, as they were passing through Galilee, that is, going from the mount of transfiguration to Capernaum; but Luke does not

mention any place, though it is possible that he thought of the word as spoken at the foot of the mountain on which the transfiguration took place (Mark ix. 30; Luke ix. 37, 43). Here the difference between Luke and Mark is not merely in the setting; it is also in the announcement itself, for in Luke Jesus alludes to His death, but *not* to His resurrection (Luke ix. 44). The healing of Bartimæus took place, according to Mark, as Jesus was leaving Jericho on His journey to Jerusalem, but according to Luke it took place before He reached Jericho (Mark x. 46; Luke xviii. 35). Finally, the circumstances introducing the prophecy regarding the destruction of the temple are quite unlike in Mark and Luke. In Mark it was one particular disciple who called attention to the great stones of the temple, but in Luke several persons were speaking of the temple. In Mark four disciples, whose names are given, asked Jesus privately when His prophecies should be fulfilled, but in Luke there are no names and there is no privacy (Mark xiii. 3, 4; Luke xxi. 7).

Now in this group of passages which we have considered, it is manifest that, especially for the narrative portions, Luke had a source different from Mark; but it certainly is not probable that this source contained merely the setting of Jesus' words without the words themselves. The probability is rather that he drew his entire material in these passages from other sources than the Gospel of Mark.

We pass on now to consider the texts in which Luke's

divergence from Mark is not in the setting of the event or of the words of Jesus, but rather in the report of the words or in the description of the event. His independence is here more strikingly manifest, though of course not equally in every passage.

Early in the Galilean ministry Jesus healed a leper (Mark i. 40-45; Luke v. 12-16). Luke says this took place in one of the cities — an item not found in Mark. Again, the reason which Mark gives why Jesus was in desert places is not found in Luke, and his narrative is in consequence somewhat obscure. Had he been dependent upon Mark, it is not probable that he would have omitted so important a point. Finally, Luke gives the information that Jesus, during this period spent in desert places, was much in prayer.¹ All these facts are against his dependence upon Mark.

In the account of the appointment of the twelve disciples, it is difficult to regard Mark as the source of Luke's narrative (Mark iii. 13-19; Luke vi. 12-16). Luke alone tells us that Jesus went up into the mountain to pray. We should infer from Mark's report that His chief object was to appoint the twelve. The very important material which Mark gives us, that the appointment of the twelve was to the end that they might be with Jesus, and that He might send them out, is not in Luke. Finally, while Mark arranges the first four apostles according to rank, Luke arranges them according to their call by Jesus, putting Andrew second instead

¹ Note the force of ἦν . . . προσευχόμενος in Luke v. 16.

of fourth. And Luke gives us one name not found in Mark's list, namely, Judas, son of James.

Consider in the next place the account of the storm on the lake (Mark iv. 35-41; Luke viii. 22-25). The summons to go over to the east side is made in Luke when both Jesus and His disciples are *in the boat*; while in Mark the disciples are *on land*, perhaps Jesus also. The words uttered by the terrified disciples are not the same in Luke and in Mark. And finally, if Luke had had Mark's most vivid picture of this event before him, it would be strange that he retained none of the picturesque details—the many boats that started with Jesus, the waves beating into the boat, Jesus asleep on the cushion in the stern, and the words which He spoke to the sea.

Take the narrative regarding Herod Antipas (Mark vi. 14-16; Luke ix. 7-9). In Mark Herod says, on hearing about Jesus, that John the Baptist is risen from the dead; while in Luke he is said to be perplexed because *others* are of the opinion that John is risen. He says, "John I beheaded; but who is this concerning whom I hear such things?"

In the narrative of the rejection of Jesus in Nazareth, Luke's material is mainly peculiar to himself, and there is no suggestion of dependence upon Mark (Mark vi. 1-6; Luke iv. 16-30). In the section regarding the mission of the twelve in Galilee, Mark allows a staff; Luke says that the disciples are not to take one (Mark vi. 7-11; Luke ix. 1-5). Luke's account of the trans-

figuration is such that we cannot regard it as dependent upon Mark (Mark ix. 2-8; Luke ix. 28-36). According to Mark, the transfiguration was six days after Peter's confession; according to Luke, it was about eight days after that. Luke alone tells us that Jesus went up into the mountain *to pray*, and that the transfiguration occurred *while He was praying*. Luke has other material which is not in Mark, namely, the shining of Jesus' face and the subject of the conversation which Moses and Elijah had with Jesus. Finally, according to Mark, Peter's word about three tabernacles for Jesus, Moses, and Elijah, together with the cloud and the voice out of the cloud, *precede* the departure of Elijah and Moses, while in Luke they *follow* that departure. These features of Luke's narrative are against his dependence upon Mark. The argument is equally strong which is afforded by the narrative regarding the relative rank of the disciples (Mark ix. 33-37; Luke ix. 46-48). Mark locates the controversy in Capernaum in a house, presumably the house of Peter; Luke mentions no place. In Mark Jesus places the little child in the midst of the twelve; in Luke He places it by His own side. Moreover, if Luke had been acquainted with Mark, it would be strange that he should have omitted the fact that Jesus *embraced* the child.

Again, consider the parable of God's vineyard (Luke xx. 9-19; Mark xii. 1-12). If Mark had been the source of Luke, is it probable that Luke would have made the following changes? Mark says that the owner of the

vineyard went abroad; Luke adds *for a long time*. Mark speaks of three servants sent one by one to receive the fruits, and then of *many others*; Luke drops the *many others*. Mark represents the son as slain *in* the vineyard; Luke puts the deed *outside* the vineyard. Then Luke has important details not found in Mark. Thus, according to him, the parable called out from the hearers the words, "God forbid." And Luke says that Jesus, when about to quote the Scripture regarding the corner-stone, *looked* upon the people. This sounds like the word of an eye-witness, and as Luke was not such a witness, it suggests that he had a first-rate source. Finally, Luke has the word of Jesus about falling upon the "stone." Now if Luke did not invent these various details, he must have had a source other than Mark. And if he had a source other than Mark, who can say how closely and largely he followed it?

Again, in his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, Luke certainly is not dependent upon Mark (Luke xxii. 19-20; Mark xiv. 22-25). If we follow the view of Westcott and Hort in regard to the Greek text of this passage,¹ the cup preceded the bread, while in Mark the bread was given first, then the cup. Moreover, Luke makes important additions to Mark's version. Thus to the words, "This is my body," he adds, "which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me"; and he speaks of the covenant as the "new" covenant. Then he represents Jesus as saying that

¹ *The New Testament in Greek, Appendix*, pp. 63-64.

His blood is shed "for you," that is, for the disciples ; while in Mark Jesus says it is shed "for many." We conclude in regard to this passage that it furnishes strong evidence for Luke's independence of Mark. Had Mark been his chief source, then why did he not follow him ? But if he had another source from which he drew his material and the order of events, then what reason is there for thinking that he had *any* acquaintance with Mark's Gospel ?

There are numerous sections in the account of the betrayal, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus which furnish decided evidence against the theory of Luke's dependence upon Mark. Thus, in Luke the announcement of Peter's denial of his Master has little resemblance to that which we have in Mark (Mark xiv. 27-31 ; Luke xxii. 31-34). Luke's record of what transpired in Gethsemane is independent of that of Mark (Mark xiv. 32-42 ; Luke xxii. 39-46). He says that Jesus was separated a stone's cast from the disciples, and that he knelt down instead of falling upon the earth. The injunction to pray, addressed to the disciples, occurs twice in Luke's account, once in Mark's ; but Luke speaks of only one prayer of Jesus in the garden, while Mark's narrative implies three. In the narrative of the arrest of Jesus (Mark xiv. 45, 47 ; Luke xxii. 47, 50, 51), Mark says that Judas kissed the Lord effusively, while in Luke it is only said that he drew near to kiss Jesus. Mark says that the high priest's servant had an ear cut off ; Luke says it was his *right* ear, and adds that Jesus

touched the ear and healed it. His account of what took place at the bar of the Sanhedrin does not read as though dependent upon Mark. For in Mark it is the high priest who asks Jesus whether He is the Christ, while in Luke the question comes from several people, and not from the high priest. Then the reply of Jesus which Luke gives us is unlike that in Mark, for in Mark the thought of the bystanders is directed to some specific future event, while in Luke it is directed to something which is to be realized *from now onward* (Mark xiv. 61, 62; Luke xxii. 66-69). In the narrative of Peter's denial of the Lord, Luke differs from Mark in several details where, on the theory of dependence, we should not expect differences; and he also gives one incident, not found in Mark, which seems to have come from an eye-witness (Mark xiv. 66-72; Luke xxii. 56-62). He says that the Lord turned and looked upon Peter. In Luke's account of the crucifixion and the death of Jesus, his material is very largely peculiar to himself, and there is nothing that suggests dependence upon Mark (Mark xv. 22-32; Luke xxiii. 33-43; Mark xv. 33-41; Luke xxiii. 44-49).

Finally, we may notice the narrative of the empty grave (Luke xxiv. 1-11; Mark xvi. 1-8). Luke mentions one woman by name who does not appear in Mark. Luke says that *two* men appeared to the women in the grave, while Mark mentions but one. According to Luke, they ask the women why they seek the living with the dead; according to Mark, they say,

“Ye seek Jesus the Nazarene who was crucified.” The latter part of the angelic announcement in Luke is wholly different from what is attributed to the angel in Mark. In both narratives the disciples are reminded of a word of Jesus, but in Mark that word of the Master is a promise that His disciples should see Him in Galilee, after His resurrection, while in Luke it is simply His announcement that the Son of man should be delivered into the hands of sinners and be crucified, and rise on the third day. Here again there is no trace of dependence, but everything points to independence.

We have now considered briefly the data which bear on the relation of Luke to Mark. We find that for every passage where a dependence of Luke upon Mark is possible, there are two passages where such a dependence is highly improbable. Therefore, in view of this preponderating evidence against dependence, we hold that it is more rational to assume a common source for Luke and Mark, that is, for those passages in which they so closely agree, than to hold that Luke was here dependent upon Mark.

It remains to consider the relation of Mark and Matthew. The prevalent view among those who hold the interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels, is that Matthew depended upon Mark, though, as we have seen, the latest writer inverts this order. There are twelve short sections, not to mention single verses, in which Matthew and Mark have common matter not

found in Luke. Of these twelve sections, one-half¹ present differences so slight that, if there were other evidence pointing to a dependence of Matthew upon Mark, they also might be regarded as in accord with such dependence. However, in the majority of these cases, it would be as easy to argue for Mark's dependence upon Matthew as for Matthew's dependence upon Mark; and we might as well suppose that both alike depended upon a common written source as that either of them was dependent upon the other. But in the other half of the twelve sections, the preponderance of evidence is against the dependence of our Matthew upon Mark. Thus, in the narrative of the Syrophœnician woman, the peculiar features of Matthew are in favor of his independence of Mark (Mark vii. 24-30; Matt. xv. 21-28). His geographical description of the journey differs from Mark's. He gives the very words which the woman used as she sought help from Jesus, and also notable words of Jesus which are not found in Mark. Again, Matthew's brief account of what took place on the east side of the lake when Jesus with the twelve returned from Tyre and Sidon cannot be regarded as based upon Mark (Mark vii. 31-37; Matt. xv. 29-31). For Matthew speaks of a public work of Jesus, in which

¹ Mark i. 16-20 with Matt. iv. 18-22.
 Mark vi. 45-52 with Matt. xiv. 22-27.
 Mark vi. 53-56 with Matt. xiv. 34-36.
 Mark vii. 1-23 with Matt. xv. 1-20.
 Mark x. 35-45 with Matt. xx. 20-28.
 Mark xv. 16-20 with Matt. xxvii. 27-31.

many miracles of healing were wrought, while Mark speaks only of a private work and of a single miracle. One cannot speak with positiveness of Matthew's relation to Mark as indicated by the narrative of the feeding of four thousand men with seven loaves (Mark viii. 1-10; Matt. xv. 32-39). The circumstance that both employ the same word for *basket*—a different word from that which is found in the account of the feeding of five thousand—suggests that they had a common source, unless one depended on the other. Matthew's statement that there were four thousand men besides women and children, and the statement that Jesus went from the scene of this miracle to the borders of *Magadan*, whereas Mark says that He came into the parts of *Dalmanutha*, do not favor his dependence upon Mark. The conversation which Jesus had with the disciples, as they came down from the mountain on which He had been transfigured, is somewhat obscure in Matthew (Mark ix. 9-13; Matt. xvii. 9-13), which we should not expect if he had drawn his material from Mark. According to Mark, Jesus repeats a teaching of the scribes, namely, "Elias coming first restores all things." And then He sets over against this teaching of the scribes a truth which He had found in the Old Testament that greatly modified the popular teaching. But in Matthew the words of the scribes are fully appropriated by Jesus, and the significant antithesis to them, which Mark has, is omitted. Next we have the dialogue with the Pharisees regarding divorce (Mark x. 2-12; Matt.

xix. 3-12). In Mark the Pharisees ask whether it is lawful to put away one's wife, but in Matthew they ask whether it is lawful to put away one's wife *for every cause*. One question is from the standpoint of the strict view, the other from the standpoint of the liberal view, of that day. In Mark the order of the argument is, first, the Mosaic legislation, then the Adamic institution; in Matthew this order is reversed. Finally, in the narrative regarding the barren fig tree, the dependence of Matthew upon Mark is not probable (Mark xi. 12-14, 20-26; Matt. xxi. 18-22). Matthew says the tree withered immediately, and puts the conversation regarding it in the same hour, while in Mark it is not until the next morning that the withering of the tree is noticed, and of course the conversation incident upon that fact occurs then. It seems that we must here accept separate sources, unless we suppose that the first evangelist modified Mark's report in order to heighten the impression of Christ's wonder-working power.

Now in these last six passages the evidence is plainly against the dependence of Matthew upon Mark. The phenomena can be accounted for more readily on the hypothesis of different sources. Therefore, in the previous six passages, where dependence of Matthew upon Mark is possible, we are inclined to hold that such dependence is not probable.

When we examine the material which Matthew and Mark have in common with Luke, we find that the

relation which they sustain to each other is somewhat different from that which Luke sustains to Mark. There are some fifty-nine of these common sections. Of these about twenty-four show such slight differences between Mark and Matthew that it would be possible to regard one as dependent on the other.¹ But in these cases the question of priority cannot be answered. Mark might have borrowed from Matthew, or Matthew from Mark. In a few passages, where the two narratives are closely related, Matthew is briefer than Mark, and here, if either was dependent upon the other, priority might be conceded to Mark.² But for every passage of this sort there are five in which there is evidence against the dependence of Matthew upon Mark. This is the important point which must now be considered by a rapid survey of the material in question. In the narrative of the teaching of the Baptist, Matthew gives the words of John, and in so doing indicates why he was calling men to repentance (Mark i. 1-6; Matt. iii. 1-6). He also adds to Mark's geographical description of the extent of John's influence, this detail, that all the country around the Jordan went out to hear John preach. The Baptist's announcement regarding the Messiah presents some significant points of difference (Mark i. 7, 8; Matt. iii. 11).

¹ Mark i. 32-34, 40-45; ii. 18-22, 23-28; iii. 13-19, 31-35; iv. 1-9, 13-20, 30-32; vi. 1-6, 31-34; viii. 34-ix. 1; ix. 2-8, 30-32; x. 32-34; xi. 15-17, 27-33; xii. 13-17, 18-27; xiii. 28-32; xiv. 10, 11, 18-21, 53-65, 66-72.

² *E.g.*, Matt. ix. 1-8, 9-13, 18-26; xvii. 14-20.

Thus the Baptist says, in Mark, that he is not worthy to loose the latchet of the Messiah's sandals; in Matthew that he is not worthy to carry His shoes. In Mark the Messiah is to baptize with the Holy Spirit; in Matthew with the Holy Spirit and *with fire*. Mark's narrative of the baptism of Jesus is enriched by Matthew with the conversation between Jesus and the Baptist (Mark i. 9-11; Matt. iii. 13-17). But more than this, Matthew appears to be independent in the matter common to both. Thus the heavenly voice speaks in the second person in Mark, but in the third person in Matthew. In Mark it bears witness to Jesus Himself; in Matthew to some other, presumably to the Baptist. Is this an intentional change by the first evangelist, or is it rather a separate tradition? In the account of the temptation of Jesus, Mark is very brief, and Matthew gives an extended report; but Mark cannot be regarded as an abbreviation of Matthew, for in Matthew the temptation which is described comes at the close of the forty days, while in Mark Jesus is tempted during the period of forty days (Mark i. 12, 13; Matt. iv. 1-11). The question of Matthew's dependence cannot arise here.

In the account of the healing in Peter's house, Matthew represents Jesus as moved by the sight of the sick woman, while Mark says that the disciples tell Him concerning her. Then, in Matthew, Jesus touched her, and she arose, while in Mark He took her by the hand and raised her up. These details are against

Matthew's dependence. The same is true in regard to Matthew's account of the healing of a withered hand (Mark iii. 1-6; Matt. xii. 9-14). In Mark the Pharisees watched Jesus with hostile intent, but silently; in Matthew they ask Him whether it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath. The words of Jesus and His grieved look are not found in Matthew, and he also omits the significant reference to the Herodians.

Consider next the account of the storm on the lake (Mark iv. 35-41; Matt. viii. 18, 23-27). Matthew puts this earlier in the ministry than does Mark. The cry of the disciples in their peril, in Matthew, is not that which we have in Mark's narrative. Further, it is peculiar to Matthew, that he represents Jesus as rebuking the disciples *before* He arose from the place where He was lying. Matthew's account of the healing of a demoniac in Gadara, though much briefer than Mark's, can scarcely be regarded as an abbreviation, for in Mark there is mention of only one demoniac, while in Matthew there are two (Matt. viii. 28-34; Mark v. 1-20). Matthew represents the demoniac as asking Jesus whether He had come to torment them *before the time*; but this thought may, perhaps, be attributed to the evangelist.

In the narrative of the death of the Baptist, Matthew is much briefer than Mark, but appears to be wholly independent (Mark vi. 17-29; Matt. xiv. 3-12). For in Mark, Herod is said to reverence John and to protect him, but in Matthew he is said to desire John's death.

He would kill him if he dared. It seems inconsistent with this when Matthew, in a later verse, says that Herod was grieved by the request of Herodias for the Baptist's head. Matthew's account of Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi not only contains peculiar matter, but shows itself independent of Mark in that which is common, for where Mark says that Peter rebuked Jesus, Matthew gives the very words which he used (Mark viii. 27-33; Matt. xvi. 13-23). In the incident regarding the rank of the apostles, Matthew's narrative seems to be inconsistent with Mark's, and if so, was probably not dependent upon it. According to Mark, the disciples had discussed by the way which of them was greatest, and when Jesus asked them what they had been talking about, they were silent, naturally because they were ashamed. But in Matthew they are represented as coming to Jesus and asking who was greatest in the kingdom of heaven. This is certainly independent of Mark. So, apparently, is Matthew's narrative regarding the children who were brought to Jesus (Mark x. 13-16; Matt. xix. 13-15). For he omits the two significant facts that Jesus embraced the children and kissed them. In the incident of the rich young man, we can hardly regard all of Matthew's divergences from Mark as intentional changes (Mark x. 17-31; Matt. xix. 16-30). His words, "Why askest thou me concerning the good?" may be so regarded; but when he represents the young man as saying, after his declaration that he had kept the law, "What lack

I yet?" and also when he represents Jesus as saying to him, "If thou wouldst be *perfect*," then we have features which cannot be accounted for on the theory of Matthew's dependence upon Mark.

Matthew's description of the institution of the Lord's Supper, though so closely related to Mark, is not dependent upon it (Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Mark xiv. 22-25). In connection with the bread, he alone has the command *to eat*, and in connection with the cup, he alone has the command that *all should drink of it*. He alone says that the blood is shed unto *remission of sins*. By the words *with you* in the 29th verse he makes the drinking of new wine in the kingdom a celebration of the reunion with the disciples. This thought is wanting in Mark.

Matthew's description of the scene in Gethsemane bears evident traces of being independent of Mark (Matt. xxvi. 36-46; Mark xiv. 32-42). The most noticeable difference is in the prayers of Jesus. In Mark we read, "Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee: remove this cup from me." In Matthew we read, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." Mark says that at the second time Jesus spoke the same word: he does not record it. Matthew gives the second prayer, and it is different from the first. It is, "My Father, if this cannot pass from me except I drink it, thy will be done." The first is a prayer that the cup may pass; the second is rather a prayer for a spirit of resignation. Here it would be easier to

suppose that Mark depended upon Matthew than that Matthew depended on Mark, but neither supposition is satisfactory.

In the narrative of the crucifixion there are details which argue against Matthew's dependence upon Mark (Mark xv. 22-32; Matt. xxvii. 33-44). Thus Mark says that Jesus did not receive the mixture of wine and myrrh which was offered Him as He was about to be crucified, but Matthew says that, *having tasted*, He would not drink it. To another source than Mark we are pointed, in like manner, by the circumstance that the soldiers, having crucified Jesus, sat down and watched Him.

Finally, in the section regarding the empty grave and the angel, there is evidence of Matthew's independence of Mark (Mark xvi. 1-8; Matt. xxviii. 1-10). Thus, according to Mark, *three* women went early to the grave, but Matthew mentions only *two*. In Mark the women see an angel in the tomb, who tells them that Jesus is risen; in Matthew the angel who tells the women that Jesus is risen, is *without* the tomb, seated on the great stone which had been rolled from the door of the sepulchre. After announcing the resurrection, the angel summons the women to come and see the place where Jesus lay, while, according to Mark, they saw the interior of the tomb before the angel spoke to them. There is another singular difference in the narrative. The angel, according to Mark, tells the women to go to the disciples with this message: "He goes before you into

Galilee; there shall ye see Him, *as He said to you.*" This last clause seems to refer to the promise made by Jesus the evening before His crucifixion (Mark xiv. 28). But according to Matthew, the angel says to the women: "Say to His disciples that he is risen from the dead, and lo, He goes before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him. *Lo, I have told you.*" It seems quite plain that the writer of this passage cannot have been acquainted with Mark's Gospel, for he would not have exchanged the word of Jesus for an angel's word, which, moreover, has little significance.

We have thus far considered only the *content* of the Gospels in its bearing upon the question of their mutual relationship.

There is another fact which is often adduced as proof that Matthew and Luke are dependent upon Mark, and that is the agreement in the *order* in which the Synoptists recount the various events of the life of Jesus. It is, of course, improbable that three persons, proceeding independently, would arrange in the same order a large number of biographical events, which might with equal propriety be arranged in different ways. But let us notice the extent to which the Synoptists agree in this point, and the character of the matter where this agreement is found.

Taking Huck's arrangement of the Greek text as a general basis, we have about sixty-four sections which are common to all the Synoptists. Of these sections,

about thirty-eight occur in the same order in all the three narratives. But in the larger part of these thirty-eight sections the events are such that they can be arranged in only one order.¹ Thus they all speak of the Baptist, of his announcement of the Messiah, of the baptism of Jesus, His temptation, His return to Galilee, and the beginning of His work in Capernaum. So far there is no necessity of supposing that one evangelist derived his order of events from another.

The story of the days spent near Cæsarea Philippi shows the same order of events in all the Synoptists. The confession of Peter was followed by Christ's announcement of His death, the transfiguration, the cure of the epileptic boy, the second announcement of death, and the strife among the apostles as to who was greatest. Yet here the agreement in order is quite explicable without the assumption of the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark. The first three events are in logical order, and could not have been narrated otherwise than as they are. The agreement in the order of the others may be readily explained without the assumption of any written source whatever. The most continuous agreement in the order of events is found in the narrative of the last few days of the life of Jesus. Between His entry into Jerusalem and His resurrection, the matter common to the three evangelists is arranged

¹ This aspect of the subject is not taken into account in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Vol. II., where the question of order in the Gospel material is elaborately discussed by F. H. Woods.

in the same order, with few exceptions. But in most of these cases only one order was possible, and therefore the agreement has no bearing upon the mutual relation of the three narratives. Thus, for example, if we begin with the preparation for the Passover, we can have but one order of sequence for the following events: the paschal feast, the Lord's Supper, Gethsemane, the arrest, trial by the Sanhedrin, trial by Pilate, the incident regarding Barabbas, the crucifixion, death, burial, and the empty grave. When the sequence of events is not thus determined by the very nature of the events themselves, we find the cases of disagreement in the order of arrangement much more numerous than the cases of harmony. The agreement of Mark and Matthew in the arrangement of some ten events of the Galilean ministry, where the order is not determined by internal necessity, argues a common source for both. It does not necessarily point to a dependence of one upon the other. In view of the strong evidence against such dependence, this partial agreement in order cannot be regarded as having any considerable weight.

Such, then, is the extent and such the quality of the evidence which seems to support the position that our Synoptic Gospels are mutually independent. The items which favor the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark are as adequately explained by the hypothesis of common sources; and then we have to reckon with the more numerous items which are wholly incon-

sistent with the theory that Mark was a main source for either Matthew or Luke.

A second element in the solution of the Synoptic problem is *the recognition that the writers drew, to some extent, from written sources*. This seems to have been the case most largely with the third evangelist, and to the least extent with the second evangelist. The only writer who tells us anything about the origin of his Gospel is Luke. He says that, prior to his time, *many* had taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning the things which had been fulfilled among them (Luke i. 1-4). These unnamed writers had drawn their materials from those who had been eye-witnesses from the first, an expression which of course applies to the apostles, but not to them exclusively. For when the eleven wished to fill the place made vacant by the treachery of Judas, there were men of whom Peter could say, they "have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that He was received up from us" (Acts i. 21, 22).

All these early narratives which Luke had in mind were thus based on personal testimony, and yet no one of them was wholly satisfactory to Luke for the purpose of confirming the faith of Theophilus. But there is no reason to doubt that some of these narratives, which Luke knew to be based on the testimony of eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, were among his sources when he drew up his own Gospel. He him-

self was not an eye-witness, and, so far as we know, had not associated with eye-witnesses. He is known to us as the companion of Paul. Therefore, he had to depend upon the witness of others, and it seems probable that these written narratives were of special value to him, as his life was not spent in Palestine, where he would be in contact with the fullest oral tradition, but in Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome. It is altogether probable that Luke was more largely dependent on written sources than either of the other Synoptists. As appears from the foregoing analysis of the Synoptists, there is no reason for holding that among the many narratives to which Luke refers, the Gospel of Mark or of Matthew was included.

With reference now to the second Gospel, it might be thought at the outset that there is no necessity of assuming any written source. For, according to the well-known testimony of Papias,¹ Mark wrote, apparently after the death of Peter, what he remembered that Peter had said. This living apostolic source might be supposed to render any other source unnecessary. But we should be giving an unwarrantable importance to the statement of Papias, if we concluded from it that Peter was the *exclusive* source of the second Gospel, or if we held that the second Gospel had preserved *all* that Peter taught, and exactly *as* he taught it. The vividness of the second Gospel, its numerous touches which betray the eye-witness, and its superiority in those sec-

¹ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, III. 39.

tions where Peter alone of the Synoptists was an eyewitness, confirm the statement of Papias regarding Mark's relation to Peter, but it cannot be held that Mark drew from no other source. When he took in hand to record what he remembered from the preaching of Peter, it is not probable that he found himself able to recall the entire matter of the Gospel as we have it. Single incidents and particular sayings he may have heard from Peter's lips so often that they were in distinct remembrance, but it is unlikely that he could reproduce from memory the whole narrative with its almost innumerable details. There are passages which from their nature would have been seldom related by Peter; for example, the question of the Pharisees regarding divorce, the question of fasting, Herod's opinion of Jesus, and the discussion regarding ceremonial cleanness. It can hardly be supposed that in such portions of his narrative he consulted no other source than his memory of what he had heard from Peter. But whether there is evidence that he used any *written* source is perhaps still an open question. Jülicher¹ thinks there is no stringent proof that Mark had any written sources. Weizsäcker² too, though he thinks Mark was acquainted with the so-called *Logia*, believes that he made very little use of this writing. On the other hand, Weiss³ holds that Mark must have had

¹ *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1894, p. 226.

² *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, 1886, p. 385.

³ *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1886, p. 506; also Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*, 1899.

some documentary source, such being necessary in his judgment to account for a long address like the Eschatological Discourse; and Sanday¹ also seems to let Mark, as well as Matthew and Luke, depend upon a common written source. Others think only of an oral tradition as underlying Mark, which, however, had become almost as fixed in form as though it had been written.

In regard to the first Gospel, we should have to say at once that it rests in part upon written sources, were it plain that the writing which Papias² ascribed to Matthew included only the *sayings* of Jesus. Scholars are divided on this point, some limiting the *Logia* which Papias says that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, to the *words* of Jesus, or the words with brief narrative settings, and others holding that the language of Papias refers to an Aramaic Gospel.³ However, even on the assumption that our first Greek Gospel is a substantial reproduction of the Aramaic writing and so is virtually the work of Matthew, there is not a little probability that he made use of written sources. For the Sermon on the Mount and other long addresses of Jesus can scarcely have been reproduced from memory after the lapse of thirty or forty years with all the freshness and conciseness which mark these addresses. It seems probable that they had been committed to writing by some one long before the composition of the present

¹ *A Survey of the Synoptic Question*, in the *Expositor* for 1891.

² Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, III. 37.

³ E.g., Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, II. 252-262.

Gospel. And this probability receives support from the analysis of the material common to the Synoptists. The verbal agreement between Matthew, Mark, and Luke is, in some cases, most satisfactorily explained on the supposition of written sources. A striking illustration of the necessity of assuming a written source is furnished by Mark xiii. 14 and Matthew xxiv. 15. Both evangelists insert the same parenthetic remark into the words of Jesus, and insert it at precisely the same point. Now since there is evidence for the independence of Mark and Matthew, the fact just mentioned argues dependence of both upon a written document. Yet while holding it highly probable that all our Synoptists were to some extent dependent upon written sources, we would not press the point of their verbal agreement, and say that this absolutely *requires* written sources. As we have seen, the verbal agreement of all three Synoptists rarely extends to an entire verse, even in the words of Jesus, and such resemblances are perhaps not inconsistent with oral tradition, especially when it is remembered that these three narratives originated within a few years of each other, originated among those who had the deepest interest in the facts, and originated while eye-witnesses were still living. If we could assume with Mr. Wright that there had been from the very beginning systematic and thorough catechetical instruction in the Gospel, instruction which involved a careful memorizing of the different parts of the narrative, then it would appear still less necessary to pre-

suppose written sources in order to account for the verbal agreement between the Synoptists, or for their agreement in the order of narration.

A third element in the solution of the Synoptic problem is *a recognition of the fact that there were several or many eye-witnesses of the various events in the life of Jesus, and several or many persons who heard His teaching; that these witnesses, each in his own circle, became sources of information regarding Jesus; and that to this original plurality of witnesses the greater part of the differences between the Synoptists can easily be traced.*

For nearly every incident in the life of Jesus there were many witnesses. Even on the mount of transfiguration and in the garden of Gethsemane there were three disciples with Jesus, and when He hung upon the cross there was one apostle near, besides several believing women. The various apostles and disciples saw and heard each with his own eyes and ears, and when the apostles began to teach after Pentecost, it is inconceivable that they all taught with the same words. Each taught according to what he had seen and heard. There was essential agreement in their testimony, but all degrees of difference in details.

Now without doubt the apostles were the chief ultimate source from which flowed the Gospel story, but they were not the only eye-witnesses. There were many believers who had heard some of the Great Teacher's words, many who had witnessed this or that miracle. Such people would inevitably tell what they

had seen and heard, and thus little Gospel rivulets were started which may easily have reached to the time when our Gospels were composed. Indeed, at the beginning of the second century, the oral tradition, whether from apostolic or other source, was so copious and well attested that a Papias could say that he preferred it to the written Gospels. The air seemed to be full of the facts of the wonderful life.

It seems natural and indeed inevitable that the oral tradition in its entirety bore the stamp of diverse personalities. Nor was this stamp effaced as time went by, and the Gospel passed from mouth to mouth. It persisted, and when written narratives finally appeared, it reappeared in them. One man was the author of each of the Synoptic Gospels, with a possible exception of the first, but the material embodied in his narrative may have had, ultimately, diverse sources. Luke tells us that he traced the course of all things accurately from the first, and to judge from the rich content of his narrative, he gleaned widely. To how many unnamed eye-witnesses the separate stories of his Gospel finally reach, no one can say. The second Gospel probably preserves the Petrine style of teaching, and largely also the material used by Peter. The first Gospel bears another stamp, regarded as a whole, and contains many details which may have come originally from various sources.

We of course cannot deny to the evangelists a certain freedom in the use of the material in their hands, but

this freedom cannot without arbitrariness be made to cover and account for all the phenomena in question. Multitudes of differences between the Synoptic Gospels, including the majority of the greater ones, may be ascribed most naturally to the original plurality of witnesses, and others to the liberty of oral tradition, especially in its earlier period. Such, then, seem to me to be the important elements in the solution of the Synoptic problem—recognition of the mutual independence of the narratives, recognition of fixed sources, these probably written to some extent, and recognition of the original plurality of witnesses, with all that this implies.

The Historicity of the Synoptic Gospels.

The exact relation of the Synoptic Gospels to each other, together with the question of their sources, is less important than the question of their historical value, and fortunately this latter question is in a measure independent of the former. Scholars may substantially agree on the question of historical value while one regards the Gospels as based on oral tradition, another on written documents, another on both oral and written sources, and while still others regard Luke or Matthew or both as dependent upon Mark. On the other hand, however, the particular view we take of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels may have a certain bearing on their historical value. Thus, for example, we can rate their value higher when their differences

are traced to different witnesses, or to the unconscious alterations of early tradition, than when these differences are regarded as intentional changes made by the evangelists.

An argument for the historical character of these writings may be based either upon external or internal evidence. We may hold that the essential facts of the written Gospel are established by the living Gospel, that they have been verified from day to day and from year to year, through the centuries, and are still being verified, by the most reliable spiritual phenomena with which men are anywhere acquainted.¹ This argument for the essential truthfulness of the Gospel narrative is invincible. It does not substantiate details, but great central facts like the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, His holy character, His claim to be the Messiah, the revealer of God, and the founder of a heavenly kingdom — these it does substantiate. Again, the historical character of these writings is supported by internal evidence. This cannot be given here in detail, and for the present purpose need not be. I will refer to a single line of evidence only. The portraits of Christ, drawn by the first three evangelists, though each one is produced in part by the use of materials not found elsewhere, are essentially one. In each narrative He is the Messiah, equipped with Messianic authority to teach, to heal, to establish the Kingdom of God, to forgive sin, and to be the final judge of men. In each narrative He is truly human,

¹ Dale, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, 1890.

a descendant of David, living His life under the limitations of humanity. According to each of the narratives, He is a being who has perfect fellowship with God, and who lives a sinless life. In each He is represented as loving men, as setting an immeasurable value upon the human soul, and as laying down His life in behalf of men. These truths constitute the essential Gospel, the glad tidings of great joy. The fact that these three independent narratives, while differing in a multitude of details, agree in presenting essentially the same portrait of Jesus, is a strong argument for their historical character. Their origin at a time¹ while eye-witnesses were still living, and their acceptance among believers from that early day, are also the best possible evidence of their historical trustworthiness.

But this claim of historicity does not imply that all narratives in these Gospels must be regarded as of equal historical value. There are details in one Gospel which are contradicted by details of another. There are also details which are rendered doubtful by the general trend of the entire Gospel in which they stand. There are points in regard to which we have in one Gospel, it may be Mark, the testimony of an eye-witness, but which are differently presented in another narrative that is not directly from an eye-witness. Peter, the chief source of Mark, was the only one of the Synop-

¹ The composition of Mark may be placed shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, Luke soon after that event, and Matthew, in its present form, somewhat later.

tists who was present on certain occasions in the life of Jesus; for example, at the restoration of the daughter of Jairus.

Again, there are events described which no one of the disciples claims to have witnessed; for example, the descent of an angel on Easter morn, his rolling the stone from the door of the tomb, the rending of the veil in the temple at the death of Jesus, and the appearance of the risen saints who entered into the holy city after the resurrection of Jesus. The evidence for the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus is incomparably fuller and more conclusive than the evidence that the veil of the temple was rent at His death, or that the stone at the door of His tomb was actually rolled back by an angel. We may, therefore, affirm that the claim of historicity for the Synoptic Gospels as a whole does not imply that all statements of these narratives are of equal historical value.

Again, the claim of historicity for the Synoptists does not imply that the impression which bystanders received from the works and words of Jesus was always a correct one. Thus, for example, people thought that the woman who touched Christ's garment was healed without the Master's knowledge. Mark narrates the miracle from this point of view (Mark v. 29, 30). But this was doubtless a false impression. The miracles of Jesus were not wrought by any magnetism, or by any subtle physical force which people could steal from Him by a touch; but they were wrought by an act

of His will, with full consciousness of what He was doing.

As His acts were misunderstood at times, so also were His words, and that even by His own disciples. But this is so manifest that we need not dwell upon it here. It will be admitted generally that the claim of historicity for the narrative does not imply that every comment of the evangelist on the life and teachings of Jesus is necessarily correct, or that all impressions made by Jesus and reflected in the Gospels are right.

But the evidence for the historical character of the essential claims of the Synoptists is abundant and conclusive, and one ought not to be troubled by any of the concessions, which must be made in reference to details. "A robuster faith in the Gospels is needed, which, instead of always seeking to deny the existence of difficulties or to explain them away, shall freely confess them, and learn the lessons which they teach."¹

3. THE FOURTH GOSPEL

In General.

A brief statement of the critical position which we assume toward the fourth Gospel is all that is contemplated in this paragraph. That Gospel still appears to me to be a trustworthy source of information regarding the life of Jesus. The view that, as history, it has no value, seems quite as extreme as the view that it is of all

¹ Wright, *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, p. 163.

the four Gospels the most valuable.¹ In regarding it as a trustworthy source of information, I would not minimize the wide and varied differences between it and the Synoptic Gospels—differences in regard both to the external facts of Jesus' life, and also in regard to His teaching. These are to be freely conceded, but it does not follow that the writing is historically unreliable.

The Narratives of the Fourth Gospel.

There are some considerations in regard to the trustworthiness of the narrative portions of the fourth Gospel which may properly be stated here in a general way. First, this narrative, while chiefly independent of the Synoptists, often supplements them in a manner that awakens confidence in the author's acquaintance with the subject. The fourth Gospel's independence of the Synoptists, with perhaps some slight exceptions,² is manifest on every hand, though denied by Schürer and Jülicher. It not only contains a large amount of matter unknown to the first three Gospels, but in that which it shares with them, it evidently draws from an independent source. Thus, in the short story of Christ upon the lake (John vi. 16-21), which is given also by Mark and Matthew (Mark vi. 45-52; Matt. xiv. 22-33), the fourth Gospel alone has the following important details:

¹ H. K. Hugo Delff, *Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, 1889; Arthur Kenyon Rogers, *The Life and Teachings of Jesus*, 1894; Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1894.

² Sanday, *Contemporary Review*, 1891.

it tells us that the disciples embarked *at even*, that they started for *Capernaum*, that Jesus *had not yet come to them*, that they rowed *twenty-five or thirty furlongs*, that Jesus *drew near to the boat*, and that after Jesus came to them *the boat was immediately at the land*. Or take the anointing in Bethany, which John has in common with Mark and Matthew (John xii. 1-8; Mark xiv. 3-9; Matt. xxvi. 6-13). His narrative is fuller than the others of such touches as we might expect from an eye-witness. Thus he alone tells us that the supper at which Jesus was anointed was *six days before the Passover*, that *Martha served*, that *Lazarus sat at meat with Jesus*, that it was *Mary* who brought the ointment, that she anointed the *feet* of Jesus, that she *wiped* them with her *hair*, that the house *was filled with the odor*, and that *Judas* murmured. These incidents illustrate the independence of the fourth Gospel; and what is shown in regard to these two passages is manifest in the others which John has in common with the Synoptists.

But the fourth Gospel, while plainly independent of the Synoptists, often supplements, explains, and justifies them in a way impossible to a writer of the second century. Thus Mark and Matthew tell us that after feeding the five thousand near Bethsaida, Jesus *constrained* His disciples to enter into a boat and start for the west side of the lake (Mark vi. 45; Matt. xiv. 22). This word *constrained* implies a strong unwillingness on the part of the disciples to return to the west shore, but the Synoptists do not intimate *why* they were

unwilling to return. The key to this difficulty is furnished by John, who tells us that after the miracle, and in consequence of it, the multitudes were wrought up to such a pitch of enthusiasm for Jesus that they were ready to attempt to force Him to become king (John vi. 15). Of course the disciples were unwilling to leave their Master when the air was charged with this excitement.

Again the Synoptists leave us in doubt regarding the movements of Judas on the last evening. Mark and Matthew tell us nothing about him from the time when Jesus announced that one of those with Him at the table would betray Him, until the hour of the arrest. We could not learn from them whether Judas partook of the Lord's Supper. Luke, however, puts the institution of the Supper before the remark of Jesus that "the hand of him who betrayeth me is with me on the table" (Luke xxii. 21), and this implies that Judas partook of the Supper. Here the fourth Gospel comes in with important information. It supplements the narrative of Mark and Matthew, and reverses the order of events which Luke gives. It says that when Judas received the sop from Jesus with the accompanying words, "That thou doest do quickly," he went out straightway (John xiii. 27-30). This must have been early in the evening, for some of those at the table thought Judas had gone to *buy* things for the feast, others that he had gone out to give something to the poor. And further, when it had once been announced by Jesus that one of the apostles should betray Him, and they were thereby

thrown into a state of wondering sorrow, each asking, "Is it I?" it is most probable that the moment did not pass without some intimation from Jesus to Judas that he was the one (comp. Matt. xxvi. 25). If this intimation was given, then we are obliged to associate John's record with this moment, and hold that the departure of Judas preceded the Lord's Supper. This is confirmed by the inherent probability of the case. It is natural to suppose that Jesus desired to speak His farewell words in a circle freed from the oppressive presence of the traitor. It should be noticed before leaving this incident that the passage with which the fourth Gospel supplements the Synoptists bears, throughout, the clearest imaginable stamp of genuineness. We see a disciple reclining on the bosom of Jesus. Peter beckons and whispers to him that he should find out of whom Jesus was speaking. Jesus whispers a sign to the disciple reclining on His bosom, and then speaks a word to Judas which the rest did not understand. Some thought it meant one thing, some another. All this is the language of an eye-witness, and is utterly inexplicable as an ideal picture dating from the second century.

Another illustration of the point in hand is furnished by the story of the crucifixion. According to Mark and Matthew, when Jesus uttered the cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" a man ran and gave Him drink (Mark xv. 36; Matt. xxvii. 48). But this act stands in no logical relation with the cry. Why should these words of mental anguish lead any one to

give Jesus physical refreshment? Here is a manifest obscurity. The fourth Gospel removes it by telling us that Jesus uttered the word, "I thirst" (John xix. 28). It was on account of this cry, therefore, that the drink was given to Him.

These cases may suffice to show how this narrative of the fourth Gospel, which is manifestly independent of the Synoptists, fits into the Synoptic story, completing, explaining, and justifying it, as we might expect if the author was an independent eye-witness, or one who had access to the testimony of such a witness, but as we certainly could not expect from a religious writer of the second century.

Again, the trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel as regards the *events* of the life of Jesus which are therein recorded, seems to receive additional support from the fact that it does not hesitate to *depart* from the representation of the Synoptists. For it is generally admitted that its author was acquainted with the Synoptists¹ and he probably knew at least as much as we regarding their indirect apostolic origin. It seems probable that Mark had been in use many years before the fourth Gospel was written, also that Luke and Matthew had been circulated for a number of years. Such being the case, a new and divergent narrative could scarcely have received the indorsement of the churches unless it was supported by unquestionable historical acquaintance with the facts and by apostolic authority.

¹ Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 453.

As examples of what is meant by the fourth Gospel's divergence from the Synoptists, we may mention the following points. The Synoptists put the triumphal entry on the same day with the journey from Jericho, but according to the fourth Gospel it came on the first day of the week, after Jesus had spent a day and two nights in Bethany (Mark xi. 1; Matt. xxi. 1; Luke xix. 28, 29; John xii. 1). The Synoptists put the anointing in Bethany *two* days before the Passover (Mark xiv. 1; Matt. xxvi. 2); the fourth Gospel puts it *six* days before the feast (John xii. 1). The second Gospel says that Jesus was crucified the *third* hour (Mark xv. 25); the fourth Gospel says it was about the *sixth* hour when Pilate passed judgment on Jesus (John xix. 14). The Synoptists represent the burial of Jesus as being performed hastily, the body being simply wound in a linen cloth (Mark xv. 46; Matt. xxvii. 59, 60; Luke xxiii. 53, 54); the fourth Gospel says it was embalmed as the custom of the Jews is to bury, and that about one hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes were used (John xix. 39, 40). It is impossible that such a narrative was received by the Church early in the second century unless it was known to proceed from a man of recognized authority.

The Discourses of the Fourth Gospel.

The discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel are less like those of the Synoptists than the narrative parts of John are like the Synoptic narrative of the same events.

And yet I think we must regard these discourses as essentially trustworthy. I say *essentially* trustworthy, for it is to be admitted at the outset that the teaching of Jesus is not given with the same historical accuracy, as regards its *form*, that characterizes the Synoptic version.¹ It has received a deep personal coloring from the devoted and profound mind through which it has passed. This appears from the wide difference between the Johannean discourses of Jesus and His words as recorded by the Synoptists, both as to style and content. It appears also from the fact that the discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel are sometimes indistinguishable from the words of the evangelist. We can scarcely admit all that Holtzmann² claims, who says that "the addresses, formally considered, are the *property* of the author," and that "they form a *compact* mass with the explanations of the evangelist as regards language and content"; but that there is a considerable element of truth in the claim nearly all scholars admit. It is not necessary therefore to dwell on this point.

The report of the teaching of Jesus in the fourth Gospel is accepted as essentially trustworthy because, first, its portrait of Christ, notwithstanding many peculiarities, is in fundamental harmony with that of the

¹ Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 605; Sanday in *Contemporary Review*, 1891; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 127-130; Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, 1890, p. 426.

² *Einleitung*, p. 461. But we must agree with Holtzmann, also Weiss and Sanday, as against Wendt, that the fourth Gospel has an "essential and indissoluble unity." It cannot be divided into earlier and later parts.

Synoptists. Thus in the fourth Gospel Jesus claims a unique knowledge of God (John iii. 13; v. 20; vi. 46; xvii. 11, 12, 25), a unique mission from God (John v. 36; vi. 29; vii. 28; viii. 42; xvii. 18), and a unique union with God (John xiv. 10, 11; xv. 22-24; xvii. 21, 22). These claims are elaborated in the fourth Gospel beyond what we have in the Synoptists, but the claims themselves are not new. Matthew and Luke record words of Jesus which involve all these claims (*e.g.* Matt. xi. 25-27; Luke x. 21, 22). Thus they represent Jesus as saying, "All things have been delivered unto me by my Father." That implies all that is said in the fourth Gospel about the unique mission of Jesus. Again, we read in the Synoptists, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son." Here is the claim of a unique knowledge of the Father as clear and as strong as that of the fourth Gospel. And these two claims imply all that is meant by the fourth Gospel when it speaks of a unique union of Jesus and the Father. The very consciousness of Messiahship, which is as positive in the Synoptists as in John, implies a consciousness of an altogether peculiar relation to the Father. Take the testimony that came to the soul of Jesus in the hour of baptism, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" (Mark i. 11). The Christology of the fourth Gospel does not go beyond this.

It is true that Jesus in the fourth Gospel alludes to His preëxistence, and does not in the Synoptists, but the thought of preëxistence in the fourth Gospel, that is

in the words of Jesus, is in no sense a vital feature of the Messiah, it appears incidentally.¹ This point is not always recognized. Holtzmann,² for example, presses the words of Jesus in John iii. 11, 12; vi. 46; x. 18, and finds in them also the thought of preëxistence. This view, however, is exegetically untenable. Jesus never claims to have been taught by the Father before He came into the world. As a rule, He uses the *present* tense when speaking of the Father's communications to Him (John v. 20, 30; xiv. 10). Thus the Father *shows* Him from day to day what He does, and Jesus speaks what He *sees* and *hears* with the Father in the perfect spiritual fellowship which He has with Him.

And moreover, the teaching of Jesus that His union with the Father is *morally* conditioned (e.g. John viii. 29; xv. 10) certainly involves that His unique knowledge of the Father was acquired in His earthly life. Therefore it cannot be affirmed that in the words of Jesus in the fourth Gospel the doctrine of preëxistence appears otherwise than in an incidental manner.

We hold that the portrait of Christ in the fourth Gospel is in fundamental harmony with that of the Synoptists. But some writers³ find a repression of the true humanity of Jesus in the fourth Gospel, which corresponds to its supposed exaggeration of His divinity. This repression in the matter of Christ's inner develop-

¹ Comp. Delff, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1892, p. 99.

² *Einleitung*, p. 455.

³ E.g., *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 455.

ment, is seen also in connection with the baptism, the temptation, the need of prayer, the struggle in Gethsemane, and the sufferings on the cross. But if, when one speaks of inner development, one thinks of Christ's Messianic consciousness, then we may reply that in the Synoptic Gospels also there is no evidence whatever that Jesus was more certain of His Messiahship at the end of His ministry than He was at the beginning. There was development in the disciples' *apprehension* of His Messiahship in the Synoptists and also in John, but the Synoptic narrative brings before us a Christ who, from the hour of His baptism, had a serene and perfect assurance of His Messiahship.

It is true that in the fourth Gospel the baptism of Jesus is not said to have had any significance for Jesus Himself, but to have been a sign for the Baptist (John i. 32-34); true also that the temptation, the struggle in Gethsemane, and the cry of loneliness on the cross are omitted; but it is surely unjustifiable to argue from this silence that the author wishes to repress the humanity of Christ. These events had been described by the Synoptists, and, as a rule, the fourth Gospel brings forward other matter than is contained in the first three. But further, how can this idea of a repression of the humanity of Jesus have any weight in view of such decided affirmations as we find, for example, in John iv. 6, where Jesus is represented as being *wearied* with His journey; in iv. 22, where He joins Himself with the Jews and says, "*We* worship that which we know";

in v. 19, where Jesus explicitly repudiates what the Jews affirm that He claimed, namely, equality with God. He declares on the contrary that He is wholly dependent upon the Father. And what becomes of the idea of a repression of the humanity of Jesus, in view also of John viii. 40, where Jesus speaks of Himself as “a *man* that hath told you the truth;” and xi. 35, where it is said that Jesus *wept*; and xx. 17, where Jesus says, “My Father and your Father, *my God* and your God”?

These passages are also a sufficient answer to the point that the Christ of the fourth Gospel does not betray a need of prayer as does the Christ of the Synoptists. In support of this objection, John xi. 42 is cited, where Jesus says that His words of thanksgiving are spoken on account of the multitude; also xii. 30 and xvii. 13. But the first of these passages, which alone has even an apparent pertinence, proves the very opposite of what it is thought to prove. For when Jesus says, “I knew that thou hearest me *always*,” it is certainly plain that He was in the habit of praying.

He who seeks to show that the author of the fourth Gospel minimizes the humanity of Jesus undertakes a large task, and must discover a great deal more and better evidence than has yet been adduced before his assertion will have any plausibility.

Again, the essential trustworthiness of that version of the teaching of Jesus which we have in the fourth Gospel is supported by the twofold fact that in numerous points it differs from the Synoptic version, while *at*

the same time its peculiarities are consistent with the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists. It has its peculiarities, just as we should expect if the Gospel is from an independent and able source. The teaching of Jesus is by no means identical in Mark and Matthew, or Mark and Luke. Still less should we expect that a man capable of producing the fourth Gospel, a man of the speculative and imaginative power which appears there and in the first epistle by the same author, not to mention the Apocalypse, — that a man of such gifts would have received the same impressions from the Great Teacher which Peter received, or would have emphasized the same truths. In the teaching of Jesus regarding Himself, and regarding His Successor with His disciples, regarding the future of His cause, and other points, the fourth Gospel has peculiarities, in some cases very noteworthy, but these peculiar features combine harmoniously with the teaching of the Synoptists. They complete rather than mar the great portrait. This proposition cannot be proven here in detail, but one or two illustrations of its provableness may appropriately be given.

Every thoughtful reader of the Gospels is struck by the fact that while Jesus, according to the Synoptists, did not make a public *verbal* claim to Messiahship till near the close of His ministry, in the fourth Gospel we have the most outspoken claim almost at the beginning of His public work. Furthermore, this contrast is heightened by the fact that according to the Synoptists

there is an effort on Christ's part to prevent the proclamation of Himself as the Messiah. Thus He enjoined silence upon the demoniacs who addressed Him as the Son of God (Mark i. 34; iii. 12, etc.). Again, He insisted that those who had witnessed the raising of the daughter of Jairus should not tell of it (Mark v. 43), and when the apostles at Cæsarea Philippi confessed that they still believed Him to be the Messiah, though most people were turning from him, He charged them not to make Him known (Matt. xvi. 20). Now these representations seem to reveal a radical difference of policy, if not a radical difference in the apprehension of His Messiahship, but this is not really the case. There are two facts which must be taken into consideration. First, it seems that in Galilee, the home of the inflammable Zealot party (see Acts v. 37; Mark iii. 18), the populace were more readily moved to insurrectionary steps than in Judea. So in Galilee Jesus forbade the leper, whom He had healed, to tell of the miracle (Mark i. 44); but across the lake, in the semi-Gentile Decapolis, He commanded the healed demoniac to do just what He had prohibited in Galilee (Mark v. 19). So it seems not improbable that the Galilean character itself may account in some measure for the reserve of Jesus in regard to all merely verbal claims to Messiahship.

The second fact to be taken into consideration is yet more important. It is true that, according to the Synop-
tists, the public verbal claim to Messiahship was made late in the ministry, and then not in Galilee but in Jer-

usalem ; but it is also true that Messiahship was *virtually* and *fully* claimed even from the beginning of Christ's public work. Thus demoniacs are said to have recognized Jesus as the Holy One of God, and He did not deny it (Mark i. 24). He claimed authority to forgive sin (Mark ii. 10). He said that He was lord of the Sabbath and greater than the temple (Mark ii. 28 ; Matt. xii. 6). He claimed to be the fulfiller of the law (Matt. v. 17). He said that all things had been delivered unto Him by the Father (Matt. xi. 27). Thus it appears that He laid claim to Messiahship from the very beginning of His ministry according to the Synoptists as well as according to the fourth Gospel.

In view of this virtual claim to Messiahship which we find at the beginning of the Synoptic narrative, the argument of Schürer¹ and Wendt² against the historical character of John i. 33, 34, loses much of its force.

Or we may take the doctrine of the parousia. This is prominent in the Synoptists, but does not once clearly appear in the fourth Gospel. Here we have the thought of Christ's spiritual presence with His disciples ; but no reference to a future coming. There is, however, no incongruity between the idea of spiritual presence and the idea of the parousia, at least, according to one possible interpretation of that difficult term. The fourth Gospel rather supplements the Synoptic teaching. Both ideas alike are involved in the conception of Messiahship. Jesus, because conscious of being the Mes-

¹ *Contemporary Review*, 1891.

² *Die Lehre Jesu*, Vol. I. 1886.

siah, knew that He should rise from the dead, and that in coming time His cause would rise and triumph. He knew also that He should judge men. But for the same reason he knew that His death and removal from the sight of His disciples would not mean that they were to be left orphans. In that case His Kingdom could not continue. Out of the same consciousness of Messiahship in which the conviction of a future return was rooted, there sprang inevitably the conviction of a continuation of vital contact between Him and His disciples, to be realized in His spiritual Successor.

But this line need not be continued further. Enough has been said to define the position which is taken. The trustworthy character of the fourth Gospel's report both of the outward course of the life of Jesus and also of His teaching is accepted, and accepted simply on critical and historical grounds.

While holding the historical trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel, I would by no means deny all weight to the objections which are urged by such scholars as Schürer, Holtzmann, and Jülicher; but they do not seem to me to make out a case. It may be noticed in passing that these writers deal chiefly with the internal evidence, and they doubtless regard this as of paramount importance. We must not, however, undervalue the external evidence, or forget that it has been growing more and more invincible from year to year.¹

¹ On this phase of the argument see especially Ezra Abbott, *Critical Essays*, 1888; and J. B. Lightfoot in *Expositor* for 1890.

The historical trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel does not stand or fall with its authorship by the Apostle John. The argument for its composition by him seems to me stronger than the argument that he did not write it; but even though written by a pupil of John, or by John the Presbyter,¹ it does not therefore lose its historical value.

There is yet one objection which is urged over and over again, to which I wish briefly to refer. It is that the Galilean fisherman, who as late as 52 A.D. was an apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii 9), "a narrow legal Christian," could not have developed into the author of the fourth Gospel, who is radically opposed to the Jewish people, who thinks that an irrevocable sentence of condemnation has been pronounced upon them, who has a Greek philosophical training, and whose world of thought is much more Hellenistic than Jewish.²

It may be observed, in the first place, that it is not safe to say that John might not have become the author of the fourth Gospel because he was at first a Galilean *fisherman*. The town of Nazareth was also in Galilee, and one might as well expect great things from a fisherman as from a carpenter. Then we plainly have no right to say that John was a narrow legal Christian in 52 A.D. It is true that he was an apostle unto the

¹ Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, 1897, p. 677, inclines to this view.

² See Schürer in *Contemporary Review*, 1891; Holtzmann's *Einleitung*, pp. 468-470; and Jülicher's *Einleitung*, p. 255.

Jews, with James and Peter, but he had taken part in receiving the Samaritans, who were esteemed as Gentiles; and Peter, with whom he was associated, had preceded Paul in welcoming the Gentiles to the faith. He, with James and Peter, gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul, thus indorsing his work among the Gentiles. From the fact that he regarded himself as providentially set apart to the work among the Jews, we cannot infer that his Christianity was narrow. Therefore we cannot say positively that an extraordinary change must have taken place in John between 52 A.D. and about 90 A.D., if he was the author of the fourth Gospel. We simply do not know how catholic he was in 52 A.D.

As regards the author's way of speaking of the Jews, it is explained by the judgment of God upon the Jewish people in the destruction of Jerusalem according to the prophecy of Jesus. The kingdom of heaven had been taken from them and had been given to the Gentiles (Mark xii. 9). There is nothing, however, in the fourth Gospel to indicate that the author regarded their future as wholly without hope.

Finally, "the philosophical training" manifested by the author is rather imaginary than real. It is doubtful whether even the Prologue of the fourth Gospel presupposes any such training on the part of the author. The conception of the Logos has, perhaps, better roots in the Old Testament and in the teaching of Jesus than it has in Philo. It is quite true that in the fourth Gospel there is "a primary and fundamental contrast" between

the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, between God and the devil, between light and darkness, and truth and falsehood. But that fundamental contrast is as old as the oldest Scripture, and did not need to be borrowed from Gnostic philosophers. And by whom was it the more probable that this contrast would be deeply felt and positively expressed,—by one who had long companied with Jesus Christ and had caught His spirit, or by Gnostic philosophers, before whose eyes Jesus, the revealer of God, was a hazy and half-divine being?

This Gospel which, as Lightfoot says, is thoroughly saturated with the Messianic ideas of the time of Jesus, this Gospel whose portrait of Christ is in fundamental accord with that of the Synoptists, whose narrative, though plainly independent of the Synoptists, is as plainly self-consistent and self-legitimizing,—this Gospel is not, I think, appreciatively judged when it is regarded as “a philosophical fiction, with religious tendency, dating from the third Christian generation,” or regarded as an idealization of the earthly life of Jesus, blended with the development of the Christian Church through the first century of its history.

And who, we may ask with Beyschlag, in conclusion, who is the wondrous stranger of the second century, who, untouched by any of its weaknesses, towered a full head above all the ecclesiastical dignitaries of his time, and nevertheless, personally considered, remained absolutely unknown?

Had there lived in the second century a man capable of producing the fourth Gospel, we should doubtless find abundant personal traces of him. But we know the great men of that century, and know that there was not among them one who distantly approached the mental stature of the author of the fourth Gospel.

4. THE GOSPEL OUTSIDE THE GOSPELS

If our New Testament began with the Book of Acts, we could still form a tolerably complete outline of the life of Jesus. It is true that the great evidence of the New Testament writings from Acts onward is evidence which firmly establishes the fact that beneath them and behind them a new and divine *force* had come into the world through a certain Jesus; and yet they contain a good many specific references to points in the life of Jesus, some of them incidental in character, others introduced as being of fundamental significance. A large part of these references are earlier than the earliest of the Synoptic Gospels. It is therefore the more important that we notice the outline of this earliest Gospel.

It includes the following points: Jesus was born of the seed of David (Rom. i. 3); His mother's name was Mary (Acts i. 14); He had several brothers (1 Cor. ix. 5), one of whom bore the name James (Gal. i. 19); and He was in body and spirit a true man (Rom. i. 3, 4; Phil. ii. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 5; iii. 16; Heb. iv. 15, etc.).

He was heralded by John the Baptist, who declared himself unworthy to loose the shoes of the coming One (Acts xiii. 25), and who prepared His way by the baptism of repentance (Acts xiii. 24). The ministry of Jesus began in the days of the Baptist (Acts i. 22), and was spent in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem (Acts x. 39), an important part of it being spent in Galilee (Acts xiii. 31). This ministry was primarily for the Jews (Rom. xv. 8). Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit (Acts x. 38) at the time of His baptism (1. John v. 6). He gathered around Him a company of disciples which at His death numbered more than five hundred (1 Cor. xv. 6), and appointed twelve to be apostles (1 Cor. xv. 5), whose names are given (Acts i. 13, 16). His life was marked by mighty works and wonders and signs which God wrought by Him (Acts ii. 22). He went about doing good, healing all who were oppressed of the devil (Acts x. 38), and the manifest aim of His life was to destroy the devil's works (1 John iii. 8). He was a poor man (2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 7), meek and gentle in manner (2 Cor. x. 1).

He was a *holy* man (1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 22, 23), a living condemnation of all sin, and so unlike the law's condemnation which consisted in a dead letter (Rom. viii. 3). And yet He was tempted as other men (Heb. iv. 15), and was made perfect through sufferings (Heb. ii. 10). He was the manifestation of the love of God (1 John iv. 9; Eph. iii. 19; v. 2), and as such He pleased not Himself (Rom. xv. 3), but was the servant

of others, teaching that it is more blessed to give than to receive (Acts xx. 35), and at last He gave Himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6). He was a faithful witness (Rev. i. 5), the sum of whose message was that God is light (1 John i. 5), and His teaching was such that it became law to His followers (Gal. vi. 2; Col. iii. 16). The sum of His ethics for His disciples was that they should love each other (1 John iv. 21).

Sometime in His earthly life, on a certain mountain, His disciples had been granted a singular manifestation of His glory, and had received divine assurance that He was the Christ (2 Peter i. 16-18). At last He was betrayed to the rulers by Judas, an apostle (Acts xiii. 27; i. 16). The Jews condemned Him to death in Jerusalem (Acts iv. 27; xiii. 27). He was afterward brought before Herod and Pontius Pilate (Acts iv. 27), and Pilate was determined to release Him (Acts iii. 13), but failed, as the Jews asked that a murderer be granted to them instead of Jesus (Acts iii. 14). No cause of death was found in Him (Acts xiii. 28), but yet He was crucified outside the city, both Jews and Gentiles participating in His death (Heb. xiii. 12; Acts iv. 27; ii. 23).

In the night of His betrayal, He instituted a supper for His disciples, giving them bread as a symbol of His body, and wine as a symbol of His blood, and He asked them to keep this supper in memory of Him (1. Cor. xi. 23-26). When death was approaching, He prayed in an agony that He might be

delivered from it, but though He was heard, His specific request was not granted, and He was perfected as a Redeemer, through suffering (Heb. v. 7-9). Through these words we can see the entire scene in Gethsemane as described by the evangelists.

When Jesus had expired on the cross, His body was taken down and laid in a tomb (Acts xiii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 4). On the third day He rose, or was raised by God (1 Thess. iv. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 14, etc.), and through many days (Acts xiii. 31) or forty days (Acts i. 3), He was manifested to chosen witnesses, who were largely Galileans (Acts x. 41; xiii. 31). Of these appearances at least five are particularized, — one to Peter, one to James, two to all the apostles, and one to more than five hundred brethren at once (1 Cor. xv. 5-7). When this statement was written, both Peter and James were alive, and, as far as we know, all the other apostles, with the exception of James, the brother of John; and of the five hundred, the majority were still living. This Risen One showed Himself alive by many proofs (Acts i. 3). He spoke with His disciples, and they ate and drank with Him (Acts x. 41; i. 3). He told them that they should soon be baptized with the Holy Spirit, that they should be His witnesses unto the end of the earth; and then He was taken up (Acts i. 9), or was received up (Acts i. 22), or He ascended (Eph. iv. 10).

In this mass of specific information, much of it earlier than any one of our canonical Gospels, there is

nothing which is at variance with the detailed accounts of the evangelists. There are some notable omissions, — for example, the omission of any reference to the supernatural conception of Jesus; and there are some notable additions, as the appearance of the risen Lord to more than five hundred brethren at once: but still the outline contained in these references, which are drawn from various writers, some of whom were eye-witnesses and some not, is in remarkable agreement with the outline of the Gospels, and offers strong substantiation of their account of the essential facts in the life of Jesus Christ.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Anna, witness of, 28.
 Annas, Jesus before, 281-283.
 Apostles, appointment, 134-135.
 number, 135-137.
 purpose of appointment, 137-138.
 mission, 149-155.
 return to Jesus, 163-164.
 journey with Jesus, 178-180.
 tested, 185-192.
 ambition rebuked, 200-202, 232.
 feet washed, 262-264.
 Appearances of the risen Lord, 320-330.
 Arrest of Jesus, 278-281.
 Ascension of Jesus, 332-334.
 Augustus, the census of, 14-15.
 Authority, the question of, 245-247.
- Baptism of Jesus, 45-56.
 by Jesus, 101-103.
 Bethany, friends of Jesus in, 225-226.
 feast in, 233-236.
 Bethesda, sign, 157-160.
 Birth of Jesus, the place, 12-19.
 the date, 19-24.
 Blind man healed in Jerusalem, 211-213.
 Brothers of Jesus, 7-9, 35-36.
 their opposition to Jesus, 141-142.
 last conversation with, 202-203.
 Burial of Jesus, 309-310.
- Cæsarea Philippi, in the region of, 187-197.
 Cana, wedding in, 84-90.
 second visit in, 111-112.
 Capernaum, first visit in, 90-91.
 second visit in, 112-129.
 third visit in, 130-143.
 synagogue address in, 173-174.
 Centurion of Capernaum, 139-140.
 Children, treatment of, 202, 220-221.
 Chronology of the life of Jesus, 72-78.
- Circumcision of Jesus, 26-28.
 Coin in fish's mouth, 198-200.
 Commandment, the greatest, 250.
 Conception of Jesus, 2-11.
 Criticism of sources, 335-337.
 Cross, words from, 301-304.
 Crucifixion of Jesus, 298-301.
- Darkness on day of crucifixion, 304.
 David's son, 250-251.
 Death and resurrection announced, 190-192, 197-198, 231.
 Death of Jesus, 307-308.
 Decapolis, work in, 180-185.
 Demoniac possession, 117-123.
 Disciples, the first, 80-84.
 call of four, 112-114.
 call of Levi, 131-132.
 mission of seventy, 150-153, 217-218.
 Divorce, question of, 218-220.
- Early life of Jesus, record of, 1-2.
 Earthquake at death of Jesus, 306-307.
 at resurrection, 316-317.
 Education of Jesus, the home circle, 33-37.
 the study of the law, 37-40.
 the study of nature, 40-41.
 the study of man, 41-44.
 Egypt, flight to, 31-32.
 Enrolment under Quirinius, 14-19.
 Entry into Jerusalem, 236-241.
 Ephraim, Jesus in, 229.
- Fig tree, the barren, 242-244.
- Galilee, early ministry in, 110-155.
 later ministry in, 163-203.
 tours in, 129-130, 149-150, 174-178.
 last incidents in, 197-203.
 Genealogy of Jesus, 6-7.
 Gerasene demoniac, 144-146.
 Gethsemane, 273-278.

- Golgotha, procession to, 297-298.
 Gospel outside the Gospels, 402-406.
- Healing the sick, 123-129.
 Herod baffled, 31-32.
 Herodians, 132.
- Jacob's well, 105-109.
 Jairus' daughter, 146-148.
 Jericho, Jesus at, 229-231.
 Jerusalem, at feast of Purim, 156-162.
 last labors for, 204-215.
 at feast of Dedication, 214-215.
 last journey to, 229-231.
- John, Gospel of, 383-402.
 narratives in Gospel, 384-389.
 discourses in Gospel, 390-402.
- John the Baptist, 45-48.
 arrest of, 104-105.
- Judas, choice of, 136
 departure from upper chamber, 264-265.
 death of, 296-297.
- Judea, early ministry in, 92-103.
- Knowledge of Jesus supernatural, 83-84, 107, 226.
- Last days, 233.
 public teaching, 244-245.
 words to disciples, 269-273.
- Lazarus raised, 226-229.
- Magi, 28-31.
- Mary and the record of Jesus' birth, 8.
 opposition to Jesus, 141-142.
- Ministry of Jesus, length of, 67-71.
 beginning of, 80-91.
- Miracles, 87-90, 127-129, 147-148.
- Multitudes fed, five thousand, 165-169.
 four thousand, 180-183.
- Nicodemus, 98-101.
- Parables, biographical hints in, 142-143.
- Passover, the last, 255-265.
- Perea, ministry in, 216-224.
- Peter, confession of, 187-190.
 denial of, 283-286.
- Pharisees, at meat with, 160-162.
 condemnation of, 176-178, 251-252.
- Presentation of Jesus, 26-28.
- Purim, feast of, 156-162.
- Resurrection, question of, 248-249.
 of Jesus, 317-320.
 objective reality of, 330-332.
- Ruler, the young, 221-222.
- Sabbath, works on, 132-133, 158, 213.
- Samaria, Jesus in, 105-109, 205-206.
- Scribes, opposition of, 140-141.
 warnings against, 251-252.
- Sealing the tomb, 310-313.
- Shepherds, the, 24-26.
- Simeon's testimony, 27-28.
- Son of man, 131.
- Sources of the life of Jesus, 335-406.
- Spirit, His descent upon Jesus, 50-56.
 successor of Jesus, 272-273.
- Star of Magi, 22, 29-31.
- Storm on the lake, 143-144.
- Supper, the Lord's, 266-269.
- Sychar, 104-109.
- Synoptic Gospels, problem of, 337-342.
 present state of discussion of, 342-344.
 solution of problem of, 344-379.
 historicity of, 379-383.
- Syrophenician woman, 179-180.
- Tabernacles, to the feast of, 204-207.
- Teaching of Jesus, 114-116.
- Temple cleansed, 93-95.
 sign of, 95-97.
 prophecy concerning, 253-255.
- Temptation of Jesus, data of, 57-60.
 form of, 60-62.
 content of, 62-65.
 through life, 65-66.
- Topography of life of Jesus, 78-79.
- Transfiguration of Jesus, 192-196.
- Trial of Jesus, by Sanhedrin, 286-289.
 by Pilate, 289-291, 293-296.
 by Herod Antipas, 291-293.
- Tribute, question of, 247-248.
- Veil of temple rent, 304-306.
- Walking on the lake, 169-173.
- Women at the tomb, 314-317.

INDEX OF PASSAGES FROM THE GOSPELS¹

MATTHEW		CHAPTER	PAGE
CHAPTER		CHAPTER	PAGE
I. 1-17, 16, 18	6	VII. 24	139
18	7	VIII. 5	179
19, 19-21, 24	33	5-13	125, 139
18-25	2	10	139
20	37	11, 12	140
22, 23	10	13, 16	124
25	36	14, 15, 16-17	123
II. I	12, 19	19, 20, 21, 22	223
1-12	28	31	118
4	282	32	145
7-8, 16-18	31	IX. 9	131
14, 21-22	33	14	132
16	13, 22, 30	15	133
22	2	18-26	147
23	13	28	126, 127
III. I	59	32	117, 119
4	60	35	124, 149
11	102	37	149
11, 12	99	X.	153
12	46, 81	1	119
13-17	48	5	109
14	80	5-6	135
14, 17	47	10	154
15	49, 50, 54, 55	17-38	176
IV. 1-II	57	24, 27, 32-33	115
3	199	29	40
3, 4	62	32	120
5-7	64	XI. 2-6, 11	47
8-10	65	4, 5	101
12	75, 92, 103, 105	5	128
23	124, 129	6	187
V. 1, 13, 14	138, 139	XI. 9-11	80
17	108, 139	11	3
44, 45	41	14	48
VI. 13	59	18	45
26, 28-30	40	20-24	176, 184
VII. 8	116	28	175
15, 16-21, 24-26	42	XII. 2	132
		6	79, 199

¹ The passages cited in the Appendix are not included.

CHAPTER	PAGE	CHAPTER	PAGE
XII. 9, 10	114	XVIII. 10	34, 202
9-14	132	XIX.	77
22	117, 119, 120, 140	I	153, 204
27	140	3-12	219
28	84, 125, 141, 144, 228	4, 5, 9, 13-15	220
38-42	185	16-26, 17	221
38-45, 46-50	141	XX. 1-16	42, 223
39-40	190	17-19	191, 231
XIII. 1	114	17, 29	204
19, 38	41	20	232
33, 44	42	XXI. 1	233
47-50	42, 143	1, 3, 7	238
53-58	149	9	237, 239
55	33, 34, 36	10, 14	240
XIV. 1, 12, 13	164	13	93
14, 17	165	15, 16	241
23	169	18	242
28-31	172	19, 28-32, 33-46	243
33	173	23	114, 282
34-36	175	23-27, 31, 32	246
36	124	XXII. 1-14	243
XV. 1-20	176	15-22	247
12, 13	177	23-33	248
21	78	34, 35	249
21-28, 24	179	41	250
29	114	XXIII.	42, 94
30	124	1-12, 13-31	251
30-31	180	32, 33, 35, 36, 37-39	252
32-39	181	37	68
39	183	XXIV.-XXV.	253
XVI. 4	185	XXIV. 1	252
5-12	186	29-31, 36, 39, 42	254
9, 10	182	XXV. 31-46	42
13, 14, 15	187	XXVI. 6-13	235
14	46, 129	14-16	236
17	188	14-16, 20	261
18	83, 189	17, 18	260
19	189	21	265
21	190	23	263
23	136	26-29	266
24, 25	192	28	267
XVII. 7, 8	193	30-35	269
12, 13	196	32	321, 329, 332
14-20	197	39-46, 40	274
22, 23	191	41	275
24, 25	198	47	278
XVIII. 1-14	200	48-50	279

CHAPTER	PAGE	CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. 27	41	VII. 19	178
35, 38	130	24	138, 174, 178
V. 1-20	180, 217	24-30, 31	179
2	117	25	117
5	158	31-VIII. 12	217
7	120	32	124, 126
8	122	32-36	180
13, 17, 18	145	33, 34	125
14	144	36	180
17, 18, 21	143	VIII. 1	180
17, 19	146	1-10, 2	181
21-43, 25-34	147	5-32, 14-30	253
23, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40-42	148	10, 11	183
24	147	11, 13, 22, 23, 26	184
25	124	12	305
27	125	13, 22	185
34	126	14, 14-21	186
40	94, 100	19, 20	182
VI. 2	38	22	78, 124, 126
2, 3	39, 149	22-25	126
3	33, 34, 36, 85	23	124
5	126, 158	27	138
6, 1-6	149	27, 28, 29	187
7	122, 137, 152	31, 32	190
7-13	153	32	81
8, 9, 10, 34	154	33	66
13	118, 119	34	42
14	187	34-35, 38	192
14, 30, 31, 33	164	35	97
17	104	34, 35, 38	305
19	178	IX. 1, 30-33	192
27, 28	292	5, 6, 7, 8	193
30	155	9, 11, 12	196
30-32	75, 78	10	232
33, 34, 38	165	14-29, 30, 31, 33	197
43	166, 239	18	119
45, 46	169	20, 38	118
45-53	90	21, 25	120
48	170, 171	25	117, 122
51-52	173	30-32	191
52	183	30, 34, 35	201
53-56	175	32	81
56	124, 125	33	232, 263
VII. 1	161, 178, 184	33-50	200
1-23	176	35	189
1, 24, 31	78	36	34
5, 10-13, 17	177	38-41	202

INDEX OF PASSAGES

413

CHAPTER	PAGE	CHAPTER	PAGE
IX. 42	42	XIV. 12, 13, 13-15	260
X. 1	76, 153, 217	12-17	241
1, 32, 46	204	12, 18, 26, 43	255
1-45	77	17, 51, 52	262
2-12	219	20	263
6-8, 9, 13-16	220	22-25	266
13-16	34	24	267
17-27	221	26-31	269
22, 29, 30	222	28	320, 321, 329, 332
32-34	191	35, 36, 38, 47, 50	275
32-34, 47, 48, 52	231	33, 34, 35-42, 37, 41	274
35-37, 38-40	232	43	278
38	276	47, 50	280
43-45	263	50	315
46-XI. 1	233	53, 54	280
52	124, 126	54	283, 284
XI. 1, 3	238	57, 58	96
9	237	62	100
10	239	64	288
11	241	65	289
12, 13, 14, 20	242	XV. 1	286, 287, 289
14	243	1, 24, 42	255
18	244	8-9, 10, 11, 15	293
27-33	47, 246	15	294
30	49	16	289
XII. 1-12	243	21	259, 297
13-17	247	21, 46	256
16, 17	42	25	298
18-27	248	29	96, 298
24	249	36	299
28, 34	250	29, 30, 31, 32	300
37, 38-40	251	33, 38	304
38, 39, 41-44	252	34	301
XIII. 1	252	35, 36, 40	302
2, 5, 9, 13, 23, 24-27,		37	303
30, 32	253	37, 44	307
32	254	39	308
2, 30, 24-27	254	41	137
XIV. 1, 2	242	42	260
1, 10, 18	265	43	309
2	158, 278	46	260, 309
44, 45	279	47	310, 311
3	161	XVI. 1	310, 314
3-9	162, 234	2	316
6, 9	235	3	311
10, 11	236	5-6, 8	318
10, 11, 17	261	6, 7	319

INDEX OF PASSAGES

415

CHAPTER	PAGE	CHAPTER	PAGE
IX. 51	77, 151, 204	XVIII. 18-30	221
52	105	31	77, 204
52, 53, 54, 56	205	31-34	191, 231
57, 58, 59, 60	223	34	81
X.	150, 151, 153	35	229
1-12, 17	218	XIX. 1-10	230
13-16	176	1-10, 12	42
17	118, 217	5	229
18	62	28, 29	234
20	122	29, 31	238
33	106, 206	37, 41-44	239
38-42	77, 225	39, 40	240
51	151	41-44	227
XI. 1	140	48	244
4, 20	228	XX. 1-8	246
20	84, 125, 141	9-18	243
24-26, 29-32	141	20-26	247
29-32	185	27-38	248
30	191	XXI. 1-4	252, 346
XII. 28	228	5, 8-36	253
49-53	217	28	254
50	276	38	244
XIII. 1, 4	42	XXII. 3-6	236
6	242	3-6, 14	261
6-9, 24-30, 32	217	8, 9, 10-12	260
7	70	14	262
10-17	132	15-20	266
11, 13	124	18	268
15	133	31-34	269
22	204	19	267
31	186	21	264, 265
31, 32, 33	224	24-26	263
31-33	77	28	66
34	68	39-46, 34, 44	274
34, 35	252	46	275
XIV. 1-6	132	47	278
1-24	161	47-48	279
2	124	50, 51	280
15-24	243	51	124
24	217	54	280
28-33	176	54, 66	284
XV. 3-7	42	61	285
XVI. 1-12, 19-31	223	66	286
XVII. 11-19	77, 206	XXIII. 1	289
14	124	2	290
14, 19	126	5	291
XVIII. 15-17	220	8-12, 11	292

INDEX OF PASSAGES

417

CHAPTER	PAGE	CHAPTER	PAGE
V. 18	178	VIII. 48	106, 118, 119
18, 19, 24-26, 27, 33, 36,		48, 59	211
37, 39, 40, 45-47	159	52	118
19	203, 222, 394	57	44, 69
19, 30	52	59	207
22, 26, 37-47	160	IX. 1, 6	126
35	105	1, 8	211
VI. 1	75, 78	2, 3-7, 8-13, 16, 18-21,	
1-4	157	22, 28, 34, 35-38	212
1-VII. 10	163	2, 16	208
2	164	27, 31-33	213
3	114	33	128
3, 9	165	X. 1-16	42
4	70, 71, 75, 76, 154	10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 30, 36, 38	209
5, 9	166	18	307
13	158	20	118, 119
14, 15	168	21, 32	208
15	169, 239	22	76
15, 17	159	22, 31, 39	207
17, 19, 22	170	22, 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34-36	214
19	171	22, 39, 40	216
20, 25-58	173	23	114
25-59	114	31, 39	224
66, 67	174	35, 36, 39, 40	215
66-71	186	38	128
70, 71	136	40	40, 218
VII. 1, 2, 10, 19, 30, 32, 44	76	40-42	77, 79
2, 23	71	42	217
2, 10, 11, 12, 32	207	XI. 4, 8, 11, 15, 16, 28, 45	226
3	103	4, 42	88
3-9	202	5	162
5	36	5, 15	225
6, 8	203	7, 54	79
10	78, 203, 205, 217	7, 17, 55	76
10-X. 40	204	17	216
12, 31, 46, 51	208	33, 36, 38, 42	227
15	39	41, 42	125
16, 28	209	41, 42, 47-53	228
20	118	45, 54	229
31, 41	210	54, 55	216
42	13	55	77
VIII. 2	114	56	236
12, 16, 18, 23, 24, 26, 28,		57	237
36, 38, 42, 55	209	XII. 1	70, 77, 79
20, 59	76	1-2	161
30	208	2-12	234
31, 32, 34, 44	210	3	162
2 E			

CHAPTER	PAGE	CHAPTER	PAGE
XII. 3, 4, 7	235	XVIII. 14, 24, 28	282
9-11	226	15	283
12-19	237	15-18, 25-27	284
13	239	15	137
16	238, 239	18, 25	285
20-36	244	19-23	282
23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32	245	24	286
27, 28	275	28	256, 258, 286, 295, 303
44-50	244	28, 38, 34-37	291
XIII. 1	70	29-30	290
1, 2-4, 25, 26-29, 34, 35	263	31	289
1-20	262	39	293
1, 21-30	255, 257	XIX. 1-5	293
26	136	4	294
26, 27	265	6, 7, 8, 9	294
27-29	258	12, 13, 15	295
30	264	14	256, 259
31-XVI. 33	269	14, 15, 20	298
35	268	17	297
XIV. 2, 3, 13, 14	271	18	77
11	129	18, 23	299
12	295	25, 26, 27, 28, 30	301
16, 17, 18, 21, 26	272	26, 35	82
21, 23, 27	270	26, 27	315
16	322	27	137
21-22	306	31	307, 309
23	263	31, 42	259
30	62, 66, 269	34, 36, 37	308
31	269	38	288, 309
XV. 1-10	42	39	309, 310, 315
3	264	40	315
26	272	41	310
9, 15	270	XX. 1	316
XVI. 7-11, 13-15, 23, 24, 26	272	1, 2	314
7	273	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	318
XVII. 1	269	17, 19, 25, 26, 27	326
1	273	11, 13	321
1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9-19, 20, 21	270	16	107
4, 11, 20, 26	272	17	222, 322, 333
23, 24, 26	270	19-23	324
10, 11, 18, 22	271	19, 22, 23, 26	325
XVIII. 1	269	22, 23	190
2	273	24	324
3	278	31	280
4-9	279	XXI. 1-22	326
8, 10, 11, 15	280	2	82, 135
13, 15, 19-23, 24	281	7, 23	327

The Student's Life of Jesus

BY

GEORGE H. GILBERT, Ph.D., D.D.

*Iowa Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in
Chicago Theological Seminary*

Cloth. \$1.25 net

"Admirable in arrangement, concise in form, with abundant indexing, this modest work speaks most eloquently to every one who would study the history of Jesus seriously, by the truly critical and scientific method."

— *The Christian Advocate.*

"It will assuredly become the *vade mecum* for the class for whom it is particularly written." — *The Evangelist.*

"Written by one who is a profound believer in the supernatural, and whose belief does not in the least prevent his application of sound criticism and practical common sense to the consideration of such questions as the miraculous birth, and the interpretation of such events as the temptation."

— *The Outlook.*

"Acuteness, candor, and conspicuous fidelity to its purpose are the notable characteristics of this volume. . . . Its claim to be scientific in method is fully justified. It is thoroughly modern in spirit and manner, . . . with a clearness, completeness, and judicial calmness which all scholars must admire. The work is admirably adapted to its end, the use of students. . . . Any ordinarily intelligent layman will like it, and it will be a useful book in the Sunday-school library, although it is not in the ordinary narrative form." — *Congregationalist.*

"A work peculiarly suited to the needs of students."

— *The Chautauquan.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

The Student's Life of Paul

BY

GEORGE H. GILBERT, Ph.D., D.D.

*Iowa Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in
Chicago Theological Seminary*

Cloth. 12mo. \$1.25 net

“Clear, compact, and critical.” — *The Outlook*.

“The aim of this book is threefold: First, to present the **Simple and scientific; accessible and usable** biography of the great apostle, entirely apart from a study of his theological teaching; second, to present the facts in as simple and scientific a manner as possible without comment and without rhetorical elaboration; third, to present the material in an accessible and usable form. There are full references to Biblical sources, and abundant references to the modern literature of the subject.” — *The Examiner*.

“A volume that will be of special service to all students. . . . We unreservedly and heartily commend this volume.”

— *Zion's Herald*.


“It is characterized by freshness of treatment, and intelligent use of the latest literature; . . . its arrangement is admirable, the style engaging.” — From a review of Dr. Gilbert's “Student's Life of Paul” in the *Christian Intelligencer*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK



BS2420 .G467 1900
The student's life of Jesus

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00034 1299