




3 3433 06824813 1

Gilbert



THE

STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS.

BY

GEORGE HOLLEY ^{o.c.} GILBERT, Ph. D., D. D.,

Iowa Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in Chicago Theological Seminary.

12195

PRESS OF
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
CHICAGO.


1896.

1905
1906

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
746441
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1916 L

COPYRIGHT, 1896.
CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY PRESS.





TO
ALL EARNEST STUDENTS
OF
THE IMMORTAL THEME,
THIS BOOK
IS
RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.

"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.

CHAPTER III.

THE EDUCATION OF JESUS	-	-	-	-	108-116
(a) The Home Circle	-	-	-	-	108
(b) The Study of the Law	-	-	-	-	111
(c) The Study of Nature	-	-	-	-	114

CHAPTER IV.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS	-	-	-	-	117-125
(a) The Data	-	-	-	-	117
(b) Significance of the Water-baptism	-	-	-	-	118
(c) The Dove and Voice	-	-	-	-	119
(d) Significance of the Spirit-baptism	-	-	-	-	121

CHAPTER V.

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS	-	-	-	-	126-135
(a) The Data	-	-	-	-	126
(b) Time and Place	-	-	-	-	127
(c) The Fasting	-	-	-	-	128
(d) The Content of the Temptations	-	-	-	-	129
(e) The Form of the Temptation	-	-	-	-	132
(f) Subsequent temptations of Jesus	-	-	-	-	134

CHAPTER VI.

A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS	-	-	-	-	136-143
(a) Length of Christ's Ministry	-	-	-	-	136
(b) Chronological Outline	-	-	-	-	139
(c) Topographical Outline	-	-	-	-	143

CHAPTER VII.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MINISTRY	-	-	-	-	144-157
(a) At the Jordan	-	-	-	-	144
(b) At Cana	-	-	-	-	148
(c) At Capernaum	-	-	-	-	155

CHAPTER VIII.

THE EARLY JUDEAN MINISTRY	-	-	-	-	158-172
(a) The Data	-	-	-	-	158
(b) First Public Act	-	-	-	-	159
(c) The Challenge of the Jews	-	-	-	-	161
(d) Signs in Jerusalem	-	-	-	-	163
(e) The Work of Preparation	-	-	-	-	169

CHAPTER IX.

TWO DAYS IN SYCHAR	-	-	-	-	-	173-179
(a) Departure from Judea	-	-	-	-	-	173
(b) At Jacob's Well and in Sychar	-	-	-	-	-	175

CHAPTER X.

THE GALILEAN MINISTRY—FIRST PART	-	-	-	-	-	180-233
(a) General View	-	-	-	-	-	180
(b) The Teaching of Jesus	-	-	-	-	-	181
(c) The Demonized	-	-	-	-	-	192
(d) The Miracles of Healing	-	-	-	-	-	199
(e) The Appointment of the Twelve	-	-	-	-	-	206
(f) Jesus on the Lake	-	-	-	-	-	211
(g) Raising the Dead	-	-	-	-	-	218
(h) The Opposition	-	-	-	-	-	222
(i) The Mission of the Twelve	-	-	-	-	-	226

CHAPTER XI.

IN JERUSALEM AT PURIM	-	-	-	-	-	234-241
(a) In General	-	-	-	-	-	234
(b) The Bethesda Sign	-	-	-	-	-	235
(c) At Meat with a Pharisee	-	-	-	-	-	236

CHAPTER XII.

THE GALILEAN MINISTRY—SECOND PART	-	-	-	-	-	242-283
(a) General View	-	-	-	-	-	242
(b) Height of Galilean Popularity	-	-	-	-	-	243
(c) Last General Messianic Work in Galilee	-	-	-	-	-	251
(d) On Heathen Soil	-	-	-	-	-	255
(e) Signs Sought and Signs Given in Decapolis	-	-	-	-	-	258
(f) At Caesarea Philippi	-	-	-	-	-	264
(g) The Final Departure from Galilee	-	-	-	-	-	278

CHAPTER XIII.

LAST LABORS FOR JERUSALEM	-	-	-	-	-	284-297
(a) The Data	-	-	-	-	-	284
(b) The Journey to Jerusalem	-	-	-	-	-	285
(c) General View of the Third Visit in Jerusalem	-	-	-	-	-	287
(d) Teaching in the Temple	-	-	-	-	-	288
(e) Testing the Jerusalem Disciples	-	-	-	-	-	292
(f) The Man Born Blind	-	-	-	-	-	293
(g) In Solomon's Porch	-	-	-	-	-	295

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PEREAN MINISTRY	- - - - -	298-305
(a) General View	- - - - -	298
(b) The Seventy	- - - - -	299
(c) Perean Incidents	- - - - -	301

CHAPTER XV.


IN BETHANY AND EPHRAIM	- - - - -	306-310
(a) In Bethany	- - - - -	306
(b) In Ephraim	- - - - -	308

CHAPTER XVI.

THE LAST EIGHT DAYS	- - - - -	311-354
(a) The Data	- - - - -	311
(b) Friday and Saturday before the Crucifixion	- - - - -	312
(c) Sunday of the Last Week	- - - - -	314
(d) Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of the Last Week	- - - - -	320
(e) Thursday of the Last Week	- - - - -	335
(f) The Day of the Crucifixion	- - - - -	357

CHAPTER XVII.

THE RESURRECTION AND THE RISEN CHRIST	- - - - -	385-405
(a) Incidents of the Sabbath	- - - - -	385
(b) The Resurrection	- - - - -	388
(c) Appearances of the Risen Lord	- - - - -	392
(d) The Objective Reality of the Resurrection	- - - - -	400
(e) The Ascension	- - - - -	403



PREFACE.

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.

March 24, 1896.

G. H. G.



12195cs

232.3
87

INTRODUCTION.

THE SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

I. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

(a) *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. They are a product of the devoted research and careful thought of Christian disciples of the first century. Their divinity 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; xxi. 24), 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 are anonymous, and though they make no claim whatever

for themselves, 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.

“ Their writings must be regarded as human history, though they are the revelation of God. And it is only from the human side that scholarship can approach them. But it is our duty to do this boldly, though with reverence, for the more we understand the human the more are we in a position to search into the deep things of God.”¹ 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

1. See *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, A. Wright, 1890.

always the same in the different Gospels, and the student must decide which order is the true one. 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 different 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. And to take still another illustration. The wide and varied differences between the Synoptists on the one hand and the fourth Gospel on the other, while they do not justify the conclusion that the fourth Gospel is unauthentic, yet support the claim that these sources must be tested by Christian scholarship.

But examples of this sort need not be multiplied. This word only may be added, that the results of the critical study of the sources in the past half century, even when that study has been carried on in an unbelieving spirit, have been of great value for the understanding of the Gospels. Like the recently discovered Röntgen rays, by which the invisible structure

of different substances can be photographed, criticism has to some extent discovered the structure and origin of the Gospels, which had been hidden for centuries. It must be honored for what it has done, and cultivated for what remains to be done.

(*b*) *The Literary Problem in the Synoptic Gospels.* A comparative analysis of the Synoptic Gospels reveals the two-fold fact that in a multitude of details they are remarkably alike, and in a multitude of details 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 all quite dif-

ferent, 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 stories 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. 12), 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 stories do really concern two different works of our Lord, or are simply different versions of one and the same event, as some scholars hold. 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 at least *thirteen* words (Mark viii. 35; Matt. xvi. 25; Luke ix. 24).¹ The identity reaches through *fourteen* words in the case of one Old Testament quotation common to all the Synoptists (Mark xii. 36; Matt. xxii. 44; Luke xx. 42). In the narrative part of the Gospel absolute verbal identity does not extend, so far as I have been able to find, beyond *three* consecutive words (Mark v. 40; Matt. ix. 24; Luke vii. 53). If we take but *two* of the three Gospels, we find the identical passages some-

¹ See the Greek text in Huck's excellent *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien*, 1892.

what longer and more frequent. 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 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. 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 phenomena that constitute the literary problem in the Synoptic Gospels.

(c) *Elements in the Solution.* A recent English writer¹ has remarked that the critical study of the Gospels is still in its infancy, and the wide diversity of views regarding the origin of the Synoptic Gospels justifies this statement. Not that the labors of the past have been fruitless. Much has been accomplished negatively and positively, but much remains to be accomplished. The problem is not simple, and no part of it is simple. "I doubt," says Sanday, "if in the whole range of literature there is another question which involves data so complicated, so minute, and to all appearances so conflicting."²

¹ Arthur Wright, *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890.

² See *Expositor*, 1891.

There is still a great diversity of solutions of the problem in spite of the comforting statement of Wendt in the *New World* for June, 1895. He says "it is now quite generally recognized by the theologians who occupy themselves with the Synoptic problem that we must assume a direct knowledge of one of our Synoptic Gospels by the other two. . . . The Mark-hypothesis in combination with the Matthew-Logia hypothesis has become dominant with the scientific theologians of Germany." But this language gives a rather too pacific picture even of the German field. For Holtzmann¹ says that it is still doubtful whether there was a primitive Mark, that is to say, whether our canonical Mark is at the foundation of our Matthew and Luke, or whether the foundation was some predecessor of our canonical Mark. He admits also 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." This means that the evidence of interdependence between Mark and Matthew (or the *Logia*, a document which some think to have been the basis of our Matthew) is inconclusive. The same writer says that it is doubtful whether Matthew and Luke are independent. But if the interdependence of Mark and

¹ See *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1886, pp. 362-366.

Matthew is still a burning question, it can scarcely be affirmed that the dependence of Luke upon Mark is settled. Therefore the statement of Holtzmann leaves the impression that the consensus of German scholars is far from complete regarding various phases of the Synoptic question. Beyschlag¹ says that we must give up the position that any one of our present Gospels is the source of the others, and Holsten² inverts the favorite order, making Mark subsequent to Matthew.

And when we consider the work of scholars in other lands, we certainly do not find unanimity. Wright³ 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 presuppose any documentary source, except for the history of the birth and childhood of Jesus and of John the Baptist. And Salmon⁴ thinks we can assert with confidence that the sayings which Matthew and Luke have in common were *not* drawn from any documen-

1 *Das Leben Jesu*, I. p. 81.

2 *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1885.

3 *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890.

4 *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the N. T.*, second edition, 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*, sixth edition, 1881.

tary 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. Marshall¹ on the other hand finds the solution of the problem in a primitive Aramaic Gospel translated into Greek by the different evangelists. Sanday does not think the *Logia* alone are always adequate to account for the phenomena in Mark and Luke where the matter is common, and though he thinks the common foundation of the Synoptic Gospels was a document which is best represented in Mark, I do not understand that he regards our canonical Mark as itself the document which was used by the other Synoptists.² Therefore the time is not yet come to say that any particular theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels holds the field.

The conclusions to which my own studies have led me, are, first, the mutual independence of our present Synoptic Gospels. This conclusion is forced upon me by the analysis of the text. Not only are Matthew and Luke independent, but Matthew and Mark as well. Neither one had a copy of the other before him as he wrote, which he largely followed, and there is no sufficient evidence for saying that either copied

¹ See Articles in *Expositor*, 1891, vols. III-IV. Comp. Alfred Resch, *Agrapha*, 1889.

² *Expositor*, 1891.

the other from memory. In the relation of Luke and Mark there is more ground for accepting a partial dependence; but none, as it seems to me, for the view that Mark's narrative had a *regulative* influence upon Luke. The independence of Matthew and Luke is so generally admitted that it may be passed over in this brief survey of the subject, and the evidence for the independence of Mark and Matthew, and Mark and Luke cannot be given in full, but only in outline. And first, we will consider 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. It may be noticed at the outset that Luke has not less than thirty passages regarding the public 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, and two sections in which they both give fuller infor-

¹ So, e. g., Bleek, *Einleitung*, 1875, p. 290.

mation regarding particular events than does Matthew. 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 through *Decapolis*, in Luke he published it through the *city*. In this instance a dependence of Luke upon Mark seems wholly improbable. Or, take the story of the raising to life again of the daughter of Jairus (Mark v. 21-24, 35-43; Luke viii. 40-42, 49-56.) 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." 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. We will take at random two passages from the smaller list. The first is the story of the call of Levi (Luke v. 27-32; Mark ii. 13-17). There are details even here which are not quite favorable to Luke's dependence. Thus while Mark puts the call of Levi by the lakeside, 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? 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. In spite of these peculiarities it is perhaps possible that Mark had a determining in-

fluence upon Luke. Take a second case at a venture. It is the section regarding *the abomination of desolation* (Luke xxi. 20-24; Mark xiii. 14-20). 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 be an interpretation of this Jewish figure. 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. This seems to presuppose that he is to escape by flight from roof to roof, and so the language naturally applies to Jerusalem. 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 difference 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. These two cases

which have been considered may represent the score of passages where it is possible to think of Mark as the source of Luke.

But over against these we have twice as many passages where we cannot entertain the thought of Luke's dependence. We will consider two or three of these passages in order to show the quality of the argument. Take first 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 spake to the sea.

Again, let us look at 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. 18-20; Mark xiv. 22-25). The word of Jesus in regard to drinking wine again with the disciples, Luke puts *before* the institution of the Supper; Mark *after* it. Then Luke adds important words 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." He speaks of the cove-

nant as the "new" covenant, and the blood is "shed for you." Either Luke drew here from some other source than Mark's Gospel, or we must suppose that he invented these weighty additions to the words of the Lord. Which hypothesis is the more probable the reader may judge.

A single instance more may be noted, the story of the empty grave (Luke xxiv. 1-11; Mark xvi. 1-4). 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 this case, as in the preceding, it is impossible to regard Luke as dependent upon Mark. And so we might go on through two score passages, but that is not possible here, and perhaps is not necessary. The quality of the argument has been indicated both for and against dependence.

We must now consider briefly the relation of Matthew and Mark. The prevalent view among those who hold the interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels is that Matthew depended upon Mark. There are

some eighteen sections in which Matthew and Mark have common matter not found in Luke. An analysis of these shows that the preponderance of evidence is against the dependence of our Matthew upon Mark. In about one third of the cases it would be possible to regard Matthew as dependent upon Mark,¹ but in the remaining two thirds the argument is for independence, and the two thirds are more decisively *against* dependence than the one third are for it. The character of the evidence for Matthew's independence may be seen from the consideration of one or two passages. Take, for example, the question of divorce which the Pharisees laid before Jesus (Matt. xix. 3-12; Mark x. 2-12). According to Mark the point is whether it is lawful *at all* for a man to put away his wife, and the reply is an absolute negative. According to Matthew the Pharisees ask whether a man may put away his wife *for every cause*, and the reply is that the sole cause for which he may put her away is fornication. Again, in Mark Jesus in His reply proceeds from the Mosaic legislation back to the original institution of the Creator, *He* Himself asking the *Pharisees* what Moses had commanded; but in Matthew Jesus simply holds up the original institution, and then when

1. Such passages are the following: Matt. iii. 4-6 on Mark i. 4-6; Matt. xiv. 22-27 on Mark vi. 45-52; Matt. xv. 1-20 on Mark vii. 1-23; and Matt. xxvi. 6-13 on Mark xiv. 3-9.

the *Pharisees* ask *Him* why Moses commanded to divorce a wife, He said that this was permitted on account of the hardness of their hearts. These differences are scarcely explicable if Matthew depended upon Mark.

Or take the incident of the fig-tree which withered (Matt. xxi. 18-19, 20-22; Mark xi. 12-14, 20-26). Matthew says the tree withered immediately, and puts the consequent conversation 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. We must accept separate sources unless we suppose that the first evangelist deliberately modified Mark's report in order to heighten the impression of Christ's wonder-working power; but against this supposition is the fact that the first evangelist betrays no tendency to exaggerate the power of Christ.

The evidence against Matthew's dependence upon Mark remains about the same when we pass from the sections peculiar to Matthew and Mark, to the more numerous ones which are common to all the Synoptists. A few of these present colorless deviations from Mark, or deviations which might be regarded as made for a purpose, but the majority seem to be decidedly unfavorable to dependence. The character of the

evidence may be shown by a few passages taken at random. First, the Baptist's announcement regarding Jesus (Matt. iii. 11-17; Mark i. 7-8). The Baptist says in Mark that he is not worthy *to loose the latchet of the Messiah's sandals*; in Matthew he says 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*. Then follow words of the Baptist for which Mark has no parallel at all. Dependence of Matthew upon Mark is here out of the question. His narrative contains the substance of Mark, but it is too artificial to suppose that he took the narrative of Mark and inserted here a word and there a sentence. Such patchwork composition is least of all probable in an age when many eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus were still living and when the stream of oral tradition flowed copiously.

Take the account of the baptism of Jesus (Matt. iii. 13-17; Mark i. 9-11). Matthew enriches Mark's narrative with the conversation between Jesus and the Baptist, which presupposes a good source; but more than this, in the common matter Matthew is independent. 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 narrative of the incident in Gersa, the first evangelist is apparently independent of the second. He has *two* demoniacs, while Mark has but one, and they are so fierce that no one can pass by that way.

Again, Matthew's brief report of the death of the Baptist can not depend upon Mark, for it is at variance with it (Matt. xiv. 3-12; Mark vi. 17-29). According to Mark, Herod revered John and protected him; according to Matthew he wished to kill him, and would have done so but for his fear of the people. This is most easily explained by supposing separate sources.

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. Now what shall we say? That a Christian disciple of the second generation

took the liberty thus to modify words of Jesus which must have been regarded as especially sacred, or that this disciple simply had a fuller source than the second evangelist had?

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.

Yet one more illustration, Peter's denial (Matt. xxvi. 69-75; Mark xiv. 66-72). Matthew has some minute circumstantial details not in Mark, which presuppose a good source. Thus Peter's second denial was with an *oath*, and Peter *went out* before he wept.

These details are surely not fictitious. Then there are differences where the substance remains unchanged, which can hardly be regarded as intentional alterations by Matthew. Thus Matthew says that Peter was *without* in the court; Mark that he was *below* in the court. Matthew says, "with Jesus the Galilean"; Mark "with the Nazarene Jesus." It is not easy to see why the first evangelist made these changes if he was dependent upon Mark, but they give no trouble at all if each had a separate source.

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.

Of some eighty-three paragraphs which the Synoptists have in common, only about thirty-four come in the same order in all three narratives. That is to say, in some forty-nine instances the Synoptists do not all agree in the order of their narratives.

There is still another important fact to be noticed. More than half the cases of agreement occur in the story of the beginning and the end of the public life of Jesus, where the evangelists simply follow a chronological order. Thus they all speak of John the Baptist, then give his announcement of the Messiah, then proceed to the baptism of Jesus, to His temptation, to His return into Galilee, and the beginning of His work in Capernaum. So far there is not the slightest necessity of supposing that one evangelist got his order of events from another. All have simply followed the natural historical order, and consequently agree with each other.

Again, in the story of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus there are about twelve events which are found in the same order in all three accounts; but here also the order is simply chronological. The next thing after the hour in Gethsemane was the arrest of Jesus, then the trial by the Sanhedrin accompanied by Peter's denial, then the trial before Pilate ending with the release of Barabbas, then the procession to Golgotha, the execution, death, burial, and resurrection. This was the natural order, and we should expect it to be substantially observed by all who were telling the story of the last days of the earthly career of Jesus, whether they were three

or thirty. The remark of Renan is here applicable, that there was at bottom but one way of telling the life of Christ.

The story of the days spent near Caesarea 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 a common written source. The first three events are in logical order, and could not have been narrated otherwise. The agreement in the order of the others, and in the events that immediately followed the storm on the lake, and in two or three minor groups of events, does presuppose, not necessarily a *written* source, but at least a stereotyped and fixed oral tradition. This, then, is the conclusion in regard to the order of events. The very large *lack* of agreement favors the independence of the Synoptists. The cases of agreement are either natural, as required by the logical or chronological order, or are explained by a written source or a fixed tradition.

Such then is the quality, and such the extent of the evidence, which seems to justify the conclusion

stated above, that our Synoptic Gospels are mutually independent. It follows of course that the differences, sometimes amounting to contradiction, cannot be regarded as intentional changes made by the writers of these Gospels. They must have arisen in some other manner.

A second conclusion which appears to me valid is that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels had to some extent 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 Synoptist 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). They

put forward Joseph Barsabbas and Matthias, and the latter was chosen.

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 himself 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 neces-

sity 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 has 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 sections where Peter alone of the Synoptists was an eye-witness, confirm the statement of Papias regarding Mark's relation to Peter, but it can not 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

1. See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii. 39.

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. Weizsäcker too, though he thinks Mark was acquainted with the so-called *Logia*, believes that he made very little use of it. On the other hand, Weiss³ holds that Mark must have had some documentary source, such being necessary in his judgment to account for a long address like the Eschatological Discourse; and Sanday⁴ 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

-
1. See *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1894, p. 226.
 2. See *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, 1886, p. 385.
 3. See *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1886, p. 506.
 4. See *A Survey of the Synoptic Question in the Expositor* for 1891.

say at once that it rests in part upon written sources were it plain that the writing which Papias¹ ascribed to Matthew included only the *sayings* of Jesus. Scholars are about equally divided on this point, many limiting the *Logia* which Papias says that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, to the *words* of Jesus, or the words with brief narrative settings, and many holding that the term might have been used with perfect propriety to describe our first Gospel, and that Papias really had this book in mind. However, even on the assumption that our first Gospel in substantially its present form is 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 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 Gospel.

But as regards the necessity of assuming written sources to explain the verbal agreement of Matthew, Mark and Luke, it does not appear with conclusive force. A strong argument can be made for it, and a

1. See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii. 37.

strong argument can also be made against it. 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 story, 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 story, instruction which involved a careful memorizing of the different parts of that story, then it would appear still less necessary to presuppose written sources in order to account for the verbal agreement between the Synoptists, or for their agreement in the order of narration.

The almost unbroken diversity of the different reports of the same event or the same saying of Jesus is unfavorable to any extended written sources for the matter common to all three Synoptists. The large element of wholly peculiar matter in each Gospel, especially in the first and third, as well as the independence of each writer in presenting that matter which he has in common with the others, seems to point back to a time when no record either of the

words or deeds of Jesus had gained a recognized standing in the Christian community.

I have now stated two conclusions based upon data found in the Gospels themselves. There is another which is based rather on the laws of the human mind, and on that which we know of the history of the New Testament times. It is that the disagreement between the Synoptists in regard to the content of their message is to be set down largely to the fact that there were several or many eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus, and partly to the unconscious or even designed alterations by those who repeated the story over and over in the early years of the Church.

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 story 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 our present Gospels, 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 can not 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.

(d) *The Historicity of the Synoptic Gospels.* The origin of the first three Gospels is less important than the question of their historical value, but 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, and yet another on both oral and written sources. On the other hand, however, the particular origin may have a certain bearing on the historical value. Thus, for example, we can rate the historical value of the

Synoptic Gospels 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.

Now in regard to the historical value of the Synoptists, it seems to me that the essential claims which they make are amply verified from day to day and from year to year by the most reliable spiritual phenomena with which men are anywhere acquainted.¹ The written Gospels are established by the living Gospel.

But if we pass by this aspect of the subject and look at the Gospels themselves, we shall arrive at the same result. 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, 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

¹ See Dale, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, 1890.

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 time 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. This is a conclusion that has stood unshaken through the centuries, and was never more completely established than it is to-day.

But this claim of historicity does not imply that every narrative 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 Synoptists 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 angél 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 so abundant and conclusive that one ought not to be troubled by any of the concessions, which must be made in reference to details. "A robust 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

2. THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The fourth Gospel seems to me a trustworthy source of information regarding the life of Jesus.

¹ Wright, *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, p. 163.

True, it begins with a theological passage concerning the prehistoric Logos; it contains a considerable element of reflection and interpretation; and it is written with the avowed purpose, not of producing a history of Christ, but the purpose of leading men to believe that Jesus was the Messiah (John xx. 31). And yet these facts are not necessarily prejudicial to the historical character of the words which the writer attributes to Jesus, or of the events in the life of Jesus which he describes.

(a) *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,¹ is manifest on every hand, though denied by Schürer² and Jülicher.³ 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

¹ See Sanday, *Contemporary Review*, 1891.

² See *The Fourth Gospel in Contemporary Review*, 1891.

³ See *Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1894.

upon the lake (John vi. 17-21), which is given also by Mark and Matthew, the fourth Gospel alone has the following important details. 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). 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. His narrative plainly flows from an independent source.

Thus far we have had the Synoptists in view. But it is affirmed, for example, by Holtzmann,¹ that *Paul-*

¹ See *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 452.

inism is the lowest foundation of the fourth Gospel, and is in part the source of its expressions. He compares John i. 12 with Gal. iii. 26; John i. 17 with Rom. vi. 14; John vii. 19 with Rom. ii. 17-19; and finds other resemblances of the same sort. But these resemblances, so natural in the writings of two contemporary disciples both of whom were Jews, both apostles, and both dealing with the same great revelation, are far from establishing even a slight relationship of dependence; and a relationship of dependence in the matter of a few words or sentences, even if established, would constitute no valid argument against the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. "Literary dependence of one writer upon another is one of the commonest phenomena all through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation."¹

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

¹ See *Contemporary Review*, 1891.

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 from the narrative of an independent eye-witness, but as we certainly could not expect from a romance-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 representations 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 two of them, Mark and Matthew, had been in use many years before the fourth Gospel was written, and that Luke, also, had been known for a decade. Such being the case, a new and divergent narrative could scarcely have received the endorsement of the churches unless it was supported by unquestionable historical acquaintance with the facts and by apostolic authority.

As examples of what is meant by the fourth Gospel's divergence from the Synoptists, we may mention the following cases. 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

¹ See Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 453.

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.

(b) *The Discourses of the Fourth Gospel.* Thus far we have considered the fourth Gospel's narrative of the *events* of the life of Jesus. It remains to indicate briefly why its report of the *teaching* of Jesus is also regarded as essentially trustworthy. I say *essentially* trustworthy, for I think 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

¹ See Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 605; Sanday in *Contemporary Review*, 1891; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 127-130; Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, 1890, p. 426.

by the Synoptists, both as to style and construction. 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 Holtzmann¹ claims, 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 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. Mat-

¹ See *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.

thew 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 in its claim 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 pre-existence, and does not in the Synoptists. Much has been made of this point by some writers. But the conviction of pre-existence is by no means alien to the consciousness of Messiahship, which we have in the Synoptists. To Jesus, as conscious of Messianic character, the Old Testament teaching that

the eternal Jehovah is manifested in the Messiah (Is. vii. 14; ix. 6), and that the goings forth of the Messiah have been from everlasting (Mic. v. 2), would bring the thought of His pre-existence very near. Moreover, the thought of pre-existence in the fourth Gospel, that is in *the words of Jesus*, is in no sense a vital feature of the Messiah, but appears incidentally.¹ This point has not always been recognized. Holtzmann,² for example, presses the words of Jesus in John iii. 11-12; vi. 46; x. 18, and finds in them the thought of pre-existence. 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

¹ Comp. Delf, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1892, p. 99.

² See *Einleitung*, p. 455.

Jesus in the fourth Gospel the doctrine of pre-existence appears otherwise than in an incidental manner.

We have said that the portrait of Christ in the fourth Gospel is in fundamental harmony with that of the Synoptists. But Holtzmann¹ finds a repression of the true humanity of Jesus in the fourth Gospel, which corresponds to that exaggeration of His divinity which is found in this Gospel by the same writer. He sees this repression in the matter of Christ's inner development, in connection also with the baptism, the temptation, the need of prayer, the struggle in Gethsemane, and the sufferings on the cross. But if, when he speaks of inner development, he 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' *appreciation* 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

¹ See *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 455.

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 view of Holtzmann have any weight in view of such decided affirmations of the humanity of Jesus 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 and Holtzmann 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 Holtzmann’s statement, 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 *wcpt*—as strong and expressive an evidence of His humanity as anything in the Synoptists; 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. Holtzmann cites in support of this objection John xi. 42, 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.

But this is enough. He who seeks to show that the author of the fourth Gospel minimizes the humanity of Jesus has a large task on his hands, and must discover a great deal more and better evidence than this writer adduces 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 two-fold 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 teach-

ing 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 can not 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 the 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 Caesarea Philippi confessed that they still believed Him to be the Messiah, though most people were turning from Him, He charged them not to tell abroad that He was the Messiah (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 Jesus forbade the leper, whom He had healed in Galilee, 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 Synoptists the public verbal claim to Messiahship was made late in the ministry, and then not in Galilee but in Jerusalem; 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 interest.

Or we may take the doctrine of the *parousia*.

¹ See *Contemporary Review*, 1891.

² See *Die Lehre Jesu*, vol. i., 1886.

This is prominent in the Synoptists, but does not once appear in the fourth Gospel. Here we have the thought of Christ's spiritual presence with His disciples; but with the exception of one somewhat uncertain allusion (John xxi. 22), no reference to a future coming. But there is no incongruity between the idea of spiritual presence and the idea of the *parousia*. The fourth Gospel rather supplements the Synoptic teaching. Both ideas alike are involved in the conception of Messiahship. Jesus, because conscious of being the Messiah, 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 cannot 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 not deny all weight to the objections which are urged by such scholars as Schürer, Holtzmann, and Jülicher; but they do not 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 It is an exceedingly stubborn fact for those to deal with who deny the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. It would not be strange if they should seek comfort in other quarters.

Some of the objections of these writers have been touched already. There is yet one 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 pro-

¹ On this phase of the argument see especially Ezra Abbott, *Critical Essays*, 1888; and J. B. Lightfoot in *Expositor* for 1890.

nounced upon them, who has a Greek philosophical training, and whose world of thought is much more Hellenistic than Jewish.¹

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 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 endorsing 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.

¹ See Schürer in *Contemporary Review*, 1891; Holtzmann's *Einleitung*, pp. 468-470; and Jülicher's *Einleitung*, p. 255.

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. Neither Hellenistic thought nor philosophical training is requisite to an adequate explanation even of the Prologue of the fourth Gospel. The conception of the Logos has far 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?

No. 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-legitimating, this Gospel is not appreciatively judged when it is regarded as "a philosophical fiction, with religious tendency, dating from the third Christian generation (Jülicher)," 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 (Holtzmann).¹

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.

¹ Comp. Gustav Krüger, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 1895, p. 31.

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.

3. 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 Christ, 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), and He was in body and spirit a true man (Rom. i. 3-4; Phil. ii. 7; I Tim ii. 5-6; 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 (I. John v. 6). He gathered around Him a company of disciples which at His death numbered more than five hundred (I Cor. xv. 6), and appointed twelve to be apostles (I 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 (I. John iii. 8). He was a poor man (II Cor. viii. 9), meek and gentle in manner (II Cor. x. 1).

He was a *holy* man (I Cor. xv. 3; I 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 (I 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 (I Tim. ii. 56). He was a faithful witness (Rev. i. 5), the sum of whose message was that God is light (I 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 (I 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 (II 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 (I. 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; I Cor. xv. 4). On the third day He rose or was raised by God (I Thess. iv. 14; I Cor. xv. 4; II 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 (I 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.

12195

232

G7

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SUPERNATURAL CONCEPTION.

(a) *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; ii. 1-20). The other evangelists make no allusion to it, nor is it referred to in the remaining books of the New Testament. The story in Matthew is somewhat different from that in Luke. Both agree that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit, 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; in Luke it is announced to Mary, and, as far as the story goes, while she is awake.

Beyschlag¹ holds that these data conflict with each other. It is said that Joseph, according to Matthew, knows nothing of the announcements, which are made to Mary, according to Luke. But it is improbable, the author says further, that this was really the fact, for every motive of shrewdness, of honor, and of duty, would have constrained Mary to communicate these announcements to her betrothed at once. This may be granted, but it does not follow that Joseph might not still need the assurance, which, according to Matthew, was given him in a dream. The test of his confidence in Mary was such that it is not derogatory to his character to believe that he needed a divine assurance of her faithfulness, even if she had already communicated to him the angelic announcement, which it is certainly natural to suppose that she did.

(b) *The Difficulties.* Some objections are raised to the supernatural conception even by those who accept the Gospels as in the main historical. Thus it is said, first,² 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, by Willibald Beyschlag, 2 vols., 1885-1886, i. 149.

² Keim, *The History of Jesus of Nazara*, six vols., 1876-1883, English translation, ii. 39-68. Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 164.

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 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. 1-17; 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. Weiss¹ holds this view, and says in its defense 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. But it must be said in reply that this is just what Matthew plainly does. He gives the genealogy of Joseph (Matt. i. 16), and then says that Jesus was

¹ Bernhard Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 2 vols., 1882, vol. i. 211.

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.

Luke's genealogy, therefore, like that of Matthew, must be regarded as the genealogy of Joseph. This fact on the face of it is perhaps unfavorable to the supernatural conception of Jesus, but it by no means precludes that conception. Jesus was the *adopted* son of Joseph, if not his physical son, and the evangelists therefore regarded him as heir to Joseph's genealogy. This is plain from Matt. 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 the explicit teaching of a supernatural birth. Therefore we must admit that the evangelists did not regard the genealogies as conflicting with the supernatural conception of Jesus.

But our confidence that Jesus was descended from David does not rest upon these genealogies. There is evidence of another and better sort. Thus according to Luke i. 32, Mary was descended from David. Then, too, Jesus was hailed as the Son of David again

and again, and accepted the title (Matt. ix. 27; xii. 23; xxi. 9). He must, then, have believed that He belonged to David's line. Further, the fact that Paul and John regarded Jesus as born of the seed of David shows that this was the accepted belief of the apostolic church¹ (Rom. i. 3; Rev. v. 5). It is plain, therefore, that we have good ground for holding the Davidic descent of Jesus, and it is not of great importance that the two genealogies of Joseph cannot be harmonized.

Third, it is said² that the unbelief of the brothers of Jesus shows that the story of His supernatural conception is not historical. But assuming that Mary made known to her other children the facts concerning the birth of Jesus, which we scarcely dare to assume, still thirty years of obscure life in Nazareth, in which Jesus made no claim to be the Messiah, would have been sufficient to destroy any faith which they may have had in their mother's story.

It may be noted in this connection that Mary's language at the marriage feast in Cana is what might be expected if the narrative of the supernatural conception be true (John ii. 3). She speaks there as

¹ See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii. 19-20. He relates that grandchildren of Jude, the brother of Jesus, were brought before Domitian as suspicious persons because they claimed to be descended from David.

² E. g., Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 151.

though anticipating supernatural assistance from Jesus. The account of His baptism and the fact that He had come to Cana accompanied by men who regarded Him as the Messiah *might* alone have awakened such an anticipation, but it is more easily understood if the story of His wondrous birth is accepted.

(c) *Unscriptural Claims.* It has sometimes been held that the *sinlessness* of Jesus required the supernatural conception¹. It must be said in reply to this view that the New Testament, though unanimously teaching Christ's sinlessness, never suggests that this was due to His supernatural conception. It represents His sinless character as the victorious development of a true man, and not as a heritage.

It is also to be said that, so far as the New Testament teaches, the *divinity* of Christ did not require the supernatural conception. John and Paul, the writers who most emphasize the divine nature of Jesus, do not suggest that it was conditioned upon a supernatural conception. Whatever significance the supernatural conception had for them, it plainly was not this. They neither inferred the divinity of Jesus from His supernatural conception, nor held the supernatural conception to be a necessary accompaniment of His divinity. Hence if the supernatural conception

1 For advocates of this view, see Dorner, *Christologie*, i. 320, etc.

is accepted, it must be on the testimony of Matthew and Luke, as far as the New Testament basis is concerned, and it is this only that we have here in view. When, therefore, a writer speaks of the supernatural birth of Jesus as one of the three *essential* miracles of the New Testament, and ranks it with the miracle of Christ's person and the miracle of His resurrection, he does not fairly present the teaching of the New Testament.

It is said that allusions to the real and ideal elements in the birth of Christ are common to the New Testament books besides 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 do not 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

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

in His miraculous conception; and even if it could be made to seem probable that they believed in a supernatural conception, it would still be a wide misrepresentation of New Testament teaching to say that it esteems the supernatural conception of Christ as being no less *necessary* than the miracle of His resurrection. The apostles believed that Christianity rested upon the resurrection as its very foundation, but apart from the first and third Gospels, there is not even an allusion to the supernatural conception.

(d) *The Narrative Historical.* Weiss¹ has shown that the narrative of the supernatural conception cannot be explained as a myth. The reason is that the doctrinal teaching of the New Testament, as we have already seen, did not *require* the supernatural conception, and hence there was no occasion for the formation of such 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 219. Comp. Neander, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, 1837, p. 10.

² See Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, 1886, pp. 339-342.

regarded as a prediction of the supernatural birth of the Messiah, was not so understood among the Jews of the first century, and apart 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, the ground is cut away from beneath those who deny its historical character, and seek to explain it as a myth.

Two items may be mentioned here which witness for the historical credibility of the story. First, Luke ii. 19, 51, points to recollections of Mary as the ultimate source of Luke's narrative regarding the conception and birth of Jesus; and second, the fact that there is no trace of opposition to the story in the apostolic Church. James and Jude, the brothers of Jesus, who lived through the period in which the Synoptic material took form, were qualified to pass judgment on the story of the supernatural conception. 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 so 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.

(c) *Meaning of the Supernatural Conception.* This is a point on which the Gospels throw no clear light, and on which, therefore, one must speak with caution. The supernatural conception of Jesus indicates, according to Beyschlag, who, however, holds that the story is a poetic legend,—it indicates that Jesus was one whom humanity could not beget, but only receive. Of course the supernatural conception does not allow us to think of Jesus as the product of evolution, at least as regards His holy personality, though physically and intellectually He might be so regarded still.

It sets Jesus in parallelism with the first man. As God was directly concerned with the first Adam, breathing into his body the breath of life, so that man became a living soul, in like manner He was concerned with the origin of the second Adam, making Him in a unique sense the child of the Spirit. Thus the supernatural conception would afford an explanation of the fact that Jesus from childhood up never yielded to temptation. We cannot say that this is the necessary and only conceivable explanation of that fact. Hase holds the sinlessness of Jesus, but does not accept the supernatural conception.¹ He thinks that Jesus in

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, Dritte Auflage, p. 58.

His very origin was separated from sinful human life by a creative act of God.

This is conceivable, and is, perhaps, not the only rational assumption which might be made. But what can be claimed is that the supernatural conception furnishes *an* explanation of the fact that Jesus was always able to maintain Himself in purity. And it does so, not because it makes Him less human than other men, for it does not, but because it represents Him as being in a unique sense the child of the Spirit (Luke i. 35). This original dower of the Spirit, while it did not do away with the reality of temptations, may be thought of as giving to Jesus a peculiarly clear moral insight, an unusual love of the good, and a consciousness of God's presence in which He was able to get the victory over every temptation.

CHAPTER II.

THE BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS.

(a) *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 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. 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. We must agree with Weiss¹ that if we had 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 *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 239.

Yet too much weight is sometimes given to this apparent difference. The desire of the parents on their return from Egypt to go to Bethlehem was in keeping with what they knew of the destiny of their child. The common expectation was that the Messiah would come from Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 6; John vii. 42), and the parents may naturally have desired that their child should grow up in this old city of David (Micah v. 2). Hence their plan to return to Bethlehem does not necessarily imply that this was their original home. As to the other point in Matt. ii. 23, we may hold this view. Matthew says they came to "a city called Nazareth," as though he did not know that this had previously been their home. But this language may owe its strangeness to the fact that Matthew was intent on the significance of the word *Nazareth*.¹ He saw a fulfillment of prophecy in the fact that Jesus was a *Nazarene* (Is. xi. 1). Since this is the one thing which he wished to record, he made no allusion to the previous residence of Mary in Nazareth.

According to Luke (ii. 1-3), the fact which led to the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem was an enrolment that had been ordered by Augustus, of which it is

¹ See Erich Haupt, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate in den vier Evangelien*, 1871, pp. 235-237.

said: "This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria." According to Josephus, Quirinius became governor of Syria in 760 of Rome, or about eleven years after the birth of Jesus. Zumpt² has shown, however, that Quirinius was probably twice governor of Syria (750-753, 760-765 of Rome), and that the enrolment was *completed* by him in the period of his first governorship. It was begun by Sentius Saturninus. Weiss³ holds that Quirinius was at this time a royal commissioner in the East, and so had charge of the enrolment, but thinks Luke is mistaken in calling him *governor*.

It seems probable that this first enrolment was a census proper, for the ascertainment of the population, while the one mentioned in Acts v. 37, which led to the great uprising under Judas of Galilee, was an apprizal of property. This enrolment which took Joseph to Bethlehem, was made according to the Jewish method, as appears from Luke's story. Every one went to *his own city*, not to the city of his district necessarily, but the city to which his house and family belonged.

The law did not require the presence of Mary in

1 *Antiquities*, xviii. 1, 1; 2, 1.

2 Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*. Comp. Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 141.

3 *Leben Jesu*, i. 241.

Bethlehem. Joseph took her for other reasons. The chief of these may have been, as Weiss² suggests, that the child whom Joseph expected might be enrolled as his son. Perhaps the acquaintance of the parents with Micah v. 2 may also have prompted the step.

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 as a stable, as the word *manger* indicates.

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.

(b) *The Date.* Dionysius the Little, a Roman abbot who died in 556 A. D., introduced the present

¹ See Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 2d edition, i. 183.

² *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 242.

Christian reckoning, according to which the year of Christ's incarnation and birth was the year 754 of Rome. 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 conception by the Holy Spirit.

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). Herod died shortly before the Passover of the year 750 of Rome.¹ The Gospels, however, do not indicate what interval elapsed between the birth of Jesus and the death of Herod. Weiss² assumes that Jesus was about a year old when the Magi came, and therefore somewhat more than a year old when Herod died; Keim³ 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

¹ Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii. 8, 1; 9, 3.

² *Leben Jesu*, i. 262.

³ *Jesus of Nazara*, ii. 110.

thirty years old, and this was in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. Both these statements are somewhat indefinite. If we reckon the fifteenth year of Tiberius from the time when he became co-regent with Augustus,¹ 764 of Rome, then Jesus began His ministry in 779 of Rome. If He was then thirty years old, He must have been born in 749 of Rome. But Luke simply says He was *about* thirty years old, and this language allows us to think that He was some months, perhaps a whole year less or more than thirty.

Again, the fifteenth year of Tiberius may be reckoned from the death of Augustus, 767 of Rome, when Tiberius became sole emperor. According to this, Christ's ministry began not earlier than 782 of Rome. Now since Jesus was born before the Passover of 750, He must have been at least thirty-two years old when He began His ministry. This, however, would scarcely accord with Luke's statement that He was about thirty years old. Hence it seems probable that Luke reckoned the fifteenth year of Tiberius from the time when he became co-regent with Augustus, 764 of Rome. This would put the beginning of Christ's ministry in the year 779 of Rome, and His birth in the

¹ So Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*; Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 137.

year 749, speaking approximately. (3) A third datum which has a bearing on the question is John ii. 20. The Jews said that the temple had been forty and six years in building. Now Josephus tells us that Herod began the temple in the eighteenth year of his reign, probably 733-734 of Rome. This would give the year 779-780 of Rome as the year of the first Passover of Christ's ministry. If He was then about thirty years old, He must have been born about 749 of Rome, 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 Oct. 1 and Dec. 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* (*astēr*), the term used in Matthew ii; 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

1 *Antiquities*, xv. 11. 1.

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 747 and 748 of Rome stood in some causal connection with the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem, but they do not therefore determine the exact year of Christ's birth. If it is made probable on other grounds that Jesus was born in 749 of Rome, then the identification of the star of the Magi with the conjunction of planets in 747 of Rome might tend to establish the correctness of that date. In conclusion, it seems most consistent with the foregoing data to put the birth of Jesus in the year 749 of Rome, that is, 5-6 years B. C. 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 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 25th is not mentioned earlier than the fourth century. 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. Most critical scholars agree that the month and day of Christ's birth are wholly unknown (*c. g.* Weiss, Beyschlag, Keim). Ederheim² thinks there is no adequate reason for questioning the historical accuracy of the traditional

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

² *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 187.

date, but he offers nothing in its support. Andrews¹ also accepts it.

(c) *The Shepherds.* The story that the birth of Jesus was first announced to the *shepherds* (Luke ii. 8-10) is in keeping with the lowliness of that birth. Yet it was not announced to them because they were lowly. These men are represented as belonging to the little circle of those who had a living faith, and who were longing for the Messiah; and who therefore were qualified to receive heavenly communications. For they did not take offence at the mean surroundings 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 certain pious souls. Some response was sure to be made in due season, for God does not leave human longings for His salvation unanswered.

¹ *The Life of Our Lord*, 2d ed., 1891.

This particular response 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 became heralds of the angelic word. 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.

(d) *Circumcision and Presentation in the Temple.* 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 was necessary if He was to deliver those who were under the law (Gal. iv. 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 41st 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. Legend would not have represented Jesus as being redeemed from the service of the Lord, who yet was 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). Edersheim estimates the cost of the two doves at about sixteen cents.

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. There is no indication that he worshiped Jesus, as there is none that the shepherds had done so. 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 (Is. 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 redemption, and deserves to be classed with the shepherds as one of the first evangelists.

(*e*) *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 Roman Catholic 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 they 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 was directly over them. This re-appearance of the star, as they looked southward toward Bethlehem naturally gave them confidence in the word of the scribes. What they saw was probably some natural phenomenon, and their belief that it heralded the birth of the King of the Jews was 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 Matt. ii. 16 that it had appeared about two years before the Magi reached Jerusalem. How old Jesus was when the Magi came, is also uncertain. We do not know that the star appeared just when Jesus was born, 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.

(f) *Herod Baffled.* 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 unknown. The computation of Farrar (followed by Edersheim¹) that there were not more than twenty killed, must be regarded as a rather improbable guess. The flight of the parents into Egypt was in obedience to a divine intimation (Matt. ii. 13.) This flight 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

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

and their child. There were many Jews in Egypt, 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 See Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiv. 7; xii. 2.

CHAPTER III.

THE EDUCATION OF JESUS.

(a) *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 had a spiritual religion. Joseph was a righteous man (Matt. i. 19), *i. e.*, right in his relations to other men; and he was also obedient to the Lord (Matt. i. 24; ii. 14, 21-22). He had a heart that was open to receive heavenly messages. 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 died before the public ministry of Jesus began (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3).

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

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 implies exceptional purity of heart and obedience to the will of God. Yet there is no basis for the Roman Catholic doctrine (made an article of faith on December 8, 1854), that Mary, "from the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God," was "preserved free from all stain of original sin." There is no ground for this doctrine in Scripture. On the contrary, we must think of Mary as subject to the universal law of human sinfulness.

It may be inferred from Mary's song¹ (Luke i. 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

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

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 divine and Messianic character and mission. But 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 at once understand Jesus after He began His Messianic work. His ideal of the Messiahship was widely different from the popular thought, and even the disciples, who were constantly with Him, came but slowly to understand Him.

Besides Joseph and Mary, there were in the home of Jesus four brothers¹ and at least two sisters, all younger than He. 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.² Together with Peter and John he was a "pillar" of the church in Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9).

¹ Modern critics are generally agreed that the *brothers* of Jesus were full brothers, not cousins, nor half-brothers, but children of Joseph and Mary. So Beyschlag, Weiss, Edersheim, Keim, Hase, etc.

Both James and Jude have the imperishable honor of being among the authors of the New Testament.

Such was the home circle in which Jesus spent His youth and early manhood. It was an ideal Israelitish family. They were poor, but not dependent. The prayer of Agur (Prov. xxx. 8) was fulfilled in their case: "Give me neither poverty nor riches." Joseph was a carpenter (Matt. xiii. 55) and supported his family by the labor of his hands, which was honorable among the Jews. Even boys who were set apart to the life of scribes learned some trade¹. "Love work" was the motto of Rabbi Shemaiah, and another teacher said, "Great is work, for it honors its master²."

The family was ideal in that there were numerous children, a heritage of the Lord (Ps. cxxvii. 3). It was ideal also in that Joseph and Mary feared the Lord and walked in the ways of His commandments. Ideal too in that Joseph and Mary trusted each other.

(b) *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 the man. In

¹ Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 160.

² See Delitzsch, *Juedisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu*, p. 27.

a home like that of Joseph and Mary a child began to learn the law as soon as it began to speak. From the dawn of consciousness, says Josephus¹, we learn the laws with accurate care, and hence have them as it were engraved on the soul. Paul says that Timothy knew the sacred writings from his *infancy* (II 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 whether He learned to read the law in Hebrew or in Aramaic. If He knew Hebrew at all, which seems to be implied in Matt. v. 22, and probable in view of the fact that Hebrew was cherished as the sacred tongue, He probably learned it as a child at home². 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.³, while Schürer⁴ is of the opinion that they existed much earlier. But there was a synagogue in Nazareth which Jesus doubtless attended, and where through many years He heard

¹ *Against Apion*, ii. 18.

² See Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, ii. 152-153.

³ *Jesus of Nazara*, ii. 151.

⁴ *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 353

the law read (Mark vi. 2). Yet His accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the law implies that He studied it long and patiently for Himself. It is probable 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 was sustained by their feeding on the word of God. So their teaching would naturally lead their children into the inner sense of Scripture. As it is uncertain whether Jesus read the law in Hebrew, so it is uncertain whether He knew Greek. It is probable, however, that He did. 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.

Jesus did not study the law with the scribes. During His ministry it was well known that He had not learned it from the recognized teachers (John vii. 15; Mark vi. 2). 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, which was called forth by His surpassing knowledge of the law.

(c) *The Study of Nature.* From the language of Jesus we may infer that He was a close observer of Nature, and that He had thought of the meaning of natural phenomena. As evidence of this, we may mention the *aptness* of His many illustrations drawn from Nature, and the fact that not a few of His parables are based on natural phenomena. Thus 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. He saw in Nature a spiritual significance. Thus it is *God* who clothes the grass of the field, and *God* who watches the fall of the sparrow (Matt. vi. 28; x. 29).

That Jesus was a *delighted* student of Nature might be inferred from His description of the beauty of the lily, from His fondness for illustrations from Nature, and perhaps from His apparent fondness for mountain tops (Matt. xvii. 1; v. 1; xiv. 23; xxviii. 16). As Jesus looked upon Nature, He saw in it a manifestation of the goodness of God, and the minuteness of His providential care (Matt. v. 45; vi. 26).

Nature was also a book of mysteries to Him as it is to 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). And there is no evidence that Jesus had more than a man's knowledge regarding these things. We must suppose that He looked out upon the world with a truly human and hence limited vision, though it was the clear vision of an unfallen humanity. He saw in Nature the conflict and disorder which mar its harmony. To Him the tares 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. 38, 19). Thus Nature was to Jesus a book, o'er whose pages He pondered long and deeply.

We will conclude this paragraph with a few words on the personal appearance of Jesus. The Jews said to Jesus on a certain occasion, "Thou art not yet *fifty* years old" (John viii. 57). From this it might perhaps be inferred that He looked somewhat older than He really was. When Jesus was arrested, the soldiers, as they approached Him, were wholly overawed by something in His appearance, and fell to the ground (John xviii. 6). We might infer from

this that His features were capable of expressing in a high degree the majesty and greatness of His spirit. We are doubtless to assume that Jesus was entirely free from disease. We cannot associate sickness with an unfallen state. Even so we cannot think of Jesus as dying a natural death. Death as a fact in His career could come only through the malice of men, and as the result of His own conscious volition (John·x. 18). All representations of Jesus have been imaginary, and have expressed the ideas of the various ages in which they have been produced. He has been painted, now as the most wretched, and now as the most beautiful of men.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

(a) *The Data.* The Synoptists agree in saying that Jesus was baptized by John in the Jordan. They all speak of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, and of a voice out of heaven (Mark i. 9-11; Matt. iii. 13-17; Luke iii. 21-23). Matthew alone records any conversation between Jesus and the Baptist. According to Mark and Luke, *Jesus* saw the spirit descend and heard the voice. In Matthew, it was the *Baptist* who heard the voice, and the narrative does not make it plain who saw the descent of the Spirit.

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 during the early part of His

ministry He practiced the same baptism (John iii. 22-26; iv. 2). John tells us that Jesus Himself did not baptize, but His disciples performed the rite, of course with His approval. Such was Jesus' own estimate of that baptism to which He submitted.

(b) *Significance of the Water-Baptism of Jesus.* 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 a devotion to God. 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. Its significance was chiefly for Jesus, though the act was also a sign to John. For Jesus, His baptism was a part of the fulfilment of righteousness (Matt. iii. 15), an act which He regarded as a duty. For all Israel were called upon to prepare for the coming Kingdom of God, the best as well as the worst (Matt. iii. 2); and He, 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.

(c) *The Dove and Voice.* 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) Jesus throughout His ministry is represented as *filled* with the Spirit (John iii. 34; Matt. xii. 28; Luke iv. 1). The Spirit is not without Him, but within Him. (3) If the voice be thought of as physical, there is a plain conflict between

Matthew and Mark. One version would have to be omitted. We cannot suppose that the voice uttered both sayings. And which would be rejected as unhistorical? (4) 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.

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 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 seems to 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. We must either reject the narrative of Mark and Luke as unhistorical (so Neander, Beyschlag, etc.), or we must hold that Jesus as well as John had a revelation in the hour of His baptism. According to Mark and Luke, the heavenly voice is addressed to *Him*, and *He* sees the symbol of the Spirit. There is nothing necessarily improbable in this representation, and it is easier to think of Jesus as having a vision than to regard this narrative as wholly wrong. A vision, however, in the case of Jesus is not a necessity. We may think of an immediate revelation to His spirit. For He was in perfect fellowship with God, and nothing dulled His inner ear to the divine voice. But that which was wholly an inward and spiritual event was set forth by Jesus, or by the Baptist, in the concrete symbolism of our narrative.

(*d*) *Significance of the Spirit-Baptism of Jesus.* Jesus had possessed the Spirit all His life as the Spirit of holiness. He was a child of the Spirit (Luke i. 35). He had had undisturbed communion with God, and had known that God was His Father (Luke ii. 49). But at His baptism He received the Spirit as

the Spirit of wisdom and might for His *Messianic* work. This is indicated by the fact that the temptation immediately succeeded the baptism. The Spirit which had descended upon Him impelled Him into the wilderness that He might ponder the career now opened before Him. The Spirit given at baptism and the *Messianic* career of Jesus are not separable. When Jesus says that He works His miracles by the Spirit of God (Matt. xii. 28), and when it is said of Him that He came into Galilee, after His baptism and temptation, in the power of the Spirit (Luke iv. 14), we are to think of the Spirit given at baptism.

This relation of the Spirit to the *Messianic* work of Jesus is further confirmed by the fact that the descent of the Spirit was either accompanied or immediately followed by the voice which said, "Thou art my beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased." These words seem to have echoed in the soul of the Baptist, and were to Him an assurance that Jesus was the Messiah, who should baptize with the Holy Spirit (John i. 29-34). They are based upon Old Testament passages, especially Psalm ii. 7, where the Messiah is called the *Son* of God. Hence there can be no doubt that the Spirit given to Jesus at His baptism was the Holy Spirit as an equipment for the *Messianic* work.

Almost all scholars agree that from the time of

the baptism of Jesus forward, He was perfectly conscious of being the Messiah; but it is questioned whether this consciousness was awakened at the baptism, or whether Jesus had long possessed it. Weiss¹ thinks that Jesus came to the Jordan with a clear consciousness of His Messiahship, and he finds support for this view in the words recorded by Matthew, "Suffer it to be so *now*" (iii. 15). Here it is implied, according to Weiss, 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 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 ante-

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 309. For the other view, see *e.g.*; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, ii. 66; Beldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 160.

dated 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 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 Matt. iii. 15, on which Weiss lays stress. 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. No sin had alienated Him from God. Being conscious of doing always the things that pleased God, He could refer to Him as *my Father*, and must feel a peculiar interest in the things which pertained to His worship. The fact that the doctors were amazed at His understanding and answers (Luke ii. 46-47) is just what might be expected if He had searched the Scriptures in the light of a perfectly pure conscience. Even Josephus claims that when but fourteen years of age he himself had such learning that the high priests and principal men of the city came frequently to him in order to know his opinion about the accurate understanding of the law¹. The knowledge of the boy Jesus

¹ *Life of Josephus*, i.

may well have been much more spiritual and profound than that of Josephus without our attributing to Him aught which is not claimed by the Gospels.

In view of these things we are justified in saying that, though Jesus' consciousness of the presence of the Father with Him had been unique before His baptism by John, He had not possessed the consciousness of being the Messianic Son of God. This came in the hour of baptismal consecration, when the divine voice bore in upon His soul the words, "Thou art my beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased."

CHAPTER V.

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS.

(a) *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. (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. This idea that Jesus was led about in the wilderness from place to

place *suggests* an inward agitation which was reflected in a certain outward restlessness.

(b) *Time and Place.* According to Mark, Jesus went into the wilderness *immediately* after His baptism (i. 12). This is intrinsically probable, for in the baptism Jesus had become conscious that He was the Messiah, and it was natural that He should at once retire where He might quietly ponder the great work which was now definitely before Him.

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; I 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.

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.

(c) *The Fasting.* There was *some* food to be had in the wilderness, such as locusts and wild honey (Matt. iii. 4), and Weiss supposes that Jesus ate these as the Baptist had done. Yet the language of Matthew and Luke (as Weiss admits) plainly implies that Jesus abstained from *all* food, and there seems to be no good reason for rejecting this view.

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 physical need. 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.

(d) *The Content of the Temptations.* 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 with that came the temptations. The first (Matt. iv. 3-4; Luke iv. 3-4), was a temptation to prove His Messiahship by working a miracle to supply His hunger. The tempter used Christ's physical need as a ground for the miracle. 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 he had received at the Jordan, and His present extreme need. This gave force to the tempter's subtle insinuation when he said, "*If Thou art the Son of God.*" So it was 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." 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. He would not seek confirmation of His Messianic consciousness by attempting to work a miracle for the satisfaction of bodily hunger. Such an attempt would be a confession that He thought this of more importance than obedience.

The second temptation (Matt. iv. 5-7; Luke iv. 9-12) was a temptation to prove His Messiahship by some act which would call out the promised aid of God. It is as though the tempter had said, "I see that you trust in the word of God. Cast yourself upon it, then, and put God to the test. Go and throw yourself from the temple. It is written, 'He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways'" (Ps. xci. 11). This temptation came along the line of the *intellectual* man, as the first came along the line of the physical.

The fair-sounding suggestion of the tempter was

that Jesus should test the word 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.

The third temptation (Matt. iv. 8-10; Luke iv. 5-8) was a temptation to fall in with the popular idea of the Messianic kingdom. The temptation in this instance was primarily along the line of Jewish patriotism. It was also an appeal to human ambition, and the thought seemed to be supported by many Old Testament passages which refer to the kingdom of the Messiah as outward and material.

In this third temptation there is no question about the Messianic character of Jesus. This is granted by the tempter. The temptation concerns the *method* of realizing the Messianic ideal. Shall this be the popular method, on the plane of physical force, or shall it be a spiritual method? In other words, shall

the Messianic kingdom be a kingdom of the devil or of God? This is the final question. To fall in with the popular conception would virtually be to worship Satan. So this temptation is overcome, and now the circle is complete. The tempter has approached Jesus on the physical, the intellectual, and the spiritual side, and each time in vain.

(c) *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, and the essential thought of the narrative in Matthew 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. Yet even here we are not wholly in darkness. We may be reasonably certain 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.

We are therefore compelled to take the narrative symbolically. This however is in keeping with the method of Jesus. He frequently set forth spiritual truths in concrete forms (see *e. g.* Luke x. 18; John i. 51; xiv. 30). So it is in this case. The temptation was a spiritual struggle with an invisible foe. Thoughts were presented to the mind of Jesus, and courses of action were suggested, which He recognized as of Satanic origin. To follow out these 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 Satan or the reality of the temptation. These realities are in no wise affected by this interpretation. On the contrary, it is easier to see how

the temptation was a real temptation when it is carried into the mind of Jesus, than when we think of it as a conversation between Jesus and the visible devil, or some representative of the devil, as for example, a member of the Sanhedrin, and it is more in keeping with the character of the devil, who is a spirit full of subtlety, to suppose that his approach to Jesus was in a purely spiritual way.

(f) *Subsequent Temptations of Jesus.* It is said in Luke v. 13 that the tempter left Jesus *for a time*, the implication being that later he assailed Him again. This is in keeping with the words of Jesus in Luke xxii. 28, where, looking back over His entire ministry, He says to the twelve: "Ye are they who have continued with me in my temptations" (*peirasmois*). We have a suggestion as to the character of these temptations in Mark viii. 33, where Jesus calls Peter *Satan*, because Peter had sought to turn Him from His course of suffering. His Messianic career must have been one long temptation, inasmuch as He was solicited, now by the deep impression which His miracles made, and now by the failure to win any considerable response to His spiritual teaching,—He was solicited to turn from His divine ideal to the ideal of the people. The fact that these subse-

1 See J. P. Lange, in *Commentary on Matthew*.

quent temptations of Jesus are represented by Luke as being temptations by *Satan*, no less than the first great temptation in the wilderness, together with the fact that there is no suggestion of a visible devil in connection with them, confirms the above interpretation of the first temptation.

CHAPTER VI.

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

(a) *Length of Christ's Ministry.* (1) *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. And the fact that the Synoptists mention only one Passover has little weight when it is remembered that they 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). 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 feasts. Moreover, the view that the ministry of Jesus continued only one year has against it the great difficulty of crowding into so brief a space all the events that are recorded by the Synoptists. They know of extended sojourns in Capernaum, of several tours through Galilee, of periods of withdrawal 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 protracted training of these. Therefore the Synoptists, instead of witnessing for a ministry of one year, require us to think that it was longer.

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 Dr. Delff,¹ who thinks Jesus was more than forty years old when His ministry began.

(2) *The Probable View.* The Synoptists give no

¹ *Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, 1886, p. 251.

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; xiii. 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 three 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. 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, 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 just past thirty-two when He was crucified. He died and rose again in the early prime of manhood. The disproportion between the length of His ministry and its results is wholly without a parallel in history, and inexplicable on natural grounds.

(c) *The Chronological Outline.* The Synoptists do not aim to give all their material in chronological order,

and certain important sections of the ministry they omit entirely. Further they do not wholly agree either with John or with each other in the chronological data which they give. John's Gospel is the only one that contains anything like a chronological outline of Christ's ministry. This is very general, and concerns chiefly the material which John himself gives. It does not help to determine the place or sequence of events which are recorded by the Synoptists only. Yet the Synoptic material, in the main, easily arranges itself under the outline of John's Gospel,¹ and so we can get a synopsis of the ministry, chronological and topographical, which is measurably complete.

The brief public life of Jesus was a perfect unit, controlled throughout by a single purpose, and moving steadily toward its goal. It was not divided into periods by any changes of plan on His part, or by any developments through which He passed. Yet there are certain milestones in the ministry, dividing it into nine periods of varying length, as follows:

1. From the baptism to the first Passover. Approximately two months (John i. 29, 35, 43; ii. 1, 12; Mark i. 13; Matt. iv. 1-2).

2. From the first Passover to December of the

¹ Comp. Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 250; Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 110.

same year. Approximately eight months (John ii. 13; iv. 3). The ground of the statement that this period extended to December is found in John iv. 35. While in Samaria, Jesus said to His disciples, "Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then cometh harvest?" Now the harvest began to be gathered the first of April. Four months prior to that would be the first of December.¹ Some writers (*e. g.* Bey-schlag) have thought that this statement might be regarded as a proverb, and thus have no bearing on the time of year when Jesus was in Samaria. But this saying cannot be regarded as a proverbial 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. Edersheim's² view of this passage is surely unexegetical. He inverts the order of the sentences, and puts the reference to white fields first. But this is impossible, 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

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

² *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. Appendix xv.

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."

3. From December to March. Approximately three months (John iv. 35; v. i). This division assumes that the feast of John v. 1, was the feast of *Purim* on the 15th of Adar.

4. From March to the second Passover. Approximately one month (John v. 1; vi. 4).

5. From the second Passover to the feast of Tabernacles. Approximately six months (John vi. 4; vii. 2).

6. From the feast of Tabernacles to the feast of Dedication. Approximately three months (John vii. 2; x. 22).

7. From the feast of Dedication to the resurrection of Lazarus. Approximately three months (John x. 22; xi. 44).

8. From the resurrection of Lazarus to the Crucifixion. Approximately three weeks (John xi. 44; xii. 1; xix. 18).

9. From the resurrection of Jesus to His Ascension. Forty days (John xx-xxi; Luke xxiv; Matthew xxviii; Acts i. 9).

(c) *The Topographical Outline.*

In the first period (2 months) Jesus went from the *Jordan* to *Jerusalem*, by way of *the wilderness*, *Cana* and *Capernaum*.

The second period (8 months) was spent in *Judea*.

The third period (3 months) was spent in *Galilee*, with a brief sojourn in *Samaria*.

The fourth period (1 month) was spent partly in *Jerusalem* and partly in *Galilee*.

The fifth period (6 months) was spent in *Galilee*, with a brief sojourn on heathen soil and in the Decapolis.

The sixth period (3 months) was spent in *Jerusalem*.

The seventh period (3 months) was spent in *Perea*.

The eighth period (3 weeks) was spent in *Bethany*, *Ephraim* and *Jerusalem*.

In the ninth period (40 days) the risen Lord appeared to His disciples in *Jerusalem* and its vicinity, and in *Galilee*.

It appears from this survey that Jesus spent nearly twelve months in Jerusalem and Judea, a longer time than He spent in Galilee. However, eight months of this time seem to have been relatively unimportant for the Messianic work. And speaking approximately, He spent nine months in Galilee (this including the sojourn on heathen soil in the vicinity of Tyre and Sidon, and the visits to Decapolis), and three months in Perea.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MINISTRY.

(a) *At the Jordan.* 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 wholly (*e. g.* by Holtzmann) or in part (*e. g.* by Weiss), and has been attributed to the evangelist, in the thought that it is too spiritual and universalistic to fit the forerunner. But, in reply to these views, it may be observed 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 Jesus regarded him as the Elijah who should precede the Messiah, it would certainly be remarkable if he had no appreciation of the spiritual and fundamental side of the Messiah's work as sketched, for

example, by Isaiah. So the testimony of the Synop-
tists stands in the way of our denying the essentially
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) speaks for the historical value of the words
which are put upon his lips.

The thought of the Baptist in the words, "Behold
the lamb of God, who bears the sin of the world," is
an echo of the profound teaching of Isaiah liii. Jesus
is the meek, unresisting sacrifice of God. The Bap-
tist like Simeon saw that the Messiah would be a
sufferer, and that His great work had to do with sin.

But we need not suppose that John the Baptist,
in calling Jesus the lamb of God, had clear knowledge
of the specific way in which Jesus would at last bear
the sins of the people. This is not required by the
language, and indeed is not probable.

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
even 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 declared a second time that Jesus was the lamb of God, 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.

It seems probable that James and John were own cousins of Jesus, their mothers being sisters (John xix. 25; comp. with Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xiv. 40). All the five were Galileans.

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.

In connection with the call of these men two incidents are especially noteworthy. In the case of Nathanael and perhaps of Simon also, Jesus was given a more than human knowledge. In regard to Nathanael, Jesus not only read his character as he approached, but He also declared that He had seen him under the fig-tree; this seeing impressed Nathanael as divine and is so presented by the evangelist. Whether the fig-tree was in distant Cana (so Weiss), or elsewhere, cannot be certainly determined. But it was somewhere beyond the range of mortal vision. Thus a supernatural knowledge regarding Nathanael was given to Jesus. With regard to Peter the narrative does not *require* us to think of supernatural knowledge. Jesus gave Simon a new name which implied that He saw to the center of his character. He said that he should be called a *rock*. But Simon was an impulsive man, and superficially judged was not a rock-like character. Yet this deep insight of Jesus does not necessarily involve supernatural knowledge.

The case of Nathanael, however, as reported, admits of no other explanation. Jesus saw what no unaided man could have seen. But we must not draw from this fact the inference that He always had supernatural knowledge by virtue of His very being. We might as well argue that because He sometimes

wrought miracles, therefore He did it by virtue of a power inherent in His being. But He Himself teaches us that this was not the case. He wrought His miracles by the finger of God or by the Spirit of God (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20). And the fourth Gospel, which has been accused of magnifying the power of Christ beyond what is found in the Synoptists, is most explicit on this point, as the scene at the tomb of Lazarus proves (John xi. 41-42). The supernatural knowledge of Jesus, like His supernatural power, must be regarded as part of His Messianic equipment, a gift from the Father, according to the needs of His work.

(b) *At Cana.* On the third day after leaving the Jordan, Jesus with His five disciples¹ attended a wedding in Cana of Galilee (John ii. 1.) This place, if identified with the modern *Kefr Kenna*, was between three and four miles northeast from Nazareth on the road to Capernaum. Jesus seems to have been asked because His mother was there, and His disciples were 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,

¹ Or six, if John i. 41 implies that as Andrew found his *own* brother *first*, so John found his brother also, but later.

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 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.

Three points in the narrative deserve special notice. (1) *Mary's remark to Jesus.* Weiss¹ supposes that she had in mind *natural* help, when she came to Jesus and told Him that the wine had all been used. In support of this he mentions the fact that Jesus had not yet wrought a miracle. He says also that what the

1 *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 365.

mother had experienced at the birth of Jesus would turn her thought only to the high destination of her Son, but not to a higher nature by virtue of which an unlimited power to work miracles stood at His disposal. He thinks it quite improbable that she had heard of the testimony of the Baptist and the experiences of the disciples.

Now to begin with this last point first. It seems wellnigh incredible that these men who believed that Jesus was the Messiah should not have spoken of their belief, and should not have told what had transpired by the Jordan. When the heart is full, the lips overflow. There was no other subject of conversation to be compared with that.

Then Mary's knowledge of the wondrous circumstances connected with the birth of Jesus, while it might not justify the belief in "a higher nature by virtue of which an unlimited power to work miracles stood at His disposal," would certainly make it natural for her to think that Jesus might one day do such wondrous works as had been done by the Old Testament prophets. To receive power from God to work a miracle is one thing; to have a higher nature by virtue of which unlimited power to work miracles stands at one's disposal is quite a different thing.

Further, it is unfavorable to Weiss' view, that

Jesus had no money with which to buy wine, and as far as we know had no friends in Cana who could have helped Him. Therefore it seems on the whole probable that Mary, in reporting the state of things to Jesus, did it with at least a trembling hope that He would help in a manner befitting Him as the Messiah.

(2) *The form of the Miracle.* Beyschlag¹ thinks the miracle was wholly in Christ's power over the minds of the company. 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 of spirits 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 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 132-135.

its genuinely miraculous character, its derivation from the nature-controlling holy will-power of Jesus."

But we cannot 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 Beyschlag 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 is also against the view of Beyschlag. 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). But to mention yet one point more, the event as Beyschlag interprets it, ceases to be a miracle. It is reduced to simple magnetism. Now beyond question the author of the fourth Gospel believed that Jesus wrought a miracle on this occasion (John ii. 11). He regarded it as a *sign* no less than the resurrection of Lazarus.

Quite different from this is the view of Weiss¹,

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 369-370.

though perhaps equally open to criticism. He thinks that Jesus promised to help, believing that God would furnish the means; that Jesus at the time did not know whence the help would come; that while He and the disciples waited in faith, the desired help came in an entirely unforeseen though natural way. This was "an unquestionable miracle of divine providence," and in later times, as the details of the event had faded out of memory, it came to appear like a miracle of omnipotence, and is so reported in the fourth Gospel.

But we cannot accept this explanation as scientific. There is no evidence 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 resurrection 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 narra-

tive (xi. 42) that Jesus was assured in the very hour when the messenger came that God would grant Him power to raise Lazarus. There is 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 not historical to say 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 resurrection of Lazarus. If the event was what Weiss supposes, then it was not a miracle as that term is used in the Gospels; 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.

(3) *Significance of the Miracle.* The evangelist treats the sign at Cana as he does the other miracles of Jesus. It is the first of those signs by which Christ manifested His Messianic character and power. Herein was the *glory* which the evangelist saw. The most important thing was not the change of water into wine, not this exercise of supernatural power. This

was only a *sign*, an index finger, which pointed to the deep and divine meaning of the event. So, in the fourth Gospel, the miracles of Jesus are always regarded. The miracle itself is incidental; the primary fact is behind the miracle, something personal and spiritual. This spiritual fact, the character and purpose of the Messiah, was manifested, it is true, through signs, but not chiefly on this wise. In His grace and truth also the evangelist beheld His glory (John i. 14). The *works* which bore witness of Him were His *words* as well as His miracles (John iv. 34; v. 20; xvii. 4).

The *abundance* of the supply of wine (according to John's estimate from 108 to 162 gallons) and its excellent quality, like the abundant supply of bread and fish at another time (John vi. 13) showed Jesus as the *bountiful* helper, as the one who was richly able to provide for the needs of men.

(c) *At 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 probably to be found either at Khan Minyeh¹ or at Tell-Hum.

¹ See *The Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, 1895, by Geo. Adam Smith. This favors Khan Minyeh. So Selah Merrill in *East of the Jordan*, 1883.

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). 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 with Him to Capernaum may be regarded as a consequence of His miracle in Cana. 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, 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 Nazareth.

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

best think of Him as quietly spending His time 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.

(a) *The Data.* The data for the early Judean ministry of Jesus are all contained in John ii. 13–iv. 3. The Synoptists make no allusion to this ministry, not even to the cleansing of the temple. They are not only silent in regard to the early Judean ministry, but their narratives, taken by themselves, seem to allow no place for that ministry. They proceed from the temptation to the Galilean ministry without suggesting that there was any interval between them (Luke iv. 14–15; Matt. iv. 11–12; Mark i. 13–14). It may perhaps be supposed that the Synoptists, or those from whom they drew, did not have a personal acquaintance with the Judean ministry. Matthew was not yet a disciple. Peter, from whom Mark derived most of his material, *may* not have been with Jesus during this period, and so may have been silent about it in his preaching. Then, in addition to this, the period seems to have been devoid of Messianic incidents and to have been without much permanent fruit.

This also may help to explain the fact that the Synop-
tists pass over the Judean period in silence. It may
well be that they put a cleansing of the temple in the
last week of the ministry of Jesus (Mark xi. 15-17;
Matt. xxi. 12-13; Luke xix. 45-46) because it was no
part of their plan to refer to the first Passover and the
early Judean ministry. The fact that they mani-
festly do not aim to arrange all their material in
chronological order justifies us in supposing that
such a transference of the cleansing of the temple
was possible.

(b) *First Public Act.* During the few weeks since
Jesus left the Jordan with His first disciples He had
not worked or preached openly. The one sign which
He had wrought had been wrought in a private house.
It was fitting that His first public act should be in
Jerusalem and in the temple, for this was the center
of the national and religious life. This center, how-
ever, 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.

(1) 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 knew that God was with Him. Those who were defiling the sacred place may well have had in their secret heart some sense of wrongdoing. This sense 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.

(2) 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. On the contrary, 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). They did not see in it a fulfilment of Mal. iii. 1-3. 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 protests against the evil practices of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii; Mark ii. 23-28, etc).

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.

(c) *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 strong 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

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.

am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days" (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). Thus the popular understanding of Christ's words was that they referred to the temple of stone.

Weiss¹ and Beyschlag² think that the true meaning of Christ's words is to be found in this popular view, and that John's explanation is wrong (John ii. 21). Weiss' view is this: Jesus called upon the officials to destroy the temple, as they had already begun to do by various desecrations of it, and said that He would build it again soon, meaning that He would soon establish the true temple, *i. e.*, the Church of God. Instead of *the Church of God*, Beyschlag thinks of that which Jesus is to build as "the worship of God in spirit and in truth." But the text is against this explanation, for that *identifies* the temple which is built with that which is destroyed. It does not allow us to think of the material temple in one case and that which it symbolized in the other. Jesus will build again *what* they destroy, and not something else.

According to John, Jesus referred to His body. He said, in substance, "You may destroy me, you

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 394.

² *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 148.

may put me to death; yet ultimately I shall triumph over you. My resurrection will be a sign that I have a right to cleanse the temple." At a later time Jesus gave to scribes and Pharisees the same answer in different form (Matt. xii. 39-40), which helps to confirm the correctness of John's interpretation of the utterance in the temple. It is not necessary to hold that Jesus saw at this time that He would be crucified and rise again after three days. But we must suppose that He had learned from the Old Testament pictures of the suffering Messiah, that He was to go through great conflicts before He should reach His throne, and even that He should be put to death by the powers of the world before He should triumph over the world. But He knew that out of this apparent defeat He should speedily rise to assured dominion. It is this general thought which is contained in His enigmatic answer to the challenge of the Jews.

(d) *Signs in Jerusalem.* Jesus wrought signs in Jerusalem on His first visit, but we 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 of the kingdom 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 dared not visit Jesus openly, but came by night.

Nicodemus was one of the few 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 the life of Jesus for the following reasons: (1) It shows that Jesus at the very beginning of His ministry insisted on the necessity of a new heart in the case of every one who would enter His kingdom. Descent from Abraham would not secure admission to that kingdom, as was commonly supposed; indeed, it was of no value whatever in this respect (John iii. 3). Strict observance of the law, such as Nicodemus had doubtless practiced, did not remove the necessity of this change. This newness of heart, or radical inward

change, consists, according to Jesus, of two elements (John iii. 5), the putting away of sin, which is symbolized by the birth *out of water*, or water-baptism¹, and consecration to God, which is symbolized by birth *from the Spirit*, or Spirit-baptism. It contains, therefore, no idea which is not involved in Jesus' conception of *believing* in Him, for to believe Him is to receive Him as Messiah, and this involves, among other things, a turning from sin and a consecration to God. (2) It shows that Jesus at the beginning of His ministry was sure of ultimate victory. He was certain that men were to have life eternal through Him, all men who should believe. Whether we understand the being "lifted up" as an allusion to the cross, or as a reference to the Messianic throne², it means victory for those who trust in Him. (3) The conversation with Nicodemus shows that Jesus from the first of His ministry felt that His mission was to manifest 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 appearance³. Judgment would not have mani-

¹ Comp. Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 262.

² Comp. Erich Haupt, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate*, etc., pages 174-182.

³ See Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, pp. 347-354.

fested the love of God for sinners, and had Jesus instituted a judgment, He could not have saved that which was lost. (4) The conversation with Nicodemus shows that Jesus at the beginning of His ministry, at least on some occasions, taught the supreme importance of His *person* in salvation. According to the Synoptists, Jesus studiously avoided Messianic claims at the beginning of His ministry, that is, verbal claims publicly made. He spoke and acted like the Messiah, but left men to draw the inference for themselves. Even in private He did not explicitly claim Messiahship. The impression given by the Synoptists is modified by John, as the conversation with Nicodemus shows.

The importance of personal faith in Jesus, as far as this narrative goes, rests on the fact that He is the Messiah. This is the central idea of the term *Son of man*¹ (John iii. 13), and also of the term *Son of God* (John iii. 18). The former term is the most common self-designation of Jesus. Its Messianic import is inferred, first, from the probable fact that it is based on the Messianic passage in Daniel vii. 11; second, from the fact that it is closely associated by Jesus with His specific work as Messiah (*e. g.*, Mark ii. 10,

¹ Comp. Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, pages 77 and 84. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, ii. 434. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii 292.

28; viii. 31; xiii. 26); and third, from the probability (antecedent) that Jesus, as conscious of Messiahship, would not adopt or coin a self-designation, which was to be His one peculiar name, which did *not* recognize His Messianic character.

As to the other term, *Son of God* (John i. 49; x. 36; xi. 4, 27; xx. 31; Mark iii. 11; v. 7; Luke iv. 41; Matt. xiv. 33), varying with *Son* or *only begotten Son* (John iii. 16-18; Mark i. 11; ix. 7), the words of Jesus seem to put it beyond question that He used it as synonymous with Messiah. In John x. 36, Jesus justifies His claim to call Himself the Son of God by the fact that the Father had *consecrated* Him and sent Him into the world. This consecration by the Father can be found nowhere else than in the event recorded by all the evangelists, namely, the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus in the hour of His baptism (Mark i. 10-11). The being *sent into the world*, which *followed* the consecration (John vi. 27), a term which Jesus used of the mission of His disciples no less than of His own (John xvii. 18), cannot mean a change of worlds, but simply the change from the quiet life of a private citizen in Nazareth to the public career of the Messiah. Therefore the term *Son of God* in John x. 36 is plainly equal to Messiah. In the other passage where Jesus uses the

term, John xi. 4, it manifestly has the same sense. Jesus said that the sickness of Lazarus was in order that the *Son of God* might be glorified. But how was He to be glorified? This is seen from the prayer at the tomb (John xi. 41-42). Jesus says that the object of His audible utterance was that the people might believe that God had *sent* Him, *i. e.*, that He was the *Messiah*. It is thus that the Son of God is glorified, when men believe that He is the Messiah. It is evident, therefore, that *Son of God* is a Messianic title.

This use of the term *Son of God* is natural in view of the Second Psalm, where Jehovah is represented as saying to the Messianic King, "Thou art my *Son*." But as Jesus used the term synonymously with *Messiah*, so also did the demonized (Luke iv. 41) and the high priest (Mark xiv. 61; Matt. xxvi. 63). This seems to have been the recognized meaning of the term among the Jews of that day. Thus Martha says, "I have believed that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, even He that cometh into the world" (John xi. 27), and the evangelist writes his Gospel that men may believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (John xx. 31). The central idea of both terms, then, is Messiahship; but we may perhaps say that one term defines it rather in its relation to man, the other in its relation to God.

Jesus as the Messiah has a unique knowledge of the will of God, which fact alone would make a man's relation to Him a matter of vital importance. This unique knowledge of the Father is the claim of the figurative words to Nicodemus (John iii. 13), "No man hath ascended into heaven but he that hath descended out of heaven, even the Son of man." The coming down out of heaven must surely be a fact of the same sort as the ascending into heaven, and the only sense in which Jesus had at that time ascended into heaven was a spiritual one. He had had perfect fellowship with God. He spoke the things which He had seen and heard with the Father (John v. 19, 30). So when He declared to Nicodemus the "heavenly things," that is the Messianic truths, He did so on the highest possible authority. If Nicodemus, or any one, accepts these Messianic truths, it must be on the testimony of Jesus, for He alone is in perfect fellowship with God and competent to reveal Him.

The importance, then, of a right personal relation to Jesus is all gathered up in the fact that He is the Messiah, and because He is the Messiah, He is God's appointed way of helping man. He is the expression of God's love and the way to His favor (John iii. 16).

(e) *Work of Preparation.* (1) *Time and Place.*
The short period of work in Jerusalem, in which Jesus

made a salutary impression on at least one soul (John xix. 39), was followed by a long period of semi-activity in Judea, of which we have but a meager 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 Aenon near Salim (John iii. 23), but it is not known where Aenon was, though the language of John iii. 26 seems to favor the view that it was east of the Jordan. Weiss¹ thinks it was in Galilee or Perea. Eder-sheim,² following an old tradition, puts it in the northeast of Judea, not far from Scythopolis. Others have placed it far away in southern Judea. 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.

(2) *Baptism by the Disciples of Jesus.* The narrative in John implies that baptism by the disciples of Jesus was not different from John's baptism. It was,

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 408.

² *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 393.

accordingly, a baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. Christian baptism at this time, before the Holy Spirit had been given, was of course impossible. If 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 a work of preparation. He was making straight His own paths (Mark i. 3). His recent experience in Jerusalem had shown Him the need of this.

The success 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). What the real spiritual result of the work was can not be said. Yet it may not be too much to suppose that the Church which Jesus left in Jerusalem when He ascended on high owed some of its members to this preparatory work.

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. Then, as the forerunner had said (Mark i. 8), Christ's baptism would be with the Holy Spirit, and the time for that had not yet come.

It is probable that Jesus taught the people regarding the coming kingdom, but without making such disclosures concerning Himself as He had made to Nicodemus.

It is significant that Jesus, even after His baptism with the Spirit for Messianic work, had this time of waiting. It can not well have been other than a time of trial for Him. He knew that He was the Messiah, and yet He must turn aside from the Messianic proclamation of the kingdom and direct His disciples while they performed a merely preparatory work.

CHAPTER IX.

TWO DAYS IN SYCHAR.

(a) *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 Jesus left Judea, the Baptist was still at liberty.

The Synoptists do not wholly agree with this statement. Mark says that after John had been cast into prison, Jesus came into Galilee (Mark i. 14). He does not affirm that Jesus returned to Galilee *because* John had been seized, but only that the return of Jesus *followed* the seizure of John. Neither does he say that the Baptist was imprisoned before Jesus left *Judea*. He knows nothing about the Judean ministry, or at least makes no allusion to it. His one point is that the work of the forerunner was finished before Jesus began to proclaim in Galilee the kingdom of

God. And John's language does not really conflict with this. He only says that the Baptist was at liberty when Jesus left Judea; but he may have been arrested the next day. We know nothing to the contrary.

Matthew says that when Jesus heard of John's imprisonment, He withdrew into Galilee (Matt. iv. 12). He also makes no allusion to the Judean ministry, but passes at once from the temptation to the Galilean preaching. But while Matthew does not speak of a withdrawal from *Judea* into Galilee, he does seem to make the imprisonment of the Baptist the *reason* why Jesus went into Galilee. In this point he conflicts with John, but his main thought may have been that the work of the Baptist was ended before the Galilean work of Jesus began, and this is not necessarily at variance with John. While then we must accept John's statement that the Baptist was at liberty when Jesus left Judea, and that Jesus left because the Pharisees were watching Him, there is nothing to prevent our supposing that the Baptist was arrested immediately after the departure of Jesus. Indeed the fourth Gospel itself favors this view. For about three months after Jesus left Judea, He came again to Jerusalem, and at that time He referred to the Baptist's work as a thing of the *past* (John v. 33-35).

(b) *At Jacob's Well and Sychar.* Jesus left Judea by the road which led through Samaria, just as in the following year He took the Samaritan route when coming to the feast of Tabernacles (Luke ix. 52). He did not share the Jewish prejudice against the Samaritans, and according to Josephus¹, the Galileans as a rule were so free from this prejudice that they traveled through Samaria without scruples. About noon He reached Jacob's well, probably the same that has borne that name since the fourth century. It is located near the foot of Mt. Gerizim. The neighboring town of Sychar, to which the disciples went to buy food, is now believed to have occupied the site of the modern 'Asker, twenty-three minutes' walk eastward 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 is important in the history of Christ's life for these reasons: (1) It shows that Jesus, unlike the religious teachers of the time, was free from prejudice against

¹ *Antiquities*, xx. 6. 1.

Samaritans and women. While the Pharisees thought that all Samaritans were possessed by demons (John viii. 48), 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 wife¹. But Jesus was 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. His first full 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

¹ See Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae*, iii. 287; Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, p. 150.

and development of womanhood among His disciples. (2) 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. (3) The conversation with the woman at the well, like the earlier experience at the Jordan, shows that supernatural knowledge was granted to Jesus for the needs of His Messianic work. It can not be supposed that He read in the woman's face 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. (4) This conversation 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). But 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 economy. This thought is contained implicitly in the Synoptic word of Jesus, that He came to *fulfil the law* (Matt. v. 17). 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. And such was indeed the case in the early Jewish-Christian church. (5) Once more, this conversation shows, like that with Nicodemus, that Jesus from the beginning of His ministry, when the occasion was fitting, declared Himself to be the Messiah (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*, as was the Jewish (John iv. 25), and the Samaritans were entirely isolated from the Jews, so that His announcement of Himself among the Samaritans would have no influence upon His further work among the Jews. Like the conversation with Nicodemus, this conversation with the Samaritan woman shows that Jesus' consciousness of Messiahship

was not a gradual development, as some have thought, but was as clear and positive at the beginning of His ministry as at its end.

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 (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, 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, the Gospel was sent freely to Samaritan and Gentile (Acts i. 8; viii. 4-8).

CHAPTER X.

THE GALILEAN MINISTRY: FIRST PART.

(a) *General View.* The Messianic character of Jesus began to manifest itself as soon as He came forth from His temptation in the wilderness, but not until He came into Galilee, about December of the first year, did He enter on continuous public Messianic work. The baptism of preparation which His disciples had been administering in Judea is now dropped, never to be resumed. Instead of isolated miracles, as in the previous eight months, the Galilean ministry, especially the first part, is rich in them. Now for the first time Jesus appears in the synagogue, and in the midst of great throngs in the open country, as a teacher and preacher of the kingdom of God. He makes His headquarters in the most thickly settled portion of Galilee, in the town of Capernaum. From this center He makes several tours throughout the province, and once at least appears on the eastern side of the lake. During the period of some three months He is forming a circle of disciples, twelve of whom,

at the close of the period, He sends forth to announce Him far and near through the province. But in this period, for the most part also in the subsequent ones, we cannot follow Jesus from place to place, or trace His life from day to day. There are no data for such a narrative. We can only present certain great features of the period, those salient facts which have been preserved in our Gospels.

(*b*) *The Teaching of Jesus.* Here at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, when Jesus at last enters on continuous work as a teacher, it will be in place to glance at His teaching as a whole. It would be foreign to the present purpose to enter into a detailed study of the teaching of Jesus. That requires a volume by itself. All we seek is to give a brief survey that will not too long interrupt the study of His life.

(1) *Place of Teaching.* When in Jerusalem it was Christ's practice to teach in the courts of the temple¹ (Matt. xxi. 23; John x. 23, etc.). There is no record of His having taught in any of the four hundred synagogues, which are said to have existed in Jerusalem in His day. But in Galilee it was His custom to teach in the synagogue (Mark i. 39; Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35, etc.). We learn from Luke's description of the

¹ Against the existence of a synagogue in the temple, see Ederheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 742-743.

scene in Nazareth that Jesus *stood* to read the Scriptures (Luke iv. 16, 20); and from this and other passages, that He *sat* while speaking upon that which He had read (Matt. xiii. 1; xv. 29; John vi. 3; viii. 2). He allowed questions to be asked (Matt. xii. 9-10), and John describes an occasion when a lengthy dialogue took place between Him and those present in the synagogue (John vi. 25-59). But although it was Christ's custom in Galilee to teach in the synagogue, no synagogue-address has been preserved, excepting that in John vi. The teaching recorded is almost entirely that which took place in the open air. It was here only that large audiences could hear Him. It seems probable that the synagogue-teaching belonged especially to the initial part of His work in Galilee, and that later on as the hostility of the rabbis increased, and as crowds too large for the synagogues thronged Him, His teaching was more and more in the open air. Public teaching and working miracles seem to have been wellnigh continuous in the Galilean ministry until the opposition led Jesus to withdraw with a small band of disciples, and to devote Himself largely to them. But before this He seems to have been active in teaching and healing every day. When enthusiasm for Him as a worker of miracles ran so high that He desired to escape from the throngs,

and went into desert regions, even there He was surrounded by crowds and was constantly active (Märk i. 45). Sometimes He was so pressed that He had not time to eat bread (Mark iii. 20).

(2) *Form of Teaching.* It was noticed at once that Jesus did not teach *like the scribes* (Mark i. 22). Instead of endless references to dry tradition, He spoke out of His own full heart, and hence He seemed to His hearers to have authority. 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 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

1 Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 265.

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 presents thought in a pointed way, it presents only one phase of a truth. Thus Jesus says, "Everyone that asketh receiveth" (Matt. vii. 8). Taken by itself, this gives a very imperfect idea of Christ's 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 *symbolic*. This is especially the case with those which are found in the fourth Gospel, though true also of

the Synoptists. The symbols used by Jesus were drawn from common life and from the outer world. Take, for example, the seventh chapter of Matthew. It contains these symbols: the mote in the eye, the dog, the swine, knocking at the door, the narrow gate, wolf in sheep's clothing, good tree good fruit, house on the rock, house on the sand. These were all easily intelligible, and needed no explanation.

Finally, Christ's teaching was to some extent in *parables*. About thirty of these have been preserved by the Synoptists. The parable is a fictitious story, but one that might be from life. It is based on the analogy which exists between the visible and the invisible world. The parable has a double meaning, a meaning on its surface and a meaning beneath its surface. It was an attempt to draw men gently along to think of the truth of the kingdom of God; and to put that truth in a portable form. The parables of Jesus are so finished in form as to suggest that they were not extemporaneous productions, but carefully thought out and wrought out by Jesus before they were spoken.¹

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 gentle-

¹ Comp. Delitzsch, *Ein Tag in Capernaum*, p. 87.

ness and grace of His manner, the love that spoke from His eyes, the sympathy that expressed itself in His voice—this personality was far greater than the spoken word, and may well have made a more abiding impression.

(3) *Content of Teaching.* The Synoptists begin their narratives of the public ministry of Jesus with the statement that He came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of the kingdom (Mark i. 14-15), and at the close of His ministry, when He was before Pilate, He admitted that He was a king and spoke of His kingdom (John xviii. 36-37). So the kingdom of heaven and the King of that kingdom were the two-fold theme of His teaching. The first part of this theme was more prominent at the beginning, the second part more prominent at the close, of His ministry. His teaching on the first was to all kinds of hearers; His teaching on the latter was confined more especially to His own disciples. His teaching on the first part of the theme is prominent in the Synoptists; His teaching on the second part is prominent in John.

Jesus does not define the term *kingdom of heaven*. It is taken for granted that His hearers are familiar with the conception, and therefore Jesus must have been conscious of using the expression in the same

general sense in which He found it used in the Old Testament. Here, as elsewhere, He came to fulfil the outline of the old revelation. The roots of all His teaching are in the Old Testament. Further, it is manifest that Christ's view of the kingdom was in line with Old Testament prophecy, because when He began His teaching, He said, "The *appointed time* is fulfilled" (Mark i. 15). This must have been understood by His hearers as meaning the interval which was to elapse before the fulfilment of the old prophecies of a coming kingdom.

Yet it is not to be inferred that Christ's view of the kingdom was the popular view because it was based upon the Old Testament. It was far more comprehensive and more spiritual than the common view of the Jews. The common view was in line with those Old Testament passages which dwell on the outward glory of the Messiah's kingdom. Deliverance from enemies, political supremacy of the Jews, a splendid city, and temporal prosperity—these were the features which received emphasis in the popular mind, but they are not mentioned by Christ. He puts in their place deliverance from sin, purity of heart, fellowship with God, and unselfish service (Matt. v. 3, 6, 8; vi. 12; Mark x. 43-45). Further, the common view placed a judgment by the Messiah at the beginning of

the kingdom; Christ put it at the kingdom's consummation (Matt. iii. 12; xiii. 30). The common view emphasized the *national* character of the kingdom; Christ's teaching, though designed primarily for the Jews, was without national limitations. It was adapted to man as man.

But while Christ's teaching of the kingdom of God is based on the Old Testament, it is more than the Old Testament teaching. That was the shadow; this the substance. That was an imperfect dream; this a divine realization. Christ was greater than the temple, and His kingdom more glorious than the combined visions of all the prophets.

The term *kingdom of God*, as used by Christ, has not a constant meaning. There are at least four great ideas which are at times associated with it. Sometimes one of these is its prominent burden, sometimes another. First, the term means the *dominion* of God, realized within and without, but with the emphasis on the inward realization (Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; vi. 10; xiii. 44, 45). Christ did not discuss the relation of His truth to political affairs, or set up civil ideals. His aim was moral and religious. Yet He of course knew that the inner determines the outer, and that when the dominion of God is realized in the heart, it will begin to realize itself in the social and civil rela-

tions of the individual, and ultimately transform them all. Second, the term means the *company* of those who are under the dominion of God. Thus Jesus says that the kingdom of God *consists* of those who are childlike in heart (Mark x. 14; Matt. xiii. 24, 41). Third, it means the *blessings* and *privileges* that accompany the divine dominion, as when Jesus tells the Jews that the kingdom of heaven shall be taken away from them, and be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits of it (Matt. v. 3, 10; xxi. 43). Finally, it means the *place* that is to be occupied in the future by those who are under the divine dominion (Matt. vii. 21; viii. 11; xiii. 43; xxv. 34; xxvi. 29). This signification is quite common. Thus Jesus says that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; and that after the final separation, the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

As to the teaching of Jesus regarding His own person, we may say that both in the Synoptists and John it is the real burden of His words. Teaching concerning the kingdom of heaven in the first three Gospels leads up to this greatest theme. His words and works are designed to reveal *Him* as the promised Messiah, the anointed One from God, sent for

the deliverance of the world. In the Synoptists we have a gradual unfolding of His Messianic claim; in the fourth Gospel we have the claim at the beginning of His ministry. But in all alike is the ultimate word which He speaks, and both here and in eternity the condition of men is said to be determined by their attitude toward Him. This teaching of Jesus in regard to His person is simple, especially in the Synoptists. Even when speaking of His death His words neither contain a definite theory of atonement, nor afford adequate basis for any elaborate theory. But their burden is everywhere unmistakable, the absolute value of Himself in the redemption of man.

Particular points in His teaching will be touched from time to time, especially as they bear on the biography of Jesus, but this very general statement may suffice for the present.

(4) *Christ's Relation to the Law and to Tradition.*

Jesus regarded the law as a plant planted by His heavenly Father, and tradition as a heavy burden imposed by men (Matt. xv. 13; xxiii. 4). He fulfilled the requirements of the law as He understood it. His observance of the Sabbath, which created the deepest hostility toward Him, was wholly in accord with the spirit of the law. He justified it by the example of David (Mark ii. 25-26), by the moral

sense of men (Mark iii. 4), by the experience of His critics (Luke xiii. 15; xiv. 5), and by the example of God Himself (John v. 17). He said substantially that God was active on the Sabbath, and that for this reason He was active.

Not only was the Sabbath kept by Jesus, but other requirements of the law as well. He sent the healed leper to fulfil the Mosaic statute (Mark i. 44). He paid the half shekel (Matt. xvii. 25). He kept the Passover (Matt. xxvi. 17). He did not pronounce all meats clean as regards *Levitical* cleanness (Mark vii. 19), but He went deeper than the Levitical ordinance, and taught purity of heart. First and last, Jesus declared that He had come to fulfil the law, and that not one jot of it should perish till it was wholly fulfilled (Matt. v. 18; xxiii. 3). He recognized no distinction between the moral and the ceremonial parts of the law. The law was an organic whole, and He was in vital connection with it. Hence His disciples saw Him on the mount of transfiguration talking with Moses and Elijah.

Jesus regarded the law as fulfilled in Himself, and hence, as law for His disciples, it gave place to His word and His person. Throughout the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus sets Himself in seeming antithesis to the law, and yet not in the antithesis of *opposition*,

but in the antithesis of fulfilment and consummation. The antithesis involves the same thought that is contained in Christ's declaration that He was greater than the temple (Matt. xii. 6). He was the consummation toward which the temple and all the law pointed. As greater than the temple, His word and His person took the place of the temple for His disciples and His kingdom.

Since Christ's attitude toward the law was one of profound loyalty, He could not do other than condemn the traditions of the scribes. He charged them with neglect of the important matters of religion (Matt. xxiii. 23). Their observances were a grievous burden (Matt. xxiii. 4). He disregarded them completely, and it was this opposition to tradition which at last caused His death.

(c) *The Demonized.* We pass in this section to consider a phenomenon which presents itself almost at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, and which created a deep impression (Mark i. 27), namely the casting out of demons. The first case occurred in the synagogue in Capernaum, and apparently on the first occasion of Jesus' appearing there (Mark i. 21-27).

(1) *Occasions and Terms.* The casting out of demons belonged to the Galilean ministry in particular. There is no reference to this phenomenon in the

Judean ministry. There are six cases of demoniac possession which 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 (Luke viii. 2). There are, also, three *general* references to the cure of demonized ones (Mark i. 34, 39; iii. 11). These ten references, particular 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 a 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's references to demons are peculiar. He 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 told Him that He had a demon (John viii. 52). Finally, when He had presented Himself as the good shepherd, who had power 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. If men had not at least *believed* in the reality of demoniac possession, there would have been no force in the abusive language when they said that Jesus had a demon.¹

(2) *Demoniac Possession and Physical Disease.*
As a rule, the Synoptists distinguish between demoniac possession and physical disease (Mark i. 34; vi. 13).

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

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—and this point is of great importance—possession by demons is 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.

(3) *Demoniac Possession and Sin.* There is no indication that demoniacs were regarded as especially wicked either by Jesus or by others. Weiss'¹ view that in the demoniac the sinful state had reached a climax, where the man no longer had sin but sin had the man, is, as Beyschlag says, without a particle of 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. 27). 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. At

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 459.

the same time we are not to suppose that the demoniacs were *good* men before they came under demoniacal influence. This is not likely. It is probable that the demoniacs had belonged to the world rather than to God, but there is no evidence of their being especially bad.

(4) *Demoniac Recognition of Jesus.* It was characteristic of the demoniacs that they recognized Jesus as a divine being. They call Him the *Holy One of God* (Mark i. 24), *the Son of God* (Mark iii. 11), and *the Son of the Most High God* (Mark v. 7). They asked whether He had come to *torment* or *destroy* them, thus recognizing His superior power (Mark i. 24: v. 7). It is psychologically impossible to explain this fact if the demonized were only ill physically, and it is morally impossible to explain it if the demonized were only very wicked persons. Surely sin does not clarify the vision for the recognition of the Divine; 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. "The recognition of Jesus by the possessed," says Weiss,¹ "is explicable only on the supposition that the possessed ones were really under the influence of a superhuman spiritual power, which was conscious

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 463.

not only of its absolute opposition to the Holy One of God, but also of His supremacy over the kingdom of evil, which Christ as the chosen of God had come to destroy." Keim¹, who regards demoniac possession as a mental disease, adopts heroic treatment in regard to the passages which represent the demons as recognizing Jesus. He says they are not historical. It is the evangelists who put this recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus upon the lips of the demonized. They themselves really believed that the demoniacs were possessed by demons, and they represent them as acknowledging Jesus to be the Christ; but they did this, he says, from a dogmatic rather than a historical interest. This treatment of the text is necessary to the support of his view, but it is too arbitrary to be seriously considered.

(5) *Christ's Treatment of Demoniacs.* Jesus treated the demoniacs as though they were really possessed by evil spirits. He called upon the unclean spirit to come out of the Gerasene (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). Now it might perhaps be said that in these cases Jesus accommodated Himself to the delusions of the possessed

¹ *Jesus of Nazara*, iii. 226-239.

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. Or are we to hold with Beyschlag¹ that Jesus Himself shared the Jewish notion in so far at least as to attribute the phenomenon to Satan while it was really a mental malady? This does not seem probable. For, first, this view does not account for the fact that the demonized ones addressed Jesus as the Holy One of God and the Son of God. And, second, it is not consistent with the intimate knowledge which Jesus had of spiritual phenomena. He knew in an altogether exceptional manner what was in man. He read spiritual states as no one else had ever done. In view of this it does not seem probable that He should have utterly failed to diagnose this phenomenon of demoniac possession. We cannot, then, adopt

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 293-295.

the view of Beyschlag that Jesus Himself shared in a popular delusion when He talked of demoniac possession.

(6) *Conclusion.* We conclude that the demonized ones were, according to the Synoptists and according to Jesus Himself, actually possessed by an evil spirit, and that the language of the Gospels, if historical, cannot be explained unless this possession was a reality. But the proof which we have for this reality is wanting in connection with the phenomena of any other time which have been called demoniac possession.

Intrinsically considered, it is no more difficult to understand how an evil spirit can enter into a human being who is alienated from God than to understand how the Holy Spirit can enter into a human being who is united to God. But centuries of Christian experience prove that the Holy Spirit does thus enter into men and control them. Further, we may say that it was antecedently probable that some extraordinary manifestation of Satan should accompany the extraordinary manifestation of God in Christ. Jesus came to destroy the works of Satan, and it was natural that Satan should make especial efforts to counteract the influence of Jesus.

(d) *The Miracles of Healing.* The miracles of

healing belong largely to the first part of the Galilean ministry, as do the cases of demoniac possession, and therefore may properly be considered as a whole in this place.

(1) *Number and Variety.* Specific cases of healing by Jesus are more than twice as abundant in the Gospels as the specific cases of casting out demons, there being at least seventeen. These are met with in Jerusalem as well as in Galilee. 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 eleven, namely, 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 can not be affirmed that each of these dis-

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.

eases 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). It may be noted that all the specified diseases, except the first, are *chronic*.

(2) *Method and Condition*. 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). Hence it can not 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 a natural thing to do, expressive of sympathy and tending 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. 41; 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, that of the nobleman's son in Capernaum, the cure was wrought in the distance, Christ's word of assurance to the father being spoken in Cana (John iv. 46-53); or, if we identify the event of Matt. viii. 5-13 with the healing recorded in John iv. 46-53,¹ the word was spoken in Capernaum, but still at a distance from the house.

It was not Christ's 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

¹ It seems very difficult to identify these incidents. In Matt. it is a *prosclyte* who comes to Jesus; in John, a Jew. In Matt. 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.

cases can not 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. Weiss supposes that the healing, in these cases, was miraculously *begun*, but was then aided by the physical means. Support for this view seems to be wanting.

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 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.¹ As Jesus raised the dead when there was apparently no clear 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 *would* have wrought miracles of any sort had there been a positive and outspoken unbelief.

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

The faith that was, as a rule, required was faith in Jesus as one sent from God who was able to work the desired cure. It was not faith in the divinity of Christ, it was not even faith in the Messiahship of Jesus. It was only a belief that He was able to help them. This faith might be mixed with much of superstition, as in the case of the woman who thought that the touching of Christ's garment would of itself make her whole.

(3) *Purpose of the Miracles of Healing.* These acts of Jesus were a part of His proper Messianic work. 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 See Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 469.

1, which referred to His miracles of healing and His preaching to the poor. Thus He seems to have regarded the Old Testament picture of the Messianic deliverance as involving deliverance from physical ills. By His miracles as well as by His preaching He fulfilled the prophetic picture of the Messiah's work.

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 endorsement 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 it. Accordingly we find that in the case of the people in general the signs of Jesus did not accomplish their purpose. They were regarded 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 however attributed them to Satanic power (Mark iii. 22).

But while the signs were not in themselves conclusive evidence of the Messiahship of Jesus, they were, *in the circumstances*, such an evidence that to reject them was a sufficient ground of judgment. Hence the stern woes that Jesus pronounced on Capernaum and other cities because His mighty works had not led them to repentance (Matt. xi. 20-24).

(c) *The Appointment of the Twelve.* (1) *The Circumstances.* The beginnings of the apostolate 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, but there is no evidence that the others were with Him. On the contrary, the absence of any reference to this ministry in the Gospel of

Mark, which was based on the preaching of Peter, makes it somewhat probable that Peter was not with Jesus during these months.

According to all the Synoptists, as soon as Jesus began His Galilean ministry, He called Simon and Andrew, James and John (Mark i. 16-20). If John had been with Him in Judea, he had now returned again to Capernaum, and was engaged temporarily at his trade when Jesus called him.

The great draught of fishes recorded by Luke (v. 1-9) seems to belong very near the day on which the first four disciples were called to permanent fellowship with Jesus, if not on that very day itself. Its central teaching, the promise of success in their discipleship, naturally suggests that the event was associated with their call, as does also Luke's remark that after the draught of fish the disciples left all and followed Jesus (Luke v. 11). The evangelist plainly thought that, hitherto, these men had not followed Jesus unless in an incidental way. The fact that the lesson of this event is none other than that of the draught of fishes taken by the seven disciples after the resurrection (John xxi. 1-11), can scarcely be regarded as sufficient evidence on which to reject the historical character of the former event.¹

¹ See Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 259.

The Synoptists make special reference to the call of Matthew (Mark ii. 13-15), and then without mention of any other disciples by name they come to the appointment of the twelve. The time seems to have been toward the close of the Galilean ministry, not many weeks before the twelve were sent out. The place was some eminence not far from Capernaum (Mark iii. 13; Luke v. 12). The night before the appointment was spent by Jesus in prayer (Luke vi. 12). There is no indication of the size of the body of disciples out of which Jesus chose the twelve.

(2) *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). Bartholo-

Nathanael was from Cana (John xxi. 2.) Matthew seems to have lived in Capernaum (Mark ii. 14.) James the son of Alphaeus and Thomas were disciples of Matthew, as Weiss¹ thinks, then five of the twelve apostles were from Capernaum. Simon, the Galilean was probably a Galilean, for it was in Galilee particularly that Zealots were found. The name of 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 85.

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.¹ 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 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 taxgatherer. It may safely be assumed that all of the twelve had a thorough biblical education of the rabbinic sort.

(3) *Purpose of the Appointment.* The immediate purpose of the appointment of the twelve

¹ See, e. g., Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 354. "We know what they (the apostles) are in the Gospels, fishermen, like their class, ignorant, superstitious, weak, impulsive."

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. They were also to take part in the Messianic work of casting out demons and healing 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 of Galilee (Mark vii. 24), and the other to the region of Caesarea 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.

(f) *Jesus on the Lake.* (1) *Stilling the Storm.* The

first time that Jesus crossed to the east side of Lake Galilee, at the close of a day in which He had addressed great multitudes, the boat was overtaken by a sudden and violent tempest (Mark iv. 35-41). Some 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. According to Matthew, Jesus first rebuked His disciples on account of their lack of faith, and then rebuked the wind and the sea (Matt. viii. 26). According to Mark and Luke, He rebuked the wind and the sea, and then reproved His disciples (Mark iv. 39; Luke viii. 24). All the Synop- tists agree that Jesus addressed the wind and the sea. He did this, 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). Weiss¹ thinks that Jesus did not speak to wind and sea, and that He could not command the elements with divine omnipotence, as He seems to do according to the

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 34-37.

evangelists. It is quite true that Jesus did not claim to work signs by virtue of inherent omnipotence, but by the Spirit of God (Matt. xii. 28), and in dependence upon Him (John xi. 41-42); but what reason is there to think that He did not still the storm in this very way? 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. Beyschlag's 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 have apparently slept through the storm.* But He had His apostles with Him, and His act is intelligible as a lesson to them.

(2) *Walking on the Lake.* Christ's deliverance of His disciples when He came to them walking on the water belongs to the second part of the Galilean ministry (Mark vi. 45-52; Matt. xiv. 22-33; John vi. 16-

21), but may conveniently be considered here because of its similarity to the miracle of stilling the storm. 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 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 half miles.

Sometime between three and six o'clock they saw Jesus walking on the lake. It seems probable from John vi. 17 that it was Christ's 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. 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 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.

Weiss¹ finds no adequate purpose for this miracle.

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 211-213.

and therefore reduces 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.

It must be admitted that there are difficulties connected with the miracle, but this hypothesis of Weiss seems to make more and greater ones. There is small probability that fishermen like Peter, accustomed for years to this lake, should not have known in a bright night whether they were near the shore, and small probability that *all* should have been convinced that Jesus was on the water when in reality He was on the land.

It may be held that this miracle has as plain and as adequate an aim as has any one of the miracles of Christ. 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, had not Jesus come to them; but they were certainly in a condition to *appreciate* help, and that was reason enough for Christ to help them. If there was not adequate reason for this miracle, then there was not adequate reason for the miracle of feed-

ing the five thousand. It was not a matter of life and death that they should have bread that evening when Christ 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 so Weiss¹ regards this narrative as an allegory (Matt. xiv. 28-31). He objects to it because it is not in Mark, but he thus assumes that Peter must have related, in his preaching, everything about himself, and assumes that Mark must have recorded everything that he heard from Peter. But we have no right to make these assumptions. He objects to it also on the ground that the Gospel of John leaves no place for it (John vi. 21). For John says that when the disciples wished to take Jesus on board, the ship was immediately at land, and therefore there was no chance for Peter to walk on the water. But the force of this argument is not quite apparent. 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, can not possibly be construed to mean that,

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 214, Note.

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 rods, *with Jesus on board*, would seem as nothing.

As against these objections of Weiss, it should also be noticed that the narrative is perfectly in accord with the character of Peter. It was like him to try to walk on the water, but it is not likely that any one would have thought of inventing such a daring deed of faith. Nor is it probable that the story, if invented, could have come into circulation as history at the early date when the first Gospel was composed.

(g) *Raising the Dead.* (1) *Circumstances.* The first two cases of raising the dead occurred in the first part of the Galilean ministry, but for convenience the later case may also be considered here. There are but three cases in the record of Christ's work, and the general statement in Matthew xi. 5, made when but one person had been raised from the dead, is not to be regarded as implying other undescribed cases. The daughter of Jairus in Capernaum, the son of the

widow of Nain, and Lazarus of Bethany, are the three whom Jesus raised (Mark v. 22-24, 35-43; Mt. ix. 18-19, 23-26; Luke viii. 41-42, 49-56, vii. 11-17; John xi. 1-44). Of these one had just died, one was being borne to the grave, and one had been buried four days. In each case Jesus addressed the departed, and summoned him or her back to life. In neither case was Jesus *asked* to raise the dead. When Jairus came to Him, his daughter was at the point of death, and all that he asked was healing (so in Mark and Luke). The widow's son was raised out of compassion for her, but unsolicited. Mary and Martha did not ask Jesus to raise their brother, but asked Him to come while Lazarus was sick. No one ever asked Jesus to raise the dead.

The Gospels represent these three persons as actually dead, but the question is still raised, how much is necessarily meant by that statement. Had the soul departed to the spirit world, or was it still held, though by ever so slight a bond, to its old tabernacle? Beyschlag¹ speaks of these cases as being on the dark border-land between the here and the hereafter, and inside the period in which according to antiquity the body and the soul were not yet wholly separated from each other. He says that one who holds the histori-

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 298.

cal character of the narratives must assume that the condition of these persons was not that of complete death, and that the sundering of body and spirit was not yet irrevocable. If the soul had already awakened in another world, to another sort of existence, it could never again, he says, feel at home in this world, however mightily it may have been called back.

But this statement is not wholly satisfactory. Plainly, death might be complete and the separation of body and soul irrevocably accomplished, and yet the soul not have awakened to another sort of existence. We are certainly at liberty to think that in these three cases the spirit had not entered upon that other sort of existence. But it does not follow that death was not complete, or that body and soul were not irrevocably sundered, as far, that is, as human power was concerned. These three persons were dead both in the estimate of their friends and of Jesus, and this means that, without divine intervention, body and soul were irrevocably sundered.

(2) *The Miracle.* Although Jesus was not asked to raise the dead, perhaps because it seemed too great a thing to ask, there is no reason to suppose that this was harder for Him than any other miracle. He raised the dead, as He wrought other signs, by the Spirit of God. In connection with the resurrection of

Lazarus, it is plainly implied that the miracle was in answer to Christ's prayer (John xi. 41-42). He wrought the miracle not by virtue of inherent omnipotence, but through faith.¹ It required divine power, but so did all the signs of Jesus.

But while not more difficult than the other signs, this one had especial significance, as appears from the narrative of the consequences in the three instances. The report of the raising of Jairus' daughter went forth into all that region (Matt. ix. 26); the report of the raising of the widow's son went through all Palestine and the adjacent lands (Luke vii. 17); and John states that the resurrection of Lazarus led many Jews to believe on Jesus, an effect not recorded in connection with any other miracle of Jesus. Hence Hase calls this the most successful of all the miracles. The miracle of raising the dead, while, like the other signs, it showed Jesus as the divine helper, was of special value as a confirmation of His word that He could raise those dead in sin into a new and higher life (John v. 25), and that He would raise His disciples at the last day (John vi. 40). As a sign it pointed to a profounder spiritual truth than was contained in the ordinary miracles of healing. For it showed Jesus, not as the restorer of the old life,

¹ This is plainly taught also in Mark ix. 23-29.

but as one able to impart new and eternal life. He said that He was the life (John xiv. 6), that He came to give life (John x. 10); and when He called Lazarus forth from the tomb that was the mightiest proof of the truth of His word which could be given to the senses.

(/i) *The Opposition.* The first part of the Galilean ministry was comparatively free from effectual interference with the work of Christ, yet it was by no means a springtime of unclouded success. Throughout these three months, but more especially toward their close, the word of Jesus was illustrated that He came not to send peace but a sword (Matt. x. 34). There were three classes of opponents. First, there were the demonized. At the very beginning of the Galilean ministry one of the possessed ones stood up against Jesus in the synagogue, and declared that he and Jesus had nothing in common (Mark i. 24). There was a spirit of opposition in his words. When Jesus commanded the demon to come out, it tore the man as though seeking to destroy him, and so to thwart the beneficent design of the Lord (Mark i. 26). On another occasion, the one who had been possessed was left by the demon as dead (Mark ix. 26). The manifest aim of the demons was the aim of the prince of the demons, opposition to Christ, the enslavement and destruction of men.

Second, the unbelieving among the common people. Christ sought to win the hearts of men, and all unbelief was opposition. The disobedient leper prevented Christ from entering into cities, to continue His ministry (Mark i. 45). Christ's own brothers sought to lay hold upon Him, saying that He was out of His mind (Mark iii. 21). The people of Gersa besought Him to depart from their coasts after He had wrought a beneficent miracle (Mark v. 17). People in Capernaum who had had opportunity to know most of His wisdom and power, laughed Him to scorn in the house of Jairus (Mark v. 40). In His own town of Nazareth, the people were offended in Him (Mark vi. 3). The parable of the sower probably reflects Christ's own experience in this first part of the Galilean work. Among His hearers, some were wholly unreceptive, like the hard ground by the wayside; others promised well at first, but soon were offended; yet others received His word with only half a heart.

Finally, there was the opposition of scribes and Pharisees. From the first, almost, this opposition was active. It was not mere passive unbelief, as was the case with the common people. Their influence with the masses was threatened by the new teacher, and they were quick to see that self-interest required

them to oppose Him. They complained that He ate with publicans and sinners (Mark ii. 16), and that He allowed His disciples to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath (Mark ii. 23). The tax-gatherers, Jews who accepted office under the hated Roman government, and *sinner*s, that is people who were *not* Pharisees,¹ people who did not know the law and keep it as did the Pharisees (John vii. 49), with these people it was a sin to eat. And so the conduct of Jesus who assumed to be a teacher, appeared to the scribes very reprehensible. He openly violated one of their sacred regulations. Likewise in allowing His disciples to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath, He put Himself in opposition to their laws, for they had decided that to pluck ears on the Sabbath was *harvesting*, and harvesting was work, and work on the Sabbath² was forbidden. It was because of His disregard of the Pharisaic observance of the Sabbath that the opposition to Him took an acute form, and His enemies planned to kill Him (Mark iii. 6). This is plainly stamped upon the Synoptic narrative. Mark, Matthew and Luke have each two notable Sabbath discussions, and Luke yet two more that are peculiar to himself, and which seem to belong to the same period (Mark

¹ See Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 330.

² See Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 394.

ii. 23-28; Matt. xii. 1-8; Luke vi. 1-5. Mark iii. 1-6; Matt. xii. 9-14; Luke vi. 6-11. Luke xiii. 10-17; xiv. 1-6). Jesus allowed His disciples to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath, and when called to account by the Pharisees and scribes, defended His disciples by an appeal to *Scripture*. He healed the withered hand on the Sabbath, and defended the act by an appeal to *reason*. It must be lawful to do *good* on the Sabbath. A woman who had been deformed for eighteen years He healed on the Sabbath, and when charged with violating the day He defended the act by an appeal to their own *experience*. They loosed oxen and asses on the Sabbath, to give them water. Surely, He might loose a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound. Again, He healed, on the Sabbath, a man who had the dropsy, and justified His course by appeal to the experience of His hearers. They did not hesitate to lift a child or an ox out of a pit on the Sabbath. But that was *work*, no less than His healing the sick man.

How bitter the hatred was, which His disregard of Pharisaic Sabbath ordinances occasioned, is shown by the fact that it led the Pharisees and Herodians to join hands for His destruction, who yet were hostile toward each other. For the Pharisees were religiously opposed to the Roman rule over Palestine, but the

Herodians favored it as they favored whatever was acceptable to the Herodian house.

One of the first attempts of the enemies to carry out their plan was the charge that Jesus wrought His signs by Satanic aid (Mark iii. 22-30). They hoped in this way to discredit Him with any of the common people who were following Him. If their accusation was believed, it would at once destroy Jesus' influence. But He pointed out the absurdity of saying that Satan would cast out Satan, and then intimated that, instead of being in league with Satan, He had bound him, and consequently was able to cast out demons. Another accusation was made by the Pharisees in this early period, namely, that Jesus was a glutton and winebibber (Luke vii. 32-34) and thus unworthy of any respect from the people as a teacher. The Pharisees themselves were abstemious, fasting twice in the week (Luke xviii. 12), and hence the life of Jesus, which in the matter of eating and drinking we may suppose to have been normal, was far from their standard.

Thus there was open hostility between Jesus and the religious leaders during the first part of the Galilean ministry (cp. also Matt. vi. 5; vii. 15).

(i) *The Mission of the Twelve.* (1) *The Mission of the Twelve and the Mission of the Seventy.* Weiss¹

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 381.

and Beyschlag¹ 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 (Weiss), 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 (Beyschlag), 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.

These writers suppose that Luke found a second and modified report of the mission of the twelve and thought it the report of an independent mission. According to Beyschlag, Jesus began by sending out the twelve apostles, and then, perhaps on the next day, sent out other disciples to the number of seventy.

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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 261; ii. 225.

according to Matthew, are found in Christ's address to the twelve. But the importance of this fact is over-estimated by these writers. If Jesus sent His disciples out 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. 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. Part of this interval He spent in Jerusalem, and part in Perea. The idea of Luke (x. 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 within 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 much 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. But we cannot say that twelve disciples were too few to accomplish what Jesus wished to have done in Galilee. These grounds, therefore, for the identification of the two missions 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 Christ's final departure from Galilee, but the mission of the twelve was in the midst of the Galilean work (Luke x. 13). 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. 2), 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.

(2) *The Instructions to the Twelve.* Mark and Luke give a brief account of Christ's instructions to the twelve; Matthew gives a long account (Mark vi. 7-13; Luke ix. 1-6; Matt. x.). But Matthew's account can not 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. The laborer was worthy of his hire. It is 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. They must stay in the first friendly house which they enter till their work in a particular town is done. Thus they were to regard their mission as an urgent one.

Weiss¹ thinks this mission of the twelve was a house to house mission, doubting whether they were quali-

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 128.

fied to appear in the synagogues. But as they were given authority to heal the sick and cast out demons, and were commissioned to announce the near approach of the kingdom, it seems probable that they did not in anywise seek privacy, but went where they could reach the largest numbers, and so in all probability did not avoid the synagogues.

(3) *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.

The *reason* of the mission may well have been the crisis which Jesus saw approaching, and His desire that all should be prepared to act intelligently when that crisis should come. He was being hindered

more and more in his work by the opposition of scribes and Pharisees, and by the misguided zeal of those who wished to make Him a political Messiah. He could not personally reach all in Galilee, and therefore He sent His disciples to continue His work.

CHAPTER XI.

IN JERUSALEM AT THE FEAST OF PURIM.

(a) *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. There is no indication that He 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 Him 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 at least

as many weeks. The objection of Edersheim then, that because Jesus could have had no interest in the Purim feast, therefore we cannot suppose that He visited Jerusalem at the time of the feast, is without force.¹

Jesus went to Jerusalem after an absence of nine or ten months, presumably to continue His Messianic work. He cannot have remained very long, for before the Passover which came a month later than the Purim feast, He was again in Galilee (John vi. 1-4). We know of one miracle which He wrought at this time, and from the controversy that it occasioned we can infer what the relation was between Jesus and the religious leaders.

(*b*) *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. The impression which they make is that Jesus healed, as it were, for the sake of healing. He healed great numbers of sick people. Here the exercise of His miraculous power is more plainly for a *sign*, and for this end the healing of one person is as good as would be the healing of several.

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 768.

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, 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 proceeding against Him openly 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.

In the record of His words spoken on this occasion, the prominent thought is His Messianic claim. He said that God was His Father (John v. 17, 19), and that what the Father did He also did (John v. 20). 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 (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." 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 His *divinity* but of His *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.

(c) *With a Pharisee at Meat.* We must hold that Jesus was twice anointed, for it is impossible with Holtzmann,¹ for example, to identify the event in Bethany with the scene described by Luke (vii. 36-50). 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 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

¹ *Hand-Commentar, Johanneisches Evangelium*, p. 143.

expression of a love and faith which secure forgiveness of sins (Luke vii. 47, 50). But this enumeration of differences may suffice. The situations and motives are too diverse to allow room for the theory of identification.

The event described by Luke in chapter vii. 36-50, and perhaps also the feast of Luke xiv. 1-6, may be placed with the Bethesda sign in the visit to Jerusalem at the time of the Purim feast¹. At the later visits in Jerusalem, the attitude of the Pharisees was so hostile that we cannot readily think of Jesus as being invited to a social meal in a Pharisee's house.

This event is variously interesting for the biography of Jesus. With the wedding in Cana (John ii. 1-11), the feast in the house of Lévi (Mark ii. 15-17), the banquet by one of the chief Pharisees (Luke xiv. 1-6), and the dinner given by Simon (Mark xiv. 3-9), it shows that Jesus was ready to accept invitations to social feasts. He was no wilderness-prophet, no recluse or ascetic. But He did not attend these feasts for pleasure. They were opportunities for self-revelation, and were so used by Jesus. The present occasion in the house of the Pharisee shows how quickly Jesus perceived the spiritual meaning of passing incidents, and with what ease He could express

¹ See Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 263; ii. 230-232.

and apply that meaning. The tears and kisses and ointment bestowed upon Him by the woman were proof of her "much love," and so were proof that she felt in her heart that her many sins were forgiven. 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. In order to teach the lessons which He saw ought to be taught, Jesus did not hesitate to rebuke His host even in the midst of a social gathering.

CHAPTER XII.

THE GALILEAN MINISTRY: SECOND PART.

(a) *General View.* The second part of the Galilean ministry extended from shortly before the second Passover to the feast of Tabernacles; in round numbers about six months. The fullest record of it is contained in Matthew and Mark. John has less than a chapter in regard to it, and Luke also relatively little.

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. Thus the second part of the Galilean ministry contained a larger element of *teaching* than the first, and more time was spent in private with the disciples than was given to them in the earlier period. 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.

(b) *The Height of Galilean Popularity.* (1) *Return of the Disciples.* 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. 32-33). They reported what they had done and taught, apparently dwelling on the miracles which they had wrought in Christ's 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 should have rest for a little while (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, Herod's capital, on the southwest side of Lake Galilee. At any rate, he was much perplexed, and sought to see Jesus (Luke ix. 9). Jesus learned of this, and withdrew to a place outside the jurisdiction of Herod, namely, Bethsaida Julias (Luke ix. 10). This was in the domain of Philip. Jesus had no desire to meet the man who had just murdered His forerunner (Matt. xiv. 1-12). He understood his character and judged it best to keep away from him.

(2) *The Crisis.* (2a) *The Occasion of the Miracle.* 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. 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.

(2b) *The Miracle.* 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). The disciples seem to have *bought* these loaves and fish of a boy who chanced to be present. They had left Capernaum in haste, and seem to have taken nothing with them. Apparently they bought the loaves and fish *after* Jesus asked what they had. 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.

The meaning of the miracle was the same as the meaning of all the miracles. It showed Christ 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.

(2 c) *Recent Attempt to Explain the Miracle.* Bey-schlag¹ says it is unnatural to 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, he

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 310.

says, was as much to the glory of God and of Christ as though He had miraculously increased the loaves in His hands. This is also essentially the view of Weiss¹. He says the narratives do not speak of a miracle of creation, and we are at liberty to think that the miracle was one of providence. Christ's example led others to give of their provisions. Keim² also thinks of the actual event in much the same way.

Now it is conceivable that the example of Jesus might influence men in the way which this explanation supposes, but it is impossible to reconcile the text with this explanation. For, *first*, 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 four narratives which claim to be historical. John says that the twelve baskets of fragments were taken up from the *five* barley loaves. This seems to exclude any other provision: *Second*, the evangelists regard the act of Jesus as a great miracle, but if we reduce it to the influence of His example, however beautiful and significant that might be, then it is no longer a miracle in the New Testament sense of that word. *Third*, it is improbable

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 193.

² *Jesus of Nazara*, iv. 194.

that people on their way to Jerusalem, assuming with these writers that there were many such in the crowd (see John vi. 4), would have carried their baskets of provision aside into this desert region south of Bethsaida Julias. If there were many festal pilgrims in the multitude, it is not likely that they turned aside from the road to Jerusalem unless they did so for a very brief halt, perhaps for a few hours, and in that case they would hardly have taken any unnecessary luggage with them. *Fourth*, 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.

(2 a) *Consequences of the Miracle.* 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). Jesus saw that they would attempt to take Him by force and make Him king. There must have been intense excitement. The people knew Jesus well enough to be certain that He would not willingly head an insurrection, and allow Himself to be pro-

claimed as the political deliverer of His people; but 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. 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 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.

(3) *The Synagogue-Address in Capernaum.* 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 now damped 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. He was not at all the Messiah of their hopes, but seemed rather as a dreamer.

It is important to notice that in this address which so emphasizes the necessity of faith in Jesus, and which alludes to His death, there is yet involved no specific conception of the value of that death. The reference to eating His flesh and drinking His blood anticipates His death, and naturally implies its necessity. But this necessity is defined by His own interpretation of the terms, *eating His flesh* and *drinking His blood*. These expressions are synonymous with *believing* on Him (John vi. 35, 53). They set forth the idea of vital faith in a concrete manner. Faith in Him is *appropriation* of Him. To appropriate Him it is necessary to understand Him, and in order that He may be understood He lays down His life (John viii. 28; x. 11). This is not His complete thought in regard to His own death, but it is the only thought which is here brought forward.

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 plain to Jesus at this time that hope for the people as a whole was vain. They had no hunger for the bread which He offered, and He could not awaken this hunger.

(c) *The Last General Messianic Work in Galilee.*

(1) *Enemies from the Capital.* Both Matthew and Mark record a meeting between Jesus 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, nor the exact time. It seems, however, to have occurred in the last days before Jesus' retirement from Galilee. 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 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 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 hand before eating, on which the Pharisees

laid the greatest stress. Under the influence of Jesus, but without any positive command from Him, they gradually dropped Pharisaic ceremonialism, as at a later day, under the influence of the Spirit, the disciples 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. Yet Jesus had not controverted the Levitical law in saying that nothing could defile a man. He only went deeper than its

letter. He was aiming at purity of *heart*, and not at ceremonial cleanness. The words spoken in private to His disciples regarding the Pharisees suggested that He had no hope for them (Matt. xv. 14). "Let them alone," He said. "They are blind leaders of blind ones, and both shall fall into a pit."

(2) *The Last Public Tour in Galilee.* There was a short interval between the critical day in Capernaum and Jesus' retirement from Galilee, and in it Jesus continued His public Messianic work, though this was mingled now with words of judgment. This was the last wholly public working of miracles in Galilee. Jesus wrought isolated cures later, but in a private manner.

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 that it was continued elsewhere. He speaks of Christ's entering into cities and villages and country-seats. This sounds like a summary of an extended tour. 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.

It must have been when He was leaving the lake at this time that He spoke words of condemnation and threatening over the lake cities (Matt. xi. 20-24; Luke x. 13-16). Chorazin here appears for the first time. 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. So Jesus left His adopted home on the west side of the lake, not to return again as a public teacher.

It seems probable, on the whole, that it was in the following days that Jesus paid the visit to Nazareth of which Luke gives us so vivid a picture (Luke iv. 16-30; Mark vi. 1-6; Matt. xiii. 53-58).¹ It inwardly suits the close rather than the beginning of the Galilean ministry. For, in the first place, it represents Jesus as openly claiming to be the Messiah (Luke iv. 21), while elsewhere in the Synoptists there

¹ Comp. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 245. Beyschlag (i. 256) puts it at the beginning of the ministry.

is nothing like a public verbal claim to Messiahship till late in the ministry. Then, again, the tone of the latter part of His address is such a tone of warning and judgment as meets us at the close of the Galilean ministry (Matt. xi. 20-24). He likens Himself to Elijah and Elisha, and His hearers to the unbelieving Jews of their days. As Elijah relieved but one widow, and she a Sidonian, and as Elisha cleansed but one leper, and he a Syrian, so is it now with Jesus. The people of Nazareth are rejecting Him; the Galileans as a whole have already turned from Him. He reaches a soul only here and there, as was the case with the prophets. This language suits the close of the Galilean period, but not its beginning. Finally, the fact that His towns-people tried to *kill* Him is more readily understood, if the visit came at the close of the work in Galilee, after they had heard how hostile their religious leaders in Jerusalem were toward Him, and how the people of Capernaum and the adjoining towns had turned from Him, than it is if it came at the very beginning of the Galilean period. Therefore we are to think of the rejection in Nazareth as following closely upon the rejection in Capernaum. Thus it helps to explain why Jesus, in the next days, withdrew for the first time to heathen soil.

(d) *On Heathen Soil.* (1) *The Purpose and Course*

of the Journey. It had become plain in the last days that the Galileans, for whom Jesus 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 clearer in the last days, and at the same time the thought of the continuation of His work by His disciples would naturally assume increasing prominence in His mind. And, indeed, from this time 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).

Jesus passed through some part of the territory of Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 31), then probably took the Damascus road over the Lebanon range, and after crossing the mountains He followed some southerly road which brought Him at last to the east coast of

Lake Galilee (Mark vii. 31). This tour of at least a hundred miles must of necessity have occupied several days, and may have occupied weeks.

(2) *The Canaanitish Woman.* 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, but it is quite probable that this centurion was a proselyte. Jesus was not inclined to hear the woman's prayer, but her persistency 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 Christ's sympathy. But Jesus 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.

(c) *Signs Sought and Given in Decapolis.* On the east of the lake, in the territory of Philip, in a region where Jesus had not been, unless indeed it was the region of Gersa, where He had healed the demonized one (Mark v. 1-20), He now tarried some time after His northern tour. Of the incidents belonging to this visit three at least have been preserved by Mark and Matthew.

(1) *Signs Given.* Matthew records that Jesus wrought at this time miracles of healing, and that the people in consequence glorified the God of Israel (Matt. xv. 29-31). His statement that *multitudes* came to Jesus implies that He had already been in the region some time, for the region was sparsely inhabited, and time was required for great multitudes to gather, especially as they brought with them all manner of sick persons. There is no suggestion in Matthew that Jesus sought *privacy* at this time, but on the contrary He seems willingly to have taken up public work.

Mark puts in this period and region a miracle whose attendant circumstances differ from those of the miracles in Matthew (Mark vii. 31-37). In healing a deaf and dumb man Jesus took him aside *privately*, and when He had healed him, He charged those who knew of the miracle not to tell any man.

But Mark adds that the injunction of Jesus was ineffectual, and that the miracle was published abroad in that region.

Since Mark proceeds to record another miracle which was wrought in public (Mark viii. 1-10), and in regard to which Jesus did not enjoin secrecy, it seems probable that we must adopt this view of the ministry in Decapolis, namely, that when Jesus arrived in Decapolis He avoided the public working of miracles, as Mark says (vii. 36); but when the miracle wrought in private became widely known, and the effect was seen to be good rather than the reverse, Jesus worked openly as He had formerly done in Galilee.

Matthew and Mark put in these days of the Decapolis sojourn the miracle of feeding four thousand (Mark viii. 1-10; Matt. xv. 32-39). Weiss¹ and Beyschlag², with others, 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 Christ had already wrought one miracle of feeding, and that the consequences of the first miracle would have deterred Jesus from repeating it. But the divergencies of the two narratives are *not* incidental.

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 191.

² *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 310-311.

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. 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* (*kophinos*), and in the story of the second both writers who give it use another word (*spuris*). Later, when Jesus refers to the two miracles and asks how many 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. Such a local difference might readily be assumed to have existed between the

speech of the Galileans from the region of Capernaum and the half-heathen population 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. 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 the general experience of the disciples. Immediately after the first miracle of feeding, when Christ 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 as with men of all times it was easy to forget past deliverances, and hard to believe in divine interpositions in their behalf. Hence we must regard the miracle of feeding four thousand as wholly distinct from the miracle near Bethsaida Julias. It is

biographically important because it suggests that the ministry of Jesus in Decapolis, like that in Galilee, was one of mighty signs and of great popular interest.

(2) *Signs Sought.* Matthew and Mark agree that Jesus took boat after the feeding of the four thousand, but Matthew says that 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 not to be identified with *Magdala*. Dalmanutha is located by Robinson, Thompson, and others, on the southeast shore of Lake Galilee, about one mile north of the Jarmuk. 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 is supported also by the incidental statement of Mark viii. 11, that the Pharisees came *forth* to meet Jesus. This is best explained as coming forth from what they considered to be the holy land into the semi-Gentile region of Decapolis. Further evidence of a positive kind that Dalmanutha was on the east side of the lake is found

in the verses following the reference to Dalmanutha. 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 has 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 were probably from Jerusalem, like those who had recently followed Him to Galilee (Mark vii. 1). 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 called the generation, which they so well represented, evil and adulterous, which language, as Weiss remarks, is severer than any previously used. Jesus refused the sign which they sought, but intimated (Matt. xvi. 4) that a sign would be given at some future day, even the sign of Jonah.¹ When Jesus uttered this mysterious word, He must have seen clearly that He was to be put to death and rise again. This is the first allusion made by Him both to His death and resurrection.

But although Jesus refused the desired sign, He did not leave the multitudes without intimating who He was and how vital was a right relation to Him (Luke xi. 31-32). In their midst was one greater than Jonah and greater than Solomon. 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 that generation and condemn it, naturally because it did not accept Jesus.

(f) *At Caesarea Philippi.* (1) *The Confession of Peter.* When Jesus left the Decapolis and came to

¹ See Erich Haupt, *Die Alttestamentlichen Citate in den Vier Evangelien*, p. 170-173.

the west side of the lake, 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. His public activity in Galilee was at an end. The journey with His disciples to the region of Caesarea Philippi seems to have been undertaken in order that He might have undisturbed intercourse with them. The narrative of the journey itself abundantly supports this view.

On the way across the lake, as Jesus came from the Decapolis, He warned His disciples against the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees and Herod (Matt. xvi. 6; Mark viii. 15). No particular teaching is referred to, but it would seem that the *leaven* which Jesus had in mind was the leaven of *unbelief*. There was no specific doctrine of the Sadducees, Pharisees, or of Herod, which the disciples were in danger of adopting. But all these people were alike unbelieving as regarded the claim of Jesus. This is plain in the case of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and the attitude of Herod toward the forerunner of Jesus shows his real attitude toward Jesus Himself. This will appear clearly at a later day. The warning of Jesus suggests that there was danger lest some of the twelve should

become unbelieving. It was in line with this warning when Jesus, in the region of Caesarea Philippi, put a test question to His disciples. He wished to know, and wished to have them know, exactly where they stood in regard to Him.

He led up to this test 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 of 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, 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 come to hold a more spiritual view of the Messiah's work. 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 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 church. 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. Peter was not recognized subsequently as having any official primacy. He was treated by Jesus exactly as were the other apostles. 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 *Church* of Christ, should have authority to loose and bind, and their acts would be recognized in heaven as authoritative (Matt. xvi. 19). This power to loose and to bind may be identified with the authority to forgive sins and to refuse forgiveness, spoken of in John xx. 23, or be taken in a more general sense. In

1 See Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 384.

view of Matt. xxiii. 4; v. 19, Beyschlag understands the terms as used in the talmudic sense. To *bind* is thus to declare anything to be obligatory or forbidden; and to loose is to declare anything to be not obligatory, or allowable. The purport of the figurative utterance is that the Church, as the representative of Christ, is the norm of truth in the world. It is this as the representative of Christ, and only in so far as it does represent Him.

It is here in connection with Peter's confession that Christ first speaks of His *church* (Matt. xvi. 18). The only other case on record where He used the term is Matt. xviii. 17. The Church in the first passage is something future, a building yet to be built. The multitudes whom He had healed and the still larger multitudes to whom He had preached the kingdom of God were not in this Church. The term which He used on this occasion had doubtless the same essential meaning as the kingdom of God or kingdom of heaven.¹ For had He used a term that was radically different from the familiar *kingdom of heaven* and yet so important as the word *church* manifestly is in this passage, it seems altogether probable that, either by more frequent use or by explanation, He would have sought to make the difference between the two terms plain to

¹ See Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 192.

His disciples. But there is no explanation, and the term is found in but one Gospel, and there on but two occasions, on one of which it plainly has a universal sense (Matt. xvi. 18), in the other a local sense (Matt. xviii. 17).

Yet while the term used by Jesus on this occasion must have had essentially the same force as *kingdom of God*, it involved this difference, that *kingdom of God* looked toward the whole people as a people, while *church* contemplated a narrow circle within a larger one.¹ This thought is confirmed by the fact that Jesus had now been virtually rejected by the nation as a whole, and His subsequent work was chiefly for a small band of disciples. What He had formerly said of the spirit and character of the kingdom was still to be realized, but not in any national form; it was to be realized in the company of His disciples, His Church.

Of this Church yet to be built, He says that the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18). Hades is not hell, and the reference is not to the adversaries of Christ. Hades is the place to which all the living at length go. It prevails over all flesh because all flesh is mortal, but it shall not prevail over the Church of Christ. This shall live on, superior to death, though the individual falls.

¹ See Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 275.

(2) *The Announcement of Death.* 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). He had brought them to a point where they could bear it, or at least would not be caused to stumble by it. Jesus did not refer to His death for the first time at Caesarea Philippi. He had alluded to it before in figurative language. He had spoken of the removal of the bridegroom (Mark ii. 20), of the destruction of the temple of His body (John ii. 19), of the lifting up of the Son of man (John iii. 14), and of giving His flesh for the life of the world (John vi. 51). But not until the days at Caesarea 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 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 Christ's conception. He could not yet associate death with his Messiah. Therefore from this time forward Jesus spoke with His disciples again and again concerning His death. Two other formal announcements are recorded by the Synoptists (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 came just before leaving Galilee, and the third was made in Perea. In connection with the second of these explicit announcements, Matthew says that the disciples were exceeding sorry, Mark that they did not understand the word, and Luke that they feared to ask of Him an explanation. Thus they seem to have had a presentiment that something fearful was to befall their Master, but they knew not what. Apparently they could not think that Jesus meant His words to be taken literally. All the Synoptists agree that on the last occasion when Jesus announced His death to His disciples, he dwelt more on the details of suffering, presented the thought in a form that would be more fearful to their minds, thus seeking to prepare them by degrees for the still more fearful reality.

(3) *Resurrection and Parousia.* 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 (Isaiah liii. 10-11). The first announcement of His return is in connection with the thought of judgment, and immediately after the first formal announcement of death (Mark ix. 1; Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27). When He announced the suffering of His own way, He also announced that the way of His disciples would be one of suffering. 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 earthly life, and deterred from endangering the welfare of their souls, by the prospect of His returning in

glory, when He would reward all according to their deeds. Thus the thought of His *parousia* was first presented to His disciples as a motive to faithfulness. This thought also sprang directly out of His Messianic consciousness, like the thought of His resurrection. It will be considered again in connection with the fuller statement in the Eschatological Discourse.

(4) *The Transfiguration.* (4a) *Its Setting.* 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 Caesarea 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 excludes the traditional view that the transfiguration was upon Mt. Tabor. A journey from Mt. Tabor to Capernaum would not take them *through Galilee*.

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

(4b) *Its character.* It seems easier, on the whole, to regard the transfiguration as a vision than as an objective reality, and there is no exegetical objection to this view. The verb which describes the appearance of Moses and Elijah is regularly used of visionary phenomena (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 Christ. 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 it was not *necessary* on the disciples' behalf, for a vision might convey to them the 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.

(4c) *Its Meaning*. It is not 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. It taught them, first, that the death of the Messiah was in line with the law and the prophets; second, that the Messiah should enter into His glory through death; and third, it was 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 said about dying was a part of the Old Testament picture of the Messiah. They beheld Jesus glorified, which could be understood by them only as a pledge of the fulfilment of His recent word to them about His coming again in the glory of the Father. The voice out of the cloud gave them new assurance of the Messiahship of Jesus (II 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.

(g) *The Final Departure from Galilee.* From Caesarea Philippi Jesus with His disciples passed through Galilee to Capernaum as secretly as possible (Mark ix. 30). There is no record of public words or deeds which certainly belong in this time, but there are three incidents which probably fell in the days of the final departure from Galilee. Matthew puts here the incident of the *stater* (Matt. xvii. 24-27), which shows that the presence of Jesus in Capernaum must have become known. This incident is illustrative of the attitude of Jesus toward the laws of the land. When the collectors asked Peter whether his Master did not pay the half shekel, Peter at once replied that He did. This implies 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 Edersheim¹ 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 put His payment of the tax on the ground that He would not give offense. In reality He was not under obligation to pay it, even as the son of a king is not taxed to support the king. These words echo the consciousness of 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 apochryphal 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, *v. g.*, by Hase and Beyschlag, that in supplying the needed money in this miraculous manner Jesus would have appeared to be doing

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

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 can not 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 knowledge; but it is plain from the Gospels that Jesus was given supernatural knowledge and power for the accomplishment of His *Messianic* work. In this case, however, such knowledge does not appear to be necessary for His Messianic work. And finally, as Weiss points 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." The objection to this view is obvious. 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. Thus Edersheim fails, as others have, to point out any adequate ground for the miracle, and the story remains a stranger and a foreigner in the circle of the great works of Jesus.

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. This incident is biographically interesting for these reasons: (1) It suggests that the three favored disciples, who had been with Jesus on the mount of transfiguration, had intimated to the others that they had had a wonderful experience on the mountain, and so had excited jealous feeling among their brethren. This at any rate accounts in a natural manner for the rise of the controversy. (2)

It was in the course of this conversation that John related how the disciples had found an unknown man casting out demons in the name of Jesus (Mark ix. 38-41). This fact belongs to the brighter side of the Galilean work, for it shows that there were here and there souls which had been profoundly influenced by the name of Jesus, and which had become active in good works. (3) The address on greatness shows, incidentally, Christ's estimate of childhood (Mark ix. 36-37; Matt. xviii. 2-5, 10; Luke ix. 47-48). He set a little child in the midst of the disciples as their *teacher*, and said that greatness in His kingdom required the humility of a little child. He said also that the child or childlike disciple was His representative, and He set forth the preciousness of the child-soul under the symbol that the angels of children were especially near to the heavenly Father.

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 which plainly appears also elsewhere. 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 way (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.

(a) *The Data.* The data for the third period of Messianic activity in Jerusalem are found in John exclusively. 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, and from Perea to the last Passover. Luke also omits this Jerusalem period. When he says (ix. 51) that Jesus, at the close of the Galilean ministry, set His face to go to Jerusalem, it is not certain that He has in mind the journey to the feast of the Tabernacles, which John records. 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* Jerusalem².

¹ See Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 381.

² Luke ix. 51; xiii. 22; xviii. 31 do not necessarily refer to three journeys, but may be three references to the same journey. See Edersheim, ii. 127.

(*b*) *Journey to Jerusalem.* 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 started at least by the Samaritan route. 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, with Beyschlag, that it refers to the journey in March to the feast of Purim. The messengers who were sent before Him to find lodging were naturally disciples, but this is not in conflict with John's statement that Jesus went up to the feast as it were in secret. John simply contrasts the way in which Jesus went with the going in the 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 and He went to another village (Luke ix. 56). Edersheim¹ supposes that this second village was Jewish, and that Jesus turned back across the border into Galilee, but there is no evidence for this other than the assumption that if one village rejected Him, all villages would. This, however, is utterly improbable. Indeed, there was one village in Samaria where Jesus would have been

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

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 Jewish money would, as a rule, overcome Samaritan prejudice. 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. This is the only case on record where Jesus wrought a miracle in behalf of a Samaritan.

Jesus had not been in Jerusalem at the last Passover, though He had been there at the Purim feast a month earlier, and therefore when the feast of Tabernacles came there was a general expectation that He would attend it. 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 further than this. Even those who were friendly toward Him 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 His works had raised their expectations, and had made them think that He might be the Messiah; but when they had sought to make Him king, He had refused. Here, then, we have a distinct echo of what followed the miracle of feeding the five thousand near Bethsaida Julias. But the rulers in Jerusalem were more actively and intensely hostile toward Jesus than any of the common people, and their purpose, which was known in the capital, was to destroy Him (John vii. 19).

(c) *General View of the Third Visit to Jerusalem.*

Jesus went to Jerusalem in September (John vii. 2, 10), and remained until the feast of Dedication, which was in December (John x. 22). Thus He was there about three months. During this period He seems to have taught much in the temple, and in His teaching great stress falls upon His Messianic claim. So far as we are informed, He wrought but one miracle in these months.

From the first there was a deadly hatred toward Him on the part of the rulers, and He was preserved, humanly speaking, by virtue of the popular favor. The division among the people saved Him, as in later times a similar division saved Paul. He finally departed from Jerusalem, when a determined attempt was made to take Him, and went into Perea (John x. 40).

(*d*) *Teaching in the Temple.* 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. Then He claims to be without a sense of sin (John viii. 29, 46), though this claim is not prominent. He has a conviction of His own pre-existence (John viii. 56, 58), which is here more unambiguously expressed than elsewhere (comp. John vi. 62; xvii. 24-25). 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 con-

sciousness, 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. Thus He saw clearly the nearness of the end.

Two points in the above claim may be considered a little more in detail. The unique union which Jesus claimed with the Father is defined in His own words. It is *conditioned* on His perfect obedience. The Father is *with* Him because He does always the things which are pleasing to Him (John viii. 29). He *abides* in the Father's love because He keeps the Father's commandments (John xv. 10). Thus the unity claimed has a moral basis. Further, Jesus makes it plain that this oneness which He claims is oneness of *character*. Thus He says, "He that hath

seen me hath seen the Father" (John xii. 45; xiv. 9). The *seeing* here meant cannot be physical, for the Father is spirit, and as such invisible to eyes of flesh (John iv. 24). The language of Jesus accordingly means this: he that hath seen my *character* hath seen the Father. His oneness with the Father is several times expressed in the phrase, "I *in* the Father and the Father *in* me" (John xiv. 10, 11, 20; xvii. 11, 21, 22). It is plain that this refers to character, for Jesus prays that His disciples may have the same oneness, or may be perfected into the same unity. In this case a metaphysical unity is of course out of the question. Again, after mentioning His words and works which the Jews had seen, Jesus said that they had seen and hated both Him and His Father (John xv. 22-24). This can only mean that the words and works of Jesus manifested the character of the Father, as they also manifested the character of Jesus.

The second point to be noticed a little more fully is Jesus' conviction of pre-existence. The clearest statement of this is in the address under consideration. There was an earlier allusion to it in John vi. 62, and a later allusion in xvii. 24-25. These are confirmatory of the present utterance: "Before Abraham came into being I am." Here He affirms not only that He existed before Abraham, but also seems to

affirm eternal pre-existence. For He does not say, I *was* before Abraham, but He says, when speaking of existence in the distant past, "I *am*." The view of Beyschlag and Wendt that this pre-existence was *ideal*, not personal, cannot be here considered in detail. It seems, however to be open to fatal objections. (1) A merely ideal existence in the thought of God would not have proven the superiority of Jesus over Abraham, for Abraham also must have pre-existed in the mind of the omniscient God. (2) The words of Jesus in His farewell prayer, "Glorify Thou me with Thyself with the glory which I had with Thee before the foundation of the world" (John xvii. 5), are plainly not the same as these, Glorify Thou me with Thyself with the glory *which thou didst purpose for me* before the foundation of the world. (3) John and Paul teach an eternal personal pre-existence, the former in the Prologue of his Gospel, and in his first Epistle, the latter in Col. i. 17; II Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6-8. Where did they get this doctrine, if Jesus did not teach it? It was not found in the Jewish theology. That speaks of the pre-existence of the Messiah in the thought of God, as Israel and the temple had pre-existed, but knows of no personal pre-existence.¹ But while holding that Jesus claimed a

² See Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, pp. 339-342.

personal pre-existence, there is no ground for holding that He claimed to be *conscious* of pre-existence. He had a *conviction* of it, but not consciousness. His consciousness was human, and His Messianic consciousness reached back, as has been seen, to the hour of His baptism. But if He knew Himself to be the Messiah, He would predicate of Himself what the Old Testament predicated of the Messiah (Isaiah ix. 6; Micah v. 2).

(e) *Testing the Jerusalem Disciples.* The words of Jesus in the temple 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. Jesus began on a certain occasion (John viii. 31-59) by promising His hearers freedom through the truth, and must then explain that He

meant freedom from *sin*. 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. When Jesus spoke this word, those who a little before had been, at least outwardly, disciples of Jesus, called Him a Samaritan, possessed with a demon, and a few minutes later they took up stones to stone Him. 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 Christ's 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.

(f) *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. This giving sight to a man born blind (John ix) is biographically important in several respects. (1) It again caused a division among the people, and created a party favorable to Jesus (John ix. 16). Thus it made it possible for Him again to appear in public, which He did, and by His words won yet further support. (2) 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 disregarded the statutes of the sanhedrin¹, 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

1 Gröerer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 183.

shows that the rulers considered Jesus a dangerous enemy even in Jerusalem, the center and stronghold of their power. (3) It 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. (4) It 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.

(g) *In Solomon's Porch.* The miracle on the blind man and the subsequent words of Jesus won temporary security for Him. He appeared in the

temple again as a teacher. This was at the feast of the Dedication in December (John x. 22). The leaders now sought to entrap Him in speech. They asked Him to tell them plainly whether He was the Christ. They probably hoped, as Weiss¹ says, to get from Him a statement which would alienate the sympathy of the people, or a statement which would enable them to proceed against Him in a legal manner.

Although Jesus saw their design, He spoke in unequivocal terms of His Messiahship, and used language which His enemies interpreted 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. Were not earthly rulers, because of their office, called *gods* (Ps. lxxxii. 6), and He whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world as the Messiah had claimed only to be the Son of God!

And again, the fact that He does the works of the Father, as in opening the eyes of the blind man, justifies His language. But this reference to His relation to the Father roused them to a new assault, and He

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 414.

deemed it best to make His escape from them. Thus His longest ministry in Jerusalem terminated, and He left the city a fugitive.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PEREAN MINISTRY.

(a) *General View.* The Perea ministry 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 others, yet it is not always possible to say with certainty that particular events and discourses of his narrative 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 easy to determine in every case whether a passage belongs to the Jerusalem period or to the Perea.

Neither of the evangelists mentions a single place in Perea by name, though the fourth Gospel says that Jesus abode in the place where the Baptist first baptized.

The Perea ministry began in 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. 54-55). A certain preparation for work in this district had been made by John the Baptist, who had worked 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). 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). Yet there was in His teaching a tone of judgment that may have owed its emphasis to the nearness of His suffering in Jerusalem (Luke xii. 49-53; xiii. 6-9, 24-30; xiv. 24, etc.).

As in the Galilean ministry, so here Jesus came into conflict with scribes and Pharisees (Mark x. 2; Luke x. 25).

(b) *The Seventy.* The mission of the seventy may most easily be explained as a part of the ministry in Perea. It cannot well have been in connection with the journey of Jesus to the feast of Tabernacles, for that was semi-private (John vii. 10). It must, therefore, have fallen in the later period.¹

It is intrinsically probable that Jesus should have

¹ For reasons why it cannot be identified with the mission of the twelve, see pages 124-126.

wished, in the brief time that remained, to spread as broadly as possible through the large Perea region the knowledge of His kingdom. 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).

The seventy were sent out, according to Luke, with about the same instructions which had been given to the twelve (Luke x. 1-12). They were to go with speed, and in simple dependence upon God. They were to heal the sick and preach the kingdom, and thus prepare for the coming of Jesus. This address, which Luke represents as spoken to the seventy, may be only a modified version of the address to the twelve, but as their ministry was essentially the same as that of the twelve, the address may fit the later circumstances as well as the earlier.

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 that even the demons had been subject to them in Christ's name. Presumably they had also accomplished the other part of their task.

The mission of the seventy, as Luke presents it, implies that Jesus visited many cities and villages in Perea (Luke x. 1).

(c) *Perean Incidents.* 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. This may have been due in part to the fact that the early church had fewer roots in Perea than in Galilee and Judea, where Jesus had labored much longer; 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. The following four events seem to belong to the trans-Jordanic period.

(1) *Question of Divorce.* 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 better¹. We are not to 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, he did so in the plain language of Scripture, which they could not gain-say.

(2) *Blessing Little 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 not 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

¹ See Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, p. 152.

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.

(3) *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. 17-31; Matt. xix. 16-30; 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?" And yet it is not strange that Jesus rejected the epithet. It is rather in keeping with His entire character. 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. 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 (Mark x. 21) 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.

(4) *Jesus and Herod.* It was probably while Jesus was in Perea that the Pharisees reported to Him Herod's desire to kill Him (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, 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 x. 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.

(a) *In Bethany.* Jesus was summoned from Perea by the death of Lazarus (John xi. 15). This may have been two or three weeks before the last Pass-over. It seems probable that Jesus had become acquainted with the family in Bethany during the Jerusalem visit from September to December. He was especially attached to this home. John says that He loved each of the three members of the family (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 (John xi. 4, 11). He knew before setting out for Judea that Lazarus was dead, and that He should raise him to life. 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 to believe in Jesus (John xi. 15, 45; xii. 9-11).

The resurrection of Lazarus is important biographically because, first, it indicates plainly how Jesus wrought miracles. Before calling Lazarus from the tomb He thanked God that He had heard Him (John xi. 41-42). Thus it is plain that Jesus had *previously* prayed to God, and the situation requires us to think that He had prayed for authority to raise Lazarus. He had also received assurance that His prayer was answered. Both the prayer and the assurance seem to have belonged to the hour in which the messenger came from the sisters (John xi. 4).

Here the fourth Gospel, which is often said to lay greater stress on the divinity of Jesus than the other Gospels do, is wholly at one with them. What was true at the raising of Lazarus we must assume to have been true in all the miracles of Jesus, there being no evidence whatever to the contrary. They were wrought in dependence upon the Father, and not by virtue of inherent power in Jesus. (Luke xi. 20; Matt. xii. 28).

Second, the resurrection of Lazarus led to the

first ecclesiastical action against Jesus. When the report of the miracle was brought to the priests and Pharisees they gathered a *council*, and Caiaphas advised the death of Jesus (John xi. 47-53). From that time, according to John, the officials sought how to kill Him. They were agreed that He must be destroyed. As the governing religious body they informally decreed the death of Jesus.

(b) *In Ephraim.* Once more 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 located by Weiss and Bey-schlag in the northeastern corner of Judea, by Eder-sheim in the northern part of Perea. 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.

When the Passover drew near and the caravans of pilgrims were moving up to Jerusalem, Jesus joined them at some point before they reached Jericho (Luke xviii. 35). He could return to Jerusalem with His Galilean countrymen, for He had in their presence a bulwark against the hatred of the leaders. He doubtless would have gone in any case, for He had long

known that His death would be in Jerusalem (Luke xiii. 33), but it was natural that He should make use of His Galilean supporters.

When He came forth from His retirement in Ephraim, the old cry for help soon reached His ear again. Just before He entered Jericho (Luke xviii. 35-43), or just as He went forth from the town (Mark x. 46-52; Matt. xx. 29-34),¹ a blind man who had heard of Jesus before, and who believed Him to be the Son of David, called on Him for mercy, and at the word of Jesus received his sight. The incident is like that of the Canaanitish woman in this particular, that those about Jesus sought to silence the man.

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 of Zacchaeus (Luke xix. 1-10). He saw this man in a tree as He was passing through the town, and noticing the unusual interest which Zacchaeus had in Him, He at once responded to it by giving Zacchaeus an opportunity to entertain Him. This opportunity was gladly embraced, and Zacchaeus took Jesus to his home. The act of Jesus was widely criticized (Luke

¹ Possibly to be harmonized by the fact that there were two towns near to each other, the older Jericho and the new city (Phasaelus) which Herod the Great had built, but more probably to be regarded as two different versions.

xix. 7). People felt that it was wrong for Jesus to lodge with a sinner. So at the beginning of the ministry in Galilee, scribes and Pharisees arraigned Jesus before His disciples because he ate with tax-gatherers and sinners (Mark ii. 16-17). And although He had manifested this spirit 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 Zacchaeus was amply justified by the result. Before He left the house, Zacchaeus, 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 fourfold, 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.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE LAST EIGHT DAYS.

(a) *The Data.* About thirty-six per cent of the combined narrative of the four Gospels is concerned with the last eight days of Christ's 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 story 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.

(b) *Friday and Saturday before the Crucifixion.*

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 to Bethany, 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 Jesus and His disciples reached Bethany. The supper which was made for Him in the house of Simon the leper (Mark xiv. 3) may most naturally be placed on the following day, the Jewish Sabbath. This is partially confirmed by the statement in John that Jesus was in Bethany long enough for the fact to become known to the common people in Jerusalem, so that they came out to Bethany to see Jesus and Lazarus (John xii: 9-11). So we are required to suppose that Jesus on His way to Jerusalem stopped in Bethany over the Sabbath.

Two events of this Sabbath in Bethany are biographically important. (1) A supper was made for Jesus at which Mary anointed His feet and wiped

them with her hair (John xii. 1-8; Mark xiv. 3-9; Matt. xxvi. 6-13). The ointment used was valued at about fifty dollars, and some of the disciples, especially Judas, murmured at what they thought wasteful extravagance. Jesus however rebuked them, saying that they would not always have Him with them, and that the anointing was in anticipation of His burial. Thus even at a social feast He turned the thought of His disciples to His death. From this it seems probable that He lost no opportunity in these closing days, of preparing His disciples for His approaching end. Of this anointing we have three accounts, which differ in many details but agree in essential points. Simon the host is designated *the leper*, and was probably a monument of Christ's miraculous power. He was perhaps related to Lazarus and his sisters. The Synoptists represent Mary as anointing the *head* of Jesus; John represents her as anointing His feet, this being perhaps a more forcible evidence of her love (Luke vii. 38). But neither act excludes the other. 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.

(2) 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* (imperfect tense) 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 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 had been growing more and more plain to him since the crisis in Capernaum that Jesus was not the Messiah according to 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.

(c) *Sunday of the Last Week.* (1) *The Escort from Jerusalem.* The great question in the days

before the last Passover, as people met in the temple, was whether Jesus would come to the feast (John xi. 55-57). The resurrection 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). This was the *second* ecclesiastical action against Him.

With the morning of the first day of the week (Sunday) a great multitude took palm-branches and went forth from Jerusalem to meet Jesus (John xii. 12-19). 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.

2. *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 seems probable that Jesus adopted this mode of entering Jerusalem in memory of the words of Zechariah (ix. 9), which He regarded as being fulfilled by Him. The disciples, however, saw no special significance in it until a later day (John xii. 16).

Beyschlag¹ is of the opinion that the Synoptists represent Jesus as *miraculously* procuring the ass, an idea which is certainly not found in John's narrative. But this difficulty does not appear to be a necessary one. 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 374.

implied that the owner would know who was meant by this designation; in other words, 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, or He may have seen it from where He stood when He sent the disciples. 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*, seems to be a modification of the narrative due to a 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. This fact probably gave rise to the view in Matthew's Gospel.

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. Mention was made of His mighty works, and the kingdom of David was hailed as now at hand (Luke xix. 37). 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.

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 contrast, 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 fate He wept.

The only discordant note in the midst of the common rejoicing was the voice of some Pharisees, who wished Jesus to quiet the shouting (Luke xix. 39-40). He 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. *They* did not consider Him the Son of David, and thought He had no right to consider Himself in that light (Matt. xxi. 15-16). His answer was a justification of the children from the eighth Psalm. God is praised even by babes and sucklings (Ps. viii. 2). Much more is He praised in the praises rendered to His Son by these children, who are old enough to shout intelligent hosannas to the Son of David.

(d) *Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of the Last Week.* It seems plain that Jesus spent Thursday of the last week outside the city, but it is not certain whether Tuesday or Wednesday was the last day of public activity in Jerusalem (Mark xiv. 12-17). I assume 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. It is impossible to assign to different days the various events which certainly fell between Monday morning and Wednesday night, with a few exceptions, nor is this important. We will consider these events in the following order.

(1) *Preaching the Kingdom.* According to Luke Jesus taught daily in the temple during the last week, and people hung upon Him in rapt attention (Luke xix. 48). They came early in the morning to hear Him (Luke xxi. 38). 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. He taught what the kingdom was, and told his hearers concerning its king. 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 His 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 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, that is, His *character*. 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. Such was the fair vision He had even in the shadow of the cross.

(2) *Warnings.* Matthew and Mark relate how, as Jesus went into Jerusalem Monday morning, He approached a green fig-tree in the hope of getting fruit (Mark xi. 12-14; Matt. xxi. 18-19). Finding none, He then solemnly declared that no one should ever eat fruit from it. 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 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. In figurative language Jesus speaks the approaching doom of this 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. Weiss¹ calls this a miracle of

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 458.

God, a concrete endorsement of the word which Jesus had spoken regarding the Jewish people. Beyschlag is in doubt whether the story is not based on Luke xiii. 6-9, a fictitious miracle based on a misunderstanding of that parable. But, as has been pointed out, the lesson of Luke's parable is that the Jewish people have still a little time for repentance. Judgment is threatened, but is not just at hand. Therefore its teaching is different from that of the fig-tree which withered. Here there is no longer space for repentance.

As to the other view, that of Weiss, it seems to be contrary to the constant teaching of the Gospels. These know only of miracles wrought by Jesus, or more exactly by God through Jesus. They do not know of miracles wrought directly by God without the agency of Jesus. Therefore the fate of the fig-tree, if that fate was miraculously caused, must be regarded as caused by Jesus. It is perhaps conceivable that its withering was due to some natural cause, in which case its fate was a providential confirmation of the word of the Lord, but not a miracle.

In line with the lesson of the fig-tree are the parables of judgment which belong in the last three days. These are the parables of *The Vineyard* (Mark xii.

1 *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 303.

1-12; Matt. xxi. 33-46; Luke xx. 9-19), *The King's Marriage Feast* (Matt. xxii. 1-14; Luke xiv. 15-24), and that of *The Unlike Sons* (Matt. xxi. 28-32). These seem to have been spoken in the hearing of Pharisees and priests, and to have been 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 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.

Before leaving the temple for the last time (Tuesday or Wednesday), and in the hearing of all the people (Luke xx. 45), Jesus warned the multitudes regarding the scribes and Pharisees (Mark xii. 40; Matt. xxiii. 13-31; Luke xi. 39-52; xx. 46-47). He charged them with hypocrisy in all their religious life, with shutting the kingdom of heaven to those who would like to enter, with evil influence on their proselytes, with spiritual blindness, with neglect of the great matters of the law while they were painfully particular in unimportant details, and with building monuments to the prophets whom their fathers had

slain, while they themselves killed other prophets. He closed His denunciation with words declaring the certainty of severest judgment.

The fact that Jesus could thus, in the very temple, denounce the scribes and Pharisees in the most scathing terms, suggests that He must have had a considerable following.

(3) *The Opposition.* 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.

(3a) *The Question of Authority.* 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). He had not received rabbinic ordination. They came upon Him suddenly in the temple, and challenged Him to produce His credentials. 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 bap-

tism 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 Christ silenced the Pharisees and scribes. Naturally they were pleased, and glorified God.

(3b) *The 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 Caesar. 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 with an answer which recognized the claims both of Jehovah and Caesar. If the Pharisees had said that nothing at all should be rendered to Caesar, then the coins in their own hands would have testified against them.

(3c) *The Question of the 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.

¹ See Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, p. 18.

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

He then proceeds to give a Scripture proof of the immortality of the soul. He takes His text from the law which they also claimed to believe. He referred them to Jehovah's words out of the bush to Moses: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Ex. iii. 6).¹ If, then, Jehovah designated Himself as the God of these men, they must be living, for otherwise God would designate Himself by His relation to dead men. But Jesus takes it as self-evident that the living God is the God of the living. He could not speak of Himself as the God of Abraham if Abraham was non-existent.

(3d) *The Question of the Greatest Commandment.*

Yet a fourth time His enemies sought to discredit Jesus in the eyes of the people by getting an advantage over Him in controversy (Mark xii. 28-34; Matt. xxii. 34-40; Luke xx. 39-40; x. 25-28). The Pharisees sent a scribe to ask Him which was the greatest com-

¹ See Erich Haupt, *Die Alttestamentlichen Citate*, etc., p. 197.

mandment in the law. It appears from Mark's narrative that this scribe was not himself deeply hostile to Jesus (Mark xii. 34). This may have been part of the shrewd plan of the Pharisees. They may have hoped in this way to disarm Jesus of any suspicion He might have regarding the question. The answer of Jesus to the question was such a comprehensive summing up of the Old Testament, and appealed so directly to all that was noble in men, that the Pharisees were again without advantage over Him.

It may well have been on this occasion when His enemies sought to entangle Him with hard questions, that He in turn asked them the question of Christ's relation to David (Mark xii. 35-37; Matt. xxii. 41-46; Luke xx. 41-44). The Pharisees promptly replied that Christ was the son of David. Jesus then asked them how David could call Him *Lord*, citing the language of the 110th Psalm. No one was able to answer this question, and so the victory was wholly on the side of Jesus. In all the five encounters He had silenced His adversaries. No wonder that the common people listened with great satisfaction while Jesus thus stopped the mouths of scribes and Pharisees and Sadducees (Mark xii. 37).

(4) *The Discourse on Olivet.* In tracing briefly the life of Jesus we have to notice the discourse on

Olivet, the so-called *Eschatological Discourse*, but only in a general manner. It concerned primarily the life and fortunes of the disciples of Jesus in the times subsequent to the crucifixion and resurrection. Yet it has a certain biographical value, which should be noticed, and it may be fitting also to consider the general trend and character of the teaching.

(4a) *Biographical Value.* The discourse on Olivet (Mark xiii. 3-37; Matt. xxiv. 3-51; Luke xxi. 5-36) shows that Jesus had a supernatural knowledge of the future, and also that there was a *limit* to this knowledge. He foresaw that the temple would be utterly destroyed, and that this would happen within that generation (Mark xiii. 2, 30). He foresaw also that He should come again in glory to gather His elect to Himself and to judge the wicked (Mark xiii. 24-27; Matt. xxiv. 29-31; Luke xxi. 25-28). But He declared that He did not know the day or the hour of His coming (Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxiv. 36). This statement alone is fatal to the view that Christ, *while on earth*, was omniscient. Where His knowledge transcended human limitations, it was given to Him by the Father for His Messianic work, as we have already shown.

It is a question whether Jesus thought His own *parousia* much nearer than it really was. Weiss thinks He regarded it as near, and the belief of the

apostolic age seems to support this view. Edersheim thinks Jesus was not mistaken, but admits that the *evangelists* seem to have been mistaken, and to have associated the *parousia* with the destruction of Jerusalem. Some points bearing on this question will be presented later.

(4b) *General Teaching of the Discourse.* According to Matthew, the disciples ask for a sign of Christ's coming, and also for a sign of the destruction of the temple (Matt. xxiv. 3). The discourse of Jesus concerns these two great events. The difficulty is to ascertain what portions concern each event, and what relation of time the two events sustained to each other in the mind of Jesus.

There are certain points in the narrative which seem to indicate that Jesus thought of the *parousia* as indefinitely remote. So the statement that the Gospel of the kingdom must be preached in the whole world, for a witness to all the nations, before the end should come (Matt. xxiv. 14; Mark xiii. 10). It may be granted that neither Jesus nor anyone of that age had a just conception of the magnitude of the earth, but we must suppose that every intelligent Jew who had reached mature years had some apprehension of the size of the Roman empire. He knew from his Bible something about Egypt and the eastern empires; he

knew, through Greeks and Romans, something about the western world, as far as the Roman arms had carried their conquests. Therefore, when Jesus spoke of a Gospel work in all the inhabited earth, His thought must have taken in a territory in comparison with which Palestine was exceedingly small. And we know how He thought of the advance of His cause. It was to be like the working of leaven. His disciples were to meet with varied and great opposition. Thus the witnessing to the nations was to be a slow and protracted work. Some of His disciples would live to see the kingdom come with great power, as it did on the day of Pentecost and in the immediately subsequent years, but this was only the beginning of the wide work. Hence if Jesus really said that the Gospel should be preached to all the nations before the end, and if He possessed even an average knowledge in regard to the extent of the world, He cannot have thought that the work would be accomplished within that generation. There is no reason to think that He attempted to compute how many years or generations it would require. He told His disciples that the Father had set times and seasons within His own authority (Acts i. 7).

Again, the reference to the times of the Gentiles, during which Jerusalem would be trodden down, puts

an indefinite period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end (Luke xxi. 24). Weiss thinks that this statement of Luke is a late addition to the discourse, caused by the observation and reflection of the apostolic age; but, even in that case, we must suppose that the apostolic age thought that this view faithfully represented the mind of Jesus. It must have seemed to them to be in accord with what had been handed down as the teaching of Jesus, and, therefore, it has a value still for the solution of the question.

Finally, this discourse of Jesus on the last things seems to imply a long period when it speaks of indefinite wars between nation and nation, when it speaks of *many* false prophets, and when it speaks of the love of the many waxing cold, and then adds that all these things are only the *beginning* of the travail pains which precede the end (Mark xiii. 5-8; Matt. xxiv. 4-8; Luke xxi. 8-11). Thus there seem to be unmistakable indications in the Olivet discourse that Jesus thought of His *parousia* as being indefinitely removed from the destruction of Jerusalem.

Yet this is not a complete statement of the subject. By the side of this indefinite postponement we have passages which seem to represent the *parousia* as quite near. Thus Jesus says to His disciples,

“Watch, for ye know not what hour your Lord cometh” (Matt. xxiv. 42); and, “In an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh” (Matt. xxiv. 44). Again, He says, “Watch ye at every season, making supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of man” (Luke xxi. 36). Still more explicit are the words of Jesus in Matt. x. 23: “Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come.”

From this survey we see that the *parousia* is represented both as near and as remote. It is to take place before the disciples shall have finished the evangelization of *Palestine*, and again it is postponed to the time after the evangelization of *all the nations*. It is impossible to hold that both these classes of passages refer to one definite historical event. If both classes of passages are equally historical, then we must suppose either that the thought of Jesus was inconstant, or that He looked upon His *parousia* as a *process*, and that He gave His disciples two scenes out of that one long process, namely its beginning and its culmination. Jesus knew that the first of these scenes would fall within the present generation, but as for the time of the second, that was known to the Father only.¹ The details of this view can not be

¹ Compare Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 351.

given in this place, but perhaps enough has been said to show that it is not necessary to suppose that Jesus was mistaken in regard to the time of His *parousia*, or that His disciples were *wholly* mistaken. This is as far as we need to carry the subject in this biographical study.

(c) *Thursday of the Last Week.* (1) *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.

John's statement seems to be in conflict with this. In xiii. 1 he places the Supper *before* the Passover. 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 Passover. 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 being done on the day of the crucifixion which would not be done on the sacred day of the Passover. Weiss¹ specifies three points: 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 (*e. g.*, Neander, Hase, Weiss, Beyschlag and Hort.) Against this conclusion, however, there is, first of all, some presumptive evidence. Thus there is a presumption 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 Christ's life must have remained in especially vivid remem-

¹ Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 494.

brance 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 mistake, he would have done so in an intelligible way. 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.

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 supper at which Jesus announced the treachery of one of His disciples, and hence the supper which the Synoptists put on the same evening with the Passover, is said to have come *before* the Passover. But this is an indefinite statement, and one cannot say that it means a *day* before the Passover. It is simply a word of relation, and locates the washing of the disciples' feet, and perhaps some other events of the subsequent verses, *before* the Passover. But they are not thus banished from that evening altogether. 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. 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* means paschal lamb, then John puts the crucifixion the day before the feast, and is at variance with the Synoptists. But must it mean that? Edersheim seeks to show that it was used to denote all the Passover sacrifices, and especially the festive offering that was brought on the first feast day.¹ And is not this view confirmed by the fact that the ceremonial defilement caused by entering the palace of Pilate would have continued only till evening, and so would not have prevented their eating the Passover lamb? There remains the passage, John xix. 14. The day on which Jesus was

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 568. Comp. Friedlieb, *Archaeologie der Leidensgeschichte*, p. 102.

crucified is called the *Preparation of the Passover*. But the term *Preparation*, as we learn from Mark xv. 42, was a designation of the sixth day of the week, and consequently *Preparation of the Passover* means Preparation of the Passover *week*, that is, the day before the Sabbath in the week of the Passover.

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. Traveling was allowed within certain limits, and hence the reference to Simon causes no difficulty. The text does not say that he was coming from *work*, but only that he was coming from the *country*. Joseph bought a linen 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.

In view of all these considerations it seems to me that there is no *insuperable* obstacle in the way of a harmonious interpretation of both John and the Synoptists.

(2) *Preparation for the Passover*. Jesus spent Thursday at least outside the city, probably in Bethany (Mark xiv. 12). 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. Yet it appears that He had done so, 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.

This pre-arrangement by Jesus 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 is due to the wish of Jesus that Judas should not know of the place.

(3) *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 Christ's 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. 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. Jesus in answering Peter's request 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 507.

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 (John xv. 3), all but one.

(4) *The 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, Judas went out 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. 26). This passage in John does not make it absolutely certain that Judas went out before the institution of the Supper, but it strongly favors that view.¹ The representation of John is 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 dis-

¹ Adopted by Weiss, Edersheim, etc. For fuller reference to this point, see *Introduction*, pp. 55-56.

covery 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; 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).

(5) *The Institution of the Lord's Supper.* (5a) *The Data.* There are four accounts of the institution of the Supper, the earliest being by Paul (I 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 Mark and Matthew the other. The differences between the two groups are noteworthy, but not essential. 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 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*. This statement, however, concerns the meaning of Christ's death, and not particularly the meaning of the Supper.

(5b) *The Significance.* The Lord's Supper is biographically interesting because, *first*, it is the clearest expression in the Synoptists of the importance 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 prominence 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.

We may well believe that Jesus, in instituting the Supper by the side of the Passover, regarded it as the fulfilment of the Passover, the symbolic realization of the old type. So it was His final declaration of the truth that He came to fulfil the law. If He regarded the Supper in this way, then He must have meant that for His disciples it should supersede the old rite. He did not say this, but left it to be taught by the Spirit. It would become plain to the disciples in coming days that they could not go back from the fulfilment and the Divine Fulfiller to the imperfect prefigurements and forerunners of the truth.

Third, the Supper is biographically interesting 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 (I 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 interesting because it contains the hope of Jesus for a heavenly reunion with His disciples. All the Synoptists report that Jesus, before leaving the table, spoke of drinking wine with His disciples in the kingdom of His Father. If this word suggests the end of an earthly fellowship, it points, also, to a future fellowship. 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.

(6) *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). The thoughts with which we have to do here group themselves around two points: first, the relation of Jesus to the Father; and second, the relation of Jesus to His disciples. First, 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.

At the same time by the side of this true sense of dependence, there are here, as in the eighth chapter of John, intimations of a conviction that He had had a personal existence with the Father before the foundation of the world (John xvii. 5, 24).

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 the most sublime and most difficult of which we can conceive. It 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).

Second, 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 glorification 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 Christ's 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 (John xvii. 11, 22), a knowledge which He has imparted to them; and one with them in the *love* of the Father (John xv. 3; xvii. 26), which He has revealed to them. In consequence of this union, His disciples will bear fruit (John xv. 3), 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 Christ's 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). All that He said of Him, He said in the closing hours. 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 Christ that Christ 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.

These words of Jesus regarding a spiritual successor, sent from the Father but sent through Him as the channel (John xiv. 16; xv. 26), plainly transcend human knowledge. His conviction that His Successor

would carry on His work even better than He could do if present in the flesh (John xvi. 7), accounts 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.

(7) *In Gethsemane.* (7a) *The Place.* Gethsemane was an enclosed garden across the Kedron brook, on the slope of Olivet (John xviii. 1-3). Jesus had often been there with His disciples, perhaps for quiet and refreshment. 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 two-fold. First, He did not wish to involve His friends in trouble, in whose house He had spent the evening; and, second, He wished a secluded spot for prayer.

(7b) *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). At last, when He had

finished His struggle, He said to them: "It is enough" (Mark xiv. 41). That is, 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, and there is no sufficient reason for questioning the historical character of Matthew's statement that there were three prayers.

Mark and Matthew relate that as Jesus withdrew from the eight disciples with the three chosen ones, He was greatly agitated, and that He said He was full of sorrow (Mark xiv. 33-34; Matt. xxvi. 37-38). This anguish can be explained only as the prayer itself is explained. The cause of one is the cause of both. The text of Luke xxii. 43-44, which refers to the strengthening angel and to the bloody sweat, is probably an interpolation¹. It is characteristic of Jesus that on His first return to His disciples, when He found them sleeping, He turned from 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

¹ Not found in MSS. AB Aleph^a, etc. Rejected by Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 540, Note; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 440.

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 defense of Jesus (Mark xiv. 47), and when they all left their Master alone and fled (Mark xiv. 50).

Jesus prayed that a certain *cup* which was being put to His lips might pass away (Mark xiv. 35-36, 39; Matt. xxvi. 39, 42-44; Luke xxii. 42). This was doubtless a symbol of the suffering just before Him. Not a symbol of physical death merely, for His pure heart and His sense of God's presence and His certainty of final victory must have given Him the sublimest martyr courage; nor a symbol of the mental sufferings which would be occasioned by seeing the people whom He had loved and served turn against Him; but a symbol of death as a judgment of God. Man as created was not to die. Death was incurred as a consequence of sin (Rom. v. 12). Jesus was about to meet death with a perfect sense of its meaning. It meant judgment; it meant a feeling of separation from God. It meant that one who knew no sin was made sin. It meant bearing the chastisement of our peace. It meant treading the wine press alone. It meant to Jesus, who was sinless and who was conscious of being the Messiah sent from God, some-

thing far deeper and more dreadful than we at our wide remove from Him are able to conceive.

(f) *The Day of the Crucifixion.* (1) *The Arrest.*

(1a) *The Arresting Force.* The force sent to arrest Jesus was large. There was not only a company from the chief priests, but also a Roman cohort, the particular one which was stationed in the tower Antonia near the temple (Mark xiv. 43; Matt. xxvi. 47; Luke xxii. 47; John xviii. 3). This, if full, numbered six hundred men. 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.

(1b) *Incidents of the Arrest.* The Synoptists all agree that Judas kissed Jesus, and 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 the soldiers fell to the ground when Jesus faced them, is intrinsically probable. All the circumstances conspired to overawe superstitious men. It was in the dead of night. 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 of the soldiers.

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 Jesus 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). Only Luke, who was not an eye-witness, records the healing of Malchus (Luke xxii. 51). Weiss rejects this incident, Edersheim accepts it. A certain motive for the miracle may be found in this fact, that Jesus did not wish to have men suffer through the violence of His disciples.

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 defense. It would be very hard to remain passive when their Lord was in danger. 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).

(2) *Before Annas.* The fact that Annas was an ex-highpriest, of great influence and wealth, also

father-in-law of Caiaphas, together with the probable fact that the sanhedrin could not be at once assembled, even for an unofficial meeting,¹ may explain why Jesus was taken directly to his palace (John xviii. 13).

The Synoptists say nothing of this trial before Annas, perhaps, as Weiss suggests, because it proved of no particular value. We must hold that John xviii. 19-23 concerns this trial, though Edersheim¹ without good reason denies it.

Annas seems to have thought that Jesus was the head of a secret society and had secret doctrines (John xviii. 19-21). Jesus repudiated this idea, and affirmed that His teaching had been from the first and wholly in public. Annas could find out what the teaching of Jesus was from any of those who had heard Him. This seemed disrespectful to one of the officers standing by, and he struck Jesus in the face—the first of the long line of physical indignities and sufferings to which Jesus was subjected during His trial (John xviii. 22-23). Nothing seems to have been accomplished by this hearing before Annas.

(3) *Peter's Denial.* John places Peter's denial in the palace of Annas (John xviii. 15-18, 25-27), while the Synoptists place it in the house of Caiaphas. It

¹ See Friedlieb, *Archaeologie der Leidensgeschichte*, p. 24.

² *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 548.

has often been held that Annas and Caiaphas occupied the same palace, and hence that there is no discrepancy between John and the Synoptists on this point. This is conceivable, though the language of John xviii. 24, "Annas, therefore, *sent* Him bound unto Caiaphas," is not favorable to the supposition.

It was natural that the Synoptists should put the denial by Peter in the palace of Caiaphas since they had nothing to say about the scene in the palace of Annas. The historical character of the denial itself is in no wise affected by this difference as to place.

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. While there are no two reports which do not present numerous points of difference, it is interesting to note that the four accounts fall into two groups, Mark and Matthew forming one, and Luke and John the other. The groups differ from each other more noticeably than do the members of either group. The most important difference is that Peter appears in a 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 still the four accounts agree in substance. They agree 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 a cock crew, reminding Peter of Jesus' prediction regarding him. Matthew and Luke agree that Peter went out after the denial, and wept. These are the essential facts of the narrative.

(4) *Before Caiaphas.* It is remarkable that John has no word about the trial of Jesus by the sanhedrin. He simply says that Jesus was sent to Caiaphas (John xviii. 24), and then passes on to the trial before Pilate (John xviii. 28). Mark and Matthew contain the fullest accounts of the scene before Caiaphas, Luke has only a brief notice (Mark xiv. 53-65; Matt. xxvi. 57-68; Luke xxii. 54-55, 63-71). The regular place of meeting for the sanhedrin was on the temple mount, but that was probably not available for the trial of Jesus, since the gates of the temple were closed at night.¹ According to Luke, the day was beginning to dawn when the trial before Caiaphas was opened. Three important points are to be noticed in connection with the trial by the sanhedrin. First, the failure to make out a case against Jesus. Many false wit-

¹ See Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 162-164.

nesses appeared, but their testimony was not accepted even by a jury who had long purposed to kill the prisoner. One special charge made was that Jesus had spoken lightly concerning the temple. This charge was based on the figurative utterance of Jesus at the time of the cleansing of the temple two years before. Second, the challenge of Caiaphas. He demanded that Jesus 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. Third, Christ's declaration of His *parousia* in glory. In strongest contrast with His present position as a prisoner, waiting the sentence of the sanhedrin, He places that future scene where the prisoner of the present will be seated on the clouds as supreme judge. This word of Jesus, an echo of Dan. 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.

(5) *First Appearance Before Pilate.* According to all the evangelists, Jesus was brought to Pilate (the

Roman procurator, 26-36 A.D.) early in the morning¹ (Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1; John xviii. 28). The council which the high priests and elders held early in the morning (Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1), may have been held for the purpose of deliberating how the matter should be brought before Pilate, what charges should be preferred, and what the method of the prosecution should be; but it has sometimes been thought that it was held to satisfy a technical requirement of their own criminal law, viz., that a sentence of condemnation should not be pronounced until the day after the trial.² Naturally the enemies would lose no time in bringing the trial to an end and putting Jesus to death, for they had reason to fear lest His friends should make an attempt to release Him. Three points may be noted in the first appearance of Jesus before Pilate. First, the charges. In the earlier part of His trial by Pilate the charges against Jesus were purely *political*. There were three: that He claimed to be a king, that He refused tribute to Caesar, and that He perverted or stirred up the people, that is, to throw off the Roman yoke (Luke xxiii. 2-3; Mark xv. 2; Matt. xxvii. 11). All these charges were

¹ See G. A. Müller, *Pontius Pilatus*, 1888.

² See Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 165; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 63; Friedlieb, *Archaeologie der Leidensgeschichte*, pp. 95-96.

malignantly false. Jesus claimed to be a king, but absolutely refused to be the political Messiah which the Jews desired Him to be. He had not refused tribute to Caesar, but had recognized it as due. Second, the bearing of Jesus. In response to the accusation of the priests, Jesus made no reply whatever, so that even Pilate marvelled. But when Pilate, in the palace, asked Jesus whether He was a king, Jesus replied to him (John xviii. 33-37). He said that He was a king, but His kingdom was not of this world, and He said also that He had come into the world to witness unto the truth. Third, the impression made on Pilate. When Pilate had heard the charges, and had conversed with Jesus within the palace, he came out and said that he found no fault or crime in Him (Luke xxiii. 4; John xviii. 38). Jesus had admitted that He was a king, but Pilate saw that Jesus had no political end in view. Therefore he was ready to dismiss the prisoner. 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).

(6) *Before Herod.* 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 only 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. 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.

(7) *Final Appearance Before Pilate.* When Pilate saw that he had the prisoner again on his hands, he sought earnestly to secure His release. His desire may naturally have been intensified by the entreaty which at this time came from his wife (Matt. xxvii. 19), that he would have nothing to do with "that righteous man." Her solicitude was based upon a dream which she had had in the past night. Knowing that Jesus was being prosecuted because of the jealousy of the religious leaders (Mark xv. 10; Matt. xxvii. 18), he asked the throng whom he should release to them, in accordance with his practice to pardon one prisoner at the Passover. He evidently hoped that the popular voice would demand the release of Jesus, and this might have been the case had not the religious leaders used all their influence with the people (Mark xv. 11; Matt. xxvii. 20). But they persuaded the multitude to ask for Barabbas, and thus Pilate's aim was thwarted.

The procurator's next move was to satisfy the popular cry for vengeance by having Jesus 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 for John's fuller narrative. From this it is plain that the scourging, for which there was of course no legal ground, 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. Pilate came forth with Jesus after the scourging and again declared that he found no crime in Him (John xiv. 4). But the chief priests 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 (Mark xiv. 64; Matt. xxvi. 65-66; Luke xxii. 70-71), and now despairing of getting a sentence on the political charges, they ask for one on this religious charge. 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 xiv. 12), but was met with a political threat, which at last turned the scale against Jesus. The prosecutors declared that he was not Caesar'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 and about to pronounce sentence, he halted and asked the Jews if he should crucify their king (John xix. 15). Thus his conscience protested to the last, and he tried to silence it with the thought that the *Jews* were crucifying Jesus, and not he.

(8) *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, and it may be supposed that believers gladly dropped the tragic details from memory.

(9) *The Crucifixion.* (9a) *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 scourging that He was not able to carry the cross all the way.

As the procession moved toward Golgotha, certain women followed Jesus, beating their breasts and weeping (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. Jesus did not feel that He was to be compassionated. He was doing the will of God as He had always done.

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 (formerly St. Stephen's), 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.

(9b) *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. The sanhedrin gathered at early morning (Luke xxii. 66), held a formal trial, condemned Jesus to death, and then subjected Him to various abuse and mockery. Then there seems to have been a consultation as to the best method of securing the necessary confirmation from Pilate (Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1-2). Then came the first part of the trial before Pilate, the trial and mockery before Herod, the second part of the trial before Pilate, with its scourging and various conversations with the procurator in the palace, and finally the sentence and the preparations for the execution of three persons, and the journey to Gol-

gotha. In view of all these proceedings the hour given by John seems much more likely than Mark's. 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 must 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 supercription was placed *above* Jesus favors the so-called *crux immissa*, which is the traditional form of the cross (Matt. xxvii. 37). As an act of mercy an anaesthetic was administered to criminals before fastening them to the cross (Matt. xxvii. 34). This was offered to Jesus, but was refused by Him as He wished to endure His fate consciously. 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

¹ See W. M. Ramsay, *Expositor*, vol. vii. 1893.

² Weiss and Beyschlag both follow John.

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).

(9c) *Words from the Cross.* 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.

Weiss rejects the first of these sayings.¹ He thinks it impossible that one of His disciples could have come near enough to the cross to hear a prayer of Jesus, had there been one to hear; and also that it was not Christ's way to pray in public. But it may be said, as against these objections, that this first word from the cross breathes the very spirit of Jesus; and it is perhaps as easy to believe that John may have been near enough to hear the prayer, as to believe that any one invented it.

The thoughtful and filial love of Jesus is illustrated in His committal of His mother to John; and His Messianic consciousness appears in His 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

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 579-580.

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. It 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 Christ's request for drink, probably did not misunderstand His previ-

ous 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 Christ's 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 agony of death as a judgment, in which He felt Himself forsaken by God. 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. Here again is blessed and close fellowship, even that fellowship which Jesus had always had with the Father, excepting only 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?"

(10) *The Portents*. The Synoptists agree in reporting an uncommon darkness which was over the land during the time while Jesus was on the cross, that is, 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. There could not have been an eclipse at that time, for the moon was full. Luke's statement that the sun's light failed does not require us to suppose that he thought of an eclipse. We must 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). Yet it is doubtful whether their language can be taken as strictly historical. 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 center 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 was 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. The evidence cited by Edersheim¹ to prove that something remarkable happened in the temple about this time is very unsatisfactory. The prodigies of which Tacitus (Hist. v. 13) and Josephus (Jewish War, vi. 5.3) 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 Heb. x. 19-20; for it is in the midst of a historical narrative.

Another portent is found in Matthew only (Matt. 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

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 610.

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. It is difficult to regard these statements as 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 is one that is used only of *spiritual* appearing (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. This also seems to be an inconsistency in the narrative. It is possible that this whole story is an attempt to put into historical and objective form the true thought that Christ's resurrection stood in a vital relation to the resurrection of all the saints, and that, as

1 Weiss (ii. 588) speaks of the resurrection of these departed ones as having taken place on the day of the crucifixion. This is a possible grammatical construction of Matt. xxvii. 53, but not a necessary nor a probable one. If they had risen that day, it is not probable that they would have waited outside the walls until the third day. Why should they?

Paul says, Christ was the firstfruits of them that slept (I 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 Christ brought with it the resurrection of the saints who were buried about Jerusalem, then why not the quickening of all the saints?

(11) *Death and Burial of Jesus.* (11a) *Death.* Jesus expired after He had been on the cross only about three hours. 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 hastened¹, 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.

¹ Friedlieb, *Archaeologie*, p. 63-68, regards the breaking of the legs as a substitutionary punishment.

Weiss¹ supposes that the suddenness of the death of Jesus was in answer to His prayer, which he finds in the cry, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" But apart from the doubtfulness of this interpretation of Christ's words, there is another fact which offers an explanation of His sudden death. 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). This seems to require us to suppose that He laid down His life by an act of His will, as He had said that He had authority to do (John x. 18). After He had tasted all the bitterness of death in the sense of being forsaken of God, then He said it was finished, and with a prayer and a great shout He gave up His spirit.

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), 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. 34-45). If John attached any special significance to this fact, as he seems to have done (I John v. 6-8), that

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 584-586.

significance cannot now be made out with certainty. Weiss¹ thinks he may have seen in it a suggestion of the fact that the blood of Jesus *cleanses*, as water does, and Westcott² regards the words as suggesting that the death of Jesus is the source of atonement (blood) and sanctification (water).

(11b) *The Burial.* 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 there was special urgency that it 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. It was common that the bodies of criminals who had been executed were given to friends, with or without compensation.

Two men were actively concerned in the burial of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathea, a member of the sanhedrin, but secretly a disciple of Jesus and so one who

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 591, Note.

² *The Epistles of John*, p. 173.

had not consented to the counsel of the sanhedrin, and Nicodemus, who two years before had come to Jesus by night, also a member of the sanhedrin (John xix. 38-39; iii. 1). Joseph secured the body of Jesus from Pilate (Mark xv. 43; Matt. xxvii. 58; Luke xxiii. 52; John xix. 38), and furnished a tomb, and the linen, while Nicodemus brought a hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes (John xix. 39; Mark xv. 46). The tomb of Joseph was in a garden near Golgotha, and was new (John xix. 41).

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 Jesus, 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).

CHAPTER XVII.

THE RESURRECTION AND THE RISEN CHRIST.

(a) *Incidents of the Sabbath.* According to Matthew (xxvii. 62-66) the chief priests and Pharisees went to Pilate on the Sabbath, and asked that the sepulchre be made sure till the third day. The ground of this was their fear that the disciples of Jesus would steal the body and so be able to make people believe that the word of Jesus about His rising on the third day was fulfilled. As the result of their request, the sepulchre was sealed and a guard set.

Weiss¹ rejects this story. He says that the oldest tradition (Mark) knows nothing 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). This objection however can scarcely be regarded as valid. Matthew represents the sealing of the tomb as taking place on the Jewish *Sabbath*,

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 594.

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.

More serious objections are raised by Beyschlag.¹ He says it is incredible that the priests should have been so well acquainted with Christ's 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 certainly is not incredible that they should have heard of this strange utterance of Jesus. It would rather be strange if they had not heard of it, and especially since one of the apostles of Jesus had turned traitor, and for days had been in close communication with the priests. But having heard of the prophecy, they surely would not neglect any precaution which might now be suggested to guard against a renewal of the influence of their dead rival.

Beyschlag says further that it is incredible that the

¹ *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 405.

priests would at once believe the report of the soldiers who told them of the occurrences at the tomb. It would be remarkable, he continues, if they immediately believed that Jesus had risen from the dead, when His 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 stricken 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 Christ's 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 Christ. 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 there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the historicity of this narrative.

(b) *The Resurrection.* (1) *The Women with the Spices.* Matthew, Mark and John agree that Mary Magdalene came early to the tomb of Jesus. John mentions no one else. Matthew mentions also Mary the mother of James, and Mark mentions both these and Salome (Mark xvi. 1; Matt. xxviii. 1; John xx. 1). Luke mentions a certain Joanna (Luke xxiv. 10).

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.

The Synoptists say that the body of Jesus was wrapped in a linen cloth and laid in the tomb. They say nothing of its being embalmed. Luke's statement

(xxiii. 54), that as they laid the body in the tomb, the Sabbath drew on, suggests that there was not time for the embalming. Accordingly, the further representation of the Synoptists that the women prepared spices and ointments to embalm the body of Jesus, is natural. 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). Nothing was left undone. 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. 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 not have entertained the thought of leaving the embalmment two nights and a day until the Sabbath should be past. Therefore we must accept John's narrative of the burial, and must hold that the women did not know what had been done by Joseph and Nicodemus.

(2) *Accompaniments of the Resurrection.* The first Gospel records that at the resurrection of Jesus there was an earthquake, as also at His death (Matt. xxviii. 2). The stone was rolled back by an angel, and when the women came he was sitting upon it. The Roman guards were prostrate through great fear.

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 story which the author found and adopted because he thought it was in keeping with the majesty of the event.

But the way in which the stone was removed is, after all, only an unimportant detail. All the evangelists agree that the women found the tomb open.

(3) *The Resurrection.* It is noticeable that no one of the evangelists alludes to the act of Christ's 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 Harnack¹ ascribes to the beginning of the second century, professes to give information in regard to the very act of resurrection. 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 soberness and propriety of the Gospels does such a fiction fall!

All the evangelists agree that the women found the tomb empty; the body of Jesus was gone (Mark xvi. 5-6; Matt. xxviii. 5-6; Luke xxiv. 5-6; John xx. 1-2). All agree that the women (or according to John, woman) hastened to bring word to the disciples. Peter, John and some others heard the news first

¹ *Bruchstuecke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus*, 1893.

(Luke xxiv. 9-11; Mark xvi. 8; Matt. xxviii. 8; John xx. 2). It is not probable that the eleven were all together at this early hour.

(c) *Appearances of the Risen Lord.* From three of the evangelists¹ and from Paul we learn of the following appearances of the risen Lord. The order in which they are given can not be proven to be correct in every case.

(1) As the women fled from the tomb, Jesus met them with a greeting (Matt. xxviii. 8-9). These women were Mary the mother of James, Salome and Joanna (Mark xvi. 1; Matt. xxviii. 1; Luke xxiv. 10). Mary Magdalene was not with them. The women recognized Jesus, clasped His feet and worshipped Him (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).

(2) Mary Magdalene was not with the other women when they met Jesus, though she also had left the tomb to bring word to the disciples that the body of Jesus was no longer there (John xx. 2). She seems to have followed Peter and John back to the tomb,

¹ The account in Mark xvi. 9-20 is not taken into consideration, since it is not regarded as authentic. Moreover, it has no appearances which are not found in the other Gospels.

and there she lingered after they had returned (John xx. 11). After seeing two angels in the tomb, to whom she told her sorrow, Jesus appeared to her (John xx. 13-14). She did not recognize Him until He spoke her name. Then with the cry *Rabboni*, 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 her sorrowful heart 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 *Paraclete* who would fulfil their joy (John xiv. 16).

(3) A third appearance 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, and then He showed from the Scriptures that the Messiah should enter into His glory through suffering. When the two reached Emmaus, they 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. Straightway the two went back to Jerusalem, full of joy at what they had seen.

(4) A fourth appearance on the day of resurrection was to Simon (Luke xxiv. 34; I Cor. xv. 5). This may have preceded the third appearance.

(5) The fifth appearance of the risen Lord was also on the day of the resurrection. According to John (xx. 19, 24, 26), this appearance seems to have been to ten of the apostles; according to Luke (xxiv. 33), it was to the eleven and those with them. But he may here use the term *the eleven* somewhat loosely, to designate the apostolic circle, so that it does not necessarily conflict with John's statement. On this occasion, Jesus appeared while the doors were closed. The disciples were affrighted at first, thinking that they beheld a spirit, for what they saw did not enter the room through the door. Jesus then proved that it was He by showing His hands and His feet (Luke

xxiv. 39), or His hands and His side (John xx. 20), and by eating a piece of broiled fish (Luke xxiv. 42-43). Then their fright was turned into gladness (John xx. 20). Jesus told His disciples that the Scriptures were fulfilled in His suffering, death and resurrection (Luke xxiv. 46). He spoke peace to them, and said that He sent them forth as the Father had sent Him. They were thus to be the continuators of His work (John xx. 21). According to Luke, Jesus told them to tarry in the city until they should be clothed with power from on high (Luke xxiv. 49); according to John, He breathed upon them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (John xx. 22). We should not however hastily infer a conflict between these two statements.¹ The act of Jesus, according to John, is to qualify His disciples to forgive or retain sins. But this is something different from the equipment with power to preach the Gospel, which they received at Pentecost. Authority to forgive or retain sins is authority to be the norm of truth in the earth, to represent Christ as the revealer of the Father, authority to be the incarnate law regarding holy and unholy. But this is plainly different from the gift of the Spirit as the Spirit of wisdom and courage and force for the conversion of men.

¹ Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. 374, says that John's narrative simply does away with Pentecost.

(6) The sixth appearance of Jesus was separated from the first five by an interval of one week (John xx. 26). It was in Jerusalem, and apparently to the eleven apostles. Here again Jesus appeared suddenly in a room whose doors were shut. The appearance was especially on account of Thomas, who had not been present when Jesus appeared to the apostles the week before. They had told him of seeing the Lord, but he declared that he could not believe without certain material tests. 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.

(7) With the seventh appearance of the risen Lord, the time of which is not definitely fixed, we are taken from Jerusalem to Galilee (John xxi). There were seven disciples together, and the names of five of these are given — Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, James, and John. 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 apparently the fish which were being cooked were not enough for all the seven, and 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 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. John himself according to the twenty-third verse of this chapter, saw clearly that the obscure saying of Jesus was not equivalent to a statement that he should not die.

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.

8. The eighth appearance of Jesus was also in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 16-20). Matthew teaches that Jesus had appointed a particular place, a certain mountain, where He would meet His disciples. Here He appeared to the eleven apostles, and probably at the same time to the large company of more than five hundred believers, an event reported only by Paul (I Cor. xv. 6). This is probable, for, first, it was only in Galilee 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. Therefore we should hold that the eighth appearance of Jesus was the only appearance to a great number, and was the chief event in the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension. The commission of Jesus to go and disciple all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19-20) was accordingly

addressed, not to the eleven apostles, but to them and more than five hundred disciples in addition.

In the *importance* of this eighth appearance of Jesus lies the 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 were to individuals, while that on the Galilean mountain was, as it were, to the entire Church. So the word of Jesus and of the angel is in a measure justified.

(9) 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 (I 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). The apostles had returned to Jerusalem, probably in accordance with a request of Jesus, and, being gathered together, Jesus met them (Acts i. 4). He seems

to have been with them at meat and to have shared in the refreshment which was provided (Acts i. 4; x. 41). He told them not to depart from Jerusalem until the promise of the Spirit should have been fulfilled unto them. Then He led them forth until they were over against Bethany (Luke xxiv. 50), possibly that the dear friends who lived there might receive His farewell blessing. It seems to have been at this time on Olivet that the apostles asked Jesus whether He would then restore the kingdom to Israel (Acts i. 6). He had spoken of the coming of the Holy Spirit in the immediate future, and they desired to know whether that would bring the fulfilment of prophecy, especially with reference to the redemption of Israel. His reply was that only the Father could answer the question of *time* (Acts i. 7; Mark xiii. 32), and as for the *restoration*, this was to be through them as His witnesses, equipped with the power of the Spirit.

(d) *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 (John xx. 7-8). Mary the mother of James, and Salome 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 (I Cor. xv. 44).

The theory that the disciples had a *vision* of Jesus, but that He was not objectively present, is irrecon-

cilable with the narrative¹. 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 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.

¹ Comp. Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu*, i. 430-435.

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.

(*e*) *The Ascension.* Luke alone refers to the ascension, and that not in his Gospel but in the Acts (Acts i. 9). The leading text-critics omit from Luke xxiv. 51 the words, "and was carried up into heaven." According to the passage in Acts, Jesus was, apparently seen, 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 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 (xxi. 1-23) 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 represents Jesus as speaking of His ascension (John xx. 17). It is something about to be realized. 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. Thus, for

example, it is implied in the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, for Jesus had promised to send Him when He should return to the Father (John xv. 26; xvi. 7). It is also directly affirmed many times in the teaching of the apostles. Paul says in Romans viii. 34:

“Who is he that shall condemn?
 Shall Christ Jesus that died,
 Yea rather that was raised from the dead,
Who is at the right hand of God,
 Who also maketh intercession for us?”

And again, “Seek the things that are above, where Christ is, *seated on the right hand of God*” (Col. iii. 1). In the visions of the Apocalypse, He is seated with the Father *in His throne* (Rev. iii. 21; xxii. 1).

Nothing was more certain to the faith of the apostolic age than that the Lord Jesus was seated at the right hand of God, exalted far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.

Unto Him be glory through all ages.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Abomination of desolation	27
Annas, trial of Jesus before	359-360
Anonymous Gospels	13
Anointing of Jesus' feet	239-241
Anointing of Jesus in Bethany	312-314
Announcement of death	271-272
Appearances of the risen Lord	392-400
Aramaic Gospel	23
Arrest of Jesus	357-359
Ascension of Jesus	403-405
Authority, question of	325-326
Baptist's testimony	33
Baptist's death	34
Baptism of Jesus	33, 34, 117-125
Baptism by the disciples of Jesus	170-172
Bethesda sign	235-239
Bethsaida Julias, crisis at	244-249
Birth of Jesus	90-99
Burial of Jesus	383-384
Caesarea Philippi	264-278
Caiaphas, trial of Jesus before	362-363
Children blessed	302-303
Church of Christ	269-270
Chronological outline	139-143
Circumcision of Jesus	100-101
Claims of the Gospel	13-14
Correspondences in Synoptic Gospels	18-19

Contradictions in Synoptic Gospels.....	19- 20
Conception of Jesus.....	79- 89
Coin in fish's mouth.....	278-281
Commandment, question of greatest.....	328-329
Criticism of the sources.....	13- 16
Cross, words from.....	374-377
Crucifixion.....	372-374
Dalmanutha.....	262-263
Darkness on day of crucifixion.....	377-378
Date of the birth of Jesus.....	93- 99
Death of Jesus.....	381-383
Decapolis, ministry in.....	258-264
Demoniac possession.....	192-199
Discourses in fourth Gospel.....	59- 69
Disagreements in Gospels accounted for.....	45- 47
Divinity of Jesus and the Supernatural Conception.....	84
Divorce.....	31-32, 301-302
Dove and voice.....	119-121
Earthquake on day of crucifixion.....	379-381
Education of Jesus.....	108-116
Elements in solution of Synoptic problem.....	20- 51
Ephraim, Jesus in.....	308-309
Eschatological Discourse.....	329-335
Fasting of Jesus.....	128
Feeding five thousand.....	244-249
Feeding four thousand.....	259-262
Fig-tree withered.....	32, 322-323
Flight into Egypt.....	106-107
Form of the temptation.....	132-134
Fourth Gospel's relation to Synoptists.....	54- 57
Fourth Gospel independent.....	52-54, 57- 59
Fourth Gospel trustworthy.....	51- 74
Galilean ministry—First part.....	180-233
Galilean ministry—Second part.....	242-283
General view of first part.....	180-181
General view of second part.....	242-243

Gerasene Demoniac.....	25, 34
Gethsemane.....	35, 354
Golgotha, the procession to.....	370-371
Golgotha, site of.....	371-372
God's vineyard.....	28- 29
Gospel outside the Gospels.....	74- 78
Grave of Jesus.....	30
Greatness in Christ's Kingdom.....	281-282
Hellenistic culture of the fourth evangelist.....	70- 74
Herod baffled.....	106
Herod Antipas' desire to kill Jesus.....	304-305
Herod Antipas, trial of Jesus before.....	365-367
Historicity of Synoptic Gospels.....	47- 51
Home of Jesus.....	108-111
Humanity of Jesus in the fourth Gospel.....	63- 65
Independence of Synoptic Gospels.....	23- 39
Jacob's Well.....	173-179
Jericho, blind man healed in.....	309
Jerusalem, last labors for.....	284-297
Jesus' personal appearance.....	115-116
Jesus at the Jordan.....	144-148
Judas with the chief priests.....	314
Judas' departure from the Supper.....	344-345
Judas, end of.....	370
Judean ministry.....	158-172
Kingdom of God.....	188-189
Last words of Jesus to His disciples.....	349-354
Last preaching in the temple.....	320-322
Law in the education of Jesus.....	111-114
Lazarus raised.....	306-308
Length of Christ's ministry.....	136-139
Levi's call.....	26
Literary problem in Synoptists.....	16- 20
Lord's Supper.....	29-30, 34
Lord's Supper, institution of.....	345-346
Lord's Supper, biographical value of.....	346-349

Magi	103-106
Man born blind	293-295
Mark's dependence on Peter.....	40 42
Mark-hypothesis.....	21
Mary Magdalene and the risen Lord.....	393-395
Matthew-Logia	21
Matthew and the Logia	42- 43
Matthew's independence of Mark.....	30- 39
Messiahship in the Fourth Gospel and Synoptists	66- 68
Messianic consciousness.....	122-125
Messianic entry into Jerusalem.....	312, 314-319
Miracles of healing	199-206
Mission of the twelve	226-233
Nature in the education of Jesus.....	114-115
Nazareth, the rejection in.....	254-255
Nicodemus with Jesus	164-169
Observance of the Sabbath.....	224-225
Olivet, discourse on.....	329-335
Opposition in the early Galilean ministry.....	222-226
Opposition in the last days	325-329
Order of events in the Synoptists.....	36- 38
Origin of Luke's Gospel.....	39- 40
Paraclete, see Spirit	
Parousia in Synoptists and fourth Gospel.....	68- 69
Parousia, nearness of	330-335
Passover, time of the last.....	335-339
Passover, preparation for	339-341
Perean ministry.....	298-305
Peter's confession.....	264-269
Peter's denial	35-36, 360-362
Pilate, trial of Jesus before.....	363-365, 367-369
Prayer, the high-priestly.....	349-351
Prayer in Gethsemane.....	355-357
Pre-existence of Christ.....	290-292
Presentation of Jesus	101
Purim.....	137-139, 142, 234-235

Quirinius' enrolment	91- 92
Raising the dead	218-222
Resurrection and parousia	272-274
Resurrection, question of	327
Resurrection of saints at the resurrection of Jesus	379-381, 390
Resurrection, accompaniments of	390-392
Resurrection, objective reality of	400-403
Risen Lord, appearances of	392-400
Ruler, the young	303-304
Sealing the sepulchre	385-388
Seventy disciples	226-230, 299-301
Shepherds' vision	99-100
Sidon, visit in	255-257
Simeon and Jesus	102-103
Son of man, Son of God	166-168
Sources written	39- 45
Spirit, the	352-354
Spirit-baptism of Jesus	121-122
Storm on the lake	28, 211-213
Supernatural conception	79- 89
Sychar	179
Synagogue—address in Capernaum	249-251
Synoptic Gospels and John	15
Synoptic problem	20- 23
Synoptic Gospels independent	23- 39
Synoptic Gospels historical	47- 51
Teaching of Jesus	181-192
Temple cleansed	159-163
Temptation of Jesus	126-135
Topographical Outline	143
Transfiguration	274-278
Tribute, question of	326
Twelve disciples	207-211
Tyre, visit in	255-257
Union with the Father	289-290
Veil of the temple rent	378-379

Walking on the Lake.....	213-218
Warnings.....	322-325
Washing the hands.....	251-253
Washing the disciples' feet.....	341-344
Water-baptism of Jesus.....	118-119
Wedding in Cana.....	148-155
Women with spices.....	388-389
Zacchæus.....	309-310

