

THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS
AND
ITS FOUNDATION.

An examination
of the Gospels and the
Book of Acts.

By.

BERTRAM LEE WOOLF.,
M.A., B.Sc., B.D. (Edin).

LIVERPOOL.

1926.

*Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
Degree conferred 20th July, 1926.*



TO.

M. A. W.

ΜΕΤ' ΕΪΚΟΣΙΝ ἔΤΗ.

—••—

P R E F A C E.

The present inquiry is confined to the Canonical Gospels and The Book of Acts, and attempts to deal mainly with the foundations of the authority which Jesus came to exercise over the people who heard His living voice. The earlier chapters are concerned with the historical material implicit in the sources of the relevant documents. Though still strictly confined to the point of view of His authority, the later chapters deal with more general considerations in regard to the person and character of Jesus, but no attempt is made to draw out the implications for systematic theology. The general positions adopted in modern scholarship are assumed, the attitude to the miracles being indicated in its place.

While the greater portion of the documentary material is laid under contribution, not all of it is immediately relevant to the present purpose. Thus many passages, of great intrinsic interest are passed over without comment. It is not pretended, of course, even in the passages dealt with in detail, that the general questions raised by them have been considered, but only those that seem to bear on

the present issue.

The Literary references are indicated by the authors name and the year of the publication of the edition used, fuller particulars being given in the Bibliography. This latter does not pretend to be complete, but only to indicate the works found most useful in the course of prosecuting the present study.

For the convenience mainly of collating what is said about passages dealt with from several points of view, Indexes of Scriptural passages, and of Principal Subjects have been drawn up. It is believed that the former is complete, but the latter is only of the most general character. The Table of Contents will probably be found sufficiently detailed to give any further indications required.

The English versions of the scriptural references in both Testaments, follow the translation of Dr. James Moffatt.

April 12th 1926.
"Toxteth Manse."
Sefton Park.
LIVERPOOL.

Bertram Lee Woolf,

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S.

	<u>Page.</u>
Preface.	1.
Table of Contents.	iii.
<u>CHAPTER I. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS....</u>	<u>1.</u>
Section i. The Historical Conditions.	1.
" ii. The Literary Records.	14.
" iii. Jesus of Nazareth - Who is He?.	23.
 <u>CHAPTER II. JESUS AS THE SON OF GOD AND THE</u> <u>AUTHORITY HE POSSESSES AS SUCH....</u>	 <u>32.</u>
Section i. Jesus as Son of God in Q.	33.
" ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark.	39.
(a) Explicit passages.	39.
(b) Secondary passages....	43.
Bearing of Secondary passages.	46.
(c) Passages offering difficulty.	47.
Section iii. Jesus as Son of God in passages peculiar to Matthew.	54.
" iv. Jesus as Son of God in passages peculiar to Luke.	58.
General Summary of Synoptic Sources.	62.

(Table of Contents Cont:)

	<u>Page.</u>
Section v. Sonship of Jesus in St. John's Gospel.	64.
" vi. Summary of Jesus as Son of God as found in our Main Sources.	67.
<u>CHAPTER III. AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS LORD.</u>	68.
Section i. Lordship of Jesus in Q.	68.
I Explicit references.	68.
II Passages offering difficulty.	69.
III Other Passages.	70.
Section ii. The Lordship of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.	71.
(a) Explicit references.	71.
(b) Passages offering difficulty.	72.
" iii. Jesus as Lord in Passages Peculiar to Matthew.	75.
(a) Favourable references.	75.
(b) Passages offering difficulty.	78.
" iv. Jesus as Lord in Passages peculiar to Luke.	80.
(a) Those favouring the reference.	80.
(b) Passages offering difficulty.	83.
<u>Summary of Synoptic Sources.</u>	85.
" v. Jesus as Lord in St. John's Gospel.	86.
<u>General Summary.</u>	88.
<u>CHAPTER IV. THE-AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS SON OF MAN.</u>	89.

(Table of Contents Continued).

(I) Passages adduced by the evangelist.	<u>Page.</u> 142.
(II) Passages original to Jesus and His times.	142.
(a) Mainly exegetical.. . . .	142.
(b) quoted by the people.	143.
(c) Personal support.	143.
Section iii. Jesus as sanctioned by Scripture in Sources peculiar to Matthew.	147.
(I) Passages adduced by the Evangelist.	147.
(II) Passages original to Jesus and His times.	147.
" iv. Jesus as sanctioned by Scripture in passages peculiar to Luke.	148.
" v. Jesus as sanctioned by Scripture in St. John.	150.
" vi. <u>General Summary.</u>	151.
<u>CHAPTER VII. THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS SANCTIONED BY MIRACLES.</u>	152.
Section i. Miraculous sanctions acc: to Q.	154.
(A) Miracles performed by Jesus.	154.
(a) affirmative on the whole.	154.
(b) negative.	157.
(B) Other supernatural phenomena.	160.
Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions acc: to Mk.	162.
(A) Miracles performed by Jesus.	162.

(Table of Contents Continued).

	<u>Page.</u>
(A) Miracles performed by Jesus. ...	162.
(a) More affirmative.	162.
(b) mainly negative.	166.
(B) Other Supernatural Phenomena in Mk.	171.
Section iii. Miraculous sanctions according to Sources peculiar to Mt.	173.
" iv. Miraculous Sanctions according to Sources peculiar to Lk....	174.
" v. Miraculous sanctions according to Sources peculiar to John.	176.
(a) mainly positive. ...	176.
(b) mainly negative. ...	179.
Section vi. <u>General Summary.</u>	181.
 <u>Chapter VIII. THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS A PROPHET.</u>	 183.
Section i. Jesus as a Prophet in Q. ...	186.
" ii. " " " " " Mk....	189.
<u>Summary of Section.</u>	198.
" iii. Jesus as a Prophet acc: to Sources peculiar to Mt.	199.
" iv. Jesus as a Prophet acc: to Sources peculiar to Lk.	199.
<u>Summary of Synoptic Sources.</u> ...	201.
" v. Jesus as a prophet in St. John.	202.
<u>General Summary of Chapter.</u> ...	205.

(Table of Contents Continued).

	<u>page.</u>
<u>CHAPTER IX. THE PERSONAL AUTHORITY OF JESUS. . . .</u>	207.
Section i. The Personal Authority of Jesus in Q.	212.
" ii. The Personal Authority of Jesus in St. Mark.	219.
" iii. <u>Summary of Section.</u>	251.
" iii. The Personal Authority in Sources peculiar to Matthew.	252.
" iv. The Personal Authority in Sources peculiar to Luke.	254.
" v. The Parables.	262.
Summary of Section.	269.
" vi. Personal Authority in St. John.	270.
(I) Sources of the personal Authority.	271.
(II) Jesus' claim to Authority.	273.
<u>Summary of Section.</u>	275.
 <u>CHAPTER. X. THE VERDICT OF THE SOURCES ON THE</u> <u>AUTHORITY OF JESUS.</u> <u>AND ITS FOUNDATIONS.</u>	 277.
Section i. The Verdict of Q.	278.
" ii. " " " Mark.	286.
" iii. " " " The Sources peculiar to St. Matthew.	298.
" iv. The Verdict of Sources peculiar to St. Luke.	308.
" v. The Verdict of John.	314.
<u>Summary of Chapter.</u>	319.

(Table of Contents Continued).

	<u>Page.</u>
The metaphorical character of Divine Sonship.	381.
Jesus' conception of God as a Father.	384.
- and of Himself as Son.. . . .	387.
The value of the term 'Son'.	391.
Sonship as related to Messiahship.	395.
The authority of Sonship.	396.
Redemption and Sonship.	398.
 <u>CHAPTER XV. THE MEANING OF THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS AND THE AUTHORITY FLOWING FROM HIS PERFECTION.</u>	
The antiquity of the dogma... ..	402.
The relation of Sinlessness to Deity.	403.
Analysis of Passages in John.. ..	406.
" " " " " Synoptic Gospels.	407.
Jesus' Consciousness of sinlessness.	415.
Passages held to imply sin.	420.
The meaning of His baptism	423,
The Jewish standpoint.	429.
The Perfection of Jesus as related to the Greek ideals.	434.
The Teaching of Jesus.	440.
I. His personal influence.	440.
II. The nature of the Kingdom of God.	442.

(Table of Contents Continued).

	<u>Page.</u>
III. The redemptive ethic.	455.
The identity of Person with Teaching.	462.
A permanent source of ethical inspiration.	464.
- and of an adequate self-adapting ideal.	466.
<u>CHAPTER XVI. CONCLUSION.</u>	470.
The Authority of Jesus and the response of faith.	471.
The ultimate spiritual authority. ...	475.
<u>APPENDIX - The Conception of Authority in Religion</u>	478.
Authority and Truth... ..	478.
The Source of Authority.	482.
Authority and Freedom.	483.
Authority as Inspiration... ..	485.
Authority in the higher Christian Ethic.	486.
Ultimate Christian Authority. ..	487.
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY - OF MORE IMPORTANT WORKS.</u> ...	488.
<u>INDEX.</u>	
(I) Scriptural Passages.	497.
(a) Old Testament.	497.
(b) New Testament.	498.
(II) Principal Subjects.	512.
(see also Table of Contents).	iii.

AUTHORITY OF JESUS AND ITS FOUNDATIONS.

- A STUDY IN THE GOSPELS AND THE BOOK OF ACTS.

Chapter I.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

Section I. The Historical Conditions.

"Nothing is more perverse than the modern distinction between the Christ-idea, or the Christ-principle and the person of the Redeemer. The Christian religion depends on the fact that in the historical person we have the perfect revelation of God. But if so, then the start must be made from what is given us in history. There is no value in emphasising the historical and then starting from the dogmatic construction which cannot be brought into harmony with history. That means simply giving water to the mills of those who despise history altogether and find value only in the idea or principle." (Kaftan. 1909. S:429).

"During the 19th century, attempts have been made to explain away Jesus as a myth. The truth consists in the exact opposite. Christ is the only non-

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

mythical element in Christianity. Through Jesus, through the cosmic greatness of this phenomenon (to which was added the influence of Jewish thought with its tendency to materialise history) Myth just became history. (H. S. Chamberlain. 1909. Vol.II. S.661).

"Christianity had a unique advantage over all its competitors, including Judaism, in having an historic person as founder, whose person was greater than his teachings. Herein lay its greatest originality and the main secret of its power. Christian enthusiasm was awakened and sustained not by an ideal but by a person." (Angus. 1925. p.:309).

"Why do men seek a Superman? It is because they yearn for Authority, not for Popes or Synods, not for Bishops or Creeds, but for souls which are strong and pure enough to draw us to themselves as the sun draws the planets and illuminates them --- Whoever finds such a soul would say to him "To love you is more than to be the discoverer of a continent, for you are vital." (F. Naumann. 1902. Vol.I. S.9).

Thus from four different angles the case is submitted that it is impossible to understand the strength

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

of the Christian religion apart from an appreciation of the historical Jesus of Nazareth. Unfortunately one frequently finds Christ and Christianity used almost as if they were synonymous terms. The Authority of the Church and of its ministers, of its traditions and formulas are all subsumed under the one general group-idea of which the Christ of history forms just a part. Indeed His part appears often a minor one, for which can be readily substituted that of one of the institutions connected with the religion. But this is not unattended with the danger, in days of religious decline, that dissatisfaction with Christianity will lead to impatience with Jesus.

We shall, therefore, attempt to eliminate from consideration many of the elements usually connected with the subject of the Authority of Jesus, even if at a later stage they must be examined. Our inquiry will be to discover exactly what He said, what He meant, what His motives and intentions were. We shall go past all the accretions of history to the records of the New Testament.

Before, however, we are in a position rightly

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

to understand what we find there, it is important to recognise that there were highly significant differences between the circumstances of those times and of our own. In the midst of an astonishing political and artistic maturity, and with a culture which in some respects still towers above anything to which mankind has since attained, there was a certain widespread grossness and naïveté which appear almost incredible. The political achievement reached in the fact of the Roman Empire, with its tempering of nationalism and its blessing of pax romana can scarcely be over-valued. But there was a heavy contra account of matters of first importance to human welfare, which were untouched by the statecraft of the Empire.

Probably the chief amongst these was the universal and debasing institution of slavery; a phenomenon of such magnitude that the greater portions of whole populations were deprived of liberty. Nor was the mere lack of personal freedom the worst feature. A vicious distinction was drawn in such a way that the majority were not regarded as fully human. They were there for the convenience and the

(Chapter I. Section 1. The Historical Conditions).

pleasure of their owners. But still worse was the fact that in addition, the slaves readily regarded themselves in the same manner. It was difficult to do other. For much in their lives they could feel no real moral responsibility, a state of affairs which reacted unfavourably upon their already deplorable level of grossness and superstition. (cf. Lecky. W.E.H. 1877. Vol.II p.:63.ff Brace. C.L. 1890. pp.41-71). This, again, was not without a regrettable further reaction upon the opinions and habits of the coarser grades of free-men in every land, and at length upon the more powerful and leisured classes. As a consequence the basest superstitions were wide-spread even amongst the most cultured, and occurred frequently if sporadically even amongst the most honoured and refined. The record of the incident of Paulina in the temple of Isis as recorded by Josephus (Ant. XVIII-3) is too significant to be overlooked.

Nor can the naïveté of the age be dismissed with a word. It was not merely a pre-scientific age. Indeed such a description is more false than true. The mathematical sciences had reached a fair level but the natural sciences were still at the magical stage. Far from any formulation, there was no suspicion of the

generalisation of cause and effect. It might be said with fair accuracy that imagination ran rife and the healthful criticism of the sceptics was of rare occurrence and relative insignificance. Signs and wonders, miracles and portents were found everywhere. The marvellous reports of common events were only rivaled by the credulity of the hearers. Nothing was too strange to be conceivable and nothing too sublime, too ridiculous or too barbarous to be believed. As a consequence effects were assigned to many causes, and immediate causal connections were found between very disparate events. How otherwise could auruspices have avoided laughing at one another when they passed in the street? But in spite of Cicero's sneer, it is impossible to doubt the immense earnestness of the priests who often endured self-inflicted agonies in virtue of their office. But this can only mean that the strangest of connections between material and spiritual phenomena were taken in real earnest. Religion indeed gained much of its sanction from its pseudo-scientific powers over nature and men. A religious leader must be a wonder-worker. Even the Rabbis of Judaism were such. (cf. Mt. XII-27). And further, the

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

greatness of the leader and the value of his teaching was inevitably popularly estimated by the greatness of the wonders he performed. Signs and wonders were the credentials of the teacher and occupied a place in general estimation analogous to a university degree today. These facts constituted at once an advantage and a disadvantage. Their advantage was that the 'sign' made an opening for any stranger, without prejudice of nationality. The disadvantage was that a new teaching was too readily accepted for its supposed concomitant therapeutic or theurgic qualities, while its real meaning was slightly appreciated or even completely misunderstood.

It was an age, also, of ferment, There was the liveliest of intercourse between the East and the West, and between each and all of the different lands. Rome, Alexandria, Corinth, Damascus and many another centre could easily reproduce the cosmopolitanism recorded in Acts II. in the somewhat 'difficult' and inhospitable city of Jerusalem. Traders and travellers, soldiers and messengers were ubiquitous. The interchange of goods was paralleled by the interchange of

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

ideas. The world was in the melting pot, and the common bond and the common language kept all in solution.

It was also a religious age. The gods of the East soon came to stand alongside of the gods of the West. While the major deities were worshipped under various names throughout the Empire, the lesser added to their number almost every day in different localities. Merchants became missionaries of their local numen, and were as zealous and successful in the spread of their cult as in the sale of their goods. The restlessness of the times drove men to seek peace from whosoever might offer the slightest hope of it. With every new tale of some local godhead the flame was fanned. Dissatisfaction with the present state of life increased. The prevailing tone became pessimistic. This Weltanschauung was confirmed by the ultimately despairing tone of the various philosophic schools. Many a soul must have echoed the sentiment of Plato "We will wait for one, be it a god or a god-inspired man, to teach us our religious duties and to take away the darkness from our eyes." (qd. Ballard. 1902. p.220).

But this deep note had an over-tone. If human-

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

ity is incurably religious, it is also incurably optimistic. Despair, if it be deep enough, and sufficiently widespread is often a hopeful sign. Plato's saying may be despairing in tone, but it expresses a hope. It was an age worshipping strange gods in the ardent hope that they would deliver. The gods were re-interpreted or their cults were spread because they were reported as saviours. While it may be too much to say that there was a profound sense of sin there was a widespread longing for salvation. A deliverer was looked for not only in Judæa and Galilea but also in every other land, if with less confidence or prophetic authentication. The deliverer anticipated was one who would release suffering mankind from its physical ills even more than from its moral insufficiency, but most of all from the terror of death and what lay beyond. (cf. Glover. 1922. p.271). Men were afraid to die lest death meant annihilation or worse. But the deliver^{er} sought for would give life so glorious that death would be but a gateway from an antechamber to a hall. This eager hope and earnest desire has left its mark upon the New Testament in both gospel (e.g. Mt.XI-3) and

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

epistle (e.g. Phil I-21), and upon Christian traditions to the present date.

It is important that the general historical situation as it effects the religious outlook should be understood, for it gives us the milieu in which the New Testament was written. Very little of the New Testament was actually written in Galilea or Judæa. Even of the Gospels themselves as they stand, not one can be traced to any purely Jewish city. The Fourth Gospel is well authenticated as born in Ephesus. There is much to be said for locating the birth-place of the first at Antioch. (Streeter. B.H. 1924. pp.500ff), the second at Rome (op. cit. pp.488ff), and the third

possibly at Corinth (op. cit. p.12, cf. 150). If we may accept the theory of Streeter, only small portions of the immediate sources of the synoptics can be traced to Jerusalem or to any of the scenes of our Lord's ministry (cf. Streeter, op. cit. Chap.IX). The significance of these observations is in the influence exercised by the churches for which the gospels were primarily written, and by the people who must have watched the M.S. growing under the eye of the evangelist and who

(Chapter I. Section 1. The Historical Conditions).

possibly listened to his dictation if they did not witness his actual autography. They must have determined in some degree the emphasis to be placed upon and the value attaching to certain recollections. They must have given a definite nuance to the vocabularies.

When we come to the actual incidents in the life of Jesus the case is somewhat different. The period was a full generation earlier. This is a fact worthy of note as, during this time, the growth of religious activity was rapid and far spreading. Then also the milieu was Jewish. But it was not a Judaism simply of the Pentateuch, of the Prophets, and the Psalms. It was also a Judaism of the Maccabees, of Enoch, of Esdras, of the Psalms of Solomon. It was not a people unitedly loyal to a purely Mosaic priesthood. On the one hand distinct Hellenising tendencies were already old and well-established in the ruling sects. And on the other hand the nation itself was divided into a multitude of minor religious sympathies of which the Sadducees and Pharisees, the Essenes and the Zealots represented but the major phases. Galilee was the home of the prophets and the mystics, Jerusalem the meeting ground of great numbers of Hellenists from all parts of the Diaspora. These Hellenists represented both the hope of the Jews in the spread of their faith,

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

and the problem of the leaders in the wealth of new phases and extraneous conceptions they must have continually brought forward. When a religion is a book-religion and legalistically conceived, such phenomena must be causes of great anxiety to the chief authorities. This fact goes far to explain the ardour with which the Jewish priests sought to suppress any promising innovations or innovators.

Nevertheless the far-reaching religious interest and the prevalent syncretistic spirit must have profoundly influenced the outlook of all classes. The Roman governors kept a close hand upon all sections and guaranteed a tolerance which gave proselytors sufficient personal security. Thus protected, if they really had a message, they had a rare opportunity of giving the impression, however faint, that there might be some truth in their novelties.

In particular it must be noted that the greater part of the life of Jesus was spent in Galilee and the North, with its more pastoral life, its simpler and more mystical Judaism, and probably its greater susceptibility to gentile influences. Here also were seen

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions),

more of the foreign-built cities and foreign citizens, traders, soldiers, messengers.

Taken altogether these facts constitute important data for understanding much not only in the gospel narrative, but also in the influence and finally the authority of Jesus. They mean that there was a rich growth of religious speculation and a keen appreciation of religious experience. Tolerance was naturally both the wise policy of the Empire and within certain limits, the liberal practice of the people. Provided his preaching was constructive, i.e. did not attack the veneration attaching to the locally-accepted creed, any wandering missionary could get an eager hearing either in the market place, or on a hill near the city. Only when the itinerant threatened the destruction of a shrine, the abrogation of a cultus, the prosperity of a religious craft, or the stability of the state, did fanaticism raise its head and, according to temperament, scoff at, stone or crucify the impious intruder. This state of affairs, however, was most propitious to the rise of a cult with a gentle spirit and a genial outlook, and especially to one whose fundamental ideas

(Chapter I. Section i. The Historical Conditions).

were both clear and well-knit. Almost any man could get an eager hearing if he could shed some light upon the worth of man or the friendliness of nature, or the idea of God, for these were the widely felt needs of the age. From this point of view it might well be said that Jesus came in the fulness of time.

Section II - The Literary Records.

The earliest literary records of the authority of Jesus are among the Pauline epistles. But in them we see the authority in one of its later, well-developed phases. They show mainly the reaction of believers and especially of St. Paul to the power of the Lord. "The love of Christ constrained" them, and we see its effect. The authority which Jesus actually exercised, and especially that which He must have exercised upon His Galilean disciples and hearers, can only be reached from this starting point by more or less hazardous inference.

To a certain extent the same is true of the

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records.)

gospels. Taken as a whole, each gospel records, doubtless quite unconsciously, the reaction of the evangelist to the tradition of Jesus. By the phrase 'tradition of Jesus' is not meant the mere report handed down about Him, but rather also the heritage of the impression which He made upon His various hearers and particularly upon His personal disciples. The personal equation naturally operates throughout each gospel. In the fourth it dominates the author to an extent that obscures the historicity of the record. The writer understands everything in the light of certain fundamental and far-reaching doctrines from which indeed He cannot escape. He lives in a different world from that of mere sight and touch, and the side of Jesus which he portrays is the supernatural, benign but somewhat ethereal and passionless Visitor to Earth, whose true home was elsewhere.

But it is certain that there lies a common experience and faith behind the synoptic gospels on the one hand, and the Pauline epistles on the other, which experience and faith are common also to the fourth evangelist. Inference which would perhaps be impossible

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records).

on the basis of St. John alone can be at least suggested by features in the other traditions of Jesus.

If the personality of the Fourth evangelist is the remarkable feature of that gospel as a literary datum, and if such phenomenon is nothing like so striking in the synoptics, it must nevertheless be recognised that even here we do not possess dispassionate records. Each is historical matter plus an interpretation, and is indeed as much of the latter as the former. St. Mark reveals himself as well as His Saviour. A vigorous and practical personality, the evangelist is more impressed with the things¹⁰⁰ that Jesus did, even than by what He said. In spite of the minute and brilliant pleading of J. Weiss (Das Älteste Evangelium. Göttingen. 1903). it appears at least probable that our second gospel is to all intents and purposes a copy of the original autograph of the evangelist (cf. Streeter. 1925. pp.305, 313 and especially 331), as far as it goes. But it is fragmentary as we have it. The ending is lost, and the chronological sequence of events is almost certainly different in detail from the order here. In spite of these facts, however, it is evident that the author

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records).

was either unaware of, or not vitally interested in some features in the life and labours of Jesus which all succeeding ages have felt to be striking and indispensable. Thus, in particular, the wonderful parabolic method could scarcely be suspected, on the basis of St. Mark, as characteristic of Jesus. From what Mark records, one cannot comprehend the intense enthusiasm with which, as he says, the people listened to Jesus (cf. IV-1, XII-37; etc). But the evangelist is deeply impressed with the greatness of the accomplishment of Jesus on behalf of the people, with the vigour and strength of His personality. Above all he is concerned to shew how such a one came to die and how He bore Himself in the face of the supreme tragedy. He dedicates no less than one third of his gospel to the Passion week. Mark is interested primarily in the conduct of Jesus, and the special characteristics of His portrait as compared with that of other sources is due largely to his omissions whether they were intentional or otherwise.

In the other synoptics, the case is somewhat different. Here, as the gospels stand, it is rather to the additions to the bare historical facts, or to the

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records).

interpretations of those facts that they owe most of their characteristic qualities. In the first gospel the evangelist himself is concerned to shew the place of Jesus in the march of the divine governance of history. Jesus does not merely fulfil the ancient prophecies, but step by step He works out the for-ordained plan. The prophecies seem to be adduced as much for illustrations as for proof that Jesus all along both fulfilled the law, realised the dreams of the national seers and prophets, and also was Himself integral to the providential purposes of God. With less of a philosophic interest than the fourth evangelist, nevertheless, the first, in his own naive and semitic manner, feels that Jesus is part of the world-system, without whom that system would be uncomprehensible. In a quite unhellenistic fashion, he shews how Jesus occupies an allotted place in the generations of mankind from the beginning of human history (Mt. I-17), how He really did fill the place and do the work pre-ordained in a plan to which the prophets were to some extent privy, and finally ascended to the supreme control of human affairs here and hereafter (Mt. XXVIII-18). In St. Matthew, in the last analysis, Jesus is only in a secondary sense

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records.)

human, real though His human nature was. The primary purpose of the evangelist is to shew Jesus as the Lord of all, and it is doubtless the success of the evangelist in this particular that makes his gospel "the best loved book in the world."

Before touching upon the question of the composition and the sources of our St. Matthew, it may be well to pass on briefly to summarise the qualities of the personal equation in the third gospel. Professedly an historical effect (Lk.I,1-4) it is not 'detached.' St. Luke is concerned to do more than "to write in order" the substance of the teaching about the life of Jesus which was current in Corinth, Antioch, or elsewhere. Consciously or unconsciously he is concerned to portray Jesus in the grandeur of His personality and in the sweetness of His human relationships. The great parables of Chapters 10 and 15 reveal the sympathies of the evangelist as well as the religious aim of Jesus. The conversation with Peter in Chapter ~~XXII~~ 31ff. and the vividly-told incident on the road to Emmaus in Chapter 24-13ff. tell us of the tenderness of the historian as well as of the Master. These facts, and many others of

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records).

a similar kind, serve to illustrate the point that this gospel also is an interpretation as well as a historical record, shewing a distinct side of the power that Jesus exercised "in the days of His flesh." It is impossible, therefore, in our examination of the nature and foundation of the authority of Jesus, to treat it as it stands as a primary source.

This conclusion is supported by other widely different considerations. While Mk. is fragmentary and incomplete, is nevertheless on the whole historically fundamental as far as it goes, Mt. and Lk. are to a large extent, confluents of earlier materials drawn from different written and oral sources. One of the solid results of modern critical analysis is to have proved that both Mt. and Lk. had our Mk. in front of them and that both used it almost in its entirety though in different ways. Mt, indeed, may probably be best regarded as "a new edition of Mk" (Burkitt. F.C. 1910. p.97) with large additions of matter drawn from another written source, Q, and smaller amounts from a further source peculiar to Mt. (Jülicher. 1901. S:274-285) which Streeter proposes to call M. (Streeter. 1924. p.231),

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records).

together with a still smaller amount almost certainly of an oral and legendary character principally in Chaps: I and II. Lk. on the other hand, is an independent composition of a still more complex kind of which our present gospel may possibly be an enlarged edition (cf. Streeter. 1924. p.231). He reproduces Mk. with great completeness usually in large blocks though with running verbal changes probably in the nature of stylistic emendations. He omits completely a whole section of Mk. (VI-45 to VIII,26), as also his last paragraphs. He draws very largely upon Q which he reproduces probably in its entirety or nearly so, with an accuracy exceeding that of Mt. and closely enough to warrant our holding that here, apart from stilistic emendations, we have the ipsissima verba of the source itself. (cf. Harnack. 1907. S:78,80) He employs to some extent a third source peculiar to himself which Streeter and others propose to call "L" (Streeter. 1924. pp.205 & 222. Klostermann. 1919. S:412) and which contains some of the most beautiful and characteristic passages in the gospel e.g. The Parable of the Good Samaritan, and The Prodigal Son, etc.

(Chapter I. Section ii. The Literary Records).

There is almost certainly, in this gospel also, a relatively small amount of material of an oral and legendary character, principally in Chaps: I & II. It is not within the scope of the present thesis to examine these positions and little or nothing in our inquiry will depend upon their finality in detail. We propose, however, to accept them as the best interpretation of the literary problems offered by the synoptic gospels.

But the object of the above outline is to maintain that the gospels as they stand are not fundamental sources from the point of view of either literature or history. What historical inquiry we shall have to attempt must be based in the first instance (i) mainly upon Mk. and Q taken side by side and as of approximately equal and mutually supplementary value, and then (ii) upon the authentic and historical sources, M. and L. peculiar to Mt. and Lk. respectively; or rather upon the whole of each of these gospels apart from Mk. and Q and from any legendary or editorial elements that can be distinctly recognised as such.

Chapter. I.

Section III. - Jesus of Nazareth - Who is He?

We begin our inquiry by frankly accepting the fact of the life of Jesus. The position taken and defended with varying ability in recent years by e.g. Drews and others in Germany, and J. M. Robertson and others in England, seems to raise more problems than it solves. (cf. A. Schweitzer. 1921. Chapter XXIII; H. v Soden. 1910 passim.) For, apart from any other aspects of the question raised, few would pretend that the epistles of St. Paul, or the material in their background, but apart from an historical Jesus of Nazareth, are sufficient to explain the foundation, and still less the survival of the Pauline churches. Indeed the gospels themselves, even in their final form as we have them, seem quite insufficient alone to account for the facts of Christian history in the first century of the church. Only scattered pages of the New Testament have much value as literature, indubitably true though it is, that, to this day, there is not one passage in the gospels that we can neglect without peril.

There is but little in the epistles that could have had

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

any meaning or any conceivable value to the primitive Pauline churches, apart from the fact of a historical Jesus. Those little communities, composed predominantly of the poorest and most ignorant classes (Deissmann A. 1908) could otherwise have had but small suspicion of St. Paul's meaning, even granting the personal character of the epistles' often colloquial language, and complete contact with a familiar environment and social usage. (Deissmann. 1909. S:168f. 1925. S:125f).

The gospels, again, with all their charm and with all their spiritual power, presuppose an historical Christ if only for the reason that they are so fragmentary, and so nearly without a real chronology, that, in the opinion of an eminent scholar (Harnack. Lectures in Berlin. 1909), a biography of Jesus is now impossible. If this be true, and the contentions of the destructive critics who deny the historicity of Jesus is directed to maintain this position, then it is impossible to understand how they gained currency, not as a body, but in isolation, and thus in their most fragmentary and least satisfying form, in different cities of the Empire. What gives any one gospel its final value is something in addition to the bare record. As a bare record it is insufficient to explain the rise not to mention the sur-

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

vival of the Christian church. When the epistles are read merely as 'a passage for the day' divorced from their historic background and without any vivid conception of their author himself, they lose power. Indeed their authority was never lower than to-day. Such studies as Deissmann's are indicative of a new era. They may be inadequate theologically, or from the point of view of many of the literary problems raised by the discussions of the last fifty years (Schweitzer. 1911. S: 135f. footnote) but they do reveal new power in the epistles themselves. We read them on the background of a living personality, of which, as far as they go, they are genuine and plastic expressions.

The same general position is valid in regard to the gospels. As books of devotion, or as ethical records, their value was probably never lower than to-day. But so also never was the person of Jesus in lower personal esteem in the Christian community. When the gospels are read, they are commonly read without a background in some vital conception of the person of Jesus. This means that their ethical and religious value is undermined. But if they are read as the records of the words and doings of a person whose every authentic utter-

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

ance was in full earnest, and every vital action the clear expression of a decision freely reached and firmly grasped, the gospels stand out in an entirely different manner. We can then immediately understand how these few rough pages are the most significant in all the world; how from age to age they have served "to keep the soul of the church alive."

Their power and authority always and everywhere, in short, presupposes a historical personality of immense force, whose living tradition has been handed down in the successive generations of Christian souls. The tradition is as necessary to the gospels, as the gospels to the tradition and both alike to the survival and propagation of Christianity. The supreme value of the gospels is not in the record, but in the revelation, i.e. not in the bare words, nor in the ethics, nor in the 'higher morality,' nor in the attitude to life, but in vision, of the personality of Jesus which their study affords. This vision, not only corrects the aberrations of a traditional interpretation, but inspires it to a renewed vitality (cf. Herrmann. W. Engl. Trans. 1906. pp. 225ff). The personality of Jesus as He was, and of the

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

Risen Lord as He is, gives the key to the gospel treasures of truth and life. We shall, therefore, assume the full historicity of Jesus of Nazareth as a fundamental datum in the discussion of the nature of His authority, i.e. we shall begin not with the assumption of the a priori validity of certain universal principles, but with the phenomenon of an individual life.

Of the birth of Jesus we have two accounts differing much in detail and more in atmosphere. Neither of these accounts occurs in our two oldest sources, viz: Q and Mk, but in sections of Mt. and Lk. respectively, which are held for other reasons to contain a large admixture of unhistorical elements. As a consequence we know nothing for certain about the infancy and early youth of Jesus. It has recently been maintained that the incident of Jesus in the Temple is based upon an authentic event (cf. Berguer. Enlg. Trans. 1923. p.142ff) though it is too uncertain to bear any weight (cf. Headlam. 1923. p.77 and footnote), whereas the Egyptian journey (Mt.II, 13-23, (cf. Grieve in Peake. 1920 and P. W. Schmiedel in E.B. col. 1780), is undoubtedly legendary. This means that when the authentic record really begins, He is already in the full flush of His manhood. His first appearance upon the page of history is in

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

connection with the striking figure of John the Baptist (Mk.I-9). John's preaching was characterised by two principal moments (i) Repentance and baptism for the remission of sins, (Mk.I,4 and parallels) and (ii) the near advent of "Him who was to come" with the Holy Spirit (Mk.I,7f and parallels) and with fire. (Mt.III-2, Lk.III-16). A close comparison of the parallel passages suggests the conclusion that in Q two traditions about John the Baptist are conflated, the first arising outside of the early church, and proclaiming a Messiah who would act as a judge of Israel and thoroughly purge the people with fire; the second, a Christian tradition which interprets this preaching of John as pointing directly to Jesus who baptised with the Holy Spirit. This second is the one which Mk. reproduces. (cf. Wellhausen. 1914. S:6). Whether this view be accepted or not it remains certain that the oldest record of the preaching of John does not point directly to the person of Jesus and it is only by a tour de force that it can be made to fit Him exactly. John expected the Messianic-Kingdom, but on fairly conventional lines. He looked for a Messiah who would not only judge Israel but exe-

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

cute a terrible sentence. What gave his preaching its tremendous power was the earnest and ethiaal way in which he took the nearness of the Kingdom, and the awful judgment which he believed it would bring.

All this means that when Jesus came to John, He came as an ordinary man, though no doubt of an exalted personality, whose high spirituality the Baptist may have well appreciated. (John I,27,29). Any other view seems hazardous and quite unfitted to bear weight in determining the status of Jesus. Assuming this position to be accepted, what are its implications? They are as follows, that right up to the time of His first public appearance of which we have any authentic record, Jesus was just one among His fellows. There was nothing outwardly to distinguish Him qualitatively from other Galileans. He was a Nazarene among other Nazarenes, a Jew among other Jews, possibly a Pharisee among others who took their ancestral faith seriously and longed for the coming of the day of the Lord (cf. Stapfer 1896. Vol I. p.122.ff). Nothing was known either of His infancy or of His youth to warrant the eyes of any turning with exalted expectation in His direction. Jesus had to win His way. Whenever it was that He first preached

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth-).

in public or first spoke in the synagogue, He had no special status. Among the people with whom He had grown up, indeed, His gifts in expounding the scripture or else the unique manner in which He explained them, actually caused offence. Whatever He may have felt in Himself, to His listener He was just one of themselves, and in Nazareth they were impatient of anything that implied He was in some way superior (Mk.VI,1-6). Therefore in public and particularly in the early days He depended for His authority entirely upon what He said and the way He said it, what He did and the way He did it; in short, on the general personal atmosphere He carried with Him, the purpose towards which He directed His life together with the way in which He could carry others with Him.

But while all this may be true, we must nevertheless repeat our question and ask "Who was He?" For very soon we find that various opinions are recorded and expressed about Him. Was He the Messiah long-expected by the Jews? Was He the Son of David and King of Israel *κατ' ἐξοχήν*? Was He in a unique sense the Son of God, or was He in the line of the great prophets, the last

(Chapter I. Section iii. Jesus of Nazareth -).

and if the greatest of them, yet nothing more? Finally what did He claim He was, and what was the reason for this? Here we have a question which is somewhat different from the others, for it by no means follows that He actually was what He might have claimed Himself to be. But what He claimed will be of great importance in helping us to determine what He really was, and also to understand His character, His personality and His purpose.

To attempt to answer to these questions we must examine our sources. The method we propose is to take each of the main questions seriatim and inquire what is the bearing of our records upon their answer.

JESUS AS SON OF GODAND THE AUTHORITY HE POSSESSES AS SUCH.

The conception of Jesus as the Son of God in a unique sense is the commonest, the most widespread and the most characteristic of all the interpretations of the place of Jesus which are to be found in Christian history. There can be no question of the immense weight of this doctrine, and, given sufficient latitude of interpretation, there can be no doubt of its validity. The authority of Jesus over men is, in its moral elevation and its spiritual power, simply that of God Himself. In all that concerns influence over the believing soul, Jesus is God. In the impression of holiness, of grace, and of love He and the Father are one - such is the verdict of the central experience of all types of Christian faith, Protestant and Roman Catholic, Western and Eastern, modern, medieval and primitive. No other doctrine is fully adequate to Christian experience.

When we examine our sources in the gospels a brief glance shews that it dominates completely the out-

Chapter II.

Look of the fourth evangelist. His gospel might be regarded as an apologetic for Jesus as Son of God. This would not be an adequate summary, but the narrative is completely shaped by this dogmatic motif. It is impossible therefore to begin our inquiry here even ^{apart} from the consideration that this is the latest of the four gospels, but it may be necessary to link up the Johannine material with that of the other sources. Rather let us commence with Q as our earliest source. It is unfortunate that it does not exist as an independent document, but there is sufficient scholarly agreement to warrant our proceeding in the main to follow Q as reproduced in the elaborate study of Harnack (Leipzig. 1907. pp.38ff) with some reference to the findings of Stanton (Vol II. 1910. Appendix II), and of Streeter (op. cit. pp.291). Thus we shall regard Lk's ^Q material as more accurate on the whole than Mt's.

Section I. Jesus as Son of God in Q.

The principal passages are as follows:-

Lk.X-22, Mt.XI-27. "All has been handed over to me by my Father:

and no one knows (who the Son is except the Father, or) who the Father is except the Son, and he to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him."

(The portions in brackets indicate important variations).

(Chapter II. Section i. Jesus as Son of God in Q).

This, and the next to be noted are the only explicit references in Q to Jesus as the Son, scil. Son of God. The present is a passage which has offered the greatest difficulty to scholars from many points of view. There can be little doubt as to its general authenticity, but its precise meaning is obscure. As it stands, Jesus claims a special and unique relation with God, but does not say in what way this enables Him to exercise authority. It is to be noted that it is He and not others who make this ascription or claim. They may have recognised extraordinary powers and a unique personality but nothing more. The passage is indeed in the Johannine mood as compared with Mk's, and in any case is too obscure and debatable to be a firm foundation upon which to build a ^{positive} theory of the authority of Jesus. It is best to omit it from consideration.

Apart from this passage the term Son of God occurs in Q only in the address used by the Tempter in the Temptation as recorded in Lk.IV,1-13, Mt.IV,1-11

εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ

The historical basis of the narrative of the Temptation is by common consent so obscure that it is impossible to base any argument upon it that for our pur-

(Chapter II. Section i. Jesus as Son of God in Q).

pose would really bear weight one way or another. But the following points may be made: the general effect of the narrative is to remove Jesus from the human level, and this not so much by virtue of His resistance and its sanction in scripture, as by the supernatural atmosphere in which the whole is enveloped. In this connection note especially the 40 days' fast, the personal devil, the visit to the exceeding high mountain, all of which is in the nature of allegory. Further, after the Temptation, Jesus seems like one who has demonstrated that He is in a special fashion, either supernaturally or almost magically, in association with super-human powers. As a consequence the authority which Jesus exercised would be of the categorical type rather than that of the personal and intimate reaction of mind on mind, and so would contradict what we know of Jesus in other connections which are historically well-founded. His person does not appear here as that of a man among men.

It may be submitted that the Temptation presupposes the baptismal experience, and is meant to elu-

(Chapter II. Section i. Jesus as Son of God in Q).

cidate some aspect of it. This objection, however, does not seem to affect the position we have adopted. It is better therefore to omit the passage from consideration at least at this stage of our inquiry.

Lk. XII-8ff. Mt. X-32f. Whoever acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man (Mt.=I) will acknowledge him before the angels of God and he who disowns me before men will be disowned before the angels of God. (Mt = I will disown before my Father in Heaven).

This passage occurs in different contexts in Lk. and Mt. In the first gospel it is in the midst of the very difficult apocalyptic passage which is certainly a conflation (cf. Streeter. 1924. pp.263ff). In the third gospel there is no trace of the apocalyptic element.

In Lk. the passage deals with the Son of Man and not with the Son of God. Indeed the person of the Son of Man seems to be set in parallel with Jesus --- "acknowledge me ... the Son of Man will acknowledge ... disown me ... the Son of Man will disown."

IN Mt. Jesus speaks in the first person and there is no reference to the Son of Man. As the passage stands it does not necessarily imply the special Sonship of Jesus. John the Baptist or one of the prophets could be appropriately conceived as saying it without great if

(Chapter II. Section i. Jesus as Son of God in Q).

any violence to the sense. The real point of the passage is in the *μη φοβεισθε*. Wellhausen (op. cit. S:48) says strikingly "Vorausgesetzt wird, dass Jesus selber bei seinen Lebzeiten ziemlich unbekannt blieb und dass seine Wirkung erst nach seinem Tode anging. Seine Jünger sollen sich nicht fürchten, vor der Welt zu verkünden, was er in einem kleinen Kreise gesagt und getan hat."

It is to be noted that this passage only in a secondary manner, and then in Mt. alone, and indeed with a rather doubtful sound, is relevant to the question of Jesus as the Son of God.

In any case Jesus is not shewn exercising authority on account of what He is, but on account of what He stands for or proclaims. The disciples are exhorted to be courageous lest^{at} the last judgment they be put to shame for their cowardice.

Lk.XI, 14-23. In the question of alliance with Beelzebul. (assigned to 'Q' though Harnack omits v: 15). Here Jesus makes no definite claim to Sonship nor even to a specific alliance with God. He points out that if what He does is God's work it is evident where He gains

(Chapter II. Section 1. Jesus as Son of God in Q).

His power and His authority. But it is only as a tour de force that this passage can be brought in to support the Sonship of Jesus.

I have been unable to find any other passages in Q which refer to Jesus as Son of God or that can be brought secondarily to bear in support of the doctrine. Of all those cited only one is quite explicit in its phraseology, but its significance is obscure. We may safely say (i) that Q probably knows nothing of Jesus as the Son *κατ' ἐξοχήν* and (ii) that any authority either felt or exercised by Jesus throughout this source is independent of this status. The result is not so surprising if one remembers that it is a record practically confined to the words of Jesus, i.e. to His ethical and religious teaching. On the other hand it does tend to show that Jesus to a large extent, at least as far as our earliest substantial source goes, let His teaching as understood by those who heard His living voice carry its own influence apart from any consideration of what He Himself might be.

(Chapter II.)

Section II. - Jesus as Son of God in St. Mark's Gospel.

(a) Let us now go on to consider relevant passages in our next oldest source, viz: in St. Mark's gospel. I propose to take first those that are quite explicit, and in the order of their occurrences; then those that seem to imply the doctrine, and finally those that occasion difficulty. We therefore begin with:-

(I) Mk.I-11 (cf. Mt.III-17, Lk.III-22). "Then said a voice from heaven (at the baptism) Thou art my Son, the Beloved, in thee is my delight."

A symbolism natural to a Jewish Christian teacher. Probably this was "an objectively real miraculous sign to the evangelists, divinely authenticating the Divine Sonship of Jesus: as originally told the story may well have been the expression in symbolical form of an experience which came personally to our Lord.,"

(Rawlinson. 1925. p.10. note)

(II) Mk.III-11f. "And whenever the unclean spirits saw Him, they fell down before Him, screaming, "You are the Son of God." But He charged them strictly and severely not to make Him known."

The evangelist has a theory that the demons have a supernatural knowledge, and so immediately recog-

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark)

nised Jesus as a divine person. The people either do not share the theory or else the event is not narrated as it actually occurred, for there is no sensational change of attitude to Jesus on the part of any one. In any case Jesus gains no additional authority from the outburst. The evangelist explains this by saying that Jesus wished the fact to remain a secret and He betrays Himself into the false position of representing the people as taking no notice of the declaration.

(III) Mk.V-7. (cf. Mt.VIII-29, Lk.VIII-28). The demoniac at Gerasa shrieks:- Jesus, Son of God most High, what business have you with me? By God I adjure you, do not torture me."

Jesus here tacitly accepts the title. It is to be noted that He does not enjoin silence in this instance. One would have expected that all Judaism would have been immediately afire with the news. We are compelled to suppose that the events did not take place exactly as narrated. Certainly Jesus does not afterwards exercise any new form or degree of authority as a consequence of the confession.

(IV) Mk.IX-7 (cf. Mt.XVII-5, Lk.IX-35). At the transfiguration a voice (scil. of God) says: "This is my Beloved Son (Mt. and Mk.) chosen Son (Lk) Hear Him."

The historical kernel of this incident is prob-

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

ably a form of hallucination which has recently been keenly studied by psychologists, and which expresses the conscious and subconscious belief of the subjects of them. Many commentators reject the incident altogether, but in so doing probably go too far. Nothing, however, is added to our knowledge of the basis of our Lord's authority.

(V) Mk.XIII-32 (cf. Mt.XXIV-36) "Now no one knows anything about that day and hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but only the Father."

This passage occurs in the midst of the 'Little Apocalypse' which is often regarded as a pseudepigraphic interpolation and which even Streeter (op. cit. pp.491ff) regards as only based upon authentic sayings of Jesus. It is not in itself a unity (Klostermann. 1907. p.111) but Mk.XIII-32 is "ansch~~e~~nend ~~ein~~ echtes Herrnwort, das eine spätere Zeit kaum erfunden hätte." (ibid. p.116.f).

Jesus here claims rank as Son superior to that of the other Divine beings. He places Himself next to the Father and as if subject only to Him.

Note the limitation of His knowledge and therefore of His authority which Jesus Himself confesses. This is very significant for our inquiry. Lk. omits the passage.

(VI) Mk.XV-39. (cf. Mt.XXVII-54). The remark of the Centurion "Truly this is the Son of God." (Lk. XXIII-47 says "This man was really innocent.")

The variation of reading makes the historicity obscure, but even in the form given in our present source, the Centurion's remark cannot be taken as a complete

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

Christian expression of faith, nor can R.V. margin 'a Son of God' be entirely ignored. It recognises a certain nobility of character or bearing, but nothing is certain.

This completes the list of explicit references in Mk. which occasion no literary difficulty. There are six, of which two are the utterances of voices from heaven (at the baptism and at the Transfiguration), two are on the lips of demoniacs, one by a Roman soldier. None of these has any of the value which we are seeking. But one is on the lips of Jesus. This last is in the middle of an extremely obscure chapter, but it is authentic. Its value is great as a self-testimony of Jesus to His special status, and it is a foundation pillar not only for the historicity of our Lord but also for His self-consciousness. It cannot be explained away. It must be accepted just as it stands. These facts are of great importance because, in spite of all ^{the} unique status and consciousness claimed in the passage, Jesus places Himself outside the sphere of special knowledge. He takes His stand explicitly alongside other men. As far as times and seasons are concerned, and indeed of the supreme event which Jesus lived to realise, for which He

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark)

laboured and suffered, i.e. the realisation of the Kingdom of Heaven, or, on the eschatological theory, the descent of the Kingdom of Heaven from above, He has no better standing than anyone else. He has no special information, and no special authority.

The result of our examination as regards any explicit records is that Mk. contains only one authentic passage where Jesus is the Son *κατ' ἐξοχήν* but the writer avails himself of such ancillary testimonies as the heavenly voices and the second sight of demoniacs to support his case. To the evangelist these were miraculous and sufficient, but their historicity is very obscure. In any event the authority of Jesus gains nothing from these passages.

(b) Let us now examine those of secondary importance, where we reach the doctrine indirectly and by inference. There are three main passages as follows:-

(VII) Mk.VI-10f. Lk.IX-5. (cf. Mt.X-14) - (Sending out the twelve as preachers, Jesus said)
 "Wherever you enter a house, stay there till you leave the place. And if any place will not receive you and the people will not listen to you, shake off the very dust from under your feet when you leave, as a warning to them."

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

The passages should be read in their context, which sketches a picture very familiar in the Hellenistic age. Many preachers did the same thing without claiming special status for themselves.

As they stand the words mean nothing more than "Have nothing more to do with such places."

But they can read as if Jesus felt Himself pronouncing a divine judgment against the obstinate, much as if they were guilty of the unpardonable sin. Perhaps however this is only by forcing the meaning of the passage.

(VIII) Mk.XIV,22-25 (Mt.XXVI,26-29, Lk.XXII,15-20).

"And as they were eating He took a loaf, and after the blessing He broke and gave it to them, saying: "Take this, it means my body." He also took a cup and after thanking God, He gave it to them, and they all drank of it; He said to them, "This means my covenant-blood which is shed for many; truly I tell you, I will never drink the produce of the vine again till the day I drink it new within the Realm of God."

Much depends upon the exact interpretation which Jesus put upon this incident and especially whether He intended to found an institution. On the "eschatological theory" quite plainly He had no such intention. On other views the matter is obscure. If the decision

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark)

is in the affirmative He undoubtedly took a place as a divine being. If negative, nevertheless Jesus places Himself in a religious (vs. merely human) relation with His disciples. In Jesus' case and with His conception of things, this amounts to a claim to be the Son of God

Otherwise too, even in an ordinary meal as opposed to an institution, to call bread His flesh and the wine His blood is offensive. Yet nothing seems better founded than that He did so. His relation to His disciples is therefore remarkable. His authority over them is at once personal and divine. This is the side of things which the historical church soon developed. It early emphasised the doctrine that it was a *καινή διαθήκη* This is the actual reading of Lk; it has great support from Mt. and much from Mk.

(IX) Mk.XVI, 1-8 (cf. Mt.XXVIII, 1-10, Lk.XXIV, 1-11 (12).)

The empty grave.

Mt. reports an earthquake and an angel, where Mk. reports a young man (two in Lk.) who however has an intimate acquaintance with Jesus (entrusted with message).

The account is broken off, so that no definite result can be reached.

The general feeling in Mt. and Lk. is that the unseen world was interested in the empty grave, but this cannot be found in the fragmentary passage of Mk.

The bearing of the Secondary Passages.

The result of the examination of the secondary passages does not greatly help. The exact bearing of (VII) is a matter of difficulty and, as it stands, one seems unduly to stretch its meaning by calling in its aid. (VIII) and (IX) are closely connected respectively with the greatest and oldest institution in the Christian Church and with the crucial point of the earliest preaching and experience. Both offer the most searching problems, and both are used as historical foundations for the most important Christological doctrines. All we can say is that (i) after all they are not explicit. Whatever is got out of them is in some sense first read into them. (ii) Already at the time when this record was made there had been 30 years of Christian history with all its fervour and preaching, and its action and reaction with the surrounding world. In these often-repeated matters, it is difficult to imagine that there was no

change of phraseology, or no adaptation^{ta} of presentation to puzzled or offended understandings, i.e. it is difficult to think that we have the ipsissima verba of Jesus or a complete and unquestionable historical record of these events. That we have doctrine as well as history is undoubted. Thus the authority of Jesus does not receive much historical elucidation from these secondary passages.

(c) Let us now go on to consider those that offer difficulty to the doctrine, whether their reference to it be explicit or implicit.

(X) Mk.I-12f. (cf. Mt.IV,1-11, Lk.IV,1-13). - The Temptation. Then the Spirit drove Him immediately into the desert, and in the desert he remained for forty days, while Satan tempted Him; He was in the company of wild beasts, but angels ministered to Him."

Only Mt. and Lk. give the temptations in detail, or report the term Son of God. That Mk. should have omitted any such reference would not be significant if Mk. were alone in reporting the temptation. But it looks as if Mk, rather than Q, has here preserved the older tradition which knew nothing of the implication. For it is difficult to imagine the doctrine dropping

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

out once it had been elaborated. But this view can be only tentatively stated.

(XI) Mk. IV-41 (Mt. XIV-33 ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶμι) "But they were over-awed (as a consequence of Jesus' walking on the sea and calming the storm) and said to each other "Whatever can He be, when the very wind and sea obey Him?"

Mk. does not go so far as to make the disciples call Jesus θεοῦ υἱός, but expressly notes that they did not understand. This makes the passage in Mt. look like a dogmatic Erfindung, i.e. he records what he thinks they would have said if they had understood. He was doubtless quite correct, but the parallel makes it appear as if Jesus was to the disciples, in spite of the marvels, just a man among men. How could the more exalted ascription ever have been omitted, if it had been historical and once expressed in writing? But if the disciples did not understand, then Jesus exercised no authority over them as Son of God.

(XII) Mk. VIII, 27+33, Mt. XVI, 13-23, Lk. IX, 18-22. Peter's Confession.

This passage is of prime importance in all the gospels, for it is quite explicit, and intentionally so,

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mk).

on the question of the identify of Jesus. The evangelist and especially Mk are aware of this. Mk makes this confession the crucial point of his narrative. Henceforward in this gospel Jesus is not quite what He was before. What then do we find?

According to the 2nd Gospel Peter said σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός

acc. 1/2

" to the 1st Gospel Peter said σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος

" " " 3rd " " τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ

The whole incident is omitted from Q.

Mk and Lk record a simple confession of Messiahship.

Mt. records that Peter confesses Jesus not only as Messiah but also as Divine, and it is only in this gospel that the special promises are made to Peter. It is thus the acknowledgment of the divinity (vs. the Messiahship) of Jesus that is specially connected with the promises to Peter and with a special revelation of the prerogatives of Jesus.

According to Mt Jesus thus claims to be divine and as such to have an ex cathedra authority (v.18f). All this means that a distinct development had taken place in Christian tradition and in the honours paid to Jesus. The development may at the time have been

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

local. At least Lk. appears to know nothing of it though he probably wrote at a later date.

The passage gains its whole weight from the connection between the giving of the keys and the fact of divinity, and was of immense significance in the later history of Roman church. But Mk. was written in Rome, a circumstance which makes his silence upon this point a great difficulty to our accepting the historicity of the record as in Mt.

The result appears almost inevitably that the disciples were never aware of any unique divine consciousness or claim of Jesus. Moreover the incident as a whole implies that Jesus had not hitherto revealed or spoken of Himself as Messiah, much less as Son of God. All this means that, throughout His life and labour hitherto, Jesus' influence and His authority had been gained apart from the consideration of these questions. Indeed if they weighed at all, it is because of what influence Jesus otherwise exercised and not vice versa.

Another important passage tending to confirm the same general result is to be found in the narrative of Jesus in Gethsemane. Mk. XIV, 32-42 (cf. Mt. XXVI, 36-46, Lk. XXII, 39-46). Note especially Mk. XIV, 35f.

"Then He went forward a little and fell to

the earth, praying that the hour might pass away from Him, if possible. "Abba, Father," He said, "Thou canst do anything. Take this cup away from me. Yet, not what I will but what thou wilt."

Note the close and intimate relation with God. Jesus speaks of God "as a man talketh with his friend." But it is nevertheless to His God that He speaks, for:-

- (a) He does not know God's counsels.
- (b) He still hopes for a "happy issue or a supernatural intervention.
- (c) He distinguishes His will from God's though finally submitting to the mysterious purpose of providence.

Further Jesus has no unction, i.e. none of the self-consciousness of a person who thought he was about to do a big job for his country or for mankind. He is certainly not "posing as if the world were watching." He appears to have had no special feeling that the course He was taking had been selected for Him in particular. It was rather that He felt, from the inner moral necessity of the circumstances, that the facts needed to be faced right out. And He felt a special need of God's



(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

help in His task. This places Him very near us and removes Him from the circle of experience which we should have expected in the Son *κατ' ἐξοχήν*.

The result is that in this important secondary passage the argument is against the exercise of any authority on the basis of His special status as Son of God in His own mind or in that of His disciples right up to the night of the betrayal.

Mk. XII-35ff.

And as Jesus taught in the temple He asked, "How can the scribes say that the Christ is David's son? David himself said in the Holy Spirit,

The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies a footstool for your feet."

David here calls Him Lord. Then how can He be his son?"

The significance of this discussion is obscure, but since it may well be regarded as quite impersonal (so also Klosterman, op. cit. S:107f), it cannot be made to bear weight as a self-testimony of Jesus to His own authority. We therefore omit this passage from further consideration at this juncture.

Summarising the Witness of Mark - we may say:-

(1). There are very few references to Jesus as *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* before Peter's confession. They are all on the lips of

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark).

demoniacs or by special supernatural voices. Very striking is the incident of the walking on the sea when Mt. only makes Peter use the title which though near at hand Mk. almost consciously avoids.

(ii) The secondary passages, as bearing unconscious witness to the issue are important, but on the whole are strongly negative.

(iii) And there are several important passages which are directly or indirectly decidedly negative.

(iv) Mk. and indeed all the synoptics, are very sketchy up to the confession of Peter. The writers seem either not to have been strongly impressed with the importance of the earlier days, or not to have full information. After the confession, however, all the narratives become detailed, but even then there is strong evidence against the historicity of the doctrine in the teaching of Jesus.

(v) The authority of Jesus as found in Mk. certainly owes nothing to any special status of Jesus as Son of God right up to the time of the Last Supper, if one omits the difficult and probably pseudepigraphic apocalyptic

(Chapter II. Section ii. Jesus as Son of God in Mark)

chapter XIII. Even in the Last Supper everything depends upon the difficult historical interpretation of the intention of Jesus.

(vi) The existence of a considerable body of unquestionable evidence inconsistent with the exercise of authority by Jesus as Son of God entirely destroys the value of the few passages which might be regarded as favourable witnesses.

(vii) The exact type of authority that Jesus exercised cannot be determined at this stage of our inquiry, but we can say that qua Son of God He exercised none during His lifetime.

Section III. - Jesus as Son of God in Passages peculiar to St. Matthew

The conclusion reached thus far is surprising, for if we read any gospel straight through, or in passages purely for devotional purposes, we gain a very different impression. Everywhere we are face to face with a

being, whose feet are indeed on the earth, but whose nature is divine. How then do we account for the fact when neither of our earliest records, Q or Mk, know anything of this matter, but rather present us with a Jesus who was a man among men and nothing more?

The answer to this important question is to be found largely in the matter peculiar to Mt. and Lk. respectively, and in the Johannine and Pauline gospels. But let us confine ourselves for the time being to the synoptics. The new edition of Mk. as edited by Mt. (see supra p. 20) was put forth with a prologue and an epilogue. All the clear, decisive and unmistakeable passages dealing with the Sonship of Jesus are to be found in these sections exclusively Thus:-

Mt. I-17. Thus all the generations from Abraham to David number 14, from David to the Babylonian captivity number 14, from the Babylonian captivity to Christ 14.

The Messiahship of Jesus is the tacit assumption. It is accepted as an established fact. It colours, of course, both the writing and the devout reading of the entire narrative of the gospel.

One gains the impression that Jesus had to come just then or the scheme based upon the holy numbers three

(Chapter II. Section iii. Jesus as Son of God in Mt).

and seven would break down.

It is an ancient version of the Hegelian system of history. The whole thing took place under the grip of ἀνάγκη set in motion by Jehovah ordering things together for the coming of the Divine One.

Mt. I, 18-24, II-1ff - The Birth of Jesus Christ.

Jesus was not only begotten of a virgin by a special activity of the Holy Spirit, but the angels in heaven were watchful that nothing untoward took place. i.e. they were keenly interested in the events now preparing -cf. also II-13ff.

God had planned the whole long ago in detail, (v.22) And everybody knew He had done so.- it had been proclaimed (I-23). It was not an obscure affair. The birth of Jesus was of world-wide interest and importance.

The ancient science of astrology is invoked to support His royal claims (II, 2-10).

God takes special steps for His preservation, and, later, to bring the child back to His own people.

All this is very cogent to the antique mind. Jesus is presented as a King but not in the ordinary sense of the term. He has more of the outer sanctions. His commission depends upon a heavenly descent and a super-

natural birth. He is indeed in every way, physically and spiritually, the Son of God who is the ruler of theocratic Israel.

This is the character of the Prologue. There is nothing quite like it in this source until we come to the Epilogue in XXVIII-8ff, where we immediately meet the same attitude. The psychological orientation has quite changed from what it was before the Cross. The style of the narrative is distinctly more mythological. The sorrow of the bereaved is not the dominating feature so much as the beginnings of a theology. The strange other-worldly atmosphere is not dispelled by the moonbeams of the re-appearance of Jesus. Why should the disciples now worship Him? (vv.9,17). Worship presupposes a dogmatic change which was not psychologically vouched for by the history of the previous eight days. But the account leads up to the concluding verses which constitute the epilogue proper. Here Jesus is portrayed as the Son, indeed as the Second Person of the Trinity. Everything becomes clear when we look back from this point which was evidently the writer's lodestar.

The Prologue and the Epilogue together determine the kind of emphasis which the reader customarily

(Chapter II. Section iii. Jesus as Son of God in Mt.)

lays upon passages otherwise neutral, e.g. XI-28 "Come unto me all ye that labour etc" Mt. XII-5f. "A greater than the temple is here" - "the Son of Man (Mt's special sense- see sub. Son of Man infra p.:107f) is Lord of the Sabbath." Mt.XV-12f. Mt.XVIII-10 "my Father in heaven etc", All these and several others owe their special divine significance from the atmosphere of the prologue and epilogue. Of ὁ πατήρ μου in particular is this the case for all Jews claimed God as their Father (cf. e.g. John VIII-41).

Section IV.- JESUS AS SON OF GOD

In Material Peculiar to St. Luke.

When we examine the material peculiar to Lk. for its testimony to the Sonship of Jesus, our conclusions are very similar. There is nothing that even remotely suggests the Sonship of Jesus or any authority exercised by Him as such outside of the first two chapters and the last one.

In Lk.I,32f. we read:- "He will be great, He will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give Him the

(Chapter II. Section 171. Jesus as Son of God in Lk.)

throne of David His father; He will reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and to His reign there will be no end."

Not one of these prophecies was fulfilled, but the right atmosphere was given.

Lk. I-35. "The angel answered here "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, the power of the Most High will overshadow you; hence what is born will be called holy, Son of God.'

This prophecy was not fulfilled till after the resurrection, nor does Lk's gospel attempt to shew that it was fulfilled. But the two passages together make it appear that Jesus from His birth was not only supernaturally appointed to high office, but also His parents were supernaturally informed of it and knew with certainty that from His birth and throughout His life, He was Incarnate God.

Such a meaning placed at the fore-front of the gospel tends to give a special construction to all subsequent acts and words of Jesus, to read a special meaning into everything the people say in praise of Him, and to find a special perversity in the minds of His enemies. His authority also is affected with extraneous elements and is made to rest primarily upon supernatural

(Chapter II. Section iv. Jesus as Son of God in Lk.)

sanctions. How far this has operated in the history of Christology seems a fit subject for inquiry.

In the material peculiar to St. Luke there is no other direct reference to the Sonship of Jesus until we reach the closing Chapter.

Lk. XXIV, 36-49. The appearance of the Risen Lord in Jerusalem.

The spiritual Jesus speaks of *τοῦ πατρὸς μου* (e.g. v. 48) and in the special circumstances, gives it a meaning necessarily quite different from what would well content us earlier.

He promises a power from on high - in the sense that He Himself will send power (cf. John XIV-1ff) although this is not quite explicit.

This account of the Risen Lord is very detailed and very 'physical.'

Jesus as Risen Lord is now made to base Himself and to authenticate His presence etc, not upon the personal experience of the disciples and others who were with Him and upon the irresistibility of that experience, but rather upon the external authority of the Old Testament scriptures regarded as describing a cosmic order fixed

(Chapter II. Section iv. Jesus as Son of God in Lk.)

apart from and antecedently to the earthly life and death of Jesus.

The authority of Jesus in this passage is thus widely different from that of the greater part of the gospel,

- (a) It is external to Jesus. He is a mere channel for it.
- (b) His own exercise of it is founded in His power of appealing to certain assumptions as to the place of prophecy and of the Old Testament generally as already accepted by believers.
- (c) Jesus is far from being life-like and His faith is not of the energetic personal kind which has been the characteristic before. It is now of a passive order making Jesus appear as the first of the Order of Jesuits.

Summary of Witness of Synoptic Gospels to Jesus as Son of God.

Thus we are driven to the conclusion in regard to the Sonship of Jesus that as far as the Synoptic Gospels are concerned, the doctrine is to be found only in the historically doubtful but theologically comprehensible material at the beginning and the end of the first and

(Chapter II. Section iv. Jesus as Son of God in Lk.)

third gospels. But this point of view and the nature of the records there are such as to cause a complete transformation of the plain understanding of the rest of the gospel narrative. It should perhaps be added that in Lk's case, as we shall see later, there are frequent additions of little phrases, e.g. 'the Lord said,' which serve fully to maintain the atmosphere of the supernatural divine presence in the form created by the first two chapters.

The doctrine of the divine Sonship of our Lord is a doctrine which finds no direct support in the oldest records, but seems to be founded entirely upon the power of the Risen Christ as experienced by the disciples and the first Christian communities in whose ears the great words still rang, and before whose eyes there seemed still alive the Jesus whose figure, at once winsome and majestic, both simple and profound, had stamped its impress indelibly upon their soul. Whatever authority Jesus exercised during His lifetime, was exercised in spite of the fact that no one recognised His Sonship, and that He Himself in all probability never actually made any such claim. It would be pushing our conclusions further than the premisses warrant to say categorically

(Chapter II. Section iv. Jesus as Son of God in Lk.)

that Jesus had no consciousness of a special and unique Sonship, but it is true to say that the historical material preserved in the two older sources is not aware of any such consciousness, and none of the authority He is there shown to have exercised depends upon it.

We are doubtless nevertheless justified in holding that Jesus was conscious of a unique Sonship, but we reach this conclusion either by inference from the general nature of Jesus' life, thought and conduct, or by carrying over to His inner-self statements found in other than the oldest sources. Indeed those passages in the Synoptics which make the Sonship a presupposition, and leave us no alternative to holding that Jesus was conscious of it are all of them regarded on other grounds as of a secondary historical character. Moreover there is no real meaning in their ascription of Sonship to Jesus. It is nothing but a title or an office. The authority flowing from it is purely impersonal and external. Content is only gained and the authority is only made real, personal and inspiring when we have in front of us the historical material of Q and Mark. Apart from these sources the place and authority of Jesus, as found in the

(Chapter II. Section iv. Jesus as Son of God in Lk.)

Synoptics, is purely supernatural and almost magical; with these sources it becomes an interpretation, a theology of a religious phenomenon and of a religious experience.

Section V - Sonship of Jesus in St. John's Gospel.

The fourth gospel shows a further stage in this theological development. The $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ prologue presupposes the full Sonship of Jesus in the trinitarian sense, and is particularly noticeable when one fully accepts the view that the prologue is integral to the gospel and Lütgert (A) - among others - (B) may be held to have made the point clear once and for all. But everywhere throughout the gospel the doctrine is already complete.

(A) "Die Johanneische Christologie." 2nd Auf. S:65.
 "Aber bei näherer Betrachtung ziehen sich die Fäden, aus welchen dieser Saum gewebt ist, durch das Gewebe des ganzen Evangeliums hindurch, und er lässt sich nicht abtrennen, ohne dass das ganze Evangelium zerstört wird. Der Eingang des Evangeliums ist nicht ein Prolog, vielmehr zeichnet der Evangelist zunächst den Hintergrund, auf dem nachher das ganze Christusbild ausgetragen wird."

(B) Streeter. 1924. p.377. deploras the great name of Harnack as connected with the opposite view.)

(Chapter II. Section v. Jesus as Son of God in John).

The grounds that are cited as sufficient for Nathaniel (I-49) are really totally inadequate as proof of the Sonship, but they are sufficient to give the evangelist an opportunity of so describing Jesus. It almost seems indeed as if the incidents were introduced for the sake of the declaration. The ascription in this place presupposes that the doctrine was well acknowledged. In general the same is true of the passage VIII-21-59, recording a dispute in the temple with a futile ending. Jesus makes immense claims, but there is nothing in this paragraph spiritually exalted enough to make us concede them. Nor is there any moral power. The passage presupposes in the minds of the readers of the gospel an attitude to Jesus in which everything He says is accepted and whatever He does is right, whereas all His opponents are ipso facto condemned.

Further the gospel contains very many passages in which the Sonship of Jesus is quite explicit or in which also His hearers are also quite cognisant of the claim, or where what He says gains its point altogether from His status. (cf. III, 16, 35, V-19f, VI, 40, 48ff, VIII-26, XI-25f). Some of these passages are amongst the most

(Chapter II. Section V. Sonship of Jesus in John).

precious in the New Testament literature, and are in full accord with Christian experience, but they exhibit a Christology rather than a history.

It is noteworthy that this development of the recognition of the status of Jesus is accompanied by a similar shift in the type of authority He exercised. In Jn. we have relatively little which can be attributed to the intrinsic spiritual or ethical merit of what Jesus says or does, or is. It is not so much authority as meaning the impact of personality upon personality in a dynamic sense, but rather the submission and overwhelming of heart and mind under the ineffable majesty, holiness, mystery, and wonder of the enigmatic but enrapturing phenomenon of the incarnation of the God of Ages and the Father of Souls, who, of Grace, passed a little space of time amid the sorrows, ^{the} sins, the miseries and the yearnings of men. What we find in this gospel is not the magic of the personality of Jesus, but the miracle of divine Grace using the Son to redeem the world from sin and judgment. It is the first attempt to explain how or why it was that Jesus exercised the influence so wonderful in His lifetime and so marvellous after His death. Such authority it finds rooted in the Grace of a

(Chapter II. Section v. Sonship of Jesus in John).

living God and in the needs of yearning souls. It is a philosophy rather than a history of the authority of Jesus.

Section VI.- Summary of Jesus as Son of God
as found in the Main Sources.

The fourth gospel adds nothing to our knowledge of the historical foundation of any authority exercised by Jesus as Son of God, during His earthly ministry, and the result remains the same as outlined at the conclusion of our examination of the material found in the sources of the Synoptic gospels. (see p.61 supra).

Chapter III.

THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS LORD.

Section I.- The Lordship of Jesus in Q.

We shall begin with an examination of Q for the origin and significance of this very difficult and much disputed term. We take it next however because it seems to be the ascription which comes nearest to that of Sonship and to be more general than that of the Messiah or the enigmatic Son of Man.

I. As far as I can trace, however, there is in Q only one explicit reference even to Jesus as Lord, but there are two recensions.

Lk.VI-46. Why do you call me 'Lord, Lord! and obey me not?

Mt.VII-21. It is not everyone who says to me 'Lord, Lord' who will enter into the Realm of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father in heaven.

The form in Lk. is probably the more authentic as it seems easier to conceive that Mt. is an expansion of the original, than that the term 'my father in heaven,' or the reference to the Kingdom would have been passed over if original.

(Chapter III. Section i. The Lordship of Jesus in Q).

But the form in Lk. carries the meaning of 'master' only, which meaning is perfectly good in Mt. and therefore possibly correct.

Wellhausen (1915 S:32) incisively says "The verse permits an inference to the relative age of Q. Jesus is already in Q addressed as Lord, i.e. marana (I Cor: XVI,22) but in Mk. regularly only as διδάσκαλε (=rabbi). In Jesus' life-time there were none who had any interest in giving themselves out as His disciples. In Mk.III,35, whence Mt. borrowed the concluding sentence which is lacking in Lk, it is rather that the spiritual kin of Jesus are set in opposition to His blood relatives who refuse to recognise Him. This difference says everything."

We conclude then that the meaning of 'master' is alone permissible here.

There are no other direct references to the Lordship of Jesus in Q.

II. On the other hand there are certain passages which are not easily reconcilable with the idea.

(1) Lk. XIII,35. Mt. XXII,39. You will not see me again till the day comes when you say,
"Blessed be He who comes in the Lord's name."

(Chapter III. Section i. The Lordship of Jesus in Q).

Here Jesus differentiates Himself from God as Lord. He hopes to come in the name of the Lord, i.e. as the agent of God.

This prophecy was not fulfilled in any positive sense.

(2) Lk.IV,1-13, Mt.IV,1-11. The Temptation of Jesus.

The explicit reference of the term *κύριος* is to God from whom Jesus is distinguished and to whom He owes a duty.

Again, the very idea of temptation is against the conception of the Lordship of Jesus in a religious sense.

(3) There are many other passages in Q in which the term *κύριος* occurs, but either the reference is directly to God (Mt.IX,38, XI,35) or else the meaning is plainly the equivalent of sir, master or teacher. (Mt.VI,24, VIII,6,8, X,24f, XXIV,45,46,49,50).

Thus the term is quite current but it speaks against the conception of the Lordship of Jesus in a religious sense in this source.

(Chapter III. The Authority as Jesus as Lord).

Section II.- The Lordship of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.

The references are surprisingly few. In Mk.I-3 we have a quotation from Isaiah which includes the words "make ready for the Lord" which doubtless Mk. applies to Jesus, but the meaning of 'Master' or 'Ruler' predominates over that of 'object of religious worship.'

V18f. . As He was stepping into the boat the lunatic begged that he might accompany Him^s but He said "Go home to your own people, and report to them all that the Lord has done for you and how He took pity on you."

The full religious meaning might have been in the mind of the evangelist, but it cannot have been present in the mind of the sufferer or his attitude, especially in the circumstances, would have been one of worship.

κύριος here may mean God (cf. Klostermann al.op. cit. p.:42) but the order to go and tell all is so contrary to the usual habit of Jesus (as in I-44, V-43 etc) that the whole verse must be under some suspicion as to its verbal authenticity.

XI-3. If any one asks you "why are you doing that?" say "The Lord needs it and He will send it back immediately."

(Chapter III. Section ii. The Lordship of Jesus in Mk).

On the face of it, *κυρίος* here = Master, although one cannot help feeling that possibly Mk himself read more into it.

Mk.XII,35-37. Discussion on David's Son.

"And as Jesus taught in the temple He asked, "How can the scribes say that the Christ is David's son? ... David here calls him Lord. Then how can he be his son?"

The phrase is quoted by Jesus as referring to the Messiah, but the discussion is enigmatic.. It is impossible to determine exactly whether it was a mere discussion, or possibly whether Jesus took advantage of a rare opportunity of teaching something about His own person, or whether indeed the whole matter is unhistorical. "Bousset and others find it difficult to believe that 'this argument with the scribes' goes back to our Lord Himself" (Rawlinson. 1925. p.173) though Rawlinson finds no such difficulty. But even if we accept the passage as authentic, its testimony to the authority of Jesus as Lord is obscure and uncertain, and is probably best omitted from consideration.

(b) As against the Lordship of Jesus in a religious sense as found in Mk, we observe the following:-

(1) IX-5 (cf. Mt.XVII-4, Lk.IX-32)- The Transfiguration.

(Chapter III. Section ii. The Lordship of Jesus in Mk)

This is a very favourable opportunity for the religious use of *κύριος* or for making Jesus = Lord especially on the part of Peter. For according to Mk. the Transfiguration took place six days after His confession. But so far is the question from being in doubt that Mk. expressly uses the term *יהוה* which explicitly excludes the religious sense of *κύριος*. Mt. translates and uses *κύριος* but otherwise he reproduces Mk. verbatim. Lk. uses the term *ἐπίστατα* but otherwise changes nothing. *ἐπίστατα* again has no religious significance, and as *κύριος* was a synonym immediately at Lk's hand, it would appear that he felt that *κύριος* less exactly reproduced the connotation of the original which he felt implied nothing of religious Lordship.

(II) VIII-29. Peter's Confession.

It is highly significant that in Mk. nothing is said about the Lordship of Jesus, though parallels exhibit different attitudes. Thus:-
Mt. XVI-18f.- presupposes the doctrine, as also Lk. IX-20 though in a somewhat different and secondary reference.

(III) Mk. I-13 - The Temptation.

The conception per se is not consistent with

(Chapter III. Section ii. Lordship of Jesus in Mark).

the Lordship of Jesus, though the ministration of angels implies a certain special status in the mind of the evangelist.

This concludes the references, direct and indirect to the subject as found in Mk. The conclusion is:-

- i. Mk. himself holds Jesus to be Lord (cf. I-3).
- ii. Jesus (in the second gospel) never referred to Himself in that way, nor did anyone else so think of Him.
- iii. Jesus re-gards God as His own Lord ~~and~~ as well as of all others.
- iv. If Jesus had regarded Himself as Lord, it is difficult to see how or why some of the passages in Mk. while using the actual term, are totally indifferent to its possible religious significance. Even though Mk. himself, like the church when he wrote, worshipped Jesus as Lord, yet he does not make the attitude seem the natural and inevitable thing in the gospel apart from I-3 (and the spurious XVI-19).
- iv. The passages in some sense favourable to the doctrine are completely nullified by those

(Chapter III. Section ii. Lordship of Jesus in Mark).

inconsistent with it, whose survival is impossible to understand had they not been historical.

Section III.- Jesus as Lord in Passages Peculiar to Mt.

Let us now examine the passages found in Mt. but not in Q or Mk. The matter is not quite simple as on many occasions of Jesus' use of the term Son of Man it is not quite certain whether Jesus is referring to Himself or possibly to man in the general sense, or again to the Son of Man after the manner of the conception of the Book of Daniel.

(a) Passages in some sense favouring the doctrine.

(Mt. XVIII-20. "Where two or three have gathered in my name, I am there in their midst.")

This is a very clear case especially following after v. 19. (*παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου*) where *ὑμῶν* would have been very natural and right. (The same is true of XVIII-35 where 'your' would have been appropriate instead of 'my'.)

The reference to Lordship is reached by inference.

Mt. XIII-41. "The Son of Man will dispatch His angels and they will gather out of His realm, etc" cf. XVI-28. "There are some standing here who will

(Chapter III. Section iii. Jesus as Lord in Mt.)

not taste death till they have
seen the Son of Man coming Himself
to reign."

It is not explicit that Son of Man = Jesus. As they stand these passages could be read as if Jesus were expounding the true idea rather than applying it to Himself. Certainly the application to Himself is not essential to the value of the passage, though integral to the eschatological theory as expounded by Schweitzer and others.

But granting that the Son of Man = Jesus, then there is here strong support for His Lordship. But then also there is a strong eschatological tendency here.

This turn to the saying is peculiar to Mt. Neither Mk. nor Lk. mention the Son of Man, but only that "many shall not see death till they see the Kingdom of God." (Mk. adds "Coming in power,)."

Mt. XXIV-42. "Keep on the watch therefore for you never know at what hour your Lord will come."

Jesus is probably referring to Himself in an eschatological sense, but *κύριος* need not mean more than 'Master.' Certainly in similar passages in Mk. XIII, 33, 35 no other sense is present.

a. *κύριος* here may = God. (cf. Day of the Lord.)

(Chapter III. Section iii. Jesus as Lord in Mt).

- b. Jesus may have been expounding the Messianic idea.
- c. There is the question whether these are the ipsissima verba of Jesus or an interpretation of Mt. or what?

Mt.XXVIII-6. "See, here is the place where He (the Lord) lay."

The words of the angel to the women on the resurrection morning. But the reading is doubtful, and nothing can be safely built upon the passage.

XI-28. Come unto me all ye that labour and I will give you rest. Take my yokeetc.

A position is claimed which is premonitory to and strongly suggestive of Lordship but it is not yet here.

XII-1ff (especially v:6) "One is here who is greater than the temple. (and v:8) For the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath."

Jesus sets Himself as superior to Sabbath regulations and also gives His disciples rights such as only the temple priests enjoy. This can only mean Lordship in a religious sense. The meaning carries over to Son of Man in v:8 and makes the reading then quite different from the parallel in Mk.II-27 and Lk~~V~~-5 where Son of Man

(Chapter III. Section iii. Jesus as Lord in Mt).

probably means men generally. In Mt.XII-8 Son of Man means Jesus as the Lord.

But the passage looks however like a compound of the idea as found in Mk and of the eschatological conception of the Son of Man as in Mk.XIII and Mt.X. All turns upon the understanding of the Son of Man and how closely Jesus is to be identified with him.

Mt.XVI, 18f. The passage is peculiar to Mt, and implies Lordship, but is certainly unhistorical.

(b) On the other hand there are certain passages in the matter peculiar to Mt. which are difficult to reconcile with any real tradition of the Lordship of Jesus.

XVI-22 Ἰλεῶς σοι, κύριε ^{οὐ μόνον} ~~μὴ~~ ^{εἶ} εἶπαι σοι τοῦτο

This oath seems quite inconsistent with the idea of Lordship and it is evident, therefore, that Peter did not regard Jesus as Lord in the religious sense at this period.

IV, 7, 10.- The Temptation.

"It is written again, You shall not tempt the Lord your God." "Begone, Satan! it is written, You must worship the Lord your God, and serve Him alone."

Both passages imply that Jesus places Himself in a totally different category from God.

(Chapter III. Section iii. Jesus as Lord in Mt.)

XXI-11.- The Triumphal entry. "This is the prophet of Nazareth."

This is a very tame thing for people to say and is quite an anticlimax after the immense enthusiasm described by Mt. We would have expected far more.

Summary.

i. Passages in which Jesus is regarded as Lord are confined in Matthew to his peculiar sections.

ii. Matthew shews the use only in a relatively undeveloped form. We get most by inference. But he sometimes re-interprets Mk. in the general direction of this sense.

iii. No synoptic passage is agreed in calling Jesus Lord.

iv. The doctrine of Lordship is incipient in this source but is not found in the historical events which it records. Jesus is not exhibited as actually exercising authority in virtue of His Lordship and the passages in-consistent with the doctrine could not have survived had they not been authentic. They therefore nullify the value of the favourable witnesses. This source therefore in spite of itself, testifies to a time when Jesus was not regarded as Lord.

(Chapter III. The Authority of Jesus as Lord).

Section IV.- Jesus as Lord in Passages Peculiar to Lk.

(a) Those in some sense favourable to the doctrine.

In St. Luke's Gospel we find a complete change of atmosphere and the final stage of development of the use of the term κύριος . It has become indeed the usual mode of reference employed by the evangelist. (e.g. XIX-8, X-1, VII-13, XXII-61). He uses it almost exclusively when introducing passages from Q. (e.g. Lk. XII-42, XIII-15, XVII-5,6 etc), and elsewhere (e.g. XVIII-6). He seems to think of Jesus not in terms of 'Messiah' as perhaps Mt, or 'Son of God' as in Jn, but of "The Lord." These passages or most of them must therefore be disregarded as evidence of the primitive attitude to Jesus. Indeed they tend to give a construction to other passages which is not inherent in them. (e.g. in Lk.V,8 where Peter says, " ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁματωλός εἰμι, κύριε.")

VI-5. "The Son of Man is Lord even over the Sabbath."

The meaning of Son of Man here = Jesus. This is gained by omitting Mk's passage "The Sabbath was made for man not man for Sabbath." Here Lk. agrees

(Chapter III. Section. ivi. Jesus as Lord in Lk.)

with Mt.

'Lord' then =Master of the Sabbath with the implication of the Lord of worship, or Son of Man = Jesus = Lord.

X-1. "After that the Lord commissioned other seventy disciples."

This use of Lord seems on the whole intended to be with a religious significance, but it springs from the evangelist's habit. It is in rather striking contrast with the next verse "Pray ye the Lord of the Harvest etc" where Lord certainly means God.

XIX-31 is not a case in point *κύριος* = Master, employer (where Jesus instructs His disciples what to say when borrowing the ass).

XXII-31. The reading *κύριος* is to be rejected on critical grounds.

XXII-61. Lk. Reads "And Peter remembered the word of the Lord."

Mk. reads "And Peter remembered the word which
Jesus spoke to him."

Mt. reads "And Peter remembered the word spoken
by Jesus."

Thus Lk. gives the distinct meaning of Lord in religious sense to the passage as against the trad-

(Chapter III. Section iv. Jesus as Lord in Luke).

ition preserved by Mk. and Mt.

There remain the passages in the first two Chapters and in the last Chapter which by universal consent stand on a different literary basis ~~from~~ the rest of the Gospel.

I,31-33 (especially verse 33). "You are to conceive and bear a son, and you must call his name Jesus.

He will be great, he will be called the Son of the Most High,
and the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father;
he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and to his reign there will be no end."

The Lordship here has not a purely religious but a partly political character.

I-43. "What have I done to have the mother of my Lord come to me ... and blessed is she who believed that the Lord's words to her would be fulfilled.

Here Lord is used in similar senses both of Jehovah and Jesus.

II-11 ... a saviour born in the town of David, the Lord Messiah.

II-26 ... not see death till he had seen the Lord Messiah. (There are many references in Chapter II to God as Lord and the same word is used in the same sense of the Messiah.)

XXIV-3 ... They could not find the body of the Lord Jesus.

XXIV-34 .. who told them that the Lord had already

arisen and had appeared unto Simon.

(The use of the term in the last instances is practically that of a proper name).

From these passages it is not possible to come to the conclusion that any one regarded Jesus as Lord during His life-time, though the attitude of the evangelist is quite clear. On the other hand the following passages of a negative character point to a definite conclusion against the Lordship of Jesus.

(b) Passages inconsistent with the doctrine.

IV-18,22. Jesus read Isaiah 61-4, 58-6. "The spirit of the Lord has come upon me etc," and, in verse 22, applies this prophecy to Himself.

But this is quite inconsistent with a consciousness that He Himself is the Lord. Rather He feels Himself as prophet, messenger, etc, but not Lord. Only a forced reading of the passage would make it otherwise. The whole sense of the Chapter is that Jesus is a prophet.

(Chapter III. Section iv. Jesus as Lord in St. Luke).

V-17. "And the power of the Lord was present for healing.

Here is meant God's power, and this is sharply distinguished from that of Jesus, and also from the status of Jesus.

(Lk. IX-18ff.- Peter's Confession.)

In this passage, it is not the incident itself but the form which is peculiar to Lk. and it is very significant that nothing is said about Jesus' Lordship though it was a good opportunity for Lk. to apply his favourite term. cf. p.48ff).

(IX-33.- The Transfiguration.)

Here also it is the form alone which is peculiar to Lk. Though the occasion was very propitious for using a favourite term, Lk seems purposely to avoid κύριος which would have been a good rendering of רַבּ (as is seen in Mt.) Instead he uses the rare word ἐπισημότης which seems chosen in order to avoid the religious connotation of κύριος. (The term occurs in Lk.V-5, VIII-24,45. ~~IX,33,40~~ XVII-13 and not elsewhere in N.T. cf. p.40f supra).

XIX-38. "Blessed be the King who comes in the Lord's name."

King is here used with a political rather than a religious reference.

The person of the King is contrasted with God as Lord: for He comes 'in the Lord's name.'

These passages enable us to reach a positive conclusion viz:- that though the third evangelist himself is completely accustomed to regard Jesus as Lord, his narrative shews that this attitude did not exist during the earthly life of Jesus either on the part of his disciples or any others. Jesus gained no authority from His Lordship.

Summary of Synoptic Sources.

Thus all the synoptics and Q are agreed. They reveal to us a Jesus who was not regarded as Lord and who had no consciousness of Lordship as an object of religious worship. But the attitude appears to have developed in certain localities between A.D. 50 and A.D.80.

CHAPTER III.Section V.- The Lordship in St. John's Gospel.

In St John's Gospel we find another nuance in the use of the term. *Κύριος*

IV-1. "Now when the Lord heard that the Pharisees had heard of Jesus gaining and baptising more disciples than John ..."

Κύριος is a mere alternative name to Jesus cf. VI-23.

IV-11 = sir! so IV-15,19,49; V,7; VI-34,68; VIII-11; IX-36; Chapter XI passim.

VI-68. "Lord to whom else can we go, etc."

The title here has a fairly strong religious flavour, but it seems due rather to the gospel than to the choice of the term itself, so IX-38; XIII-6,9,13,14,25,36,37; XIV-5,8,22; XX-18,20,25; XXI-7,12,15,16,17,20f.

XI-2,12,21,27,32,39,- the uses of the term in connection ~~with~~ the raising of Lazarus - all in the same sense.

Verse 27 shews the term = sir, dear master, rabboni, otherwise the confession of Martha is tautologous, and would be unnecessary if implied in the term itself.

(Chapter III. Section V. Lordship in St. John.)

Chapters. XVI, XVII, XVIII and XIX never use the term.

XX-2 Μαριά... λέγει αὐτοῖς ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνηγείου

i. κύριον = Master (so Moffatt) otherwise Mary

would not have said "They have taken," but "He is risen."

XX-25. and when the rest of the Disciples told him, "We have seen the Lord," he said, "Unless I see His hands with mark of the nails, and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand in His side, I refuse to believe it."

'Lord' is not used in religious sense here, or Thomas could not have said what he did.

XX-28. Thomas answered Him "My Lord and my God."

This is the first and only explicit use of the term in a religious sense.

Summary of St. John's witness.

The result is surprising.

i. A distinctly religious use of the term is absent till the very end. Its place, as in Mk. seems to be taken by ὁ υἱός in the mind of the evangelist.

ii. Probably ἄδελφε gives the best sense when used by intimates or 'sir' when used by others.

(Chapter III. Section v. Lordship of Jesus in John)

iii. Long passages avoid the term altogether although it is very frequent in others. In fact the term is all but confined to Chapters. IV, XI, XIV, XX and XXI. None in I, II, III, VII, X, XVI-XIX.

iv. The definitely historical and religious use is confined to the reply of Thomas which is the climax of the resurrection story. XX-28.

v. But it is to be noted that this ^{is} after the crucifixion.

vi. Not even John is aware of any consciousness of Lordship in Jesus.

Section VI.- Summary of Jesus as LordAs found in The Main Sources.

The general conclusion is that the authority of Jesus is not founded historically upon his Lordship nor did He Himself make any such claim in His life and labours among the people or in His intimate intercourse with His disciples. The ascription of Lordship rises later, and is due rather to the subsequent experience of the disciples and of the early church.

Chapter IV.THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS SON OF MAN.

We now embark upon one of the most disputed questions in N.T. study. In what sense or senses did Jesus employ the term? It is difficult to see how Jesus can have used the term without Messianic implications, and yet if He frequently used it as a self-designation it is difficult to understand how the people in general and the disciples in particular were in any doubt that He made distinct Messianic pretensions. Perhaps the explanation is that the term Son of Man was not a current Jewish name for the Messiah (Dalman. Engl. Trans. 1902. p.241ff). "Man hat wohl in apokalyptischen Kreisen unter diesem Namen auf Grund Dn.VII, 13 vom Messias geredet, aber der breiten Masse ist der Ausdruck unbekannt geblieben" (Strack-Billerbeck 1922. S:486) But in this case it becomes doubtful whether Jesus used the term at all, as it would have no meaning to His usual hearers. In the book of Daniel VII, 13, by general consent we have a personification of the people, (Dalman. op. cit. Charles. 1914. p.60. Burkitt.

(Chapter IV. The authority of Jesus as Son of Man.)

1910. p.64f), but in the Book of Enoch "it is not to be denied that the author, though in this part of the Similitudes he avoids every other Messianic title, really imputes to "the Son of Man" a Messianic significance." (Dalman. op. cit. p.243. cf. Bousset 1906. Engl. Trans. p.186). R.H. Charles holds that Jesus adopted the title from I Enoch and thereby made supernatural claims for himself. (op. cit. p.91). But it is worth nothing that the Psalms of Solomon even in the finely conceived and detailed description of the Messiah contained in XVII-23ff. and XVIII-1ff, make no use of the term. This fact suggests once more that 'Son of Man' was not indissolubly bound up with the 'Messiah,' that it was probably not a common and possibly a rather unusual term in Jewish circles, and that its meaning would not be immediately apparent to the average man of the time.

Why then and in what sense did Jesus employ the Phrase? Did He always use it in the same sense and did He use it equally throughout His ministry? The

(Chapter IV. ~~So~~The Authority of Jesus as Son of Man).

views on these points are various. Some hold there is no problem as it is a mere substitute for the personal pronoun. (cf. E.B. Vol.4716). Martineau thinks Jesus used it to express "the trustful self-surrender, the blended fearlessness and tenderness before men, the shrinking from words of praise, "Why callest thou me good?" which speak in all the features of His portraiture." (Martineau. 1898. p.338). "It by no means implied any Messianic claim. It might on the contrary be intended to emphasise the very features of His life and love which are least congenial with the national idea." (Ibid. p.339). According to Moffatt "The Messianic connotation of the title, on the lips of Jesus, includes humanity and apocalyptic triumph in the future. It expressed as one critic has said, the messianic consciousness of Jesus in three distinct directions. It announced a Messiah appointed to suffer, richly endowed with human sympathy, and destined to pass through suffering to glory.' All theories that Jesus used to denote some other than Himself ... some future agent of God ... or that it merely expressed His consciousness of personal humanity, may be set aside

(Chapter IV. The Authority of Jesus as Son of Man).

without hesitation. (1912. p.153). But we shall have some grounds for regarding this question as not yet closed (e.g. p.99 & 108 infra). Harnack holds that it is certain Jesus used the phrase, but that no single case is trustworthy. (Harnack. 1907. S:169). Denney regards this as an overstatement but he does so on the ground that "in the vast majority of cases where one evangelist has "The Son of Man" so has the other." (Denney. 1908. p.287). But this view is somewhat misleading as both gospels in most of these cases represent one source. Boussett declares "The title 'Son of Man' cannot have been used as a regular and constant self-designation by Jesus. Not until the end of His life, and then only briefly and sparingly, did He adopt the name. ...

"The stereotyped way in which the Synoptics represent Jesus as using the title 'Son of Man' is not historical ... Yet this constantly repeated use of the title by tradition is best explained on the supposition that it is based on a few genuine words of Jesus, because the fact that the mysterious title never appears in the narrative part of the Gospels, but always in the

(Chapter IV. The Authority of Jesus as Son of Man).

sayings of Jesus, would otherwise have no explanation." (Boussett. 1906. p.&193).

In a classification of the passages in which the term occurs, Garvie says that it is not one of the recognised titles for the Messiah as is proved by Jesus' question which called forth Peter's confession, (Mt. XVI-13) but He has to admit that here we have the possibility that Mt. used this title where Jesus only used the first personal pronoun. Garvie evidently feels it is going too far to say that it only occurs on the lips of Jesus as certain passages in the fourth gospel are ambiguous. He sums up by declaring "It is therefore impossible to define the conception from one exclusive point of view. The predicates assigned to the Son of Man do not give to the term any distinctive meaning." (Garvie. 1907. p.305f).

Stapfer on the other hand finds no difficulty in understanding the meaning which ^{Jesus} gave the term. After a perspicacious discussion of its earlier use, concluding that the people generally retained the older meaning whereas Jesus adopted a transformed sense, He says "Le Fils de l'homme est donc, dans la pensée de Jesus: 1. le Messia, car les Rabbins, dans leurs écoles et les

(Chapter IV. The Authority of Jesus as Son of Man).

apocalypses inconnues du peuple lui donnait ce nom. 2. Un simple homme chargé d'une révélation divine, un prophète. Jesus l'emploie dans les deux senses ... Ce nom repondait donc à un procédé que Jesus aimait et qu'il a mis en oeuvre dans les paraboles: éveiller l'attention, forces les consciences serieuses à se poser un point d'interrogation. Ce nom le révélait et le cachait tout ensemble. Il ne disait pas tout et c'est bien ce qu'il voulait au debut: sans se proclamer ouvertement le Messie, faire l'oeuvre du Messie et laisser les hommes deviner et le reconnaître." (Stapfer. 1897. Vol II. p.305ff)

Berguer follows this general line of argument, but primarily on psychological grounds, and says, "The Son of Man, while designating the Messianic dignity, expressed something else as well; The Son of Man, man pre-eminently. And this, pre-eminently again, was what Jesus wished to bring to His followers. He wanted to communicate to them the human verity, He wanted to make them see man as he should be, as He Himself had realised the conception, to make them witnesses of a perfect human experience, since this was the only means by which they could find out what God was and understand Him." ABerguer.

(Chapter IV. The Authority of Jesus as Son of Man).

(1923. p.242). While the grounds for this conclusion may not be fully admitted, psychological consideration cannot be excluded, but should rather be welcomed, for "to attempt a non-psychological exposition of the Son of Man passages in the gospels, e.g. seems to me as promising and legitimate as it would be to propose a non philosophic inquiry into Plato's allusions to the demon of Socrates" (Moffatt. 1912. p.175.)

The summary of this discussion seems to be that the term Son of Man was possibly used by Jesus in four different senses.

i. For the first personal pronoun, in which case the authority of Jesus as Son of Man is simply that of His living personality.

ii. For man in general - and was first commonly so understood by the people. In this case it falls out of consideration for our purpose.

iii. Jesus as the representative and ideal man. This seems to some extent a modernised conception.

iv. As a mode of reference to the Messiah either as such or as Messiah designatus.

Chapter IV. (cont)

Section I.- The Son of Man in Q.

Let us now examine our sources, beginning with Q. The relevant passages in this document fall into two distinct classes (A) the earlier, i.e. before Mt.XIII and Lk.XII, and (B) the later.

- (A) (i) Mt.VIII-20, Lk.IX-58. "But the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head."
- (ii) Mt.X-32, Lk.XII-8. "Everyone therefore who shall confess me before men, him will the Son of Man (Mt.says "I") also confess before the angels of God!"
- (iii) Mt.XII-32, Lk.XII,10. "And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven Him, but whosoever will speak a word against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him."
- (iv) Mt.XXIV-44, Lk.XII-40. "So be ready yourselves, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect."
- (v) Mt.XI-19, Lk.XII-35. "The Son of Man came eating and drinking and they say "Behold a man gluttonous and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."
- (vi) Mt.XII-39ff, Lk.XI-29ff. "For as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so shall the Son of Man be to this generation ... behold here is more than **Jonah**;;.... to hear the wisdom of Solomon ... here is a greater than Solomon."

(Chapter IV. Section i. The Son of Man in Q).

It is immediately evident that in (i) and (v) Son of Man is simply a substitute for the first personal pronoun singular, and thus no authority attaches to Jesus as Son of Man in any special sense. (vi) evidently refers to the powerful preaching of Jonah and to the wise counsels of Solomon which are out-done by the preaching and teaching of Jesus. There is no comparison of person with person. Hence it follows that Son of Man is a substitute for the first personal pronoun. In (iii) the case is somewhat different. As it stands it admits of the interpretation of the Son of Man in an apocalyptic sense. But even if this be allowed then the context would permit of no special status. He can be spoken against without grievous sin, indeed probably the meaning is that there is no wrong in speaking against the Son of Man. This is to give Him little or no authority on account of His status. Certainly it is not to add to the place of Jesus because Son of Man. For our purpose at least, we may therefore without loss equate the term once more with the pronoun. In (iv) the reference is very obscure, though the apocalyptic sense is prominent in the use of

(Chapter IV. Section 1. The Son of Man in Q).

the term. It is probable that Q understands Jesus to be referred to, but the passage really falls under the second half of the present section (see. p.99 infra).

There remains only (ii) which can be readily interpreted in an apocalyptic sense as it stands. But there are certain considerations ^{which} make us pause. (a) Mt. does not use the term but retains the first personal singular. (b) the passage appears to have a double in Mk.VIII-38, Lk.IX-26, in which both the first singular and also the term Son of Man occur and are identified, and where both the Father and the angels are mentioned. (c) This doublette in Mk. is followed only by Lk. who alone used the term Son of Man in the passage we are discussing. It would, therefore, appear that in Lk. we have the possibility of some conflation of texts and that Mt. retains the purer form. We should, therefore, be justified in regarding this use of Son of Man as merely an equivalent for "I" and the eschatological sense as imported from other doubletted passages.

Klostermann (1919. p.496 a.l.), apparently agrees with this conclusion. He finds here only a "Weiteres Motiv zum fürchtlosen Bekennen."

(Chapter IV. Section 1. The Son of Man in Q).

(B) Passages later in the gospel.

- i. Mt. XXIV-27 (cf. Lk. XVII-24). For as the lightning ... so will be the coming of the Son of Man.
- ii. Mt. XXIV-37, 39 (cf. Lk. XVII-26ff). "As were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of Man."
- iii. Mt. XXIV-44 (cf. Lk. XII-39f). "Be ye also ready, for at the hour that ye think not, the Son of Man cometh."

In all these passages the use of the term is radically different from that in the preceding group. Here we are really dealing with the apocalyptic Messiah who is to come unexpectedly in the future. The term Son of Man still seems to bear some of its connotation as the equivalent of the first personal pronoun singular. It is therefore best regarded as the link between the person of Jesus as He appeared among men and His conception of the Parusia. But it is to be noted that in this passage where all three instances occur the Son of Man need not refer to Jesus at all, but may be a discussion of the current ideas of the Son of Man as in I Enoch etc,

Indeed this consideration brings before us the real object of this entire passage. While Mt. lays special stress on the fact that the date of the Parusia is unknown and Lk. emphasises the unpreparedness of the people,

(Chapter IV. Section 1. The Son of Man in Q).

(so Klosterman, op. cit. a.l. p.538f) both alike imply that when it does come every one will know it plainly - the lightning will shine from one end of the sky to the other. (Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. a.l. S:954 et seq). Jesus is not speaking of His own parusia, but of false ideas prevalent among the people and the mistaken grounds upon which they will look for their fulfilment. In effect Jesus says that whenever it does take place there will be no room for anyone to doubt it, but the main thing is that men should be faithful to their duties and to their Lord and then it will not matter when it comes. (cf. Mt.XXIV,36-44).

But on this understanding of the passage, the apocalyptic interpretation of the Son of Man as applied to Jesus, fades into the background even if it is not entirely dismissed. Jesus is speaking on His personal authority directly to His disciples, and the close reference of the term to Himself is rendered nugatory. This passage is then seen to be quite in line with the usage in group (A). The general conclusion is that Q. knows nothing of the apocalyptic sense of the Son of Man as applied to our Lord in His earthly ministry.

Section II.- Jesus as Son of Man in St. Mark's Gospel.

It is well known that there are two distinct periods in Mk. (i) Before the Confession of Peter. (ii) The confession and afterwards.

There are only two instances of the use of the term before the Confession, viz: Mk. II, 10 and 28. where the weight of opinion seems to be that Son of Man here means mankind or men in general. While this opinion may be subject to doubt, the two passages are much too disputable to support by themselves any argument for the special authority of Jesus as Son of Man either to forgive sins or to re-order Sabbath observance, or in other ways.

We therefore pass on immediately to the Confession of Peter. We shall divide our consideration into three parts. (A) The question of Jesus. (B) The reply of Peter. (c) The further words of Jesus.

Mk. VIII, 27-33 (cf. Mt. XVI, 13-23, Lk. IX, 18-22).

- (a) According to Mk. VIII-27 Jesus said "Who do people say I am?"
- | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|---|--|
| " | " Mt. XVI-13 | " | " | "Who do people say the Son of Man is?" |
| " | " Lk. IX-18 | " | " | "Who do the crowds say I am?" |

(Chapter IV. Section ii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mk).

(B) According to Mk.VIII-29 Peter said "You are the Christ."

" " Mt.XVI-16 " " "You are the Christ
the Son of the Living God."

" " Lk.IX-20 Peter said "The Christ of God."

Thus Mk. does not employ the term Son of Man.

In this he is followed by Lk. Where Mt. employs the term it is not in the technical sense at all, but only as a synonym for first personal pronoun singular.

(C) Accord: to Mk.VIII-31 Jesus said "The Son of Man had to endure great suffering etc,"

" " Mt.XVI-21 Jesus said "He had to leave for
Jerusalem and endure great
suffering."

" " Lk.IX-22 Jesus said "The Son of Man has
to endure great suffering."

Here again Mk. is followed by Lk. and abandoned by Mt. but in the alternate direction Mk and Lk. use the term Son of Man and Mt. avoids it. But even from Mk. alone it is apparent that the term is not used in the technical sense, but only as a synonym for the personal pronoun, for the apocalyptic Son of Man is certainly not connected with personal suffering. It is true that Jesus is probably thinking of Himself as of a special status, but scarcely as Son of Man in any historical or technical sense, i.e. He is not speaking of Himself or of His

(Chapter IV. Section ii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mk).

future as the apocalyptic Son of Man as in I Enoch. Indeed to emphasise any technical meaning of the term Son of Man, and make it other than a mere substitute for the personal pronoun, is to obscure the real point of the passage, which is in the teaching immediately following. The whole force of the incident lies in the connection between the person of Jesus and suffering or even death. Peter felt it to be unmerited in the Jesus he loved, but the compatibility of the noblest life with suffering is of the essence of the gospel of redemption, though it is a hard saying even yet. But for this reason Jesus rebukes Peter, and then immediately begins to teach the doctrine with great power to both the crowds and His disciples (see. also Rawlinson. 1925. pp.112f).

Thus this important key passage is unaware of any special sense attaching to the term either as representative man, or as a sign of His humility or His supernatural powers, or the like. The sense of the passage either as a whole or in part would be in no way altered if the term were altogether absent and its place were taken by the first personal pronoun singular.

(Chapter IV. Section ii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mk).

Mk.VIII-38 to IX-1 (cf. Mt.XVI-27f, IX-26f).

"Whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this disloyal and sinful generation, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when He comes in the glory of His Father with the holy angels. "I tell you truly, "He said to them,"there are some of those standing here who will not taste death till they see the coming of God's reign with power."

This passage is really inseparable from the preceding, but if it be taken by itself, we may possibly regard Jesus and the Son of Man as two distinct persons or even to look on Jesus as Son of Man in some technical sense, but when read in connection with the preceding this interpretation is impossible. Further if we substitute the personal pronoun we get no significant change in the sense of the passage. There is foreshadowed a parusia, but scarcely that of the Son of Man in the technical sense of the Apocalypics.

Even^{if} this be disputed, the sense is that Jesus is not Son of Man now, but that He will be so when He comes in the glory of His Father. Thus in no way can this passage be employed to shew the authority of Jesus as Son of Man during His ministry.

In Mt.XVI-28, The term is a mere alternative to the first person pronoun singular as is shown by the parallels.

(Chapter IV. Section ii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mk).

Mk.IX-9 (cf. Mt.XVII-9). After the Transfiguration Jesus "forbade them to tell anyone what they had seen till such time as the Son of Man rose from the dead."

Here again, even granting the full historicity of the narrative, the substitution of first person singular makes no difference to the sense. This is not a technical use of the Son of Man. But it is extremely doubtful how far there is a historical basis to the record, so that in any case nothing can be built upon it for our purpose. (cf. Rawlinson. 1925. pp.120f. Klosterman. 1907. S:71f).

So also Mk.IX-31, X-33. where the same subject is dealt with in a similar manner. Jesus' authority is quite external and arbitrary, but not as Son of Man.

Mk.IX-12 cf. Mt.XVII,10ff. "He said to them, "Elijah does come first, and restore all things, but what is written about the Son of Man as well?"

The immediate identification is between Son of Man and the Messiah, (see p.144 infra) but then Jesus has just been confessed as Messiah. Thus we have another case of a substitution for the personal pronoun.

Mk.X-45. "The Son of Man Himself has not come to be served

(Chapter IV. Section ii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mk.)

but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many."

i. The synonym for first person pronoun is manifest.

ii. The authority here is not external but calm, intuitive and personal.

Mk.XIII,24-27. The day of the Son of Man and the Return of the Son of Man. (see sub. Mt.XXIV-27,37, in Q. supra. p. 99).

Summary.

The result of our examination is that Mk. exhibits the term Son of Man in two senses only. (i) referring to mankind generally in the earlier half of the gospels (ii) as a synonym for Jesus of Nazareth or for first person pronoun singular. He does not use it in the technical eschatological or apocalyptic sense anywhere in the gospel. He attributes no rank or authority to Jesus on account of His identification with the Son of Man of Daniel, Enoch, or the like, as it is doubtful whether there is any necessary or real connection between the two in the evangelist's mind. In other words the apocalyptic conception of the Son of Man is of negligible importance to Mk.

(Chapter IV.)

Section.III.- Jesus as Son of Man

In Passages Peculiar to Matthew.

These are three in number.

- (i) Mt.X-23. "When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next; truly I tell you, you will not have covered the towns of Israel before the Son of Man arrives."

This verse derives much of its significance from our view-point. It is clearly, however, connected with the preceding six verses which appear to refer to the Christian community generally and not merely to the disciples. If this be true the eschatological sense is not so urgent as Schweitzer would make out, (1901. S:16,81ff. 1921. S:405f. etc) but the question of the identity of the Son of Man remains substantially unaltered. The passage is from Mt's version of the Little Apocalypse as seen otherwise in Mk.XIII.

- (ii) Mt.XIII-37,41. "Explain to us the parable of the weeds in the field."
So He replied, "He who sows the good seed is the Son of Man ... (verse 41)
So will it be at the end of the world; the Son of Man will dispatch His Angels, and they will gather out of His realm all who are hinderances and who practice iniquity."

(Chapter IV. Section iii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mt).

It is to be noted that the allegorical interpretation of a parable is not usual in the practice of Jesus.

(iii) Mt.XXV-31. (Parable of the Sheep and Goats.)
"When the Son of Man comes in His glory,
and all the Holy Angels with Him, then
He will sit on the throne of His glory...

(Mt.XVI-28. (see under Mk.IX-1. p.104 supra))

(Mt.XVIII-11 is omitted on critical grounds).

The points to be noted are as follows:-

All these three passages are strongly eschatological.

Whereas in the other sources examined thus far the identification of Son of Man with Jesus, or the use of the term as a substitute for the first person pronoun was unmistakable, except where the term might have meant men in general, here the identify of the Son of Man is quite uncertain. If these passages be taken in their immediate context but apart from the rest of the gospel, there is no necessity for identifying Jesus as Son of Man. They seem indeed to be rather expositions of the general conception with evaluation of its validity. - in this respect similar to the reference to Jonah in Mt.XII-40. (vide supra p.84f)

(Chapter IV, Section iii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mt.)

The exact identity of the Son of Man is in no case the point at issue and makes no difference to the value of what is said in any of the three passages. In (i) the real point is an exhortation to 'seeing it through' as persecution will not last for ever. In (ii) and (iii) righteousness, though hid^en now, will eventually be readily distinguishable and have its appropriate blessing. But this will be the case independently of the identity of the judge. In (ii) indeed, it is the angels who do the actual judging even if at the orders of the Son of Man. The Son of Man is thus only the agent for completing the plan upon which life is built. But Jesus Himself gains no authority thereby. If He be conceived as identical with the Son of Man in these verses, nothing is added to their urgency. On the other hand, if the Son of Man be regarded as entirely another person, nothing is taken from them. If they be literally authentic, and if Jesus did really intend to refer to Himself, the connection cannot have been inevitable, nor can it have been present in the minds of His hearers. It certainly was not the important thing to them, nor what gave weight to His words.

(Chapter IV. Section iii. Jesus as Son of Man in Mt.)

The conclusion therefore is that while in the writer's mind Jesus was possibly the apocalyptic Son of Man, nothing in the present source itself regarding the Son of Man as such helps us to understand the authority which Jesus exercised or felt in His intercourse with the people or His disciples.

Section IV.- Jesus as Son of Man

In Passages Peculiar to Luke.

Here again they are three in number.

- (i) Lk.XVIII-8. "Will he (God) be tolerant to their (the elects') opponents? I tell you He will quickly see justice to His elect." And yet, when the Son of Man does come will He find faith on earth?"
- (ii) Lk.XIX-9f. "And Jesus said of Him, "To-day salvation has come to this house, since Zaccheus here is a Son of Abraham. For the Son of Man has come to seek and save the lost."
- (iii) Lk.XXI-36. "From hour to hour keep awake, praying that you may succeed in escaping all these dangers to come and in standing before the Son of Man."

(Chapter IV. Section iv. Jesus as Son of Man in Lk.)

The following are the points to be noted:-

a. In (ii) the term Son of Man is a mere alternative to first person pronoun.

b. In (i) and (iii) practically all that was said on the passages peculiar to Mt. (p. 107f supra) is applicable. The whole point is in the urgency of the ethico-religious life, and the coming of the Son of Man is merely the sign of the end of the effort and the vigilance required of all men.

Our conclusion is that the source peculiar to St. Luke's gospel in dealing with the term Son of Man does not help us to understand the authority which Jesus exercised or felt.

Section V.- Jesus as Son of Man

In St. John's Gospel.

The use of the term throughout the gospel is comparatively simple and uniform. Always it is closely and unmistakably identified with Jesus for whom it is

(Chapter IV. Section v. Jesus as Son of Man in John).

used as a title, though with a somewhat special flavour, e.g. VI-53,62; VIII-28; IX-35, XII-24; XII-34 (where the people refer to the Son of Man though Jesus had not used the term. The passage has meaning only when the second personal pronoun is substituted for Son of Man); XIII,21.

It cannot be denied that the term Son of Man is possibly something more than a mere proper name. The old conception of the Son of Man includes that of Judge of all the earth, an element which cannot be entirely excluded from John's use of the term. The peculiar authority of Jesus rests upon the fact that He is human. He knows our flesh. Here the title Son of Man seems emphasised in the sense that because His human life incarnates the divine, He is our judge. God would fail as Judge if His verdict did not become ours. That is why Jesus receives the task. Only a representative man can judge imperfect men. Jesus is the Son of Man in this general sense. But in what degree this view was present in Jesus seems doubtful. Rather it appears as one of the fruits of meditation upon the significance of His person. It is in the mind of the evangelist rather than of Jesus.

Three earlier passages, however, make a complete

(Chapter IV. Section v. Jesus as Son of Man in John.)

identification not only with Jesus but also with Son of Man as a heavenly being. Thus:-

- (i) 1-51. (After the Confession of Nathaniel)
"Truly, truly I tell you all, you will see heaven open wide and God's angels ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."

Jesus is linked up with the theophany at Bethel in Gen:XXVIII-10ff. i.e. with the fundamental promises of God to the Hebrew race and thus with O.T. prophecy.

Jesus appears as by nature a heavenly being.

This prophecy was not fulfilled.

- (ii) III-13f. "And yet the Son of Man, descended from heaven, is the only one who has ascended into heaven. Indeed the Son of Man *must* be lifted on high, just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert."

But Jesus had not yet ascended. The point of view is post crucem.

And here we have an unmistakeable instance of the use of the term Son of Man as applied to Jesus long after His life was over.

Again, Jesus is closely identified with the tradition of the apocalyptic Son of Man as still lingering in the Christian church. The question may arise

(Chapter IV. Section v. Jesus as Son of Man in John)

whether this is transmuted apocalyptic of some sort.

- (iii) V-27. "The Father has granted Him authority to act as Judge since He is the Son of Man."

This is a complete identification of Jesus with the Son of Man of the apocalypics of which it may be a transmutation.

As Son of Man, Jesus has a place in the Cosmos of distinct authority.

The above list completes the uses of the term in the fourth gospel. It will be noticed that the specially clear identification of the term, in the first three instances, with Jesus on the one hand and with the Apocalyptic being on the other, naturally colours the usage in all the remaining instances in this source. And this gospel, being the refuge of devotional minds, has spread its interpretation far and wide over the synoptics when devotionally read, and has helped to transform the meaning of many a passage therein. Indeed one may go so far as to submit that without the fourth gospel it is difficult to understand how there ever arose the question of the identity of Jesus with the apocalyptic Son of Man in Daniel or Enoch, or elsewhere.

(Chapter IV. Jesus as Son of Man.)

Summary of Witness of all the Sources
to the Authority of Jesus as Son of Man.

The use of the term by Jesus is exceedingly obscure, and any Messianic implications have a very uncertain sound. On the whole it would appear safest to regard it as practically a substitute for the personal pronoun without any distinct colour of meaning. It cannot be doubted that in certain areas at a later period eschatological belief influenced the form in which the gospel of the primitive Christian evangelists was understood, and thus again affected to some extent the literary form of the records current in such an area. But no particular eschatological interpretation was universally accepted at any time, and none current later seems to go back to Jesus Himself. The use of the term Son of Man only helps us to understand the authority of Jesus in so far as it makes clear that that authority was not founded upon apocalyptic expectations either in our Lord Himself, or in the people,

That the term Son of Man should have early fallen into disuse confirms this opinion even after one has allowed full weight to the linguistic considerations adduced

(Chapter IV.)

by Dalman (1902, p.240) and to the probably local character of a vivid eschatological expectation. If Jesus really did identify Himself with some form of apocalyptic, it is difficult to understand why the linguistic awkwardness was not overcome. If an idea is truly vital some valid form of expression will be found for it. And in the same way local beliefs will spread far and wide if they are important enough.

Our general conclusion is that the term Son of Man in no way helps us to understand the authority of Jesus.

Chapter V.THE MESSIAHSIP OF JESUS
AS RELATED TO HIS AUTHORITY.

The essence of the Messianic conception is that of a deliverer divinely chosen and appointed. As commonly understood among the Jews He was to effect mainly a political deliverance, though not always by ordinary political means of force.

(Psalms of Solomon. XVII-37,39,42. "For He shall not put His trust in horse, rider or bow, nor shall He multiply unto Himself gold, silver for war, nor by ships shall He gather confidence for the day of battle.. (verse 39) For He shall smite the earth with the words of His mouth .. (verse 42) for God shall cause Him to be mighty through the spirit of holiness, etc,")

As commonly understood among the gentiles, the kind of deliverer looked for was mainly personal, and salvation would come by means of an inner preparedness leading to a mystic union with the Saviour God who then makes the devotee free from the bonds of life and especially enfranchises the soul into eternal life. (Angus. 1925. p.137f and passim.) The usual title for such a deliverer was Lord, (cf. I Cor: VIII-5f). There can be little doubt that both these conceptions have operated ⁱⁿ the

(Chapter V. The Messia^hship of Jesus.)

history of the doctrine of the Messia^hship of Jesus.

It may be doubtful to what extent the gentile conception had penetrated Palestine in the time of Jesus, or even in the time of the apostles, but it was widespread in the world into which the gospel was carried in the first generation. This fact can scarcely have done other than influence the thought of the evangelists and it may have affected their primary sources to some extent. At any rate, in the Acts and in the epistles, Jesus is regarded as Saviour and as Lord more frequently and more correctly than as Messiah. "The retreat of the Messianic categories in favour of the Logos Christology corresponded to the universal necessity for a religion with a cosmic outlook." (Angus. op. cit. p.74) The term Messiah even when translated as Christos had no meaning to the great masses of the gentile world. It very quickly became a mere cognomen, (Mt. I, 16ff. Rom. XV, 3 etc.) In itself the term was Jewish, national, and therefore limited by all the traditional and racial preconceptions of that people. If Jesus did possess the conception, are we to assume that He was entirely unaware of the yearnings of the gentiles for a deliverer? Did His outlook, in any case, even supposing the religious unrest of the larger world were beyond His ken, remain confined to the horizon of Judea,

(Chapter V. The Messiahship of Jesus.)

Samaria and Galilee? It is difficult in that case to understand either the greatness of His impact upon the gentile world when the gospel spread to them, or the urgency with which St. Paul sought to preach the gospel to the Greek and the Barbarian. It is common knowledge that Jesus did not accept the prevailing or any other purely Jewish notion of the Messiah. What then was His conception and in what way, if at all, did He relate it to Himself? To answer these questions we turn to our sources. We shall begin with Q.

Section I.- Jesus as Messiah according to Q.

Mt.XI-2ff. (cf. Lk.VII-18ff) "Now when John heard in prison what the Christ was doing, he sent his disciples to ask Him, "Are you the coming One?" Or are we to look for some one else?" Jesus answered and said, etc."

i. The exact wording of the entire passage must always remain subject to some doubt as the parallel in Lk. varies considerably, and especially in points that immediately effect our present inquiry. Harnack, after elabor-

(Chapter V. Section i. Jesus as Messiah in Q).

ate discussion, decides in favour of the more primitive character of Mt's. version (Harnack. 1907. S:14ff,64ff), which he eventually accepts as a reproduction of Q. (Ib. p.91f).

ii. The term *χρίστος* is evidently employed from the point of view either of the author of Q or of the first evangelist, and not from that of the Baptist. Indeed otherwise it begs the question.

iii. Since Mt. and Lk. agree verbatim on the point in a passage containing divergences elsewhere, there can be little doubt as to John's exact question. He seems almost consciously to avoid the term Messiah. He asks *οὐ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν* The question may thus imply either Messiah, or Son of Man or some other, e.g. Elias or Jeremiah or one of the prophets. (cf. Mt. XVI-13ff and parallels). It is true that "In der messian. Heilszeit erwartete man Heilung aller Krankheiten" (Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:593) and John had already heard of the deeds of Jesus, and yet was dubious. After all there were others who healed, even among the Jews, and it has been maintained that "it is utterly unthinkable" that John, previous to his imprisonment, could ever have entertained the idea of a connection between Jesus and the

(Chapter V. Section i. Jesus as Messiah according to Q).

Messianic hope (Scott. 1911. p.84).

iv. Similarly there can be little doubt that Jesus Himself avoided a direct answer, but left the matter practically where it was. He allowed the question of His status to rest upon the witness of His conduct and aims and personality. As far as the question of His authority goes He desired to add nothing to what men saw and experienced for themselves.

Summary.

This is the only passage in Q where the Messiahship of Jesus is touched upon. There is no reference even of a secondary character to the subject - nothing of Him as Son of David, King of Israel, and the like. That the question itself was present to the author of Q is probable from the passage under discussion though it may possibly have been only in the mind of Mt. This strongly concurs with the conclusion to which we were driven in regard to the term Son of Man in this source. Certainly we are justified in holding that the Messiahship of Jesus was not an urgent question to Q, and that the authority Jesus exercised over the author, or over His own disciples and hearers was probably entirely independent of this issue.

(Chapter V. The Messiahship of Jesus).

Section II.- Jesus as Messiah according to Mark.

The baptismal experience of our Lord is closely connected with His sense of a divine vocation but seems more germane to the sense of Sonship than of Messiahship, and thus has been dealt with to some extent under the former heading (see. p.39 supra). As it has much to do with the inner certainty of Jesus, its bearings in this connection will be dealt with later (see. p.220 infra).

So also the exorcism related in I,21-28 may have been introduced by Mk. to illustrate the Messianic authority of Jesus, but the ascription is probably unauthentic as the demoniac makes use of a later Christian term (cf. Rawlinson. p.15f and footnote 6. on p.16) In any case the reference to Messiahship is indirect and was not understood at the time.

There is no direct and explicit reference to Jesus as Messiah till the confession of Peter. Mk.VIII-27,33. Mt.XVI,13-23. Lk.IX,18-22.

In Mk. Peter says simply οὐ εἶ ὁ χριστός
 " Mt. " " οὐ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
 " Lk. " " τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ
 Mark adds (verse 30) καὶ ἐπιτίμησεν αὐτοῖς

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah according to Mk).

ἵνα μηδενὶ λεγῶσι περὶ αὐτοῦ

in which Mt. and Lk. substantially, though not verbally, agree.

It is historically certain that Peter did ascribe Messiahship to Jesus although it must remain doubtful whether the other disciples had previously agreed on this point. "No stress is here laid as in Mt., on St. Peter's Confession as such." (Rawlinson. op. cit. p.112).

Jesus tacitly accepts the designation but regards it as a secret doctrine and of no value to the public generally, possibly indeed as inimical to His work and purpose as far as they were concerned.

The designation seems to accord with Jesus' own inner consciousness. He appears satisfied because the disciples have reached this point i.e. that they have so appreciated His life and work and personality that they apply to Him the highest title available in their Jewish vocabulary even if in many points it is not applicable to Him.

Why then did Jesus seek this acknowledgment or 'confession' from them? This is one of the most disputed questions. It is to be noted that Jesus immediately goes

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah in Mk.)

on to speak (a) about Himself while avoiding the title He had just accepted, and (b) about the question of suffering. Indeed He did more than merely speak about the matter. (Lk. = εἰπών). He took it up earnestly and seriously and taught. (Mk. = διδάσκειν Mt. = δείκνυειν). There must, therefore, have been some important connection between the Messianic status and the question of His lot. The idea of suffering was foreign to the conception of the Messiah, but not more so than the lowliness and the general character of the life which Jesus lived, or indeed than His birth, boyhood, youth and manhood.

The difficulty, then, in the new connotation of 'Messiah' was in the significance of the suffering. Jesus made quite explicit the subject of the Messiah not for itself or Himself, but in order that the value of any future humiliation and suffering, and His own personal attitude towards it might be appreciated at its full worth. The actual confession of Peter, and the complete and explicit acceptance of the ascription by Jesus, could scarcely have meant anything more to the disciples than the confirmation of identification previously somewhat

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah in Mk).

vaguely and tentatively held. This confirmation must have re-inforced the moral impression already created upon their minds, but it would not qualitatively change its nature. But the re-inforcement was a great advantage in view of the ominous situation which Jesus felt looming up, whose significance He perfectly understood. The close connection in history between religious faithfulness and personal suffering was well known to Him. (Mt. XXIII-30ff,37). Much of the power of Jeremiah depends upon this fact, while the Servant Songs in Isaiah, especially Chapter 53, elaborate the whole conception till it is almost idealised.

These points are scarcely subject to dispute, and they cause no difficulty to us. But there is the perennial psychological reluctance to connect suffering and virtue. This is seen in the common use of the terms 'vicarious' and 'unmerited' and the like. Only if there is an essential ethical connection between suffering and sin on the one hand, and between virtue and reward on the other, are such terms possible in the last analysis. But experience would seem to suggest that, if there be any essential connection, it is between virtue and suffering, on the one hand, and between sin and pleasure on the

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah in Mk).

other. Virtue is often most virtuous when it is virtue through suffering, whereas it is difficult to account for sin except for its vital connection with pleasure. Without an element of suffering virtue loses an essential quality, viz: that of victory. (cf. Temple. 1924. p.268f). Jesus did not face His work immediately out of the feeling that His life was required as a price to ransom many; or at least such a consciousness does not readily appear in Jesus' bearing or words. Rather He came to "seek and to save that which was lost" and to do the will of Him that sent Him."

The suffering was entailed in that He was misunderstood but that nevertheless He must finish the work. Jesus would not have betrayed mankind anymore than He would have betrayed Himself if He had not set His face steadily to go to Jerusalem. By drawing the confession from Peter, Jesus added not merely confirmation to His own status, but also immensely to the dignity of the road He was to take. He showed that though He was conscious of Himself as Messiah and though He was aware that His disciples knew it, nevertheless there was no alternative to the lowly and risky path. If Jesus had done anything else He would not have been victor but vanquished. As it was

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah in Mk).

He greatly increased His personal authority.

If this view of the confession and its relation to the teaching concerning Jesus' suffering is correct, we are able to relate the incident harmoniously with other features in the conduct of our Lord. For an immediate and important consequence of the new situation was that Jesus had forestalled any possibility of the disciples ascribing external authority to Jesus or expecting it from Him in the use of non-spiritual means (e.g. Miraculous interventions and the like), to establish the Kingdom He had so vividly proclaimed.

The Messiahship was, without doubt, an immensely important datum, but it was easily misunderstood. Jesus said little or nothing of it in His usual teaching as is proved by its entire absence from Q, and by the fact that our other main primitive source knows nothing of it until the last and briefest period of the ministry. But that Jesus should now bring it forward, especially in such circumstances and yet maintain it as a secret reserved for the inner circle only, must have added immensely to the power of His personal influence over his disciples and to the authority of His words. The gain is due, however not to an external addition, but rather to the revel-

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah in Mk).

ation of the larger scope and the higher significance of Jesus' character and conduct, which now appear in their full majesty and personal grandeur. The crucifixion of such a person, as thus understood, was what made the birth pangs of the Christian faith. And it is precisely here that we touch upon the power found, age after age, in the preaching of Jesus and Him crucified.

Mk.IX-41. "Whoever gives you a cup of water, therefore you belong to Christ. I tell you truly, he will not miss his reward."

Χρῖστος without article is very rare in the synoptics.

There is a strong Pauline colouring present.

(cf. Rom.VIII-9).

"Vielleicht ist *ὅτι χρῖστου ἐστε* erklärender Zusatz zu *ἐν ὀνόματι μου* oder Mt's *εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ* ursprünglicher." (Klostermann. op. cit. p.78 ad. v.37).

Both Mt. and Lk. omit this verse in their parallels though Mt.X-42 seems to be another recension of it in a different context.

This passage, therefore, gives no further light upon our problem.

Mk.XI, 1-11 Mt.XXI, 1-11, Lk.XIX, 28-38. The Triumphal Entry.

(Chapter V. Section ii. Jesus as Messiah in Mk).

Mk.XI,1-11, Mt.XXI,1-11, Lk.XIX,28-38. The Triumphal Entry.

"The people shouted 'Hosanna! Blessed be He who comes in the name of the Lord."

The greeting of Hosanna and the riding on the ass are in the closest connection with the Messianic hope (Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:849), but the significance of the records in Mt. XXI,11 & 46 is incomprehensible, if we have in Mk an authentic account and interpretation of the incident. If the crowds had greeted Jesus as Messiah, and especially if with such enthusiasm, how could they possibly have held Him only to be a prophet? The striking character of this last record shows it to be authentic, and thus renders the Markan account of the Triumphal entry dubious. It is possible indeed that *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* was used in the sense of the original reference to any pilgrim attending the feast. (compare Klostermann. 1907. S:94), and was felt specially applicable to Jesus on account of His being a prophet.

This passage, therefore, falls out of observation as a Messianic reference, but is a witness to Jesus as a prophet. (See further p.143 & 194 infra).

There are no other references in Mk's gospel to the Messiahship of Jesus except the satirical use by the priests in XV-32. The whole matter thus far rests in the position reached in our discussion of Mk.VIII-27ff.(p.122ff supra)

(Chapter V. ~~The~~ Messiahship of Jesus).

Section III.- Jesus as Messiah

In Special Sources of Matthew and Luke.

Having reached a clear orientation of the Messiahship of Jesus as understood by our two earliest main sources, we may go on to examine the problem as it appears in sources peculiar to Mt. and Lk respectively. We are at once met by a striking fact. It is that neither Mt. or Lk. when taken alone, either for their special sources or as editors, adds one iota to our understanding of the Messianic doctrine or to our appreciation of the personality and authority of Jesus from this standpoint.

Apart from the genealogy, Mt. never refers to the subject, his independent material being entirely silent. The term occurs four times in the genealogy (I-1,16,17,18). but in each case it is used purely as a cognomen or a title. This can only mean that by the time and in the circumstances in which this passage was written the problem was solved, Jesus and the Messiah are completely identified and the issue is dead. But placed at the forefront of the gospel it colours the significance of all the other passages later in the gospels with a meaning not to be

found in the original sources, and gives Jesus an external authority corresponding to the conception of the title.

Substantially the same is true of the third gospel. The only references are in the prologue (II-10f, 26) which is admittedly of later date and of different historical value from the body of the gospel, and in XXIV-25f, 46. There is very considerable difficulty in regarding the prologue as even substantially historical (cf. Klostermann. op. cit. p.363ff), and in any case the references to Jesus as Messiah presuppose that he was recognised as such from His birth and even before. This presents us with a situation which makes our earliest main sources quite incomprehensible. We have therefore no alternative to neglecting Lk's prologue as irrelevant to our inquiry.

In Lk. XXIV, 13-53 we are doubtless presented with material based upon historical incidents, but it has been much worked over from a special point of view (Klostermann. op. cit. p.597,601ff). The historicity of no single phrase is assured. Further it must be noted that the standpoint is that of a generation later than the events described. Thus, the Messiahship of Jesus is

(Chapter V. Section iii. Jesus as Messiah in Mt & Lk).

presupposed, but the old difficulty has recurred. It is the suffering and not the Messiahship which is the subject of the apologetic contained in the chapter. This passage, therefore, bears witness to the faith of the local early church as to the Messiahship of our Lord, but it gives us none of the grounds upon which that faith was founded, and it adds nothing to our understanding of His authority as Messiah. But these special passages in Lk. occurring as they do either at the beginning or in the close connection with the sacred tragedy and triumph at the end, colour the reading of the whole gospel with a tinge not to be found in Mk. or Q.

Our general conclusion therefore remains untouched at the place reached by an examination of the two primary sources.

Section IV.- Jesus as Messiah in St. John's Gospel.

As is well known the attitude of the Fourth Gospel to this issue is quite different from that of the synoptics, and is irreconcilable with history. The dis-

(Chapter IV. The Messiahship of Jesus.)

ciples come to Jesus from the very first because they believe He is the Messiah (I-41). He makes Himself known as such to casual acquaintances (IV-25f) and many Samaritans frankly recognise Him (IV-42). His Messiahship is a matter of open speculation in Jerusalem (VII-26f. 41f. IX-22, X-24). Jesus seeks recognition of His supernatural status from Martha (XI-25ff) which is to some extent an equivalent in Jn. for Peter's Confession in Mk. The miracles are performed expressly in order that the people may believe in His Messiahship, which belief is essential to salvation (XX-31). Throughout the gospel His personality has a strong other-worldly character, and the recognition of His Messiahship is the touchstone of divine acceptance or of simple perversity. In this gospel the Messiahship of Jesus is represented as the most self-evident and indubitable of facts, and its recognition is of paramount importance. The authority which He exercised, He exercised not so much from the inherent superiority of His words or works or personality, as from His superior status in belonging to a superior world. It is entirely ex cathedra.

This standpoint represents the faith of a later generation far removed from the historical material of

(Chapter V. Section iv. Jesus as Messiah in John)

the life of Jesus. It exhibits the reaction of a profound and deeply religious mind, of mystical tendencies, to the great tradition of the Redeemer, who not only lived and laboured in Galilee and Jerusalem, but who, as Risen Lord, ever continues His blessed activity (XX-30, XXI-25). It therefore records both in its extent and its type, the authority which Jesus had come to exercise in the church by about the end of the first century. It may furnish material for a psychological analysis of the foundation of Jesus' authority, but none for the purpose of our present historical inquiry into the foundations.

Section V.- Summary of results re the Messiahship of Jesus.

What then are we to say of the significance of the Messiahship of Jesus? It is evident from our examination that Jesus possessed this consciousness, i.e. He felt that He Himself, what He aimed at and His personal relation with God, were really both what the prophet and the apocalypics had been feeling after but had failed to grasp, and also what met the needs of the world.

(Chapter V. Section V. Summary.)

But how He came to His conviction and the immediate significance He attached to it are further questions. If only on literary grounds it is difficult to believe that He came to the conviction because He had accepted in full earnestness the doctrine of the approach of a supernatural Kingdom of God (Streeter. op. cit. p.255). Nor is it possible that He can have said to another or even to Himself "I am the Messiah. Let us set about the Kingdom." (Schweitzer. 1921. S:294).

And it is well worth considering whether Jesus would have conceived His work differently if He had had no Messianic consciousness. The real value of His ministry seems independent of the Messiahship.

In any case the Messianic consciousness has presuppositions beside those worked out in the fourth gospel. Jesus must first of all have reached a unique consciousness of God and His personality, and later have found Himself in a relation to God un-paralleled among His contemporaries. The consciousness of Sonship is prior to that of the Messiah, and it is possible there were several psychological stages between. (cf. Harnack. 1907. p.169).

(Chapter V. Section v. Summary).

Further, it does not seem quite satisfactory to hold that the conception of the Kingdom of Heaven, or of its near approach, depended upon an aboriginal Messianic consciousness as suggested by Schweitzer's position. (Schweitzer. 1901. pp. 1-18). Nor does it correspond with the records to assert that the Kingdom of Heaven preached by Jesus was not of a wholly spiritual order. (Schweitzer. 1921. p.294).

But if this be true, we are driven with all the more force to find what was the dynamic experienced by Jesus in His work. If it was not merely the near approach of the supernatural Kingdom of Heaven, visibly descending fully articulated and equipped from the skies that made His message urgent, then what was it? Why did Jesus find His meat in doing the will of Him that sent Him? (John IV-34). It may be true that Jesus was far from carrying the whole people with Him (Schweitzer. ib. S:284), but we have to account for the fact that the common people heard Him gladly (Mk.XII,37), and that the disciples were able to set the world alight. Our examination of the sources shews that neither the contemporaries of Jesus nor the early church, nor the disciples, nor even

(Chapter V. Section v. Summary).

Jesus Himself was overawed by His Messiahship. That consciousness seems to be a conclusion drawn from other premisses rather than the starting point of a programme, and the conclusion itself soon became lost in the larger doctrine that He was Lord of Life and death.

Chapter VI.THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS
SANCTIONED BY SCRIPTURE.

We have now examined our sources for their testimony to the authority of Jesus as exercised under several important categories, each of which purposes to set Him in a place apart and to give Him an appropriate title. The authority He would exercise would thus be to some extent of an external character and would imply that what He said or did would carry weight just because He who said it was the Messiah, The Son of Man, the Lord, or Son of God. But our oldest sources lead us to believe that nothing of this character was to be found in the authentic attitude of Jesus or in the mind of the people. He does not appear to have spoken or acted as He did because of what He was, but because of what He saw and understood; and the people do not appear to have listened or watched except for the truth of what He said and the rightness of what He did. The secret of His power resided in Himself.

But let us ask to what extent Jesus regarded Himself, or possibly the people regarded Him, as fulfilling the scriptures, and what was the value attached by His contemporaries during His lifetime, to any such fulfilment? This is a question of considerable importance

(Chapter VI. The Authority of Jesus as Sanctioned
by Scripture.)

both in view of the preaching and teaching of the apostles in the early church, and also on account of present day interest.

Section I.- Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture
According to Q.

There are no direct references in this source and the indirect are both few and remote.

- (i) Mt.X-7, Lk.IX-2, X-9,11. "Go preach saying that the Kingdom of God is at Hand."

The sanction lies not so much in the scriptures as in the widespread interest in and desire for the day of salvation. (so also Mt.X-15 = Lk.X-12).

- (ii) Mt.XI-2-11, Lk.VII,18-28. "When John heard in prison ... Go tell John what ye hear and see ... The blind receive sight, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the dead are raised and the poor have the good tidings."

The passage is reminiscent of Is.XXXV,5f & LXIII,1ff. but Jesus does not claim that He is fulfilling scripture. As recorded in Mt. Q explicitly refers to the miracles as works of the Christ. (v.2) but this

(Chapter VI. Section 1. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture).

reading cannot be original as it renders the Baptist's inquiry superfluous. There is some possibility that the opening of the eyes and the like were meant metaphorically (Wellhausen. 1914. S:51)., but in view of the last word of verse 5 this is scarcely probable. There is, however, sufficient variation in the readings to warrant our leaving the question open. The intention of Jesus in giving this enigmatic answer is merely to maintain that such actions are a result or a proof of the presence of the Spirit of God in the man, whoever it was, that did them. It is not a testimony to the status of Jesus beyond that, and He is content to leave the matter there. His attitude is thus quite in harmony with His general practice. (see further page 119f. supra and 155 infra).

(Mt. III, 10-12, Lk. III-16, 17. John said to them all. "I baptise you with water, but after me one who is mightier will come, and I am not fit to untie the strings of His sandals. He will baptise you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fan is in His hand to purge His threshing floor, together the wheat into His granary, and burn the straw with fire unquenchable."

(Chapter VI. Section i. Jesus as Sanctioned by
Scripture.)

This is strictly not applicable to our present category, but the testimony of John may be regarded as that of one of the prophets.

John only refers to "One mightier than I" whom he expected but his description of that One is not readily applicable to Jesus (... baptise with fire ... burn the straw with fire unquenchable), even allowing the greatest latitude of prophetic imagery.

At a later stage John appears not to have recognised Jesus as fulfilling His own preaching and expectations, as we have seen in the passages just examined.

Nothing in Q depends upon this identification.)

The Summary, is that in Q Jesus is not regarded in a direct and important sense, as fulfilling prophecy of any sort.

Section II.- Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture

According to Mark.

Passages under this heading will fall into two

(Chapter VI. Section 11. Jesus as Sanction by
Scripture in Mark).

main sections.

i. Those adduced by the evangelist himself at the time of writing and regarded by him as fulfilled or confirmed by Jesus (no instances in Mk).

ii. Those original to Jesus and His times. These again may be divided into three groups, (a) where the main purpose of Jesus is exegetical, e.g.

Mk. VII-6f. This people honours me, etc.

Jesus uses quotations from Isaiah. XXIX-13, Ex. XX, 12. Dt. V-16. in support of His personal attack upon prevailing practices and strengthens His own personal authority in so doing. But His attack is based upon the falseness of what He is criticising and not upon scripture, and He goes on far beyond the scriptures to give positive teaching of the highest value and based entirely upon His personal authority (VII, 4-16)

Mk. X-19, (Mt. XIX-18, Lk. XVIII-20). "Good teacher," he asked, "what must I do to inherit life eternal?" Jesus said to him, "why call me 'good?' No one is good, no one but God."

Jesus resolves the question first of all by an appeal to scripture and in particular to the decalogue.

(Chapter VI. Section ii. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture in Mk.)

But the real pressure of His authority is only felt when He goes beyond and says "There is one thing more you want, etc." (verse 21ff).

(b) Where the people quote scripture and apply it to Jesus whom they deem to fulfil it. Only one instance occurs in this source.

Mk.XI-1-11, Mt.XXI,1-11, Lk.XIX,28-38. The Triumphal Entry.

"The people shout "Hosanna! Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord." (cf. p.120 supra) (cf. Mt. XXI,11 & 46).

The people evidently greeted Jesus as a prophet (see p.192f. infra.) which added greatly to His purely personal dignity, but it is a testimony to what the people had otherwise experienced, rather than a status giving Him a special authority. They adduce scripture which is customary on similar occasions and which is in general appropriate to the person of Jesus.

(c) Where Jesus used scripture as a personal support in various ways.

Mk.IV-12. Mt.XIII-13, Lk.VIII-10. re speaking in parables.

Jesus appeals generally but not in exact quotation, to Isaiah IV-9,10. Some hold this to be imposs-

(Chapter VI. Section ii. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture in Mk).

ible in the mouth of Jesus. (Baur. quoted with approval by Menzies. 1901. a.1; Klostermann. 1907. S:12,34). But it is nevertheless founded upon a true quotation used by Jesus in support of the enigmatic character of His method.

N.B. This is the only instance up to the Transfiguration where Jesus adduces scripture in His support, and this case is doubtful on critical grounds.

Mk.IX-12 (cf. Mt.XVII,10ff). "He said to them, "Elijah does come first, to restore all things, but what is written about the Son of Man as well? This, that He is to endure great suffering and be rejected."

The broad meaning of the passage is that a suffering and dying Elijah corresponds to a suffering and a dying Messiah, for which term Son of Man here is a substitute. There is no scriptural support for the latter, but some for the former (cf. Is.53). Jesus has just acknowledged Himself to be the Messiah (see further p.105 supra).

Jesus regards scripture as an authentic account of what is to take place. It must be fulfilled. But He gains support from scripture both for His action, His reception and His lot in life. This is normal Christian usage and implies little that is special and peculiar to Jesus Himself.

(Chapter VI. Section ii. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture
in Mark)

Mk.XI,15-19. Mt.XXI-12f. Lk.XIX,45-48. Cleansing the Temple.

Jesus quotes Isaiah LVI-7 and Jer.VII-11 for apology, but His action is not founded upon scripture so much as upon His own personal indignation at sacrilege. The scripture is a sanction post eventum.

Mk.XIII-26. Mt.XXIV-30f. Lk.XXI-27. The Return of the Son of Man. "Then they will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory."

Jesus links Himself up quite definitely with the apocalyptic of Daniel VII-13f.

The passage belongs to the "Little Apocalypse" and on critical grounds bears little or no authenticity, (Streeter. 1924. p.491f, Klostermann. 1907. S:111) and so falls out of observation for our purpose.

Mk.XIV-26f. Mt.XXVI-30f. - It is written "I will strike at the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered."

This is the second occasion where Jesus definitely adduces scripture as an independent authority to be accepted as it stands, as the expression of an *inseparable* preordained plan.

Mk.XIV-49, Mt.XXVI-56. Jesus taken prisoner, submits quiet-

(Chapter VI. Section ii. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture in Mk).

ly, feeling all is happening "to let the scriptures be fulfilled."

This is the last occasion where Jesus quotes scriptures as of ex cathedra authority, but He does not act in order to fulfil it. Rather His own lot and the predictions of scripture coincide because both express God's will.

Summary.

Thus in Mk. Scripture is little used to throw light upon or add weight to the authority which Jesus exercised. He occasionally adduced it in support of some line He took, He often gained much peace from the light it shed upon the ominous future . He sometimes expounded it in a penetrating fashion. But all this seems to lie well within the scope of any original religious teacher. There is nothing in this gospel to make one think that the people or Jesus Himself thought that all scripture culminated in Him or that He was in any mechanical sense walking in a path foretold by the prophets. He masters scripture more than it masters Him. After all the general impression was that He talked with authority but certainly not as the scribe, a position which seems congruous with what we have found.

(Chapter VI).

Section III.- Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture
In Sources Peculiar to St. Matthew.

Adopting the same classification as in the previous section we find:-

(i) There are numerous passages adduced by the evangelist shewing how in his view Jesus actually was fulfilling the scripture, e.g. Mt.II-15, XII-18ff, XXI-5, which are interesting as illustrating how certain minds must have regarded Jesus by the time the gospel came to be written. But they give no certain knowledge of the attitude of Jesus or the people and are better omitted from consideration for our present purpose.

(ii) (a) There are no instances in this source of Jesus expounding scripture.

(b) Passages quoted by people as applying to Jesus - there are none in Mt's. special sources.

(c) No Instance, in this source, of passages from which He drew personal authority.

The result is surprising. Mt. is by common consent the gospel of scripture proof, but an examination of its peculiar sources shews us that that proof is brought to bear entirely by the evangelist. The gospel adds nothing to what we already know from Q and Mk.

(Chapter VI).

Section IV.- Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture
in Sources Peculiar to St. Luke.

With one exception the relevant passages are confined to the historically late and doubtful material in the prologue and the epilogue.

(1) I-46-55, 68-79.

These passages are predominantly quotations from the Old Testament and are only partly relevant to the present situation. The historicity of the first two Chapters is at least doubtful, but the effect of these passages occurring in their present context is to give to the events narrated a certain scriptural and traditional authority precisely on a par with the more explicit method applied by Mt.

(ii) Lk. XXIV, 13-35. The Road to Emmaus.

(v.27). "Then he began with Moses and all the prophets and interpreted to them the passages referring to Himself throughout the scriptures."

No passage is definitely indicated, but it is made to appear that the scriptures both as a whole and in detail, if properly understood, point to Jesus as Messiah and indeed as suffering Messiah. But the support is vague and is of little value for our purposes, especially as

(Chapter VI. Section iv. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture in Luke.

the historicity of the whole matter is subject to grave question. It seems to reflect the happy custom of a later time which "searched the scriptures daily whether these things were so" (Acts. XVII, 11).

Lk. XXIV, 36-49 (especially v.v. 44ff). The Appearance of the Lord in Jerusalem.

The same position holds good in this case (see on Lk. XXIV-13ff supra).

Lk. IV, 14-30. Jesus' first preaching in Nazareth.

As reported by Lk. but not as in parallels in Mt. or Mk - Jesus founds His right to be heard upon His fulfilling the scriptures, but He completes and gains it by His gracious words (v.v. 21f), i.e. by His personality. He arouses opposition indeed by His further personal interpretation and application of scripture, so that its support can scarcely have seemed clear to the people, or of much practical advantage to Himself.

The Summary is that in the strictly historical parts of Lk. there is only one instance where Jesus adduces scriptural authority or claims to fulfil it. Therefore He cannot have laid much emphasis upon His fulfilling its pro-

(Chapter VI. Section iv. Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture in Luke.)

phesies. In the passages whose historicity is doubtful on critical grounds (Chaps: I & II, XXIV), scripture is adduced either in an indirect fashion or in general terms in a way that does not help us to add anything to what we have found in Q or Mk.

Section V.- Jesus as Sanctioned by Scripture
According to St. John.

There are no references in this gospel. As we shall see in a later stage of our inquiry the evangelist has passed on to other external sanctions. We may surmise that by the time John wrote, the connection of Jesus with Hebrew prophecy was not regarded as vital, but that it had become important to shew Him linked up with some cosmological view. This is done to some extent in the opening verses of the gospel, and in many passages connected in thought therewith. In addition there is a more con-scious effort to shew that Jesus' methods were similar to those of God in nature (V-17,19). Miracles are, however, the predominating source of testimony to the authority of Jesus (see p.176finfra).

(Chapter VI.)

Section VI. Summary of Scriptural Sanction for Authority
Exercised by Jesus as found throughout our Sources.

While Jesus used scripture like every devout Jew of His time and gained much personal comfort and strength therefrom, there is no clear and insistent record that He read it and understood it to refer to Himself in some unique fashion. Nor do the people in general seem to have interpreted scripture in such a way. There is ample testimony in both Mt. and Lk. as to the opinion of the evangelists, but this is the interpretation of a later period, and not the verdict of the immediate impression. Scripture may help us to understand Him better, but so will it help us to understand any religious teacher either ancient or modern. There is thus no evidence that Jesus founded His authority upon the support of ancient scripture. (see further pp. 303f & 310infra).

Chapter VII.THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS
AS SANCTIONED BY MIRACULOUS PHENOMENA.

This is a complex problem raising questions, some of which lie beyond the scope of our present inquiry. It is impossible here to discuss the validity of such phenomena in principle or even exactly to define the meaning of the term, further perhaps than to state that definition and validity seem to be mutually dependent categories. (cf. Tennant F.R. 1925. espec: Lecture II). But it will ^{be} sufficient for our purpose to take those phenomena which were regarded as miracles by the people who witnessed them, whether we ourselves to-day would so designate them or not. The point in view is not to demonstrate or to deny whether Jesus performed miracles' as a matter of history and as scientifically demonstrable phenomena, but what authority accrued to Him from the miracles He was right or wrongly deemed to have performed. The question of their historical or 'scientific' validity may be of great importance for the modern mind, but it does not necessarily affect the inquiry into the authority which Jesus exerted over His contemporaries.

The question may be stated thus: Did the people

(Chapter VII. The authority of Jesus as Sanctioned by
Miraculous Phenomena).

believe that Jesus performed miracles? Did Jesus believe He could perform miracles? What was the value both they and He placed upon them? Were they a help or a hindrance in His life's work? Do they help us to understand His personality and the influence He was able to exercise then, or immediately after His crucifixion? A later faith was doubtless prone to regard the miracles as the sign par excellence of His divinity. Still later the miracles were regarded as the chief difficulty to a rational faith. But we are concerned with their significance during the times of Jesus' public ministry, and up to the date of the gospel records.

The same general principle holds true in regard to other supernatural phenomena, e.g. angelic voices, recorded in the gospels. We are not concerned with either their historicity or their nature so much as the value attaching to the event behind the record in the minds of Jesus and the people. We may thus usefully deal with both classes of phenomena under one category though in separate sections. (a) Miracles performed by Jesus, and (b) Other supernatural phenomena related to His ministry.

(Chapter VIII.)

Section I.- Miraculous Sanctions According to Q.

(A) Miracles performed by Jesus.

There are very few references to phenomena of either class, and in still fewer instances are we able to discover their practical significance. Beginning with the miracles of Jesus, the references are of two classes.

(a) Those affirmative on the whole, (b) negative.

(a) Lk. VII, 1-10, Mt. VIII, 5-13. The Centurion's 'Servant.

So Jesus went with them. But He was not far from the house when the captain sent some friends to tell Him, "Do not trouble yourself, sir, I am not fit to have you under my roof, and so I did not consider myself fit even to come to you. Just say the word, and let my servant be cured. For though I am a man under authority myself, I have soldiers under me; I tell one man to go, and he goes, I tell another to come, and he comes, I tell my servant, 'Do this,' and he does it." When Jesus heard this he marvelled at him, and turning to the crowd that followed He said, "I tell you, I have never met faith like this anywhere even in Israel."

Jesus performed this miracle on the basis of a faith already active and an authority already gained and not vice versa. We have no means of estimating any increase of authority He exercised as a consequence. It seems to have been assumed that He could perform this miracle because of what He was deemed to be - though no hint is given as to opinion on this point. His authority aided

(Chapter VII. Section 1. Miraculous Sanctions acc: to Q).

the miracles, rather than vice versa.

(Lk.VII-21. (Not in Q acc: to Harnack) "Jesus at that moment was healing many people of diseases and complaints and evil spirits: He also bestowed sight on many blind folk. So He replied:-)

Lk.VII-22ff, Mt.XI-4ff. Go and report to John what you have seen and heard, the blind see, etc.

This question of the Baptists is of the greatest moment from our point of view. It gives the nearest approach in Q to the problem of the authority of Jesus as He Himself conceived it. In a certain sense it is a messianic passage for "In der Messian. Heilszeit erwartete man Heilung aller Krankheiten.... Diese Erwartung hatte übrigens für das jüdische Denken nichts Exorbitantes. Die Tage des Messias erreichten damit nur die Höhenlage der Zeit der Gesetzgebung am Sinai:" (Strack-Billerbeck 1922. S: 593). Thus there is nothing apologetic or Danielic implied, but rather the return to the glorious days of the full Mosaic dispensation.

Therefore the answer returned by Jesus is at best enigmatic and seems to imply that Jesus wished John to draw his own conclusions. But it is the miracles which appear to have first raised doubt in John's mind. (cf. Lk. VII-18f, Mt.XI-2f). Indeed Wellhausen (op. cit. p.51)

(Chapter VII. Section i. Miraculous Sanctions Acc: to Q).

tellingly says that this is why Mt. is explicit that they are the works of the Christ. Certain it is that John expected very different 'signs' from those shewn by Jesus (cf. Mr. II, 18, 12). Or rather, what John wanted was a direct and explicit pronouncement from Jesus as the miracles could be read in different ways and were not sufficient in themselves.

But the point is that the miracles, per se, do not appear to be decisive factors and might easily be the cause of Jesus' losing all authority (cf. Lk. XI-14ff), as some heroic persons have discovered in the course of history. Miracles, like scripture, are thus double-edged, depending upon the mind of the interpreter.

Lk. X-9. (cf. Mt. X-7) .. (Instructions to the disciples)..
 "Heal those in the town who are ill, and tell them "The Reign of God is nearly on them!"

The message about the near approach of the Kingdom is addressed to the inhabitants in general (so Klostermann. 1919. S:478).

The healing works seems to be incidental to their mission as preachers of a new faith and not their authentication.

The disciples apparently stand upon the same footing as Jesus, both in the preaching and in the healing. The miracles therefore would lend no special auth-

(Chapter VII. Section 1. Miraculous Sanctions Acc: to Q).

ority to Jesus as distinct from the disciples.

(Lk.X-17 is in all probability not in Q. It is omitted by Harnack and queried by both Stanton and Streeter, and in any case adds nothing to our knowledge of the effect of the miracles on the people, although Jesus' own confidence and that of the disciples in Him seems to have been greatly increased as a consequence of the experience of the preachers).

Lk.X-13f. (cf. Mt.XI-21f). "Woe to you Khorazin!
Woe to you Bethsaida! Had the miracles performed in you, been performed in Tyre and Sidon, they would long ago have been sitting penitent in sackcloth and ashes."

In this passage, as in the reply to the inquiry of the Baptist (Lk.VII-22ff, Mt.XI-4ff. see p.155 supra), the exact import attached by Jesus to the miracles is obscure. But their significance appears to be attached to their effect upon the minds of the people as predisposing them to a new faith, and not as a testimony to the personal authority of the person performing the miracles, i.e. they are held to authenticate the operation and co-operation of God, and the preaching of His Kingdom rather than the personality of the preacher. (So also are to be understood Mk.II-9ff, Lk.XI-14ff).

(B) The passages refusing value to the miracles are:
(Lk.IX,51-56.. Fire from heaven refused.

This passage probably does not belong to Q. Of

(Chapter VII. Section 1. Miraculous Sanctions in Q).

our authorities, neither Harnack nor Stanton find it in the document. Even Streeter regards it as suspect.

But the effect of the passage is that Jesus refuses to base His authority upon at least this kind of miracle.)

Lk. XI-14ff. Beelzebul - a sign from heaven sought.

The passage is possibly a conflation of Q and Mk. (Klostermann. 1919. S:488 .. Harnack omits only v.v 15 & 18 as not in Q. Stanton and Streeter regard the whole passage as from Q).

Jesus recognises that even the Jews are able to cast out demons (v. 19), and therefore any special significance attaching to such miracles lies outside the miracles themselves - perhaps in their object, or the nature of their occasion. As far as these miracles are concerned Jesus places Himself on a similar footing to others who could do the same things.

It is not a question of what authority the miracles give but the diametrical opposite, viz: what authority has Jesus to perform the miracles. Jesus has to explain both how He is able to do and why He has done these things (verse 20), and He elaborates His position at some length (verse 21f).

It is further to be noticed that the onlookers,

(Chapter VII. Section 1. Miraculous Sanctions in Q).

demanding a sign from heaven, evidently did not regard exorcism, and possibly other miracles, as such signs, but possibly even as difficulties. The authority of Jesus by its very association with this kind of work was thus in a most precarious position (cf. also Acts XIV-8ff - the experience of Paul and Barnabas at Lystra).

Lk.XI-16,29-32, Mt.XII-38f,41f. "We would see a sign .. no sign except that of .. Jonah .. Solomon."

This passage probably follows immediately upon that dealt with in the preceding paragraph.

The special point is, however, that Jesus explicitly refuses to rest His authority upon anything outside His preaching and what He Himself is as interpreting personally what He says. He finds its roots in the inherent justice and wisdom of His words. This is surely the basis of His charge against the Pharisees in verses 39ff. (cf. also Mt.XXIII,16ff. Blind Pharisee).

Summary.

1. According to the records of this source the miracles of Jesus added a very doubtful quantity to the authority of Jesus and on occasion even detracted from it and formed a difficulty in His general work. Personally He shrank from resting any weight upon them.

(Chapter VII. Section 1. Miraculous Sanctions in Q).

ii. Q itself seems unconscious of the apologetic significance of miracles either as authenticating the teaching of Jesus in itself or any unique claims for Him personally. As we shall see this is strongly contrasted with, if not ~~the~~ contradictory of the attitude of the Fourth Gospel (see pp. 176 *infra*).

(B) Other Supernatural Phenomena in Q.

(Lk. III-21f - The voice at the Baptism. is probably not in Q, though Streeter assigns it to this source.)

Lk. IV, 1-13, Mt. IV, 1-11. The Temptation.

Harnack's elaborate discussion of this passage is invaluable for the understanding of the text (Harnack. 1907. S:33-37). The chief point for our purpose is the complete omission of all references to angels in the original document, which reference is an addition to Q from Mk.

The fact of the Temptation is against any special authority of Jesus as a heavenly being, and yet the graphic description of the presence and words of the Devil present in His own person bears testimony to the uniqueness of the circumstances in the opinion of the Prince of Darkness. The important is that Jesus must have been more than an ordinary man.

But by the nature of the case the historical tempt-

(Chapter VII. Section 1. Miraculous Sanctions in Q).

ation whether with or without the personal devil was a most private experience of Jesus, and could not have influenced any other person in any way.

The presence of a personal devil or indeed merely a very insistent inner consciousness of temptation would serve rather to undermine Jesus' confidence in Himself and in His Mission.

Q contains no reference to the transfiguration and no account of the crucifixion, and we may therefore summarise Q's record of the outer sanctions to the authority of Jesus as meagre and on the whole negative. This source certainly does not present us with the portrait of a Being living as if aware that the heavens were watching Him. He is placed before us standing upon His own feet as a simple man among men, guided in no supernatural fashion, but purely by His own spiritual insight and experience.

(Chapter VII.)

Section II.- Miraculous Sanctions according to St. Mark.

(A) Miracles performed by Jesus.

Beginning with the miracles of Jesus, the principle references are as follows:-

(1) more affirmative.

Mk.I-27f, Lk.IV-36f.

Mk. says "Then they were all so amazed that they discussed it (curing man of an unclean spirit) together, saying "Whatever is this?" "It's new teaching with authority behind it!" "He orders even unclean spirits" "Yes, and they obey Him." So a fame of Him at once spread."

Lk. says "Then amazement came over them all; they talked it over among themselves, saying, "What does this mean? He orders unclean spirits with authority and power, (*δυναμῖς*) and they come out!" (vs. 37) and a report of Him spread"

1. The terms *δυναμῖς* and *ἐξουσία* are closely related. According to Meyer the latter means the power which one possesses (Meyer. 1880. Vol II. p.32). Klostermann urges after Mk.I-22 that *ἐξουσία* refers and is limited to the *διδασχῆ* (1907. S:27) a view found also in Meyer (*ibid*) who thinks that Lk. introduced the term *δυναμῖς* in order to refer principally to the miracles.

But if Jesus brought power into the operation, then the miracle bears witness to the power residing in Him.

(Chapter VII. Section 11. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk)..

The historicity of the demoniacs ascription is doubtful, as he makes use of a later Christian term in describing Jesus. (Rawlinson. 1925. p.16. and footnote).

On the other hand it is to be noted that Jesus explicitly refused the help of such sanction or rather to receive the aid of an enhanced status from a person who could not have understood His previous teaching, but who might be held by the crowds to speak with supernatural insight. Thus this passage might well have been classed with those of mainly a negative character.

Mk.IV,41, Mt.VIII-27, Lk.VIII-25. - after the calming of the sea the disciples say to each other - "Whatever can He be, when the very wind and sea obey Him?"

The miracle is very difficult to accept as historical on prima facie grounds. If it be suggested that it was the result of a fortunate coincidence, that coincidence would be of tremendous effect upon the disciples or 'the men' (Mt), but the precise historical basis is now irrecoverable (Rawlinson. op. cit. p.60) and the incident must be omitted from our consideration.

In any case the effect of the miracle as it stands recorded is to make Jesus a wonderworker of the order of the medicine-man of Africa. It adds nothing to

(Chapter VII. Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

our appreciation of Him as a moral or religious force, and may even detract from His personal authority as it removes Him further from the plane of our own experiences. Mk.V-20, Lk.VIII-39. The demoniac cured at Gerasa proclaims "throughout Decapolis all that Jesus had ^{done} for Him: it made everyone astonished."

And the effect was to increase interest in Jesus, producing a type of mentality more open to receive influence, but it did not lead to any definite conclusion. Jesus' power in teaching would be magnified, but nothing more.

(Mt.XIV,24-33,)Mk.VI,47-52 - Walking on the sea.

Mt. says they worshipped Him and said "You are certainly God's Son."

If this were historical, the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi would be emasculated. Either the 'confession' would be a mere repetition of an involuntary and, to that extent, more valuable ascription, or else Jesus Himself betrays a certain anxiety of mind on the matter. But according to Mk. the disciples said nothing. He records simply that they were perplexed and their minds were dull.

But also Mt. adds the incident referring to

(Chapter VII. Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk.)

Peter stepping out of the boat which gives "a graphic illustration of the power of faith and the effect of doubt." (Wellhausen. 1914. s:75). The whole reads more like a parable than the account of a veridical miracle.

It should not pass unnoticed that the term God's Son is not necessarily a confession of divinity but might well be the equivalent of "belonging to the company of the divine ones" in a general sense. But the probability is that the term is not historical here, and that Mk's naive account is authentic.

We need have no hesitation, therefore, in holding that whatever be the historical basis of the present records, the incident did not enhance the authority of Jesus over the disciples. They were frankly puzzled.

Mk.VII-37. Jesus heals the deaf and enjoins silence about it.

The people feel intense admiration and say "How splendidly He does everything! He actually makes the deaf hear and the dumb speak."

The people recognise great superiority in Jesus on account of His miracles. His popularity increases but we cannot say more.

Jesus will not willingly extend the tidings of

(Chapter VII. Section 11. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

His cures merely to increase His fame. He Himself therefore does not wish to lay any weight upon the authority thus gained. This passage might, therefore, be regarded quite well as of a negative character.

This seems to complete the list of the principle passages recording miracles whose effect was to increase the authority of Jesus over the people. Yet even here, with the exception of the cases of the calming of the sea, and the walking on the water, which are unique in their quality, Jesus seems to shrink from the notoriety occasioned by His cures. He builds nothing upon them. He does not even regard them as giving a favourable opportunity for a little evangelisation. His method is rather to preach first and heal afterwards. (cf. Mt. Chaps: V-VII followed by Chapter VIII which is a passage confined to Miracles. This arrangement may be to some extent accidental, but it is not entirely without significance.)

(11) Passages mainly negative:

cf. Mk.I-27f, Lk.IV-36f, and Mk.VII-37. in the foregoing discussion.

Mk.I,40-45. Mt.VIII,1-4, Lk.V,12-16 - cleansing the leper and enjoining obedience to the Mosaic law.

1. Jesus' authority seems personal and also prior to the miracle (εἰς τὸ θεῖον)

2. Mt. in common with Mk and Lk. presents Jesus in

(Chapter VII. Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

in a fashion that shews Him/as requiring no justification beyond Himself. Although this is the first miracle that Mt. records, there is no appeal to God, none to tradition or scripture.

It is notable that Jesus enjoins obedience to the requirements of the Mosaic regulations dealing with such cases. This would have the effect of bringing the sufferer under the immediate authority of God.

Jesus claims no respect for Himself, nor does He build anything upon the cure. Here is simply the authority of a noble, humanitarian spirit over one hitherto weak and at a disadvantage.

The miracle gains moral significance from Jesus and not vice versa.

Mk.II-12. Mt.IX-8, Lk.V-26 - after the healing of the man

sick with palsy -

"And he rose, lifted his pallet at once, and went off before them all: at this they were all amazed and glorified God saying, "We never saw the like of it."

The historical element in the passage is not altogether clear, but in any case the record shews that popular opinion, differing widely from that of the scribes, was sensitive to the beneficial and humanitarian element in the work of Jesus.

(Chapter VII. Section 11. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

But it is immensely significant that the people glorified God rather than Jesus. The addition "for giving such power ($\epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$) to men" found in Mt. alone only serves to sharpen the point. The effect of the miracle was either to point men to God or else to lead them into unfriendliness to Jesus. They do not enhance His real authority to any measurable degree.

Mk.VIII,22-26. Healing of the blind man at Bethsaida - first he sees men as trees walking, later he sees everything distinctly.

This miracle is very similar to that recorded in VII,31-37 of which it may be a doublet (cf. p.165 supra).

Jesus bids the man go straight home, i.e. keep the matter private.

But it is noteworthy that Jesus makes a second attempt to heal, the first having been only imperfectly successful. This is exceptional in our records. It leaves open the possibility however that on more than one occasion the same thing occurred, and in this sense one may well understand the parable of the returning devil with seven others worse than himself (Mt.XII-45ff) Moreover there were times when Jesus found it impossible to perform a miracle (e.g. MkVI-5). Thus there must have been an ele-

(Chapter VII. Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

ment of uncertainty in any specific case. One could not altogether take the cure for granted. Both He and the people must have been aware of this. But the uncertainty however slight must imply that Jesus could find no permanent or secure basis in miracles for His inner sense of rightness or authority. They must have been to some extent outer and incidental, and not of the essence of His position or witness. It is a distinct witness to His greatness of character and to the fundamental truth of His point of view that He should have refused even to attempt to work miracles as signs from heaven, or to regard them as of more than ancillary value to His specific work of preaching the Kingdom of God.

Mk.IX-29. "Nothing can make this kind come out but prayer and fasting."

Jesus does not specifically claim that He would have been able to do what the disciples had failed to do, but if He can succeed, it is because of His own self-discipline in fasting and prayer.

A technique is implied, which the disciples had imperfectly grasped, explaining their success in some cases but their failure in this.

But the fact of a technique places Jesus as a

(Chapter VII. Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

miracle worker on the same basis, in the last analysis, as both His disciples and others, and does not allow any special unique authority to Jesus beyond that of the insight and personality of the expert physician, and these can be far too easily under-estimated.

There is a sense of immediate dependence upon God("and prayer") as the ultimate source of the healing power: Jesus in any case being but the vehicle of its virtue.

Thus the verdict of the Markan records of the value of miracles accords completely with what we have found in Q (see pp.154ff supra). They add nothing to our appreciation of the authority Jesus felt and exercised while they evidently psychologically predisposed certain people to favour His teaching. Menzies trenchantly says "He does not wield divine powers, nor is He equipped with superhuman insight. His cures are achieved with labour and effort, so that it is a question if it is not breaking the Sabbath to do them on that day, and they are connected with a simple method of practice, not unknown in the country. The idea of a being who can order anything He likes to

(Chapter VII. Section ii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mk).

happen in an instant, is not found in Mk. Jesus here secures His results by urgent effort and prayer, and sometimes cannot accomplish them at all." (Menzius. 1901. p.52).

(B) Other Supernatural phenomena in Mk.

Mk.I:11, Mt.IIIa17, Lk.III-22 .. - The Baptism;
'then a voice from heaven "Thou art my
Son, the Beloved, in thee is my delight."'

Sons of God were not unknown to the majority of ancient peoples and the idea is not foreign to the Psalms. In a certain sense indeed all Jews claimed to be Sons of God. But in what sense Sonship is meant in this passage, or what were its metaphysical consequences in the mind of Jesus we cannot say. Here opens out a rich field of Christological speculation into which the church fully entered in due time. (see Klostermann 1907. S:9).

Voices from heaven are well authenticated in rabbinic literature in addition to the O.T. (see Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:125-134).

The voice was for Jesus only according to Mk. and

Lk, but it is an open question in Mt. One may best understand the phenomenon as an inner experience of Jesus graphically recorded by the evangelists. Its authority is, therefore, that of such an experience and not of some external supernatural phenomenon. It is fundamentally a problem of His personal religion (see p. 220 infra)

Mk.I-13, Mt.IV-11 (Lk.IV-13) After the Temptation ..
"He was in the company of wild beasts,
but angels ministered to Him."

The usual sense of διακονεῖν is "supply food" or nourishment (so Klostermann. 1907. S:10). In I Kings XIX-5, Elijah is similarly cared for. Jesus is, therefore, on the same basis as the great ancient prophet of Israel.

There does not appear to be any other similar phenomena recorded in Mk.

From the above we may gather what was the moment of Jesus' self-dedication to God and how intense was His feeling of a divine commission. The second case, however, places Him in the succession of the great tradition of the authentic prophets of Israel. Any further inference from the records seems precarious.

(Chapter VII.)

Section III.- Miraculous Sanctions According to the
Sources peculiar to St. Matthew.

There are no references apart from the historically doubtful material in Chapters I and II, but here we have much that has bulked largely in Christian history. We note the following points:-

i. Jesus came at the end of the third series of periods of fourteen generations each and thus in a specially appointed place in the whole cosmogony. (I-17)

ii. The Virgin Birth I-18ff.

iii. The visit of the magi guided by a moving star.

iv. The Egyptian exile miraculously ordered, and the divine guidance on the return to Nazareth.

v. The remarkable series of events exactly fulfilling the suggested reading of scripture.

This material placed right at the forefront not only of this gospel, but of the four gospels, has a very wide effect upon our mental attitude towards the rest of the gospel narratives. The concatenation of supernatural phenomena of all kinds, serves to put Jesus from the beginning in a different category from ordinary men. Thus the impression gained from reading the first gospel as a whole in its present form, is very different from that gained if we

(Chapter VII. Section iii. Miraculous Sanctions in Mt).

read its separate sources in their chronological order. The older sources, Q and Mk know nothing of the apologetic value of miracles, and little, if any, attaching to the supernatural phenomena, Chapters I and II know nothing else. The entire outlook is supernatural, and this serves completely to shroud the plain message of the older sources.

Section IV.- Miraculous Sanctions According to the Sources Peculiar to St. Luke.

There are no references apart from the historically doubtful material in Chapters I and II, and the special matter of XXIV, 13-53, dealing with Emmaus, and the Ascension. We note the following points:-

- i. The angelic promise of the birth of Jesus (itself not merely natural) which promise was accompanied by miraculous punishments in the absence of implicit belief, I, 12-25.
 - ii. The developed story of the Virgin Birth. I, 26-38.
 - iii. The prenatal recognition. I, 39-56.
 - iv. The miracles connected with the birth of the Baptist. I, 57-79.
 - v. The angelic revelation to the shepherds. II, 8-20.
 - vi. The revelation to Symeon. II, 25-35 (and possibly

(Chapter VII. Section iv. Miraculous Sanctions in Mt).

Hannah II-36-38).

The first two chapters thus appear packed with material characterised by this special view point, which is quite different from that of the older sources used throughout the gospel to XXIV-12.

At this point (XXIV-13) a new source seems to have been employed, and we have again a strong supernatural element.

XXIV-13-32. The disciples on the road to Emmaus.

XXIV,33-49. The Resurrection appearance in Jerusalem.

XXIV,50-53. The Ascension.

The first of above, the Emmaus incident, seems to be an authentic experience, but which modern writers might describe differently. The precise historical nature of the other two is a matter of keen controversy, everything depending upon the working assumptions in the mind of the critic.

The authority of Jesus as depending upon these instances will be felt as either unbounded and co-equivalent with that of the Almighty or else as entirely dubious and legendary, just according to the interpretation put upon the passages. For our purpose it is better to leave the question

(Chapter VII. Section iv. Miraculous Sanctions in Mt).

open, and to restrict our data to material found elsewhere. Thus the sources peculiar to Lk. add nothing to our understanding of the authority of Jesus as supported by supernatural phenomena of any kind.

Section V.- Miraculous Sanctions According to

St. John's Gospel.

(A) Passages mainly positive.

The references to miracles is more numerous than in any of the synoptic sources, and the general tendency is to use them as the irrefragable argument for the authority of our Lord. There is a special term used for them. They are 'signs'. It is indeed the function of the miracles, not merely to cure, but to exhibit the unique authority of Jesus. They are not performed as usual in the older sources out of sympathy or humanitarian feeling. Indeed sometimes Jesus seem positively to flout such emotion. Thus on hearing of the illness of Lazarus, instead of hurrying to his aid, He dallied

(Chapter VII. Section v. Miraculous Sanctions in John).

where He was for a couple of days (XI-6). His purpose was frankly to demonstrate His great powers and that "The Son of God may be glorified thereby." (XI-4, cf. also XI-15). He regarded the illness and death of Lazarus as affording a desirable opportunity to deliver a telling practical apologetic. The miracles are indeed the apologetic par excellence of St John's Gospel. The following are the main references consonant with this view.

II-11, Changing water to wine.

II-23, General reference to the witness of miracles.

IV-42. The woman of Samaria - miraculous knowledge leads to faith.

IV,46-54. Healing the dying boy of the royal household.

VI-2. Large following on account of miracles.

VII-31. "Indeed many people believed in Him, saying,

"When the Christ does come, will He perform more Signs than this man?" - a somewhat enigmatic complaint as the people really deny Him Messianic status.

IX,1-41. The man born blind, cf. especially verse 30f,

"Well, this is astonishing! You do not know where He comes from, and yet He has opened my eyes! God we know doesnot listen to sinners; He listens to anyone who is devout and obeys His will,etc."

(Chapter VII. Section v. Miraculous Sanctions in John).

XXI, 1-7. The miraculous draught of fishes. - This should perhaps be put in a somewhat different category on both historical and literary grounds, but it serves to supplement the forgoing list, with which it is in harmony.

Supporting the evidence of the miracles done by Jesus, there are also two occasions where heavenly voices are heard:-

I-32f. At the Baptism.

XII-28f. "My soul is now disquieted. What am I to say? 'Father save me from this hour?' Nay, it is something else that has brought me to this hour, I will say, 'Father glorify they name! Then came a voice from heaven, "I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again! When they hear the sound, the people standing by said it had thundered: others said, "An angel spoke to Him."

(But in spite of the enigmatic character of the voice) Jesus says "The voice did not come for my sake but for yours, etc."

Thus Jesus Himself regards this supernatural phenomenon not as a support to His own inner consciousness but as a public apologetic for Him. This position is supported by VI-26, where He upbraids the people for following out of self-interest rather than as a consequence

(Chapter VII. Section v. Miraculous Sanctions in John).

of faith in Himself on the basis of the evidence of the signs themselves. (cf. XI-5 and XI-15 to which reference has already been made (cf. p. 177. supra) reveal the same attitude.)

(B) Passages mainly negative.

But on the other hand there are certain references in this gospel which must not be overlooked, and which are the more important as they are against its general bearing on the apologetic value of miraculous events.

Thus in IV-19 the woman of Samaria "Sir, I see you are a prophet."

VI-14. After the feeding of the 5,000.

"when the people saw the Sign He had performed, they said "This really is the prophet who was to come into the world."

VII-31. The people say "When the Christ does come, will He perform more signs than this man?"

(where 'this man' is explicitly contrasted with the Christ).

IX-31. "God listens to anyone (i.e. enables Him to perform miracles) who is devout and who obeys His will."

IX-33. If this man were not from God, He could do nothing. (where at least no special status is recognised in Jesus).

(Chapter VII. Section iv. Miraculous Sanctions in John).

In all these cases the miracles are accepted as 'signs' or evidence, but not of the divinity of Jesus. They shew He was a godly man or a prophet but nothing more. Thus even in this gospel there are indelible traces of an attitude of mind which regarded the miracles as evidence, but for something less than the divine Sonship of Jesus.

Moreover there are traces in the gospel of an attitude of mind in Jesus Himself which is really consonant with this view. Thus:-

VI-35 'Jesus said "I am the bread of Life, He who comes to me will never be hungry, and he who believes in me will never be thirsty again. But, as I told you, though you have seen me you do not believe."'

VI-48,51,55, etc. "I am the bread of life (51) I am the living bread come down from heaven etc. (55) for my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink," (cf. also VII-37)

VI-68. The words of Peter. "Lord who are we to go to? You have got words of eternal life."

In all these cases, the point is that Jesus Himself is the 'sign'. He comes direct from heaven, or rather is in direct communion with God, and an intimate personal relation with Him is a guarantee of the satisfaction of all the great longings of the heart. But this

(Chapter VII. Section v. Miraculous Sanctions in John).

point of view is in rather strong contrast with that where the miracles are the strongest signs or proofs. John seems more historical in these passages as a consequence.

Thus the evidence of miracles in the fourth gospel while intended to be the sign par excellence of the authority of Jesus, is nevertheless insufficient in itself, and is ultimately outdistanced by the fact of what Jesus was in Himself, which is the supreme sign. Jesus quite explicitly lays no value on the signs as support to His own consciousness but recognises their apologetic value for the people. This looks like a reading of history on the part of John, ^{which he then read} ~~and then put~~ back into the intention of Jesus.

Section VI.- Summary of the Witness of the Sources

As to the value of Miraculous Phenomena as Sanctions

For the Authority of Jesus.

The earliest sources seem unconscious of their apologetic value and even as late as the fourth gospel their evidence is not quite sufficient or satisfactory.

(Chapter VII. Section VI. Summary).

There is an undertone pitched in a different key. The full and undisturbed consciousness of their value is confined to the first two chapters in Mt. and Lk. respectively, but these are of little help in enabling us to understand the foundations of the authority of Jesus among His hearers and onlookers and disciples. Their value, even where legendary, is rather as psychological witnesses, shewing the tendencies at work in attempting to account for the unique experience enjoyed in the spread of the gospel.

In conclusion it should be added that few people would take the miracle records practically at face value as we have done. The actual events behind the narratives with which we have been dealing in this chapter were almost certainly less miraculous than the value we have been content to take for our purpose. But this fact can only mean that Jesus gained less support from, and Himself rested less weight upon miracles than we have concluded was the case.

CHAPTER VIII.THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AS A PROPHET.

Let us now attempt to discover the remaining features in the personality and consciousness of our Lord. Passing over such titles as King of Israel (Jn. IV, 34) Son of David (cf. Schweitzer. 1921. S:284) as of minor significance, and, in any case, as of metaphorical value determined entirely by the worth attaching to the term Messiah, we come to Jesus as a prophet.

Here we are in a widely different position from that involved in examining any of the previous terms. A prophet though illumined, actuated and inspired by God is a purely human figure. "The possession of a single true thought, not derived from current religious teaching, but springing up in the soul as a word from Jehovah Himself, is enough to constitute a prophet." (Robertson Smith. ed. Glover T. R. 1922. p.130). At the noblest he belongs to the succession of Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah. He speaks the word of the Lord in the name of the Lord. He carries weight by the moral and religious urgency of what he says. His political utterances may be arguable but never when he says **אני יהוה**. What he foretells may be unfulfilled, but not what he preaches. He is what he is not by birth

(Chapter VIII).

or by official designation (Amos VII, 14f) but by the sense of an inner call and by the verdict of the religious intuition and experience of his hearers or readers, who feel the inevitability of the **נאם יהיה**, which he utters, and this feeling of inevitability which they experience, is their clue to his identity as a prophet. He is known for what he is as a consequence of his discharging his function. He does not function merely because he has been as it were appointed to an office. "The characteristic mark of a true prophet is that he has stood in the secret counsel of Jehovah, and speaks the words which he has heard from His mouth ..." They (the prophets) are in sympathy with Jehovah's heart and will, their knowledge of His counsel is no mere intellectual gift but a moral thing (Robertson Smith. 1881. p.274)... The word is within his heart like a burning fire shut in his bones (Jer. XX, 9) so that he cannot remain silent (ibid. p.281).

As a rule a prophet makes no personal claim to be heard. He speaks, he acts, and leaves the matter there. "The prophets were thus dependent for the success of their prophecy upon their audiences, just as modern preachers are. They had no way of convincing men of the truth that is not open to the modern prophet. They could not and

(Chapter VIII.)

did not enforce their teaching by any external authority. The power of their message lay in its appeal to the hearts and minds of those to whom it was addressed. Truth was self-authenticating in their age even as in our own. It must find its way into the minds of men as a welcome guest; else it will not enter at all. Its only credentials are its own inherent worth. The man who cannot or will not recognise its value for himself will never know the truth by any other token. The prophets, therefore, like all heralds of the truth, were perforce content to send forth their message by spoken word and printed page and trust it to do its own work in the lives of men." (M. Smith. qd. Cadbury. "Jesus and the Prophets." Journal of Religion. Chicago. Nov. 1925). The word or the aim is the important thing, and not the vehicle. It makes no difference, if, like II Isaiah, the prophet himself is unknown and unrecognised. His prophecy may nevertheless reach the greatest heights and be of paramount value. The prophet gains authority from his utterances and not vice versa. His personality is of account, but posterior to his words and deeds, and its special quality is seen in them and through them but before them. And if Jesus is in any sense in the succession of the prophets we may look for things of the highest importance to our understanding of His personality and His authority.

(Chapter VIII).

Section I.- Jesus as a Prophet in Q.

This being the case, then here to a degree impossible elsewhere we must look for the testimony of our sources to this status in Jesus rather among indirect indications than among direct claims or ascriptions. The substance becomes far more important than the use of any particular expression. Thus the term is never applied to Jesus or claimed by Jesus in the whole of Q. Such a silence would be of immense significance in regard to the Messiahship, the Lordship or the Sonship of Jesus, but in the matter of His being a prophet one can say "si monumentum quaeris, circumspice." It is impossible to read Q as a continuous document (e.g. in Harnack. 1907. pp.83-102) without the deep impression that here we are dealing with prophecy in its purest form. It is not merely the almost complete absence of incident, and the almost exclusive interest in the words of Jesus that create this impression, but much more the nature of the utterances and the incidents. The utterances are almost all direct, intuitive, speaking from soul to soul. No reference is made to the support of tradition or custom or logical reasonableness. The epigrammatic style, with all its picture-

(Chapter VIII. Section i. Jesus as Prophet in Q).

esque vividness and unforgettable clear phrases, is but the vehicle of spiritual perpicacity which probes each subject to the bottom and exhausts it. There is in actual fact nothing left for succeeding students of the same question except to expound or to apply what has already been brought to the surface. Now this is the supreme test of prophecy.

The question may thus be enunciated. What further moral secret remains to be won from the issue? What richer spiritual discovery still lies hidden? The reply is that Jesus exhausts the issues that He joins. There is nothing more to be said. No man can neglect what Jesus has said without peril to His spiritual health, nor can he attain complete inner satisfaction and peace along any path contrary to that indicated.

Those beatitudes and the large portions of the Sermon on the Mount, which belong to Q (Mt.V,1-4, V-6,11, 12,25f,39f,42,44-48, VI,25-33, VII-12,1-5, 7-11,13f,16-18, 21,24-27f), together with many another section (e.g. Mt.X 26-33 and portions of Mt.XXIII) exhibit these qualities clearly and irrefragably. What we find is that, whereas Q has offered us many difficulties and but little support

(Chapter VIII. Section i. Jesus as prophet in Q).

in our pursuit of help on other subjects, here the source becomes eloquent. The whole document is luminous. It breaks forth into song. It exhibits Jesus speaking, acting, feeling as a prophet, and the effect of the written record upon the reader is of the same order as, though of different quality from, that of the great figures of the Old Testament and of the great historic preachers. (e.g. Luther). The effect of the living presence of Jesus and of His living voice set in their native surroundings can be now only distantly and vaguely felt, but there is no doubt that here we are on the firm ground and on the open road. Whatever else Jesus was, whether as "der Kommen-Sollender" or as The Son $\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\chi\eta\varsigma$, He was a prophet, and the earliest source we possess, a source held by ^{certain people of} a later generation to be of equal importance with the gospel as received in Rome, is content to deal with Jesus as a prophet and almost to ignore other issues.

It may be going somewhat beyond our present reference, but it is true to say that the scope and attitude of Q seems to reproduce very faithfully the method of our Lord Himself in His public ministry. He appears to have regarded practically the material we find in Q as the in-

(Chapter VIII. Section 1. Jesus as a prophet in Q).

dispensable, but sufficient foundation of His ministry and His hearers' faith. Anything further must come after a larger Christian experience and a more intimate insight into His mind and program. In the nature of the case this could only take place during His lifetime in the circle of disciples or after His death by His presence as the Risen Lord with those who live "in Him."

Section II.- Jesus as a Prophet in St Mark's Gospel.

Mk.I,7-8; 14,15. "After me one who is mightier will come, and I am not fit to stoop and untie the string of His sandals: I have baptised you with water, but He will baptize you with the holy Spirit."
... "After John had been arrested, Jesus went to Galilee preaching the gospel of God; he said, "The time has now come, God's reign is near: repent and believe in the gospel."

As compared with Q (cf Mt.III,5,7-12 Lk.III, 3,7-9,16,17) we find Mk's record of John's preaching of the coming Heir of the Promises, much more closely applicable to Jesus. Indeed one may say that Q as seen in Lk.

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a prophet in Mk).

III-16f exhibits John preaching the coming of One who would be much more vehement than himself. He will baptize with fire. His winnowing fan will beat out the wheat from the chaff thoroughly and He will burn the straw in an unquenchable fire. According to Q, John can scarcely have been thinking of the Jesus we know. But in Mk. these severer tones are not reproduced, and it is evident of whom the evangelist is thinking as he writes down the words of John. But it is to be noticed that Mk. does not make the Baptist refer explicitly to Jesus, which, in the circumstances, is very significant (cf. Scott. E.F. 1911. p.82f). Further we see that Mk. finds the occasion of the commencement of the public ministry of Jesus to be the silencing of John by arrest (I-14f). Jesus quietly takes up the work which John had been compelled to relinquish. This connection, while not lost, is obscured in Mt. (IV-12ff), and is entirely gone in Lk. (cf. III-19ff). But in Mk. the connection^{is} immediate and indeed the first words Jesus utters in public are more characteristic of what we know of John than of the rest of Jesus' preaching: "The time is now come. God's reign is near; repent and believe the gospel." or, better, "repent and believe the good news." In any case it is evident that, according to

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a Prophet in Mk).

Mk, Jesus first appears in His ministry as a prophet in direct succession to the prophet John.

Mk.VI-4, Mt.XIII-57 "A prophet never goes without honour except in his native place and among His kinsfolk and in His home."

This is in the nature of the quotation of a proverbial saying and it may possibly be nothing more. On the other hand, the fact that it occurs also in John, shews it must have created a great impression when uttered. We should understand it in a plastic manner fully to appreciate it. But it is not without significance that this is Jesus' first appearance in Nazareth after the commencement of His ministry. He classes Himself among the prophets and does not actually claim to be more than a prophet. Indeed His ineffectiveness seems due to the fact that the people were dubious about His being a prophet or even a teacher.

Mk.VI-14f. (cf. Mt.XIV-1f, Lk.IX-7ff) .. People said "John the Baptist has risen from the dead, that is why miraculous powers are working through Him." Others said, "It is Elijah" others again, "It is a prophet, like one of the old prophets."

But on all hands it was felt that Jesus was in the prophetic succession. He reminded them most closely of the Baptist - so much so that some thought He was the

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a prophet in Mk.)

same man. 'Jesus of Nazareth is a prophet.' - that was the verdict upon which all were agreed. And the suggestion is that to call Him a prophet was a tremendous acknowledgement.

Mk.VIII,11-12. (cf. Mt.XII,38-42, XVI,1-4, Lk.XI,29-32)

(Jesus said) 'Why does this generation demand a sign?' I tell you truly, no sign shall be given this generation.'

The parallel in Lk. and the doubletted parallel in Mt. are illuminative. They make the exact words doubtful, but the sense is clear. "Why no sign?.. The real explanation of this reference to Jonah is given by Lk.XI-32 .. Nineveh instinctively recognised the inherent truth of Jonah's message and repented. Truth is its own evidence .. God is known that way" (Glover. 1920. p.102) Jesus takes His stand purely as a prophet. Nothing else gives any light upon Mk's version, and Lk. confirms it.

Mk.VIII-28 (cf. Mt.XVI-14, Lk.IX-19) .. "On the road He inquired of His disciples, "Who do people say I am?" "John the Baptist" they told Him, "though some say Elijah, and others say you are one of the prophets." .. leading up to the confession of Peter that He is the Messiah.

In substance, verse 28 is a doublette of Mk.VI-

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a prophet in Mk.)

14f and parallels, and to that extent confirms the record that He was regarded as a re-incarnation of one of the great historical prophets. It must have been strongly felt that He belonged to their genre.

As far as the mere wording goes, the inquiry of Jesus would have been adequately met if the reply had been (in modern terminology) "you are quite different from Elijah or any of the old prophets. You abrogate them. You are your own glorious self." Any further identification leads to as many problems as it solves. If He were the Messiah then the sort of Messiah He was must be clearly understood and must be kept secret, till there could be no remaining confusion as to its significance in His connection.

One may possibly venture to say that it would have served Jesus' object equally well if the disciples had said He was a veritable Son of God and had meant it not merely in the general physical sense so much as in the usual Semitic meaning. That this was not far away is shewn by the version in Mt. and to some extent by that in Lk. Indeed this grew to be the attitude of the church as soon as it became a universal and no longer merely a nation-institution. Thereupon the question of the Messiahship

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a prophet in Mk).

became of secondary importance, and has probably survived mainly on account of the human interest in the fulfillment of prophecy. Such an interest is, however, of value only as it indicates the existence of an overruling Providence in whose love and care for men we can obtain deep satisfaction in our inquiry why Jesus really came at all. But the interest is baneful in so far as it introduces a certain externality and necessitarianism both into Jesus Himself and into His relation with the world. At the same times it makes prophecy almost a form of necromantic and clairvoyancy.

But the point for the moment is that in whatever manner one or perhaps more of His closest disciples may have regarded Him, His hold on the mass of the people was that of a prophet, and it was as a prophet that He did His work.

Mk. XI, 1-11, especially verse 10f. (cf. Mt. XXI, 1-11, Lk. XIX-28-38) - The Triumphal Entry.

"Hosanna! Blessed be He who comes in the Lord's name!"

(cf. Psalm 118^v26). See p.129 & 143 supra. (sub Messiahship and Scriptural Sanctions respectively)

That this is a quotation from the Old Testament in no way endangers its historicity, or its applicability

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a prophet in Mk).

to Jesus. Neither can there be any question that Jesus had now reached the very height of His popularity. The escort whether very numerous or not and whether mostly Galileans or not, were evidently in the state of highest exultation and the Messianic thought could not have been incongruous with their temper.

The exact passage quoted was only part of one of the temple hymns sung antiphonally by priests and people. It belongs to the period of the Maçabean victories (C.A. Briggs. 1909. Vol.II. p.404) and carries with it that atmosphere. It is in a Messianic context but 'the person of the Messiah bears the same relation to a Kingdom of living persons that Zion, the capital of the Kingdom, does to the kingdom.' The metaphor (of Psalms. 118-22 'the stone that the builders rejected, has become the head of the corner'), stands equally well for both relations." (op. cit. p.407). The Messiahship of the passage must, therefore, be understood in a very strict Jewish sense, and indeed in the old sense of a material deliverer specially chosen and anointed by God. But this is on a different plane from what was present in Peter's confession or developed at a later date, e.g. in John's gospel.

(Chapter VIII. Section 11. Jesus as a prophet in Mk).

For confirmation of this view we may notice the extreme tameness of Mk's next record. "Then ~~he~~ He entered Jerusalem, entered the Temple, and looked round at everything: but as it was late He went away with the twelve to Bethany (XI-12).

But this corresponds exactly in temper with the verse in Mt. alone, where in XXI-10f we read:

"When He entered Jerusalem the whole city was in excitement over Him. "Who is this?" they asked, and the crowds replied, "This is the prophet Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee."

(historically confirmed by XXI-46 "The crowds held Him to be a prophet.") If the crowds made that reply it was in the nature of an anticlimax unless all along they had been greeting Him as a mighty prophet indeed, but a prophet, an Elias or Jeremias, who was at last 'coming to His own.' Nothing more is needed to explain the ovation of the people, and anything beyond raises difficulties. The context of the passage in Mk. disappoints higher expectations. Mt. offers splendid opportunities for making Messianic claims with which the evangelist was thoroughly in sympathy. But the internal evidence of the passage points to a different conception altogether.

The crowd greeted Jesus either as a prophet or as Messiah in the special sense outlined above. Any other sense only increased the contrast between the two terms.

(Chapter VIII. Section ii. Jesus as a Prophet in Mk).

The people cannot have greeted Him in both ways. As the term prophet could only have survived if it were a hard fact of history, it must be held authentic. In that case the passage loses all value as a Messianic witness. There is less difficulty in accepting this conclusion if we recognise that the Hallel was used as a greeting, originally, to every pilgrim ascending to the Holy City at the festive season (Klostermann. 1907. S:94). The only conclusion to which we can come, therefore, is that this passage is of no value in support of the Messiahship of Jesus, but it does constitute a witness of the highest value to Him as a prophet and indeed to the people's joyful recognition of Him as such.

Mk.XI,27-33, Mt.XXI,23-27, Lk.XX,1-8 - Cleansing the Temple.

A passage closely linked with Mk. XII,1-12, Mt.XXI,33-46, Lk.XX,9-19 - The Parable of the wicked Vinedressers.

Both passages could have been adduced in this place but are somewhat more appropriate under the heading of the Personal Authority of Jesus. They are, therefore, dealt with infra. pp.223f.

Summary.

The above discussion exhausts the references of our present source to this subject, and the result may be summarised as follows: Mk. Is not primarily interested in Jesus as a prophet, but rather in what Jesus did and especially in the way He bore Himself in the face of the fatal tragedy. The evangelist indeed devotes nearly one half of His gospel to the last week of our Lord's life, an amount which must have been even greater originally as the end of the document has been lost. But in contrast with the indefiniteness or poverty of the material he offered us in our inquiries under previous categories, he is quite clear in exhibiting Jesus as a prophet, conscious of being such, recognised as such, claiming the status and exercising its prerogatives and its functions. However adequate the term may be felt on other grounds, the broad outline of the portrait given in this source is that of Jesus living and labouring as a mighty prophet and in the noblest sense of the term.

(Chapter VIII).

Section .III.- Jesus as a Prophet According to Sources
Peculiar to St Matthew.

The above discussion exhausts the references to the subject found in the passages peculiar to Mt. In other words, the first evangelist in publishing what Streeter calls a new edition of Mk. was satisfied with what he found in his two main sources as far as they touched upon this issue and as far as it was present explicitly in his mind. The only note he adds is the highly significant one in XXI-11 (confirmed by XXI,46) which comes in as a severe anticlimax as we have already seen (cf. p. 196 supra), and which, from the point of view of the evangelist and his gospel as a whole, would more appropriately have been omitted. No further proof than this is required for entire historicity and the far-reaching significance of Jesus as a prophet.

Section IV.- Jesus as a Prophet in St. Luke's Gospel.

There are three instances in the material peculiar to Lk. and each of them has a truly authentic ring.

(Chapter VIII. Section iv. Jesus as a Prophet in Lk).

- (i) Lk.VII-16. 'All were seized with awe and glorified God. "A great prophet has appeared among us" they said, "God has visited His people."'

The verse records the consequence of the rising of the Son of the Widow of Nain. The status given is very noteworthy. This is the case even if the strict historicity of the miracle be disputed, for, at least to the evangelist, there was no question as to the miraculous nature of the event, and yet He records that the people called Him a prophet. The historicity of this record is simply cannot be denied.

- (ii) Lk.XIII-33. 'But I must journey on to-day and to-morrow and the next day; it would never do for a prophet to perish except in Jerusalem.'

There is no question of the authenticity of this passage. It is an important testimony to Jesus' self-consciousness, and is in the same key as Mk.VI,4.

- (iii) Lk.XXIV-19. '"What is that?" He said to them. They replied, "All about Jesus of Nazareth! To God and all the people He was a prophet strong in action and utterance."

The passage occurs in the narrative of the events on the road to Emmaus. The restraint of the passage bears strong testimony to the fact that throughout His lifetime

(Chapter VIII. Section iv. Jesus as a prophet in Lk.)

His disciples regarded Him as a prophet and indeed that this truly indicated their general attitude.

The value of these passages is enhanced if we remember that St. Luke's Gospel is dominated throughout by the conception of the Lordship of Jesus. - a conception which is still further developed in Acts. Nevertheless it is in this gospel that we have preserved the clearest and most indubitable and explicit testimonies to Jesus as a prophet. We have the testimony from all three possible sides - people, disciples and Jesus Himself.

Summary of Synoptic Sources.

There can be no question indeed that according to the entire synoptic tradition or rather according to all the sources with which the Synoptics were acquainted, Jesus stands out as a prophet. If this aspect could be eliminated Q would fall to pieces and several undoubtedly authentic passages from other sources would hang in the air.

Whatever else they may testify, all our great sources regarded Jesus in this way, and the other categories examined thus far possess nothing like the same certainty or definiteness. This category has ample testimony on its behalf and there is nothing in any of the great sources which is consistent with it.

(Chapter VIII.)

Section V.- Jesus as a Prophet in St John's Gospel.

By the time this gospel was written the church had already experienced sixty years of history, - a period crowded with events of vast significance for the evolution both of the administration of the church and for the development of its Christology. The whole atmosphere of the gospel is dominated by the fully developed and explicit belief in the Divine Sonship of Jesus. It may be described as pre-eminently the gospel of the Son of God. We should naturally expect, therefore, that there would be little or no trace of any reminiscence of Jesus as merely a prophet. Such a view would be swallowed up in the more majestic and satisfying conception of His eternal Sonship and divinity, even in the passages which retain an authentic historical ring. We should not be surprised if there were no reference under our present category. It is one we do not at all associate with the mystical evangelist. What we actually do find is, therefore, all the more striking. There are no fewer than six explicit references as follows:-

- (1) IV-19, - The Woman at the Well.

(Chapter VIII. Section v. Jesus as a Prophet in John).

(i) IV-19, - The Woman at the Well.

"'Sir' said the woman, 'I perceive you are a prophet.'"

(ii) IV,44. "Jesus said "A prophet enjoys no honour in his own country.'"

The saying must have created a great impression and should be understood quite plastically if we are to gain its original force.

(iii) VI-14. "Now when the people saw the sign (feeding the 5,000) He had performed, they said "This really is the prophet who is to come into the world."

(iv and v) VII-40,52. See notes infra. (p.204)

(vi) IX-17. So they asked the blind man once more, "What have you to say about Him for opening your eyes?" The man repeated, "I say He is a prophet."

(i) and (ii) are instances of cases which have already been sufficiently discussed (see. p. 19' supra).

(iii) is remarkable as concluding a passage closely parallel to that found in Mk.VI,30-44 and parallels, which is also doubletted in Mk.VIII,1-10 and parallels. But in the synoptics there is no reference to the status of Jesus at the time although the issue arises soon afterwards (cf Mt.XIV-33 in a somewhat different connection). Here, however, He is confessed as

(Chapter VIII. Section v. Jesus as a Prophet in John).

ἀληθῆς θεοῦ υἱός. It is commonly held that the fourth evangelist had the synoptics in front of him when writing. However that may be, he was probably familiar with the close concatenation between the miracle of the 5,000 followed immediately by that of the walking on the sea, the narrative closing with the confession noted above. But in spite of that He concludes his own narrative of the miracle with the record that the people regarded Him as a prophet. There is a distinct Johannine ring in the phraseology, "who is to come into the world," and yet the utmost status recorded is 'prophet.'

The whole passage VII,40-52 bears out this view. An involved disputation is recorded in which the point is not the divinity or the messianity of Jesus but whether He was a prophet. The dispute is closed with the words "search and you will see that no prophet ever springs out of Galilee."

In (vi) the same point is illustrated. The blind man is roughly handled, not because he holds Jesus is the Messiah or Son of God, but a prophet.

Thus we may say that in St. John there is unexpected but reliable historical witness to the fact

(Chapter VIII. Section v. Jesus as a Prophet in John).

that Jesus was regarded as a prophet and that the issue as to His credentials even for that status was a sharp one. The evangelist himself goes far beyond this position but his narrative indubitably reflects a period when Jesus was regarded in this way and no other. This seems much more historical and comprehensible than a dispute as to His divinity in an assembly of Jews.

Summary of Jesus as a Prophet.

The general result of our inquiry may be briefly summarised as follows, that during His life time

i. Jesus indubitably regarded Himself as a prophet.

ii. His disciples habitually looked upon Him in that way.

iii. The friendly people almost universally held Him to be a prophet. Any other ascription is controversial and would have been at best momentary and uncertain, besides being late in His career.

iv. The questions of His status as a prophet, was quite sufficient to account for the hostility that gradually grew in certain sections of the people.

(Chapter VIII. Section v. Jesus as Prophet in John).

v. To understand Jesus as a prophet seems fundamental to a right comprehension of His self-consciousness, His God-consciousness, His attitude to life, the attitude of the people, the power He exercised over them, the growth of Christological doctrine, the enduring freshness of His words and indeed of the whole gospel of the Redeemer.

But this circumstance introduces us at once to the question of the personality and the personal authority of Jesus. What have our sources to say upon this subject? The questions are 'Why did Jesus of Nazareth come to be called the Prophet of Nazareth? Why did Peter call this prophet the Messiah or the Son of God? Why did St. Luke and St. Paul call Him Lord? and why did the church call Him Saviour?'

Chapter IX.THE PERSONAL AUTHORITY OF JESUS.

The result of our inquiry thus far makes it evident that Jesus was not listened to on account of any belief in what He was, in the sense that some special and supernatural divine status was ascribed to Him. It is evident indeed that He had to win His way (cf. Mk.VI,1-6). What He said and did was adjudged on its own intrinsic merits. He was a prophet not merely by acclamation as in the Triumphal Entry, but because of His wisdom and grace, because He spoke with a certain compelling power and not as the scribes. (Mk. I,22, Mt.VII,29).

The common people heard Him gladly not because He appealed to their self-interest, or merely tickled their palate, but because of the gracious words that proceeded out of His mouth. The secret of His power is to be found quite as much in His person and in His program. Apart from a peculiar force of personality, which perhaps cannot be conveyed in written words, it is difficult to understand fully the effect produced by some of His words and deeds (Lk.V-8). This is particularly the case in several passages in St. John's Gospel

(Chapter IX. The Personal Authority of Jesus.)

(John I-49, IV,42. etc), a fact at once apparent when we read them with a detached mind. It is not satisfactory to suppose that John was obsessed with the doctrine of the divine Sonship, till He attributed^{external} authority to His indiscriminately; nor to argue that the people of the time were so eagerly on the look out for the Messiah that they accepted with uncritical credulity any pretender who arose; nor will it do to say that John's connections between insignificant episodes and tremendous ascriptions are merely theological 'Erfindungen.' Much more satisfactory both historically and psychologically is it to submit that the tradition of the powerful personality of Jesus is preserved in the Fourth Gospel with such purity and at such a potential that it frequently springs the gap in the argument or the record with the electric spark of its vitality (cf. e.g. John IV-42, VI-68).

Many of the passages in this gospel only become clear when we read there, not the divinity of Jesus as a doctrine, but the overpowering influence of the personality of Jesus operating upon the evangelist till he writes almost mechanically the words he attributes to Jesus. (e.g. VI-52ff, 60ff, VIII-21ff etc). If this

(Chapter IX.)

mystic-minded writer were so completely at the same time both mastered and elevated by the personality of Jesus, we could readily understand how this gospel comes to be the gospel of Jesus as the Son of God. The total impression made by Jesus had been so tremendous that any other doctrine simply proved patently inadequate. Our hope, therefore, of understand^{ing} the Fourth Gospel does not lie so much in the possibility of our laying bare its implicit Christology or Soteriology or what not, (cf. Lütgert. 1916. S:1). It is doubtful whether there is any really systematically consistent theory to be found in the gospel. Rather we must seek to penetrate into the personality which lies behind the document.

And if this be true of the Fourth Gospel, it is no less true of the synoptics and of Q. John assumes a personality which we must attempt falteringly to reconstruct, helped largely by the nature of the lacunae in the argument. The earlier sources, however, tend to describe that personality and it becomes our business to analyse their presentation. Analysis is more difficult when, as here, we have but few records of the inner life of the subject, and the description is confined mainly to the outer deeds and to the words uttered by way

(Chapter IX).

of teachings or of intercourse with various types and groups of men.

Fortunately the utterances of every origina-
 tive religious teachers have a twofold value. In the
 first place they are oracular and inspirational. They
 shed light on obscure issues and give an impetus to a
 higher type of life. In the second place they are con-
 sciously and unconsciously a self-revelation of the
 prophet. And the more nearly can we restore to them
 their original significance, the better the understand-
 ing we obtain of the prophet Himself and, by reaction,
 of His own words and influence. There is unavoidably
 a logical circle, but in practical life it is not so
 much a circle as a spiral. We may be constantly re-
 turning to the same point of the compass, but we do so
 at different levels. This is the reason why a contin-
 ually repeated study of the gospels and the prolonged
 practice of the presence and the service of God enable
 the student to understand ever more truly the person
 of Jesus, and why the truer understanding of that per-
 son leads to a greater delight both in Biblical studies
 and in practical service. If it be true that "he ^{that} doeth
 the will shall know the doctrine," it is also true that
 he who knoweth the Master will do the will.

(Chapter IX).

The point is, however, that it is all important for us to understand the personality of our Lord if we are to understand His authority, while conversely the authority He actually exercised will be of great help in our gaining an understanding of His personality. Our examination thus far has led mainly to negative results, but it has served to clear the ground of ascriptions which were either false or irrelevant or anachronous.

Jesus stands before us at the opening of His ministry as a prophet. He has undertaken the prophetic role in succession to John (p.189 supra). He is, therefore, conscious of a vocation as prophet. From shortly after that time till at least shortly before the final tragedy (p.194ff supra), He lives and labours, and is received and acclaimed as a prophet. Anything more than that is doubtful. His entire resource is in His lonely inner consciousness and in the nature of His impact upon the people. His authority is a matter of the sources of His strength, and of the reaction of His soul upon that of His contemporaries. We have attempted briefly to sketch the temper and circumstances of the day (p.3ff supra) Assuming this in the background we must now proceed to examine our sources.

(Chapter IX).

Section I.- The Personal Authority of Jesus

As found in Q.

Practically the whole of Q (cf. Harnack. 1907. S:88ff), is a witness to the personal Authority of Jesus. There is little or no reference to Him as Son of God. Only a few claims are made for Him as Son of Man; none as Messiah, King, Son of David. There is nothing about His being one of the prophets nor even explicitly that He is Himself a prophet. He speaks mainly from the force of His own convictions with fresh insight, great independence of judgment, amazing moral elevation, a communicating faith in God and with a genial attitude to mankind. What He says He says for Himself and it stands by its own inherent worth. There is little or no claim to support from either tradition or miracle or law or ratiocination. It is the immediacy of the truth He declares that constitutes His defence and His power.

In the first place He has an immense confidence in the right ordering of the world and He feels the reality of a personal God "less than a handbreadth off."

"Your heavenly Father knoweth." (Mt.VI-32). He finds

(Chapter IX. Section i. Personal Authority of Jesus
in Q).

in the order of nature support for His own actions. God's sun shines and God's rain descends upon good and evil. The Father is both patient and forgiving. He Himself, therefore, cannot be other.

He sees limitless possibilities in ordinary men, whom He exhorts to "become children of the heavenly Father," as if it lay in their personal choice.

He gives a new content to the conception of brotherliness (Mt.V-39ff) which is sufficiently exalted for us to feel that, though lovely, "it is so high that we can scarce attain unto it." Nevertheless we cannot but admit it would make men more winsome and life more liveable if we practised it. And winsomeness and 'liveableness' are sound tests of spiritual truth. Further one feels that suggestions alternative to the ideals of Jesus in this connection would be on a lower plane. Jesus has said the last word.

The same is substantially true on the allied matter of forgiveness (cf. Mt.XVIII-21, Lk.XVIII-3,4). "Lord how often is my brother to sin against me and be forgiven?" Up to seven times?" Jesus said to him, Seven times? I say seventy times seven!" Notice the emphasis on the pronoun. Now these are words that live,

(Chapter IX. Section 1. Personal Authority of Jesus
in Q).

and they live largely in proportion as we are able to visualise and appreciate the personality of Him who uttered them. If we read them hurriedly and pass on to the next, half their value is undiscovered. Let us remember that the question of offences between friends and their forgiveness was a subject for discussion in the schools. There is a fairly extensive literature of this discussion leading up on the whole to the general conclusion based on Amos II-4 that after the third offence forgiveness was out of the question. (cf. Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. Vol I. S:795f). The reply of Jesus lifts the whole matter on to another plane, and this by what was probably a daring antithetic allusion to Gen. IV-24. One cannot help recognising that Jesus has left breathless both the rabbinic argumentation and the mind of even so great a prophet as Amos. If one further realises that this position reflects the regular practice of Jesus, he gets a glimpse of an extra-ordinarily convincing personality whose winsome forcefulness must have carried everything with Him. His words bring conviction by their own weight, and it is the conviction of the existence of a new spiritual world waiting for men to inherit. But that effect is multiplied when it is realised

(Chapter IX. Section i. Personal Authority of Jesus in Q).

that the words are uttered by a man who Himself always took them at their own full value and yet in the most natural and unrestrained manner.

It would be possible to take the beatitudes seriatim and come to the same conclusion. Some of them indeed will stand out for ever as among the greatest creative sayings which have graced human speech. Note especially, among those in Q, "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for goodness! They will be satisfied." (Mt.V-6) "Blessed are those who feel poor in spirit! The realm of Heaven is theirs!" While, from Mt's special source, the beatitudes on purity and peacemaking, stand in the same rank, (Mt.V,8-9) especially if one understands καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ to be contrasted with ceremonial purity.

The depth of meaning Jesus gives to lust, anger and whatever else is a hindrance, reveals not only another facet of, but also gives another focus for the personal power of our Lord. These sayings burst in upon us. They come with their own self-evidencing power as of a new and more exalted spiritual sphere, especially when understood as the personal convictions of an eager but naturally clear-sighted and balanced person-

(Chapter IX. Section i. Personal Authority of Jesus
in Q).

ality. Indeed then it is their balance and finality that come home to us as inevitably as their ethical altitude.

Now this^{is} personal authority. It is individual but it is universal. The subject is exhausted. Whatever alternative we propose is less and lower.

If Q gave us nothing else than large portions of the Sermon on the Mount we should have sufficient for us to conclude that whatever influence Jesus may have otherwise exerted or whatever authority He may have otherwise exercised He spoke and acted with the maximum personal power. The action and reaction between Himself and His contemporaries must have been of the most plastic, intimate, suggestive and transformative type. Men's minds conformed to Him. Their ideas and ideals vanish in His. Their personal habits, interests, judgments, prejudices, aims, hopes are all recast in a nobler mould. He Himself is untouched or rather unspoiled by either native environment or changing circumstances. He makes all things work together for good, i.e. to enable Him to do the will of Him that sent Him. Because He lived, men began really to live their lives.

(Chapter IX. Section 1. Personal Authority of Jesus in Q).

That is the nature of the personal authority He exercised. It was not constraint exercised over others but liberation, the opening of the prison to them that were bound. It was not a new set of regulations, but a new inspiration enabling men to get the last ounce out of life. The common people heard Him gladly. For as Mk. says "He spoke with authority and not as the scribes." (Mk.I-22).

The sense of the personal authority of Jesus which dominates the mind of Q is borne out by certain important general considerations. These are of both a negative and a positive character. Q seems almost unaware that any other position has ever been held than that Jesus gained His influence by His own personal authority. He presents Him neither as Son of God $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \omicron\chi\eta\prime$ (cf. pp. 33 ff supra) nor as Lord in the religious sense (cf. pp. 68 ff supra) nor as Apocalyptic Son of Man (cf. pp. 96 ff supra) nor with any urgency as Messiah (cf. pp. 119 ff supra). He avails Himself of no external proof of the uniqueness of Jesus (pp. 139 ff, 154 ff supra). Q's record of the testimony of the Baptist is the least direct of any of the surviving traditions (p. 189 f supra)

(Chapter IX. Section 1. Personal Authority of Jesus
in Q).

The sense of the urgency of the preaching of the gospel on the ground of the catastrophic imminence of the Kingdom whether conceived eschatologically or spiritually, is less marked than in any other source. (Mt.X-7, Lk.IX-2, X-9,11, Mt.X-15, Lk.X-12 (Lk.XVII-1ff and parallels is scarcely in point, cf. especially XVII-21). No appeal is made to testimony of scripture, none to the support of ancient prophecies of their fulfilment. The question of the value of miracles as signs simply does not arise (pp. 160 supra). The answer to John's inquiry (Lk.VII,18-28, Mt.XI,2-11) seems intended to place all the different sides of Jesus' labours on one level and the value of each being left to the untrammelled judgment of the observer. There is a significant silence in this reply to John either in reference to the Baptism or Temptation experiences of our Lord, with which one might well surmise the Baptist must have had some acquaintance and which could have been recalled with telling effect. But either we have an unhistorical account of those experiences or else Jesus apparently prefers to stand entirely upon His own selfwitnessing life.

Moreover, Q contains nothing of the Trans-

(Chapter IX. Section 1. Personal Authority of Jesus
in Q).

figuration, or of the confession of Peter, and nothing of the final tragedy and triumph.

All these facts constitute something more than negative evidence from which no definite conclusion can be drawn. What it amounts to is that at the time Q was written it was sufficient barely to record some of the sayings and speeches of Jesus. The memory of the living person was so vivid, the personal impression He left was so nearly all-compelling, that there was simply no need then felt for any other support for the faith and the authority which were found in Jesus. Thus Q is a testimony of the first rank for the personal and prophetic authority of Jesus as the foundation of whatever doctrine might be later elaborated and of whatever worship a later generation might be impelled to offer.

Section II.- Personal Authority in St. Mark.

The passages fall fairly well into certain classes
I. Those exhibiting mainly the sources of, or sanctions

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal authority in Mark).

for His conduct.

II. Those exhibiting mainly the immediate personal reaction between Jesus and the people as seen in (a) His axiomatic utterances or self-authenticating acts, (b) what carries convictions when seen in relation with His own personality, (c) more esoteric teaching whose meaning becomes clear at a later stage.

III. Those dealing mainly with the effect of Jesus and His words upon the people.

Under I. we have the following:-

Mk. I, 10f (cf. Mt. III, 17, Lk. III, 22). "And the moment He rose from the water He saw the heavens cleft and the Spirit coming down upon Him like a dove, then said a voice from heaven,
'Thou art my Son the Beloved
in thee is my delight.'"

Mk. accepts the full historical truth of the events, the gaping skies, the dove-like shape of the Holy Spirit and the audible voice articulated from above, and in so doing he takes his stand alongside other ancient writers. But his belief presupposes a cosmogony we can no longer accept.

While the dove is usually a symbol for Israel, an occasional reference in rabbinic literature shews that

(Chapter IX. Section 11. Personal Authority in Mark).

it was used as a symbol of the Spirit of God (Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:123ff). Somewhat similarly, though with very numerous literary references, the 'voice from heaven' occurs under the symbolism of an echo (op. cit. S:125ff).

On the other hand, many of the prophets had visions which constituted a call to their life's work. (e.g. Isaiah VI,1. Jer.I,4ff, Ezek. I,1) nor should we forget that of Peter at the commencement of his gentile mission (Acts. X,10). And as Klostermann points out, "the O.T. analogies were known not only to the evangelist, but also to Jesus" (Klostermann. 1907. S:8).

It would seem, therefore, both on material and historical grounds that the narrative in Mk. gives in graphic form an account of the inner and personal experience of Jesus at the time when He felt His 'call' to His life's world. Jesus Himself may have used the familiar symbolism in describing the events at a later time to His disciples.

But, for our purpose, the point is that the whole force of the narrative and the incident depends upon the inner experience of Jesus. He came to a certainty at that moment. He dated His ministry from His

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Baptism. It was then that He received His divine mission. Henceforth He was under the authority of God in a definite and explicit way. He could do no other, either in faithfulness to Himself or to His Heavenly Father than labour while it was day and finish the work. But what constituted the 'call' was neither the dove nor the voice, but the inner experience and that alone.

Apart from that inner certainty and that personal self-dedication, the narrative has no meaning. It is simply a graphic account of a purely personal experience. Taken as such, it illuminates the ministry of Jesus from beginning to end.

Mk.I-35, Lk.IV-42. "In the early morning, long before daylight, He got up and went to a lonely spot. He was praying there etc"

Jesus' sense of power and of a mission was intimately connected with His sense of dependence upon God, cf. also the passage next quoted, viz:-

Mk.VI-50. Jesus walking on the sea says "Courage, it is I, have no fear."

He feels at home with the powers of nature. cf. also Mt.V-45, where He finds instruction upon God's character from the working of nature.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mark).

Mk.X, 13-16, Mt.IX-13f, Lk.XVIII, 15-17 - Blessing the children.

Jesus here appeals to a natural instinct and from its force gains His authority. The saying itself, and the position implied is very striking.

But it was an innovation based upon the independence and force of a truly sunny character (cf. Deismann. Licht v. Osten. 2 Aufl. p.111).

Mk.XI, 15-19, (Mt.XXI-12f) Lk.XIX, 45-48 - Cleansing the Temple.

Then they came to Jerusalem, and entering the Temple, He proceeded to drive out those who were buying and selling inside the temple; He upset the tables of the money changers and the stalls of those who sold doves, and would not allow anyone to carry a vessel through the temple; also He taught them. "Is it not written," He asked, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations? You have made it a den of robbers." This came to the ears of the scribes and high priests, and they tried to get Him put to death, for they were afraid of Him. But the multitude were all astounded at His teaching. And when evening came He went outside the city.

In spite of the appeal to scripture, the main-spring was Jesus' own zeal for the dignity of the Temple as the house of God. We see operative the energy of a mind sanctioned by a true reverence for the association

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mark).

of a hallowed place of worship. But this passage is incomplete apart from the following:-

Mk.XI,27-33, Mt.XXI,23-27, Lk.XX,1-8

Once more they came to Jerusalem. And as He was walking within the temple the high priests and scribes and elders came and asked Him, "What authority have you for acting in this way? Who gave you authority to act in this way? Jesus said to them, "I am going to ask you a question". Answer this, and I will tell you what authority I have for acting as I do. What about the baptism of John? Was it from heaven or from men?" Now they argued to themselves, "(What are we to say?) If we say, 'From heaven,' He will ask, 'Then why did you not believe him.' No, Let us say, From men" - but they were afraid of the multitude, for the people all held John had been really a prophet. So they replied to Jesus, "We do not know." Jesus said to them, "No more will I tell you what authority I have for acting as I do."

The direct question ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς ; must be dealt with. It has to do explicitly with our inquiry in one of its aspects. What would the Jews have accepted as a satisfactory answer? (a) Reference to an accepted scriptural passage? (b) A claim to an evident and manifest equality with the acknowledged prophets or what?

It can scarcely be submitted that Jesus cited John in order to lead to a mere dialectical triumph of some sort. Suppose the Jews had given some definite answer, how would Jesus have proceeded? If the answer

(Chapter IX. Section 11. Personal Authority in Mark).

had been 'from God', would Jesus have said "So am I,"? If it had been 'from men', would Jesus have said "So am I?" His authority was from God in so far as He spoke as a prophet would speak, and in that when the people witnessed His deeds they glorified not Jesus but God. His authority was from men at least to this extent, that they listened to Him gladly and had recently hailed Him as a prophet coming authentically in the name of the Lord.

But in any case (i) Jesus seems to place His authority on the same footing as John's. (ii) He accepts the position that He did act upon some authority beyond Himself.

Again it is to be noted that when His opponents said they did not know, Jesus may have been completely frustrated in going further, if He held, as in all probability He did, that His authority was on the whole either self-evidencing, or nothing at all. John's right to speak lay in the nature of his message and the universal respect and assent it commanded as an authentic message from God. Jesus, in this passage at least, seems to be content to stand on the same footing, or rather, to hold that any other claim He might make could not be made unless this first position were admitted.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mark).

The authority of Jesus as implied in the course of the argument here is first of all self-evidencing, and then when this is granted, but only to minds open to admit what cannot honestly be denied, was He in a position to speak further to any purpose. This interpretation harmonises closely with the stages of the development of the authority of Jesus as we have traced ^{it} throughout Mk.

But this passage is incomplete and cannot be fully understood apart from the following:-

Mk.XII,1-12, Mt.XXI,33-46, Lk.XX,9-19. The Parable of the Vinedressers.

Then He proceeded to address them in parables. "A man planted a vineyard, fenced it round, dug a trough for the wine-press, and built a tower; then he leased it to vinedressers and went abroad. When the season came round he sent a servant to the vinedressers to collect from the vinedressers some of the produce of the vineyard, but they took and flogged him and sent him off with nothing. Once more he sent them another servant; him they knocked on the head and insulted. He sent another, but they killed him. And so they treated many others; some they flogged and some they killed. He had still one left, a beloved son; he sent him to them last, saying, "They will respect my son," But these vinedressers said to themselves, 'Here is the heir; come on, let us kill him, and the inheritance will be our own!' So they took and killed him, and threw him outside the

vineyard. Now what will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the vinedressers, and he will give the vineyard to others.

Have you not read this scripture?—

The stone that the builders rejected is the chief stone now of the corner:

This is the doing of the Lord,
and a wonder to our eyes."

Then they tried to get hold of Him, but they were afraid of the multitude. They knew He had meant the parable for them.

Jülicher on the whole doubts the authenticity of this parable and thinks it a tame vaticinūm ex eventu of a first century Christian (1899. Vol.II. S:406).

Particularly does he doubt the original connection between verses 1-9, and 10f. He regards 10f as a rather unfortunate gloss. (op. cit. S:405).

On the other hand Fiebig not only regards Jülicher's general position as hypercritical, and the parable, therefore, as authentic, but also the connection of verses 10f as indubitable and quite clear to Jewish hearers. (Paul Fiebig. 1912. S.200ff). In a very fine discussion of the whole position Bugge holds the parable both as fully authentic, of the utmost value, in close connection with and indeed the completion of the preceding section re the Baptist's status and the authority of Jesus Himself. He brings out points which incidentally shew its special significance for our purpose. (Chr. A.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Bugge. 1903. S:286ff).

Therefore, we are surely justified in holding that the point of the parable is that Jesus claims to be chosen by God though rejected by the leaders of the people. He draws His authority from the whole history of the prophets of Israel up to and including John the Baptist, whom the Jewish authorities have in effect just refused to recognise. That He Himself should be unrecognised is thus put forward as a sign of His true prophetic authority for He is in noble company.

That Jesus was right is seen ^{not} only from Jewish history up to the time of Jesus, but by the course of Christian history since that time. The vineyard has in fact been taken from the Jews and given to others and Jesus has become the chief corner-stone. Jesus found confirmation for His claim in a consciously true insight into religious history. He is a prophet and He gains His authority, like all prophets, from a personal but right view of things, undisturbed by traditional opinion or recognised authority.

Mk.XIV,32-42, Mt.XXVI,36-46, Lk.XX,39-46. Jesus in Gethsemane.

There is a close and intimate relation with God.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority $\delta\eta$ Mk).

Jesus speaks to God "as a man talketh with his friend."

But it is nevertheless to God that He speaks, for

(a) He does not know God's counsels. ($\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ $\delta\tilde{\upsilon}$ νατόν)

(b) He still hopes for a happy issue, or possibly, a divine miraculous intervention.

(c) He distinguishes His own will from God's though finally submitting to the mysterious plan of Providence.

(d) He derives His personal confidence from His faith in God's goodness.

Jesus' authority is rooted in a full and vital faith in God in spite of the dread coming of the unknown future. It is His vivid, real, plastic and personal faith in the immediate presence and the personal care and the absolutely unfailing trustworthiness of the goodness and love of God that forms His ultimate strength and gives Him the sense of power to meet the future whatever it may contain. This comes out strongly in the most awful hour of Jesus' inner experience, and we should not be justified in overlooking its fundamental significance throughout His ministry.

It is to be noted that there is no sign or suggestion of His claiming or possessing a special status. He appears before us as entirely human, on precisely the

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

same footing as the great prophets of history. He rises above them in power and personal authority, because He experienced God more fully, more earnestly and more truly, and was thus more surely able to understand ~~both~~ the true proportions of all things both within His own soul, and in the whole of His outer circumstances. What stands out is the splendid force of His personality founded on a living faith which was itself born of a full, earnest and happy communion with and understanding of God.

Thus, in brief it may be said, that according to Mk. the sources of the authority which Jesus was able to exercise is of a threefold character. It is founded upon an "instinct for" self-evidencing truth and a peculiarly forceful earnestness in faith in God. This is nourished by an intimate personal 'Verkehr' with Him which must have been an hourly experience, and also by special and solemn seasons of prayer and worship. He also recognised the true place of certain instincts, whose force thus sanctions His own position and increases His hold over His hearers. It is very remarkable and quite characteristic that He calls in no adventitious support either from scripture or miracles or elsewhere in

(Chapter IX. Section 11. Personal Authority in Mk.)

order to lend a special ex cathedra quality to His authority. He finds it sufficient to stand alone confident in His experience of God and in His own attitude to life and the world.

Under II(a) we find the following passages:-

Mk.I,22. "And the people were astounded at His teaching for He taught like an authority, not like the scribes (cf. Also Mt.VII-28f; Lk.IV-31f)"

And yet in one sense it was the scribes who taught with authority, i.e. with the consensus of tradition, scripture, and the approval of public opinion. But this is explicitly contrasted with the authority which Jesus exercised.

Strack-Billerbeck (op. cit. I.470) cite Talmudic literature on the parallel passage in Mt.VII-28f and conclude :- "Dann ist der Sinn der Stelle: Jesus Lehrte nicht aus sich selbst, nach einem Gutdünken, sondern wie ein Prophet, der aus dem Munde Gottes redet." In which case this passage is a witness to Jesus as a Prophet. But if we ask further how the people came to recognise Him as a mouthpiece of God especially at this early stage of His ministry, one is driven to the conjecture it could only have been because of the extreme force of His personality and the self-evident and inspiring truth

of what He said. His authority was that of any man who can convince, convict, and stir the hearts and consciences of people to a higher life, and particularly to a new grasp of the great truths by which men can really live as they feel they ought, and gain close fellowship with God.

Mk.I-40f. "A leper came to Him beseeching Him on bended knees, saying "If you only choose, you can cleanse me," so He stretched His hand out in pity and touched him saying, "I do choose, be cleansed."

Mk.II,1-12 (cf. Mt.IX,1-8, Lk.V,17-26). Healing the paralytic.

The passage offers many historical difficulties as it stands, including the open identification of Jesus with the Son of Man and the working of a miracle for the sake of its apologetic value. One may avoid the difficulty by suggesting that originally all we had was a simple story of healing, but this view ignores the main point of the passage, which has to do with forgiveness. No fully satisfactory reading of the passage has yet been put forward (But cf. Rawlinson. 1925. p.24f).

The term Son of Man in this instance means man in a generic sense. (see p.101 supra).

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Jesus, therefore, forgives the sins as a man. The scandalous thing possibly was that He did so without ensuring the payment of the ceremonial sacrifices, and thus broke the customary religious sanctions. This is not usual with Jesus who is careful to observe the traditional forms in other respects (cf. Mk.I-44). But after all, sin cannot be got rid of by payment, without a new inner attitude. Here a word can do what a sacrifice cannot. It can give the feeling to the sinner that he is not out of fellowship with other men.

The authority of Jesus lies in His independent judgment and His fearless insight into the needs of the case. Mk.II,23-28 (Mt.XII,1-8, Lk.VI,1-5). Rubbing ears of corn on the Sabbath.

Mk.III,1-6 (Mt.XII,9-14; Lk.VI,6-11). Healing a withered hand on the Sabbath.

Jesus bases Himself upon the inherent rightness of the attitude He adopts in both instances. He feels fully the value of men as against institutions. He expresses this with a certain energy of conviction which carries its own truth. The authority which the people feel is not of the sort that cramps but that liberates. It gives broader horizons and a new sense of power.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

II, 15-17, 18-22^(in Mk), support these general conclusions. Mk. III, 20-30 (cf. Mt. XII, 22-37, Lk. XI, 14-23, XII-10, & VI-43, 45) - The alliance with Beelzebul.

Jesus founds His authority not upon the type of work He is doing, for, as the parallels shew, the Rabbis do the same sort of thing, but explicitly upon the humanitarianism of the action itself, and doubtless also upon the milieu He created in so acting.

Again the power of Beelzebul is, naturally, to increase evil, but Jesus decreases it. Refusal to recognise the actual facts by prejudice of any kind cannot be too strongly condemned. He insists upon the right of private judgment and attaches great penalty to its misuse. (verse 28f).

Quite evidently Jesus wants no slavish uncritical acceptance of what He says (Lk. XII-10) He would have everything depend upon the inner judgment of men (Mk. IV-9) whom Jesus bids also to be alert (Lk. XII-37). Mk. IV, 11-12 (cf. Mt. XIII, 10-13, Lk. VIII-9f). The object of speaking in parables.

"The open secret of the Realm of God is granted to you, but these outsiders get everything by way of parables, so that for all their seeing they may not perceive, and for all their hearing they may not understand, lest they turn and be forgiven."

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

The passage offers many difficulties both in itself and in its context. It is evidently not a direct reply to the question of the disciples, as it speaks as if they had been asking about the object of speaking in parables, and not merely about their meaning. It is thus scarcely possible that the passage is in its original context. This is borne out further by the observation that Jesus had only uttered one parable, whereas the disciples ask Him about the parables. (cf. also Klostermann. 1907. S:34f).

That being so, we can easily understand (in spite of Baur and Menzies) that Jesus may well have quoted Is.VI,9f in support of His method, but that we have not the original context, and, therefore, not the original meaning. The quotation itself is quite in accordance with Jesus' vivid and provocative style.

Jesus gained much power from His gift of making things live - so that the common people heard Him gladly. Thus He begot a fertile mind in His hearers who were previously listless (cf. Mk.IV,33).
Mk.VI-5f (Mt.XIII-58, Lk.IV-40).

There He could not do any miracle beyond laying His hands upon a few sick folk and curing them. He was astonished at their lack of faith.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Faith here connotes more than a mere acceptance of a supernatural authority. It means personal rapport and a certain immediacy of perception of spiritual values.

It is explicitly stated that Jesus depended upon such for His effective work, i.e. His authority was of a personal nature.

Mk.VI,6-13. (cf. Mt.IX-35, X-1,9,11,14 also Lk.IX,1-6).

Sending out the twelve in pairs.

The meaning of ἐξουσία (to which Lk. adds δύναμις) is doubtful. It can mean merely the right to exercise, but probably means the power to exercise evil spirits. It is difficult to say which is the prior thought in the term. Was there held to be a prerogative of exorcism in certain classes, e.g. the Rabbis? If so, does it mean that Jesus raised the disciples to the rank of exorcists as well as preachers? But in any case Jesus probably imparted to them both a certain amount of methodological instruction (cf. Mk.VI-13) as well as initial personal confidence.

He gives His evangelists no external status, and no means of independent subsistence. They must, therefore, win their way among the people. On the other

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

hand they must maintain strict independence and self-mastery (VI-18f).

All this exhibits a vigorous but restrained personal authority over His disciples.

Mk.VII,1-13, Mt.XV,1-20, on Ceremonial and Ethical purity.

Now the Pharisees gathered to meet Him, with some scribes who had come from Jerusalem. They noticed that some of His disciples ate their food with 'common' (that is, unwashed) hands. (The Pharisees and all the Jews decline to eat till they wash their hands up to the wrist, in obedience to the tradition of the elders; they decline to eat what comes from the market till they have washed it; and they have a number of other traditions to keep about washing cups and jugs and basins (and beds). Then the Pharisees and scribes put this question to Him, "Why do your disciples not follow the tradition of the elders? Why do they take their food with 'common' hands?" He said to them, "Isaiah made a grand prophecy about you hypocrites - as it is written,

This people honours me with their lips,
but their heart is far away from me:
vain is their worship of me,
for the doctrines they teach are but
human precepts.

You drop what God commands and hold to human tradition. "Yes, forsooth," He added, "you set aside what God commands so as to maintain your own tradition. Thus, Moses said, Honour your father and mother, and, He who curses his father or mother is to suffer death. But you say that if a man tells his father or mother, "This money might have been at your service, but it is Korban" (that is, dedicated to God), he is exempt, so you hold, from doing anything for his father or mother. That is repealing the word of God in the interests of the tradition which you keep up. And you do many things like that."

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Jesus is quite fresh in His thought, very independent in attitude and fundamentally right. We feel His power to-day and have nothing to add or diminish. He still grips us and reveals the horizon.

His use of scripture is fearless and yet reverent. He makes it search out of hidden places of the heart, and its message live again. This is typical of Jesus' profound and exalted authority. As Luther says, "All was full of life and sounded as if it had hands and feet." (qd. Meyer. 1877. p.243).

Mk.VIII-11ff, Mt.XVI,1-4 (cf. Lk.XI-32, XII-54)

The Pharisees ask a sign "But He sighed in spirit and said "Why does this generation demand a sign? I tell you truly no sign shall be given this generation."

Jesus takes His stand entirely upon the inherent truth of what He says and the native rightness of what He does. According to Mt. He adduces Jonah as a parallel case. Jesus was never finer or stronger than in this incident, never more convincing nor more authoritative. No nature miracle can guarantee the truth of any other of that man's words or deeds. Each must carry its own validity in itself, though part of what it is in itself is to be found in the personality of the doer.

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Nineveh recognised the truth by itself alone, why not Jerusalem?

Mk.X, 17-31, Mt.XIX, 16-30, (cf. Lk.XVIII, 18-30) - Of the danger of riches.

As He went out on the road a man ran up and knelt down before Him. "Good Teacher," he asked, "what must I do to inherit life eternal?" Jesus said to him, "Why call me 'good'? No one is good, no one but God. You know the commands do not kill, do not commit adultery, do not steal, do not bear false witness, do not defraud, honour your father and mothers." Teacher," he said, "I have observed all these commands in my youth." Jesus looked at him and loved him. "There is one thing you want," he said, "go and sell all you have; give the money to the poor and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, take up the cross and follow me." But his face fell at that, and he went sadly away, for he had great possessions. Jesus looked round and said to His disciples, "How difficult it is for those who have money to get into the Realm of God!" The disciples were amazed at what He said; so He repeated, "My sons, how difficult it is (for those who rely upon money) to get into the Realm of God!" It is easier for a camel to get through a needle's eye than for a rich man to get into the Realm of God." They were more astounded than ever; they said to themselves, "Then who ever can be saved?" Jesus looked at them and said, "For men it is impossible, but not for God: anything is possible for God." Peter began, "Well, we have left our all and followed you." Jesus said, I tell you truly, no one has left home or brother or sisters or mother or father or children or lands for my sake and for the sake of the gospel who does not get a hundred times as much - in this present world homes, brothers, sisters, mothers, children and lands, together with persecutions, and in the world to come, life

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

eternal. Many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first."

This is one of the finest passages revealing Jesus' personal power and insight. It is not rational or conventional or supernatural in the ordinary sense. But it is penetrating and final. (See further p.407 infra) Mk.XII,13-17, Mt.XXII,15-22, Lk.XX,20-26 - Tribute to Caesar.

This is another illustration of the same quality. Jesus settles the point not by refined rabbinic argument but by sheer human sense. At the same time,

- i. He preserves reverence for God.
- ii. He recognises that earthly authorities have a place.
- iii. He makes it a matter for personal judgment to proportion the tribute.

Mk.XII,28-34, Mt.XXII,34-40 (Lk.X,25-28) - the greatest commandment.

A further illustration. Jesus deals with the matter from the standpoint of 'sanctified common sense!_ The Jews would probably have answered the question differently. For, by the common saying of the Jemara, the

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

613 Commandments of the law could be reduced to 11, Isaiah compressed them to 6, Micah to three and finally Amos and Habbukuk to one, (qd. cf. Briggs. International Crit. Commentary. Psalms. Vol.I p.113). Jesus was probably familiar with all this, but His own summary is finer, and carries a superior weight by its own self-evidence. This is typical of Jesus' authority.

I(b) Of a somewhat different quality is the personal authority exhibited in the following passages. Here the truth is not quite self-evident when taken alone, but only when closely linked up with the personality of Jesus as in full earnest and moving on the highest spiritual level. But then they become some of the most important and effective in the whole of the gospels. It is a form of dogmatic teaching which gradually leads to deepened insight and a profounder faith till it touches the last problems of man's relations with God.

Mk.VIII-31 and parallels. After the confession of Peter Jesus immediately "proceeded to teach that the Son of Man had to endure great suffering, to be rejected by the elders and the High Priests and the scribes, to be killed, and after three days to rise again."

After the confession the disciples are

(Chapter IX. Section 11. Personal Authority of Mk).

psycho-
logically prepared for dogmatic and exegetic teaching of the highest spiritual importance especially at a time when goodness was so closely connected with bliss here as well as hereafter.

The point of the passage is not so much in the details of the future as in the connection between the highest personal merit with the greatest personal woe and suffering.

Mk.VIII,34-37, Mt.XVI,24-26, Lk.IX,23-25 - Saving life and losing the soul.

Then He called the crowd to Him with His disciples and said to them, "If any-one wishes to follow me let him deny himself, take up his cross, and so follow me; for whoever wants to save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it." What profit is it for a man to gain the whole world and to forfeit his soul? What could a man offer as an equivalent for his soul?"

Here is some of the finest personal teaching of the gospels. It is quite undreamt of apart from Jesus but crystal-clear and powerfully cogent as uttered by Him. The impression created by the words "What could a man offer as an equivalent for his soul". must have been superb.

But the appeal is mainly to the sense of the

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

religious values which He had developed in His disciples. One may ask what the Athenians would have thought of it if St. Paul had first asked the question on the Areopagus.

Thus it could then and can now carry full conviction only on the basis of an awakened personal Christian faith and energy of character. Once said, doubtless confirmation would fall in from history (cf. Maccabees).

The Cross here means the scaffold. The prophetic sense is entirely absent (so also Klostermann. 1907. S:70). It means "We must be prepared to follow Jesus to the very scaffold and bear all the preceding agony and shame - and still go on."

The challenge of the personal authority of Jesus is very great but to the educated Christian conscience it is both unavoidable and very inspiring.

Mk.IX-1, Mt.XVI-23. Lk.IX-27. "I tell you truly there are some of those standing here who will not taste death till they see the coming of God's reign with power. (Mt. = till they see the Son of Man Himself coming to reign. Lk= till they see the reign of God).

The emphatic word in Mk. is with power and this is significant. Mt. seems to have read this passage in a personal sense and Lk. to have read it impersonally. Mt's version alone is capable of an eschatological

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

rendering but this is not necessary, nor, in view of his source and of Lk's version, is it natural. For if Jesus could speak of His kingdom as not of this world, and of bearing the cross in a figurative sense as in a preceding verse (Mk.VIII-34), it is probable that He could also think of the Kingdom as later Christendom has come to understand it, i.e. as the sphere of the actual reign of Himself, of His very spirit or mentality in the hearts and over the lives of His disciples and others. Surely a man of spiritual insight and rare mental balance could scarcely conceive anything else. Moreover this kind of sovereignty did actually begin within a few weeks after the above words were uttered, a period much shorter than the limits set by Jesus. For it is nothing less than sheer fact to hold that His Kingdom was inaugurated in the upper room at Pentecost a couple of months after this very date. If this kind of Kingdom is not what Jesus actually meant, then quite evidently He did not understand the nature of His own mission, and much of the church's later experience of the Risen Lord loses historical connection with the Jesus of Nazareth. But if it be true that Jesus did understand all this, what refreshing insight it gives into the power of His personality!

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Mk. IX, 33-37, Mt. XVIII, 1-5, Lk. IX, 46-48. The dispute about rank.

"If anyone wants to be first" He said to them, "he must be last of all and servant of all."

Then they reached Capharnahum. And when He was indoors He asked them, "What were you arguing about on the road?" They said nothing, for on the road they had been disputing about which of them was the greatest. So He sat down and called the twelve. "If anyone wants to be first," He said to them, "He must be last of all and the servant of all." Then He took a little child, set it among them, and putting His arms round it said to them,

"Whoever receives one of these little ones in my name receives me, and whoever receives me receives not me but Him who sent me."

This position presupposes the Christian view of life at its purest. Otherwise it is sheer nonsense. It gets its force from the person of Jesus, and the construction He places upon life and the world. It is, however, axiomatic to the sensitive and educated Christian conscience, and reveals something more of the special features and the unique force of Jesus' personal authority.

The same holds for Mk. IX, 42-48, Mt. XVIII, 6-9. (also cf. Lk. XVII, 1-2) "If your right hand offend etc)

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

Mk.X,1-12, Mt.XIX,1-12 - The question of divorce.

Jesus bases Himself, most unusually, upon a rabbinic reading of scripture to which He adds His own interpretation quite against the views of His time or ours.

His interpretation seems antiquated to us, and it is doubtful if it carried any weight then. Its truth is only apparent on the basis of His own teaching about purity of heart (Mt.V-27ff) and shews a character capable of carrying His own teaching to its logical conclusion.

But Jesus speaks as if He were expounding the logic of the early scriptural position as found in the story of Adam and Eve. What He says is really nothing more than what scripture says. He is content to leave it at that, as sufficient.

I (c) Of a somewhat different nature are the next two references. They are without much ethical value in themselves, but reveal other facets of the character of our Lord and His concern for His disciples, He appears anxious to make the way easier for them.

Mk.XIV,18-21, Mt.XXVI-21-25 (Lk.XXII-21ff). Foretelling

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority of Jesus
in Mk).

His betrayal.

This was not necessarily due to some supernatural revelation, but rather to private but penetrating personal observation and insight. Judas' absence (on his fall errand) could not have been entirely unnoticed in the last tense days before the Passover. Mk. XIV, 22-25, Mt. XXVI, 26-29, Lk. XXII, 15-20. The Last Supper.

Mark reads like an account of a simple meal under very solemn circumstances.

Matthew reads as if Jesus intended to institute a ceremonial (καινή is read in many M.S.S. and accepted e.g. by Moffatt.)

Luke reads as if Jesus were inaugurating a new dispensation (cf. especially verse 20, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη).

Much will depend upon our understanding of what Jesus really intended to do. But it is to be noted that Jesus somehow places Himself in a religious relation to His disciples, (rather than a merely friendly and human relation).

This understanding seems inevitable unless the accounts are to lose all historical value in detail e.g. *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης.*

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

The sense of the passages we have adduced thus far from this source exhibit the personal authority of Jesus in its three stages of (a) axiomatic character of His utterance; (b) the self-evidence of others when viewed on the basis of a developed Christian teaching, none of which type occurs in the records of the earlier period of His ministry; (c) teaching which is largely without intrinsic ethical value but prepares the way for His disciples to stand fast in the faith. Now we pass on to:-

III. The effects of the Personal authority of Jesus.

We now come to one of the more difficult aspects of the present section of our inquiry, and only a few illustrative passage can be selected.

Mk.VIII,27-33, Mt.XVI,13-23, Lk.IX,18-22 - The Confession of Peter.

Jesus is clearly unwilling to exercise any authority over His disciples on the basis of general runour, but only on that of personal conviction (Mk.VIII-30 and parallels).

The effects of the catechism must have been to define and quicken the opinion of the disciples till

(Chapter IX. Section 11. Personal Authority in Mk).

it became a true conviction.

The confession was psychologically a part of the process in coming to a full understanding of Him. Peter really understood Jesus personally only after he had confessed Him as Lord.

The effect of forbidding reports of the conversation would be that no converts were made on the basis of an experience peculiar to the disciples even though they were eye-witnesses, but only on the grounds of personal experience perhaps reinforced by personal confession.

Mk.IX, 14-29, Mt.XVII, 16-21, Lk.IX, 37-43a. Healing the Epileptic Boy.

Jesus' faith in the power of a right trust in God is as energetic as ever (XVII-30. Mt).

Lk.IX-43 records that they gave thanks to God. This is significant. In an age when cures were normally regarded as miraculous and as sometimes due to the agency of demons (Mt.III-22) there is reason for special notice here. It must have been more than a mere healing act. The scribes do not ascribe praise to God. The people do it frequently (cf. Mk.II-12, Mt. IX-8, Lk.V-26; Mt. XV-31, Lk.VII-16, XIII-13, XVII-15, XXIII-47). So that

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

the effect of the operation of the personality of Jesus was to make the people more conscious of God, and to increase their faith in Him.

It is interesting to notice that this cannot have been merely accidental, but was quite certainly Jesus' purpose, as is seen from Mt.V-16 where He bids His hearers so to act that men may see the good they do but glorify their heavenly Father. And what He enjoins He also practises.

Mk.XI,1-11, Mt.XXI,1-11, Lk.XIX,28-38 - The Triumphal Entry.

As we have already seen (see p.194 supra) Jesus' authority here is purely personal and prophetic but the people link up the occasion arbitrarily though doubtless correctly with scripture. They felt the power of God behind Jesus and they felt the sanction of divine tradition and of the sacred national expectation.

Mk.XV-39. The Remark of the Centurian.

"This man was certainly the Son of God."

The testimony is, of course, not on the same footing as the same words on the lips of demoniacs (Mk. III-11f) or of the disciples (Mt.XIV-33) or Peter (Mk.VIII-27)

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

or at the Transfiguration (Mk. IX-7) even if all these be authentic.

But the question is "How came Jesus to exercise that kind of influence upon a pagan centurion who had possibly crucified a score of criminals? Why did Jesus make a different impression from either of the other two victims crucified at the same time?" It must have been something in the personal bearing of Jesus, which in principle is the same as His authority over His disciples. The centurion, if the record is authentic and whatever may have been the precise connotation of his terms in his own mind, felt himself in close contact with some deity either in or just beyond the crucified Jesus.

Summary.

This position briefly summarises the effect of the authority of Jesus on those who knew Him personally. If there was any propitious relationship between them and Him, they felt nearer to God. If there was lack of sympathy, He could do little or nothing (cf. Mk. VI, 1-6), and they felt considerable religious horror (Mk. III-22). But this is precisely the effect we should an-

(Chapter IX. Section ii. Personal Authority in Mk).

ticipate if the authority of Jesus were prophetic and personal as we have found it and our position is thus strongly confirmed.

Section III.- Personal Authority of Jesus in Sources Peculiar to St. Matthew.

There are very few references.

Mt.VII-29. He taught them like an authority, not like their own scribes.

While this passage doubtless comes from Mt's special source it adds nothing to what we have already said on this subject under Mk.I-22 (p.220 supra). The contrast appears to be between the prophetic type of utterance flowing from an inner conviction and the scribes who taught on the ground of tradition. (cf. Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:470 a.l. note 2).

"The ἐξουσία of Jesus was felt, not in the novelty of all that He said, but in His inborn knowledge of right and wrong. The scribes rested mainly on the authority of antiquity and precedent. The Apocalyptic writers claimed to give out something new, learned by

(Chapter IX. Section iii. Personal Authority in Mt).

Immediate inspiration, but their speculations did not touch the life of the masses; the Lord dealt not merely with the future, but also with the living present as a preparation for it." (McNeile. 1915. p.99. a.1.)

Mt. XXVIII, 16-30. The conclusion to St. Matthew's Gospel is in a different plane from that of the body of the gospel as a historical source, but it is the natural conclusion to which the evangelist himself was led. The authority of Jesus here is of a different quality from what we find in the earlier sources. It does not depend upon insight or self-evidencing truth, or the impact of personality in the deep intimacy of the fellowship of the spirit. There is here a distance, a sense of otherworldliness, a feeling that certain vital things are known to Jesus which by the nature of the case are forever hidden from ordinary men. We are asked to accept His word as of ex cathedra authority. This attitude presupposes a dogmatic change in the records not psychologically vouched for by the history of the preceding eight days so much as by the experience of the early church. The passage adds nothing to our understanding of the foundation of Jesus' authority during His ministry though it reveals something of the psychological and religious material upon which He operated in succeeding

(Chapter IX. Section iii. Personal Authority in Mt).

years.

The further material in this source which bears upon the present category, is mostly in the form of Parables. This is an highly important subject and is common to the special Source of St. Luke. It will, therefore, be considered under a special section (p.262ff infra), and then the whole will be summarised.

Section IV.- The Personal Authority of Jesus in Passages Peculiar to St. Luke.

Lk. IV, 16-30.- The first preaching in Nazareth.

As reported by Lk. but not as in Mt. (XIII-53ff - where His authority is founded on wisdom and miracles, but all is futile through lack of sympathetic response, i.e. faith) or Mk. (VI, 1-6), Jesus founds His authority upon His fulfilling the scripture. But He completes and gains it by His gracious words (verses 21ff) i.e. by His personality, and it is the strong personal element which at a later stage arouses resentment. (Lk. IV, 25-30).

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk.)

Lk. VI, 24-26, 34, 45. - Scattered verses from the Sermon on the Plain.

"But woe to you rich folk! You get all the comforts you will ever get."

"Woe to you who have your fill to-day! You will be hungry."

"Woe to you who laugh to-day! You will wail and weep."

"Woe to you when all men speak well of you! That is just what their fathers did to the false prophets."

This passage is very sharp and penetrating, but not cynical. It is based upon an insight which carries its own verity as soon as uttered. It reveals the vigour of a mind not affected by things accidental to the real values of life.

Verse 34. If you lend only to those from whom you hope to get something, what credit is that to you? Even sinful men lend to one another so as to get a fair return.

The ethical plus is its own sanction when once expressed.

Verse 45. The good man produces good from the good stored in his heart, and the evil man evil from his evil: for a man's mouth utters what his heart is full of.

The point is that the good man is prior to good actions or circumstances - a point of view which can never again be lost sight of, however often it may be ob-

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk).

scured. The great revivals of religion as at the Reformation, and in eighteenth Century in England, gained much of their force from the earnest re-iteration of this principle. The sterility often felt in the sacerdotal forms of religion, Christian and non-Christian, no less than the futility or disappointment connected with non-religious programs of social amelioration, is connected with the inadequate appreciation of this matter. That Jesus should have expressed Himself clearly and unmistakably as He did on this issue is of great importance for understanding the force of His personality and the nature of the authority He exercised. It is purely personal and ethico-spiritual.

Lk.VII,36=50. The incident of the alabaster box.

There is tremendous personal power exhibited in this passage. Jesus is without any trace of conventionalism, or the marks of prejudice deeply rooted in conventional thought. He is seen at once strong, independent and original-minded, yet sympathetic and winsome. The word $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ here does not mean "accept statements" and the like, but rather "to take up a certain personal relationship." It seems to include also the word $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\mu\eta$. The forgiveness depends upon a reaction of loving confidence towards another. But this is entirely

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk).

personal authority of the purest type.

Lk.IX,51-62. Jesus sets His face to go to Jerusalem - refuses to call down fire upon a hostile Samaritan village - various followers.

Verse 56. How easy to seek to call down fire, like Elijah, and destroy them - but Jesus prefers quietly to go to another village. It is the instinct for essentials, apart from self-glorification. Jesus will exercise no influence which is not on the basis of free personal recognition and inner allegiance - and this after Peter's Confession and the Transfiguration.

Lk.X,17-24. The Return of the Seventy.

The terse and graphic brilliance of Jesus' invective is very striking, and no less if it is intended to be mainly figurative. He is fresh, forceful and confident. The sense of a living unity with God, and of the truth and the value of His own convictions is very marked. The tone is one of complete and over-mastering rightness and personal confidence.

X,25-28. The Greatest Commandment.

Jesus bases His judgment on 'sanctified common-sense.' His authority is in His insight (So also XI-27f -

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk).

Blessed be she who bore thee.)

Lk. XI, 29-32 - A greater than Jonah or than Solomon.

Jesus is content to rest upon the same basis as Jonah and Solomon for His authority, i.e. on the immediate appeal to good sense and human understanding.

Lk. XIII, 1-9 + The tower of Siloam and the parable of the unfruitful fig tree.

Jesus teaches that natural mishaps or the suffering of political injustice is not a sign of personal turpitude in the sufferers, nor of rectitude in those who escape. The right attitude is not one of blame and of self-righteousness towards the sufferers, but of thankfulness for oneself and of repentance while yet there is time. Jesus presses the teaching home in the parable whose point is that even worthless fig trees cumbering the ground, are sometimes spared.

The passage as a whole inspires confidence in the soundness of Jesus' judgment and must have made His hearers feel He really did understand both God and the world.

Lk. XIII, 10-17. Healing a woman on the Sabbath.

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk.)

Lk. XIII, 10-17.- Healing a woman on the Sabbath.

He laid His hands on her, and instantly she became erect and glorified God. But the president of the synagogue was annoyed at Jesus healing on the Sabbath, and he said to the crowd, "There are six days for work to be done; come during them to get healed, instead of on the Sabbath." The Lord replied to Him, "You hypocrites, does not each of you untether his ox or ass from the stall on the sabbath and lead it away to drink? And this woman, a daughter of Abraham, bound by Satan for all these eighteen years, was she not to be freed from her bondage on the sabbath?" As He said this, all His opponents were put to shame.

The vigour of Jesus' reply is very great. He places human need far above that of any institution however sacred and important. No reply is possible, the truth is self-evident. (So also XIV, 1-7).

Lk. XIII, 20-30. Who belongs to the Kingdom of Heaven?

Jesus refuses to make this a theoretic question.

No unethical advantage like race (verse 28) or religiosity (verse 25) is real, but only personal effort. (v. 24)

Lk. XIV, 7-11. Take the lowest room.

The actual motive to which Jesus appeals is not very high, but the point of the teaching is that rank is an external matter and is independent of inner realities. It is not to be claimed, but to be ascribed. Jesus acted upon this principle Himself. He never claimed prerogative or authority, or sinlessness, or divinity.

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk).

These things are debased and impossible just to the extent that they are claimed. But when ascribed as the result of personal experience they are indisputable.

Lk.XIX, 1-10. Zaccheus.

An example of personal influence par excellence and shews clearly the ethico-spiritual nature of the authority which Jesus exercised.

Lk.XXII, 35-38 - Sends out His disciples armed etc.

And He said to them, "When I sent you out with neither purse nor wallet nor sandals, did you want for anything? "No", they said, "for nothing." Then He said to them, "But he who has a purse must take it now, and the same with a wallet; and he who has no sword must sell his coat and buy one. For I tell you, this word of scripture must be fulfilled in me: he was classed among criminals. Yes, there is an end to all that refers to me." "Lord" they said, "here are two swords!" "Enough! Enough!" He answered.

A very enigmatic passage (cf. Klostermann. 1919. S:580f. a.1.) but at least it implies (a) that Jesus sees a change of method may be necessary and (b) that there is a future. The movement is not yet finished in spite of ominous appearances. They must press on.

Lk.XXIII-8. "Herod was greatly delighted to see Jesus; he had long wanted to see Him, because he had heard about Him and also because he hoped to see Him perform some miracles."

(Chapter IX. Section iv. Personal Authority in Lk).

Jesus could not have been a very important factor in the life of the state, for it is apparently necessary to note that Herod had heard of Him. This fact points away from any great claims on Jesus' part or any striking ascriptions on the people's part, which confirms the point of view we have adopted.

Thus we see how strongly marked is the personal authority of Jesus in the sources peculiar to Lk. There is ample material, and some of it belongs to the most precious of the records preserved in the gospel. Were it to be expunged the tone of the document as a whole would be entirely changed.

But we cannot complete our survey and summarise our impressions at this juncture, as there remain to be studied certain features of even greater importance.

We, therefore, pass on at once to the highly characteristic expression of the personal authority of Jesus as found in the parables. These occur in both Mt. and Lk. but cannot well be studied as the independent witnesses of the two sources.

(Chapter IX.

Section V.- The Parables.

There remains to be noticed a very important feature of the sources peculiar to Mt. and Lk. respectively, viz: the parables, although it is impossible to attempt here a detailed study of this important, striking and characteristic feature in the ministry of Jesus.

We cannot pretend that He invented the parabolic method, nor even that all the parables recorded in the gospels are original to Him (cf. Fiebig. op. cit. §:277. and passim). But taken altogether there is nothing that so illimitates the problem of the authority of Jesus. Mk. reports only one or two, Mt. a great number mostly brief; , Lk. a still greater number including some of the largest and most perfect. Only in a relatively small number of instances is a parable to be found in more than one of the gospels. We receive the impression that there is recorded but a selection from a large body of material, and indeed that this was the common form of Jesus' speech. His thought is concrete and practical rather than systematic and ab-

stract; inductive rather than deductive; intuitive rather than ratiocinative; popular rather than academic; in short, Semitic rather than Hellenic. Profound, far-reaching, unique and often revolutionary though much of His thought is, the common people, the illiterate, the unschooled can readily grasp His meaning because His method is the same as theirs. The common people heard Him gladly primarily because they could understand what He meant, and secondly because He seized upon the common things of everyday experience and linked them up indissolubly with the fundamental things of God and man and the world, with which things they thus became intimate in a new and glorious way. What had been obscure to the wise became revealed unto veritable babes. He made clear the nature of God, the nature of human duty and the whole purpose of the world. And not only so but He revealed them in their sublime winsomeness till religion became not an imposed task but an indispensable vehicle of glad self-expression.

Now this is prophecy, and indeed prophecy in its noblest possible expression. The authority here is profoundly personal and of such a character that it is final and ultimate. It is authority which at once over-

(Chapter IX. Section v. The Parables).

masters, and liberates. It compels and also inspires. It gives new conceptions, ideals, and paths of life which, however, are immediately claimed as native to, nay indeed, of the very essence of the liberated soul. It is not too much to say that in the end it becomes impossible to distinguish between the imposed will of Jesus and the revealed will of God and again between either of these and the will of the individual as now conscious of himself. And all this is the natural and proper consequence of the self-evidencing character of the profound teaching of our Lord in the method He chose.

The parables are the most important expressions of these principles. The great majority of them teach their own lessons and bring their own inspiration. Very few need to be expounded even to-day before simple-minded people can gain elemental religious benefit from them. Only two or three of those recorded needed to be explained to the disciples, but each of these is of a special character and is rather to be regarded as an analogy from nature illustrative of special circumstances of the times, (e.g. The Parable of the Sower. Mt. XIII, 1-9, Mk. IV, 1-9, Lk. VIII, 4-8 and The Tares in the Wheat. Mt. XIII, 24-30, XIII, 36-43. Cf. Bugge. 1903. S: 102f & 125) than

(Chapter IX. Section v. The Parables.)

a piece of religious teaching.

Very few of the parables have any direct reference to Jesus Himself. He does not employ them to gain some personal authority lying beyond what is inherent in the acceptance of His teaching as intrinsically true, but He uses them freely and, ⁱⁿ Mt's selection, characteristically to illustrate the Nature of the real Kingdom of God. e.g.

The Sower.	Mt.XIII,1-9 (Also MkIV,1-9).
The Pearl.	Mt.XIII-45f.
The Salt of the Earth.	Mt.V-13.
The Vinedressers.	Mt.XX,1-16.
The Two Sons.	Mt.XXI,28-31.
The Sheep and the Goats.	Mt.XXV,31-46.

to mention only a few at random. He makes frequent use of the parabolic method to enforce a right appreciation of human duty and of God which is perhaps the main quality more particularly of St. Luke's selections. e.g.

The Good Samaritan.	Lk.X,29-36.
The Pharisee and the Publican.	Lk.XVIII,9-14.
The Rich Fool.	Lk.XII,16-21.
The Prodigal Son.	Lk.XV,12-32.
The Friend at Midnight.	Lk.XI,5-8.

This classification is naturally only of the most general kind and is adopted in order to make explicit what are the principal subjects to which Jesus applied the main stress of His most characteristic teaching.

(Chapter IX. Section v. The Parables).

And now we must go on at once to add that in all the parables, even in those which apparently needed some special explanation from Jesus to His disciples in order to make them more fully applicable to contemporary circumstances, there is felt a certain spiritual urgency proceeding from the very nature of the truth which has been expounded. That is to say Jesus does more than expound interesting religious ideas, somehow He challenges men. He makes the issue a live one. We must come to some decision either for or against, a decision to do nothing amounting in actual fact to a negative. Thus, e.g. in 'The House on Sand and the House on the Rock.' (Mt.VII,24-27), we have a forced option for we must build somewhere; or 'The Sower' (Mk.IV,1-9), where in any case the seed is being sown, and our choice is only whether to destroy or to cultivate it; or 'The Talents' (Mt.XXV,14ff). ^{where} God gives each of us a stewardship, and the urgent question is as to its discharge. Other instances are numerous.

Now this power of placing forced options before the conscience, or rather of shewing that life itself is constantly placing such options is highly characteristic of Jesus, and is one of the features making for

the enduring power of His preaching and His person. For what we gain from Him is more than a mere increase of ideas, religious and other. We gain a new attitude in which outer circumstances, the play and interchange of the social and other influence, act as a continual and yet varying stimulus to moral and religious endeavour. And we find that this new attitude both arises from and produces a new inner relationship with the personality of Jesus, in which we recognise the greatness and the grandeur of His authority

It is no longer possible to describe what the force of the parables must have been when spoken by the living voice of Jesus, and heard in their natural surroundings with a sower, or a Samaritan actually in sight. We can only dimly feel that the effect must have been plastic, profound and compelling beyond words.

In an age of rapid and far-reaching changes and of universal religious ferment, in a land traditionally and passionately devoted to a purely spiritual religion, men and women must have felt "everything sounded as if it had hands and feet" - to use once more a phrase of Luther's. One has only to read a sober historian's description of the effect of the Bible upon relatively

cold and immoveable Englishmen when it was translated into the vernacular and made accessible to whosoever could read. Crowds stood for hours even in the rain listening to some man with a clear voice who could read. Strong men thronged round, tears streaming down their faces, as they heard the priceless words. "Sunday after Sunday, day after day, the crowds that gathered round Bonner's Bibles in the nave of St. Paul's, or the family group that hung on the words of the Geneva Bible in the devotional exercises of the home, were leavened with a new literature. England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible." (T. H. Green. "Short History of the English people." 1909. One Vol. p.460f). That, or something very much like it or beyond it must have been the effect upon those who heard Jesus in Galilee and Judea. It is reflected in the conduct of the people who crowded after Him forgetful of food (Mk.VI-35ff and parallels) who brought Him their sick or their children (Mk.X-14), who eagerly sought to touch if only the hem of His garments (Mt.X-21, XIV-36), who shouted Hosanna! on the steep climb from the Jordon up to Jerusalem. (Mk. XI-9f and parallels). It is also reflected in the experience of countless men and women and children since

(Chapter IX. Sectionv. The Parables).

that day who through some special advantage have come to a vivid personal appreciation of the character and spirit of our Lord. It is revealed in the hymns (e.g. "Jesus, The very thought of Thee.") and the prayers of the church and the home throughout the ages.

Summary.

The authority of Jesus as seen in the parables is predominantly that of the personality of Jesus. The more intimately He is understood, the greater is His power to elevate and mould other men's lives. And that seems to have been, in its place, the conviction that moved the first and third evangelists when they brought to bear the material contained in their special sources and combined it with that found to hand in Q and Mk. The world would be incalculably poorer without this special material, for not only would it suffer from lack of literary and religious matter of the highest value, but also its impression of Jesus would be at once less exalted and less human than that which it now enjoys. On the other hand it may perhaps be submitted, greatly daring, that if the material contained in the sources peculiar to Mt. and Lk. respectively apart from their first two Chapters had alone been preserved, then, in

(Chapter IX. Section v. The Parables.)

spite of the heavy loss of much that is vital to the Christian religion we should still have retained both the chief characteristic of the teaching and aims of Jesus, and also sufficient to enable devout minds to perceive the glory of the personality of our Lord.

Section. VI.- The Personal Authority of Jesus as seen
In the Fourth Gospel).

Here we at once enter a very different atmosphere from what we have experienced hitherto. What this gospel has to say on the authority of Jesus has been almost exhausted under the categories we have already studied. Moreover the present inquiry is rendered difficult on literary grounds, for it is extremely doubtful in any single case whether we have the apsissima verba of Jesus or an authentic account of an historical event. Both these points are of supreme importance in dealing with the personal authority of Jesus. We have no help for it but to proceed cautiously and to a large extent by inference. In any case the relevant passages are few, though different individuals prosecuting the same inquiry might find indications in different places. They seem

(Chapter IX. Section vi. Personal Authority in John).

however, to be as follows:-

(I) The Sources of the Personal Authority in
St. John's Gospel.

V-17,19. "As my Father has continued working to this hour, so I work too. (v.19) Truly, truly I tell you, the Son can do nothing of His own accord, nothing but what He sees the Father doing; for whatever He does the Son also does the same."

Jesus feels His authority is in the order of the cosmos which He regards as expressing God's will.

(cf. also Mt.V,38-48).

V-28. "Since He is the Son of Man."

Jesus feels that the identification with the Son of Man (whether of Daniel or as representative man) gives Him a place in the cosmos with a sanction of tradition that would not be possible otherwise. (See also V-45).

VIII-12ff. Then Jesus again addressed them saying, "I am the light of the world, he who follows me will not walk in the darkness, he will enjoy the light of life." (v.13) So the Pharisees said to Him, "You are testifying to yourself; your evidence is not valid." (v.14) Jesus replied, "Though I do testify to myself my evidence is valid, because I know where I come from and where I am going to - whereas you do not know - (v.15) You judge by the outside." etc, etc.

(Chapter IX. Section vi. Personal Authority in John).

Though this passage is expressed in characteristic Johannine language it closely follows an authentic utterance. Jesus founds His authority upon the self-evidence of His utterances and life (verse 15) and still more upon an inner certainty (verse 14) which must always be final to the subject, and from which there can be no appeal in the last analysis.

Thus a particular examination shews us that in this passage Jesus' authority is linked up closely with the position occupied by the general synoptic tradition.

More generally, however, His authority both for His inner certainty and for His practical influence is founded upon His place in the cosmos. He is conceived as part of the providential world order and as coming with that authority. This position is in danger on the one hand of undue abstraction from the workaday world, and on the other, of a certain predestinationism. We feel ourselves lifted up above the world into that supernatural sphere where God reigns by His arbitrary will alone, and yet at the same time we are caught in the mechanism of a cosmic scheme which must press on to its foreordained ends. That the Fourth Gospel should have avoided the full force of both these dangers is due to the evangelist's

(Chapter IX. Section vi. Personal Authority in John).

insight into the life and spirit of our Lord. His gospel, in spite of its numerous perplexities, will ever remain the constant refuge of the more mystically inclined and the frequent source of comfort and peace to all.

(II) Jesus' Claim to Authority in St. John's Gospel.

XII-46ff.

(a) "I have come as light into the world, that no one who believes in me may remain in the dark.(47) (b) If anyone hears my words and does not keep them, it is not I who judge him; (c) for I have not come to judge the world but to save the world.(48) (d) He who rejects me and will not receive my words has indeed a judge. The words I have spoken will judge him on the last day(49) (e) for I have not spoken of my own accord - the Father who sent me, He it was who ordered me what to say and what to speak (50) (f) and I know His orders mean eternal life."

i There is a certain authentic personal note in the whole of this passage giving the impression that it may follow fairly closely a verbatim utterance of Jesus. (see *iv. infra*).

ii There are references to I-4f in verse 46, but in such a fashion as makes it appear that the prologue is a development of this utterance and not vice versa.

(Chapter IX. Section vi. Personal Authority in John).

iii Similarly the second part of verse 47 and 48 may be the historical basis of III,16-18 since.

iv Jesus rejects the idea of being Himself the judge at the last day. (cf. III-17, also V-24,45, VIII-15) He is content to let His words bear their own witness. (cf. II^I-18, V-45, VIII-40). And, finally, His confidence in God is simple and energetic.

X,19-29 and X,1-18 - an apologetic for Jesus' reticence about His identity.

The explicit question in this passage is the Messiahship of Jesus, but the real issue is as to the authority which Jesus actually exercised, what were its sources and its nature?

Jesus makes the following important points:

It is no use saying anything -owing to the perversity of opponents (verse 25) - His authority is founded on a certain rapport (cf. also Mk,VI,1-6).

His works are a sufficient witness(v.25 & X-37) (cf. the reply to the Baptist's inquiry. Mt.XI-2ff, Lk.VII-22ff).

Belief, and therefore authority, is founded only in a disposition of the heart. (verse 27f).

(Chapter IX. Section vi. Personal Authority in John).

The continuation of the main paragraph is found in John X, 1-18 where the important point is made that the renewed and enlarged life of His followers is a witness for His authority, which is the contrary of that of the thief etc, who damage or restrict.

Self-sacrifice is a vital consideration.

X-10f, 30ff practically repeats the main arguments of X, 19-29.

XV, 1-10. The parable of the Vine and the Branches.

Jesus makes the highest claims and the recorded words here have an authentic ring. It is noticeable that the parable gains its weight from historical and personal experience, i.e. its authority is not self-evident but depends upon our reading it in close connection with the personality of Jesus. If we read them in Koran or the Zend Avesta, these words would probably carry little weight. The part played by Christian experience can never be overlooked in estimating the authority of Jesus.

Summary.

This concludes our study of the passages in the Fourth Gospel dealing with the personal authority of Jesus. Inquiries under other categories have already shewn that

(Chapter IX. Section vi. Personal Authority in John).

the main interest of this evangelist really lies elsewhere, but unconsciously he bears strong testimony to the accuracy of the view adopted as a consequence of our examination of the earlier sources. The authority of Jesus is fundamentally personal. It depends upon the penetrating insight and the inner personal experience of our Lord, reacting upon a certain mentality in His contemporaries by virtue of its unique force, its self-evidencing truth, and its inherent harmony with the world and the needs of men. It may be summed up in the words of Peter,

"Lord, to whom can we go? You have got the words of Eternal Life." (John VI-68).

CHAPTER X.THE VERDICT OF THE SOURCES ON THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS
AND ITS FOUNDATIONS.

At this stage of our inquiry the attempt should be made to bring together briefly what each main source has to say on the nature of the authority of Jesus. In doing so, we must remember various things. In the first place only one of them, St. Mark's Gospel, is extant substantially as the author's autograph and even this is not quite complete. Q is known only in a secondary manner but is probably preserved practically in its entirety. Still there must always be an element of doubt especially as to whether we have its conclusion.

In regard to M. and L. the matter is on a much inferior footing. While as far as they go they reproduce a record of Jesus' words and works with an authenticity equal to that of Q. or Mk, no one is in a position to say whether we have them in fair completeness or only fragments of a much larger body of material. Only very hazardous conclusions can therefore be drawn from their silence on any particular points.

The material found in the first two Chapters of Mt. and Lk. respectively is of acknowledged dubious historicity. It is impossible, therefore, to draw any

(Chapter X).

valuable and positive conclusion in regard to the events which they narrate, but they are valuable records of the state of Christological thought both at the time or place where they were written, and at the time or place where they were incorporated in our gospels.

Another problem is presented to us by the Fourth Gospel. Here we have an independent tradition embodying matter which in itself seems equally authentic with any in the great primary sources, but which is deeply embedded in a great deal of theological material presented with a strongly-marked apologetic angle. The historic datum must always remain uncertain as it can only be reached by inference of varying degrees of hazardousness. Still the attempt must be made as there can be no doubt of the existence in many places of a firm historical foundation.

Section I.- The Verdict of Q.

Q is simple, naive and the most nearly impersonal of any of our sources. The portrait it presents

(Chapter X. Section i. The verdict of Q).

of Jesus is characterised by certain features. On the negative side we may note that it omits all reference to several matters of outstanding importance either in other sources or in subsequent Christian history. Thus it contains no version of the Lord's prayer, no reference to the Confession of Peter, the Transfiguration or the Last Supper, all of which we might well have expected to find there. Nothing in Q would seem either to be incongruous with them or to render them superfluous. Moreover as Q is possibly the earliest of our great sources, these omissions have value different from similar omissions from the Fourth Gospel which was written in all probability with a full knowledge of the contents of all the synoptics. It, therefore, seems as if Q either did not attach first rank importance to the things omitted, or else that common knowledge then current rendered it unnecessary to record them. At least in his special circumstance he felt he could present a worthy case without them.

The fact that Q does not mention the crucifixion or the Resurrection is not on the same footing as it is within the bounds of possibility that the ending of the original document was lost ^{or} for some other reason was not

incorporated. No inference can therefore be safely drawn from this omission from Q.

We now turn to a series of observations of a more definite though not yet quite positive character. Our examination shews that Q apparently knows nothing of Jesus as Son of God, as the Lord in the religious sense, or as the promised Messiah. The nearest approach in Q to the question of the Messiahship of Jesus is in the passage giving^{-ing} the reply to the Baptist's inquiry. According to Strack-Billerbeck (1922. S:593) healing from all the ills lost by Adam's fall, was expected in the Messianic era, but thereby "the days of the Messiah would reach only the height of the time of the Law-giving on Sinai; for there also was Israel free from illness and death." (see also p.120 supra). Q knows nothing of Jesus as the expected Son of Man and this in such a manner as leads to the conclusion either that these questions were not definitely present in his mind or in the locality where he was writing, or else that he regarded them as relatively unimportant. The Jesus of Q is simply not vitally concerned with these issues.

In the same way he makes no reference to scripture either on the side of Jesus' attitude towards it or on the side of what he himself conceived to have been

(Chapter X. Section 1. The Verdict of Q).

fulfilled by Jesus, while the general bearing of Jesus is very independent of the ordinary Jewish method and tradition~~d~~emphasis. He has a widely different outlook and finds elsewhere the things essential to life, inner rather than outer, in nature rather than historical records. In presenting such an account Q can hardly have regarded the fulfilment of scripture as vital to understanding Jesus or His message.

He records miracles both as done by Christ and in the form of supernatural phenomena, though this last in a very meagre and negative manner. In regard to the former he attaches no apologetic significance to them in any way (cf. also Lk.X-20) which both Stanton and Streeter regard as possibly in Q, though definitely excluded by Harnack and Klostermann), and he uniformly presents Jesus as shrinking from any publicity or notoriety which they may inevitably involve. They are incidental to His real ministry and are occasioned by sympathy, pity, or other humanitarian motives. Thus Q must surely have felt that the picture he had to present, or the record he was making was indelible, indubitable or sufficient apart from the apologetic value of miracles.

The authority of Jesus, as Q felt it, appears

(Chapter X. Section i. The Verdict of Q).

to have been founded entirely upon two main considerations. The first was the religious experience of the Christian people with whom he was directly or indirectly acquainted, and the second was the bare record of what Jesus said and did.

At the date when Q was first written, of course, many people must have still been alive who had seen and heard Jesus Himself, and we may perhaps be permitted to conjecture, not very hazardously, that a fair proportion of the acquaintances of Q within the Christian community were such eye-witnesses. This fact, however, need not be understood to mean that they would supply tacitly and out of their own knowledge what they felt was missing from Q especially in regard to the more theological matters such as Jesus' Sonship or Messiahship and the like. If there had been in its own circle any serious consciousness of Q as thus gravely defective we should have real difficulty in understanding why it came to be incorporated practically in its entirety first by Mt. and then by Lk. Q must surely have been held in great repute in some important community or it would have been more neglected.

What the fact of many living eye-witnesses does imply is rather that Christian opinion was still in a dis-

(Chapter X. Section i. The Verdict of Q).

ingenuous stage. The implications of their own impressions and experiences, and of the records in Q were relatively undeveloped. The simple but glowing memory and the bare but graphic record were in themselves sufficient for their needs.

We are not able to analyse at this stage the positive content of their memory or experience apart from what may be gathered from N. T. records, and it is no part of our immediate task to attempt to do even this. But the positive content of Q lies open to our inspection.

Jesus is presented to us as a prophet, and as such in His own right. He was the object of love by what He was in Himself, and by the intrinsic merit of what He said and did. Far from there being any sense of lack in this presentation, or any feeling that the foundation for His authority was too restricted or frail, there is exhibited an almost explicit joy and an abundant eloquence in making the record. Q speaks at best haltingly when we refer to Him on other important matters, but on this **it** is at home. **It** presents Jesus with astonishing/graphic ease. **It** reveals Him speaking with unexampled ethical insight and creative power, power not only to enunciate new truth, but also to awaken immediate response in the

(Chapter X. Section 1. The Verdict of Q).

dead or sluggish souls of those who read Him to this day. The record of such portions of the Sermon on the Mount as he presents is a sufficient example.

Nor must it be thought that Q portrays Jesus as merely an ethical teacher. He is a prophet preaching the gloriousness of a God whose goodness, love, righteousness and patience exceed the limits of human thought. And His personality is such that it authenticates His message. He thus awakens a responsive love toward God, and calls to a sense of stewardship which is of the last majesty and exaltation. There is simply nothing else to say on these matters. The subjects are exhausted. Anything further can only be in the nature of commentary or practical applications.

And yet Q does not present Jesus as speaking merely out of the fulness of His own heart or the richness of His own blessed intuitions. Jesus has His eyes upon both history and nature. (cf. Lk.X,13ff, XII,22ff. XIII,13ff) He bases Himself equally upon the proper expression of human instincts, and upon events common to the constitution of society and family. (cf. Lk.XI, 9ff, XII,34ff, XVI,13). He is a prophet to whose sympathetic insight there is no bounds, to whose joy in God

(Chapter X. Section i. The Verdict of Q).

there is no limit, and to whose power of appeal and of inspiration there is no measure. He makes life, the world and God appear as a simple unity in which a man can feel that life is really worth living. And that is salvation.

Thus Q gives us a fairly complete and life-like description of the personality of Jesus. He has a definite answer to the questions "Who is He?" and "What is the source of His influence?" and "What is the nature of His authority?" The answers are: He is a prophet, and His Authority is purely personal. His significance is primarily in His profound insight into the nature of God and the world, and His equally profound understanding of and sympathy with both the individual souls and the meaning of society, It depends upon His power of awakening an ethical response to the challenge of life, and of passing on to others the flame of love to both God and man which burnt in His own soul. And in the end it is doubtful whether there is anything in heaven, or earth, or human thought which goes beyond that priceless gift.

(Chapter X).

Section. II.- The Verdict of Mark.

In our second main source we have a literary and historical advantage in so far as the original autograph has been preserved substantially in its entirety, and in so far as we know with fair certainty that it was published in Rome about A.D. 60. Thus we have some knowledge of the general conditions under which it was written, and of the demands it might well have been designed to meet.

The capital of the Roman Empire enjoyed an atmosphere widely different from that of Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem or of any of the neighbouring cities with varying large proportions of Jewish inhabitants. In Rome religion was strongly syncretistic. Judaism was at best only one of many faiths; at worst it was a hateful and impious creed. The sanctions of its peculiar tradition and its sacred books were simply unknown to the vast majority of the people, and must have been considerably ameliorated or liberalised among the Jewish community itself.

The Christian church in Rome would be a mixed group of Jews and gentiles of various nationalities, mostly of the poorest classes. It would consist of the more

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

open-minded Jews and of the more earnest-minded gentiles. The Pauline influence must have been profound, and, if tradition can be trusted, the Petrine influence must have been of equal or even greater moment. For our purpose the main significance of these factors is in the consequent implicit or explicit demand for an apologetic for the faith, an apologetic for the most part of a more external character than would be felt necessary in a region where, as in Palestine, a strongly ethicised and refined spiritual standpoint in religion was widely appreciated. On the other hand, the simple community as a whole would be content with a fairly dogmatic presentation of the new truths.

In addition the well known Roman interest in biography might be expected to operate to some extent especially when large numbers of converts and 'inquirers' were totally unacquainted beforehand with the historical figure of Jesus.

Thus in approaching our second source we are in an advantageous position from many points of view, as compared with our relation to Q. What then are the characteristics of Mk. taken as a whole? It is ostensibly biographical but it is not a biography, for there is no real chron-

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

ology of events before the last week in our Lord's ministry, and when He first appears on the scene He is already in the full flush of His manhood. Nor is there any analysis of persons or circumstances. It is rather a biographical account of some important features of the ministry of Jesus (1) The outstanding interest is in the last week of His life and particularly in the story of His trial and Crucifixion. Sketchy, if graphic, meagre though vivid, chronologically confused yet historically authentic up to this point, Mk now becomes detailed, fairly chronological and more definite. His account is as full as that of Jn. which is the only other independent account extant.

Whatever may have been the reason for this proportioning there can be no doubt that it well served a certain apologetic interest. It can scarcely have been that Mk noted down everything that Peter knew about the earlier ministry of Jesus, but rather that the important thing was to know how this Jesus whom they preached was brought to a criminal's death; how He met it; and what took place immediately afterwards. Practically one half of the entire document as extant is occupied with this in-

(1) Wendland. 1912. S:261f.

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

terest, and it is not to be forgotten that a portion, of unknown extent, of that very section has been lost. Thus it is well within the compass of our data to say that the chief purpose of our second main source is to shew how Jesus met His death. But this is practical apologetic of the most cogent kind. And taken as a whole its effect inevitably is to sharpen the contour in the delineation of the personality of Jesus. After all, meeting one's death, especially if, as in Mk. much of the path that will lead to it is perceived beforehand, is the greatest test and the clearest revelation of the character of the sufferer; nor is there anything else which in fact can yield a fuller sympathetic conviction in the observers. That "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church" is but an illustration of the experience involved.

But the point to be noted is that such a story would enhance above all else, especially at the time and place of its publication, the personality and the personal influence of Jesus. All deductions or theological superstructures are secondary and subsequent. The Divinity, the Lordship, the Messiahship, the fulfilment of prophecy are each and all valueless and indeed worse

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

than valueless doctrines except as they are built upon the over-awing and supreme qualities in the personality of Jesus. Assured that Jesus was the biggest and the best man in human history our Christological speculations are on the firmest of foundations. The personality of Jesus is primary to the right understanding of all the rest, and not vice versa.

Substantially this is the case which Mk presents. What first of all strikes us in the detail of the gospel as compared with Q is that the writer has a viewpoint or a doctrine of Jesus which is distinct from that of the historical material he is presenting. He presents his story in the matrix of his Christology, though the two elements are kept distinct and not fused together as in the Fourth Gospel.

Thus he opens his record with the words "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ," and it is just possible that the A.V. additional reading "The Son of God" may be correct. But in any case, Mk. himself presents Jesus as the Christ or the Messiah. That is his primary assumption. Once or twice only in the course of his narrative does he venture a personal remark. It is not always clear what is in his mind when he does so, but something of

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

the fact that his own understanding of the significance of Jesus was absent from the onlookers seems implied in the observation "for they had not understood the lesson of the loaves; their minds were dull." (VI-52). The parenthetic remark in VII-19 ("thus . . . He pronounced all food clean") accords Jesus an authority of an ex cathedra quality as over against the divinely sanctioned Mosaic regulations, and implies something of the dogmatic position of the evangelist himself. (see Wendland. 1912.S:267).

But the material which he presents is, broadly speaking, in fairly close agreement, as far as the question of authority is concerned, with that presented by Q. It knows nothing of Jesus as Son of God, or as Lord in the religious sense, while the term Son of Man is used in the apocalyptic sense only in Chapter XIII, which is almost extraneous to the work of our author and his source (see Klostermann. 1907. S:111. Streeter. 1924. p.491). It knows Jesus as Messiah, but this only becomes a definite and explicit matter late in the ministry and by the confession which Jesus drew from Peter. Even then it is an esoteric doctrine not to be communicated because misunderstood by and, therefore, harmful to the people at large. Even the disciples require repeated and definite instruc-

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

tion in its significance which is widely different, in the mind of Jesus, from that commonly accepted, and, incidentally, very different from the role described in the 'Little Apocalypse' to which we have just referred. In fact we may say that Messiahship as Jesus understands it according to Mk is the same term but a fundamentally different thing from what the Jews commonly understood.

This can only mean that Jesus was not the Messiah from the standpoint of the Jews. He was really the Messiah, however, but only from the standpoint of an educated and perspicacious Christian opinion. He Himself conceived and created this type of Messiah and He, therefore, stands and falls by what He Himself was and thought and said. It makes little difference to our understanding of Him whether or not we call Him Messiah.

On the question of miracles we find broadly the same position as in Q. Jesus lays no apologetic value upon them. They are works of mercy pure and simple, and Mk himself on the whole regards them similarly, but there are occasional hints that he had heard of their evidential value (cf. Mk.VI-52. and especially MkII,10. Here the whole incident as reported is clear evidence of St. Mark's own attitude, in spite of the dubious historicity of the

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

record as it stands. (cf. Rawlinson. 1925. p.24f). In general, however, his attitude to them is that they served to predispose the sympathy of the people and so to produce a favourable milieu in which Jesus might preach and teach.

Like Q the Jesus of Mk draws support very sparingly from scripture or from His fulfilment of it, all of which is quite consonant with Mk's presentation of Jesus as outlined hitherto.

An important but distinct question confronts us in regard to the fulfilment of scripture as recorded in XV, 16-38 with its frequent reference to Psalm XXII. Apart from the cry of Jesus 'Eloi! Eloi lama sabachthani' it reveals the standpoint of the evangelist. He is convinced that Jesus really is the person foreseen by the Psalmist-prophet and that His experience and sufferings did actually fulfil the scripture. (cf. Klostermann. 1907. a.l. S:141). Exactly what the words of Jesus were, or even the language that He used is not quite certain (cf. Dalman. 1902. p.53f), but more is not necessarily implied than the words of scripture came very naturally to His lips in His great suffering. Without being forced, the passage can scarcely be regarded as indicating that He felt He

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

was fulfilling scripture in a technical sense. But it is not very likely that the words are historical, as both Lk and Jn omit them, and there are readings extant which weaken their force. "Even if they are genuine, it is still impossible to determine how much Jesus intended to express by them." (Klostermann. op. cit. S:141).

But when we approach the question of Jesus as a prophet and of His personal authority, we find ourselves as in Q at once with 'our feet set in a broad room.' What was before halt and tentative, now becomes expansive and free. Though the evangelist himself believes Jesus to have been far more than a mere prophet, his source presents Jesus strongly as a prophet and historically as nothing more. Everything becomes simple and harmonious from this standpoint and all that we have already said on this subject when dealing with the standpoint of Q may be said here.

The authority of Jesus is that of His own personal force, insight and faith. This feature is somewhat more explicit than in Q. There are several passages where Jesus refuses to recognise the authority with which some wished to invest Him, e.g. Mk.I-25 - "You are God's Holy One" - a term, by the way, in itself quite applicable to

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

to a recognised prophet, but in fact drawn from later Christian usage (Acts III,14). Jesus does not specifically refuse the title, but He prohibits the publication. We may similarly understand Mk.III-11f, a passage which has no parallels in Mt. or Lk, but which professes to describe the custom of Jesus to "forbid them strictly and severely not to make Him known." (cf. also V-43). But if Jesus refused to allow avoidable publicity, it can only mean that He Himself preferred to exercise influence purely on the authority of what people personally realised about Him. It must be experiential or none.

This view is borne out on the positive side by the all but uniform interpretation put on the word 'faith' in this source as personal rapport either with Himself (X-52 and V-25ff) or with God (IX,14-29). There is an element of a somewhat different kind in Mk.XI-22 where faith to some extent implies absence of questioning, but the dominant note is still that of positive, joyful, personal rapport.

Moreover Mk records that Jesus was unable to exercise any influence in Nazareth, and gives the reason for it in the well-known unacceptability of a prophet in His native place. In other words, again, Jesus carried no

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

authority apart from the general attitude of the people and from what He was in Himself. When for any reason that failed, then He failed altogether.

Thus the main outlines of the case are clear and self-consistent, but they are perhaps not quite so simple nor so self-consistent as in Q. There are occasions when something besides a purely personal authority is ascribed to Jesus.

Thus we read in Mk.X,29-31 - The Reward of leaving all for Jesus' sake. -

Peter began, "Well, we have left our all and followed you." Jesus said, "I tell you truly, no one has left home or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or lands for my sake and for the sake of the gospel, who does not get a hundred times as much - in this present world, homes, brothers, sisters, mothers, children and lands, together with persecutions, and in the world to come life eternal. Many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first."

We see that there is no necessary or purely ethical connection between the service and the reward. The Authority is of a type that is beyond the reach of criticism.

Mk.X,33-34 - The Third prophecy of the Cross.

"We are going up to Jerusalem," He said, "and the Son of Man will be betrayed to the high priests and scribes; they will sentence Him to death and hand Him over to the Gentiles, who will mock Him, spit on Him, scourge Him, and kill Him; then after three days He will rise again."

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

The detail here is quite impossible to mere natural insight, and there is no essential connection between the alleged guilt and the suffering.

The passage is conceived as if Jesus were aware that mankind was watching or the heavens were listening, an atmosphere not at all congruous with what is usual with Him. Very striking is the complete difference in tone in the passage immediately following, which deals with Jesus' reply to the request of the sons of Zebedee. (cf. especially X,40 "it is not for me to grant seats at my right hand or my left.")

Mk. XIV, 22-25, Mt. XXVI, 26-29, Lk. XXII, 15-20 - The Last Supper.

And as they were eating He took a loaf, and after the blessing He broke and gave it to them, saying, "Take this, it means my body." He also took a cup and after thanking God He gave it to them, and they all drank of it; He said to them, "This means my covenant-blood which is shed for many; truly I tell you, I will never drink the produce of the vine again till the day I drink it new within the Realm of God."

Much will depend upon the interpretation of the occasion. - whether Jesus intended to found an institution and if so what value He would attach to it. If He did intend an institution then He places Himself in a relig-

(Chapter X. Section ii. The Verdict of Mark).

ious rather than a purely personal relationship with His disciples and His authority is no longer only that of the reaction of person on person but more of an ex cathedra character.

Thus in the main while the general and important features of the personality and the authority of Jesus remain almost identical with those of Q, there is a certain tendency distinctly noticeable in the way the material is presented. One may perhaps summarise the whole by saying that Mk presents us with a Jesus who was a prophet of the highest conceivable quality, whose power and authority could not be fully comprehended by the people nor even the disciples, and whose real significance the church itself was only just beginning to realise.

Section III.- The Verdict of the Sources Peculiar to St. Matthew.

As these sources do not form a literary or historical unity it is impossible to consider their verdict as one, though it is convenient to discuss them to-

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

gether in the present section.

There are three classes of passages in these special sources.

i. Those historical records giving important parts of the Sermon on the Mount and of the woes against the Pharisees, many parables, some miracles, and other important details of the ministry and particularly of the Passion. The exact contents of the authentic document must always be uncertain so long as we have no second extant form with which it may be compared as in the case of Q. Moreover it seems possible there may have been overlapping with Q, as much of the material, e.g. in the Sermon on the Mount is in the same vein. Something will depend on the passages assigned to Q, or held to be derived from Mk. Moreover at the present stage there can be no real certainty that it is a single and definite source. But as far as Mt. itself reproduces it, we may perhaps say tentatively that the record consists of the following passages:- III, 14, 15, IV, 13-16, 23-25. V-5, 7-10, 14, 16, 17, 19-24, 27-31, 33, 38, 41, 43, VI, 1-8, 14-18, 34, VII-6, 15, 19, 20, VIII, 1, 17, 18, (IX - passages very doubtful) X, 2-6, 8, 17-23, 41-XI-1, 28-30. XII-5, 6, 7, ³⁴36, 37. XIII-14, 15, 24-30, 36-52. XIV, 28-31. XV, 12-13, 29-31. XVI, 17-19. XVII, 24-27

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

27. XVIII-3,4,10,16-19,20,23-35. XIX,10-12. XX,1-16, XXI-14,16,17,28-31,43. XXII,12-14,46. XXIII,1-3,5,8-11,15-22,24. XXV-1,2,(3,4), 5-10 (11-13),31-46. XXVI,1-3. XXVII, 3-10,19,24,25, 62-66.

The above list of passages, when combined with those given under (ii) and (iii) infra, varies a little from that given by Streeter (1924. p.198), and Hawkins (1909. p.3), a difference which is to a large extent accounted for by the passages where he differs from Harnack as to their source in Q or elsewhere. But the differences do not appear to affect the argument drawn from the sources by the present study.

ii. The more or less unhistorical or even legendary material in Chapters I and II and in XXVIII.

iii. What might perhaps be best termed editorial material consisting mainly of sporadic verses linking passages from different sources, or introducing a passage after a hiatus in the narrative. Much will depend upon the sympathies of the student, but *hesitatingly* it may be regarded as, e.g. V-1, XI-14f. (?)XV-23f. XVII-6f, XIX-15, XXIV,11-13,42. XXVI,52-54, (?)XXVII-52f, XXVIII,2-4. Possibly some others, but the matter is very tentative.

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

It is remarkable that, as might have perhaps been anticipated, the general trend of the editorial glosses, harmonises fairly well with that included in group (ii).

Thus the main material as in (i) supra, does not rank on a level with Mk, nor even with Q. It is too fragmentary. But as far as it goes its historical value and its primitive character bear all the marks of trustworthiness equally with the two main sources. What then are the main characteristics for our purpose of this document in its present fragmentary form? Like Q it is concerned mainly with the words and teachings of Jesus but with a new, and what has since come to be naturally regarded as a characteristic quality. Mk on two or three occasions refers to the parables of Jesus (cf. Mk.IV,2, XII,1), but gives only one example in each case. He is indeed quite explicit and says that "In many a parable like this He spoke the word to them, so far as they could listen to it." (Mk.IV,33).

In contrast, this source is rich in parables, and their presence it is which so largely helps to make this source of peculiar value in understand^{ing} much of the authority Jesus came to exercise over His hearers. Here

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

we have also a large number of epigrammatic sayings of peculiar value, stylistically and spiritually of the same order as those in Q. We are surely almost bound to believe that altogether in the Gospels there has been preserved only a selection of an exceedingly great treasure.

This source knows nothing of Jesus as Son of God, though it is so conscious of His preeminence that it regards Him as Lord in almost but still not quite a religious sense. There are references to the Son of Man all of which are of the eschatological character which the term conveyed in the common thought of the time, but no one from this source alone could identify their references. If it is to Jesus Himself the connection is vague to a high degree and is incapable of carrying weight, nor does it help us in any way to understand the historical authority of Jesus.

This source does not add anything to our knowledge of Jesus as Messiah nor to our understanding of His Messianic consciousness.

There are numerous miracles either described or referred to, but they are all incidental to the work of Jesus as a preacher and teacher of Israel. He builds nothing upon them for Himself, nor do the people regard them in any apologetic fashion.

The fact is that Jesus stands before us here pre-eminently as a prophet, and the authority He carries is that of His own personal insight and knowledge. He is exceedingly strong and vigorous in His dealing with life's problems. He finds in Himself and in His experience of God and the world all that is needed for Him to speak with final authority. The words "But I say unto you," are frequent. They give a peculiar vigour to His utterances, and are by no means confined to the familiar passage in Mt.V. (cf. also XIII-36, XVIII-10, XXI-31,43 etc).

His attitude towards scripture is striking. He discusses it, claims to have come in order to see it fulfilled, but, with the utmost vigour and with a personal vehemence that carries great weight, He goes far beyond it and exhausts the subject. All that He says in the great passages beginning "Ye have heard that it hath been said --- But I say unto you ---" stand out with the greatest prominence. They, with His comments, represent the highest peaks to which human thought has ever attained. If it can be claimed that some passages are more characteristic of Jesus and more exalted, and yet at the same time more truly human than others in all the in-

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

comparable epigrammatic utterances of Jesus, it is surely to these simple but powerful words that we must look.

But throughout Jesus rides lose to scripture. He treats it with all reverence but He displays, as no one else, its limitation. He fulfils 'what was said by them of old time' as they themselves could not have conceived, and then He goes on beyond. He fulfils it in no mechanical sense of falling into a place in a timetable or of a lever in a machine. He fulfils its intention, i.e. brings men into a true harmony with God. Any other form of fulfilment of scripture is, by comparison, unspiritual or even necromantic. But this is ethical, inspiring and ultimate. There is nothing beyond possible to the human soul. Now this is prophecy and revelation. It is the voice of God. Here is the kind of man for which the ages and the nations had yearned and sought, but had not found.

Characteristic equally with these immensely significant but brief and pithy utterances is the parabolic speech displayed at length in this source. It is here that we find the parable of the Tares, the Treasure in the Field, the Pearl, the net, the 10,000 Talents, the Vinedressers, the Two Perverse Sons, the Virgins, and

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

the Sheep and the Goats. The writer is apparently as conscious of their value as he is of the prophetic quality of the utterances we have just been studying. They reveal Jesus more distinctly as a teacher and as a master of didactic method. They enable us to understand why the people crowded after Him. He spoke like one who could handle His subject. He could bring ^{out} the indispensable essence of things and link it up closely with the familiar events of everyday life. He made religion a concrete matter, and He found it expressed on occasions where men were themselves face to face with the sorrows, the burdens, the fears and the hopes of the common round and the daily task. He interpreted the battle of life in spiritual terms, and indeed in terms of the highest spiritual significance. He shewed God concerned with, His will woven into, His love part of the very fibre of human life. Thereby He linked up His didactic with His prophetic quality, and thus the personality of Jesus at once suffuses all things with sympathy, gives them a plastic interpretation, and kindles them with a flame communicating itself from heart to heart.

Such is the characteristic contribution of this source and it speaks highly for the spiritual per-

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

spicacity of the first evangelist that he should have felt that it was valuable alongside the glorious contributions of Mk. and Q. The broad outline of the portrait of Jesus is the same. The position He takes to His life's task is identical. The authority of Jesus is purely personal and prophetic as in them, but he puts us in a better position to appreciate all this, especially us who have never had the great joy of meeting our Lord face to face. One inclines indeed to the conjecture that it was because the number of the eyewitnesses was growing steadily fewer, and the number of the proselytes without personal acquaintance steadily greater that Mt's gospel came to be written, particularly in its present form. However that may be, from Q and Mk and this source as combined in the first gospel we are well placed to understand how that the birth of Jesus was the greatest event in the history of mankind.

This position also enables us to understand better the material in the rest of the gospel. Chapters I and II are cast in quite a different mould. They represent a completed Christology. Jesus is accepted as Son of God, as Messiah, as fulfilling the predictions of scripture, and occupying an integral place in the cosmic

§Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Mt).

scheme as the subject of a supernatural interest. Some of the remarks which we have ventured to conjecture as possibly editorial are similar in their outlook, and in their stage of Christological development, e.g. XVII, XXVI, 53. 6f, XXIV, 11-13, XXVII, 52-54. The last verses of the gospel also are cast in the same form and reveal the same theological development. They do not explain the authority which Jesus exercised, but rather presuppose it. It is that authority, the force and elevation of that personality and life which enable us to understand the closing verses. We should indeed wonder if, in the circumstances of the time, any other change had taken place. The striking thing is not the presence of unhistorical elements, but the reverence and restraint found in these passages no less than their harmony with the spiritual life of Christian people generally. They do not jar upon us; rather they elevate us and make us feel something of the mystic music playing behind the providential order. They add their indispensable contribution to making this gospel "the best loved book in all the world."

(Chapter X).

Section IV.- The Verdict of the Sources Peculiar to
St. Luke.

Here again we have three groups of material, which are not in themselves a literary or historical unity, which, however, may be conveniently discussed in one section.

(i) The first group consists of a large amount of material which itself may possibly not be a literary unity, and which is broadly of a character and authenticity similar to the material contained in the main body of Mt's special sources. Its passages may be tentatively and in general denoted as follows, though probably owing to Lk's skill as historian and editor it is even more difficult to estimate the precise scope of his additions:- III, 1-2, 5, 10-15, 18-20, 28-38; IV, 16-30; V, 1-11, 17, 39; VI, 12, 24-26, 34, 45; VII, 11-17, 36-50; VIII, 1-3, 22, 43a, 45, 51-56; IX, 61-62; X, 1, 16-20, 25-42; XI, 1, 5-8, 15, 18, 21, 27-32, 36-38, 40, 45, 53-XII, 1, 11-21, 35-38, 41, 47-50, 52, 54-57; XIII, 1-17, 22-23, 25-27, 30-33; XIV, 1-10, 12-15, 25, 28-33; XV, 1, 8-32; XVI, 1-12, 14-15, 19-31; XVII, 2, 5, 7-22, 25, 28-32; XVIII, 1-14; XIX, 1-11, 41-44, 48; XXI, 34-36; XXII, 4, 6, 8, 15-17, 31-32, 35-38, 51b-52a; XXIII, 2, 4-16, 27-31, 40-43, 46, 48, 56.

Hawkins (1909. p.194) includes several of the

(Chapter X. Section iv. The Verdict of Lk).

above verses in his list of "smaller additions in St. Luke's Gospel," but in total he (ib. p.15) and Streeter (1924. p.198) give lists similar to the above. Much depends here as in the analogous case in Mt (see p.299f) supra) upon the precise scope given to Q and to Mk, as well as to the evangelist himself. But none of the differences between the views of the different authorities, on the general basis of whose opinions the present list has been drawn up, affects the conclusions we shall reach as to the authority of Jesus as recorded in this source.

(ii) Material of a lesser historical quality, and probably of a later date, to be found in Chapter I and II and also in XXIV-13ff. It does not follow that this material is a literary unity.

(iii) Editorial additions some of which are very brief and others of which are of greater length. Of these the principal may be very tentatively suggested as IV,41b, XV,3. XX,18. XXI,25b,26a, XXII,43f, and possibly many more. (But cf. Hawkins. 1909. p.194). It is noteworthy that where there is any trend or tendency in these presumed additions that they are in substantial harmony with the cosmogony and the religious outlook of Chapters I and II etc.,

(Chapter X. Section iv. The Verdict of Lk).

In regard to Lk's special source in the first of the above groups as already noted, we have in general the same characteristics as in the analogous source in Mt. Thus there is a large amount of parabolic material including indeed the most valued of all, the Parables of the Prodigal Son and of the Good Samaritan. But here also are the Parables of the Lost Coin, The Rich Fool, The Fig Tree, The Friend at Midnight, The Unjust Steward, Dives and Lazarus, The Unjust Judge, The Pharisee and the Publican, and one or two minor ones. There is the same quality as in Mt. but the power seems greater, possibly owing to Lk's greater literary skill. Jesus appears once more as the greatest of teachers, and His authority is that of a man who sees both the depths and the heights. It is the authority of one who 'understands life.'

His attitude to scripture is far from that of blind acceptance of a word from the past. He lives in it and with it but not under it. He feels that scripture is fulfilled not because He has come at a time foretold, but rather because the spirit of God is descending and giving freedom to the Captives and bringing to pass the year of acceptance through the preaching of a word which

(Chapter X. Section iv. The Verdict of Lk).

redeems (Lk.IV,16ff). He finds support in scripture in disappointment at His reception by the people of Nazareth (IV-25ff), in difficulty elsewhere (XI-29ff) and on the Cross (XXIII,46). When asked about human duty He quotes it (X-25ff), but when pressed further, soars far above it in sweetness, and in spiritual power (in the parable of the Good Samaritan). He uses it as a man who has learned from the great souls of the past, but who now stands upon His own feet and utters the high things with which His heart is full.

Compared with that in Mt, this source is not so strongly characterised by epigrammatic and axiomatic pithy utterance. The general tone^{is} rather calmer and somewhat less urgent. One would scarcely guess the power of invective found elsewhere. But occasionally flashes of epigram are preserved, e.g. in the three 'woes' (VI, 24-26) or in (VI-34) "If you only lend to those from whom you hope to get something, what credit is that to you? Even sinful men lend to one another, so as to get a fair return." (VI-45) "The good man produces good from the good stored in his heart, and the evil man evil from his evil." (XI-40) "Foolish men! did not He who made the outside make the inside of things too?" - which are isolated but replendent gems.

(Chapter X. Section iv. The Verdict of Lk).

There are many miracles (cf. V-17, VII, 11-17. VIII-51ff. XIV-1ff. XVII-7ff) but Jesus builds nothing for Himself on them. The people glorify God or else He bids them say nothing. These works are purely humanitarian and quite incidental to His main work of proclaiming a new message. Their apologetic value is found in the new realisation of God's grace which they may bring.

This source knows nothing of Jesus as Son of God or Messiah. Its use of the term Son of Man is a little doubtful but seems best understood as a literary synonym for 'ego.' We are presented indeed with Jesus as a prophet but with the didactic and more tender side of this activity rather than with that of the great preacher. His authority in speaking is mainly that of one "who knoweth our frame" and "who was tempted in all points like as we are." Jesus here is our elder brother who has opened up a way that leads to God."

But in the first two Chapters of the gospel there is a different level both of cosmogony and of religion. The Christology has ripened. Jesus is the Lord, the Messiah, the Fulfilment of the Scripture, the One whom the prophets had exactly foretold. The divine powers are interested in Him before birth and even similarly in His re-

(Chapter X. Section iii. The Verdict of Lk).

latives. He fulfils a place in the fore-ordained scheme of things. All this presentation of the events corresponds with the ascription which later generations were almost bound to make as they came to meditate upon the profound influence wielded by Jesus during His life and after His Crucifixion, and as they attempted to find a theory for it all.

But as this interpretation is placed as a preface to the Gospel, it colours that of the whole whether from Q or Mk. or L. We usually read the gospel, therefore, not in the self-luminant glow of the simple historical sources it combines, but in that of the theology of Chaps: I and II, which is also that of the evangelist Himself as we may judge by scattered notes that seem to come from His hand, or else to have been inserted from elsewhere because they suited His own view point. (cf. XX-18. XXII-43f. IV-41). And when the closing scenes of our Lord's appearance on earth are conceived in the same manner, this type of supernaturalism receives a final confirmation. But if we keep our eyes firmly fixed upon the picture presented to us in so harmonious and mutually complementary fashion by Q, Mk, "M" and "L," gradually

(Chapter X. Section iv. The Verdict of Lk).

the grandeur of the personality and the real nature of our Lord make themselves felt in their proper majesty, and we realise that of a truth in knowledge of Him lies our peace.

Section V.- The Verdict of St. John.

As we have already said, and as is so well known, we have in the Fourth Gospel an apologetic for Jesus as the Son of God rather than the evangel of a faith. The historical datum though present lies in the background. The purpose of the writer is not to present new historical facts so much as to give a right understanding of the significance of Jesus, His words and His works. (cf. Strachan. 1925. p.32).

John's method is dogmatic. He tells us what Jesus is and adduces proofs. He is the Son of God. He is also the Son of Man, i.e. He is a heavenly being bearing a title with a special connotation as also a representative man. He is the Messiah, and is fully conscious of the fact. His Messiahship is regarded as really self-

evident except to the perverse, and the authority it carries is quite ex cathedra. There are very few explicit references to scripture except those adduced by the evangelist himself. Miracles abound and are regarded in a manner not historically met with in any of our other main sources. They are regarded as the express proofs of the divinity and the Messiahship of Jesus. Indeed this is really the only interest that Jesus has in performing them, sometimes even to the exclusion of humanitarian motives (cf. Jn. XI, 6, 15). Quite explicitly Jesus Himself lays no personal value on them. They are done only and always predominantly for their apologetic value and not primarily for the relief they afford to sufferers. So marked is this in the case of Lazarus that one is made to pause. The character of Jesus is presented in a manner that clashes strongly with our knowledge of Him in the nobility and sweetness and courage of His sympathy.

The question, therefore, arises whether this is a true portrait of Jesus and this His authentic attitude towards miracles. The answer is not in doubt. In view of the unanimity of the great early sources we must say 'no.' Rather, what we have here is a kind of vaticinium
^

(Chapter X. Section v. The Verdict of John).

ex eventu. One may perhaps suggest that the evangelist is quite aware of Jesus' own attitude of indifference to any authority based upon miracles, but He is also aware of the very different attitude among the people particularly of later times. He therefore describes Jesus quite explicitly as feeling self-sufficient without them, but as intending to support the weakness of the people by their aid. Thereby, however, the evangelist robs the miracles of their human value and Jesus of ready sympathy. History is sacrificed to apologetics.

Nevertheless as we saw in our categorical study (cf. p.270ff supra) the fourth evangelist bears much involuntary testimony to the personal authority of Jesus. His own main interest may lie elsewhere but he hints at the great personal power of our Lord. There are no fewer than six passages which refer to Him as a prophet all of which carry an authentic note. There is only one clear reference to Him as Lord in the religious sense, and even this is in the supernatural twilight of the period between the resurrection and the ascension. No one can pretend we have simple history or any certainty in regard to a particular utterance. Whether we have anywhere the ipsissima verba of our Lord is doubtful, but

(Chapter X. Section v. The Verdict of John).

there is much here that breaths with the authentic air once blowing upon the hills of Galilee and the valley of Jordan. The conversation with Nicodem^{as} (III, 1ff) and with the Woman at the well (IV, 7ff), the sayings about the living bread (VI, 32ff) and the living water (VII, 37), the parable of the Vine (XV, 1ff), the door (X, 1ff), the faith of the passage beginning "Let not your heart be troubled" (XIV, 1), reveal a new but authentic note in the ministry of Jesus.

In spite of all the disputes to which Jn refers - and every page contains some of them - the tone of this gospel is calmer. There is depicted the serenity of the soul of Him who lived in the bosom of the Father (I-18). It is probably the deep lying and untroubled serenity of Jesus in the face of much misunderstanding and great perversity, which makes this gospel the refuge of the weary and the heavy-laden, the disillusioned and the hungry hearted, in short of those who by nature or by circumstances have been driven to seek a mystic union with Christ in God and apart from all the world beside.

The authority of Jesus as given us in this gospel is the authority of a prophet. It is that of a

personality, whose immense significance has been linked up with the great background and the broad sweep of things, where the single individual soul counts and feels it counts for nothing except it be in communion with the all-pervading Spirit of God. When in such communion, however, there is nought on earth which can destroy its peace. Jesus is the life and the light of men (I,4). He gives us entry to the Father (XIV,6), He can keep all who have been committed to Him (XVII,12ff). Knowledge of Him is itself eternal life (XVII,3). He can impart the Holy Spirit both by His very breath (XX,22) and also by sending Him when He reaches His home (XIV,17). Salvation and peace, peace here and hereafter are found in just believing that He is the Son, the Christ, and in finding life through His name (XX-31). This is authority, but it is the authority which can only be rightly exercised when one has fought the good fight and finished the course. It is not the authority Jesus ever sought or felt in the days of His flesh, but it is the authority which gradually grew as the church lived and battled, and as saint after ageing saint found that He was indeed, "able to keep all that they had committed unto Him." (II Tim. I,12).

(Chapter X. Section v. The Verdict of John).

Summary.

Having thus examined our sources, we find they differ in certain important respects, but all are agreed in holding, as a fundamental datum, that the authority of Jesus is based upon what He was in Himself. Their differences from this view are not contradictions of it but developments, all of which can be readily understood on the simple assumption that the early Christians attempted to account for the mighty experience through which they had passed. And such attempts were inevitable as the new faith and the new experience of Christian redemption spread in the Hellenic and Roman world.

For it was a true redemption, and not a mere unio mystica with a Godhead. It was guaranteed by the joy believers experienced in common with many others who had received salvation in the rites attaching to one or more of the many cults with which the religious world then fermented. (Wendland. 1912. S:137). It was guaranteed also by the superior ethical power they received, and not least by the experience of harmony within and without. They felt they now understood the world.

(Chapter X. Summary).

They felt they had a solution for its problems (A), and could find a satisfying purpose in their actual life. They could link everything up with what they might hope for in life beyond the grave. The drabness and the purposelessness, the misery and the futility of life were gone while yet outer circumstances remained what they were. Many a one could say with the apostle Paul "To me life means Christ, and death is gain." And that experience is the experience of redemption.

But such an experience demanded explanation, and the demand became more insistent as the first generation of Christians, a large proportion of whom had been eyewitnesses and actual hearers of Jesus, gradually died out. The developments found in the different strata of our gospel records are just such as we would expect to find in devout communities of true believers. They are marked by insight and restraint. They are sound first-attempts to state a doctrine of their faith. They assume and imply both the greatness of the experience of believers and still more the unequalled majesty of the

(A)
 Justin Martyr's "Discourse to the Gks." Chap: V.
 "Hortatory Address," III seq. "Trypho" II-VIII.
 (Engl: Trans: in Ante-Nicene Library) are worth
 consulting on this point.

(Chapter X.. Summary).

person of Jesus. The developments of doctrine found within the gospels thus become perfectly understandable in themselves, and they support the truth of the position we have been compelled to adopt as a result of an examination of all the primitive sources which are authentic and independent as far as we can trace them back.

Thus everything we have discovered points in the same direction, that the authority of Jesus is rooted in the greatness of His personality and in the profound depth of His immediate experience of God.

CHAPTER XI.THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS.

Having thus examined in detail under different categories the witness of the various Gospel sources, we must now attempt to combine them into a single concrete image. For we would see not Jesus in any one aspect, as Son of God, or as Messiah or as Prophet. Nor can we be content with seeing Him from the point of view of Q nor Mk. nor any other of the great historical sources. We would see Jesus as nearly as possible for ourselves as the whole combined primitive record reveals Him. And so we repeat the question propounded at the beginning of our detailed inquiry and ask, "Jesus of Nazareth, who was He, what was He like, how did He really influence the people of His times? How would He have affected us if we had been among those who were familiar with Him as He moved among the towns and villages of ancient Palestine?" We cannot presume satisfactorily to answer these questions in all their detail, nor is it to our purpose to attempt to do so. Let us consider the questions from the point of view of the power He exercised over men.

Few people who began their acquaintance with the records of Jesus by reading the sources in the order

we have adopted, would surmise the immense significance which has been attached to relatively isolated passages in the course of the history of dogma. While not denying the importance of miracles, or of the testimony of supernatural phenomena, they would surely find it difficult to believe that upon the question of their unqualified acceptance has often hung the fate of Christian men and women.

Similarly aware of the existence of a Jewish tradition of the Son of Man and of some amount of indefinite Messianic expectation among the people, they would find it hard to believe that much recent scholarship has raised this issue to the supreme place and has made it the criterion of 'stantis aut cadentis' of a right understanding of the history behind the gospel narratives. They might perhaps think it singular that the question of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus was even to-day frequently a touchstone of worthy and orthodox Christology.

Much the same could be said of the dogmas of the Lordship or the Sonship of Jesus. The fact is that our earliest recorders seem to have been almost unaware of the existence of a pressing issue in regard to one or other of these points.

(Chapter XI.) The Personality of Jesus.

Our synoptic sources give us relatively little material upon which to elaborate a Christology but relatively abundant material for bringing us face to face with Jesus. Their object is undoubtedly to keep the memory of Jesus vivid. Our difficulty in attempting an estimate of the personality of our Lord is not in drawing out the consequences from a few passages, or finding the exact metaphysical-ethico-theological implications of an incidental event or utterance, but rather in catching the original significance of each passage. We must discover their proper force and glow, their first value and weight, their originality as over against the thought background and the customs of the ancient world, especially of ancient Palestine.

It is scarcely possible to say that Jesus comes before us in the first instance as a smiling, winsome, mystic, with dreamy eyes. (Renan. Engl: Trans: 1888. p.25f). What strikes us is rather the extraordinary naturalness of Jesus. There seems nothing forced, nothing assumed, nothing 'difficult,' no arrière pensée, no mere enthusiasms or points of view or faddish preferences, no obliviousness to things worth noticing, no lack of balance in judgment or taste or affectation or personal habit. He is natural almost to the point of being unnatural. He is gentle; but the gentleness is a

natural self-expression and not a calculated and habituated self-restraint. He is magnanimous, but not of policy. He has not thought it out. He is magnanimous because magnanimity expresses His nature. He feels it. He believes in God, but not as a result of conning His providence in history, or working out the systematic implications of the immanence of God in the universe, but because He has sought and found God in prayer and personal communion, because He knows and trusts Him as a man knows and trusts his friend, and because He can see His handiwork and His characteristic personal activity in the events of ordinary nature, and in the lives of men.

He exhibits wonderful firmness of character and great personal courage, but not because He feels it beneath Him to be afraid, not because He has steeled His heart to meet whatever fate has in store, but rather because He feels there is really nothing to fear but everything to welcome when one is truly in line with God.

Thus His prayers have a certain remarkable reality in them. They are not literary, nor are they conventional. They are rather the natural expressions of a man who feels a need of taking further counsel with One whose wisdom is as loving as it is exalted, and they ex-

(Chapter XI). The Personality of Jesus.

express the need of a renewed sense of the nearness of God whose presence is both sweet and strong. His very seasons of prayer are significant. They are times of refreshment of a soul seeking rest. The great labours of the day send Him to the solitude of the night. The urgent and ominous future finds Him in prayer in the garden. If any man might have lived without prayer, surely it was Jesus. In one of His exalted personality and His sense of the immediacy of communion with God, direct intuition would seem more to be expected. But as a matter of fact there is nothing in the records that is so natural or so noble as His prayers. He prays not because it is the season of prayer but because His "heart and flesh cry out for the Living God."

There is too an extra-ordinary sympathetic element in His nature. He seems to have no particular theory of society and to be quite indifferent to social distinctions. He is not even suspicious of them as such. His mighty works are not exhibitions of power. He seems indeed rather to have shrunk from doing them, and from their publicity when done. But the cry of human need never falls upon His ears in vain. He will stop a triumphal progress to help a blind man. Time and again

He risks the misunderstanding and eventually the grave hostility of the leaders of the people by doing works of mercy on the Sabbath. Simple humanitarianism outrode any concern for a mere institution however venerable and sacred. He would not seek to offend the susceptibilities of the strict sects, but doubtless many of those miracles which were performed on the Sabbath are recorded just on account of the fact that it was the Sabbath, if also because of their special significance for understanding some elements in the growth of hostility.

This general quality accounts for His attitude both to women and to children, and to sinful folk. In His eyes they are all children of God. He can see the love of God expended upon them, the purpose of God possible in them, the service of God waiting for them. And yet not that alone, He sees something valuable in their own selves just because, apart altogether from sex or age or sinfulness, they are human beings with souls. Anyone who seeks to do the will of God He regards as His brothers (Mt.XII,50). But He does not draw the circle too distinctly. The little children still too young to know anything about these high endeavours are of the Kingdom of God (Mk.X,14), and sinful women who perform simple acts just for affection's sake are assured of

an everlasting name. (Mk.XIV,9).

But coupled with all this there is a certain outstanding naïveté or simplicity of a mind without prejudice. 'Forbidding,' or 'irritable' or 'annoyed' are probably the least applicable epithets in all the world. He has no personal hostilities. Right up to the last He will argue, nay almost chaff with hostile men (Mk.XI, 27-33). Whether the cry of forgiveness on the Cross is historical or not, it exactly corresponds to His whole genial and generous attitude towards men.

In this connection we may notice how often and how insistently He enlarges on the duty of forgiveness. Contrary to the general impression we may aver that He has not a great deal to say about the forgiveness of God, and still less to add to what is to be found in the Old Testament on this great subject, (cf. McGiffert. 1924. p.7ff). But on forgiveness as between man and man He is emphatic. It is here indeed that we find some of the most characteristic utterances of the gospels (cf. Mt. XVIII,22; V,23; VI,14f). And it cannot be denied that Jesus has won His case. A forgiving spirit is what is commonly meant by a Christian spirit, and nothing so readily gains the reproach of unchristian as the cherishing

(Chapter XI). The Personality of Jesus.

of a bitter and revengeful temper.

But the forgiveness Jesus enjoins is different from the balanced and calculated amendment followed by a return to the status quo ante, as found inculcated in much Rabbinic literature (cf. Joma. qd Strack, VIII,9 see also Joma, edited by P. Fiebig. Tübingen. 1905.p.28f. Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:795f; McGiffert. 1924. p.9). Nor is it the supercilious indifference of Aristotle's highminded man. There is the element of love in it (Lk.VII,47) and of reference to God (Mt.VI,14f) and of ordinary human prudence (Mt.V,23). But above all its characteristic is a big-minded geniality which prizes the maintenance of goodwill more than an artificial concern for one's personal dignity. (Lk.XV,11ff. esp: v.20).

All these qualities and many others that could be described combine to form an outstanding winsomeness of personality, and lend a magnetic quality to every word every action, and to His very bearing. One must add to them the effect of His healing work, though the precise nature of this effect can be easily misunderstood if we adopt a standpoint at the bidding of some theological assumption. Rather we might well agree that their effect on the attitude of the people must have been closely analogous to that produced by our medical missionaries in

in India and China at the present day. These facts give us the clue to the place of miracles in the life of Jesus. They are predominantly works of mercy, and apart from their psychological effect on the attitude of the people have no apologetic value. Nor are they signs of the dawn of the New Age as has of recent years been submitted, (cf. Scott.E.F. 1911. p.113,150,153), or similar miracles wrought by the Jews would require a similar explanation (Mt.XII,27. cf. also Fiebig. 1911. S:13,23, for details even of raising the dead, stilling a storm, etc, as wrought by Jews in the age under review). That Jesus laid no apologetic value upon His miracles (cf. p. 152 ff supra) is a witness to the outstanding power of His personal influence over the people.

We must next take into account the extra-ordinary power of His simple, graphic and eloquent speech, lighting up dark places, linking up everything with blessed thoughts of God, cutting clear pathways through the jungle of traditional precepts and instinctive feelings.

Of still greater importance was the high and final quality of the content of His teaching both about God and man, life and death, the world and the hereafter; - high and final and yet within reach of a simple soul

(Chapter XI). The Personality of Jesus.

hungering for salvation (Mt.XI.28f). Most important of all, forming at once the basis, the background and the key of all that He said was the energy of His own personal faith. This faith was unique. Its scope was manifold. It was founded in God, but it had far-reaching applications. It was also rooted in His own personal experience of life in all directions. It was faith in God, in Himself, in human nature, in the providential order of the universe, in the best elements of the Jewish tradition, in the future still unreached and uncreated but within the compass of God's power and of man's consecrated soul. The vigour and the unity of His faith, His purpose and His character are testified to in what He accomplished, not in a long life like Gautama's, but in a few brief months. "The spiritual power that broke up the old pagan world and founded a new, is here compressed into a single volcanic point." (qd. Forsyth. 1909. p.64). If one can catch rather more than a mere glimpse of the significance of all this, then he begins to feel something of the authority which Jesus exercised upon His hearers and observers and which was such that even the very next generation found that a new category of nomenclature was needed adequately to describe Him.

(Chapter XI). The Personality of Jesus.

And yet His personality, like that of every other man, was something more than the sum of His character and His natural gifts. There is also a certain unique force. Personality is, of course, unique in every man in some sense. Even a soldier in a marching regiment is still a unique individual determined by his own volition and moving ultimately in his own peculiar way. But the uniqueness of Jesus seems more qualitative or definitive. He possesses a certain power that is not disturbed in its quiet but relentless operation by external considerations of any kind. Thus, when men question Him, before long it turns out that He is questioning them (cf. Lk.X,29 and 36) There is a certain purity and loftiness combined with a personal sympathy and directness that lead to a kind of normal arraignment, (cf. Simpson. pp.33f,52). It is this rather than the nature-miracle which enables us to understand the cry of Peter "Depart from me for I am a sinful man." (Lk.V,8).

Again, the utterances of most men express an opinion largely charged with an arbitrary element. St. Paul is aware of this and is careful to guard some of his views by expressly noting they are his personal opinions and not those of the Lord. (2 Cor:XI,17, I Cor:VII,25). He is not prepared to see them endowed with a false uni-

(Chapter XI. The Personality of Jesus.

versal validity. We commonly allow for this arbitrary element in estimating the value of a person's utterances or deeds. But in the case of Jesus, the very reverse is to be observed. We never have to 'allow for' the personal element, but to take it more seriously into account. Nay His words take us beyond themselves and bring us face to face with a universal. We feel as if God Himself were speaking. (cf. Inge. 1909. p.81. Moffatt. 1912. p.173. Weinel. 1910. S:32f). "We do not merely come to Christ through God. It is truer to say that we find in God Himself nothing but Christ" (Herrmann. 1906. p.32). Something of the structure of a spiritual universe is being revealed. There is a certain finality making itself felt. When Jesus speaks there is nothing to add. The subject is exhausted.

There is this further observation, the words of Jesus identify themselves with the messages of God, and also in a wonderful manner with our own inner selves. They bring to light not only the self that is, but the self that ought to be. He can make the ideal the real. We feel we would like to have said what He says just because He expresses what we really are at bottom and what we really can live by (cf. Berguer. 1923. p.123).

(Chapter XI). The Personality of Jesus.

We are made conscious of being "divided, wrong, inferior and unhappy," (James. 1902. p.139), and we experience at the same time a sense of quickening of inner power. There is a stimulating or positively creative element in Him. He is the 'fons et origo' of that great succession of Christian folk whose lives made Augustine exclaim "One loving heart sets another on fire." In this quality we find an indispensable factor in His personal authority. From one point of view personal authority is precisely this imparting of power. Merely to quell, or to inhibit, or to restrain, exhibits the same quality, but with a more negative sense. But to change, to stimulate, to give new will, to create new power, to introduce to a larger life, - that is the positive and the supreme test of personal authority. And that is what we find as nowhere else in Jesus of Nazareth.

"There can be no greater developments of personality," says Forsyth (1912. p.322f) "than that represented by the slow conversion of a rude fisherman to a great apostle, of the Galilean pilot to the writer of I Peter. And that was done entirely, not by the development of the private judgment, but by the growing subjection of every thought to the authority of Jesus Christ." (cf. also Weinel. op. cit. p.83). Forsyth's

(Chapter XI. The Personality of Jesus.)

statement expresses an important truth, but it should be pointed out that 'the growing subjection of every thought' was collateral with a growth of personal freedom and grace. Peter was apparently better able to exercise his private judgment after his subjection than before, as we see when we compare, e.g. the episode of Cornelius with that of Peter's reproach to Jesus in regard to His prediction of suffering. At least, as he became more subject to Jesus, he was less bound by mere tradition. He was indeed a new man. St. Paul insists strongly upon the same point in his frequent references to the freedom of the gospel, or the freedom he enjoys in Christ, (Rom.VIII,21; II Cor:III,17).

The person of Jesus exhibits the creation of "a new genus of humanity" (H. S. Chamberlain. 1909. Vol.I. S:239), whose platform is no longer the world though he is not a stranger there. Jesus' citizenship is of heaven and with God though He is not far from any one of us. There is a new empire within gained by a new independence and mastery of things without. There are new values everywhere and with them a new sense of the meaning of life and of victory. An element of triumph takes the

(Chapter XI. The Personality of Jesus.)

place of the pervading pessimism. There is a sure foundation for the struggle of life, and an inner conviction that we can work together with God whatever our circumstances. The life of Jesus "constitutes, we are convinced, the point of departure and the most powerful force that has ever been given to human individuals to assist them in affecting the sublimation towards which they aspire. What was lived here does not die." (Berguer. 1923. p.64). It is the individual experience of passing "from darkness into God's marvellous light," which is conveyed to us in the person of Jesus.

(Addendum) The position reached in the last paragraphs, brings us face to face with the metaphysical difficulty of subjectivism. How can the mere impression of compulsion be of final validity? How can the feeling of compulsion by one personality over another furnish any guarantee of its right to do so? What are its sanctions?

Our reply is that there can be no sanctions beyond the experience itself. For this is not a mere blind feeling of compulsion and of acting against one's will. There is the experience of the will itself being freed really to will and to reach after what the whole of the self desires. There is a feeling of peace and inner harmony or satisfaction, and of power. There is the sense of a plastic, reciprocal communion with all that constitutes the universe with which we are in contact. Our reason is not silenced, it is satisfied. The different elements of our experience support and supplement one another in an ever growing circle. (cf. Galloway. 1924. p.264-6).
Amid all the changes of experience there

is a changeless self to which we can refer everything or we are lost in both hopeless pessimism and unrelieved scepticism. But "the practical and moral spirit of man reveals itself as constant in the midst of the most various religious beliefs." (Croce. 1913. p.145), and it is upon this constancy within the uniformity of experience without that we base our estimate of the personal authority of Jesus. There is an increasing force of conviction that we have found the key, that we really can live our life, that Jesus holds the vital secret, that our lives are indeed hid with Him in God.

CHAPTER XII.THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS AND ITS
SIGNIFICANCE FOR HIS AUTHORITY.

There can be no question that the authority of Jesus was based upon what He was in Himself, and that apart from His personality He would have exercised no valuable and abiding authority whatsoever. But we may legitimately ask how far what He was in Himself, His force of conviction, His convincing power, His elevation was due to a special consciousness that He was the Messiah long promised, though perhaps erroneously expected, by the Jewish people. The Messianic consciousness is a particular instance of the general question "In what way was the consciousness of Jesus different from that of other men, and what was the significance of that difference?" It is not quite unimportant to realise that the problem of the Messianic consciousness is really only such a special case and that the answer to the particular does not in itself decide the answer to the general problem.

Thus an admitted Messianic consciousness may be the consciousness of a redemptive function valid within the jurisdiction of Judaism, but it leaves open the question of a universal Redeemer. For the desire

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

or the need of the nations was not set upon the fulfilment of the specifically Jewish eschatological hope. They had both ethical and religious needs of their own in addition to any they may have had in common with the Jews. Indeed the Jews themselves had ethical and religious needs which would scarcely have been met if the Messiah had come quite in conformity with their hope. This is to some extent confirmed by the fact that there was no single, clearly defined and universally accepted hope which any one Messiah could possibly have fulfilled. There was a doubtless a range of needs felt in one section of the people not felt in another, whenever a new form of the Messianic expectation gained any currency. Few to-day pretend that the hope as expressed in the Psalms of Solomon was universally held, though it may be admitted it was the expression which can be most nearly applied to the life and aims of Jesus. The conception found in these Psalms may have made it possible for Him not to disdain the name, but, on the other hand, "from their standpoint the Pharisees reasoned not amiss that the marks of the Messiah were conspicuously absent from (Jesus of Nazareth)" (E. B. col.3063).

One of the most constant features associated

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

with the Messianic hope was found in its political bearing. While the Messianic era was universally regarded as a new order in which the wicked would cease from troubling, it was also one in which Israel would be freed from the assaults of hostile nations. Isaiah, Jeremiah and Daniel reproduce this feature, and all look forward to a time when Israel would be established under an ideal Kingship as an ideal nation. It can scarcely be the case that this ancient and attractive picture faded away completely from the faith of any who enjoyed the Hope even in its most refined forms. It must surely have been an abiding integral part of the conception as held by the people generally, as by the average Pharisee. After all, patriotism was a phase of religion to the Jew, and a phase associated with some of its most characteristic expressions.

But such a political element in the Messianic hope is also its limitation. The final victory of Israel meant inevitably the final defeat of the gentiles. Re-compense to the one carried with it retribution to the other. What is nationally conceived, can scarcely be universal. In short there was a certain exclusiveness about it from which it was never entirely freed.

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

This being the case, especially in the popular conceptions of the time, one would have little difficulty in appreciating His position if Jesus hesitated to claim the title however truly He may have felt it was really His. Indeed from one point of view it would speak in favour of His conception of His life and work if He positively turned aside from the Messianic hope as being both inadequate and misleading. Such an attitude on His part would not mean that He believed the part of Messiah was above Him, but rather that He clearly saw its national and other limitations, and was perfectly conscious that He came to do something far vaster, as later experience proves, than merely to fill the role of Jewish Messiah however nobly conceived.

Making the above suggestion, however, is not tantamount to holding that He may have refused any commerce with the conception. The point is rather that His fulfilling the role can scarcely be held essential to His spiritual authority among the people of His own nation, still less of the gentiles, nor need it have been essential to His own certainty either of God or of His own mission.

It is conceivable that Jesus might well have

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

adopted the same attitude to the Messianic hope as He did to the ethical teaching of the Law and the prophets. He came not to abrogate but to fulfil, and yet He did abrogate just in so far as He fulfilled them. At best they are a propaedeutic to His gospel. Both their ethics and their theology are, as it were, extended historical footnotes to the teaching of Jesus. Similarly in regard to the current and the ancient Messianisms of His day. It may be held that He both fulfilled and abrogated them. He emptied them of significance just because He Himself was in His own person all that they meant at their best, and also more in ways which they never conceived. To say that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews is surely to hold that He occupied a place both different from and less significant than what Christian thought usually accords Him.

To predicate of Him a Messianic consciousness may mean one of two things. (a) It may mean that He conceived He was Himself the very Messiah of whom the great prophets had dreamed, whom they had foreseen, or for whom the people yearned. This is to claim a very high place and to give Him a special standing in the providential order of history. In one sense, it makes Him more

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

than a mere prophet speaking and working by the force of His own inner experience and conviction. It gives Him a special divine authority which makes itself felt in the course of His life, in the nature of His utterances and in the uniqueness of His personality. It would let Him feel that in some sense He could compel the Kingdom to come (cf. Scott. 1911. p.130ff). But at the same time it makes Him somewhat less than a free agent and somewhat different from an ordinary man. His temptations would assume a different form and have a different significance from ours. His achievements His moral victories, His insight and understanding would be on another place than ours. His consciousness of God and hence His faith in God would have a foundation and hence a value all of their own. In short His inner life would be qualitatively distinct from that of common men.

Now all this may be quite historical. If so we must just accept it and proceed to the logical developments for Christology generally and for the authority of Jesus in particular, however well or ill it may accord with our views as hitherto elaborated. But we may note that it accords only with difficulty with the teaching that He was "in all points tempted like as we

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

are" (Heb. IV-15, 'R.V.) and it brings its own meaning to the problem of His sinless perfection (cf. Chap: XVI infra).

On the other hand (b) The Messianic consciousness may mean that Jesus believed Himself to have been anointed by God to do a certain special work whose form, substance and significance He would clearly conceive, but which was peculiarly His work. It was His because He was what He was by His own insight into and His own experience of the nature of both God and the world. Jesus would then believe that His mission may or may not have fulfilled that which the prophets (up to and including the Psalms of Solomon) foresaw would be needed to bring the people to a proper consciousness of God and His purpose. But it would mean, in any case, that His conception of His life's work was Messiah in the most significant sense possible, viz:- that it was redemptive, that it offered the people not the salvation for which they yearned, but which they needed. It would be Messianic not in a national or political, but in an ethical and spiritual sense. It brought the possibility of each man's being anointed by God - a universal baptism of the Holy Spirit. It would mean not establishing a supernatural

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

Kingdom by an overthrow of the natural order and the special cosmogonic creation and descent of a physical-superphysical Kingdom of Heaven from the skies or elsewhere, but the actual creating and perfecting of a sphere of human experience, and the initiating of an empirical order of human society in which God was truly King, where His will was truly done, and where His reign was inward and unchallenged, and therefore complete.

We submit that broadly speaking there are these two alternatives to our understanding of the term 'Messianic consciousness' as applied to Jesus and it is now our task to decide which, if either, is historical and what was its significance for our Lord.

In the course of the examination of our sources to discover the nature of their witness to the Messiahship of Jesus in relation to His authority (see p. 117ff supra) we found several important things. (a) In the first place, Q though aware of the question does not apparently regard it as an important issue, and the authority of Jesus exercised was independent of a decision in the matter. (b) Then in Mk. we have a clear and unmistakeable record that He did possess consciousness of Messiahship, but He never permitted it to be publicly

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

known. He built none of His influence among the people upon it and none of His ethical or religious teaching in the course of His public ministry was founded upon it. He does not teach because He is the Messiah, nor because the Kingdom is coming, but vice versa. Even among His own disciples it was only on the confession which He drew from Peter that the knowledge of His Messiahship became a possession common to the circle.

His purpose in making it explicit at that time seems to have been twofold. In the first place He wished to give a proper understand^{ing} of the term, making it very different from any conception the disciples may have held and which they may have been attempting vaguely to apply to Him. And then He wished the disciples to attain a proper understanding of the significance of the path He had decided upon and the sufferings He foresaw. At least it must be admitted that His close connexion between Messiahship and suffering altered the connotation of the former and the dignity of the latter. As a matter of historical fact His teaching on these points did much finally to remove the offence of the Cross, and to make it possible for the eleven to believe in spite of the tragedy, nay confirmed by the tragedy, that His was the

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

only name given among men whereby they might be saved. It was one of the important aspects of Christian truth which Paul eventually seized upon and developed so effectually throughout his preaching. But it is to be found first of all in the teaching of our Lord as He imparted it to His disciples during the last journey to Jerusalem.

We have then, the secure historical datum of a Messianic consciousness in Jesus. What was the exact significance which He attached to the status?

As we have already seen (p. 135 supra) any form of Messianic Consciousness presupposes a certain amount of religious experience. It is impossible to imagine that Jesus began by becoming aware in some natural or supernatural fashion that He was the Messiah or even a Messiah. He must first have had an immensely vivid and far-reaching consciousness of God as a living God and as having an immediate relation with and purpose for the world. He must further have felt most clearly the power and also the limitations of the preaching of the Baptist. If the records of His baptism mean anything they mean that Jesus received the call to His ministry then. Certainly He seems to have taken up the work which the

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

work which the imprisonment of John shortly afterwards brought to an end. (Lk.III-23, cf. also Mt.IV-12f, Mk.I-14). His power as a preacher and especially His unique qualities as shewn in His extant parables, presuppose some amount of practical experience in this difficult sphere, between the actual commencement of His ministry and the first recorded work. It was apparently in this period also that He gathered His earliest disciples Simon and Andrew, James and John. (Mk.I-14ff).

If Luke's account of His first public visit to Nazareth be correctly placed right at the beginning of His recorded ministry (Lk.IV-16ff) we have more than a hint as to his self-consciousness at that date. In any case it is diagnostic of His conception of Messiahship. He comes forward as a preacher and yet not merely as a preacher, but as one who has been divinely anointed to preach. He fulfils the scripture by preaching to the poor and also by His sense of being anointed for the purpose. The character of the Messiahship here depicted and claimed is decidedly not that of one whose main business it was to introduce the hyper-physical Kingdom of Heaven, but to proclaim the meaning of a time which God could look upon with favour. He was "consecrated

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

and sent to proclaim or to introduce the end of imprisonment, blindness and oppression (in an ethical-religious sense) in short to proclaim a year of the grace of God." (Klosterman. 1919. S:426. a.1). The consciousness of Jesus was thus the consciousness of a special mission of God along the lines of a similar experience spoken of in Is. LXI-1f or **LVIII-6**, and "with Him and His preaching the Messianic era already begins." (Klostermann. loccit).

Close inspection of this passage shews that it was by assuming the duty and responsibility that Jesus could claim status of Messiah. He was not Messiah prior to and apart from this task. If He had not undertaken this special work, if He had not answered this divine call to service, He would not have been Messiah at all. The function gave the title and not the title the function.

Further the situation we are confronted with means that Jesus was conscious of God and of the urgency of God's will in a vivid manner. He had become aware of a special and deep need in the world. He felt the need for a renewed and revitalised understanding of God and His relation to men, and for a clear utterance of what His insight made Him aware of. The impulse to speak became imperative. His sense of the nearness, the love and

the faithfulness of God, His profound sympathy with the condition of the people in the poverty of their legalistic religion, His joyful understanding of life and its meaning, worked together. He felt He really had a message. This was what also the ancient prophets experienced. His message as He conceived it, and God's will as He knew it fused into one another. The results accruing to His early ministry and the adherence of the first group of disciples must have added to the strength of the inner urgency. It became altogether supreme and irresistible. It was the will of God, and yet His own. It was His own and yet God's. He dedicated life and strength to proclaiming it. But that is Messiahship, and if Messianic consciousness means anything ethical and religious as distinct from something titular and external or the mere fulfilment of a role conferred, we see it exemplified in the consciousness of Jesus in this leading passage in Lk. It is the consciousness of a mission rather than an office (cf. Forsyth. 1912. p.94f). It is born of an inner experience rather than an outer 'call.' It was indeed a new creation. Jesus was not the Messiah of the Prophets nor of the Apocalypics, nor of the Baptist, nor of contemporary Judaism.

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

He was the Messiah born of His own soul through His own communion with God. He based Himself upon, He fulfilled and He disappointed the dreams of prophets and preachers and Pharisees and people in varying degrees analogously to the way in which His teaching derived from scripture fulfilled and yet went far beyond it.

The Messianic consciousness of Jesus lent urgency to His ministry, or rather it would be more correct to say that it was the sign of its urgency. The urgency itself lay in His compassion for mankind, whom He had come to seek and to save and who seemed like sheep without a shepherd. (Lk.XIX,10; Mk.VI,34). He felt that the Kingdom would indeed be here if He could win the masses, and the crowds that often followed Him showed that a 'mass-movement' might come at any time. And what blessings it would bring to the people! There we have the ethical basis of the urgency of His labour. We cannot conceive that it would have made any intrinsic difference to Him or to His life's work even if He had never thought of Himself in connection with the Messianic hope. But the title was there. It represented the most adequate available term for describing His life's work and His own person, yet not without great caution

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

in its use and a clear understanding of the line of life Jesus proposed to take. Apart from this understanding the title is misleading and fallacious. Jesus had no consciousness of it as involving power and claims, which He could arbitrarily exercise, or that were valid apart from their own inherent authority. Only in connection with the life He lived and the ministry He exercised as it were independently of it can the Messianic consciousness be understood. Thus in relation to the authority of Jesus it only adds to our appreciation of the force of His inner self and the power of His personality. It is the person of Jesus which makes the doctrine of Messiahship important for us to-day and not vice versa. Apart from Him it would be only of historical and literary, but not of religious value.

On the whole it must be admitted that the conclusion we have reached on this subject accords well with the other important passages revealing Jesus' consciousness of Himself. They are to be found in the confession of Peter, the Triumphal entry and, with somewhat doubtful historical value, in the Transfiguration. We have dealt with the significance of these passages in detail in our study, (see pp. 122 ff supra) and it may be

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

sufficient now merely to say that whatever consciousness of Messiahship may be implied in them, it is scarcely influences Jesus in the line He chose. He does not set His face towards Jerusalem because He is the Messiah, but in spite of it. His Messiahship is the difficulty, and it has to be carefully explained and its real meaning as understood by Him jealously guarded lest it lead the disciples into false ways of thought. But once properly understood by others it served to emphasise the spiritual significance of the path Jesus had chosen. It added, as it were, a classical sanctity to the memory of His life when the disciples came to themselves after the tragedy of the Cross. It gave them additional power in their subsequent preaching among the Jews, for they went beyond the mere re-iteration of the doctrines taught by Jesus of Nazareth, or the interpretation of them in the light of what He was in Himself. They linked all up into a powerful spiritual unity with the historical and prophetic religious experience of their nation. The disciples felt themselves in an immensely strong position, for they could do far more than speak of the figure of a redeemer of whom men had dreamed, but whose precise significance was open to disputation.

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

They were able to speak of one whom they had seen with their own eyes, heard with their own ears, who had re-created the lives of those who followed Him, and who did really fit in with and refreshingly interpret the best traditions of the great prophets. For the disciples and the first believers these dreams were no longer merely dreams. They were experienced facts of the first spiritual importance, and the proof of them was to be found in the sufferings their Lord endured, and in the present power they themselves experienced.

It seems to have been this difficulty of connecting the crucified Jesus with the Messianic hope which constituted the great moment in the factors contained in the conversion of St. Paul. The essence of His first preaching was that Jesus was the Son of God (Acts IX-20) and He made it one of His essential points when arguing with the Jews at Thessalonica (Acts.XVII-3 . "The Messiah had to suffer .. The Jesus I proclaim to you is the Messiah"). When defending himself before King Agrippa He brings it forward and says " Why should you consider it incredible .. that the Christ is capable of suffering (Acts XXVI.VV.8,23)(A)

(A) The reading is given by restoring v.9 to its original position immediately before v:23 as suggested by Nestle and quoted by H. H. Wendt. 1899. S:390f and 397, and followed by Moffatt in "A New Translation of the New Testament." New Edition revised.

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

It is implied and more than implied in many of the fundamental passages of His epistles. (e.g. I Cor: I-23).

But the point is that the identification of Jesus with the Messiah was of great importance in the spread of Christianity among Jews both at home and throughout the diaspora. It gradually evaporates, however, into a bygone^{issue} as the church becomes more and more gentile in its composition. In many places in St. Paul's letters the term Christ has lost its Messianic significance. It is a title, nay it is but a proper name which may well be used as an alternative to 'Jesus.' (e.g. I Pet:IV,1). It becomes indeed the name by which the followers of the 'new way' are called (Acts XI,26; XXVI,28), and Tacitus refers to Jesus by this name which has apparently in his locality displaced the birth name of our Lord.

This it would seem that the question of the Messiahship of Jesus was properly one of local and temporary significance only. It is however really an aspect of a larger and a permanent issue, namely, of the place of Jesus in the providential order. The important thing is whether Jesus plays an essential part in

(Chapter XII. Messianic Consciousness of Jesus).

the redemptive purpose of God. We want to know what is the authority of Jesus in the process of human salvation, in satisfying the legitimate demands of the soul, in reconciling man and God. Can we say of Jesus, 'This is the ideal of man?' Does His teaching embody the final norm for human conduct? Does He give men an ultimate understanding of God? Does He confer upon men the power rightly to live their lives and to become heirs of God? These questions penetrate into the farthest recesses of our life and have vitally to do with its deepest foundations. Upon our answer to them depends the ultimate validity of the Christian faith.

But before we attempt an answer, let us briefly examine the records of the earliest experience of the church of the power and person of the Risen Lord. We therefore turn to the Book of Acts and seek to evaluate its witness.

CHAPTER. XIII.THE AUTHORITY OF THE RISEN LORD.

One of the outstanding features of the results of our inquiry thus far, is their inadequacy. What we have gained from a close examination of the historical sources of the life and ministry of our Lord, and from the qualities of His character and His teaching, is quite unique. No such life or ministry, no such ethical purity or loftiness, nor any other personality so exalted or inspiring, in short, no other man of such tremendous significance has ever been born. Of these conclusions there can be not the slightest doubt. But it is equally undoubted that they are not fully adequate to account for Christian experience, nor do they account for the attitude of Christian faith. Both faith and experience take innumerable forms, but where there is contentment with the broad position indicated by the results we have gained, there is something less than the normal Christian consciousness. But after having examined carefully all the authentic records of the ministry of our Lord, we may well ask why there should be any inadequacy, and whether indeed what is claimed as normal Christian experience contains elements foreign to its real nature,

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

and, perhaps, added syncretistically in the course of the succeeding ages.

While admitting the possibility of such additions, our reply cannot be hesitant. For, after all, and in spite of all their unrivalled splendour, the gospels do not give us all that is contained in the new dispensation! They tell us only what "Jesus began both to do and to teach" (Acts I-1) and none has ever been more conscious than the first generation of believers that what is now contained in the gospel records was but such a beginning. To prove this statement may be adduced two significant facts. (1) that the most important portions of the rest of the New Testament were written prior to the gospels, and it was largely in the light of the former that the latter were written at all. This means that much vital Christian experience took place after the crucifixion of Jesus. And (2) there is a striking change of atmosphere when one passes from the gospels to Acts, a change which cannot be explained on the basis of external accretions, but only by the valid enrichment of a legitimate experience. And the experience implied by the record in Acts, and by the message of the epistles, is vital to our understanding the normal Christian faith of to-day, and the authority which Jesus

now exercises. In other words, the Christian faith depends directly, but only partly upon the gospel records. It includes them and goes beyond. It also depends directly upon what is fundamental to the special message of first century New Testament writings, and this completes the foundations of the authority of Jesus.

Thus it is impossible for us fully to appreciate the authority of Jesus on the basis of the Gospel records alone, but it is also impossible for us to do so without those records. The distinction sometimes drawn between the Jesus who lived among men, and the Christ of experience is gravely misleading unless it is made purely for convenience of theological discussion. The 'universal Christ' or the 'Christ' idea, to which reference was made in our opening paragraph, is really fatuous and arbitrary when divorced from Jesus of Nazareth. It may be true that it is impossible for succeeding generations of Christians to approach the Christian faith or to attain Christian experiences apart from the operations of the Christ idea, but neither faith nor experience can come to their proper fulness and certainty unless they be firmly footed in the Jesus of the gospels.

What then is the nature and the validity of

the authority of the Risen Lord? Throughout the Acts there is the consciousness that believers are in the presence of the same Jesus as before. (IV-10, II-32,36), and it is the identity which St. Paul emphasises (Acts XIII-29ff, I Cor.I-23 etc), equally with any other contention. And as has often been said, the Christian preachers were at a great advantage as compared with those of any of the cults which were beginning to flood the Greco-Roman world, in so far as they were able to appeal to the historical person of Jesus and the memory of eye-witnesses.

But here we come across a striking thing, viz: that though the apostles insisted upon the identity of the Lord they preached with Jesus of Nazareth, they do not appear to have frequently invoked the memory of Him. There are only one or two references to the Memory of Jesus, and all of them seem to be immediately connected with the Memorial Supper (I Cor.XI-23ff) which was related more particularly to the death He died rather than to the life He lived. The point is that the primitive believers did not deify the memory of Jesus, nor was it those whose memories were fullest and clearest that came to be held in the highest esteem. It is doubtful whether we have extant an autograph of the records of one of the

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

disciples. It was important, indeed central, to keep the memory sacred, but the memory was not the dominant factor in the authority of Jesus after the crucifixion.

Immediately we turn to the records of the post-crucifixion experiences, we find that this Jesus, who was formerly known and loved pre-dominantly as a prophet, and only in a narrow circle for a short time and with serious limitations of understanding as a Messiah, is now worshipped. He is Lord. To a smaller circle of Jewish believers He is for a short while worshipped as the Messiah which is, however, to be regarded only as a temporary and national form of the same attitude. But the nature of the influence He exercises is certainly not that of a memory personified and revered. There is exhibited in the records little turning of the eyes towards the wonderful days of Galilee. In fact, so slight is the trace of such a reference to be found in the epistles, that it is a matter of inference to determine to what extent St. Paul preached upon the ministry of Jesus. What we do find is rather that all the apostles of whose preaching we have any records, believe themselves in relation with a living Lord (cf. Wendland. 1912. S:260). It is in His present power that they work miracles (Acts IV-10,30) that they preach (IX-29) and that they can die (VII-59).

And this Lord Jesus is not a lesser deity alongside Jehovah, for prayers, ascriptions and references are made to Him as if He were God. If He were to be regarded as a living Lord at all, anything less would be impossible. For the first group of believers were entirely Jews and some, if not all, as later history witnesses were of a distinctly rigid and orthodox type. It was indeed their very intransigence that within a very short time provoked a crisis within the body of the growing church. But these same men are found worshipping Jesus personally and preaching Him publically with the utmost fervour of conviction. They apply to Him the same name as that given by tradition to Jehovah. They call Him Lord and worship Him as Lord. It is the same name or title as that with which many of the Jewish proselytes and especially of the Jewish Diaspora were perfectly familiar in the heathen cults and mysteries. Here the name Lord meant 'a deity' or 'a divine Saviour' a meaning impossible to any Jew. To them He must be 'the Deity,' 'the Saviour' or nothing at all and, in fact, that is the type of authority which henceforth is ascribed to Jesus. There is simply no discoverable difference between the personal

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

the personal relation to Jesus the Risen Lord and the personal relation to God. It would be true to say that what they knew of the God whom they preached and whom they trusted, was what they found in Jesus. Apart from Him they had nothing to say about God. They seem to have had no consciousness of any need of divine good which Jesus could not and did not satisfy. They found God in Jesus rather than Jesus in God.

As is well known, and as has been emphasised in the attractive researches of Adolf Deissmann this feature predominates in the faith of St. Paul. (Engl: Trans: 1923. pp.181ff; 1925. S:107-143). The apostle lives as a new man 'in Christ,' (2 Cor.V-17). Life indeed means Christ to him. (Phil.I,21,IV,13). He conceives of a Christ-mysticism (Deissmann. 1923. pp.181ff). He finds the Lord within and yet without (Gal.II,20, I Cor.I,21). He is penetrated by Him as the sunlight penetrates and warms the flowers. He breathes in Christ as he breaths in the air. He is in Christ and Christ is in Him as he is in the atmosphere and the atmosphere is in him. Christ is more than the world itself, and through Him ordinary men are more than conquerors over it (Rom.VIII,37). He makes known the length, the breadth, the depth and the height of the love of God which really passeth mortal knowledge (Eph.III,18f).

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

Indeed there seems no term fully adequate to St. Paul's conception of the being of Christ and no authority less than the divine is adequate, he feels, to account for either His conversion-experience or the labour and the powers of the succeeding years. He is glad of life and all that it has meant to him, but at length he will be glad to depart and die and be with Christ which will be far better (Phil. I, 23).

But this characteristic attitude of St. Paul betokens an authority in Jesus which he experienced in common with the older apostles, who indeed when they differ, do so not as to the divinity to be ascribed to Jesus (cf. Gal. II, 2), but as to whether one form of worship is adequate (Gal. II, 14).

Such then is in general terms the nature of the authority of the post-crucifixion Jesus. It is ethically indistinguishable from that of God, i.e. it is divine authority. But the question of questions is whether such authority as exercised by Jesus is valid. We want to know (i) what right had He to exercise such authority, or rather perhaps, on what grounds was such authority ascribed to Him and (ii) on what grounds is it ascribed to Him to-day. And further (iii) Is He the ultimate reference in all things concerning our spiritual life, and if so in

what way?

Our answer must be congruous with what we have determined to be the quality and attitude of the mind of Jesus in the days of His flesh, for it is ex hypothesi the same person and not two different persons. It is Jesus of Nazareth whom 'death could not hold' (Acts II-24).

Let us begin with the historical certainties in the events that followed crucifixion. In this attempt we are at once met with a problem of the first order. No one is able to determine just precisely what was the nature of the Resurrection of Jesus as a historical event. The doctrine of the bodily resurrection is one that raises as many difficulties as it seems to solve. No view yet propounded has been universally received, and we are faced finally with the question of what became of the resurrection body in the end. Moreover it is problematical whether the apostles themselves know anything of such a form of the Resurrection of Jesus. Certainly St. Paul places the appearance of the Lord to himself on precisely the same footing as that on any of the other occasions (I Cor. XV, 4-8), and it is of importance to note that St. Paul's record of the resurrection appearances is considerably older than that found in any other of our sources. His conception

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

of the Risen Lord formed one of the fundamental convictions in St. Paul's own ministry, and of the faith of the churches in which he laboured. And this conception was apparently never challenged in any way whatsoever. But it is what might be called an entirely spiritual conception.

The important thing is not the form of the resurrection, but the fact that the person of Jesus was alive. He had conquered death. He was as truly as ever a living person. He was as surely as ever personally present. On occasion, He became visible or audible. The usual sense criteria are probably not fully adequate, for sometimes it would seem it was difficult to distinguish between His visibility or His audibility. At least some accounts tell us He was heard but not seen (Acts. IX-7), and others dealing with the same event say He was seen and not heard (XXII-9) by the companions of the apostles (cf. re Pentecost. p. 371 infra). The root of the whole matter is in the powerful personal impression created by the living Lord Jesus upon the minds of the people concerned. Whatever other element may or may not have been present, of the entire historicity of this datum there can be no doubt, and it remained fundamental to the faith of St. Paul throughout his life.

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

The precise form of the 'appearances' of Jesus is a matter for scientific inquiry and any decision so reached will not affect the religious bearings of the Resurrection life of Jesus. What alone matters here is the established fact of the personal survival and presence of the Lord in the experience of the apostles. This is in itself a 'miracle' unique in its significance for the history of the Christian faith. But the point to be noted is that the doctrine of the bodily resurrection postulates a miracle of an entirely different order. It puts a religious value entirely at the mercy of a scientific or literary decision which may possibly be adverse. A religious value would depend ultimately not upon an indubitable personal experience of the apostles or of later generations, but upon the balance of the credibility of literary and other evidence which on every ground it is extremely difficult to evaluate. Most importantly such a basis for Christian experience, and for the authority of Jesus would be completely out of harmony with the attitude and method of Jesus of Nazareth during His earthly ministry. For He assigned no apologetic value to miracles of this character. As we have seen (p. 152ff. esp. 181 supra) He definitely declined to found any authority upon them, and

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

for a whole generation afterwards no such value seems to have been set upon them, as we know from the fact that our fundamental sources know nothing of any religious influence upon which Jesus laid any weight, and which was founded in this way. We should therefore be driven to assume that the mind of the Risen Lord was in this regard opposed to that of the earthly Jesus, if we were to posit an acceptance of such a miracle as fundamental to the authority of Jesus as Risen Lord. And we should soon be compelled to distinguish clearly between their persons to the danger if not the end of the authority of the earthly Jesus. In other words it would appear that our ultimate understanding of the history of Christ-^{ian} experience depends upon a purely spiritual conception of the resurrection and life of Jesus after the crucifixion. Thus the authority of Jesus is founded, as before, upon His immediate reaction upon individuals and upon the society of believers.

An examination of our records bears out this view. When we first tread firm historical ground after the crucifixion, we find the disciples gathered in the upper room (Acts I-13). Their mood is pensive if not actually gloomy. As is evident from the scriptural references (cf. e.g. I Sam. XVI, 7; I Chron. XXVIII, 9; Jer. XI, 20,

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

(Jer)

XVII, 10) their first recorded prayers are most significantly directed not to Jesus but to God (I-24). But what transformed the whole situation was the experience on the day of Pentecost. Henceforth they speak and labour boldly and in the open. They connect themselves and their experience immediately with scripture (II-17f) and equally with Jesus of Nazareth who is now regarded as Lord both by virtue of prophecy (v.25) and of the fact that He is still alive unconquered by death (v.32), and by virtue of the gift of the Holy Spirit (v.38). He is able to forgive sins (v.38). It is He who chooses and saves believers (v.47). Henceforth the disciples (cf. I-15) are apostles (II-42f) not merely in name (as proleptically in I-26), but as men with a message and a mission which they must discharge. And whatever they do, is done in the name, i.e. under the authority of Jesus as Lord (e.g. III-6). Nothing of all this marvellous and most significant change is comprehensible apart from the Pentecostal experience of Acts II-1ff. Conviction and power came upon them and the believers, and they immediately set out upon their life's work. And not only so, but they do it in the courage and in the manner, with the sympathies and interests that in their own way are a direct continuation of the work done by Jesus of Nazareth.

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

With all the changes of person and circumstances it is in the last analysis the same experience which we observe in the conversion of St. Paul. The outstanding fact is that his own personality is overmastered by that of the living Jesus. Henceforth he is His servant (Acts. XXII-10, Rom.I-1) and his life is characterised by that ethically redemptive activity which is inherent in the gospel and ministry of Jesus (cf. I Cor.IX-19ff) (cf. pp. 459. infra)

Such instances are typical rather than normative. Though the passages dealing with the work of Stephen (Acts VI-8ff) and of Philip (VIII-26ff) are really concerned with other matters, they reveal the same characteristic features of Jesus as Lord and as fulfilling the scriptures. But both Stephen and Philip are His servants. They carry on His work. Their object is to serve men. They are guided or inspired by the Risen Lord (VI-10, VIII-26) with whom they are in direct personal but religious relationship.

Nor is this the most striking feature of the records of the events of that period. While the Holy Spirit, often indistinguishable from the Risen Lord (X-19 cf. verse 14; XIII-2,4; XVI-6) is potent to guide and inspire believers, He speaks or makes His presence felt

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

in ecstasy (XIX,21; XX,22ff) rather than in prayer or meditation. Ecstasy and glossolalia are indeed regarded as normal signs characteristic not only of the fact that the converts have truly given themselves to 'the way,' but that the Lord Jesus has truly accepted them, (VIII-15ff, X,44ff, XIX,2ff in the light of which we can better understand the experience recorded in II-1ff). Accompaniments of glossolalial ecstasy seem to have been expected in normal cases, though nothing is said about it in the case of the Ethiopian baptised by Philip (Acts VIII,28ff), nor do we hear of it in immediate connection with St. Paul's conversion though, later, he claims pre-eminence in this respect (I Cor.XIV-18).

The appreciation of glossolalia as determinative of a right relation towards and true acceptance by the Lord was based upon the experience of the disciples in the upper room. Pentecost was a day not merely of a supernatural phenomena of noise and wind and flames. These are but words, all too adequate, used to transmit to others some conception of a tremendous soul-stirring inner experience (cf. re Acts IX,7 and XXII,9. p.366 supra). Pentecost was above all else the day when they received power, a power which they could only attribute directly to the presence of some mighty Spirit in

(Chapter XIII. Authority of The Risen Lord).

their midst. It conferred upon them energy, confidence, and understanding. They were lifted clear out of themselves into an elevation of mind and a simple directness of purpose, in which they were able to add to their number many devout people from among the crowds then present in the Holy City (Acts II,47). The only parallel to this illumination, this sense of confidence, this feeling of energy, this simplicity of purpose within their experience must have been that which they had often experienced under the magic of the personality and teaching of Jesus (cf. also Lk.XXIV-13ff). Such a parallel is simply unavoidable as soon as we attempt to realise vividly what we have attempted to summarise under the heading of the Personal Authority of Jesus (p.207ff supra). The identification must have been inevitable to the disciples as is seen in the fact that the first work of the apostles as spiritually baptised, was to go out and preach the Lordship of Jesus and the identity of the Risen Lord with Jesus of Nazareth. There can, therefore, be little surprise if ecstasy assumed the normative character we find attributed to it all but uniformly throughout Acts.

Moreover it had the advantage of being an external and objective sign, not in itself open to ques-

tion, and in any case betokening a close sympathy between the preachers and their hearers. While the preachers were the disciples, or men like Stephen and Paul who would familiarise themselves completely with the content of the movement, doubtless the sufficiency of glossolalia may be granted. Certainly it appears to have been regarded as decisive throughout Acts, and its manifestations have been sought and similarly regarded within recent religious history as in the work of Wesley, the Welsh revival and elsewhere.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that in itself glossolalia is not a religious phenomenon or at least is not necessarily and, therefore, not specifically a Christian thing. It is well known in Hindu literature and even present-day experience. "Chaitanya never asked his hearers to show that they now desired to live a life of devotion to Krishna. He waited till the ecstasies of his own devotion had convinced them of the truth of his teaching and had aroused a like spirit of bhakti in them. So powerfully suggestive were his methods that he rarely had to wait long before many were so carried as to immitate him in song and dance ... At times the san-kirtan swept whole crowds off their feet and they professed

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

faith in Krishna .. etc, etc., (A. C. Underwood. 1925. p.216ff).

And if glossolalia is not specifically Christian, neither is it specifically ethical, a fact which is probably at the root of a wide-spread distrust of typical revivalism and indeed of emotionalism in religious practices to-day. But glossolalia appears to have been discredited quite early on in the history of the church. Thus St. Paul, already at the time of writing I Corinthians, plainly prefers the normal-mindedness of prayer to exercises in the spirit which he regards as fraught with positive ethical danger (I Cor.XIV,1-19). While the phenomenon occurs in later generations it is associated on the whole with heretical and undesirable forms of the faith.

But if this is the case, if glossolalia is not specifically Christian, nor even ethical, what are we to make of the Day of Pentecost, "a day on which the Spirit of God manifested Himself through the Disciples as a power for the conversion of others" (McGiffert. "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age." p.50. qd. Underwood. op. cit. p.34)? Our reply is that the glossolalia was accidental to the conditions. It was well known in the

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

mystery religions and other cults of the type (cf. Angus. op. cit. pp.101f. Underwood. op. cit. p.209ff) and was even then frequently accompanied by ethical renewals as well as joy. And St. Paul was rightly driven to the decision to emphasise the truly ethical and spiritual qualities of the Christian life rather than these dubious but attractive phenomena, which could so easily be sought apart from the ethical and religious material which at first formed their basis. In other words, the essential thing was not the glossolalia but the sense of power, ethical renewal, spiritual elevation, fearless courage, personal freedom and immediate communion with the Living Lord.

But what it all amounts to is that the authority of Jesus rests upon the immediate personal experience of a contract of soul with soul, accompanied by ethical and spiritual renewal of a unique type tending towards an experience, the very promise of which gives an unequalled sense of personal freedom and of the sublime quality of a certain spiritual life. Once the first exuberance of Christian life was over, many things like communism and glossolalia were found to be hindrances to, rather than evidences of the faith or of the authority of Jesus, and were, therefore, quietly discarded. Everything henceforth

Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

depended upon the immediate influence of person on person as conveyed either directly by communion with the Risen Lord, or as mediated through the accumulated Christian tradition, the lives of outstanding saints and martyrs, through the ancient scriptures or the newer writings associated with revered names. But each and all of these secondary vehicles gains its value ultimately from the way it brings the individual into a sense of immediate personal contact with the Risen Lord, who exercises His own authority personally to bless, to calm, to teach, to liberate and to inspire. The ethico-spiritually redemptive interest was always the essential feature and foundation of Christian experience though occasionally associated with extraneous interests of varying importance.

The type of authority revealed in the records of Acts is thus essentially similar to what we have found in the sources of the Gospels, but it was found to be supported by voices and visions and these were regarded as of ex cathedra authority, as commonly in the antique world. But the authority to which St. Paul bows is rather that of his own conscience and understanding as he approaches his problems in the light of his Christian experience. He appears seldom to call upon a word of Jesus for justificati

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

of the gospel he preaches, but rather upon his experience of the Risen Lord in his own person, and as seen in the gift of the Spirit to the gentiles. He opposes and finally defeats Peter, and gains His point with the presbyters in Jerusalem, not by adducing a word of Jesus whose authenticity and authority all would recognise, but out of the strength of the inner logic of his own immediate understanding of the problems to be dealt with (Gal. II, 6ff). This is pre-eminently the very mind of Christ and the antithesis of the legalism of either Judaism, later ecclesiasticism or any other cult. St. Paul stands for the freedom of 'the Way,' a freedom which seems to spring from its own inner nature, and not to be prompted merely from without. His main external supports and sanctions are especially noteworthy. Though he preaches Christ and Him crucified he never appeals to any eye-witness of the crucifixion, nor to any historical memories preserved by those who knew Him in the days of His flesh. Like his Lord he goes, if anywhere at all, directly to the Old Testament scriptures even if it is true that he usually expounds it in a rabbinic, or at least not in any unusual form or with any noticeable freshness.

In general one gains the impression from the

(Chapter XIII. Authority of the Risen Lord).

record in 'Acts' that the new faith is going forward by the momentum of the personalities of Peter, Paul, Barnabus and other men like them, a momentum which is, however, derived from their immediate, plastic, mystic communion with Jesus. They feel His authority in the same way as they feel that of God Himself, from whose authority it is almost, if not quite, indistinguishable. In particular we may say that Paul feels he is working along the lines of the very nature of things and the very purpose of life and the world. He finds his faith confirmed by scripture, evidenced by glossolalia, and born out by the spiritual power of His Lord. His faith is not a merely arbitrarily personal conviction. It is rather part of the very make of things. And such a basis was as broad as the sum of his whole experience.

Such then is, in outline, the answer to the question of the grounds upon which Jesus first exercised authority as Risen Lord. We see that as far as the records go, and as far as we can read the minds of the apostles it was absolute and ultimate and divine. To them He was the Son of God. Let us now ask what is the meaning that is attached to such an ascription when we are dealing with the authority of Jesus.

CHAPTER XIV.THE MEANING OF THE SONSHIP OF JESUS, AND OF HIS
DIVINE AUTHORITY.

The idea of divine sonship is not confined to the person of Jesus. It was widespread throughout the ancient world. The Greeks were familiar with it (cf. Acts XVII-28). Their heroes were the immediate descendants of divinities, and were intimately connected with Both Gods and man. At a certain stage in Greek early history it is difficult to determine whether we are dealing with human or divine persons. Similarly, the Romans were descended from Gods and throughout their history were perfectly familiar with men who became Gods (cf. Cicero. In Catalinam III-1). The remark of the Centurion witnessing the crucifixion of Jesus "Truly this was the Son of God," (Mk.XV-39, MtXXVII-54) must also be remembered in this connection.

Nor was the conception by any means confined to the classical peoples of antiquity as is instanced in the New Testament records by the experience of Paul and Barnabas at Lystra (Acts XIV,8-13) and even by the attitude of Cornelius to Peter at Caesarea (Acts X-25f).

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

There was, further, a sense in which the Jews believed themselves to be sons of God (Jn.VIII-41) and even divine (Ps.LXXXII-6). The idea was not entirely foreign to the great prophets of antiquity (Hosea I-10). It is incorporated in Jewish genealogies (cf. Lk.III-38) and even its most extravagant form is to be found in the canonical records of the intercourse between the sons of god and the daughters of men (Gen.VI-2).

The idea of divine sonship, of course entirely separated from a physical connotation, but as applied to the rank and file is extremely common in the early Church (Rom.VIII-14,16,19; Phil.II-15; I John III-1f. Gal. III-26 etc). It is found in Athanasius, (e.g. de Incarnatione LIV,3; Second Oration. 70. etc) and it formed a marked feature of the literature on which Luther was nurtured (e.g. Meister Eckhardt: Buch der göttlichen. Tröstung. Ed. Strauch. 1922. S:9; Theologia Germanica Chap.XLI. Eng. Trans. 1854. p.141,145, etc).

Thus there are numerous instances of the idea of divine sonship widespread throughout the world, and of all degrees between a dominantly physical to a purely spiritual relationship. The fact that a man was a man did not preclude his being a god, nor that a god was divine his also being a man. These allotropisms were quite

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

familiar to current thought in New Testament times. (A)

And yet there was an element here which was strongly repugnant to severe Jewish monotheism. They themselves might in a sense be children of God and yet it was nothing less than the vilest blasphemy for any man to claim to be a son of God in the sense that he himself was divine, or equal with Jehovah, (cf. Mt~~XXVI~~-63ff). Any claims made by a man, which seemed to invade the prerogative of God were regarded with great hostility and quickly produced charges of blasphemy (Mk.II-5ff). This firm sense of the reverence due to God and of the impiety of making any divine claims was of course at the root of the attitude of the Jews to Emperor worship, an attitude which was met by special legislation in the Roman Empire. And there can be no question that fundamentally the Jews were quite right, however disputable some of the inferences which they may have drawn. Nor can we afford to neglect this attitude to-day even under the teaching of the Christian faith. What then have we to say of the divine Sonship of Jesus of Nazareth?

It is evident in the first place that in whatever sense we take it we are dealing with a metaphor. Sonship here means something analogous to, but different from the ordinary relationship connoted by the term 'son.'

(A) cf Wendland. 1912 S:123ff, 146, 149.

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

Similarly the collateral term 'father' as applied to God is not the same thing exactly as what we mean by the term as usually employed. These facts are brought clearly to light if we write the word without the initial capitals and note the change of atmosphere which is thereby produced. So familiar have we become with the terms 'Father' and 'Son' that they are almost the equivalent of proper names, and thus another meaning is given to them if instead we write 'father' and 'son' when applying the terms to God and Jesus. The point we are trying to make is that for a proper understanding of the Sonship of Jesus we cannot be content with the ordinary meaning of the term. It connotes something else. It may be the best and most adequate terminology available, but it is not entirely suitable as it stands. There are certain other elements which seem vital to the right understanding of the person of Jesus, His relation with God and His authority over us.

Ordinary sonship means 'of filial origin; offspring of a father.' This is essential. It may be frequently accompanied by similarity of appearance, character, talent, tastes or will, but such similarity is not a sine qua non of the paternal-filial relationship. But the position is entirely reversed when we speak of

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

the Sonship of Jesus. The question of His paternity may be important, and in history the highest value has attached to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth on this account. Yet, few will pretend that it is of a similar importance to the nature, the will, the character and the ideals of Jesus. The former may be regarded as not essential and even inapposite, but the latter is fundamental from every point of view. Thus we are justified in holding that in the Sonship of Jesus we are dealing with what is primarily a metaphor.

The examination of our earliest sources shewed that they knew nothing of any authority exercised by Jesus during His ministry in virtue of His Sonship, but it left open the question of His consciousness of Sonship and what that consciousness would signify to Him (see. p. 62f supra). It must also be understood, of course, that the fact that the sources themselves seem unaware of it, does not by any means preclude the possibility that Jesus nevertheless had a very profound sense of Sonship, and even that sense was of vital importance in the discharge of His Ministry. In other words, the sources record the impression produced by Jesus, but His consciousness takes us into the secret and sacred precincts of His soul. It is possible for us with all reverence yet with impartial

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

minds to enter here and record what we observe? We believe not only that we may but that we must. Jesus Himself would surely not have it otherwise, for only the truth as personally assimilated, is congruous with a real faith in Him, and with this real authority over us.

Before making the attempt let us note, however, that the conception of sonship implies that of fatherhood which is really prior. Jesus could not have had any conception of sonship except on the basis of a prior conception of fatherhood. He must first have come to a clear idea of the Fatherhood of God before He can have reached a clear view of His own Sonship. And every step He took towards a fuller view of Sonship must have been preceded by a similar step in His conception of God as Father. We may premise, therefore, that we can only hope to solve the problem of the nature of His Sonship as He conceived it and as it is significant for us, collaterally with, if not following upon our solution of the problem of the Fatherhood of God.

How then did Jesus conceive of God as a Father? Our material is rich. He finds God active everywhere. He clothes the grass, adorns the wild irises, cares for the sparrows, orders the outpouring of sunshine and rain;

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

in short the works of Nature are the works of God. But it is more than a mechanical operation of natural law merely working out what has once been ordained. It is also a providential order. God cares for the sparrows, He sends the rain and the sunshine, i.e. He is concerned in what is taking place. Nay, He is interested in the food we eat and the clothes we wear. It is appropriate to ask His blessing on a meal we are about to partake. He is so directly concerned with the satisfying of men that their anxiety in face of the violence of nature shews a lack of confidence in Him (Mk.IV,40). His relation to the world is thus quite personal, and especially so is His relation to men. He is concerned with their expressions of joy so that if these are inhibited He can make the very stones cry out (Lk.XIX,40). He is longsuffering and patient. He sends the blessed sunshine and the grateful rain not with indifference but with compassion upon the wicked man's fields, and that is why men should love their own enemies. This longsuffering and compassion of God is indeed a sign of His perfection (Mt.V,43ff).

But for all this care and sollicitude, He can be resentful. Any harm done to little children will be dealt with in a manner worse than if the offender were

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

flung helplessly into the middle of the ocean (Mk.IX,42). Any unjust attitude taken by men towards their fellows is noted by Him and will be requited in the same coin (Mk.XI,26). On the other hand He is active in helping every man to do good. God it is who casts out the devils in the cures Jesus effects (Mt.XII-28) and He will supply the strength Peter will need if he is not to fail (Lk.XXII,31f).

Sufficient has been brought forward for us to say that God as Jesus conceives Him is not at all the God of the omnipotences and omnisciences and omnipresences and eternities and infinities, however useful these terms may be for theological speculation. He is concrete, personal and immediate. His providential care, His patience, His concern, His faithfulness, His trustworthiness, His very presentments can all be brought together and summed up in the attitude and the thought which are expressed in the opening words of the Lord's Prayer. "Father who art in heaven." Thus even the word 'God' is not enough to express all that Jesus means. It is inadequate. But so also the term 'father' alone is not sufficient. At its best, even in prayer, it falls short. He is neither God merely, nor father merely, but,

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

as we find it expressed elsewhere, Heavenly Father or rather Divine Father, (e.g. Mt.VI-32, V-48 etc).

Thus Jesus understands the Fatherhood of God. How then does He understand Sonship? Once more there are many references though not all of them quite so direct as those we have just been studying. He recognises a general filial relation towards God as existing in all men (cf. "your heavenly Father" etc, Mt.VI-32), but this is by no means the full extent of the relationship possible and even desirable. There is a sense, He feels, in which in spite of this general filial relationship, men are not spiritually, i.e. metaphorically sons. But they can become such 'sons.' By loving their enemies and praying for their persecutors they follow in the wake of God and thus become His sons, but it is at the price of going beyond what is required in the scriptures (Mt.V-43f, and also Lk.VI-35). This same sense of becoming children of God is found in Jn.I-12, and it is of the essence of Christian conversion (e.g. Gal.III-26, Rom.VIII-21). In Eph.V-1 we read "Copy God, then, as His beloved children, and lead lives of love ..." which shows the essential vitality of the primitive phraseology as well as of the substantial idea.

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

Another passage throwing light on this matter is found in Mk. III-35 "Whoever does the Will of God, that is my brother and sister and mother." The filial relationship is not explicitly ascribed but it is implicit in the general phraseology. It seems to say "There is a real kinship existing among those who do God's will, a kinship which is more exalted as well as more real than the kinship of blood. They are brothers and sisters to each other. Nay, they are the offspring of those from whom they gain inspiration, (cf. I Cor. IV-15) and all alike are children of God." There can be no questioning the entire historicity of this paradoxical and daring passage, and it completely bears out the position we have found elsewhere.

Sonship in relation to God is thus of two kinds. (i) It is a general, largely unethic thing which exists just because men are human beings. But (ii) there is also a metaphorical sense with an ethico-spiritual value. It is a condition to which men can attain by doing the Will of God either as a result of their direct observations of the way in which God Himself actually does operate in nature or history, or else primarily as a consequence of their mutual help and inspiration to the same end.

Now it is to be noted in the passage just re-

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

ferred to, where Jesus speaks of His spiritual kin, that at the same time He makes clear the basis and the nature of His own Sonship. It is a spiritual relationship subsisting in the fact that He does God's Will. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." (Jn.V-17). The ethic He enjoins in the great utterances found in Q, M. and L, and so largely gathered together in the Sermon on the Mount, is based upon a wide and perspicacious observation of the ways of God as acting personally in nature. He grasps their meanings for human life and utters them as guides for conduct. The ethic He lays down for men is the ethic upon which the divine conduct itself is founded. He declares little children are of the Kingdom of God by the very nature of the case (Mt. XVIII-4), and also by their openness to receive impressions of God (Mk.X-15). And the unquestionable impression given by the narrative is that Jesus is only laying down for others what He has already fully experienced and acted upon for Himself. He found His meat in doing the Will of Him that sent Him and accomplishing His work (Jn.IV-34).

This wide-eyed and sympathetic observation of the ways of God in nature, understood as expressions of

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

a personal and immediate Will, seems to be the basis also of much of Jesus' attitude towards established institutions. He observed the sun shining, the rain falling, the corn growing, the cattle feeding on the Sabbath. Children are born on that day and mother and child must needs be attended to. Sheep fall into pits and are in danger of drowning, and men lift them out (Mt. XII-11), in spite of generally accepted religious regulations. God breaks the Sabbath, Humanitarianism breaks the Sabbath, He Himself follows in the Father's ways completely. His will was to do the Father's Will. He always did those things that pleased God or that God willed (John VIII-29). His will and the Father's were one.

Most of the textual references are to the fourth gospel but they are to passages which contain an authentic note. But the same things are seen, if from a somewhat different angle, in the earlier sources. The nights of prayer after laborious days, the peaceful sleep at sea in the presence of a raging storm, the constant reference in the parables and the epigrams to the analogy of nature, His delight in children, His patience with sinners, His healing work done at the bidding of a quick sympathy, together with the general but inevitable implications of the exalted understanding of and joyful

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

confidence in God such as we have seen He possessed, all point in one direction. They indicate an overmastering sense of a profound spiritual kinship between Himself and God. Any single word is inadequate to describe all that is contained in this relationship, but if any one term must be used then that of 'Son' does the most justice. That is the term which succeeding ages have used with various shades of meaning. In the time of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, it was felt to be not quite satisfactory and the paradoxical declaration is put into the lips of Jesus "I and my Father are one." (X,30).

But the term 'son' is more appropriate than perhaps might appear from the foregoing discussion, where stress has been laid almost entirely upon spiritual similarity and upon a complete harmony and finally an identity of purpose. This position is open to the objection that when one no longer does the Will of God, he is no longer a child of God, and that on obeying once more the divine leading, he once more becomes a child of God. The whole relationship then becomes occasional, incidental and lacking in a certain vital permanence.

This may be granted without difficulty, however, scarcely for it will be submitted that anyone can really do the Will of God, identifying his will with the divine in any

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

true sense, if it be only a mere momentary coincidence of intention between the soul and its Maker. God's will is done from the heart and not from what is seen in the synagogues or in the streets. And whole-heartedness is the firmest basis of a permanent relationship that exists within us. Besides which, it must be remembered backsliding is a melancholy phenomenon of religious experience. But it presupposes that the subject was once what he now is not. He was a child of God who has become an alien from Israel.

The term 'son' gives an essential weight to the element of permanence alongside of that of similarity, but even then its appropriateness is not exhausted. It includes also the essential idea of origin. This may be the region in which the term is most strongly metaphorical when used in the spiritual sense, but it is also the region where it is the most appropriate.

Jesus had a sense of mission. He recognised God's will and personal activity in all phases of the world round about. He felt the unity of His own will with that of the Divine Father, and He preached the gospel of a realm whose God was King. But He also felt that this mission was not of His own seeking. It had been born into

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

Him. It may have seemed at times to come like a dove from heaven as at His Baptism, or like a voice of an ancient prophet speaking directly to His heart (Lk.IV,16ff). At other times it may have given Him the feeling of being sent (Jn.IV,34 etc), or again, that He was born for a special purpose (Jn.XVIII-37). At any rate this sense of a life impregnated with an aim given from without, however completely identified with what lay within, was constant in Jesus. He had come to seek and to save that which was lost (Lk.XIX-10 ?L). He had come not to destroy the law but to fulfil it, (Mt.V-17. ?M), not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance, (Mk.II-17; Mt.IX-13; Lk.V-32), not to send peace on earth but a sword (Mt.X-34f; Lk.XII-51f Q). The above passages from all four primary sources, bear strong witness to the sense of mission which Jesus experienced. St. John's Gospel is full of passages in the same tone some of which are doubtless interpretations of the evangelist, e.g. III-17 "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world etc," but some of the others must indisputably be historical, e.g. IX-4 "I must work the work of Him that sent me etc," The references are very numerous.

The point to be noted is that Jesus had an overmastering sense of the personal presence of God in

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

the world, and of a complete harmony and union of His own will with the Divine, and also a powerful feeling that He has been sent. These three moments cannot be regarded as operating or even as existing separately within His consciousness. They form an organic whole. As a religious experience each is necessarily a phase of the others. But in that case we have spiritual Sonship, and when the experience is of the greatest clearness, the highest intensity, and occupies the entire consciousness to the exclusion or rather to the inclusion of all else, then we are face to face with what Sonship meant in the consciousness of Jesus of Nazareth. It consists in His profound experience of God in nature, in men, and in His own self. It includes a joyful sense of identity between God's Will and His own so that the truths He utters with all their convincing power out of His own insight, and the deeds He does out of His own compassion, and the attitude He takes up to men out of His own love or sense of right and worth are yet truly God's own Will. And, reaching into all the details of His life, spreading throughout its entire sweep, lending urgency and keen purpose to every hour, was the feeling that He had been sent by God (Jn. XVIII, 37: Mt. IX, 15, Jn. X, 10: Mt. XX, 28; Mk. II, 17 etc). In these experiences

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

unique in their scope and power consists the uniqueness of His Sonship. Than this Sonship, there is nothing nobler or truer or holier, nor can there be, Jesus fulfils and exhausts its meaning. He is the Son *κατ' ἐξοχήν*.

Our understanding of Sonship as here discussed harmonises completely with the view of His Messianic consciousness which we reached at an earlier stage of our inquiry. It was just because He had accepted a Messianic task that Jesus reached a Messianic consciousness (see p. 349 supra). And now similarly He became conscious of His Sonship, because of His unique consciousness of God and the world, and because of His own accepting of a divine Mission. To use a current phrase it was a dynamic consciousness, the consciousness of a dynamic experience, all-embracing, all-pervading, all-satisfying. God was near, and within. He was in God, in complete harmony and unity with Him. It was enough. Fear, doubt, hesitation have gone with all the pettiness of things. A serenity, and a power, a peace and yet a 'concern,' a mighty faith fed daily by service, by preaching, by human intercourse, and by prayer, takes complete possession of Him. He can rejoice in everything beautiful, innocent and good. He can sympathise and help wherever there is woe. He can face whatever men prepare.

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

He is able to do all things through Him whom He loves and trusts, with whom He walks, and whom He knows better than a man knoweth his friend.

But how does such a Sonship affect His authority? Most profoundly! In the first place the ex cathedra authority attaching to an office outwardly conferred is absent. It is foreign to the conception, for the authority one exercises is born out of the authority one feels. The authority of Jesus, who was conscious of His Sonship to the Heavenly Father, is founded upon the reaction of one soul on another. It has the validity of the wider experience, the truer conception, the deeper insight, the surer knowledge, the wiser interpretation, the loftier ideal, the larger unity of life, the greater sense of power, the finer type of character, the more satisfying food for the soul, the higher efficiency in moral effort, the broader freedom in the spirit and the profounder communion with God, as these almost ineffable things make themselves known between heart and heart. And because Jesus enjoyed these great qualities to the full in the natural yet eager sympathy and in the serene peace of a mighty soul at one with God, He was able to speak as never man spoke and to live as never man lived, Because of His consciousness of Sonship as we have des-

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

described it, because of His complete personal conviction behind every word He uttered, because of His complete identification of His whole self with every act He performed, and because of the entire appropriateness to their purpose of both word and deed, there was a peculiar power in His life, and that is what constituted His unique authority. He was able to communicate in unexampled degree His outlook to His followers. He was able to confer upon them something of the courage and serenity He enjoyed, and something of the glorious freedom He had won. He set their feet upon the path which He Himself trod, leading to the presence of the Heavenly Father. In short His authority was founded upon His redemptive power over the soul. His words were spirit and they were life. Under His inspiration men drew near to God and, through His fellowship they gained a communion with a God of goodness and of love.

The sense of sonship which Jesus possessed and which defined the terms of His relationship with God gave Him both the definiteness of aim and the personal certainty which are the preliminary foundation for gaining the confidence of other people. It also enabled Him to complete His redemptive tasks by imparting

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

sooner or later the conviction to His believers that they also were children of the Heavenly Father. The sense of Sonship is thus the basis of the religious authority which Jesus exercised as distinct from that which was more purely ethical. He interpreted in Himself what He meant when He said "Become children of your Heavenly Father," and so laid the foundation of a final redemption.

This position means two things. (i) That the authority of the sonship of Jesus is ethical rather than metaphysical. It is founded upon His power to redeem and to bless. His practical authority is what determines His place and not vice versa. We understand the doctrine in so far as we know personally that He is doing the work. The test of the dogma is in the Christian experience of salvation through Jesus Christ.

But (ii) the second thing is that if Jesus is the Son in this sense then it is the same as that in which other men may be. The inference may cause us to pause for a moment. Nevertheless the idea of men being divine is of the essence of Christian thought, and was indeed condensed into an aphorism by Athanasius (ΑΥΤΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΗΜΑΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΝΟΥΣ, ΙΝΑ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΠΟΙΗΘΩΜΕΝ . de incarn. LIV,3). The ethical Sonship of Jesus and that of ordinary

(Chapter XIV. Meaning of Sonship of Jesus).

men are not two distinct entities, but we can only discover the meaning a posteriori. Only when we set out on the voyage of experiment ourselves, finding our meat and drink in doing God's Will, ourselves giving our lives to seeking and saving that which was lost, and treading the road that leads to our Calvary, and walking in it as naturally and serenely as if it led to Cana, then only are we in a position to understand what divine Sonship means. The marvellousness, the unique miracle of the achievement of Jesus, His wonderful knowledge of God, and the peerless superiority of His personality are then seen in their true setting. The Sonship of Jesus cannot be understood on the prior basis of metaphysical speculation, but only after the experience and of personal redemption of the meaning of outright obedience to the ensuing demands of the Christian life. In the last analysis it is because we experience through Christ the authority of God, and find in His life the very challenge of God, that we find in Him the Son of God.

CHAPTER XVTHE MEANING OF THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS,
AND THE AUTHORITY FLOWING FROM HIS PERFECTION.

Frequently in the course of our discussion we have found it essential to depart from the self-evident truth of what Jesus taught or the immediately apparent value of the conduct He exhibited and enjoined. We have been compelled to regard His teaching and His action even when taken together as insufficient to explain the authority which Jesus exercised over the people of His time. And we may contend that the same holds true to-day.

In other words the authority of Jesus is more than or different from that of a teacher or an example. He appears to those who in any degree admit of His authority as, at least the ideal man and yet such an ascription does not seem fully to exhaust the quality of the nature which He exercises over them. In an ideal there is no compelling power beyond what flows from the fact of our choice of it. Ultimately such authority seems exercised from within our own selves, and not to flow in upon us from without.

And yet there is an element in all true authority

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

which makes it to some degree external to us. In the case of the authority exercised by Jesus this indispensable quality comes to us not as from an ethical ideal which we accept and assimilate, nor from the religious intuitions which spring into being within our experience, but rather from the immediate reaction which takes place between the person of the Redeemer and that of the believer. The element of personal reaction, interpreting the words, illustrating the religious intuitions, and adding an individually unique sense of urgency is essential in our experience of the authority of Jesus, and is sometimes indeed apparently the only operative factor. Instances are quite frequent in the course of every Christian life, for we are all faced from time to time with spiritual dilemmas. The utmost carefulness of thought seems to bring no help. Resort is made to prayer. The believing suppliant seeks only to be led by his Lord, He submits himself completely to mystic guidance. He accepts his subsequent intuition as the Will of His Master, and thus resolves his problem.

Now these experiences are completely valid and belong to the profoundest depths of the Christian life. But why is it that there is no feeling of mere ethical subjectivism? Why is it that the soul feels

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

not overwhelmed by the personality of **His** Master, but liberated as if indeed he had been supernaturally enabled to break his bonds? In especial, why is it that he feels no arbitrariness in the choice his Master has made for **Him**, but rather that it accords with the very nature of his own real self, and with the purpose of the entire universe? Why is it that ^{His} Master's choice expresses an ultimate rightness which is completely unquestionable?

The answer has to do with the sinless perfection of Jesus, and we must now proceed to examine its significance.

The sinlessness of Jesus is a dogma of high authority and was developed quite early in the primitive church. It is implied in Rom.VIII-10, 'If Jesus be in you, your body is dead because of sin'. It is explicit in II Cor.V-21, 'made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin,' in Heb.IV-15 'He was tempted like as we are, yet without sin,' also in I Peter II-22 'who did no sin, nor was guile found in His mouth,' and in I Jn.III-5 'He was manifested, and in Him is no sin.' There can be no question that this dogma corresponded to the entire experience of the gentile churches. Its significance lies primarily in the difference between

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus)

the Saviour Jesus and the numerous other saviours at that time being preached throughout the Mediterranean world. It emphasises the peculiar and essentially ethical quality of the religious experience of the early church. They had received something more than a mere freedom from the chains of this world and an assurance of a serene immortality. They had received also a spiritual life of the greatest ethical loftiness and power, a life which was available in this world. Their Lord was a Lord in this sense also.

For it must be noted that sinlessness is not a sine qua non in the conception of deity, nor is it a thing of absolute value. It is a relative idea of the same order as that of truth or beauty. Gods have been worshipped of whom it could not be predicated. Thus it is well known that the best of the Greeks regarded many of their own Gods as immoral, e.g. Athene (deceitful), Ares (cowardly, which was a vice to the Greeks) Chronus (cannibalistic), Zeus (incestuous). Euripedes, among others, actually held that the gods were corruptors of youth. Xenophanes said "Homer and Hesiod fastened upon the gods everything that is shame and blame among men - theft, adultery and trickery" (qd. Glover T.R. 1922. p.91).

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

In India to-day, much the same holds true. Many of the deities are harsh and cruel. They are actuated by pique, revenge, anger and lust. They take advantage of mistakes of ignorance and of weakness. Many are worshipped entirely out of fear which is a motive of questionable ethical value. Thus again we see that the idea of sinlessness is not integral to that of divinity (cf. Glover. 1922. p.64).

One can go further. Sin is a moral conception, but only in a few cases is religion conceived of ethically. Islam is of an ethical quality as far as its teaching concerns this world, but its eschatology is of a different nature. It is doubtful to what extent other religions outside the Old Testament can be regarded as ethical. Even Buddhism, if it can be classed as a religion in its primitive form, has a fundamental unethical strain in its pessimistic attitude to life and the world, and its sense of sin readily evaporates into mere folly. It is not the weight of sin that oppresses Gautama but the burden of living. And it is by right wisdom rather than moral regeneration that he finds the path to Nirvana which is itself a non-spiritual ideal (*but* (cf. Rhys Davids: 1907 p.112). One may be well excused for doubting whether he had a sense of sin in the full

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

Christian sense of the term. But the point is that salvation from sin is not the one test even of a redemptive religion.

Thus it is impossible on merely general grounds to argue, say, from the divinity of Jesus to His sinlessness. We are bound to indicate first of all the quality of the divinity, or of His relation to God. But we are then immediately in the fallacy of the circle. Conversely it is not possible to argue merely from the dogmatic assertion of the New Testament epistles in regard to His sinlessness, that He had, therefore, an immediate and unique relation with God. Even the lack of awareness of sin in Him, if such be historically proved, does not lead logically to conclusions of His divinity or His divine authority which is the real point we are seeking.

The problem of the ultimate moral authority of Jesus, therefore, cannot be solved on the dogmatic grounds of His divinity, nor merely by an analysis of His own inner consciousness. The records have great value where positive in character, but the argument from silence in such a case, is really entirely negligible. What then is the verdict of the records?

We may say that the records bear a witness of

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

a twofold character. They bear testimony to the ethical quality of Jesus as seen both from within His own consciousness, and in His general teaching and conduct. They also witness to the judgment passed upon Him by the official opinions of His nation and epoch. There are one or two explicit references.

In Jn.VIII-46. Jesus challenges the Jews with the question "Which of you can convict me of sin?" and earlier in the same chapter He declares "I always do what pleases Him" (who has sent me. v.29). He frequently refers to Eternal life as His inalienable possession. (Jn.VI-54; XVII-3; cf. X-28; VI-68).

All these references, it is to be noticed, are in the Fourth Gospel and we cannot build upon them as authentic words of Jesus, especially as there are no similar passages in any of the older sources.

What they do tell us is, however, that at the end of the first century the question of the sinless perfection of Jesus was of considerable importance and His attitude to the matter was of great interest. Such a development is only natural in view of the authority which the Risen Lord exercised in the church. His spirit was the ultimate arbiter of right and wrong, of godliness and of sin.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

In the synoptic gospels we find the following parallel passages:-

Mk.X-17f .. "Good teacher," (a man) asked "What must I do to inherit life eternal?" Jesus said to him, "Why call me 'good'? No one is good, no one but God .."

Mt.XIX-16 .. a man said to Him, "Teacher, what good deed must I do to gain life eternal?" He said to him, "Why do you ask me about what is good? One alone is good .."

Lk.XVIII-18. reproduces Mk. "Good teacher, what am I to do to inherit life eternal?" Jesus said to him, "Why call me 'good'? No one is good, no one but God."

On the face of it, this passage contains an explicit denial of goodness by Jesus, and it has, therefore, been the subject of much discussion. But it will be sufficient to quote Dalman (Eng. Trans: 1902. p.337. whose view is closely followed by Meyer 1880. p.163. Klostermann 1907. S:83f. and others, e.g. Forrest. 1903. p.32f). After some discussion of current usage, He says, "Further, the address $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\varsigma$ 'רַבִּי would not lead anyone to think of moral goodness. The proper translation is "Kind Master." The rejection of the epithet, therefore, does not mean, as is generally supposed, that God alone is morally perfect, but that in Him alone is the quality of kindness personified" and Dalman then proceeds to support this reading from the Old Testament usage of the word $\alpha\iota\omega$ and suggests that the issue of sinlessness does not arise there.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

Strack-Billerbeck (op. cit. Vol.II S:25)

fully agree and say "Bei dieser zweifellos richtigen Erklärung der Worte: "Guter Meister" fehlt natürlich jeder Grund zu der Frage, wie sich die Sündlosigkeit Jesu mit seinen Worten .. verträge: οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἶ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός."

But it is noteworthy that Mt's rendering is such that it seems intended to avoid the issue whether Jesus denied the applicability of the term to Himself, and thus that at least by about A.D.80, this text may have been understood to refer to the character of Jesus.

We gain a different interpretation, however, if we understand the emphasis of the reply of Jesus in another sense. It is not perfectly obvious if one translates back into a Semitic original, that the force of the question does not lie in the word 'why?' e.g. **יִשׁוּב** **לִי** **קָרָאָה**. Jesus' position, in any reading of the word **יִשׁוּב**, would then be very much the same whether as recorded by Mt. or by Mk. It might be stated as follows. "You have used the word **יִשׁוּב**. Now the question of **יִשׁוּב** is integral to that of Eternal life. For what reason then, do you call me **יִשׁוּב**? By common consent only one is **יִשׁוּב**, and that is God. Thou knowest the commandments and they express His will. Keep them. That is the way

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

to Eternal life."

In any case even if the word ἀγαθός is in this instance to be rendered by "kind," the denial is very striking, and, in His case at least, lack of kindness would be a serious defect if not a direct sin.

From the earliest times commentators have sought a meaning in this text which avoids the denial of sinlessness by Jesus (cf. Literature cited in Meyer op. cit. loc. cit. and Klostermann. op. cit. loc. cit), and, for us, in whatever form it is read, it raises the question of the moral perfection of Jesus, and still more urgently that of His consciousness of complete harmony with His own interpretation of the human ideal, and most of all that of His ethico-spiritual identity with God.

How then are we to deal with the issue joined in this passage of St. Mark's Gospel? The answers in recent times have been various. Most, if not all, writers admit the substantial historicity of the reply made by Jesus, but seek to explain that Jesus did not at all refer to His own character. Some have interpreted the passage as if it meant "Only God is good, but you do not recognise me as God; therefore you ought not to call me good." Forrest (1903. p.32) regards this

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

interpretation as unlikely, and suggests that Jesus rejected the epithet as applied by the ruler because "it had no moral depth or inwardness. Jesus will not have the holiest terms thus cheapened, and restores to the word its true content by reminding him that there is only one Being absolutely good and that all goodness flows from Him. "He Himself as man is not good in the absolute sense, as God is, but draws His goodness from a complete dependence on the Father. Of this human perfection there is no repudiation in Jesus' words for the ruler did not believe He possessed it. There is only a refusal to accept the designation when it was not bestowed on right grounds. But whatever view is taken, the only impossible interpretation is that which presents Jesus as on this sole occasion disowning a perfection which His entire life before and after shows He claimed." (Forrest. 1903. p.32).

Now while one may thoroughly agree with the opinion that any conclusion other than that which asserts the perfection of the character of Jesus will ultimately be found impossible, this is surely not the kind of argument to use. For (i) in this passage Jesus gives no hint to the young ruler that 'He draws His goodness from a complete dependence on God;' nor (ii)

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

that He will only accept a designation when offered on certain grounds. And (iii) the last remark gives the impression that whatever happens you must interpret the passage somehow in the sense that Jesus was sinless, and you are referred for support to the nebulous generality of 'the entire life before and after.' All this is simply not argument.

Beyschlag understands the passage in a similar sense when he says "the point is the concept 'good,' with which the youngman is so lavish." Jesus means to say that in the absolute sense it applies to God alone. In contrast with God, even the good are wicked. He Himself has nothing in the nature of evil to confess, yet even He is still subject to moral development and to temptation." (qd. Warschauer, 1908. p.135).

Thus Jesus is good (as far as this text goes) only in a negative sense, but He is far from being perfect yet. Moreover, there is a qualitative distinction drawn between God's goodness and that of Jesus. On the basis of this type of argument, therefore, even if we could be sure of the impeccability of Jesus we should have considerable difficulty in passing from the sinlessness of Jesus to His divine perfection.

Griffith-Jones seems to recognise the difficulty

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

of such a position when He says "Even He (Jesus) had not at any stage of His earthly life attained to the ultimate and absolute goodness ... Not till He had completed the work which had been given Him to do, not till He had gone through the awful experience of the Cross, and had shewn Himself obedient to death, was the last possibility of sin conquered even in His holy life" ("Faith and Verification" p.131. qd. ib. p.136).

Kaftan is quite explicit and holds that the goodness of Jesus is of a different character from that of God. God is holy, perfect and above the struggle and temptation - beyond good and evil. But Jesus did not possess this kind of holiness. Because He was a man He had to undergo temptation. His holiness consisted in steadily winning - therein we recognise Him as God. Jesus rendered full obedience to God, not as a matter of course, but by fighting with temptation. "Even this character of unbroken moral preservation which the life and work of Jesus manifested in the world, gives a real content to His sinless perfection. It consists not in the impeccability of His human nature which, as the orthodox doctrine teaches, was taken out of the reach of inherited sin. This

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

conception contains a contradiction in itself. An innate habit (Beschaffenheit) cannot be in itself moral. Something moral, however, must be understood by sinless perfection, if the words are to mean what they say ... In itself it consists in the moral activity springing out of the personal will of the self," and Jesus became the sinlessly perfect man through His own action and conservation, by means of real moral decisions in the face of temptation. (Kaftan. op. cit. S:454ff).

Warschauer states the logical conclusion with great clearness. He says "(Incapability of sin) were it proved that our Lord enjoyed it, would at one stroke deprive His character of all moral complexion and His life of all moral value for us. Indeed, 'sinlessness' is an almost misleading term as applied to a being incapable of sin. Such a being it has been justly observed (Beeby. Doctrinal Significance of a miraculous Birth) though artistically perfect would be morally less perfect than many a sinner who hates sin and resists and yet only imperfectly overcomes." (op.cit.p.118).

Thus we are driven back from an identification of the goodness of Jesus with the goodness of God. His sinlessness was moral perfection in a necessarily human

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

sense from which the elements of temptation, moral warfare and victory are inseparable. The essence of His perfection is not found in an inability to sin, which is a negative and non-moral quality, but in His ability to conquer temptation. If the quality is to have any value at all it must rest in the real ethical power of His personality. We must look for it in the steadiness of His will, the firmness of His living faith in God, and in the completely undivided unity of His character.

Such a conclusion, however, takes us far away from the question of the young ruler and the reply of Jesus, and raises much greater issues than were raised on that occasion. Nothing that Jesus then said, however understood can really settle the problem, altogether apart from the consideration that this passage is at best both isolated and negative. No amount of ingenuity can give it the force of a positive assertion, or do anything better than shew that it does not really deal with the major question of the sinlessness of Jesus.

And yet that question must be capable of being dealt with on historical grounds even if dogmatic considerations must eventually be entered upon. Thus we are well justified in asking whether the records do

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

sense from which the elements of temptation, moral warfare and victory are inseparable. The essence of His perfection is not found in an inability to sin, which is a negative and non-moral quality, but in His ability to conquer temptation. If the quality is to have any value at all it must rest in the real ethical power of His personality. We must look for it in the steadiness of His will, the firmness of His living faith in God, and in the completely undivided unity of His character.

Such a conclusion, however, takes us far away from the question of the young ruler and the reply of Jesus, and raises much greater issues than were raised on that occasion. Nothing that Jesus then said, however understood can really settle the problem, altogether apart from the consideration that this passage is at best both isolated and negative. No amount of ingenuity can give it the force of a positive assertion, or do anything better than shew that it does not really deal with the major question of the sinlessness of Jesus.

And yet that question must be capable of being dealt with on historical grounds even if dogmatic considerations must eventually be entered upon. Thus we are well justified in asking whether the records do

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

reveal Jesus as morally perfect, and if so, in what sense. Our attention is then drawn to the following facts.

As presented to us in our sources Jesus exhibits no trace of remorse. Now this feature is unusual and striking. For Jesus had an extraordinary sense of the holiness of God, of the urgent ethical quality of His will and of His personal relations with mankind. So close and vivid was God to Jesus and so precious was He to Him that, as we have found, the consciousness of Sonship was the characteristic feature of His relation with God. There cannot have been anything else than an extreme sensibility to the stirrings of the divine spirit and the leading of the divine will, and yet there is no trace of a consciousness of transgression, no sign of a confession of sin.

But as is frequently pointed out, the holiest men are those most conscious of their short comings when in God's presence. "Alas, I am undone!" cries Isaiah (VI-5 Moffatt's trans:) "man of unclean lips that I am, living among a people of unclean lips! I am undone!" Similarly St. Peter, because he is a sinful man, feels it dangerous to be in the presence of Jesus, (Lk.V,8) Even at the end of his life St. Paul regards himself as the chief of sinners (I Tim.I,15).

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

St. Augustine is oppressed with his sense of sin and reveals his soul in the Confessions. Bunyan, that greatest among the uncanonised saints, tells in the conclusion of 'Grace Abounding,' of the horrors and fears that pursued him on account of his sins and gives a list of the seven dreadful iniquities into which he is constantly falling, iniquities which to less saintly persons would seem venial. Time fails to tell of the consciousness of Thomas à Kempis, Francis, Luther, Wesley and the rest canonised and uncanonised. Enough to say that it would appear wherever sainthood has been ascribed, there a poignant sense of sin has been felt. And yet neither our records of the life of Jesus nor the extant recollections of those closest to Him reveal any sense of sin, or omissions, or remorse, or repentance, or of any consciousness of a cloud between Jesus and His God due to incompatibility of Spirit (cf. Mackintosh. 1914. p.35ff).

There can be no question that the argument from the sunny consciousness of Jesus of His relation with God, is of immense significance, and it can scarcely be overrated. On the other hand, it is not quite conclusive. For it cannot be forgotten that Jesus had also a vivid sense of God's compassion and forgiveness,

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

and of His essential Fatherhood; and it must be admitted that in our own experience, one of the things which make fatherliness most real and valuable is precisely a personal acquaintance with what the long-suffering forgiveness of a loving but slighted father means. No mere observation of it in others can have the same educative effect. Nothing else can give the same keenness to the insight into the nature of fatherly love, nor the same beauty of subsequent relations of mutual confidence and affection. Where a man has affronted his father in his youth and has come to realise the patient forbearance the parent exercised all along until he himself realised his wrong-doing, there, given the right character in the son, is to be found a depth and a verity of understanding he could not otherwise reach. Further it is all the more likely that after such an experience the subsequent relation between parent and child will be entirely unmarred and of the highest kind.

The point is that the argument from the unclouded consciousness of Jesus in regard to His relation with the heavenly Father, is not completely and finally cogent. It may, if pressed, appear possibly to operate in the other direction.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

Another element to bear in mind is that after all our historical sources are not autographs of Jesus. They are for the most part anonymous records, and in no case is it anything like certain that they were actually written by personal disciples. They are thus primarily external. Almost everything that we know of the consciousness of Jesus is reached by inference. Even in the best of instances, e.g. in regard to the Messianic consciousness, or that of Sonship, we are at a disadvantage. But when it comes to such an extraordinary delicate and intimate matter as the secret relations between Jesus and God we stand afar off. We know Jesus frequently resorted to prayer, long and lonely nights were passed in vigil, of whose nature we *often* have not the slightest hint. Did He merely seek guidance or was it not sometimes also strength? In Gethseman He seems to have sought both (cf. Mk.XIV,36; Mt.XXVI, 42, and especially Lk.XXII,53). But seeking strength implies the sense of weakness of faith, and Bunyan finds in this weakness one of His sins ("Grace Abounding," concl:)

We are doubtless carrying our speculation to a fine point and one feels a dread in going too far. Let us call a halt and count it sufficient to say that the argument for the sinlessness of Jesus based upon the

(Chapter XV. Meanign of Sinlessness of Jesus).

silence of the records is only just as strong as all argument e silentia.

Moreover it is not to be forgotten that all the records were produced, both as sources, and in their present form, in the midst of communities which had already found their Lord in Jesus. He was confessedly either their Messiah or their Redeemer. He brought them to God, and He gave them life. He made them heirs of Eternity. The question of His moral perfection, therefore, simply did not arise. It was already a presupposition by the time they accepted the new faith. And the records were made for devotional and propaganda purposes. What is recorded is what, on the whole, was felt most vital to sustaining the faith or to aiding the missionary enterprise. It is, of course, quite false to suggest that any events whatsoever were deliberately suppressed; the naivete no less than the self-harmony and the restraint of the records is a sufficient demurrer. Nevertheless we cannot be sure that no incidents or words were omitted, which might have given us material for forming judgments on other aspects of the character of our Lord.

Thus we may say that the argument for the sinlessness of Jesus, as developed so far, cannot be

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

made to depend too closely upon the negative quality of the narratives of our sources.

Let us now proceed to examine them for their positive witness, but without reference to the Fourth Gospel. Objection has been taken to the conduct of Jesus under the following heads, (i) that in boyhood He shewed a want of filial obedience or respect (Lk. II-4 ~~14~~). (ii) that when driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple He shewed an excess of passion, or even that He was only following the custom permitted by the temple regulations (Mk.XI-17 and parallels). (iii) That in delivering the Gaderene demoniac He unwarrantably destroyed the property of others (Mk.V-1ff and parallels). (iv) That He treated the Syro-Phoenician woman with harshness and contempt, (Mk.VII-26ff). (v) That on the Cross ultimately His faith in God gave way, when He cried "eloi eloi lama sabachthani" (Mk.XV-34 and parallels).

It is not needful to discuss these objections in great detail, and a few remarks on each must suffice.

On (i) we may say that the historicity of the event is far from certain (cf. Klostermann. 1919. p.408 and the literature cited there) though opinion to-day seems to be gathering in its favour (e.g. Berguer. op.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

cit. p.142ff). But in any case it is surely pushing all sane exegesis aside to read this passage in the sense suggested. It is not a witness to unfilial conduct.

On (ii) it must again be said that the historicity is none too certain. Lagrange (qd. Rawlinson. 1925. p.155f) accepts the historicity and says it was "The fleecing of the people that Jesus seems to have especially condemned as well as the resulting secularisation of the sacred precincts." If there is any truth at all in the parallels Lagrange cites, then Jesus would surely have committed a sin of omission had He done other than cleanse the temple.

On (iii) we may remark that this seems to be a particularly modern conception of sin. From a Jewish point of view surely it would be a sin to keep swine! Moreover nothing is said whether possibly the madman was their owner. Lastly the historicity of the narrative is severely open to question at least in detail (cf. Rawlinson. op. cit. a.l.) There is undoubtedly a large element of Volksglaube present and the historical facts are not immediately apparent (Klostermann. 1907. S:41).

In regard to (iv) once more it is sufficient to say that the exegesis offered is forced and fundamentally

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

false. "The precise meaning of the story will depend upon the nuance with which it is read." (Rawlinson. op.cit. p.99.a.1.) but there is surely a certain play of wit here which is far from contempt.

(v) offers the greatest foothold to the objections to the sinlessness of Jesus. Objections have been offered to its historicity, but its very offensiveness to Christian reverence is a witness to its authenticity. Schmiedel makes it one of his foundation-pillars (E.B. loc. cit). We must accept the words as historical. Discussions are lengthy and numerous in all the commentaries. (The discussion of J. Weiss "Das Aelteste Evangelium." 1903. pp.337ff should not be overlooked). The record in Mk has claim to authenticity but no more than that in Lk.XXIII-46 ("Father unto thy hands I commend my spirit.") Even if we say with Klostermann (1907. S:141) "Ist das Wort echt, so weiss man immer noch nicht, wieviel Jesus damit hat ausdrücken wollen," it cannot be overlooked that the centurion, who all day had been watching Him die, said He died like a God (Mk.XV-39). Thus the incident after all offers no firm argument against the sinlessness of Jesus. Few, if any positive conclusions can be drawn from it.

In concluding our examination of the passages

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

cited in objection to the sinlessness of Jesus we may say that nothing contained in them is of positive value. With the exception of the last, they are both trivial and debatable. Further, it is to be noted that, with the exception of the first which is almost certainly of an unhistorical character, all occur in the Markan tradition, where, if at all, both on account of its date and of the style of the writer we should expect witness of a positive character if there were any. The general effect of the inquiry is to raise our esteem for the character of Jesus.

There is, however, just one further passage of a somewhat different order that we need to notice. It is that dealing with the baptism of Jesus. We are told that John baptised unto repentance and remission of sin. What then was in the mind of Jesus when He approached John for baptism?

Much, if not everything, will depend upon our understanding of the incident itself. This is divided into two parts viz:- (i) The actual baptism by John, of ^{the} historicity of which there can be no question, although several writers have tried to diminish its force by saying that Jesus only submitted in a formal manner etc., (ii) The descent of the Holy Dove,

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

and the Voice from Heaven, which, in any case, it seems best to understand as "The expression in symbolical form of an experience which came personally to our Lord (Rawlinson. 1925. p.10 note 6).

Our problem also divides itself into two parts:

(i) What was in the mind of Jesus when He sought Baptism?

(ii) What was the nature and the effect of His baptismal experience?

We have naturally the greatest reluctance to say that Jesus came to John for Baptism unto repentance and remission of sins, although there is no doubt that Jesus came and was baptised by him.

The clue to the matter is in the nature of the preaching and the baptism of John. He came preaching the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven. (Mt.III-2 is explicit) as is shewn in the nature of the quotations from Old Testament prophets, "prepare the way of the Lord ... all flesh shall see ^{the} salvation of God." "John takes from the prophets, in Lk. (verses 7-9) as well as in Mt, not only their ethical, but also something of their eschatological teaching. The latter was also the starting point of the expectations found in the current apocalypses. And John's baptism had an eschatological

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

meaning as a preparation by which men could 'flee from the wrath to come.' Echoes of His words are sometimes heard from the Lord's lips (cf. Verse 7 with XII-34, XXIII-33, verse 8 (*καρπός*) with VII,16-20.)" (cf. A. H. McNeile 1915. p.25.) In other words John's baptism had a novel element. It was not merely an ablution of ceremonial impurities as in common Jewish practice, nor even of moral impurities. It is doubtful to what extent John would have been regarded as a prophet if he had substituted baptism for remission of sins in the place of the requirements of the established law with its specified offerings. John's forgiving sins even by a rite would have been likely to cause some offence to sensitive consciences just as in the case of Jesus a little later on (cf. Mk.II-5ff).

Thus we are compelled to hold that while John undoubtedly awakened a new consciousness of sin, and insisted upon a certain moral standard in his adherents, and while the rite he instituted contained a large element of the ablutionary idea, this does not by any means exhaust its significance. He preached the coming of the Kingdom, and those who joined him did so because they had come to share his expectation and would

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

not have joined him had they not passed through such a *μετανοία*. The novel thing about the baptism of John, and therefore the significant thing, is that it was a rite of initiation into a fellowship of believers. The initiation was accompanied by the idea of ablution as a sign of repentance from all classes and degrees of ceremonial and ethical impurity, if ever and wherever they might occur, which would render a person unfit for the new fellowship.

If the above statement represents the facts at all fairly, it is evident that Jesus could shew that He too shared the faith of John only by baptism; otherwise He would have been but a secret disciple. That Jesus may have had different views as to the nature of the Coming Kingdom in no way affects the suggestion offered, for it is undoubted that the preaching of John was the historical preparation for the preaching of Jesus in both its eschatological and its ethical aspects.

But the point is that it is impossible to argue from the baptism of Jesus by John that Jesus had a sense of sin, but rather that He had a sense of His essential unity of faith with John. That Jesus should have sought baptism from the same hands and the same

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

water as other proselytes tells us nothing about the state of Jesus' moral consciousness of defect, but it does indicate a consciousness of the call of God and of an accepted purpose in life.

Let us now pass on to the second part of the baptismal incident, where we are told of the dove and the voice from heaven. We shall frankly accept the view that this is a personal experience expressed in symbolic form. But a personal experience of what? The inquiries we have hitherto made in our sources leads us to dissent from the view that Jesus was simply confirmed in His consciousness of "His vocation to be Messiah and also that He was now equipped with power and authority for such a work ." (McNeile op. cit. p.11). There can be little doubt that what Mk. understands here is not merely the point where Jesus was acknowledged to be Messiah, but rather where He received and heard His 'call,' where He definitely surrendered His life to the service of God. (see. supra. p.220ff also Klostermann. 1907. p.9 and Mackintosh. op. cit. p.17).

Thus the whole point in His baptism is found in the self-surrender to what Jesus felt to be a divine

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

summons, His consecration to His life's task, and His consciousness, thereby further developed, of His own personality. Had Jesus refused the baptism of John we should have had cause to examine His spiritual quality. Because He sought it, we know more of His inner self, and what we know reveals Him with His face set towards His redeeming work. And at this stage we can add nothing further to our understanding of His soul. But what we do understand is enough to give Him spiritual authority among those whose hand is not yet put to the plough.

Summarising the position we have reached thus far we may say that we have not yet found any grounds for impugning the sinless consciousness of Jesus, although, on the other hand, we have found no very solid or extensive basis for building any real authority upon His uniqueness in this respect.

Let us, therefore, now attempt to deal with the subject from another angle. For if the evangelists and their sources are quite sure of the sinless perfection of Jesus, and if we ourselves can find no trace of moral imperfection in the consciousness of Jesus, still our sources do shew us repeatedly and

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

plainly that that was not the case with the Jewish religious authorities of the time. From their point of view Jesus was not only a sinner but one of a very grievous type. If we dissent from their view, and hold that Jesus was right and they were wrong, we shall have to produce our grounds for doing so. And this will take us to the roots of the authority of Jesus.

Jewish morality is easily underrated if one is confined to the picture contained in the gospel. It should be remembered that after all Judaism represented the great tradition of the ethical preachers of Old Testament. No one can read, e.g. "Pirke Aboth" without realising something of the ethical loftiness enshrined in the religion at the time of our Lord. "Be strong as a leopard, swift as an eagle, quick as a stag, brave as a lion, to do the will of thy Father in Heaven" (Pirke Aboth. Ed. Strack *AL*1901. S:46, v.20a) is a phrase which will serve to indicate something of their ardour, their faith and their moral altitude. It is no use attempting as is strangely and unfairly done, e.g. by Bruce and many others, to maintain that Jewish morality "consisted in observing unnumerable minute rules .. Scrupulosity, vanity and contempt made up the current type of goodness as found in the Pharisaic character." (Bruce *AB*1893. p.347).

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

For these minute rules were probably no more minute nor more numerous than the minutiae of the forms of etiquette maintained to-day in good society, and it is doubtful whether they were more grievously felt amongst cultured Jews than the symbolism of 'good form' in our own society. 'The scrupulosity, vanity and contempt' of the Jew was only a counterpart of our modern class-distinctions and their prejudices. The main difference in principle is that whereas our minutiae are purely social, of value only as etiquette, often antagonistic to religion, and sometimes broken without prejudice to moral character, in the case of the Jews they were intimately connected with religion, and their non-observance was not only bad form, but positive sinful transgression, placing a man outside the pale of both human and divine society.

Now it was these men, trained in the moral school of the prophets, practised in the detailed observances of the divine etiquette who condemned Jesus as a sinner. They accused Him of Sabbath breaking (Mk. II-24, Lk. XIII-14) of blasphemy (Mk. II-7; XIV-64) of (ceremonial) uncleanness (Mk. VII-2ff) of condoning sin (Mk. II-16 etc,) and what not more. There was probably much in His attitude to the Temple (cf. Mk.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

(cf. Mk. XIV-58) to the scriptures (cf. Lk. IV, 25-28) and the tradition generally (cf. Mt. V, 21ff) that gave them severe anxiety. Jesus seems to have found it necessary to protest that He came not to destroy the law of the prophets, but to fulfil them (Mt. V, 17) which surely means that He was thought to have appeared to threaten them. But what He did in effect was to treat them quite differently from the Rabbinic or orthodox method. He divided the law and the tradition, nay He divided the law itself. With a sure step He chose what was ethical and spiritual and separated it from what was merely formal and ceremonial. Whereas to the Jew all had been of equal spiritual worth, so that there was neither small or great but all were great, and all of the essence of the faith, Jesus found essential only what was truly ethical, having to do with the inner self in its immediate relation with God. All the rest He treated ^{as} relatively indifferent. This is not to say that He always left the remainder unobserved, for one can scarcely think that He always ate with unwashed hand or from uncleansed dishes! Rather He let such things, as He let the question of the Sabbath observance (Mk. II-27) rest upon human convenience and need.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

But which opinion was correct? Both were earnest and conscientious. Both parties were born of the same tradition and worshipped the same God, yet they were in some respects in startling contrast in their practical lives no less than in their ideals. Thus Jesus takes His stand upon His own reading of the law and the prophets, of the ways of God and the needs of humanity. His independence, His fresh insight, His firm self-confidence, His forcefulness and His energy of mind stand out from every page of the authentic records. But He is alone and His interpretation of God, of the scriptures, and of human nature is His own. In principle what could be more arbitrary?

On the other hand, His ^Pponents represent the combined product of the law and the prophets as understood by generations of schools who had studied and loved them, and who had been instructed also by the harrowing experiences through which their people had passed in the preceding centuries. It is true that their understanding of 'the law and the Prophets' had a strong ex parte character, but there can be little question that in the circumstances they could do no other than condemn Jesus as a sinner. The overwhelming weight of instructed opinion was against Him. Was Jesus then

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

ultimately in the wrong in taking His own line?

This is a problem that cannot be solved on conventional lines, nor by merely counting heads. The verdict lies at the bar of elevated but ordinary human insight, and finally at the bar of history. The first must be promulgated by an act of personal faith, the latter by the cumulative experience of men. And at this stage of the world's history one can say without fear that the ethical judgment and the spiritual discernment of Jesus have been amply endorsed. Rabbinic ethics and religion are, in principle, discredited. So indubitably indeed is this true that one may go further and say that if Jesus had not taken the stand He did and had not made good even at the expense of His life, as the event demanded, the position He held, He would have misled mankind and in that sense He would have sinned.

If, however, we now ask how Jesus ever came to teach and live as He did, in the end we must say that He could only have taken the course He adopted on the basis of an unclouded understanding of and intimacy with God, and of a crystal clear insight into His own soul and into that both of the prophets of the past and of humanity as such. In this most difficult of matters, it is nothing less than the bare truth that

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

not a word Jesus uttered, not a position He adopted and not a facet of human character He exhibited can be ignored to-day without moral peril, but are justified more completely with every passing year. And if this be true, we have here a cogent reason for holding the doctrine of His sinless perfection of character.

Strictly speaking, of course, the argument thus far deals only with the moral perfection of Jesus as contrasted with that prevailing in His day among His own people. While this may be sufficient for general purposes, still it is not quite final for determining the authority of Jesus as based upon the perfection of His moral consciousness. The world has had other teachers beside Jesus whose teachings in the broadest sense of the word have been of immense value, but which are out of harmony with those of our Lord. And, while Rabbinism is now dead, they are still active forces. Plato and Aristotle had their own ethical systems. The Buddha is revered and worshipped by almost countless millions. Have we any claims to submit that they are wrong, but that Jesus is right and should eventually entirely supercede them? and indeed any others past, present or future?

The questions that have just been propounded

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

are of immeasurable significance in all departments of human thought whether religious, ethical or metaphysical. They deal with the fundamental issue of the relation between truth and authority, an issue too large to be joined in the present instance, but to which further reference will be found in the Appendix, (A. On the Conception of Authority. pp.478 infra).

This is scarcely the place to discuss in detail the validity of Greek ethical thought, but its high value cannot be questioned. Much in Plato and still more in Aristotle has been fundamental to higher thought throughout the ages, nor can it be ignored to-day. The four Platonic virtues of Courage, Wisdom, Temperance, and Justice have much in common with Christian thought, but the abstract manner in which they are conceived makes them difficult to compare with the practical and experimental virtues enjoined by Jesus as recorded in The Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere. Certainly in Athens we are in a very different world from that of Galilee. The real value of the Greek virtues can perhaps only be rightly appreciated when we see how they actually worked out in practical life and in concrete cases.

Too much weight need not be laid upon the

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

failure of Plato to realise his ideal republic in Syracuse at the invitation of Dion (cf. 368 B.C), for it may be that the philosopher had little executive ability. Nevertheless it would appear that on their social side, his conceptions were unworkable except possibly under conditions that did not and never could exist. The trouble was that it left out of account the actual facts of ordinary human nature. The ideal state was and could be, therefore, nothing more than a dream, and perhaps not even a beautiful one.

What the implications of his thoughts were for the individual person may perhaps best be seen in the developments given them by Aristotle. In the course of the Nicomachean Ethics (cf. D.P. Chase. 1877. bk. IV especially. Chap. V-IX) he gives his well-known delineation of his ideal man with his admirable qualities, and also his strong contrasts as compared with the view to which Christian thought is accustomed. Thus it is small-minded not to grasp after one's real deserts, and to have too lowly an opinion of oneself has a deteriorating effect on the character (P.9). The object of Great-mindedness (or the ideal character) is great honour, but he must not aim at this more than he ought, or from wrong sources. There is a right mean (P.10). Meekness

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

is a character that errs rather on the side of defect, and a man who labours under it is thought to have no tendency to avenge himself, which is a slavish thing (P.11). And (the great-minded man) is by no means apt to make laments about things which cannot be helped or requests about those that are trivial. Again he is the kind of man to acquire what is beautiful and unproductive rather than what is productive and profitable, this being rather the part of an independent man (P.8).

He is the sort of man to do kindnesses but he is ashamed to receive them; the former putting a man in a position of superiority, the latter in that of inferiority; accordingly he will greatly over-pay any kindness done to him because the original actor will thus be laid under obligation and be in the position of the party benefitted.

(He will) bear himself loftily towards the great or fortunate, but towards people of middle station affably (P.8). (Aristotle does not mention his attitude to the poor man or the Helot).

Also slow motion, deep-toned voice and deliberate style of speech are thought to be characteristic of the great-minded man; for he who is earnest about

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

few things is not likely to be in a hurry, nor he who esteems nothing great to be very intent; and sharp tones and quickness are the results of these moods. (P.8).

Even if we make every allowance for differences in national tradition, mode of thought and literary style, we are compelled to admit that there is a wide difference and frequently a sharp contrast between the ideal of Aristotle and the ideal of Jesus. Nay more, on several occasions he refers explicitly to some of the qualities praised by Jesus at a later stage and in another climate. But Aristotle condemns them roundly, e.g. compare "To have too lowly an opinion of oneself has a deteriorating effect upon the character," with "take the lowest room" or with "Blessed are the poor in Spirit." Or again, compare the contempt for the man who is not ready to avenge himself with the spirit in 'turn the other cheek also.' In short, from the point of view of Aristotle, and apart from individual sentences, Jesus was wrong and He was also misleading. Nor is this point of view confined to Aristotle, but is developed by Nietzsche, and other philosophers of the Superman, who combine to regard Jesus as "the worst deceiver of the human race" enjoining a 'slave-morality' unworthy of respect. (cf. Genealogy of Morals. Essay I).

We may readily admit the wide difference between the ideal person of Aristotle and of Jesus, and we further grant that Sanday is substantially correct in saying that the peculiarly Christian virtues are all of the gentle, submissive and retiring order. But such is the nature of the case that we can refer judgment only to the general conscience of public opinion, however difficult to determine. We shall be safe in saying, however, that few will be attracted by the ideal of the Greek philosopher as compared with the number of those attracted by Jesus. Few will not notice a certain offensive artificiality and superciliousness in the Greek ideal. Most men will feel that if that were indeed what all should aim at, the outlook would not be very pleasing, and many of the practical social problems, whether of our own day and nation or of the human race in general, would be rendered more difficult of solution.

To put the matter in a somewhat different form: there is no commanding authority in Aristotle's conception of the ideal man. It does not compel personal respect. There is no quickening of the affections, no profound stirring of the will. One does not see how the human race would be better-off if the "high-minded man"

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

were incarnated in numerous cases. It remains nothing but an empty intellectualisation not only unpleasant but impossible of realisation.

But now why is it that we have reached this judgment? We may anticipate our argument a little and say that it is because we have learned to know something better and we have learned it at the feet of Jesus. For, in contrast, with the view we have just examined, we may note the following points in the conceptions of Jesus.

Taken in the broad sense of including what He Himself was, Jesus taught three distinctive things. (i) He not only spoke about certain ideals of conduct, but He exemplified them in Himself. He interprets in His own person what He means by His words. We are thus not dealing with something merely abstract, which may be regarded as the epitome of an ethic. We are dealing with One who was a man among men, and who spoke of human duty on the basis of a profound insight into the human nature, with its woes, its hopes and its needs.

The factor of an historic basis in a person who had once really so lived was of immense advantage in the early missionary propaganda, and it is just as effective to-day. "We should see Jesus" is not the

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

expression merely of a few inquisitive strangers on a single far-off day; rather it represents the need all feel if they are really to understand and fully to appreciate the meaning of Christian spirituality. As we have often sought to demonstrate, the authority of Jesus during His life-time was that of the reaction between His onlookers and His own personality as interpreting His teachings and His aims. And the tradition of that personality has never died down altogether within the community of Christian believers, but has been transmitted from age to age. There is a commanding experimental truth in the great saying of St. Paul that the church is the body of which Christ is the head and the believers are the members. (I Cor. XII, 12, 27; Eph. I-22 etc).

This, then, is the first element of the teaching of our Lord. It is in the personal character of all ethical and all spiritual truth. It is communicated from soul to soul as much as it is transmitted by word and thought. Words indeed appear inadequate. It is the spirit which giveth life, although His words themselves appear as both spirit and life (Jn. VI-63). And there can be no doubt that here we reach something of ultimate validity to the soul. For each man, his own

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

personal experience, His own sense of the power or authority exerted upon Him is final. "One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." Here is the ultimate answer to all questions regarding authority. It is essentially personal, and in such a way that it suggests that the very structure of the universe is personal. The authoritative finality of Jesus cannot be understood apart from this consideration and, as our examination of the sources seemed to shew, it constituted the great factor upon which Jesus consistently relied in the entire course of His ministry.

(ii). The second characteristic of the teaching of Jesus is in regard to the nature of the Kingdom of God. In recent years a wealth of literature has grown up upon this question which is thus raised to a controversial issue. Opinion is sharply divided between those who hold that Jesus was completely eschatological in His expectation of the Kingdom and those who hold it was more spiritual. The former say He conceived it to be imminent and as a physico-superphysical entity. God would exercise immediate judgment and in full earnest. Then the end of the world would be ushered in. They say that because Jesus held this belief in the full

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

seriousness of His great soul, He preached an ethic with great power and urgency but specially adapted to the brief period before the catastrophic appearance of the Kingdom. His own part was, for the present, to prepare the people as well as possible, but at the coming of the Kingdom, to assume the role of the Messiah and act as vicegent of God (cf. Schweitzer. 1901 passim, 1921 mult. loc. esp: ss:390-443).

It is noticeable that it is specifically held that the ethic of Jesus is not and was never intended to be universal. It is warranted only in view of the urgent circumstances of the time, and it would be abrogated as soon as the Kingdom appeared, and give place to other norms of conduct. But thereby also it is implied that the ethic of Jesus is not as such, fully applicable to our own times or indeed to any circumstances essentially different from those which Jesus mistakenly conceived to exist at the time when He entered upon His urgent ministry. Such universality as they may possess, then, would be due rather to the overruling providence of God, or else to the plastic character of the teachings themselves, enabling them to be adapted to other times and climes.

The objections to the above striking and

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

forceful theory are numerous and weighty. But those can be ruled out of count without the benefit of consideration which are put forward on the basis of the extensive damage which the theory would do to our reverence for the person of Jesus or to the universal validity of His ethical teaching. If the theory be true we have no alternative to accepting it. We must then accommodate ourselves as best we can to the new orientation of Christian truth.

But is the theory valid? Does it give us an interpretation of the mind, ministry and the teaching of Jesus which is substantially in accordance with the facts? The answer seems to be unquestionably in the negative. Indeed as Streeter quietly suggests (*op. cit.* p.255 footnote) "Schweitzer's whole argument depends on the assumption that Mt.X is, word for word, an exact report of what was said at the time. The demonstration .. given .. that Mt.X,5-23 is a late conflation of at least two sources, Mk and Q would alone be a sufficient refutation of his argument." The fact appears to be undoubtedly that Schweitzer has misread his text and also forced his theory upon his mis-reading. Thus the nerve of his position is cut.

Moreover the character of Jesus as portrayed

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

on the basis of the eschatological passages, chiefly in Mt.X and Mk.XIII (which latter is itself subject, on other grounds, to grave suspicion as to its unity and its authenticity) taken in isolation, is completely out of harmony with the strong consensus of the documentary sources as found in Q, Mk, M, and L. His deep insight into human nature, His quick spontaneous sympathy, His large patience, His sublime calm, His lightness of touch, His charm are all either blurred or else down-right incomprehensible. In other words, if the eschatological theory be sound we have two incompatible pictures of Jesus, or rather pictures of two persons each called Jesus of Nazareth. It is far simpler to assume that our main sources are substantially authentic and that the special pleading of Schweitzer and the eschatological school is historically unwarranted.

We must, therefore, turn our attention to the school of thought which regards the Kingdom of God as conceived by Jesus, to consist really in a purely spiritual entity. It is the sphere of human experience in which God is really King. He rules, He alone exercises authority. His Kingdom consists in that fellowship

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

of believing souls in which God's Will is truly realised and His purposes accomplished. His Kingdom is not actually present, neither is it merely future. In a certain degree it is already actually realised and yet in another sense it is always being more perfectly realised. It is found wherever a soul obeys the Will of God in simple earnestness and steadfast faith (Mt.VI-33), and more perfectly where a few are banded together in the spirit of Jesus., (Mt.XVIII-20). In essence it depends upon the simple and immediate responsiveness between the individual soul and its Maker, and also between such souls as related to each other and to God. Where such responsiveness exists there is to be found the Kingdom of God. It represents a problem, an ethical task, a vital spiritual challenge which meets men along the whole point of their daily life (cf. Ritschl. A. 1903. S:2ff). In a certain sense, therefore, it is a present entity.

On the other hand there can be little doubt that it was conceived of more or less closely in connection with one of the traditional forms of apocalyptic expectation without precisely defining the time, and indeed, with an explicit impossibility of defining the time (Mk.XIII-32). It was to arrive at the close of

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

the age - whatever that may mean (Mt.XIII-39) - but its coming is deferred until the gospel is made known to all mankind (Mt.XXIV-14), although this consummation was expected within the lifetime of the present generation (Mt.XXIV-34). Nevertheless it is quite explicit that the words of Jesus are more enduring than the world itself, and after the end of the latter, the former will retain their force and their truth, (Mk.XIII,31 and parallels. cf. Mt.V,18. see also Strack-Billerbeck. 1922. S:244f).

But further there are passages of apparently equal authenticity where the horizon is very much narrower. Jesus expects His parousia well within the lifetime of His onlookers (Mk.IX,12-13. "...many shall not taste death,") and in fact His messengers will not have finished their missionary task of Israel (Mt.X-23). And this expectation of the nearness of the coming of the Kingdom seems to have formed an element integral to Jesus' view of the future.

Thus there are two strains of thought combined in the conception of the actual consummation of the Kingdom of Heaven. The first is based upon the indestructible quality of the Law, and of the unassailable timeless security of the God beneath (cf. Deut. XXXIII-27) beyond (Ps.CXXXIX,9) and above (Is.LV-9, Ps.CXXXIX,3),

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

and of the equal validity of the teachings of Jesus (Mt. XXIV-25). But, superimposed is the view that a certain consummation will take place within a brief period, and will introduce the age that is to last for ever.

Now it is evident that these two strains of thought are by no means ultimately incompatible, but it is nevertheless a matter of considerable question to what extent the eschatological expectations, which appear to have become marked and almost extravagant in the early church in certain localities if not universally, may have influenced the literary form of the records that have reached us within the limits of the gospel. So marked was this influence that, as appears certain, the major part of the whole chapter, dedicated to this subject, has been introduced into one of our main sources as Mk. XIII and that not merely as an editorial addition but as a piece of the veritable teaching of Jesus (So Klostermann. 1907. S:111). It is not possible for us at this stage to determine whether Jesus held any of these views, and if so in what sense He held them.

For our special purpose, however, the solution

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

of these questions is of secondary importance compared with the fact that, in any case, Jesus made the consummation dependent upon the preaching and indeed upon the acceptance of His gospel. His words must be preached before the end should come (Mk.XIII-10). The righteousness of God must first be sought before the Kingdom could be realised in its completeness (Mt.VI-33). The point is not that the preaching of the gospel supplies merely the warning and the necessarily spiritual preparation for the coming of the Kingdom, but rather somewhat as follows. The fulness of the times is at hand, God is prepared to institute His Kingdom, but it is not of this world (Jn.XVIII-36). What it means is, that God is really prepared to reign among men. That being so, the urgent question is whether men are really willing to be reconciled to God and to make the necessary changes in heart and lip, so that the divine Kingdom can be instituted. In so far as individuals take the will of God in full earnest, God already reigns. Thus the preaching of the Kingdom is part of what makes the Kingdom possible, just as guests are indispensable to a wedding feast (cf. Mt.XXII, 1ff. esp: v.9). This fact makes the preaching of the Kingdom an urgent matter, for without preaching, and all that it

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

implies, the Kingdom can never issue into fact. When the Kingdom does come it will certainly take many by surprise (Lk.XVII,31ff) but it cannot come at all except in so far as the truth is proclaimed (Lk.X,2; Mt.XIII,8) and understood (Mt.VII,24; XII,50).

It seems little less than a perversion of the data to suggest that Jesus believed the Kingdom was imminent in any case, and that His message was principally a warning (Schweitzer. 1901. S&15f etc) In His view rather the ethic of His message was the prerequisite of the Kingdom and the preaching of that ethic was the medium or instrument for creating in men the mentality integral to the Kingdom. The Kingdom is already here when, and in so far as, the new spirituality is born in men, but it is still future in so far as many men remain untransformed, and the conversion of the world is, therefore, incomplete.

That this understanding of the nature of the Kingdom is correct is born out by what we have already seen to be the nature of both the Messiahship and the Sonship of Jesus. It was His acting upon His insight or faith, and His personal discharge of the relevant function that made Him conscious of being the true Messiah (cf. p.349 supra) and that gave Him His unique

(Chapter XV, Meaning of the Sinlessness of Jesus).

sense of Sonship (cf. p.387^{supra}). And in the same way to arouse in men the true relation with God and to create a group of believers enjoying that relationship itself, which is the function of preaching, is actually to bring the Kingdom into being. It means taking it by force (cf. Mt.XI,12).

Complimentary to all this is the fact that the earnest taking of God's Will is at once an easier (Mt.XXIII,4; Lk.XI,46) and a harder thing (Mt.V-20) than was commonly understood and practised by the Pharisees and the Scribes. It is to be understood through and through as a matter of the heart (e.g. Mt.V-23), of establishing the same kind of relations between man and man as exist or are sought between man and God (cf. Mt.V-23f. cf. esp: 38-48 giving various practical injunctions leading up to 'be ye perfect as your heavenly father is perfect.' Lk.XI-4 'forgive .. as we forgive'). The criterion of right conduct or right aim is not to be found in the regulations of tradition, nor even in the law and the prophets taken in an external fashion, although these last can only be abrogated as they are fulfilled. Rather it is to be found in a proper understanding of human nature and its instincts, for 'whatever you would like men to do unto you, do

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

just the same to them' (Mt.VII-7; Lk.VI-31); and in learning to discern the truth for oneself by exercising his private judgment (Lk.XII,54-56) or by joint consultation and decision (Lk.XII-57ff).

The community of those who thus live and act are themselves brothers and sisters and mother of Jesus (Mk.III-34). They are of His family and kin, and there is the Kingdom in essence (Mt.XVIII,20).

But this ⁱⁿdependence of judgment, together with this genial relation between man and man is precisely what rapidly produces an intelligent and profound faith in God. A wide and independent observation of nature and the seeking first of all the Kingdom, i.e. acting as if it were already an established fact, immediately brings with it ease from anxiety about one's person (Mt.VI-27) or about the morrow (v.30), for he then sees that all things are in the hands of God and nothing escapes His sympathetic understanding (v.32). God is King indeed and He truly reigns in the heart.

Much more might well be added, but enough has been said to shew that in the preaching of Jesus the taking of a certain attitude to life and to God is a necessary preparation to the coming of the Kingdom.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

Nay, more it is the actualisation of the Kingdom itself. The Kingdom exists in so far as, on the one hand, a certain mentality exists in and among men, and, on the other, as it is the gift of a gracious God waiting to present it to those ready and able to receive it (Lk.XII-31f "only seek His Realm .. Fear not, you little flock, for your Father is delighted to give you the Realm").

In especial, Jesus does not make His own words into rules and regulations nor His own example into the criterion of life in any narrow sense. It is doubtful if the question "What would Jesus do?" when answered in any manner as meaning the abrogation of one's own judgment in favour of that of another, even though it be our Lord's own, really represents the final norm. He strongly condemned those who bound chains upon proselytes (Mt.XXIII-4) and He urged men to open their eyes and exercise their own judgment (Mt.XVI,3).

Reference) Thus in the Oxyrynchus ^{Papyri} we read what is undoubtedly an authentic saying of our Lord "Jesus saith .. The Kingdom of God is within you, and whosoever shall know himself shall find it. Strive, therefore, to know yourselves, and ye shall be aware that ye are sons of the Father."

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

Jesus awakens within us the deepest understanding of duty, and the profoundest conception of the meaning of life, and the noblest faith in God, but when thus awakened it is our part as His followers just to live by the judgment which the sum-total of our experience has produced in us. We dare not shut down our inquiry or silence our conscience and blindly follow even His utterances or example. What He would have us do is hear His word, receive His spirit, accept His faith in God, and then learn to discern the face of the times for ourselves (cf. Herrmann. 1907. S:29ff).

But this is religion with a forward look. It is independent of special times and conditions. It is plastic and self-adapting. The fellowship of persons who have accepted it constitutes a community naturally adapted to every age and race and clime, and calculated to elevate each individual to the highest reaches of his own spiritual perceptions and indeed to cause them to expand into circles which otherwise never could have been anticipated. And that fellowship will likewise represent the community among men which will most nearly correspond to what each will long for, and what each really can attain. There do not seem to be any circumstances possible of conception, in which each

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

man cannot exercise his own best judgment, nor any in which he can feel that in so doing he is shut out from the will of God, and thereby from the service of God.

In short, the Kingdom of God as preached by Jesus and the nature of human duty as required of all those who seek the Kingdom seem well within not merely the dreams and the desires, but the practice and the realisation of, a work-a-day world. And each degree of its actualisation represents its own perfection while yet pointing to and preparing for a further stage in whatever adaptations new outer circumstances and further inner experience, with all the additional data then brought to bear, may seem to bring into the common fund. Thus the Kingdom of God preached by Jesus and illustrated in His person, represents a conception of practical ethico-spiritual perfection, beyond which it does not seem possible to reach.

(iii) There is one further aspect of the teaching of Jesus upon which we must touch. For He is not concerned merely with the salvation of the individual by a right communion with God, nor yet with the realisation of a Kingdom of God in such individual persons and in their fellowship with one another. There is also the feature of the redemptive quality of the Higher Morality.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

In one way it is true the concern of the individual for others is included in the conception of the Kingdom of God, but it is implicit rather than explicit when viewed from this standpoint. For the society of the Kingdom is possibly concerned only with the relationships of the subjects to each other. But it may be said with equal truth and appropriateness that the Kingdom of God is itself an aspect of the development of redemptive morality in the individual, and that both alike are aspects of the right relation of the individual to God. The redemptive morality inspired by Jesus has, however, as great a right to independent treatment as either of the others.

Briefly what one meets in this aspect of the teaching of Jesus is that apart altogether from questions of the ulterior value to the individual, or to the realisation of the Kingdom of God, we owe a duty to our fellow-men. Thus "whoever forces you to go one mile, go two miles with him. Give to the man who begs from you, and turn not away from him who wants to borrow" (Mt.V-41f), i.e. 'serve him at any cost to yourself.' "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you (v.44)," i.e. the good and even the salvation of other people, even of those who have no human

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

claim upon us, is nevertheless part of our human duty independently of consideration of the Kingdom, for "an unforgiving, grudge bearing spirit is not simply a fault but also unutterably mean" (cf. Mt. XVIII, 21-24 and 27-30).

Jesus was accused of consorting with publicans and sinners (Mt. XI-19; Lk. VII-34) and His friendliness towards them was doubtless one of the causes contributing to the hostility of the Pharisees. But why is it that He followed the practice? Why did He chose to dine with Zaccheas rather than some person less hated and despised? (Lk. XIX-5). Why did He adopt the remarkable attitude to the adulterous woman (Jn. VIII-1ff) and to the woman with the alabaster flask of perfume (Lk. VII-36ff)? There is only one answer. Jesus cannot have delighted in them as ~~was~~ they were. But He was set on winning them. We can read of the effect recorded on Zaccheas, and we can imagine that the women just mentioned received from such a spirit as His their best chance of redeeming their lives. And in this connexion we must understand the second part of the parable of the prodigal son and the redemptive attitude of the father as compared with the ethically justifiable conduct of the older son.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

"This overflowing good-will towards unfriendly (and unworthy) people is one of Jesus' unique contributions to the moral life, and He was aware of the fact.

When He said "Ye have heard that it was said an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth .. Ye have heard that it was said 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you love your enemies" (Mt.V-38,43ff). He was consciously contrasting Jewish sayings with His new commandment. When He said, "If ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the Gentiles the same?" He was definitely contrasting Graeco-Roman morals with His own." (H. E. Fosdick. 1924. p.22). It was thus no mere accident of a particularly sunny nature. It was also a definitely-felt need to round out and make perfect the spiritual quality of human life. And He Himself acted upon it consistently right to the end. Thus He prays for Peter that his faith fail him not (Lk.XXII-31f) and there is a strongly authentic note in the final injunction to the same apostle: "feed my lambs.... be a shepherd to my sheep" (Jn.XXI-15ff). The prayer of forgiveness on the Cross is a supreme instance of the same quality.

Indeed it is nothing less than the bare truth

to say that the redemptive ethic of the Christian gospel is one of its unique features, for it is here that one sees the characteristic quality of Christian love. That love is more than an affection towards kindred spirits, or to other members of a fellowship. It is an earnest concern for the well-being also of the outsider (Lk. XIX, 10 .. "to seek and to save that which was lost") and even for an enemy (Mt. V, 44). It is desire for another's good no matter what that other's personal attitude to ourselves or the Kingdom, and if need be, no matter at what cost to oneself (Mk. IX, 34). Thus under the teaching and inspiration of Jesus, the disciple becomes himself a centre of redeeming love, and a worker together with Christ. It is undoubtedly this noble quality which constituted the driving force of the church. The early believers were rather drawn on by a newly awakened love of or concern for their fellows, than driven by fear of impending cataclysm. St. Paul becomes all things to all men that he might at least gain some (I Cor. IX-22) and one feels that he does less than justice to himself in saying that his aim is to secure his share in the gospel he preaches (v. 23). And the same motive is to-day no less one of the main springs of the foreign missionary enterprise.

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus)

Nor can one understand the Cross of Jesus apart from this consideration. Whatever else the Cross implied to Him, it implied that He was faithful to His gospel for the sake of the people. It was not merely concern for Himself or His Kingdom, nor for those who had believed in and followed Him in the course of His ministry, but also for the many who knew not what they did. Had He weakened, his disciples must inevitably have utterly and finally failed. If the truth was to be preserved, the truth by which men could live, the truth which made life worth living, then He must face the issue right through, come what may. And after-ages felt keenly this very aspect of the crucifixion. It was for our sakes that though He was rich yet He became poor (II Cor.VIII,9). The very unhistorical quality found in St. John's Gospel itself bears witness to the indelible impression upon believers that Jesus lived and ministered mainly for the sake of the people.

It is difficult to express in a few words all that this attitude of mind, exhibited freely, so forcibly and so tenderly by our Lord, and incalculated with such power in epigram and parable, has meant for mankind. Suffice to say that we gain the impression

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

from it all that "a new humanity began on earth with Him" (Weinel. 1910. S:82). We can fully agree with Strauss in holding that "with reference to all that bears upon the love of God and of our neighbour, upon purity of heart and upon the individual life, nothing can be added to the moral intuition which Jesus has left us" (qd. Ballard. 1902. p.222). He has done "More to redeem and to soften mankind, than all the disquisitions of the philosophers and all the exhortation of moralists" (Lecky. op. cit. Vol.II. p.8f). And it is upon some such intuitions of the significance of His ministry that our estimate of the ultimate value of His teaching must rest.

The fact is that when we attempt to compare the simple but effective, practical idealism of Jesus with that of the great thinkers of antiquity, we feel to be dealing with incompatibles. We are comparing with cold and chiselled marble a man who breathes with a vital spirit. The classical symmetry and artistic balance of the former cannot weigh with the warmth and the reality of the latter. "In Him was life and that life was the light of men."

How then are we to estimate the ultimate meaning of the sinless perfection of our Lord? The Jews

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

condemned Him as both wrong and misleading. Aristotle holds before us very widely different ideals of human character which cannot possibly be reconciled with that of Jesus. And it may be sufficient to say, in a single sentence, that the Buddha's negative attitude to life cannot be harmonised with the positive acceptance of Jesus, whatever may be said for the ethical loftiness of the former's views. But what is the root of our conviction of the ultimate superiority of Jesus, and on what grounds do we hold to His supreme sinless perfection?

It is precisely at this point that we find our last difficulty and also our ultimate solution of the problem of the nature of the sinlessness of Jesus. What we find is twofold. (i) The teaching of Jesus is not mere teaching, but is inseparable from its interpretation in His personality and in His life and death. There is no such thing as an adequate system of Jesus' theology or ethic. Christian principles, of which one hears much, are always different from and less than the real message and power of the gospel, which is a word plus an interpretation and the interpretation not left to the arbitrary Gutdünken of the individual inquirer, nor to the mercy of metaphysical analysis, necessary

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

though such an analysis may afterwards prove to be. But the real significance of the gospel message itself goes beyond anything words can fully express. It can only be truly grasped when the system of thought as thus conveyed is accompanied by an immediate intuition of the living Lord through the ethical operation of His actual person upon our own when engaged upon His truth. All these elements are essential, this voluntative movement, the play of the critical faculties, and the immediate operation of person on person.

But then (ii) the criterion of ethical conduct as thus enjoined, and of the ideal of faith and life as thus brought home, is none other than the entire self-consistency of Jesus Himself with all that He puts before us. The criterion of His sinless perfection is found just in what He Himself advances. He creates a new sensibility in us, a conscience that approves itself and its own standards. It carries its own authority in its harmony with our inner self, for "the human heart is naturally Christian." But then it adds daily to its authority by coming home as belonging to the ultimate structure of the moral universe. And it is because that refined and educated sensibility finds

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

its greatest satisfaction and its highest joys in contemplating Him and the harmony of His whole life that we can do no other than call Him the sinlessly perfect One. Our apologetic consists simply in pointing to His person, His life, His consciousness, His aim and His influence on those who have truly accepted Him as Lord. We can only say that in order for us to judge Him we cannot use any other standard than what He has set before us. Do we look for what a man should be? We look towards Him. Do we seek for an attitude towards God or to the world that we can wish universalised? We find it nowhere so perfectly or so satisfying as in Him. Do we seek to know what is the ideal relation between man and man, or what is the purpose of the whole of life and of the very world? We find no expressions that content ^{us} so well as those that gain their inspiration from Him.

Of course statements like these are not universally accepted and, in the nature of things, perhaps under the very inspiration of the attitude of mind our Lord Himself adopted, we often depart from their track and make our own experiments. With what result? It is impossible to give an answer on the basis of

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

collated results. But we can summarise the general impression made by observing the course of things within one's own experience, and also in process of history in all degrees and scales. And we can seek the opinion of men of large outlook, profound knowledge and extensive human sympathy. Having then done our best we may perhaps venture an opinion. Meantime we may say it is our conviction that men are gradually approximating to the type of character which Jesus endorsed, and accepting the teaching He put forth, and this not by any outer compulsion of a mechanically conceived evolution, but rather because what is inconsistent therewith is found less satisfying. It leads to a poorer life than that which follows from the guidance of Jesus, who thus again proves to us His unique quality of perfection.

Similarly, we venture to hold that society reveals much the same features. As the ages pass by we can see that it sheds evil after evil and develops good after good, but what is shed as evil and developed as good has no other criterion than that already laid down in the ethic of Jesus. It is that ethic which interprets humanitarianism and that moulds the conception of 'the right.' While explicitly following only the dictates of such non-religious motives, nevertheless

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

consciously and unconsciously, society approximates ever more closely and consciously to the words and teachings and leadership of Jesus. Thus it is in the self-consistency of His own person, and the harmony of His ideals with what human nature really needs in all its varying phases that we may find the sinless perfection of Jesus.

Nor is this quite all. For as the ages have passed by, new situations have constantly arisen and new problems have demanded new solutions - situations and problems simply undreamed of, and indeed totally impossible in the days of the ministry of Jesus in Palestine. But the ethic of Jesus knows no difference between new and old. It seems equally applicable to all. It is not found wanting. Its ideal but shines the clearer, and the power gained in personal adhesion to it is an ample dynamic.

Further there have been occasions when new ethical and spiritual principles, however implicit they may be regarded, have needed enunciating. The right to freedom as against the justification of slavery; the claim of each child to at least elementary education and of every man to a living wage; the moral

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

necessity for searching heaven and earth and sea for facts - these are new principles not easily found even as implicit in the gospels or the rest of the New Testament. But they are one and all rightly regarded as Christian principles. For the fact is that in the heritage of the tradition of Jesus we have actually received a leadership in these enunciations. Greatly daring one may say that if Jesus had precluded any of these advances He would have been wrong and to that extent not morally perfect. But all the ethical movements of the human spirit, both in the minutiae of the individual soul and on the broadest scale of the human race, can be interpreted in terms of Christian ethic. Nay more, for not only may all these movements be thus interpreted, but, when so interpreted, they themselves seem to receive fresh meaning. Their significance is expanded and enriched. The Christian interpretation is in itself the worthiest, and it gives the most scope for the developments that may lie beyond as far as the mind can reach. And this fact constitutes an unimpeachable witness to the supreme moral and sinless perfection of Jesus. We feel that every possible degree of certainty in matters effecting human conduct and the hope of the amelioration of the race is granted to us through Jesus of Nazareth. And that sense of

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

confidence is the sequel to or the correlative of the authority which He exercises over us.

If it be objected that this conviction is after all purely subjective, we may perhaps best reply that that is true. But it is not arbitrary and we need not be disturbed. For all validity and truth are founded upon a sense of satisfaction and of harmony which are also individual experiences and judgments. A narrow conception of the human mind makes all inquiry and any certainty impossible, and renders human endeavour largely futile. "The spiritual satisfaction which is the token of truth must involve all the psychological factors in a working harmony, it acquires the response and the assent of the whole man ... The more fully the different elements support and supplement one another, the greater is the assurance of religious truth, (cf. Galloway. 1904. pp.264ff). And it is because of the supreme and unalloyed satisfaction when in communion with the Risen Lord, and when surveying life, the world and God in His way that we call His authority ultimate. We may be wrong, but only the event can prove it.

Nor is this whole of experience an isolated

(Chapter XV. Meaning of Sinlessness of Jesus).

fact, but is linked up with and is partially built upon similar experiences and judgments in those men of the past and the present whose lives come closest to our own. We find, in short, that the ethic of Jesus interprets ourselves, our experiences and our needs to ourselves as we should like to do for ourselves if only we were good enough and wise enough. He fits our case completely. He seems to hold the key to our life. As the apostle said "Our life is hid with Him in God." And that complete adaption to our individual case is the only sign of the completely valid. The perfect expression of any entity is in its sphere the only universal of which we have any knowledge. It carries its own sanction and is the guarantee of its own finality. And that guarantee is what we find in the ethical authority which Jesus exercises over us. His authority is what we desire, what we need, what we rejoice in. It is what satisfies, uplifts and inspires us, what enables us to express the last bit of our personality. And that is final. There is nothing more to say. Jesus exhausts the subject and opens out the path that leads to what lies beyond. In following Him we pass from darkness into God's marvellous light, and in that light we experience once more the authority of His Sinless perfection.

CHAPTER XVI.C O N C L U S I O N .

On what grounds then does Jesus exercise authority to-day in the normal Christian experience? We worship Him as Son of God, as the Second Person in the Trinity, as the Saviour of Mankind, as the Sinless Perfect Divine man, and feel that because He is such all obedience is due to Him, to His recorded words, or to His ancient institutions such as the church, the priesthood or the sacraments. But all such worship and obedience, however earnest and all-engrossing, and however awful, uplifting and sanctifying, is to be distinguished as outer and in the best sense of the term uninspiring. It silences and overwhelms more than it liberates and inspires. Our own will and personality are engulfed and outflooded, rather than embraced by and unified with His. We lose ourselves more than we find ourselves. We are entailed in a system of faith rather than given the glorious liberty of the authentic children of God. In short such authority whatever name it may bear, and whatever its sacred associations may be, is not the authority of a living Lord who has personally to do with us. In the last analysis it is not what we

(Chapter XVI. Conclusion).

mean by the authority of Jesus Christ. That authority is only to be found in the inmost experience of a believing soul.

If now, we may venture to enter here what is it that we find? The question is far easier to ask than it is to answer although the answer is within the consciousness of all those who have found their faith. It is found first of all, in the sense of impact. The centres of our ethical consciousness are shaken. We find our spiritual references are being shifted. Moral wisdom and religious truth receive new clothing and new meaning. The hard things of the moral life such as self-abnegation or the prevailing superiority of the motive of love assume an unthought of attraction. We began to feel that we simply must revise our life, our conduct and our ideals, and this with a sense of a newly discovered inner need as well as of an outer compulsion. It flows as it were automatically from the fact of our contact with Him. The question of our inner character arises at once as part and parcel of our experience and it becomes urgent. We find ourselves arraigned in a way that only God can arraign us for our experiences are paralleled and illumined most of

(Chapter XVI. Conclusion).

all perhaps by the utterances of the great penitential Psalms. Not that our experience is necessarily only an experience of sin, but it is that of an imperative which demands a life higher, larger, worthier both in its references and in its practical expressions. We have a sense of a unification of our gifts, our aims, our tastes and our ideals.

Like the apostles in the upper room, we find we do indeed receive power. We find ourselves able to see things and to do things we had not noticed nor would have attempted before. Life and the world are transformed. Things once keenly desired lose their charm, others formerly neglected acquire a wonderful appeal. The will to follow the dictates of ethical love begins to dominate. What once was regarded as sacrifice is now often found to be an essential means of self-expression. Anything indeed is but waste except what expresses the will of Christ or what leads into a closer intimacy with Him; but what does that is precious beyond expression.

Nor is this a shallow emotional satisfaction, for it corresponds with the severest demands of the ethical elements in human nature. None of these is

(Chapter XVI. Conclusion).

unsatisfied and many are far exceeded, in the fresh reachest of redemptive morality opened up in normal Christian experience. Love literally fulfils the law and goes beyond towards the second mile. There is an overplus which expresses itself in a unique inner exaltation. We are more than conquerors.

And even this is not adequate, for the ethical satisfaction in all its completeness is not merely individually nor subjectively interpreted. It gains its concrete quality and its striking stable character from the identification of the authority of the Person operating upon us inwardly with the Jesus of Nazareth whose words and ministry are in a measure recorded in the gospels. Those words and that ministry then come home to us in a unique manner. They act as a kind of written conscience. They search us. They assure us. They bring us back to the great fundamental things and yet they lift our eyes to the very horizon of the spirit of man. We are in the grip of an authority which we feel we can only neglect to our moral peril, and yet at the same time, there is not a thought we receive, nor an impulse aroused which is not of our own veriest self. Thus the voice of the historical record, the inner sanctions of the ethical and religious

(Chapter XVI. Conclusion).

self, and the immediate influence of the Risen Lord unite into one authority with a power and an urgency of the highest conceivable order. Let Him who can, say it is other than the power and the presence of Deity. As for us, it is sufficient to say, 'our life is hid with Christ in God.' (Col.III,3).

And this is at once the experience of redemption of justification, of atonement, of salvation. It is the gift of our communion with the Lord. He has done for us what only God can do, or rather, let us say that it is impossible for us to determine whether He has done it and done it out of love, or whether God has done it and done it out of Grace. Nor does this indeterminability affect the issue spiritually, for it is all one. We know God through Christ and we know Christ through God. If we call Him God, as Herrmann says, we but give Him His name. In all that concerns our spiritual life His authority and God's are the same. As Luther in his great Commentary on Galatians says "But seeing Christ giveth grace, peace and the Holy Ghost, delivereth from the power of the devil, from sin and death, it is certain that he hath an infinite and divine power, equal in all points to the power of the Father ... (These) are not the words of any

(Chapter XVI. Conclusion).

creature but of the Divine Majesty alone ... and seeing Paul doth attribute the self-same power of creating, and giving all these things unto Christ equally with the Father, it must needs follow that Christ is verily and naturally God ...

He hath the divine works not of a creature, but of a Creator, therefore He giveth grace and peace, and to give them is to condemn sin, and to tread the devil underfoot... Seeing they are attributed unto Jesus it must needs follow that He is verily God by nature." (Eng. Trans: by P.O. 1796. ad. loc. I,3. p.35).

May we then approach the last question in regard to the authority of Jesus and ask in what way He is the ultimate spiritual authority? But now as is inevitable we are carried to the limits and even beyond the limits of personal experience. Once more we must beware of all attempts either from within or from without unduly to stereotype the authority of Jesus in the form of the tradition of a word or a society, which would be but to hand ourselves over at last to unreality. Personal experience as far as it goes is our guide. It is true that one who is used to the important but secondary support of church, or

(Chapter XVI. Conclusion).

tradition or scripture may feel this authority is too slender or delicate, and quite unable to bear the demands that will be made upon it. But as he becomes more accustomed to its purity and its grace he becomes more aware of its strength, until at length he may realise it as the only authority which has ultimate and effective ethical or religious power.

Another feature of the type of authority revealed by our sources is its apparent modernity. It seems remote from the mentality of antiquity. This, however, is only another way of saying that in religion Jesus is the master. He deals with what is fundamental and essential to all ethically religious experience. The fact is that probably in every age Jesus has seemed modern, and when there has taken place any development there has been a closer approximation to the new conception of ^{His} personal significance. He is always new, and where emphasis is placed upon the essentially Jewish, or ancient features in our Lord's thought, the probability is that undue pressure is placed upon certain aspects of the records. The authority of Jesus is that of person on living person, and that is always and essentially a present fact dating from to-day. The authority of Jesus in so far as it is felt to be modern

authenticates itself to be the authority of the Lord of Life.

Let us then be content to say that we hold our trust in God on the same tenure as our trust in each other, and that we recognise the authority of Jesus by the intuitions springing from the same soil of immediate personal intercourse. If our Lord be not a living Lord then our hope is in vain and we are of all men most pitiable, for the first need of the soul is not met - the need for a Master. Our faith is not merely an ethic nor a metaphysic, still less is it a psychology. It is essentially a personal reaction between the soul, its Saviour and its Maker. Our religion becomes clearly incarnate in the person of its Founder. What it all may mean for us, in life and its interpretation, only the event can prove. Our part is to use fully the light and power He gives, while we earnestly seek for the broader day and the fuller inspiration. Meantime for us there is no alternative to the course we have chosen, nor do we need one. He has brought us our peace and we are content to say 'In Him is life, and that life is the light of men.'

A P P E N D I X:

THE CONCEPTION OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

Authority in religion is based upon the conviction that the life-process issues in a certain direction and that any other direction, sooner or later, offers a hindrance. This conviction is more than a feeling. For the particular person and the particular instance at the particular time it is a fact of experience. Religion may cover the entire field of conscious life. It can bring certain concepts and perceptions to bear upon each issue. In each case there are impulses, feelings and reactions involuntary and voluntary. These are held together and directed. The religious sanction is derived from the precise manner in which all these factors march with one another. And that one is recognised as the higher authority which gives the experience of greater satisfaction due to the more complete and harmonious mobilisation of all the factors which contribute directly or indirectly to the richness of the impulse of life. The dominance of religious authority, when it is dominant, is due to the extent of the inner field which it covers, to the sharpness of the impression made by some of the factors, and also to a third component of a somewhat different nature which derives from the person as a voluntary agent, rather than as intellectual and sensient. The authority of religion is not truly analagous to that of an engineer over a machine or of a potter over the clay, or a driver over a horse. It covers these cases more or less completely, but the analogy here is not perfect. For the engineer never identifies himself with the machine, nor the potter with the clay, or the driver with the horse. In ethics we recognise authority in so far as we decide, in a rational manner, the line of conduct enjoined, and identify ourselves in a certain degree with the circumstances that arise. But there is the dominance of logical reasoning. An ethical judgment is a rational judgment. But a moral philosopher need not be a 'moral' man.

In religion, however, the authority experienced is more far-reaching. Intellectual assent alone is not enough. That we agree to the truth of a proposition

(479)
(Appendix)

is not sufficient. We may take it for granted that in any particular case subsumed under the general title of a religious judgment we may be dealing with a purely ethical issue, and often with factors that could be decided upon purely ethical grounds. This is because religion is ethical. But the sanction of religion goes beyond that of ethics, in so far as it is not content with assent but requires adhesion. It is this factor of personal adhesion to the judgment which gives the final authority in the sphere we are now considering. While it may be true that we find the factor of personal adhesion in other regions, e.g. art, still it remains true that we cannot hold a religious-principle or judgment to be sound and escape reproach as religious people if we withhold our personal adhesion to it. Nay, we find, such is the nature of the authority of religion, that there arises much more than a question of our not withholding personal adhesion. We are required to give a certain strength to the adhesion. It may be impossible to command a man to like anything (cf. Seeley JR1895. p.176ff), but it belongs to the very nature of religion in the last analysis that we "love the Lord our God, with all our heart, ... soul, ... mind ... and strength." We must practice what we believe, otherwise we repudiate our premisses.

Here we have a fact without which the authority of the religious sanction over the mind of the ignorant or the uncivilised cannot be fully explained. And here is also an essential feature in what at times appears as the very opposite, viz: the impossibility of the religious sanction in the same class of persons or at least in the debased. Ethics as such obtains its sanction only after processes of thought of a preponderatingly abstract nature. It becomes less authoritative as the reference becomes more concrete. But the ignorant and the uncivilised man functions only with difficulty, if at all, from the purely rational reference, but with relative ease as a concrete person with fairly definite emotions recognising but limited rational control. In such circumstances, ethics is uncomfortable.

But religion functions with equal facility through the particular reference to which the individual concerned is most accustomed. He has, by hypothesis, already given personal adhesion to religion if he has any religion at all, and it is this fact of adhesion that enables religion to function and exercise authority,

(480)
(Appendix).

whose quality and degree depend upon the character of the individual. If he function as rational and ethical, his religion will require to function rationally and ethically to the same degree in addition to any other type of activity it may exercise. The attempt to refuse this function to religion accounts then for two things (i) the frequent breakdown of religious authority over the individuals concerned, (ii) the frequent divorce between religion and ethics. This is often to be observed among the more cultured members of society. But in the ignorant religion will function equally well, as far as the particular individual is concerned, through his customary channels of self-expression. And as rational control in him is weak the rise of mere emotion is easily experienced as a rise of religious authority.

From this point of view also we can understand why, in the case of debased persons, religion seems incapable of exercising authority. For by debased, we mean an individual with a divided personality in the sense that it is precisely not the whole self which functions when he feels, or thinks, or even possibly when he wills. In addition there is lack of balance between the activities of the person. It is usual to think of the over-activity of the emotional side of personality and to regard the coldly rational individual as the very opposite of debased. But callousness is an instance in which the dominating feature may be some adherence to a system considered apart from emotion, and yet is quite evidently debased. The same may be said for the merely impulsive and fickle person who is otherwise normal. But in all these types it is easy to see how religion may be unable to exercise any authority. It requires personal adhesion. Its authority is personal and unified. But here we are considering individuals of incoherent and non-unified personality. There is thus a hiatus. The single authority which normally functions through the entire man, though dominating through his accustomed channel, is divided and so broken. What such a person experiences when 'converted,' is not merely some form of reconstruction of life. He experiences a definite unification. He becomes aware of a kind of neatness in place of the mental chaos, a certain mental balance in place of the distortion. Religion serves him as a bearing rein. It exercises authority as of a master mind over that of a junior apprentice.

From what has been said, it is evident that experience of authority is not necessarily dependent upon a prior intellectual conviction nor upon a moral assent. It may indeed depend upon a sub-conscious reaction

(Appendix).

similar to the case of hypnotised persons or to suggestion, as in the psychology of a crowd. In particular it is clear that truth as such in whatever way truth may be regarded is not an essential element in the functioning of authority. Authority may be exercised or experienced without the question arising as to its truth or falsity. The question of truth may arise later and may largely effect the final outcome, but it may have little or nothing to do with the immediate experience of authority.

When we assert that an intellectual conviction is not necessary previous to the experience of authority we are only describing a psychological fact. But when we say that authority and 'truth' are in no necessary inter-connection we may require to justify ourselves from the ethical standpoint and ask: "Ought there not to be some essential connection between truth and authority? Surely what is true should carry authority and what exercises authority should be true?" This may be granted without further discussion as a general proposition provided our definitions of truth can be agreed upon as meaning that which completely harmonises with the total of the universe as comprehended in human experience. If by truth, however, we are to understand a mere intellectual or logical consistency of one idea with an arbitrary chosen system of ideas, then there seems no possibility of granting the proposition as a universal judgment.

A proposition of an intellectual character is received as true when it is able to exercise authority, and the discovery of its falsity would mean that we have come to feel the authority of some other proposition logically inconsistent with it. It is a purpose of education in the widest use of the term so to train and inform the mind that inconsistency with the relevant system is immediately apparent. There is thus a necessary connection between truth and authority within the limits here laid down. Indeed from a slightly different point of view we may say that is precisely what we mean by calling a certain intellectual judgment true. We mean that it has received an assent which we could not withhold from it. From this point of view a judgment is true if it is conducive to our dominant purpose for the time being.

But there is also a certain constancy and permanency and unchangeableness in the term truth which derives from the self-consistency and self-identity of personality. It is what is felt to stand in a constant relation to our stream of life. It is something

(Appendix).

like the point in a surd, where the point retains its own value no matter to what extent the surd is worked out. So also truth is relative to us and our life with its irreducible, unknown but not quite unappraisable residuum, and yet it is a criterion by which the value of life itself is judged.

We may now turn to the fact that authority must be experienced as coming from without. This raises various difficulties. We may state them as follows. If it comes entirely from without then how is it possible for it to exercise any authority? We must have some relation between the authority and the mind experiencing it. If it comes entirely from within, it is surely impossible to distinguish it from a merely subjectively dominant idea, and we are compelled to ask whether a subjective idea can be authoritative. Leaving this corollary for the time, we may ask, if the authority is in some way both within and without, how is the relation to be conceived? Moreover does not authority as thus conceived encroach upon the question of personal freedom?

We may begin by granting that it is impossible for any authority to function at all if it be entirely without the mind. This statement of the case may be open to objection on the ground that the mind is not a spacial entity and an authority as such has no location. It is perhaps better to say that nothing can exercise authority which has no existence for that particular mind, or that anything that does exist for the mind is an idea in the broadest sense of the term, But an idea is no idea unless it be in some sense within the mind, i.e. unless it be one of the ideas upon which the mind is engaged more or less closely. Thus we grant that the authority must be within the mind. This at once raises the issue of the subjectivism and we seem driven to the conclusion that all authority is subjective, which is apparently little better than a contradiction in terms. It may be authority, but it implies social anarchy. Each man is his own court of appeal and each "doeth what is right in his own eyes."

On the other hand, all we can mean by an idea that is partly within and partly without, is an idea that is not clearly grasped. And, in so far as this is the case, the idea exercises a weaker authority. We are thus driven to the conclusion once more that the idea must be wholly within the mind for its proper exercise of authority. The question of subjectivism is now raised in its acutest form, and we are compelled

(Appendix).

to ask whether such an idea is necessarily subjective, or ultimately whether subjectivism is fatal to authority. Both assumptions are usually made but both are possibly fallacious. For, in the first case, every idea whatsoever would then be purely subjective, a position closely identified with that of Berkeley. And, on a priori grounds, there is probably no escape from the difficulty. There is a sense in which every idea is subjective, i.e. what is in my consciousness is in mine and not in another's. He may have a similar idea which may function similarly upon him, but my idea is in my mind and mine only. It may be questioned how far this line of argument can be followed and how far its assumptions are a priori. Some degree of experience seems implied. We are comparing an idea (a person) in a certain relation to another idea (what is in his mind) with another system of ideas (myself, plus what is in my mind). The whole is still subjective but it assumes a certain amount of experience. This is indeed true of all comparisons, while thoroughgoing a priori reasoning makes comparison impossible.

But on the a posteriori grounds to which we are now driven, the whole aspect of affairs changes. As a matter of experience we do compare. The process of mental operation is inseparable from it. The validity of our thought is bound up with it. The stream of consciousness itself demands it. We must accept this condition of mental activity or withdraw from life. Let us then accept it quite frankly. Let us not call it subjectivism in the sense of arbitrariness or of mere caprice, but rather a necessary outcome of our personal relation with the ultimate constitution of things, and with the conditions inseparable from mental activity. Or, if it be insisted that 'subjective' is still the correct term, then let us submit that this form of it is not vicious, for it is inevitable. Every valid idea is significant of reality. As thus significant, it is logical and is, therefore, both subjective (psychological) and objective (logical) at the same moment.

But we now come to deal with the question of personal freedom in relation to authority. Cases that can be subsumed under mere physical compliance with natural law are of course beyond the scope of the discussion. We may thus take it for granted that in certain senses we have no freedom. We cannot but adopt certain lines of conduct if we would walk or swim or fly, although we may be free to choose whether we will walk or swim or fly. Instances of nervous reactions to certain stimuli are also to be placed in

(Appendix).

the same category though they are near the border line, e.g. reactions to fear; the sex impulse and the like. Leaving these on one side we come to the questions of intellectual and ethical action where authority functions par excellence. It is evident that from one point of view when we obey an authority, our freedom is limited. We say we are compelled, that we have no choice and so forth. It is probable, however, that a further analysis will reveal that this is mere popular language. For if we probe deeply enough we find we obey because we feel an inner urgency. All the factors influencing us apparently externally must be assimilated by the mind, conscious and unconscious. In so far as they have not been assimilated they exercise no influence. It is the inner self as thus enabled to expand that finally determines the course of action (cf. Croce. 1913. p.474).

From this point of view the authority is simply one of the options open to us, and it is the one which in the specific circumstances best harmonises with the total self. It may seem to shut out some options, but it does so by attracting a strong attention to another. It is thus not necessarily a question of damming up the life stream as it were, but of opening a channel which was before inadequate or inexistent. It may even be a means of enlargening the range of our freedom. Thus we may be baffled by a mathematical problem and our freedom of intellectual activity thereby hindered. But, if an expert mathematician joins us in breaking down the obstacle, he does not further encroach upon our freedom. Rather he enlarges it, and by his authority, i.e. by his breaking down the barriers to our intellectual activity, we are soon out in the open country. Again, the village clown lives within a narrow mental radius. But let him come under the authority of a Shakespeare or a Gibbon, and he is freed from the village. He becomes a citizen of the world. Further we observe that, morally, the merely commercial mind lives in a groove. But let that mind come under the authority of Darwin or Kepler or Jesus, and the universe is his parish. Now, however arguable these specific applications may be in detail from certain points of view, they shew that authority in its actual functioning does not necessarily imply the negation of freedom. It forces upon the mind an option which was formerly negligible. The stress of authority does not come in something

that denies our power of choice. It is doubtful whether the power of choice can be taken away from us without destroying the constitution of human personality. The stress of an authority consists rather in enlarging the area of contact of certain ideas with our personality until their aim and that of the person become identical. At this point the choice is made, or the person wills. But authority then immediately ceases to function. It has become a historical fact and no longer a present dynamic. It is analogous to a case of double decomposition in a chemical action where authority plus subject becomes free act plus historical fact. There is a new relation of constituents without any having enjoyed a separate existence. And in the new relations the constituents have become other. Authority and freedom thus stand on opposite sides of the human equation and each is there by its own right. Neither could be present without the other. It is precisely because we are free that authority is authority and not mechanical control or something in the nature of a logical premiss.

This conclusion is supported by the further consideration, that we experience authority most strongly when we feel it leads to a larger life. It not only exercises power over us but it increases power within us. Even where we are 'compelled against our will,' this is true. For here our choice is between destruction and the act to which we are driven. We are 'compelled against our will' in so far as what we really had willed is now beyond our reach and we are faced with another option of things, all of which were undesired, but one of which is now the least undesirable. We chose, therefore, what is, for the moment, least inhibitive to, or most in harmony with our stream of life. Thus authority is not measured merely by the control it exercises. When there is mere control, we have tyranny with its accompanying defects of weakened and perverted character. Tyranny is a form of authority which we recognise as of a lower order, and which is constantly threatened with subversion. An authority of a higher order is measured by the power it confers upon or arouses in the mind of the person under it. He obeys, but he is enlarged by so doing. He is actually helped in some measure towards self realisation. He that is servant has become master.

Here we touch upon the secret of the authority attached to the names of the great leaders of the human race. They lead not because they dominate so

(Appendix).

much as because they inspire. Inspiration is at once dominance and new power. This is the basis of the authority of the poets, the sages, the prophets, the apostles, the saints and the seers. It is measured by the increase of range of life and the increase of inner power which it confers. In the end this is also the basis of the authority of Jesus. He is an abiding authority because He is found to retain in century after century, and in nation after nation, and tribe after tribe, in person after person, the power, not merely to control conduct by negation, but to enlarge its horizon and give a greater range to actions and choice. If he be the supreme authority, that supremacy will be based upon the superiority not merely of the ethical standard implied, or of the tone involved, but of the power and range conferred.

Thus it is also that we recognise and claim that there is a higher ethic in the Christian faith. It is an ethic which goes beyond any conception, however enobled, of mere equity, justice or truth, or any ideal of a static good. The higher ethic is redemptive. It goes beyond the person exercising ethical judgment, or ~~what~~ can be justified by a merely ethical logic, i.e. beyond ~~what~~ could demand to be treated as a universal imperative. It finds its sanction rather in a certain immediacy of recognition. This is rendered possible when the mind is stirred and when a new power is experienced which so enlarges the constitution of personality as to make it in a sense another. And its rightness is recognised, again, by its reflex action upon the practical morals of the ordinary man. It is, so to speak, the leaven which transforms the lump. All this is in harmony with the saying of St. Paul "The love of Christ constraineth us." It emphasises the important aspect of the apostle's meaning in calling himself a bond-slave of Christ while yet speaking of the freedom he has gained through him. Far from being cramped by his obedience to the authority of Christ, St. Paul enjoyed a liberty exceeding anything he before knew or that could be readily paralleled. He revels in his liberty in Jesus till it forms a paradox after his calling himself a bond-slave. But both expressions are true to the experience of the authority of Christ. Here we have the greatest conceivable authority, an authority experienced as dominating the whole of the inner man, until he can no longer call himself his own, experienced as compatible with the greatest conceivable liberty. Nay, indeed, the completeness of the authority is the very condition of the perfect liberty. He no longer does the

(Appendix).

things he would not, nor leaves undone the things he would. He can fully realise all that is implied by the possession of personality.

Thus the discovery of the ultimate authority is the discovery of final freedom really to live our lives. But as there be gods many, and lords many, the task is one of considerable difficulty, and the history of the human race may be regarded as the history of trial and error in attempting it. The discovery depends ultimately upon an intuitive recognition of the superiority of some forms over others when viewed in the light of personal experience. We feel the closing in of the path as we adopt some and the opening out as we adopt others. The Christian certainty of the supremacy of Christ is based upon the superior quality of the experience which believers enjoy. We believe that this is God's world, because when we regard it as such, we feel we are on the open road, and His way is the only way which can bring us into the fulness of life. As we live in society, and not each man to himself, the full realisation of our life is dependent upon that of others. The whole missionary enterprise is bound up with this fact and its implications. Those who have had the experience of the authority of Christ recognise that they have touched finality, and they believe that others enjoying the same experience will share the conviction. But whether this faith is finally justified can only be decided when the course of human life is over. Meantime, we can do no other than stake souls upon it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

of the more important works used.

(R) beside the title indicates incidental reference only.

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Allen. W.C.	"The Gospel according to St. Mark."	1915.
Angus. S.	"The Mystery Religions and Christianity."	1925.
Aristotle.	"Nichomachean Ethics." Eng. Trans. By D. P. Chase. 4th Edition.	1877.
Athanasius.	"On the Incarnation, the Greek Text." ed. A. Robertson. 4th Edition.	1910.
Athanasius.	"The Orations of S. Athanasius, Against the Arians." Anon. Eng. Trans. Ancient & Modern Library of Theol. Lit.	(no date).
Ballard. F.	"The Miracles of Unbelief." 4th Edition.	1902.
Bauer. W.	"Das Johannesevangelium." in Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament."	1925.
Berguer. G.	"Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus." Eng. Trans.	1923.
Billerbeck. P.	(See under Strack).	
Bouquet. A.C. (R)	"Is Christianity the Final Religion?"	1921.
Bousset. W.	"Jesus." Eng. Trans.	1906.
Brace. C. L.	"Gesta Christi." 4th Edition.	1890.
Bruce. A. B.	"Apologetics or Christianity defensively stated." 2nd Edition.	1893.
Bugge. C.A.	"Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu."	1903.
Burkitt. F.C.	"The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus."	1910.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Cadbury. H.J.	"Jesus and the Prophets." art: in "The Journal of Religion." Chicago. Nov.1925.	1925.
Caird. E.	"Evolution of Religion." 3rd Ed: II Vols:	1899.
Calvin. J. (R)	"Institutes." Eng. Trans. Vol.I.	1845.
Chamberlain. H.S.	"Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts." VI Auf. II Vols.	1909.
Charles. R.H.	"Book Of Enoch."	1893.
Charles. R.H.	"Religious Development between The Old Testament and the New Testament."	1914.
Cornford. F.M. (R)	"Greek Religious Thought."	1923.
Groce. B.	"Philosophy of the Practical." Eng. Trans.	1913.
Curtis. W.A.	"Infallibility." (Art: in E.R.E).	1914.
Dalman. G.	"The Words of Jesus." Eng. Trans. BY D. M. Kay.	1902.
Deissmann. A.	"D. Urchristentum u:d: unteren Schichten." 2nd Aufl.	1908.
Deissmann. A.	"Licht vom Osten." 2nd and 3rd Aufl.	1909.
Deissmann. A.	"The Religion of Christ and the Faith Of Paul."	1923.
Deissmann. A.	"Paulus." 2nd Auflage.	1925.
Denney. J.	"Jesus and the Gospel."	1908.
Eckhart, Meister.	"Buch der göttlichen Tröstung." ed. P. Strauch.	1922.
—	"Encyclopaedia Biblica."	1914.

(490).

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Fairweather. A.	"Jesus and the Greeks" or "Early Christianity in the Tideway of Hellenism."	1924.
Fiebig. P.	"Die Gleichnisreden Jesu Im Lichte Der Rabbinischen Gleichnisse."	1912.
Fiebig. P.	"Joma; Der Mischna tractat etc."	1905.
Fiebig. P.	"Rabbinische Wundergeschichten des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters in vokalisiertem Text."	1911.
Forrest. D.	"The Authority of Christ." 4th Edition.	1903.
Forrest. D.	"The Christ of History and of Experience." 4th Edition.	1903.
Forsyth. P.T.	"The Person and Place of Jesus Christ."	1909.
Forsyth. P.T.	"The Principles of Authority."	1912.
Fosdick. H.E.	"The Manhood of the Master." 18th Ed.	1924.
Galloway. G.	"Studies in the Philosophy of Religion."	1904.
Galloway. G.	"Philosophy of Religion."	1914.
Gardner. P.	"The Practical Basis of Christian Belief."	1923.
Garvie. A.E.	"Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus."	1907.
Glover. T.R.	"Progress in Religion to the Christian Era."	1922.
Glover. T.R.	"The Jesus of History."	1922.
Gore. C.	"Belief in Christ."	1922
Gore. C.	"Lux Mundi." 14th Edition.	1895.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Haering. F.H.	"The Christian Faith." Eng. Trans. from 2nd German Edition.	1913.
Hall. Stanley.	"Jesus the Christ in the Light of Psychology." II Vols.	1921.
Harnack. A.	"Sprüche Und Reden Jesus"	1907.
Harnack. A.	"Sayings of Jesus."	1908.
Hawkins. J.C.	"Horae Synopticae." 2nd Edition.	1909.
Headlam. A.C.	"The Life and Teachings of Jesus the Christ." 1st Edition.	1923.
Herrmann. W.	"Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott." 5th & 6th Edition.	1908.
Herrmann. W.	"The Communion of the Christian with God." 2nd Eng. Edition.	1906.
Herrmann. W.	"Die Sittlichen Weisungen Jesu."	1907.
Huck. A.	"Synopsis Der Drei Ersten Evangelien."	1906.
Huck. A.	"Die Johannesparabeln zu den Synoptischen Evangelien."	1916.
Hastings, J; Ed.	"Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics."	
Inge. W.R.	"Faith and its Psychology."	1909.
Iverach. Principal.	"Authority." (art: in E R E).	1909.
Iverach. Principal.	"Orthodoxy." (art: in E R E).	1917.
	<i>Evangelical, 1899.</i>	
James. Wm.	"The Varieties of Religious Experience."	1902.
Jülicher. A.	"Die Gleichnisreden Jesu." Vols. I & II.	1899.
Jülicher. A.	"Einleitung in das N.T." 3rd & 4th Aufl.	1901.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Kaftan. J.	"Dogmatik." 5th & 6th Auflage.	1909.
Klostermann. E.	"Das Lukasevangelium." (in Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament. Von Hans Lietzmann).	1919.
Klostermann. E.	"Markus." (in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. von Hans Lietzmann.)	1907.
Leckie. (?) J.H.	"Authority in Religion."	1909.
Lecky. W.E.H.	"History of European Morals." II Vols. 3rd Edition, Revised.	1877.
Lewis. F.W.	"Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel."	1910.
Liddon. H.P.	"The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."	1867.
Lütgert. W.	"Die Johanneische Christologie."	1916.
Luther. M.	"A Commentary on the Galatians." Anon: English Translation. initiated by P.O. pub: Chester.	1796.
Mackintosh. H.R.	"The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ." 3rd Edition.	1914.
Martineau. J.	"The Seat of Authority in Religion." 4th Edition.	1898.
Martineau. J.	"A Study in Religion." 2nd Edition. II Volumes.	1900.
McDougall. W.	"An Outline of Psychology."	1923.
McGiffert. A. Cushman.	"The God of the Early Christians."	1924.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
McNeile. A.H.	"The Gospel According to St. Mk."	1915.
McNeile. A.H. (R)	"N.T. Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's."	1923.
Menzies.	"The Earliest Gospel."	1901.
Meyer. H.A.W.	"Commentary on the New Testament." English Translation. Matthew. Mark and Luke. John.. 3rd Edition.	1877. 1880. 1903.
Moffatt. J.	"The Theology of the Gospels."	1912.
Moffatt. J.	"Intro: to the Literature of the New Testament."	1911.
Moffatt. J.	"The Old Testament - a New Trans: 1st Edition.	
Moffatt. J.	"The New Testament - a New Trans: New Edition, Revised.	
Naumann, F.	"Gotteshilfe."	1907.
Newman. F.W.	"Grammar of Assent." New Impression.	1906.
Oman. J.	"Vision and Authority."	1902.
Otto. R.	"Idea of the Holy." English Trans:	1923.
Peake. A.J.	"One Volume Commentary."	
Rawlinson. A.E.J.	"St. Mark with Introduction, Commentary and Additional Notes." (In Westminster Commentaries. Ed. by Walter Lock).	1925.
Renan. E.	"The Life of Jesus." English Translation. People's Edition.	1888.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Ritschl. A.	"Rechtfertigung u: Versöhnung." Band. II & III. 4th Auflage.	1895.
Ritschl. A.	"Justification and Reconciliation." English Translation.	1900
Ritschl. A.	"Unterricht in der Christian Religion." 6th Auflage.	1903.

(Bibliography. Addenda).

Sanday. W.	"Outline of the Life of Christ."	1905.
Sanday. W.	"Personality in Christ and in Ourselves."	1911.
Sanday. W.	"Christologies, ancient and Modern."	1910.
Schweitzer. A.	"Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung."	1911.
Scott. E.F.	"The Kingdom and The Messiah. Edin:	1911.
Seeley. J.R.	"Ecce Homo."	1895.
Simpson., P.Carnegie.	"The Fact of Christ." Popular Edition.	
(Smith. W. Robertson. (R)	"The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Lecture X. The Prophets.)	Edin:1881.
Stanton. V.	"The Gospels as Historical Documents." Vols. II and III.	1909.
Stanton. V.	"The Jewish and the Christian Messiah."	1886.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Ritschl. A.	"Rechtfertigung u: Versöhnung." Band. II & III. 4th Auflage.	1895.
Ritschl. A.	"Justification and Reconciliation." English Translation.	1900
Ritschl. A.	"Unterricht in der Christian Religion." 6th Auflage.	1903.
Ryle & James.	"The Psalms of Solomon."	1891.
Sabatier. A.	"Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit."	1904.
Schleiermacher. F.	"Christliche Glaube." 5th Edition.	1861.
Schleiermacher. F.	"The Christian Faith in Outline." Trans. by Bailey.	1922.
Schleiermacher. F.	"Uber der Religion." 2nd Ed.	1906.
Schweitzer. A.	"Das Messianitäts -und Leidens- geheimnis."	1901.
Schweitzer. A.	"Geschichte Leben-Jesus-Forschung" 2nd Edition.	1921.
Schweitzer. A.	"Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung."	1911.
Scott. E.F.	"The Kingdom and The Messiah. Edin:	1911.
Seeley. J.R.	"Ecce Homo."	1895.
Simpson., P.Carnegie.	"The Fact of Christ." Popular Edition.	
(Smith. W. Robertson. (R)	"The Old Testament in the Jewish Church." Lecture X. The Prophets.)	Edin:1881.
Stanton. V.	"The Gospels as Historical Documents." Vols. II and III.	1909.
Stanton. V.	"The Jewish and the Christian Messiah."	1886.

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
Stapfer. E.	"Jésus-Christ." 2nd Ed. III Vols. Vol I. Vol II. Vol III.	1896. 1897. 1898.
Strachan. R.H.	"The Fourth Evangelist." Dramatist or Historian. London.	1925.
Strack. H.L. u Billerbeck.P.	"Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud u.s.w."	1922.
Strack. H.L. u Billerbeck.P.	"Das Evangelium nach Markus. Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte erläutert aus Talmud u.s.w."	1924.
Strack. H.L. u. Billerbeck.P.	"Joma, der Mischnatractat "Versoh- nungstag" Herausgegeben. von H.L.Strack.	1904.
Strack. H.L. u. Billerbeck.P.	"Die Sprüche der Väter." ed. H.L.Strack.	1901.
Streeter. B.H.	"The Four Gospels."	1924.
Temple. W.	"Mens Creatrix."	1923.
Temple. W.	"Christus Veritas."	1924.
Tennant. F.R.	"Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions."	1925.
Tennant. F.R.	"Divine Personality." (Art. in Congregational Quarterly; October.	1924.
(Anon).	"Theologia Germanica." trans. S. Wenkworth.	1854.
Underwood. A.C.	"Conversion: Christian and non- Christian."	1925.

(496.)

(Bibliography Continued).

<u>Author.</u>	<u>Title.</u>	<u>Date.</u>
von Hügel. Baron.	"Eternal Life."	1912.
von Hügel. Baron. (R)	"Essays and Addresses."	1921.
von Soden. Baron.	"Hat Jesus gelebt?"	1910.
Warschauer. J.	"Jesus: Seven Questions."	1908.
Weiss. J.	"Christus" Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher."	1909.
Weiss. J.	"Das Aelteste Evangelium."	1903.
Weinel. H.	"Die Gleichnisse Jesu." Leipzig.	1910.
Wellhausen. J.	"Das Evangelium Matthais."	1914.
Wendland. P.	"Die hellenistisch-romische Kultur." 2nd and 3rd Auflage. (A)	1912.
Wendland. P.	"Die urchristl. Literaturformen." 2nd and 3rd Auflage. (A)	1912.
Wendt. H.H.	„Die Apostelgeschichte." 8th Auflage.	1899.
Wendt. H.H. (R)	"The Teaching of Jesus." Eng. Trans. II Volumes.	1893.
Wrede. W.	"Character u: Tendenz des Johannes- evangeliums."	1903.
" "	<i>Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien</i>	1901
(A)	Wendland. P. 1912. Two Volumes in One.	

INDEX.

I. Scriptural Passages.

A. Old Testament.

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gen: IV,24. p.214. | Is: XXIX,13. p.142. |
| VI,2. p.380. | XXXV,5. p.139. |
| XXVIII,10ff. p.113. | LIII. p.125,144. |
| Ex: .XX,12. p.142. | LV,9. p.447. |
| Deut: V,16. p.142. | LVI,7. p.145. |
| XXXIII,27. p.447. | LVIII,6. p.83,349. |
| I Sam: XVI,7. p.368. | LXI,1f, p.349. |
| I Kings. XIX,5. p.172. | 1ff. p.139. |
| I Chron: XXVIII,9. p.368. | 4, p.83. |
| Ps: XXII,1ff. p.293. | Jer: I,4ff. p.221. |
| Ps: LXXXII,6. p.380. | VII,11.p.145. |
| CXVIII,22. p.195. | XI,20. p.368. |
| 26. p.194. | XVII,10. p.368. |
| CXXXIX,8f. p.447. | XX,9, p.184. |
| Is: II. p.185. | Ezek: I,1. p.221. |
| IV,9,10. p.143. | Dan: VII,13.f p.89,145. |
| VI,1. p.221. | Hos: I,10. p.380. |
| 5. p.415. | Amos. II,4, p.214. |
| 9f. p.235. | VII,14f |

B. New Testament.

- Mt. I, 1, p.130.
 1ff. p.166,173,300,306. Mt.V. 1, p.300.
 16, p.130. 1ff. p.166,303,
 16ff. p.118. 1-4, p.187.
 17, p.18,130,173,55. 5, p.299.
 18, p.130,173. 6, p.187,215,
 18ff. p.173. 7-10, p.299.
 18-24, p.56. 8-9, p.215,
 22,23. p.56. 11f, p.187,
 13, p.265.
 II, 1ff. p.56,109,173, 14, p.299.
 300,306. 16, p.250,299.
 2-10, p.56. 17, p.299,393,431
 13ff, p.56. 18, p.447,
 13-23, p.27. 19-24, p.299.
 15, p.147. 20, p.451.
 III, 1ff. p.109. 21ff, p.431.
 2, p.28,424, 23, p.328,329,
 5, p.189. 23f, p.451.
 7, p.425. 25f, p.187.
 7-12, p.189, 27ff, p.246,299.
 8, p.424. 28, p.451.
 10-12, p.140. 32, p.246.
 14f, p.229. 33, p.299. v33: p.299,458
v38-48, p.271,4
 17, p.39,171,220. 39f, p.187.
 22, p.249. 39ff, p.213.
 IV, 1-11, p.34,47,70,160. 41, p.299.
 7, p.78. 41f, p.456.
 10, p.78. 42, p.187.
 11, p.172. 43, p.299.
 11f, p.156. 43f, p.387.
 12f, p.348. 43ff, p.385,458.
 12ff. p.190. 44, p.456,459.
 13-16. p.299. 44-48, p.187.
 18. p.83. 45, p.222.
 22, p.83. 48, p.387.
 23-25. p.299.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

- Mt. VI, 1-8, p.299.
 14f, p.328,329.
 14-18, p.299.
 24, p.70.
 25-33, p.187.
 27, p.452.
 30, p.452.
 32, p.212,387,452.
 33, p.446,449,
 34, p.299.
- VII, 1ff, p.166.
 1-5, p.187.
 6, p.299.
 6f, p.307.
 7, p.452.
 7-11, p.187.
 12, p.187.
 13f, p.187.
 15, p.299.
 16-18, p.187.
 16-20, p.425.
 19f, p.299.
 21, p.68,187.
 24, p.450.
 24-27, p.187,266.
 28f, p.231.
 29, p.207,252,
- VIII, 1, p.299.
 1ff, p.166.
 1-5, p.166.
 5-13, p.154.
 6,8, p.70.
 17f, p.299.
 20, p.96.
 27, p.163.
 29, p.40.
- IX, 1ff, p.299.
 1-8, p.232.
 8, p.167,249.
 13, p.393.
 13f, p.223.
 15, p.394.
 26f, p.104.
- IX, 35, p.236.
 38, p.70.
- X, 1, p.236.
 1ff, p.78,445,
 2-6, p.299.
 5-23, p.444,
 7, p.139,156,218,
 8, p.299.
 9,11, p.236.
 14, p.43,236.
 15, p.139,218.
 17-23, p.299.
 21, p.268.
 23, p.107,447.
 24f, p.70.
 26-33, p.187.
 32f, p.36,96,
 34f, p.393.
 41, p.299.
 42, p.128.
- XI, 1, p.299.
 2ff, p.119,155,274.
 2-11, p.139,218 ~~3, p.9.~~
 4ff, p.157.
 8, p.58.
 12, p.451.
 14f, p.300.
 19, p.96,457.
 21f, p.157.
 27, p.33.
 28, p.58,77.
 28f, p.331 ~~28-30. p.299.~~
 35, p.70.
- XII, 1ff, p.77.
 1-8, p.233,
 5f, p.58.
 5-7, p.299.
 6, p.77.
 8, p.77,78.
 9-14, p.233.
 11, p.390.
 18&&, p.147.
 22-37, p.234.

(Index. New Testament. Continued).

Mt. XII (Continued)

27, p.6,330.
 28, p.386.
 32, p.96.
 34, p.299,425.
 36f, p.299.
 38f, p.159.
 38-42, p.192.
 39ff, p.96.
 40, p.108.
 41f, p.159.
 45ff, p.168.
 50, p.327,450.

XIII, 1-9, p.264,265.

8, p.450.
 10-13, p.234.
 13, p.143.
 14f, p.299.
 24-30, p.264,299.
 35, p.69.
 36, p.303.
 36-43, p.264.
 36-52, p.299.
 37, p.107.
 39, p.447.
 41, p.75, 107,
 45f, p.265.
 53ff, p.254.
 57, p.191.
 58, p.235.

XIV, 1f, p.191.

14, p.447.
 28-31, p.299. 24-33, p.164.
 33, p.48,203,250.
 34, p.447.
 36, p.268.

XV, 1-20, p.237,

12f, p.58,299.
 23f, p.300.
 29-31, p.299.
 31, p.249.

Mt. XVI. 1f, p.192,

1-4, p.192,238,
 3, p.453.
 13, p.93,101,
 13ff, p.120.
 13-23, p.48,101,122,248.
 14, p.192,
 16, p.102.
 17-19, p.299.
 18, p.78.
 18f, p.49,73.
 21, p.102.
 22, p.78.
 24-26, p.242.
 27f, p.104.
 28, p.75,104,108,243.
 56, p.145.

XVII, 4, p.72,

5, p.40.
 6f, p.300,307.
 9, p.105.
 10ff, p.105,144.
 16-21, p.249.
 24-27, p.299.
 30, p.249.

XVIII, 1-5, p.245,

3f, p.300.
 4, p.389.
 6-9, p.245.
 10, p.58,300,303.
 11, p.108.
 16-20, p.300.
 19, p.75.
 20, p.75,446,452.
 21, p.213.
 21-24, p.457,
 22, p.328.
 23-35, p.300.
 27-30, p.457.
 35, p.75.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

Mt. XIX, 1-12, p.246.
 10-12. p.300.
 15. p.300.
 16. p.407.
 16-30. p.239.
 18. p.142.

XX, 1-16. p.265,300.
 28. p.394.

XXI, 1-11. p.128,143,194,250.
 5. p.147.
 10f, p.196.
 11. p.79,199,129,143.
 12f. p.145,223.
 14. p.300.
 16f. p.300.
 23-27. p.197,224.
 28-31. p.265,300 .
 31. p.303.
 33-46. p.197,226.
 43. p.300,303.
 46. p.129,143,196,199.

XXII, 1ff. p.449.
 9. p.449.
 12-14, p.300.
 15-22. p.240.
 34-40. p.240.
 39. p.69.
 46. p.300.

XXIII, 1ff. p.187.
 1-3. p.300.
 4. p.451,453.
 5. p.300.
 8-11. p.300.
 15-22. p.300.
 16ff. p.159.
 24. p.300.
 30ff,37. p.125.
 33, p.425.
 37. p.125.

Mt. XXIV, 11-13, p.300,307.
 14. p.447.
 25. p.448.
 27. p.99,106.
 30f. p.145.
 34. p.447.
 36. p.41.
 36-44. p.100.
 37. p.99,106.
 39, p.99.
 42. p.76,300,418.
 44. p.96,99.
 45f,49f. p.70.

XXV, 1-13. p.300 .
 14ff. p.266.
 31. p.108.
 31-46. p.265,300.

XXVI, 1-3, p.300.
 21-25, p.246.
 26-29, p.44,247,297.
 28. p.108.
 30f. p.145.
 36-46, p.50,228.
 42, p.76,418.
 52-54. p.300.
 53. p.307.
 56. p.145.
 63ff. p.381.

XXVII, 3-10. p.300.
 19. p.300.
 24f. p.300.
 52f. p.300.
 52-54. p.307.
 54. p.41,379.
 62-66. p.300.

XXVIII, 1-10, p.45,
 2-4. p.300.
 6. p.77.
 8ff. p.57.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

Mt. XXVIII, 11. p. 108.
 11ff. p. 300.
 16-30. p. 253.
 18. p. 18.
 19. p. 75.
 41. p. 75.

Mk. I, 1-27. p. 77.
 3. p. 70, 74.
 4. p. 28.
 7-8. p. 28, 189.
 9. p. 28.
 10f. p. 220.
 11. p. 39, 171.
 12f. p. 47.
 13. p. 173, 172.
 14. p. 189.
 14f. p. 190, 348.
 15. p. 189.
 21-28. p. 122.
 22. p. 162, 207, 217, 231, 252.
 25. p. 294.
 27f. p. 162, 166.
 35. p. 222.
 40f. p. 232, 233.
 40-45, p. 166.
 44. p. 71.

II, 1-12. p. 232.
 5ff. p. 381, 425.
 7. p. 430.
 9ff. p. 157.
 10. p. 101, 292.
 12. p. 167, 249.
 15-17, p. 234.
 16f. p. 430.
 17. p. 393.
 17ff. p. 394.
 18-22. p. 234

Mk. II, 23-28. p. 233.
 24. p. 430.
 27. p. 77, 431.
 28. p. 101.

III, 1-6. p. 233.
 11f. p. 39, 250, 295.
 20-30. p. 234.
 22. p. 251.
 28f. p. 234.
 34. p. 452.
 35. p. 69, 388.

IV, 1. p. 17.
 1-9. p. 264, 265, 266.
 2. p. 301.
 9. p. 234.
 11-12. p. 234.
 12. p. 143.
 33. p. 235, 301.
 40. p. 385.
 41. p. 48, 163.

V, 1ff. p. 420.
 5ff. p. 295.
 7. p. 40.
 18f. p. 70.
 20. p. 164.
 43. p. 71, 295.

VI, 1-6. p. 30, 207, 251, 254, 274.
 4. p. 191, 200.
 5. p. 168.
 5f. p. 235.
 6-13. p. 236.
 10f. p. 43.
 13. p. 236.
 14f. p. 191, 192.
 18f. p. 237.
 30-44. p. 203
 34. p. 351.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

MkVI, (Continued).

35ff. p.268.
 45 - VIII,26. p.21.
 47-52. p.164.
 50. p.222.
 52. p.291,292.

VII,1-13. p.237.

2ff. p.430.
 4-16. p.142.
 6f. p.142.
 19. p.291.
 26ff. p.420.
 31-37. p.168.
 37. p.165.

VIII,1-10. p.203.

11f. p.192.
 11ff. p.238.
 22-26. p.168.
 27. p.101,251.
 27ff. p.129.
 27-33. p.48,101,122,
 248.
 28. p.192.
 29. p.73,102.
 30. p.248.
 31. p.102,241.
 34. p.244.
 34-37. p.242.
 38. p.98,104,192.
 38-IX,1. p.104.

IX,

1, p.108,243,447.
 5. p.72.
 7. p.40,251.
 9. p.105.
 12. p.105,144.
 14-29. p.249,295.
 29. p.169.
 31. p.105.
 33-37. p.245.
 34. p.459.

Mk. IX,41. p.128.

42. p.286.
 42-48. p.245.

X,1-12. p.246.

13-16. p.223.
 14. p.268,327.
 15. p.389.
 17f. p.407.
 17-31. p.239. 19. p.442.
 21ff. p.143.
 29-31. p.296.
 33. p.105.
 33f. p.296.
 40. p.297.
 45. p.105.
 52. p.295.

XI,1, p.301.

1-11. p.128,129,143,194,
 250.
 3, p.9,71.
 7. p.40.
 9f. p.268.
 10f. p.194.
 12. p.196.
 15-19. p.145,223.
 17. p.426.
 22. p.295.
 26. p.386.
 27-33. p.197,224,328.

XII,1. p.301.

1-9. p.227.
 1-12. p.197,226.
 10f. p.227.
 13-17. p.240.
 28-34. p.240.
 35ff. p.52.
 35-37. p.72.
 37. p.17,136.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

Mk. XIII, 1ff. p. 78, 107, 291, 445,
448.

10. p. 449.
24-27. p. 106.
26. p. 145.
31. p. 447.
32. p. 41, 446.
33. p. 76.
35. p. 76.
39. p. 41.

XIV, 9. p. 328.
18-21. p. 246.
22-25. p. 44, 247, 297.
26f. p. 145.
32-42. p. 50, 228.
35f. p. 50.
36. p. 418.
38, p. 413.
49. p. 145.
58. p. 431.
64. p. 430.

XV, 16-38. p. 293.
32. p. 129.
34. p. 420.
39. p. 41, 250, 379, 422.

XVI, 1-8. p. 45.
19. p. 72, 74.

Lk. I, 1ff. p. 111, 150, 174, 309.
1-4. p. 19.
12-25. p. 174.
28-38. p. 174.
31-33. p. 82.
32f. p. 58.
35. p. 59.
39-56. p. 174.
43. p. 82.
46-55. p. 148.
57-79. p. 174.
68-79. p. 148.

II, 1ff. p. 111, 174, 309.
8-20. p. 174.
10ff. p. 131.
11. p. 82.
25-35. p. 174.

Lk. II (Continued)

26. p. 82, 131.
36-38. p. 175.
41ff. p. 420.
42-52. p. 27.

III, 1f. p. 308.
1ff. p. 111, 150.
3. p. 189.
5. p. 308.
7-9. p. 189, 424.
10-15. p. 308.
16. p. 28, 189.
16f. p. 140, 189, 190.
18-20. p. 308.
19ff. p. 190.
21f. p. 160.
22. p. 39, 171, 220.
23. p. 348.
28-38. p. 308.
38. p. 380.

IV, 1-13. p. 34, 47, 70, 160.
13. p. 172.
16-30. p. 254, 308, 149,
311, 348, 393.
18. p. 83.
21f. p. 149.
21ff. p. 254.
22. p. 83.
25-28. p. 431.
25-30. p. 254, 311.
31f. p. 231.
36f. p. 162, 166.
40. p. 235.
41, p. 309, 313.
42. p. 222.

V, 1-11. p. 308.
5. p. 84.
8. p. 80, 207, 332, 415.
12-16. p. 166.
17. p. 84, 308, 312.
17-26. p. 232.
26. p. 167, 249.
32. p. 393.
39. p. 308.

VI, 1-5. p. 233.
5. p. 77, 80.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

Lk. VI (Continued).

- 6-11. p.233.
- 12. p.308.
- 24-26. p.255,308,311.
- 31. p.452.
- 34. p.255,308,311.
- 35. p.387.
- 43. p.234.
- 45. p.234,255,308,311.
- 46. p.88.

VII, 1-10. p.154.

- 11-17. p.308,322.
- 13. p.80.
- 16. p.200,249.
- 18ff. p.119,155.
- 18-28. p.139,218.
- 21. p.155.
- 22ff. p.155,157,274.
- 34. p.457.
- 36ff. p.457.
- 36-50. p.256,308.
- 47. p.329.

VIII, 1-3. p.308.

- 4-8. p.264.
- 9f. p.234.
- 10. p.143.
- 15. p.80.
- 22. p.308.
- 24. p.84.
- 25. p.163.
- 28. p.40.
- 39. p.164.
- 43. p.308.
- 45 p.84,308.
- 51-56. p.308,312.

IX, 1-6. p.236.

- 2. p.139,218.
- 5. p.43.
- 7ff. p.191.
- 18. p.101.
- 18ff. p.84.
- 18-22. p.48,101,122,248.

Lk. IX (Continued).

- 19. p.192.
- 20. p.102,73.
- 22. p.102.
- 23-25. p.242.
- 26. p.98.
- 27. p.243.
- 32. p.72,192.
- 33. p.84.
- 35. p.40.
- 37-43a, p.249.
- 43. p.249.
- 46. p.451.
- 46-48. p.245.
- 49. p.84.
- 56. p.257.
- 51-56. p.157.
- 51-62. p.257.
- 56. p.257.
- 58. p.96.
- 61f. p.308.

X, 1. p.80,81,308.

- 1ff. p.19.
- 2. p.450.
- 9. p.139,156,218.
- 11. p.139,218.
- 12. p.139,218.
- 13f. p.157.
- 13ff. 284.
- 16-20. p.308.
- 17. p.157.
- 17-24. p.257.
- 20. p.281.
- 22. p.33.
- 25ff. p.311.
- 25-28. p.240,257.
- 25-42. p.308.
- 29. p.332.
- 29-36. p.265.
- 36. p.332.

XI, 1. p.308.

- 3. p.9.
- 4. p.451.
- 5. p.43.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

Lk. XI (Continued).

5-8. p.265,308.
 9ff. p.284.
 14ff. p.156,157,158.
 14-23. p.37,234.
 15. p.158,308.
 16. p.159.
 18. p.158,308.
 18ff. p.84.
 19. p.158.
 20. p.58.
 21. p.308.
 21f. p.158.
 27f. p.257.
 27-32. p.308.
 29ff. p.96,311.
 29-32. p.159,192,258.
 32. p.192,238.
 33. p.84.
 36-38. p.308.
 40. p.308,311.
 45. p.308.
 53ff. p.308.

XII, 1. p.308.

8. p.96.
 8ff. p.36.
 10, p.96,234.
 11-21. p.308.
 16-21. p.265.
 22ff. p.284.
 31f. p.453.
 34ff. p.284.
 35. p.96.
 35-38. p.308.
 37. p.234.
 39f. p.99.
 40. p.96.
 41. p.308.
 42. p.80.
 47-50. p.308.
 51f. p.393.
 52. p.308.
 54. p.238.
 54-57. p.308,452.
 57ff. p.452.

Lk. XIII, 1-9. p.258.

1-17. p.308.
 8. 110.
 10-17. p.259.
 13. p.249.
 14. p.430.
 15. p.80.
 18ff. p.284.
 22-23. p.308.
 24,25. p.259.
 25-27. p.308.
 28. p.259.
 29-30. p.259.
 30-33. p.308.
 33. p.200.
 35. p.69.

XIV, 1ff. p.312.

1-7. p.259.
 1-10. p.308.
 7-11. p.259.
 12-15. p.308.
 25. p.308.
 28-33. p.308.

XV, 1. p.308.

3. p.309.
 8-32. p.308.
 11ff. p.329.
 12-32. p.265.
 20. p.329.

XVI, 1-12. p.308.

13. p.284.
 14-15. p.308.
 13-53. p.174.
 19-31. p.308.

XVII, 1ff. p.218.

1-2. p.245.
 2. p.308.
 5. p.80,308.
 6. p.80.
 7ff. p.312.
 7-22. p.308.
 13. p.84.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

Lk. XVII (Continued).

15. p.249.
 21. p.218.
 24. p.99.
 25. p.308.
 26ff. p.99.
 28-32. p.308.
 31ff. p.450.

XVIII, 1-14. p.308.
 3,4. p.213.
 6. p.80.
 8. p.110.
 9-14. p.265.
 15-17. p.223.
 18. p.407.
 18-30. p.239.
 20. p.142.

XIX, 1-10. p.260.
 1-11. p.308.
 5. p.457.
 8. p.80.
 9f. p.110.
 10. p.351,393,459.
 28-38. p.128,143,194,250.
 31. p.81.
 38. p.84.
 40. p.385.
 41-44. p.308.
 45-48. p.145,223.
 48. p.308.

XX, 1-8. p.197,224.
 9-19. p.197,226.
 18. p.309,313.
 20-26. p.240.
 39-46. p.228.

XXI, 25f. p.309.
 27. p.145.
 34-36. p.308.
 36. p.110.

XXII, 4,6,8, p.308.
 15-17. p.308.
 15-20. p.44,247,297.
 21ff. p.246.
 31. p.81.

Lk. XXII, (Continued).

31f. p.308,458.
 31ff. p.19,386.
 35-38. p.260,308.
 39-46. p.50.
 43f. p.309,313.
 51f. p.308.
 53. p.418.
 61. p.80,81.

XXIII,

2,14-16. p.308.
 8. p.260.
 27-31. p.308.
 40-43. p.308.
 46. p.308,311,422.
 47. p.41,249.
 48,56. p.308.

XXIV, 1ff. p.150.

1-11. p.45.
 3. p.82.
 12. p.45,175.
 13. p.175.
 13ff. p.149,309,372.
 13-32. p.175.
 13-35. p.148.
 13-53. p.131,174.
 19. p.200.
 25f. p.131.
 27. p.148.
 31ff. p.19.
 33-49. p.175.
 34. p.82.
 36-49. p.60,149.
 44ff. p.149.
 46. p.130.
 48. p.60.
 50-53. p.175.

John. I, 1ff. p.88.

1-49. p.65.
 4. p.318.
 4f. p.273.
 12. p.307.
 18. p.317.
 27,29. p.29.
 32f. p.178.
 41. p.133.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

John. I (Continued).

47,48. p.274.
49. p.65,208.
51. p.113.

II, 1ff. p.88.
11. p.177.
23. p.177.

III, 1ff. p.88,317.
13f. p.113.
16-18. p.274.
16-35. p.65.
17. p.274,393.
18. p.274.

IV, 1. p.86.
1ff. p.89
7ff. p.317.
11. p.86.
14. p.179, 203.
15. p.86.
19, p.86,179, 202,203.
23. p.86.
25f. p.133.
32. p.133.
34. p.136,183,389.
34ff. p.393.
42. p.133,177,208.
44. p.203.
46-54. p.177.
49. p.86.
68. p.208.

V, 7. p.86.
17. p.150,271,389.
19. p.150,271.
19f. p.65.
24. p.274.
27. p.114.
28. p.271.
45. p.271,274.

VI, 2. p.177.
14. p.179,203.
26. p.178.
32ff. p.317.
34. p.86.
35. p.180.

John VI (Continued).

40. p.65.
48. p.180.
48ff. p.65.
51. p.180.
52ff. p.208.
53. p.112.
54. p.406.
55. p.180.
60ff. p.208.
62. p.112.
63. p.44.
68. p.86,180,208,276,406

VII, 1ff. p.88.
26f. p.133.
31. p.177,179.
37. p.180,317.
40. p.203,204.
41f. p.133.
52. p.203,204.

VIII, 1ff. p.457.
11. p.86.
12ff. p.271.
14. p.272.
15. p.272,274.
21ff. p.208.
21-59. p.65.
26. p.65.
28. p.112.
29. p.390,406.
40. p.274.
41. p.58,380.
46. p.406.

IX, 1-41. p.177.
4. p.393.
17. p.203.
22. p.133.
25f. p.65.
30f. p.177.
31,33. p.179.
35. p.112.
36,38. p.86.

X, 1ff. p.88,317.
1-18. p.274,275.
10. p.394.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

John X, (Continued).

10f. p.275.
 19-29. p.274,275.
 24. p.133.
 25,27f. p.274.
 28. p.406.
 30. p.391.
 30ff. p.275.
 37. p.274.

XI, 1ff. p.86,88,
 2. p.86.
 4. p.177.
 5. p.179.
 6. p.177,315.
 12. p.186.
 15. p.177,179,315.
 21. p.86.
 25ff. p.133.
 27,32,39. p.86.

XXI,24. p.112.
 28f. p.178.
 34. p.112.
 46,46ff. p.273.
 47f. p.274.

XIII,6,9,13,14. p.86.
 21. p.112.
 25,36,37. p.86.

XIV,1. p.317.
 1ff. p.60,83.
 5. p.86.
 6. p.318.
 8. p.86.
 17. p.318.
 22. p.86.

XVI,1-10, p.275,
 1ff. p.317.

XVI, 1ff. p.87,88.

XVII, 1ff. p.87.
 3. p.318,406.
 12ff. p.318.

John XVIII, 1ff. p.87.
 36. p.449,
 37. p.393,394.
 XIX, 1ff. p.87,88.

XX, 1ff. p.88.
 2. p.87.
 18. p.86.
 20. p.86.
 22. p.318.
 25. p.86,87.
 28. p.87,88.
 30. p.134.
 31. p.133,318.

XXI, 1ff. p.88.
 1-7. p.178.
 7. p.86.
 12,15. p.86.
 15ff. p.458.
 16. p.86.
 17. p.80,86.
 20f. p.86.
 25. p.134.

Acts I, 1. p.358.
 10. p.221.
 13. p.368.
 15,24,26. p.369.

II, 1ff. p.7,239,371.
 17f. p.369.
 24. p.365.
 25. p.369.
 32. p.360,369.
 36. p.360.
 38,42f. p.369.
 47. p.369,372.

III, 6. p.369.
 14. p.295.

IV, 10. p.360,361.
 30. p.361.

(Index. New Testament) Continued.

Acts: VI, 8ff, 10. p.370.
 VII, 59. p.361.
 VIII, 15ff. p.371.
 26, 26ff, p.370.
 28ff. p.371.
 IX, 7. p.366, 371.
 20. p.354,
 29. p.361.
 X, 10. p.221.
 14, 19. p.370.
 25f. p.379.
 44ff. p.371.
 XI, 26. p.355.
 XIII, 2, 4. p.370.
 29ff. p.360.
 XIV, 8ff. p.159..
 8-18. p.379.
 XVI, 6. p.370.
 XVII, 3. p.354.
 11. p.149.
 28. p.379.
 XIX, 2ff. p.371.
 21. p.371.
 XX, 22ff. p.371.
 XXII, 9. p.366, 371.
 10. p.370.
 XXVI, 8, 23. p.354.
 28. p.355.

Rom. I, 1. p.370.

VIII, 9. p.128.

Rom. VIII (Continued).
 10. p.402.
 14, 16, 19, p.380.
 21. p.335, 387.
 37. p.363.

XV, 3ff. p.118.

I Cor: I, 21. p.363.
 23. p.355, 360.

IV, 15. p.388.

VII, 25. p.332.

VIII, 5f. p.117.

IX, 19ff. p.370.
 22, 33. p.459.

XI, 23ff. p.360.

XII, 12, 27. p.441.

XIV, 1-19. p.374.
 18. p.371.

XV, 4-8. p.365.

XVI, 22. p.69.

II Cor: III, 17. p.335.
 V, 17. p.363.
 21. p.402.

VIII, 9. p.460.

XI. 17. p.332.

Gal: I, 3. p.475.

II, 2. p.364.
 6ff. p.377.
 14. p.364.
 20. p.363.

III, 26, p.380, 387.

(Index. New Testament Continued).

EPH. I, 22ff. p. 441.

III, 18f. p. 363.

V, 1. p. 387.

Phil. I, 21. p. 10, 363.
23. p. 364.

II, 15. p. 380.

IV, 13. p. 363.

Col. III, 3. p. 474.

I Tim. I, 15. p. 415.

II Tim, I, 12. p. 318.

Heb. IV, 15. p. 344, 402.

I Pet. II, 22. p. 402.

IV, 1. p. 355

I John III, 1f. p. 380
5. p. 402.

INDEX. (Cont:)

II. Principal Subjects.

(See also Table of Contents). p.iii.)

Apocalyptic. cf Index Mk.XIII, 1ff; Mt.X, 1ff etc.,

Aristotle's ethic. 436ff.

Authority, as creative. 466f, 471f, 486.

and truth, 336, 479-482.

and freedom, 336, 483, 487.

of Jesus, its basis (see contents) 30, 224, 226ff, 230, 236, 251, 252, 277ff, 306, 316, 375, 471.

Baptism of Jesus. 28, 35, 160, 171, 220, 423ff.

Confession of Peter. 48f, 73, 84, 101ff, 122, 248, 279.

Crucifixion. 161, 279, 293, 460, 458, 460. (See Scripture Index).

Divinity of Jesus. 59, 62, 64ff, 333, 362, 379ff, 392-396. (See also 'Sonship').

Eschatological Theory. 444ff, 450.

Ethic, redemptive. 319, 455ff.

Faith. 295, 331.

Gethsemane. 50, 228 (See Scriptural Index).

Glossalalia. 371ff.

(Index. Principal Subjects Cont:).

God as Father. 384ff, 416f.

God, Kingdom of, 442ff.

Gospels - where written. 10.

Nature of the records. 14ff.

As Sources. 22f.

Their Historical portrait of Jesus. 25.

Greek ethical ideals. 435ff.

Jesus.

see 'Authority,' 'Baptism,' 'Crucifixion', 'Divinity,'
'Messiah',
'Resurrection', 'Risen Lord', 'Sinlessness',
'Temptation', 'Transfiguration', 'Triumphal Entry',
Birth (See Scriptural Index) also p.27,56.

Character. 326ff.

Circumstances of Lif. 11.

Ethical Ideals. 237ff, 242, 439ff.

Historical vs Eternal. 1f, 360.

Humanity. 29.

Lordship (See Contents).

Personal Authority (See Contents) also 284, 294,
306, 316, 332.

Personality (See Contents) also 207ff, 284ff, 294ff,
306, 312, 316ff, 322ff, 375, 440, 463ff.

As a Prophet. (See Contents) also 183ff, 283, 294.

Son of God (See Contents) also 32ff, 312, 379ff, 388ff.

(Index. Principal Subjects Cont:).

Jesus-Son of Man (See Contents) also 89ff, 145, 323.

John the Baptist. (See Scriptural Index) also 28, 189.

John's Gospel. (See Contents) also 16, 33.

Judaism and Jewish moral idealism. 11, 429ff.

Kingdom of God. 442ff.

Little Apocalypse. (See under Mk.XIII,1ff & Mt.X,1ff).

Lord - Jesus as Risen - p.27, 60, 149, 357ff, 473, 417.

Lordship. (See Contents) also p.74.

Lord's Supper.,44, 247, 279, 297, 360 (see Scriptural
Index).

Luke - Gospel of - 19ff, 308 (See Table of Contents).

Omits Mk. 21.

Nature of Chapters I & II. (see under Lk.I,1ff
Lk.II,1ff).

Mark's Gospel. 16, 286 etc.,

Matthew's Gospel. 18, 298 etc.,

Messiah, Messiahship etc, (see Contents) also 28, 55,
117, 121, 124, 134, 323, 338ff, 347.

Miracles. (see Contents) also 152, 170, 281, 292, 302,
312, 315.

Parabolic Method. 17, 19, 143, 234, 262ff, 301f, 304, 310.

Pentecost. 368, 374, 472.

Personality of Jesus (see Contents).

(Index. Principal Subjects Cont:).

Peter, (see under Confession).

Pirqe Aboth, 429.

Prophet, Jesus as, (See Contents).

Redemption, 319, 456ff, 474.

Resurrection. 45, 279, 365ff.

Risen Lord (See Contents) also 361-378.

Roman Empire. 4ff, 286.

Scriptural Sanctions (See Contents).

Sinlessness. (See Contents) also 400ff, 461, 465ff.

and divinity. 405.

consciousness. 406f, 415f.

difficulties. 407f, 420ff, 430ff, 435.

Solomon - Psalms of, 90, 147.

Son of God (see Contents) also 32ff, 379ff, 388ff, 474,
396, 398.

Son of Man, (See Contents) also 106, 111, 112.

Teaching of Jesus. 440ff, 462.

Temptation. 34f, 47, 70, 73, 78, 160.

Transfiguration. 72, 84, 161, 279 (See Scriptural Index).

Triumphal Entry. 79, 129, 143, 194, 250.