

insult then? John heard the message, and he had time in the prison to think?

He understood. How can we doubt that he understood? What else was the prison won for? What else was the message sent for? He understood that he had been sent, not before the strong wind and the earthquake, as he had supposed, but before the still small voice; not before the axe and the fire, but before the gospel to the poor. He had preached repentance and judgment to come. Jesus also preached repentance, but his long-suffering was not weary yet. John preached repentance and the axe; Jesus preached repentance and the Kingdom. And yet John understood now that Jesus demanded more than he.

For John demanded repentance and amendment of life: Jesus demanded repentance and a change

of heart. John demanded reformation; Jesus demanded regeneration. It was plain to see that the life must be amended, that the tax-gatherers must no longer extort, that the soldiers must no longer do violence. And if the axe was already at the root of the tree, the amendment could not be too speedy. Jesus began at the heart, touched the affections, drew forth the inalienable capacity of man to love, brought the human heart in contact with His own. The amendment will come. It may be longer in showing itself; but it will last longer; and He can wait. 'If thou art he that should come, where is the axe?' said John. The axe is become a hand to touch the leper, a voice to preach the gospel to the poor.

John understood. He had won his prison nobly, and now he saw that it was worth the winning.

The Secret of the Triumph of Christianity over the Ancient World.

BY PROFESSOR G. GRÜTZMACHER, PH.D., HEIDELBERG.

ALL attempts of the Imperial power of Rome to destroy Christianity by fire and sword had come to nought. Hundreds of victims had been sacrificed, but the Christian faith could not be slain. Phoenix-like it ever rose from the ashes. But a similar failure attended also the efforts to ally it with heathen cults—efforts fraught with greater peril to Christianity—which preceded or showed themselves simultaneously with the persecutions. In vain had that religious libertine on the throne of the Cæsars, Heliogabalus (218–222), invited the Christians to worship Christ as their God in the temple of his Syrian god, from whom he derived his name. In vain had the noble emperor Alexander Severus (222–235) sought to introduce a peculiar mixed religion, in which he also assigned a place to Christ. This was the first emperor who showed not merely toleration but a real sympathy for the Christians. His mother, Julia Mammæa, had caused the great Christian theologian, Origen, to

come to Antioch, that she might discuss with him the immortality of the soul; and Alexander Severus set up in his palace two oratories, in which he practised the cult of the saints of paganism. In the first a place was given to divine men of a less perfect type, such as Cicero and Virgil; in the second were set up the images of his ancestors, the best of the deified emperors and of holy souls, among whom, side by side with Apollonius of Tyana, Orpheus, and Alexander the Great, admittance was accorded to Abraham and Christ. Thither the emperor betook himself every morning before commencing the business of state, to find edification in presence of all that humanity had produced of what was noble, great, and holy. Possessed of a soul mystically inclined, with high culture and fine feeling, he found there religious enjoyment in spiritual communion with all the great souls of the past whom he could love and reverence. But noble as were the intentions

of this ruler; they had not and could not have any success. All who yearned for an embodiment of the Divine in the human, turned more and more, as time went on, to the crucified and God-exalted Son of Man, whose wonderfully simple history gave men's hearts the certainty that here God has truly manifested Himself in the flesh. Alexander Severus had brought them to the threshold of the sanctuary. His little oratory with its mystical semi-darkness speedily changed into a light and lofty temple with its gate thrown open wide. The figure of Jesus Christ freed itself from associations with Apollonius of Tyana, Orpheus, and Alexander the Great, and towered far above the heroes of the ancient world. And the same figure opposed itself with equal energy to all attempts of the Gnostics to transform it into mere abstractions; it retained flesh and blood, and the conquering Church invested it with the most glorious halo.

With Constantine, Christianity ascended the Roman throne, although this emperor continued outwardly a catechumen all his life, not suffering himself to be baptized till he lay upon his death-bed. After the victory of Constantine over his colleague, Licinius (323), the triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire was decided. The Church historian, Eusebius, has drawn a picture of the first Christian emperor, in which all the dark features in this brilliant career are either omitted or softened. Blinded like most of his contemporaries, Eusebius could not judge Constantine fairly. In the estimation of the latter, who, like his father, was a convinced monotheist, religion underlay all the various religions, but afterwards he went deeper into Christianity, and showed a genuine interest in ecclesiastical affairs. Greedy of power and unscrupulous, he has the merit of having rightly understood the signs of the times and of having indicated to his followers the correct path in religious politics. As sole ruler he did not, indeed, make Christianity the religion of the State; but, while still tolerating the old gods, he granted privilege upon privilege to the Christian Church and repressed paganism. With clear statesmanlike penetration he recognized that the Christians alone could give the tottering State the support which it urgently required. But the sudden and unlooked for change of conditions had also pernicious results for Christianity. The emperor had constituted himself lord and director of the Church, and the bishops bowed submissively to the will of the

ruler. The profane crowd, who had kept aloof from the martyr church, were attracted by a church endowed with rich privileges; and the moral level of the congregations sank visibly.

The sons of Constantine took sharper measures against paganism than their father. The heathen system, however, maintained its hold in the lowest strata of society, amongst the rural population, as well as in the highest circles, amongst the old Roman nobility. Both these grades of society clung tenaciously to the traditional religious faith; the one, because, naturally attached to the old and the traditional, they could not readily adjust their view-point to what was new; the other, because to them patriotism and mental culture were coincident with adherence to the ancient faith. Then came a brief period of reaction. Julian the Apostate, the nephew of Constans, ascended the throne in the year 361. This same emperor Constans, who had been the murderer of his kindred and the foe of his life, had shut the temples, prohibited the sacrifices, and well-nigh destroyed the old worship of the gods. Thus the youth, who had enjoyed a Christian training, early conceived a thorough aversion for Christianity. As ruler it was his aim to gain for a refined paganism the victory over Christianity. The dreams of poets and the speculations of philosophers were now to become living realities. Himself severely moral, he led the life of a strict ascetic, preaching moderation to a luxurious age. And yet he had soon to discover the utter futility of his policy. The great Alexandrian bishop, Athanasius, kept together the Christian Church, which Julian sought to tear asunder by his toleration of heretical movements. Although Athanasius had staked his whole life to secure the victory in the Church for the dogma of the *homoousia* of the Son with the Father, as what alone conserved the dignity of Jesus Christ as Redeemer, he was now broad-minded enough and prudent enough to sink petty differences, and in the time of need to conclude an alliance with the leaders of the new orthodoxy. A noble nature, an unbending character such as the times required, hated by his enemies, esteemed and loved by his followers, Athanasius was the man who gave steadfastness to the Christian Church. Julian, the blinded epigone of a great human epoch that was passing away, met a glorious death in the Persian war. Even if it is only a Christian legend that has put in the mouth

of the dying emperor the words, 'Galilæan, thou hast conquered!' these express the deepest truth. Christ had in fact conquered; the world's history is the world's judgment. This extended beyond the unhappy emperor, and the airy framework of a reformed heathen church which he had constructed was laid low as by a whirlwind.

In Julian the family of Constantine died out, and there followed a series of Christian emperors who accorded an honourable toleration to the heathen cults as well. Magical sacrifices alone were, with the assent of enlightened pagans, interdicted. The emperor Gratian, in conjunction with his Eastern colleague, Theodosius, was the first to abandon the hitherto practised policy of toleration of the heathen religion. Gratian had grown up under episcopal influences, and the amiable but weak Imperial youth was controlled even as ruler by Ambrose, the bishop of Milan. With the dignity and the consciousness of rank of an aristocrat, Ambrose united the energy of a true religious champion. An imperative sense of duty made him a genuine prince of the Church, while a delicate and profound knowledge of men constituted him a true pastor. The same man who gained the great Augustine to the Catholic Church, steeled the powers of resistance of a yielding prince against all the attempts of the heathen nobility to win the emperor to their side. In spite of their profession of Christianity, the emperors, from Constantine onwards, had retained the dignity of a heathen high priest (*pontifex maximus*). Gratian was the first to lay this aside. He also caused the altar of Victory to be removed from the *curia* of the Roman Senate. Then the heathen party rose once more, led by Ambrose's cousin, Q. Aurelius Symmachus. An enthusiastic patriot for the antique, he besought the emperor on behalf of the wasted temples and the desecrated altars. A noble character, an amiable personality, an upright statesman, a kind and conscientious father, he lacked faith in his own cause. A religious sceptic, he had no real interest except in sport and games. When we compare his extant correspondence with that of his Christian contemporary, Jerome, we are struck with the immense spiritual inferiority of this best of Romans. Although Symmachus in more than one respect stands morally higher than Jerome, the latter has upon his side ability, energy, and a living faith, which, in spite of its grotesque form and its being coupled with fanaticism, pos-

sesses world-subduing power. Paganism, as it aged, sank lower every day, and the Roman aristocracy, the women in particular, turned from the ancient deities to the crucified God. The breach with the old sensuous life completed itself in the sharpest form; noble Roman ladies like Marcella, Paula, and her daughter Eustochium, became nuns; senators like Pammachius, consulars like Paulinus of Nola, became monks. And the rise of the ascetic movement above all enriched the world of women with privileges that cannot be too highly estimated. Now it was possible for women to satisfy their mental and religious interests by taking Bible lessons under the guidance of so learned a man as Jerome.

The emperor Gratian had died in 383. Shortly before his death he had promulgated a fresh enactment, under which the penalty of going over to paganism or Judaism was the loss of the privileges of Roman citizenship. Accordingly, when Valentinian II., at the age of thirteen, ascended the throne, Symmachus approached the emperor once more, and besought him to revoke the anti-pagan decrees. 'He should distinguish the faith of ancient Rome, which conquered the world, from his private religion. Since man has no certain knowledge of Divine things, he must hold fast to the authority of antiquity.' But this patriotic petition availed nothing. Ambrose strengthened the hands of the emperor, and Valentinian gave the decidedly adverse reply, that he meant to spare the Christian religion and the memory of his brother Gratian. Hand in hand at first with Gratian, and then with Valentinian, the emperor Theodosius in the East extirpated heathenism by sharp measures. The Catholic Church became identified with the State religion, and any going over to heathenism was forbidden. Yet this powerful emperor had to bend before the Christian bishop, Ambrose, who excluded him from Church fellowship, and compelled him to do penance publicly when Theodosius had quenched in blood the flames of the revolt at Thessalonica. In spite, however, of this temporary collision between the secular and the ecclesiastical power, the relation between Ambrose and Theodosius continued friendly down to the death of the emperor. 'I loved the man,' says Ambrose, 'who was merciful and humble in the use of his power, and who had a pure and broken heart. I loved the man who in the Church publicly bewailed the sin into which the wiles of others

had led him. I loved the man who listened more to reason than to flattery. The step from which shame would have deterred a private person, the emperor was not ashamed to take, namely, to submit to public church discipline, as afterwards he never ceased to lament his error. Nay, on account of the blood shed on the occasion of his brilliant victory in the civil war, he voluntarily separated himself from the enjoyment of the Holy Supper until the arrival of his son, so earnestly expected, assured him of the return of the Divine favour. I loved the man who, on his deathbed, desired to see me, who in breathing his last was more concerned about the Church than about the welfare of his own.'

When, upon the death of Theodosius in 395, the empire was divided between his sons Honorius and Arcadius, the Imperial prestige sank ever lower, owing to the incursions of barbarians in the West and the East. No one had any longer clean hands and a pure conscience, or any delicate natural disposition. But in the Western Church there rose characters of great strength. The greatest of these was Augustine. In darkness and distress he had vainly turned for peace to Cicero, to the morally strict Manichæans, to Aristotle, and to Neo-Platonism. He had been guilty of serious moral aberrations, until at last he found steadfastness and strength in the Catholic Church. The well-known motto, which he himself prefixed to the sketch of his life in his *Confessions*, expresses all the greatness of this Christian character: 'Great art Thou, O Lord, and greatly to be loved. Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless till it rests in Thee.' No one since the days of the Apostle Paul has exercised such influence upon posterity; no one did more to pave the way for the decisive victory of Christianity over effete paganism; none had such a share as he in rescuing all that was valuable in the ancient system and bestowing upon Christianity the heritage of antiquity. In the year 426 he finished his 'apology' for the Kingdom of God, in which he sought to show that Christianity was not responsible for the misery of the times. The prestige of the emperor sank, but that of the Christian bishop rose. This condition of things is eloquently witnessed to by the decree of the emperor Valentinian III. addressed to the bishop of Rome, Leo I. the Great, in the year 475: the empire is hastening to its end, let all eyes be turned to the Bishop of Rome.

To him the providential task was assigned of keeping safe in the ark of the Church whatever in the ancient system was capable of life, until the deluge of popular migrations was over.

With more severity in the East than in the West it was sought to destroy the last remnants of heathenism. The bigoted emperor Theodosius II., who had himself consecrated as a priest, sent monks with full Imperial powers into all provinces of the empire to persecute the heathen. The noble heathen lady philosopher, Hypatia, was trampled to death by the Christian mob of Alexandria (445), not without blame on the part of the bishop, Cyril. In 448 all heathen polemical writings directed against Christianity were ordered to be burned. The Church teachers, like the three Cappadocians, the high-souled Chrysostom, the heterodox idealist, Synesius of Cyrene, who trusted for the victory of Christianity to its spiritual power, had their place taken by wild fanatics, who laid it upon the emperors as a matter to conscience to destroy heathenism by fire and sword. But the truth that the pagan faith was dying out was widened plainly by the circumstance that it had not the energy to oppose martyrdoms to the triumphant advance of Christianity. The emperor Justinian abolished the ancient festal games, and in 529 closed the philosophers' school at Athens. Its last spiritual rallying-point was thus taken from paganism. The light of heathen philosophy was extinguished, the dying hour of heathenism in the Græco-Roman empire had come.

If now we raise the question, What were the forces that led to the triumph of Christianity over the world of antiquity? the answers given vary greatly, according to one's own attitude to the Christian faith. So confirmed a scoffer as the poet Heine says: 'The desperate condition of humanity in the time of the Cæsars explains the success of Christianity. The suicide of noble Romans, who all at once gave up the world, was frequent in those days. Those who lacked courage for this act had recourse to the slow suicide of the religion of self-abnegation. Slaves and unhappy people were the earliest Christians. Through their numbers and new-born fanaticism they became a force, which Constantine comprehended, and the Roman spirit of rule quickly made itself master of it, and disciplined it by dogma and cultus.' And a famous professor of

our own day pronounces this judgment on the victory of Christianity: 'Christianity would never have made its way in a single lane in Jerusalem, if it had not allied itself with the Greek philosophy.' As believing Christians we see the hand of God in this historical process whereby the preaching of the crucified One achieved the victory over the proud wisdom of paganism. The most remarkable feature is that, in spite of all human aberrations and all human fanaticism, God fathered His cause and used even doubtful characters for the extension of His kingdom.

The religious and philosophical development in paganism had ended in the most decided idealism. The lively interest in a tenable spiritual religion had given birth to Neo-Platonism, the last great philosophical system of antiquity. This took its rise at the beginning of the third century, A.D. But the final conclusion of Greek wisdom was that we can attain to no correct knowledge, that we must believe. Neo-Platonism despaired of solving the highest problems by observing the world with the resources at the command of human reason. Only a profound God-inspired intelligence, so it proclaimed, can penetrate the mystery of the world. The world of phenomena is only appearance, true being lies beyond this world, the Godhead alone has true existence. But the way to deity is through asceticism, self-abnegation. What the Neo-Platonism of antiquity wearied to death preached as the ideal of life was not the conquest, but the renunciation of the world. In this Neo-Platonic school the religions and the cults of antiquity were conserved, being regarded as the popular forms of expression for communion with the Deity or with some lower intermediate being, and appreciated as revelations of the Divine. But in spite of this spiritualizing of the heathen faith, it was overcome by Christianity. And if the reasons for this be asked, the first and principal is that Neo-Platonism lacked the Person of the Saviour. It is true that the life of the philosopher Apollonius of Tyana was worked up by Philostratus into the life of a heathen Messiah, but this pagan rival saviour had to pale before the picture of the Son of God, which, in spite of all over-colouring by ecclesiastical legends, was preserved in the simple and moving narrative of the Gospels. A system of profound doctrines could not save men, but to the Person of Christ was attached the recognition of sin and of the holiness of God, and

in the Person of Christ was bestowed the pardon of sin and strength for a life in God. Neo-Platonism remained the religion of the upper ten thousand, intelligible only to them; the emperor Julian strove in vain to make it popular with the masses. The gospel of Christ offered to all comfort, peace, strength; Divine wisdom had discovered a form in which it was accessible to all. All ages, both sexes, all ranks, all peoples, wise and unwise, rich and poor, found their place in the Christian brotherhood. Neo-Platonism separated men by a gulf that could not be bridged from the eternal unknowable Deity. Only for a brief period and only for the elect was it possible to enter in enthusiastic rapture into communion with the Deity, but Christianity pointed the way to an enduring and constant fellowship with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ on the basis of faith. Neo-Platonism, which stood intellectually so high, spoke with the tongues of men and of angels, but it remained sounding brass and a clanging cymbal. Neo-Platonism did not fashion its followers to be martyrs, Christianity gave its adherents the strength to suffer and thereby also to conquer.

Christianity, to be sure, had lost much of its primitive strength and purity. In the conflict with heathenism—for in every honourable spiritual struggle the conqueror adopts something from the conquered—the influences of polytheism had not failed to leave traces on the Christian Church. The superstitious veneration of relics and the worship of saints had forced their way into the Church. Also the social contrasts of high and low, and the distinction between clergy and laity make their presence felt. The picture of the Christian body drawn by the old apologist Aristides about the year 150, now belonged to the past: 'The Christians,' Aristides boasts, 'comfort those who have troubled them, and make friends of their foes and do them good. Their wives are as virgins, and their daughters chaste. Slaves, male and female or children, they persuade to become Christians, out of love to them, and when they have done so, they call them brothers without distinction. Falsehood is not found among them, they love one another.' The pictures which Chrysostom and Jerome have sketched for us of the Christianity of the great cities of their day, are far darker. The most hateful motives are often at work with candidates for the priesthood

or the diaconate. For instance, a man might become a priest in order to have more freedom to associate with women. At the same time there was a reign of foppery among the clergy. With many it was the greatest concern whether their clothes were well scented and their boots tight and neatly fitting. Their hair was curled with the tongs, and their fingers sparkled with rings. When such a *bon vivant* in clerical attire got up at sunrise, he first drew up a plan of the order of his visits. He considered the shortest roads, and a shameless grey head intruded almost into the sleeping apartments of matrons. If his eye lighted upon a beautiful cushion or an elegant handkerchief, he would praise and admire it. Then he would complain that it was just such a thing he wanted, and, although he did not actually demand it, he finally extorted it, because every woman was afraid of offending the city courier, who, with barbarously bold mouth, repeated everywhere the city gossip. The Christian emperors saw themselves compelled to make laws against the legacy-hunting of the clergy, laws whose necessity even an Ambrose and a Jerome do not dispute but bewail.

At the same time, it would be quite perverse to treat these features as universal, and to depict the condition of Christianity as wholly corrupt and degenerate. The monastic movement, which was directed against the growing luxury of the Church, produced Christian characters of heroic self-denial, who retired from the world's din to live to their God in the bosom of nature. And there were still priests like Chrysostom who realized as far as is possible for man the high ideal of the priesthood which he himself has sketched, who conquered the solicitations of the flesh, the dangers of a love of power, of pride and vanity, who in their priestly mediatorial capacity united earth and heaven, who carried the whole world in praying hearts, and who realized amongst men the work of redemption, namely, to be divine and to make divine. In an age when celibacy was considered the highest Christian ideal of life, there were Christian mothers like Monica, the mother of Augustine, who prayed unceasingly to God for her son, and had no rest until the son of her tears had turned from the error of his ways to God. There were still bishops who, like Athanasius and Hilary, preferred exile and forsook fatherland and friends rather than deny their faith; like Ambrose and Augustine, who as true shepherds and pastors preached the gospel to

themselves and their flocks. The spirit of Jesus Christ was still mighty in His Church, and it was this spirit of the glorified Lord that conquered the world of antiquity. No true historical investigation will ever deny that the faith which through Christ lives in God and with God subdued the ancient world. And with this faith was coupled love, which had its most brilliant manifestations just in the era when the Church was achieving its triumphs. It was the Christian Church that first instituted hospitals for sick and suffering humanity. Upon the model of the institutions founded by the bishops Eustathius of Sebaste and Basil of Cæsarea there arose all over the world places where Christian brotherly love celebrated quiet but glorious triumphs by its care for the poor and its nursing of the sick. In the port of Rome and on the road to Bethlehem pilgrim hostels were established. Wealth discovered a nobler employment than that of ministering to sensual appetites. And even when Christians mingled in the life of the world, they did not lose sight of the object of their hopes, but remembered that they are pilgrims who, while on earth, remain ever imperfect, but are journeying to the Jerusalem above, into which God will receive those who love Him and have been faithful to Him.

Finally, let us sum up once more what we have said. What was the secret of the triumph of Christianity over the ancient world? The heathen cults left the religious feelings unsatisfied; the heathen mysteries awakened, indeed, in the heart longings after redemption, but their mystical rites did not contain what they promised; the heathen philosophy preached, indeed, redemption by the path of self-abnegation, but it failed to supply the strength for self-redemption; the belief in the old world of deities and their myths, which men sought to conserve by transforming its meaning, was shattered at once by criticism and by septicism. Christianity took away from man the vain dream of self-redemption and pointed him to Jesus Christ as the Saviour sent by God into a world of sin. Christianity produced heroes of faith, who gave to this faith forcible expression in the realm of thought as well as of life, who firmly trusting in God counted the world as nothing and overcame the world. Christianity set loose the powers of active brotherly love, which helped to transform the ancient world, with its regardless egoism and its deification of man, into a brotherhood of redeemed children of God.

Problems in the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., LITT.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

II.

The Twelve and the Seventy.

THE Gospels of Mark and Matthew give the sending forth of the Twelve, the Gospel of Luke the sending forth of both the Twelve and the Seventy. The Gospel of John says nothing about either event, does not mention the Seventy at all. It mentions the Twelve only twice, and even these passages may be redactional. But, on the other hand, this Gospel gives a group of seven disciples, and mentions several names not known to the Synoptists. These differences raise several difficult questions.

The story of Mark (6⁷⁻¹³) is simple. The sending forth of the Twelve in pairs to preach repentance and work miracles is given without explicit motive. The story of the death of John the Baptist is inserted (6¹⁴⁻²⁹). Then the return of the Twelve is given in connexion with the feeding of the multitudes (6³⁰⁻⁴⁶).

The story of Luke (9¹⁻⁶) is evidently based on Mark, and gives nothing additional of any importance. But Luke also gives an account of the sending forth of the Seventy (10¹⁻¹⁶) and their return (10¹⁷⁻²⁴) in connexion with a large amount of material usually supposed to belong to the Peræan ministry, unknown for the most part to Matthew and Mark, and evidently derived from a source unknown to these Evangelists.

A large amount of the material, in the form of logia, spoken by Jesus in connexion with the sending forth and the return of the Seventy, is given by Matthew in connexion with the mission and return of the Twelve (10¹⁻¹¹ and 11²⁰⁻²⁷). Between these is inserted the sending of the disciples of the Baptist to Jesus (11²⁻¹⁹), given by Luke elsewhere. In fact, as I have shown, Matthew heaps up in this section a number of logia connected with the ministry of the disciples, not only those uttered by Jesus according to Luke on these two different occasions, but also some belonging to the final commission of the Twelve before His departure from the world to the Father (*The Apostolic Commission*, Article I. 'Studies in Honour of B. L. Gildersleeve'). Many of the logia scattered through

those chapters of Luke which are peculiar to him, are found in Matthew attached to his versions of the Sermon on the Mount, the Woes of the Pharisees, and the Eschatological Discourse, all derived from the Logia of Matthew by our Gospels of Matthew and Luke, notwithstanding this difference in the grouping of the material.

There is no sufficient reason why we should doubt the mission of this second group of disciples by Jesus. It is altogether probable that the Twelve were commissioned for a Galilean ministry, the Seventy for a Peræan and Judæan ministry. It is a common opinion that Jesus was accompanied by the Twelve throughout His ministry, and that their absence from Him was quite brief. This opinion is due doubtless to the fact that the return from their mission is given in the narrative so close to the sending forth. But this, as in the case of the Seventy also, was due to topical reasons, and by no means implies the close proximity in time of the sending and the return. This mission, if it amounted to anything, must have continued several weeks at least.

There are in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark many instances of calls to a special following of Jesus connected with the abandonment of all things else, some accepted, others rejected—calls which imply a larger circle of special disciples than the Twelve, and which, therefore, incidentally sustain another and a larger group of ministers, such as the Seventy of Luke. Only thus can we get a basis in the life of Jesus for the two groups of the apostolic history, the Twelve and the larger group of prophets such as Barnabas, Ananias, Joseph, and Matthias, the latter of whom was assigned the place of Judas in the group of the Twelve. The term *apostle*, as I have shown elsewhere (*Apostolic Commission*), was not used by Jesus, but was first given at Antioch in connexion with the mission of Barnabas and Paul, and was a comprehensive term which was used indifferently for both of these groups.

A careful study of the Gospels shows us that there was indeed a natural and simple development in the calling, training, and sending forth of the ministry by Jesus during His lifetime. The

synoptic narrative tells of the call of the four fishermen and of Matthew. The narrative of John tells us of the call of Andrew and Simon, Philip and Nathanael, and a fifth, probably John. Nathanael is usually regarded as another name for Bartholomew of the Synoptists; but this is by no means certain. How and when the others named among the Twelve were called by Jesus we are not told. But it was not long before a group of Twelve was selected with Peter at the head (Mk 3¹⁸⁻¹⁹, Mt 10²⁻⁴, Lk 6¹²⁻¹⁹).

The Sermon on the Mount, so called, according to the version of Luke, which is nearest to the original, was a discourse of consecration. Matthew has attached to it a large amount of material gathered from the Logia of Matthew, given by the other Synoptists on many other different occasions.

After continuing with Jesus as a group of Twelve for some considerable time, they were sent forth in pairs to conduct missions throughout Galilee. At this time Jesus gave them a solemn charge. This mission continued until shortly before the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem.

It is probable that one of these pairs always remained with Jesus; at one time John and James, at another Andrew and Peter, at another Matthew and Thomas. But the Twelve, as a whole, were absent on their mission from this time forth until they rejoined Jesus just prior to the feeding of the multitudes, which was only a short time before the Passion of Jesus, and not in the midst of His ministry, as is commonly supposed.

In the meanwhile, Jesus was attaching other disciples to Himself besides the Twelve by special calls, and preparing them for a special ministry. Before setting forth upon His Peræan ministry, He organizes Seventy of these in a group and sends them forth in pairs to prepare the way before Him in Peræa and in Judæa. These also return to Him, probably on His last passage along the border of Peræa on His way to Jerusalem.

The mission of the Seventy is not reported in Mark because that Gospel depends upon the preaching of Peter, and Peter seems to have limited his testimony to that which he himself had seen and heard. He was not present during the Peræan and Judæan ministry of Luke and John, and therefore makes no report of it, or of the work of the Seventy, with which he had nothing to do.

The Gospel of Matthew is based on Mark and

the Logia of Matthew, which latter, as I have shown in my articles on the 'Wisdom of Jesus' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June, July, August, November 1897), was simply a collection of the wisdom of Jesus with occasional introductory incidents, but without historical narrative. These the author of our Gospel of Matthew arranged as best he could in groups on the basis of Mark's narrative. He had no knowledge of the special sources used by Luke and John, or of the historical material given in those sources.

If the order in the development of the ministry given above is correct, we have an important help for the arrangement of the material relating to the life of Jesus.

1. The calling of disciples to follow Jesus in a life involving an abandonment of all else.
2. The selection of Twelve of these into a special group, and their solemn setting apart.
3. The mission of these Twelve to Galilee.
4. The selection of a larger group of Seventy, and their consecration.
5. The mission of the Seventy to Peræa and Judæa.
6. The return of the Twelve near Bethsaida in order to accompany Jesus to His last Passover.
7. The return of the Seventy on His last journey along the border of Peræa to Jerusalem.
8. The final commission of the apostolic ministry.

If now we take this as a framework for the material given in the Gospels, it is evident that the usual arrangement of the harmonists is incorrect.

The material Mk 6³⁰⁻⁹ = Mt 14¹⁸⁻¹⁸ = Lk 9¹⁰⁻⁵⁰ does not precede Lk 10-18¹⁴, but follows it. Lk 18¹⁵⁻³⁴ coincides with Mk 10¹⁸⁻³⁴. The material inserted here in Luke between 9⁵⁰ and 18¹⁵ is material, apart from the logia, derived from another source unknown to Mark and Matthew. Luke does not mingle the material derived from this source with the material derived from Mark, but follows Mark essentially as far as 9⁵⁰, only changing the order occasionally for topical reasons, and then gives his new material entirely by itself. This new material, apart from the logia, belongs for the most part to the Peræan ministry, while Peter was absent from Jesus in Galilee. There is no sound reason which compels us to place this ministry subsequent to the entire Galilean ministry as the modern harmonists do.

The situation is similar with the material given in Jn 7¹⁻¹¹⁵⁴. This is based on a source unknown

to the Synoptists. There is no sound reason why it should be placed between Mk 9⁵⁰ and Mk 10². The single intervening verse (10¹) may or may not correspond with Lk 9⁵¹. The passages are not so similar that a coincidence is evident. In the former Jesus goes into the borders of Jordan and Peræa. In the latter He goes steadfastly towards Jerusalem through Samaria, which is very different. The latter probably corresponds with the journey to the Feast of Tabernacles of Jn 7¹⁻¹³ to which He went up secretly through Samaria, the unusual route, to avoid the publicity of the usual route by

the valley of the Jordan. The former probably was much later, His last journey on which He cast all secrecy and prudence aside, and therefore went to Jerusalem by the usual route with all His disciples by way of the Jordan, Jericho, and Bethany.

This arrangement of the material gives a better development to the narrative, explains the silence of Mark as to the Peræan and Jerusalem ministry by the absence of Peter, whose preaching was the basis of Mark, and puts a new light upon many obscure problems.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Jesus Christ and Paul.¹

THE question, 'Is the theology of Paul a legitimate development of the teaching of Jesus?' which has so often been answered in the negative in the course of the last century, is met in this volume with a distinct affirmative. Professor Feine has no hesitation in tracing back all the main features of Pauline doctrine, or their germs, to the words of Jesus as handed down by tradition and the historical manifestation of the Lord, inclusive of the resurrection and ascension and revelation on the road to Damascus. He points out, indeed, occasionally a difference between the disciple and the Master. In relation to the goods of this world, for example, the apostle on whom devolved the organization of the Churches, whilst agreeing with the Lord in principle, laid more stress on that aspect of the question which admits of the use of the earthly for the advancement of the aims of the kingdom of God.

The work is arranged in three chapters, dealing seriatim with fundamentals and methods; the apostle's idea about his dependence on Jesus; and the facts of that dependence as set forth in our sources.

The first chapter briefly traces the history of the subject from Schleiermacher, who is held to have furnished the originating impulse, down to

¹ *Jesus Christus und Paulus*. Von D. Paul Feine, ordentlichem Professor der evangelischen Theologie in Wien. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. M. 6.

the present time, points out some considerations to be borne in mind throughout the inquiry, deals at some length with the personality of Jesus, and defines the writer's attitude to the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. All these topics are suggestively handled. We are reminded that all religious life is individual, never a mere repetition of another's. Paul was not, could not be, a mere embodiment of the nature of Christ, or a copy of Christ. Again, we must not lose sight of the distance religiously between the apostle and his Lord, and we must not restrict the historical manifestation of Christ to His earthly life, but must regard as belonging to it His death and resurrection and sovereign authority over His own. It is admitted that Jesus possessed in a sense an individual character, and was to some extent influenced by His age. Had this not been so He would have been a phantom, not a human being with flesh and blood, and would have been unable to exert historical influence. On the other hand, He cannot be grouped with the rest of men. Under different circumstances He exhibited different temperaments. He combined in perfect unity characteristics which are generally regarded as incompatible. He belonged in a certain sense to no age, no nation, neither sex. Both the masculine and feminine ideals receive their distinctive marks from Him. His image, wherever it is presented to-day, stands before men as vivid and life-giving as 1900 years ago. The reason is that in Jesus we have a religious life which is absolutely unique. Other