

plicated factors, if 2 Timothy were contrasted with Titus.

Some variations in terms, wholly devoid of significance, occur in these sections of the two letters. The younger class is called in 1 Timothy *νεώτερος* and *νεώτερας*, in Titus *νεώτερος* and *νεός*. The old women are called *πρεσβυτέρας* to Timothy, and *πρεσβύτιδας* to Titus. Such variations show how the same person may change his terminology from moment to moment.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS.

III.

TWO MORE FEATURES IN THE GENUINE JESUS-TRADITION.

BY collecting and sifting the evidence afforded by our first three Gospels, we found that notwithstanding a marked tendency towards bringing in eschatological views there was a large enough genuine stock of eschatological sayings of Jesus to prove that He Himself believed in a change of all things which would come quickly, and not later than the end of His own generation; the kingdom of God would then be established in its full glory and happiness by His own coming in power and glory; all His believers, or rather, all pious and good men, heathen as well as members of the chosen people, participating in its happy life. We do not see Jesus interested in the details of eschatology like most of the apocalyptic writers of late Judaism and early Christianity. For Jesus eschatology has only a twofold significance: (1) it is a help for Him to understand and make men understand His own position: being the Messiah, the culmination in God's revelation to His people, final in all that He does and says, He brings about the Kingdom of God; and (2) it is a motive in His admonitions: be ready, be watchful, because the kingdom of God is at hand.

I.

But beside these clearly eschatological utterances there is another set of sayings dealing likewise with the notions of the kingdom and of His Messiahship, but showing quite a different aspect of them: the kingdom is present, and Jesus, humble and meek as He is, is the Messiah, because He fulfils the expectation in its true form and brings salvation in its deepest sense.

A. 1. When attacked on account of His casting out devils, Jesus argues—according to Mark iii. 24–27—by two parables: a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand, and a man cannot enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods except he first binds the strong man. Q, represented by Luke xi. 19, 20 and Matthew xii. 27, 28, gives two more arguments used on the same occasion by Jesus. He refers to the casting out of devils by the rabbis and their pupils, so defending His own practice *per analogiam*; then He goes on to say: “*But if I by the finger (or, according to Matthew, by the spirit) of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.*” This “*is come*” (ἐφθασε) must mean something more than the usual “*is at hand*” (ἤγγικεν); it is the solemn declaration that the kingdom is present in Jesus' acting; His casting out of devils proves that the powers of the kingdom are at work. Some interpreters take pleasure in urging the discrepancy between these two arguments. When Jesus' casting out of devils, they say, is nothing else than what was done by the rabbis, how can it be taken as a sign of the kingdom of God being present? Perhaps this is logically correct; it is hardly true psychologically; you can easily compare one thing with another without admitting that both are on the same level. That the casting out of devils by Jesus was far beyond the usual exorcism of the rabbis is admitted by His opponents by their very attack. If, then, the kingdom of God is proved to be present

by the casting out of devils by Jesus, we have here a peculiar notion of the kingdom. There was, as we have seen before, beside the political notions of the kingdom of God, another idea in Jewish eschatology, a mythological one, taking the kingdom of God in contrast to the power of Satan and his evil spirits. This we have here; but the difference is that Jesus by His deeds realises the idea. He Himself is "the stronger," spoken of in that other parable connected with our saying both in Mark and Q, who, having first bound the strong man, spoils his goods. The individual act of casting out a devil is only the consequence of what Jesus has done before, overcoming Satan. So we read in Luke x. 18 that when the seventy returned with joy exulting that even the devils were subject to them in Jesus' name, Jesus answered them: "*I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.*" I am not prepared to accept this as a parallel to Revelation xii. 9, where the dragon is cast out from heaven and comes down to the earth in order to persecute the children of the Church.¹ I understand it as an allegory of Satan's power being broken, so that it is easy work now to cast out his evil spirits. For the disciples it is no matter of glorifying themselves on account of their exorcising power; they had rather enjoy their own salvation.

2. A second saying to be studied in this connexion is found in Luke xvii. 20-21 only: "*And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said: the kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for Lo, the kingdom of God is within you.*" So ἐντός ὑμῶν is translated both by the A.V. and the R.V., while some interpreters prefer to translate *in the midst of you.*² The discussion as to the true meaning

¹ F. Spitta, "Satan als Blitz" in Preuschen's *ZNTW*, ix., 1908, 160.

² The Latin *intra vos* seems to patronize this later view: *unter euch, among you*: on Old Syriac *bainathchon* (*among you*) and *Pešitta begau menchon* (*in the midst of you*) and Diatessaron *within your heart*, see F. C.

of this ἐντός goes through the whole history of interpretation and will perhaps never come to a final decision, most interpreters maintaining that there must be the same notion of presence as in the former saying. Joh. Weiss tries to get rid of this notion by taking "is in the midst of you" in the sense of "will then be in the midst of you suddenly, without being announced by outward visible preparations." But in order to express "in the midst of you" Luke would have used ἐμμέσῳ;¹ the rather uncommon expression ἐντός ὑμῶν he can have chosen only with the aim of giving to "in" the peculiar colouring of inwardness.² Now it may be an open question, if we can trust his rendering of the Aramaic original. There may have come in a misunderstanding in the very act of translation. But we cannot reach this Aramaic original behind the extant Greek text. And I see no necessity for putting aside Luke's meaning, as inwardness of the kingdom, if not stated expressly by other sayings of Jesus, is quite in the line of what he says about clean and unclean: "*There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man*"; "*for from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed . . . and defile the man*" (Mark vii. 15, 21; cp. Matt. xv. 11, 19). If it is man's heart where the evil thoughts come from, or, in other words, where the devil exercises his dominion, then it is man's heart, too, where the kingdom of God is to be established. "*Thy king-*

Burkitt, *Evangelion da Mepharreshe*, ii. 198, 298. A. Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, ii. 2, 347, understands the Pešitta meaning: "*within you.*" "*Inside of you*" is the Bohairic rendering (G. Horner).

¹ This is found in Luke's writings more than a dozen times; ἐντός c. gen. only xvii. 21.

² It is worth remark that the parallels brought forward in favour of the meaning "*in the midst of you*" are all taken from early writers, as Thukydides, Plato, Xenophon, whereas the LXX uses the word in the sense of. "*in the interior of.*" I should attribute a great value, too, to the linguistic sensorium of Chrysostom, who champions the inward-view.

dom come, thy will be done" points in the same direction.

3. A third saying is still more difficult. It is found in Matthew xi. 12, 13, and Luke xvi. 16, i.e., at two different places, and in two quite different forms, too. I therefore do not think that it comes from Q, but rather from some other source, perhaps an oral one. We hardly can say what are the original words; we had better put the two redactions side by side:—

MATTHEW.

(a) And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence¹ take it by force.

(b) For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.

LUKE.

(a) The law and the prophets (were) until John:

(b) from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently² into it.

Whatever may be the original form (most of the interpreters trying to gain it by a rather hazardous combination);³ whatever may be the meaning of that most disputed word *βιασται* and *βιάζονται* (Luke, evidently taking the latter in a passive sense: *is compelled to enter into it*): one thing seems to be beyond any doubt: the time of Jesus is set in opposition to the time until John, the present to the past, and it is to this present that the kingdom of God belongs, not to a third form, the future. And because it is present, it is to be taken as something inward, some experience of happiness which men try to get so eagerly that they rather jostle one another in the effort to reach it.

4. A fourth saying, which one would mention in this connexion, is perhaps not so certain; it is found in Mark x. 15 (cp. Luke xviii. 17⁴): "*Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shal*

¹ The violent, A.V.

² Presseth, A.V.

³ See the various attempts at reconstruction by Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, i. 75; Harnack, *Sprüche Jesu*, 101; B. Weiss, *Die Quellen der syn. Überlieferung* (Texte u. Unters., 3 ser. ii. 3); H. von Soden, *Die wichtigsten Fragen in Leben Jesu*, does not include this saying in Q.

⁴ Matthew omits this word at xix. 14, because he has a various form of the same in xviii. 3.

not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." While in the second part the notion of the kingdom is the usual one, a different notion seems to be presupposed in the first part. If to receive the kingdom is the condition for entering into the kingdom, it must be in the first place some kingdom before the kingdom, i.e., some inward experience, accessible to man in the present time, before the kingdom in the external eschatological sense is to be revealed. The kingdom of God as an experience of man's heart would be in agreement with what we learned from Luke xvii. 21. On the other hand, "*the kingdom of God*" can be taken here as an abbreviated expression for the "gospel of the kingdom of God," and in this case the conclusion would not be quite necessary.

5. Lastly, we have to mention here the two parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, only the former being given in Mark iv. 30-32, while Luke xiii. 18-21, following probably Q, has the original couple, and Matthew xiii. 31-33 combines, as he likes to do, the Marcan form with the Q-tradition. The notion of the kingdom of God, given by these parables is at any rate quite opposite to the eschatological one which makes the kingdom appear suddenly in its full power and glory. Here we are told that it is growing up, however quickly, and that it is exercising influence by its inheritant power. Certainly Jesus' opinion has nothing in common with the modern view of a gradual evolution, the seed of His gospel coming to grow up by hundreds and hundreds of years. He thinks of a rapid growing up and a quick leavening of the whole people by His gospel. But at all events it is by His own preaching and teaching and healing that the kingdom is to be realised. We would not be surprised to hear Him speak of the great success of His gospel, as He tells His disciples in the parable of the sower that what falls into good ground brings fruit, some thirty and some sixty and some an

hundred (Mark iv. 8). But in these two parables He is not speaking of His gospel, but of the kingdom of God, illustrating its extensive and intensive power. The conclusion is inevitable, that it is by His preaching that the kingdom comes, or, rather, is present; the effect of His preaching is that inward experience of man which we found identified with the notion of the kingdom in two former sayings.

B. This peculiar notion of the kingdom of God as some present, inward experience is supported by a set of sayings which show Jesus looking upon His own present activity as means of—not so much preparing, but bringing salvation to His people.

1. When the Baptist sends to Him asking, “*Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?*” (Luke vii. 19, Matt. xi. 3), Jesus answers neither Yes nor No; He makes John glance over His activity and see how it fulfils what the prophets had said about the time of salvation. In whatever sense you may take the words, “*the blind receive their sight, etc.,*” spiritual or realistic, Jesus’ doings, His preaching, His healing fulfil these expectations. The Baptist, being a stern prophet of the last judgment, had not done any miracle, as we are informed John x. 41¹: Jesus is surrounded by miracles, the outward miracles of healing being, in His own opinion, only small proofs of the still greater inward miracles of conversion of sinners (Mark ii. 10 f.). So Jesus’ answer to the Baptist is a Yes, but a Yes which has to be made out by the asking man himself: Look and see, and then you will make up your mind that I am really He that should come. Jesus, the humble Son of Man, the preaching and healing prophet, is indeed the Messiah. So He declares to the people by telling them that John the Baptist, the greatest of all prophets, is far behind any one who belongs to the kingdom.

¹ The same is implied in the popular estimation of Jesus’ relation to John, Mark vi. 14 (Matt. xiv. 2).

He is not speaking of Himself, but whoever has ears to hear may understand that He who speaks is more than a small member of this kingdom : He is the King in this kingdom.

2. And His disciples did understand Him. At a time when the people still looked out for various solutions of the problem put before them by this Son of Man, who was so unlike all others, who, being the most humble and meek, yet spoke with power as nobody ever had spoken before Him ; at a time when people called Him a prophet, one of the great prophets of times past, Elijah, or perhaps even John the Baptist himself, risen from death, and, therefore, gifted with miraculous power :—His disciples, by the mouth of Peter, found the right expression solemnly declaring Him to be the Messiah, i. e., the unique, the final bringer of salvation.¹ And He did not decline to be called so ; He only forbade them to tell this to the people, because He was aware that such a claim would lead the people to expect of Him what He never intended to do, i. e., to relieve the people from foreign tyranny, to deliver it from the Romans, and may be, even from the Sadducees ; in one word, to carry on a line of political revolution. This He declined, and therefore He not only forbade His disciples to use the title of Messiah, but He told them at once that He had to be delivered into the hands of His enemies and to be put to death—death, however, not being able to destroy His work or overcome Himself.

3. Jesus' activity was indeed a Messianic one, if only we

¹ See Mark viii. 27 ff. ; Matt. xvi. 13 ff. ; Luke ix. 18 ff. There is an ingenious interpretation of the Lukan form by Prof. F. Spitta in his book *Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu*, 1907, 85–143 : ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι . . . τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, not being taken as the disciples' personal confession, but as their speaking to the people about Jesus (*μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο*, ver. 21). Then the whole scene would have another significance than we are accustomed to ; Mark must have misunderstood this, and Matthew reinforced this misinterpretation by his well-known addition. I am not convinced that this was Luke's meaning, nor that his relation is independent of Mark.

take this word not in its national and political sense, but in the purely religious meaning of bringing salvation and happiness. He said to His disciples, according to Luke x. 23 and Matt. xiii. 16 : “ *Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see, [and the ears which hear the things which ye hear] :¹ for I say unto you that many prophets and kings² desired to see the things which ye see and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear and heard them not.*” We can hardly imagine a more solemn form of proclamation for the fact that in Christ’s present actions all promises are fulfilled. And this is not the evangelists, Luke or Matthew, but it is Q or some other old source.

4. That in Jesus was fulfilled whatever was expected for the Messianic time, will further be seen by a comparison of several sayings :

a. A commonplace of eschatological expectation was mutual hatred between the nearest relations. So Mark xiii. 12 (cp. Luke xxi. 16 ; Matt. x. 21, xxiv. 10) records as a saying of Jesus that in the last time *brother shall deliver up brother to death and the father his child, and children shall rise up against parents, and cause them to be put to death.* Now in Q we read nearly the same, but it runs quite another way, Jesus saying—

LUKE xii. 51-53.

Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth ? I tell you, Nay, but rather division : for there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. They shall be divided, father against son and son against

MATTHEW x. 34-35.

Think not that I came to send peace on the earth ; I came not to send peace but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

¹ This part is wanting in Luke, but it is certainly original, as we have in Matt. : “ *Blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear.* The parallelism is supported also by the continuation.

² The “ *righteous men* ” of Matthew is probably his own ; he likes this combination, cp. x. 41, xxiii. 29.

the father, mother against daughter and daughter against her mother ; mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

Jesus is come to fulfil what was expected for the last time. And Jesus Himself realises some of this result of His mission by the unbelief He met with in His own family (Mark iii. 21, 31 ff. ; cp. Matt. xii. 46 ff., Luke viii. 19 ff., John vii. 5), and on the part of his countrymen (Mark vi. 1-6 ; cp. Matt. xiii. 53-58, Luke iv. 16-30).

b. The Messianic judgment was to bring up a sharp separation, as is said in a saying recorded by Q itself : "*Then shall two men be in the field (or according to Luke : In that night there shall be two men on one bed), one is taken and one is left ; two women shall be grinding at the mill, one is taken and one is left* (Matt. xxiv. 40, 41 ; Luke xvii. 34). Now this very separation is worked out by Jesus Himself when He calls some fishermen to follow Him and left others ; when He calls Levi and Zacchaeus the publicans and the Pharisees stand outside ; when He declines to allow the one who asks to follow Him, whereas He presses on another who is rather unwilling : "*follow me ; and leave the dead to bury their own dead*" (Matt. viii. 22 ; Luke ix. 60).

c. At the Messianic time a large festival was expected, all members of the chosen people taking part in it. Jesus, in His well-known parables accepts this expectation correcting only its last part. Those who were first invited refusing to come, others will be introduced (Luke xiv. 16-24 ; Matt. xxii. 1-14) ; this is nearly the same as what He says about the heathen taking a place at the Messianic table together with the patriarchs (Luke xiii. 28 ff. ; Matthew viii. 11 f.). But the same is fulfilled already in Jesus' own lifetime by His preaching the gospel of the kingdom to the poor,

declaring that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before the Pharisees (Matt. xxi. 31 f. ; cp. Luke vii. 29) ; it is accomplished when He sits down with publicans and sinners, so that the honourable men who pretend to be alone worthy of His company are rather shocked (Mark ii. 15 f. c. par.) ; when He finds faith among Gentiles in a measure He never had found before among His own countrymen (Luke vii. 9 ; Matt. viii. 10).

5. All this points to the same effect : Jesus is the Messiah, whatever may be the discrepancy between His appearance and the popular expectation. He is the Messiah in this sense, that He brings judgment and salvation. He is the stumbling-block for one class of men and to the other He brings happiness and joyous life. As He is the son, so His disciples are the son, freed from all bondship, so that they need not even pay the regular tax for the temple, a saying which, though found only in Matthew xvii. 26, in a context belonging to a not very trustworthy collection of Peter stories, nevertheless has a genuine colouring.

Jesus as surrounded by His disciples represents the new era of Messianic time. The wedding, a very common Messianic notion, spoken of in so many parables of Jesus, is already going on ; Jesus is the bridegroom, His disciples are the children of the bride-chamber, as He puts it in His apology for non-fasting (Mark ii. 19, 20 ; cp. Matt. ix. 15, Luke v. 34, 35). This is all the more remarkable as we have it not in Q as most of the words mentioned before, but in that same Marcan tradition which we found to be distinguished for its eschatological views.¹ Jesus looked upon His estate

¹ About the authenticity there can be no doubt (against Wellhausen). The question rather is, if those words belong to so early a period in the life of Jesus (Wendt). As a matter of fact Mark's chronological arrangement is not beyond doubt ; it was criticised already by the Elder from whom Papias got his information. But having no means of settling the chronological order by ourselves, we had better refrain from expressing decision. I am not

as belonging already to the new order of things. So in the parables of the piece of new cloth and of the new wine (combined in Mark ii. 21, 22, c. par. with the parable of the bridegroom) He declares as clearly as possible, that there is something new about Him in opposition to all that which was before. It is the same contrast as we found it in the word Luke xvi. 16, dealing with John the Baptist as representative of the time gone and the preaching of the kingdom as the characteristic of the time now.

Here we may stop. The evidence collected is quite sufficient to prove that in the teaching of Jesus there is a strong line of what I would call *transmuted eschatology*. I mean eschatology transmuted in the sense that what was spoken of in Jewish eschatology as to come in the last days is taken here as already at hand in the lifetime of Jesus ; transmuted at the same time in the other sense that what was expected as an external change is taken inwardly : not all people seeing it, but Jesus' disciples becoming aware of it. For the great mass of the people Jesus is only one of the prophets ; for His enemies, Pharisees as well as Sadducees, He is a pseudo-prophet deceiving the people ; but His disciples recognise and acknowledge Him to be the Messiah, the Chosen one of God ; and in His company they enjoy all the happiness of the Messianic time.

Now we must compare this with the first group of sayings dealing with pure eschatology : Jesus the Messiah to come on the clouds of heaven ; the Messianic judgment to be held at the end of the days ; the Messianic meal to take place after this glorious event, and so on. Both groups are quite distinct and to be kept separate. Neither of them may be reduced easily to the other one without violence being done to the tradition, nor can we put aside one of them as a later

persuaded that there was an evolution in Jesus' thought during His public ministry.

addition or transformation, both being attested by our best sources. One may say that in Mark the eschatological view prevails, whereas the other view is predominant in Q; but Q is not without eschatology nor Mark without the other element. This is the evidence of the Gospel-tradition.

II.

Before starting a solution of this problem, we have to take account of one more point of tradition, worth being remarked.

Taking together all materials collected hitherto, eschatology as well as transmuted eschatology, we find that they represent only a small part of the whole gospel-tradition; there are plenty of sayings beside these, which we may call, for the sake of brevity, entirely non-eschatological. We do not need lose time with a detailed investigation. Every one knows what Jesus says about trust in God, God's care for the individual, about prayer and the certainty of its being heard, not trusting in riches, loving the neighbour and even the enemy, pardoning offenders, etc. It is (as Harnack stated against Wellhausen) the great value of Q that it represents Jesus from this peculiar side. But even in Mark we have plenty of this non-eschatological, purely moral matter: e.g., Jesus' sayings about cleanness (vii. 1-23), marriage and divorce (x. 1-12), children (x. 13-16), and the rich (x. 17-31). It may be interesting to settle this statement by means of a peculiar inductive investigation.

There are the so-called doublets, i.e., sayings related both by Mark and Q. They are of some importance in the critical study of the Gospels, some critics maintaining that they prove a literary relation to exist between these two main sources—I on the contrary, am rather inclined to say that they prove both sources to be independent, giving the same saying mostly in quite different renderings. But they have another importance, too, as Professor Burkitt has pointed

out¹: they allow us to infer not only which sayings are the best attested, but at the same time sayings which were the most appreciated, and, therefore, had the widest circulation and the greatest influence. Now out of the thirty doublets, which may be read in Professor Burkitt's book² there are but seven dealing with eschatology,³ all the others containing non-eschatological matter of a moral character. Of course the eschatological background may give a peculiar colouring to some of them; e.g., that *nothing is hid save that it should be manifested*, may, set by itself, well be taken as an announcement of the last judgment. But, in general, we should not miss anything for the understanding of those general moralisations, if we had no knowledge of the eschatology of Jesus.

At this point we may be able to pronounce a fair criticism of the so-called theory of "consistent eschatology." According to this theory there is nothing in the life of Jesus nor in His sayings which is not to be explained by eschatology, that is to say, by Jesus' belief that He was to bring the end of this present order of things. Now (1) this theory is to be maintained only by doing violence to the tradition, which, besides some distinct eschatological matter, gives a few but very expressive instances of what I have called transmuted eschatology, and as the main content a large amount of non-eschatological matters. It means doing violence to Jesus' moral teaching, if this is subordinated to His announcement of the approaching end in the way of being only an "Interimsethik"; it means doing violence to the other group of sayings representing the kingdom and the Messiahship as present, if these are taken only as mere anticipations of the future, to be jumped over, while Jesus' real doctrine is said to be repre-

¹ *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1906, 147 ff. Cp. also Sir John Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 1899, 65 ff., and Professor V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii., 1909, 59-60.

² Nos. 2, 3, 12, 15, 29, 30, 31 in Burkitt's list.

sented only by the first group of sayings, the purely eschatological group. (2) The surprising lights this theory seems to throw upon several points of the gospel history are gained by a strange interpretation which reads into the text what is to be demonstrated : e.g., when the feeding of the multitude as well as the last supper is taken as a Messianic sacrament, assuring to all partakers the participation at the Messianic meal, it has to be admitted that there is not the slightest indication thereof in the texts, but even that probably no one of all who were present was able to conceive this meaning. (3) It is Jesus himself who contradicts this modern view of his activity, viz. that he was working by all his forces to the effect of bringing about the Kingdom of God or the end of history ; in the parable of the seed (Mark iv. 26-29) he expressly states that when the seed has been cast into the ground the man has nothing else to do but to wait for the time of harvest.

It is not only the amount of non-eschatological materials in the Gospels that forbids us to account for Jesus' whole life and teaching by His eschatology. It is at the same time the permanent value of His non-eschatological doctrines that causes us to put them in the first rank, whereas the transmuted eschatology points out in what direction Jesus Himself would form the mind of His believers. It is, lastly, as we have said before, the history of the Christian Church, from its beginning in the apostolic age to our own time, that proves the non-eschatological element to be essential. This statement does not include, however, the opposite thesis, that eschatology has no place at all in Jesus' mind. A sound and sober interpretation will be found to be one which gives to every group of sayings its own value and weight.

ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ.