

endency of God. God is the great Unknown, the Stranger to man. What comes from God is unknowable, impalpable, inaccessible to human experience. The only thing which is knowable is the negation. The only experience is the judgment, God's "No!" spoken to humanity. The only evidence is the necessity of dying. But in accepting this judgment, we are saved. In hearing the terrible "No!" we are sure of God's redeeming "Yes!" In being ready to die, we are given the new life of resurrection.

We face here another characteristic of this theology of crisis: its *dialectic* method.

ADOLF KELLER.

(To be continued.)

THE VISITS OF JESUS TO JERUSALEM.

THE older Gospel-harmonies and lives of Jesus in vogue a generation ago were constructed on the assumption that the Gospel-data made it possible to restore, not indeed with finality and certitude, but with a high degree of probability, the true sequence of events in our Lord's public life.¹ For this purpose, the different arrangements of all four Gospels were laid under contribution: now one, now the other of them, was given the preference. Modern critical study has done much to break up the confidence felt in these popular reconstructions, and is inclined to regard the whole effort as a forlorn hope. It is urged that Mark wrote his Gospel *ὁ . . . τάξει*; that 'Matthew,' with his artistic arrangement of masses of teaching alternating with clusters of incidents, is obviously valueless for chronology; ² that Luke

¹ See, for example, Farrar, *Life of Christ*, Pref., chs. xvi. init., xxii. init.

² How utterly devoid 'Matthew' was of a sense of chronology comes out strikingly in two places. In xiv. 12f. he makes John's execution the starting-point of a fresh series of incidents in Jesus' life: yet the execution

simply copies Mark's order, omitting unaccountably one considerable section and massing the bulk of his non-Markan material in two groups (each arranged anyhow—for lack of full knowledge¹) at two arbitrarily chosen points in Mark's programme; and that the Fourth Gospel, with its free doctrinal handling of the whole tradition, and especially its transfer of the Temple-cleansing to the beginning of the ministry, cannot be taken seriously in its presentation of an elaborate schema of Jewish festivals.² Hence we are urged to forego the futile task of endeavouring to discover the march of events—and with it, of course, the psychological development of Jesus—during the period of His public ministry.³

It is good and right that a check should be given from time to time to our natural tendency to assume that we know more than we actually do. Yet on this matter it may be doubted whether an absolute 'non possumus' is really the only sound attitude. Waiving finally all hope of arriving at certainty *in details*, we may yet plead

(1) that Mark's lack of *τάξις* may well refer to literary

itself is introduced in a purely parenthetical section inserted to explain the statement in the main thread of narrative that Antipas (sometime after John's execution) began to wonder who Jesus was. The main thread is thus dropped in favour of one that begins at an earlier point in the story: yet the two never meet, nor is their interrelation made clear. Again, at the moment of Jesus' death (xxvii. 50–53), an earthquake opens the tombs, and many saints rise bodily, and "after his resurrection" enter Jerusalem, and appear to many. What were they doing between Friday and Sunday? Furthermore, as McNeile points out in his *Gospel according to St. Matthew* (p. 486), 'Matthew' is wrong as against Luke in the position he gives to the so-called Sermon on the Mount.

¹ There is at least one obvious example of this—Luke xvi. 14–18.

² Wellhausen, for example (*Das Evangelium Johannis*, pp. 28, 105), emphatically rejects the Johannine chronology as intended to lengthen the public activity of Jesus to several years, and argues that the notes of time in John vi. 4, x. 22 serve no real purpose in the narrative.

³ Typical of this modern critical attitude are Lohmeyer's recent reviews of Headlam's *Life of Jesus in Theol. Litzg.* 1923, No. 22, 466–469, and of Cadman's *Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, in *Theol. Litzg.* 1924, No. 18, 401. Cf. Bousset, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?* pp. 51 f., 62.

articulation and form, rather than chronology, and that the Gospel shows clear traces of an historical appreciation of the development of events: ¹

(2) that Luke makes an explicit claim to have written *καθ'εξῆς*, which clearly means in chronological order;

(3) that in regard to the Fourth Gospel, while the insertion of much imaginary discourse and the exploitation of narrative in the interests of doctrine and symbolism are not to be questioned, yet it is not possible, without much forcing and unnaturalness, to apply the theory of "tendency" or ulterior religious motive to the whole of the Johannine narrative. Much of it can be naturally accounted for only on the supposition that it is genuine tradition regarding actual occurrences.² And when once it is admitted that even the Synoptics *imply* more than one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem before the Passion,³ there is at least a *prima facie* case for regarding the *main* Johannine story as historical (even supposing that the position it gives to the Temple-cleansing is erroneous).⁴

Let us now see what happens if we assume these moderate pleas to be justified, and proceed to compare the Johannine and Synoptic outlines. We set aside John i.-iv. 44 as dealing with the period before the Galilæan ministry opens—a period, apparently, of about nine months, viz. : from a little before the Passover (ii. 12 f.), i.e. March or April, to four months before harvest (iv. 35), i.e. December.⁵ There is no

¹ We may quote, not only Swete, *Mark* (1923), pp. lviii.-lxii., Menzies, *Earliest Gospel*, pp. 20 f., 29-31, and Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. pp. 185-188, but also H. J. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* (1911), i. pp. 472 f.

² This is well brought out in A. E. Brooke's essay on 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel' in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909), pp. 291 ff. ³ Moffatt, *ILNT*, pp. 541-544.

⁴ It is well known that the Fourth Gospel is thought by most scholars to be in the right as against the Synoptics in the matter of the date of the crucifixion.

⁵ Against the widely accepted suggestion that iii. 22-30 should be

Synoptic counterpart to this Johannine section, beyond the narratives of the Lord's baptism and temptation. Further, we must transpose John v. and vi. and make certain other adjustments which are necessitated by the dislocation of the contents of the Gospel.¹ The Fourth Gospel then gives us (after the December of iv. 35):

- a Passover (vi. 4) at the time of the crowd-feeding, in the midst of a Galilæan ministry;
- a visit to Jerusalem for an unnamed feast (v. 1), usually assumed to be Pentecost;
- a further period in Galilee (vii. 1);
- a visit to Jerusalem for the Feast of Booths (October: vii. 2, 10);
- a visit to Jerusalem for the Feast of Dedication (December: x. 22);
- a journey across the Jordan (x. 40);
- the raising of Lazarus at Bethany (xi. 1-53);
- a retirement to Ephraim (thirteen miles north of Jerusalem: xi. 54);
- the Passover of the Passion (xi. 55 ff.).

Unless therefore the unnamed feast of v. 1 be Passover (which we have no reason to suppose), we have here a period of about fifteen months. It is surely rather a striking confirmation of this that Mark (who has no explicit dates except that of the final Passover) has, in iv., parables about sowing (which took place in January and February), in vi. 39 an allusion to the fresh "green grass" of spring inserted between ii. 12 and 13, see *Journ. Theol. Studies*, July, 1919, pp. 316 f.

¹ The bare fact of dislocation seems to be established by the obvious necessity for transposing v. and vi. and the lack of continuity between what precedes and what follows the interpolated *Pericope Adulteræ* (vii. 53-viii. 11). I accept in the main the restorations of F. W. Lewis, *Disarrangements of the Fourth Gospel*, for v.-xx.; but comparatively few of the detailed alterations affect the chronological scheme. It is a pity that Turner, in his excellent article on 'Chronology' in *Hastings' DB*, does not assume the transposition of v. and vi.

(in connexion with the story of the crowd-feeding), and in ii. 23 ff. the account of an incident (placed before its proper time in a special group of 'conflict-accidents,' ii.-iii. 6), which probably took place shortly after Passover.¹ Thus without the help of any but the most moderate hypotheses, we may fairly claim that Mark and John are in substantial agreement as to the period between the opening of the Galilæan ministry and the Passion.² A further point of contact is that Mark, like 'John,' has a visit of Jesus across the Jordan shortly before the Passion (x. 1, cf. Matt. xix. 1).

How does Luke's arrangement compare with this Marco-Johannine framework? The value of his arrangement is indeed impaired somewhat by occasional obvious misplacements,³ by the embodiment of the erroneous Marcan inclusion of only one visit to Jerusalem, viz., at the end of Jesus' life, and possibly also by the desire to compress the whole ministry within the space of twelve months (iv. 19). On the other hand, not only does Luke expressly claim to have written chronologically, and that after thorough investigation (i. 3), but the general faithfulness with which he follows Mark's order and (as most think) the original order of Q also, suffice at least to acquit him of the suspicion

¹ It was illegal to eat the new harvest's corn until the sheaf of first-fruits had been duly offered at Passover.

² The oft-alleged discrepancy between the Johannine and Synoptic versions in regard to the length of the ministry reduces itself therefore to the Johannine insertion of nine months' activity between the baptism of Jesus and the commencement of the Galilæan ministry proper.

³ E.g. the visit to Nazareth (iv. 16-30) is put at the commencement of the Galilæan ministry, though the premature mention of Kapharnaum (iv. 23) proves that the later Marcan date (Mark vi. 1-6) is preferable. The synagogue incident (Luke xiii. 10-17) is probably inserted too late, in view of Jesus' growing aloofness from the synagogue. The Lucan setting of the great lamentation over Jerusalem (xiii. 34 f.: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc.) has even less verisimilitude than the Matthæan (xxiii. 37-39), which is saying a good deal. See also above, p. 176, n. 1, and below, p. 191, n. 2.

of being actuated, in the arrangement of his materials, by any other interest. At one point, indeed, he seems to have been in a position to correct Mark's order. Of the two 'conflicts' in Mark iii. 22-30 (Beelzebub) and vii. 1-23 (defilement), the latter is far less violent and embittered than the former, and certainly looks like the earlier of the two.¹ Now Luke omits the dispute about defilement, but his version of the Beelzebub-incident, which is clearly taken from Q,² appears at a considerably later point in the story than the defilement-discourse would have occupied, had Luke inserted it in the Marcan order. We seem led to the conclusion that, where the order of Mark and Q differed, Luke gave priority to Q.³ If he did so, his preference must have rested on a belief in its superior accuracy. But would this procedure, if established, help us? In other words, was the original order of Q chronological? Most modern scholars would be likely to exclaim in reply, with Pauline emphasis, *Μὴ γένοιτο!* There are, however, two things to be said on this point. Firstly, since Q was not simply a collection of sayings, but consisted largely of narrative, the natural arrangement for its author to adopt would be the chronological, especially if (as its obvious truthfulness and the words of Papias combine to suggest) it is from the hand of an apostolic eye-witness. Secondly, its original arrangement, as visible in the Lucan series of excerpts, reveals no trace of inherent improbability or of any artistic or artificial schematism, such as would make it useless for chronology.

It may then be put down as a preliminary finding that Luke's arrangement of events is probably even nearer the

¹ A. T. Cadoux, in the *EXPOSITOR*, Jan. 1918, pp. 72 f.; W. H. Cadman, *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, pp. 22 f., 38.

² B. H. Streeter in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 169-171.

³ Another instance of this would be the parable of the mustard-seed (Luke xiii. 18 f.=Matt. xiii. 31 f.; cf. Mark iv. 30-32).

truth than Mark's, and that, although (like Mark) he makes no exact statement on the matter, his view of the duration of the ministry probably did not differ widely from that of the earlier evangelist.

The question, however, has now to be asked whether Luke gives as little support as Mark does to the Johannine series of Jerusalem visits. The Synoptic story of the ministry, down to the commencement of the final journey to Jerusalem (i.e. Mark i. 14—ix, and its parallels), contains virtually nothing that explicitly suggests Jerusalem as the scene of action, except the statement in Luke iv. 44 that Jesus was "preaching in the synagogues of Judæa," which, if the text be correct, may be a general recognition of the bare fact that Jerusalem was sometimes visited.¹ Now it is exactly at the lower point just referred to, viz., the termination of the Galilæan ministry according to Mark, that the Greater Interpolation of Luke begins (ix. 51—xviii. 14). We have, indeed, no certain knowledge of the source or sources which Luke followed throughout this large section; but it is clear (1) that none of it is drawn from Mark,² (2) that it contains a larger proportion of excerpts from Q than any other part of the Gospel. The simplest explanation of these data is that advanced by Dr. Streeter, viz., that the Greater Interpolation is, in the main, an extract from Q.³ It is generally thought to give a rather loosely-knit version of a single leisurely journey from Galilee to Judæa.⁴ True, Luke himself may have so regarded it:

¹ Or Judæa may simply mean Jewish territory generally (cf. i. 5, vii. 17 [around Nain], xxiii. 5 [includes Galilee], Acts x. 37 [ditto]). Some sayings in 'Matthew' (e.g. v. 23 f.) seem to have been spoken in or near Jerusalem. May we say the same of Matthew viii. 4 = Mark i. 44 (see McNeile, *Matthew*, p. 102a) ?

² Sir J. C. Hawkins, in *Oxford Studies*. pp. 28—59.

³ *Oxford Studies*, pp. 189—203.

⁴ It is sometimes called the "Perræan Section" because in *Mark x.* 1—45 (= *Math.* xix.—xx. 28) Jesus is beyond the Jordan en route for Jeru-

at any rate, nowhere in the course of it does he specifically mention that Jesus got to Jerusalem, and then left it again. But its indications of locality do not lend themselves at all well to the theory of a single journey. Thus—

- ix. 51-56. Jesus starts for Jerusalem, and enters Samaritan territory.
- ix. 57 He and His company are still on the road.
- x. 1-20. The mission and return of the Seventy.
- x. 29-37. The parable of the Good Samaritan (with its notice of the Jerusalem-Jericho road).¹
- x. 38-42. Jesus at the home of Martha and Mary (i.e. according to John xi., Bethany, within two miles of Jerusalem).
- xi. 1. He is "in a certain place," praying.
- xi. 45-52. He denounces the Jewish persecution of the Prophets, etc. (? at Jerusalem: note the allusion to the Temple in verse 51).
- xiii. 1-5. He calls for a national repentance (? at Jerusalem: note the mention of sacrifices, Siloam, Jerusalemites).
- xiii. 10. He teaches "in one of the synagogues" on the Sabbath.
- xiii. 22. He journeys through cities and villages on His way to Jerusalem.
- xiii. 31-33. He is warned to flee from Antipas (therefore He is in Galilee or Peræa).²
- xiv. 25. Great crowds journey with Him.
- xvii. 11. En route to Jerusalem, he passes along

salem: but *Luke* says nothing anywhere about Jesus crossing the Jordan or visiting Peræa.

¹ Both Rush Rhees (*Life of Jesus of Naz.*, p. 157), and O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus* [E. T.], pp. 390, 402) believe this parable to have been spoken in or near Jerusalem.

² For Luke xiii. 34 f. ("O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc.), see above, p. 179, and below, p. 191, n. 2.

between Samaria and Galilee (i.e. probably towards the Jordan : note also the Samaritan leper in the immediate sequel).

xviii. 9-14. He utters the parable of the two men praying in the Temple (? therefore at Jerusalem).

xviii. 15 ff. are parallel to Mark x. 13 ff., the scene of which is in Peræa.

Now it is hard to believe that a literary artist like Luke would have tolerated these extraordinarily confusing notes of place, unless he had felt compelled thereto either by his authorities or by some special necessity. If they go back to Q or any other single source, we might explain them as due either to sheer clumsiness, or to some obscure accidental corruption, which has left the sequence of the sections and some of the notices of locality untouched, but has obliterated others, with the result that almost all explicit mention of Jerusalem and all trace of journeys away from Jerusalem have disappeared. More probable than either of these suppositions is the suggestion that such corruption was intentional, on the part, either of Luke himself, or of the compiler of that version of Q which Luke used as his immediate source, and that the motive of it was the fancied necessity of removing the apparent disagreement with Mark's view of Jesus' itinerary.¹

¹ It is worth observing that of two out of the three occasions on which the indefinite *τις* is used of a place in the Greater Interpolation, one (x. 38) refers to Bethany (which it is difficult to imagine Luke not to have known to be the home of Martha and Mary), and the other (xi. 1) apparently to Jerusalem or to the Mount of Olives. That *ἐν τόπῳ τινί* in xi. 1 is a deliberate substitute for a specific place-name is probable : otherwise, why should the phrase be inserted at all ? Only once elsewhere (xvii. 12) does Luke take the trouble to indicate a locality in this vague way (*εἰς τινα κώμην*), and there the fact that the context is narrative (instead of teaching, as here) would suffice to explain the insertion of some note of locality, while the fact that the village was small and little known would account for the vagueness.

If we look carefully at the above list of movements, we shall see that, if chronological, it implies, not one visit to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, but three :—

I. covers at least Luke x. 25–xiii. 9.

II. covers at least Luke xviii. 9–14.

III. is the Passion-visit, narrated by all four Gospels.

It will be remembered that the Fourth Gospel has, in the period corresponding to the Synoptic story of the ministry, *four* visits to Jerusalem :

1. for the unnamed Feast (? Pentecost), John v. 1–47, vii. 15–24, viii. 12–20.
2. for the Feast of Booths (October), John vii. 1–14, 25–52, viii. 21–59, ix., x. 19–21.
3. for the Feast of Dedication (December), John x. 22–29, 1–18, 30–39.
4. for the Passover of the Passion, John xii. ff.

Of these, No. 1 seems to have nothing whatever corresponding to it in the Synoptics ; but as John's No. 4 corresponds to Luke's No. III., may not John's Nos. 2 and 3 correspond respectively to Luke's Nos. I. and II. ?

For purposes of comparison, let us concentrate our attention on the former of these two, viz., the visit for the Feast of Booths (John vii. 1–14, 25–52, viii. 21–59, ix., x. 19–21, = [?] Luke x. 25–xiii. 9. It must be admitted that the Lucan and Johannine versions seem to have little in common, and present at least one rather glaring discrepancy. In Luke, Jesus journeys publicly, sending messengers on before Him to announce His approach and prepare for His reception ; He sends out the Seventy Missioners, and receives them on their return ; rejoices over His intimacy with God ; tells a lawyer about love to God and to man as the condition of inheriting eternal life ; utters the parable of the Good Samaritan ; visits Martha and Mary (? at Bethany) ; teaches the disciples about prayer ; replies to the charge

of being empowered by Beelzebub ; adduces the " sign " of Jonah ; dines with one of the Pharisees, and denounces them ; prepares the disciples for persecution ; refuses to be a " judge or divider " ; warns against wealth and earthly worries ; enjoins watchfulness ; alludes to His approaching " baptism " ; urges the Jews to " interpret this season " and " judge what is right " ; advises the speedy settlement of a debt-dispute ; speaks about the Galilæans whom Pilate had killed at their sacrifices and the men on whom the tower had fallen at Siloam ; and utters the parable of the barren fig-tree. In John, on the other hand, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem (after a dispute with His brothers), " not publicly, but as it were in secret." People look for Him at Jerusalem, discussing whether He be a good man or a deceiver. Half-way through the festival, He suddenly appears in the Temple, teaching ; this excites wonder, and He enters upon discussions concerning His personal claims. Attempts are made to arrest Him, but they come to nothing. This goes on until the end of the festival, when the failure of the last effort to seize Him leads to an altercation between Nikodemus and the other Pharisees. Then follows another long and acrimonious argument between Jesus and " the Jews," culminating in an attempt to stone Him ; but He " hid Himself, and went out of the Temple." After that comes the healing of the man born blind (by means of a wash in the Pool of Siloam), with its interesting sequel leading up to yet further dispute and further division of opinion.

It would be futile to attempt to harmonise the Lucan and Johannine stories in any detailed way. Their mutual independence and at least partial incompatibility are sufficiently obvious. In particular it is hard to recognise in the secret journey of the Fourth Gospel the leisurely and public progress described in Luke. It does not, however, follow that we have not here two versions of one and the

same visit. That the Johannine discourses have no close parallel in Luke occasions us no difficulty, for, as is usual in the Fourth Gospel, these discourses are almost entirely the free composition of the evangelist, not the record or tradition of what had actually been said. For the rest, there are a number of points of contact, which vary in significance, and may be in part fortuitous, but are in any case worth bringing together. First we may note that the proportionate space devoted in both Gospels to the antepenultimate and penultimate visits of Jesus to Jerusalem is approximately the same: in each Gospel the latter gets a little less than one-third the space of the former. The only places where Siloam happens to be mentioned in the Gospels fall in the two narratives of the former. The one "Johannine" passage in Q—that, namely, in which Jesus speaks of His unique intimacy with God—occurs in Luke almost immediately before the arrival at Bethany. Common, further, to the Lucan and Johannine stories are the general atmosphere of hostility and controversy and the allusions to present and imminent persecution (Luke xi. 4b, 15 ff., 47–51, 53 f., xii. 1, 4–9, 11 f., 49–53; John vii. 7b, 13, 25, 30, 44, viii. 28, 37, 40, 59, ix. 22). When due allowance is made for the natural and inevitable fragmentariness of all our Gospel-narratives, there is nothing in the Johannine *story* of this visit, except the alleged secrecy of the journey, which conflicts badly with the Lucan account.

But, however much or little of the Fourth Gospel it may prove possible to salvage for the genuine history of this episode in Jesus' life, our main source of information must, of course, always be the narrative of the Synoptist. Apart altogether from points of contact with John, there is much in the Lucan section to suggest Jerusalem as the scene of action. As the force of the argument is here cumulative, it is worth while putting the several indications together.

In x. 25-28, the conversation with the lawyer, we have the Lucan parallel to Mark. xii. 28-34=Matthew xxii. 34-40, where Jesus speaks *in Jerusalem* about the two greatest commandments. In x. 30 He speaks of the road "from Jerusalem to Jericho"; in x. 38 He reaches "a certain village" (which may be a deliberate substitute for Bethany—the place almost certainly in Luke's mind); in xi. 1 He is at prayer "in a certain place" (perhaps a substitute for the mount of Olives); in xi. 4 He tells the disciples to pray that they may not be led into *πειρασμός*—surely a hint of approaching conflict and strain (cf. xxii. 28, 40, 46). In xi. 15 ff. we have the passionate Beelzebub-controversy, which—as one scholar graphically says—"smacks of Jerusalem," and which Mark (iii. 22) may be as wrong in locating in Galilee as he is in putting it too early in the story.¹ Later in the chapter come those vehement denunciations of the Pharisees and lawyers, the Marcan and Matthæan parallels to which belong to the story of the last days of Jesus *in Jerusalem*. xii. 1-48 contains little that points definitely to Jerusalem, unless we may include as such the warnings of approaching persecution (1, 4-9, 11 f.) and the allusion to the grandeur of Solomon (27). With xii. 49, however, begins a little series of utterances, forming a closely knit unity, and containing unmistakable signs of having been spoken in the capital. The Galilæans slain at their sacrifices, the accident at Siloam, and "all the men that dwell in Jerusalem," combine in suggesting the same locality. The parable of the barren fig-tree is paralleled in the other Synoptics by the story of the cursing of an actual fig-tree just outside the city-walls (Mark xi. 12-14, 20-25, and parallel).

But the signs of a Jerusalemite setting for this section do not all lie in matters of detail. Its general purport points in the same direction. The thread that links to-

¹ See above, p. 180.

gether the several sayings (xii. 49-xiii. 9), which are at first sight apparently so disconnected, is Jesus' sense of the peril which the nation at large was incurring through its virtual rejection of Himself as its leader. With their refusal of that distinctive ethic which Jesus insisted upon in His teaching, there vanished the one hope of curing the Jewish nationalist hostility to Rome and so of averting the eventual outbreak of a bloody struggle with Cæsar. One frequently meets in early Christian literature with the statement that the disaster which overwhelmed the Jewish nation in 70 A.D. was a punishment Divinely inflicted on them for their wickedness in rejecting and crucifying Jesus. So expressed, the idea, however gratifying to Christian pride, was a crude one, and assumes a deeper knowledge than we possess of the ultimate relations between the will and providence of God on the one hand, and, on the other, the operation of the laws of cause and effect and man's exercise of free-will in his treatment of his fellows. The crudity arose because the psychological causes were ignored. If due account be taken of them, the connexion becomes clearer. Whether the disaster of 70 A.D. ought to be called a Divine punishment or not, it certainly was the natural consequence of the Jewish revolt, which was itself the natural consequence of the Jews' refusal to adopt, at the invitation of Jesus, the distinctively Christian ethic of forgiveness, love, and goodwill. It has been increasingly emphasized by recent writers that, contrary to the opinion of most earlier interpreters of the Gospels, Jesus did not regard the great international problem of His time and country as outside His own concern. The Messiahship, of which He was conscious from the time of His baptism onwards, was a distinctively *national* rôle: different people might conceive of it as taking many different forms, but all agreed that it had reference to *the nation*. And Jesus certainly hoped at the outset that the nation would accept

Him as its leader.¹ Proof of this may be seen in His later words of evident disappointment (Matt. xxiii. 37-39 and parallel; Luke xix. 41-44, etc), and His frequent use of the term "brother" (i.e. fellow-Jew) as equivalent to "fellow-disciple" and of "Gentile" as equivalent to "outsider" (e.g. Matt. v. 47 [vii. 6?], x. 5 f., xviii. 15-17). Here then was one conscious of being called to a national rôle, determined to fulfil that rôle, and hopeful at first of doing so with success. Is it conceivable that such a one should have had nothing to say on the most burning national question His fellow-countrymen had to face, no policy to advocate in regard to the most pressing political question of His time and nation? These considerations suffice to show how utterly inadequate for the interpretation of this side of His work are the old formulæ that He did not come to found a 'worldly' or 'political' kingdom, that He "accepted the State," and that in general He took little or no interest in political questions. They throw a new light on the Temptation-story and on Matthew v. 38-48, where the word for "enemies" holds good for national as well as private foes, and the picture of one being "compelled" to go a mile strongly suggests the overbearing conduct of a foreign official.²

¹ Cf. R. Mackintosh, *Historic Theories of Atonement*, pp. 42-46.

² Matt. v. 41. The word used for "compel" (*ἀγγαρεύσει*) is the technical term for forced labour exacted by the State: for a case of it, see Mark xv. 21.

Jesus' own application of His distinctive ethic to the political problem of His fellow-countrymen's antipathy to their foreign rulers has been attracting more and more attention lately. See S. Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (1916), J. R. Coates, *The Christ of Revolution* (1920), pp. 1-16, etc., Lily Dougall on "The Salvation of the Nations" in *The Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1921, pp. 113-123, and in *The Lord of Thought*, pp. 120-122, 136-153, 177; A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking* (1922), pp. 105-125, 138 f.; V. G. Simkhovitch, *Towards the Understanding of Jesus* (1923), esp. pp. 11, 28, 37, 41, 47 f., 60, 73; E. Grubb in *Expository Times*, Feb. 1923, pp. 214-217. Cf. H. Weinel, *Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat* [1908], p. 9: "Sein ganzes Leben ist ein Kampf mit der politischen Frage seines Volkes gewesen, und er hat mit seinem Leben seine Stellung bezahlt."

As the hostility of the national leaders stiffened with the progress of Jesus' public work, the likelihood of a terrific national catastrophe naturally grew greater. Hence the note of urgency perceptible at so many points in the story, and in particular in the Lucan story of this visit to Jerusalem, which occurred at a rather advanced stage in the ministry. We may well gather from the woes pronounced over Khorazin, Bethsaida, and Kapharnaum (x. 13-15), that such a sense of urgency lay behind the despatch of the Seventy. But in any case it is the prime concern of xii. 54-xiii. 9. Jesus has just been speaking to the disciples with deep emotion about His approaching martyrdom (xii. 49 f.). Conscious, not only of the dissension and persecution consequent on men's rejection of Him (52-53), but also of the national calamity that will follow it (49, 51),¹ He next utters a series of appeals to the public. First He refers them to their normal skill in reading the signs of the weather: why can they not use the same skill in reading the threatening signs of the time (xii. 54-56)? The storm-clouds of war are rolling up on the distant horizon; yet men are blind to them, and will not see for themselves the right path of reconciliation (57).² Then follows the injunction to settle a quarrel without delay, lest the enemy, by a prompt appeal to the rigour of the law, foreclose all chance of reconciliation, and exact his full legal due (58).³ Next Jesus is told of the Galilæans

¹ Vide Matt. x. 34 f. for Q's probable original reading. The apparently final or purposive meaning of the infinitives in these verses must not be pressed: the infinitive can be used to express mere result, and the distinction between mere result and purpose is not sharply drawn, especially in the Semitic mind (cf. A. J. Robertson, *Grammar of Greek N. T.*, pp. 1001-1003, 1089-1091).

² Cf. Simkhovitch, *op. cit.* p. 11; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (1923), pp. 93 f.

³ 'Matthew' has the passage (v. 25 f.) in a setting which suggests a purely personal reference. The general superiority of Luke's arrangement and the excellent sense it here gives make it probable that this sense is the one which the passage originally bore.

martyred by Pilate (xiii. 1). Nothing else is known of the incident: but it is more than likely that the victims suffered as a consequence of some manifestation of patriotism on their part, which was offensive to the Roman power, and that Jesus' informants hoped that the outrage might sting Him into a true Messianic vigour after the pattern of the Maccabees.¹ But Jesus in reply, while dismissing the suggestion that the slaughtered men were more sinful than the other Galilæans, urged that a similar fate overhung all His hearers, unless there should intervene a national change of heart and mind, such as would obviate a violent struggle with Rome. And He reinforced His plea by repeating it with reference to the men who were killed by the fall of a tower at Siloam (xiii. 2-5). Lastly He spoke the parable of the barren fig-tree. The parable is peculiar to Luke; and he omits the story of Mark and Matthew about Jesus having cursed and withered a real fig-tree. That story has difficulties of its own, both scientific and moral; and it would in some ways be a relief if we could regard it as a garbled version of the parable. However that may be, the parable at all events is genuine. We must not try to interpret it in detail, like an allegory: it sets forth one point only—the imminence of destruction, calling urgently for immediate amendment in the last brief remaining interval.²

I do not know whether the interrelation of the several

¹ "In all pre-Christian documents, the chief function of the Messiah is the overthrow of the oppressors, the crushing of the ungodly powers" (Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

² Later and more acute stages in this agonising concern of Jesus are seen in Luke xvii. 26-37, *viz.* 41-44, xx. 9-18, 21-25, xxi. 5-28 (Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, p. 39), xxiii. 27-31. (Simkhovitch, p. 42). The passages in italics have no Synoptic parallel. The great lamentation, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 34-35=Matt. xxiii. 37-39), seems to be out of its proper chronological place in both Gospels. The precise meaning of its closing words is obscure; but the best place for it would be at the close of Jesus' last visit to Jerusalem but one,

subsections comprised in the passage Luke xii. 49-xiii. 9, and their united reference to the national peril consequent upon the Jewish rejection of Jesus and His teaching, has been observed before. If the view here advocated in regard to this passage be accepted, it confirms our faith in the general superiority of Luke's arrangement, and strengthens very considerably the theory (suggested by numerous less striking touches) that the Great Interpolation conceals within itself the story of at least one, and in all probability two, visits of Jesus to Jerusalem prior to the last visit at which He suffered.

C. J. CADOUX.

*SOME INTERESTING READINGS IN THE
WASHINGTON CODEX OF THE GOSPELS.*

IN 1912 Professor Alexander Souter wrote in his excellent handbook, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (p. 31), concerning the newly discovered "Freer Gospels," bought in Egypt by Mr. C. L. Freer of Detroit and now in Washington (hence called W by Gregory): "to this MS. one can merely call attention, as at the moment of writing very little is known about it." But in that same year Professor H. A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan, published a *Fascimile of the Washington MS. of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection* (pp. x. 372), and issued at the same time *The Washington MS. of the Four Gospels* (pp. vii. 247), an elaborate discussion and collation of W. He has presented the essential facts, so far as known, concerning the history of the document. It belongs either to the fourth or to the fifth century, as is plain from the style, uncial writing, infrequent punctuation, absence of accents and of the Eusebian sections, etc. The Gospels appear in the Western order like that in D and the Old Latin