

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

LOCALITY AND DOCTRINE
IN THE GOSPELS

LOCALITY AND DOCTRINE IN THE GOSPELS

BY

ROBERT HENRY LIGHTFOOT

FELLOW OF NEW COLLEGE

DEAN IRELAND'S PROFESSOR OF EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

HON. D.D. (ABERDEEN)

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LIMITED LONDON

FIRST PUBLISHED . . . 1938

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., London and Aylesbury.

SENATVI ACADEMICO
VNIVERSITATIS ABREDONENSIS
ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
I. THE CONCLUSION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORD- ING TO ST. MARK (1)	1
II. THE CONCLUSION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORD- ING TO ST. MARK (2)	24
III. THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN ST. MARK AND ST. MATTHEW	49
ADDITIONAL NOTE: THE MEANING OF ST. MARK 16 ⁷	73
IV. THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN	78
ADDITIONAL NOTE: THE NARRATIVE OF ST. JOHN 21	101
V. THE NARRATIVE OF THE MINISTRY IN ST. MARK AND ST. MATTHEW	106
VI. THE NARRATIVE OF THE MINISTRY IN ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN	132
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES	159
INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES	161

PREFACE

FOUR of the lectures in this book were delivered at Bangor in January of this year by invitation of the theological faculty of the University College of North Wales. I much appreciated the interest shewn in the lectures by the audience, which included both seniors and juniors; and I was told that my hearers would have welcomed a fuller treatment of the problems connected with the conclusion of St. Mark's gospel than was possible on that occasion. Accordingly I gave two lectures on this subject last term at Oxford, and these now stand as an introduction to the four lectures delivered at Bangor. This has involved a certain amount of repetition in the second and third lectures of the book, but I hope that this may be excused for the sake of clearness.

Those readers of this book who are already acquainted with Dr. Ernst Lohmeyer's *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, published in the summer of 1936, will see that I have been much influenced by the first part of his book, and I desire gratefully to acknowledge the help and stimulus which I have received from it and also from his revised edition, published this year, of Meyer's commentary on St. Mark's gospel. The themes discussed in these lectures had been for some time in my mind, when Dr. Lohmeyer's works appeared; and it was a welcome discovery that I was approaching certain problems along lines which had

commended themselves independently to Dr. Lohmeyer. In particular I had become increasingly doubtful whether there is any real support for the common assumption that the end of St. Mark's gospel is mutilated; it seemed to me more likely that the book ends, and was meant by its author to end, at 16⁸; but Dr. Lohmeyer's interpretation of Mk. 16⁷ had not occurred to me, and it is desirable that his view should be laid before english readers for their consideration. If some are inclined to dismiss it out of hand as quite incredible, I hope they will not for this reason refuse a hearing to other points debated in this book.

Dr. J. M. Creed has once more been good enough to help me by reading the lectures in manuscript, and I have received valuable suggestions from friends who have read with me for the schools at Oxford or have worked with me in other ways, especially Mr. D. M. MacKinnon, Fellow of Keble College, Mr. R. W. H. Phillips, B.A., of Jesus College, and Mr. C. P. M. Jones of New College.

R. H. L.

NEW COLLEGE,
OXFORD.
August, 1937.

I

THE CONCLUSION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK (1)

THE difficulties connected with the end of the gospel according to St. Mark have long been familiar to students of the gospels; but it should be noticed that in the course of the last two generations the centre of interest in the discussion of these difficulties has changed. The debate was concerned at first almost exclusively with the problems presented by Mk. 16⁹⁻²⁰, the last twelve verses of the gospel as printed in our bibles. For our present purpose it is not necessary to go further back than 1881, the year in which Westcott and Hort published their great edition of the greek testament. In it, on grounds of both external and internal evidence, they decisively repudiated any claim on behalf of these verses to form part of the original gospel of St. Mark. So far as I know, no previous editor or commentator had dealt so exhaustively with the problem presented by these verses or had reached so definite a conclusion; and it is therefore not surprising that during the remainder of the nineteenth century the debate upon the conclusion of this gospel occupied itself chiefly with this point; and as late as 1899, the year in which the veteran scholar Dr. George Salmon published the ninth edition of his *Introduction to the Books of the New Testament*, he allowed himself still to maintain, against

Westcott and Hort, that these twelve verses were "from the first an integral part of the second gospel."¹

With the arrival of the twentieth century however the current seems to have turned decisively and permanently against the view championed to the end of his life by Dr. Salmon. Already Dr. Swete in his great commentary on the gospel according to St. Mark, first published in 1898, had thus summed up his investigation of the matter: "Besides the fact that in the fourth century, if not in the third, the 'accurate copies' of the gospel were known to end with 16^s, and that in the two great fourth-century bibles which have come down to us the gospel actually ends at this point, those who maintain the genuineness of the last twelve verses have to account for the early circulation of an alternative ending, and for the ominous silence of the Ante-Nicene Fathers between Irenæus and Eusebius in reference to a passage which was of so much importance both on historical and theological grounds. When we add to these defects in the external evidence the internal characteristics which distinguish these verses from the rest of the gospel, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that they belong to another work, whether that of Aristion or of some unknown writer of the first century"²; and in a note on the same page, with special reference to Dr. Salmon's plea for their Marcan authorship, Dr. Swete adds, "Unless we entirely misjudge the writer of the second gospel, the last twelve verses are the work of another mind, trained in another school."

¹ P. 151.

² Pp. cxii f. This whole section, pages ciii to cxiii in Dr. Swete's introduction, should be studied carefully.

Owing to Dr. Swete's well-merited reputation for cautious and massive scholarship, this verdict, thus deliberately given after nearly twenty years' further consideration of the evidence, was doubtless very influential, and indeed it is unlikely that at the present time any sober English student of St. Mark's gospel would dispute the matter; it is now generally agreed that the last twelve verses are the concluding portion of another document, and have been added as a kind of appendix after Mk. 16^a.

This result, however, inevitably aroused interest in another problem; if Mk. 16⁹⁻²⁰ is not the work of the evangelist, what was the conclusion of his gospel? Can this be found in 16^a? Or, if the words of this verse are thought to be intolerably abrupt for such a purpose, must we assume that the gospel either was never finished or else has suffered mutilation; and if the latter, was this mutilation accidental or deliberate?

By Dr. Hort twenty years earlier this question had been rapidly disposed of, since the answer to it was in his opinion not doubtful. "It is incredible" he says "that the evangelist deliberately concluded either a paragraph with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, or the gospel with a petty detail of a secondary event, leaving his narrative hanging in the air"¹; and without further discussion of this aspect of the matter, he bends all his energies to shew that, although a more satisfactory ending than 16^a is needed, this cannot be found in 16⁹⁻²⁰, and therefore that these verses must not be regarded as the true and original conclusion of this gospel. Accordingly for Dr. Hort the problem of the original con-

¹ *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction, Appendix, p. 46.

clusion of St. Mark's gospel only began *after* 16^b, since in any case the verse 16^b itself could not be the evangelist's concluding words.

Dr. Hort's verdict thus briefly but decisively given, that Mk. 16^b cannot be the ending of this gospel, has been almost undisputed in this country. Only during the last ten years have any even tentative attempts been made in Great Britain to consider the difficulties with which this solution of the problem is beset, and also to put forward the view that Mk. 16^b may be and may have been intended by the evangelist to be the ending of his gospel. With the first of these points Dr. Swete did not deal at all, and with the second only slightly. He speaks in his comment on Mk. 14²⁸ of the evangelist's "unfinished work," with reference to his gospel as a whole; and in his comment on 16^b, after alluding to "the abrupt ending," he continues with characteristic caution: "It is perhaps improbable that the evangelist deliberately concluded a paragraph with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ."¹ So far as he expresses an opinion, he seems to think that the last sentence of 16^b may be mutilated, and he alludes in his second edition to Mr. [later, Professor] Burkitt's suggestion²

¹ P. 399.

² In his *Two Lectures on the Gospels* (delivered in 1900), p. 28. The passage runs: "That the gospel was originally intended to finish at verse 8 is quite inconceivable. Not only the narrative, the paragraph, and the sentence are each left incomplete, but even the subordinate clause seems to hang in the air. Greek sentences do not usually finish off with a particle, and the two last words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ . . . may very well have meant 'for they were afraid of' *something* now lost, whether it was the chief priests or the fanatical mob or the incredulous and mournful scorn of St. Peter and his companions. The gospel as we have it is accidentally imperfect, not intentionally

that some object may have followed the verb (ἐφοβοῦντο). It is, however, interesting that a view which Dr. Hort in 1881 qualified as "incredible" is stated by Dr. Swete seventeen years later to be "perhaps improbable."¹

Dr. Swete's commentary had barely reached its second edition (1902), when the semitic scholar Julius Wellhausen published in 1903 his penetrating commentary of 143 pages on St. Mark, this being the first-fruits of his interest in the synoptic gospels. His verdict on the ending of the gospel is given with characteristic brevity and vigour: "With 16^b the gospel of Mark reaches its conclusion. Most of the expositors are not content with this and assume that the author was hindered from completing his work or that originally more followed, which later for some reason was sacrificed to the censorship. They have not understood 16^a."² Nothing is wanting; it would be a pity, if anything were added." These words are repeated unchanged in the second edition of his commentary (1909), and to them is added, instead of some concluding remarks in his first edition, this sentence:

curtailed; in other words, the MS. from which all our copies are derived must have lost one or more leaves at the end."

¹ It must not however be forgotten that both the great scholars C. H. Turner (†1930) and F. C. Burkitt (†1935) to the end of their lives regarded the view that St. Mark's gospel could end at 16^b as "inconceivable."

² The first part of Wellhausen's commentary on Mk. 16^a runs thus: "The stone is rolled away; it was however very great. Therewith all is said. For *the risen Christ* has rolled it away, in the act of breaking through the closed door. Mark makes the resurrection known only through this result, which was seen; he makes not the slightest attempt to describe clearly the event itself, which no one saw."

"Also the three remaining evangelists, Matthew, Luke and John, support the conclusion that Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ was the conclusion of the old gospel narrative."

In Germany the prevailing view at the present time is that the supposed "lost conclusion" of St. Mark never existed. On the other hand, it is widely held that although the book originally ended at 16⁸ this conclusion is too sudden and abrupt to represent the plan and deliberate purpose of the evangelist. Dr. Ernst Lohmeyer however in his new edition (1937) of St. Mark's gospel in Meyer's commentary believes that the book ends and was meant to end and is brought to a suitable conclusion at 16⁸, and so do also the veteran Dr. Adolf Jülicher and Dr. Erich Fascher in their new revised edition (1931) of the former's invaluable *Einleitung in das neue Testament*.¹

In England however little attention has been paid to the possibility of this solution of the problem. I know only of three warnings in recent years that it

¹ It is of interest to compare the treatment of the subject on pp. 309-12 of this edition with that in the edition of 1900, in which it is assumed that the gospel cannot originally have ended at 16⁸, and the explanation tentatively put forward is that the actual ending was intentionally removed some time in the second century, before the gospel had gained canonical recognition; see *An Introduction to the New Testament*, by Adolf Jülicher, translated by Janet Penrose Ward, London, 1904, pp. 328 f.

It is also desirable to notice the reason given in the earlier edition for the assumption that the gospel cannot originally have ended at 16⁸; it is that in 16⁷ "appearances of Jesus are foretold, the occurrence of which the evangelist must naturally have described."

It will be seen later that in Dr. Lohmeyer's view Mk. 16⁸ is only tolerable, as a satisfactory conclusion to the gospel, if 16⁷ points forward to an event in Galilee which is much more than an "appearance" of the risen Christ.

should not be dismissed too lightly. In the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1926, Mr. R. R. Ottley pointed out that a sentence ending with γάρ is by no means without precedent or parallel in greek literature; but he expressly disclaimed any desire to deal with the problem of the original ending of St. Mark's gospel. His purpose was to make one suggestion only. We ought not, he thought, to infer from the form of the sentence in Mk. 16^a that mutilation of some sort has undoubtedly occurred; the sentence may be complete, and even the paragraph ended. Secondly, in an article entitled "The conclusion of the gospel according to St. Mark," published in the same *Journal*, January, 1930, Dr. J. M. Creed urged that the gospel ends at 16^a. The writer's chief purpose, indeed, was to state the argument in a new form, which it had taken in his own mind;¹ but he began by setting forth the difficulties involved in the hypotheses which have been framed to account for the supposed incompleteness of the gospel. To these difficulties english students of the gospels seem hitherto to have paid less attention than they demand. And thirdly, in *Theology*, vol. 29,

¹ An important point in Dr. Creed's argument was that verses 7 and 8 of Mk. 16 are contradictory to one another. A divine injunction is laid upon the women in verse 7, but in verse 8 we are told that they failed to obey it. Dr. Creed urged that the juxtaposition of these two verses, although not impossible as it occurs in Mk. 16¹⁻⁸, makes any consistent continuation of the narrative after 16^a extremely difficult; and as evidence of this he observes that the later evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Luke, independently found themselves compelled to break down the contradiction in St. Mark. In their gospels the women are represented as giving or proceeding to give a report to the disciples. In Dr. Creed's view these facts create a strong presumption that St. Mark's narrative was never continued beyond 16^a; and, so far as I know, his contention has not been refuted.

no. 170, pp. 106-7 (August, 1934), Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke has some brief but important notes, in which he draws attention to the complete lack of evidence for the existence at any time of a lost ending, and also urges that if St. Mark's gospel is considered as a whole and certain characteristics of it are borne in mind, Mk. 16⁸ might perhaps be regarded by the evangelist as a suitable ending to his work.

Of the view which at present holds the field in this country no more stalwart champion could be found than Dr. F. C. Burkitt. He constantly reverted to the problem and maintained to the end of his life that the gospel had been accidentally mutilated at 16⁸. A representative expression of his opinion may be found in an article by him, entitled "The historical character of the gospel of Mark," in *The American Journal of Theology* (vol. xv. 2) for April, 1911.

"At Mk. 16⁸ the narrative is left unfinished, the paragraph is left unfinished, the sentence is left unfinished. The narrative is left unfinished, for the evangelist's readers have been carefully prepared in 14²⁸ and 16⁷ for an appearance of the risen Jesus in Galilee; we expect either an account of it, or an explanation of why it did not happen. The paragraph is left unfinished, for we want to know when the women, who fled from the tomb and said nothing to anyone, finally broke silence. Most clearly of all, the sentence is left unfinished. Greek sentences do not often end with γάρ, and it is almost safe to say Greek paragraphs never end with γάρ. The only other sentence in the New Testament that ends with γάρ is Jn. 13¹⁸, and that (εἰμι γάρ) is a mere parenthesis in the middle of a continuous speech. When Mark wishes to tell us

that certain persons did not know what to say because they were afraid, he does not end with γάρ: he tells us that Peter and his companions did not know what reply to make, ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο(9⁶). Or again, we may consider how very abrupt the paragraph Mk. 11¹⁵⁻¹⁸ would be, if it had finished in the middle of verse 18 with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. In fact, I venture to think Westcott and Hort have not gone far enough when they end Mk. 16⁸ with a colon (ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ'); the clause is unfinished, γαρ should have no stop after it at all and it should have a grave accent (ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ . . .). In a word, we ought to translate the half-verse 'and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid of . . .,' leaving it to conjecture whether the next missing words were 'the Jews' or 'telling their companions.'

"But if the sentence, as well as the paragraph, is not finished at Mk. 16⁸, it becomes improbable that the gospel can have been intentionally curtailed at this point. What originally followed it is impossible to know for certain. It has been conjectured that the resurrection appearances may have been more 'dotic' than those given in Matthew, Luke, and John. But if that were the reason for cancelling the end of Mark, why should the cancel have been made in the middle of a sentence? If the person who made the cancellation was unable or unwilling himself to supply a passable conclusion (a most improbable supposition), why was the cut not made at 16⁷? It may safely be affirmed that it ought to be possible to add *Amen!* at the end of every early Christian writing of which the conclusion is preserved, if not as part of the work itself, yet at least as the response of those to whom it

was read. But who feels inclined to add *Amen!* at the end of Mk. 16^s?

“ I believe that there is no satisfactory answer to be given to these questions, and that the only conclusion possible is that the end of the gospel of Mark is not extant, because the work has been *accidentally* mutilated. But then it follows (1) that we do not know the original extent of the work, and (2) that all our texts are derived from the one mutilated copy. It is not improbable that what is missing at the end is more, considerably more, than a single ‘leaf’ or a few columns at the end of a roll.”

In the paragraphs just quoted Professor Burkitt deals with the problem of the ending of St. Mark's gospel in respect both of form and of content. It is however desirable to keep these two aspects of the problem separate, as far as may be, and we will deal first with the question of form. It will have been noticed that he regards this question of form as affording the clearest evidence of the incompleteness of the gospel.¹

On literary and philological grounds is it possible that the sentence 16^s and the paragraph 16¹⁻⁸ could have ended with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ ?

This question has been considered in recent years not only by Mr. R. R. Ottley in the article already referred to, but by several writers between 1925 and 1927 in successive numbers of the *American Journal of Biblical Literature*, and in the following pages I avail myself freely of their findings.

Mr. Ottley adduces the following examples, among others, from classical literature in order to show that

¹ “ Most clearly of all, the sentence is left unfinished.”

there is nothing in itself suspicious about a sentence ending with γάρ. The necessary condition, he says, is simply that as γάρ regularly stands second, the rest of the clause must consist of a single word, either a verb, or implying a verb; and this clause must end a sentence, giving the reason or justification for what precedes.

Τοιγάρ ἐγώ τοι ταῦτα μεταστήσω· δύναμαι γάρ.
Homer *Od.* 4⁶¹².

μίμνει δὲ μίμνοντος ἐν χρόνῳ Διὸς
παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα. θέσμιον γάρ.
Aeschylus *Ag.* 1563f.

σύ νυν διάφερε τῶν κακῶν· ἔξεστι γάρ.
Euripides *Or.* 251.

To these three examples from classical greek poetry may be added three others from classical greek prose, two from Plato and one from Aristotle.¹

Few dialogues of Plato are more carefully constructed than the *Protagoras*, and in one of the longest speeches in this dialogue, a speech occupying more than eight pages in Jowett's translation, the last paragraph (328c) ends thus, with a reference to two young men who were present. Τῶνδε δὲ οὐπω ἄξιον τοῦτο κατηγορεῖν· ἔτι γάρ ἐν αὐτοῖς εἰσιν ἐλπίδες· νέοι γάρ. "But as yet it would not be right to lay this charge against them; for in their case there is yet ground for hope; for they are young." The break after the words νέοι γάρ is absolute, as may be seen from a translation of the next few lines. "Protagoras thus completed his argument and ceased to speak. And I [Socrates] was for a long time spellbound and continued to regard him as though he were about to say something, so

¹ For these I am indebted to my colleague Mr. E. C. Yorke, Fellow of New College.

eager was I to listen to him. But when I saw that he had really finished . . .”

The other example from Plato occurs in the *Gorgias* (466A). At the end of a long speech Socrates excuses his prolixity on the ground that, since Polus had failed to understand him, an explanation was necessary, and he concludes thus: “If then I shew an equal inability to make use of your reply, I hope that you will speak at equal length; but if I am able to understand you, let me have the benefit of your brevity, for this is only fair. And now do what you please with my answer.” ἐὰν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐγὼ σοῦ ἀποκρινομένου μὴ ἔχω ὅ τι χρῆσωμαι, ἀπότεινε καὶ σὺ λόγον, ἐὰν δὲ ἔχω, ἕα με χρῆσθαι· δίκαιον γάρ. καὶ νῦν ταύτη τῇ ἀποκρίσει εἰ τι ἔχεις χρῆσθαι, χρῶ. The words δίκαιον γάρ bring Socrates' defence to an end, and the last sentence looks forward to Polus' reply.

The example from Aristotle may be found in the *Poetics* (1453b, 39). τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν γινώσκοντα μελλῆσαι καὶ μὴ πρᾶξαι χεῖριστον· τὸ τε γὰρ μιαρὸν ἔχει, καὶ οὐ τραγικόν· ἀπαθὲς γάρ. “But of these ways, to be about to act knowing the consequences, and then not to act, is the worst; for it is shocking without being tragic; for no disaster follows” (S. H. Butcher's translation). Here, as in the examples from Plato, the last two greek words form a completely self-contained clause, giving the reason why the representations under consideration are not tragic.

Returning to Mr. Ottley's illustrations, and passing to the greek translation of the Old Testament, called the Septuagint, we read in Genesis 18¹⁵ ἠρνήσατο δὲ Σάρρα λέγουσα Οὐκ ἐγέλασα· ἐφοβήθη γάρ. Here the words occur at the end of a sentence, though not of a paragraph. They translate וְיָרָא יְיָ, the same phrase

which in 1 Chron. 10⁴ is rendered (except that in the latter case it is masculine) ὅτι ἐφοβεῖτο.

In Genesis 45³ it is said of Joseph's brethren καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀποκριθῆναι αὐτῶ· ἐταράχθησαν γάρ. It should, however, be added that eight of Brooke and McLean's selected cursives, and two versions, add "at his presence" in accordance with the hebrew. An example from Isaiah 16¹⁰ πέπαυται γάρ is described by Mr. Ottley as dubious, since some (Lucianic) MSS. add κέλευσμα. But no such difficulty arises at Isaiah 29¹¹ καὶ ἐρεῖ ὁ δύναμαι ἀναγνῶναι, ἐσφράγισται γάρ.

A close parallel to Mk. 16⁸ occurs at the end of a paragraph in St. Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, 32¹; Trypho is speaking: οὗτος δὲ ὁ ὑμέτερος λεγόμενος Χριστὸς ἄτιμος καὶ ἄδοξος γέγονεν, ὡς καὶ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ κατάρᾳ τῇ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ περιπεσεῖν· ἐσταυρώθη γάρ.

Dr. H. J. Cadbury offers the following examples of final γάρ from the papyri, "in refutation of the current assumption that the particle could not stand at the end of a paragraph or sentence":

Pubblicazioni della Società italiana (Firenze, 1912 ff.), *Papiri greci e latini IV*, 410 (3rd cent. B.C.), 8 ff.: ἐὰν οὖν ὑμῖν δόξῃ, καλῶς ποιήσε <τε> συναναβάντες Ἀπολλωνίῳ· παραγίνεται γάρ· περὶ Ὄρου ἐντυχεῖν Ἀμμωνίῳ.

Zenon Papyri, ed. C. C. Edgar (Cairo, 1925 ff.), I, 59082 (3rd cent. B.C.), 11 ff.: ὁ σιτοποιὸς ἐπεκάλυ <σ>εν· ἦρα ἄν σοι ἀπεστάλη· ἔφθανε γάρ· ἔρρωσο.

The editor comments: The letters ἦρα are quite clear, but ἦ ῥα would be too literary. Perhaps something has been omitted, e.g. ἡ <ὀπώ>ρα οἱ ἡ <μᾶς, τὰ ἄλευ>ρα.

Berliner Griechische Urkunden IV, 1097 (1st cent. A.D.), 3 ff.: ἡὲν δὲ ὁ ἀντίδικος ἀνάβη, περίβλεπε αὐτόν. φοβοῦμαι γὰρ μὴ σχάση, νε<ν>αυσίακε [γ] ἄρ. περὶ δὲ Σαραπᾶτος κτλ.

Dr. Cadbury remarks, "Not only because of their vernacular character do the papyri afford a proper field of comparison with Mark. It will be observed that in all the instances cited the final γὰρ is really final. What follows is either a new paragraph on a new subject or in one case the separate abrupt word 'Farewell.'"

The three examples above are taken from a note by Dr. H. J. Cadbury in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1927. Two years earlier another writer, Dr. C. H. Kraeling, had published in the same *Journal* a philological note on Mk. 16^b, from which I extract the following.

"A direct parallel to the mooted expression, taken at random from the papyri, should at least establish the literary and philological self-sufficiency of ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ. *Pap. Oxy.* IX, no. 1223 (late 4th cent. A.D.), a business document containing an order for certain goods, and incidentally quoting the current rate of exchange, reads in part as follows:

"'. . . Send and tell your people to hand over to me the remainder of the wine and one and a half units of the general account. ὁ ὀλοκόττινος νῦν μου <ριάδων> βκ ἐστίν· κατέβη γὰρ.¹ Do not neglect to send the boat or the sailor to-day.'

"The reference to the rate of exchange is parenthetical. Κατέβη γὰρ terminates this element of the thought-structure. The final γὰρ is by no means

¹ "The solidus now stands at 2,020 myriads, for it has come down."

remarkable. . . . Formally then ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is not objectionable."

In conclusion I submit two examples from the Hermetic writings, which are probably to be dated between 100 and 300 A.D.

Libellus 5^{1b} πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φαινόμενον γεννητὸν ἐφάνη γάρ. "For all that is manifest has been brought into being; for it has been manifested."

Libellus 13^{1b} καλῶς σπεύδεις λυσαῖ τὸ σκῆνος · κεκαθαρμένος γάρ. Hermes is speaking to the regenerated Tat: "You do well to hasten to put off the earthly tabernacle; for you are purified." The greek printed above is the reading of the MSS.; but it should be added that Mr. Walter Scott, editor of the *Hermetica*, questions the use of the active λῦσαι in this sense and proposes an emendation, in which the order of the words is changed.

It will have been noticed that, although none of the examples given illustrates the closing of a *book* with a sentence ending in γάρ, the first example from Plato and that from St. Justin Martyr conclude what may probably be regarded as formal sections, while others conclude paragraphs and all conclude sentences. As a matter of form therefore the use of γάρ at the close of Mk. 16^a, although no doubt surprising, is probably not impossible, perhaps not even objectionable. It should also be noticed that at a later stage, when it was felt necessary to provide an appendix to the gospel and a new start was made with a fresh paragraph, the final γάρ at 16^a was left untouched; no attempt was made to remove the alleged barbarism due to the conclusion of the preceding paragraph with γάρ.

It is sometimes said however that the word

ἐφοβοῦντο constitutes a further difficulty, and that the sentence is not really concluded, since the verb is not likely to have been used absolutely and means not so much "they were afraid," but "they were afraid [of] . . ." or "they were afraid [that] . . ." It is urged that some complement such as an object, an infinitive, a clause or a phrase is required, and the sentence ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is therefore unfinished and impossible.

This objection is vigorously set forth in the quotation above from Professor Burkitt, but it cannot survive an examination of St. Mark's use of φοβεῖσθαι.

Apart from Mk. 16^s this verb occurs eleven times in this gospel.¹ In five of these it is used absolutely, i.e. without any complement, and in the last example (10³²) we have the same form of the word as is used in 16^s:

5¹⁵ θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον κατήμενον...καὶ ἐφοβηθήσαν.

5³³ ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα...ἤλθεν.

5³⁶ μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.

6⁵⁰ ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

10³² οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο.

The remaining six occurrences fall into the following classes:

(a) With a cognate accusative, one example 4⁴¹, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν.

(b) With a direct object, four examples:

6²⁰ ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην.

11¹⁶ ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν.

11³² ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον.

12¹² ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον.

(c) With a complementary infinitive, one example, 9³² ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

¹ In the following paragraphs I have followed closely an article by Dr. M. S. Enslin in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1927.

There is no example in this gospel of a complementary clause following some form of the verb φοβεῖσθαι and introduced by μή or the like. It is not therefore the fact that ἐφοβοῦντο could not have been used absolutely in 16⁸. It is clear that St. Mark, like the LXX translators, could use φοβεῖσθαι indifferently, with or without an object. In 10³² it is used absolutely, while in 11¹⁸ the same form of the verb (ἐφοβοῦντο) has the object αὐτόν. Again, ἐφοβήθησαν is used absolutely in 5¹⁵, but is followed by τὸν ἕχλον in 12¹².

Allusion must be made at this point to a possible difficulty felt by Mr. Ottley. "One thing, however," he says "seems to give a possible ground for thinking that some words may have followed the γάρ in this passage. The tense of the verb is imperfect, and this, more than anything else, gives something of a feeling that the matter is, perhaps, not finally closed (as it is in most of my examples) with the γάρ. The effect of an aorist would have been much more conclusive. Such, at least, is my own impression; but Dr. Thackeray, who kindly read through this paper in an earlier stage, is not inclined to agree."

Mr. Ottley's difficulty is perhaps sufficiently met by a reference to 10³² οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο, with which words the sentence ends; the WH. text has a full stop after them, not a colon, as at 16⁸. But two further points may be noticed:

(a) We saw above that the LXX renders the hebrew וַיִּבְּרָא in Genesis 18¹⁵ by ἐφοβήθη γάρ, and in 1 Chronicles 10⁴ the same phrase (except that in the latter case it is masculine) by ὅτι ἐφοβεῖτο. Similarly there is no real difference of meaning between

ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον in Mk. 1 1³² and ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον in Mk. 1 2¹².

(b) Even if, as is probably the case, the meaning in 1 6⁸ is "they continued in a state of fear," this would be in full agreement with the strong preceding words οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν, which Dr. J. M. Creed paraphrases thus, "they kept the whole matter to themselves"; the fear and the silence were not merely momentary.

It should also be noticed that St. Mark is fond of ending a statement with a brief clause introduced by γάρ. Examples are:

1¹⁸ ἦσαν γὰρ ἄλλεῖς.

3²¹ ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη.

9⁶ ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο.

10²² ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.

16⁴ ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.¹

Lastly, if we see in St. Mark a writer translating at any rate occasionally from the aramaic, it may be asked whether ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ would not seem to him a natural and literal rendering of the aramaic equivalent of כִּי יִרְאוּ. Even if it is not the most elegant attic idiom, it is, like the greater part of this gospel, altogether tolerable greek; and in the light of the evangelist's many roughnesses it can hardly be regarded as incredible or inconceivable that the section 16¹⁻⁸ ends with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.²

We pass, therefore, from the consideration of form to the consideration of content. Is the section

¹ Cf. also 1²² 5²⁸ 6¹⁴ 14⁷⁰.

² See also p. 23, note 1.

Mk. 16^{a-b}, and especially the last sentence, a suitable or at least a possible conclusion to the book ?

Our answer to this question is likely to depend to a large extent upon our conception and interpretation of St. Mark's gospel as a whole. It will be remembered for example that Professor Burkitt was ever a champion of the "historical" character of our earliest gospel. The article from which I have quoted, written by him in 1911, is entitled "The historical character of the Gospel of Mark"; and in 1921, in the preface to the new and revised edition of his book *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, he says: "I am convinced that not even yet is the supreme historical importance of that work [The gospel according to Mark] sufficiently appreciated either by the general public or by many professed scholars." It may perhaps be fairly said that, without any depreciation on Dr. Burkitt's part of the importance of St. Mark's gospel in other respects, it was this historical element, to be found, as he believed, in a unique degree in St. Mark as compared with the other evangelists, which gave to the book its especial importance in his eyes; and to the end of his life he adhered to the position which he thus expressed in 1911, "I am inclined to believe in the traditional authorship of this gospel, and that a chief source of the information possessed by the author consisted of what he had heard from Simon Peter."

Upon this view the greater part of St. Mark's gospel may be not unjustly called a memoir, however slight and fragmentary, of the ministry and passion of the Lord, as described or set forth, ultimately, by the chief of the apostles. St. Peter is thus the single and immediate link between the occurrence of most of

the events narrated and their record in writing by his attendant St. Mark, and we owe our earliest gospel chiefly to these two authorities and need not assume other intervention, at any rate to any great extent.

It is not difficult to see that anyone regarding the second gospel in this light would be most unlikely to find Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ satisfactory as the final section of the book, or Mk. 16⁸ possible as its conclusion. From such a point of view the ending is indeed impossible, intolerable. In St. Mark's gospel no appearance is recorded of the risen Lord to anyone,¹ and the fact of the resurrection itself is made known only to three women, who admittedly were reduced by the announcement to an extremity of terror, and yet remain in this gospel the sole recipients of the news that the event has taken place. It is altogether natural that

¹ In my preparation of these lectures nothing has caused me greater surprise than the following words of Dr. Hort: "it becomes incredible . . . that his [St. Mark's] one detailed appearance of the Lord on the morning of the resurrection should end upon a note of unassuaged terror" (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction, Appendix, p. 47). There is no appearance, detailed or otherwise, of the risen Lord in St. Mark's gospel, nor, if the suggestions made in these lectures are accepted, was it the purpose of the evangelist to record "appearances" as these are understood, for example, by St. Luke. Dr. Hort's words can only be explained on the ground of his presuppositions derived from the contents of the other gospels and of such passages in the rest of the New Testament as 1 Cor. 15³⁻⁷. All the three later gospels do indeed record appearances of the risen Jesus, but according to the argument of the third lecture of this course we have no right to say that St. Mark desired to record such appearances. If we assume that he did so desire, we are unconsciously and illegitimately influenced by the record of appearances in the other gospels, which represent a later stage of gospel-composition than St. Mark. In any case there is no justification for describing Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ as an account of an appearance of the risen Lord.

writers who appreciate St. Mark's gospel primarily as a historical record should demand after Mk. 16⁸ a statement of the ultimate assuagement of the women's fears and an account at least of the appearance to St. Peter, referred to in 1 Cor. 15⁵ and anticipated, on their interpretation of the passage, in Mk. 16⁷. Professor Burkitt himself indeed suggests in one of his later publications¹ that St. Mark's gospel "may have lost about a third of its original contents, and that the work once dealt with the period covered by Acts 1-12."

The matter however will perhaps appear in another light, if we adopt a different approach to St. Mark's gospel and regard the book not so much as an individual composition, due chiefly to the activities of St. Peter and St. Mark and appearing for the first time as a novelty, perhaps at Rome shortly before or after 70 A.D. (although there may well be elements of truth in this conception of it), but as the culmination of a considerable process of growth. In the course of this process oral and for the most part anonymous traditions with regard to the ministry and passion of the Lord will gradually have taken shape, partly though not solely in order to meet the circumstances and experience of the growing and expanding church, and they will finally have been put together, no doubt by an individual writer, but one acting under the sanction and on behalf of the church,² in the connected record

¹ *Christian Beginnings* (1924), p. 83.

² It may be of interest here to refer to a letter written to me by Dr. R. R. Marett, Rector of Exeter College, Oxford. He informs me in connection with his own studies, that "in primitive communities the oral traditions, including those which bear most closely on their religious experience, are always of more or less collective origin and therefore need to be interpreted throughout from that point of view."

which we know as the gospel according to St. Mark.¹

This gospel, as is generally admitted, consists very largely of short stories, describing separate incidents, and of sayings of the Lord, and there is considerable and increasing ground for the belief that these stories and sayings circulated at first among the churches either independently or at most in small groups, before the evangelist incorporated them in his connected narrative. "In the main" says Dr. J. M. Creed, with reference to St. Mark's gospel, "the particular narrative is the unit."² Even in the passion narrative, chapters 14 and 15, where the record shows a more natural and continuous sequence than we find elsewhere, it is not difficult to discover sections, e.g. 14³⁻⁹, 18-21, 22-25, which may have been well known to the members of the churches as separate stories, before they found their present setting. There is reason also for thinking that this setting or framework in which the stories are now found is not always so "original" as the content of the stories, and may be to some extent the work of the evangelist himself, although no implication is thereby intended that he was not working in this matter also with help from earlier tradition.³

The stories often illustrate some aspect of the "work" of Jesus Christ, such as an act of power, many of which bring help to men, or a refutation of

¹ For the belief that there was a period when "no church had more than one [written] gospel, and when this was commonly spoken of, not by its author's name, but simply as 'the Gospel,'" see B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (fourth impression, 1930), p. 559.

² *J.T.S.*, Jan. 1930, p. 179.

³ On the framework of the gospel narrative an article by Professor C. H. Dodd in the *Expository Times*, June 1932, may be consulted with advantage.

opponents, or an incident giving the occasion of a saying. Many of the sections may thus be regarded as particular illustrations of "the gospel" which the church proclaimed, that is, the revelation of God's love to man, as made known in the life, death and resurrection of the Lord, and also in the expected consummation at his coming. These four "eschatological" truths, although they formed a series of events in time, were regarded by the church as forming but a single truth in him; each one of them implied the rest, and each was essential to the presentation of the gospel as a whole.

Viewed in this light, few stories in St. Mark could be more completely satisfying than that which is told in 16¹⁻⁸; few stories could contain in such small compass more, or more important aspects of "the gospel."¹

¹ It should be also noticed that Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ has the same characteristic *form* as many earlier sections in this gospel. Thus the first three verses form the preparation, and in the last of these the conversation of the women about the problem which presents itself to them emphasizes the wonder of that which is to be related in verse 4. The climax of the story is reached in verses 5 to 7, which narrate the theophany and the angel's proclamation and command; and the section closes in verse 8 with the impression produced by the vision and the message upon those who have been chosen to receive these.

Close parallels to the form of the section may be found in such passages as Mk. 1²³⁻²⁷ 2³⁻¹² 4³⁶⁻⁴¹ 6⁴⁶⁻⁵¹ 7³²⁻³⁷.

So far therefore as Marcan usage elsewhere is a guide, Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ must be pronounced, in respect of form, altogether complete and satisfactory.

II

THE CONCLUSION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK (2)

IN order to approach the narrative in Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ as sympathetically as possible, let us try to put ourselves in the position of an instructed christian at Rome or elsewhere in the second generation of the church's life, who, we may assume, hears the story read at a meeting of the church for worship.¹

Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ opens with an account of the preparations made by the three faithful women to come and anoint the dead body of their Master.² Any difficulties which surrounded this intention on their part are not likely to have occurred to the christian of whom we

¹ For a fuller consideration of this passage see pp. 56 ff.

² It is remarkable that our later gospels emphasize ever more strongly the earliness of the hour at which the resurrection was made known. In St. Mark the women come "very early on the first day of the week . . . when the sun was risen"; in St. Luke "on the first day of the week at early dawn" (for the greek compare the opening words of Plato's *Crito*); in St. Matthew "late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week"; in St. John Mary Magdalene comes "on the first day of the week . . . early, while it was yet dark."

In the *Acts of Pilate*, a work probably not earlier than the fourth century, the women are expressly stated to have been at the tomb "at midnight."

At the present time the celebration of Easter in the eastern church begins at midnight, and in the western church still earlier, before noon on holy Saturday.

are thinking any more than they seem to have deterred the women themselves. But by this reference to anointing his thoughts will perhaps have been carried back to that other story of an anointing, placed in this gospel at the outset of the passion narrative, an anointing of the *living* body of the Lord, which did not, like this, prove frustrate but was expressly accepted with reference to the coming death and burial, these being regarded as the fulfilment, on the part of the Lord, of his work and office. In the present instance therefore it will not surprise our listener to hear that the women cannot carry out their purpose, of which indeed he hears no more, for his interest is almost at once concentrated on the tomb itself, now found free of barrier, since the great stone has been rolled away. Further, the angel's words spoken to the women, difficult as these words in some respects may seem to us,¹ so far from causing our hearer perplexity, will arouse in him a deeper conviction of the triumph and supremacy of his once despised and outcast Master; in them he will hear the church delivering its message to the incredulous or uninstructed world. The world "sought" the living among the dead; it regarded Jesus as the Nazarene, the crucified; but the church knew better, and its chief watchword was ἡγέρθη, he is risen, as the tomb itself gave witness.

Thus far the narrative has dwelt on the office of Jesus as Messiah, in connection with his death and burial, and with the reversal or perhaps rather the explanation of that death in and by the resurrection. It remained to shew how the events just narrated are connected with the future and above all with that

¹ See p. 57.

doctrine which seems at first to have been more strongly emphasized than any other in the christian preaching, the doctrine of the coming of the Son of man to judgement and therewith the consummation. But, before we go further, it is necessary to recall two points which are strongly emphasized by the evangelist in the first fifteen chapters of his gospel.

In the first place Galilee, not Jerusalem, is for him, as we shall see,¹ the scene and seat of revelation. Here had already taken place, according to St. Mark, the proclamation of the gospel and the manifestation of the Lord, although, except by an intimate body of disciples, the manifestation was unrecognized, and could not but be unrecognized, throughout the Galilean ministry. As regards the period spent in Jerusalem, this was in the evangelist's view only a stage, although a necessary and, perhaps we should add, the most important stage, which had to be passed through before the consummation.

And in the second place the complete failure, moral and intellectual,² of the disciples and above all of St. Peter is brought out more sharply in St. Mark than in any other gospel. We read repeatedly that in spite of their Master's efforts the disciples did not understand his teaching; and at the end they all forsook him and fled, while St. Peter went further and denied his Lord. Only a group of women remained watching afar off at Golgotha; only two of these women beheld the burial; and to three only of them, in the first instance, was the rolling away of the stone and the

¹ See pp. 113 ff.

² 4¹³, 40, 41 6³⁷, 51, 52 7¹⁸ 8¹⁴⁻²¹, 32 f. 9²⁸, 32, 34 10¹³, 37, 41 14²⁷⁻³¹, 50.

discovery that the tomb was empty, with all that these two things signified, made known. The women, not the disciples, constitute in St. Mark's gospel the connecting link in the witness of the threefold event of the death, burial and resurrection, which formed so important a feature of the church's testimony.¹

It may be part of St. Mark's purpose to emphasize the uniqueness and solitariness of Jesus Christ, if we

¹ It is noticeable that although we are told in 15⁴¹ that the women had followed and ministered to the Lord while he was in Galilee, they are not actually mentioned in the record till this point; in St. Mark, unlike St. Luke, they are kept completely in the background during the ministry. If this is deliberate, St. Mark's purpose may be to suggest that just as "the disciples" and especially the three are the chosen recipients of the revelation during the ministry but fail completely at its close, so the women, who are probably not to be regarded as belonging to the group of "the disciples" during the ministry and in any case not to its inner circle, now take the place of the disciples and come prominently forward in the record as the sole witnesses of the death 15⁴⁰, the burial 15⁴⁷, and of the fact of the resurrection 16¹ ff.

In this connection however a further point of importance should be noticed. In the very early form of "the gospel" followed and perhaps quoted by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 15⁵⁻⁸ the appearances mentioned form the transition from the "work" of Jesus Christ referred to in 15^{5,4} to the life of the church and in four of the five cases enumerated are granted to its leaders. It seems clear that "the gospel" is regarded in this passage as proceeding from and through them. In St. Mark's gospel it is indeed true that these same leaders are chosen during the ministry to surround the Lord and to receive his revelation, e.g. 4^{11, 12, 24} 5²⁷ 8³¹ 9^{2, 31} 10^{32b} 14²⁹, but they are constantly represented as unable to assimilate it, e.g. 4^{12, 40} 6⁵² 7^{19, 14-21} 8^{22 f.} 9^{5 f., 28, 22, 23} ff. 10^{26, 25} ff., and in the last three chapters, as we have seen, their failure is complete and they disappear from the scene. In St. Mark almost the only passages where the disciples appear in a favourable light, as responding to their Master, are 1^{18, 20} 2¹⁴ 3¹³ 6^{12, 30} 8²⁹.

It seems likely, as is suggested above, that the evangelist's purpose

may use these terms, in the work of man's redemption; he wishes perhaps to exclude altogether the possibility of any human claim, apart from the work of Jesus Christ, to merit before God, even in respect of those who had formed the first and most intimate body of disciples and subsequently had given up everything for Christ. For St. Mark as for St. Paul "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."¹

But as soon as this truth has been thus stressed and guarded, there is no limit to the hope and expectation offered. Indeed the disciples' own unworthiness and failure are likely to make them more conscious than they could otherwise have been of the salvation offered to them, its greatness and its meaning. Through the instrumentality of the women, who, although perhaps not themselves admitted during the ministry to intimate discipleship, had been the sole witnesses of their Lord's death and burial and have now received the first intimation of the resurrection, the disciples may learn that they are to be once more united with their Master, but not in Jerusalem, the scene of his rejection

is partly at any rate doctrinal. The church knew well that the proclamation of the gospel had proceeded from its leaders, the chosen eye-witnesses and ministers of the word Lk. 1², and the reference in Mk. 16⁸ to the silence of the women in respect of the revelation just granted to them may perhaps be quoted as additional evidence of this; however great their faithfulness and devotion (15^{40, 47}) to their Master and the surpassing honour now bestowed on them (16⁷), none the less the gospel did not proceed from them; but equally the failure of the leaders, from whom the gospel did proceed, was absolute. In the last acts, according to St. Mark, they played no part, either as helpers or as witnesses. It is possible that the part assigned to the women in Mk. 15⁴⁰-16⁸ can be best explained along these lines.

¹ Rom. 3²³.

and death and of their collapse and failure; their sight of him, whatever these last words may mean, is to be in Galilee, the land of revelation, where they first came to know him and whither he is now preceding them.

And the last words of the message in verse 7, "even as he said unto you," are to remind them that this message is not new; it contains nothing beyond the possibility of credence; it is in accordance with the pledge which he himself had given to them.

We are perhaps inclined to think that the angel's words in 16⁷, full as we may feel of promise and of hope, would form a not unfitting conclusion to the gospel; and it is not surprising that the contents of 16⁸, the verse which on the view taken in these lectures may be the conclusion of this gospel, are usually thought to present peculiar difficulty. This difficulty consists in the two connected points which are emphasized in it: first, the psychological effect of the angel's words upon the women, and secondly, their failure to carry out the command entrusted to them.

Frequently, in the biblical record, when a theophany occurs, the recipient of the revelation after a longer or shorter period of dismay or hesitation accepts and is obedient to the divine command, and the heavenly apparition is withdrawn. As examples in the Old Testament we may recall Judges 6¹⁻²⁴, the vision to Gideon, or Judges 13²⁻²³, that to Manoah and his wife. The call of Isaiah, as recorded in Is. 6¹⁻⁸, is also a signal example of initial fear later giving place to confidence. Similarly in the New Testament we have the record of the annunciation¹ Lk. 1²⁶⁻³⁸, and of St. Peter and the vision of the sheet

¹ Ending "and the angel departed from her."

at Joppa¹ Acts 10⁹⁻¹⁶. This however is not so in Mk. 16¹⁻⁸, if this verse is the conclusion of the gospel. In the first place we are not told of the withdrawal of the angel; the women themselves bring the interview to an end, by their precipitate flight from the tomb. In the second place, they do not carry out in this gospel the charge given in verse 7; and in the third place there is at the end of St. Mark's story no record of a cessation of the amazement which in verse 5 is said to have fallen upon them when they entered into the tomb and saw the angel; on the contrary, after the angel's words their amazement is turned into an extremity of fear, and upon this note and their consequent silence the gospel closes.

I have drawn attention elsewhere² to the imperfect adjustment, in St. Mark's gospel, of the different notes or moments in the accomplishment of man's salvation, which the evangelist and his readers had found in Jesus Christ. Among the chief of these notes or moments, as emphasized in St. Mark, are the life, the death and resurrection, and the expected coming of the Lord to judgement; and they are in the last resort, as at a later date St. John's gospel was to teach, inseparable. In St. Mark's gospel however we are conscious from time to time of a certain difficulty on the part of the evangelist in giving *harmonious* expression to these different fundamental truths included in the proclamation of the gospel. A notable example of an imperfect adjustment of this kind may be found in Mk. 9⁹⁻¹³, a difficult passage which is

¹ Ending "and straightway the vessel was received up into heaven." We may refer also to St. Peter's obedience, Acts 10²⁹.

² See *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, p. 104.

placed immediately after the vision, granted for a brief space to the three foremost disciples upon the high mountain in the north, of their Master glorified; and since this passage has a close bearing upon our present inquiry, we may turn aside to consider it for a moment.

We read in these verses that as the party was descending from the mountain the three were bidden to tell no one what they had seen, namely, the vision of their Master glorified, "until the Son of man had risen from the dead." The disciples are described as keeping the saying and puzzling among themselves what this rising from the dead implied. They then turn to their Master with a question, which runs thus: "Why do the scribes say that Elijah must first come?"—that is, before the consummation, since the function of the returned Elijah, according to contemporary expectation, was to make the necessary preparations for the final judgement. It is clear that rising from the dead and consummation are brought here into close, if as yet imperfect, connection; and we notice also that silence is enjoined upon those who have received the revelation granted in Mk. 9¹⁻⁸, until one at least of the two connected events, that is, resurrection from the dead, has taken place.

With the verses which follow, namely Mk. 9^{12, 13}, containing an indirect reference to John the Baptist and his end, and direct reference to the sufferings and reduction to nothing of the Son of man, we are not here immediately concerned. It is desirable indeed to notice that not only resurrection and consummation but suffering and death are being gradually brought into very close connection; but for our present purpose we return at once to 16⁸, where it is recorded

that the condition laid down in 9^{ob} has now been realized. Resurrection has occurred, the resurrection of him whom¹ the women in their love had come to anoint. It will be remembered however that at 9^o those who are in the company of the Lord are the three most intimate disciples, not the women; and silence is enjoined upon the three until *the Son of man* had risen from the dead. In the resurrection of their Master now made known to them, were then the women² to discern the rising of the Son of man, the judge of quick and dead? And if their Master was the Son of man, what was the meaning of his life of rejection and his death of shame? Had he already come, although secretly, both for salvation and for judgement, in and by means of the days of his flesh, and, above all, through suffering and death? And if so, would he not now forthwith be manifested as the Son of man?³

¹ αἰτόν 16¹, as at 15⁴⁶.

² And along with the women we should perhaps include our supposed roman christian, as he hears this passage read.

³ If it be asked how Mk. 9^{12, 13} are to be understood along these lines, the following answer may be offered. The coming of Elijah "who sets all in order" before the supreme event is tacitly implied to have already occurred in the mission and work of St. John the Baptist. But a shadow had fallen over John's life; men had had their way with him, and this was not due to sport of circumstance; it was of divine appointing; and it is no less part of that same divine will that the Son of man should suffer much, and, though the Lord of all, should be reduced to or treated as nothing.

The ministry and death of Jesus Christ are here given full eschatological content and together with the resurrection, verse 9b, are regarded as themselves the fulfilment, that for which the Baptist, as Elijah, had prepared the way. If for the moment we neglect Mk. 9^{9, 10}, we notice that Mk. 9¹¹⁻¹³ contains no reference to resurrection; the same interpretation is given in these verses to the ministry and death of Jesus Christ as in the fourth gospel itself. It is not

If these were some of the problems presented to the women, according to St. Mark's gospel, by their discovery and experience at their Master's grave, the attitude of mind attributed to them in Mk. 16⁸ is not surprising; and they could hardly be anything but silent.¹ It is clear that the silence, fear, trembling and

that the resurrection and the expected consummation are forgotten, but the twofold event of the ministry and death is regarded as itself including and in a measure comprising the resurrection and the fulfilment of all things. The qualification "in a measure" is especially important in respect of St. Mark's gospel, for in it not only is the fulfilment regarded as taking place secretly, but those who are admitted to its mystery are pledged to secrecy about it, e.g. 9⁹; this secrecy is only for a time, but it is part of the divine will and plan. In St. John's gospel however, although the manifestation there made is still partly secret e.g. 7¹⁰, there is no pledge to secrecy, nor is the future needed (in spite of such passages as 13^{7b}, 16¹²) to reveal the significance of that which has occurred or is occurring; the manifestation is here given in its fulness; if or in so far as it is secret, this is because owing to blindness and sin men cannot see it.

¹ Other examples in this gospel of partial or complete silence in face of an event containing revelation are 9⁸ (in spite of 9⁵), and not less, if the passage is rightly understood, 14^{40b}.

Reference should also be made here to the disciples' reception of the thrice-repeated instruction 8³¹ 9³¹ 10³³ about the coming event of the suffering, death and resurrection after three days of the Son of man. The first instruction is followed by a rebuke of the Lord by the leader of the twelve in deprecation of such language. After the second we read that the disciples "understood not the saying and were afraid to ask him." After the third there is neither remark by the disciples nor comment by the evangelist (for at 10³⁵ a fresh start is made, the section 10³⁵⁻⁴⁵ being quite separate from 10³²⁻³⁴); the amazement and fear of those in the Lord's company at this moment have been already mentioned 10³², immediately *before* this last instruction; for in this third case the mere fact of his presence and demeanour is enough to produce this state on their part.

Finally at 16⁷ the women find themselves confronted with the last stage in the fulfilment of the events which were foreseen in the instruc-

amazement¹ referred to not only at Mk. 16⁸ but constantly throughout this gospel in connection with the person of the Lord, must indeed have had a great rôle to play within the early church. Only slowly for the most part were its members able to realize the implications of the historical events in which they had been called to take their share, and of the truths with which they found, in the beginning to their astonishment,² that they had been entrusted. At first it was only with stammering lips and in a new tongue that the church was able to express these truths. For some time silence may have been the only possible resort³; and without forgetting the legitimate and manifold presentation of events set forth in Mt. 28⁸⁻²⁰ or Lk. 24 or Jn. 20, 21 or the early chapters of the Acts, we may say with confidence that the record which lies before us in our earliest gospel has at least as much right to a hearing as the later presentations, in which we may perhaps trace even more clearly than in St. Mark the results of a considerable process of reflection and enlightenment. According therefore to the view here taken, the emphasis in Mk. 16⁸ is primarily upon the women's silence or dumbness, in consequence of

tions; and their complete silence due to fear is thus in full agreement with the later reactions of those present at the time when the instructions were given, as the implications of these instructions were increasingly realized, the fulfilment of which has now occurred.

¹ For examples of fear on the part of the disciples in the presence of Jesus, see 4^{40f.} 9⁸, 32 10³²; of amazement, 5^{42b} 6⁶¹ 10⁸².

² It is probably no accident that in St. John's gospel no one, friend or foe, is "astonished" at the presence or the work of Jesus. The strongest expression of this kind in St. John is *θαυμάζειν*, e.g. 5²⁰, 10^{7¹⁵, 21}.

³ Reference may perhaps be made to Acts 9⁸⁻⁹ by way of illustration.

revelation, not upon their disobedience to the order given to them. To interpret the passage in this latter sense, that is, to lay great emphasis upon the disobedience, would be to understand it too literally, too externally.¹

We turned aside to consider Mk. 9⁹ ff. primarily as an example of the phenomenon that, although in St. Mark's gospel fundamental truths or moments of the christian revelation are often shewn in close connection with each other, yet when this evangelist wrote the time had not fully come for their complete adjustment.² In the light therefore of the considerations put forward in the last four paragraphs, it seems possible that in the two final verses of this gospel we have another example of the writer's difficulties in this respect. At the close of the last lecture the claim was made for the section Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ that few stories could contain in such small compass more, or more important aspects of the gospel; and we have seen that the story dwells at the outset upon the Lord's office as Messiah, in connection with his death and burial. We have seen also how the explanation of his life and death, referred

¹ But see the last words of note 1 on p. 27.

² Possibly the most signal example of this trait is the apparently simple but really very difficult threefold instruction given to the disciples at 8³¹ 9³¹ 10³³ in regard to the suffering, death and resurrection of the Son of man. The term "the Son of man" is, as it were, the given factor or quantity, and it is never explained in the gospels; it would probably bring vividly enough before a contemporary jewish or christian hearer the thought of all that was connected with the consummation and the judgement. The new factor, and the factor which needed explanation, was the connection of the chief actor or agent in the consummation with suffering, death and resurrection; and the four gospels represent inter-related but differing attempts to meet this need and to give this explanation.

to in 16^{aa}, was found in connection with the discovery of the empty tomb, and the divine announcement to the women of the resurrection, in 16^{ab}.

Our supposed roman christian however, as he listens to the section, has at present heard nothing in it of that part of the message of salvation which at first as we can see from various books of the New Testament formed its dominating feature, namely the doctrine of the coming of his Lord, the Son of man, to judgement, and therewith the consummation.

No doubt, in so far as the hearer of whom we are thinking had appropriated the significance and meaning of his Master's death, he could contemplate the final event, which he believed to be imminent, with hope and expectation; but equally also it was an event which was calculated to engender awe and fear. The note of godly fear which we find, for example, in Psalm 130^d is by no means abolished, as is often supposed at the present time, by the religion of the incarnation; it sounds loudly throughout the New Testament¹; and it is not incompatible with the most vivid perception and realization of God's love and mercy, as revealed in Jesus Christ.

It does not therefore seem impossible that in the last two verses of this gospel, the book, as we ought probably to describe it, of the message and action of divine salvation, on which the church's life was built, St. Mark has sought to emphasize two permanent elements in the traditional proclamation of the gospel.

These elements are the mingled notes of hope and fear. In verse 7 expression is given to the note of hope, the hope that the disciples in accordance with

¹ Cf. Rom. 11²⁰, 2 Cor. 7¹, Phil. 2¹², Heb. 12²⁸, 1 Pet. 1¹⁷ 3¹⁶.

their Master's promise would now see him no longer as it were in secret, but openly, in the place and at the time of his appointing. The place was to be the same district in which they had first come to know him in the beginning of the gospel, and he would be the same Master as before. There would however be a difference between the earlier coming and that which was now to be expected, for in the coming manifestation he would be known and seen for what he truly was, as that which all along they had had reason to believe or expect him to be. And this open manifestation in the north had now been made possible through the final events in the days of his flesh, the events which had just been completed in the Jewish capital and of which the women only had been witnesses, namely, the rejection by his own nation, the death and the burial, and the resurrection.¹ The time therefore might be expected to be imminent.

But this brings us to the second of the two notes, which are emphasized in the last two verses of this gospel. In verse 8 expression is given to the note

¹ It would be more correct to speak of the discovery of the empty tomb and the angel's announcement to the women than of the resurrection. In none of our canonical gospels do human eyes behold the resurrection; the first extant description of it is in the non-canonical gospel of Peter.

If then Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ is the last section of the book, the manner of the ending of this gospel is similar to that of its beginning. Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke points out that in St. Mark the manner of the coming of the Lord into the world is veiled from human eyes; and the first event recorded after he appears upon the stage of history is the divine attestation to him at the baptism 1⁹⁻¹¹. Similarly in 16¹⁻⁸ we are not told of the manner of the Lord's resurrection, and the book ends with the divine announcement of it.

of fear and awe, which equally with the note of hope is of permanent importance in the proclamation of the gospel. It was an ancient Jewish belief that no one could see the face of God without forfeiting at the same instant his life as a man; the vision would inevitably bring death to him who witnessed it.¹ In the case of Jesus Christ, his disciples had every reason to believe that his open manifestation would be accompanied by love and mercy, not by wrath and condemnation; but it remained true that in their own strength, particularly after their collapse at Jerusalem, they would be unable to endure the vision and the judgement. This note of fear and prostration receives very strong expression in the last words of St. Mark's gospel. The women who were the first to receive evidence of the reversal of their Master's death by his resurrection are represented as having been utterly overcome by the further news of the imminent completion of the action of salvation, with the appearance of their Master to his followers in Galilee,² and we read that they went out and fled from the tomb, in the grip of trembling and amazement, and that they remained silent, owing to their fear. It is very noticeable that both St. Matthew and St. Luke, in whose gospels the narrative of the death and resurrection does not lead on so immediately as in St. Mark to the thought of the ultimate event, find it necessary to modify this note of silence due to fear, the note upon which St. Mark closes his gospel. In St. Matthew the women leave the tomb quickly in fear and great joy, and run to bring word to

¹ Cf. Gen. 33²¹, Judges 6²² 13²², Isaiah 6⁵, Rev. 1¹⁷.

² For an attempt to justify this interpretation of Mk. 16⁷ see lecture 3.

his disciples; and St. Luke, who we shall find¹ records a divine message 24^{5b-7}, containing no reference to the future or to Galilee in connection with the future, has no allusion at all at this point² to fear; he narrates simply that the women return and make their report to the eleven and to all the rest.

Both these later evangelists intercalate as it were records of appearances of the risen Lord between their narratives of the resurrection and that to which, as we shall see reason to think, in the tradition represented by St. Mark's gospel, the resurrection may perhaps have been regarded as forming the immediate introduction, that is, the consummation. In both St. Matthew and St. Luke therefore the relation between the death and resurrection on the one hand and the consummation on the other hand is less immediate than it is, according to the view here put forward, in St. Mark; and indeed in Lk. 24 the doctrine of the expected event in Galilee finds no place; in Lk. 24 the expected event is that of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Jerusalem.³

If it be asked why in Mk. 16⁷ we read only "there

¹ See lecture 4.

² St. Luke's reference in this passage to fear is at 24⁵, and the fear is simply due to the theophany; it is not caused by the contents of the divine announcement, as in St. Mark.

³ The presentation in Acts 1 and 2 agrees on the whole with that in Lk. 24. In Acts 1¹¹ we have indeed a verse which perhaps represents an attempt to combine St. Luke's doctrine of the ascension, verses 9 and 10, and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit at Jerusalem with St. Mark's doctrine of the event which was to be fulfilled in Galilee; and a reference to Galilee and to "the coming" are included in the verse; but both doctrines suffer in the process, and the prevailing emphasis in Acts 1 and 2, as in Lk. 24, is on the bestowal of the Holy Spirit at Jerusalem, and the disciples' witness to be borne there "and in all Judaea and Samaria" Acts 1⁸,

ye shall see him " and not " there ye shall see him *coming on the clouds with great power and glory,*" as is stated with regard to the Son of man at Mk. 13²⁶, a partial answer may be that St. Mark (and in using his name I include also the tradition which he follows here) is conscious that Jesus Christ, whom he believes to be the Son of man, has been already in some way glorified in and through his ministry and death and resurrection.

The doctrine of St. Mark's gospel is by no means identical with that of St. Luke's, but in this verse, Mk. 16⁷, the evangelist seems to approximate in certain respects to the doctrine found in the last chapter of St. Luke. There it is unmistakably implied that by his sufferings the Christ entered into his glory, and the reference is not to a future manifestation, but to a glory already attained by the speaker, in and by the resurrection.¹ And this interpretation is made certain by another similar passage in the same chapter, Lk. 24⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹, where, although the future as well as the past is under consideration, there is no reference to the coming or manifestation of the Son of man.

A very important difference however between Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ and Lk. 24 is that in Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ the Lord, although perhaps in the view of the evangelist ² already in some sense now glorified, is not yet manifested as such to his disciples; this manifestation is to occur in the future at the event which will take place in the north, in Galilee, and until it takes place, they cannot

¹ " *these* " sufferings, Lk. 24²⁶, i.e. those narrated in verse 20.

² We may perhaps say that St. Mark had no need to raise or to consider this question. As a true hebrew, his interest was not in the present state or nature, but in the future activity and manifestation, of his Lord.

"see" him. In Lk. 24 however Jesus Christ, who has attained his glory in and through the events of the last three days, makes himself known, but not "apocalyptically," to his disciples in and near Jerusalem. The emphasis in Lk. 24, as we shall see in the fourth lecture, is upon the identity of the risen Christ with the Jesus whom the disciples knew before the crucifixion.

It seems therefore that in spite or because of its pneumatological value the doctrine found in Lk. 24, if pressed, is in danger of neglecting the eschatological content, which is essential to the gospel; whereas the doctrine of Mk. 16¹⁻⁸, as also that of the whole gospel of St. John, avoids this danger.

This point may be made clearer if we consider the threefold instruction given to the disciples in the latter part of St. Mark's record of the ministry with regard to the passion and the resurrection. The three passages referred to, Mk. 8³¹ 9³¹ 10³³, describe the events which must be undergone, according to the speaker, by one who fulfils or is to fulfil the office of the Son of man; they are an interpretation of the Jewish doctrine of the Son of man, with reference to the coming death and resurrection. It may be for this reason that we find in these instructions no reference to any further final event, after the resurrection. Since these passages are designed to impart the true doctrine of *the Son of man*, their character is or becomes by that very fact apocalyptic.¹

St. John indeed in the end reaches the doctrine that

¹ It is not forgotten that all three synoptists, St. Matthew and St. Luke no less than St. Mark, include in their gospels the three passages referred to, in slightly different forms. But at the moment we are concerned only with the doctrine of Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ and that of Lk. 24.

the lifting up of the Son of man, an expression in which the primary or chief reference is to the crucifixion,¹ is the supreme "moment" in the revelation of the glory of the Lord²; but St. Mark, closely akin as his doctrine is to that of St. John and clearly as he sees in what direction the solution of the church's intellectual problems must be sought, has not yet achieved a fully satisfactory co-ordination of the ministry, crucifixion, resurrection and expected coming of the Lord as together forming the revelation of his glory. He sees that the glory of Jesus Christ is essentially connected with his ministry and above all with his death and resurrection; but for this evangelist the Lord remains during the ministry unrecognized for what he is, and his passion and resurrection form primarily a period and an experience which must be gone through before the end is reached. For the manifestation itself St. Mark still looks to the future and to Galilee, the sphere, as he seems to have believed, of revelation, in contrast to Jerusalem, the city of destruction and of death.

It will be remembered that in the last lecture the difficulties connected with the two final words of Mk. 16^s were considered as a question of form. The conclusion reached was that the words are probably by no means impossible as the conclusion of a sentence or even of a paragraph, but the question was not then raised whether they were equally possible as the conclusion of a *book*; and certainly no other example is known in greek literature of a book ending in this way.³

¹ E.g. Jn. 3¹⁴ 8²⁸ 12³².

² E.g. Jn. 13^{31 f.} 17¹.

³ In his consideration of "the lost end of Mark" Dr. B. H. Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, pp. 333-360) assumes that the gospel is unfinished

We are now, however, in a position to consider whether the interpretation of St. Mark's gospel given in these lectures does not make the last words of 16^a less difficult, even if they are regarded as the last words

at 16^a. The author, he says, cannot have originally meant to end it without the account of the appearance to the apostles in Galilee which is twice prophesied in the text, 14²⁸ 16⁷. Indeed, he continues, the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ* in greek may not even be the end of a sentence; they lead us to expect a clause beginning with *μή*, "They were afraid, lest they should be thought mad," or something to that effect.

These two points, the former dealing with a question of content, and the latter with one of form, are considered in the text of the lectures of this book. But it is important for our purpose to draw attention to Dr. Streeter's emphatic and reiterated assertion that the loss [if there was a loss] was primitive. The evidence, he says, "compels us to assume that the gospel ended here [16^a] in the first copies that reached Africa, Alexandria, Cæsarea, and Antioch," and probably also in the most ancient roman text. "There is no difficulty," he says, "in supposing that the original copy of Mark, especially if the gospel was written for the church of Rome about A.D. 65, almost immediately lost its conclusion." He expresses agreement also with Wellhausen's view that St. Matthew and St. Luke shew no knowledge of a text of St. Mark after Mk. 16^a.

In other words, there is no external evidence of any kind for the content of the supposed lost ending of St. Mark; the loss was absolutely primitive. But from this admission it seems but a short step to take, to question whether we are right in assuming that there ever was a loss at all.

It may also fairly be asked whether the freedom with which St. Matthew and St. Luke admittedly treat the text of St. Mark suggests that the church would have felt any insuperable difficulty in providing forthwith a suitable conclusion to St. Mark's gospel, if it had been known that this was incomplete or mutilated; and the question becomes the more pertinent when we reflect that the questions of literary proprietorship to which we are now accustomed did not then arise, and also that the putting forth of the book is likely to have been the act of a community at least as much as of its writer.

of the book. For according to the view here taken, St. Mark's gospel in the full meaning of this word could not be complete. If it may be said to begin at 1¹, it certainly does not end at 16⁸, except as a literary document; and its character as a literary document should probably be regarded as altogether subordinate to its character as an expression of the gospel. The roman christian whom we have imagined, as he heard its last words, would be less likely to be conscious of abruptness, as he reflected that the life of the church, of which he was a member, was also at that moment the expression of the gospel,¹ continuous with its origins of which he had been hearing, but still also incomplete.²

It is important to remember that St. Luke's gospel alone of the synoptic volumes can be called in any strict sense a literary work, to be compared in this respect with other contemporary literature; and we should beware of being influenced, in our attempt to understand St. Mark, by the method and practice of St.

¹ Cf. Phil. 4¹⁵: "in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia."

² If it be asked whether on the assumption that Mk. 16⁷ has been correctly interpreted the supposed roman christian at the time when he heard or read these words still expected the consummation to take place in Galilee, the reply must be made that this was the *form* in which his conviction of the triumph and supremacy of his Master expressed itself. The verse would not necessarily cause him any more difficulty than Mk. 14⁶², the verse in which it is stated that the members of the Sanhedrin will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of God, and coming with the clouds of heaven. In both verses we find ourselves in the presence of religious truths to which human language can only give imperfect or inadequate expression; and in such cases the substance of the faith or the hope expressed is independent of its form to a unique degree.

Luke.¹ St. Luke's gospel has no doubt an altogether satisfactory ending as a literary work, but we have seen that his doctrine is by no means identical with that of St. Mark; and this doctrinal difference is reflected in the very different conclusions of the books. If we compare the ending of St. Mark's gospel with that of St. Luke's, we shall undoubtedly feel that St. Mark is incomplete; but for the reasons just given this comparison is apt to be misleading and should not be made.

It may be added that neither St. Matthew's gospel nor St. John's gospel, whether regarded as ending at 20³¹ or 21²⁵, are complete in the same way in which St. Luke's gospel is complete. In neither St. Matthew nor St. John is the Lord parted from his disciples, as at Lk. 24⁵¹.

Further, St. Matthew's gospel ends characteristically enough with a command, a mission instruction, to disciples; St. Luke's gospel, as fittingly, with an idyllic picture of the disciples in Jerusalem; would it not be equally characteristic and fitting if St. Mark's gospel, the gospel throughout which deep religious emotion and reserve are very strongly emphasized, ended at 16⁸ upon the note of trembling, fearfulness and silence in the presence and perception of the completed act of God in the work of man's salvation, and its cost?

I will bring this lecture to a close with a translation of the last half of Dr. Lohmeyer's conclusion as regards Mk. 16¹⁻⁸. "The accounts of appearances

¹ In this connection it is noteworthy that St. Luke in his gospel avoids the expression τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, although he is fond of the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.

form, in all those gospels which contain them, the transition from 'the gospel of Jesus Christ' to the foundation of the primitive church. The question, at what point the end of the first and the beginnings of the second are to be placed, depends to a large extent upon the theological and historical outlook of the particular evangelist.¹ In 1 Corinthians 15³⁻⁹ St. Paul has no doubt included the appearances of the risen Lord as part of the κήρυγμα χριστοῦ, and in doing so he follows an old tradition; but we have other testimonies to its content in such passages as Philipians 2^{6 ff.}, 1 Peter 3¹⁸, 1 Timothy 3¹⁶, in which these appearances and to some extent even the resurrection find no mention. And if it is urged that these formulations are of later origin, then their evidence is all the stronger; for it is scarcely conceivable that the proofs

¹ A suggestion by Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke in the article mentioned on p. 8 may usefully be set alongside Dr. Lohmeyer's point made here. Dr. Clarke holds that St. Mark's gospel ends at 16⁸, but considers that if such an ending be thought incredible it is best to assume that the evangelist intended to continue his narrative *in another book*, and to include an account of the appearances of the risen Lord in this volume, in which they would thus form the first chapter of church history, the acts of Jesus Christ in his church. Dr. Clarke thinks that one of the sources used by the author of Acts for his record of the church in Jerusalem may possibly go back to such a continuation of the second gospel; and he points out that anyone engaged on such a task would have to decide how to employ the traditions of the resurrection, ascension, and the bestowal of the Spirit. St. Luke, confronted by this problem, apparently assigned the ascension to the Acts, and in his previous volume told the same story as the last of the resurrection appearances. Later the conclusion of his gospel was revised in order to make the ascension explicit, by the addition of the so-called "Western non-interpolations." St. Mark, suggests Dr. Clarke, may have acted in regard to the resurrection appearances as St. Luke did in regard to the full story of the ascension.

of the resurrection of the Lord should no longer have been regarded as important. The utterance to St. Thomas in Jn. 20³⁰, in a gospel which itself relates appearances, 'Blessed are they that see not and yet believe,' shews clearly the limit of the importance which such accounts possess.

"Accordingly it is altogether conceivable that a work, the theme of which is simply 'the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God', has excluded any account of the appearances of the risen Christ, of which St. Mark will obviously have known, and has ended with the divine proclamation of the Lord's parousia. Could there be an ending to this work, which would correspond more fittingly to the content of the gospel and to the primitive, original christian belief?

"Further, the Lord's appearances are not the only argument for the truth of his resurrection. The story of the empty tomb, with or without an angelic appearance, was itself long esteemed by primitive christian belief as a conclusive proof; and in this connection it is not unimportant that the speeches in Acts up to the conversion of St. Paul are completely silent about appearances of the risen Christ and instead testify to the truth of the event only with the expression, susceptible of more than one meaning, 'We are witnesses of these things', 2³² 3¹⁵ 5³² 10³⁹. Only once in Acts, 13³¹, does St. Paul¹ say 'He was seen (ὤφθη) for many days by those who had gone up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem.' It is therefore altogether possible that the earliest gospel only adduces the single proof of the empty tomb and does not relate the appearances which

¹ I do not know why Dr. Lohmeyer, who refers to St Paul's words in Acts 13³¹, does not also refer to St. Peter's words in Acts 10⁴¹.

belong to the history of the apostles, although or it may be for the very reason that the writer will have known of them.

“With 16⁸ therefore St. Mark’s gospel ends, not only in respect of form but also of content. It is however easy to understand that as time went on this kind of conclusion was no longer understood. St. Matthew’s gospel already interprets the sentence ‘There ye shall see him’ as a reference to appearances in Galilee, 28^{10, 15}. When the three other canonical gospels were in use, one and all ending with accounts of appearances, this conclusion of St. Mark was bound to appear harsher than ever, and also defective. We have two attempts, the purpose of which is to redress this apparent defect in the earliest gospel; the longer alone of these, 16⁹⁻²⁰, can be described as a subsequent conclusion; the shorter is only an appended note of late origin.”

In the attempt to obtain a hearing for the suggestion that St. Mark’s gospel may have ended and been meant to end at 16⁸ it has been necessary to investigate a mass of detail. It is at any rate satisfactory to reflect in conclusion that if the argument has been upon the whole correct there was originally no problem at all, except, it should perhaps be added, the permanent problem set to the church of understanding and assimilating the person, office, and work of him with whom it has to do.

III

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN ST. MARK AND ST. MATTHEW

AMONG the problems connected with the study of the gospels there are two to which attention is often drawn, but of which no altogether satisfactory solution is as yet forthcoming. The first of these problems is concerned with the scene of the ministry of Jesus Christ. Did this take place chiefly in and near Galilee, as for example St. Mark and St. Matthew seem to imply, or was Jerusalem its centre, the residence there being only interrupted by occasional visits to Galilee, as St. John's gospel represents the matter?¹ And the second problem is connected with the scene of the Lord's manifestations after his resurrection. It is well known that St. Luke's gospel and the first chapter of the Acts refer only, and exclusively,² to appearances in or near Jerusalem; and the same presentation seems to obtain in St. John's gospel,³ with the exception of chapter 21. Other parts of the gospel tradition however and in particular the tradition represented in our earliest gospel, St. Mark, and in

¹ In St. John's gospel visits to Galilee and residence there are implied at 1⁴³ 2¹⁻¹² 4¹⁻³ 4³⁻⁶⁴ 6¹⁻⁷, about one hundred verses in all.

² Lk. 24⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹, and still more strongly Acts 1⁴.

³ No place is mentioned by name in Jn. 20; indeed, the last explicit reference to Jerusalem in this gospel is at 12¹², the so-called triumphal entry; and probably this is not accidental; but we seem to be meant to assume that the events of Jn. 20 take place in the capital or its immediate neighbourhood.

St. Matthew point clearly to Galilee as the district in which the Lord was seen or was expected to be seen by his disciples.

These two problems have often been discussed in isolation, but it has not usually been recognized that they are certainly connected, and that the consideration of either of them is necessarily involved in the consideration of the other. Thus it is St. Mark, for example, who places the ministry in or near Galilee, and brings the Lord to Jerusalem only for the last week; and it is St. Mark also who points forward at the close of his book to Galilee, not to Jerusalem, as the destined scene of the final drama in the gospel story. *Per contra*, it is St. John who places the bulk of the ministry in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, only assigning out of a total of some 820 verses in chapters 1⁹–20^{end} about one hundred verses to the ministry in Galilee; and it is St. John also who, apart from chapter 21, a chapter requiring special and separate consideration, appears to record manifestations of the Lord only in Jerusalem.

It is my purpose to examine these two problems, and it will be convenient to deal first with the second of them, and to consider forthwith the evidence of the New Testament as regards the appearances of Jesus Christ, as these are usually called, after his resurrection.

Our earliest literary evidence seems to be indifferent to questions of locality. In 1 Corinthians 15⁶⁻⁸ St. Paul gives a list of six such appearances, the last being to himself. In no single case is there any note of place. We may indeed infer from Galatians 1¹⁶⁻¹⁷ that the appearance to St. Paul, the sixth and last in the list, took place at or near Damascus, and this agrees

with the evidence of Acts; but in 1 Corinthians 15, although the appearances seem to be narrated in order of time, no reference is made to any topographical details. It is desirable to bear this important point in mind, namely, that our earliest literary evidence lays no stress at all on the locality of the appearances, for when we turn to the gospels we shall find that the case is very different and that we have to deal with intricate and unexpectedly far-reaching issues.

Before we deal with St. Mark's evidence, we may also remind ourselves that everything which follows upon the death of Jesus Christ is wrapped in our records in great difficulty and mystery. Of the fact of the resurrection the New Testament from beginning to end is a triumphant witness; Dr. Arthur Wright calculates in his synopsis that there are forty-six direct references to the resurrection in the books of the New Testament other than the gospels; and but for this fact and this belief we should hardly be considering this matter now; but as regards the events which either did or were expected to succeed the resurrection the New Testament leaves us in a state of great uncertainty.

The grounds for thinking that Mk. 16⁹⁻²⁰ is probably no part of the original gospel of St. Mark are well known, and need not be repeated here. If they are well based, the text of St. Mark's gospel ends at 16⁸ after the departure of the women from the tomb, and therefore does not record a manifestation of the risen Christ to the disciples, or indeed to anyone. This, however, does not prevent us from saying with confidence where St. Mark would have placed such a manifestation, if one had been included in his gospel.

It would have been in Galilee. This is made certain by two passages. In 14²⁸, when the Lord is on his way from the upper room to Gethsemane with the disciples, he foretells that they will all be caused to stumble, in accordance with the scripture of Zechariah 13⁷; and he then continues¹ "But after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee."² Similarly in 16⁷, the last verse but one of the original gospel as we have it, the young man at the tomb, after making known the fact of the Lord's resurrection to the women, continues: "But go ye, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there ye shall see him: even as he said unto you."

We must consider these two important passages more closely. Neither of them is free from difficulty.

As regards 14²⁸, it is certainly strange that St. Peter in his reply to the Lord which immediately follows takes no notice of the momentous announcement

¹ It is true that Mk. 14²⁸ is not found in the so-called Fayoum Gospel-fragment, but the fragment is possibly not a quotation from a gospel at all; see M. R. James' *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 25 (Oxford, 1924). If the fragment does represent Mk. 14²⁷⁻³⁰, the omission of verse 28 from it is an exception which serves only to test the general rule, since the verse is found in all our other authorities for the text of this gospel. Also it was certainly part of the Marcan text followed by St. Matthew at this point.

² The rendering advocated by Johannes Weiss for these words "I will lead you forth, i.e. go at your head, into Galilee" cannot be maintained. The words are repeated in the message sent to the disciples at 16⁷, with the substitution of the third person for the first and of the singular tense for the future, "he goeth before you into Galilee," and they are there followed by the words "there ye shall see him." It is thus quite clearly implied that the disciples will not see their Master elsewhere than in Galilee, or before they meet him there. The correct translation of 14²⁸ is thus made certain by 16⁷.

which this verse contains, but only protests, in reference to the prophecy of the disciples' failure, that he at any rate will not be caused to stumble. No doubt it is true that St. Mark's gospel has many surprisingly abrupt transitions; one of the most remarkable is at 10³⁵, when immediately after the third and most detailed instruction with reference to that which is to happen at Jerusalem, the two sons of Zebedee approach their Master with a request for the chief places of honour in his glory, for all the world as if the instruction had not just been spoken; but this example is not quite similar to the case which we are now considering. At 10³⁵ the abruptness is probably due to the collocation or juxtaposition of two quite independent sections, whereas in 14²⁷⁻³¹ it is only the single verse 14²⁸ which causes difficulty. Without it the context would cohere quite well.

On the other hand it will be remembered that from time to time St. Mark relieves the otherwise complete darkness of his passion narrative by sudden momentary gleams of light, which remind the reader not so much of the necessity and inevitability of the passion, although this also is constantly emphasized, but of its meaning and its purpose. Thus in 14^{1,2} at the outset of his passion narrative we read of the resolution of external enemies, the Jewish authorities at Jerusalem, to destroy Jesus, and again in 14^{10,11} of the unexpected and as it proved fatal help which this resolution received from internal disaffection, the faithlessness of Judas; but between these two terrible passages St. Mark inserts the account of an anointing of the Lord at Bethany by an unnamed woman in the house of his friends, an anointing to which the evangel-

ist assigns great significance.¹ Thereby he seems to invite his readers' attention from the beginning not only to the gathering darkness, but also to its meaning and its issue, in this case through the grave (verse 8, end). Similarly at the examination in the presence of the Sanhedrin the Lord, when required to reply to the question of the presiding judge, asserts his Messiahship in the most explicit terms; and as if in order to emphasize the solemn and critical nature of the decision which is imminent, an assurance is given that those now engaged in the trial or examination will see the greatest and the last event of history, the coming of the Son of man, in the fulness of divine authority, to judgement. And finally, when the body of Jesus hangs lifeless on the cross, the utterance of the gentile centurion "Truly this man was the Son of God"² reminds us that the death which made so great an impression upon him was not as the deaths of other, "ordinary" men.

Accordingly it is not impossible that in Mk. 14²⁸ we see another example of this tendency on the part of the evangelist. The Lord goes his last walk with his disciples; very soon he will be parted from them; this is indeed his final conversation with them as a brotherhood; and he has just warned them that the issue is inevitable; they cannot follow; he will be smitten and they will be scattered, as the scripture has

¹ See verse 9, noting especially the reference to "the proclamation of the gospel."

² The omission of the article, *υἱὸς θεοῦ* instead of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, need not cause difficulty, and does not necessarily make the meaning indeterminate. It may be due to the fact that the words here form a predicate, cf. Mt. 14³³ and perhaps also Jn. 5²⁷.

foretold; it is of divine appointing. But this is not all the truth; the divine appointing has an end or purpose; he will be raised up and he will "prevent" them into Galilee. If we approach the verse in this way, it will hardly prove too difficult.

But before ending our consideration of this verse we should notice that nothing is said in it about anything which will happen in Galilee. The Lord simply utters a prophecy or perhaps rather gives a promise; he says that after he is raised up he will precede or "prevent" his disciples into Galilee; that is all; the immediate or the subsequent future, after he has done so, is not touched on. The sentence is not even an instruction that they are to leave for Galilee to meet him. If we try to consider the words without presuppositions, especially presuppositions drawn from our knowledge of the other, later gospels, it may occur to us that this "prevention" into Galilee, whatever it may signify or point to, is regarded in St. Mark as the climax of the situation and of the conditions produced by the ministry and death and resurrection.

We pass now to consider Mk. 16⁷, the other reference in this gospel to Jesus' "prevention" of his disciples into Galilee; but here it will be even more necessary than it was at Mk. 14²⁸ to consider the context as a whole. This context, it will be remembered, is the passage Mk. 16¹⁻⁸, which forms the last section of St. Mark's gospel proper, as we have it.

We may recall that the previous chapter has ended with the story of the Lord's burial at the hands of Joseph of Arimathæa and the mention of the two Maries, who remained watching and beheld where he

was laid. The sixteenth chapter begins by telling us that when the sabbath was over, that is, after sunset on the Saturday evening, three women, one of whom at least, Mary Magdalene, was mentioned also in the last verse of the fifteenth chapter, bought unguents with the intention of making a visit to the tomb, in order to anoint their Lord.

In St. Mark's gospel, therefore, the passion narrative begins and ends with a reference to anointing; but there is a difference which should be noticed. In 14³⁻⁹ the unnamed woman succeeds in carrying out her purpose, which is expressly stated to be connected with the coming burial of Jesus Christ (verse 8); she anoints his head, her offering is accepted, and she becomes the subject of a high encomium (verse 9); but by the time of the second attempt it is found that the body neither needs nor can admit anointing at the hands of human love. This love must henceforth seek to satisfy itself in other ways than this. In 16¹⁻⁹ the women are not able to use the unguents they have bought; indeed we hear nothing of the unguents or of this purpose on their part after the first verse. From this point onwards our attention is directed rather to the thoughts and actions of the women at the tomb itself. In the first place we read that a possible difficulty, which apparently presents itself to them for the first time when they are already almost at their goal, proves unsubstantial; on looking up, they see that the great stone at the door of the tomb, the removal of which might have proved too much for their unaided strength, is not, after all, an obstacle; it lies rolled back; the way is open for them to carry out the purpose of their coming, and they enter the tomb.

And in the second place, if hitherto the thoughts of the women have been centred on the last sad offices of love, these thoughts are now suddenly directed into an altogether different channel. Inside the tomb they find themselves in the presence of a being, whose supernatural appearance is described according to the custom of the time; he is seated "on the right," that is, on the side which portends good fortune and success¹ to men, and he is clothed in the white robe which is the recognized garment of celestial beings.² Such a manifestation however cannot but cause amazement, if not perturbation, to the women; and therefore the angel's first task is to remove their astonishment, before he proceeds, first, to tell them that their Master is risen and no longer where they had thought to find him, and, secondly, to lay a charge upon them, consisting of a message to the disciples, and in particular St. Peter, who, unlike the women themselves, had according to St. Mark forsaken their Master.³

The essence of the good tidings is given in the single word ἡγέρθη, he is risen, and the news itself is established by drawing the attention of the women to the place where the body of their Lord had lain; but the tidings themselves are preceded by a sentence, the form of which is in some respects surprising. This sentence runs, "Ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, the crucified one." The words are doubtless a statement, not a question; it is altogether fitting that an angel should know what human beings are about; but is it altogether natural for the angel to say that the women

¹ Cf. Jn. 21⁶.

² Cf. Mk. 9³ and particularly 2 Maccabees 3²⁶, 3³⁰.

³ Mk. 14⁵⁰.

were at that moment "seeking" Jesus? Was this quite the fact? They had had no doubt about the situation of the tomb itself, and they were hardly so much seeking their Lord, as seeking to anoint his body; this was the purpose of their coming. And even if it be felt that this is no real difficulty, we can hardly help asking why it is necessary for the angel, in speaking to the only persons who had been faithful to their friend and Master and had been, so far as their weak nature allowed, partakers of his passion, to define him as the Nazarene, the crucified one?

It is possible that words which as employed in the New Testament usually emphasize the lowliness or rejection of the Lord are here deliberately employed to point the contrast to the news which is now immediately announced and that the sentence reflects the triumphant convictions of the early church.¹ He whom the Jews were seeking and could no longer find,² he whom the world regarded as the Nazarene, the crucified,³ is risen, as the condition of the tomb bears witness. If or in so far as the women also have thought of their Lord primarily as the Nazarene or the crucified one, and in this spirit have come in order to anoint his body, they must do so no longer, or at any rate they must do so only in the light of the truth

¹ Acts 4¹⁰, which is very similar to this sentence, should be carefully compared with it.

² Cf. Jn. 7¹¹, 34, 36 8²¹ 11⁵⁶.

³ At Mk. 1⁹, where the Lord is first brought upon the scene in this gospel, he is described as coming "from Nazareth of Galilee." This is the only occasion in the book where Nazareth is mentioned by name. The epithet Ναζαρηνός is applied to him in three other important earlier passages in St. Mark, 1²⁴ 10⁴⁷ 14⁶⁷. The verb σταυρώω is used in reference to him only in Mk. 15, and there six times.

which the angel now makes known. For he is risen, and beyond their power to see or to handle, in connection with the grave. There is to be a seeing indeed, but it is not connected with his tomb, nor with Jerusalem, as the women must now learn. For at this point we pass to the second part of the angelic utterance, which runs as follows: "But go ye, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there ye shall see him: even as he said unto you."

1. It is often thought that the special reference to St. Peter, or at least the order of the words "his disciples and Peter," constitutes a difficulty. It is felt that if St. Peter is to be specially mentioned he should at any rate be mentioned first, before his colleagues. We may however recall that in the passage 14²⁷⁻³¹, with which the verse under consideration, Mk. 16⁷, is closely connected, it was foretold that all the disciples would be caused to stumble; and when Peter protested that he at least would be faithful, even if he had to stand alone, it was further foretold that for him a special failure was reserved. It does not therefore seem unnatural that in Mk. 16⁷, which as we have just seen is closely connected with Mk. 14²⁷⁻³¹ and indeed repeats part of 14²⁸, the same order of narration should be kept. Just as in 14²⁷⁻³¹ the reference is to the coming relations between the Lord in his passion at Jerusalem and the disciples as a whole, with special reference to St. Peter, so here in 16⁷ the reference is to the coming relations between the risen Lord in Galilee and his disciples as a whole, with special reference to St. Peter.

2. This verse 16⁷, as we have just seen, recalls very strongly 14²⁸, "After I am raised up, I will go

before you into Galilee." But two points of difference between the verses should be noticed. In the first place there is no direct reference to the resurrection in the message of 16⁷; that has been announced to the women in connection with the empty tomb, in the preceding verse. And secondly, whereas 14²⁸ ended with the words "I will go before you into Galilee," 16⁷ runs, "He goeth before you into Galilee; there ye shall see him; even as he said unto you."

As regards the first of these three clauses, we notice that the promise given in 14²⁸ is now in process of fulfilment. If the words are not being pressed too strictly, they imply that, while the message is being given, the risen Lord is preventing his disciples into Galilee. And the emphasis is on the prevention into Galilee and its sequel or purpose,¹ not on the resurrection, which seems to be assumed.

As regards the two remaining clauses, we should naturally expect the words "Even as he said unto you" to refer to the immediately preceding clause "There ye shall see him"; but it is by no means certain that they do. Not only was there no direct reference in 14²⁸ to a seeing of the Lord by the disciples, after he had "prevented" them into Galilee, but a consideration of St. Mark's style shews that he is strongly addicted to parenthetical clauses. In an examination of St. Mark's tendency in this respect,² Professor C. H.

¹ "There ye shall see him."

² *Journal of Theological Studies*, January 1925, pp. 145 ff. A good example of this usage in St. Mark has already occurred in Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ at verses 3 and 4, with regard to the women on the way to the tomb. Here the majority of the best manuscripts read, "And they were saying among themselves, Who will roll away the stone for us from the door

Turner finds nineteen such clauses in this gospel, although they are not all of the same character; and he decides that the message in 16⁷ should be punctuated thus, "He goeth before you into Galilee (there ye shall see him) even as he said unto you."

Apparently therefore it must be regarded as possible, perhaps probable, that in 16⁷ the words "Even as he said unto you" are to be taken with the words "He goeth before you into Galilee," and simply point the reference to 14²⁸.

3. It remains now to ask what is the meaning of the words "There ye shall see him," whether these are to be connected with the last words of the verse or not; and here it is necessary once more to guard our minds against presuppositions which may prove to be misleading. We are not unnaturally accustomed to think that the

of the tomb? And looking up they see that the stone lies rolled away; for it was exceeding great." Prof. Turner comments thus: "I cannot doubt that St. Mark's motive in the words For it was very great was to account for the anxiety of the women to find help in the rolling away of the stone. If it had been a small one, they could have rolled it away unaided: as it is, they doubt their own capacity to do so without assistance. The parenthesis explains that after all their anxiety was unnecessary."

A still more illuminating example of St. Mark's usage is at 12^{12a}, "And they sought to take him, and they feared the multitude, for they perceived that he had spoken the parable against them." Prof. Turner comments: "Obviously the recognition on the part of the Jewish authorities that the parable of the vineyard and the husbandmen had been directed against them, was the reason not for their fear of the multitude but for their desire to arrest Jesus. The words 'And they feared the multitude' interrupt the connection and it is from that point of view necessary to bracket them. The evangelist ought logically to have put first the reason for the desire before mentioning the obstacle which interfered with its fulfilment."

purpose of the promise given in 14²⁸ of the "prevention" into Galilee and repeated in 16⁷ with the additional assurance "There ye shall see him" can be readily perceived. The purpose was, we assume, to enable the risen Jesus to manifest himself to his disciples, as having truly conquered death, before his final withdrawal to his Father's side. But, apart from the fact that none of our authorities which refer to manifestations in Galilee (Mk., Mt., Jn. 21) has any reference to the ascension, we have to ask ourselves, from a consideration of St. Mark's gospel as a whole, what expectation with regard to their Master and his future state or office is likely, so far as we can judge, to have been in the minds of the writer and the readers of this book; or, to put the question in a slightly different way, what climax with regard to their Master would be most clearly in accord with the previous teaching of this gospel. And here the answer is not doubtful. There is no suggestion in St. Mark that the disciples expected to enjoy after the crucifixion and resurrection a longer or shorter period of occasional communing or intercourse with their Master before his last complete withdrawal and then to await the final consummation. He of whom suffering, death and resurrection are predicated in the three instructions and elsewhere in this gospel is the Son of man. If we are right in believing that in St. Mark the central figure is tacitly identified with the Son of man of Jewish expectation, it seems probable that the evangelist and his readers in the light of the resurrection would expect to see their Master made manifest as the Son of man and coming with great power and glory. In St. Mark the cardinal features of the gospel are the ministry, the

death and resurrection, and the expected coming. It must therefore be regarded as possible that Mk. 14²⁸ and 16⁷ rightly interpreted point to an expectation on the part of certain sections of the early church that the death and resurrection were to be followed closely by the parousia or presence of the risen Christ as the Son of man, which would take place in Galilee. If so, the verses are to be understood as an invitation to the disciples to proceed thither in anticipation of an imminent event, which would be the consummation.

It is therefore perhaps significant, in reference to the clause "There ye shall see him" in 16⁷, that the only previous examples in St. Mark where the future tense of the verb ὀράω occurs are in the eschatological passages 13²⁶ and 14⁶², which are concerned with the coming of the Son of man. "Then they shall see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory." "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power (that is, God), and coming with the clouds of heaven." This interpretation of the words "There ye shall see him" in 16⁷ will of course hold good, whatever punctuation be adopted for the verse as a whole. But if, as is usually assumed, although as I have said the assumption is in my opinion doubtful, the words "As he said unto you" are indeed to be referred to the clause "There ye shall see him" which immediately precedes, then the conclusion seems inevitable that the reference is to 13²⁶, the verse in which private instruction is given to the four leading disciples with reference to the coming of the Son of man.¹ In that case the divine promise at the tomb is that the parousia will

¹ Although at 13²⁶ the verb is in the third person plural, not the second.

take place in Galilee, the risen Jesus being identified with the Son of man of 13²⁶. Galilee, not Jerusalem, is thus to be the centre of interest and expectation for disciples; and the consummation, not a temporary appearance, is the purpose of the "preventing" thither.

Finally it may be thought that this interpretation is rendered still more probable if we consider the contents of the last verse of the gospel, Mk. 16⁸, to which we must now pass. We should have expected that the women would be forthwith obedient to the heavenly vision, as indeed they are in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and that they would proceed at once to carry out the task with which they had been entrusted. The reverse, however, is the case. So far from delivering the message, they kept the whole matter to themselves,¹ so that, if it be true that joy always wishes to be shared with others, the angel's words in 16⁷ cannot have seemed to them altogether at any rate a message of good news. And this view of the matter is borne out by their action and demeanour; they fled from the tomb, in the grip of trembling and astonishment; nor was this a merely momentary experience, for the gospel ends with the words already referred to, that they kept the whole matter to themselves, because of fear. The implication seems to be that there was something in the nature of the message which was too staggering for them to grasp or to express. And if they understood this message as implying that the consummation was at hand with the appearance of their Master as the Son of man in Galilee, then the fear and

¹ So Dr. J. M. Creed understands οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπεν, *J.T.S.*, January 1930, p. 177.

also the silence, which St. Mark, unlike St. Matthew and St. Luke, attributes to them, become perhaps less difficult to understand.

On this view, the plan of St. Mark's gospel, the book of the divine message and action of salvation, will be this: first, the heralding by St. John the Baptist of the imminent day of the Lord with the coming of the mightier than he; then the ministry in and round about Galilee; then the journey to and the last days at Jerusalem, ending with the crucifixion, this being followed by the resurrection in the same place; all this to be consummated by the expected coming of the risen Christ as the Son of man in Galilee, the whole record being vitally interconnected as the narrative of a decisive final divine event, wherein and whereby the kingdom of God has come near.¹

Accordingly, if this interpretation is possible, it should not be too readily assumed that St. Mark is a witness to "appearances" of the risen Lord in Galilee. It may be, to judge from the plan and statements of his book, especially if, as is possible, it ends and was meant to end at 16^b, that St. Mark should be regarded as a witness to an expectation of one appearance or manifestation of the crucified and risen Lord in Galilee; and that this appearance or manifestation was to be the consummation itself.²

¹ No mention has been made of the church's doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine could hardly but be present even in our earliest gospel, but it plays a surprisingly small part in it; references to the Holy Spirit under this head occur only at 1^a 3²⁰ 13¹¹. Elsewhere the only passage in which the expression is found is 12³⁰, "David himself said in the Holy Spirit."

² See additional note at the end of the lecture.

When we turn to Mt. 28¹⁻²⁰, we notice two features which distinguish it from its Marcan counterpart.

In the first place, the conclusion of St. Matthew's gospel, unlike that of St. Mark's, is not by any means abrupt. The end of St. Mark's gospel, if it is the end, leaves the reader's attention fixed on a mysterious future, in connection with a fulfilment to take place in Galilee; he is led to feel that only there and in the future will the book, the perusal of which he has just completed, receive its explanation, and the gospel as thus far revealed be crowned with consummation. But the end of St. Matthew's gospel leaves the reader in no such state of tension or at present largely unsatisfied expectation of the future. No doubt St. Matthew, more than most of the evangelists, to the end looks forward, as the last words of his gospel show¹; but equally also his last scene is a suitable climax and finale for his gospel, especially from a literary point of view, in a sense in which the last scene in St. Mark is not and cannot be for his. In other words, the narrative in Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ strikes us as resembling a transition section rather than as being a satisfactory conclusion of a gospel, if we use the word "gospel" in its later sense of a written document; and in support of this impression we may appeal to the common belief, especially in this country, that St. Mark's gospel has been mutilated and its ending lost; but no one could find difficulties of this sort in connection with the conclusion of St. Matthew's gospel.

And in the second place, although St. Matthew's narrative leads up, like St. Mark's, to a great event in Galilee, there is now a certain change of emphasis,

¹ "Until the consummation of the aeon."

chiefly because in St. Matthew's gospel, unlike St. Mark's, this event is recorded as *having taken place*. The event therefore cannot now possess the absolute ultimate importance which, according to the interpretation given above, St. Mark assigns to it, since in St. Mark the expected event is to be the consummation itself, the end and winding-up of all things. In St. Mark therefore this event could not be recorded. In St. Matthew however an event is recorded, which therefore cannot itself be the consummation. Accordingly the event described in Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰ becomes to a considerable extent an event like the other events already narrated in this gospel; and just as on the one hand it can no longer have the paramount, final importance assigned to it in St. Mark, so on the other hand the earlier events recorded in St. Matthew, especially those connected with the crucifixion and the resurrection, become invested with greater and more surpassing moment than they could have, when they were regarded as chiefly preparatory for the one supreme event.

In the light of these two considerations, let us consider St. Matthew's narrative more closely, bearing in mind the earlier record of St. Mark.

It is possible, as we have seen, that in St. Mark's narrative everything leads up to the parousia, so that no great emphasis is laid by him upon the resurrection or the empty tomb, except as forming the necessary transition to the final event in Galilee, nor does he need to record an appearance of the risen Christ. St. Matthew, partly perhaps because he is writing at a later date, views the matter rather differently. Thus in his opening verses we are at once conscious of a

greater emphasis upon the resurrection than we find in St. Mark. Since the final scene in St. Matthew is no longer the parousia, certain traits which contemporary thought probably expected to signalize that great event are as it were thrown back, perhaps as a kind of compensation, though I do not think that this is a complete explanation of the matter, upon the story of the resurrection.¹ This story therefore now tends to be to some extent externalized² by the mention of the earthquake and the coming and the actions of the angel, whose appearance is too great for unregenerate or hostile eyes, as is shewn by the prostration of the guards at the tomb. Secondly it is the resurrection, not, as possibly in St. Mark, the parousia, which now becomes the fulfilment of the Master's word or prophecy³; and the message which the women are to give to the disciples now includes, as its first and probably its greatest element, the news of this event, the resurrection. And thirdly the difficulty which we encountered in trying to understand the words in Mk. 16⁷ "Even as he said unto you" is now removed, whether intentionally or not. The words "Even as he said" are now transferred, as we have just seen, to the preceding verse, Mt. 28⁹, where they become a reference to the Lord's own prophecy of his *resurrection*; and at Mt.

¹ And similarly upon the crucifixion. To the eschatological traits which he shares with St. Mark, the supernatural darkness and the rending of the temple veil, St. Matthew adds the earthquake, the rending of the rocks, and the resurrection of many bodies of the saints, Mt. 27^{51b, 52}; cf. also 27^{54a}.

² But not completely; there is no attempt to describe the resurrection itself. This attempt is first made, so far as we know, in the non-canonical gospel of Peter.

³ "He is risen, even as he said," Mt. 28⁹.

28^{7end}, the parallel to Mk. 16^{7end}, is substituted for them "Lo, I have told you"¹; in St. Matthew the angel who speaks offers himself as the divine pledge of all that he has said; not only or primarily of the fact of the prevention into Galilee, but also and above all of the promise that there the disciples should see their risen Master, a seeing which, as the sequel shows, is no longer identified with the seeing involved and to be expected at the consummation.

None the less the topographical interest, as we may call it, is still centred upon Galilee. This becomes clear, if we consider the appearance of the Lord to the women as they return from the tomb. The account of this appearance is peculiar to St. Matthew, and in consequence of it he is often claimed as a supporter of the Jerusalem as well as of the Galilean tradition in the matter of the scene of the appearances after the resurrection. But a careful consideration of the content of this appearance will make it probable that such an exposition of the narrative would shew misunderstanding of the evangelist's purpose in recording it. The appearance in verses 9 and 10 is very different

¹ ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν. Dr. Hort, although retaining εἶπον in the text as printed, would like, with very slight support from the versions, to read εἶπεν in Mt. 28⁷ as in Mk. 16⁷, regarding εἶπον in Mt. 28⁷ as a primitive corruption of εἶπεν. "The essential identity of the two records in this place [Mt. 28⁷, Mk. 16⁷] renders it improbable that the corresponding clauses would hide total difference of sense under similarity of language" (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction, Appendix, p. 23). Professor C. H. Turner, however, decides against him: "I think Matthew was puzzled by Mark's statement as he understood it, and deliberately altered it . . . ἰδοὺ appears to me to exclude εἶπεν. It introduces a new speaker" (*J.T.S.*, January 1925, p. 156, note 1).

from and altogether secondary to the appearance or manifestation which is to take place in verses 16 to 20. So far as the women are concerned, the appearance in verses 9 and 10 may indeed be regarded as giving them additional and on this occasion immediate assurance that their Master lives. But this is not the chief purpose of the narrative. It will be noticed that the women have no doubt at all, who meets them; they are not given proofs, like the disciples in St. Luke and St. John; as loving followers, who realize at once that their lost Master is restored to them alive, they clasp his feet in reverent homage.

The primary purpose of the appearance in verses 9 and 10 is to give a direct instruction to the disciples, who are here described by the Lord as his brethren,¹ to leave Jerusalem for Galilee, in order that they may there behold the risen Christ. In this passage we hear nothing of the Lord's prevention into Galilee, which it will be remembered was the primary element in the angel's message in St. Mark, but now for the first time the disciples are directly bidden to go away to Galilee, there to obtain the promised vision of their Master. Clearly, for whatever reason, the evangelist regarded a manifestation, in its fulness, of the risen Christ to the disciples as only possible in Galilee. Otherwise why must the disciples leave for Galilee, in order to behold him? If the risen Lord could manifest himself to the women in Jerusalem, why not also to "his brethren"? Obviously the appearance to the women in Jerusalem is not comparable with that to the disciples in the north. Galilee is for St. Matthew,

¹ As also at Jn. 20¹⁷. Cf. Mt. 12⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰ 25⁴⁰.

as for St. Mark, the most truly holy land,¹ the scene of revelation.

And this view is confirmed by a consideration of the content of the final section, verses 16 to 20. In the first place, that which is here recorded proves to be much more than a vision of the risen Lord. Indeed the "seeing" is of quite secondary importance, allusion being made to it only in a participial clause, verse 17; nor is there any direct reference to the resurrection. That which is here described is in the first place the disclosure on the mountain top to those of the eleven who were able to receive it² of a fact now accom-

¹ Doubtless Jerusalem is twice called in this gospel "the holy city," 4^b 27⁵³; but this is its traditional title, cf. Neh. 11¹⁸, Is. 52¹, and has reference to its age-long significance in the history of the chosen people, not to its present state; cf. Mt. 21⁴³ 23³⁷⁻³⁹.

² It is impossible to say with certainty whether the words οἱ δεῖ δόξασαν in Mt. 28¹⁷ refer to some of the eleven just mentioned or to others who are conceived as also being present on this occasion together with the eleven. The same difficulty occurs in the exegesis of Mk. 10³². But although many readers of Mt. 28¹⁷ are likely to prefer the second alternative, the probability remains that there is no thought of the presence of any but the eleven disciples. All the eleven worshipped, but some of them doubted, or perhaps more simply had hesitation; cf. Mt. 14³¹.

According to the interpretation given in the text above, Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰ is very much more than "a resurrection-appearance"; it is rather, for such as could receive it, an anticipation or foretaste of the actual consummation. But it was an accepted Jewish belief that the consummation would involve a judgement and discrimination. Further, the doubt or hesitation here mentioned on the part of some of the worshippers is not of the same kind as that in Lk. 24³⁷ ^a. or Jn. 20²⁸ ^a., which had reference to the physical reality of the Lord's resurrection-body and could be dispelled by sight and touch. The adoration implied in Mt. 28¹⁷ is an adoration of Jesus Christ as king of kings and lord of lords, an adoration which could express itself in such language as we find in Rev. 19¹⁻¹⁰; and it seems to be implied that the devotion

plished and fulfilled, namely, the divine investiture of their Master with the universal sovereignty and power which at the consummation will be revealed as belonging to him, although in St. Matthew the consummation itself is now not yet. This infinite and universal lordship is described in words which ultimately go back to Daniel 7. In the second place and as a result of his completed act and fully sovereign power, his representatives receive both their authority and their commission; they are sent out with the marching orders, as the Duke of Wellington described this section, of the christian church. And lastly he who is already endued with all the attributes which at the consummation will be known and acknowledged to be his is with his representatives continuously, until that consummation; we do not read that he leaves them, when his charge is finished; for them at any rate is possible a foretaste of the consummation; for he is with them always.

And all this divine energy and power is to radiate from the mountain-top in Galilee; not from Jerusalem nor from the Jewish church and nation as it now is or has become, but from Galilee, from amidst the eleven disciples is to be made known to all the nations the message of the consummated action, and the community of the redeemed is to be continuously instructed in obedience to their Lord's commands. Galilee is in St. Matthew the birthplace of the christian church. and insight on which such adoration must be based was not at once possible for all the eleven members of the apostolic band.

One of the twelve had already fallen away; and in Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰, regarded as an anticipation of the consummation, we are reminded by the last words of 28¹⁷ of the discrimination which such a revelation as is here implied must necessarily make.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE MEANING OF ST. MARK 16'

It has been already pointed out that apart from this verse the future tense of the verb $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ is used only twice in St. Mark: at 13²⁶ "Then they shall see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory," and at 14⁶² "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven."

With the use of the future tense in these two passages, where the reference is certainly to the sight of the Son of man at the consummation, we may compare 1 John 3³ "We shall see him even as he is"; Heb. 9²⁸ "Christ . . . shall appear a second time apart from sin to them that wait for him unto salvation"; and Rev. 1⁷ "Behold, he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him."

Reference should also be made to a passage, to which Dr. Lohmeyer attaches great importance, in the Jewish apocalypse known as The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, to be dated about 108 B.C. In the Testament of Zebulun 9⁸ we read, according to Dr. R. H. Charles' translation, "And after these things shall there arise unto you the Lord, the light of righteousness, and ye shall return into your own land. And ye shall see him in Jerusalem for his name's sake."

If part of this passage is placed side by side with Mk. 16^{7b}, the parallelism is certainly striking:

Test. Zeb. 9 ⁸	Mk. 16 ⁷
ἐπιτρέψετε εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·	
καὶ ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε αὐτὸν ἐν	ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε.
Ἱερουσάλημ.	

Dr. Lohmeyer offers this comment: "Here we find, strongly emphasized in a Jewish apocalypse, a reference to a future parousia of God in Jerusalem, and with it is connected the return of all captives into the holy land. Then they will see the Lord, who has risen in glory like the sun, in their midst, in the holy city of Jerusalem, which he has chosen, as a variant

in the text more precisely states, for an abiding habitation. Substantially St. Mark agrees completely with this Jewish expectation; accordingly he also refers to the future parousia; only it is no longer the parousia of God, but of Jesus; and it comes to pass not in Jerusalem, but in Galilee. Galilee is therefore the hallowed land of his eschatological coming."

It must also not be forgotten that in Jn. 16¹⁴⁻²² the future tense of ὁράω is used four times in seven verses with reference to the reunion of the Lord with his disciples after the brief period of separation, during which they will be unable to "behold" him. In St. John's gospel however the whole gospel-revelation, from the beginning of the ministry, is the manifestation of the Son of man, as is made clear in the important verse Jn. 1⁵¹, although the manifestation is only completed in and by the death of Jesus Christ. St. John does not anticipate a future consummation such as is expected for example by St. Matthew. On the other hand the "seeing" of the Lord mentioned in Jn. 16¹⁴⁻²² should by no means be regarded as satisfied by such brief resurrection-appearances as are narrated in Jn. 20, 21 or Lk. 24 or I Cor. 15⁵⁻⁸. The "sight" of their Lord promised to the disciples in St. John includes their knowledge of and communion with him as the bread of life, the light, the truth, the true vine, and the resurrection.

So far therefore as the passages just considered are concerned, it does not seem impossible that the future middle of the verb ὁράω in Mk. 16⁷ should refer to the disciples' sight of their Master at the parousia itself. Again, it has already been pointed out¹ that elsewhere in St. Mark's gospel the complement to the passion and the resurrection is the coming of the Son of man in glory; but it should now be noticed further that these supreme events do not concern the Lord only; they are closely connected with the disciples also. Thus in Mk. 8²⁷⁻⁹¹ after the first instruction on the passion-resurrection and its rejection by St. Peter an attempt is made to correct his error by means of the teaching that to bear the cross is an essential feature of discipleship. The teaching ends with the warning that those who shun

¹ See pp. 31 ff.

this task will be shunned by the Son of man at his glorious coming 8³⁰; and in the following verse it seems to be implied that this event will occur within the lifetime of some of the hearers. Similarly in 10³²⁻⁴⁵ after the third and last instruction on the passion-resurrection, reference is immediately made to the desire of two disciples to share closely in their Master's "glory." It is thus assumed in both contexts that the passion-resurrection is the prelude to the glory; and although this glory is connected with a baptism and vocation which can be fulfilled only by Jesus Christ 1⁹ ff. 10³⁸ ff. 45, disciples are invited to take their part also with or after him 8³⁴ ff. 10³⁸⁻⁴⁴. And thirdly we may observe that the eschatological discourse in Mk. 13 with its final reiterated command to watch brings the reader to a top-most peak of expectation. At 14¹ the narrative seems to call him to make a fresh start, as it were, from the bottom; but this is only because according to the teaching of this gospel the passion must be fulfilled before the goal is reached; and if this is so, when at Mk. 16⁷ the reader finds himself once more on the heights of expectation, there is a significant difference between the situation here and that at 13³⁵ ff.; for the prelude, the essential prelude, is now over; the passion and the resurrection have occurred.

None the less, we may question whether it is wise or possible to assert confidently that the words "There ye shall see him" in Mk. 16⁷ refer explicitly and exclusively to the event of the parousia. In the first place the verb ὀράω is certainly used in other parts of the New Testament with reference to temporary appearances of the risen Lord, as these are usually termed and as they are mentioned, for example, in 1 Cor. 15⁴⁻⁸, Lk. 24³⁴, Acts 13³¹ 26¹⁸. It is true that in all these instances the form of the verb is ὡφθη, "he was seen by . . .," a point on which great stress is laid by Dr. Lohmeyer. He is inclined to make a sharp distinction between this passive use of the verb, followed by the dative of the person who receives the revelation, in reference to the "appearances," and the use of δψεσθε and its cognates, considered above, in reference to the parousia. But references to appearances of the risen Lord are not confined

to the first aorist passive of ὁράω. The words of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 9¹ "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" almost certainly refer to an appearance of the risen Christ; and we find a similar use of this verb in Jn. 20^{18, 25, 29}. We may compare also the parts of the verb εἶδον used at Mt. 28¹⁷, Lk. 24³⁹, Jn. 20²⁰.

And in the second place we may remind ourselves that St. Mark no doubt knew well the tradition of the appearances to St. Peter and to others, as this tradition is mentioned, for example, in 1 Cor. 15⁵⁻⁸. It is true that in this latter passage no reference is made to the locality of the appearances, whereas in the fifth lecture we shall find reason to believe that for St. Mark Galilee is the divinely chosen sphere for the proclamation of the gospel, in contradistinction to Jerusalem. Galilee therefore was for this evangelist the natural and necessary scene for the last act in the drama of the gospel. But at the time when St. Mark wrote, the manifestations to St. Peter and to the rest had long been part of the tradition on which the church's faith was built, and the question remains how far the evangelist could regard the event anticipated in 16⁷ as the consummation. In any consideration of this problem much is likely to depend upon the degree of importance seen in the reference at Mk. 16⁷ to Galilee and upon the significance which this district is believed to have held in St. Mark's doctrine as a whole.¹

¹ In a recent German review of Dr. Lohmeyer's book attention was drawn to the fact that in Mk. 16⁷ the Lord is described as *preceding* his disciples into Galilee, and the question was raised whether, if Dr. Lohmeyer's interpretation of the passage is correct, it would not be more natural that the disciples should be bidden to go to Galilee and simply to await his manifestation there; why should the Lord be in Galilee before them?

So far as a reply can be attempted to this objection, it may be said that, his victory at Jerusalem having been accomplished, the Lord would naturally be found forthwith in Galilee, if this district is for St. Mark the land of eschatological fulfilment. He goes forthwith to Galilee and will there meet his disciples, just as he did in Mk. 1¹⁴ ^a. at the outset of the gospel.

On the assumption that Mk. 16^{7f.} is the close of this gospel, perhaps the wisest course would be to avoid the expressions "the consummation" or "the parousia" in connection with the passage, as they are avoided by the evangelist himself, and to say only that the reader is left in anticipation of an event, a crisis, which was to have and, we may add, was on one side found to have the quality of absolute finality. "He that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."¹

The "reserve" of St. Mark has been often noticed. He was faced, like all the writers of the books of our New Testament, with the necessity of accounting for a person and a revelation which in the last resort were found to defy complete analysis or explanation. In the case of our earliest evangelist the difficulty may have been particularly great. Fully aware, as he is likely to have been, of the important part played by such appearances as are narrated at 1 Cor. 15⁵⁻⁸ in the establishment and confirmation of the church's faith it may not have been his desire to narrate such "temporary" appearances; his purpose as an evangelist may have been to hold together as closely as possible the supreme events of the ministry, death, burial, resurrection and expected consummation. This is certainly true of his gospel as a whole; and so far as its conclusion is concerned, he may have carried out his purpose by a reference to the coming manifestation to the disciples and St. Peter in the district of salvation, that is, Galilee. In following the tradition which placed in this district the reunion of the disciples with their Master and in making the promise of it the climax of his gospel, St. Mark perhaps invites his readers to discern in the angel's message a reference rather to the appearance of the Son of man himself than to a passing revelation of the risen Christ.²

¹ Jn. 6³⁵; cf. Heb. 6⁵.

² On the whole subject of eschatology and history, the appendix to Professor C. H. Dodd's recent book *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* may be studied with advantage.

IV

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN

THE tradition with regard to the resurrection as set forth in the last chapter of St. Luke's gospel, with which for our present purpose the opening sections of the Acts of the Apostles may be conveniently taken, differs in certain important respects from the tradition followed by St. Mark and St. Matthew.

In the first place, Jerusalem and its neighbourhood are in St. Luke the sole scene of the events which form the sequel to the crucifixion. St. Luke not only relates no manifestations of the risen Christ to the disciples in Galilee; he expressly excludes the possibility of any such. In his story of the passion narrative he has no equivalent to Mk. 14²⁸; and the reference to Galilee in the angels' conversation with the women at the tomb has in his gospel a backward, not a forward reference: "Why seek ye him that liveth with the dead? Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying . . ." Lk. 24⁶. To the content of this verse and the next we will return in a moment; at present let us only notice that all the events narrated in Lk. 24 between the visit of the women to the tomb and the Lord's last parting from the eleven and those that were with them are represented by St. Luke as occurring in or near Jerusalem, and also, we

may add, according to the strict letter of the narrative, upon one and the same day, so that as regards both place and time everything set forth in this chapter is brought into very close and intimate connection. It is on that very day, we read, that the two disciples, one of whom is named Cleopas, set forth to the village named Emmaus at some distance from Jerusalem; and it is on the evening of the same day, as soon as they have recognized their fellow-traveller, that they rise up in that very hour and return to Jerusalem. While they are still relating their experiences to the eleven and their friends the Master himself is found standing in the midst of them; and thence he leads them out, after his last words, to the final parting from them over against Bethany, after which they return to Jerusalem. And finally, in the last words just referred to, Lk. 24⁴⁴⁻⁴⁹, it is expressly stated that the messengers of the christian gospel, as St. Luke conceives it, will make Jerusalem their starting-point, and the disciples are to remain there, until they are divinely empowered for their work; while in Acts 1⁴, still more emphatically, the apostles are charged not to leave Jerusalem, but to wait there for the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The possibility of manifestations of the risen Christ in Galilee is decisively excluded.¹

¹ It does not seem to be the case that St. Luke finds the same theological importance in Jerusalem as the necessary sphere of divine revelation, which St. Mark for example sees in Galilee; indeed the first recognition of the risen Lord to be narrated at length in St. Luke's gospel takes place in Emmaus, at some distance from the capital; but for reasons connected with St. Luke's general scheme and purpose as an evangelist and also historian of the early church Jerusalem and its neighbourhood form for him and for those on whose behalf he wrote

But this topographical definition of the appearances of the risen Christ is closely connected with another feature of the last chapter of St. Luke's gospel, in which once more he differs markedly from St. Mark and St. Matthew. We saw a moment ago that on the occasion of the visit of the women to the tomb the angelic mention of Galilee has in St. Luke a backward reference. It will be remembered that in St. Mark and St. Matthew Galilee is mentioned at this point in connection with the future: "He goeth before you into Galilee"; in whatever form the last act of the drama of the divine revelation is to be unfolded, the scene of it will be in Galilee; no reunion between the Lord and his disciples is contemplated, or regarded as possible, at Jerusalem; and one chief part of the purpose of the divine communication at the tomb is to point away from Jerusalem to Galilee. In Lk. 24^{6, 7} however the angels' words at the tomb have an altogether different purpose. They now contain no message to the disciples, nor have they any reference to the future. In St. Luke the women have discovered for themselves the absence of the body from the tomb and have been reduced to perplexity thereby, *before* the heavenly visitants appear; and it is their state of mind which determines the form of the communication made to them. The angels' purpose is to rebuke and at the

the focus and headquarters as it were of the christian revelation; and he regards one great part of this revelation as completed with the crucifixion and the resurrection. And the link between the events narrated in Lk. 22-24, by which the Christ has reached his glory 24²⁸, and the fresh start which is to be made with the coming of the day of Pentecost, is found in the continuous residence of the expectant disciples in Jerusalem.

same time to remove the women's perplexity by reminding them of words spoken to them by their Master while he was still in Galilee. It is implied that, if they had been mindful of these words, they would have had no cause to expect anything else than that which, it is implied, has now taken place. "Why seek ye him that liveth with the dead? remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." It will be noticed that although a reference to Galilee at this point is kept, the reference itself is deprived of any great significance, and the emphasis in the passage as a whole is, first, on the discovery by the women of the emptiness of the tomb and, secondly, on the divine explanation or justification of this by reference to the Master's words in Galilee. That of which he there forewarned them has now taken place. In Galilee he had told the women of the necessity that the Son of man should be delivered up and crucified and on the third day rise again; let them learn therefore from the empty tomb in which they stand that his words are now fulfilled.

It is extremely significant that St. Luke chooses to emphasize at this point the fulfilment of the prophecy or instruction, three times reiterated during the ministry, with regard to the passion, to be followed by the resurrection, of the Son of man.¹ This threefold

¹ In all the synoptists the prophecy is given in its briefest form on the second of the three occasions; but in St. Luke it is shortened at this point even more than in St. Matthew and St. Mark. At Lk. 9⁴⁴, the second occasion of the prophecy, we read simply, "The Son of man is to be delivered into the hands of men."

instruction is common in varying terms to all the synoptists in the earlier part of their narratives, but it is only St. Luke who pointedly draws attention to it here. In Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ and Mt. 28¹⁻¹⁰ the writers, as we have seen, look forward at once from the fact of the resurrection to that which in their view is to follow and complete it, and we have also seen reason to think that this further and final event is perhaps expected at any rate by St. Mark to be the appropriate manifestation of the Son of man; the future, last event will be his glory, a conception which has probably left its mark also, as we saw, upon St. Matthew's narrative.¹ But St. Luke in this chapter seems to regard the resurrection as itself finishing and completing the work of Jesus Christ. His victory is now complete.²

¹ It will be remembered that although the scene described in Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰ is not itself the consummation, the attributes mentioned in verse 18 as now belonging to the risen Lord are those granted to the Son of man in Daniel 7¹⁴, and the disciples are sent forth to their task in the strength of this revelation. To them the Lord is now made known as he will be known universally at the consummation; but meantime they have their appointed task, in the accomplishment of which he is permanently with them.

² It is true that St. Luke can speak at the beginning of his second volume, Acts 1¹, "of all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach until the day in which he was received up"; the writer does not regard the Lord's activity as ceasing after he parted from his disciples, Lk. 24⁵¹; cf. also Acts 16^{7b}; but the last chapter of St. Luke most emphatically brings to a close the Lord's work on earth, and an altogether fresh start is made, under a new dispensation, on the day of Pentecost.

We do not find this presentation in the other gospels.

In St. John the dispensation of the Spirit begins with the first meeting of the glorified Christ and his disciples on the resurrection day itself; nor is any departure on his part mentioned in this gospel;

It is clear that St. Luke attached the greatest importance to this idea of victory through suffering, in connection with the resurrection, for it is emphasized twice again in this last chapter, an emphasis to which no parallel will be found in the conclusions of the first two gospels. It is noticeable, however, that after 24⁷ he does not bring the idea into connection with the doctrine of Jesus as the Son of man, but with that of Jesus as the Christ. In 24²⁶, on the way to Emmaus, the two disciples are taught that only through the gate of suffering could *the Christ* enter into his glory; and in 24⁴⁴ ^a it is suggested that all parts of scripture, rightly understood, bear witness to the necessity of the victorious suffering of *the Christ*, and that in him who was at the moment standing in the midst of the disciples those scriptures have been now fulfilled; the work of the Christ himself, except for the fulfilment of the promise referred to in 24⁴⁹, that is, the coming of the Holy Spirit, is complete. In the last chapter of St. Luke there is no reference to the parousia or to the authority and power of the Son of man. With the exception of the verse 24⁷ just considered, in which

see page 94 f. Such break as there is in the intercourse between the Lord and his disciples in St. John takes place in the brief period between the crucifixion and the resurrection; it is not caused, as in St. Luke, by his removal after his resurrection into another sphere of being.

If the views put forward in the third lecture are on the whole correct, St. Matthew's gospel only achieves completion by giving a deeply eschatological significance to the reunion of the risen Lord with the eleven upon the mountain-top in Galilee, and no departure from them is recorded, rather the reverse, 28²⁰; while St. Mark we may feel, and with some justice, makes even less effort than St. John or St. Matthew at completeness.

the doctrine of the Son of man is mentioned, as in the pre-passion instructions, in connection with the death and resurrection, the Lord is conceived in this chapter, in connection with his death and resurrection, as Messiah.

The second difference therefore of which we become conscious on comparing St. Luke's traditions in this chapter with the parallel narratives of St. Mark and St. Matthew may be summed up thus. St. Mark and St. Matthew regard the resurrection as essentially preparatory, either to the last event itself or to a manifestation of the Lord as possessing after the resurrection all the attributes expected to be found in him at the parousia, that is, above all, as the Son of man; and in Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰, on the mountain top in Galilee, he commissions his representatives accordingly. But the record of the empty tomb and of the appearances of the risen Christ at or near Jerusalem in the last chapter of St. Luke teach the lesson that with the resurrection the work of Jesus Christ on earth is finished and completed. For him personally, if we may so speak, there remains only the final withdrawal from his followers, which neither in Lk. 24 nor Acts 1, the only two passages of the New Testament which give an account of the ascension,¹ is set forth as an exaltation of the Son of man. Rather the withdrawal as narrated in St. Luke's gospel is the closing scene in the revelation of Jesus the Messiah, and the disciples may be called his witnesses Lk. 24⁴⁸ more correctly

¹ If we do not admit the "western non-interpolation" at Lk. 24^{51b}, and we probably ought not to admit it, Acts 1⁹⁻¹¹ becomes the only passage in the first five books of the New Testament, apart of course from Mk. 16¹⁹, to give an account of the ascension; see p. 46, note 1.

than his representatives. And finally the link between the events narrated in Lk. 22-24, by which the Christ has reached his glory Lk. 24²⁸, and the fresh start which is to be made with the arrival of the day of Pentecost, is found in the continuous and unbroken residence of the expectant disciples in Jerusalem. But that which they are now expecting with great joy is the gift of the Holy Spirit rather than the final and awful consummation of all things with the appearance, in great power and glory, of the Son of man.

It remains to draw attention to a third difference between the presentation of the resurrection and its sequel in St. Luke and that which is given to us in the other two synoptists, although the difference in this last case is perhaps mainly one of emphasis. It concerns the nature of the resurrection, and the purpose of the appearances of the risen Christ, as these are recorded in St. Luke.

In St. Mark the fact of the resurrection and also of the empty tomb is stressed, but, this once done, it is not further dwelt upon; the women's thoughts are turned away at once from the grave at Jerusalem at the present moment to Galilee and the future reunion with the disciples there.

In St. Matthew the fact of the resurrection is emphasized more strongly and at greater length than in St. Mark, partly because the scene is now furnished with apocalyptic elements; but in this gospel as in St. Mark's the interest is still in that to which the resurrection points the way; even in the two appearances of the risen Lord which are recorded by St. Matthew the interest is not primarily in the resurrection. We saw, for example, that when the Lord meets the

women as they return from the tomb, Mt. 29^{9, 10}, no attempt is made to offer proofs of his identity; St. Matthew indeed shews no interest in this aspect of the risen Christ. The women recognize their Master immediately and grasp his feet; they have no fear that they are in the presence of a disembodied spirit. The purpose of the encounter is not to assure them that their Master lives; of this they are already well assured. The purpose of the two verses is to transmit, by means of the women, a definite instruction to his "brethren" that they leave for Galilee; there and there only, as it is implied, can they see him, Mt. 28^{7, 10, 16}. This instruction had been at most implied, it was not expressly given, in the angel's message to the women at the tomb. Whatever the nature of the meeting recorded in Mt. 28^{9, 10}, it is not put forward as a proof of the resurrection, and it is clearly regarded by the evangelist as different from and inferior to the meeting which is recorded at the final scene in Galilee, Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰; and this, as we saw, is very much more than a "resurrection appearance."

But in Lk. 24 the emphasis is on the resurrection in and for itself and on the Master as the risen one. "He is risen" is the great message of the chapter, and as testimony to it the evangelist seeks to offer evidence of a more physical and tangible kind than anything which appears in the two other synoptists.

In the first place, a greater emphasis is laid upon the emptiness of the tomb by St. Luke than by St. Mark and St. Matthew. These two evangelists lay great stress, in connection with the tomb, upon the rolling away of the stone which, as they relate, had been placed on the door of the tomb by Joseph of Arimathæa when

he completed his labour of love upon the Friday evening. It is probable that in this rolling back of the stone St. Mark and St. Matthew see a deep significance; to them it is perhaps the chief point of interest in reference to the tomb; indeed in St. Matthew's gospel the women apparently do not enter the tomb itself, and in both gospels the news of the absence of their Master from the tomb is conveyed in the angelic message, although the women are invited to verify its truth.

But for St. Luke the absence of the body from the tomb is the fact of primary importance; and in his gospel the women make the discovery that the tomb is empty, for themselves. At 24^a St. Luke does indeed allude to the rolling away of the stone, which he has not previously mentioned; but he does not dwell upon it, and seems to refer to it chiefly in order to explain how it came about that the women gained entrance to the tomb. This done, he concentrates the reader's interest on their discovery within the tomb: "they found not the body"; and it is this fact and their consequent perplexity, which gives rise to the angelic conversation.

But the emptiness of the tomb, although this receives greater emphasis in St. Luke than in the two other synoptists, is only the beginning of his story, especially since the report about it given by the women to the apostles "appeared in their sight as idle talk"; and accordingly we find, in the second place, that the purpose of the appearances which are now to be described, in Lk. 24^{13-31 and 38-51}, is above all to confirm belief in the identity of the risen and therefore victorious Messiah with the crucified and suffering Jesus.

With this matter St. Matthew, as we have seen, does not concern himself; except for the single note of hesitation on the part of some briefly referred to at 28¹⁶, he finds no difficulty upon this point. But it is conspicuously prominent in both the appearances recorded at length in the last chapter of St. Luke.

Thus in the first of these the Lord walks and converses for some time, all unknown for what he is, with the two travellers to Emmaus; his words indeed may cause their hearts to burn, as the meaning of the scriptures is unfolded to them, but he is at length only recognized, after he sits down to meat with them, by familiar gestures associated with the blessing, breaking and distribution of bread; thus his identity is attested, and their eyes are opened and they know him, although he at once vanishes from their sight.

And the same interest finds still stronger expression in the second story, that of the appearance to the eleven and the rest on the same evening at Jerusalem. On this occasion we read that in spite of their Master's salutation of peace the disciples are at first only frightened and dismayed, believing that they see no human person, but a disembodied spirit. Before their fears can be assuaged, they must be invited to assure themselves by the tests of sight and touch that their Master as they knew him formerly is once more with them; and later, before their incredulity is finally dispelled, he eats before them. The purpose of both these demonstrations, Lk. 24⁴⁰ and ⁴³, if we may so call them, is the same; namely, to convince the disciples that no unsubstantial spirit is standing in their midst; it is the same Jesus whom they have always known; he has left

the tomb and is now alive and still and truly with them; they are his witnesses.¹

We find ourselves therefore in the presence of at least three considerable differences between our first two gospels and the third in connection with their resurrection narratives.

St. Mark and St. Matthew differ from St. Luke, first, in respect of the scene where the risen Lord is or is to be made manifest; in the first two gospels, this is Galilee; in the third, Jerusalem or its neighbourhood.

Secondly, in their interpretation of the resurrection. For St. Mark and St. Matthew its importance is chiefly preparatory; it prepares the way for that which is to follow and complete it; but for St. Luke it is important in and by itself; it crowns the work of Jesus Christ.

And thirdly, in the manner of their interest in the resurrection. St. Mark and St. Matthew are content upon the whole to dwell upon the resurrection and the emptiness of the tomb as a fact; St. Luke is at pains to offer evidences for them. We have now to consider how the subject is dealt with by the last and greatest evangelist, St. John.

It is widely believed and it is indeed extremely probable that the fourth evangelist was aware of the existence and of the contents of earlier written gospels, whether or not these were identical with and more or less in number than the three synoptists. On the other hand, for all his indebtedness to his predecessors, he is usually also extremely independent of them and

¹ Attention should also be drawn to the interest shewn throughout Lk. 24 in the fulfilment of the scriptures in connection with the Lord's death and resurrection, verses 27, 32, 44-47.

goes his own peculiar way in the treatment of the material to his hand. This holds good no less of his twentieth chapter, with which it seems certain that he either ended or at one time intended to end his gospel, than of the first nineteen.

The sequence of events in the twentieth chapter is familiar. Before daybreak on the Sunday morning Mary Magdalene comes to the tomb and sees that the stone has been removed from it. No previous reference to the stone has been made by St. John, nor does he allude to it further; in both these respects his narrative is akin to St. Luke's, not to St. Mark's or St. Matthew's. Mary Magdalene infers from the removal of the stone that the Lord has been placed elsewhere, and comes running with the news to St. Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved.¹ These two then go running to the tomb, and a careful description is given of the state in which the linen cloths were found within the tomb. In these cloths Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus had enfolded the body on the Friday evening, and it is implied that the body was now no longer there. Indeed, we read that the beloved disciple on entering the tomb "saw and believed." We notice therefore that great weight is assigned by the fourth evangelist to the evidence of the empty grave. It is regarded as sufficient to engender belief in the beloved disciple, a belief which is apparently regarded as the more remarkable, because "as yet

¹ It should be noticed that in St. John the discovery that the tomb is empty is made not only or chiefly by Mary Magdalene 20², but by St. Peter and the beloved disciple 20³⁻⁹. In the synoptic gospels the discovery is made by the women only, for we are probably right in regarding Lk. 24¹² as a later addition to the text of the third gospel.

they knew not the scripture,¹ that " their Master " must rise again from the dead."

The two disciples having gone away home again, we are brought back to Mary Magdalene, who is now introduced afresh, standing by the tomb in tears. On this occasion she stoops and looks into the tomb, which previously it seems she had not done, 20¹²; and now she is granted a vision of two angels, whose position in the tomb is described. It is remarkable that this is the only reference to angels in St. John's gospel, apart from the important words spoken to Nathaniel at the end of the first chapter, 1⁵¹.

To the angels' inquiry why she weeps she replies almost with the same words which she had used to the two disciples, 20²; but thereafter she turns back, away from the grave, and becomes conscious of the presence of one whom she thinks to be the gardener. To his inquiry as regards her sorrow and her quest she again assumes in her reply that the body of her Lord has been removed and can be found elsewhere, and then once more, it seems, concentrates her attention on the grave. But on hearing herself addressed by name she turns round for the second time and now becoming aware of the presence of Jesus greets him with the Hebrew title of respect, Rabboni. Thus far then we notice two further points of contact, amid much difference, between St. John and St. Luke; in addition to their similar reference to the removal of the stone, each alludes to *two* heavenly visitants, and each (unlike St. Matthew) represents friends or disciples as failing at first to discern the presence of the risen Lord.

In the next verse 20¹⁷ however we come upon an

¹ Cf. Lk. 24 ²⁵⁻²⁷, 44-47.

important point or perhaps two points of contact, again amidst much difference, with St. Matthew. Mary Magdalene is bidden not to touch her Lord,¹ but, as in Mt. 28¹⁰, she is given a message from him to the disciples, who here as there are called his "brethren." The message in St. John is an announcement of the Lord's imminent if not immediate ascension to the Father, that return which is constantly mentioned in this gospel as the destined conclusion of "the work" of Jesus Christ. Mary Magdalene delivers the message to the disciples, prefacing it with the announcement "I have seen the Lord."

On the same evening of that first day of the week Jesus fulfils the promise given to the disciples at the last supper, that he would not leave them desolate, but would come to them. We read that, the disciples being gathered together behind closed doors for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in their midst and having given them the salutation of peace² shewed to them his hands and his side. "Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord." The salutation of peace is then renewed, and forthwith they receive their commission: "as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you"; and the Holy Spirit is

¹ The words are best understood as deprecating an attempt on Mary's part to "stay" her Lord, who is now "going to the Father." His work on earth is completed and he will now stand in a new relationship to believers. By means of his ascent to the Father, he will become more closely united with the disciples than he previously could be.

² The emphasis in St. John on the bestowal of this gift by the risen Lord is remarkable. It is mentioned at 14²⁷ and 16³³ and is bestowed at 20^{19, 21, 26}. Elsewhere in the resurrection narratives it only appears in a "western non-interpolation" at Lk. 24³⁶.

bestowed upon them by the action of breathing, together with the power to loose and to bind. The narrative here should be carefully compared with the discourse at the last supper in Jn. 14¹²⁻²⁸, of which it may be regarded as the fulfilment. The close connection between the coming of Jesus to the disciples, after the brief period of the separation caused by the passion, and the gift of the Holy Spirit to them is emphasized in both contexts.¹

In this section which we have just considered, Jn. 20¹⁹⁻²³, dealing with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, we have St. John's version of the fulfilment of "the promise" referred to in Lk. 24⁴⁹, the last recorded words of the risen Christ in that gospel, and it might be thought that St. John's narrative could now be brought to a close; but one further scene is narrated, which culminates in the last words of Jesus Christ in this gospel as it was originally conceived. The sentence itself is often called the last beatitude, and its purpose is to declare the blessedness, a word of great and comprehensive significance in the New Testament, of that type of religious faith which does not walk by sight or crave external proof.

We read that one of the twelve, St. Thomas, was not with his fellow-disciples at the coming of the Lord, and he refuses to accept the news they bring to him, the same news which Mary Magdalene gave to them, except on the most compelling evidence of an external

¹ The content, however, of 20¹⁹⁻²³ is in certain respects so different from the anticipations of 14¹²⁻²⁸, that the evangelist, who perhaps gives expression to his own interpretation of the gospel in 14²²⁻²⁸, at 20¹⁹⁻²³ may be making use of an existing tradition. In any case 20^{22b} recalls 1³⁰.

kind. It is possible that the two previous references to St. Thomas in this gospel throw light upon his temperament, and upon the story which is here narrated of him. When at 11¹⁸ the Lord announces his determination to return into Judæa again, in spite of the danger of physical violence from the Jews, St. Thomas says to his fellow-disciples, "Let us also go that we may die with him." And secondly, when the Lord at the last supper says to the disciples, "Whither I go, ye know the way," St. Thomas replies as bluntly as before, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest; how know we the way?"

Returning therefore to 20²⁶, we read that a week later the scene of the preceding Sunday is repeated, the evidence which St. Thomas has demanded is forthcoming, and he is invited to avail himself of it and to become "not faithless, but believing." The offer apparently is not accepted, but it leads to a supreme confession of faith on the part of the disciple. "Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." On the other hand, his reply is followed by the utterance of the Lord, which we have just considered. This reply, although it does not necessarily contain a rebuke to the type of faith represented by St. Thomas, does unquestionably bestow the final blessing of the gospel story upon a faith which involves a spiritual apprehension of the revelation recorded in this gospel; and it has been St. John's purpose to provide his readers with the means to this. They are assured in this last scene that there is a better way to the knowledge of God, which is eternal life, than that which was chosen by St. Thomas.

We may notice, in passing, that no mention is made,

on either of the occasions when the disciples saw the Lord, of his departure from them. In this respect St. John's narrative resembles the last scene in St. Matthew.

We have now to consider the contribution of the fourth evangelist to the matters thus far considered in connection with the resurrection narratives. We found that the chief contrasts in this matter between the last chapters of St. Mark and of St. Matthew on the one hand and that of St. Luke on the other could be summarized thus:

(*a*) In the first two gospels the scene of importance after the resurrection is or is to be Galilee; in the third it is and remains Jerusalem.

(*b*) In the first two gospels the resurrection is preparatory to a further, final event; in the third it is regarded as itself the completion of the work of Jesus Christ.

(*c*) In the first two gospels the fact of the resurrection and the empty tomb is stressed, but it is not further dwelt on; St. Luke on the other hand emphasizes both the evidence for the disappearance of the Lord's body from the tomb and also the attestation for the nature of the risen body.

Let us take these three points of contrast separately, and consider St. John's attitude to each of them.

As regards the first, St. John in ch. 20 sides with St. Luke in his preference for Jerusalem to Galilee. The city itself indeed is not mentioned by name in this chapter, whereas Galilee is mentioned three times in Mt. 28, and Jerusalem four times in Lk. 24; but just as the whole chapter Jn. 20 is closely bound together by three notes of time, at verses 1, 19, and 26, so we

must assume, in the absence of explicit statement to the contrary, that it also holds together in respect of unity of place, and that the assembly of disciples in verses 19 and 26 is conceived as taking place in or near Jerusalem. At the same time it is possibly not accidental that Jerusalem is mentioned for the last time in this gospel at 12¹², before the opening of St. John's passion narrative proper at 13¹; and in any case we shall do well to bear in mind the important saying to the woman of Samaria in Jn. 4²¹: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father . . . God is Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth."

We have next to ask whether the resurrection in St. John is preparatory to something further, as in St. Mark and St. Matthew; or whether it is itself the crown of the work of Jesus Christ, as in St. Luke. Before we attempt to answer this question, which is one of great difficulty, let us recall some obvious points of similarity, which we have already noticed, between Lk. 24 and Jn. 20. Each refers to two heavenly visitants at the tomb, and each has a scene, or scenes, in which the risen Lord is not immediately recognized by friends or disciples. We may now add that St. John at 20¹⁷ has a reference to the ascension, of which St. Luke gives an account in Acts 1, and that St. John records the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, to which St. Luke also refers at Lk. 24⁴⁹. Externally therefore the resemblances between St. John and St. Luke are much more obvious than those between St. John and St. Matthew.

And yet it seems to be true that doctrinally St. John is nearer to St. Matthew than to St. Luke. Let us

consider in this connection the message from the risen Lord to the disciples which in both St. Matthew and St. John is entrusted to Mary Magdalene (and according to Mt. 28¹ to the other Mary also). In St. Matthew the message is a charge to the disciples to leave for Galilee, that they may see their Master there; and the meeting is described in the last five verses of St. Matthew's gospel. We noticed in the third lecture that since this meeting is now a recorded event like other events, it cannot be the actual consummation; but he who in it gives a final charge to his disciples makes himself known as having received all power in both heaven and earth, that is, as the Son of man, and, as such, being ever with them in their work until the end. This is the final revelation in St. Matthew's gospel.

In St. John the message to the disciples runs thus: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." We have here indeed no command to the disciples to leave for Galilee, nor any reference to their seeing Jesus; we have only a message respecting the last act as it were in the revelation of their Master. For the ascent or return of Jesus to the Father is constantly set forth in St. John's gospel as the end and completion of his work. As early as 7³³ we read "Yet a little while am I with you, and I go unto him that sent me"; and the same note is struck at least eight times in the passion narrative. The Son therefore now returns to the Father, who sent him into the world to perform the work which he had now accomplished. But twice in the earlier part of St. John's gospel this "ascension" to the Father, if we may so call it, is expressly connected with the Son of

man; at 3¹³ we read "No one hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, namely, the Son of man": and at 6⁶² "What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" and the verb used is in both cases the same as that in 20¹⁷.

In so far then as the Lord's message to the disciples in St. John contains by implication a reference to the Son of man, it has probably a real affinity, in spite of much difference, with the doctrine of St. Matthew, the chief difference being that in St. John the meeting of the Lord and his disciples now takes a different form. According to St. John, at the first reunion of the Lord with his disciples on that "first day of the week," as soon as they have been assured that they see him, that it is their Master, he fulfils to them the promise which he made at the last supper with regard to his return; they are commissioned, and they receive the Holy Spirit; and this is his own presence, the presence of the Son of man, under another and more abiding form. For it is probable that the ascension is regarded as having taken place *before* this meeting. In St. John the ascension of the Lord to the Father, like his coming forth into the world from the Father, is secret and is treated with very great reserve; but we notice that the message sent to the disciples, *before* they see their Master, is that he is now ascending; presumably therefore at the time when he himself sees and speaks with them, that of which he spoke in the message has now taken place; otherwise why had the message to be sent, if he could have told them its content later the same day? We may observe also that on the morning of that day Mary Magdalene was bidden not

to touch her Master, *because* he had not yet ascended to the Father; but at the second meeting with the disciples a week later, St. Thomas is expressly invited to do that which had been refused to Mary Magdalene; presumably, therefore, the reason given—that the ascension to the Father had not yet occurred—had in the meantime, that is at any rate before the second meeting, ceased to be a difficulty. But on all grounds it is probable that the return to the Father is regarded as taking place between the appearance to Mary Magdalene and the giving of the Holy Spirit; and St. John would thus be following the earlier tradition, in so far as the giving of the Holy Spirit takes place *after* the ascension.¹

But so great is St. John's transmutation in chapter 20 of the earlier narratives, that it is difficult to say how far he links himself with the first two gospels or with the third as regards the preparatory or the final character of the resurrection. Doctrinally however he is certainly nearer to the first two gospels than to the

¹ Cf. also such passages in the last discourse as 14¹⁶, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may be with you for ever": 16⁷, "If I go not away, the Paraclete will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you."

The extreme reserve with which St. John treats the doctrine of the Lord's ascension should be noticed; it is not described any more than the "descent" of the Son of God is described at the outset of the record. And in neither case is there any thought in St. John of a movement in space. The descent of the Son of God is his act of self-dedication on behalf of mankind, involving condescension to the lowest place, cf. 13¹ ^{R.}; his ascent occurs in his accomplishment of his Father's will, which was perfectly carried out in and through his death 19³⁰, cf. 17⁴. The Lord's death in St. John is even more the moment of his greatest glory than of his final self-abasement; for in this gospel in his act of condescension is revealed his glory.

third. While superficially he seems in his record to have much close contact with St. Luke, his doctrine is in reality much more precise and exact than that of the third gospel, and has definite affinity with that of the first two synoptists, although this is difficult to perceive, chiefly because of his reinterpretation, throughout the whole of his gospel, of the doctrine of the Son of man.

Our third and last consideration can be briefly dealt with. We found that St. Luke was at pains to dwell upon the evidences for the resurrection, as shewn by the empty grave and the nature and properties of the risen body, while St. Mark and St. Matthew are content to state the facts and then to leave them.

The record in Jn. 20 seems in this respect to have a double purpose and thus to be in sympathy with both these views. On the one hand great care is shewn in the description of the empty tomb, the witnesses of which are now not the women, or a woman, only, but also St. Peter, the leader of the twelve, and the beloved disciple; and similarly reference is made to the wounded hands and side of the Lord on both the occasions when he shews himself to his disciples. On the other hand, the purpose of the "resurrection appearances" in St. John is by no means simply to assure the disciples that their Lord is risen. Perhaps we may say that in this gospel no appearance of the risen Lord is altogether an end in itself. Even the appearance to Mary Magdalene issues at once in a message to the disciples, and the message is not about the resurrection, but about the completion of their Master's "work"; the Lord's first meeting with the disciples leads at once to their commission, and he

bestows on them the Holy Spirit; and at the second final meeting his last words bestow a peculiar blessing on those whose faith does not depend on sight.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

THE NARRATIVE OF ST. JOHN 21

Some reference must be made to the record of the manifestation of the risen Lord to seven disciples at the sea of Tiberias as described in Jn. 21, although for the sake of clearness a discussion of this chapter has not been included in the text of the lectures.

The chapter Jn. 21 as it stands in our bibles is clearly intended to follow closely upon the narrative of Jn. 20. Thus the manifestation is described in 21^{1, 14} as the third granted to the disciples after the resurrection, the first two being apparently those narrated in Jn. 20^{19 ff., 20 ff.} It also resembles the narrative of Jn. 20, and we may add of Lk. 24, in that the disciples do not immediately recognize their Master 21^{4, 7}; cf. 20¹⁴ Lk. 24^{16, 37}. And in style and language, and to a certain extent in outlook also, it is not to be distinguished from the previous chapters of St. John.¹

None the less, in spite of the link between the two chapters provided by 21^{1, 14}, there is a definite break between Jn. 20 and Jn. 21. In the first place the scene in Jn. 20 appears to be laid in Jerusalem; the doors are shut where the disciples are, for fear of the Jews 20¹⁹. In Jn. 21 on the contrary the scene is

¹ The connection of the beloved disciple and St. Peter at 21^{7, 20 ff.} recalls 13^{23 f., 20² ff.} With the exception of the sons of Zebedee, the disciples mentioned by name in 21⁸ have already played some part in this gospel. The silent awe of the disciples in the presence of their Master at 21^{12b} is similar to that at 4²⁷. The language used to describe the meal of bread and fish in 21^{13 f.} has affinities with that used to describe the meal of bread and fish in 6^{4 ff.} The expression "two (other) of his disciples" at 21² is found also at 1³⁰. The note in 21¹⁴ is of the same character as those in 2¹¹ 4⁶⁴. Finally with 21^{10a} cf. 12³³ 18³²; with 21^{10b} cf. 13³⁶; and with 21²⁴ cf. 19²⁶.

laid at the sea of Tiberias 21¹, that is, in Galilee.¹ Secondly, in Jn. 20 the risen Christ twice meets his disciples in circumstances of great solemnity, and one purpose though by no means the only purpose of these meetings is to assure them of the reality of the resurrection. After the second of these meetings the chapter closes with an impressive passage in which the writer's purpose and his hope for his readers are set forth. It may be said with confidence that but for the addition of Jn. 21 in all our authorities the gospel as a whole would have been thought to reach a carefully planned conclusion at the end of Jn. 20. In Jn. 21 however this conclusion is disregarded and a fresh start is made. In spite of all that has been narrated in Jn. 20, seven disciples are found in Galilee and St. Peter has returned to his former occupation as a fisherman. The meeting of the risen Christ and these disciples which now takes place is described as a "manifestation" to them, 21^{1, 14}. This word is not used in Jn. 20, and in reference to appearances of the risen Lord it occurs elsewhere only in the appendix to St. Mark's gospel, 16^{12, 14}.² And thirdly, the narrative of Jn. 21 is not designed like that of Jn. 20 to offer evidence for the resurrection; a definite reference to the resurrection is only made in a participial clause at the end of verse 14. Indeed but for 21^{1, 14}, the verses which form the introduction and conclusion to the first part of the record in this chapter, the contents of Jn. 21 might have been placed in the course of the ministry,³ although the threefold injunction to St. Peter in 21¹⁶ ²¹ no doubt presupposes the latter's threefold denial of his Master.

In connection therefore with our inquiry we find that Jn. 21, although it is to be regarded as an integral part of the fourth gospel, in certain respects resembles the Marcan and Matthæan resurrection narratives more closely than those of Lk. 24 or Jn. 20. First, it places the manifestation in Galilee. Secondly,

¹ Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 82.

² At Col. 3⁴, 1 Jn. 2²⁸ 3² it has reference to the manifestation at the consummation.

³ With Jn. 21^{4b}, for example, when the disciples at first fail to discern the Lord's presence, we may compare Mt. 14²⁶⁻²⁸.

it does not present the manifestation as designed to prove or bear witness to the resurrection. Thirdly, it is chiefly concerned with two subjects, the mission and the leadership of the church; and in this respect it is even more akin to Mt. 28¹⁶⁻³⁰ than to Jn. 20²¹⁻²². Fourthly, in its reference to the Lord's coming 21²², it looks forward to the consummation; and this as we have seen is true also of Mt. 28¹⁶⁻³⁰ and perhaps also of Mk. 16¹⁻⁸, but not of Lk. 24 or Jn. 20.

The story of the chapter consists of three parts, although the connection between the parts is not altogether clear; first the great draught of fishes, secondly the meal on the beach, and thirdly the threefold commission to St. Peter, with a supplement in reference to the beloved disciple.

At the outset St. Peter, accompanied by six other disciples, four of whom are named, goes a-fishing; and, as on the occasion described at Lk. 5¹⁻¹¹, in the absence of their Master they have no success. As dawn is breaking, they become aware of an unknown stranger on the shore; but the story does not suggest that they have any suspicion of his identity, until after obeying his instructions they have great success, so great indeed that at first they cannot bring their catch to land, 21⁶. In the end this seems to be achieved by St. Peter alone 21¹¹, and the unbroken net is found to contain fish of every kind.¹

¹ Jn. 21¹¹ is perhaps best understood symbolically. St. Peter is in reality a fisher of men, Mk. 1¹⁷, Lk. 5¹⁰; the unbroken net, Jn. 21¹¹, symbolizes the unity of the church; and if it was generally believed at the beginning of our era, as St. Jerome's words below suggest, that one hundred and fifty-three different species of fish existed, the catch will represent the universality of the church's commission and appeal.

This interpretation of Jn. 21¹¹ appears to be supported by St. Jerome's words in his comment on Ezekiel 47⁶⁻¹². Referring to the many fish which will be found in the Dead Sea after its waters have been healed, he explicitly refers to the story of Jn. 21¹¹ and to the precise number given in Jn. 21¹¹, and continues: " Aiunt autem qui de animantium scripsere naturis et proprietate, qui ἀλιευτικὰ tam latino quam graeco didicere sermone, de quibus Oppianus Cilix est

After their task is completed, on the invitation of their Master the disciples partake of a meal, prepared and dispensed by him. The solemn language in which the meal is described recalls the feeding of the multitude in Jn. 6. On that occasion the inference of those present was that they had found "the prophet that should come into the world"; but in 21¹² the disciples are well aware that their host is none other than the risen Lord.

The first section of the third part of the story describes St. Peter's restoration and commission. With clear reference to such passages as 13³⁷ and still more Mk. 14²⁸, the disciple is asked whether his love for his Master is indeed greater than that of others. In reply St. Peter, avoiding all comparisons, appeals only to his Master's knowledge of the reality of his devotion, and his thrice-repeated avowal is on each occasion followed by the bestowal upon him of a commission as shepherd, perhaps we should say chief shepherd, of his Master's sheep.¹ To the commission is added the prophecy of his martyrdom and the command to him to follow his Lord. In the last words of this third scene St. Peter asks about the destiny and future of the beloved disciple, who is also following; and the story closes

poeta doctissimus, centum quinquaginta tria esse genera piscium: quae omnia capta sunt ab apostolis, et nihil remansit incaptum: dum et nobiles et ignobiles, divites et pauperes, et omne genus hominum de mari huius saeculi extrahitur ad salutem."

The poet Oppian probably flourished in the latter half of the second century A.D. He wrote a poem entitled τὰ Ἀλιευτικά, but so far as I know does not refer in it to the number of species of fish believed to exist; and he is perhaps only mentioned here by St. Jerome as having been the author of a famous poem on the subject of fish. St. Jerome however not infrequently refers to the writings of the elder Pliny, and it is possible that he may have Pliny's *Natural History* in mind here. In it the following passage occurs: "Non alienum videtur indicare per tot maria . . . animalia centum quadraginta quattuor omnino generum esse" (*Hist. Nat.* xxxii, 53). Variant readings are found for the numbers here, although none corresponds exactly with that given by St. Jerome above; and in *Hist. Nat.* ix, 43 Pliny himself gives another, smaller estimate of the number of species of fish.

¹ Cf. Jn. 10¹⁻¹⁶.

with an explanation of the Lord's reply to St. Peter, which, as the writer is at pains to show, had been misunderstood.

The position assigned to St. Peter in Jn. 21 is remarkable. He takes the initiative in the first scene, 21³; he is the chief and perhaps the only successful agent in securing the draught of fishes, 21¹¹; he alone receives the commission to feed and tend the Lord's sheep; and it is prophesied of him that he will follow his Lord, even to martyrdom. On the other hand it is the beloved disciple who first recognizes the Lord upon the beach and makes known his discovery to St. Peter; and in the last scene of the chapter St. Peter seems to receive a rebuke in reply to his inquiry about the future of the beloved disciple.

If it is one chief purpose of Jn. 20 to narrate the inauguration of the "new creation," the purpose of Jn. 21 is not dissimilar, although the setting is now very different. The themes treated in symbolic language are those of the mission and leadership of the universal church; and it should be noticed that in spite of the reference in Jn. 21²² to a future "coming" the risen Lord is not described as leaving his disciples after the last scene, any more than in Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰ or Jn. 20.

V

THE NARRATIVE OF THE MINISTRY IN ST. MARK AND ST. MATTHEW

WE have now considered in detail the evidence of the resurrection narratives in our four canonical gospels as regards the setting of their story. We found that while all the gospels agree with one accord upon the fact of the resurrection, the synoptic writers divide themselves sharply into two classes, the one consisting of St. Mark and St. Matthew and the other of St. Luke, with reference to the most important topographical centre after the resurrection, St. Mark and St. Matthew placing this in Galilee, St. Luke at Jerusalem. This led us to consider certain other contrasts between these two classes in their resurrection narratives, contrasts which are probably not unconnected with the particular contrast which we set out to consider; and owing to the brevity of St. Mark's resurrection narrative 16¹⁻⁸, the comparison became now for the most part one between St. Matthew and St. Luke, although there is no reason to think that St. Mark's doctrine differs from St. Matthew's to any great extent. This inquiry revealed that St. Matthew in Mt. 28 regards the risen Christ chiefly in respect of his office as the Son of man. It is in accordance with this view that St. Mark and St. Matthew appear to regard the resurrection as preparatory to a still greater event, which may be in

the last resort the consummation; apart from the fact of the resurrection, the reader's attention is directed almost wholly to that which is still future, to that for which the resurrection has prepared the way; and no great interest is shewn in the evidences for the resurrection, as these are usually called, except that St. Matthew incidentally refutes the jewish calumny that the body had been stolen from the tomb.

St. Luke on the other hand in Lk. 24 thinks of the Lord chiefly in respect of his office as Messiah, who has won his victory and his right to the kingship through his faithful obedience unto death. By and with the resurrection he *has entered* on his glory; his work is now complete, and for him there remains only the final withdrawal to the Father's side. In accordance with this interpretation we found in Lk. 24 no reference to the future, apart from the brief allusions to the destined spread of the gospel from Jerusalem and to the sending forth in due course upon the expectant disciples the promise of the Father, that is, the Holy Spirit. Rather, St. Luke's interest is in the evidences for the resurrection and in the conformity of all that had occurred with the divine witness of the scriptures.¹

The attitude of the fourth evangelist to the varied testimony of his predecessors was found to be complex, and difficult to estimate. While in Jn. 20 he tacitly ranges himself on the side of St. Luke as regards topography, and also shews signs of being influenced by the Lucan tradition and up to a point sympathizing with it, he yet altogether restamps it in the light of his own conception of the work of Jesus Christ and

¹ As regards the doctrine of Acts 1 and 2 in this respect, see note 3 on p. 39.

thereby comes nearer to the doctrinal position of St. Mark and St. Matthew than to that of St. Luke, although in Jn. 20 there is now no anticipation of a *future* manifestation of the Son of man. St. John's narrative in this chapter however can only be satisfactorily understood after his previous narrative in the first nineteen chapters has been taken into account.

In Jn. 21, which should probably be regarded as a supplement to the first twenty chapters but none the less an integral part of the book, the evangelist shews certain affinities with the Marcan and Matthæan presentation of this part of the gospel story. For the scene of the events described is laid in Galilee, although Galilee itself is not named any more than Jerusalem is named in Jn. 20; and like Mt. 28¹⁶⁻²⁰ the chapter is concerned rather with the mission and leadership of the church under its divine Lord than with evidences for his resurrection. And finally there is an incidental reference to his "coming," a note which is markedly absent from Lk. 24 or Jn. 20. It seems therefore that in Jn. 20 and 21 justice is done in a measure to both forms of the tradition found in the synoptists. In the fourth gospel as we have it they stand side by side, although each is seen in a new light.

During the last few years much attention has been paid, in this country notably by Dr. C. H. Dodd, to the earliest forms which we can trace of the apostolic preaching of the gospel, and we are now invited to see certain aspects of this preaching from a new and significant angle. The chief difference between the earlier conception of the apostolic preaching and that which is being put before us at the present time may be illustrated by a comparison between Dr. Dodd and his

predecessor at Cambridge, Dr. F. C. Burkitt, in respect of the explanation which they severally give of the great importance assigned in the New Testament writings to the fulfilment of prophecy.

To Professor Burkitt the interest shewn by the early church in the fulfilment of prophecy was due chiefly to an apologetic motive. "The argument from prophecy," he says,¹ "is ultimately an attempt to shew that the life and mission of Jesus was no divine freak or caprice, but a part of a well-ordered whole. . . . The power of the argument from prophecy, both the motive force which prompted its use and its effect upon those who were influenced by it, was that it attempted to legitimize the gospel history, to shew that it was the legitimate outcome of the religion of holy men of old."

But in the constant appeal throughout the New Testament to the fulfilment of scripture Professor Dodd sees much more than an attempt to justify the gospel story and to assign to it its rightful place in the age-long story of God's dealings with his people. The gospel preaching, so far as it was concerned with events which had already taken place, concentrated attention on three things in particular, the life, the death and the resurrection of the Lord; and these events had indeed their essential and permanent connection with all that had preceded and led up to them; but the events themselves were not proclaimed as merely one more link in a continuous chain; they represented an end as well as a beginning, for in them the church had been led to discern the *fulfilment* of the promises of God. It had therefore now become pos-

¹ *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 201.

sible for men to taste the powers of the age to come¹; the kingdom of God was no longer only a matter of hope and expectation; the fulness of the time had come² and a new age or order was inaugurated.

In the light of this conception, it is not altogether sufficient to say that the apostolic preaching of the gospel on the one hand looked back to the ministry, the death and the resurrection of the Lord, and on the other hand looked forward to his future coming. Such a statement fails to do justice to the close and essential interconnection of past and future in the earliest preaching of the gospel, for the saving events of the past were now seen in an "absolute" or "eschatological" light; and conversely the future, whatever it might hold in store, was to some extent already known or guaranteed owing to its essential connection with that part of the gospel which, already a matter of past history, had received a living embodiment in the church under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The eschatology of the early church is thus twofold. On the one hand we have "realized eschatology": the belief that with the coming of Jesus Christ the fulness of time has arrived, the prophecies are fulfilled, the kingdom of God is no longer wholly a matter of the future. On the other hand we have an eschatology which still looks to the future for the consummation of that which is already known and present. This "realized eschatology" is common to all the four evangelists. They differ however with regard to the relation conceived to exist between the fulfilment which is already matter of history, and the further

¹ Heb. 6⁵.

² Gal. 4¹.

fulfilment which belongs to the future; and we are now beginning to perceive that in connection with the realization of the eschatology they differ also with regard to the estimate in which they hold the different areas of Palestine, where the ministry of Jesus Christ was passed. There seems reason to believe that for St. Mark and St. Matthew the area of salvation, if we may use the term, is Galilee and not Judæa or Jerusalem, which is regarded as the sphere of sin and death; while for St. Luke the area of salvation is the whole land, Galilee, Samaria, Judæa alike, and perhaps especially Jerusalem. About St. John's contribution it will perhaps be best to say nothing for the present.

But before we deal with the evidence of St. Mark, it is advisable to say a few words about the boundaries of Galilee in the time of Jesus Christ. It appears to be not possible to define precisely the extent of the district which the word Galilee as used in the gospels is understood to signify. Since the time of the Maccabees and especially since that of Herod the Great, who died about the beginning of our era, this district had experienced several changes of government, and its boundaries had fluctuated. It seems however that at the time with which we are concerned Galilee may be regarded as comprising the whole district which stretched from the plain of Jezreel in the south to Mount Hermon in the north. If so, its limits would only be Samaria on the south, and Syria on the north, both these districts being outside the Jewish pale. Even Galilee itself however was regarded with disfavour by strict Jewish piety at Jerusalem, owing to the strong strain of gentile elements in its population and the consequent infiltration of Greek

ideas and ways of life, to the presence of which in Galilee the gospels themselves bear witness.

The word Galilee occurs in St. Mark twelve times, and always in narrative, except in two places, 14²⁸ and 16⁷. This fact enhances the significance of these two passages, the one consisting of the Lord's last words to his disciples as a body in this gospel, and the other of the angel's message to the disciples by means of the women at the tomb. The passages were considered at length in the third lecture and the conclusion was reached that they perhaps point to Galilee as the destined or expected scene of the consummation of the gospel revelation, in contradistinction to Jerusalem, which for whatever reason was not to be or could not be its seat.

The remaining ten passages all occur in narrative and, with one exception¹ which is not of primary importance for our purpose, in the first nine chapters. These chapters deal with events occurring in the north of Palestine, that is, either in Galilee or its immediate neighbourhood. Only at 10¹ is this region finally quitted for the south. The section 1¹⁴ to 9⁵⁰ is indeed often named the Galilean ministry, in contrast to the "last week" at Jerusalem, the narrative of which extends from 11¹ to 16⁸, chapter 10, with its mention of the borders of Judæa, Peræa and Jericho, being a connecting link between these two chief sections of the book.

We have seen that great emphasis is laid upon Galilee in 14²⁸ and 16⁷ as the scene of the expected event or events after the resurrection, and we have now

¹ Mk. 15⁴¹, the reference to the women at the crucifixion, "who, when he was in Galilee, followed him and ministered to him."

to ask in what light Galilee is regarded in the first nine chapters of St. Mark.

I have pointed out elsewhere¹ that Mk. 1¹⁻¹³ probably forms a single section and should be regarded as the introduction or prologue to the book as a whole. No break should be made, as in the text of Westcott and Hort, after verse 7; but there should be a considerable break after verse 13. Just as the first eighteen verses of St. John's gospel put into the reader's hands at the outset the key by which he is to understand the contents of the book as a whole, so the first thirteen verses of St. Mark's gospel are designed to explain the importance of the events dealt with in the rest of the book, and the person and office of the central figure. Both prologues dwell upon the relation of Jesus to John the Baptist, in whose appearance St. Mark and his teachers had been led to discern the return of Elijah the prophet, regarded as the immediate herald of the expected day of the Lord; and in each book it is shewn that, however great and important the forerunner, his work pales into insignificance when set against the arrival of him, whose way John had prepared.

Thus these verses of St. Mark contain both a backward and a forward reference.

(a) They recall certain beliefs of the Jews with regard to the expected supreme intervention of their God in the events of the world's history. This intervention, which the Jews believed would bring the course of history, as it had been known hitherto, to an end, was to be prepared for, according to contemporary expectation, by the return of Elijah the prophet, who

¹ *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, p. 62 f.

would make the final preparations for the end. When therefore we read in Mk. 1⁴ a description of the appearance of the Baptist, we are reminded, by the way in which the story is told in our present text,¹ of his resemblance to the prophet Elijah; and the very strong expressions in Mk. 1⁵, that all the country of Judæa and all the dwellers in Jerusalem went out to him, are probably not to be regarded as picturesque exaggeration, but emphasize that which was only to be expected at the appearance of the herald of the end.

(*b*) The mission and work of the Baptist were essentially preparatory. His task was to warn his hearers that the final divine intervention referred to above was imminent, and to prepare them for it. At the time when St. Mark's gospel was written, that part of the church in which this gospel arose believed that this intervention had now taken place, although it was not yet complete. In the life and work of Jesus Christ, above all in his death and resurrection, and in the life of the church which resulted therefrom, believers had found the inauguration of a new dispensation, although they still expected, when this gospel was written, that a consummation would take place at the supernatural appearance of their Master as the

¹ There is reason to believe that the earliest reading in this verse, so far as the Baptist's clothing is concerned, may have been simply "And John was clothed with a camel's skin." If so, the words in reference to his clothing and his food draw attention to the roughness and simplicity of his life, like that of many of the earlier prophets. The ordinary reading, whether original or not, emphasizes the resemblance between John and Elijah, and this emphasis reaches its climax in St. Matthew. In 2 Kings 1⁸ Elijah wears a leathern girdle about his loins, and Zechariah 13⁴ shews that at the time when the words were written a prophet usually wore a mantle of hair.

Son of man with great power and glory. In this gospel therefore the ministry of John is presented as a prelude to and a preparation for the ministry of Jesus Christ; and with the coming of the latter into Galilee the destined hour strikes, the era of salvation draws near.

Owing to our familiarity with the gospel story, we are apt to forget how remarkable not to say impossible it is likely to have seemed to Jewish thought, that this should take place in Galilee.¹ But we are now in a better position to understand Mk. 1¹⁴, 1¹⁵ and the great importance which should be attached to these verses, forming as they do the opening of the gospel proper. With the conclusion of the herald's task, he comes for whom the way is now prepared, and that to Galilee. And just as the herald proclaimed in the wilderness the coming of a mightier than he, so his successor arrives in Galilee and there proclaims the gospel of God. Here at the outset and here only does this expression "the gospel of God" occur in this book, here and here only, in rhythmical and triumphant language, is the general content of this gospel given, although the important and technical words which it contains are not explained; they are indeed part of the content of the Christian message of salvation, and would be familiar and intelligible to the readers of the book.

Immediately after these verses we read of the calling

¹ The story told in Josephus' *Jewish War II*, 259, about Theudas, who persuaded a multitude of people to follow him to the Jordan in expectation of a supernatural event, is probably no objection to the view stated in the text. It is not even certain that Theudas put forward messianic claims.

As regards the estimation of Galilee in this connection, see particularly Jn. 7⁴¹⁻⁶⁸.

of the two pairs of brothers, who are always named first in the lists of the apostles handed down in the New Testament, and St. Mark notices that this took place by the sea of Galilee. The incident is perhaps placed at this point, because the churches looked back to the connection of these men with their Master as the beginning of the church's life itself. The gospel is indeed inseparably connected with the existence of the christian church. It is permissible to regard the church as the legacy of its Master to the world,¹ and one chief part of the purpose of the church's existence is to proclaim its Master's gospel. From this point onwards therefore the gospel and the church, as it were, advance together. Both have their origin in Galilee, and the first story of the ministry to be narrated, dealing with the conquest of evil, in the expulsion of an unclean spirit, is placed in Capernaum, which is perhaps treated by St. Mark as a kind of headquarters² of the Lord in Galilee.

The episodes at Capernaum in 1²¹⁻³⁴ are probably regarded, for religious purposes, as occurring on the first day of the ministry³; in the language of 2 Timothy 1¹⁰ it is the day of the manifestation of our saviour Jesus Christ, and it is altogether appropriate therefore that it should be a sabbath. None the less, or perhaps rather for this reason,⁴ it is a day of great activity and

¹ Cf. Acts 20²⁸.

² It is, however, only mentioned three times in St. Mark, 1²¹ 2¹ 9³³. The Q logion about Capernaum, Mt. 11²³, Lk. 10¹⁶, should be noticed at this point.

³ St. John's gospel shews the same tendency to link together by notes of time the earliest activities recorded of the Lord, Jn. 1²⁹, 35, 39, 43 2¹.

⁴ Cf. Jn. 5¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

strain for him.¹ For our present purpose two points call for notice. After his first public act in 1²¹⁻²⁷, the expulsion of an evil power, an expulsion which is used significantly enough to throw light upon the purpose of his coming² and to reveal to the reader the nature of his person, the thread of the narrative is deliberately broken for a moment at 1²⁸. "And the rumour of him went forth straightway everywhere into all the region round about Galilee," for so it seems necessary to translate the words.³ It is emphasized at this early point that Galilee and its environs form the sphere which hears the news of Jesus. And similarly in 1^{38, 39} we read that all Galilee receives the gospel message. And, in the second place, it is worth while to draw attention to the technical term *κηρύσσειν* used for the proclamation of the gospel message. It is used three times in this chapter of the activity of the Lord himself, and in each case with specific reference to Galilee. In the following chapters it is used of others who proclaim about him or on his behalf; indeed at 3¹⁵ the twelve are appointed partly for this very purpose, and at 6¹² they carry it out. The word

¹ This is possibly also suggested in the language of 1³⁶. The associations of the words *ἐρημος τόπος* in St. Mark are those of divine refreshment after strain; see 6³¹. References to the Lord praying occur in St. Mark three times, 1³⁵, 6⁴⁶ after the feeding of the multitude, 14³⁵ in Gethsemane; the prayer is always alone and at night, and the occasions are times of great tension.

² The words in 1^{24b} are probably not an interrogation but a statement: Thou art come to destroy us.

³ Cf. the same construction in Mt. 3⁶ Lk. 8³⁷. Grammatical usage seems to exclude the meaning "all those parts of Galilee bordering on Capernaum." For this reason Dr. Lohmeyer regards the specific reference to Galilee here as an addition by the evangelist for his own purposes.

occurs for the last time, in reference to a present activity, at 7³⁶, that is, towards the close of the Galilean section of the gospel; on the two occasions when it is used later, at 13¹⁰ and 14⁹, it has reference to a future proclamation of the gospel; in St. Mark there is no present proclamation of the gospel at Jerusalem, or elsewhere than in Galilee and its environs.

From 2¹ to 3⁶ we have for the most part five stories of opposition to Jesus Christ and his work. They are often called conflict-stories, but they are also or perhaps rather gospel-stories, each one, except the last, emphasizing a feature of the good news of the gospel; for the opposition, except in the last case, is not really more than a foil to reveal and demonstrate the glory and supremacy of Jesus Christ. Thus the Son of man can and does forgive sins upon the earth, 2¹⁰; he came to invite sinners to him, 2¹⁷; how can his disciples fast, while he is with them? 2¹⁸; he, the Son of man, is lord of all law, even of the sabbath-law, 2²⁸. The last story, however, ends with an explicit reminder that the gospel was only to be brought to men at the cost of the destruction of the bringer.

We need not now concern ourselves further with these stories; but the next section 3⁷⁻¹⁹ is of importance for our inquiry. At 3⁶ we have read of an alliance on the part of Pharisees and Herodians, in order to put an end to Jesus; and in 3⁷⁻¹⁹ the evangelist by means of scattered fragments of tradition seems to have constructed a scene which may be regarded as giving the reverse side of the picture, although this is not an adequate or complete description of the section. The Lord with his disciples at this point withdraws from the synagogue to the seaside, and a great body of

people comes to him there, primarily from Galilee, which is as it were the pivot of the whole, but also from every other part of Palestine inhabited by Jews; for it seems that in the enumeration of the various districts whence the people come, an enumeration unique in this gospel, all those districts of Palestine are mentioned which were inhabited by Jews; only the non-jewish neighbouring districts of Samaria and Syria are omitted. The picture presented therefore perhaps implies that on the shore of the sea of Galilee all Israel gathers together to meet the Lord of Israel, who there, although now to some extent separated by the boat from immediate contact with his people, performs on their behalf his deeds of beneficence and mercy; and there homage and testimony are given to him by the only beings who are in a position to recognize his presence. Finally from among this great multitude of people some are bidden to a mountain top, and there the divine or supernatural community is chosen and established. The number of its leaders is doubtless designed, not so much to recall the actual twelve tribes of history which had ceased to exist centuries before, but the perfect or ideal completeness of the people of God; and their commission is, through association with their Master, to carry out the work which at the outset of the ministry, as we have seen, was done by him alone. At the same time, according to St. Mark, a mystery encircles all that now takes place. Just as in the first story of the ministry recorded in St. Mark, the expulsion of the unclean spirit in the synagogue, it was made clear that only unseen powers were aware of the divine presence in their midst and grasped the significance of that which was occurring ("Thou art

come to destroy us ”), so here. Between the picture of the great multitude of Israel assembled on the shore of the sea of Galilee to greet the Lord of Israel and the ascent to the mountain top before the calling of the twelve, St. Mark inserts a reference to the homage yielded to Jesus by the unclean spirits: “ And the unclean spirits, when they beheld him, fell down before him and cried, saying Thou art the Son of God. And he charged them much that they should not make him known.” Hence even those to whom a share is now given in “ the mystery of the kingdom of God,” to borrow an expression used in the next chapter, do not know fully what they do¹; and just as a secret envelops the person of the Son of man himself, so it envelops also those who now become his messengers and representatives; nor does Galilee know that it has been chosen as the scene of the fulfilment of God’s purpose.

We may pass directly from the scene of the choice of the twelve in chapter 3 to that in chapter 6, in which they are sent out with their Master’s authority and power to do his work; and it is on their return from this mission that they are called apostles, the only occasion, 6³⁰, on which this word is used by St. Mark. It is clear, although it is not expressly stated, that their mission is to Galilee, and not beyond it; for at its close we read in 6¹⁴ that Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee, now hears, apparently for the first time, of the fame of Jesus. Similarly the great act of power, the feeding of the multitude, even if it is to be placed on the north or east shore of the lake outside the territory of Galilee,

¹ Cf. the way in which 4¹³ follows immediately on the very different 4¹⁰⁻¹².

is designed for Galileans, as the narrative at 6³⁵ makes clear. And even if between 7²⁴ and 8²⁷ we read of the Lord's journeyings beyond the confines of Galilee proper, the districts here thus brought within the compass of his mercy are regarded as comprised in the district around about Galilee, to use the evangelist's own expression. Tyre and Sidon, Decapolis, Bethsaida, the villages of Cæsarea Philippi, all these stand on the circumference of Galilee and are thereby brought within the orbit of salvation. Just as only in reference to Galilee and its environs does St. Mark use the word *κηρύσσειν*, which in his gospel always refers in some way or other to the message of salvation, so the shadow of the cross begins permanently to fall across the page only when Jerusalem begins to come clearly into view.

It is when the Lord and his disciples are in the distant north, on the outskirts of Galilee, that we become conscious of a change in the tone and the direction of the narrative. He now invites the attention of the disciples to himself and to the nature of his office. First, who do men, unenlightened men, those who have not been admitted to the mystery, say that I am? And the answer is given in terms lofty indeed, some of which recall names on the great roll-call of prophecy, the peculiar glory of the Jewish people: John the Baptist, or Elijah, or this or that one of the prophets. No comment is passed on the reply, and the question is renewed: And you, you who have been called, to whom the mystery has been given, who do you say that I am? And even St. Peter's reply, Thou art the Messiah, is treated in the same way as the earlier answer. No comment is passed upon it

beyond the charge to secrecy, and a fresh start is made with an even greater title, and a prediction of the fate which is in store for the holder of it. He proceeds to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected—and at Jerusalem, for this is implied in the reference which follows to the different sections of the Sanhedrin. It is true that Jerusalem is not mentioned by name in the last half of St. Mark's gospel until the opening of the third and most detailed instruction with reference to the coming passion, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem"; but from the time of the first instruction at 8³¹, it is apparent where the end is to be. We must not of course forget that each of these three instructions on the coming passion ends with the promise of almost immediate resurrection, "and after three days rise again"; but the emphasis is on the passion. The vital element in the instructions is that an altogether incredible fate is in store for the holder of the supreme office in heaven and earth, the Son of man himself. That for such an one death could not be the end, that, in St. Peter's words in the Acts of the Apostles, it was not possible for him to be holden by its travail-pangs, is, on the contrary, scarcely a matter for surprise. The emphasis in the three prophecies is on the cross, and at Jerusalem. At present however we are still in or near Galilee, and a week later on the mountain top Jesus is revealed to the three disciples in his glory. Not in the hallowed city of Jerusalem, but in the remote north of Galilee, in secrecy and mystery the Lord is made known for a moment to the three disciples as he truly is.

Soon after this the journey to Jerusalem begins, but

until Galilee is left, we remain within the sphere of secrecy. "They went forth and passed through Galilee, and he did not wish that any man should know it." This is the last mention of Galilee in the first nine chapters and the last mention also of any note of secrecy in reference to the movements or actions of the Lord.¹ At 10¹ we read "From thence he arose and cometh into the borders of Judæa and beyond Jordan"; and at 10³² the ascent to Jerusalem is made.

The contrast between the contents of the last part of St. Mark's gospel, 10¹ to 15⁴⁷, and those of the first nine chapters is remarkable.

In the first place there is now, as we have already noticed, no proclamation of the gospel, and also, we may add, no summons or invitation to repentance. Jerusalem, into whose power the Son of man is now delivered, is a city of destruction; it destroys him and itself will be destroyed.

Secondly, many characteristic features of the Galilean ministry or revelation are either altogether absent or at least much less conspicuously present. Only two acts of power are narrated in this section, the healing of blind Bartimæus on the way out from Jericho, and the withering of the barren fig-tree near Jerusalem; and the second at least of these probably owes its position in the narrative to its symbolical significance. Only one parable is recorded, the ominous parable of the wicked husbandmen, and unlike the parables of the kingdom of God in chapter 4 it is understood by those to whom it is addressed, in

¹ Unless we should include the private conversation with the four disciples, 13³⁻³⁷. It will be remembered that its theme is eschatological.

this case the enemies of Jesus Christ. The exorcisms of the unclean spirits, to which great importance was attached in the first part of the gospel, and their confession of their conqueror entirely cease, along with the commands to secrecy. The only trace of a welcome offered to the Lord by the Jerusalem populace is at 12³⁸, "And the common people heard him gladly"; and in chapter 15 a few days later the same people clamour for his death. At the entry into Jerusalem the cries of triumph proceed in St. Mark not from the people of Jerusalem, but from those that "went before and those that followed," that is, those who were accompanying Jesus up to Jerusalem from Galilee. The first act of the Lord in Jerusalem is the cleansing of the temple; it illustrates the depth of the gulf between his conceptions and those of the ecclesiastical authorities. The action is followed for the most part by controversies with them, and at the close of these controversies he significantly leaves the temple. Its destruction is foretold, and in the great apocalyptic discourse which follows we learn that so far from the Messiah appearing at Jerusalem, the abomination which makes desolate will be established in the temple. Then follows the passion narrative proper, in the darkness of which Jerusalem itself is darkened. One of the very few rays of light which pierce the darkness of the narrative is contained in the assurance, "After I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee."

Galilee and Jerusalem therefore stand in opposition to each other, as the story of the gospel runs in St. Mark. The despised and more or less outlawed Galilee is shewn to have been chosen by God as the seat of the gospel and of the revelation of the Son of

man, while the sacred city of Jerusalem, the home of Jewish piety and patriotism, has become the centre of relentless hostility and sin. Galilee is the sphere of revelation, Jerusalem the scene only of rejection. Galilee is the scene of the beginning and middle of the Lord's ministry; Jerusalem only of its end. Why he must thus pass from the one to the other, is not made clear; it can only be explained by the counsel of God; it "must" so be, 8³¹; although there are suggestions that the destruction of the Son of man at Jerusalem is connected with the destruction of the Jewish nation itself. But the dark passage through which he is led has an end, and this is given in the words "After I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee," the land where the divine fulfilment began and the land where it will receive its consummation.

If this interpretation is correct, the plan of St. Mark's gospel rests to a certain extent on a doctrinal conception, the belief that Galilee whence Jesus Christ came was the land divinely chosen as the sphere of revelation.

It has often been noticed that St. Mark's gospel itself shews traces of a longer or a more frequent residence of the Lord at Jerusalem than is apparent from the book itself. Thus he has friends at Bethany, as we learn from the story of the anointing in the house of Simon the leper, 14³; and we recall also the readiness with which the colt is lent, at a village near Jerusalem, 11⁵ ". Within the city itself we have the episode of the man bearing a pitcher of water, and the willingness of a resident to set apart a room in his house for the last supper, 14¹² ". Further, at the time of the arrest the Lord can say, "I was daily with you in the temple

teaching"; but this expression is hardly natural after the two days in the "last week" which are all that St. Mark's narrative itself allows for. If however in the interests of his doctrine the evangelist wished to separate as sharply as possible the two scenes and the two epochs, as it were, of the ministry, we have a possible explanation of the facts before us; and in that case, if the way in which St. Mark used his historical material was decided in the last resort by his theological conceptions, it becomes also less difficult to explain why other evangelists, influenced in turn by other interpretations of the ministry, differ more or less sharply from the Marcan scheme.

St. Matthew's gospel was described by Professor Burkitt as a fresh, revised and enriched edition of St. Mark's; and certainly this evangelist, whose work has always been the favourite gospel of the church, after his infancy narrative follows closely in the footsteps of his predecessor St. Mark as regards the setting of his story. It will therefore not be necessary to work through St. Matthew's gospel even in the cursory way in which we have traced the order of events in St. Mark, but only to draw attention to certain special features in it.

In his first two chapters, the so-called infancy narrative, St. Matthew shews clearly enough his strong inclination to account for early events in the life of the Messiah by reference to scripture; and it is therefore not surprising that he adds to his version of the beginning of the Galilean ministry an Old Testament quotation of peculiar solemnity. The Lord, we read at 4¹³ ^a, now "came and dwelt in Capernaum,

which is by the sea, in the borders of Zebulun and Naphtali: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying,

The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali,
Toward the sea, beyond Jordan,
Galilee of the Gentiles,
The people which sat in darkness
Saw a great light,
And to them which sat in the region and shadow of
death,

To them did light spring up."

So far as the geographical expressions in the quotation are concerned, the district referred to seems to be identical with Galilee as understood by St. Mark, and the writer implies that because Jesus Christ has lived and worked in this region the whole district is now consecrated. Where there was darkness, light appears; where there was death, now springs up life. In what respect then, we may ask, does Galilee differ in this gospel from Jerusalem, which St. Matthew himself twice calls the holy city? The answer seems to be that in St. Matthew's view the divine counsel and election with regard to Galilee is solely eschatological, whereas with regard to Jerusalem it is continuous and historically age-long. In Galilee there is one event and one only: the coming which has now dawned, all unsuspected though darkly promised, upon the northern land; whereas Jerusalem all through its history has been the scene of divine activity and intervention. Doubtless the last and greatest of these interventions is the sending of Messiah; but for Jerusalem as for the Jewish nation this last intervention means darkness and not light, destruction, not salvation.

Upon the whole St. Matthew preserves throughout his narrative this conception of the special choice of Galilee. The picture which we considered in connection with Mk. 3⁷⁻⁹, of all Israel gathered to meet Israel's Lord by the shore of the sea of Galilee, has no precise equivalent in the parallel context in Mt. 12^{15 ff.}; but it seems to be represented in St. Matthew by the great picture, at the outset of the ministry, of the multitudes present immediately before the delivery of the sermon on the mount; the districts mentioned in Mt. 4^{24 f.} are almost identical with those in Mk. 3^{7 f.}, and in each gospel a similar event follows. At Mt. 5¹ the Lord seeing the multitudes ascends the mountain and there gives instruction to *disciples*; and at Mk. 3¹³ the Lord ascends the mountain and there calls to him whom he would.¹

Attention should also be drawn in this connection to the remarkable passage Mt. 15²⁹⁻³¹, which replaces the story of the healing of the deaf mute in Mk. 7³¹⁻³⁷. We read in these verses that the Lord on his return from the northern districts of Tyre and Sidon came to the neighbourhood of the sea of Galilee and once more "went up into the mountain and sat there." And St. Matthew continues, "And there came unto him great multitudes, having with them the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them down at his feet; inasmuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing; and they glorified the God of Israel." This section occurs

¹ St. Matthew has no actual account of the appointment of the twelve, as this is set forth in Mk. 3¹³⁻¹⁶; at Mt. 10¹ they seem to have been already appointed.

immediately before the second account of the feeding of the multitude, with which in St. Matthew, though not in St. Mark, it seems to be brought into immediate association. If so, the significance of the passage is perhaps increased, for it is usually held that the feeding of the multitude is connected in all the four gospels with the close of the Galilean ministry or at least the close of the ministry in Galilee proper. In any case it will be noticed that in Mt. 15²⁹⁻³¹ the revelation itself is still hidden; the multitude glorifies, not Jesus, but the God of Israel; on the other hand the beneficent results of the revelation which has been and is being made to Galilee are brought out very strongly, and its hiddenness and mystery are less strongly emphasized than they are, for example, in such a passage as Mk. 3¹⁰⁻¹².

At Mt. 16¹³ ^a the same change comes over the narrative which we noticed at this point in the parallel passage in St. Mark; but at 16²¹, unlike St. Mark, St. Matthew specifically alludes to Jerusalem by name, immediately before the first instruction on the passion. "From that time began Jesus [+ Christ, so WH.] to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go *unto Jerusalem*." As in St. Mark, until the last week the Lord's journeys are confined to Galilee and its environs, and his final departure from it is solemnly announced at 19¹, "And it came to pass when Jesus had finished these words, he departed from Galilee, and came into the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan."

In Jerusalem the note of condemnation sounds longer and more loudly than in St. Mark; in addition to the Marcan material, we have now the parable of the royal marriage feast and the guests who would not

come, and the sevenfold condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees in Mt. 23. And finally, as we have seen, St. Matthew is as consistent as St. Mark in pointing away from Jerusalem to Galilee as the scene of fulfilment, after the resurrection. In Galilee only is the Son of man made known.

None the less, the idea of the distinctive choice and of the pre-eminence of Galilee is not so consistently kept in view in St. Matthew as it is in the earlier gospel. Just as the commands to secrecy which are so distinctive a feature in St. Mark are sometimes omitted or tend at least to become otiose in St. Matthew,¹ so, although he retains the Marcan framework with regard to Galilee, its bounds are not infrequently exceeded. At the outset of the mission charge to the twelve, for example, we read that they are sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel²; and later in the same charge it is implied that as many as possible of the cities of Israel are to hear their message.³ Again, the note of disaffection or hostility, which was by no means absent even from the Galilean section of St. Mark,⁴ is still stronger in that section of St. Matthew; we now read of condemnation passed on Chorazin and Bethsaida, and even on Capernaum, the city of Jesus' residence in Galilee and the subject of the triumphant quotation from Isaiah which we considered. And conversely the lament over Jerusalem, if it expresses condemnation, is also an expression of the speaker's love for it.

¹ Cf. e.g. Mt. 17²² with Mk. 9³⁰.

² Mt. 10⁶.

³ Mt. 10²³.

⁴ Mk. 2¹⁻³ 3²¹⁻²⁶ 6^{1-6a} 7¹ ff. 8¹¹⁻¹³. It is noticeable however that the hostility described is twice definitely stated to have been due to influences proceeding from Jerusalem, 3²² 7¹.

In these ways the extreme contrast between Galilee and Jerusalem which a close study of St. Mark reveals, although still retained, is slightly but definitely modified in St. Matthew; and this is in accord with the difference which we noticed in considering the resurrection narratives in these two gospels. We saw that, if it be true that in St. Mark Galilee is to be the scene of the final consummation, then Galilee can no longer have quite the same absolute importance in St. Matthew also. For however great the scene and the event may be which is described in the last five verses of St. Matthew's gospel, however august and world-wide the instructions to the eleven given there may be, yet that scene and that event, just because it is a scene and an event, is not now the coming of the Lord to judgement, and that in Galilee.

VI

THE NARRATIVE OF THE MINISTRY IN ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN

WE have seen that the plan of St. Mark's gospel, however obscure it may be in chapters 6 to 8, is at least clear as regards its two main divisions of the narrative. From 1¹⁴ to 9⁵⁰ the scene is laid in the upper part of Palestine, that is to say, in Galilee and the adjacent districts on the east and north; and from 11¹ to the end of the gospel in or near Jerusalem, the two sections being joined by chapter 10, with its account of a journey by way of the borders of Judæa, Peræa and Jericho towards Jerusalem. Samaria is not mentioned in St. Mark.

St. Matthew agrees on the whole with the Marcan outline, and his only allusion to Samaria is in sympathy with the Marcan presentation. At Mt. 10⁵, at the beginning of the charge to the twelve before their mission-journey, we read, "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans."

We come however upon a plan of a quite different kind when we consider the outline of St. Luke's gospel.

From 4¹⁴, where the ministry begins, the scene is laid in Galilee; from 9⁵¹ to some undefined point in chapter 18 it is in Samaria; at 18³⁵ Jericho is mentioned, and thenceforward to the end of the gospel we find ourselves in or near Jerusalem.

Further, the distribution of verses in these three sections is remarkably similar: 275, 350, 320. Each of the three districts therefore has its fair share of the tradition assigned to it, if we may so speak; no one district receives any notable preference.¹

Still more instructive is the way in which St. Luke adapts St. Mark's plan of the ministry to suit his special purpose. Like St. Mark, he places the opening of the ministry in Galilee and alludes to the Lord's teaching in the synagogues there; but forthwith he brings him to Nazareth, so that the story of his rejection here is the first incident of the ministry to be told at length.² We might therefore at first sight expect that St. Luke's gospel will be even more tragically coloured than St. Mark's, in which it will be remembered that we hear at first of no open opposition; for in St. Luke's version of the story at Nazareth not only is the Lord rejected but an attempt is made at once upon the spot by his own fellow-citizens to kill him. But a careful study of the story itself and a further

¹ If we count the pages assigned to each of these three sections in the text of Westcott and Hort, the result is much the same, being roughly 19, 22½, 19. I have regarded the central, Samaritan section as ending at Lk. 18²⁵, since there the Marcan narrative is resumed, which had been dropped at Lk. 9⁵⁰; but if the central section is continued until Jericho is reached at Lk. 18²⁵, the slight but definite predominance of the central section over either of the other two becomes more clearly marked.

² It should be noticed at this point that just as Mk. 16¹⁻⁸ is on the view taken in these lectures eschatological, and Lk. 24 on the other hand is prevalingly pneumatological, so at the outset of the ministry Mk. 1¹⁵ with its strongly eschatological note has no equivalent in St. Luke; and also that the words "Jesus came into Galilee" Mk. 1¹¹ become "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" Lk. 4¹⁴.

consideration of St. Luke's gospel as a whole will certainly lead to a modification of this view. The attempt to lay violent hands on the Lord harms neither him nor his cause. For himself, we read that he passing through the midst of them went on his way; and as regards his cause, the only result is a transference of the work from Nazareth to Capernaum and thereby an extension of it. For at this point St. Luke takes up the narrative in Mk. 1 of the first twenty-four hours in and near Capernaum, to which our earliest evangelist, as we saw, attaches great importance; and whereas at Mk. 1³⁹ the section ends with the words "And he was preaching in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and casting out demons," in Lk. 4⁴⁴ we find, according to the reading which should certainly be preferred, "And he was preaching in the synagogues of Judæa." We are indeed brought back at once at the beginning of the next section to the lake of Gennesaret, but by the reference at this early stage to Judæa, probably in the sense of all Palestine including Galilee, St. Luke brings before us the great and spreading stage on which, so far as historical considerations allow, he desires to place the gospel story as he sees it. It is therefore no surprise to us, some verses later, when, in the story of the healing of the sick of the palsy, instead of St. Mark's brief reference to "certain of the scribes sitting there" we read in St. Luke that "there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, who were come out of every village of Galilee and Judæa and Jerusalem." Obviously the framework of the Marcan narrative is already strained severely, and there are other indications of this tendency. After the raising

of the widow's son at Nain the report concerning Jesus goes forth "into the whole of Judæa and all the region round about"; and Professor Creed in his commentary on this verse thinks that the meaning is "the whole of Palestine and all the region round about Palestine."¹

If Wellhausen is right in thinking that from Lk. 4³¹ to 7⁵⁰ Capernaum, which is twice mentioned in this section, is regarded as a kind of headquarters of the work, then at 8¹ we have an extension of it. In any case, the Lord at this point enters on a widely ranging ministry: It came to pass soon afterward, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God. The geographical reference is indeed extremely vague, but probably the scene of the ministry is conceived as still being Galilee. It is also remarkable that the wanderings on the borders of Galilee, so striking a feature of St. Mark's gospel at this point, find hardly any place in St. Luke; there is no mention of Tyre and Sidon or Decapolis or the villages of Cæsarea Philippi. The only introduction given to the story of St. Peter's confession in this gospel is: "And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him."² Indeed the sole topographical notes in this section are at 8²⁶, the arrival at the country of the Gerasenes, which is described as being over against Galilee; this forms the introduction to the story of the healing of the Legion; and secondly at 9¹⁰ the withdrawal to the city called Bethsaida, before the feeding of the multitude; both these places, it will be noticed, being in the immediate neighbourhood of Galilee. It seems therefore that St. Luke, in spite as it were of occasional glances at a

¹ Cf. p. 117.

² Lk. 9¹⁸.

greater framework by means of his references to Judæa, is anxious to keep Galilee in the forefront of his picture during the first one-third of the ministry, as he records it.

But before we close our survey of St. Luke's Galilean period, we must not fail to notice a special feature in his account of the transfiguration, almost the last incident to be recorded in this period. Neither St. Mark nor St. Matthew deals with the content of the conversation which is said to have taken place on this occasion between the Lord on the one side and Moses and Elijah on the other. St. Luke however states that they spoke of his exodus or decease which he was to accomplish or perhaps rather complete at Jerusalem.

No doubt it is true that in the parallel chapter St. Mark himself, a few verses earlier, in the first instruction about the coming passion Mk. 8³¹, has already pointed to Jerusalem by means of the mention of the component sections of the Sanhedrin as the destined place of suffering for the Son of man. But it is St. Luke alone of the synoptists who brings this doctrine into connection with the transfiguration and there mentions Jerusalem by name, repeating it a little later when the journey thither is represented as beginning, 9⁵¹. According to the view put forward in the last lecture, the transfiguration in the distant north is in St. Mark a great, secret, eschatological event in the Galilean ministry; there for a moment Jesus is shewn to the three chief disciples in his true nature, and the contrast with the succeeding narrative of humiliation, desertion and suffering is as sharp as could well be. But in St. Luke's version of the

transfiguration it is possible to regard the event to a considerable extent as the Lord's faithful preparation, with heavenly help, for that which lay before him¹; and the divine blessing descends upon him as he prays, this feature also of the narrative being peculiar to St. Luke.

In any case at 9⁵⁹ the ministry in Samaria begins, prefaced by the following remarkable words: "And it came to pass, when the days of his assumption were being fulfilled." In a careful note in Professor Lake's commentary on Acts 2¹, And when the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled, a passage which has certain affinities with the present context, the writer states his view that the meaning of Lk. 9⁵¹ is Towards the completion of the period which was closed by the ascension; the words perhaps connoting the various stages by which the Lord was conceived as having passed from an earthly to a heavenly existence. If so, Galilee is thus linked up by St. Luke with Samaria and Jerusalem as an essential process in a divinely ordered sequence of events, which will reach its close in the last chapter of his book; and all three districts are of equal significance and worth. Galilee is not the scene of divine election and revelation, to the exclusion of Jerusalem; nor, in spite of the events that happen there, is Jerusalem any more than Galilee the scene of ruin and desolation, as perhaps St. Mark would have it.

Several unobtrusive parallelisms suggest that in St. Luke's estimation the Samaritan section of the gospel stands with equal right beside the Galilean.

¹ The same observation could be made in connection with St. Luke's account of the Lord's baptism, if Lk. 3²¹ is compared with Mk. 1¹⁰.

At the outset in each case, if the Lord is rejected from motives of religious intolerance at Nazareth in the first scene of the Galilean ministry as described in 4¹⁶⁻³⁰, so he is also by the first Samaritan village which he proposed to visit 9⁵¹⁻⁵⁶. If the twelve are chosen in Galilee 6¹³ *ff.*, the seventy-two are appointed in Samaria 10¹ *ff.*; if the former are sent out in Galilee, the latter are sent before the Lord's face, apparently in Samaria, into every city and place whither he himself should come. If the Pharisees and others are constantly on the watch to cause difficulty in Galilee 5¹⁷⁻⁶¹ especially 6¹⁻¹¹, they are equally so in Samaria 11⁵³ *f.* 14¹ *ff.*¹ Again, just as out of the reference to the Lord's mother and his brethren at 8¹⁹ *ff.* during the Galilean ministry opportunity is given to him to declare his intimacy with those who hear and do the word of God, so a reference to his mother at 11²⁷ leads to the same lesson in Samaria. Just as in the Galilean ministry immediately after the mention of the presence of a great multitude at 6¹⁷⁻¹⁹ the sermon on the plain is delivered to disciples 6²⁰⁻⁴⁹, so at 12¹ *ff.* in Samaria in the presence of "many thousands of the multitude" a discourse of no less importance than the sermon is addressed to the disciples. And finally just as we have the story of the cleansing of the leper in Galilee 5¹² *ff.*, we find a similar story with regard to ten lepers, one of whom was a Samaritan, in 17¹¹ *ff.*² Indeed the two districts seem as it were to be united by this journey of Jesus; for as late as this passage 17¹¹ we

¹ Cf. also 5²⁹ *ff.* with 15¹ *ff.*, and as regards the lawyers 7³⁰ with 10²⁵ 14³.

² Similarly the parable of the sower in 8⁴ *ff.* has its equivalent in two other parables on the subject of the kingdom of God in 13¹⁸⁻²¹. Also teaching similar to that of 9²⁸ *f.* is given at 14²⁸ *f.*

come upon the difficult expression And it came to pass, as he was going to Jerusalem, he was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee, or perhaps, along the borders of Samaria and Galilee.

And if Jerusalem through its treatment of the Lord is the scene of guilt, it is also the city of his love. This is shewn not only by the lament over Jerusalem at the end of chapter 13, which St. Luke shares with St. Matthew, though in a very different and less embittered context, but by the weeping over the city and the words used on this occasion 19th, which are peculiar to St. Luke.

At Jericho, difficult as the itinerary is here owing to the previous repeated mention of the travelling through Samaria, the last stage of the journey begins. But although we have just learned in the third prophecy of the passion the immediate purpose of the journey to Jerusalem, namely, the handing over of the Son of man to the Gentiles in every circumstance of shame and obloquy, St. Luke alone of the evangelists at this point suggests a further and very different issue, which none the less is also connected with Jerusalem. After the incident of Zacchæus at Jericho we read that "he added and spake a parable, because he was near to Jerusalem, and they supposed that the kingdom of God should immediately appear" 19th. Then follows the story of the nobleman who goes into a far country to be invested with a kingdom that is due to him. For the period of his absence he gives to certain of his servants a pound apiece, to trade therewith till his return. With this story seems to have been interwoven the additional theme that his citizens hated him and sent an embassy after him, saying that

they would not tolerate his rule. None the less the nobleman is invested with his sovereignty; he returns and after examining his servants does judgement on his enemies. The suggestion is made by Dr. Lohmeyer that the position of the parable is due to these two themes, for apart from them there seems no satisfactory reason why the parable of the pounds should be placed at this point. But its position is explained, if in St. Luke's view he who is now ascending to Jerusalem is or one day will be the lawful ruler there, and although his citizens will not now have him as their Lord and shew their hatred for him, yet he will return and after doing judgement on his enemies will reign in his kingdom, that is, at Jerusalem.

If this suggestion is correctly based, it lends support to the belief that whereas St. Mark and St. Matthew despair of Jerusalem, St. Luke does not. And all that we considered in our study of Lk. 24 in the fourth lecture is in accordance with this outlook. It is doubtless true that in his second volume St. Luke has set himself to describe the steady extension of the gospel message throughout the Roman empire; "beginning from Jerusalem" it moves forward finally to Rome; it is truly a light to lighten the Gentiles. And this thought is seldom far away even in the first volume; it is St. Luke alone of the evangelists who dates the earliest beginnings of his story, 2¹ 3¹, with reference to the secular authority of Rome itself.

But equally it is true that St. Luke wishes the gospel message to be also the glory of God's people Israel, and that, possibly for this reason, the Jewish capital is seen in a much more favourable light in his first volume than it is in the two other synoptists. St.

Luke for instance is at pains to remove the notes of time which suggest in St. Mark that less than a week elapsed between the Lord's arrival in the city and the end; the editorial notes at 20¹ "It came to pass on one of the days as he was teaching the people in the temple and preaching the gospel," and at 22¹ "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew near," instead of St. Mark's "After two days," make the length of the residence at Jerusalem in St. Luke's gospel, like the length of the residence in Galilee or in Samaria, of indeterminate duration.¹ Again, the cleansing of the temple is reduced to the very brief compass of two verses in St. Luke,² and indeed in the first of the two passages which I have just quoted the Lord actually preaches the gospel or at any rate good tidings there, a conception which we may confidently say would have been impossible to St. Mark or to St. Matthew. Further the mysterious withering of the fig-tree, in which the two other synoptists almost certainly see a symbolical reference in some way or another to Jerusalem, finds no place in St. Luke.³ And finally in the eschatological discourse, whereas St. Mark speaks of the abomination which makes desolate standing where he ought not, that is, in the temple and thereby desecrating it, in the Lucan parallel Jerusalem is surrounded by armies,

¹ Cf. also Lk. 19⁴⁷ 21³⁷. St. Matthew on the contrary, for all his additions to the Marcan narrative in Mt. 21 to 25, shews no desire to lengthen the duration of the period in Jerusalem, Mt. 21¹⁰ 22²⁸ 26^{3,17}.

² Luke 19⁴⁵ f.

³ In Lk. 13⁶⁻⁹, the parable of the fig-tree which for three years has borne no fruit and is in danger of destruction on the ground of uselessness, a further respite is granted for one year, and meantime, before a final decision is reached, every assistance is to be given to the tree to mend its ways.

and is trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.¹ It seems possible that in his gospel the affliction of Jerusalem is regarded as temporary only; to it, as to believers, ultimately redemption will draw nigh.² It will be remembered that in St. Luke's infancy narrative Anna the prophetess speaks of the child Jesus to all those who were looking for the redemption of *Jerusalem*.³

We have thus in the synoptic gospels two different conceptions at work with regard to the significance of the ministry and work of Jesus Christ; and in these conceptions topographical and doctrinal considerations are indissolubly connected. The conceptions are seen at their clearest in St. Mark and St. Luke respectively. For St. Mark Galilee is the scene of ultimate importance in the ministry of Jesus Christ; in Galilee alone occurs the conquest of evil, as represented by the exorcisms of the demons, in which St. Mark sees great significance; and from Galilee alone proceeds the preaching and extension of the gospel, whether by the Lord or by his disciples. This importance which is assigned to Galilee rests not only on historical grounds, but on doctrinal or, more precisely, eschatological considerations; it rests above all on the conception of Jesus as the Son of man.

¹ Lk. 21²⁴.

² If so, the thought here is closely similar to that expressed in the parable of the pounds as interpreted above.

³ Lk. 2³⁶. Further the supernatural or perhaps rather eschatological darkness which envelops Jerusalem from the sixth to the ninth hour on the day of the crucifixion, as this is viewed in St. Matthew and St. Mark, is expressly ascribed to natural causes in St. Luke, 23⁴⁵, "who no doubt had not realized the impossibility of a solar eclipse at the time of the Paschal full moon" (J. M. Creed *ad loc.*).

St. Luke on the other hand records the ministry in such a way that the three chief districts of Palestine are equally the scene of the ministry of Jesus Christ. In all of them alike the good tidings are preached. St. Luke's conception of the ministry is correctly described in Acts 10³⁶⁻³⁸,¹ just as at Luke 23⁵ the chief priests complain to Pilate that the prisoner stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judæa, and beginning from Galilee even unto this place. Whereas in St. Mark and to some extent also in St. Matthew Galilee is the beginning and the end, as the sphere of revelation, and Judæa and Jerusalem are as it were only a dark passage which must be traversed before the end is reached, for St. Luke on the other hand Galilee is only the beginning; Jerusalem is the goal and the culminating scene of the Lord's activity. And once more this presentation rests not only on historical considerations, but on the doctrinal conception that Jesus is primarily Messiah, the lawful king of Israel, who receives the throne of his father David, and will be king over the house of David for ever.²

It is well known that in St. John's record of the ministry Judæa and Jerusalem fill a larger place than is assigned to them in the synoptists. Between Jn. 1⁴³ and 7⁹, for example, the Lord passes to and fro between

¹ "The word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all)—that saying ye yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; even Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him."

² Lk. 1³² f.

the southern and the northern districts; and at 7¹⁰ the northern territory is left for the last time, and thereafter most of the events recorded happen in Jerusalem. At 10⁴⁰ there is a passing reference to Peræa, and at 11⁵⁴ to the city called Ephraim near to the wilderness; and the scene of the greater part of Jn. 11 is laid at Bethany; but we are not again on Galilean soil till Jn. 21, a chapter which is probably to be regarded as an appendix and in any case is outside the scope of this lecture.

We have found that the synoptic writers are probably not uninfluenced by doctrinal beliefs and purposes in their treatment of the topographical traditions of the gospel story; and this is even more true in the case of St. John. He has, it appears, accurate knowledge of Palestinian localities and of the Jewish feasts, but it seems probable that no evangelist more readily subordinates the traditions which had come to him about the ministry, including its topographical setting, to the religious purpose which prompted him to write his gospel.

No small part of this purpose is to set forth the ministry and death of Jesus Christ as themselves the manifestation of the Son of man; in rejecting him therefore the Jews are shewn in this gospel to have passed sentence on themselves and to stand condemned in the day of the righteous judgement of God. And whether or no the Lord was often or for a long period in Jerusalem, it is not easy to see how St. John could have worked out this great theme, without representing him as engaged in prolonged conflict with "the Jews" at Jerusalem. In any case for the sake of his purpose he handles details of time and place with a considerable and fearless freedom.

One valuable key to the understanding of St. John's topography is that in the fourth gospel the *patris* or home-country of the Lord is not, as in the synoptists, Galilee and in particular Nazareth, but Judæa, in the narrower sense of this word,¹ and in particular Jerusalem. In accordance with St. John's manner and method this remarkable modification of the synoptic tradition is not emphasized, although from time to time clear sign-posts as it were are set up to invite attention to it; but it is not dwelt upon by the evangelist and is often overlooked. The matter is however so important for the right understanding of St. John's gospel in respect of our inquiry, that it is desirable to examine it more closely.

In St. Mark and St. Matthew the Lord visits his *patris*, which is unnamed, in the course of his ministry in Galilee, Mk. 6^{1-6a} Mt. 13⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸; and when his countrymen are offended in him, he observes that a prophet is not without honour except in his own *patris*. It is usually assumed that in these two passages the unnamed *patris* is Nazareth, and the manner of the allusion to the Lord's kinsmen in Mk. 6³ || Mt. 13⁵⁵ probably supports this view.

In St. Luke the rejection of Jesus in his *patris* is the first incident of the Galilean ministry narrated at length 4¹⁶⁻³⁰, and the place is definitely stated to be Nazareth 4^{16. 23}; on this occasion the form of the saying given above is "No prophet is acceptable in his own *patris*." Thus the word *patris* occurs in all the synoptists in the section which narrates the rejection of Jesus by his

¹ Contrast, for example, Lk. 4⁴⁴, where the reference is probably to the whole of Palestine; see p. 134.

countrymen¹; and although St. Luke alone states definitely that the reference is to Nazareth, all three synoptists agree in placing the rejection at an earlier or later stage of the ministry in Galilee.

But one of the main themes of St. John's gospel is that which is stated in the prologue 1¹⁻¹⁸, in reference to the true light; he came, we read, unto his own, τὰ ἰδία, and his own people, οἱ ἰδιοί, did not receive him 1¹¹; and a careful study of this gospel will reveal that in it the Lord's fellow-countrymen, his own people, are the Jews rather than the Galileans, and his patris Judæa and Jerusalem, not Galilee or Nazareth. Thus at 4³ the Lord leaves Judæa a second time for Galilee and passes through Samaria. Here he remains two days and then leaves for Galilee 4⁴³; and the evangelist continues, with manifest reference both to his own previous words at 1¹¹ and to the parallel saying, quoted above, in the synoptic tradition, "For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country," ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι. The note seems at first sight incidental, almost trivial, but in reality it is by no means so. It shews conclusively that the Lord's patris in this gospel is not Galilee or Nazareth, but Judæa and Jerusalem. Instead of returning to Judæa, his πατρίς, where he has no honour, he goes on to Galilee and is there received and even welcomed. In Jerusalem he is not received at all 5⁴³.

¹ In the gospels the word πατρίς occurs only in these three synoptic sections and in Jn. 4⁴⁴, to be dealt with immediately in the text above.

It is clear from Heb. 11¹⁴ and other examples outside the New Testament that the word can mean native country as well as native town.

This leads us to notice that the Lord is not first mentioned in this gospel, as in Mk. 1^o, in connection with Galilee and Nazareth. At Jn. 1²⁹ cf. 3²⁸, he is on the east of Jordan, and there testimony is given by the Baptist to him. Indeed, before he proceeds to leave for Galilee 1⁴³, four disciples, Andrew, Simon, Philip and Nathanael have already joined him; for in St. John disciples are not called 1⁴³ or made 4¹ in Galilee, even if they hail originally from the north. Of these four disciples for example the first three are said to be from Bethsaida 1⁴⁴ cf. 1²¹,¹ and Nathanael from Cana of Galilee 2¹². Further in an important passage, as we shall see, at 7³ the Lord's brethren urge him to leave Galilee and to go into Judæa, that "his disciples also" may behold the works which he is doing. It seems therefore that in St. John's gospel the disciples as a whole are regarded as resident in Judæa, not in Galilee; indeed one of them is mentioned at 18¹⁵ as being an acquaintance of the high priest. It is true that disciples are found in the Lord's company in Galilee 2³, 11² 6³, 16, 30, no less than in Judæa 2¹⁷ 3²² 9² 11⁷ and in Samaria 4⁸, 27, 31; but like the ministry itself as recorded in St. John they are connected chiefly with Judæa and its environs; in this gospel the seat of the ministry as of discipleship and of opposition is in the south.

The evangelist however does not ignore the connection of the Lord with Galilee and Nazareth. At 1⁴⁶ Philip speaks of him to Nathanael as Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. Similarly at 6⁴² in the synagogue at Capernaum the Jews say, "Is not this

¹ In Mk. 1²⁹ SS. Peter and Andrew appear to have a house in Capernaum.

Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know ?” And from 2¹² 7³ we learn that his brethren, although they may go to Jerusalem for the feasts 7¹⁰, are resident in Galilee. It is regarded as fatal to the greatness ascribed to him that he should have sprung from Nazareth 1⁴⁶, and from Galilee 7⁴¹; the Messiah must come, it is claimed, of royal lineage and from the south 7⁴². Prophecy itself cannot arise in the north 7⁵². But in fact we have here an example of the not infrequent irony of the fourth evangelist. It is only an imperfect or superficial or hostile understanding which traces his origin to Nazareth and Galilee and believes itself to know his parentage, cf. 7²⁷¹; such an understanding fails and must fail to perceive his true origin 8¹⁴. 19 9²⁹, which is not from Galilee or Nazareth.

This does not mean that the title Jesus of Nazareth is altogether false; the Lord himself accepts it at 18⁶ and it forms part of the title on the cross 19¹⁹. But by this name the Lord is known even to enemies, such as those who come to arrest him 18⁴; the title does not enable them truly to find him, in the religious sense of this word 7³⁴ 8²¹; it has therefore no such importance as the title the king of the Jews. It is the dispute about this latter title which leads directly to the crucifixion 18³³ⁿ; and it is this part of the title on the cross to which the Jews object but which Pilate refuses to alter 19¹⁹ⁿ.

In the comparatively small part which Galilee plays in St. John, it appears on the whole in a favourable light. We have already seen that of the Galileans alone among the Jewish nation we read in this gospel that they received and even welcomed Jesus Christ

4⁴⁶.¹ Again, when Nicodemus at a meeting of the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem enters the plea that a man should not be condemned unheard, the reply is, "Art thou also of Galilee?" To be of Galilee seems almost identical with being an adherent of Jesus² and hostile to "the Jews"; and he who is so minded does not understand the scriptures 7⁵².

The impression received from these two passages is possibly confirmed by the evangelist's arrangement and treatment of the "signs" which are narrated in the first five chapters. These seem to be four in number and to fall into two groups, each of which contains two signs; and within each of the two groups a sign in Galilee is followed by a sign in Jerusalem.³ But whereas the signs in Galilee are in each case fruitful and forthwith produce belief, the signs in Jerusalem in each case lead at once to controversy, the presence of opponents being strongly emphasized.⁴

Thus in 2¹⁻¹¹ at the marriage in Cana of Galilee water is changed into wine. In this sign we may discern the passing of the old order with the arrival of the new, and it is expressly stated that in this sign the Lord manifested his glory and that this did not pass unseen; his disciples believed on him. This sign in Galilee is followed by a sign in Jerusalem, the cleansing of the

¹ Cf. the remarkable testimony given by the Samaritans in Jn. 4⁸⁰⁻⁸².

² The same conception seems to be found at Mk. 14⁷⁰.

³ I have not felt at liberty to assume that there are disarrangements in the order of the text. I understand that Dr. C. H. Dodd, who has devoted much attention lately to St. John's gospel, holds that no such have occurred.

⁴ The contents of the "transition verses" 2²²⁻²⁶ should not be overlooked; but the remark in the text above is true of the contents of the sections themselves, 2¹⁴⁻²², 5²⁻⁴⁷.

temple which has been profaned 2¹³⁻²². Here too the temple is a natural symbol of the old order; but in this case its destruction is implied, for it is to be replaced by a new temple, a spiritual order which will be brought into existence by the death and resurrection of the Lord.

Again, at 4⁴⁶ on the arrival of Jesus for the second time at Cana of Galilee the nobleman's son who is seriously ill at Capernaum is healed, and as a result the nobleman and his whole house believe. But at the next visit to Jerusalem, which St. John proceeds to relate in 5¹, the cure of the man at the pool of Bethesda, which is said in 5⁹ to have occurred upon a sabbath-day, leads at once to sharp controversy with "the Jews," nor is there any reference to consequent belief.

The only occasion when the Jews appear in opposition to the Lord elsewhere than in Judæa is in Jn. 6, which opens with the stories of the feeding of the multitude and the walking on the lake 6¹⁻²¹, then passes on to the discourse next day in the synagogue at Capernaum 6²⁴⁻⁵⁹, and closes with a confession by St. Peter speaking in the name of the twelve, to this being attached a reference to the future betrayal by Judas 6⁶⁰⁻⁷¹.

It is generally agreed that the correspondence between this chapter and the parallel narrative or narratives in St. Mark is particularly close. The connection however is possibly more remarkable and subtle than is sometimes thought and is not to be confined to the first two narratives, the feeding of the multitude and the walking on the lake. After these clear parallels to the Marcan record we have in Jn. 6 the discussion

about the problem of a sign in connection with the work of Jesus, the discourse on the bread of life, a confession by St. Peter, and an indirect reference, in connection with the coming betrayal by Judas, to the passion.

In certain respects St. John's narrative in Jn. 6¹⁻²⁴ is more closely akin to Mk. 6³⁴⁻⁵⁶ than to Mk. 8¹⁻¹⁰; and immediately after Mk. 6⁵⁶ we read in Mk. 7¹ of a controversy between the Lord and "the Pharisees and certain of the scribes who had come from Jerusalem," the controversy opening with a reference to the manner of the eating of bread. It is however important also to notice that Mk. 8¹, the second feeding of the multitude, is followed by a controversy with the Pharisees about a sign 8¹¹, a difficult discourse with the disciples in reference to bread 8¹⁴, and a little later by St. Peter's confession and immediately thereafter the first announcement of the coming passion 8²⁹⁻³¹.

If then in view of these further slight traces of parallelism it is permissible to think that the fourth evangelist throughout his sixth chapter had the earlier Marcan record or records and their order in any way in mind, it is possible that the Jews of Jn. 6^{41, 52} are not especially to be identified with the people of Galilee; they are as much the Lord's standing opponents in St. John, as the Pharisees and scribes, especially those who have come from Jerusalem, are in St. Mark. And if so, the murmuring and controversy among the Jews in Jn. 6^{41, 52} need not form an exception to the general rule of the friendliness of Galilee and its inhabitants to Jesus Christ; rather, the Jews mentioned in this chapter will be conceived, like the

opponents mentioned at Mk. 7¹, as coming from the south.

In any case we never hear in St. John of attempts made in Galilee to do away with Jesus; these are reserved for Judæa, and reference to them there is frequent 7¹, 19¹, 25 8³⁷, 40, 59, 10³¹ 11⁵³.

It remains to consider Jn. 7¹⁻¹⁴, a passage of great importance and difficulty, which records the Lord's last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem in this gospel and may thus be compared with the Marcan narrative of the journey from Galilee to the south, Mk. 9³⁰⁻³² 10¹. Like Jn. 4¹⁻³, 43¹ however the opening words remind us of a profound difference between the two evangelists. In St. Mark the gospel comes to Galilee, and its home is in the north; but in St. John's presentation of his subject the normal sphere of the Lord's activity is in Judæa; it is only for the special reasons given at 4¹, 44 7¹ that he goes to Galilee. Accordingly we read in 7¹ "And after these things Jesus walked in Galilee; for he would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews sought to kill him." And the narrative proceeds "Now the feast of the Jews, the feast of tabernacles, was at hand." This feast was the most important and popular of the three annual pilgrimages of the Jews, and this passage which immediately precedes the Lord's attendance at it is of special interest. In Jn. 7⁸ we read "His brethren said unto him, Depart hence and go into Judæa, that thy disciples also may see the works which thou doest. For no man doeth anything in secret and himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou doest these things, manifest thyself to the world." And the evangelist adds "For even his brethren did not believe on him."

Residence in Galilee is here identified with secrecy¹ and lack of notoriety; and the Lord's brethren, who do not "know" him or his mission, invite him to become known openly and to manifest himself openly and to the world, that is, at Jerusalem. On the part of one alleging the office and commission of Messiah this would be a particularly appropriate action at the feast of tabernacles.

The Lord's brethren, however, could not know what they were asking, when they invited him to make himself known to the world.² For the manifestation of the light, the coming and presence of the King, as is made clear in Jn. 7 and 8, necessarily involves a *κρίσις*, the word which with its cognates is used in this gospel for separation and discrimination. When Jesus Christ makes himself known as the light of the world³, there must be a moral affinity between him and those to whom he offers his leadership; otherwise they will be unable to recognize his presence; and in this case, as the narrative proceeds to shew, the coming of light and life is found to involve as its inevitable counterpart darkness and death.

The story therefore of the manifestation of the Lord in Jerusalem in Jn. 7 and 8, like the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum in Jn. 6, is a record of the sifting of his hearers by their reaction to him. Accordingly when the Lord in the midst of the feast

¹ Is there here a reminiscence or echo of the Marcan conception of the ministry in Galilee?

² Such passages as Jn. 3³, 14²² ff. explain why in the evangelist's view no such manifestation is possible, even when the Lord, his "hour" having come, enters Jerusalem "openly" 12¹² ff. Cf. Acts 10⁴¹ f. 1 Cor. 2¹² ff.

goes up¹ into the temple and begins to teach, it is still "as it were in secret." The prophecy of Malachi 3¹, "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple," is fulfilled, but those who hear him are for the most part unable in their blindness to perceive it, and the narrative only reveals and establishes the impassable gulf between him and his opponents. At the close of the eighth chapter the manifestation of the light is withdrawn; we read at 8⁵⁸ that Jesus hid himself and left the temple. Thus the scene which opened with the Lord's presence in the temple in secret closes with his departure from the temple in secret, not

¹ If in Jn. 7⁸ we follow the text of the RVmg., the contradiction between verses 8 and 9 is best explained by reference to the double meaning of *ἀναβαίνειν* in St. John. In its deeper sense it is used of the Lord's ascent to the Father 3¹³ 6⁴² 20¹⁷, when his work reaches its completion 17⁴ 19²⁸, 30 through his exaltation, that is, his death 3¹⁴ 8²⁸ 12^{32, 34}. In Jn. 7⁸⁻⁹ however it is stated with emphasis that the Lord's time has not yet come, is not yet fulfilled. In this sense therefore he does not go up, i.e. ascend to the Father, at the coming feast of tabernacles 7⁸, although he does go up shortly 7¹⁰ into the temple at Jerusalem. It is in full accordance with St. John's manner to use words having a double significance, i.e. a simple, literal and also a deeper, spiritual meaning; and as regards the Greek of 7⁸ the meaning of *εἰς* with the accusative does not necessarily differ in St. John from that of *ἐν* with the dative.

The words *ὁ ἔμὸς καιρὸς οὕτω πεπλήρωται* Jn. 7⁸ also recall strongly Mk. 1¹⁵ *πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς*. In the Marcan context these are the opening words of the Lord's proclamation of the gospel of God on his coming into Galilee at the beginning of the ministry; and we have seen that in St. Mark the gospel is only proclaimed in Galilee and its environs, not in the south. St. John however unquestionably regards the Lord's work as reaching completion in and with his self-oblation on the cross; this was the fulfilment of his "time" or "hour," and in it, above all else, St. John sees "the gospel of God," although he avoids both the noun "gospel" and the verb connected with it.

because such was his purpose, for he came as the light of the world 8², but because when he made himself known to the world, the world did not receive nor know him.

At Jn. 7⁶. 8 in the conversation with his brethren which we have just considered the Lord twice states that his time has not yet come or is not yet fulfilled, and he goes up to Jerusalem "not publicly, but as it were in secret" 7¹⁰. This is the only passage in St. John in which the expression "my time" occurs, and it does not seem to be essentially different from the more solemn expression "mine hour" 2⁴ cf. 7³⁰ 8²⁰ 12²³ 13¹ 17¹, which unquestionably refers to the Lord's passion and death. The words imply therefore that the time has not yet come for the last scene, which we may call the consummation; and indeed when this does arrive, the last visit to the capital is not made in secret 12¹²⁻¹⁹, although at the time its meaning was not understood 12¹⁶. It must always be remembered that in St. John's gospel the death of Jesus Christ is not a humiliation but an exaltation, the exaltation of the Son of man; not an hour of darkness, except for Judas and the rest 13³⁰ cf. 18³, but rather the hour of his glory; not a brief period of strain and strife, soon to be overcome and swallowed up in the glory of the resurrection, but itself the completion of his work. There is no darkness during the crucifixion, in St. John.

We saw in the last lecture that the gospel of the early church consisted chiefly in the proclamation of certain facts as together comprising a message of salvation. The chief of these facts seem to have been the ministry, death, resurrection and expected coming of the Lord. It was realized that these facts formed the

one work of Jesus Christ and were vitally connected, but the connection between them was variously interpreted. In St. Mark's gospel for instance the gospel is proclaimed in Galilee Mk. 1¹⁴. 1⁵; and although the scene of the crucifixion is Jerusalem, the completion of the work is to be in Galilee, and in the future. If the argument in the first two lectures was sound, the abrupt ending of St. Mark's gospel, which leaves the reader expecting in awe and fear the supreme event in Galilee, is striking evidence of this.

St. Matthew's gospel also lays emphatic stress upon the future and upon the importance of Galilee in connection with it; but Galilee is now the scene of an event which, however august, is not itself the consummation. Moreover the evangelist can speak also, in the closing words of his gospel, of a permanent, abiding presence of the crucified and risen Lord: "Lo, I am with you alway"; and if these words are given their full weight, it is inevitable that the preponderant significance attached to the future will decline.

With St. Luke's gospel we come into a different atmosphere. It will be remembered that in his resurrection-chapter, Lk. 24, there was no reference to the future, except in connection with the spread of the gospel and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit; nor was any sharp distinction drawn between the significance of Jerusalem and that of Galilee. St. Luke's gospel should always be considered along with his second volume, the so-called Acts of the Apostles; and if this is done it becomes clear that for him the christian revelation is on the whole the record of a steady progress, in which temporary opposition or difficulty is, if rightly viewed, a stepping-stone, and

inevitably leads to an extension of the work. He sees the proclamation of good tidings passing from small but powerful beginnings in Galilee, by way of Samaria, onwards to the Jewish capital; and from thence in due course, under the guidance of the Spirit, a similar expansive movement taking place outwards from Jerusalem to Rome. There is no absolutely culminating point, nor we may add is there tragedy, in St. Luke's presentation of the gospel.

It is a noteworthy contribution of the fourth evangelist that he brings back the note of culmination, completion, consummation, into his presentation of the gospel, but now without reference to the future or to Galilee. This does not imply that St. John is by any means forgetful of the future. The Lord in the last discourses in St. John looks forward to an increasing revelation of himself to his disciples as they are able to receive it under the guidance of the Holy Spirit 16¹² ⁿ; in 10¹⁶ 17²⁰ ^f he anticipates a single universal church; and the expression "the last day" is used several times in Jn. 6 and again at 12⁴⁶. But *eschatologically* St. John unlike St. Mark does not need to make drafts upon the future, just as topographically he does not assign to Galilee the important part which it plays for example in St. Mark.

In St. John's gospel the whole message of salvation is found within the life of Jesus Christ on earth, if this be taken to include and to receive its consummation in the passion and the death. Step by step through his gospel he shews that the historic life of Jesus Christ has brought to the world all that had been hitherto associated with the thought of the future consummation: judgement, light, victory over the

powers of evil, and eternal life. The last word upon the cross in St. John is τετέλεσται, it is finished or completed, and the word has reference not to the ending of the earthly life, but to the completion of the work of Jesus Christ; nothing remains to be added to this in the future, or elsewhere than in Jerusalem; the consummation is his life and death. The resurrection is not a reversal of the passion, in St. John.

But this surpassing and absolute significance attached to the historical facts reveals them not only in their glory but their tragedy. If Jerusalem is the scene of God's mightiest working and of mankind's supreme deliverance, it is also the sphere of the bitterest, intensest conflict. For though salvation is or should be from the Jews Jn. 4²², yet by rejecting Jesus Christ they have shewn themselves, in St. John's view, to be not children of God but children of the evil, Jn. 8⁴⁴. Accordingly in St. John's gospel there falls on Jerusalem, as on the cross itself, not only light, but shadow; and Jerusalem holds the chief place in St. John's gospel because the cross stood there.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

- Aeschylus, 11
 Anna, 142
 Aristion, 2
 Aristotle, 11 f.
- Bartimæus, 123
 Brooke, A. E., 13
 Burkitt, F. C., 4 f., 8 ff., 16,
 19 ff., 102, 109, 126
 Butcher, S. H., 12
- Cadbury, H. J., 13 f.
 Charles, R. H., 73
 Clarke, W. K. Lowther, 8, 37, 46
 Cleopas, 79
 Creed, J. M., 7, 18, 22, 64, 135,
 142
- Dodd, C. H., 22, 77, 108 f., 149
- Edgar, C. C., 13
 Elijah, 113 f., 121, 136
 Enslin, M. S., 16
 Euripides, 11
 Eusebius, 2
- Fascher, E., 6
- Herod the Great, 111
 Homer, 11
 Hort, F. A., 1 ff., 9, 20, 69, 113,
 133¹
- Irenæus, 2
- James, M. R., 52
 Jerome, St., 103 f.
- John the Baptist, St., 31 f.,
 113 ff., 121
 Joseph of Arimathæa, St., 55,
 86 f., 90
 Josephus, 115
 Jowett, B., 11
 Jülicher, A., 6
 Justin Martyr, St., 13, 15
- Kraeling, C. H., 14
- Lake, K., 137
 Lohmeyer, E., ix f., 6, 45 ff.,
 73 ff., 76, 117, 140
- McLean, N., 13
 Marett, R. R., 21
 Mary Magdalene, St., 56, 90 ff.,
 97, 99
 Moses, 136
- Nicodemus, 90, 149
- Oppian, 103 f.
 Ottley, R. R., 7, 10 ff., 17
- Peter, St., 19, 21, 26, 57, 59, 90,
 101, 103 ff., 121
 Plato, 11 f., 15, 24
 Pliny, 104
- Salmon, G., 1 f.
 Scott, W., 15
 Streeter, B. H., 22, 42 f.
 Swete, H. B., 2 ff.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., 17
 Theudas, 115

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Thomas, St., 93 f., 99 | Westcott, B. F., 1 ff., 9, 113, 133 |
| Turner, C. H., 5, 60 f., 69 | Wright, A., 51 |
| Weiss, J., 52 | Yorke, E. C., 11 |
| Wellhausen, J., 5 f., 43, 135 | Zacchæus, 139 |

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis		St. Matthew	
18 ¹⁵	12, 17	4 ⁵	71
45 ³	13	4 ¹³ ff.	126 f.
Judges		4 ¹⁴	132
6 ¹¹⁻²⁴	29	4 ²⁴ f.	128
13 ²⁻²²	29	5 ¹	128
2 Kings		9 ⁵¹	132
1 ⁸	114	10 ¹	128
1 Chronicles		10 ⁵	132
10 ⁴	13, 17	10 ⁶	130
Nehemiah		10 ²³	130
11 ¹⁸	71	12 ¹⁵ ff.	128
Psalms		13 ⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸	145
130 ⁴	36	14 ²⁶⁻²⁸	102
Isaiah		15 ²⁹⁻³¹	128 f.
61-8	29	16 ¹³ ff.	129
16 ¹⁰	13	16 ²¹	129
29 ¹¹	13	18 ³⁸	132
52 ¹	71	19 ¹	129
Ezekiel		23	130
47 ⁶⁻¹²	103	27 ⁵¹ f.	68
Daniel		27 ⁵²	71
7 ¹⁴	72, 82	28	95, 106
Zechariah		28 ¹	97
13 ⁴	114	28 ¹⁻¹⁰	82
13 ⁷	52	28 ¹⁻²⁰	66 ff.
Malachi		28 ⁶	68
3 ¹	154	28 ⁷	69
		28 ^{7, 10, 16}	86
		28 ⁸⁻³⁰	34
		28 ^{9, 10}	69 f., 86, 92
		28 ¹⁶	88
		28 ¹⁷	71 f., 76
		28 ³⁰	83, 156
		St. Mark	
		11-13	113
		1 ⁵	114

St. Mark	PAGE	St. Mark	PAGE
1 ⁶	114	6 ⁵⁰	16
1 ⁷	113	6 ⁵⁶	151
1 ⁸	65	7 ¹	152
1 ⁹	58, 147	7 ¹ ff.	130, 151
1 ⁹ ff.	37, 75	7 ²⁴⁻³²⁷	121
1 ¹³	113	7 ³¹⁻³⁷	128
1 ¹⁴	133	7 ³⁶	118
1 ¹⁴ f.	115, 156	8 ¹⁻¹⁰	151
1 ¹⁴ ff.	76, 115 f.	8 ¹¹ ff., 14 ff.	151
1 ¹⁴⁻¹⁵	112, 132	8 ^{27-9¹}	74 f.
1 ¹⁵	133	8 ²⁹ ff.	151
1 ¹⁶	18	8 ³¹	33, 41, 122, 125, 136
1 ¹⁷	103	8 ³⁴ ff.	75
1 ²¹⁻²⁷	117	8 ³⁸	75
1 ²¹⁻²⁴	116	9 ¹⁻⁸	31
1 ²⁴	117	9 ⁶	9, 18
1 ²⁸	117	9 ⁹	32
1 ²⁹	147	9 ⁹ ff.	30 ff., 35
1 ³⁵	117	9 ³⁰⁻³²	152
1 ³⁸ f.	117	9 ³¹	33, 41
1 ³⁹	134	9 ³²	16
2 ^{1-3⁶}	118, 130	10	112, 132
2 ^{10, 17, 19, 28}	118	10 ¹	112, 123, 152
3 ⁷ f.	128	10 ^{1-15⁴⁷}	123
3 ⁷⁻¹⁹	118 ff., 128	10 ⁶ f.	125
3 ¹⁰⁻¹²	129	10 ²²	18
3 ¹³	128	10 ³²	16 f., 33, 71, 123
3 ¹³ ff.	128	10 ³²⁻⁴⁵	75
3 ¹⁵	117	10 ³³	33, 41
3 ²¹	18	10 ³⁵	53
3 ²¹⁻²⁵	130	10 ³⁸ f., 46	75
3 ²⁹	65	10 ³⁸⁻⁴⁴	75
4	123	11 ^{1-16⁸}	112, 132
4 ⁴¹	16	11 ¹⁵⁻¹⁸	9
5 ¹⁵	16 f.	11 ¹⁸	16 f.
5 ^{23, 38}	16	11 ³²	16, 18
6 ff.	132	12 ¹²	16 ff., 61
6 ¹⁻⁶	130, 145	12 ³⁶	65
6 ⁸	145	12 ³⁸	124
6 ¹²	117	13 ²⁻³⁷	123
6 ¹⁴	120	13 ¹⁰	118
6 ²⁰	16	13 ¹¹	65
6 ²⁰	120	13 ²⁶	40, 63 f., 73
6 ²⁴⁻²⁶	151	13 ²⁵ ff.	75
6 ²⁵	121	13 ³⁷	75

St. Mark	PAGE	St. Luke	PAGE
14 ¹	75	4 ¹⁴	133
14 ^{1 f.}	53	4 ^{16, 23}	145
14 ³	125	4 ¹⁸⁻²⁰	138, 145
14 ³⁻⁹	22, 56	4 ²¹⁻⁷⁵⁰	135
14 ⁶	54	4 ⁴⁴	134, 145
14 ⁹	118	5 ¹⁻¹¹	103
14 ^{10 f.}	53	5 ¹⁰	103
14 ^{13 ff.}	125	5 ^{13 ff.}	138
14 ^{18-21, 22-25}	22	5 ¹⁷⁻⁶¹¹	138
14 ²⁷⁻³⁰	52	6 ¹⁻¹¹	138
14 ²⁷⁻³¹	53, 59	6 ^{13 ff.}	138
14 ²⁸	4, 8, 43, 52 ff., 59, 112	6 ^{17 ff.}	138
14 ^{29 ff.}	104	6 ²⁰⁻⁴⁹	138
14 ⁵⁰	57	8 ¹	135
14 ⁵²	44, 63, 73	8 ^{10 ff.}	138
14 ⁷⁰	149	8 ²⁸	135
15 ³⁰	54	9 ¹⁰	135
15 ⁴⁰	27 f.	9 ¹⁸	135
15 ⁴⁰⁻¹⁶⁸	28	9 ⁴⁴	81
15 ⁴¹	27, 112	9 ⁵⁰	133
15 ⁴⁷	27 f.	9 ⁵¹	136 f.
16 ^{1 ff.}	27	9 ⁵¹⁻⁵⁶	138
16 ¹⁻⁸	6 f., 10 ff., 23, 24 ff., 35 ff., 55 ff., 66, 82, 103, 106, 133	9 ⁵²	137
16 ^{3 f.}	60 f.	10 ¹⁻¹²	138
16 ⁴	5, 18	11 ²⁷	138
16 ⁵	30	11 ^{33 f.}	138
16 ^{5 f.}	28	12 ^{1 ff.}	138
16 ⁶	31 f., 36, 57 ff.	13	139
16 ⁷	6 f., 8 f., 21, 29 f., 33, 36 ff., 43, 52, 55 ff., 59 ff., 73 ff., 112	13 ⁸⁻⁹	141
16 ⁸	2 ff., 29 f., 34, 51	14 ^{1 ff.}	138
16 ⁹⁻²⁰	1 ff., 51	17 ^{11 ff.}	138 f.
16 ^{12, 14}	102	18 ¹⁸	133
16 ¹⁹	84	19 ¹¹	139
		19 ^{41 ff.}	139
		19 ^{45 f.}	141
		20 ¹	141
		21 ²⁴	142
		22 ¹	141
		23 ⁵	143
		23 ⁴⁸	142
		24	39, 41, 74, 84, 95 f., 102 f., 107, 133, 156
		24 ²	87
		24 ^{5 ff.}	39
		24 ⁶	78, 81
St. Luke			
1 ³	28		
1 ²⁶⁻²⁸	29		
1 ^{28 f.}	143		
2 ¹	140		
2 ²⁸	142		
3 ¹	140		

St. Luke	PAGE	St. John	PAGE
24 ⁶ f.	80 ff.	4 ¹⁻³	49, 152
24 ⁷	83 f.	4 ³	146
24 ¹³	90	4 ^{4, 8} ff.	150
24 ¹³⁻³¹	87 ff.	4 ⁸	147
24 ^{30, 36}	40	4 ²¹	96
24 ²⁶	80, 83, 85	4 ²³	158
24 ^{27, 32}	89	4 ²⁷	101, 147
24 ³³⁻⁵¹	87 ff.	4 ³¹	147
24 ³⁴	75	4 ³⁰⁻⁴²	149
24 ³⁶	92	4 ⁴³ f.	146, 152
24 ³⁷ ff.	71	4 ⁴³⁻⁵⁴	49
24 ³⁹	76	4 ⁴⁴	144, 152
24 ^{40, 43}	88 f.	4 ⁴⁵	149
24 ⁴⁴ ff.	83, 89	4 ⁵⁴	101
24 ⁴⁴⁻⁴⁹	79	5 ¹ ff.	150
24 ⁴⁶ ff.	40	5 ⁹	150
24 ⁴⁸	84 f.	5 ⁴³	146
24 ⁴⁹	83, 93, 96	6	150, 153
24 ⁵¹	45, 82, 84	6 ¹ ff.	101
		6 ¹⁻²¹	150 f.
		6 ^{1-7⁹}	49
		6 ^{3, 16}	147
		6 ²⁴⁻⁵⁹	150
		6 ³⁰	147
		6 ³⁶	77
		6 ⁴¹	151
		6 ⁴²	147
		6 ⁵²	151
		6 ⁶⁰⁻⁷¹	150
		6 ⁶²	98
		7 f.	153
		7 ¹	152
		7 ¹⁻¹⁴	152
		7 ³	147 f.
		7 ³ f.	152
		7 ⁴	154
		7 ^{6, 8}	155
		7 ⁸ ff.	154
		7 ¹⁰	33, 143 f., 148, 154 f.
		7 ¹⁹ f.	152
		7 ²⁵	152
		7 ³⁰	155
		7 ³³	97
		7 ³⁴	148
		7 ⁴¹ f.	148
St. John			
I ¹⁻¹⁸	113, 146		
I ¹¹	146		
I ²⁰	116, 147		
I ³⁸	93		
I ³⁶	101, 116		
I ³⁹	116		
I ⁴³	49, 116, 147		
I ^{43-7⁹}	143		
I ⁴⁴	147		
I ⁴⁵	147		
I ⁴⁸	148		
I ⁵¹	74, 91		
2 ¹⁻¹¹	149		
2 ¹⁻¹²	49		
2 ^{3, 11} f.	147		
2 ⁴	155		
2 ¹¹	101		
2 ¹²	148		
2 ¹³⁻²³	149 f.		
2 ¹⁷	147		
3 ^{3, 5}	153		
3 ¹⁸	98		
3 ^{22, 26}	147		
4 ¹	147, 152		

St. John	PAGE	St. John	PAGE
7 ⁴¹⁻⁵²	115	17 ¹	155
7 ⁵²	148 f.	17 ⁴	99
8	153	17 ²⁰ f.	157
8 ¹²	155	18 ³	155
8 ^{14, 19}	148	18 ⁴	148
8 ²⁰	155	18 ⁵	148
8 ²¹	148	18 ⁶	148
8 ^{37, 40}	152	18 ¹⁵	147
8 ⁴⁴	158	18 ²²	101
8 ⁵⁹	152, 154	18 ³³ g.	148
9 ²	147	19 ¹⁹ g.	148
9 ²⁹	148	19 ³⁰	99
10 ¹⁻¹⁶	104	19 ³⁵	101
10 ¹⁶	157	20	49, 74, 95 f., 101 ff., 107 f.
10 ²¹	152	20 ¹	95 f.
10 ⁴⁰	144	20 ²	90 f., 101
11	144	20 ² g.	101
11 ⁷	147	20 ³⁻⁹	90
11 ¹⁶	94	20 ¹²	91
11 ²²	152	20 ¹⁴	101
11 ⁵⁴	144	20 ¹⁶	91
12 ¹²	49, 96	20 ¹⁷	91, 96, 98
12 ¹² g.	153, 155	20 ¹⁸	76, 92
12 ¹⁶	155	20 ¹⁹	92, 95 f., 101
12 ²¹	147	20 ¹⁹ g.	101
12 ²³	101, 155	20 ¹⁹⁻²²	93, 98
12 ⁴⁸	157	20 ²⁰	76
13 ¹	96, 155	20 ²¹	92, 103
13 ¹ g.	99	20 ²¹ g.	103
13 ⁷	33	20 ²²	93
13 ¹²	8	20 ²⁵	76
13 ²² f.	101	20 ²⁵ g.	71
13 ²⁹	155	20 ²⁶	92, 95 f.
13 ³⁶	101	20 ²⁶ g.	94, 101
13 ³⁷ f.	104	20 ²⁹	76
14 ⁵	94	20 ³⁰	47
14 ¹²⁻²²	93	21	101 ff., 108, 144
14 ¹⁶	99	21 ¹	101 f.
14 ²² g.	153	21 ¹ g.	103
14 ²⁷	92	21 ²	101, 147
16 ⁷	99	21 ³	105
16 ¹²	33	21 ⁴	101 f.
16 ¹² g.	157	21 ⁶	103
16 ¹⁶⁻²²	74	21 ⁷	101
16 ²²	92		

St. John	PAGE	I Corinthians	PAGE
2I ¹¹	103, 105	15 ⁵	21
2I ¹²	101	15 ⁵⁻⁸	27, 50, 74 ff.
2I ^{13 f.}	104	Galatians	
2I ^{13 f.}	101	1 ^{16 g.}	50
2I ¹⁴	101 f.	4 ⁴	110
2I ^{15 g.}	102	Philippians	
2I ¹⁶	101	2 ^{6 g.}	46
2I ^{20 g.}	101	4 ¹⁵	44
2I ²²	103, 105	Colossians	
2I ²⁴	101	3 ⁴	102
Acts		I Timothy	
I	84, 96	3 ¹⁶	46
I f.	107	2 Timothy	
I ¹	82	1 ¹⁰	116
I ⁴	49	Hebrews	
I ^{4 f.}	79	6 ⁵	77, 110
I ⁸	39	9 ²⁸	73
I ⁹⁻¹¹	39, 84	11 ¹⁴	146
2 ¹	137	I Peter	
2 ²²	47	3 ¹⁸	46
3 ¹⁵	47	I John	
4 ¹⁰	58	2 ²⁸	102
5 ²²	47	3 ²	73, 102
9 ⁹⁻⁹	34	Revelation	
10 ⁹⁻¹⁶	30	1 ⁷	73
10 ²⁰	30	19 ¹⁻¹⁰	71
10 ²⁶⁻²⁸	143		
10 ²⁹	47		
10 ⁴¹	47		
13 ²¹	75		
13 ²¹	47		
16 ⁷	82		
26 ¹⁶	75		
Romans			
3 ²⁶	28		
I Corinthians		St. Justin Martyr's	
9 ¹	76	Dialogue with Trypho the Jew	
15	51	32 ¹	13, 15
15 ^{9 f.}	27	Testament of Zebulun	
15 ⁸⁻⁷	20	9 ⁸	73
15 ⁸⁻⁹	46		