

Problems in the Gospels.

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

II.

The Twelve and the Seventy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Gospel of Matthew is based on Mark and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recent Foreign Theology.

Jesus Christ and Paul.¹

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

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

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

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

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