

1911

# The synoptic gospel

---

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/6110>

*"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."*

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPEL

By

Ross L. Finney

*Ph. D.*

*June 1911*

*Call -*

*Small +*

PhD

1911

f

Preface.

The present volume owes its origin to the want the author has experienced in finding a suitable text for his classes. The texts based on harmonies of the four gospels seem to him to be out of the question, because they ignore the standpoint of modern scholarship, which studies the <sup>synoptic</sup> ~~synop-~~tic and the Johannine records separately. If this <sup>synoptic</sup> method is good for the scholars, it ought to be good for the people; and if this method is to be popularized, a text-book with that purpose in view, for the use of college and other classes, seems necessary. This necessity became evident to the author and to other college teachers of the Bible, very soon after the publication of his English arrangement of Huck's Synopsis.

In addition to this need the author has felt another. The world is full of good books for the study of one phase or another of Jesus' life, work, and influence. There are introductions to the gospels, histories of Jesus' times, biographies, treatises on his teachings, and books on the modern social application of the gospel message. Some very excellent works deal with two or more of these phases. But the author knows of no one book that deals with all of them. It seems to him that none of these subjects can be ignored in a proper study of Jesus. To bring them all together, therefore, into a brief, elementary form, suitable for the use of college classes, is what the author has sought to do in these five chapters.

To meet these two needs the present volume is offered to the public. The subject matter, substantially as presented here, has been used by the author in his own classes for several years.

Ross L. Finney,

378

B

1911

f

## Contents

- I. The Sources.
- II. The Times.
- III. The Career.
- IV. The Message.
- V. The Present Worth.

## Bibliography,

### I. The Sources.

In this chapter I am dependent upon some type written Notes on the Synoptic Gospels which Dr. Euell used in his classes. I have also read what Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible has to say on the various gospels. I have done a very great deal of original meditation on the subject in connection with my preparation of Huck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, subjecting every verse to minute scrutiny. My own conclusions I have checked up finally with Sharman's chapter on "The Sources and their History" in his The Teaching of Jesus about the Future. Treatises attempting to harmonize the four gospels have, of course, been ignored.

### II. The Times.

1. Hastings: Dictionary of the Bible.
2. Mathews: History of the New Testament Times in Palestine.
3. Mathews: The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.
4. Rhee: The Life of Jesus of Nazareth.
5. Riggs: A History of the Jewish People, Maccabeau and Roman Periods.
6. Purves: The Apostolic Age.
7. Schurer: A History of the Jewish People in the Times of Christ.
8. Josephus: Complete Works.
9. The Apochrypha (and Bible, of course.)
10. The Kent Series, Willetts, Cornill, Mitchell, etc., etc., on the Prophets.

### III. The Career.

1. Eidersh ems: The Life of Christ.
  2. Cary: The Synoptic Gospels.
  3. Schmidt: The Prophet of Nazareth.
  4. See above: II. 2. 3. 4. 7.
  5. Various works on Psychotherapy and the problem of the Supernatural.
- N. B. In this chapter I have worked independently to a considerable degree, building a biography, on Huck's outline, as it seemed to me.

#### IV. The Message.

1. Bruce: The Kingdom of God.
2. Stevens: The Teachings of Jesus.
3. Cary: The Synoptic Gospels.
4. Schmidt: The Prophet of Nazareth.
5. King: The Ethics of Jesus.
6. Rauschenbusch: Christianity and the Social Crisis.
7. Sabatier: Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion.
8. Mathews: The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.
9. Sharman: The Teaching of Jesus about the Future.
10. Dewey and Tuft: Ethics.

#### V. The Present Worth.

1. Rauschenbusch: Christianity and the Social Crisis.
2. Ely: Social Aspects of Christianity.
3. Mathews: The Social Teachings of Jesus.
4. " The Church and the Changing Order.
5. Peabody: Jesus Christ and the Social Problems.
6. Henderson: Social Duties.
7. Wilcox: The American City. (and others *on the same subject*)
8. Warner: American Charities. (and other works on charities).
9. Wines: Punishment and Reformation.
10. Parmelee: Anthropology and ~~###~~ Criminal Procedure.
11. Meade, Ely, Clarke, Jenks, etc., Etc., on the Monopoly Problem.
12. Sumner and Adams: The Labor Problem (and other works).
13. Butterfield: Chapters in Rural Progress.
14. Ross: Social Control and his Sin and Society.
15. Daniels: Public Finance.
16. Johnson, B. Meyer, H. R. Meyer, Hadley, Daggett; etc., on the Railroad Problem.
17. Ely, Seager, Walker, Saligman, Hadley, etc., on Economics.

18. Giddings: Elements of Sociology.

19. Gladden: Applied Christianity, and his Christianity and Socialism.

20. Various works too numerous to mention on Ethics, Philosophy, General History, Political Science, Socialism, Religion, Theology, Current Events, etc., etc.

N. B. It is impossible to make a complete list of books that have influenced me in writing this manuscript, as the work represents my conclusions after fifteen years of reading and meditation. I mention the works I have made actual use of in the preparation of the chapters.

R. L. F.

*N.B. The figures in parentheses (in the foot notes) refer to pages in my Huck's Synopses.*

-0-

I. THE SOURCES.

-0-

## THE SOURCES.

The professional historian is constantly talking about his "sources". By sources of history he means traditions, folk-lore, official records, original documents, contemporaneous literature, and archaeological relics, from which he gathers the facts concerning the age and events of which he wishes to construct a history. These the historian collects and sifts, and the wheat of them he grinds into his grist.

But there is another class of sources, concerning which it might be debated whether they are history or sources of history. That is, narrations or accounts written some little time after the occurrence of the events which they describe. These also the historian examines carefully, indeed critically.

From this kind of sources he gathers information about two distinct periods: the period they describe, and the later period in which they were written. The latter he reads between the lines, and it is often the more valuable of the two. Take, for instance, the *Nibelungen* lied and the Homeric poetry. Their descriptions of the prehistoric events they describe are not wholly trustworthy. But the historian finds between the lines a good deal of information about the somewhat later times in which they were written. The author, so to speak, betrays that incidentally. This is neatly illustrated in Gen. 12: 7 where it says: "And the Canaanite was then in the land." Thus the writer tells without intending to, that there were no Canaanites left in

the land at the time he was writing? In like manner the Canterbury Tales furnish material for description of English social life in the fourteenth century; the prophecy of Ezekiel, for an account of the social life of the exiled Jews in Babylon; and the Book of Daniel for an essay on the religious horror of the Jews at the abominable persecutions by Antiochus Epiphanes, in 168 B. C.

But some sources of the above mentioned class, may almost be called history instead of sources. Take Caesar's Gallic Wars. Of course the historian must make some allowance for Caesar's clever, modest way of bragging; but that does not seriously discount the narrative. Other illustrations of this class of sources are the writings of Tacitus, Herodotus and Josephus .

Now the Christian is confronted by skeptics who are anxious to impeach the historical value of the Bible. They challenge us tauntingly to subject the sacred page to critical examination. Then there are scientific historians, who, though they have no skeptical intent, insist upon sifting what they call our "sources". To evade the challenge of the one would subject us to the charge of cowardice; to ignore the contention of the other, would subject us to the ridicule of scholarship and the charge of bigotry.

But Christianity stands neither upon cowardice nor bigotry. Accordingly the Christian army has its division of engineers; reverent, scientific historians who devote their lives to this very work. They have made the most searching investigations possible. And it will be not merely interesting but indeed inspiring to the student to learn something of how they have investigated the gospel records, and what impregnable defenses they have constructed.

Sometimes the defenders of a city have been misunderstood and abused by the very non-combatants whom they have been defending. Unfortunately this has not been untrue of these defenders of the faith. Witness, for example, the opprobrium sometimes attached to the word "higher criticism"; which is the technical term they themselves have applied to the work they are doing for the Church.

For the sake of the interest and the sense of security to be derived, let us proceed to the examination of what the scientific historian is pleased to call "the sources" of the history of Jesus' words and works. And as we proceed let us be grateful that we are in possession of sources so exceedingly valuable as our four gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. For, if they are not so encyclopedic with respect to details of that revered life as we might sometimes wish, it should be reverently remembered that they are, with respect to essentials, adequate to all our needs.

The first three of these gospels are technically known as the synoptic gospels. They have a striking similarity to one another; but between them and the book of John there are equally striking differences. We may note three chief differences: the synoptics differ from John in material, in purpose, and in point of view.

The difference in material, or subject matter, is clearly presented to the eye by Appendix 2 in Huck's Synopsis. The material of only about sixty-five verses of the first thirteen chapters of Mark is duplicated in John. The first fifteen chapters of Matthew, and the first twenty-one chapters of Luke, virtually correspond to the first thirteen chapters of Mark; and this

material ( excepting about sixty-five verses ) is absent from John. Only when it comes to the history of the martyrdom do John and the synoptics record the same events.

This difference is nowhere more strikingly presented than in the so-called harmonies of the four gospels. On page after page of them one sees the three columns: Matthew, Mark and Luke, but no John; Matthew, Mark and Luke, but no John. Then as one turns the pages he finds John, John, John, page after page, but no Matthew, Mark and Luke. Until one comes to the Passion Week; only then the four columns appear side by side. The outstanding impression from these harmonies is that John and the synoptics are not parallel so far as contents are concerned. Their material is mutually supplemental, rather than parallel.

This difference of material may perhaps be accounted for by a more fundamental difference; that of purpose. John states explicitly <sup>1</sup> (~~John 20:31~~) that its purpose is to plead a cause, to prove a point: that Jesus is the Son of God. Only a casual reading of the Johannine gospel makes this purpose evident. In fact this purpose is almost announced as a thesis in the first few verses. <sup>2</sup> (~~John 1:1-18~~)

The purpose of the synoptists is not stated in Mark or Matthew; but it is stated, or at least implied, in Luke, (~~Luke 1:1-4~~). In the prologue to that gospel the author states that he, like others, is taking in hand to draw up a narrative. To draw up a narrative seems to have been the simple purpose. And if Mark and Matthew are among the many "others" to whom Luke refers, and that will seem more probable as we proceed, we may take it for granted that the purpose of all the synoptists was

(1) Jno. 20:31.      (2) Jno. 1:1-18.      (3) Lk. 1:1-4(17).

simply to draw up a narrative. We may add incidentally that they doubtless had in mind, as did John, the consequences of drawing up so important a narrative; and we shall also see that the synoptists had also secondary purposes in addition to the primary purpose just painted out.

As to point of view, with respect to which John and the synoptics differ, that is partly covered by the difference of purpose. By the expression 'point of view', it is intended to imply that there are reasons for the difference of purpose. Without going into evidences the statement may be made that John was written somewhat later than the synoptics. This is universally held, though there is some dispute as to how much later. Now it would be strange if this lapse of time had not wrought its changes. There may have been a somewhat different atmosphere in the church when John was written than when the synoptics were. John doubtless finds a menace, or reflects a sentiment, which did not exist at the earlier date. The gospel lenses, through which we see the same Jesus, have absorbed a little ecclesiastical color from the decade in which they were ground. Their points of view are different. Accordingly, in the Johannine gospel we see the theologian's Jesus, the Son of God; while in the synoptic gospels we see the common man's Jesus, the Son of Man.

Because of these well recognized differences, it is now quite generally agreed that the synoptics and the fourth gospel should be studied as distinct work, in order to an adequate comprehension of either. Such is rapidly becoming the method of all New Testament scholars. As a consequence the ethical principles and social ideals of Jesus are being precipitated out of their theological solution, and the world is appreciating them as

never before. Another century will doubtless see them practiced as never before.

The first question to which the aforesaid defenders must give a well substantiated answer is the question of origin and authenticity. That is, in plain English: When and by whom were the synoptic gospels written?

The spontaneous answer would be that they were written by the men whose names they bear. And this indeed is the answer of a very old tradition; though these names are nowhere mentioned in the texts themselves of the gospels, nor is there internal evidence of any kind to confirm the tradition. And it might seem as natural that the "Gospel according to " might have been added by some early copyist, as that the coincidence should have occurred of each author prefixing to his manuscript a title so similar to each of the other titles. But even so, that hardly throws doubt upon the authorship.

This ancient tradition that Matthew, Mark and Luke wrote the gospels bearing their names, is partially corroborated in an almost romantic manner by an independent testimony of record. Harking back across the centuries we hear the call of one Eusebius, a historian who wrote about 325 A. D. He calls to us of a man who lived two hundred years before him: Papias by name, an early church father. Our testimony is now back within a century of Jesus. And Eusebius' call is a fragmentary quotation in his writing from the writing of Papias. He says that Papias said someone designated as "the elder" used to tell him ( i. e. Papias ) that Mark wrote down in order what he had been accustomed to hear Peter teach about Jesus.

What<sup>1</sup> is like our boyhood play of skipping stones across the river; it is a far shore; but each skip of the stone makes is a shorter one, and at last it lands safely on the other side.

Yes, and Papias also testifies, according to Eusebius, of another document: the sayings of Jesus, written in the Hebrew tongue by Matthew.

Evidently, then, there were two documents in existence at a very early date: one by Mark: an account of things either spoken or done by Jesus; another by Matthew: sayings of Jesus, in Hebrew. The question is, are these documents identical with our Mark and Matthew gospels.

First as to the Mark document referred to by Papias. It may as well be said at the outset that scholars do think that that ancient Mark document was substantially the same as our present gospel according to Mark. There were some minor differences, but these we may pass by for the present. But in setting forth the reasons for that scholarly belief we come upon several very interesting considerations. For instance we bring to light some interesting facts and probabilities as to how Mark came to write down his narrative.

It seems this Mark had been-- so the Papias' fragment says-- the interpreter of Peter. Greek scholars differ as to what the word translated interpreter means; whether Mark had been a kind of private secretary to Peter, or whether he had translated Peter's addresses as he discoursed in Aramaic to Greek audiences. Without even cutting the Gordian knot by guessing "both", let us look between the lines and get a picture of Peter's later ministry. The lines ( of the Papias' fragment ) declare that Mark wrote down what he

what he remembered Peter to have said in his addresses about Jesus. Between the lines, then, we see Peter preaching the flaming evangel of Jesus Christ, doubtless in many places and perhaps <sup>often</sup> before audiences of Greek hearers; illustrating and enforcing his preaching by incidents and narratives from the life of the Master, perhaps almost the entire discourses being composed of such material.

And much, if not all of the time, he was accompanied by Mark, who interpreted when the hearers were Greeks. For Peter, it would seem, spoke Aramaic only, which was the language of the Jews in Jesus' times. Who this Mark was, and what part he played in apostolic history, anyone interested may readily learn by looking up the references to him in the New Testament.

From what has already been said it may safely be inferred that the testimony concerning Jesus was passed along by word of mouth until Mark committed Peter's oral tradition to writing. Reading Mark then, we are, as it were, virtually listening by proxy to Peter, the eyewitness. And to this we have the chain of testimony: Eusebius, Papias, the presbyter, Mark, Peter, Jesus. It would certainly be an unappreciative student who could be introduced to this chain of independent testimony without a thrill of delight!

When Mark wrote this document is a further question of much interest, inasmuch as we are curious to know how long a period was bridged by oral tradition. Another form of the same question would be: When would Mark first come into possession of a motive for committing the oral report to a written record? And to this question almost any school boy would propose the

answer: As soon as Peter was dead. And this is the answer that seems most reasonable. As to the date of Peter's death very little if anything is known, but the traditions seldom or never place it later than 65 A. D., and it may have been much earlier. Later on we shall find reasons for thinking that the completed synoptics must have been in existence at a time not much if any later than the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A. D. More definitely than this a date cannot be assigned to the Mark document.

Such then is the historic evidence for the origin and validity of our gospel according to Mark.

If there was any other or earlier written record than Mark's we know nothing of it. And as for our present gospel according to Mark, the great bulk of it looks on the surface like precisely the kind of material we should expect Peter to have transmitted. By saying "the great bulk" the intention is to indicate what the student will not be surprised to learn that there are words, and occasionally a whole paragraph that appear to have adhered to the original Mark document from some later source. For instance, in the Westcott and Hart Greek Testament you will find the last eleven verses of Mark enclosed in brackets, indicating that they are not found in the most ancient Greek manuscripts, but begin to appear in later ones. (~~See Huck's Synopsis, page 150~~). But if a house has a new coat of paint, new shingles, and even a new porch, baywindow or small lean-to, people nevertheless speak of it as the same house. The original Mark document, therefore, is preserved to us in our present Mark gospel.

One who has never done so before will find great pleasure in reading the gospel through at a single sitting. He will

(1) See Huck's Synopsis, p. 150.

find it a vivid, rapid narrative, and full of action. It is without rhetorical adornment other than simplicity; its most characteristic introductory adverb is "straightway"; and its manifest purpose is just to tell the story of the Master's ministry and death. It is, as we shall see, the earliest and the oldest of the gospel records. It takes us back to Christ nearer in point of time than any other testimony we possess. Unless, indeed, it be that Matthew document of which Papias speaks, so let us inquire what that was.

Papias says that other early document consisted of sayings of Jesus, written in Aramaic by Matthew. Now the question is: Was that document the same as our present gospel by the same name? And here again it may as well be answered at the outset that it was not. So we may speak of it as the Matthew document to distinguish it from the Matthew gospel: or to be more technical; the Matthew logia document, logia being the Greek word for sayings.

It will now be interesting to learn the reasons for the above assertion about the logia document. They are very simple and convincing. First, Papias says that document consisted of sayings. But our Matthew gospel contains a very great deal beside mere sayings. To be sure it contains whole chapters of Jesus' sayings such as chapters five, six, seven and others; but all these put together are but a small fraction of the whole gospel. So we may say that the gospel contained sayings, plus. But plus what? When this question is answered we shall have a second of the reasons sought a moment ago.

Now take your Huck's Synopsis and turn to the Analytic-

al outline on page seven. Notice that Mark 1:1-6 is paralleled by Matthew 3:1-6. Going through the whole of Mark in the same way, you will observe that nearly all of Mark is paralleled in Matthew. In fact if you will take the trouble to go through the outline and count all the Mark verses omitted from Matthew, you will find only forty-four. And that is so small a percent of all the Mark verses ( less than seven percent by actual count ) that one is justified in saying that Mark is found bodily in the Matthew gospel.

And did the reader notice as we were passing that those three sayings chapters, five, six and seven, known as the Sermon on the Mount, are peculiar to Matthew? But already the truth has flashed upon the reader: our Matthew gospel consists of the Matthew logia document plus the Mark document. So one has in the same hand the reasons why the Matthew document could not have been the same as the Matthew gospel, and an explanation also of how the Matthew gospel was pieced together. Yes, and we see why the gospel got its name, Matthew; from the Matthew logia document that was incorporated into it.

Another question the reader's curiosity will now propose is whether the logia document was exactly the same as the part of Matthew we have so long known as the Sermon on the Mount.

The reader will involuntarily mention the wish that it was; and scholarship on the whole humors the wish.

There is considerable other discourse material in Matthew ( and let us anticipate by saying, in Luke also ) besides the Sermon on the Mount. The student will note " The Parables Address",<sup>2</sup> (~~Huck's Synopsis, page 58~~) "The Synoptic Apocalypse",<sup>3</sup> (~~ditto, page 119~~) and others. Now it is just these discourse materials

(1) See Huck's Synopsis, p. 58. 30

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 119.

(2) *Ibid.* p. 58.

that the most striking verbatim parallelisms of the synoptics are found. The Apocalyptic Address is found in all three of the synoptics with surprising verbal parallelisms. And an inquisitive study of the Parables Address <sup>1</sup> (~~Mark 4~~) leads to a ~~semi~~ similar observation. Also one's curiosity is piqued to discover absolute verbal parallelisms in other unexpected places, namely certain discourses peculiar to Matthew and Luke. Examples of such passages are the ones beginning "Ye offspring of vipers, who warned<sup>d</sup> you, etc." <sup>2</sup> (~~Huck's Synopsis, page 36~~), "What went you out into the wilderness to behold" <sup>3</sup> (~~ditto, page 55~~), "Woe unto thee, Chorazin, etc.", <sup>4</sup> (~~ditto, p. 7~~), "I thank thee oh Father, Lord of Heaven and earth, etc.", (~~ditto, p. 75~~), and others that might be mentioned.

As for Matthew-logia: did it include the Sermon on the Mount, and also those other discourse materials? Let us answer by limiting it to the Sermon on the Mount. In the first place, the Sermon on the Mount seems to be a literary unit, a finished whole. And this with the further fact that Matthew puts it all in a block, leads one to presume that that was all the block there was to put in. Then it is nearly all of that epigrammatic style, full of terse, pithy sentences, many of them containing enigmatic propositions. Jesus used these terse epigrams so frequently and so pertinently that he seems to have impressed them more deeply on the minds of his hearers and the imagination of their immediate posterity than we suspect by superficial reading. There are in the synoptics some two dozen of them that are duplicated in two or more places in the scheme of parallels (~~see Huck's Synopsis, Appendix 3~~). That is decidedly significant: it means that

such sayings fell frequently from his lips, that he was known

(1) See Huck's Synopsis, p. 58. (3) *Ibid.* p. 53. (5) *Ibid.* p. 75.  
 (2) *Ibid.* p. 20. (4) *Ibid.* p. 70. (6) *Ibid.* p. 154.

and remembered by them. And certain papyrus scraps of Jesus' sayings found in Egypt in 1897 are precisely of this character; succinct gems of pertinent philosophy. These new Egyptian sayings contain material not found in the gospels at all, they are not scraps of the gospels or of any other known writings, yet among them we find these familiar epigrams, "Many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first", "For there is nothing hidden that shall not be made manifest", "A prophet is not acceptable in his own country"; and others. For such sayings Jesus must have been famous in his own time and for centuries afterwards. And that is the kind of sayings the Matthew-logia must have consisted of; at least such we find in the Sermon on the Mount. But the other discourse materials are of wholly different character, as a casual observer will notice. Their eligibility to a place in the original logia document seems therefore questionable. Moreover there is another difference: Luke reproduces the Sermon on the Mount very differently than Matthew does. Luke omits much of it, varies the wording, and even the sense. But the Matthew-Luke parallel discourses contain word for word identities through long paragraphs. If the Sermon and the Matthew-Luke parallel discourses are from the same document, why should the two parts be treated so differently in the synoptics? The inevitable conclusion is that they cannot be from the same document. It seems probable, then, that the logia document must be limited to the Sermon on the Mount.

But other questions press for consideration. One is: When and by whom was the Matthew gospel pieced together? Manifestly it was after the composition of Mark; and there are the same reasons for thinking it was finished during or soon after the

Titus conquest as there are for thinking Mark was. As to who the compiler was we do not know except the evidences that he was a Hebrew. He must have been able to read the logia in Aramaic, and his audience, as we shall see later, was Jewish.

When was the logia document composed? No one knows, but doubtless as early as, or earlier than the Mark document. Did the compiler of the Matthew gospel have a copy of the Mark document before him as he wrote? If the student will glance but hastily down the Mark and Matthew columns of Huck's Analytical Outline he will see that Matthew does not follow the Mark order. The Matthew material has to be rearranged to adapt it to the Mark order. If the compiler had the Mark document before him, why did he rearrange the material? Again, a careful perusal of the texts of the parallel columns will show the student that the Matthew gospel surprisingly seldom duplicates the Mark narrative word for word. And yet the duplication is <sup>often</sup> tantalizingly near the verbatim. If the compiler of Matthew had Mark before him, can we doubt that he would have copied it? His purpose was to report the material: why would he have avoided the wording? But if we suppose the Mark document to have been frequently read in the assemblies, and passed about by word of mouth, and that the compiler of Matthew had its familiar contents stored away in his memory, and that he wrote from the fulness of such recollection; then we might naturally expect just such results as we actually have: the substance of Mark reproduced, the order sometimes altered and sometimes followed, the language often approached with tantalizing nearness, but seldom, very seldom duplicated exactly through passages of any length.

But there remains a further question about additional material in Matthew explained neither by the logia nor by the Mark document. For example, the "Introduction" and the "Jesus Risen"<sup>2</sup> sections (~~see Huck~~) manifestly belong to neither of these documents. Also, the student may amuse himself by tabulating a list of all the verses in Matthew that are not in Mark. Among this non-Mark material of Matthew will be found much of the discourse material referred to above.

With all this material before him the student faces one of the hardest knots in "the synoptic problem". Where did the compiler get this material? Beside the Mark and the logia documents did he have access to other documents and traditions which scholarship can perchance restore?

So far as this treatise is concerned, which is intended to be elementary, we may as well cut the knot by saying that the question is, for us at least, of no special consequence. The compiler must have had access to traditions, and perhaps also to documents of minor importance of which no historic testimony has been preserved. But what they were we can hardly be sure. Some scholars have made quite plausible guesses, and we shall refer to one of them later on. But at best they can only hypothetically specify what the residuary sources were. Even then the question involves but a relatively small fraction of the gospel of Matthew; while the great bulk of it we have already traced to the eyewitnesses, Matthew and (by proxy) Peter. On the firm foundation of these sources we take our stand; with no vital concern as to the residue.

The gospel of Matthew was addressed to the Jews and was intended to convince them that Jesús was, according to the

(1) See *Huck's Synopsis*, p. 17.

(2) *Ibid.* p. 145.

old scriptures, the fulfilment of their messianic hope. Aside from the primary purpose of telling the story this was the compiler's secondary purpose. This is evident from his Old Testament quotations, of which he inserted many more than did either of the other synoptics (~~see Huck's Synopsis, Appendix I~~); and which he usually prefaced with the explanation: "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophet, saying--". Jesus' drastic arraignment of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matthew 23) is more complete in Matthew, and this is another indication of the Hebrew character of the gospel. Other indications might be mentioned, but it is unnecessary.

So much for Matthew. Now the same questions arise, of course, with regard to Luke. But it will not be necessary for us to go so minutely into them. In the first place, we have seen how the critics work out their defensive conclusions; and that was half the battle: to get into the atmosphere of their work-shops. And in the second place, we should reach quite similar conclusions about Luke that we have about Matthew. But whereas we speak of Matthew's having been pieced together by a compiler, we could more appropriately speak of Luke's having been composed by an author. This is partly because, according to a very old tradition which is and always has been accepted, it was put into nearly, if not quite its present form by Luke. It is further because, whatever documents and traditions Luke used, he seems to have made a more free-handed, independent use of them than did the compiler of Matthew.

This is illustrated in his use of the Mark document.

This document is incorporated into his gospel as it is into Matth-

(1) See Huck's Synopsis, Appendix I, p. 152.

(2) Mt. 23: 1-39 (115f).

ew, as will be seen by a perusal of Huck's Synopsis. But its material is broken up and scattered more than it is in Matthew. As for his use of the logia document, a mere glance at the "Sermon on the Mount" part of Huck's Analytical Outline<sup>1</sup> reveals the free-handed use he made of that. And a study of the parallel deepens the impression. The fact that he reports "Blessed are ye poor" instead of "Blessed are the poor in spirit", is only one of a score of like facts that might be mentioned. Indeed, some think that Luke did not have access to the logia document, but merely remembered parts of it; or else had unknown documents containing references to it. This may account for the fact that he uses only part of the logia material and scatters that through the gospel instead of holding it in one block as in Matthew. Or, it may be accounted for by Luke's literary method: perhaps his idea was that each epigram or paragraph was uttered at its own time and place in Jesus' life; and he was assigning it to its proper place in the narrative.

But what shall we say of the problem of Luke's additional sources? The student will do well to tabulate the Luke material found neither in Mark nor in the logia. He will see that it is considerable. And here it may be well to introduce the student to one of those theories about hypothetical "restored" documents. Not that the matter is of vital concern, but merely because the student will want to know something about such guesses.

Let the student take a testament and, clipping out the text, paste it together into one long strip. Let him begin with Luke 9:51<sup>2</sup> and take everything to Luke 18:14. To this add Luke 19:1-28. Having this all together in one strip, the student may

(1) p. 7.

(3) *Ibid.* p. 92 ff. (cf. p. 15).

(2) See Huck's Synopsis, p. 42

imagine he has "restored" before him a lost document used by Luke in compiling his gospel. Such is Professor Burton's theory; and he calls it the Perea document. The Mark parallels to it are virtually negligible. The logia material in it is quite altered from the form we find it in the Matthew gospel. It reads consecutively, and seems to constitute a unitary whole. Moreover, those striking verbal parallelisms which were referred to a few pages back, are Matthew-Luke parallels, i. e., they are absent from Mark altogether; showing that Matthew or Luke or both actually copied something; either one copied the other, or both copied some lost document. And most of them are within the confines of this supposed Perea document. All of these things, it must be admitted,, contribute to the plausibility of the theory, if they do not prove it. Even so, it is exactly what we should imagine: that other documents existed beside the two mentioned by Papias; written by the many others whom Luke mentions(~~Luke 1:1~~). But instead of regretting that we have no historical corroboration of them, we should be grateful for the corroboration we do have of those two principal ones.

The distinguishing characteristics of Luke are briefly summarized. He does not seem to be proving a point as did Matthew; he is telling a narrative, enriched by much material not found elsewhere. Some of our most prized parables, such as The Prodigal Son and The Good Samaritan, are found only in Luke. This gospel not being addressed especially to the Jews, it may have had the Gentile world for its intended readers; which falls in with the belief that Luke was Paul's companion on one of his journeys. It brings out the social teachings of Jesus, and portrays him as mingling with the people, as does no other gospel.

(4) Lk. 1:1 (17).

Before closing this chapter it is necessary to say a final word about one matter to which tentative reference has several times been made; that is, The Synoptic Apocalypse (~~see Huck's Synopsis, page 119~~). Here we find ourselves breathing the atmosphere of a time somewhat later, but not too much later, than the memorable and cataclysmic conquest of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. of which a brief account will be given in the next chapter. Having acquainted himself with the main facts of this bloody era, the student will do well to read again the aforesaid apocalypse. Let him imagine himself a Jewish Christian who is in the midst of, or has just passed through, those events. He can hardly fail to appreciate the applicability of the words to those circumstances; his imagination will indeed be sluggish if he does not catch the inspiration of confidence and hope they were manifestly intended to produce.

Now this apocalyptic address is found in all three of the synoptics. The contrast in literary style and subject matter between this address on the one hand, and on the other hand, the terse epigrams of the logia and the duplicates (~~see Huck's Synopsis, Appendix 5~~), may suggest the problem of synoptic strata to inquisitive readers; but however that may be, this apocalypse and therefore the three synoptics into which it is incorporated, must have been finished during, or not long after, that memorable conquest which it reflects: that is, sometime between 70 and 80 A. D. This is evidently the latest date assignable to the composition of the first three gospels.

And now we come to the conclusion. We have seen what the sources are, and how their critical examination is conducted.

(1) See Huck's Synopsis, p. 119. (2) *Ibid.* Appendix III, p. 154 ff.

And we have seen how unimpeachable is their validity even from the standpoint of secular historical science. And we have also seen how the early apostles and evangelists were laborers together with God in the composition of the inspired pages; just as men in all ages have been laborers together with Him in the evangelization of the world.

And through the transparent lenses of these ancient documents, mounted in our New Testament gospels, whose unmistakable form do we clearly see? We see Jesus, a prophet indeed, doing wonders and works of good will, speaking keen-edged incisive epigrams, and hopeful parables of the kingdom, with authority as never man spake. Jesus, who announced himself as the Son of Man and the Son of God, and who is not only the Saviour of men but the Saviour of the world as well. And he, if he be lifted up, will draw all men unto him.

II. THE TIMES.

If Vespasian or Titus has possessed the literary genius of Caesar, it is conceivable that High School students might today be introduced to classic Latin with the words : Palæstina est omnis divisa in partes tres. Of these three divisions, the one lying farthest to the north was Galilee. Galilee extended almost to the foot of snow capped Hermon on the north, and included the fertile middle "plain" of Esdraelon, drained by the Kishon on the south. This was a distance of about sixty miles. In width it averaged less than half as much. From the hills of Galilee the blue waters of the Mediterranean could be seen to the west across the narrow strip of populous Phœnicia. Among the high, almost mountainous hills of southern Galilee lay Nazareth, and Cana four miles to the northwest. Five miles to the east across a little section of the plain of Esdraelon, towered Tabor, nearly two thousand feet high. Down to the eastward from this pleasant highland, with its forest covered mountain slopes, its vine clad hillsides, and grain bearing valleys lay the hot, fertile plains of Tiberias and Genessaret, and with their busy prosperous cities, Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Tiberias. These narrow little plains, famous for their semi-tropical abundance were bounded on the east by the placid Jordan, seven hundred feet below the level of the sea, and by the high steep shores of Genessaret, flaming with oleander.

Samaria lay to the south of Galilee, so that Jesus in going to Judea would travel among its hills and across its fertile valleys; unless he went by the Jordan route, which many pilgrims preferred. In Jesus' time Samaria was inhabited by a mixed and alien race, descendants of colonists transported seven centuries before from various parts of the east to take the place of the ten tribes exiled by Assyrian tyrants. Ever since the return of the Jews from the Babylonian exile the Jews and the Samaritans had been at odds for racial, political, and religious reasons.

Judea is a hill country, for here the Palestinian range is most rugged. On one of the most impregnable spurs stands Jerusalem surrounded on the east, south

and west sides by deep, narrow gorges. To the east, across the Kedron gorge is the Mount of Olives. The valleys of Judea are not without agricultural resources, however; and in Jesus' time Judea supported a numerous population. There were many villages, among others Bethlehem, <sup>six</sup> ~~three or four~~ miles south of Jerusalem; <sup>and Bethany,</sup> two miles to the <sup>north</sup> ~~southeast,~~ <sup>just over the summit, near the crown of</sup> ~~on the slopes of Mt. Olive~~ and on the road that led down, down to Jericho, near the north end of the Dead Sea, twelve hundred feet below the Mediterranean level. Beyond Jericho were the Jordan, and the desert where John Baptist preached; while at the southern end of the Dead Sea were the northern frontiers of the Arabian Desert, a wild district known as Idumea.

If we include in Palestine the country known as Perea, which lay on the east side of the Jordan, opposite Samaria, and the tetrarchy of Herod Philip lying at the east of Lake Genesaret and the upper Jordan, then the division of Palestine into three parts is hardly applicable, for it is only Palestine west of the Jordan that is so divided.

Jesus' career and message cannot be adequately understood except in connection with the spirit of his times; and the spirit of the times cannot be appreciated without tracing at least briefly the historical development of certain sects and ideals which dominated the atmosphere in his day. Now dates constitute a skeleton of history, and for an intelligent understanding of this developmental epoch the following dates may very advantageously be memorized:

- 168 B. C. Beginning of the Maccabean revolt.
- 63 B. C. Romans under Pompey subjugate Jerusalem.
- 37-4 B. C. Reign of Herod I.
- 4 BC-40 A. D. Palestine in three political divisions.
- 40-44 A. D. Herod Agrippa I.
- 44-100 A. D. Herod Agrippa II<sup>1</sup> and various procurators.
- 70 A. D. Titus' Conquest of Jerusalem.

At the dawn division of the Macedonian Empire at the death of Alexander, 323 B. C., Syria and Phoenicia-but not Egypt-fell into the hands of the Seleucidae. Time out of mind Judea had been at the point of friction between the Egyptian and Eastern empires. Antiochus Epiphanes was the last of the Seleucidae to control Judea. Returning in 168 B. C. from his Egyptian campaigns, and

(1) Ac. 25: <sup>13</sup> 26.

suspecting the Jews of disloyalty, he determined to perfect the Hellenization of the people, that he might have a perfectly loyal buffer province between himself and Egypt. Accordingly he began a war for the extermination of a religion; one of the most fascinating, though cruel and revolting, in history. It has been likened to Philip's attempt to subjugate the Netherlands, but Antiochus, who even sacrificed a swine to Zeus on the sacred altar in the temple, had miscalculated the fanatical, religious patriotism of the Jews; and their revolt, under the successive leaders of the Maccabean or Asmonean, house, resulted in complete liberty. This political religious upheaval gave rise to some of the most fervid and influential of the later Hebrew literature. The Book of Daniel plainly reflects the events of this period; and the First Book of Maccabees, the earlier chapters of Enoch, and the Sibylline Oracles could not have been written much later.

Hebrew history from beginning to end was an internal struggle between two tendencies, one of which sought political and commercial intercourse with surrounding nations, the other of which advocated a narrow, bigoted separatist policy, in the interests of Israel's peculiar religion. It was only through the successes of this latter tendency that Israel accomplished its unique contribution to the development of civilization. This internal conflict of parties was not absent during the Maccabean period and it is in this conflict that we trace the rise of those conspicuous sects of Jesus' time, the Pharisees and Sadducees. But internal conflict generates civil chaos, and civil chaos invites conquest. Thus Maccabean independence lasted only a single century, and Pompey made Palestine a Roman province in 63 B. C. The details we must pass over—they are very confusing—as we must also pass over the details of the early Herodian dynasty, except to say that King Herod I,<sup>3</sup> though unscrupulous and murderous, was a strong ruler, a successful maintainer of peace and a great builder. Among his architectural enterprises is to be counted the rebuilding of the temple.

(1) Dan. 11:31; 1 Macc. 1:54; Jos. Ant. 12:5:4.

2 (2) Lk. 1:5(17). Mt. 2:1(27); 2:19(28).

3 (3) Dan. 11:21-45.

Herod the Great was king of all Palestine and considerable territory besides, but upon his death in 4 B. C. his kingdom was divided into three parts. One division was given to each of three sons of <sup>his.</sup> Herod the Great. Herod Antipas, the Herod of Jesus' life time, had Galilee and Perea; Herod Philip had the tetrarchy mentioned above,<sup>1</sup> of which Caesarea Philippi, near the foot of Mount Hermon was the capital. This was a city of his own building, named after himself and Caesar to distinguish it from the more important Caesarea on the Samaritan coast. Archelaus inherited Judea, Samaria and Idumea; but he was deposed for bad administration in 6 A. D., and during the life of Jesus Judea was under Roman governors of whom Pilate was one.<sup>2</sup> All Palestine was never again united except for a short time under Herod Agrippa I.<sup>3</sup> If the student will distinguish among these various rulers in Palestine, he will avoid much confusion in reading New Testament history.

It will detain us too much with details to define minutely the prerogatives and powers of these little sub-kings called tetrarchs and these little sub-governors called procurators. Suffice it to say they were local representatives of imperial authority; and that it was the imperial policy not to interfere more than necessary with local customs. Thus the Jews enjoyed a large measure of religious liberty; their Sabbath was recognized, and their sacred objects respected. Their <sup>own</sup> local courts or councils,<sup>4</sup> also, consisting of seven judges in the small towns, and of twenty-three in the larger ones, were permitted, under limitations, to administer the Jewish laws locally. The chief of these courts was the Sanhedrin. This was a supreme court composed of seventy-two members from both the Pharisees and Sadducees;<sup>5</sup> and had jurisdiction under the Jewish law over all kinds of cases, religious, civil and criminal, except that it could not execute a capital penalty without the sanction of the Roman procurator.<sup>6</sup> It met regularly twice a week, and was presided over by the High Priest. Historically the court or its prototype dates back to the Greek period and its development coincides partially with the development of the two sects

\* insert the sentence on the back of this page.

of which it was composed.

But notwithstanding the measure of religious and political autonomy enjoyed by the Jews, they were harassed by the erratic whims of ambitious administrators,<sup>1</sup> by the maintenance of an obsequious peace, under the heel of an oppressive soldiery,<sup>2</sup> and by the tyrannical collection of burdensome and often dishonest taxes.<sup>3</sup> Being a people whose patriotism at times amounted to a religious frenzy, they were increasingly discontented, therefore, under the Roman regime; ~~and~~ <sup>so that</sup> their discontent finally reached the point of revolt, and their revolt resulted in the complete and final annihilation of their national existence, in 70 A. D.

Most readers of the New Testament are more familiar than they realize with the social conditions in the midst of which Jesus lived. It is only necessary, therefore, to render this familiarity explicit by bringing the facts as revealed in the gospels into the focus of consciousness. Here was a comparatively dense oriental population, mostly native Hebrews,<sup>4</sup> but with a considerable sprinkling of Greek and Roman officials and commercial adventurers.<sup>5</sup> All three of these languages were in use therefore, especially in Jerusalem.<sup>6</sup> The population was housed upon a territory hardly larger than two average American counties. Primitive agriculture was doubtless the principal occupation; and grainfields, vineyards, orchards and pastures are accordingly in evidence everywhere in Jesus' travels and parables. The fisheries of Tiberias must have furnished employment for many; and Jesus' disciples were mostly from men of this occupation. Jesus himself was reared a carpenter; and all the other necessary trades must have had their proportionate representatives among the people. We have but few references in the Synoptic Gospels to traffic and commerce;<sup>7</sup> but we do have many references to the publicans,<sup>8</sup> who were the collectors of the customs. The existence of such officials is conclusive evidence that there was a commerce to levy

toll upon, and the fact that they were rich and generally hated ~~ix~~ for their corrupt practices is evidence that the commerce was large. The distribution of wealth, however, was a deplorable instance of social injustice. Apparently the land was all in the hands of comparatively few landlords<sup>1</sup>, who, like the commercial and official<sup>2</sup> aristocrats, lived in good houses<sup>3</sup> and fared sumptuously every day. The Sadducees<sup>4</sup> represented the political and religious spirit of this social class? They were the logical descendants of the perennial party favoring commercial intercourse with other peoples; their interests were secular; they ignored Jesus until he interfered with the prerogatives of the Sanhedrin by clearing the temple of the money-changers; they denied the physical resurrection and repudiated the Messianic expectation.; and were the conservators of the policy of peaceful submission to the Romans--they could fish best in still waters! But while wealth was in the hands of the few, the populace consisted of slaves and hired laborers who lived in little mud huts and at poverty-stricken wages served private employers or public enterprises. The most familiar incidents of Jesus' life give us a picture, also, of beggars of all sorts, and of numberless defectives of mind and body--not to mention the ubiquitous Oriental dog--swarming the streets. It was before Christian civilization had institutionalized the care of such classes. And as might be expected, such a society was not without its criminal class, who subsisted by preying upon wealth and commerce. These social conditions help to explain the attitude of Jesus and of his reporters toward the ownership of wealth. It also explains the multitudes of miserable folk who followed Jesus eager for his ministrations, and the insurrections that were imminent or actual during his lifetime, and for a generation following his death.

But notwithstanding the presence of these miserable and violent elements in the community there was undoubtedly a considerable element of pious, industrious law-abiding poor; and it was from this class that Jesus sprang. These homes probably exemplified as high a stage of ethical development as any of the homes of antiquity; for it was from the Hebrews that Christendom has inherited its best ethical principles. Each village had its synagogue where the scripture was read and expounded every Saturday at least and though it must not be supposed that all or even a majority

new paragraph

new paragraph

5 of

7

8

9

10

11

physical

13

12

14

15

of the people were regular attendants, still here was the center of the community's religious life. Here also was conducted the village elementary school and occasionally a political meeting.

The customs levied upon traffic have been mentioned--the direct taxes levied by the Roman procurator might also have been spoken of in the same connection--but besides these fiscal burdens there was laid upon the people an additional load of religious taxation in the form of tithes. for the support of the numerous clergy known as the priests and Levites. Twenty-four distinct classes of these mitred and phylacteried functionaries swarmed about the temple at Jerusalem; and to each, according to his grade, was assigned in rotation some more or less honorable task in connection with the complex liturgy of the temple. In addition, ~~xxx~~ to the temple clergy, there ~~xxx~~ were also numerous priests connected with each of the village councils, their function being that of religious assistant to the judges. Evidently the common folks were priest-ridden, both materially and spiritually; for these men were dominated by the spirit and ideals of Phariseeism, though many of the more humble of them were doubtless men of sincere godliness.

Phariseeism, indeed, dominated the religious atmosphere of the times, and without an understanding of it the message of Jesus cannot be properly appreciated; for that is the background against which his teachings stand in bold relief. But Phariseeism was the culmination of a long historic development, and its spirit cannot be comprehended apart from a brief survey of its history.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the Pharisees of Jesus' time were the degenerate heirs of the ancient prophets: they were the official representatives of prophetism now institutionalized, codified and decadent. The prophets had demanded a pure and righteous service of Jehovah, unadulterated by any tolerance of foreign religions. It was the separatist policy of Ezekiel and of the deutero-Isaiah that welded the Babylonian exiles together preparatory to their return. Otherwise Jehovah worship might have syncretized with the Babylonian religion, and

perished like a river in the desert sand. When Ezra and Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem about 432 B. C., they found the "people of the land" practicing commercial relations and matrimonial intercourse with foreigners. To combat this tendency they led the Jewish people to adopt a new law in which the ancient separatist policy was codified more stringently than ever before. This law was the Priestly Code of the Pentateuch. It was adopted under the most urgent need and with the most admirable sincerity, and it doubtless proved of great value in preserving the purity of the unique Hebrew faith and worship. To this law and its interpretation the Pharisees of New Testament times were assiduously devoted; but their interpretations had become irrelevant and evasive, and their devotion stale.

Mention has already been made of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the Maccabean revolt which his persecutions provoked. The saviours of Israel in these dreadful straits were the Maccabees, Mathathias and his sons; but the leadership of this family of heroes would have been in vain had they not been joined by a party known as "The Pious". These religious enthusiasts reared before the eyes of their faith at this dark crisis the vision of the Messianic hope, as set forth in Daniel, some of the later Psalms, perhaps, and the Book of Enoch. But their chief characteristic was their fanatical devotion to the law. So extreme was their devotion indeed that on one occasion they allowed themselves to be slain "with their wives and their children and their cattle, to the number of a thousand people", rather than join battle with their persecutors on the Sabbath day. But however decadent the party may have become two centuries later, their brave and desperate stand with Mathathias and his sons against Antiochus, in the name of righteousness, religion and liberty classes them with the Huguenots, the Hollanders and the Puritans among the heroic saints of history. It is only by admiring the purity of such a movement at its source that one learns the lesson of history, namely, that reforms degenerate into soulless institutions, and revivals become inert and visionless hierarchies.

When religious freedom was secured in 163 B. C. the Pious withdrew from the

war. But the war did not cease; it continued under the Maccabees until political liberty was secured and the Maccabean dynasty set up. This secular state naturally had its worldly ambitions and Gentile alliances, but with these liberal interests "The Pious" had no sympathy. It thus came about that in the reign of Hyrcanus ( 135-105 B. C.) there were two parties, the Pharisees, representing the ancient separatist policy, and the Sadducees whose real god was mammon. The Pharisees had therefore become the enemies of the Maccabean House whom their fathers, "The Pious", had helped set upon their throne. But the change was in the Maccabees rather than in the Pharisees, for their strict devotion to the letter of Jewish legalism had remained consistent.

Cooperation was undreamed of in those days. There was the strength of union only under the power of a great tyrant. What if the Greek cities, or the little kingdoms at the east end of the Mediterranean could ~~have~~ ever have federated? What if the Pharisees and Sadducees could have estimated majorities with ballots rather than with swords! But they could not; and the loot was Pompey's ( 63 B. C. ) . But after the dust and blood of a half-century's internal strife had been obliterated and after still another half-century's abject submission to Rome had elapsed, the Pharisees and Sadducees still remained upon the scene, guardians of their ancient differences.

Only Phariseeism had sadly degenerated.. Whether it was the lethargy of an enforced and intolerant peace, or the seal of the Lord's house which Herod had built or the mere lapse of time it would be hard to say; but certain it is that they had, at the beginning of the Christian Era, substituted in large measure at least, the letter for the spirit of their ancient principles. The inevitable tragedy of a sincere legalism is that it multiplies specifications and interpretations in its anxiety to provide for all possible situations. Whoever would please God by keeping a law must have a law that will descend to all the minute details of life. Especially will this be true when the legalist worships so inexorable a deity as the God of the Pharisees. It was this very demand for specifications and minutiae that gave rise to the Scribes. They catered to this need,

(1) See Matt. 23: chapter (116).

amplifying, applying and interpreting the ancient code. The absurdity to which they carried their work is seen in the tithing ~~of~~ garden herbs and vegetables. It is said that their laws about the Sabbath, which necessitated their knowing precisely when the Sabbath began, led to something of this kind: "If only one star was visible, it was still day, for the text in Nehemiah<sup>2</sup> says 'stars', and if only two stars were visible, it was doubtful, for the first star did not count, but when three stars were seen, night had certainly arrived" and the Sabbath had begun. After the appearance, therefore of three stars, a tailor would be breaking the Sabbath if he walked out in the street under the burden of a needle stuck in his garment. Many other instances of these absurd and irrelevant minutiae might be cited;<sup>3</sup> but it is unnecessary; the spirit and temper are evident.

But as Paul points out, a detailed legalism is too much for erring human nature,<sup>4</sup> so that the cry inevitably arises: "O, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death." This is the pathos and tragedy of the sincere legalism, coupled with the worship of so austere a God as that of Saul the Pharisee. The Scribes escaped by hiding their heads in the band of evasive chicanery. They built up laws which evaded the law. Thus a man might repudiate his oath sworn by the temple on the technical ground that the oath to be binding must be sworn by the gold on the temple.<sup>5</sup> Or, if he had indigent and dependent parents, he could technically dedicate his property to God, and call it Corban, whereupon Phariseeism justified him in turning his dependent parents out into the street.<sup>6</sup>

It would appear from such facts as these, gathered not only from the gospels but from the Talmud, that Phariseeism had become an empty and ~~far~~ external formalism. It would seem that the most irrelevant substitute for an ethical code, a system wholly foreign and extraneous to essential morality and religion, was buttressed by the most sacred ancient authority.<sup>7</sup> Students of the Talmud declare that the superiority of the tradition to the law was openly declared; and the New Testament would indicate that the most corrupt practices were common,<sup>8</sup> and apparently justified by the evasive casuistry of the times.

*if not universal among them*

This shirking of moral obligation was not, however, the worst phase of their deterioration. They were hypocrites with respect to their motives and sentiments, as well as sinners with respect to their deeds. They counted themselves to have apprehended. And yet they were so vain that they habitually circulated their depreciated moral currency in the market place "to be seen of men"; and even presented it at the throne of grace.<sup>2</sup> And being so well pleased with their own self-righteousness they piously despised the common people to a degree which puts our modern race prejudice to shame.<sup>3</sup> They called the masses who were not strict observers of the law and their traditions "the people of the land"; and believed them to be accursed.<sup>4</sup> Their ceremonial washings<sup>5</sup> were largely for the purpose of removing possible defilement derived from contact with them in the streets. But strange as it may seem, Phariseeism, being the dominant religion of the day, the common people looked up to these men who looked down upon them, and aspired to imitate those by whom they were despised. Thus Phariseeism has become a synonym for sensorious, exclusive, self-righteousness, the most contemptible of spiritual vices. No wonder Jesus pronounced against it one of the most drastic philippics in all literature.<sup>6</sup> The only use the world has for such a system is to make it a background against which a better way may be clearly seen, like apples of gold in baskets of silver.<sup>7</sup> How Jesus put it to this use and with what cost to himself will be pointed out in later chapters. One cannot but wish, however, that modern Phariseeism might oftener be put to such uses; for the vice is perennial wherever reform and revivals have gone to seed.

and  
Neither Phariseeism nor the religious atmosphere of the time nor the ministry of Jesus can be understood apart from the Messianic Hope., which in one form or another was common to all elements of Jewish society in the New Testament period. This hope seems to have been peculiar to the Hebrews, for whereas the golden age of the classic world was a lost age of the past, the golden age of Israel was an inspired dream of the future. From the earliest epochs of her history, Israel had been conscious that she was a chosen people with especial mission to the future. The prophets were the chief exponents of the national hope. Amos foresaw

through and beyond the impending disasters with which the chosen people were to expiate their apostasy that Jehovah would bring again the captivity of his people Israel and plant them upon their land never to be plucked up again.<sup>1</sup> Isaiah<sup>2</sup> after rebuking Ahab for his disobedience of Jehovah predicted the birth of a child, who in the near future<sup>3</sup> should bring national ~~and~~ deliverance, peace<sup>4</sup> and blessedness.<sup>5</sup> Apparently the prophet foresaw the outlines of the Messianic order, but with a faith impatient of delay. Jeremiah was the martyr prophet who wept over Nebuchadrezzar's smoking ruins of Jerusalem and the temple,<sup>6</sup> and on whose features Sargeant depicts the most abject grief and disappointment; but yet even he saw the vision of justice and judgment to be reestablished under the reign of a Branch<sup>7&</sup> of the House of David, who should gather together again the scattered remnant of Jehovah's people.

It was in the times of national calamity, however, that the Messianic Hope flamed up most confidently to lighten the dark pathway of events. Ezekiel, therefore, the Shepherd of the Exiles,<sup>8</sup> held his discouraged flock together by presenting to their Messianic faith the promise of a restored, purified and protected nation<sup>9</sup> to be blessed with fruitfulness and prosperity<sup>10</sup> and an ideal sanctuary with grand appointments.<sup>11</sup> But the deutero-Isaiah,<sup>12</sup> the unknown prophet of the later exile, heralds the evangel more clearly than any of his predecessors. To him the deliverance of the exiles is at hand.<sup>13</sup> Cyrus is to liberate them, and a highway<sup>13</sup> is to be cast up across the desert for their return to Palestine.<sup>15</sup> The faithful remnant of the people, through and for whom this delivery is to be accomplished, the prophet personifies as the suffering Servant of Jehovah,<sup>16</sup> whose vicarious Messianic work he then describes in language strangely applicable to Jesus.<sup>17</sup> Here the national expectation of a restored Davidic dynasty is given almost a transfigured meaning, and righteousness<sup>18</sup> is set forth as its means and end as never before, and as never again till the Messianic message should fall from the lips of the Anointed himself.

National affliction never stimulated Messianic visions more effectually than in the dark days of Antiochus Epiphanes. The events in which he participated

were followed by an outburst of Messianic literature of the most fervid sort. The First Book of Maccabees, the record of these events, expects the true prophet.<sup>1</sup> Daniel, in connection with his metaphorical description<sup>2</sup> of Antiochus and his deeds introduces the Messianic expectation<sup>3</sup> in the most vivid terms to comfort his readers and inspire their faith. Like Isaiah he believed the expected Kingdom would come immediately with manifestations of supernatural power.<sup>3</sup> Other literature of this period that sets forth the Messianic expectation has already been mentioned in connection with the legal ~~laws~~<sup>4</sup> reforms of "The Pious". It was the literature of this period, especially Daniel<sup>3</sup> and Enoch, that first used the term "Son of Man" to designate the Messiah; and as these writings were in very common use in Jesus' day, we may readily see how the people would understand Him when he called himself the Son of Man.

Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem, like earlier national disasters gave rise to a new literature of Messianic reassurance, the Psalms of Solomon. The Messiah of these Psalms is described as a descendant of David who should come in God's good time, and expel both Romans and Sadducees from Jerusalem, and set up a kingdom of holiness, justice and peace. These psalms for the first time, it is maintained by some, conceived of the Messiah as a person, and they therefore mark a distinct stage in the development of the Messianic idea.

So much for the history of that unique Hebrew expectation, the Kingdom of God. But perhaps there never was a time in all the Jewish centuries when that hope was keyed to so high a pitch as during the first century A. D. For two centuries preceding, this expectation had been rapidly increasing in definiteness and enthusiasm until it had reached a culmination in Jesus' day. Not all conceived it in the same terms, however. There were two conceptions, that of the Pharisees and that of the Zealots. The Messianism of the Pharisees had become almost entirely apocalyptic.<sup>5</sup> They believed that Jehovah would in his own good time send the Davidic Messiah amidst some display of supernatural power, who would gloriously reestablish the Jewish nation, judge the world and terribly punish the enemies of the pious Jews and of their Jehovah.<sup>6</sup> This day of the Lord was not to be forced or hastened by any human appeal to arms; but when it should arrive, then Israel

would triumph both gloriously<sup>1</sup> and miraculously. Immortality, moreover, should crown the heirs of the kingdom;<sup>2</sup> for there was to be not only an earthly, but a heavenly Jerusalem as well. This Messianic era was to be ushered in by Elijah<sup>3</sup> as forerunner; after which the Son of David<sup>4</sup> was to reign and his idyllic kingdom was to be eternal<sup>5</sup> in the earth. This supernatural era the Pharisees awaited with a strange mixture of abject pessimism toward the present evil world and the common people and sublime optimism with reference to the future and their own share in its blessings. As for the common people, many of them, especially many humble souls<sup>6</sup> conceived the kingdom as the Pharisees taught it and awaited its coming with pious patience<sup>6</sup> or eager longings.<sup>7</sup>

To one familiar with the New Testament, the mere study of this Messianism of the Pharisees is sufficient to show how widely current it was among the people in Jesus' time and also ~~is~~ in what large measure its spirit was imported into the early Christian thought and literature. The expectation of the second coming of Christ<sup>8</sup> was made its convenient vehicle. Its atmosphere permeates the Book of Revelation; and the careful student is especially impressed when he thinks what comfort the Christians of Judea must have derived, after Jerusalem's destruction from this post eventum revision of the Messianic hope of the Pharisees, as it is found in the Synoptic Apocalypse.<sup>9</sup>

There is virtually but one reference in the New Testament to the Zealots;<sup>10</sup> but they were a sect of great importance especially in view of their influence on the trend of events. They operated on the principle that the Lord invests assistants in those whose evident capacity for self-help promises to justify the investment. They too entertained the Messianic hope, with a violent enthusiasm indeed; and they proposed to realize it. Their Messianism was revolutionary; their program an appeal to arms. Their first leader, Judas of Gamala, headed an insurrection against the census of Quirinius in 6 A. D.; though it must be supposed that the movement had been brewing for a generation. Probably the banishment of ~~Archelaus~~ Archelaus, which apparently terminated the Herodian tyranny in Judea, seemed an opportunity to inaugurate their kingdom of God. Their propaganda

was wholly Messianic. We have one or two references to this movement during Jesus' lifetime;<sup>1</sup> but by ~~forty-five~~ 45 A. D. it had developed to such an extent that one Theudas<sup>2</sup> could lead a great following to the Jordan, which he promised to divide before them as Moses had divided the Red Sea. The procurator quickly suppressed his enterprise and executed him. Felix also had constant trouble with the Zealots and their marauding bands of Messianic outlaws. Josephus refers to a band of desperadoes known as ~~Sicarii~~ Sicarii, or dagger-men, who, most violent of all, resorted to assassination as a means of hastening the kingdom's coming. Truly Palestine was in a state of ferment; pretenders to Messiahship were plenty,<sup>3</sup> and the people were ever ready to respond to their appeals.<sup>4</sup> It did seem as if the Kingdom of God was at hand. By seizing upon this phrase, Jesus quickly caught the public ear, especially when they discovered that he could perform wonderful works, such as they expected of the Messiah. The Messianic hope was predestined to that end.

If knowledge of the Zealot movement throws light upon the Messianic prerogative of Jesus, it also illuminates the causes leading to the wars of Vespasian and Titus; for the Zealot party with its followers among the poorer classes finally brought Judea to complete destruction. The times were pre-revolutionary in their chaotic character. Just cause of revolution, and a great ideal ahead are never guarantees against unrestrained violence. Dreams of social as well as political Utopias, led to the burning and pillaging of rich estates ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and the murder of their owners in the name of God. Jerusalem was full of idle workmen thoroughly malcontent. The Roman procurators provoked violence by their unbridled tyranny and barbarous cruelty with which they sought to suppress it. The Pharisees, opposed for religious reasons to revolution, found upon occasion that they as well as the Sadducees preferred to fish in still waters; and their opposition to the Zealot movement resulted in civil war. At last the Roman garrison was captured and slaughtered by the revolutionists, whom the conservatives could not restrain; and thus the gauntlet was thrown down to the Roman Empire. The Zealots were the moving spirits in all these revolutionary events; and their motives were almost

wholly Messianic. They drew the sword to inaugurate the Kingdom of God; but they and Jerusalem with them were destined to perish miserably by the sword.

The slaughter of the garrison not only challenged Rome, it threw all Palestine into violence. The first attempt of the Romans to restore order by force was unsuccessful. It began to look as if the Zealots were about to repeat the history of the Maccabees. The conservatives now began to come over to the Messianic cause. The war ( 66-70 A. D.) was now on in earnest, Vespasian's first campaign reduced Galilee to submission, drove the Zealots into Jerusalem and isolated that city. But just then Nero died ( 68 A. D.); and Vespasian suspended military operations in Palestine to pursue an imperial crown at Rome. The Zealots and the conservatives improved the interim by mutual destruction in civil war. It was a Reign of Terror. In the name of the Kingdom of God extreme violence prevailed. The details are confusing; but whenever events took a new turn, blind civil strife more destructive and terrible than before, resulted. And this state of affairs did not abate till Titus was actually before the walls of Jerusalem with his army. He laid siege to the city for five months, during which time fighting was perpetual, and the miseries and horrors of the beleaguered citizens were utterly indescribable. " Except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved." Titus captured the city piecemeal, each success being followed by a fearful massacre, till at last in September, A. D. 70, the entire city --a city of smoking ruins and profaned memories--was in his hands. What was left of the people were dragged away to Rome as slaves and gladiatorial victims. And from that day to this the exiled Jew has awaited the true Messiah who should restore the Kingdom unto Israel. Meantime the Kingdom of God which Jesus established is slowly filling the whole earth.

- (1) See Synoptic Apocalypse, Huck's Synopsis, page 119 ff.
- (2) Mk. 13: 20 (120).

III. THE CAREER .

The synoptic parallels begin with John the Baptist<sup>1</sup>  
~~(12:29)~~, whom Mark introduces with the words: "The beginning of  
the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God".<sup>2</sup> This, the last of the  
Hebrew prophets, has never been adequately appraised, so immediate-  
ly and completely was he eclipsed. His ~~was~~ <sup>could have been</sup> no ephemeral influence  
that had its following in Alexandria a quarter of a century later.<sup>3</sup>  
~~(Ac. 18:24)~~ Indeed, the movement itself was no minor affair; on  
the other hand, it must have been the topic of the time; for, not-  
withstanding he held forth in the wild region near the north end  
of the Dead Sea, the crowds flocked to him from everywhere in  
Judea. Doubtless many, half vagabond at the best, were impelled  
by mere inquisitiveness to see and hear this eccentric enthusiast;  
nevertheless, drawn, even though they may have been by idle cur-  
iosity, hundreds, it is safe to say, perhaps thousands, were con-  
verted; and permitted him to bathe them in the river, signifying the  
clean life of righteousness which they were espousing. It was a  
far reaching revival to which the Jewish soul, always half fanatical,  
responded with a fervor scarcely credible to the staid westerner of  
today. But no wonder, for John preached a message that never fails  
to find a response in men's hearts; it was a plain spoken, drastic  
arraignment of wrong doing<sup>4</sup> ~~(13:30)~~, and a summons to repentance and  
reformation. But the force of the Baptizer's preaching lay in his  
appeal to the Messianic hope of the Jews. <sup>It is difficult in the extreme for</sup> Let <sup>the</sup> reader <sup>imagine</sup>  
~~the patriotism of an American citizen in '76 or '61 welded into~~  
~~one with the Christian's religious hope of immortality and he will~~  
~~have but a faint appreciation of the eagerness with which~~ <sup>the</sup> Hebrew <sup>of that</sup>  
day awaited the dawn of the Messianic era. This era, John declared,  
was at hand and woe betide the man whom it should find unrighteous  
and so unprepared!!

Far into Galilee went the fame of this national revival where it came to the ears of a young carpenter. Who does not know the susceptibility of a youthful soul with whom the immanent Father hath communed. But this soul! Consequently, "it came to pass in those days that Jesus came from Nazareth and was baptized of John", <sup>1</sup> ~~(10:51)~~ One readily reads between the lines that this was a momentous crisis in the inner experience of Jesus, and marked the beginning of his career. And in response to that inner crisis an unspeakable vision was vouch-safed to his eyes.<sup>2</sup> ~~(Mk. 1:11)~~ "The words of John, ~~(The quotation is from Tolstoy)~~ who said that people must change their lives before the kingdom of God should come, and that only by the spirit of God could men become clean, sank deep into the heart of Jesus. And to think out all that he had heard from John, Jesus, instead of returning home, remained in the wilderness. There he lived many days thinking over what he had heard from John."<sup>3</sup>

The results of Jesus' inspirational experience with John at the Jordan and of his solitary meditations in the wilderness, were two-fold. The first was a clear perception of the message or doctrine he was to preach. He saw that his countrymen were looking in vain for a restoration of the Davidic dynasty; to make them peaceful, powerful, prosperous and happy. He saw that these blessings could only come through men being righteous and loving one another, trusting God humbly and doing what they could to make their fellows blessed. This way of living and the peace and happiness that would result, he afterwards called the Kingdom of God. That is the name his countrymen <sup>were giving</sup> gave to the Kingdom they hoped for so eagerly. In a word, he saw that the Kingdom of God must come but not in the way his countrymen expected but that to make it come, men must first of all change their lives.

The second result was a <sup>definite</sup> consecration of himself to the work of <sup>Teaching</sup> ~~promulgating~~ that doctrine and founding that Kingdom. It was not enough that he should accept the Kingdom as a mere theory; he adopted it as a dominant purpose and a life commission. The records ~~(17:32)~~ convince us that this was not without a terrific mental struggle. <sup>But</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>was complete</sup> moral triumph. At what ever sacrifice of ambition, <sup>1</sup> ~~(Mt. 4:8-10)~~ he would conform his actual practice to the spiritual philosophy of life he was to preach <sup>2</sup> ~~(Mt. 4:2-4)~~; and devote all his capacities <sup>3</sup> ~~(Mt. 4:6-7)~~ and the influence thereof to his great mission. Having thus made his self-commitment, he returned to Galilee in the peace <sup>4</sup> ~~(Mt. 4:11)~~ of a profound faith, the assurance of a divine call <sup>5</sup> ~~(Mk. 1:11)~~ and the strength <sup>6</sup> ~~(Lk. 4:14)~~ of a sublime purpose.

This purpose is evident from the fact that it so soon began to be actualized <sup>7</sup> ~~(18:33)~~. Perhaps Jesus may have felt and assumed the responsibility of carrying on the work John had just laid down. <sup>8</sup> ~~(Mk 1:14)~~ However this may be, the first glimpse the synoptists give us indicate that the movement had <sup>at the time their account begins,</sup> already acquired very considerable momentum; for Luke's first verses descriptive of Jesus' ministry <sup>9</sup> ~~(Lk. 4:14-15)~~ indicate that he already had a large fame and following. For some time Jesus had <sup>already</sup> been traveling through his native province, preaching <sup>8</sup> ~~(Mk. 1:14)~~ to the humble peasantry of Galilee. Where ever he could get a hearing, whether from a solitary wayfarer, from a crowd by the <sup>lake</sup> ~~sea~~ shore <sup>10</sup> ~~(Mk. 4:1)~~ or in the synagogues <sup>11</sup> ~~(Lk. 4:15)~~ on the Sabbath day, he never lost an opportunity to expound his message.

And what shall we say as to the content of the message he preached during this early period of his ministry? What was the drift and burden of it? In answer, it may be said that he, like John, heralded the coming of the Kingdom of God. <sup>12</sup> ~~(Mk. 1:15)~~

Yet it was not precisely the kind of a Kingdom John had foreseen; for John warned his hearers of impending wrath, <sup>1</sup>(Mt. 3:12) while Jesus proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom as good news <sup>2</sup>(Mk. 1:15). The good things which pious Jews almost fanatically anticipated as the fruitage of their vainly hoped Davidic restoration, Jesus assured them were attainable. But only cautiously and by degrees did he venture to declare a way of securing those blessings different from their plan and hope of national restoration. Instead, he seized upon the terminology of their dearest national hope, the kingdom of God, as they called it, and used it as a vehicle for his doctrine of good works and good will. And this doctrine he preached with an epigrammatic incisiveness <sup>3</sup>(~~Appendix III, Huck's Synopsis~~) and with a wealth of illustration <sup>4</sup>(~~79:58 ff~~) that must have piqued the curiosity of all his hearers, <sup>5</sup>(~~Mt. 13:36~~) and so attracted the throngs to him <sup>6</sup>(~~Mk. 4:1~~). <sup>(New paragraph)</sup> But the most magnetic feature of his personality and preaching was his assumption of authority <sup>7</sup>(~~69:53~~). This was particularly startling because of its contrast with the methods of the religious leaders of the day, who smothered their effete homilies under a musty blanket of traditionalism. Let the student call to life in imagination the scenes of this career. From what has just been said, let him fancy the personality and the occasions. Then, glancing through the Sermon on the Mount <sup>8</sup>(~~36:42ff~~), the Parables Address <sup>4</sup>(~~79:58 ff~~), and the Parallels and Duplicates, <sup>9</sup>(~~p. 154ff~~) let him gather up a handful of sections from here and there at his will and imagine their words falling from the lips of the Galilean preacher. For whether this discourse material represents addresses delivered by Jesus on specific occasions, or compiled blocks of discourse material uttered at various times, certain it is that we have here the kind of discourses Jesus was accustomed to utter.

Such a conception, therefore, can not lead us far astray as to the addresses of the early part of the Galilean ministry. It will thus be seen that in the face of fanatical bigotry and prejudice he was <sup>triumph</sup> to open the blind eyes of his countrymen to his own spiritual view of life; trying to make them see the blessed social fruits of humility and righteousness. How dismally, yet sublimely, he failed with his own generation we shall see as the dramatic plot of his career unfolds. And we shall also see what far-sighted use he made of the little band of adherents he had selected, some of them as early in his career as this <sup>1</sup> (19:33); whom, as time advanced, he sought gradually to instruct as to the real significance of his words and work.

Preaching was doubtless the earliest but it did not long remain the only work and attractive agency of this unique light in the darkness. One of the most characteristic features of his personality was his sympathy <sup>for</sup> of the ills of human life, both spiritual and physical. And certainly there were enough ills with which to sympathize. Imagine out modern physicians' patients wholly neglected, our hospitals, asylums for insane, feeble minded, epileptic, blind, dumb and otherwise unfortunate, disgorged of their inmates upon the public streets and one has a faint notion of the afflicted classes of Galilean society -- not to mention the gratuitous beggars. And these Jesus not only pitied but healed by the word of his command.

We have alighted, it must be confessed, upon an age of doubt. Many openly deny the <sup>miraculous</sup> supernatural. Even some Christians admit that it is a burden rather than a help to their faith. It may be well, therefore to pause just here and insist that modern psychological science makes it easier today than ever before to believe in Jesus' miracles of healing. We understand, as we never have understood before, what the force of mind is in the treatment of disease.

The work of Dr. Paul Dubois' and others marks an era. Modern scientific psychotherapy comes to the believer's support and to the discomfiture of whoever denies the healing potency of so authoritative a voice as Jesus'. There need be no reasonable doubt therefore, of his wonderful work.

But even so, "it is", as A. B. Bruce says, "the divinity of his love, not the supernaturalness of his power, that commends him to us as a man and as the Christ".

And so he pitied all whom he saw suffering; and healed all whom his great heart pitied. And as a consequence, they thronged him all the more. They met him in public<sup>2</sup> (~~27:30~~) and in private,<sup>3</sup> (~~21:35~~) in their homes and on the highways,<sup>4</sup> (~~25:36~~); they beset him in crowds on ~~Sabbath~~ <sup>Saturday</sup> evenings,<sup>5</sup> (~~22:35~~) and followed him in incredible multitudes to the ~~sea~~ <sup>lake</sup> shore<sup>6</sup> (~~34,41~~). This part of his ministry - they could understand and utilize; therefore, his fame grew apace; so much so, indeed, that he habitually tried to suppress the reports of his healing,<sup>7</sup> (~~Mk. 1:34,44; 3:12, etc.~~) lest he should be so occupied with this incidental ministrations that he would have no time, strength, or opportunity to do the work he had undertaken; namely, expound and establish the Kingdom of his Father. Under the stress of this pressure and the strain of this fear, he sometimes sought the solitudes, either alone,<sup>8</sup> (~~23,35~~) that he might recuperate his strength and renew his purpose, or with his disciples only,<sup>9</sup> (~~34,41; 35,42~~) that he might teach them. But meantime, he continued to tour Galilee, preaching and healing, even though the momentum of the movement was beginning to be a burden to it.

His popularity was now at its height; the public excitement was immense. But at this very time there arose a cloud in the west as large as a man's hand.

There was the beginning of opposition that portended inevitable reaction.

The sterile religiousity and traditionalized self-sufficiency of the religious leaders of the day, has already been pointed out. <sup>But</sup> There was a sweeping, popular, religious movement wholly outside the sphere of their program or indorsement. It rivaled their influence without soliciting their sanction. It is easy to understand how it would pique their curiosity, ~~raise~~ <sup>arouse</sup> their criticisms and arouse their envy. It was but human nature, therefore that they should seek to undermine his influence. Accordingly they impeached his assumption of divine authority as blasphemous<sup>1</sup>; ~~(27,37)~~ and declared that his very power over demons belied it.<sup>2</sup> ~~(73,55)~~ His sympathy with the depraved, their contemptible, self-righteous aloofness could not appreciate; and they meanly insinuated that his companionship repudiated his preaching.<sup>3</sup> ~~(28,38)~~ To their atrophied souls, the alpha and omega of religion consisted in irrelevant forms.<sup>4</sup> ~~(29,38; 114,79)~~ Jesus ignored these and so they probed him with criticism.<sup>5</sup> But their hobby was the keeping of Saturdays. So when Jesus and his disciples shelled out a few heads of wheat on Saturday, they held up their hands in holy horror<sup>6</sup> ~~(30,39)~~; and a deed of mercy and help which he did on the Sabbath and defended, fanned their anger to a murderous flame<sup>7</sup> ~~(31,39)~~.

The real animus of the Pharisees' opposition to Jesus was, of course, the character of their Messianic expectations. These have been sufficiently explained to make it clear that Jesus advocated a wholly different program. To them he was a heretic. Religious bigotry alone was sufficient motive for their seeking his destruction; especially as he attacked them openly. But more than that they feared the consequences of his securing a popular following; it might disturb the political status quo; in which case they had nothing to gain and everything to lose; and in any case his success meant the undermining of

8  
their religious and social interests, together with the emoluments thereof. They had vested interests; and the perennial inertia of the orthodox hierarchy.

In response to these attacks, Jesus by no means adopted a policy of conciliation. Their impeachment of his authority he repudiated firmly and decisively <sup>1</sup> (~~27,37; 73,55~~). He tried in vain to open their blind eyes to the pathetic need <sup>2</sup> (~~28,38~~) of the sinners with whom he mingled. He condemned their irrelevant formalities as worn out and discarded <sup>3</sup> (~~29,39~~); he made no attempt to explain to them <sup>4</sup> (~~Mk. 7:17,18; Mt. 15:14~~) what he knew they were too fossil hearted to understand; namely that only a good life is pleasing to God (~~75,56~~); but instead he denounced them to their very faces as hypocrites, <sup>5</sup> (~~73,55~~) and that in the name of their own prophet. As for their accusation that he disregarded their Saturdays, he quoted their own scripture against them <sup>6</sup> (~~30,39~~); he accused them of breaking it themselves for motives of sordidness rather than mercy <sup>7</sup> (~~31,40~~); he told them that his message was of more importance than their laws or even than their temple <sup>8</sup> (~~Mt. 12:6~~); he declared his intention to use even their Saturdays in the interest of his propaganda <sup>9</sup> (~~Mt. 12:8~~); he utterly repudiated their criticism; and defiantly challenged their authority <sup>10</sup> (~~Mk. 3:4,5~~). Thereupon, antagonism ripened into conspiracy and from that time on they plotted his destruction <sup>11</sup> (~~Mk. 3:6~~).

But while Jesus was so heroically withstanding the wicked antagonism of the Pharisees, an opposition of a wholly different character was developing in another quarter, the stupidity and stolidness of which appeals to us as infinitely pathetic. This opposition began at Nazareth, <sup>12</sup> (~~96,67~~). The friends of his boyhood could not comprehend his role and reputation. How could they know that he had seen the dove and heard the voice at the Jordan, met the devil in the wilderness, and foreseen the shadow of the cross. "What", said they, "this is our carpenter; we know his folks". They were scandalized at his self appropriation of

8a

authority and power. Moreover, they too must have been disappointed with his Messianic program; for he promised neither the apocalyptic wonders which the Pharisees had taught them to expect; ~~(Mt. 12: 38 (57))~~, nor the drawn sword of revolution, fomented by the Zealot propaganda, with one or both of which the common people sympathized. *And so* Jesus went sorrowfully away, having

been able to heal but few of their sick; and his remark upon the incident has become a proverb. "Approphet is not without honor save in his own country".<sup>2</sup> ~~(Mk. 6:4)~~ Gradually, but surely, the infection spread through Galilee, so that everywhere he or his disciples went there was a division concerning him;<sup>3</sup> ~~(Mt. 10:11,15)~~ and he realized with bitterness<sup>4</sup> ~~(98:70)~~ that the seed he had sown was taking but meagre root indeed; ~~(82:6-0)~~ and that all the people desired or appreciated was the material benefits he could

- (1) Mt. 12: 38(57).
- (2) Mk. 6:4(68).
- (3) Mt. 10: 11,15(40).
- (4) Mt. 11: 20-24(70).
- (5) Mk. 4: 13-20(60).

bestow <sup>1</sup> (~~111,76~~); while they were pathetically <sup>2</sup> (~~Mt. 15:52~~) unresponsive to his message of a higher good <sup>3</sup> (~~110,75~~).

The immediate result of this opposition was that he turned his attention more particularly to his little circle of intimate adherents and followers. As if he would train them by practice, he sent them out in pairs to preach and heal throughout Galilee <sup>4</sup> (~~97,69; 108,75~~). And, as if he feared they too might be swept away in the current of opposition, he forewarned them of the danger involved in discipleship <sup>5</sup> (~~99,71~~); and exhorted them to the requisite heroism of faithfulness <sup>6</sup> (~~102,72; 103,73~~). Meantime he continued his preaching tours <sup>7</sup> (~~105,73~~) and benevolent ministrations <sup>8</sup> (~~94,65; 111,76~~) in Galilee.

But not for long! The cloud in the west had covered the sky; the inevitable issue with his enemies, and his own consequent fate, challenged his early consecration. And, as if he would take time to count the cost and prepare the sacrifice, he withdrew from Galilee, and became, in the brave language of Huck's caption <sup>9</sup> (~~see P. 80~~), a fugitive and a traveller. It is impossible to reconstruct the events of this period with historic exactness. We hear of our fugitive, now in the vicinity of Tyre and Sidon, <sup>10</sup> (~~115,80~~) and again in Decapolis, <sup>11</sup> (~~116,80~~) on his way to the Sea of Galilee. Later he is near Caesarea Philippi, <sup>12</sup> (~~121,83~~) and again, having passed through Galilee <sup>13</sup> (~~136,92~~), we see him in Samaria, <sup>14</sup> on his way toward Judea <sup>15</sup> (~~158,92~~).

But the inner history is easier to reconstruct, for the meditations, the struggles, and the triumphs of the Great Teacher's spirit are evident. For instance, note the messianic confession <sup>15</sup> (~~121,83~~), early in this period. Some little time before <sup>it</sup>, there had been a characteristic encounter with his enemies, <sup>16</sup> (~~116,81~~) at the close of which he had turned his back upon them, and started with his disciples for the north <sup>17</sup> (~~Mt. 8:13,27~~). Enroute Jesus' mind must have <sup>been dwelling on</sup> dwelt sadly and even bitterly on the incident and the trend of events. Such at least is indicated by the words with which he warned his followers against the hypocritical spirit of

the Pharisees <sup>1</sup> (~~119, 82~~). And it is also indicated by the fact that, at last alone with his disciples <sup>2</sup> (~~121, 83~~), he puts to them a question of prime significance: "Who do men say that I am?" This is the first record of outspoken acknowledgement by Jesus' followers of his Messiahship. Hitherto he evidently had not ventured to claim messianic dignity, because his idea of messiahship was so different from that of his countrymen; he had only preached the kingdom. But now Peter speaks the word, and the word is endorsed by Jesus; but he immediately adds the virtual declaration that he is not such a Messiah as the people expect, but rather the suffering servant of Jehovah, destined to be rejected by the nation, and to suffer a violent death. Hence he checked their enthusiasm <sup>3</sup>, (~~Mk. 8:30~~) lest it hasten the catastrophe which he saw impending. But his disciples failed to realize what he so clearly foresaw, that if he ~~we~~ would be the reformer of religion and the founder of the Kingdom, he must be prepared to be <sup>come</sup> a martyr.

This clear insight <sup>4</sup> (~~126, 87~~), this resolute consecration <sup>5</sup> (~~122, 84~~), this almost rash determination <sup>6</sup> (~~149, 99~~), governed all the remaining events of his career, which ran on headlong toward the final tragedy, like a river toward the cataract.

• It is at this crisis in his life that Jesus' premeditated heroism is most awe inspiring and sublime. He might have crept back into the obscurity of private life, but that would have been to abandon his mission. He might have taken advantage of the popular fanaticism to lead a military movement; but then even if he could have succeeded, which was improbable, he would have degenerated into a mere Mahomed. He might have compromised with the Pharisees and evaded the issue with them; but that would have emasculated his message and sterilized its vitalizing influence over the future, for the sake of mere temporary popularity. He did neither. Instead, he improved the solitude, which he had doubtless sought for that very purpose, to discourse intimately with his

disciples about the real meaning of the kingdom. (~~See Mt. 16:5; Mk. 8:27; Mt. 16:24; Mk. 9:8; Mt. 17:19; Mk. 9:51; Mt. 18:1; Mk. 9:49; Lk. 17:1; Mt. 18:21 ff; Mt. 19:10 etc., etc., all in this period~~)

This he did that the truth, well planted in the hearts of a select few, might propagate itself afterwards and so grow to cover the whole earth. He dared face not merely martyrdom, but failure, provided it was the right kind of failure. To have himself and his message repudiated because it had been clearly and unmistakably understood: that was the right kind of failure. One clear voice, once clearly heard: the truth would do the rest. The living leaven once surely in the meal: the whole would ultimately be leavened. The right kind of failure meant ultimate and perpetual success. Thus was his faith sublimer than his heroism. And having healed a few more ill<sup>2</sup> (~~120,93; 125,86; 151,100~~), answered a few more questions<sup>3</sup> (~~118,81; 128,88; 142,94; 144,95; 150,100~~), and uttered a few more parables (131,89; 135,91; 145,96; 148,98), he set his face resolutely toward Jerusalem.

When once in Jerusalem, he acted as if he could not bear the agony of suspense, and desired to drink the inevitable cup as soon as possible, lest the iron of his will should break with waiting. Or else, as if there were no clearer background for his message than the anti-thetical hypocrisy, bigotry, prejudice, and hate of his enemies; and he purposed therefore to stir it up to one last, wild never-to-be-forgotten frenzy. At any rate, he lost no time to fling challenge after challenge in their very teeth, a policy that precipitated the final tragedy in scarcely more than a week.

The fame of the wonderful Galilean had preceded him. The crowds, always full of fanatical, messianic anticipation, were eager with hope. Jesus planned his entry into the city in such a way as to proclaim his messiahship, and at the same time symbolize the kingship of meekness, humility and service that characterized his Kingdom and message<sup>5</sup> (~~153,102~~).

If the crowds had understood the symbolism they doubtless would have not have hailed the King, but they did not. They escorted him into the city, with the fervid rapture of religious fanaticism and the volcanic zeal of a long thwarted patriotism. But the Pharisees feared lest this patriotic uprising might be interpreted by the Romans as incipient rebellion, and rigorously suppressed. Accordingly they besought Jesus to disperse the crowds <sup>1</sup> (154,103); but he bluntly rebuffed them: saying, " If these shall hold their peace the stones will cry out. " This rebuff he followed by prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem <sup>2</sup> (155,103), and by a condemnation of its inhabitants (156,104), and a call to repentance <sup>3</sup> (157,104).

As if this were not enough, he proceeded the next day to the temple, where, according to a time-worn custom, marketers were selling animals for the sacrifices. Taking a whip he drove them all out, declaring that they were profaning a sacred place <sup>4</sup> (159,105). And, strange to say, they made no resistance, however much his assumption of authority <sup>5</sup> (Mk. 11:28), and his implied rebuke may have added to the heat of their anger. That it did anger the religious authorities we are not left to conjecture <sup>6</sup> (160,105).

But words are often more stinging than deeds; and Jesus did not omit the sting of words. In fact almost all his recorded utterances of this period were stinging rebukes of the Pharisees. They had wickedly repudiated the message of John <sup>7</sup> (162,106); they were disobedient sons of their heavenly Father <sup>8</sup> (164, 107); they were like the envious elder brother of the repentant prodigal <sup>9</sup> (165,107); they were self-righteous and unrepentant, and therefore displeasing to God <sup>10</sup> (166,108); they were unworthy and rejected husbandmen of the ancient vineyard of Jehovah <sup>11</sup> (167,109); they were high-minded, and given to self-exaltation <sup>12</sup> (168,110), and had thereby forfeited their place at the wedding feast <sup>13</sup> (169,111); they had buried the essential commandments <sup>14</sup> (172,113) under their worthless

traditions; and they had utterly rejected the services of mercy and help, which are essential <sup>1</sup> (~~173, 114~~).

When the Sadducees tried to lead him into contradictions about the resurrection, he easily discomfited them <sup>2</sup> (~~171, 112~~); and when the Pharisees sought to entangle him in the question of tribute, he insinuated that they rendered no tribute to God <sup>3</sup> (~~170, 112~~). Then he uttered against them one of the most drastic philippics imaginable, <sup>4</sup> and concluded with a Jeremiah<sup>ic</sup> lament over their apostasy <sup>5</sup> (~~Matt. 23, chap.~~).

The rest is soon told; but even so, the world had heard the voice. His enemies were determined to kill him (~~199, 130~~), and they lay their plots to capture him secretly. <sup>6</sup> They were aided in this by Judas, one of the Master's intimates, whose motive for treachery was money <sup>7</sup> (~~201, 132~~)!

Meantime, the last sad gatherings with his disciples. At one of these suppers, a woman, who possibly had been reclaimed from the despair of an outcast life, poured out upon his feet a cruse of costly perfume. " She hath annointed my body beforehand for the burying ", he said, <sup>8</sup> (~~200, 130~~). At another supper, <sup>9</sup> (~~205, 133~~), this time alone with his disciples, he likened the bread and the wine to his body and his blood, which, he declared, were about to be sacrificed for the sake of humanity. " This do, " said he as they ate and drank, " in remembrance of me " .

After the supper he went out of the city, with three of his most intimate disciples, to a solitary place. Here he prayed; for he was in great agony of mind on account of the sacrifice he was about to offer. He was volunteering to die; nevertheless he involuntarily recoiled at the suffering of brutal torture and execution. Therefore he sought strength in prayer <sup>10</sup> (~~207, 134~~).

But even as he prayed, the traitor from the circle of his own friends was upon him with an armed and savage mob <sup>11</sup> (~~208, 135~~); and identified him with the most intimate greeting of sacred friendship.

Jesus made no resistance, for he knew his hour was come; but permitted himself to be led away. Some members of the Jewish sanhedrin had been called together in the night (~~209,136~~); for even murder must have the sanction of religious law! Of course it was the merest mockery of a trial; and it was with ~~the~~ great difficulty that two witnesses, the requisite number, could be got to swear to the same charge. But finally two agreed that the prisoner had actually said something blasphemous about the temple. That was enough: they condemned him to death; and heaped upon him insult and injury.<sup>1</sup>

Meantime the last of his followers had forsaken him<sup>2</sup> (~~210,137~~).

But his tormentors must needs have the sanction of the Roman authorities; so they haled him before Pilate, the imperial governor,<sup>3</sup> (~~213,139~~). Here they cleverly branded the prisoner as a royal pretender, whom the imperial government was bound to put away in self-defence. Pilate understood their motives, and knew the charges were false: but he courted popularity. He examined the prisoner for a ground of protest, but as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. Then Pilate tried to avoid responsibility by sending him to Herod; but Herod laughed and sent him back<sup>4</sup> (~~214,139~~). He sought to appease their frenzy by liberating to them a fellow-citizen; but to no avail: the frenzy of the pious mob only increased, and they yelled for his blood.<sup>5</sup> (~~215,140~~). And so, when Pilate saw that he would win their enmity by refusing, he complied with their savage demand: and turned the prisoner over to them to be crucified. Whereupon they both ridiculed and tortured him<sup>6</sup> (~~216,141~~); and then led him away to execution (~~217,142~~). It was a brutal form of ancient savagery<sup>7</sup> (~~218,142~~); but at last it was over, and he hung dead upon the cross<sup>8</sup> (~~219,143~~); with a criminal on either side. And over the head of him who had preached the "Kingdom of God" was inscribed the bitter irony of false accusation: "King of the Jews".<sup>9</sup>

When evening came his friends took him down and buried him.<sup>1</sup>

But the story is not finished! For the Easter morning sunlight fell on the blank face of an empty tomb <sup>2</sup>(~~222,145~~); and for twenty centuries the Kingdom he founded has been growing in the earth, thus fulfilling the words that he himself uttered <sup>3</sup>(~~85,61; 86,62~~), and justifying the faith in the strength of which he dared to fail and die.

" Men to bay and laurel bow,

As is meet.

But the whole world lovingly kneels

At the feet

" Of the splendid failure hung

On the Tree.

It seems yet I hear him say,

Who will be

" To the God within him true?

Who will die

For his vision? Crucified

As was I? "

---

(1) Mk. 15: 42-47 (144).

(2) See Huck's Synopsis, pp. 145-151.

(3) Mk. 4: 30-34 (61, 62).

The real animus of the Pharisees' opposition to Jesus was, of course, the character of their messianic expectations. These have been sufficiently explained to make it clear that Jesus advocated a wholly different program. So then he was a heretic. Religious bigotry alone was sufficient motive for their seeking his destruction; especially as he attacked them openly. But more than that they feared the consequences of his securing a popular following; it might disturb the political status quo; in which case they had nothing to gain and everything to lose; and in any case his success meant the undermining of their religious and social interests together with the emoluments thereof. They had vested interests; and the perennial inertia of the orthodox hierarchy.

Moreover, they too must have been disappointed with his messianic program; for he preached neither the apocalyptic wonders which the Pharisees had taught them to expect ( Mt. 13: 34 (37) ), nor the drawn sword of revolution, fomented by the Zealot propaganda, with one or both of which the common people sympathized.

IV. THE MESSAGE.

### THE MESSAGE

The one thing we expect to find in the New Testament, and in no other book, is the way of everlasting life. And if this is the peculiar function of the New Testament as a whole, it is certainly the function of the synoptic gospels; for in them we hear the words of eternal life from the lips of Jesus himself; and he is the supreme authority.

*In seeking an answer to this question*  
The unpracticed reader would doubtless begin with the first chapter of Matthew, and read the gospels through consecutively, one after another. But this method of the unpracticed Bible reader is not often the best method; many a youth has tried to read the whole Bible through, and has become discouraged before he had gotten well started in Genesis. A better way, for the present purpose, would be to take the "Synopsis of the First Three Gospels" and, turning from page to page, watch for the words of the Great Teacher, pausing only to examine them and their answer to the question, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

To devote several hours to this task is very interesting work, but somewhat confusing, it must be confessed, so far as securing a direct and definite answer to the question in hand. For there are very few passages in the synoptic gospels where Jesus handles the question explicitly; and some of these, one feels, are quite intangible in meaning, when taken by themselves, apart from their context and the background of the Teacher's thought in general. For example, in one place, <sup>2</sup>(p 39), it is intimated that one can escape hell-fire by having his hand or his foot cut off, or his eye plucked out. But this is manifestly a metaphor; and its meaning must evidently be sought in the general drift of Jesus' utterances. Again, in Jesus' conversation with the Rich Young Ruler <sup>3</sup>(95) the question is explicitly put; but here again one feels baffled; for, after implying that one must keep the commandments, Jesus proposes, as a final test, that the young man sell his possessions and give the proceeds to the poor, and follow him as a disciple. One cannot believe that literally to give away one's possessions and forsake one's family <sup>4</sup>(96) is the way of everlasting life. Jesus was a dealer in

parables and metaphors; and here one feels that some inner disposition, which this young man's riches interfered with, must be what Jesus really had in mind.

In his answer to this direct question as put to him by the scribes and Pharisees<sup>1</sup> (113) Jesus was more explicit: Thou shalt love God supremely, and thy neighbor as thyself. There is no recorded utterance of the Master in which a more definite answer to this question is given: in fact a more definite answer would hardly be possible. And the parable of the Good Samaritan,<sup>2</sup> which follows, is evidently a commentary on this fundamental principle; a declaration that the love enjoined is to manifest itself in deeds of kindness and practical service. This is plainly the drift, also, of that other parable of Jesus in which the way of life and death are set forth: the parable of the sheep and the goats<sup>3</sup> (p-128).

This hasty survey of Jesus' teachings makes clear the necessity of studying them more thoroughly. This necessity appears from the metaphorical character of the passages already noted; and from their dependence for meaning on the whole body of his thought. It would appear also from a similar study of other selections which have an implied bearing on the vital question, such as the parable of the Pharisee and the sinner praying in the temple.<sup>4</sup> We should have to turn to the general logic of Jesus' message to decide why the sinner went down to his house justified rather than the other. But the necessity for a more comprehensive study is made most clear from the fact that Jesus said so very much that seems to have no direct bearing on the question of eternal life. To pick out the sentences dealing explicitly or even incidentally with that subject is manifestly inadequate, because it ignores the vast bulk of what he did say. If the way of eternal life is the central theme of his message, then the bearing on this subject of his other utterances must be discovered. If, on the other hand, the way of eternal life is not the only subject his words throw light upon, or not even the principal one; certainly that needs to be made clear, and his pronouncements on other themes should be

understood.

It is naturally expected that a treatise like this will set forth Jesus' teachings in an orderly, systematic fashion. Logical system is the mental method of modern thought. We want to know what was the "system of thought" of Plato, Rosseau, Confucius, St. Paul, or whoever it may be that we are studying. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this chapter to reduce Jesus' teachings to a system, and to draw that system out to a few fundamental principles. But if Jesus' teachings are to be set forth in a complete logical system, they must, indeed, be reduced to such a system; for Jesus himself was anything but a logician. He expressed himself in paradoxical epigrams, and in parables, the metaphors of which will not always bear logical straining. Some of his most fundamental ideas are implied or assumed, rather than expounded; so that it is often necessary to read between the lines. The whole vein of a fundamental principle sometimes has to be surveyed from a few outcropping ledges. Moreover, the logic of his words, or sometimes the logic of his motives, has to be carried farther than it ever occurred to his mind to carry it, if one is to build his words and deeds into a system of thought such as the modern mind craves. In a very explicit sense his teachings have to be reduced to a system. For the Nazarene was a prophet, not a philosopher. Nevertheless, since our minds crave a system, there is probably no more effective way of exalting the Prophet of Nazareth, and bringing him to an adequate appreciation by the student, than to project the lines of his scattered utterances, till the utterances and the logic of them complete a parallelogram. Such a method will do no violence to Jesus, provided that we remember that his method has been translated, as it were.

As one reads and rereads the synoptic gospels, searching for what Jesus has to say about the way of eternal life, one gradually comes to realize that there are several other main themes under which Jesus' words and the motives<sup>s</sup> of his deeds, may be arranged. These~~e~~ themes would doubtless be tabulated

differently by different students; but for purposes of this study, let us note five of them as follows: first, the religious character of Jesus' thought, and his habit of referring to God as his Heavenly Father; second, his thought about human life and the relation of man to man; third, his frequent reference to the Kingdom of God; ~~###~~ fourth, his ethical teachings, and, fifth, his explanation of the way of everlasting life. These themes overlap one another, as will appear later; nevertheless it will be well to take them up and discuss them one at a time.

Jesus takes for granted the monotheistic conception of the world. It would have been absolutely foreign to his thought to question such a world view. Anything else is so utterly unthinkable that the mere mention of the matter seems hardly permissible. Nevertheless that conception of the world was unique with him and the Hebrews to whom it had originally been revealed. But the chief significance is not in the mere fact that he spoke of God, nor yet the further fact that he spoke very frequently of God, showing that his thoughts about life and the world were intensely religious thoughts. The chief significance is in the way he thought about God. He thought of God as a loving Heavenly Father. God was not only his own Father,<sup>1</sup> but he taught his disciples to think of God as their Father also.<sup>2</sup> But more than this, Jesus' parables plainly imply, if they do not explicitly state - and the great Prophet taught habitually by parables that implied rather than by dissertations that asserted - that the Heavenly Father is father not only to the favored few, but also to those who least deserve his fatherly love. This is set forth in the parables of the lost coin,<sup>3</sup> and the lost sheep.<sup>4</sup> These parables mean that just as the shepherd is solicitous for the lost sheep, just as the woman is anxious to find the lost coin, so the heavenly Father is solicitous in behalf of the sinner. But the parable of the prodigal son<sup>5</sup> sets forth this truth most explicitly; and is one of the most touching and blessed passages in the Bible. In this parable the wayward son, who has wasted his substance in riotous living, is welcomed home by his father with a love and forgiveness he had not ventured to expect; thus Jesus taught

that the repentant sinner will receive a welcome from the Heavenly Father, and that the loving Heavenly Father will forgive his wayward sons when they dare not forgive themselves. Whoever cries out: Lord, be merciful to me, a sinner, goes down to his house justified.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, Jesus taught the doctrine of divine fatherhood by carrying it out to its logical application in his treatment of publicans and sinners,<sup>2</sup> and the humble people of the land.<sup>3</sup> If God was his own Father, and also the father of these classes of people, they were of course his brothers. And this is what he calls them: "the least of these my brethren."<sup>4</sup> And he treated them as brothers, God being the mutual Father of him and them.

This conception of the divine fatherhood is of the highest importance, for it means that God loves his children; that he cares tenderly and solicitously for them,<sup>5</sup> that he pities their ills as Jesus pitied those to whom he ministered. that in obeying his commands we are discovering our own best interests;<sup>6</sup> that there is always hope for the sinful and degraded, since the loving Father will gladly give such another chance.<sup>7</sup> In short it warrants the same of religious faith in the livability<sup>8</sup> of life and in the ultimate Goodness at the heart of things.

This paternal conception of God, this filial relation of the Christian toward God, is the unique and characteristic feature of the Christian religion. Judaism had taught that God was father of a chosen nation or of a few favored persons<sup>9</sup> only. Buddhism's fundamental presupposition is a pessimistic attitude toward life; no other religion, not even those which conceive the World-force in personal terms, teaches that Love is the fundamental characteristic of deith. God is love: this is the unique and sublime declaration of the Christian faith as taught by its Founder. This is the orthodox core of Christianity.<sup>10</sup>

The paragraphs just preceeding could barely stop short of the logical corollaries of Jesus' doctrine of divine fatherhood, If God is the Father

of men, men are the sons of God. However frequently God may be referred to as Father, men, it must be admitted, are seldom referred to explicitly as his children. But it is not necessary. Jesus was seldom explicit. But the drift of his utterances is ~~no~~<sup>less</sup> certain for that. For observe: if men are sons of God, that implies two considerations of primary importance; first, the high dignity of human life; and, second, the brotherhood of man. Both of these we find Jesus teaching by epigram, parable, implication, and example.

The first. It is often said that deeds speak louder than words; and certainly Jesus' estimate of man is expressed without ambiguity in his deeds. He was the friend<sup>1</sup> of sinners; he sought the lost especially.<sup>2</sup> This cannot be explained unless we believe that he saw latent possibilities even in the depraved and degraded. If the sick could be made well,<sup>3</sup> (~~Mt 9:12~~), the health to which they would be restored would be invaluable. The very term lost implies a restorable worth; and the possibilities going to waste in<sup>4</sup> the masses he saw as a harvest. (~~Mt 9:37~~) Not the external accessories of power, possessions or reputation; but the intrinsic ~~value~~ humanness of a man, was what he valued. He cared nothing for the gold that glitters; humanity was the gold he prized: therefore his regard for the poor. He loved the common folks, he pitied their need,<sup>5</sup> their misery, and their sin. But remember, this was not a calculating love, mathematically deduced from his estimate of the worth and dignity of human life; it was a spontaneous love from which we may deduce an estimate of the high dignity of human life. Having deduced the inevitable estimate, we must concede that Jesus taught<sup>it</sup> by his deeds of spontaneous love and solicitude for<sup>the</sup> misery, suffering and sin of mankind. His condemnation of the Pharisees for their unsympathetic and heartlessly indifferent attitude toward the masses, only emphasizes his own regard for them and the logic of that regard.

It was not by his deeds alone that Jesus taught the dignity and spiritual worth of human life. He taught the doctrine also in some of his most pithy epigrams. Let them be stated as briefly as possible, for comment only

dulls their incisiveness: "Ye are of more value than many sparrows;" "How much then is a man better than a sheep;" "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"

Jesus' doctrine of the dignity of human life completes itself in his teaching with regard to immortality. It is as if he recognized man's nature to be such that it projects itself into eternity. It is not necessary here to quote the references which Jesus made to the life hereafter; they are a matter of common knowledge. As has already been intimated, the disposition to apply Jesus' teachings to this world has sometimes been carried too far; so far, indeed, as to make them relate to this world only. This is absurd; just as absurd as the mediaeval error of giving them an exclusive otherworldliness. Jesus certainly taught that life rightly lived, completes itself in everlasting life.

The second logical corollary to be deduced from the doctrine of divine Fatherhood is the brotherhood of man. It follows as a matter of course. But here Jesus uses the very terms of brotherhood. Brother is the typical word with which he expresses the relation of man to man; and he used the word very frequently in that sense: "the mote in thy brother's eye;" "the least of these my brethren;" "be reconciled to thy brother;" and so on. Moreover the fraternal relationship among men which brotherhood implies is explicitly enjoined by Jesus in those commands with which he summarizes human duty; especially in the Golden Rule and in the law of love: thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. This point will be enlarged upon when it comes to a discussion of Jesus' ethical teachings respecting our duty toward our fellowmen. Here it need only be said in conclusion that we cannot stop short of the universal brotherhood of all men when we recall Jesus' words bearing on prejudice, the implications of his monotheism, whose one God is the God of all the world, not to mention the command to preach the gospel to all the world with which the Book of Matthew ends.

Jesus' doctrine of the brotherhood of man is perhaps the most significant and important religious ideal that has ever been held up before mankind. The influence it is capable of exerting over human life and society will be made more evident in the following chapter.

Anyone who has read the gospels, especially those who have read them as often as the foregoing discussion presupposes, must have observed the frequency with which Jesus used the term: "the Kingdom of God;" Matthew paraphrases it "The Kingdom of Heaven," but that is probably due to the fact that both the author and his audience were Jews, and so under the influence of the apocalyptic Messianism described in an earlier chapter. Jesus began his ministry by announcing that the Kingdom of God was at hand.<sup>1</sup> During his ministry he frequently referred to the coming Kingdom. The term is used about a hundred times in the synoptic gospels.

Some have declared that it was the central theme of his message. This is perhaps an exaggeration. It would probably be nearer the truth to say that he seized upon this term as one of the most important vehicles of his message. That the phrase, The Kingdom of God, is only a vehicle for Jesus' message is evident from the fact that certain disagreements among the doctors — wholly gratuitous disagreements, it seems to the present writer<sup>2</sup> — as to how Jesus expected the Kingdom to come, do not involve the essential meaning of the great Teacher's message. His ethical teachings, and their bearing upon society and the everlasting life, could doubtless be gathered wholly apart from what he said about the Kingdom. Nevertheless the term was an important ~~one~~ means of expressing his thought; and we must seek to understand it.

In seeking for the meaning of this term as employed by Jesus — for he never defined it — one's mind immediately reverts to the Messianic expectations current in Jesus' time. It was the terminology of this expectation that he seized upon.

His idea of the Kingdom of God was in part like that of his contemporaries, and in part different; and the difference was what he talked about, because he was trying to show the people of his age their mistake. He said very little about that half of his idea which agreed with theirs, because it was unnecessary to do so. All understood when he mentioned the Kingdom of God that he referred to an idyllic future order. As an end, the Kingdom meant a social state in which mankind should be prosperous, happy and even blessed. Everybody understood that. In that respect his idea was like that of both the Zealots and the Pharisees.

But here the likeness ends, for the Kingdom was to the Jew not only an ideal end, but also a means whereby that end was to be attained. It was not merely a what, but a how. How the Zealots, and how the Pharisees expected the ideal benefits of the Kingdom to be realized an earlier chapter has already related. With all this Jesus disagreed. As for the Zealot program, he declared that those who take up the sword<sup>1</sup> shall perish by it; and the various Zealot Messiahs he denounced as pretenders.<sup>2</sup> The Pharisaic program he regarded as equally mistaken.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand he distinctly, though cautiously, taught that the Kingdom of God is already present among men.<sup>4</sup> He meant by this that those in whose lives love of God and man is the actuating motive of righteousness, are already in the Kingdom, and the Kingdom is manifest in them; for childlikeness,<sup>5</sup> humility,<sup>6</sup> love to God and man,<sup>7</sup> the charitable service of humanity,<sup>8</sup> and the doing of God's will<sup>9</sup> are the characteristics he speaks of in connection with the presence of the Kingdom among men.

We must conclude, therefore, that Jesus meant to teach that all the ideal social conditions of which the Jews vainly dreamed, would come, if people<sup>would</sup> changed<sup>10</sup> their lives, and be loving and humble, unselfish and kind; and that the Kingdom is already in the world to the extent to which men do live that way. That these qualities of character are the characteristics of the Kingdom is evident, also, from the ethical principles and ideals which Jesus taught in passages where he made no reference at all to the

Kingdom. In other words, a complete study of Jesus' teachings cannot be logically subsumed under a study of the Kingdom; but his ethical teachings may legitimately be imported into a characterization of the Kingdom. It is fair, therefore, to anticipate by saying that the study of Jesus' ethical teachings, which is to follow presently, will confirm the conclusion already reached, <sup>that the Kingdom of God is to be realized,</sup> according to Jesus, by the righteous, reverent way of life, and by the law of love.

And now we come to a most interesting and, indeed, inspiring part of his teaching relative to the Kingdom of God which is already among men; that is, that it is going to grow. In several passages he likens its growth to the growth of a plant from a seed,<sup>1</sup> and to the gradual working of the yeast.<sup>2</sup> These parables betray a remarkable <sup>application of the law of</sup> growth,<sup>1</sup> according to which ideals, reforms and progress bring forth their fruitage. He also taught his disciples to pray for the coming of the Kingdom.<sup>3</sup> The language of this prayer, moreover, together with such expressions as "the light of the world,"<sup>4</sup> "the salt of the earth,"<sup>5</sup> and especially "till the whole was leavened,"<sup>2</sup> not to mention the command with which Matthew closes, to evangelize the whole world,<sup>6</sup> all indicate that he looked forward with prophetic vision to the time when the Kingdom of God should be universal in the earth. In other words, Jesus had such faith in the force of love and good-will that he confidently announced their ultimate triumph in the world, and the transformation and transfiguration of the world through their triumph. In confident fidelity to his Messianic call to preach such a gospel, he died.

Our study of Jesus' doctrine of God, with its corollary doctrine of human relations, and his doctrine of the Kingdom, have both brought us out at the same place, namely; the law of love and the duty of unselfish good-will and service. Both these doctrines need to be completed in a consideration of his ethical teachings. What, therefore, were Jesus' ideas as to duty? Upon this subject he said many things not directly connected with the other two doctrines aforesaid.

In the instructions of a moral teacher one naturally expects to find specific advice as to what one should do and what one should not do. Quite an extensive list of such explicit instructions might be tabulated from the gospels. Thus, in the Sermon on the Mount we find Jesus forbidding anger<sup>1</sup> and resentment.<sup>2</sup> His prohibition of divorce<sup>3</sup> is one of the most explicit of his commands; and the "except it be for fornication"<sup>4</sup> is supposed by scholars to have been thrown in by Jesus' reporter because he felt the Master's absolute prohibition to be too rigid.<sup>5</sup> Jesus also objects to the formal oath.<sup>6</sup> The sections of the discourse that follow that concerning oaths rather baffle explicit codification, however, because they seem to refer not so much to specific acts as to the spirit and motive of action.

Indeed, here we are at the heart of the matter; for any attempt to reduce Jesus' moral teachings to a code of specifications is inevitably a failure; because almost his entire emphasis was on motives. "Make the tree good and the fruits will be good;"<sup>7</sup> this is the gist of his teaching. His specifications were almost invariably illustrations of the importance of right motives; and to wrench them from that setting, and hold them forth in their intrinsic nakedness, subjects them to the shame of absurdity.

As a matter of fact, it is the chief grandeur of Jesus' ethical teaching that it seeks to purify the fountain of the heart. His fundamental law is the law of love; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.<sup>8</sup> If a person be actuated by the motive of love, he needs no other instruction; he will spontaneously practice the Golden Rule.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, this command seeks out the remotest depths of the heart; anything less does not obey the command. Love is of such a character that to counterfeit it is to repudiate it. If one is to seek the Kingdom of God at all, he must seek it first.<sup>10</sup> Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;<sup>11</sup> for where one's treasure is there will his heart be also.<sup>12</sup> If one's eye be not single, therefore, to the law of love; his whole body is full of darkness.<sup>13</sup>

It is hardly necessary to pause for the purpose of pointing out <sup>that</sup> this insistence upon motive is the significance of what Jesus said about alms, prayer, <sup>2</sup> fasting, <sup>3</sup> treasures upon earth, sordid anxiety, <sup>5</sup> and many other themes concerning which he discoursed. But it is necessary to point out that this <sup>was</sup> the animus of his condemnation of the Pharisees. As has been explained, their morality had degenerated into a mere formal, external legalism. It was a veneer under which was a corrupt heart. They prayed loud, long and unctuously, <sup>6</sup> to be seen of men; but they did not do God's will; <sup>7</sup> *They gave alms ostentatiously to be seen of men;* but they devoured widow's houses, <sup>8</sup> and despised the common people. <sup>9</sup> They worshipped the Sabbath superstitiously; <sup>10</sup> but they utterly overlooked and denied its real value for humanity. <sup>11</sup> They trumped up various irrelevant religious forms; <sup>12</sup> but they neglected the weightier matters of justice, judgement, mercy and truth. <sup>13</sup> Their hearts were utterly empty of human sympathy and love; but yet they exalted themselves with censorious self-complacency. <sup>14</sup> And because their morality and their religion were so exactly the opposite of what Jesus saw to be the true orthodoxy of the heart, he arraigned them with superlative bitterness; <sup>15</sup> and he sealed his condemnation of their essential sinfulness of soul by a martyr's death at the hands of their pious resentment.

Absolute, transparent sincerity of devotion to the Kingdom, is, therefore, the core of the Master's requirement. Until a man prizes the life of reverence and faith, of love and good will, — the Kingdom of God, in short — as the choicest treasure, <sup>16</sup> the one pearl of greatest price, <sup>17</sup> that man has not been won by the Master. This, indeed, is a strait gate; <sup>18</sup> for the spirit of Phariseeism recurs from age to age, and reappears in all our hearts. Whoever looks into the mirror of Jesus' teaching, finds his soul searched to the very depths; but this is the mirror that one finds on almost every page of the Synoptic Gospels, and especially in the Sermon on the Mount.

The motive of conduct is a sheer abstraction, however, apart from conduct itself. It is only because motives are the predeterminants of actions and the consequences of actions that there is any practical gain in purifying the springs of life. The grandeur of Jesus' insistence upon right mo-

tives is precisely in this, namely, that in an intelligent personality and developing character, the sure way, and the only way, to get right results is to purify the motive. Nevertheless the right result, the righteous conduct, the good behaviour, is what society demands, what religion seeks to inspire, and what the good man must display. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Our task is not finished, therefore, till we have searched the Master's words for more explicit statements regarding specific concrete duties. We are especially obligated to draw out the logic of his principles till we make them yield a cogent yes or no as to the duties and moral problems of every day life.

This last sentence needs to be emphasized. The obligation referred to is imperative if one is seriously to take the teachings of Jesus as a guide for his moral life. No man can render anything to Caesar,<sup>2</sup> for Caesar is dead. But the principle Jesus uttered is not dead; it imperatively commands the Christian to discover and fulfil his whole responsibility to the democracy in which he lives. It is likewise imperative that the Christian set himself seriously to the task of discovering and doing the concrete deeds called for by the motives<sup>Jesus</sup> inculcated. If Jesus did not himself complete a system of moral instructions, still a complete system ought to be deducible from the logic of the principles and motives he inculcated; and as a matter of fact one has by no means finished his study of Jesus until he has worked out such a system. And so far from doing violence to Jesus' teachings by reducing his scattered utterances to a logically deducible system of duties, one does violence to Jesus' emphasis on motives if he does not seriously ask what concrete duties such motives require him to perform. It is by asking what Jesus would have him do that one builds his house upon a rock;<sup>3</sup> and when one asks that question his answer is to be found seldom in what Jesus said, but usually in the logic of what he said and did.

What, then, according to Jesus, are our duties toward God, toward our fellow men, and toward ourselves?

(1) Mt. 7:16 (52),

(2) Mt. 22:21 (112),

(3) Mt. 7:24 (52),

Since God is a loving Heavenly Father, we ought to entertain a loving, filial attitude toward him. Indeed, we ought to love him with all our nature.<sup>1</sup> Of course we cannot love God as we love a fellow creature. Instead we repose grateful, reverent faith in his Providence, and especially in the constitution of his World. The disciple of Jesus knows that "God's in his heaven, all's right with the world," and that Love is creation's final law. He is an optimist from the depths of his heart. And being thus imbued with a confident trust in the beneficence of God, he obeys<sup>2</sup> his laws willingly, believing that those laws are not merely good but kind. With such a heavenly Father, the mystic soul, disabused of anxiety<sup>3</sup> because of filial meekness<sup>4</sup> and trust,<sup>5</sup> communes, after the example of the Master, who often sought the solace of solicitude and prayer.<sup>6</sup>

There is no other subject with respect to which Jesus is so explicit as he is with respect to our duty toward our fellow men. This is significant when we consider that morality is in the last analysis an approved method of living together. Human relationship is preeminently the problem of Jesus attention; and sympathy, fraternal regard, and unselfish service are his solution of the problem. His message may be epitomized as the gospel of love. This is implied in his doctrine of human brotherhood. It is suggested by his example of ministration to the needy and afflicted. It is positively taught in many utterances and especially in the Golden Rule.<sup>7</sup> The measureless superiority of the Golden Rule to the so called Silver Rule of Confucius is that the Golden Rule is positive: it calls upon us to do. Confucius commands one to refrain from doing harm; Jesus fills the world with loving service. And this duty of love and good offices to others, Jesus does not permit to be interfered with by primitive instincts or artificial conceits. Previous injuries are to be forgiven from the heart;<sup>8</sup> and even our enemies (mirabile dictu!) are to be included in the scope of our love and service. Prejudice also must yield before the Golden Rule, and whoever needs our sympathy and help is not to be denied

it because he is a Samaritan. The gospel of love expands sympathy, justice and "the consciousness of kind" till they burst the narrow bands of sectarian bigotry and provincialism, and human brotherhood becomes universal.

As for one's duty toward himself there is no subject on which Jesus actually said so little, but concerning which the logic of his teachings is more insistent. His doctrine of the dignity of human life has been expounded; to fail to realize that dignity is to repudiate the teaching. It is the positive duty of every man to make the most of himself; and for a man to debauch himself and prostitute his faculties is virtually contempt of the Creator; for all men are endowed by their Creator with the image of divine sonship.

One arrives at the same deduction from Jesus' teachings relative to social relations; for it is evident that no man can fulfil his duty toward his fellow man if his own powers are below par. Social solidarity makes it impossible for a man to debauch himself without bringing suffering upon his fellows; and the evidences of this law are everywhere about us. Social efficiency and self realization stand in causal relations to one another. The Golden Rule depends for its force upon how a man estimates and appraises the values of his own life.

But also in behalf of himself as well as in behalf of society is a man obligated to the duties Jesus inculcates. Jesus explicitly teaches that a man owes it to himself to fulfil his duties to his fellow men. It is the way to life that is through the strait gate.<sup>2</sup> The highest good of life is found in the altruistic service of others: selfishness is the worst of catastrophies. "For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it."<sup>3</sup> A man's life consisteth not in the ~~things~~ abundance of the things that he possesseth;<sup>4</sup> but in the abundance of his ministrations to his fellow men.<sup>5</sup> If one reads the beatitudes negatively<sup>6</sup> he sees that in them Jesus declares

that the secrets of happiness, character, and influence are in the humble, altruistic virtues they enjoin. The reasons why we are to seek first the Kingdom of God are not only in order that the Kingdom of God may come in the earth; but also because the Kingdom of God is the greatest treasure a man can find, the one pearl of greatest price.<sup>3</sup> This, perhaps, is a hard saying; but there can be no doubt about Jesus' meaning: he insists over and over again that the life of righteousness, love, and unselfish service is the best, happiest and most livable life for the individual. The restraints that society imposes upon the individual work out not only the good of society but of the individual. Duty is utility and the secret of happiness. He that observeth the words of Jesus to do them, builds his house upon a rock.<sup>4</sup> The essential and saving faith in Jesus is the faith that believes this doctrine of the highest good; and believes it so vitally as to build life's program upon it. It involves on the part of many men a radical change of mind with respect to the meaning and values of life; but the fundamental meaning of repentance is a change of mind, and Jesus came into Galilee declaring: "The Kingdom of God is at hand, repent and believe the good news."<sup>5</sup>

We have now reviewed the various themes that invite attention in connection with Jesus' message. We may now recall that the consideration of every one of these themes has brought us out at the same place. Considering the way of everlasting life we came to the law of love, righteousness and service; there we left off, pending a study of the other themes. We found, also, that Jesus' doctrine of the brotherhood of man led us out to the same practical terminus. So did Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. Then we studied his distinctly ethical teachings; only to find that they but reiterated and emphasized the principles already familiar. We may therefore return to the question with which the chapter began, with the confident assertion that in Jesus' thought the way of life is also the way of everlasting life. To be lost and to be saved may, therefore, be defined in terms of what kind of a person one is or is becoming, as well as in terms

of where one is going to be put. Jesus' answer to the lawyer's question about eternal life,<sup>1</sup> led to the parable of the good Samaritan;<sup>2</sup> and Jesus' last recorded words to the lawyer were: "Go, thou, and do likewise." In the parable of the sheep and the goats<sup>3</sup> those who are called into life eternal are those to whom it may be said: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

It may be well, in conclusion, to reduce Jesus' teachings to their lowest terms and summarize them in five fundamental principles, as follows:

- I. The Fatherhood of God,
- II. The Dignity of Human Life;
- III. The Brotherhood of Man;
- IV. The Coming Kingdom, i. e., the gradual approximation of an ideal social order; and,
- V. The Law of Love, as the individual's highest good, and society's fundamental need.

(1) Lk. 10:25(113).

(2) Lk. 10:29-37(114).

(3) Mt. 25:31-46(128).

v. THE PRESENT WORTH.

## THE PRESENT WORTH.

Just as one turns to the gospels with the instinctive expectation of finding there set forth the way of everlasting life, so the first subject one expects to find discussed in a chapter on The Present Worth of the Synoptic Gospel is its adequacy for personal religious experience and salvation. It ~~is~~ would seem superfluous to raise such a question in view of the fact that the gospel of Jesus Christ has been the power of God unto salvation to millions of souls during twenty centuries. But the relevancy arises from the fact that in the Synoptic Gospel we have dug aside the legal formulas of mediaeval theology, and discovered the simple gospel of Jesus. Will the simple gospel of Jesus suffice as well to save men's souls, as the credal gospel of the patristics and the scholastics? Is it in fact the same old gospel, except that the husk of dogmatism has been removed?

In the first place does it offer sufficient motive to induce a man to flee from the wrath to come? The answer is in the affirmative. There has been some disposition in recent years to minimize the hope of heaven as a motive in Jesus' teachings. This is unwarranted. He certainly did hold out the rewards of the eternal life; and it is equally certain that he believed in hell. Few modern Christians believe that he meant his words to signify the physical tortures that mediaeval Christians believed in. Such a hell may have had its advantages in frightening a violent, superstitious age; but even then its remoteness was its weakness, and it had to be supplemented by ~~the~~ immediate terrors, such as penances and the whole museum of priestcraft. Let us not imagine therefore that we are losers because we understand that sins are punished by the hell of their own consequences, both to the sinner and his associates. It was these consequences that Jesus perceived; and <sup>he</sup> pitied the multitude because of them. Sin and its consequences were the sickness of which he was the great physician;

and any observer of human nature and society is exceedingly blind who does not see the miseries, comparable indeed to the miseries of a literal hell-fire, that exist everywhere about him as the natural consequences of selfishness, materialism and vice. These will be enlarged upon in latter pages; here it will merely be said that the church is missing the opportunity of the age by her failure to thunder the terrors of this hell.

The simple gospel of Jesus has therefore a regenerating power for the individual life greater than the mere individualistic, credal conception of the gospel formerly entertained; for it offers not only escape from a future hell, but also two additional incentives for a transformed life: first, a more adequate comprehension of and horror for the hellish consequences of sin here and now; and, second, an altruistic<sup>e</sup> motive for life. As for the first; consider the effect of explaining to a man the hell on earth that he brings on himself, but especially upon others, by the three great vices, or by the social sins of the modern industrial and political "criminaloid". To do this is an opportunity that has usually been overlooked by the evangelist and the gospel preacher. If we are to rely solely on the egoistic motive of fear, the simple gospel of Jesus, therefore, appeals to fear as intelligently and effectually as the gospel ever did when it wore the husks of dogmatism. But the possibilities of altruism were almost wholly unexplored by the old religion. And Jesus was the prophet of altruism and its power to transfigure a life; for he knew that altruism is an ultimate instinct of human nature, wholly independent upon egoistic consideration of any sort; and ~~it~~ often developing incalculable redemptive power in a life. In other words, give the depraved a vision of something worth doing for others, ~~and~~ for the world, and <sup>for</sup> the kingdom of God, and you put him upon his

(1) See Ross, "Sin and Society", § Chapter III.

feet in the road that leads to heaven. P Does one require a great life purpose to put meaning into his life, great enough to be worthy all the best endeavor of a man, sublime and beautiful enough to burn all the dross of selfishness out of his life and cast the gold of character into forms of eternal <sup>e</sup> ~~comeliness~~; an ideal rational enough so that in seeking to realize it one realizes his own largest, completest selfhood? Then let him seek first the Kingdom of God. Does one require a program, a motive, a religion that will descend into the trivial details of life and inspire him to be a better brother and son, a better husband and father, a better neighbor, friend and citizen? Then let him find it in the law of love and the practice of the Golden Rule; for the gospel of the Kingdom glorifies the homely duties, and renders each man's home a petty principality of the Kingdom of God. <sup>Have</sup> ~~but if~~ temptations and the pressure of primitive instincts ~~have~~ ~~en-~~ ticed some into a country foreign to the soul; and there starved it on the husks of sensuality fit only for the swine; so that they are ashamed to look themselves in the face, and dare not hope to be of service to the world? P For souls thus sick with despair, there is no medicine like the words of Jesus as recorded in the parables of the lost coin, the lost sheep, and the lost son.

Moreover, the religion of Jesus, having rescued a man from the pit and furnished him motives adequate for the righteous life, provides also for his comfort in the hour of sorrow. When life's burdens have grown too heavy, when the roses of hope have turned to the ashes of disappointment, and the glory of the sky faded into gray; let the sufferer remember that God is the loving heavenly Father and that the hairs of <sup>his</sup> ~~the sufferer's~~ head are all numbered; that no sparrow falleth to the ground without the Father's notice. All the altars of trust that the human heart has ever built are noted by the heavenly Father;

and all the Lebens of personal faith that the soul of man has ever sung find their echo in his loving heart. Jesus himself, in his hours of deepest need, retired apart to pray to the Father, who knoweth all his children's needs before they ask him.

And if one is by instinct a mystic, one may replenish the fountain of his soul from heavenly springs by communion with the companionable God his heavenly Father, whose Kingdom he serves. Such communion will prepare him for more efficient service; and such service will entitle him to ~~more~~ <sup>sweeter</sup> communion.

As a matter of fact the emphasis, so long and sadly neglected, on the social aspects of Christianity, should make it not less but more a personal religion. Jesus himself was a mystic, though not a recluse. Personal religion is most rational, healthy and complete when it takes its natural place in the circle of social relations. Heaven lies at the end of a long road, crowded with our fellow men, such as those to whom Jesus came to minister. And he who ministers, as Jesus did, and who, as Jesus taught, seeks to order his life by the law of love, in this competitive, materialistic social order, will find plenty of occasion for heroism and self-sacrifice; and he will discover the secret of happiness, peace, influence, and personal salvation. Such is the present worth of the Synoptic Gospel to the individual soul.

Every Christian who has seen the vision of Christianity's social application must have noticed and felt the death of hymns on that subject. Our hymnology has been almost exclusive, <sup>vs</sup> personal, subjective and credal. Nothing manifests better the attitude of ecclesiastical religion. But we are at the culmination of the five-hundred years' drift from the legal, credal religion of the middle ages, toward the social religion of tomorrow. We stand at the dawn of a great new era; the era when the social implications of Jesus' teachings are

seriously to be applied to the social order, under the leadership of the Church, so long blinded by dogmatism. and the significance of this new era for the Church and the world is greater than the significance of the Lutheran reformation. We shall in another generation have the hymns in plenty.

The negative work has been done by the higher critics. They have cleared the decks for action. Under their ministrations credalism has shifted, its parallel has dwindled, and we have gradually gained a more just perspective. The pentateuch controversy has been waged to the point where the very premises that made the debate so hot are being vacated, in favor of the social bearing of the gospel. Moreover, it is the work of the critics that has split apart the strata of New Testament literature, and recovered the social character of the historic Jesus and his message. It is only in the lowest stratum of the Synoptic Gospels that we get "back to Jesus". The social bearing of the gospel was never adequately understood until the sources had been critically studied.

After the work of the critics had been well done there began to appear those books<sup>2</sup> that set forth the social teachings of Jesus, and the applicability thereof to the present social crisis. Scarcely any of these books, so eagerly devoured now by the younger clergy, are twenty five years old. Most of them have appeared within a decade or a little more. But already the fire has caught; and those who are to be the leaders half a generation hence have seen the vision of the greatest opportunity ever presented to the Christian Church: to preach the social gospel to such an age of social crisis and reconstruction as this!

The present age is indeed an age of crisis. The industrial revolution, the rapid advance of modern science, the exploitation of vast new natural resources, and the rise of democracy are causes that

(1) See Gordon's "The New Epoch for Faith", p.

(2) See bibliography at close of chapter.

have conspired together to produce a new political, industrial, economic, religious, and intellectual heavens and earth. Naturally, therefore, we are confronted by social problems of the first magnitude. While we are quite confident that they will be solved with a degree of success sufficient to assure the progress of civilization, still we recall the dark ages; and shudder when we think what might be the consequences of a general failure to solve the problems of the present age. Therefore these problems command our anxious attention, and are of absorbing interest.

Idealism is the leaven of society; for without it problems are unsolved, and the people perish. Implicit in every social problem is an ideal. To solve the problem is to actualize the ideal. The present worth of the Synoptic Gospel is most clearly seen in its relation to the problems of the present age; for the ideals that indicate the line of progress are seen to be none other than the ideals of Jesus. If the problems whose solutions are prerequisite to civilization's progress are to be solved at all, it is becoming more and more clear that they must be solved by a practical application of the principles of Jesus. For the social problems of today may each be graphically represented by a ~~straight~~<sup>curved</sup> line. Across each curve may be described a chord, which symbolizes the ideal implicit in the problem. Now if on each of these chords be erected a perpendicular, the perpendiculars will be found to meet at a center. That center is Jesus! His ideals must be the guiding star of social problems. This is the present worth of the Synoptic Gospel. To point out this fact, and the potency of this idealism, is the thesis of the present chapter. This chapter is emphatically a treatise on idealism, and its

*function in the twentieth century.*

The relation of Jesus' ideals to the problems of the present age is illustrated most clearly in connection with the problems of

(1) *prophets.*

democracy. Democracy is founded upon the principles Jesus enunciated. Aristotle appraised the common man at a low value, animal in characteristics, fit only for toil and slavery, and incapable of intelligence and self direction. But it was Rousseau who played the prophet's part in the rise of modern democracy; and that was because he taught so effectively that happiness and well being are universal human rights, and that these rights are capable of realization under a just regime. It hardly needs to be stated that the ideals of Rousseau and of our own Declaration of Independence are but other words <sup>for</sup> of Jesus' principles of the dignity of human life and the brotherhood of man.

But it must be confessed that democracy has not passed the stage of experiment in this country, where it is being tested whether government of, for, and by the people can be permanently maintained upon the earth; and to those who have eyes to see it is becoming more apparent every year that the only hope of democracy's ultimate success is in the actualization of Jesus' ideals. It is only as a sufficiently large number of the members and beneficiaries of a democracy will voluntarily assume the responsibilities and duties requisite to fraternal relations, that civil liberty can be maintained. For democracy is not something that can be let down out of the skies; it must be built upon the earth. Citizens of a democracy may think and act for themselves; but they must at the same time think and act for one another; otherwise they cannot and will not long permit one another to think and act for themselves. The <sup>n</sup>individualistic, competitive, self-~~ish~~ish spirit is destructive of democracy; whether it be found in the greedy corporation magnate who corrupts the legislature, or in the self-centered citizen too busy to participate in public affairs.

But we are sadly poor in these virtues. Our <sup>n</sup>individualistic political theories and popular notions have trained us otherwise.

"Personal liberty" and "a free country" are popular phrases that mean license to debauch self, home, and the state. Our competitive industrial regime has hardened us to the minimum of sympathy and mutual help; and left us pitiably inexperienced in co-operation. Unprecedented resources have poured wealth into our laps; and led us to worship the golden calf, and deify success. The abundance of the things that we possess <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ our criterion of life and its values; even though our possessions have been secured by neglecting, mulcting, or debauching the machinery of government. Civic spirit has had slight stimulus and small opportunity to grow. Our youth have not been taught that voluntary responsibility is the requisite and sole guarantee of liberty. The consequences we are learning to our sorrow. The slang expressions of the street to the effect <sup>that</sup> ~~of~~ dog-eats dog, and big fish swallow little ones, are certainly not descriptive of successful democracy; but rather of oligarchy, or aristocracy, of plutocracy, and ultimately of chaos that ends in blood.

Democracy demands co-operation, civic spirit, some service for the general welfare, subordination of selfish, commercial ends to the public good, and a sense of responsibility to fellow man and especially to the future. But these are virtues closely allied to the Golden Rule. Civic co-operation is a modern English phrase; the Brotherhood of man is ancient Galilean; the meaning is the same. The common law of the Kingdom must become the working constitution of the republic. The Christian must serve the Kingdom by religiously serving the commonwealth; and the sincere servant of the commonwealth may well perceive that he serves the Kingdom unawares.

And it is not enough that such restraints be forced by legal requirements upon the occasional corruptionist and the great captains of industry who are in the public eye. Such is the popular program; but

it cannot permanently succeed; because it can produce no voluntary leadership <sup>by</sup> ~~of~~ geniuses, and because it cannot provide the state with a body of loyal citizens. The virtues requisite to the success of democracy must be indigenous. Some sixty millions of us at least must, in private life, put ourselves in training; for the development of these virtues; lest we be found wanting ~~in~~ <sup>when</sup> our private characters are put to the civic test. On this score the traitor can be distinguished from the patriot; for such is the only kind of patriotism demanded by the present crisis in democracy. But that kind of patriotism is sorely needed indeed.

In this age, civilization in general, and democracy in particular, are still menaced by the three ancient vices of lust, drunkenness and gambling. Modern economic conditions, moreover, seem to have aggravated these social ulcers. As for gambling, the current corporation bubble based on hypothetical economies of combination, or <sup>on</sup> franchised privileges, has increased the opportunities; while the recently increased honor of opulence, no questions asked, <sup>as to how</sup> gained, has aggravated the motive. New forms of this old vice have appeared, therefore; and the old forms seem to have grown. Drunkenness, especially in the congested centers, has apparently been increased in recent years by the pressure of modern industry, <sup>by</sup> the lack of opportunity of the legitimate pleasure of home and fellowship, by the influx of continental European ideals, and by the decline of orthodox ~~of~~ religious terrors. And drunkenness lends itself like an acid to disintegrate the fibre of popular government and public opinion. As for the social vice, the transference, through the introduction of machinery, of women workers from the homely spinning wheel to the roaring factory, together with the exploitation of wage earners of both sexes, having postponed the average date of marriage, have conscribed and assembled a numerous army of miserable,

bankrupt womanhood; whose camps are the clearing houses of disease that ~~are~~ eating at the vitals of our homes and jeopardizing the lives of innocent children. The average man seriously underestimates the social and civic menace of these vices. Gambling leads to the industrial debauchery of a nation just as of a young man. The pocketings of those who gamble in unearned increments and in the advantages of monopoly, are slowly but surely causing the disappearance of our middle class <sup>of</sup> property owners. The social vice is pregnant with the evident consequences of its logical universality. And drunkenness, with the vested interests that cater to it, stands like an unchained lion across the path that leads to every civic, economic, and social reform on the docket; besides itself being the most gigantic maw of death in modern civilization. These vices sin against Jesus' doctrines of the dignity of individual life and ~~of~~ the mutual responsibilities of human brotherhood; and the selfish devotee of these false gods tramples underfoot the logic of every word that Jesus uttered and of every deed that he did. Because of social solidarity, they cannot escape the charge that they are undesirable citizens. And he who refuses or neglects to lend the utmost weight of his influence for the suppression of these vices, is, under the logic of the Golden Rule, a sinner only in a less degree.

Texts are sometimes quarried out of the Scripture to buttress the liquor vice; just as the slave interests quarried out of the Bible the out-croppings of that pre-Christian system, to use as moral foundation stones. The wicked irrationality of such argument in behalf of ~~such~~ intoxicants is evident to those who understand what Jesus' message was, and the logic of it.

If the development of modern society has apparently entrenched the ancient vices, it certainly has given rise to many new forms of sin.

(1) See Meade, *Trust Finance*, Chapter VIII; Will Payne in *Everybody's* for June, 1907; Professor Patton in *Independent*, Feb 17, 1910.

These new forms of sin for the most part arise out of new opportunities which the complex and changing industrial machinery affords for satisfying human avarice and ambition. Our increased interdependence lays trust on men, and offers then large temptations to abuse that trust. Competition often favors the faith-breaker, and punishes the honest man; while the remoteness of consequences, and the corporate sharing of responsibility, cover the perfidy of the sinner. The rebate, the "rake-off", the underwriters' and promoters' profits, are the current forms of robbery; adulterated food, a fire trap tenement or theater inspected by a bribe-taker, the preventable industrial accident that is cheaper than prevention, are current forms of murder; the vote-buyer and the "jack-potter", are the modern traitors. And the love of money is the root of all these evils. Ecclesiasticism may sometimes wink at these wealthy sinners who steal a goose and give the giblets in alms; but they stand naked before the ideals of Jesus. Moreover, the clear apprehension and popular promulgation of Jesus' social ideals must be a powerful factor indeed for creating a public opinion alert to the social consequences of the aforesaid deeds; and enlightened, aroused public opinion, focused on these twentieth century sinners, is the only court whose sentence they can be made to fear. It is not claimed that Jesus said anything that points <sup>out</sup> the terrible consequences of such deeds; but it is insisted that to throw the light of Jesus' ideals and their logic upon the social field, will attract to that field popular attention; and with enlightened popular attention on the social field, the modern social sinner cannot long remain undiscovered. With these "criminaloids" <sup>at large</sup> ~~abroad~~, and with <sup>their</sup> ~~the~~ spirit percolating into all our hearts, a religion of mere mysticism is out of date. But Jesus was not <sup>a</sup> mere mystic; it was a social ideal of which he was the prophet; and his

ideals indicate the righteousness by which our nation is to be exalted.

It is surprising how many of our present day problems are traced back to the industrial revolution ~~as~~ for their source. There is a very intimate causal connection between the invention of the steam engine and the social evil, between the harnessing of electricity and the "jack potter". Industrial changes give rise to materialistic ideals; and materialistic selfishness menaces democracy. Moreover, the augmented vices and the syndicated sinner are the by-products of industrial progress. So are the modern social problems relative to race prejudice, labor, taxation, monopoly, poverty, crime, and municipal government. And on all these problems the ideals of Jesus speak with no uncertain voice; he furnishes the idealism in all attempts to solve them.

These problems are serious ones. Monopoly reaches into the pockets of all the people, filching its unwarranted toll for freight, light, table necessities, the public service utilities, and sometimes, though rarely, even <sup>for</sup> water. Monopoly has been authoritatively charged with fifteen per cent of the recent increase in the cost of living. Our present tax system lays the financial burdens of government on the poor, in the form of prices adequate to cover tariff, license, and revenue fees; rather than on the rich, who own the personal property so easily sworn off the lists, who possess the land with its fabulous unearned increment, on which the crowded tenement-dweller pays rent, who has been given—sometimes for a bribe—franchises, on the watered capitalization of which the strap-hanger pays dividends. If we ask Jesus precisely how to solve these problems, he is for the most part silent; but if we ask him why they must be solved, his answer is supreme: the brotherhood of man! These industrial and political devices sin grievously against the economists and the ethicists

(1) *Professor Patton in Independent, Feb. 17, 1914.*

\* Idealism awakens the will; and where there is a will there is a way <sup>13.</sup>

ideal of the equitable distribution of wealth and opportunity. But this ideal is essentially Christian! A great, just cause will not plan a campaign nor fight a battle; but it will inspire the souls of generals and men; and for it some will even dare to die.\* The economist, the political scientist, and the statesman, who are seeking to find and apply the solutions to these problems, are enlisted under the banner of the Kingdom of God. Jesus, though they know it not, is their unseen master; for it is his ideals they seek to realize.

Twenty five years ago Dr. Gladden wrote a book which he called "Applied Christianity". It dealt mostly with the conflict between capital and labor. When that problem is viewed in the large, and the trend of events throughout history is taken into consideration; <sup>it is seen that</sup> the authority of Jesus' ideals ~~(are)~~ <sup>was seen to be</sup> clearly ~~(to)~~ appealed to in justification of labor's struggle for its rights. Labor has always toiled in bondage and under oppression. Slavery was for centuries universal. It disappeared because it proved as wasteful as it was immoral. So did serfdom. These systems could not live in the same house with Jesus; for Jesus' ideals in the long run turn out to be parallel with the principles of industrial welfare. The social house is not divided against itself; right ultimately makes right, even in the industrial order.

But the logic of Jesus' teachings, in their application to the labor movement during the last one-hundred years, is as clear as its application to slavery. It is unnecessary here to go into the history of the labor legislation that grew up, and the system of collective bargaining that was developed, during the nineteenth century. These things behold are they not written in the books of the chronicles of the labor movement? The point is this: with these two weapons, labor legislation and collective bargaining, the laboring man, bur-

dened over though he is with the handicap of his own poverty and ignorance, and with the fixed charges of his daily hunger, has been able, not merely to hold his own in the unequal fight against capital and the factory system, but has actually bettered his condition to a remarkable degree. The significance of this triumph can only be appreciated when we consider what would have been the wage earner's condition today had the laissez faire of the old political individualism prevailed, together with the every-fellow-for-himself policy of the old personal individualism. Without legislative protection, what could have prevented such conditions of woman and child labor from being universal, as those obtaining in the English mines and factories a century ago, and in the cotton mills and glass factories of our own country at the present time.

But consider the wage earner's fixed charges. Fixed charges—the interest on bonds—drove the railroads during the seventies, and as they could not withdraw from business, into competition destructive both to the roads themselves and to the territory they served. Combination was their only escape. The laboring man's daily hunger is his fixed charge. It drives him into destructive competition with his fellow laborer. The principle is illustrated in the created trades. Laborers, bidding against one another under the desperate necessity of meeting their fixed charges, are driven into bankruptcy and starvation by capital, driving hard individual bargains. Wage labor thus tends to be reduced to abject poverty, not to say misery, and a condition of virtual slavery with respect to industrial opportunity and outlook, the form of freedom to the contrary notwithstanding. What we have not escaped the logic of this industrial drift, even if we have escaped its extremities, is evident to those who know how large a percentage of our people live on an income at or below

(1) <sup>See</sup> Hadley's "Railroad Transportation", p. 78.

"the poverty line", and how many thousands of children go hungry to school in our copious and bountiful republic. It probably is not true that the poor are becoming poorer in America. But let us not deceive ourselves; the drift is unmistakable, the velocity is already accelerating perceptibly. For it is undeniably true that the wage earner is falling behind the country as a whole in the growth of wealth and prosperity, that the middle class of comfortable well-to-do is in a declining ratio, and that poverty and misery have actually increased. If the average man, toiling often in danger of life and health, for a wage so meager that it condemns his family to hopeless and perpetual poverty, foredooms his children to miss all opportunities for culture, leisure, and laudable ambition, harrassed by the incessant fear of losing his job at any time and the certainty of losing it in old age; if the average laboring man, with his smoky coal smeared face, his ragged coat and his dinner pail, is as restive and unhappy under these circumstances as you would be, reader, the sum total of discontent in the hearts of men about you must be very great.

Jesus said more in condemnation of inequitable wealth, and in pity of miserable poverty, than he said on almost any other specific subject. And if he were to come to America today, and were to walk from Fifth Avenue to the ~~west~~<sup>east</sup> end, it is evident that his message would not change in tone with respect to that subject. And if he pities and demands the melioration of the conditions to which poverty logically decends under the wage system, what can we deduce but the approval of his ideals and their logic when applied to the only devices by which such degradation has been in part prevented during the past century; the devices, namely, of legislation and collective bargaining? If these tend to liberate the wage slave, surely they are as Christian in principle as the sword of our fathers which liberated the black bond

*Independent*

*of Sumner and Adams, Labor Problems, p. 541.*

slave a generation and a half ago. And he who has read the aforesaid chronicles covering a hundred years knows that these successes are the unanswerable arguments in favor of labor legislation and especially of collective bargaining through unionism. He who contributes his influence sincerely and honestly to the success of this cause, labors for the coming kingdom; and Christ is the Lord of his ideal.

For some of the details of this problem, moreover, the ideals of Jesus have a very pertinent word. It will be admitted, for instance, that the public may with Christian reason refuse to be involved in the consequences of industrial war; that the same reason demands the sympathetic co-operation of public sentiment in labor's campaigns whenever they are just; that unionism should discountance violence with Christian shame; and that the Christian employer owes to his employees obligations not dreamed of in the philosophy of business, obligations which, alas, he <sup>often</sup> cannot fulfill under the present competitive rigor without bankruptcy. Who, for example, can successfully compete with the sweat shop or with the department store that employs semi-prostitute labor? But more of this on a later page.

The "sacred right" to freedom of contract is a ready incantation on the lips of those who wish to oppose some forms of labor legislation and some of the weapons of the labor union. The closed shop, for example, is said to be condemned by this "sacred right". But the test "sacred right", according to Jesus, is for a man to subordinate himself when such subordination is necessary, to the general good. Such sacrifice is lauded in religion and war. What then if economists and unimpeachable labor leaders unite in declaring that history shows the principle of the closed shop to be absolutely necessary to the ultimate success of collective bargaining? Then it appears that "sacred rights" sometimes need to be revised to fit a larger conception of the greatest

good of the greatest number. If the economists and unionists prove to be right then the "sacred right" of the Freedom of Contract may need to be revised, lest it become a weapon of oppression, like the divine right of kings. Brotherhood is the standpoint from which advancing civilization must sometimes reinterpret her traditionalized "rights"; for when Jesus has surveyed a territory, the highways must ultimately conform to his markings.

~~Many other detailed applications of Jesus' ideal principles might be discussed but space permits the mention of but one or two others.~~

The race question is one of the most aggravating problems of the times in America. It is a little difficult for us to understand that the dusky foreigner from eastern Europe is our brother; and harder still to believe it of the black man who was our slave but yesterday. It crimps our Anglo-Saxon pride. But we should remember that it is an error of western art to depict Jesus with ~~western~~ <sup>The</sup> features. <sup>of a westerner.</sup> And there are those who believe that if we are to assimilate the foreigner we must see the human possibilities in him with ~~some~~-what the same spirit Jesus exercised toward folks of similar visage and complexion. And as for the negro, shall we brutalize him, and suffer his menace in our midst; or shall we humanize him, as a matter of self protection? And if the latter, have we not admitted him into the fraternity of social solidarity? Shall we deny him the benefits of even industrial education, as some extremists advocate, or shall we help him in his struggle up the ladder of civilization? Shall we listen to our primitive racial instincts, or to the ideal doctrine of the universal brotherhood of man?

The modern educational movement in the direction of manual and technical training in the trades is a movement which, for many reasons, promises more for the laboring classes than almost any other movement of

1. Dixon's *The Leopards Spots*, p. ; cf B.T. Washington's *Up from Slavery*.

the times. It too may very worthily recognize itself as an advance movement of the Kingdom. An appropriate motto—if only it were not in danger of being misunderstood—to be carved over the door of a trades High School would be "Thy Kingdom Come". For whoever labors efficiently at a necessary trade is a social servant; and his place of work an altar, where he offers to humanity and God a fitting sacrifice. To train the youth of a whole class of the population to real industrial efficiency is therefore the blessed task and privilege of the educator of the generation just ahead. He too is fellow laborer with God. This tendency of modern education is a star in the east, leading the wise men to Bethlehem.

The institutional care of poverty and crime is paying wonderful tribute to Jesus during the last forty years. Jesus ministered largely to the poor and defective, but greater works than he did for them have been done by the institutions of modern Christendom. Methods are being devised which are calculated to conserve the human dignity of both poor and criminal. Thus modern scientific charity and criminology are both coming to the Kingdom. They are both approaching their work from an entirely new point of view, a point of view dictated by the Christian ideal conception of human life and its worth. Alms may be given in such a way as to degrade or in such a way as to uplift. The latter result is seriously sought by modern scientific charity. The history of criminal treatment, however, is one of the most illuminating chapters in civilization's progress. The horrible tortures inflicted on criminals in the past make blood curdling tales; nevertheless such methods of treating criminals only increased crime! It was done under the doctrines of retributive justice inherited from primitive society, and incorporated into the ground work of mediaeval theology. But Jesus taught the regenerate potency of forgiving love.

In the parable of the prodigal son he taught that such is the regenerative power relied upon by the heavenly Father; and else-where he taught men to forgive one another. Hesitatingly modern civilization is beginning <sup>the</sup> venture of seeking the grain of gold in the lost coin of a criminal life, the spark of divinity latent in the soul of the criminal man. The experiment is being tried least hesitatingly upon the boys. It is the insight of love! Who can guess what the future may have in store along this line, ere the Kingdom be fully come? Reactionaries raise the plea that such threatment of criminals is absurd and impossible; but Jesus has stretched the line, ultimately we must hie to it; and the history of criminal treatment during the last century and a half indicates that we are gradually preparing ourselves for the venture.

The most significant tendency of scientific charity and criminology, however, is their search for the causes of poverty and crime. That search has gone far enough to place a large causal responsibility upon the social order. It seems we can have all the poverty and crime we make social provision for cultivating. The exploitation of labor under the present industrial regime, and the crowded tenements so adequately provided for by our tax laws and street car franchises, are among the most conspicuous causes. Over against these social conditions and these social consequences social science raises the ideal of "Social Justice". There is a large sense in which poverty, accidental maiming and deformity, nervous collapse and imbecility, blindness and disease, premature old age and youthful vagabondage, yes, even drunkenness, the diseases of vice, and personal incompetence are all generated by the conditions of our industrial progress and social development. Of many of these evils crime is the by-product. But this industrial progress pays! Society grows rich and cultured; but the benefits of

our industrial and social progress are enjoyed only by a fraction of the population, which knows nothing and often cares nothing of how the other half lives. The prosperity you enjoy, reader, is ground out for you by the gigantic industrial and political machinery of our social order. But mangled under the wheels and between the cogs, thrown off by the centrifugal force of its fly wheels, sometimes even consumed like fuel, is a vast array of miserable, prostitutes, degenerates, defectives, drunkards, invalids, cripples, aged, convicted, and dependents. Many of them, it is true, are responsible for their own misfortune, as our theology declares; but, as social philosophy is coming to perceive, it is at least equally as true that they are the unfortunate victims of progress. They have vicariously drunk for us the bitter lees from which we have pressed the wine of life; they are the modern gladiatorial victims of our cruel lust for gold with which to purchase prosperity and pleasure; they are worthy the pen of <sup>a</sup> Victor Hugo.

It is the contention of social science that this is not social justice. Social justice demands that part of the community shall not be ~~needlessly~~ sacrificed whether directly or indirectly to build high the foundations of material prosperity. It demands not only that the victims of progress shall be tenderly cared for, but that the number of victims be reduced to a minimum. It is not enough that we dip from the reservoir of misery with our little cups of charity ~~==~~ and original treatment; we must find some way to stop the flow at its social source of supply. Civilization must estimate its values in terms of human life and the fullness thereof, rather than in terms of material gain. Otherwise men decay, and wealth accumulates in an inverted pyramid over the ill fated community.

Now social justice is only another name for the brotherhood of man risen above the trees of individual detail, and taking a bird's-eye view

of the social landscape. It is social Christianity coming to adequate self-consciousness, and catching a glimpse of the divine purpose of the ages.

But if half the world is to climb down off the other half's back, then all must stand on the soil together and labor hand in hand. We must discover some larger and more adequate means of co-operation if we are all to be brothers. We shall have to cease crowding and biting one another after the manner of the pack, in which the strongest alone survives, and adopt the method of helping one another like a family, in which the weakest are carried by the group. Such is the Christian program, since God is our heavenly Father and all men are brothers. And lo! such is the recent trend of both economic and political philosophy. Individualism and the laissez faire of the early nineteenth century are out of date. We have already reaped the consequences of the laissez faire. When we permit men to divide up the world's goods according to the respective strength of each, we find that a minority soon gains an initial advantage, and the majority soon suffer an initial disadvantage. The latter are then handicapped; so that to him that hath is given, and from him that hath not is taken away even that which he hath. Presently those better in the individualistic scramble are helpless; and the others bestride their little world of opportunity like a Goliath. Individualism, we are beginning to see, must be tempered by voluntarily assumed responsibility in behalf of all; and that virtue being none too common in human nature, we abandon the laissez faire, and impose limits by social force upon extreme individualism. The application of this principle to labor legislation has already been discussed. But one thing that we are learning our blind, superstitious faith in competition as an automatic industrial regulator. It has slowly dawned upon us that some businesses are natural monopolies, and are therefore not susceptible to

competitive regulation. We have begun seriously to take in hand the regulation of prices in the railroad and public service corporations, and the end is not yet, for we shall presently open our eyes to the fact that other businesses are natural monopolies as well, and need to be regulated by and for the people. Economic, as well as political theory, is drifting away from individualism. Collectivism is the order of the day, according to the revised program of these thinkers. "Public regulation must proceed pari passu with the development of private trade and industry. The true ideal of society is not laissez faire, but economic freedom, and freedom is the child not the enemy of law and regulation" / . The proud fraternity of political philosophers and economic theorists, under duress of a century's humiliating experience with theories built on premises inherited from the old dispensation both of religion and evolution, are now bowing with bared heads before the unlettered Prophet of Nazareth and his gospel of mutual help.

And who can tell where this drift will end, especially if we once begin seriously to set the competitive machinery aside for the co-operative? And certainly there are ~~grave~~<sup>grave</sup> ethical objections to be urged against the competitive machinery. It is heartless, unappealingly heartless; as heartless as the primordial struggle for existence and the survival of the strong but bloody fit. Its actual victims, already mentioned, are but a fraction of its great army of hopelessly outstripped and beaten. And, like slavery, its worst tragedy is in the hardened heart of the successful. Friend competes<sup>e</sup> with friend; one is driven out of trade, spends his old age in penury, still neighbor to his old friend now opulent: it is the rules of the game and no one blames or feels to blame! Does not the business man who employs uneducated or semi-prostitute labor under competitive pressure

(1) Sumner and Adams' Labor Problems, p. 15.

readily persuaded himself that his practice is wholly justifiable? Likewise the corporation manager on whose ledger human life is entered at a low figure. But so pitifully are we lulled to the game and its rules that we are blind to their heartlessness and essential immorality. The modern business man believes that he <sup>na</sup> practices the golden rule toward his competitor; just as the slave owner believed that he practiced it toward his slave and his "white trash" neighbor. And he does, within the limits of the system, as conscientiously as the warrior who invokes the blessing of his deity upon the eve of a campaign of conquest. But the ethics of the market place are confessedly incompatible with the ethics of the friendly group. Competition and the competitive regime are as hostile to the golden rule as slavery or war. If the gladiatorial show debauched the moral sense of Rome, if slavery dulled the social conscience of the ante-bellum planter, what is to be said of our present competitive regime and its effect upon the moral sense of its successful manipulators? "Commerce and industry ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> based on selfishness as the dominant instinct and duty, just as christianity is based on love. ~~But~~ its tries to take its selfish trade and grasp all visible sources of income in its own hand. ~~It~~ This rule makes even honest competitive trade, to say nothing of the immense volume of more or less dishonest and rapacious trade, antagonistic to christian principles. ~~It~~ If the industrial life which would the adult set tasks of conscious social service and inspired all workers with a sense of moral solidarity, social life would be so closely akin to the christian conception that the task of christianity would be easy and comparative success would be within easy reach. Instead the young adult in the most plastic period of his development is immersed in an industrial life which largely tends to counteract and neutralize christian teaching; and

training."

The political consequences of commercial selfishness and its resultant moral blindness constitute the chief menace of democracy. The material good set up by the competitive program is exalted so far above the moral good implicit in democracy that civic spirit is rare, public office is seldom regarded as a public trust, prosperity is the customary political issue usually to the exclusion of moral reforms, votes are cheap, the grafter and corruptionist infest the cities and the states, and are exalted before the most august legislative bodies of the land. In the last analysis this is because individualistic, competitive materialism is inimical to democracy. "At the present time we in America by common consent are sliding into death with the 'Anarchymania'." Our democracy is political only; we must realize industrial democracy also on pain of losing our political liberty. Democracy cannot stand half Christian and half heathen. We cannot serve both God and mammon. The social order must be re-constructed.

However impracticable it may now appear to seek the suggested changes in the social order — as impracticable as a doubt as it would be to Aristotle to abolish slavery — there are several reasons which indicate the drift of the social mind in that direction. We shall not move far in this direction, of course, unless co-operation proves cheaper and more effective as a method of production and distribution than competition. But there are good indications that it will. The wastes of competition are evident to all observers; and the economies of combination have been capitalized and marketed at a high price of late, and dividends paid on the stocks. It is true that no other device except competition has ever been successfully employed on a large scale for distributing the products of industry throughout society; and if the competitive device should ever be put into practice

(1) Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 310.

(2) Wilcox, *The American City*, p. 227.

it is doubtful whether it ~~can~~ <sup>could</sup> be operated over the entire area of the industrial field. Nevertheless recent developments in trust and railroad experience, and the rise of collectivistic theory, indicate a disposition to abandon competition at certain points for the sake of more effective production; and also to substitute government interference for competition as a distributive regulator. True, we are as yet but experimenting, cruising along the shore, never out of sight of land. But is it probable that the majority of American voters are at this moment ready to try municipal ownership of public service utilities, and perhaps government ownership of railroads. And some day we may put boldly out to sea. This is not an argument for the socialistic program, however. It is only a declaration that industrial interest must ultimately coincide with ethical. Industrial history has demonstrated that principle frequently in the past; the signs of the times indicate that by a drift toward combination and co-operation—a drift already begun but as yet unsocialized—a like consummation will again evolve.

But if not along lines already apparent, then along other lines to be discovered by human genius; for the ethical demand is imperative. To see the need of reform, and to prescribe a correct method for reform, are two distinct problems. But it is something to have seen the need; even that is evidence of ethical advance. And we are doing more in this generation than merely perceive the need; we are actually working out the social reconstruction. We are devoting the best thought of the age to the task of meliorating the conditions of most pressing needs, and of solving one at a time the social problems next at hand. And this is better than any quantity of ~~concrete~~ Utopian schemes; for if an ideal order is ever to be attained it will be attained a step at a time. The world evolves. The Kingdom does not

come in a single day. Gradual progress is the surest forecast of ultimate reconstruction. And this is what we are actually accomplishing in this generation as never before.

The infant selects an accidentally successful act from a vast fund of ~~random~~ <sup>random</sup> movements, and habituates it to his uses. But a man puts away such wasteful methods. He reasons, plans, conceives beforehand an effective line of action; and puts it into actualization. Thus his adjustment is efficient, and progress is rapid. Society in former centuries usually blundered upon its improvements after the <sup>mn</sup> manner of the child learning to use his muscles. But in the present century society seems to be arriving at manhood. Social evolution is becoming conscious, artificial, and rapid instead of blind, slow, and wasteful, like the natural evolution of the past. Never has there been an age comparable to this with respect to social planning. Society is coming to self-consciousness; becoming deliberative and purposeful. Plans for social betterment — blue prints for society's self-building — are being worked out and adopted.

And as a result the world is full of carefully planned enterprises for the furtherance of the Kingdom. These enterprises are new. The campaign against tuberculosis, for example, is scarcely a decade old; and the man is still living who first undertook to transform an American prison into a reformatory. And these new enterprises for social betterment are very numerous. A half dozen or more will occur at once to the mind of the reader: tenement reforms, industrial education, growing religious tolerance, anti-war prop<sup>a</sup>ganda and world organization for international peace, temperance agitation, scientific charity methods -- but why enumerate? whoever will devote an hour to meditation along this line will be able to write out a list of fifty or a hundred new movements, enterprises, organization, tendencies, sentiments, indicating

that the age is seriously taking in hand the problem of realizing the Kingdom of God upon the earth. Without being definitely aware of any religious awakening, the age is coming to Christ; the Zeitgeist is Christian; the ultimate social reconstruction is in progress; the Kingdom of God is at hand.

To the college student Jesus' social vision of the Kingdom of God that is to come may well be a source of great inspiration. There is scarcely a subject of his study which is not illuminated under the light of this great ideal. If he understands what Jesus meant by the Kingdom of God, and feels the thrill of anticipation in his soul, he will better understand some of the great utterances of classic essayists and poets. He will recognise the philosophy of the Galilean Prophet in Matthew Arnold's declaration that "there is a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness"; in Burns' vision of the time when "man to man shall brothers be, the world o'er for a' that"; in Tennyson's faith that "

"through the ages <sup>one</sup> increasing purpose runs,  
 And the thoughts of men are <sup>widened</sup> broader with the process of the suns;"

and in a thousand others of the <sup>noblest</sup> ~~sublimest~~ passages of literature.

In the first pages of his history of England, Macaulay says; "Those who compare the age on which their lot has fallen with the golden age that exists only in their imagination, may talk of degeneracy and decay; but no man who is correctly informed as to the past will be disposed to take ~~the~~ a morose or desponding view of the present." The student should approach the study of history, therefore, with the reverent feeling that he is reading a commentary on the divine plan. When one compares the liberty, opportunities, and fullness of life in modern

Christian civilization with the ancient conditions when Khufu drove his slave subjects to build the great pyramid as a monument to his ambition, or when Nero made Rome horrid with his gruesome tyrannies, one realized<sup>s</sup> that the world is indeed growing better. Slow and devious and at times doubtful as progress may be, there is nevertheless progress; and history demonstrates that the Kingdom of God is not an idle dream, for it shows that through the lapse of ages it has been slowly though surely coming. One may approach the study of literature, and especially of history, therefore, with a reverence and religious fervor scarcely less than that with which he would approach the study of the Bible itself.

But these are not the only studies in which Jesus' ideals are household divinities. Psychology imparts significance to Jesus' succinct epigrams about the dignity of human life, and to his analogous behavior toward the common man. What a marvelous mechanism is the human brain as revealed by the physiological aspects of this science! And how essentially brothers in this respect does it declare us to be. This science permits no one to doubt the possibilities latent in a normal mind, however hampered by circumstance. Only put an individual through the appropriate set of experiences and as great and good things may be apperceived by him as by any of his fellows. Note the instincts and habits, the judgements and the delicate adjustments<sup>to</sup> a complex environment. Observe the emotions, sentiments, <sup>and</sup> capacities<sup>for</sup> idealism, ~~and the susceptibility to enjoy them in terms of which the worth of living must be ultimately defined.~~ Psychology joins with sociology in showing how largely the self is determined by the elements of its social environment. It, moreover, leads one to understand that the perfect self is completed only in the field of its own social interests; that is, in a man's interest in his fellow man. Thus we see scientific

reasons for Jesus' quaint assertion that life is found by losing it in the good of others, and that the greatest of all is he who serves.

Psychology, applying itself in educational theory, very logically defines the end and function of education as the ~~creation~~ <sup>training</sup> of socially efficient persons. Which again is a statement in the English language of Jesus' conception of life and its meaning that he expressed in the Galilean dialect.

Ethics also seized upon this perfect and harmonious development of all ones interests, private and social, denominates it ~~self~~ self-realization, and declares self-realization to be the highest good of life. But nothing in all the range of modern theory pays tacitly a higher tribute to Jesus than does one of the recent text books in ethics in its distinction between custom<sup>ry</sup> and conscious morality. <sup>1\*</sup> Jesus' emphasis upon the motive broke the ethical life away from custom and tradition, and turned it over to the insight of the individual. The Christian, if he is imbued with the spirit of the Master, does nothing because it is the approved method; but he acts because he loves his fellow men, and intelligently seeks their good. One of the sublimest aspects of Jesus' teaching is this faith he displays in the innate capacity of human nature to discover and desire and do the good. Thereby he lifts morality above all bondage to custom, convention, and tradational authority, and places it explicitly on the so-called conscious level. When ethics has pointed out the highest aspect of morality we find that science doing no more than to place its endorsement upon what Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount.

Ah, young reader of academic affiliations, if you will but read your books with eyes that see and ears that hear and heart that understands you may learn from them that the humble Prophet of Nazareth spoke a message the present worth of which the highest wisdom of today

(1) Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, Chapters V to VIII.

can do no more than to appreciate and to apply.

Even philosophy is in this age bearing its implied and unconscious tribute to Jesus as never before. Pragmatism seems to be the current philosophical fad; and what is pragmatism but an agnostic attitude towards speculative problems, and a transference of attention to the practical problems of the day. The following sentences are quoted from the pen of a pragmatic philosopher: "But it is one thing to point out the need and meaning of a moral society, it is another thing to bring such a society into being. It has become evident during the past century that this is the central problem for human reason to solve." The philosopher might as well have said: pragmatic philosophy seeks first the Kingdom of God.

But current <sup>philosophy</sup> ~~speculation~~ has its positive as well as its agnostic wing, and with those who have not abandoned the speculative problem altogether ~~no~~ philosophical system seems to be more acceptable than the one which conceives the World-Ground theistically. This conception sees God immanent in the cosmic processes, working out the culmination of his purposes in social evolution, the goal of which is the Kingdom of God. This philosophy makes the promoter of that social order a co-worker with the Deity. Whichever wing of present day philosophy one finds himself aligned with, therefore, he marches under the banner of Jesus' social ideal, and devotes his practical service to the coming Kingdom.

It has just been implied that the goal of social evolution is the Kingdom of God; and this is so. This leads us to say that evolution, the most universal generalization of science, is but another name for the divine purpose running through the ages. If inorganic nature develops from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, if organic nature builds the higher upon the lower, then what words more aptly describe that evolutionary process as seen in human society and history than the

(1) Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, p. 167.

words of Jesus when he predicted that the whole social lump should be gradually leavened by the spirit of brotherly love and the coming Kingdom? The conflict between science and religion appears, therefore, as a superstition of the former days of men's blindness; for now we see that the fundamental terms of both are synonymous. Further, let it be considered whether any movement in history has contributed as much to the betterment of life and civilization as the modern extension of scientific research, and the resultant application of the discoveries thereof to industry and to the comforts and health of life. To college students it may sometimes seem a very unpractical business, wholly lacking in religious idealism, to be dabbling with acids, pattering with carcasses, and fussing with test tubes. Not so! Go into your laboratories with uncovered heads, for there you are learning of ~~things~~ those who have reduced Jesus' faith in the progress of life and the development of society to the validity of universal law, and who are mixing the physical elements for hastening its demonstration in reality.

It is probably in the departments of the political and social sciences, however, that the ideals of Jesus are most frequently presented to the student's attention, however stolidly unaware of the fact he may often be. Social philosophy at the outset makes its tacit recognition of the *Master's* authority. It shows justice and sympathy at the foundation of the social order; and the decrease of frictions and artificial restraints dependent upon their growth. Thus it justifies the law of love. It shows the determination of the individual self by the social environment; and makes it clear that a man finds himself by finding his place in the social fabric. Jesus said the same thing in a familiar epigram. Its doctrine of social solidarity, moreover, gives scientific authority and imperativeness to the Christian

ideal of human brotherhood. Social philosophy shows that the law of the survival of the fittest necessitates the rejection of unsatisfactory methods of living together, and the invention and adoption of better. Thus it verifies, apart from history, the certainty of the Kingdom's coming. These better methods it makes evident, moreover, are to be found in larger applications of sympathy and justice; that is, in a larger measure of love. Love appears demonstrated, therefore, as creation's final law. Nothing comes nearer solving the riddle of evil in the world; nothing comes nearer demonstrating what Jesus held up to faith: that God is a loving Father. Sociology begins with the facts of human life and society as data, and works them out to generalizations that reflect the revelations of Jesus as a mirror reflects a face.

And if social philosophy pays tribute to Jesus, a like tribute is even more apparent in the practical branches of social science. What indeed do these text-books discuss but the facts of society and how they can be improved? As for Jesus, it was the ideal that he set forth; the potency of love that he announced. How to harness love to the social world, how to make it realize the social <sup>ends</sup> ~~ideals~~, that he left for the inspired genius and intelligence of mankind to discover. He is the source of the world's idealism; to actualize his ideal in the concrete social order is the business of human thought and activity. It is to this task that the social sciences particularly devote themselves. The class in sociology <sup>or</sup> and economics is, accordingly, a sort of sub-committee on ways and means for realizing the Kingdom of God upon the earth. Whether the course be upon governmental theories, taxation, monopoly, labor problems, poverty, crime, immigration, urban problems and rural conditions, theories of economic production and distribution, or what not, the implicit ideals are always those of Jesus; and the practical end is always to make two blades of human welfare grow where but one had been before. Naturally, therefore, hundreds of altruistic

young men and women are preparing themselves in these departments for concrete social service; thousands are being trained for the enlightened, fraternal sort of citizenship so much needed; and these disciplines are even displacing Hebrew from the curricula of theological seminaries. Men who teach in these departments should understand that their desks are altars; students should perceive that it is holy ground on which they tread. And they should look forward to the day when they shall go out into the world to contribute to right public sentiment and share in the solution of the problems of the age, as Zacharias looked forward to the day when he should, according to his lot, burn incense before the Lord in his holy temple.

The college student's religious anticipation of the part he is to take in the solution of current problems is an altogether warranted enthusiasm; for it is evident that in a society like ours public opinion is the ultimate determinant of progress. It is not relevant to the present purpose to prove this statement here; but only to emphasize it. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, however. And it is in the colleges and universities of the country that the young men and women are being trained who will largely determine the public opinion of the next fifty years. They are enlightened with respect to the elements of these problems and their meaning; their influence is strategic. And their influence will save the age if their fidelity to idealism does not yield before the temptations of personal ambitions, of materialism, and of the vested interests which some of them will inherit. Idealism is the greatest need of the age; and if the college-bred men and women of today will keep the face of Jesus in their vision, the age is safe.

This discussion cannot well be closed without a few words on the function of the church in this critical age. Indeed the question of the church's function, and the further question of whether she will fulfill her function, is itself one of the most pressing problems of the

age.

It may be laid down as axiomatic that the church's primary and fundamental business is to preach the gospel. This needs to be emphasized. If, as with the mediaeval church, it be a gospel that merely offers to save individuals from a future hell-fire, her primary business was to preach that gospel. But if, as with the church of today, it is a gospel that promises in addition to that to transform and transfigure this present world, her first and chief concern is to preach that gospel.

The function of the preacher is very different from that of the sociologist or social worker; for the church is not primarily a school of social science nor an institutionalized agent of philanthropy. It is primarily the herald of an ideal. To hold up an ideal is one thing; to devise ways and means of applying and realizing the ideal is another. The former is the essential business of the church; the latter is the task of social science, philanthropy, politics, and human endeavor in general. The potency of an ideal to stimulate and guide the intelligent activity of mankind is so incalculably great, that the function of holding up the ideal before the eyes of men is a task incomparably sublime. Therefore an institution like the church may well devote herself primarily to such a task. She will do well indeed if she keeps the ideal always untarnished by the rust of hierarchy and the mold of custom; she will do well if she devises means of reaching the ear of all the people of any given generation: her task will be as great as it is sublime if she preaches the gospel. Jesus himself, with sublime faith, was satisfied to put the leaven in three measures of meal.

Against this definition of the primary and essential function of the church it will be objected that even Jesus did not confine himself to preaching, but instead devoted his time and his energy to concrete

deeds of mercy and help to individual folks. True, nevertheless his deeds were incidental, secondary, contributory to his message. They were ultimately but means whereby he got his message understood and appreciated. And, of course, this is the sense in which the word preach is used. To preach is not merely to pronounce, it is to reach the ear of the people, yes, it is to press through the portal of the ear with a message into the sanctuary of the heart. It was to this end that Jesus was a doer of deeds as well as a speaker of words.

And this is why the church must be a doer of deeds as well as a pronouncer of words. If he had merely voiced his theories about love and the coming Kingdom Jesus would have caught the ear of only a few curious and speculative; but when the world saw him ministering to the needy, and dying for his message, they stood still with bated breath and uncovered head; they loved him and believed him: his theories ceased to be a theory and became a vital force. His deeds constituted a spontaneous, unartificial demonstration and advertisement of his principles; but the principle was end, the demonstration and advertisement were only means. However, the means he used were necessary to the end. And if Jesus used deeds to demonstrate his sincerity and his faith in his principles, the church must also make use of deeds of mercy and help, she must at times even drive the money changers out of the temple, to demonstrate her sincerity and faith in the ideals she expounds: Otherwise who will believe that she herself believes her message? And in that case the world will grow poor indeed being impoverished of idealism. If it is our first proposition that the church's essential business is to preach the social gospel in an age of social crisis; our second proposition is that concrete social service is requisite to success in that business.

But the church approaches her task under some serious handicaps. It was stated in an earlier chapter that the spirit of Phariseism,

which Jesus arranged so drastically, is perennial. The church of today will be very wise to take a hint from Jesus, and look sharply indeed into the mirror of his arraignment of ancient Phariseeism for traces of modern Phariseeism, with which her own features may be blemished. Such blemishes constitute the most serious obstacle to her success in the performance of her function.

Under this head, what is to be said of dedominationalism? Does it not emphasize the disagreements and advertise the centrifugal forces in ecclesiasticism? Does it not generate petty bickerings, and waste untold men and wealth (some secured under false pretences) upon competitive reduplication in small villages; while at the same time the folk-swamps of the cities are notoriously unchurched? This situation was not wholly unparalled in Jesus' time. The temple ~~absorbed~~ occupied the energy of an army of priests, and absorbed large sums of money; while the Pharisees ignored and despised the "people of the land".

Or, further, what would Jesus say concerning the fact that the ecclesiastical baton is often wielded by the condescending representatives of social superiority and exclusiveness, or by the vested interests of wage oppression, monopoly, municipal corruption, or the liquor traffic. That these conditions exist in thousands of American churches is undeniable. An assumption of conscientious responsibility on the part of the general body of laymen is the only cure for this evil.

Again in what more idolatrous form could the golden calf of materialism be worshipped than in the unctiously masked scramble ~~of the~~ indulged in by some clergymen for the sake of professional preferment and fame -- the only prizes of materialism accessible to their trade. And can the world be expected to hear the gospel of the Kingdom from

the lips of men who so absolutely contradict its spirit by their dominant motives. Verily they have their reward; but meantime the century is in danger of passing the Christ indifferently by.

Again, it was tradition which the Pharisees had exalted above the law and the spirit of righteousness; and the modern church should look well to her worship of tradition. Intelligent traditionalism is the conservator of civilization's gains; but blind traditionalism forestalls progress and prevents the church from performing her function. Moreover, the teachings of Jesus make ~~the~~ <sup>blind</sup> traditionalism a positive sin. This is severer than our accustomed judgment of the matter; but it is nevertheless true. Where there is no intelligence the people must be guided into moral paths by rules and codes which they obey without understanding. Jesus' emphasis on motives implies the intelligence of those who receive his teachings. A man must think if he would put himself in his brother's place so that he can treat his brother as he would like to be treated under like circumstances. If a man does not think he will treat his brother in the customary way; and thus the slave-holder will parrot the Golden Rule, and the wine-bibber will quote the Bible. But if one thinks he will understand, and the Golden Rule is the only rule he will need. Traditionalized follies and wrongs and outworn customs cannot endure in the face of such intelligent Christianity. Blind traditionalism is therefore a sin of which the church in every age must beware.

However, we have the spectacle that the church, whose business it is to preach the Golden Rule, is ~~the~~ proverbially the most conservative institution of society. Traditional hierarchies and ~~ecclesiastical~~ institutional machinery blindly push the ecclesiastical car along the accustomed highway, complacently unaware or else cynically critical of the fact that the traffic of popular need and lay responsibility has

shifted to entirely new thoroughfares. Traditionalized methods of evangelization are still ~~in vogue~~ invoked, with vain repetitions, but with confessedly declining success; while we slothfully refuse to discover a remedy or a substitute. Traditionalized criteria of ecclesiastical success, such as the size of the church rôle, the magnitude of the collections, or the number of organized sub-societies, need revising in the interests of the new age to which the ideals of the gospel must now be preached.

Must we concede that the church lacks the intelligence necessary to devise successful ways and means of preaching the gospel to such an age as this? If so she repudiates the logic of her founder's teaching. Or is she blind to the magnitude of the opportunity and responsibility which the age presents to her -- the greatest that have been presented to her by any age of Christian history? If she misses these opportunities and responsibilities it will be because blind traditionalism prevents her from seeing the vision; and blind traditionalism is a handicap of Phariseeism utterly incompatible with Jesus' emphasis on motives.

These handicaps removed -- and with the increasing emphasis of the times on the pure teachings of Jesus, they must inevitably decrease-- what are the concrete deeds of mercy and help that the church should do if the example of Jesus is to be transmuted into a present worth? This question can be raised here; but it cannot be answered except in outline. The <sup>to</sup> detailed answer -- ways and means -- must be devised by church leaders, individual pastors, laymen and laymen's associations (especially of the interdenominational sort), and by young geniuses whom God shall call thereunto -- all under the guidance and council<sup>el</sup> of expert social scientists. What the church will not do, as a rule, is to build up a vast machinery, either general or local, for social<sup>ial</sup> service of various sorts. The state and private philanthropy have

organized institutions for such work as education, charity, temperance reform and so forth. But the church can inspire, stimulate and pioneer. For example, the church mothered the three kinds of work just mentioned. She seems also to have pioneered, to some extent, in the field of psychotherapy; but her clergy will not generally become healers; specialists will appear in that line of work and a new profession will arise. There are other lines along which the church has pioneered: freedmen's aid; <sup>is one</sup> numerous others might be mentioned; the future will develop opportunities for many more. There will always be demand for the church, inspired by a love of humanity, to discover new fields of social service, occupy them for the Kingdom, demonstrate the practicability of their cultivation, and turn them over to secular agencies -- if any agency can be called secular which does the Master's work.

And the local church will always find opportunities for practical service suited to the needs of the local community. In one locality it may be a boys' club or a mother's meeting, in another a wood-yard or an employment agency, in another a gymnasium or a library, in another a day nursery or a manual training school, in another a neighborhood meeting or an anti-saloon campaign, in another a combination of various enterprises of this sort. In many communities, however, perhaps in the large majority, it will be none of these; but merely the sincere practice of common neighborliness on the part of the people. This is the social ~~service~~ service most painfully needed in every community; and it is most emphatically demanded by the Christian spirit. It is only *by* the practice of old fashioned neighborliness that Christians can oppose the growing tendencies toward artificial social stratification and ~~the~~ formation of elite and exclusive cliques. This tendency is one of the menaces of democracy's success; and this spirit, when found in a church, as it so often is found, is the swine

sacrificed to Zeus on the altar of the holy of holies. No church can render a greater social service to the community than to combat it by the sincere practice of its membership; and such practice is impossible except by those who have caught the true spirit of the Master.

Thus there are always ways of expressing real love for the people and genuine concern for their needs: means of rendering the heart of the world receptive by sincere service. And if the church, unhampered by the handicaps aforesaid, or by any of the old fashioned vices, practices such service sincerely, or if its individual members do, the world will have faith in the church and believe the message of the gospel she preaches.

Let such a Christlike church preach the gospel. Let her preach the good news of the coming Kingdom. Let her preach the individual Christian's responsibility to democracy in its present crisis, and to the specific causes of reform and particular programs of social melioration mentioned or suggested in the early pages of this chapter. Let her help build a public opinion that can be trusted both to safeguard the future of our best institutions, and also to punish the modern sinners against social justice. Let her enlighten society as to who its worst enemies are; and point out the <sup>specific</sup> social duties and civic responsibilities of Christian patriots. Let her extend the scope of the sacred so that it will include all secular pursuits or endeavors that conserve the general good; and make every man who serves the Kingdom blessedly conscious of the divine companionship. In other words, let the church hold up the ideal of the Kingdom of God; for by so doing the coming of the Kingdom will be hastened immeasurably. Such is the sublime significance of the present drift toward social religion; that is to say: "back to Jesus"!

Let the church, therefore, preach the gospel of love, altruism,

unselfish service and responsibility, sacrifice and selfcontrol in behalf of others. Let her preach that these bring not only reward hereafter, but reward here and now in the salvation of self and others from the hell on earth that results from vice and the other selfish sins of old and new sorts. And if the church will institutionalize the opportunity for young preachers, burning with the zeal of this social gospel, to go into the slums of our cities and preach their message there, as their grandfathers of the saddle-bags, with the same zeal, traversed the rural slums of the frontiers three generations ago preaching the old-fashioned gospel of personal salvation from hell fire hereafter, there will be seen a revival of a magnitude and significance for the future of civilization the like of which has not been recorded since the time when Wesley and his preachers saved England, according to the historian Green, from the terrors of a French Revolution. For the opportunity open to the church of the twentieth century to preach the gospel of social as well as personal salvation to this age of problems, crisis, and impending destiny is an opportunity such as no century has offered since the gospel of Jesus was first preached in Galilee and Jerusalem.