

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Judaism and Universalism in the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D., SHIPLEY, YORKS.

I.

THE problem with which these two articles attempt to deal is this : how far did Jesus Himself foresee, and explicitly foretell and enjoin, that universalism which, within thirty years of His death, had become so marked a feature of the movement which He started ; and how far, on the other hand, was He, as a Jewish teacher among Jews, influenced by that strong nationalistic particularism which we commonly associate with the Judaism of His time ?

I. JEWISH UNIVERSALISM.

We may remind ourselves, in the first place, that even in the Old Testament there is a good deal of quite explicit universalism. Israel started indeed with belief in a tribal deity, Yahweh, beside whom there existed many other deities worshipped by other tribes and nations. But with the growth of Hebrew national greatness and religious insight, Yahweh came to be regarded, first as stronger than and superior to all other deities, and then as the sole-existing Deity in the heaven and earth that He had made. The logical implication of this monotheism was that, not Israel only, but all the nations of the earth, were the objects of Yahweh's providential care. It took time for this implication to be clearly seen and accepted ; but seen and accepted it certainly was. Amos made a beginning by declaring that Yahweh was just as responsible for the migrations of the Philistines and the Syrians as He was for those of Israel (Am 9⁷). Isaiah saw a vision of all nations coming to Jerusalem to learn His law (Is 2²⁻⁴ = Mic 4¹⁻³). Writers of the seventh century show traces of the same general idea (Dt 32⁴³, Ps 87⁴, Zeph 3⁹). Jeremiah re-echoes it (Jer 16¹⁹⁻²¹) ; while Habakkuk declares that 'the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Yahweh's glory, as the waters cover the sea' (Hab 2¹⁴). In the early exilic period, the author of the 'Servant-Poems' depicts Yahweh's Servant as extending the knowledge of the Divine Law to the eagerly awaiting Gentiles (Is 42¹⁻⁴). 'It is too light a thing,' he hears Yahweh saying, 'that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the dispersed of Israel [only]. I will also

put thee as a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may extend to the end of the earth' (Is 49⁶). Deutero-Isaiah repeats this forecast on his own account (Is 42⁶ 51^{4f.} ; cf. Am 9¹²). Zechariah reaffirms it amid the returned exiles, 'many nations shall join themselves to Yahweh in that day, and shall be my people' (Zec 2¹¹ ; cf. 8^{22f.}). It appears again and again in the post-exilic literature : thus, for instance, 'In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth ; inasmuch as Yahweh of hosts will have blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my possession' (Is 19^{24f.} ; cf. 19¹⁸⁻²³, also 56^{6f.} ['My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the peoples'], Jer 3¹⁷, Zec 14^{16f.}). The two short and beautiful books of Ruth and Jonah were probably written (perhaps round about 400 B.C.) as a protest against the narrow Judaism fostered by the perils and difficulties of the time, and encouraged by the policy, of Ezra and Nehemiah. Universalistic expressions also occur in the late Jewish apocryphal writings (e.g. Sibyll. Orac. 3⁶⁵²⁻⁷⁰⁵, esp. 707^{f.} ; To 13¹¹ 14^{8f.} ; cf. Schürer, *Gesch.* ii. 593-96 [Eng. tr. ii. ii. 139-141]). The best Jewish minds hoped for more than the submission of the Gentile nations to the resurgent empire of Israel : they hoped for the ultimate conversion of these nations to a saving belief in Yahweh and their full participation in His coming Kingdom, and they believed that it was accordingly the duty of Israel to propagate the true faith throughout the world.¹

In the times in which Jesus lived, this Jewish universalism was still a power. A vigorous proselytism was carried on, and met with very considerable success. The irrepressible inclination to impart to others the religious truth treasured by oneself largely qualified the tendency towards a

¹ Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Eng. tr., ii. 198, 346 ; Holtzmann, *N.T. Theologie*, i. 277 ; Hirsch in *Jew. Encyc.*, v. 616a ; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 629-632 (Eng. tr., ii. ii. 172-174), iii. 162 f. (Eng. tr., ii. ii. 304) ; Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, Eng. tr., i. 16 f. ; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 146-149, 273 f., 371-373.

narrow particularism. There was much in Judaism, with its monotheism and its lofty ethic, to attract serious-minded pagans. The Pharisees of Palestine compassed sea and land in their effort to make one proselyte (Mt 23¹⁵). In the Diaspora, the work of propaganda was carried on more actively and successfully still. Proselytes were of several grades: not all were required to accept the full yoke of the Law; and we are told of one Rabbi who even argued that converts might be exempted from the necessity of circumcision. Hillel, the most famous Rabbi of the times immediately before Jesus' ministry, was interested in the propaganda, and said: 'Be ye of the disciples of Aaron, . . . loving mankind, and bringing them nigh to the Law' (*Pirke Abhoth*, i. 12). Gamaliel, Paul's teacher, was another propagandist.¹

Apart from the teaching of Jesus, there is a certain amount of universalism in the Gospels, reflecting the broader Judaism of the time. Thus John the Baptist repudiates the idea that Jewish descent was any guarantee of a share in God's Messianic blessings (Mt 3⁹=Lk 3⁸). In the Lucan narrative of Jesus' infancy, the prayer of the aged Symeon breathes this wider sympathy: 'Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared in face of all the peoples; a light for revelation to Gentiles, and for the glory of thy people Israel' (Lk 2³⁰⁻³²). This simple Jewish universalism shades off imperceptibly into the Christian universalism which the Church took for granted in the days when the Evangelists wrote. Thus Mark (7⁸) speaks of the Jews and their customs in a purely external way: Luke carries back the genealogy of Jesus to 'Adam, the son of God' (3³⁸), applies to the Baptist's appearance the prophecy 'All flesh shall see the salvation of God' (3⁶), and preserves no saying which confines the activities of Jesus to the Jews. Even 'Matthew,' with his Jewish leanings, brings the Gentile astrologers from the East to the Messiah's cradle (Mt 2¹⁻¹²), specifies 'Galilee of the Gentiles' as the scene of His activities (4¹³⁻¹⁶), and quotes the universalistic 'Servant-Poems' in connexion with His peaceful public ministry (12^{18, 21}).²

¹ Cf. also Hirsch in *Jew. Encyc.*, v. 221 f., 621a, x. 221-223; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 150-188 (Eng. tr., II. ii. 291-327); Montefiore, *Synopt. Gosp.*, i. lxxxii; Harnack, *loc. cit.* On the whole subject, see also A. Causse, *Israël et la Vision de l'Humanité* (Paris, 1924).

² Holtzmann, *loc. cit.*; Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr.,

II. JEWISH PARTICULARISM .

But alongside this broad human sympathy, and in frequent conflict with it, there ran a stream of bitter and narrow particularism. The sufferings of the Jews at the hands of the Gentiles had generated fierce nationalistic antipathies. After the Exile, the restored Jewish community had scornfully rejected the offer of their neighbours to cooperate in restoring the worship of Yahweh. Ezra and Nehemiah had discountenanced as religious treason marriages with non-Jewish women. The persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the ensuing successes of the Maccabæan warrior-princes sharpened Israel's antagonism to the rest of the world. The conquest of Palestine by Pompeius, the long reigns of the semi-foreign Herods and their sons, and the hard government of the Roman procurators, alienated the Jews still further. They came to regard the Gentiles as impious and unclean idolaters—eligible for conversion to Judaism, it is true, but, if converted, obliged to keep the whole Law, and even then admitted only to an inferior status, and if unconverted, deserving only to be despised and avoided. In Jewish apocalyptic, which was at its height in the period during which Jesus lived, the Gentiles usually figured as enemies destined soon to be overthrown and destroyed *en masse*. In the period culminating in A.D. 70, the antipathy to everything non-Jewish was steadily on the increase. One comparatively mild phase of this particularism was the fact that Jewish religious thought concentrated its interest, with an intense and exclusive energy, on the religious concerns of the Chosen People itself, to the tacit neglect of the Gentile world.³

As with the universalism, so with the particularism, of the time, we may trace its presence in the Gospels apart from the words of Jesus. John the Baptist, despite his threat that God would not necessarily save the existing children of Abraham, but could, if He wanted to, raise up others, yet seems—by his use of the rite of baptism (which i. 38-41 (but some of the passages quoted in 41, note 2, are not universalistic).

³ Cf. Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, i. 96, 277; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 162 f. (Eng. tr., II. ii. 303 f.); Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, i. 17 f.; Hirsch in *Jew. Encyc.*, v. 616-618, x. 223b; Eisenstein, *ibid.*, v. 623b; Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 16-18; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 437. Note also Paul's language in Gal 2¹⁵.

was always administered to Jewish proselytes on conversion) and by his general message—to 'have conceived of the Kingdom of God . . . as consisting of a purified Israel—the "wheat" of the nation which should be left after the "chaff" had been winnowed out and consumed by the Messiah.'¹

The Lucan Infancy-narratives, which depict truly the Jewish piety of the time, contain much more particularism than universalism. Gabriel tells Zachariah that John 'will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God . . . to make ready for the Lord a people prepared for him' (Lk 1^{16f.}); and he tells Mary that God will give Jesus 'the throne of his father David, and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever' (Lk 1^{32f.}; cf. v. 27). In the 'Magnificat,' Mary sings: 'He has helped Israel his servant, remembering mercy—as he promised our fathers—(mercy) for Abraham, and for his seed for ever' (Lk 1^{54f.}). The song of Zachariah at the birth of John is a purely Jewish song of rejoicing, without a single reference to any benefit which God intends to bestow on the Gentiles (Lk 1⁶⁸⁻⁷⁹). The angels tell the shepherds that a Saviour is born for them—the Lord Messiah—in the city of David (Lk 2¹¹); and there is no universalism in the song of the heavenly host, for 'Peace on earth, goodwill towards men' (Lk 2¹⁴) is the translation of an inferior reading, the true text giving 'on earth peace among men (divinely) favoured,' *i.e.*, presumably, the Jews among whom this Messiah was born. Symeon was looking for the consolation of Israel (Lk 2²⁵), and told Mary that Jesus was destined to occasion the rise and fall of many in Israel (Lk 2³⁴): the aged Anna spoke of Him 'to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem' (Lk 2³⁸). The parents of Jesus took Him to the Temple to carry out the regulations of the Mosaic Law (Lk 2²⁷), and returned to Galilee only when they had done so (Lk 2³⁹). Thereafter they visit Jerusalem annually for the Passover (Lk 2^{41f.}). The Gospel of 'Matthew,' needless to say, is saturated with Judaism. Jesus' descent is traced from Abraham through David and the kings of Judah (Mt 1¹⁻¹⁷). Joseph, his legal father, is addressed as 'Son of David' (Mt 1²⁰). Jesus is born 'King of the Jews' (Mt 2²), and is destined to 'save *his people* from their sins' (Mt 1²¹). According to the old prophet, God had declared to Bethlehem: 'Out of thee shall come a ruler, who shall shepherd my people Israel' (Mt 2⁶). The

¹ G. B. Stevens, *Theol. of N.T.*, 37.

Gospel speaks of Jerusalem as 'the Holy City' (Mt 4⁵), describes the crowds praising the 'God of Israel' (Mt 15³¹), and shows us Jesus fulfilling innumerable Old Testament prophecies, among others that which ran: 'Say to the daughter of Zion, Behold! thy king comes to thee . . .' (Mt 21^{4f.}). The disciples of Jesus, not to mention His fellow-countrymen generally, are obsessed with particularistic sympathies. He is addressed as 'Son of David' (Mt 9²⁷ 15²² 21¹⁵, Mk 10⁴⁸ ||s, 11^{9f.} ||; cf. Mt 12²³), and 'Holy One' (or 'Son') 'of God,' *i.e.* Jewish Messiah (Mk 12⁴ || 3¹¹ 5⁷ ||s, 8²⁹ ||s; cf. Lk 4⁴¹ || and 7¹⁶ ['God has visited his people']). After His resurrection, the two on the road to Emmaus confess that they had hoped that it would be He who was destined to redeem Israel (Lk 24²¹), and the Twelve inquire of Him whether that was the time when He would restore the kingdom to Israel (Ac 1⁷).

III. THE JUDAISM OF JESUS.

Such being the context within which the Gospel-story is told, we have now to inquire what was our Lord's own personal attitude, and firstly, how far it was characterized by a Judaistic particularism.

(a) Taking first those statements, whose historical truth we have no reason to doubt—we may begin with the fact that Jesus was born and brought up as a Palestinian Jew among Palestinian Jews, or, as Paul would have said: 'A Hebrew (sprung) from Hebrews.' He commences His public life with the clear, though unpublished, conviction that He is God's Messiah, *i.e.* a leader with a distinctively national rôle: He admitted at the end of His life that He was 'the king of the Jews' (Mk 15² ||s). He virtually confined His whole activity to Jewish soil. He chose twelve disciples, with evident reference to the number of the Hebrew tribes,² as is clear from His words: 'Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Mt 19²⁸=Lk 22³⁰ Q). He takes it for granted that the Jews as a whole are to be His disciples,³ and that the Gentiles are outsiders. Thus He often uses the word 'brother' in the sense of 'fellow-disciple' (Mt 7³⁻⁵=Lk 6^{41f.}; Mt 18¹⁵ (21f.)=Lk 17³⁽⁴⁾: both Q): and there is abundant evidence

² Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 38; Jacobs, in *Jew. Encyc.* vii. 162b.

³ See Mess, *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society*, 19, 32; Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, 42-45, 61.

to prove that 'brother' on Jewish lips regularly meant 'fellow-Jew' as distinct from the alien Gentile (Ex 2¹¹ 4¹⁸, Nu 32⁶, Dt 10⁹ 15^{2f.} 17^{16.} 30 18² 23^{18f.} 24⁷, Jer 34¹⁴, Ac 2^{29.} 37 3¹⁷ 7² 22⁵ 28²¹, Ro 9⁸).¹ He is specially interested in the salvation of Zacchæus, 'forasmuch as even he is a son of Abraham' (Lk 19⁹), and the healing of the crippled woman, because she is 'a daughter of Abraham' (Lk 13¹⁶).² Lazarus, the beggar, is taken at death to Abraham's bosom (Lk 16^{22f.}). Again, Jesus counsels His followers to avoid characteristically Gentile shortcomings, such as worrying about the future (Mt 6³²=Lk 12³⁰ Q) and domineering over their subordinates (Mk 10⁴² ||s). The herd of swine which He handed over to the legion of demons was Gentile property (Mk 5¹¹⁻¹⁹ ||s). Once, when on Gentile soil He was appealed to by a Phœnician woman to heal her afflicted daughter, He hesitated to do so, on the ground that it was not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs (Mk 7²⁷=Mt 15²⁶). 'Dogs' was a fairly frequent Jewish term for Gentiles; and it is far-fetched to suggest that Jesus' hesitation was purposely assumed by Him in order to try the woman's faith.³ The Gentiles figure in Jesus' third prophecy of His death, as those to whom He will be handed over (Mk 10³³ ||s): in His great eschatological discourse they appear as rising in war, one nation against another (Mk 13⁸ ||s [? 'little apocalypse']: also Lk 21²⁵), and as destined to tread down Jerusalem and enslave the Jews for a certain appointed period (Lk 21²⁴).

¹ Cf. Hatch, *Organiz. of Early Christian Churches*, 44; Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 406 n.; Farrar in *Smith's D.B.*, i. 230 b. Many of Jesus' sayings about the extension of the Kingdom to outsiders of one sort or another have reference, not to the Gentiles, but to Jewish tax-collectors, prostitutes, and sinners (Mt 21²⁸⁻³² 22⁹, Lk 18⁹⁻¹⁴; cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39 note 2). On the limited numbers of those who should enter the Kingdom, see Lk 13²⁴=Mt 7¹⁴: Shailer Mathews' objection (*Social Teaching of Jesus*, 200) is beside the point.

² Cf. The words which, according to the Gospel καὶ Ἐβραίων, Jesus addressed to the rich young ruler: 'fratres tui, filii Abrahæ.'

³ Wendt, *Teaching*, ii. 198; Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39 top. Cf. the remarks of F. Heiler in *Der Katholizismus*, 32 f.: 'Auch in Jesu Seele liess dieser grosse Gedanke des Gottesvolkes tiefe Spuren zurück; auch in seinem Wirken offenbart sich diese jüdische Exklusivität . . . Das kananäische Weib . . . weist er mit der harten Bemerkung zurück: "Ich bin nur zu den verlorenen Schafen des Hauses Israel gesandt."''

With the leading Jews, on the contrary, Jesus was often on friendly terms: He is invited to dinner by a Pharisee (Lk 7³⁶), enters the house of another Pharisee—a ruler—to eat bread (Lk 14¹), looks upon the rich young ruler and loves him (Mk 10²¹; cf. Lk 18¹⁸ [ἀρχὴν]), and enters into friendly conversation with a sympathetic scribe, whom He declares in the end to be not far from the Kingdom of God (Mk 12²⁸⁻³⁴; cf. Lk 10²⁵⁻²⁸). He venerates the Jewish Scriptures, finding in them strength against temptation (Mt 4^{4.} 7. 10=Lk 4^{4.} 12. 8 Q), quotes the Mosaic commandment to honour father and mother as having Divine authority (Mk 7^{9f.} 13=Mt 15^{3f.} 6), and declares that heaven and earth should pass away before one fragment of the Law should do so (Mt 5¹⁸, Lk 16¹⁷, ? Q), and that men ought to have kept the weightier matters of the Law, and not to have left the lesser commandments—like those dealing with the tithing of herbs—undone (Mt 23²³ || Lk 11⁴² Q). He wore on the corners of His outer cloak the violet tassels which the Law required every pious Jew to wear, in order to remind Him of God's commandments (Mk 6⁵⁶=Mt 14³⁶, Mt 9²⁰=Lk 8⁴⁴; cf. Nu 15³⁷⁻⁴¹, Dt 22¹², Mt 23⁵).⁴ As for the Temple and its worship, Jesus venerates the sanctity of the place, resents its desecration (Mk 11^{11f.} ||s), and teaches habitually in its courts (Mk 12³⁵ 14⁴⁹, etc. ||s).⁵ He sends the cured leper to offer the sacrifices that Moses commanded, in connexion with his curing (Mk 14⁴⁴ ||s). At intervals during His ministry He visited Jerusalem on the occasion of the great national festivals (see Fourth Gospel, *passim*); and, whether the Last Supper was a Passover-meal or not, it is certain that Jesus *desired* to eat the Passover (Mk 14^{12f.} ||s; Lk 22¹⁵). Though comparing His own message to new wine, He yet declared: 'No one having drunk old wine wishes for new: for he says, The old is good' (Lk 5³⁹: not in the parallels).

(b) So far we have confined ourselves to passages

⁴ The exact force of Mt 11¹³ || Lk 16¹⁸ (? Q) in this general connexion is not clear. Cf. Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, 26 f., and Lightley, *Jewish Sects and Parties*, 115-118.

⁵ Cf. Heiler, *op. cit.*, 30 f.: 'Dem durch das Gesetz sanktionierten Tempelkult auf dem Sion gegenüber nimmt Jesus eine ähnliche Stellung ein wie gegenüber dem Gesetz selbst. Mit seinen Volksgenossen teilt Jesus die ehrfürchtige Liebe zum Heiligtem in Jerusalem . . . Der Tempel ist wirklich Gottes Haus und Wohnstätte,' etc. See Lk 24⁹.

of almost unimpeachable historical accuracy. We can hardly challenge the reliability of Q, while Mark and Luke, writing mainly for Gentile readers, would scarcely admit to their pages particularistic sayings that did not rest on good authority. It is different, however, with statements resting on the unsupported testimony of 'Matthew,' in view of the abundant traces which that Gospel shows of having been compiled under various doctrinal influences so strong as frequently to impair its trustworthiness on points of fact. The explanation of the data furnished by it is materially helped by the theory, recently put forward by Dr. Streeter, that its composition was meant to be a compromise between the Paulinist and Judaistic elements in the Church at Antioch, and that it was accordingly based partly on Mark (the Roman Gospel), partly on Q (the logia compiled by the Apostle Matthew), and partly on a Jerusalem collection of incidents and sayings (Streeter's 'M') produced during the period A.D. 45-65, when the Jewish-Christian leaders were in fierce conflict with Paul over the Gentile-mission and the Mosaic Law, and bearing distinct marks of that conflict in the form given to many of Jesus' utterances.¹ Most of the material peculiar to 'Matthew' probably comes from M: much of it is clearly genuine tradition; but some of its sayings can hardly have been spoken by Jesus, while they are easily explicable as anti-Pauline 'dicta' believed to have the Master's authority behind them.

(c) We find among the probably reliable excerpts from M much that simply confirms our previous conclusions. Thus Jesus assumes His followers to be simply pious Jews as such. He tells them what to do when they are fasting (Mt 6¹⁶; cf. Mk 9²⁹ v.l.), or when they are 'conscripted' by some government-official to transport baggage, etc. (Mt 5⁴¹). He warns them against offences punishable by the Jewish law-courts (Mt 5^{21f.}): He assumes that they will know and speak of each other as 'brothers,' i.e. fellow-Jews (Mt 5²²⁻²⁴.⁴⁷

¹ Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 230-270. The theory has the merit of solving what Dr. Moffatt (*Introduction*, 255) has called 'the main problem of the gospel,' viz. the juxtaposition of particularistic and universalistic sayings. It also helps to explain why certain recorded sayings in 'Matthew' and Luke, though clearly parallel, are too dissimilar to be naturally assigned to a single source, Q: 'Matthew' either drew from M, or conflated M and Q, while Luke used Q only.

[contrast Lk 6^{33f.}, 'sinners' substituted for 'Gentiles'] 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷; cf. Mt 25⁴⁰ 28¹⁰, Lk 22³²): He tells them not to pray like the Gentiles (Mt 6^{7f.}), who later on will hate them as His followers (Mt 24⁹: contrast the parallels). He calls Jerusalem 'the city of the great King' (Mt 5³⁵), i.e. of God, pictures His disciples offering their sacrifices at the altar (Mt 5^{23f.}), pronounces in regard to the oaths sworn by the Temple, the altar, and the sacrifice (Mt 23¹⁶⁻²²; cf. Heiler, *loc. cit.*), and pays the Temple-tax (Mt 17²⁴⁻²⁷).² The saying, 'Every scribe that has been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his store things new and old' (Mt 13⁵²), does not well fit its present setting, and probably refers, not metaphorically to the Twelve, but literally to Jewish scribes who listened sympathetically to Jesus' teaching.³ Again, when Jesus says to the Jews, 'The Kingdom will be taken from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it' (Mt 21⁴³), He implies that He had previously regarded the Kingdom as the possession of the Jews (cf. Mt 8¹² ['sons of the kingdom'] and 13^{38, 41}).

(d) The following sayings, however, which are also peculiar to 'Matthew,' look very much as if they had been put into our Lord's mouth in the heat of the Jewish-Christian controversy with Paul: 'Whoever cancels one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, will be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he will be called great in the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 5¹⁹): 'Beware of false prophets, who come to you clad like sheep; but inwardly they are ravening wolves' (Mt 7¹⁵): 'Depart not by the road (leading) to the Gentiles, and enter not into (any) city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . Ye will not have finished the cities of Israel before the Son of man has come' (Mt 10^{5f.},²³):⁴

² The conversation of Mt 17^{24f.}, implying that Jesus and His followers are sons of God, while the Jews are foreigners, is remote from the thought of Jesus, and therefore probably a piece of early Christian, anti-Jewish polemic (see McNeile, *Matthew*, 258 f.).

³ McNeile, *Matthew*, 205 f.

⁴ Harnack, *Mission*, Eng. tr., i. 38; Wendt, *Teaching*, Eng. tr., ii. 197. The explanation of Mt 10⁵ suggested above, viz. that the words represent the views of those Christian propagandists who, in opposition to Paul, advocated concentration on Israel in view of the proximity of the Parousia, seems far more

'I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 15²⁴).¹ 'Give not what is holy to the dogs, nor cast your pearls before the swine, lest they tread them down with their feet, and then turn and tear you' (Mt 7⁶).

(e) The following sayings are not so clearly anti-Pauline as those quoted above, but seem to represent rather the Judaism of the early Jerusalem Church than that of Jesus Himself: 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil' (Mt 5¹⁷): the Matthæan version of the passage about the narrow gate (Mt 7^{13f.}; contrast Lk 13^{29f.}): 'The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All things therefore that they tell you, do and observe,' etc. (Mt 23^{2f.}): 'All ye are brothers' (Mt 23⁸): 'Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath' (Mt 24²⁰).² The passage about appealing to the Church against the offending brother and treating him, if he refuse to hear, as a Gentile and a tax-collector (Mt 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷), may be regarded either (1) as a real saying of Jesus, in which He is simply referring to His disciples as Jews habitually assembling in a synagogue,³ or (2) as a piece of early Church-Law, ascribed to Jesus, but actually emanating from the times and probable than that suggested by Rev. T. H. Weir in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February 1926, p. 237.

¹ Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39, note 1. Observe that, in the Matthæan version of the story of the Phœnician woman (in contrast to the Marcan), Jesus does not actually go on to Gentile soil at all: the woman comes thence to Him (Mt 15^{21f.}; contrast Mk 7^{24f.}: cf. McNeile, *Matthew*, 230).

² Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 39, note 2.

³ Here called *ἐκκλησία*, as was occasionally the custom (see Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 504f. note [Eng. tr., ii. 58 f.], and Oman in *Hastings' Encyclop.* iii. 617 f.).

conditions after His death.⁴ The description of the Last Judgment in Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶ (sheep and goats) has difficulties of its own; but one plausible view is that it is an attempt on the part of the Early Church to explain on what principles the unevangelized Gentiles would finally be judged. The answer given in this passage is that they will be judged according to the way in which they have treated oppressed and needy Christians. We note that those judged are described as 'all the nations,' *i.e.* the Gentiles, and the recipients of their kindness or their neglect are described by the Son of Man as His 'brothers.' The description, in any case, presupposes the existence of many Gentiles who had never heard of Jesus.⁵

(f) Finally, it seems clear that Jesus did not give to the disciples any clear or definite instructions actively to evangelize the Gentile world, though doubtless (as we shall see in the next article) His view of the Kingdom really *implied* such an evangelization. Had He given an explicit charge, it would be very hard to understand why the Jerusalem-Church should have been so slow to take any steps in that direction, and should have even put hindrances in the way of it when it was at length seriously undertaken. Paul apparently knew nothing of any such general commandment.⁶

(To be continued.)

⁴ So, strongly, Heiler, *Katholizismus*, 42 f.

⁵ Wendt, *Teaching*, Eng. tr., ii. 349.

⁶ Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.*, i. 38, 40 f., also *Origin of the N.T.*, 45 f.; Wendt, *op. cit.*, ii. 348-351; W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World*, 348-350; S. Mathews, *Social Teaching*, 201 top. See further on this point the second article.

Literature.

THE SCOTTISH LAYMAN'S LIBRARY.

FOUR new volumes of this series have just appeared. The first of the four in interest, and, probably, in ability, is *Principal Caird*, by the Rev. Charles L. Warr, minister of St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh. No one need shrink from this book in fear of a profound disquisition on Hegelian philosophy. The author was warned off this ground, the book being

designed for 'the ordinary laity.' The object of the author was the delineation of a portrait framed in the setting of an era. In both these respects he has been singularly successful. Indeed, one of the most admirable features of this biography is the description of the background on which the famous churchman lived his life. The times are sketched in with as much fulness as was possible in the space, and we see clearly in what conditions both of the nation