

GOD WHO IS RICH IN MERCY



Essays presented to
Dr. D. B. Knox

edited by

Peter T. O'Brien
*Vice Principal,
Moore Theological College,
Sydney, Australia*

and

David G. Peterson
*Head of the Department of Ministry,
Moore Theological College,
Sydney, Australia*

© Lancer Books, 1986

LANCER BOOKS are published by
ANZEA PUBLISHERS
3-5 Richmond Road
Homebush West NSW
Australia

ISBN 0 85892 277 0

Distributed in North America by
BAKER BOOK HOUSE
P.O. Box 6287
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506
U.S.A.

*All rights reserved. No part of this
publication may be reproduced in any
form or by any means without prior
permission in writing from the publisher.*

Typeset and Printed in Singapore
by Singapore National Printers (Pte) Ltd

Chapter 7

TAKE UP YOUR CROSS

DAVID P. SECCOMBE

Seldom is it possible to produce a conclusive demonstration of the genuineness of a saying attributed to Jesus in the Gospels. The most that can be done is to show that objections to the dominical origin of a saying are unfounded, and to display the congruence of the saying with what else is known of Jesus and his ministry.

In any gathering of the sayings of Jesus the cross saying (Mark 8:34; Matt 10:38; 16:24; Luke 9:23; 14:27) would be conspicuous among the inevitable group of "suspicious characters". Superficially it appears to take the crucifixion of Jesus as a picture of the disciple's life of commitment and renunciation, obviously implying a post-Easter *Sitz-im-Leben* for the saying.¹ This impression gains strength when it is realized that the Marcan predictions of Jesus' death contain no reference to crucifixion,² but only to the necessity of Jesus' suffering and death (Mark 8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33-34, 45; 14:24).³ Can anything be said on behalf of the cross saying?

If the cross sayings are held to have been placed on the lips of Jesus by the later Church, evidence of such sayings or ideas might be expected in the epistles. However, examination of the epistles' use of cross terminology reveals nothing closely related to the cross sayings. Though Paul is *par excellence* a theologian of the cross, he nowhere uses the image of the disciple bearing his own cross. The Christian has been "co-crucified" with Christ (Rom 6:6; Gal 2:19) but this is justification terminology, indicating the representative character of Christ's dying: we died *in* Christ. The Christian is also required to put to death or crucify his sinful nature (Gal 5:24; Col 3:5) but again the vivid image of *bearing one's cross to the place of execution* is absent. The closest Paul comes to the Gospel picture is in 2 Cor 4:10 where he describes his own persecutions as "always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus" (*pantote tēn nekrosin tou Iēsou en tō sōmati peripherontes*).

It is significant that although he comes close to the image of the Gospel cross sayings there is no mention of cross or crucifixion, and no verbal similarity to the cross sayings.

It would be going too far to conclude that the cross saying was not current as a picture of discipleship in the early church, but its absence from our documents gives us cause for thought, especially when we search further and find no trace of it in any of the Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius makes much of the cross,⁴ and could appropriately have described himself travelling to martyrdom in Rome as "carrying his cross", but this image is nowhere to be found.

Two suspicions are aroused: first, that carrying one's cross was not a common proverbial expression, as is often suggested though not on the basis of any evidence;⁵ secondly, that saying might well have been understood as a literal demand for martyrdom, rather than as an image for devoted discipleship. P. Parker may be right when he suggests, "so starkly did Jesus' death loom in their minds that they seem to have shrunk from calling their own sufferings 'crosses'".⁶ Carrying one's cross may have been as inappropriate a metaphor for suffering or renunciation as "going to the gallows" would be today. In fact, it would have been more inappropriate, for the sufferings and degradation of crucifixion have no parallel in the modern world.

E. Haenchen⁷ is justified therefore in seeing Mark 8:34 as a demand for literal martyrdom. However, he then proceeds to deny that confession of Jesus prior to Easter could have brought death to a disciple, and concludes that this cross saying must have reference to the time of the Church. Up to this point he is echoing many other scholars, but he takes the argument a stage further since martyrdom was exceptional in the Church before Mark wrote: the saying must have its explanation in the great persecution which Mark expected shortly to break upon the Christian community. To my mind Haenchen has inadvertently provided another strong objection to a post-Easter provenance for the saying: there was not such a danger of execution in the early church as would account for its rise.⁸ His suggestion that it was invented by Mark with reference to future persecution is untenable for the simple reason that another form of the saying was present in Q (Luke 14:27; Matt 10:38). His original contention, that confession of Jesus prior to Easter could not have brought death to a disciple should therefore be scrutinized.

However, it is not enough just to challenge this assumption, for even the admission that martyrdom was a real possibility for disciples before Easter, would not fully explain the cross sayings. Luke 14:27 especially (*ton stauron heautou*, 'his own cross') implies that Jesus too is carrying a cross with the disciple following behind bearing his.⁹ The whole party of Master and disciples are being led together to public crucifixion. In Mark 8:34 the picture is little different: those who would follow Jesus must take heed that Jesus has announced his own death.

If they are behind him carrying their crosses it is to be presumed he carried one too. We cannot evade the implication that the cross saying represents an indirect prediction, not just of Jesus' passion, but of his death by crucifixion.

I will address myself accordingly to three questions: Could Jesus have anticipated his own death? Did he expect to be crucified? Did he intend his disciples to share his fate?

Could Jesus Have Anticipated His Own Death?

According to Mark, Jesus began his public ministry around about the time of John the Baptist's arrest (Mark 1:14). According to Josephus (*Ant.*, 18.118) John was a preacher who aroused the crowds to the highest degree by his sermons. It was this which alarmed Herod Antipas and led him to arrest John to pre-empt a possible uprising, and incarcerate him in the Machaerus fortress. Some time later, in the course of Jesus' Galilean ministry John was executed (Mark 6:27-9). Jesus too was a preacher who excited the crowds. He too taught in the countryside rather than in the towns, partly from physical necessity, but perhaps also to be further away from the authorities. That Jesus and Herod were aware of each other is clear (Mark 3:6; 6:14; 8:15; Luke 13:31; 23:8-12).¹⁰

In addition to danger from Herod's quarter, all sources of the Gospel tradition bear witness to the deep-rooted conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees. That we hear less of the Sadducees accords with the fact that much of Jesus' ministry was in country areas where they would not have been so influential. Opposition from the Pharisees would not have been such an immediate threat to Jesus' life, though at times their influence with the populace could have led to dangerous confrontations. For the most part, however, Jesus appears to have been surrounded by supporters during the Galilean phase of his ministry, and any attempt on his life would have required a powerful backing. In this respect the unholy alliance of Pharisees and Herodians described in Mark 3:6 was an obvious move, analogous to the later alliance of the Sadducees and Romans. Herod's opposition climaxes in a scene which even Bultmann thinks is "in the strict sense a piece of biographical material."¹¹ Jesus is warned by some Pharisees of Herod's intention to kill him, to which he replies that he must die in Jerusalem where all the prophets are killed (Luke 13:31-3).

In one manner or another all the Gospels report Jesus' move to Jerusalem where, if John is to be believed, he already had a reputation as an enemy of religion. In any case, with the Galilean example behind him, he could hardly have gone to Jerusalem without

expecting some outbreak of passion against him there. Only if he altered his message and mission could he expect differently. There is no difficulty then in concluding that Jesus not only could have anticipated his death, but also lived under constant threat of it.

Could Jesus Have Anticipated Crucifixion?

J. G. Griffiths¹² argues that Jesus was a messianic claimant who, though non-violent in his approach, would still have been in danger of falling foul of the Romans, who practised crucifixion. Accordingly he regards the cross sayings as belonging to Jesus. The inadequacy of his argument is his failure to consider all the other alternatives to crucifixion. We have already seen that much of the danger faced by Jesus was from Herod's direction. There is no evidence that the Herods employed the Roman supreme penalty. John the Baptist was beheaded. The threat of death at the hands of the government in Galilee or Peraea would not have raised the spectre of crucifixion. Even in Jerusalem Jesus' chief enemies were Jews, not Romans, and one might have thought he was in greater danger of some action at their hands, or stoning by a mob, than from the Romans. Why crucifixion then?

The cross was the Roman supreme penalty. It was the standard form of execution of slaves and was also employed against those convicted of political offences such as treason, insurrection and banditry (usually associated with insurrection in Palestine).¹³ Such crimes were commonly punished by crucifixion in Judaea and Samaria (Galilee when it was under direct Roman control).¹⁴ The difficulty is to know whether crucifixion was limited to serious state crimes, or whether in the provinces it might have been more widely employed. On reflection it is unlikely that the Romans would have used such a barbaric form of punishment for ordinary criminals. To do so would have been extremely provocative, implying that Jews were no better than slaves. Though our historical sources tell us little about ordinary criminals, by and large they confirm this expectation. Scourging is commonly attested. Theudas was beheaded (*Ant.*, 20.98). Quadratus crucified some but beheaded others involved in a flare up between Jews and Samaritans (J. W., 2.241-2). Felix clearly handed out lesser penalties than crucifixion to those who were only charged with complicity with brigands (J. W., 2.253). Josephus was scandalized by the affrontery of Florus crucifying Jews of equestrian rank — such a thing had never happened before (J. W., 2.308). The *lēstai* who were crucified with Jesus would not have been common thieves.¹⁵ No doubt they were the *stasiastai* with whom Barabbas had been captured (Mark 15:7; Luke 23:19, 25; Matt 27:38).

It follows that if Jesus had expected death by crucifixion he must have anticipated being charged with something serious, in his case treason, since brigandage would hardly fit. It is significant therefore that the first talk of crucifixion occurs in the context of Peter's confession of Jesus as Christ (Mark 8:34 par).¹⁶ All the synoptic gospels (even Matthew) are agreed that at this point Jesus began to teach about his death (Matt 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:23 where *elegen* is probably inceptive),¹⁷ and to demand that each should take up his cross and follow. If it was his intention eventually to declare himself openly as Messiah or the like, or to allow himself to be hailed as such, the connection Messiah-suffering makes good sense and Messiah-suffering-crucifixion begins to look possible.

But why should Jesus have reckoned with the Romans as his eventual judges? Could not the Jews have dealt with him, more gently, or, failing this, violently? To the first suggestion we may perhaps surmise that Jesus understood his challenge to the leadership of his people to be so fundamental, that the only alternatives were their complete capitulation to his authority or his final removal, however many warnings and punishments of a lesser kind may have come first.¹⁸ The second suggestion is more serious. Luke 4:29 and John 8:59 tell of attempts on Jesus' life by precipitation and by stoning. If it was to the Jews Jesus intended to reveal himself, why might he not have reckoned with something other than crucifixion? Part of the answer to this is the so-called 'messianic secret'. Jesus wanted to avoid any premature outbreak of feeling which might have resulted in a spontaneous stoning. The Fourth Gospel in particular shows Jesus prudently avoiding dangerous confrontations (John 7:1, 10; 8:59; 10:39; 11:54). The apparent secrecy surrounding the choice of a place to celebrate the Passover (Mark 14:12-15) and the spot where they were to spend the night are also probably related to this. Jesus wanted the inevitable confrontation with the authorities to be at the right time and place.

But why even then should he not have been dealt with by the Jewish Sanhedrin? The Mishnah prescribes stoning, burning, decapitation and strangulation for various offences, the most serious being stoning, which might be followed by hanging until nightfall.¹⁹ If Jesus was to be dealt with by the Jewish Sanhedrin why should not the outcome have been stoning for blasphemy? Paul Winter²⁰ claims, for this very reason, that the Sanhedrin never did condemn Jesus for blasphemy, but indicted him before Pilate for sedition.²¹ Winter argues that the Sanhedrin had capital jurisdiction over Jews charged with offences against religion (67-74); he dismisses as unhistorical the Jews' statement in John 18:31, "it is not lawful for us to put anyone to death".²²

A. N. Sherwin-White, however, has shown John's statement to be perfectly in accord with Roman provincial practice:

When we find that the capital power was the most jealously guarded of all the attributes of government, not even entrusted to the principal assistants of the governors, and specifically withdrawn, in the instance of Cyrene, from the competence of local courts, it becomes very questionable indeed for the Sanhedrin.²³

In the case of Stephen, it is debated whether his stoning was a proper judicial execution or a semi-official lynching. It was carried out by the Jewish authorities, but is related by Luke as an act of passion (Acts 7:54-60), to which the Romans may well have turned a blind eye. However, this being so, it again raises the question why Jesus could not have expected to be stoned like Stephen.

The answer lies in the enthusiasm and size of Jesus' following. When he did enter Jerusalem it was amidst crowds of supporters. It was necessary for the authorities to arrest him quietly, at night, outside the city, "lest there should be a tumult of the people" (Mark 14:2). Jesus entered Jerusalem near Passover. With the city full of Galileans a public stoning may have been impossible, or very dangerous for those who organized it.²⁴ Recourse to Pilate, therefore, may have been advisable for more than legality's sake. If Pilate could be persuaded to take action against Jesus there would be less chance of an uprising of popular feeling against the Jewish leaders, and, with the execution guaranteed and safeguarded by Roman military power, less chance of any sudden reversal or of a later backlash against the Sanhedrin. It was a good way of passing the buck.

It is also worth reflecting whether an execution by crucifixion may have had a certain attraction in this case as being a sure way of destroying the aura of speculation which surrounded Jesus' person. Paul may not have been the first to see the connection between crucifixion and the curse of Deut 21:22-23 (Gal 3:13). Philo uses *anaskolopizesthai*, his normal term for crucifixion, in relation to the law of Deut 21:22-23 (*Spec. Leg.*, 3.151). The charge against the leaders, that they slew Jesus, "hanging him on a tree" (Acts 5:30) may be indicative of some intention on their part to deal with him in a manner analogous to Deut 21:22-23.

Enough has been said to indicate that Jesus might well have reckoned not only with opposition and eventual death, but specifically with crucifixion, considering the exclusiveness of his messianic claim, the political and legal situation in Jerusalem, the analogy of his experience with Herod and the Pharisees in Galilee, as well as his own careful avoidance of explosive situations, and his intention to

enter Jerusalem publicly amidst crowds of supporters. It remains to inquire whether he intended his followers to share his fate.

Did Jesus Intend His Disciples to Suffer with Him?

We are so familiar with the fact that the disciples did not die with Jesus, that we find it hard to entertain the possibility that they were intended to. There are pointers which indicate that Jesus did not *expect* his disciples to suffer with him,²⁵ but there is also much to suggest that he *wanted* them to.

According to the beatitudes, part of the disciples' role was to suffer "because of the Son of Man" (Luke 6:22; cf. Matt 5:11-12; Luke 12:27-31; 10:3; 11:49-51; 12:4-12). In Luke 12:8-12 Jesus promises to own those who are prepared to confess him before men; he will deny those who deny (*arnēsamenos*) him (cf. Mark 8:38). At the last supper Jesus warns Peter of his imminent fall: "the cock will not crow this day until you thrice deny (*aparnēse*) you know me" (Luke 22:34) and it was so (vv56-61). We often overlook the seriousness of this, thinking only of the aftermath, as though Jesus had intended Peter to fail. But Jesus prayed that Peter's faith might not fail (v32). In denying Christ, Peter placed himself outside the community of salvation; he too would be denied by the Son of Man at this coming; hence his bitter tears (v62). K. H. Rengstorf²⁶ thinks Luke ceases to use the term *mathētai* at the end of the Gethsemane story (v45) because the disciples' withdrawal constituted a breach in their relationship with him, which had to be reconstituted after Easter.

In Mark Jesus warns repeatedly against stumbling or being offended because of him. In the parable of the sower Jesus speaks of those who will believe for a while but in time of persecution fall away (Mark 4:17) (*skandalizontai*). The people of Nazareth are offended at Jesus (6:3). He warns in the strongest terms against causing 'little one' (a disciple?) who believes in him to stumble (*skandalisē*) (9:42), and urges disciples to take any action to avoid stumbling and so ending up in hell (vv43-8). At the Last Supper he warns the disciples that they will all stumble (14:27). Peter insists that he at least will not, but Jesus tells him he will thrice deny him by morning. All the disciples fail to stand with him and flee away (v50), and Peter denies him (vv66-72). Again Jesus must reinstate the disciples after his resurrection. Significantly the angel sends the message to the disciples *and Peter*: "He goes before you (pl) (*proagei humas*) into Galilee" (16:7). Despite their fall Jesus is again before his disciples on the road (cf. 10:32; 14:28).

This strong view of discipleship is also to be found in the Fourth Gospel. According to C. H. Dodd²⁷ John 12:25-26, spoken in relation to

Jesus' passion, was derived from the same tradition as Luke 14:26-27. It speaks of service (*diakonein*) not discipleship, but from there on expresses the strong concept of identification of servant and master. "If anyone would serve me, let him follow me, and where I am, there my servant will be also." This is frequently interpreted as a promise of exaltation. But in my view it is better seen as part of the demand to follow.²⁸ The servant (disciple) should be where his master is; if Jesus is going to the cross, the servant should be going there too. This is why he must hate his own life. The promise follows: "Whoever serves me, him will my Father honour" (John 12:26b). Thomas' words in 11:16 show some such awareness on the part of the disciples: 'Let us also go that we may die with him'. In John too the disciples are warned that they will fail to follow Jesus (13:36-8), and after the resurrection special steps are taken to reinstate Peter. His threefold denial is cancelled out with a threefold confession of love for Christ and a thrice repeated commission (21:15-17).

There is good evidence, therefore, across the tradition, that discipleship demanded such an identification with Jesus, that failure to stand with him at the hour of his passion and death was regarded as total failure to be a disciple. It is difficult to imagine that such a radical concept was invented by the Church after the signal failure of all the foundation apostles, especially when it is applied to them so mercilessly. Jesus must have made some demand.

I have intentionally avoided any discussion of what Jesus may have inferred about his destiny from the Old Testament. Quite apart from this it seems to me possible to affirm first that Jesus could have anticipated his own death, secondly that crucifixion would have appeared the most obvious form that death would take, and thirdly that Jesus desired that his disciples should remain with him to the end, sharing if needs be his suffering and crucifixion. Haenchen is right to see the cross saying in Mark as a demand for literal martyrdom, but it is not necessary to scan the distant horizon, as he does, looking for a suitable setting for the saying; it fits perfectly well into the ministry of Jesus. The demand "Let him take up his cross and follow me" is explicable on the lips of the earthly Jesus. From the time of Peter's confession of him as Christ he sees himself carrying the *patibulum* of his cross towards the place of execution,²⁹ and demands that the true disciple will be there following behind carrying his own cross.³⁰

This has fascinating implications for our understanding of how Jesus saw his mission and the salvation of Israel and, subsequently, the salvation of the disciples. If the disciples had been obedient, and followed Jesus to the end, what would have become of the church?

This question suggests one even more alarming. If the nation Israel had been obedient and welcomed Jesus as its Messiah, what would have become of the cross, and redemption through the blood of Christ?

Some may question the legitimacy of speculating on what might have happened if . . . Surely all that did happen was "according to the predestinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23), and there could have been no other outcome. True, but Jesus in the dynamic situation of his life on earth called on Israel to repent and enter the Kingdom of God. He did not call on them to crucify him and so fulfil the will of God. Similarly he demanded of his disciples that they stand with him through rejection and death. We cannot ignore the question of the outcome of their obedience without implying that Jesus' call was somehow false.

What would have happened if Israel had not baulked at Jesus' person (Luke 7:23)? The answer is actually given us by the Sanhedrin. "If we let him continue everyone will believe in him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation" (John 11:48). The probability which is mooted here is that if Israel were to accept Jesus as Messiah the nation would immediately come under attack from Rome. It would not just be Jesus as "King of the Jews" who would die on a Roman cross, but, metaphorically speaking, the whole nation would be crucified with him, and for most of the leaders who collaborated with Jesus, that may not have been just metaphorical. So Caiaphas counselled that it was expedient that one man should die for the people rather than the whole nation perish. He spoke prophetically.

Is this scenario something which might have been sensible to Jesus? I believe so. It has frequently been noted that the messianic pattern which is portrayed through Daniel's Son of Man and Isaiah's Suffering Servant is corporate. The "Saints of the Most High" suffer at the hands of the empires of the world but are ultimately given dominion (Dan 7). There is an enigmatic relationship between Israel and the Servant in Isaiah's songs (see Isa 49:3). If Israel had been obedient to stand with the suffering Son of Man, perhaps Israel too would have been resurrected with him? That may seem like wild speculation, but it appears to be exactly Paul's sequence of thought in Romans 11. How did Israel's fall mean riches for the Gentiles? Precisely because it delayed the arrival of the Kingdom in its consummate form and created an opportunity for Gentiles to have the Gospel before the judgement. When will the Kingdom arrive in its consummate form? When Israel turns: "For if the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

(Rom 11:15). In other words Paul sees the general resurrection of the dead to be bound up with Israel's obedience to Christ. Because they failed, the resurrection did not come when it might have. The day still awaits us.

What then of the disciples? They had the opportunity to be a true remnant Israel and an obedient "church of God". Had they died with Christ, perhaps they could have risen with him on the third day. Is this not what Jesus promises them in Mark 8:35? But at the end there was no Israel, no remnant, and no church, only one man, dying for his Church, dying for his nation, dying for his world.

By rights, Israel is disqualified and has lost its place forever. By rights the disciples also lost their place, failing to do the one thing that was asked of them: not to break faith with the Son of Man. By the Lord's own word they should be denied before the angels of God by the Son of Man at his coming (Luke 12:9). What we see taking place on the third day, then, is sheer grace as the Lord returns to forgive and reinstate his apostate church — and one day the people of Israel?

Notes

1. J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1965) 194.

2. Seen as an argument against the *post eventum* provenance of the passion predictions by D. E. H. Whiteley ("Christ's Foreknowledge of his Crucifixion", *SE* 1 [1957] 100-14). The dominical origin of the passion predictions has been the subject of debate since it was denied in 1901 by W. Wrede *The Messianic Secret* (Cambridge and London: James Clarke, 1971) 82-92. Bultmann (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963] 152) takes it for granted that the passion predictions "have long been recognized as secondary constructions of the Church", though, strangely, he seems prepared to accept Jesus' statement in Luke 13:33 that he must die in Jerusalem (p.35). For the case for dominical origin see W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1956) 125-31; K. H. Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg: 1949) 60-114; V. Taylor, "The Origin of the Markan Passion Sayings" in *New Testament Essays* (London: Epworth Press, 1970) 60-71; W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (London: SCM, 1957) 98-104; J. A. Baird, *The Justice of God in the*

Teaching of Jesus (London: SCM, 1963) 249-51; I. H. Marshall, *Eschatology and the Parables* (London: Tyndale, 1963) 18-20.

3. Except for Matt 20:19, the parallels in Matthew and Luke preserve the lack of specification of the means of crucifixion. However, Mark 10:33 does say Jesus will be turned over to the *Gentiles*. An independent prediction of crucifixion occurs in Matt 26:2, and in Luke 24:7 Jesus is said to have warned the disciples of his crucifixion while he was in Galilee.

4. In Rom 5:3 he contemplates crucifixion, in 7:2 he speaks of his lust being crucified. In Smyrn 1:1 their steadfastness of faith is as though they were nailed to Christ's cross.

5. This is not to say that carrying the cross was not a common sight in the 1st century nor that it could not have been used by way of simile. The often quoted rabbinic parallel from Gen R 56:3 is significant in this respect, for Isaac ascending Mt Moriah with the load of sticks on which he is to die over his shoulders is a perfect picture of a man being led to crucifixion. A. Schlatter's suggestion that the cross saying came to Jesus' disciples from the Zealot movement is attractive, but unsupported by any evidence. Cf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1959) 350.

6. *IDB*, 1:745.mm, 586, have only a 4th and 5th century papyrus to illustrate the metaphorical idea of suffering as cross bearing.

7. *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968) 297.

8. Though Saul's persecution should not be overlooked.

9. Luke has preserved the setting of this saying and its more original form, where Matthew has removed it to his mission discourse and softened it somewhat.

10. M. Goguel (*Jesus and the Origins of Christianity 2. The Life of Jesus* [New York: Harper, 1960] 367) thinks Jesus was unable to come into the towns in the later part of his ministry for fear of arrest by Herod's emissaries.

11. Bultmann, *History*, 35.

12. J. G. Griffiths, "The Disciple's Cross", *NTS* 16 (1970) 358-64.

13. T. Mommsen, *Romisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig: 1899) 920, 565, n. 1.

14. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.75, 241, 253, 306-8; 5.449-51; 7.202; *Ant.*, 17.295; 20.102, 129; *Life.*, 420-1; *Koh.Rab.*, 7.26; *As.Mos.*, 6.9.

15. See E. Bammel, "Crucifixion as a Punishment in Palestine" in *The Trial of Jesus* (ed. E. Bammel; London: SCM, 1970) 165. Also R.

MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge and London: 1967) 255-68; Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 47-8.

16. Matt 10:38 comes before Peter's confession but is part of a collection of teaching relevant to mission which has been gathered from all stages of Jesus' mission.

17. On the historical connection between Peter's confession and the first passion prediction see J. D. G. Dunn "The Messianic Secret in Mark", *TynBul* 21 (1970) 103-6.

18. In Mark 12:35-37, for example, Jesus claims homage even from King David.

19. See H. E. Goldin, *Hebrew Criminal Law and Procedure. Mishnah: Sanhedrin — Makkot* (New York: 1952) 28.

20. P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961) 27-43.

21. Compare *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* (New York and London: 1903) 4.373.

22. Winter, *Trial*, 75-90.

23. A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1963) 36. The Jews did have capital power over anyone who trespassed into the Temple but this is a special case, proved by the fact that their jurisdiction here applied even to Roman citizens. The stoning of James the Lord's brother shows clearly that execution was not within the general jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin. Ananus the High Priest chose a time during the interregnum between Festus and Ablinus to convene the Sanhedrin and execute James. This action brought about his deposition by the Romans (Josephus, *Ant.*, 20.200-3).

24. J. Blinzler ("The Jewish Punishment of Stoning in the New Testament Period" in *The Trial of Jesus*, 148-9) argues that stoning was a communal method of punishment.

25. Mark 14:27; Luke 19:11-27; 22:31-2.

26. K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967) 446-7.

27. C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963) 338-43.

28. Bultmann (*The Gospel of John* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971] 425-6) thinks it may be a *double entendre* referring to suffering and glory.

29. The accused carried the horizontal of his cross over his neck to the place of execution where the upright stood fixed. On the way

he suffered all kinds of verbal and physical abuse, see A. Pauly, *PW2* (1842) 768-70 and Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 22-32.

30. "Following" is part of the image of procession to the place of crucifixion, not a separate image drawn from the relationship of rabbi and *talmid* as A. Schulz (*Nachfolgen und Nachahmen* [München: Kösel, 1962] 82-97) thinks.