

*Procession of the Holy Spirit, from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne.*

1880-82.—*Theodore of Mopsuestia's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul.*

1882-87.—Articles upon the 'Holy Spirit' and 'Theodore of Mopsuestia,' in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

1887-94.—*The Old Testament in Greek.* 2nd ed., 1895-98.

1893.—*Akhmim Fragment of the Gospel of Peter.*

1894.—*The Apostles' Creed in Relation to Primitive Christianity.*

1895.—*Faith in Relation to Creed, Thought, and Life.*

1896.—*Church Services and Service Books before the Reformation.*

1897.—'The Oxyrhynchus Fragment': a Lecture delivered at Cambridge, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, September.

1898.—*The Gospel according to St. Mark: the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices.*

1899.—Art. 'HOLY SPIRIT,' in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.*

## Professor Jülicher on the Parables of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. DAVID EATON, M.A., GLASGOW.

THIS is the second part of a work on the Parables, on which Professor Jülicher has been engaged for many years. The first part, which was published eleven years ago, and of which a second edition is promised, treated mainly of general principles; in the second part we have the detailed exposition in accordance with these principles. It is neither 'a book to be read in the Christian family nor a practical interpretation of the Parables, but simply a scientific commentary on all the parabolic sections of the synoptic Gospels.' The author's aim is to ascertain, in the case of each of these sections, how the evangelist or evangelists understood it; in the numerous instances where we have several recensions of the same saying or discourse, to state the differences with precision, and, when possible, to explain their origin; and, last of all, to find out what our Saviour really said and taught. He does not attempt a reconstruction of a Hebrew or Aramaic original form of our Lord's sayings; he is satisfied if he can in some measure ascertain the thoughts and moods of Jesus.

As indicated in the title, Dr. Jülicher confines himself to the synoptic Gospels. He divides his

treatise into three sections: section 2 treating of the Parables strictly so called, and section 3 of 'example-narratives' (the compassionate Samaritan; the Pharisee and the Publican; the Foolish Rich Man; the Rich Man and Lazarus). In section 1, which extends to over 250 pages, he deals with our Lord's similes (the fig tree as a harbinger; the servant, who is bound to be always at work; the playing children; the blind as a leader of the blind; real defilement; the salt; the lamp on the stand; the city set on a hill; the eye as the light of the body; serving two masters; the tree and its fruits; the physician and the sick; the old garment, the old skins, and the old wine, etc.).

As the result of his many years study of the subject, Professor Jülicher has produced a work of very great value. It is not only a great commentary on the Parables, but also an important contribution to the understanding of the mind of Jesus. It may safely be pronounced one of the best scientific commentaries of recent years on any part of the New Testament.

It is characterized from first to last by great thoroughness and fulness. Nothing seems to have been overlooked that could in any way be considered essential to such a work. We have sometimes the feeling that in discussing the meaning of words, the grammar, etc., it is too full; but the learned author has always arranged his material in a very lucid and sometimes even vivid manner.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu.* Von D. Adolf Jülicher, Professor der Theologie in Marburg. Zweiter Theil. Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten Evangelien. Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr; London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1899. 8vo, pp. viii, 643. Price M.12.80.

He is utterly and consistently opposed to the habit of treating the Parables as allegories. Each parable teaches only one great lesson; we must employ all the means at our disposal to discover what that one great lesson is in the sphere from which the matter of the parable is drawn; *that* is the one truth that our Lord seeks to teach us in regard to the higher sphere in which He would have us supremely interested.

Professor Jülicher devotes much space to the attempt to ascertain from the frequently diverging reports of the Synoptists what our Lord actually said, and the connexion in which He said it. Such an attempt is well worth making. Experts, like B. Weiss, will doubtless have many objections to make to Jülicher's results; but it can at least be said that he has made the attempt with great circumspection.

The work is of such a nature that it is hardly possible to give a fair specimen of it in a brief form. We have, however, reproduced the substance of the exposition of Mk 7<sup>14-23</sup>, Mt 15<sup>10-20</sup> (*of real defilement*), and of Mt 20<sup>1-16</sup> (*of the same wages for dissimilar work*), mainly with the view of showing that, while true to its character as a purely scientific commentary, it is full of material, which the practical expositor will know how to use with much profit.

#### PARABLE OF REAL DEFILEMENT.

Mk 7<sup>14-23</sup>, Mt 15<sup>10f.15-20</sup>.

This parable attaches itself to a comprehensive debate between Jesus and the Pharisees as to what is demanded by religious purity. To their reproachful question, why His disciples ate bread with unwashed hands, He replies with a keen attack upon their spurious piety: in favour of their worship of tradition, they render invalid the fundamental commandments of God. He now turns to another public; in spite of Mk 4<sup>12</sup>, He desires not only to be heard, but also to be understood, by the common people (Mk v.<sup>14</sup>, Mt v.<sup>10</sup>). Mk v.<sup>16</sup> is more original than Mt v.<sup>11</sup>, but the alterations of the latter are of no consequence.

Both evangelists add an exact explanation of His saying to the multitude, given by Jesus to His disciples in private (Mk v.<sup>17</sup>) at their special request. Matthew inserts vv.<sup>12-14</sup> from another source, and makes Peter the spokesman (v.<sup>15</sup>). He begins His answer with a reproof (Mk v.<sup>18</sup>,

Mt v.<sup>16</sup>). Neither they nor the multitude have understood Him. Not even among His intimate friends does He find the understanding which He might have counted upon even among the multitude, and that too in the case of so simple a parable. 'So' in Mk v.<sup>18</sup> means, in so great a degree as your present question shows; Mt v.<sup>16</sup> has 'yet.' However, He explains the saying to them, Mk vv. 18<sup>b</sup>, 19; Mt v.<sup>17</sup> is shorter, but here again the differences are of no great consequence. That which entereth into a man from without cannot defile him, because strictly speaking it does not enter into him; and so far as it does so, it is only for a short time; in reality it only *passes through* those organs that are common to man with the lower animals, and are not specifically human. The difficult expression at the end of Mk v.<sup>19</sup> is a very ancient gloss, written on the margin by a reader who wished to prove himself not 'without understanding,' to the effect: here the Lord makes all meats clean.

In Mk v.<sup>20</sup>, Mt v.<sup>18</sup> Jesus repeats the positive half of His parable (Mk v.<sup>15</sup>, Mt v.<sup>11</sup>), with a few verbal changes; in the remaining verses He justifies His thesis. The catalogue of vices given in Mk embraces sins of thought, word, and deed: evil thoughts in all the forms in which they manifest themselves. Only such evils are mentioned as everyone, without any Pharisaic teaching, must acknowledge to be evil. 'Wickednesses' should probably be more specifically 'cheatings,' 'swindlings'; an 'evil eye' is grudging at another's prosperity; for 'foolishness' see Pr 26<sup>5-12</sup>, Wis 10<sup>8</sup> 12<sup>23</sup>. That which in reality defiles a man are the manifestations of evil that proceed from his own heart. Mt v.<sup>20b</sup> seems a happy return to the starting-point of the debate in v.<sup>2</sup>; in reality, however, it is out of place, for, as we see from v.<sup>11a</sup>, the question debated had become more comprehensive and profound.

We must not, because of the generality of the expression in Mt v.<sup>18ff</sup>, find here 'one of the strongest *dicta probantia* for the doctrine of the corruption of man's heart, and consequently for the doctrine of original sin.' As if Mt v.<sup>18</sup> spoke of *everything* that proceeds out of the mouth. We might as logically infer from v.<sup>11</sup> that, according to the Pharisees, *everything* that enters into the mouth defiles a man. The statement that 'whatsoever from without goeth into the man cannot defile him' must also

be understood *cum grano salis*; for Tertullian was right when he excepted evil things that enter into a man through the eyes or ears.

To the principle of Pharisaism, which regarded defilement as coming from without, our Saviour here opposes a new ethic, which calls only that unclean which depends on the will of man, and finds nothing sinful and morally defiling save that which a sinful heart produces. This is taught plainly in Mk vv. 18-23, where *κοινῶν* is the only ambiguous term. *κοινός* means 'common, public, general' (Ac 2<sup>44</sup> 4<sup>32</sup> etc.); *κοινῶν*, 'to make common.' But on the soil of particularistic Judaism, the 'general or universal' became synonymous with 'non-Jewish,' 'illegal'; and to a Pharisee *κοινός* naturally signified 'profane,' 'unholy,' and *κοινῶν* 'to profane, to defile, to regard as, or make, unclean.' For this sense of these terms, see Ac 10<sup>14f.</sup> 28 11<sup>8f.</sup> 21<sup>28</sup>, Ro 14<sup>14</sup>, He 9<sup>13</sup> 10<sup>29</sup>, Rev 21<sup>27</sup>; also 1 Mac 1<sup>47.</sup> 62 (4 Mac 7<sup>6</sup> is the only place in the LXX where *κοινῶν* occurs). To eat with 'common' hands (Mk vv. 2-5) is, according to the Pharisaic view, a violation of the religious-ethical duties of a Jew; the reproach, which Mark repels by his addition 'that is, unwashen,' lies in the *κοινῶν*. Jesus and the Pharisees are at one as to the condition of the hands in the case before us; but they are at variance on the question, whether unwashen hands deserve the insulting predicate *κοινῶν*. Jesus not only denies this, but He also makes use of the occasion to give a profound exposition of the truly religious conception *κοινῶν*; this is at the same time also an exposition of the conception *κοινόν*; for only that which is itself unclean can (and of necessity must) produce uncleanness. The heart is the only subject of ethical qualities in man; seek not the unclean without you, where only your imagination finds it; seek it in yourselves, in your own evil hearts.

It is interesting to compare this passage with Mt 23<sup>24-28</sup>. In the latter passage the teaching of the Pharisees as to cleanness is not replaced by a new teaching. They are, no doubt, exhorted to cleanse the inside; but they are to do so in order that the outside also may become clean. The new ethic, which turns round judgment, mercy, and faith is opposed to the pedantic tithing of dill and cummin; but with the addition, 'these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone.' Every prophet in Israel might

have spoken in that way. But Mk 7<sup>18f.</sup> contains a new revelation, a radical break with Jewish ethics. Ethical qualities are reserved exclusively to the ethical personality (*καρδία*).

This 'cannot defile' of Jesus is certainly incompatible with Lev 11<sup>24</sup>. But we must guard against exaggerations. It has been said that in Mk vv. 14<sup>f.</sup> Jesus is attacking Mosaism and throwing the whole of the Mosaic legislation as to cleanness overboard; note how, when introducing the fifth commandment, He says 'Moses said' (Mk v. 10), because here, where He is making ready to antiquate Mosaism in the most decisive manner, He could not well have used the formula 'God said.' But He is really saying nothing here either as to the division of foods into clean and unclean or as to Mosaism; an antithesis between 'Moses said' and 'God said' is no more conceivable in His mouth than in that of Paul. He has never declared any portions of Scripture, such as the laws regarding cleanness in the Pentateuch, to be abrogated; an abrogation of the commandment of God, which He, like His disciples, found in 'Moses,' is excluded in His case by Mk v. 8; and it is hardly likely that in practice He transgressed the Mosaic laws as to foods. But with the legitimate authority of religious geniality He interpreted this divine law in accordance with the canon of His own conscience, and, without attacking or defending the Levitical laws as to foods, uttered an ethical principle, which inevitably led to the abrogation of large portions of the Mosaic law. It is one of His greatest deeds, to have abolished these Levitical laws by means of a loftier ethic.

#### PARABLE OF LABOURERS.

Mt 20<sup>1-16</sup>.

This is one of the two great parables that treat of the payment of wages in the kingdom of heaven. What we have presented to us here is the altogether similar reward of the most different classes of labourers. This is the point upon which the story fixes our attention. No stress should be laid on the fact that the householder agreed with the first class of labourers for a penny a day (v. 2), with the second, third and fourth classes for whatsoever was right (v. 3<sup>f.</sup>), while in the case of the fifth class there was no mention of wages; nor on the fact that, according to their own account, the last class were willing to

work, if only some one would hire them (v.<sup>7</sup>). These receive a full day's wages, simply because their employer so wills it, and not in recognition of their previous willingness to work (v.<sup>14f</sup>). The text says nothing as to differences of mood in respect of delight in their work, trust in their employer, or value attached by themselves to their labour, on the part of the five groups; and consequently such considerations should not be dragged in in the explanation of the parable. Nor is there any hint that the householder was in any way dissatisfied with the work of those first hired or specially pleased with that of the last; we are left to infer that the work of all the five classes was of the usual average quality.

Not till the payment of the wages (vv.<sup>8-15</sup>) do we find anything surprising; and this is the *one point* of interest in the story. As prescribed in Lv 19<sup>13</sup> Dt 24<sup>15</sup>, the labourers are paid at the close of their day's work. In this case the last-hired are paid first. This, however, does not constitute any preference of the one class to the others; the first-hired do not complain of it in v.<sup>12</sup>; it is a merely secondary feature, and only of importance here, because in this way the first became witnesses of the special generosity of their employer towards their comrades. The decisive point is the payment of the same wages to all alike (vv.<sup>9, 10</sup>), doubtless in accordance with the instructions given by the householder to his steward, though not mentioned in v.<sup>8</sup>. Upon this the first-hired, who hoped to receive more from such a liberal master, murmured at their unfair treatment (v.<sup>10ff</sup>): we have not only laboured the whole day but have done so under the most disadvantageous circumstances; these have laboured only one hour, and that too in the cool of the evening; and yet thou hast made them equal unto us. Singling out one of these murmurers, the householder answers that he has done him no injustice; that it is his will to pay all alike; that he may surely do what he wills with his own; and that only envy could turn his liberality into a ground of complaint.

Every one must feel that the householder is in the right in spite of the murmuring of some of the labourers. He has shown liberality without being guilty of injustice; he has strictly fulfilled his duty and at the same time made use of his legal right in favour of poor fellow-men. And Jesus, by means of this parable, constrains us to judge in the same manner in connexion with the kingdom

of heaven (v.<sup>1</sup>). According to Him, God bestows one and the same reward on all men, in spite of their very different performances, in inviting them to His feast and in receiving them into the blessedness of the kingdom of heaven. To the Jews, and especially the Pharisees, the great offence in Jesus' gospel was that He opened the doors of the kingdom to everyone who would enter in, so long as it was day; that He heartily invited the sinners as well as the righteous; that He even showed special favour to the former, inasmuch as He went after them, seeking them out and calling them; and that He did all this in the assurance that God willed it so. The Pharisees called this an overturning of God's righteousness, which recompenses each man in strict accordance with his life. Jesus refutes them by means of this parable. As certainly as the householder acted justly, when he paid the same wages to his day-labourers, in spite of the very different amount of their labour, so certainly does God act justly and in a way to which no exception can be taken, if He keeps the one kingdom of heaven open to all, sinners and righteous, who accept His invitation. Within the limits of righteousness, He can do what He wills with His own; and by their coming, their repentance, even if at a late hour, these poor sinners prove themselves worthy of His grace, so that there can be no talk of a foolish misspending of His blessings. The God, who has prepared only *one* salvation for all men, for high priests and elders as well as for publicans and sinners, does not deserve blame, but grateful acknowledgment, whether it be for the righteousness with which He keeps His promises to those who have kept His precepts, or for the goodness and liberality with which He rewards far above men's desert and worthiness, and pays wages even where there was almost nothing but hour-long, year-long, lifelong idleness to be blamed or punished.

This is all that Jesus thought of teaching in the parable. We must not deduce from it the dogma of the absolute equality of the blessed in the future world, which would contradict other genuine sayings of our Lord (e.g. Mt 19<sup>28f</sup>). But Jesus is not seeking here to instruct us as to the forms of existence in eternal life; He is desirous of awakening in us a deep religious feeling, that, namely, of evangelical Christendom generally.

The originality of this parable is most evident when we compare it with the Jewish parallel in

the Talmud, etc. A Rabbi Bon, who died in his prime, is compared to a king who had hired many labourers for his vineyard. One of these excelled the others in diligence and skill. The king took him by the hand, went up and down with him, and at night paid him full wages like the rest. When these murmured, the king replied, Why find ye fault? This man has in two hours accomplished more than ye have done the whole day. So Rabbi Bon has done more for the law in twenty-eight years than another has done in one hundred years. Now, Jesus may possibly have known some such story as that of Rabbi Bon. But the main thing in a parable is not the material of which it is composed, but its meaning and tendency; and the parable of Jesus aims precisely at cutting up by the roots the religious standpoint of the Talmudic parable. The last-hired receive the same wages, not because they have, in one or two hours, accomplished as much as, or even more than, the others in a full day, but although they have worked far less; that which is opposed to the envious murmurers is not the *desert* of one who is only seemingly preferred, but God's goodness and liberality, which has a right to give freely, without desert, that which others have merited, and which

never waives this its right. Our parable is, therefore, like Lk 15<sup>11-32</sup>, one of the noblest documents of the new religion.

After mentioning rapidly the various allegorical interpretations of the parable, Professor Jülicher raises the question whether Matthew has inserted it in its proper connexion. If the parable stood alone by itself, v.<sup>16</sup> would mean: so, in the kingdom of heaven, every distinction between last and first will vanish (B. Weiss). But v.<sup>16</sup> is found substantially in 19<sup>30</sup>, where it can only contain the warning: in the case of many the relative position of first and last will be *reversed* (cf. Lk 14<sup>7-11</sup>); and Matthew, by inserting the parable in this place and by connecting it with what precedes by means of 'for' (v.<sup>1</sup>), makes its teaching bear upon that question. Now Jesus certainly taught frequently that the 'first,'—*i.e.* those who counted upon a sure reward of their great merit,—would be bitterly disappointed (*e.g.* Mt 21<sup>28-22</sup><sup>14</sup>). Here, however, the whole emphasis of His teaching falls upon the gracious exaltation of all the 'last.' Our parable, which is the *evangelium in nuce*, treats merely of God's great joy in freely giving to all who are willing to respond to His gracious invitation.

## At the Literary Table.

### THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

ALFRED THE GREAT. EDITED BY ALFRED BOWKER.  
(*A. & C. Black.* Crown 8vo, pp. xiv, 260. 5s.)

Not many, it must be confessed, of the men to whose names the world has added 'Great' deserve the dignity. But Alfred does. At a most critical time, and under almost unparalleled difficulties, he accomplished a work so varied and so lasting that it looks like the work of ten men rather than of one. That he is *the* English hero goes without dispute. Why is it that the average Englishman does not make him so? We venture to suggest that the romance of that mythical Arthur, thanks to Malory and Lord Tennyson, has caught men's fancy to Alfred's loss. The one is even mixed in some men's minds with the other. When history is more reasonably studied and more generally remembered, King Alfred the Great will come to his rights.

And this book will help. For it is a great book, worthy of its great subject. Ten men, each a specialist in some department, have united to tell us what they know and believe of Alfred. The Poet Laureate opens with a poem on his spotless character. Sir Walter Besant sketches his time with its demands and difficulties. Mr. Frederic Harrison describes Alfred as king. And so on. It is a great book and eminently readable. After this book English ignorance of Alfred the Great is an unpardonable sin.

The Beds. Publishing Company has issued a lecture by the Rev. H. H. Scullard, M.A., of the Howard Congregational Church, Bedford, on *John Howard* (8vo, 2s.). The lecture is of more moment than lectures are expected to be. It is, in fact, a capable selection of the features and facts