

you get nothing. You must win your way.  
*Take a little honey.*

What is the honey? It is good temper. You say that somebody has a sweet temper, and somebody else has a sour temper. It means good words, kind words, the soft answer. You know the difference this makes. It just means *Love*. Patience and sympathy and gentleness, all that is humble, thoughtful, generous, self-forgetful, all these are included in love. Read the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. See how love is the greatest thing in the world, and the sweetest thing in the world. The honey of life is love. Then *take a little honey* with you.

Thackeray says, 'Life is like a mirror: if you frown at it, it frowns back; if you smile, it returns the greeting.' I think the children may understand this. 'Like a mirror'—You know what happens when you go up to a mirror. If you want to see a smiling face, you must take the smiles with you. If you go up to it with your brows knit, it is the same unhappy face that looks out upon you. You get from the mirror just what you bring to it.

Thackeray says that life is like this. He means that if you go to your lessons singing and smiling, your lessons are ever so much easier. If you go to

your lessons grumbling like a slave, your lessons are all the harder. Even when you go to your play—if you meet your companions in a happy temper, what a grand time you have! But if you go to your games cross and sour, even the play has no pleasure in it, and everything seems to go wrong. You will find how true it is to-morrow morning. Go out in a happy temper, and the whole day is brighter. Begin with a bad temper, and the whole day is spoilt.

Life is like a mirror—if you smile upon it, it smiles on you; if you bring to it frowns, it has only frowns to give you. So take with you the smiles, the sweetness, *take a little honey*.

You will remember this: and perhaps there are some others who will remember this too: and when boys and girls begin to be not sweet but sour, there are fathers and mothers who will look round the table and say, 'Where's the honey? I'll take a little honey, please.'

Think of Jacob and his large family. When he saw his sons packing for Egypt, the old man said:

*'Don't forget the honey.'*

JAMES RUTHERFORD.

## 'Men of Galilee.'

BY THE VEN. G. R. WYNNE, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF AGHADOE.

ONE of the chief difficulties in harmonizing the Gospel of St. John and the Synoptic narratives arises from the apparently complete silence of the latter on the subject of any ministry in Jerusalem previous to our Lord's last week. Some, who do not wish to reject the Johannean account of the great deeds and discourses in the Capital, try to lessen or remove the difficulty by assigning all these characteristic narratives and discourses of St. John to the closing period of the ministry. (So Rev. H. L. Wyld, *Contentio Veritatis*, art. 'The Teaching of Christ,' pp. 156, 164.) Those who, like Professor Burkitt, besides accepting St. Mark's Gospel as the principal foundation of the Synoptic story, argue that anything which cannot be fitted in to the outlines of that narrative

should be discredited from an historical point of view,<sup>1</sup> are disposed on that account to reject all St. John's records of a Judean and Jerusalem ministry. Thus two-thirds of the last Gospel are set aside. This rejection of St. John seems to be too serious a matter to be decided chiefly by the silence of St. Mark, or the difficulty of finding place in the Marcan narrative for the Johannean story. It is assuming too much to hold that there is a complete outline of all that is of importance in the brief narrative of St. Mark, or, as seems to follow from it, that our Lord's ministry occupied little more than one year. Were the ministry even prolonged to thirteen or fourteen months, an earlier Feast would in all probability

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 103-104.

have led our Lord to the Holy City. Is not the argument from silence misapplied when the non-existence of any reference in the Synoptics to such a visit is taken to imply that it never took place, or that, during His public life, He never went to a Jewish Feast?

St. Luke's story leaves the impression of a longer ministry, but he too is provokingly indifferent to dates, and seems to proceed on the principle that, provided an event is duly recorded, it is of little importance to set it in its true surroundings. On the face of his account, there is no room for an earlier Jerusalem ministry, but it is too much to take for granted, in the presence of narratives so vague as to time and place, that none of the incidents or sayings in this Evangelist had reference to labours in or near Jerusalem.

The title, 'Men of Galilee,' indirectly brings in the question of the relation of the Synoptics to St. John. It seems to give a superficial and *prima facie* support to the theory that there were no Christians made in Jerusalem, because there was no ministry there. Let us look into this.

'Two men' at the Ascension address the band of believers, assembled within two miles of the City of Jerusalem, as 'Men of Galilee,' which is a very pointed hint that they were not in any appreciable degree men of Jerusalem. In other places also, St. Luke represents the body of believers under the same designation. He quotes the crowd on the day of Pentecost as asking, 'Are not all these which speak Galileans?' We must not, perhaps, press the argument from this title here too far, for the fact of the origin of the Christian movement in Galilee, even though many believers were afterwards found in Judea, might well lead to the designation, perhaps the nickname, 'Galileans,' just as the Christians were also called 'Nazarenes.' But, later on, in Antioch of Pisidia, St. Luke quotes St. Paul as saying that Christ was seen after His resurrection many days by 'them which came up with Him from Galilee unto Jerusalem' (Ac 1<sup>11</sup> 2<sup>7</sup> 13<sup>31</sup>). St. Luke in his Gospel quotes, 'Of a truth this man is a Galilean' (Lk 22<sup>55</sup>); but this case differs, for it refers, not to creed, but to birthplace and accent. The women at the cross are described as 'the women which came up with him from Galilee' (chap. 13<sup>49, 55</sup>).

The personnel, then, of the Church in Jerusalem and elsewhere at the earliest period seems, in St. Luke's mind, to be mainly Galilean.

How does this bear on the truth or otherwise of the Johannan narrative? The question does not depend for answer on the further question whether John the Apostle or John the 'Presbyter' of Ephesus is recognized as actual author.

If a considerable number of satisfactory believers resulted from our Lord's ministry in the capital, we should regard it as somewhat unfair and incorrect to give the Christian body the title 'Galilean.'

Does St. John, then, in connexion with his account of the Lord's ministry in Jerusalem, leave on our minds the impression that it was a successful and fruitful ministry which had results comparable with those of the Galilean preaching?

The following is a fair attempt to answer the question.

In Jn 2<sup>23</sup> we read, 'When he was in Jerusalem at the feast, many believed on him; but Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men . . . and knew what was in men.' In other words, these 'believers' were not to be trusted.

In chap. 2<sup>22</sup> 4<sup>1, 2</sup> reference is made to numbers baptized by Christ and His disciples. But this was probably at Aenon or one of the upper reaches of the Jordan. The character of these disciples is not stated.

In chap. 5, the lame man is not a very satisfactory convert; for Jesus says to him, 'Sin no more, that a worse thing come not unto thee.'

In chap. 7<sup>5</sup>, 'Neither did his brethren believe on him.'

In the same chapter, Nicodemus stands out prominently as a bright exception to general prejudice and unbelief.

In chap. 8<sup>30, 35</sup>, 'As he spake these things, many believed on him; and Jesus said unto them, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth.' A serious doubt of their sincerity is implied in the context, vv. 33, 37.

In chap. 9, the blind man seems to have been a genuine convert; see vv. 35, 38.

In chap. 10<sup>42</sup>, 'Many believed on him there'; but this was beyond Jordan, not in Jerusalem.

In chap. 11<sup>45</sup>, 'Many of the Jews which came to Mary believed on him.' In v. 43, 'If we let him alone, all men will believe on him.' This reference in chap. 11 would seem to imply that the faith was rapidly spreading. But our hopes are damped by the words in the next

chapter (12<sup>37</sup>), which convey two unfavourable impressions. Speaking of those present at the feast, 'Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that the words,' etc. Again, 'Nevertheless, even of the rulers many believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue. For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.' This is not the material of which the primitive saints and martyrs were made.

These generalizations by St. John, coming near the close of his history, as the last Passover drew near (chap. 12<sup>1-20</sup> 13<sup>1</sup>), give the impression that believers of a nominal sort were not few, but that the Apostle did not value their quality as corresponding to their quantity. They were not the kind who could be counted on in the hour of trial. And there is no hint at all in St. John's story of the making of real converts in any number in the capital, certainly not of the calling out of any definite company united in a body of discipleship.

This impression confirms that made by two very important incidents related by two of the Synoptics. The first is differently placed by the first and third. It is the lament of Christ over the Holy City, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her brood . . . and ye would not.' The very different place occupied by this incident in St. Matt. and St. Luke is a clear example of the comparative indifference to the order of events shown by the Synoptics. The other lament over Jerusalem given by St. Luke, containing the words, 'If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace . . . because thou knewest not the day of thy visitation,' closely resembles the former, and is indeed placed by the third Evangelist in the position attributed by the first to the other lament just quoted.

These two touching scenes are only explained, as it seems to me, on the ground of a rejected ministry in Jerusalem, and are not explained by (1) previous rejection of the prophets; (2) unbelief on the part of the Jews of Christ's preaching in Galilee. They refer to efforts made in the City of Jerusalem to win its population by a loving ministry there; and to the failure of these efforts.

This conclusion fits exactly with that last quoted from St. John (chap. 12<sup>37</sup>). It seems to lend confirmation to the appropriateness of the popular title of the Christian body in those first days, 'The men of Galilee,' for, clearly, only a small contingent from Jerusalem would be present, in those days of danger, at any gathering in a public place so soon after the dispersion of the disciples which took place at the time of the crucifixion.

And now we may pass to another question which bears on the relation of the Synoptic and the Johannean story. Are the Synoptics without any unconscious reference to a ministry in Jerusalem? That they make no intentional or direct reference seems agreed. But a careful examination of their narrative furnishes some perhaps slight but suggestive hints, such as these:—

1. The laments over Jerusalem, already quoted, appear to be almost inexplicable if Christ had not offered to Jerusalem, by previous visits and efforts there, His message of salvation.

2. The reference (Lk 23<sup>5</sup>) that Jesus had 'stirred up the people through all Judea, beginning from Galilee unto this place,' *may be* taken as referring to the events only of the last journey, but will certainly agree better with a wider and more systematic work.<sup>1</sup>

3. The reference (Mt 26<sup>61</sup> 27<sup>40</sup>) to Christ's prediction of the destruction of this temple and raising it up in three days, seems to refer for explanation to the original incident in St. John which took place in Jerusalem (chap. 2<sup>20</sup>). In passing observe a similar interesting link in another place between the same two Gospels. In Mt

<sup>1</sup> The careful reader will observe that SS. Matthew and Mark bring the Lord to the region of Judea beyond Jordan, some indefinite time before His ascent to Jerusalem for the last Passover (Mt 19<sup>1</sup>, Mk 10<sup>1</sup>). This retirement beyond Jordan, a reason for which is given in Jn 10<sup>40</sup>, seems not quite consistent with a thorough evangelization about that time of the northern villages and 'all the cities of Israel.' If, led by St. Luke, we assume that a very large amount of itinerating was done actually during this last 'ascent,' then the allusion during His trial to His having stirred up the whole country up to the walls of the City, may be fitted into that considerable period. But, seeing that both Matt. and Mark make the period of that journey short and not full of incident, we find it hard to apply the charge to the work done strictly on the journey. And this seems to set the words free to refer to previous missionary labours in the whole region of Northern Judea, and in Jerusalem, not a word of which is found in the two earlier Synoptics. (See various reading in Lk 4<sup>44</sup>, and the remarkable confirmation of its statement in Ac 10<sup>37-39</sup>.)

26<sup>30</sup>, 'Father, let this cup pass from me'; in Jn 18<sup>1</sup>, 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' We do not know whether the critics have suggested that each of the two references to St. Matt. were purposely introduced into St. John to produce a sense of truthfulness by such unconscious agreement.

4. Previous acquaintance with Bethphage and Bethany, and with some of the inhabitants, seems implied in all the Synoptics in the scene when the colt is sent for. It is assumed that the owner would recognize the claim made by 'The Lord,' who had need of Him. 'The Lord in this place certainly means Christ.

5. A similar incident is shortly afterwards related—the sending of messengers to the man (he is described as 'such a one' in one of the Gospels) who owned the upper room in Jerusalem. 'The Master saith, My time is at hand, where is the guest-chamber where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples?' It is reasonable to assume that the owner of the house would at once identify Jesus as 'The Master.'

6. The description of the last visit to Gethsemane not only forms another link between the Synoptics and St. John, but suggests with some force earlier acquaintance on the part of 'Jesus and his disciples,' showing that it was not knowledge acquired before the beginning of Christ's ministry.

St. John says, 'Jesus oft-times resorted thither with his disciples' (Jn 18<sup>1-3</sup>). St. Luke, in closest accord, though using language quite different, says, 'He went, as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives,' *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος* (Lk 22<sup>39</sup>). Unless these latter words are strained to apply only to the Monday and Tuesday of the then current week, for on Wednesday He did not approach the city, the 'wont' must refer to earlier days in which, on His visits to the city, He loved this sacred retreat. It may be added that the coming of Judas with a band thither, is best explained by St. John's words, which imply that this would be the most natural place to find our Lord at the time.

7. Mt 26<sup>6</sup>, 'When Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper.' According to St. Matt. and St. Mark this visit to an evidently friendly house has no antecedent. But St. Luke and St. John explain it perfectly (Lk 10<sup>38</sup>, Jn 11<sup>1</sup>); and if the 'certain village' of the former be identified with Bethany, as on all grounds seems probable, we have an interesting example of an earlier ministry

in the immediate vicinage of Jerusalem. It does not matter whether St. Luke knew the name of the village or no. If Christ was there, and Luke mentions it, you have all the evidence needed for an earlier ministry.

8. Lk 13<sup>6</sup>. The story of the victims of Pilate reads as if from the point of view of Jerusalem. The victims are called Galileans, as they would be if the conversation were held in Jerusalem; and the accident at the Tower of Siloam, closely connected with the story of Pilate's bloody deed, reads as if the location was well known to the speakers and hearers. The 'atmosphere' of the passage is not Galilean.

9. Why, but from a southern point of view, is it said that the raising of the son of the widow of Nain was 'known throughout all *Judea*'? See also the various reading in Lk 4<sup>44</sup>.

10. The Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10<sup>30</sup>) has again the flavour of one spoken by a man to whom the scenery of the road from Jerusalem to Jericho is quite familiar.

When it is remembered that, as Professor Burkitt points out, the actual accounts of Christ's ministry occupy not more perhaps than about forty days, there must be a very large amount left out (see Jn 21<sup>25</sup>). It seems that we are being asked too much when it is said that we cannot regard as safe history anything which cannot be made to find place in the 'proportion' of the Marcan narrative, whatever this word means. This remark is made to introduce a notice of that which seems St. Luke's disproportionate account of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem—his only one during the public ministry, according to the *prima facie* view of the Synoptics.

In St. Mark, to whose narrative we are asked to bring everything as a touchstone of credibility, the last journey seems to begin with chap. 10<sup>32</sup>, and to lead to its goal when, after no more than fourteen verses, Christ reaches Jericho, and in seven more, Bethphage. In other words, in this, the 'Ur-evangelium,' the whole of this journey occupies but twenty-one verses, and is quite an unimportant part of the public ministry.

Now let us view what seems to be St. Luke's account of the same section of our Lord's life. Either that which appears to be in St. Luke the narrative of a final going up to Jerusalem, with the deliberate purpose of meeting His death, is what it appears to be, reliable in a general way as to times and places, or it is compiled from accounts of more

than one progress through the country, including Galilee, Samaria, and Judea. In the former case, the Lucan narrative is but an expansion of the Marcan; in the latter, it is a silent testimony to the existence of other journeys, including some to Jerusalem, and thus a confirmation, to a certain degree, of the narrative of St. John.

We shall think of Luke's account in each light.

In the first case, supposing this to have been all one journey, it begins just after the Transfiguration and the allusion to the decease which He was about to accomplish (R.V.), in Jerusalem. From this point onward, a striking succession of references is made in ten following chapters to His 'going up to Jerusalem,' as if it was all one and the same progress through the country. Here are the references—

1. Chap. 9<sup>51</sup>, 'When he was about to be received up, *he set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem.*' The Samaritans for that reason do not receive Him. He must, then, have already passed out of Galilee at this very early stage, and been now some sixty miles north of the capital.

2. Chap. 13<sup>22</sup>, 'He went through the cities and villages, teaching, and *journeying towards Jerusalem.*'

3. Chap. 13<sup>31</sup>. Evidently He has now passed out of Samaria and is in Judea; and, on the theory of a single journey, from this time on He is in Judea, and Herod's threat to kill Him, and Christ's words about a prophet necessarily perishing in Jerusalem, are spoken apparently within a very few days of His being 'perfected.' It is then, on that occasion, that He is said by this Evangelist to have uttered the touching lament over the City, to which He evidently was very near.

4. Chap. 17<sup>4</sup>. Now, are we not rather startled, after what we have just read, at this later statement? '*As he went to Jerusalem,* he passed through the midst of Galilee and Samaria.' If we are to take St. Luke's story as chronologically correct, this is a great doubling back indeed on His line of march, and a contradiction of His words as to His speedy death. But see more.

5. Chap. 18, 'He took the twelve and said, *Behold we go (are going) up to Jerusalem,* and all things shall be fulfilled,' etc.

6. Chap. 19<sup>28</sup>. 'When he had spoken these things, he went before them, *ascending up to Jerusalem.*'

On first impressions, all these allusions seem to refer to one and the same final journey in its

successive stages. But we are disposed to question the truth of this impression when we observe how large a section of His public life seems to be involved between the beginning and close of these references to His journeyings, and when we compare this record of many deeds and sayings with the scanty account of the last journey in the other Synoptic narratives. The impression can be felt only after a definite re-perusal of the whole section (Lk 9<sup>51</sup>–19<sup>41</sup>). The journey, sketched by Mark in fourteen verses, and by Matthew in about the same space (Mt 19<sup>17-28</sup>), fills eight and a half chapters of St. Luke and is full of matter, descriptive and evangelistic, which involves the passage of a considerable length of time, and the occurrence of many weighty events.

These considerations suggest to us the opinion that St. Luke, though he seems to describe all along but one journey at the close of the ministry, is unconsciously bringing together many incidents carefully collected belonging to more tours than one, some of which may well have been connected with some of the previous ascents to the City mentioned in the Fourth Gospel.

The impression is made on the mind that, while Luke is a conscientious collector of facts, he pays little attention to arranging them in their due places, and, in fact, sometimes reverses the order in which other Evangelists have placed them. If anything like the above be a correct interpretation of the great difference between the first two and the third Evangelists in the description of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem, a slight bridge is thrown over the chasm which separates the Synoptics from St. John.

In other words, we have a means of avoiding the rough-and-ready rule—a rule which tends to discredit the third as well as the fourth Evangelist—that whatever cannot be accommodated with a place in some part of the Marcan narrative is not worthy of credit. This too may be added, that were we certain that no visit to Jerusalem for missionary purposes was ever made by our Lord previous to His ascent to the last Passover, there is not a little in the Synoptics, and especially in St. Luke, which would decidedly raise difficulties of interpretation.

The Church has, since the times of Eusebius, held the view that St. John's is a supplemental Gospel, which, for this reason, does not pretend to take like ground with the Synoptists. It is easy to



see discrepancies where there are only additions. In later times, to this difficulty has been added the other, now universally admitted, that St. John's is a 'tendency' Gospel, in which facts are looked on chiefly for the doctrines which they suggest, and are often coloured by the mind of the theologian to a degree about which people may differ. But this by no means implies that they are not facts at

all, nor does it suggest any reason why, supposing it was known on all hands that our Lord's ministry had certainly been altogether in the northern province, St. John, or the other John who is—after the current fashion—set in place of the Apostle, could not have used, or if the critic wills, invented, narratives to support his theology, and placed their scene in Galilee.

## Literature.

### THE INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY.

It is a sinister sign of the times that one after another the books of Max Nordau are translated into English. If they did not find readers they would not be translated. It is a sinister sign. Not that Max Nordau is immoral. God forbid. His cleanness is a great thankfulness. He is even serious and writes under a sense of real responsibility. But he does not know God. And all his writing is done on the understanding that there is no God to know, and that the sooner we get rid of that superstition the better.

His latest book is translated under the title of *The Interpretation of History* (Rebman; 8s. net). And well translated it is, which, no doubt, helps the cause he seeks to advocate. It is a book of essays, 'The Interpretation of History' being a general title to cover the first three of them. But the most significant essay is the sixth, on 'The Psychological Roots of Religion.' In that essay Max Nordau says that the root of religion is the instinct of self-preservation. This instinct expresses itself in two directions—on the one side in a hunger for knowledge, on the other in a clinging to life. What the clinging to life may do for religion he is not quite sure. Nor is he quite sure what will happen to religion when the hunger for knowledge is rightly understood. But it is easy to see what he hopes will happen. 'It is an open question,' he says, 'whether it will be extinguished when man finally realizes that it is quite useless to seek to know the causes of phenomena, and directs his desire for knowledge to other, attainable ends, and when his instinctive repugnance to the dissolution of his personality subsides, and he learns to think with indifference of his inevitable end.'

What he hopes is that art will then take the place of faith, and concerts, plays, exhibitions, and æsthetic celebrations of every sort, that of the church service.

Now there is nothing in science to lead a man to suppose that the fear of God rightly interpreted will pass away; there is nothing in philosophy; and all history is against it. It is a speculation pure and simple. And it would be hard to find a serious responsible writer speculating with greater harm to his fellow-men.

### THE ALCHEMY OF THOUGHT.

Professor L. P. Jacks, M.A., of Manchester College, Oxford, is a master in the art of essay-writing. For some time it was a lost art. The monthly magazine killed it. The new essay that has risen into influence is not so elaborate, and especially is it not so self-important as the essay of Addison or of Macaulay. But it differs wholly from the mere magazine article that so long has held the field, in that it demands careful reading and imparts specific instruction.

There is another respect in which the new essay differs from the old. It deals with deeper things than the outward acts called conduct; it deals with religion. One finds that all that can be usefully said about conduct is soon said, but religion is fathomless and for ever. Professor Jacks, as a Unitarian, deliberately passes by the great historical debates of the Church, but he has a genuine interest in religion, and if his discussions are broad rather than deep, they are at least fashionable and his essays likely to be read.

He calls his book *The Alchemy of Thought* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). This title is