

"The Words of Jesus"

This was the
Material used
Tuesday Jan. 9, 1950

ought
to
Fath
phy
the
deve
the
Grec
Pau
comm
the
the
conc
and
incr
agai
born
men
sele
27bo

we
ting
ly
iloso-
ch was
thin
r the
ers of
tian
rom
en in
ly
death
imari
ally
e
moveme
ury
he
e

books. Also they set up the so-called apostles Creed as the rule
f Faith emphesising the reality of Jesus life as against the
ostic conception of it, as "appearance". Also during this came

"The Words of Jesus"

Before starting on the substance of the lecture tonight we ought to review what we have thus far found reason for stating to be a substantial picture of ~~the~~ events.

1 First. The Christian movement was recognized by the early Fathers as a product of the fusion of Judaism with Greek Philosophy. The fathers stated that ~~such was the case~~ such was the case.

2 Second. The natural resistance of these two streams of development to fusion is clearly found in the conflicts within the Christian Church between the Pauline and the Petrine, or the Grecian, and the Jewish elements. We have seen how the letters of Paul were written to instruct, and enlighten various Christian communities on points of doctrine and discipline arising from the conflict of these two forces. Law and Freedom.

3 Third we have seen also how these letters of Paul written in the first century between 53 A.D. and 62 A. D. for perfectly concrete cases of discipline, came to be used after Paul's death and later in the second century controversy with constantly ~~increasing~~ increasing frequency, and with increasing authority, especially against the Gnostics in various schools. *Revan*

4 Fourth, not so much as fact already shown, as fact to be born in mind, that it was in its conflict with the Gnostic movement that the Christian movement during the ^{second} ~~Christian~~ Century selected from a large number of writings, traditions etc, the 27 books of the New Testament as their best and authoritative books. Also they set up the so-called apostles Creed as the rule of Faith emphasising the reality of Jesus life as against the Gnostic conception of it, as "appearance". Also during this same

period they developed from the free loosely organized congregatio into a fairly well organized and self conscious ecclesiastical system.

Our interest to night is in the origin, nature and purpose of the four gospels that are included in the New Testament. When ~~they were written~~ were they written , by whom, and for what purpose? People seem to have an opinion that the Gospels were written by some simple minded, straightforward, adoring ~~fix~~ disciple of Jesus, who told the sotires of Miracles, and wonders as naively as a child. That these Gospels are simply un-restrained adorations of the Person and mission of Jesus. That pure and unadulterated love prompted th the reccord, and that while they may not be exactly true they represent a ~~striking~~ adorable impression that was made upon the disciples by Jesus. That is almost as untrue as the old idea that they were inspired by God. The truth is that each Gospel was written from its own peculiar angle, for the purpose of defending some theoretical point of view in the conflicts of the Chruch. In no sense were these gospels biographies. They were treatises in controversial development. They contain some very ~~prize~~ early traditions , and doubtless real incidents in the life and teaching of Jesus/ But this are accidents in the record. Perhaps it is fortunate that we have to depend upon the accidentals for we may thus be able to get a clearer picture of what actually took place. Truth will out, for it unconsciously betrays itself if ~~any~~ people only look for it.

Last Sunday night we saw that Paul had a conception of "The Risen Lord" who would come in his Glory and usher in a new Kingdom. To Paul Christ is a suramundane being, not directly as God, but God's first born son and Image. Paul's interest is not in Jesus life but in his death, and his resurrection. If Christ be not raised from the dead then is our preaching vain." How did this idea develop? What was its origin?

One of the most illuminating facts, and perhaps one of the most easily seen facts is the way in which different persons related the "Son of God" idea to Jesus. Its history we will trace out in the documents for the purpose of showing its evolution.

Paul. Romans I ,4. states very clearly Paul's idea of the relationship of the Son of God Idea to Jesus. He speaks of god's "Son who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Not until the Resurrection did the God Spirit come to Jesus. Similar also does Peter argue as related in Acts 2, 14-36. "Jesus of Nazareth a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you." and then the closing "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."

Acts 2,36.

Again Paul in Acts 13,33 in an address at Antioch is speaking of the resurrection, "The promise unto the fathers 2That God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he raised up Jesus: as also it is written in the second psalm,- Thou art my son this day have I begotten thee." In other words according to Paul and this Petrine tradition, Jesus is given the Sonship of God, not by birth, but by

Baptism, but by the Resurrection. Until then he is just a man who goes about doing good, healing the sick etc, but by virtue of the Resurrection he has become the "Son of God" ~~with~~ who has expiated the sins of the world.

Mark. ~~Curiously enough the Gospel of Mark has a double explanation of some where in the midst of his career, the disciples are disturbed about his work.~~ In Mark appears a tradition different from Paul. The "Spirit of God" is operating throughout his Career? It enters into him at the time of Baptism by John in the Jordan. The spirit of God descends upon him in the ~~for~~ form of a dove. The dove was the type of divine wisdom in the philosophy of Philo of Alexandria. The best texts say that the spirit of God entered "into him." Then another point is raised. The revised version says, - "and a voice came out of ~~the~~ the heavens, "Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased." But in the so-called Western texts, - this remark put into the voice from Heavens is, "Thou art my beloved son, this day have I begotten thee." So according to Mark the supernatural becomes a part of Jesus at the Baptism.

~~Also there is another tradition in Mark.~~ It is important to state here that one of the important controversies in the latter part of the Century and in the second century was over this question of the time when Jesus became impregnated with the ~~the~~ spirit of God. Those who held that it was at the Baptism ~~at the time~~ were called "Adoptionists", i.e. Jesus became "Son of God" by adoption. Irenaeus tells us '~~that~~ of Cerinthus, who taught, 'that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary according to the ordinary course of human generation.' but ' that after his ~~generation~~ Baptism, Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove from the Supreme Ruler, and that he proclaimed the unknown Father, and performed Miracles. "

Also in the Ignatian Epistles is the statement, 'That those who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassable, but that it was Jesus who suffered, prefer the Gospel of Mark.'

Bacon Page 11.

But a still later tradition is found in Matthew. Matthew carries the ~~story~~ time of the ~~appearance~~ entering of the spirit of God into Jesus back to the time of conception, and thus makes him "son of God" from that time. Matthew also incorporates in his story another tradition Jewish in character, that Jesus is descended directly from the Davidic line of Kings. This geneological table is perfectly superfluous unless Jesus is the son of Joseph by the natural line. But the Birth story of Matthew carries the time of adoption by God back to the act of conception by the Holy Ghost.

Luke, however is not satisfied with that. He carries the Geneological Table back beyond David to Adam and makes Adam "The Son of God".

Further he makes John the Baptist a Semi-miraculous conception. Then the Angel Gabriel comes to Mary and announces even before conception that Mary is to have a child who shall be called Jesus.

John. But the writer of John is not to be outdone by these, and he carries the idea to its possible limit, "In the beginning was the Word, (Logos), and the word was with God, and the Word Was God. The was in the beginning with God." And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten son, who is in the bosom of the father, he hath declared him."

This is as far back as we go, to the beginning of the pre-existent Christ with God from the beginning. Here we come upon the kernel of that ancient controversy that shoot the Church from center to ~~xx~~

circumference. the Arian Controversy, which divided the Church, caused death and suffering, hardship, exile etc. without end. The Arians held that there was a time when this Logos, this pre-existent spirit that was with the father at the beginning, -- there was a time when he was not, -that he was created by the Father, and was thus a creature ~~xxxxxxx~~ Etc.

This is all interesting only in so far as it discloses to us some of the intellectual process that the early Church went through. All of the material is legendary, and mythical in character. The story of the birth of Jesus as told by Luke is so closely like the story of the Birth of Buddha as to compel one to believe that it was deliberately borrowed. The Buddhistic legend is older than the Gospel of Luke. Plato, and Alexander the Great, Scipio Africanus, Augustus and Appollonius of Tyana were said to be sons of God by the same process of supernatural conception as Jesus. Thus their greatness was accounted for.

~~This~~ I have used the development of the myth concerning Jesus birth for the purpose of pointing out that in regard to so important a point as the birth of Jesus, we have no concensus of opinion, or uniformity of statement. The same is true of many other points, in fact almost every single point. For example the three synoptics make the ministry of Jesus less than one year. The Gospel of John make it more than two years, including three Passovers. The differences both in the narration of events, events narrated, and the significance of events between the three synoptics and the Gospel of John are so pronounced that ~~he~~ ~~them~~ not even the most conservative scholars of to-day attempts to reconcile them. ~~Says Wernle of the differences between~~
~~the Christ of John is the Greek Logos.~~ The Christ of John is the Greek Logos. The Jesus of the Synoptics "belongs altogether to humanity. True, he excels all mankind through his unique vocation as Messiah, as son of God, King of God's kingdom, and through that intimate knowledge of the heart of God which no one has ever known but he. But with all that he never ceases to be a man, a creature, who bows with us in deepest reverence before the Only Holy and Good." Wernle Page 55.

So for the time being we turn to the Synoptic Gospels.

In presenting the synoptic problems I shall present it substantially as Wernle presents it. This may be regarded as a fair statement for Prof. Bacon of the Yale Theological, Othodox Congregational, school, presents substantially the same thing. I have not time to more than presents bald results.

In the synoptic Gospels we have one short gospel, Mark; and two long ones, Matthew and Luke.

First. The short Gospel Mark is the source and the basis of the two longer ones.

Second. Besides having Mark for a basis and a source, the writers of the two longer G

gospels have a common second source in Greek from which they take "s ayings."

Third. Both Matthew and Luke have, in addition to Mark and the "Sayings" , their own peculiar matter.

Some of the reasons why this ~~is~~ explanation is held to be true is that Practically all of Mark is quoted in either Matthew or Luke and much of it is found in both. So ~~xxxxxxx~~ such an extent is this true that if Mark were lost entirely we would not lose very much in the way of information, ~~xxxx~~

Second. The order of the First Gospel is one the whole exactly followed in the other two. ~~right~~ Luke breaks into the narrative of Mark in the midst of 3,19 and after inserting Luke 6,20--- 8,3, he takes up the thread again and the two run along Parallel. Another insetion is Luke 9,51-- 18,14 . Aside from these insertions, and two notices, the reason for the arrest of John ~~xxxxxxx~~ (Luke 3,19 ~~6--~~ Mark 6,1-6,) and the rejection of Jesus by his own city? Luke follows the order of Mark completely, ~~xxxx~~ prefixing the birth material, and adding the Resurrection material.

Matthew does the same thing with Mark except that he makes more and shorter additions. But the substantial outline remains the same.

Third. Even the wording of the Gospel of Mark is followed, except that many of Marks very clumsy words or sentences are smoothed out.

Perhaps one of the best illustrations of the evidence for ~~xxx~~ this dependence of the ~~xxxxxxx~~ Matthew and Luke upon Mark and another common source. There are nine cases in Luke and twelve in Matthew where ~~xxxxxxx~~ the same saying of Jesus appears twice, once in the portion that is derived from Mark and once in the portion that is derived from "The Source". Four of these doublets are found in both Matthew and Luke. One of these I want to present in Full.

Mark. 4, 25.

25 "For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath.

Source.

Matt. 13, 12

12 "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.

Luke 8, 18

18 Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.

Matt. 25, 29

29 "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Luke 19, 26.

26 For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him.

On bearing the cross.
Addressed to Disciples.

Mark 8 34.

"If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

Matthew 16, 24.

If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.

Luke 9, 23.

If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.

Matthew 10, 38.

And he that doth not take his cross and follow after me, is not worthy of me.

Luke 14, 27

Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.

These illustrations of reasons why this relationship of the three gospels is believed to exist are all that I will give, but they are only illustrations. The total array of facts have forced the conclusion upon many even gainst their desires that the relationship is substantially as stated.

Matthew and Luke are dependent upon mark as the basis of thier structure. They have a common source from which they draw material. Also each has an independent source. Then the ~~is~~ is the editorial factor in each. To state the same conclusion chronologically the gospel according to Mark was written first. Then Matthew ~~was~~ was written with Mark as the outline. To the outline the author of Matthew added material from another common source shared with the author of Luke. Then, probably after ~~Mark~~ Matthew, luke was written.

This historic process in the origin of the Gospels, and their interdependence gives us some cue as to the reason why we have some ~~xxx~~ many theories for example concerning the time when the Spirit of Gpd descended upon Jesus and transformed him into a Superna tural son of God.

Mark.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ For one interested in such problems the ferreting out of the origin and early records of the Gospels is most fascinating. The earliest and ~~XXXXXX~~ basic record that we have concerning the origin of the Gospel of Mark comes from Papias by way of the Church Historian Eusebius. Eusebius in the fourth century quotes Papias, Bishop of Heiropolis in Asia Minor, about 140 A.D. as writing the following,--

" And the Elder said this also : Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down ~~exactly~~ accurately everything that he remembered, without, however, recording in order what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him ; but afterwards, as I said, he attended Peter, who adapted his instruction to the needs of his hearers, but had no design in giving a connected account of the Lord's words. So then Mark made no mistake, while he thus wrote down some things as he remembered them ; for he made it his own care not to omit anything that he heard, or to set down any false statement therein. "

Eusibius, H.E. III 39. B & A 296.

This is probably a tradition that is substantially true. Who was this Mark. It was John Mark was the son of Mary (Acts 12,12) one of the women in the Jerusalem Church, also a cousin of Barnabas (Col 4,10) He accompanied Paul and Barnabas on Paul's first Missionary Journey. Paul refused to have Mark with him on the second missionary journey. Later he is in Rome with Paul as Col 4, 10 indicates.

Says Efleiderer, 2 Nothing can be urged against the Church tradition that this Gospel was written by John "Mark." " Such a man might well have been the author of the Gospel which unites the Jesus of the Palestinian tradition, the energetic hero of the Jewish reform

movement with the Christ of the Pauline theology, the suffering hero of a mystical world salvation, and thus paved the way which was finished two generations later in the Gospel of John. It is believed that the Gospel of Mark was written ~~shortly~~ at Rome shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) " Christian Origins 222.

What then is the Nature of this Gospel? We have seen that Peter represented a development that was profoundly different from Paul. Yet we have the strange fact that in the Markan Gospel, said on the one hand to be Petrine in origin, the ~~key~~ basis of Paulinism is also to be found. Well the point is this, at least if Papias statement is substantially true, and the references to Mark are substantially true. Mark never had heard Jesus, probably never had seen him. But he had been brought up in a home in the Jerusalem Church. ~~Christ~~ The Jerusalem cult was an inheritance for him. He had been a companion of Peter. Also of Paul. Peter represented the home tradition, the accepted background of Mark's. Later he wrote down what he remembered of Peter, and the Petrine tradition, but meantime he had come under the influence of Paul, and was with Paul at Rome at the end of Paul's career. He saw things largely and unconsciously from the point of view of Paul, but to Paul with his idea of Christ declared by the resurrection to be the Son of God, we add the Petrine, Jerusalem, human tradition.

Next is the Outline of Mark. Concerning this there is no important difference of opinion. Yet it is important for in the outline is indicated much of its character.

PART I .

Division 1/	Beginning of ministry.	1,1--3,6.
2	2- Mission of Twelve	3,7--6,13.
3	3- The Breaking of Bread	6,14-- 8,26.

PART II. The Judean Ministry.

Division 4-	The Way of the Cross.	8,27-- 10,52.
Division 5-	The appeal to Jerusalem	Ch. 11-13 .
Division 6-	Passion and resurrection	" 14-16,8

~~Chapter~~ vv 16,9ff not found in oldest mms, and not known or referred to by earliest writers. Later interpolation .

As the outline shows, and the substance of the Gospel proves beyond doubt Mark is writing as a compiler of tradition. His chief idea is to demonstrate that Jesus the Messiah , is the son of God. The whole Gospel is to demonstrate the truth of and to draw out the acknowledgement that the roman soldier utters in 15,39 "Truely this man was the son of God." Mark knows nothing of the Supernatural Birth or the childhood. The spirit of God comes into him at the Baptism. Jesus begins his work of preaching and healing. Because he associates with publican and sinners, and defends the disciples in their disregard of the Sabbath, the Pharisee plot against his life/ Chapter 3, 1-6 .

Then the twelve are chosen, and Jesus chooses his spiritual kin as stronger than his blood relationship. Then he begins teaching in Parables . then follows the list of mighty Miracles, ~~against~~ which the

are of no avail against the Jewish unbelief.

Then comes the turning point in the narrative. 6,14--8,26.

The fate of John. His Martyrdom.

Feeding of the 5000. Walking on the sea . Intervention of Scribes, Jesus denounces Meats. This is unquestionably the Pauline point of view read into Jesus. Then he withdraws from Galilee, and turns his attentions to the Gentiles. and the Judean Ministry. Here he begins to refer to the suffering on the cross, the story of the Transfiguration Teaching and miracles of healing in Judea with recurring references to the cross. Finally the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. followed by the purging of the Temple, with the parable of the Usurpers in the vineyard. Then his scribes, pharisees, etc. The parable of the fig tree, and the passion. death and burial. The tomb found empty closing with the message of the angel .

Mark is trying to demonstrate that Jesus was the Son of God, in the Pauline sense.

His proof is ~~as follows~~ is in the main the proof from Miracles. That is why the gospel of the deed is so pronounced in Mark. ~~By~~ second the voices from heaven declare him to be the Son of God. Mark 1,11 ; 9,7 ; demons, superhuman beings acknowledge him as the holy one of God, the Son of the supreme God. ~~Hardly~~ Nowhere does Mark refer to Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament Prophecy? and only three times does he quote any old Testament passage in such a manner as even to imply prophetic fulfillment. 1,2; 12,10; 14,27.

His great question that he had to prove was how the crucified man could be the Son of God. Hence we find the early references to Jesus foreknowledge of his passion .

But why did not the Jews believe Jesus to be the Messiah, if he was proved by so many miracles. Mark's answer is that Jesus did not wish to be recognized by the Jews as Messiah. It was for this reason that he forbade the demons ~~to~~ and his disciples to reveal the secret of his divine sonship, (1,25,34; 8,12 ; 9,9) also he enjoined silence regarding his miraculous power on those whom he had healed/ 1,44; 5,43; 7,36 ; ~~22~~ 8,26. According to Mark then the reason why the Jews rejected Jesus was because Jesus intentionally concealed from ~~them~~ his power. (this is the suggestion of the gnostic idea of secret wisdom) . Why did Mark do this, which is so contrary to

Matthew ? For the simple reason first that Mark was viewing the whole situation from the point of view of Rome, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and he was writing and appealing as Paul had written and appealed to the Gentiles. Already at the writing of this Gospel the City of Jerusalem ,and the last surviving remains of the Temporal power of Judaism had gone. He must present this Jesus, son of God according

to Paul to the Gentiles.

Such then is the point of view of the first Gospel. It is fundamentally Pauline in its doctrinal point of view, but it contains many of the best and probably oldest traditions. For Example the way in which Mark accounts for the fact that the whole Jewish race was not impressed by an converted through his ~~xxx~~ miracles is a disclosure of the primitive truth, that the miracles were not performed, and if ~~the~~ they were performed, they did not make the impression that Matthew would have ~~yx~~ believe.

Secondly there is no ~~supernatural~~ birth, and no ~~resurrectie~~ tion, although the tradition says that Mark wrote all that he heard from Peter. The truth is, of course, that the early tradition did not know such incidents. They are legendary.