

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

inner glass lid and locking it, advised the two holy Fathers, Polycarp and Procopius, who now act as librarians, to open only the outer wooden lid to passing travellers, and the glass lid also if a scholar should appear, who really wishes to study it. I think they will follow this direction.

AGNES S. LEWIS,

THE TRADITION THAT THERE WAS
A "GALILEE" IN THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.

THERE can be little doubt that a tradition about a "Galilee" in the Mount of Olives has existed ever since the publication of the *Acts of Pilate*. The passage relied on is as follows :—

"And, after a few days, three men came from Galilee to Jerusalem. One was a priest, named Phineas; another, a Levite, named Angæus; but the remaining one a soldier, named Adas. These came to the chief priests and stated to them and to the people: 'That Jesus, whom ye crucified, we saw in Galilee with His eleven disciples upon the Mount of Olives, teaching them and saying, "Go into the whole world and proclaim the gospel, and whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but whosoever will not believe shall be condemned." And as He said these things He ascended into heaven. And not only we, but many others of the five hundred there saw him.' ¹

I shall have something to say upon the character of these *Acts of Pilate* later on; but there can be no doubt about their existence in the time of Justin Martyr. He has at least one reference to them in his *Apology*, where, in treating of Christ's miracles, he adds, "And that He did these things you can learn from the Acts prepared under Pontius Pilate." (*Apol.*, i. 48.) Tertullian, also, in treating of the same subject, has the following reference to Christ's post-resurrection manifestations, and to

¹ Translated from the version designated by Thilo as Paris D. caput xiv. Cf. *Evangelia Apocrypha*. Edidit C. Tischendorf, Lipsiæ, 1853.

the *Acts of Pilate*, which I give in the original that there may be no mistake:—

“Nam nec ille se in vulgus eduxit, ne impii errore liberarentur, ut et fides, non mediocri præmio destinata, difficultate constaret. Cum discipulis autem quibusdam *apud Galilæam Judææ regionem ad quadraginta dies egit*, docens eos quæ docerent. Dehinc ordinatis eis ad officium prædicandi per orbem, circumfusa nube in cælum est ereptus, multo verius quam apud vos asseverare de Romulo Proculi solent. *Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit.*” (Apol. 21.)

Now it has been very fairly argued from the lines I have italicised that Tertullian had the *Acts* or *Report of Pilate* in his mind when he spoke of Jesus spending the forty days with His disciples in “Galilee, a region of Judea,” and that he had accepted the tradition about a Galilee in the province of Judea.¹

Schürer has, indeed, drawn attention to the fact that the term “Judea” was in very early times applied to the whole of Palestine, and that we cannot accordingly be certain of Tertullian having anything more in his mind than this.² But the mention of the *Acts of Pilate* seems to warrant the supposition that Tertullian, who was a very ardent and impulsive controversialist, was content to use for controversial purposes the suggestion there contained of a Galilee existing in the province of Judea. The fact, moreover, that Celsus, whose attention was directed to the difficulties in the resurrection histories, did not make anything of the incompatibility of the Jerusalem and the Galilean manifestations, seems to indicate the existence of some theory which passed muster as a solution.

Certain passages have been adduced by Prof. Hofmann from Lactantius and Chrysostom in support of his con-

¹ Cf. Dr. Rud. Hofmann's *Galilæa auf dem Oelberg wohin Jesus seine Jünger nach der Auferstehung beschied*, s. 20.

² Cf. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for April 3.

tention that there was a Galilee in the Mount of Olives; but they can hardly be accepted in his sense, since it is known from other passages that both these writers regarded our Lord's manifestations in Galilee as being made because of the disciples' fear of the Jews in Judea.¹

On the other hand, there can be as little doubt that the tradition gained a firm footing as early as the sixth century, and traces of it have been found right through the Middle Ages, showing its ready reception as a handy solution of a recognised difficulty in the Resurrection history. Prof. Hofmann deserves thanks for gathering the evidence in so complete a form in his present pamphlet. No wonder that Suarez, who was Archbishop of Coimbra, and died in 1580 (a different man from the great Jesuit writer of the same name), felt warranted in saying in a comment on Mark xvi.: "It is not to be accepted that Christ was to precede them into the province of Galilee, but into a mountain which is near the Mount of Olives. For when one comes into the valley of Jehoshaphat, there are three pre-eminent mountains, the mount called Olivet, pre-eminent in the middle of the others, the mount 'Galilee,' and another mount to the right of the mount of Olives. In mount Galilee Galileans made a commodious permanent home, whence they could come to Jerusalem on business; on which account the mount is called 'Galilee' unto this day." And a learned Jesuit, Harduin, a century later, in certain "Memoirs upon the History of the Sciences and the Fine Arts," speaks of Galilee as one of the summits of the Mount of Olives, where the disciples repaired to meet Jesus by appointment after the resurrection. Jesus, he asserts, had as a Galilean gone to the Galilean village in the Mount of Olives to enjoy His prayers in one of the village gardens, when He could not enter into the city. And he points out

¹ Cf. Schürer *ut supra*.

an analogy for the phraseology in the people of London saying sometimes, "I am going to *Savoy*," which would mean the duchy of that name, whereas, "I am going to *the Savoy*," would mean the palace with church and chapel built in London by Count Savoy in the 13th century. He would thus give the article its full force, and represent Jesus as sending word to the disciples that He would meet them in "the Galilee" (*τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*, Matt. xxviii. 7).

It thus appears that a tradition very early arose to the effect that a part of the Mount of Olives, the northern end, with sufficient ground for a hostelry and village had been appropriated by the Galileans before the time of our Lord. It went, it is thought, by the name of "Galilee," and carried the article. It was to this house of rest, accordingly, Jesus is supposed to have repaired in the last days of His life, when He could not remain in the city of Jerusalem, but went out, as the Gospel informs us, to the Mount of Olives. Here, also, it is supposed He selected His trysting-place with His disciples after the resurrection. Here He spent the most part of "the great forty days"; here He gathered round Him the 500, and here gave His parting instructions to His disciples before He was taken up.

If the tradition is thus accepted, Prof. Hofmann believes he can turn the attack made by Reimarus, Lessing, and Strauss, on the resurrection history by reason of the irreconcilability, as they think, of the Galilean and the Jerusalem manifestations. If the tradition be true, the Galilean and Jerusalem interviews melt into one.

But the fact that the tradition has had a long history, that it has succeeded in securing a lodgment even on the spot, so that the Arabs to this day are said to call part of the Mount of Olives *Kalilea*, and a chapel and even pillars were associated with it, must not blind our eyes to its suspicious origin. The *Acts of Pilate*, where it first appears, were fabricated, as we now know, by unscrupulous Chris-

tians about A.D. 150 to produce evidence ostensibly from *heathen* sources for the facts of Christ's history, which heathens would be likely to regard. No one has given more thorough attention to the pseudo-heathen and pseudo-Jewish documents than Huidekoper, and the following quotation from one of his works will set the subject in a true light. He says:—

"The average morality of Christians much exceeded that of heathens. Yet Christianity numbered among its adherents some who were unprincipled, or weak-principled. The number of these was comparatively small so long as Christians were in a decided minority, and could offer to converts neither place nor profit in a worldly sense. Yet a hundred and twenty years after Jesus taught, that is about A.D. 150, we find that some one had already supplied by fraud the want most annoying to their controversialists, namely, the lack of heathen testimony to the facts of their Master's life. At that date we find a document called the *Acts of Pilate*, and still later, a professed *Letter from Pilate to Tiberius*. Each of these documents is mentioned by but one writer during the first three centuries. Probably the chief use made of them and of subsequent forgeries was in the fourth century, when the two political parties which advocated Christianity and Heathenism were nearly equal in strength. Before this date Christians had fewer of the unprincipled in their ranks, and fewer opportunities, even when so disposed, to give currency to any forgery in their own favour. Subsequently to the fourth century, when Christianity had the upper hand, and when strife was solely or chiefly between sections of its own followers, the authority of saints and martyrs outweighed that of heathens. Later forgeries were in the name of Christian leaders, and even the forgeries which already existed were correspondingly altered, so that the *Acts of Pilate* became the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, while the *Letters of ABGARUS and Christ* became the *Letters of CHRIST and Abgarus*; those of *Seneca and Paul* being headed *Letters of Paul and Seneca*."¹

It is highly probable, then, that to the ingenious author of the *Acts of Pilate* this difficulty of how to reconcile our Lord's professed departure to meet His disciples in Galilee

¹ Cf. Huidekoper's *Indirect Testimony of History to the Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 3, 4; he also refers to the subject in his *Belief of the First Three Centuries Concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld*; and in his great work on *Judaism at Rome, B.C. 76 to A.D. 140*.

with His subsequent manifestations at Jerusalem, must have suggested itself. How could One, endowed with all knowledge and all authority, profess to start for Galilee and then change His mind and manifest Himself in Jerusalem? The difficulty, the ingenious gentleman thought, can only be met by locating a "Galilee" near Jerusalem. It would be a striking contrast to "Galilee of the Gentiles"; and the Jerusalem manifestations could be at once identified with the Galilean ones. In this way, as we may well believe, the idea got afloat, and it has had, as we have seen, a long career. Minds unaccustomed to careful criticism and anxious to be delivered swiftly from every doubt, would gladly accept it and receive through it a temporary satisfaction.

But the tradition cannot stand sober and careful criticism. It has all the look of a theory invented to meet a difficulty. Moreover, if accepted, it proves too much. We can give no intelligible account of the disciples going to the Galilean lake on their fishing expedition, if the manifestations of the risen Lord had all been in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and they were charged to tarry there until endued with power from on high. It is, besides, utterly unlikely that 500 men could be concentrated a Sabbath Day's journey from Jerusalem without arousing the wrath of the dreaded Jews. The probabilities are all in favour of the distant province of Galilee being the selected spot for the great gathering of the disciples. And there is no such difficulty in reconciling the various narratives as has been supposed.

It has been too readily assumed that an Omniscient Person, as we believe the risen Saviour to have been, would not direct His disciples to go to Galilee, if He knew He must manifest Himself to them the very same evening in Jerusalem. We must remember under what circumstances the Jerusalem manifestations were granted. They were

granted because of the "slowness of heart," manifested by all except John, to believe in the resurrection. John was the first believer in our Lord's resurrection, and he believed on *circumstantial evidence*. When he entered the empty sepulchre and saw the grave-clothes and the napkin so carefully deposited, he came to the conclusion that Jesus had risen from the dead and would never need the grave-clothes any more. "He saw and believed" (John xx. 8). Peter, Mary, and the other women had all the same circumstantial evidence before them as John, but their slow hearts prevented them from reaching John's conclusion. The manifestation to Mary, as she wept at the tomb, was condescension to her slowness of heart, and there is an undertone of implied rebuke in His dealings with her (John xx. 17, 18). The manifestation to the other women was likewise condescension to their slowness of heart; they needed confirmation of the angel's words to take away their fears and fit them to take a sufficiently certain message to the disciples (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10). The interview with Peter, the interview with the pilgrims to Emmaus, the interview in the upper room with the eleven, the interview a week later with Thomas, one and all were condescensions on the part of Jesus to meet the slowness of heart which all except John had manifested in believing in His resurrection. No wonder that He is represented as upbraiding them for their unbelief and hardness of heart (Luke xxiv. 25; Mark xvi. 14). They should have believed in His resurrection and have gone in faith to Galilee to meet Him there without all this personal dealing with Him, without the examination of His hands and feet, and the putting of Him to the most extreme tests that unbelief could suggest.

The Jerusalem appearances, therefore, are to be regarded not indeed as after-thoughts on His part, but as manifestations *forced* from Him by the unbelief of the disciples. They are perfectly consistent with the Galilean meeting,

which was to be the great manifestation. It is, I think, plain that Jesus wished all who believed on Him to be present on that occasion. The place and the time would be indicated. It could not be immediately after the resurrection. It would take time to send word to all His converts and get them together on the selected mountain. The fishing expedition on the lake of Galilee has all the appearance of an incident happening as the fishermen are *en route* to the Galilean meeting. Quietly they would leave Jerusalem, and make their way leisurely towards the trysting-place in northern Galilee. And if they thought then that they had forfeited the pastoral office by their faithlessness at Jerusalem, the Lord's gracious manifestation on the shore was to revive their hope of office in the Church, which the great Galilean meeting would confirm and seal (John xxi. 1-23).

I think, moreover, that the probabilities are all in favour of supposing that the manifestation on the Galilean mount was in *transfiguration glory*, and that the mount was Hermon. Only three persons out of the 500, viz., Peter, James, and John, had seen Jesus in such glory before. It is not wonderful if some at first doubted the identity of such a radiant personality with the "meek and lowly" Jesus (Matt. xxviii. 17). But the three favoured disciples would soon assure the rest that such glory had been His already "on the holy mount," and that they need doubt His identity no longer. Upon this theory everything becomes natural and reasonable.

The return to Jerusalem and the waiting there for the gift of the Holy Ghost would be the wisest direction of the risen Saviour to all in the 500, who were prepared to assist in the founding of the Christian Church. The 120 who gathered in the upper room represent the more earnest converts upon whose hearts the great responsibility lay of inaugurating the Christian movement. It will thus appear

that we can harmonize the histories of the resurrection without any recourse to the tradition about a "Galilee" existing in the Mount of Olives.¹

ROB. M'CHEYNE EDGAR.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD OF ZECHARIAH XI.

WITH all due deference to the learned and gifted writers who have done so much for our understanding of the Minor Prophets, it seems to me that a good deal of constructive work remains yet to be done. And in especial I venture to think that none of them gives an intelligible and consistent account of the Shepherd of Zechariah xi. That he is a personage of extraordinary interest is manifest, from whatever point of view you regard him. Whether you think of him as having had an historical existence, or as a creature of the prophetic imagination—as a parable, in fact—or again as a shadow cast before by the Christ of God, you perceive at once that you are face to face with questions as difficult as they are attractive.

The following is an attempt—which in abler hands may become more fruitful of good results—to make a connected whole of the story, and to indicate where and how the New Testament type rises out of it. It has pleased God that the story should be presented in a guise which is singularly abrupt, obscure, and even fragmentary. That fact should make us very cautious in coming to conclusions, and modest in asserting them; but it does not alter our conviction that the Good Shepherd had a very distinct and definite existence in the vision of the prophet. It was no blurred and broken image which mirrored itself upon his soul. *We* may fail to reconstruct the image now, possibly

¹ For a full consideration of the discrepancies in the Resurrection-histories see *The Gospel of a Risen Saviour*, pp. 86-134.