

## Chapter 4: Healing and Bloodshed

In the previous chapter we saw that God gave Moses three signs to serve as credentials and that the first of these, in which Moses' rod was transformed into a serpent, functions well as a symbol of Jesus' power of exorcism. We now come to Moses' second sign, in which he causes his hand suddenly to become leprous and then just as quickly heals himself. The order of this sign, in second place after the casting down of the rod/serpent, is significant because in all three synoptic Gospels Jesus must overcome Satan before he can begin to heal disease.

After Jesus' baptism but before he can begin his ministry, he treks alone into the Judean desert (or "wilderness") where Satan engages him in a psychological battle. Jesus is tempted to misuse his God-given authority in various ways but refuses to do so. In Matthew the contest ends when Jesus dismisses Satan with the command, *Hupage*, "Go!"<sup>1</sup> This is the same command Jesus later issues to evil spirits when driving them out of a Gadarene man and his companion.<sup>2</sup>

The defeat of Satan by Jesus in their desert encounter is not itself an exorcism, but it is the first manifestation of the power by which Jesus goes on to free people from demonic possession. Satan is forced to retreat without finding a foothold in Jesus' personality.<sup>3</sup>

After his initial victory over the devil, Jesus commences preaching about the kingdom of God and curing his listeners of various maladies. In Matthew the first healing that is recounted in detail occurs after the Sermon on the Mount. A man with leprosy kneels before Jesus and entreats him, "Lord, if you are willing, you can make me clean." Jesus holds out his hand and touches the man, saying, "I am willing," and then, "Be clean!" The man is immediately cured. Jesus tells him to go show himself to the priest and to "offer the gift Moses commanded, as a testimony to them."<sup>4</sup>

We will return to the healing of the leper in Matthew after we compare the way the other evangelists treat the duel with Satan and the order of Jesus' miracles. John does not help us with this question because it skips over the temptation and early Galilean healings and alludes only in the most general way to Jesus' power of exorcism.<sup>5</sup> Mark and Luke cover more of the key events, but in their own distinct ways. Mark mentions Jesus' desert ordeal only briefly and Luke reverses the order of the last two temptations as compared with Matthew. Neither Mark nor Luke leave any doubt that Jesus

withstands Satan's testing, but they omit the emphatic rebuke that in Matthew's narrative prompts Satan to withdraw. Instead, they demonstrate Jesus' defeat of the devil by giving a dramatic account of an exorcism just before their first episode of healing.

The exorcism occurs as Jesus begins teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum. A man in the audience who is possessed by a spirit shouts, "What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are—the Holy One of God!" Jesus orders the spirit to be silent and then commands it, "Come out of him!" The demon shakes the man violently and departs from him "with a shriek."<sup>6</sup>

Jesus' first healing, as related by Mark and Luke, occurs immediately after the exorcism in the synagogue. When worship is finished, Jesus goes with James and John to the home of Simon Peter and finds Peter's mother-in-law in bed with a fever. Jesus approaches the sick woman and takes her hand. "The fever left her and she began to wait on them."<sup>7</sup>

Mark and Luke therefore maintain the order of the signs, with the sign of power over the serpent preceding that of power over disease, although they reflect this order slightly differently than does Matthew. Something else about Mark's narrative that bears comparison with Matthew's is the importance of Jesus' hand. In order to heal Simon Peter's mother-in-law, Jesus "takes her hand," meaning that he holds her hand in his; in Matthew, Jesus cures the man with leprosy by "reaching out his hand" and touching him. Throughout the synoptics we find that the touch of Jesus' hand, while not necessary to every healing, is the principal means by which healing takes place.<sup>8</sup>

The use of Jesus' hand or hands to accomplish healings is another point of resemblance to the second sign of Moses, which involves Moses' hand. The subject of Moses is raised by Jesus himself after the cure of the man with leprosy, quoted above from Matthew 8:1-4. Jesus instructs the man to present himself to the priest and offer the appropriate sacrifice as "Moses commanded" in the Law.

To do as he was ordered the man would have to give the priest a testimony about Jesus' ability to heal what was at the time an intractable condition. The priest, who would be versed in the events of Moses' life, might be led to reflect on Moses' power over leprosy as a

proof of his claim to represent God. He might also remember that Moses' sister Miriam was stricken with leprosy as punishment for the sin of rebellion and afterward was healed through the intervention of Moses. These stories, found in the second and fourth Bible books (Exodus and Numbers), would have had even more significance to priests than to other Jews of the day since the priestly class was made up largely of Sadducees who held that the Pentateuch (first five books) was the only part of the Scriptures to have been divinely inspired.

Finally, the priest may have sensed the importance of Jesus having healed a leper given the harsh quarantine measures the Mosaic Law enjoins upon such people. The Law portrays skin disease, a corruption of the flesh, very much as it does sin, a corruption of the heart and spirit. Like Adam and Eve, who were expelled from the garden of God for their sin, lepers were forbidden to live within the cities and villages of Israel. The leper was required to advertise his loathsome condition by wearing torn clothes, letting his hair become unkempt, covering the lower part of his face and crying out "Unclean!" to any healthy person who might be tempted to approach him. Lepers were commanded to live in their own ghettos separate from other Israelites.<sup>9</sup>

In Biblical Hebrew, the word for "unclean" used to describe leprosy is also the word used of uncleanness due to sin. The same is true in Biblical Greek. And in either language, the "cleansing" of leprosy may be described using the same word as that for the "cleansing" of sins. The leper healed in Matthew asks to be made "clean," *katharizo*, and Jesus uses the same word in healing him, saying, "Be clean!" The book of 1 John, a letter to early Christian congregations, says that "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus, his Son, purifies [*katharizo*] us from all sin."<sup>10</sup>

The connection between sin and leprosy is of special interest given the symbolism of the second sign of Moses, where leprosy must represent all forms of disease. Evidence for that interpretation is found in a story from Mark's Gospel, where sins come up in connection, not with leprosy, but with paralysis. Jesus says to a paralytic man, "Son, your sins are forgiven." Certain scribes who are present consider this blasphemous, since only God can forgive sins. Their learning would

have told them that insofar as forgiveness was possible it could be obtained only through priestly services at the temple. Jesus was claiming to wield God's own authority, supreme over even the Law of Moses and the House of the Lord in Jerusalem.

Jesus senses the scribes' disapproval "in his spirit" and asks them, "Which is easier: to say to the paralytic, 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Get up, take your mat and walk'?" Jesus then shows his authority over human infirmity by healing the man. "He got up, took his mat and walked out in full view of them all."<sup>11</sup>

The passage does not claim that an ailment such as paralysis is a punishment for a specific sin; when the disciples try to make such a connection in the case of a blind man, Jesus dismisses it.<sup>12</sup> It does, however, imply a general relationship between sin and disease. In the book of Romans Paul says that ultimately death results from sin, and when death comes, disease is most often the door by which it enters.<sup>13</sup>

The relationship between sin and disease in the New Testament flows naturally out of the Old. We have already noted the case of Moses' sister Miriam. A more detailed and dramatic story is found in the fifth chapter of 2 Kings, in which a Syrian army officer with leprosy comes to the prophet Elisha seeking a cure. The officer, Naaman, is told to bathe in the Jordan river and is "cleansed" of his leprosy when he does so.

The cure prompts Naaman to forsake the idol gods of Syria and vow to worship only Yahweh, the God of Israel. As Naaman is on his way back to Syria Elisha's personal attendant Gehazi approaches him and, falsely claiming to speak for Elisha, asks Naaman for a gift. Elisha later unmasks Gehazi's fraud and as punishment strikes him with leprosy, declaring that "Naaman's leprosy will cling to you and to your descendants forever."<sup>14</sup> The story ends leaving Naaman cleansed, through baptism, not only of the disease of leprosy but of the sin of idolatry, while Gehazi has become guilty of the sins of greed and deceit and physically stricken as well.

### **Healing and Forgiveness in the Story of Hezekiah**

A relationship between sin and disease can also be detected in the final story of healing in the Old Testament. The incident takes place in the southern kingdom of Judah near the end of a long period

of moral and political decline likened by the prophet Isaiah to physical deterioration. “From the sole of your foot to the top of your head,” he writes to the kingdom of Judah, “there is no soundness—only wounds and welts and open sores, not cleansed or bandaged or soothed with oil.”<sup>15</sup>

This troubled state of affairs confronts the young man Hezekiah when he ascends the throne of Judah late in the eighth century B.C. King Hezekiah institutes reforms aimed at ending idolatry and reinstilling respect for the Mosaic Law. His program has only temporary success but his personal integrity is rewarded by two instances of divine deliverance. In one of them the formidable army of Assyria is forced to retreat from Judah when a large number of Assyrian troops suddenly and mysteriously die, slain by God’s angel according to the Scriptural account. In the other Hezekiah falls gravely ill but is miraculously healed, and is told through the prophet Isaiah that an additional fifteen years have been added to his life.

Hezekiah sees his recovery as evidence of God mercifully having overlooked his sins. “In your love you kept me from the pit of destruction,” he says in a prayer of thanksgiving. “You have put all my sins behind your back.”<sup>16</sup> Besides confirming the connection between sin and disease on one hand and forgiveness and healing on the other, what happens to Hezekiah is noteworthy because one man, in this case the ruler of the southern Israelite kingdom, is afflicted in a way that mirrors the nation as a whole.

God likens the waywardness of his people to cuts, bruises and running sores. And when Hezekiah falls ill the sickness is due to a boil, a skin sore, which is either malignant or infected so seriously that it threatens his life. It is as if Hezekiah is made to bear in his own flesh the morally ulcerous condition that has threatened the national existence first of Israel and then of Judah. God has said that the sores in the nation’s body have not been treated and bandaged. When Hezekiah pleads for relief, God tells Isaiah that healing will take place when a poultice is applied to the boil. Hezekiah becomes a representative of Israel, experiencing its fatal disease and receiving the life-restoring treatment God longs to provide for the nation: “The Lord binds up the bruises of his people and heals the wounds he inflicted.”<sup>17</sup>

Hezekiah suffered from one boil, a single physical

## Gospel Mysteries / 4-6

manifestation of the nation's illness. The full picture painted in Isaiah the first chapter is more harrowing, consisting of multiple injuries as would result from a vicious attack:

Why should you be beaten anymore?  
Why do you persist in rebellion?  
Your whole head is injured,  
your whole heart afflicted.  
From the sole of your foot to the top of your head  
there is no soundness—  
only wounds and welts  
and open sores. —Isaiah 1:5-6.

Overshadowing the limited application of this passage to Hezekiah is its ultimate fulfillment upon Jesus. As we saw in Chapter 2, Jesus endured separate beatings from Jewish and Roman soldiers. He then was “scourged,” *phragelloo*, meaning beaten on the back or abdomen with a many-stranded, studded whip designed to tear the skin of the victim. Jesus did not die during scourging, as prisoners occasionally did, so he was suspended from rough timbers by means of square-edged iron nails driven through his hands and heels. From his scalp, pierced by a crown of thorns to his feet, skewered by nails, he became the horrifying embodiment of Isaiah 1:5-6.

The agony of Jesus' death was, according to the Scriptures, a necessary part of the healing work begun during his ministry. In order to put an end to sin, disease and suffering, Jesus had to take them upon himself. “Surely he took up our infirmities and carried our sorrows,” says the famous “suffering servant” passage of Isaiah. “He was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed.”<sup>18</sup>

“He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree,” says the New Testament book of 1 Peter, “so that we might die to sins and live for righteousness; by his wounds you have been healed.”<sup>19</sup> In 1 Peter as in Isaiah, expiation of sin and healing of disease blend inseparably. In these we have an identifier that reveals the full significance of the second of Moses' signs, requiring Moses to take upon himself the plague of leprosy for one terrifying moment only to rid himself of it the next.

During his brief time on earth God's Son looked like anyone

else and became subject to the physical sufferings common to fallen humanity. “God,” Paul writes, “sent his Son in the likeness of sinful [spiritually ‘leprous’] flesh.”<sup>20</sup> Jesus faced the hardships that were part of growing up in the household of a Jewish laborer in first century Galilee. Foregoing the joys of marriage and family he undertook an exhausting ministry that yielded no material rewards to speak of and generated insults and threats in as great a measure as acclaim and appreciation. He burdened himself further by “stretching out his hand” to perform healings, since healing apparently taxed Jesus’ physical stamina.<sup>21</sup> Finally, during his execution Jesus endured torture that approximated the effects of an ulcerous, wasting sickness.

According to 1 Peter 2:24, Jesus’ assumption of the penalty of sin had the goal of bringing sin, and with it disease, to an end. Just as Moses rids himself of the leprosy he takes upon his hand, Jesus through his triumph on the cross leaves behind the effects of sin and gains the power eventually to end it throughout the universe. Paul in his discussion of sin and death in Romans says that Jesus “died to sin once for all” and that “death no longer has mastery over him.”<sup>22</sup> The same thought is repeated in Hebrews, which says that Jesus “did away with sin by the sacrifice of himself.”<sup>23</sup>

### **The Sign of Water and Blood**

By drawing our attention to the circumstances of Jesus’ death, the second of Moses’ signs leads naturally into the third, the pouring out of water that becomes blood on the ground. In Chapter 2 we saw in detail that “water” gushing out of a “rock” is an illustration of the infusion of God’s Spirit into the early Christian congregation and, even before that, of the flow of inspired teachings and miraculous deeds from Jesus during his ministry. For that reason Jesus can offer “living water” to the woman at the well of Sychar and can tell his disciples that “the words I have spoken to you are spirit and they are life.”<sup>24</sup> A change occurs at the crucifixion, when it is no longer simply the water of divine wisdom that pours out of Jesus, but drops of real blood.

Jesus implies the two-fold provision of water and blood in Mark when he says that “even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.”<sup>25</sup> Jesus

came to serve mankind, to be a “water carrier.” When guests arrived at a house in the Middle East of Jesus’ day, the first duty of the servant was to bring water to wash their feet.<sup>26</sup> Jesus performed this act for the apostles at the Last Supper, perhaps with the water they earlier saw being taken to the house where the supper was held.<sup>27</sup> The washing was understood later as representative of the spiritual cleansing Jesus accomplished by means of the “water” of the “word.”<sup>28</sup>

If “to serve” means to provide water, then “to give life” means to offer blood. The word for “life” at Mark 10:45 is the Greek word for “soul,” *psuche*. According to the Septuagint rendering of Leviticus 17:11, the “life [*psuche*, soul] of flesh is its blood.” Jesus later confirms that his service to the world will culminate in the shedding of his own blood when he gives wine to the apostles and tells them, “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many.”<sup>29</sup> The verb he uses for “poured out,” *ekcheo*, is a form of the same verb found in the Septuagint at Exodus 4:9 to describe the “pouring out” of water/blood by Moses.

From these identifiers we can infer the symbolism of water from Jesus changing to blood even if we limit ourselves to the synoptic Gospels. But there is a reason why this water motif only comes to the fore in John, having to do with the special place held by that book. John was in all likelihood the last of the canonical Gospels to be written. It contains only an abbreviated version of Jesus’ teachings, as can be seen by comparing its contents with the detailed ethics from Matthew’s “Sermon on the Mount.” The author takes for granted his readers’ acquaintance with Jesus’ themes of the nearness of God’s kingdom, the need for moral purity free from self-righteousness, and principled compassion toward others. He also assumes his readers’ access to information about the Lord’s Supper, which he alludes to but fails to narrate.<sup>30</sup>

John’s Gospel effectively is the “last word” in terms of purported eye-witness testimony to Jesus of Nazareth, and as such it leaves no doubt as to the issue raised by his life, ministry and death. John emphasizes that acceptance of Jesus as God’s unique Son is crucial to salvation and that Jesus’ identity arose as a point of controversy early and repeatedly during his ministry. Since it wraps up the testimony about Jesus first presented in the synoptics, we would



expect John's Gospel to reflect most clearly the final, deciding sign of Moses, the sign of water and blood.

John not only contains straightforward statements about spiritual water coming from Jesus, it has more occurrences of the Greek word for water, *hudor*, than the three synoptic Gospels combined. John also contains information not found in Matthew, Mark or Luke about the shedding of Jesus' blood. By saying that Jesus was beaten, scourged and finally crucified the synoptics necessarily indicate that Jesus bled, but only John makes the pouring out of blood explicit, saying that "one of the soldiers pierced Jesus' side with a spear, bringing a sudden flow of blood and water."<sup>31</sup>

The flow of blood and water described in John is much ridiculed for the simple reason that it is said to occur after Jesus' death, and corpses do not bleed. The narrative in these verses is not so easily discounted, however. The breaking of the legs of the men crucified with Jesus is another gruesome event recorded only in John. Breaking a victim's legs forced him to hang heavily from his outstretched arms, constricting the chest cavity and causing suffocation after several minutes. Only someone familiar with Roman crucifixion would be likely to supply this detail.

Physiologically, what John describes is improbable, not impossible. Most importantly in the present context, it underscores the fulfillment of the third sign of Moses. It is as if John shows us the actual transformation of water to blood as it spills onto the ground. The narrative of John 19:34 is a graphic token that the expenditure of Jesus' energy during his ministry has turned into the expenditure of his life at a spot called "The Place of the Skull."<sup>32</sup>

As we will see shortly, John's Gospel is not alone in reporting a visible event that illuminates the invisible reality of Jesus pouring out his life. But in John that reality jumps off the page as if printed in boldface type. It does so as well in the letter of 1 John, which says that Jesus "did not come by water only" like John the Baptist, who delivered an inspired call for repentance accompanied by water baptism, "but by water and blood"—blood that was poured out on the ground as sacrificial blood routinely was under the Mosaic Law.<sup>33</sup>

In John the sign of water and blood is foreshadowed at the very outset of Jesus' ministry, when he turns water into wine at a wedding feast in the Galilean city of Cana. John calls this event,

recorded in none of the synoptics, “the first of Jesus’ miraculous signs.”<sup>34</sup> In the Old Testament wine is sometimes compared to blood.<sup>35</sup> Therefore, to turn water into wine is to turn it into a kind of blood, which lawfully can be consumed because it is illustrative rather than literal.

The setting of the miracle at Cana also is revealing inasmuch as wine at a wedding has to do with joy. The joyous relationship between Jesus and the church is compared to that of a bridegroom and a bride, and the gathering of believers to Christ at his return is likened to a wedding feast.<sup>36</sup> The pouring out of Jesus’ blood therefore involves the paradox that ultimate happiness has been purchased at the cost of ultimate suffering. In Mark Jesus mingles the symbolism of wine as sacrificial blood with that of wine as a drink to accompany celebration. “I tell you the truth, I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God.”<sup>37</sup>

In *Gospel Fictions* skeptic Randel Helms writes about a connection between the signs of Moses and the miracle at the wedding in Cana.<sup>38</sup> But to him the only resemblance involves the changing of one thing into another. Moses changed water into blood, he says, so the writer of John had to invent a story in which Jesus could transform water into something else. He suggests that wine was chosen in imitation of pagan legends about water being changed into wine. Having failed to notice the correlation between the first two signs of Moses and Jesus’ works of exorcism and healing, Helms stumbles blindly past clues about meaning of the crucial third sign as well. The reason is that Helms contemplates only those fulfillments that can be dismissed as the evangelists’ inventions.

Any attempt to explain away John’s theme of water from Jesus turning into wine or blood must account for the way that theme mirrors the third sign of Moses. It must do the same for miniature fulfillments in the synoptic Gospels. One of these is an act performed by Pilate and recorded only in Matthew. When Pilate realizes that the riotous crowd calling for Jesus’ crucifixion will not be quelled by any milder measure, he takes water and washes his hands in front of the mob, saying, “I am innocent of this man’s blood.”<sup>39</sup>

Washing the hands as a declaration of innocence has a long tradition behind it, as can be seen from a reference to it in the Mosaic Law at Deuteronomy 21:6. In Pilate’s case it is less than convincing,

not least because he himself insists that he has the power to spare Jesus if he decides to do so.<sup>40</sup> Instead, the gesture evokes a picture of Jesus' blood already covering Pilate's hands. Washing blood off the hands of a Roman governor would entail clear water becoming bloody upon being poured out, since a man of status ordinarily washed his hands by having a servant pour water over them from a vessel.<sup>41</sup> In any case, washing blood-drenched hands would require that clear water become reddened in the process.

The other portrayal is in Luke, and occurs as Jesus is praying in the Garden of Gethsemane just before his arrest. "He prayed more earnestly," with the approach of his arrest, "and his sweat was like drops of blood falling to the ground."<sup>42</sup> The absence of verses 43 and 44 from some of the oldest manuscripts of Luke's Gospel raises the possibility that they were inserted into the book. From the fact that they were being quoted as early as the second century we know they were added not long after the original writing and may represent an independent but not necessarily fictional tradition. As likely as not, the source of these verses is an anecdote reflecting what one or more of the disciples saw during the course of the hours spent in Gethsemane.

The Greek wording does not say that Jesus' sweat actually became bloody or even red in color. Apparently, the heavy perspiration formed large, dense drops that in the shadowy light looked dark, "as if drops of blood"—*hosei thromboi aimatos*. Besides conveying the great stress Jesus was under as he contemplated the ordeal ahead of him, the image of water from his body turning to blood as it falls to the ground forms a vivid reprise of Moses' third sign.

### **The Continuing Testimony of the Signs**

How do we explain the typological correspondence between the signs given to Moses and the signs performed by Jesus, the "greater Moses"? Can coincidence, already creaking like an overloaded wheelbarrow, stand to have more weight thrown upon it? Manipulation by the Gospel writers is the only other naturalistic explanation available, but it hardly is more satisfactory than pure chance. Since internal evidence from the Gospels indicates that they

## Gospel Mysteries / 4-12

were were written at different places and times, the evangelists would not have been in a position to conspire with one another even if they had wanted to do so. And if we assume in the teeth of the evidence that they did conspire, we would still be left with nothing better than coincidence to explain the identifiers from the Old Testament, such as the passages from Isaiah and Ezekiel, that help to align the signs of Moses and the signs of Jesus.

Those signs in fact have yet one more point of correspondence to take note of. At the burning bush God tells Moses that if Israel fails to believe because of the first two signs, the third will convince them. Ordinarily this kind of detail is included in a story with a view toward what will occur later on. Strangely, however, nothing is said about Moses displaying the first two signs, encountering skepticism, and then winning his people over with the third. The account says simply that he performed the signs and the people believed, leaving us in the dark about whether all three of them proved necessary. It has been suggested that the third sign was lacking in the original narrative.<sup>43</sup> But we know from its presence in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Septuagint that the third sign was part of the story long before Jesus was born.

The enigma of the third sign is resolved when we look not to its original enactment but to the fulfillment in Jesus. Crowds flocked to Jesus to see him perform exorcisms and healings but the number of people who became steadfast disciples was small. The book of Acts says that in the weeks after the crucifixion only a few dozen believers were meeting together for worship.<sup>44</sup>

Then, at the Jewish festival of Pentecost, the disciples were imbued with the Spirit of God and began preaching to Jews and proselytes who had come to Jerusalem from the far corners of the Roman empire. The Pentecost sermon of Peter reviews briefly Jesus' career and then says that Jesus had been delivered up to death "by the plan and foreknowledge of God" only to be resurrected three days later.<sup>45</sup> Three thousand or so Jews were so struck by the message that they were baptized as disciples. The large-scale conversions necessary to establish the Christian church became possible only after the pouring out of Jesus' blood at the crucifixion. The third sign did indeed engender faith—committed faith—in a way that the first two signs did not.

In the view of Randel Helms the only hard facts we can take from the Gospels are that Jesus of Nazareth was a wandering teacher or rabbi, that to some extent he relieved sick people and those thought to be in the grip of the demons and that he was executed by the Romans. His opinion coincides closely with the collective judgment of the Jesus Seminar.<sup>46</sup> The critics who arrived at these conclusions had no inkling that they were pinpointing the qualifications foreshadowed by the signs of Moses.

We noted at the beginning of the previous chapter that Jesus himself mentioned yet another sign, “the sign of Jonah,” as confirmation of his identity. To it we turn next.

## Gospel Mysteries / 4-14

- 1 Matt 4:10.
- 2 Matt 8:32.
- 3 John 14:30.
- 4 Matt 8:1-4.
- 5 John 12:31.
- 6 Mark 1:23-25; Luke 4:33-35.
- 7 Mark 1:29-31; Luke 4:38-39.
- 8 Cf. Matt 9:29; Mark 5:22-23; 6:2, 5; 7:32; 8:25; Luke 13:12-13.
- 9 Lev 13:45-46.
- 10 1 John 1:7.
- 11 Mark 2:8-11.
- 12 John 9:1-3.
- 13 Rom 5:12.
- 14 2 Kgs 5:27.
- 15 Isa 1:6; cf. Jer 6:7.
- 16 Isa 38:17.
- 17 Isa 30:26.
- 18 Isa 53:4-5.
- 19 1 Pet 2:24.
- 20 Rom 8:3, *NASB*.
- 21 Cf. Luke 6:19; 8:46.
- 22 Rom 6:9-10.
- 23 Heb 9:26.
- 24 John 4:10; 6:63.
- 25 Mark 10:45.
- 26 Cf. Luke 7:44.
- 27 Mark 14:13.
- 28 John 13:5-7; Eph 5:26.
- 29 Mark 14:24.
- 30 John 6:53-57.
- 31 John 19:32-34.
- 32 Mark 15:22.
- 33 1 John 5:6; Exod 29:12; Lev 4:7.
- 34 John 2:11.
- 35 Gen 49:11; Deut 32:14; Isa 63:3.
- 36 Matt 22:2; 25:1; Mark 2:19; Luke 12:36; John 3:29.
- 37 Mark 14:24-25.
- 38 Helms, *Gospel Fictions*, 86-87.
- 39 Matt 27:24.
- 40 John 19:10.
- 41 Cf. 2 Kgs 3:11.
- 42 Luke 22:41-44.
- 43 Dewey M. Beegle, *Moses the Servant of Jahweh* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 79.
- 44 Acts 1:15.
- 45 Acts 2:22-23.

- 46 Along with exorcism, healing, teaching and execution by Romans the Jesus Seminar includes Jesus' association with outcasts and sinners as being historically probable. See Robert Funk and the Jesus Seminar, *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), 527.

Gospel Mysteries / 4-16

**This Page Left Blank Intentionally**