

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION:

AN INQUIRY

INTO

THE REALITY OF DIVINE
REVELATION.

COMPLETE IN ONE VOLUME.

SIXTH EDITION.

CAREFULLY REVISED.

TORONTO AND CHICAGO:
ROSE-BELFORD PUBLISHING COMPANY.

MDCCCLXXIX.

BL2775

260814

SZ

1879

The
Dif
Pre
Illo
Imp

Its
Cha
The
The
The

Chri
Clai
Nec
Mira
The
Rep
Mira
The
Dile
Mut
Doct
The
Mira

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE.
The Duty of Adequate Inquiry Admitted and Neglected	57
Difficulty of Investigating Religious Truth	57
Prevalent Characteristic of Popular Theology in England	57
Illogical Treatment	58
Importance of the Question : Is Christianity a Supernatural Divine Revelation or Not ?	58
Its Present Urgency	58
Character of the Investigation Required	59
The Two Classes of Orthodox Christians	59
Their Conflicting Views Enforce the Necessity of Inquiry	60
The Spirit in which this Inquiry should be Undertaken	61

PART I.

MIRACLES.

CHAPTER I.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity Professes to be Supernatural in Form and Essence	63
Claim to be a Divine Revelation Common to Other Religions	63
Necessity of Miraculous Evidence	64
Miracles Inseparable from Christianity	67
The Reality of Miracles the Vital Question	67
Representation of Miracles in the Bible	69
Miracles Divine and Satanic	70
The Origin of Miracles Avowedly Doubtful	71
Dilemma Arising from their Dual Character	72
Mutual Dependence of Doctrine and Miracles	73
Doctrine Made the Criterion of Miracles	75
The Doctrines are Beyond the Criterion of Reason	77
Miracles Incompetent to Perform their Evidential Function	79

CHAPTER II.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE.

	PAGE.
English and German Critics - - - - -	80
Analysis of Miracles - - - - -	81
Unknown Law - - - - -	83
Higher Law - - - - -	85
Instance of an Efficient Cause - - - - -	86
Progressive Succession of Laws - - - - -	87
The Efficient Cause Subject to Laws - - - - -	89
Antecedent Incredibility - - - - -	90
Invariability of Law - - - - -	91
The Divine Design of Revelation - - - - -	92
Such a Design Excluded by the Order of Nature - - - - -	94
The Law of Progress - - - - -	95
Miraculous and Incredible are Convertible Terms - - - - -	96

CHAPTER III.

REASON IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE.

The Argument from Experience - - - - -	98
Assumption of a Personal Deity - - - - -	102
Anthropomorphic Divinity - - - - -	103
Antecedent Incredibility of Miracles - - - - -	112
Dr. Farrar's Misconception of the Argument - - - - -	113
Mill's Criticism on Hume - - - - -	114
Paley's Argument against Hume - - - - -	119
Nature of the Evidence for Miracles which is Requisite - - - - -	122

CHAPTER IV.

THE AGE OF MIRACLES.

The Miracles of Brief Periods alone Believed to be Genuine - - - - -	124
Competency of the Witnesses - - - - -	125
Superstitious Character of the Jews - - - - -	127
The Septuagint Version - - - - -	127
The Book of Tobit - - - - -	128
The Book of Enoch - - - - -	129
Angelology of the Jews - - - - -	131
Demonology of the Jews - - - - -	134
Sorcery and Magic - - - - -	137
Exorcism of Demons - - - - -	139
Preternatural Portents - - - - -	140
Cosmical Theories of the Fathers - - - - -	143

CHAPTER V.

THE PERMANENT STREAM OF MIRACULOUS PRETENSION.

	PAGE.
The Witnesses of Miracles incompetent - - - - -	153
The Writers of the New Testament shared the popular Superstitions of the Jews - - - - -	154
Demoniacal Possession - - - - -	155
Witchcraft denounced in the Bible - - - - -	156
Witchcraft proscribed by Church and State - - - - -	158
Belief in Witchcraft dispelled - - - - -	159
Application of the Argument to Miracles - - - - -	160
Christian and Pagan Miracles - - - - -	161
The Claim of Speciality for Christian Miracles - - - - -	163
The Continuance of Miraculous Power - - - - -	164
Ecclesiastical Miracles - - - - -	165
Miracles recorded by St. Augustine - - - - -	172
The Comparative Evidence for these and Scriptare Miracles - - - - -	177
The Miracles of the Saints - - - - -	182

CHAPTER VI.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO IGNORANCE AND SUPERSTITION.

The Classification of Miracles - - - - -	184
Absence of Distinctive Character in Gospel Miracles - - - - -	186
Comparison of Evidence - - - - -	187
The Testimony of Martyrdom - - - - -	188
Gospel Miracles Sink in the stream of Miraculous Pretension - - - - -	189
The Early and Later Christian Ages - - - - -	190
The Test of Knowledge - - - - -	192
The Cessation of Miracles - - - - -	193
Hereditary Belief - - - - -	195
The Narrative of Miracles the Point really discussed - - - - -	196
Nature of the Evidence required - - - - -	198

PART II.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

INTRODUCTION.

Nature of the Examination to be Undertaken - - - - -	199
--	-----

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
Clement of Rome - - - - -	201
The Epistle of Barnabas - - - - -	212
The Pastor of Hermas - - - - -	228

CHAPTER II.

The Epistles of Ignatius - - - - -	230
The Epistle of Polycarp - - - - -	241

CHAPTER III.

Justin Martyr - - - - -	247
-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IV.

Hegesippus - - - - -	346
Papias of Hierapolis - - - - -	355

CHAPTER V.

The Clementines - - - - -	384
The Epistle to Diognetus - - - - -	408

CHAPTER VI.

Basilides - - - - -	411
Valentinus - - - - -	420

CHAPTER VII.

Marcion - - - - -	436
-------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

Tatian - - - - -	481
Dionysius of Corinth - - - - -	490

CHAPTER IX.

Melito of Sardis - - - - -	497
Claudius Apollinaris - - - - -	505
Athenagoras - - - - -	509
The Epistle of Vienne and Lyons - - - - -	515

CONTENTS.

ix

CHAPTER X.

	Page.
Ptolemæus and Heracleon - - - - -	519
Celsus - - - - -	534
The Canon of Muratori - - - - -	540
Results - - - - -	547

PART III.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

CHAPTER I.

The External Evidence - - - - -	549
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER II.

The Authorship and Character of the Fourth Gospel - - - - -	640
---	-----

CHAPTER III.

Conclusions - - - - -	698
-----------------------	-----

PART IV.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

The External Evidence - - - - -	709
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER II.

Evidence regarding the Authorship - - - - -	720
---	-----

CHAPTER III.

Historical Value of the Work. Design and Composition	PAGE.
- - -	749

CHAPTER IV.

Historical Value of the Work, continued. Primitive Christianity	- 780
---	-------

CHAPTER V.

Historical Value of the Work, continued. Stephen the Martyr	- - 804
---	---------

CHAPTER VI.

Historical Value of the Work, continued. Philip in Samaria. Peter and Cornelius	- - - - - 828
--	---------------

CHAPTER VII.

Historical Value of the Work, continued. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles	- - - - - 843
--	---------------

PART V.

THE DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES.

CHAPTER I.

The Epistles and the Apocalypse	- - - - - 921
---------------------------------	---------------

CHAPTER II.

The Evidence of Paul	- - - - - 924
----------------------	---------------

PART VI.
THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
The Relation of Evidence to its Subject - - - - -	971

CHAPTER II.

The Evidence of the Gospels - - - - -	978
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER III.

The Evidence of Paul - - - - -	1025
--------------------------------	------

The
pub
bee
all
few
hov
of r
this
tha
nev
wit
nee
suc
tain
the

T
of a
hav
siti
not
mir
phi
com
equ
Tho
but
is t
nev
only
vali
inv
whi
not
are

PREFACE

TO THE SIXTH EDITION.

THIS work has scarcely yet been twelve months before the public, but both in this country, in America, and elsewhere, it has been subjected to such wide and searching criticism by writers of all shades of opinion, that I may perhaps be permitted to make a few remarks, and to review some of my Reviewers. I must first, however, beg leave to express my gratitude to that large majority of my critics who have bestowed generous commendation upon this work, and liberally encouraged its completion. I have to thank others, who, differing totally from my conclusions, have nevertheless temperately argued against them, for the courtesy with which they have treated an opponent whose views must necessarily have offended them, and I can only say that, whilst such a course has commanded my unfeigned respect, it has certainly not diminished the attention with which I have followed their arguments.

There are two serious misapprehensions of the purpose and line of argument of this work which I desire to correct. Some critics have objected that, if I had succeeded in establishing the proposition advanced in the first part, the second and third parts need not have been written: in fact, that the historical argument against miracles is only necessary in consequence of the failure of the philosophical. Now I contend that the historical is the necessary complement of the philosophical argument, and that both are equally requisite to completeness in dealing with the subject. The preliminary affirmation is not that miracles are impossible, but that they are antecedently incredible. The counter allegation is that, although miracles may be antecedently incredible, they nevertheless actually took place. It is, therefore, necessary, not only to establish the antecedent incredibility, but to examine the validity of the allegation that certain miracles occurred, and this involves the historical inquiry into the evidence for the Gospels which occupies the second and third parts. Indeed many will not acknowledge the case to be complete until other witnesses are questioned in a succeeding volume.

The view I have taken is clearly supported by Mr. Mill. In his recently published "Essays on Religion," he directly replies to the question whether any evidence can suffice to prove a Divine Revelation, and defines what the nature and amount of that evidence must be. He shows that internal evidences, that is to say, the indications which the Revelation itself is thought to furnish of its divine origin, can only be negative. The bad moral character of the doctrines of an alleged Revelation, he considers, may be good reason for rejecting it, "but the excellence of their morality can never entitle us to ascribe to them a supernatural origin; for we cannot have conclusive reason for believing that the human faculties were incompetent to find out moral doctrines of which the human faculties can perceive and recognise the excellence. A Revelation, therefore," he decides, "cannot be proved divine unless by external evidence; that is, by the exhibition of supernatural facts."¹ He maintains that it is possible to prove the reality of a supernatural fact if it actually occurred; and after showing the great preponderance of evidence against miracles, or their antecedent incredibility, he proceeds: "Against this weight of negative evidence we have to set such positive evidence as is produced in attestation of exceptions; in other words, the positive evidences of miracles."² This is precisely what I have done. In order to show that Mr. Mill's estimate of the nature of this positive evidence for miracles does not essentially differ from the results of this work, the following lines may be quoted:

"But the evidence of miracles, at least to Protestant Christians, is not, in our day, of this cogent description. It is not the evidence of our senses, but of witnesses, and even this not at first hand, but resting on the attestation of books and traditions. And even in the case of the original eye-witnesses, the supernatural facts asserted on their alleged testimony are not of the transcendent character supposed in our example, about the nature of which, or the impossibility of their having had a natural origin, there could be little room for doubt. On the contrary, the recorded miracles are, in the first place, generally such as it would have been extremely difficult to verify as matters of fact, and in the next place, are hardly ever beyond the possibility of having been brought about by human means, or by the spontaneous agencies of nature."

The second point to which I desire to refer is a statement which has frequently been made that, in the second and third parts, I endeavoured to prove that the four canonical Gospels were not written until the end of the second century. This error is, of course, closely connected with that which has just been discussed; but it is difficult to understand how any one who had taken the

¹ Three Essays on Religion, 1874, p. 216.

² *Ibid.* p. 234.

³ *Ibid.* p. 219.

slig
sta
is
den
fro
act
ble
for
occ
tru
lish
arg
pres
poss
mon
but
far s
it is
It
spec
been
vaili
chan
argu
reali
reali
estab
to th
mira
mira
some
give
tion,
ignor
that I
can h
relati
The
is the
comm
bound
discov
culati
tative
it is to

slightest trouble to ascertain the nature of the argument, and to state it fairly, could have fallen into it. The fact is that no attempt is made to prove anything with regard to the Gospels. The evidence for them is merely examined, and it is found that, so far from their affording sufficient testimony to warrant belief in the actual occurrence of miracles declared to be antecedently incredible, there is not a certain trace even of the existence of the Gospels for a century and a half after those miracles are alleged to have occurred, and nothing whatever to attest their authenticity and truth. This is a very different thing from an endeavour to establish some special theory of my own, and it is because this line of argument has not been understood, that some critics have expressed surprise at the decisive rejection of mere conjectures and possibilities as evidence. In a case of such importance, no testimony which is not clear and indubitable could be of any value, but the evidence producible for the canonical Gospels falls very far short even of ordinary requirements, and in relation to miracles it is scarcely deserving of serious consideration.

It has been argued that, even if there be no evidence for our special gospels, I admit that gospels very similar must early have been in existence, and that these equally represent the same prevailing belief as the canonical Gospels: consequently that I merely change, without shaking, the witnesses. Those who advance this argument, however, totally overlook the fact that it is not the reality of the superstitious belief which is in question, but the reality of the miracles, and the sufficiency of the witnesses to establish them. What such objectors urge practically amounts to this: that we should believe in the actual occurrence of certain miracles contradictory to all experience, out of a mass of false miracles which are reported but never really took place, because some unknown persons in an ignorant and superstitious age, who give no evidence of personal knowledge, or of careful investigation, have written an account of them, and other persons equally ignorant and superstitious have believed them. I venture to say that no one who advances the argument to which I am referring can have realized the nature of the question at issue, and the relation of miracles to the order of nature.

The last of these general objections to which I need now refer is the statement, that the difficulty with regard to the Gospels commences precisely where my examination ends, and that I am bound to explain how, if no trace of their existence is previously discoverable, the four Gospels are suddenly found in general circulation at the end of the second century, and quoted as authoritative documents by such writers as Irenæus. My reply is that it is totally unnecessary for me to account for this. No one ac-

quainted with the history of pseudonymic literature in the second century, and with the rapid circulation and ready acceptance of spurious works tending to edification, could for a moment regard the canonical position of any Gospel at the end of that century either as evidence of its authenticity or early origin. That which concerns us chiefly is not evidence regarding the end of the second but the beginning of the first century. Even if we took the statements of Irenæus, and later Fathers like the Alexandrian Clement, Tertullian, and Origen, about the Gospels, they are absolutely without value, except as personal opinion at a late date, for which no sufficient grounds are shown. Of the earlier history of those Gospels, there is not a distinct trace, except of a nature which altogether discredits them as witnesses for miracles.

After having carefully weighed the arguments which have been advanced against this work, I venture to express strengthened conviction of the truth of its conclusions. The best and most powerful reasons which able divines and apologists have been able to bring forward against its main argument have, I submit, not only failed to shake it, but have, by inference, shown it to be unassailable. Very many of those who have professedly advanced against the citadel itself have practically attacked nothing but some outlying fort, which was scarcely worth defence, whilst others, who have seriously attempted an assault, have shown that the Church has no artillery capable of making a practicable breach in the rationalistic stronghold. I say this solely in reference to the argument which I have taken upon myself to represent, and in no sense of my own individual share in its maintenance.

I must now address myself more particularly to two of my critics who, with great ability and learning, have subjected this work to the most elaborate and microscopic criticism of which personal earnestness and official zeal are capable. I am sincerely obliged to Professor Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott for the minute attention they have bestowed upon my book. I had myself directly attacked the views of Dr. Westcott, and of course could only expect him to do his best or his worst against me in reply: and I am not surprised at the vigour with which Dr. Lightfoot has assailed a work so opposed to principles which he himself holds sacred, although I may be permitted to express my regret that he has not done so in a spirit more worthy of the cause which he defends. In spite of hostile criticism of very unusual minuteness and ability, no flaw or error has been pointed out which in the slightest degree affects my main argument, and I consider that every point yet objected to by Dr. Lightfoot, or indicated by Dr. Westcott, might be withdrawn without at all weakening my position. These ob-

jec
iss
in
ref
me
it a
wo
by
call
Fat
ous
as s
vin
Gos
pos
tha
mig
scal
sile
of—
tha
Gos
ous
side
men
T
inin
find
if, b
are
Heg
that
any
But
prop
argu
Ligh
spac
lead
upon
sage

1 M
Review
2 "

jections, I may say, refer solely to details, and only follow side issues; but the attack, if impotent against the main position, has in many cases been insidiously directed against notes and passing references, and a plentiful sprinkling of such words as "misstatements" and "misrepresentations" along the line may have given it a formidable appearance, and malicious effect, which render it worth while once for all to meet it in detail.

The first point¹ to which I shall refer is an elaborate argument by Dr. Lightfoot regarding the "SILENCE OF EUSEBIUS."² I had called attention to the importance of considering the silence of the Fathers under certain conditions;³ and I might, omitting his curious limitation, adopt Dr. Lightfoot's opening comment upon this as singularly descriptive of the state of the case: "In one province, more especially, relating to the external evidences for the Gospels, silence occupies a prominent place." Dr. Lightfoot proposes to interrogate this "mysterious oracle," and he considers that "the response elicited will not be at all ambiguous." I might again agree with him, but that unambiguous response can scarcely be pronounced very satisfactory for the Gospels. Such silence may be very eloquent, but after all it is only the eloquence of—silence. I have not yet met with the argument anywhere that, because none of the early Fathers quote our canonical Gospels, or say anything with regard to them, the fact is unambiguous evidence that they were well acquainted with them, and considered them apostolic and authoritative. Dr. Lightfoot's argument from Silence is, for the present at least, limited to Eusebius.

The point on which the argument turns is this: After examining the whole of the extant writings of the early Fathers, and finding them a complete blank as regards the canonical Gospels, if, by their use of apocryphal works and other indications they are not evidence against them, I supplement this, in the case of Hegesippus, Papias, and Dionysius of Corinth, by the inference that, as Eusebius does not state that their lost works contained any evidence for the Gospels, they actually did not contain any. But before proceeding to discuss the point, it is necessary that a proper estimate should be formed of its importance to the main argument of my work. The evident labour which Professor Lightfoot has expended upon the preparation of his attack, the space devoted to it, and his own express words, would naturally lead most readers to suppose that it has almost a vital bearing upon my conclusions. Dr. Lightfoot says, after quoting the passages in which I appeal to the Silence of Eusebius:

¹ My reply to Dr. Lightfoot's first article may be found in the "Fortnightly Review," January, 1875.

² "Contemporary Review," January, 1875, p. 1 ff. ³ S. R., i., p. 212.

"This indeed is the fundamental assumption which lies at the basis of his reasoning; and the reader will not need to be reminded how much of the argument falls to pieces, if this basis should prove to be unsound. A wise master-builder would therefore have looked to his foundations first, and assured himself of their strength, before he piled up his fabric to this height. This our author has altogether neglected to do."¹

Towards the close of his article, after triumphantly expressing his belief that his "main conclusions are irrefragable," he further says:

"If they are, then the reader will not fail to see how large a part of the argument in 'Supernatural Religion' has crumbled to pieces."²

I do not doubt that Dr. Lightfoot sincerely believes this, but he must allow me to say that he is thoroughly mistaken in his estimate of the importance of the point, and that, as regards this work, the representations made in the above passages are a very strange exaggeration. I am unfortunately too familiar, in connection with criticism on this book, with instances of vast expenditure of time and strength in attacking points to which I attach no importance whatever, and which in themselves have scarcely any value. When writers, after an amount of demonstration which must have conveyed the impression that vital interests were at stake, have, at least in their own opinion, proved that I have omitted to dot an "i," or cross a "t," or insert an inverted comma, they have really left the question precisely where it was. Now, in the present instance, the whole extent of the argument which is based upon the silence of Eusebius is an inference regarding some lost works of three writers only, which might altogether be withdrawn without affecting the case. The object of my investigation is to discover what evidence actually exists in the works of early writers regarding our Gospels. In the fragments which remain of the works of three writers, Hegesippus, Papias, and Dionysius of Corinth, I do not find any evidence of acquaintance with these Gospels,—the works mentioned by Papias being, I contend, different from the existing Gospels attributed to Matthew and Mark. Whether I am right or not in this does not affect the present discussion. It is an unquestioned fact that Eusebius does not mention that the lost works of these writers contained any reference to, or information about, the Gospels, nor have we any statements from any other author to that effect. The objection of Dr. Lightfoot is limited to a denial that the silence of Eusebius warrants the inference that, because he does not state that these writers made quotations from or reference to undisputed canonical books, the lost works did not contain any;

¹ "Contemporary Review," January, 1875, p. 172.

² *Ibid.* p. 183.

it does not, however, extend to interesting information regarding those books, which he admits it was the purpose of Eusebius to record. To give Dr. Lightfoot's statements, which I am examining, the fullest possible support, however, suppose that I abandon Eusebius altogether, and do not draw any inference of any kind from him beyond his positive statements, how would my case stand? Simply as complete as it well could be: Hegesippus, Papias, and Dionysius do not furnish any evidence in favour of the Gospels. The reader, therefore, will not fail to see how serious a misstatement Dr. Lightfoot has made, and how little the argument of "Supernatural Religion" would be affected even if he established much more than he has attempted to do.

We may now proceed to consider Dr. Lightfoot's argument itself. He carefully and distinctly defines what he understands to be the declared intention of Eusebius in composing his history, as regards the mention or use of the disputed and undisputed canonical books in the writings of the Fathers, and in order to do him full justice I will quote his words, merely taking the liberty, for facility of reference, of dividing his statement into three paragraphs. He says:

"Eusebius therefore proposes to treat these two classes of writings in two different ways. This is the cardinal point of the passage.

"(1) Of the Antilegomena he pledges himself to record when any ancient writer employs any book belonging to their class (*τινες ἀποκαίς κέχρηται*);

"(2) but as regards the undisputed Canonical books he only professes to mention them, when such a writer has something to tell about them (*τίνα περὶ τῶν ἐνδοκίμων εἰρηται*). Any anecdote of interest respecting them, as also respecting the others (*τῶν μὴ τοιούτων*), will be recorded.

"(3) But in their case he nowhere leads us to expect that he will allude to mere quotations, however numerous and however precise."¹

In order to dispose of the only one of these points upon which we can differ, I will first refer to the third. Did Eusebius intend to point out mere quotations of the books which he considered undisputed? As a matter of fact, he actually did point such out in the case of the 1st Epistle of Peter and 1st Epistle of John, which he repeatedly and in the most emphatic manner declared to be undisputed.² This is admitted by Dr. Lightfoot. That he omitted to mention a reference to the Epistle to the Corinthians in the Epistle of Clement of Rome, or the reference by Theophilus to the Gospel of John, and other supposed quotations, might be

¹ "Contemporary Review." January, 1875, p. 173.

² I regret very much that some ambiguity in my language (S. R., i. p. 483) should have misled, and given Dr. Lightfoot much trouble. I used the word "quotation" in the sense of a use of the Epistle of Peter, and not in reference to any one sentence in Polycarp. I trust that in this edition I have made my meaning clear.

set down as much to oversight as intention. On the other hand, that he did mention disputed books is evidence only that he not only pledged himself to do so, but actually fulfilled his promise. Although much might be said upon this point, therefore, I consider it of so little importance that I do not intend to waste time in minutely discussing it. If my assertions with regard to the silence of Eusebius likewise include the supposition that he proposed to mention mere quotations of the "undisputed" books, they are so far from limited to this very subsidiary testimony that I should have no reluctance in waiving it altogether. Even if the most distinct quotations of this kind had occurred in the lost works of the three writers in question, they could have proved nothing beyond the mere existence of the book quoted, at the time that work was written, but would have done nothing to establish its authenticity and trustworthiness. In the evidential destitution of the Gospels, apologists would thankfully have received even such vague indications. Indeed there is scarcely any other evidence, but something much more definite is required to establish the reality of miracles and Divine Revelation. If this point be, for the sake of argument, set aside, what is the position? We are not entitled to infer that there were no quotations from the Gospels in the works of Hegesippus, Papias, and Dionysius of Corinth, because Eusebius does not record them; but, on the other hand, we are still less entitled to infer that there were any.

The only inference which I care to draw from the silence of Eusebius is precisely that which Dr. Lightfoot admits that, both from his promise and practice, I am entitled to deduce: when any ancient writer "has something to tell about" the Gospels, "any anecdote of interest respecting them," Eusebius will record it. This is the only information of the slightest value to this work which could be looked for in these writers. So far, therefore, from producing the destructive effect upon some of the arguments of "Supernatural Religion," upon which he somewhat prematurely congratulates himself, Dr. Lightfoot's elaborate and learned article on the silence of Eusebius supports them in the most conclusive manner.

Before proceeding to speak more directly of the three writers under discussion, it may be well to glance a little at the procedure of Eusebius, and note, for those who care to go more closely into the matter, how he fulfils his promise to record what the Fathers have to tell about the Gospels. I may mention, in the first place, that Eusebius states what he himself knows of the composition of the Gospels and other canonical works.¹ Upon two occasions he quotes the account which Clement of Alexandria gives of the composi-

¹ Cf. H. E., iii. 3, 4, 18, 24, 25, &c., &c.

tion
pels
Iron
Orig
in fi
ing
bius
will
"Th
the
whic
tion,
and
ever,
of th
ity, b
it fro
have
a few
were
that t
Gosp
year,
the ap
furth
cordat
others
show
his vic
three
impris
before
gelists
tradit
could
Irenae
who w

It
to rec
the u
extan
see th
the o
thing

I n
high c

¹ H.
² H.
⁴ "C
⁵ By
should
⁶ *Ib.*

tion of Mark's Gospel, and also cites his statements regarding the other Gospels.¹ In like manner he records the information, such as it is, which Irenæus has to impart about the four Gospels and other works,² and what Origen has to say concerning them.³ Interrogating extant works, we find in fact that Eusebius does not neglect to quote anything useful or interesting regarding these books from early writers. Dr. Lightfoot says that Eusebius "restricts himself to the narrowest limits which justice to his subject will allow," and he illustrates this by the case of Irenæus. He says: "Though he (Eusebius) gives the principal passage in this author relating to the Four Gospels (Irenæus, Adv. Hær. iii. 1, 1) he omits to mention others which contain interesting statements directly or indirectly affecting the question, e.g. that St. John wrote his Gospel to counteract the errors of Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans (Irenæus, Adv. Hær. iii. 11, 1)."⁴ I must explain, however, that the "interesting statement" omitted, which is not in the context of the part quoted, is not advanced as information derived from any authority, but only in the course of argument, and there is nothing to distinguish it from mere personal opinion, so that on this ground Eusebius may well have passed it over. Dr. Lightfoot further says: "Thus too, when he quotes a few lines alluding to the unanimous tradition of the Asiatic Elders who were acquainted with St. John,⁵ he omits the context, from which we find that this tradition had an important bearing on the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, for it declared that Christ's ministry extended much beyond a single year, thus confirming the obvious chronology of the Fourth Gospel against the apparent chronology of the Synoptists."⁶ Nothing, however, could be further from the desire or intention of Eusebius than to represent any discordance between the Gospels, or to support the one at the expense of the others. On the contrary, he enters into an elaborate explanation in order to show that there is no discrepancy between them, affirming and supporting his view by singular quotations, that it was evidently the intention of the three Synoptists only to write the doings of the Lord for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and that John, having the other Gospels before him, wrote an account of the period not embraced by the other evangelists.⁷ Moreover, the extraordinary assertions of Irenæus not only contradict the Synoptics, but also the Fourth Gospel, and Eusebius certainly could not have felt much inclination to quote such opinions, even although Irenæus seemed to base them upon traditions handed down by the Presbyters who were acquainted with John.

It being then admitted that Eusebius not only pledges himself to record when any ancient writer has something to "tell about" the undisputed canonical books, but that, judged by the test of extant writings which we can examine, he actually does so, let us see the conclusions which we are entitled to draw in the case of the only three writers with regard to whom I have inferred anything from the "silence of Eusebius."

I need scarcely repeat that Eusebius held HEGESIPPUS in very high estimation. He refers to him very frequently, and he clearly

¹ H. E. ii. 15, vi. 14.

² H. E. v. 8.

³ H. E. vi. 25.

⁴ "Contemporary Review," January, 1875, p. 181.

⁵ By a slip of the pen Dr. Lightfoot refers to Irenæus, Adv. Hær. iii. 3. It should be ii. 22, 5.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 181.

⁷ H. E. iii. 24.

shows that he not only valued, but was intimately acquainted with, his writings. Eusebius quotes from the work of Hegesippus a very long account of the martyrdom of James;¹ he refers to Hegesippus as his authority for the statement that Simeon was a cousin (*ἀνελπίς*) of Jesus, Cleophas his father being, according to that author, the brother of Joseph;² he confirms a passage in the Epistle of Clement by reference to Hegesippus;³ he quotes from Hegesippus a story regarding some members of the family of Jesus, of the race of David, who were brought before Domitian;⁴ he cites his narrative of the martyrdom of Simeon, together with other matters concerning the early Church;⁵ in another place he gives a laudatory account of Hegesippus and his writings;⁶ shortly after, he refers to the statement of Hegesippus that he was in Rome until the episcopate of Eleutherus,⁷ and further speaks in praise of his work, mentions his observation on the Epistle of Clement, and quotes his remarks about the Church in Corinth, the succession of Roman Bishops, the general state of the Church, the rise of heresies, and other matters.⁸ I mention these numerous references to Hegesippus as I have noticed them in turning over the pages of Eusebius, but others may, very probably have, escaped me. Eusebius fulfils his pledge, and states what disputed works were used by Hegesippus and what he said about them, and one of these was the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He does not, however, record a single remark of any kind regarding our Gospels, and the legitimate inference, and it is the only one I care to draw, is, that Hegesippus did not say anything about them. I may simply add that, as Eusebius quotes the account of Matthew and Mark from Papias, a man of whom he expresses something like contempt, and again refers to him in confirmation of the statement of the Alexandrian Clement regarding the composition of Mark's Gospel,⁹ it would be against all reason, as well as opposed to his pledge and general practice, to suppose that Eusebius would have omitted to record any information given by Hegesippus, a writer with whom he was so well acquainted, and of whom he speaks with so much respect.

I have said that Eusebius would more particularly have quoted anything with regard to the Fourth Gospel, and for those who care to go more closely into the point my reasons may be briefly given. No one can read Eusebius attentively without noting the peculiar care with which he speaks of John and his writings, and the substantially apologetic tone which he adopts in regard to them. Apart from any doubts expressed regarding the Gospel it-

¹ H. E. ii. 23.

² H. E. iii. 11.

³ H. E. iii. 16.

⁴ H. E. iii. 19, 20.

⁵ H. E. iii. 32.

⁶ H. E. iv. 8.

⁷ H. E. iv. 11.

⁸ H. E. iv. 22.

⁹ H. E. ii. 15.

I
Eus
Mat
sim

1 P
2 P
3 P
8 I
inser
slip o
my o

self, the controversy as to the authenticity of the Apocalypse and second and third Epistles called by his name, with which Eusebius was so well acquainted, and the critical dilemma as to the impossibility of the same John having written both the Gospel and the Apocalypse, regarding which he so fully quotes the argument of Dionysius of Alexandria,¹ evidently made him peculiarly interested in the subject, and his attention to the Fourth Gospel was certainly not diminished by his recognition of the essential difference between that work and the three Synoptics. The first occasion on which he speaks of John, he records the tradition that he was banished to Patmos during the persecution under Domitian, and refers to the Apocalypse. He quotes Irenæus in support of this tradition, and the composition of the work at the close of Domitian's reign.² He goes on to speak of the persecution under Domitian, and quotes Hegesippus as to a command given by that Emperor to slay all the posterity of David,³ as also Tertullian's account,⁴ winding up his extracts from the historians of the time by the statement that, after Nerva succeeded Domitian, and the Senate had revoked the cruel decrees of the latter, the Apostle John returned from exile in Patmos, and, according to ecclesiastical tradition, settled at Ephesus.⁵ He states that John, the beloved disciple, apostle and evangelist, governed the Churches of Asia after the death of Domitian and his return from Patmos, and that he was still living when Trajan succeeded Nerva, and for the truth of this he quotes passages from Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria.⁶ He then gives an account of the writings of John, and whilst asserting that the Gospel must be universally acknowledged as genuine, he says that it is rightly put last in order amongst the four, of the composition of which he gives an elaborate description. It is not necessary to quote his account of the Fourth Gospel and of the occasion of its composition, which he states to have been John's, receiving the other three Gospels, and whilst admitting their truth, perceiving that they did not contain a narrative of the earlier history of Christ. For this reason, being entreated to do so, he wrote an account of the doings of Jesus before the Baptist was cast into prison. After some very extraordinary reasoning, Eusebius says that no one who carefully considers the points he mentions can think that the Gospels are at variance with each other, and he conjectures that John probably omitted the genealogies because Matthew and Luke had given them.⁷ Without further anticipating what I have to say when speaking of Papias, it is clear I think, that Eusebius, being aware of, and interested in, the peculiar difficulties connected with the writings attributed to John, not to put a still stronger case, and quoting traditions from later and consequently less weighty authorities, would certainly have recorded with more special readiness any information on the subject given by Hegesippus, whom he so frequently lays under contribution, had his writings contained any.

In regard to PAPIAS the case is still clearer. We find that Eusebius quotes his account of the composition of Gospels by Matthew and Mark,⁸ although he had already given a closely similar narrative regarding Mark from Clement of Alexandria,

¹ H. E. vii. 25.⁴ H. E. iii. 20.⁶ iii. 23.² H. E. iii. 18.⁵ iii. 20.⁷ H. E. iii. 24.³ H. E. iii. 19, 20.

⁸ I am much obliged to Dr. Lightfoot for calling my attention to the accidental insertion of the words "and the Apocalypse" (S. R. i. p. 433). This was a mere slip of the pen, of which no use is made, and the error is effectually corrected by my own distinct statements.

and appealed to Papias in confirmation of it. Is it either possible or permissible to suppose that, had Papias known anything of the other two Gospels, he would not have inquired about them from the Presbyters and recorded their information? And is it either possible or permissible to suppose that if Papias had recorded any similar information regarding the composition of the third and fourth Gospels, Eusebius would have omitted to quote it? Certainly not; and Dr. Lightfoot's article proves it. Eusebius had not only pledged himself to give such information, and does so in every case which we can test, but he fulfils it by actually quoting what Papias had to say about the Gospels. Even if he had been careless, his very reference to the first two Gospels must have reminded him of the claims of the rest. There are, however, special reasons which render it still more certain that had Papias had anything to tell about the Fourth Gospel,—and if there was a Fourth Gospel in his knowledge he must have had something to tell about it,—Eusebius would have recorded it. The first quotation which he makes from Papias is the passage in which the Bishop of Hierapolis states the interest with which he had inquired about the words of the Presbyters, "what John or Matthew or what any other of the disciples of the Lord said, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, say."¹ Eusebius observes, and particularly points out, that the name of John is twice mentioned in the passage, the former, mentioned with Peter, James, and Matthew, and other Apostles, evidently being, he thinks, the Evangelist, and the latter being clearly distinguished by the designation of Presbyter. Eusebius states that this proves the truth of the assertion that there were two men of the name of John in Asia, and that two tombs were still shown at Ephesus bearing the name of John. Eusebius then proceeds to argue that probably the second of the two Johns, if not the first, was the man who saw the Revelation. What an occasion for quoting any information bearing at all on the subject from Papias, who had questioned those who had been acquainted with both! His attention is so pointedly turned to John at the very moment when he makes his quotations regarding Matthew and Mark, that I am fully warranted, both by the conclusions of Dr. Lightfoot and the peculiar circumstances of the case, in affirming that the silence of Eusebius proves that Papias said nothing about either the third or fourth Gospels.

I need not go on to discuss Dionysius of Corinth, for the same reasoning equally applies to his case. I have, therefore, only a very few more words to say on the subject of Eusebius. Not content with what he intended to be destructive criticism, Dr.

¹ H. E. iii. 39.

Lightfoot valiantly proceeds to the constructive and, "as a sober deduction from facts," makes the following statement which he prints in italics: "*The silence of Eusebius respecting early witnesses to the Fourth Gospel is an evidence in its favour.*"¹ Now, interpreted even by the rules laid down by Dr. Lightfoot himself, what does this silence really mean? It means, not that the early writers about whom he is supposed to be silent are witnesses about anything connected with the Fourth Gospel, but simply that if Eusebius noticed and did not record the mere use of that Gospel by any one, he thereby indicates that he himself, in the fourth century, classed it amongst the undisputed books, the mere use of which he does not undertake to mention. The value of his opinion at so late a date is very small.

Professor Lightfoot next makes a vehement attack upon me in connection with "THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES,"² which is equally abortive and limited to details. I do not intend to complain of the spirit in which the article is written, nor of its unfairness. On the whole I think that readers may safely be left to judge of the tone in which a controversy is carried on. Unfortunately, however, the perpetual accusation of mis-statement brought against me in this article, and based upon minute criticism into which few care to follow, is apt to leave the impression that it is well-founded, for there is the very natural feeling in most right minds that no one would recklessly scatter such insinuations. It is this which alone make such an attack dangerous. Now in a work like this, dealing with so many details, it must be obvious that it is not possible altogether to escape errors. A critic or opponent is of course entitled to point these out, although, if he be high-minded or even alive to his own interests, I scarcely think that he will do so in a spirit of unfair detraction. But in doing this a writer is bound to be accurate, for if he be liberal of such accusations and it can be shown that his charges are unfounded, they recoil with double force upon himself. I propose, therefore, as it is impossible for me to reply to all such attacks, to follow Professor Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott with some minuteness in their discussion of my treatment of the Ignatian Epistles, and once for all to show the grave misstatements to which they commit themselves.

Dr. Lightfoot does not ignore the character of the discussion upon which he enters, but it will be seen that his appreciation of its difficulty by no means inspires him with charitable emotions. He says: "The Ignatian question is the most perplexing which confronts the student of earlier Christian history. The literature

¹ "Contemporary Review," Jan., 1875, p. 183.

² *Ib.* Feb., 1875, p. 337 ff.

is voluminous; the considerations involved are very wide, very varied, and very intricate. A writer, therefore, may well be pardoned if he betrays a want of familiarity with this subject. But in this case the reader naturally expects that the opinions at which he has arrived will be stated with some diffidence." My critic objects that I express my opinions with decision. I shall hereafter justify this decision, but I would here point out that the very reasons which render it difficult for Dr. Lightfoot to form a final and decisive judgment on the question make it easy for me. It requires but little logical perception to recognize that Epistles, the authenticity of which it is so difficult to establish, cannot have much influence as testimony for the Gospels. The statement just quoted, however, is made the base of the attack, and war is declared in the following terms:

"The reader is naturally led to think that a writer would not use such very decided language unless he had obtained a thorough mastery of his subject; and when he finds the notes thronged with references to the most recondite sources of information, he at once credits the author with an 'exhaustive' knowledge of the literature bearing upon it. It becomes important, therefore, to inquire whether the writer shows that accurate acquaintance with the subject, which justifies us in attaching weight to his dicta as distinguished from his arguments."²

This sentence shows the scope of the discussion. My dicta, however, play a very subordinate part throughout, and even if no weight be attached to them, and I have never desired that any should be, my argument would not be in the least degree affected.

The first point attacked, like most of those subsequently assailed, is one of mere critical history. I wrote: "The strongest internal, as well as other evidence, into which space forbids our going in detail, has led (1) the majority of critics to recognize the Syriac version as the most genuine form of the letters of Ignatius extant, and (2) this is admitted by most of those who nevertheless deny the authenticity of any of the epistles."³

Upon this Dr. Lightfoot remarks:

"No statement could be more erroneous as a summary of the results of the Ignatian controversy since the publication of the Syriac epistles than this."⁴

It will be admitted that this is pretty "decided language" for one who is preaching "diffidence." When we come to details, however, Dr. Lightfoot admits: "Those who maintain the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles in one or other of the two

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 339.

² *Ib.* p. 340.

³ S. R. i. p. 263 f. I have introduced numbers for facility of reference.

⁴ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 340.

forms, may be said to be almost evenly divided on this question of priority." He seems to consider that he sufficiently shows this when he mentions five or six critics on either side; but even on this modified interpretation of my statement its correctness may be literally maintained. To the five names quoted as recognizing the priority of the Syriac Epistles, may be added those of Milman, Böhringer, DePressensé, and Dr. Tregelles, which immediately occur to me. But I must ask on what ground he limits my remark to those who absolutely admit the genuineness? I certainly do not so limit it, but affirm that a majority prefer the three Curetonian Epistles, and that this majority is made up partly of those who, denying the authenticity of any of the letters, still consider the Syriac the purest and least adulterated form of the Epistles. This will be evident to any one who reads the context. With regard to the latter (2) part of the sentence, I will at once say that "most" is a slip of the pen for "many," which I correct in this edition. Many of those who deny or do not admit the authenticity prefer the Curetonian version. The Tübingen school are not unanimous on the point, and there are critics who do not belong to it. Bleek, for instance, who does not commit himself to belief, considers the priority of the Curetonian "im höchsten Grade wahrscheinlich." Volkmar, Lipsius, and Rumpf prefer them. Dr. Lightfoot says:

"The case of Lipsius is especially instructive, as illustrating this point. Having at one time maintained the priority and genuineness of the Curetonian letters, he has lately, if I rightly understand him, retracted his former opinion on both questions alike."¹

Dr. Lightfoot, however, has not rightly understood him. Lipsius has only withdrawn his opinion that the Syriac letters are authentic, but whilst now asserting that in all their forms the Ignatian Epistles are spurious, he still maintains the priority of the Curetonian version. He first announced this change of view emphatically in 1873, when he added: "An dem relativ grössern Alter der syrischen Textgestalt gegenüber der kürzeren griechischen halte ich übrigens nach wie vor fest."² In the very paper to which Dr. Lightfoot refers Lipsius also again says quite distinctly: "Ich bin noch jetzt überzeugt, dass der Syrer in zahlreichen Fällen den relativ ursprünglichsten Text bewahrt hat (vgl. meine Nachweise in Niedner's Zeitschr. S. 15 ff)."³ With regard to the whole of this (2) point, it must be remembered that the only matter in question is simply a shade of opinion amongst

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 341.

² Ueber d. Urspr. u. s. w. des Christennamens, p. 7, anm. 1.

³ Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1874, p. 211, anm. 1.

critics who deny the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles in all forms.

Dr. Lightfoot, however, goes on "to throw some light on this point" by analysing my "general statement of the course of opinion on this subject given in an earlier passage." The "light" which he throws seems to pass through so peculiar a medium, that I should be much rather tempted to call it darkness. I beg the reader to favour me with his attention to this matter, for here commences a serious attack upon the accuracy of my notes and statements, which is singularly full of error and misrepresentation. The general statement referred to and quoted is as follows:

"These three Syriac epistles have been subjected to the severest scrutiny, and many of the ablest critics have pronounced them to be the only authentic Epistles of Ignatius, whilst others, who do not admit that even these are genuine letters emanating from Ignatius, still prefer them to the version of seven Greek epistles, and consider them the most ancient form of the letters which we possess. As early as the sixteenth century, however, the strongest doubts were expressed regarding the authenticity of any of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius. The Magdeburg Centuriators first attacked them, and Calvin declared (p. 260) them to be spurious, an opinion fully shared by Chemnitz, Dallæus, and others, and similar doubts, more or less definite, were expressed throughout the seventeenth century and onward to comparatively recent times, although the means of forming a judgment were not then so complete as now. That the epistles were interpolated there was no doubt. Fuller examination and more comprehensive knowledge of the subject have confirmed earlier doubts, and a large mass of critics recognize that the authenticity of none of these epistles can be established, and that they can only be considered later and spurious compositions."²

In the first note (¹) on p. 259, I referred to Bunsen, Bleek, Böhlinger, Cureton, Ewald, Lipsius, Milman, Ritschl, and Weiss, and Dr. Lightfoot proceeds to analyze my statements as follows: and I at once put his explanation and my text in parallel columns, italicising parts of both to call more immediate attention to the point:

THE TEXT.

*Many of the ablest critics have pronounced them to be the only authentic Epistles of Ignatius, whilst others who do not admit that even these are genuine letters emanating from Ignatius, still prefer them to the version of seven Greek Epistles, and consider them the most ancient form of the letters which we possess.*²

DR. LIGHTFOOT'S STATEMENT.

"These references, it will be observed, are given to illustrate more immediately, though perhaps not solely, the statement that writers 'who do not admit that even these (the Curetonian Epistles) are genuine letters emanating from Ignatius, still prefer them to the version of seven Greek Epistles, and consider them the most ancient form of the letters which we possess.'"³

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 341.

² S. R. i. p. 259 i.

³ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 342.

It must be evident to any one who reads the context¹ that in this sentence I am stating opinions expressed in favour of the Curetonian Epistles, and that the note, which is naturally put at the end of that sentence, must be intended to represent this favourable opinion, whether of those who absolutely maintain the authenticity or merely the relative priority. Dr. Lightfoot quietly suppresses, in his comments, the main statement of the text which the note illustrates, and then "throws light" upon the point by the following remarks:

THE TRUTH.

Cureton, Bunsen, Böhringer, Ewald, Milman, Ritschl, and Weiss maintain both the priority and genuineness of the Syriac Epistles. Bleek will not commit himself to a distinct recognition of the letters in any form. Of the Vossian Epistles, he says: "Aber auch die Echtheit dieser Recension ist keineswegs sicher." He considers the priority of the Curetonian "in the highest degree probable."

Lipsius rejects all the Epistles, as I have already said, but maintains the priority of the Syriac.

DR. LIGHTFOOT'S STATEMENT.

"The reader, therefore, will hardly be prepared to hear that not one of these nine writers condemns the Ignatian letters as spurious. Bleek alone leaves the matter in some uncertainty while inclining to Bunsen's view; the other eight distinctly maintain the genuineness of the Curetonian letters."²

Dr. Lightfoot's statement, therefore, is a total misrepresentation of the facts, and of that mischievous kind which does most subtle injury. Not one reader in twenty would take the trouble to investigate, but would receive from such positive assertions an impression that my note was totally wrong, when in fact it is literally correct. Continuing his analysis, Dr. Lightfoot fights almost every inch of the ground in the very same style. He cannot contradict my statement that so early as the sixteenth century the strongest doubts were expressed regarding the authenticity of any of the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius, and that the Magdeburg Centuriators attacked them, and Calvin declared them to be spurious,³ but Dr. Lightfoot says: "The criticisms of Calvin more especially refer to those passages which were found in the

¹ S. R. i. p. 259.

² "Contemporary Review," February 1875, p. 342. In a note Dr. Lightfoot states that my references to Lipsius are to his earlier works, where he still maintains the priority and genuineness of the Curetonian Epistles. Certainly they are so, but in the right place, two pages further on, I refer to the writings in which he rejects the authenticity, whilst still maintaining his previous view of the priority of these letters.

³ Calvin's expressions are: *Nihil nœniis illis, quæ sub Ignatii nomine editæ sunt, putidius. Quo minus tolerabilis est eorum impudentia, qui talibus larvis ad fallendum se instruunt.* Inst. Chr. Rel. i. 13, § 39.

Long Recension alone."¹ Of course only the Long Recension was at that time known. Rivet replies to Campianus that Calvin's objections were not against Ignatius but the Jesuits who had corrupted him.² This is the usual retort theological, but as I have quoted the words of Calvin the reader may judge for himself. Dr. Lightfoot then says:

"The clause which follows contains a direct misstatement. Chemnitz did not fully share the opinion that they were spurious; on the contrary, he quotes them several times as authoritative; but he says that they 'seem to have been altered in many places to strengthen the position of the Papal power, &c.'"³

Pearson's statement here quoted must be received with reserve, for Chemnitz rather speaks sarcastically of those who quote these Epistles as evidence. In treating them as ancient documents or speaking of parts of them with respect, Chemnitz does nothing more than the Magdeburg Centuriators, but this is a very different thing from directly ascribing them to Ignatius himself. The Epistles in the "Long Recension" were before Chemnitz both in the Latin and Greek forms. He says of them: ". . . et multas habent non contemnendas sententias, presertim sicut Græce leguntur. Admixta vero sunt et alia non pauca, quæ profecto non referunt gravitatem Apostolicam. Adulteratas enim jam esse illas epistolas, vel inde colligitur." He then shows that quotations in ancient writers purporting to be taken from the Epistles of Ignatius are not found in these extant epistles at all, and says: "De Epistolis igitur illis Ignatii, quæ nunc ejus titulo feruntur, merito dubitamus: transformate enim videntur in multis locis, ad stabiliendum statum regni Pontificii." Even when he speaks in favour of them "he damns them with faint praise." The whole of the discussion turns upon the word "fully," and is an instance of the minute criticism of my critic, who evidently is not directly acquainted with Chemnitz. A shade more or less of doubt or certainty in conveying the impression received from the words of a writer is scarcely worth much indignation.

Dr. Lightfoot makes a very detailed attack on my next two notes, and here again I must closely follow him. My note (2) p. 260 read as follows:

"² By Bechartus, Aubertin, Blondel, Basnage, Casaubon, Cocus, Humfrey, Rivetus, Salmasius, Socinus (Faustus), Parker, Petau, &c., &c.; cf. *Jacobson, Patr. Apost.*, i. p. xxv.; *Cureton, Vindicte Ignatianæ*, 1846, appendix."

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 342.

² *Op. Theolog.* 1652, ii. p. 1085.

³ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 342. Dr. Lightfoot refers to

"Pearson's *Vindicte Ignat.*, p. 28 (ed. Churton).

⁴ *Examinis Concilii Tridentini*, 1614, i. p. 85 (misprinted 89.)

Upon this Dr. Lightfoot makes the following preliminary remarks:

"But the most important point of all is the purpose for which they are quoted. 'Similar doubts' could only, I think, be interpreted from the context as doubts 'regarding the authenticity of any of the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius.'"¹

As Dr. Lightfoot, in the first sentence just quoted, recognizes what is the "most important point of all," it is a pity that, throughout the whole of the subsequent analysis of the references in question, he persistently ignores my very careful definition of "the purpose for which they are quoted." It is difficult, without entering into minute classifications, accurately to represent in a few words the opinions of a great number of writers, and briefly convey a fair idea of the course of critical judgment. Desirous, therefore, of embracing a large class,—for both this note and the next, with mere difference of epoch, illustrate the same statement in the text, and not to overstate the case on my own side, I used what seemed to me a very moderate phrase, decreasing the force of the opinion of those who positively rejected the Epistles, and not unfairly representing the hesitation of those who did not fully accept them. I said, then, in guarded terms,—and I italicise the part which Dr. Lightfoot chooses to suppress,—that "*similar doubts, more or less definite*," were expressed by the writers referred to.

Dr. Lightfoot admits that Bochart directly condemns one Epistle, and would probably have condemned the rest also; that Aubertin, Blondel, Basnage, R. Parker, and Saumaise actually rejected all; and that Cook pronounces them "either supposititious or shamefully corrupted." So far, therefore, there can be no dispute. I will now take the rest in succession. Dr. Lightfoot says that Humfrey "considers that they have been interpolated and mutilated, but he believes them genuine in the main." Dr. Lightfoot has so completely warped the statement in the text, that he seems to demand nothing short of a total condemnation of the Epistles in the note; but had I intended to say that Humfrey and all of these writers definitely rejected the whole of the Epistles I should not have limited myself to merely saying that they expressed "*doubts more or less definite*," which Humfrey does. Dr. Lightfoot says that Socinus "denounces corruptions and anachronisms, but, so far as I can see, does not question a nucleus of genuine matter." His very denunciations, however, are certainly the expression of "*doubts, more or less definite*." "Casaubon, so far from rejecting them altogether," Dr. Lightfoot says,

¹ "Contemporary Review," Feb. 1875, p. 343.

"promises to defend the antiquity of some of the Epistles with new arguments." But I have never affirmed that he "rejected them altogether." Casaubon died before he fulfilled the promise referred to, so that we cannot determine what arguments he might have used. I must point out, however, that the antiquity does not necessarily involve the authenticity of a document. With regard to Rivet the case is different. I had overlooked the fact that in a subsequent edition of the work referred to, after receiving Archbishop Usher's edition of the Short Recension, he had given his adhesion to "that form of the Epistles."¹ This fact is also mentioned by Pearson, and I ought to have observed it.² Petau, the last of the writers referred to, says: "Equidem haud abnueri epistolas illius varie interpolatas et quibusdam additis mutatas, ac depravatas fuisse: tum aliquas esse supposititias: verum nullas omnino ab Ignatio Epistolas esse scriptas, id vero nimium temere affirmari sentio." He then goes on to mention the recent publication of the Vossian Epistles and the version of Usher, and the learned Jesuit Father has no more decided opinion to express than: "ut hæc prudens, ac justa suspicio sit, illas esse genuinas Ignatii epistolas, quas antiquorum consensus illustribus testimoniis commendatas ac approbatas reliquit."³

The next note (³), p. 260, was only separated from the preceding for convenience of reference, and Dr. Lightfoot quotes and comments upon it as follows:

"The next note (³), page 260, is as follows:—

"[*Wotton*, *Præf. Clem. R. Epp.*, 1718]; *J. Owen*, *Enquiry into original nature, &c., Evang. Church: Works*; ed. Russel, 1826, vol. xx. p. 147; *Oudin*, *Comm. de Script. Eccles.*, &c., 1722, p. 88; *Lampe* *Comm. analyt. ex Evang. Joan.*, 1724, i. p. 184; *Lardner*, *Credibility, &c., Works*, ii. p. 68 f.; *Beausobre*, *Hist. Crit. de Manichée, &c.*, 1734, i. p. 378, note 3; *Ernesti*, *N. Theol. Biblioth.*, 1761, ii. p. 489; [*Moshier*, *de Rebus Christ.*, p. 159 f.] *Weissmann*, *Introd. in Memorab. Eccles.*, 1745, i. p. 137; *Heumann*, *Conspect.*, Reipub. Lit. 1763, p. 492; *Schreckh*, *Chr. Kirchengesch.*, 1775, ii. p. 341; *Griesbach*, *Opuscula Academ.*, 1824, i. p. 26; *Rosenmüller*, *Hist. Interpr. Libr. Sac. in Eccles.*, 1795, i. p. 116; *Senler*, *Paraphr. in Epist. ii. Petri*, 1784, *Præf.*; *Kestner*, *Comm. de Eusebii H. E. condit.*, 1816, p. 63; *Henke*, *Allg. Gesch. chr. Kirche*, 1818, i. p. 96; *Neander*, *K. G.*, 1843, ii. p. 1140, [cf. i. p. 327; ann. 1]; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, *Lehrb. chr. Dogmengesch.*, 1832, p. 83; cf. comp. chr. Dogmengesch., 1840, p. 79; [*Neidner*, *Gesch. chr. K.*, p. 196; *Thiersch*, *Die K. im ap. Zeit*, p. 322; *Hagenbach*, *K. G.*, i. p. 115 f.]; cf. *Cureton*, *Vind. Ign. Append.*; *Ziegler*, *Versuch ein prag. Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungs-formen*, u. s. w., 1798, p. 16; *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *Versuch tib. d. gedop. Recens. d. Br. S. Ignat. in Henke's Mag.*

¹ *Critici Sacri*, lib. ii. cap. 1; *Op. Theolog.* 1652, ii. p. 1086.

² *Vind. Ignat.* 1672, p. 14 f.; *Jacobson*, *Patr. Apost.* i. p. xxxviii.

³ *Op. de Theolog. Dogmat.*;—*De Eccles. Hierarch.* v. 8 § 1, Edit. Venetiis, 1757, Vol. vii.

f. Rel. Phil. u. s. w., [1795; cf. Biblioth. f. Krit. u. s. w., N. T., i. p. 463 ff., Urspr. kath. Kirche, II. i. p. 1 f.]; H'buch Chr. K. G., i. p. 200.

"The brackets are not the author's, but my own.

"This is doubtless one of those exhibitions of learning which have made such a deep impression on the reviewers. Certainly, as it stands, this note suggests a thorough acquaintance with all the by-paths of the Ignatian literature, and seems to represent the gleanings of many years' reading. It is important to observe, however, that every one of these references, except those which I have included in brackets, is given in the appendix to Cureton's *Vindicie Ignatiane*, where the passages are quoted in full. Thus two-thirds of this elaborate note might have been compiled in ten minutes. Our author has here and there transposed the order of the quotations, and confused it by so doing, for it is chronological in Cureton. But what purpose was served by thus importing into his notes a mass of borrowed and unsorted references? And, if he thought fit to do so, why was the key-reference to Cureton buried among the rest, so that it stands in immediate connection with some additional references on which it has no bearing?"¹

I do not see any special virtue in the amount of time which might suffice, under some circumstances, to compile a note, although it is here advanced as an important point to observe, but I call attention to the unfair spirit in which Dr. Lightfoot's criticisms are made. I ask every just-minded reader to consider what right any critic has to insinuate, if not directly to say, that, because some of the references in a note are also given by Cureton, I simply took them from him, and thus "imported into my notes a mass of borrowed and unsorted references," and further to insinuate that I "here and there transposed the order" apparently to conceal the source? This is a kind of criticism which I very gladly relinquish entirely to my high-minded and reverend opponent. Now, as full quotations are given in Cureton's appendix, I should have been perfectly entitled to take references from it, had I pleased, and for the convenience of many readers I distinctly indicate Cureton's work, in the note, as a source to be compared. The fact is, however, that I did not take the references from Cureton, but in every case derived them from the works themselves, and if the note "seems to represent the gleanings of many years' reading," it certainly does not misrepresent the fact, for I took the trouble to make myself acquainted with the "by-paths of Ignatian literature." Now in analysing the references in this note it must be borne in mind that they illustrate the statement that "*doubts, more or less definite*" continued to be expressed regarding the Ignatian Epistles. I am much obliged to Dr. Lightfoot for drawing my attention to Wotton. His name is the first in the note, and it unfortunately was the last in a list on another point in my note-book, immediately preceding this one, and was by mistake, included in it. I also frankly give up Weismann,

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 343 f.

whose doubts I find I had exaggerated, and proceed to examine Dr. Lightfoot's further statements. He says that Thiersch uses the Curetonian as genuine, and that his only doubt is whether he ought not to accept the Vossian. Thiersch, however, admits that he cannot quote either the seven or the three Epistles as genuine. He says distinctly: "These three Syriac Epistles lie under the suspicion that they are not an older text, but merely an epitome of the seven, for the other notes found in the same MS. seem to be excerpts. But on the other hand, the doubts regarding the genuineness of the seven Epistles, in the form in which they are known since Usher's time, are not yet entirely removed. For no MS. has yet been found which contains *only* the seven Epistles attested by Eusebius, a MS. such as lay before Eusebius."¹ Thiersch, therefore, does express "doubts, more or less definite." Dr. Lightfoot then continues: "Of the rest, a considerable number, as, for instance, Lardner, Beausobre, Schroeckh, Griesbach, Kestner, Neander, and Baumgarten-Crusius, *with different degrees of certainty or uncertainty*, pronounce themselves in favour of a genuine nucleus."² The words which I have italicised are a mere paraphrase of my words descriptive of the doubts entertained. I must point out that a leaning towards belief in a genuine "nucleus" on the part of some of these writers, by no means excludes the expression of "*doubts, more or less definite*," which is all I quote them for. I will take each name in order.

Lardner says: "But whether the smaller (Vossian Epistles) themselves are the genuine writings of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics. And whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question." The opinion which he expresses finally is merely: "it appears to me *probable* that they are *for the main* the genuine epistles of Ignatius."

Beausobre says: "Je ne veux, ni défendre, ni combattre l'authenticité des *Lettres de St. Ignace*. Si elles ne sont pas véritables, elles ne laissent pas d'être fort anciennes; et l'opinion que me paroît la plus raisonnable, est que les plus pures ont été interpolées."

Schroeckh says that along with the favourable considerations for the shorter (Vossian) Epistles "many doubts arise which make them suspicious." He proceeds to point out many grave difficulties and anachronisms, which cast doubt both on individual epistles and upon the whole, and he remarks that a

¹ Die Kirche im ap. Zeit, p. 322.

² "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 344 f..

very common way of evading these and other difficulties is to affirm that all the passages which cannot be reconciled with the mode of thought of Ignatius are interpolations of a later time. He concludes with the pertinent observation: "However probable this is, it nevertheless remains as difficult to prove which are the interpolated passages." In fact it would be difficult to point out any writer who more thoroughly doubts without definitely rejecting all the Epistles.

Griesbach and *Kestner* both express "doubts more or less definite," but to make sufficient extracts to illustrate this would occupy too much space.

Neander.—Dr. Lightfoot has been misled by the short extract from the English translation of the first edition of *Neander's History* given by Cureton in his Appendix, has not attended to the brief German quotation from the second edition, and has not examined the original at all, or he would have seen that, so far from pronouncing "in favour of a genuine nucleus," *Neander* might well have been classed by me amongst those who distinctly reject the Ignatian Epistles, instead of being moderately quoted amongst those who merely express doubt. *Neander* says: "As the account of the martyrdom of Ignatius is very suspicious, so also the Epistles which suppose the correctness of this suspicious legend do not bear throughout the impress of a distinct individuality, and of a man of that time who is addressing his last words to the communities. A hierarchial purpose is not to be mistaken." In an earlier part of the work, he still more emphatically says that, "in the so-called Ignatian Epistles," he recognizes a decided "design" (*absichtlichkeit*) and he continues: "as the tradition regarding the journey of Ignatius to Rome, there to be cast to the wild beasts, seems to me, for the above-mentioned reasons, very suspicious, his Epistles, which pre-suppose the truth of this tradition, can no longer inspire me with faith in their authenticity."¹ He goes on to state additional grounds for disbelief.

Baumgarten-Crusius stated in one place in regard to the seven Epistles, that it is no longer possible to ascertain how much of the extant may have formed part of the original Epistles, and in a note he excepts only the passages quoted by the Fathers. He seems to agree with Semler and others that the two Recensions are probably the result of manipulations of the original, the shorter form being more in ecclesiastical, the longer in dogmatic interest. Some years later he remarked

¹ K. G. 1842, i. p. 327, *ann.* i.

that inquiries into the Epistles, although not yet concluded, had rather tended towards the earlier view that the Shorter Recension was more original than the Long, but that even the shorter may have suffered, if not from manipulations (*Uebersetzungen*), from interpolations. This very cautious statement, it will be observed, is wholly relative, and does not in the least modify the previous conclusion that the original material of the letters cannot be ascertained.

Dr. Lightfoot's objections regarding these seven writers are thoroughly unfounded, and in most cases glaringly erroneous.

He proceeds to the next "note (*)" with the same unhesitating vigour, and characterizes it as "equally unfortunate." Wherever it has been possible, Dr. Lightfoot has succeeded in misrepresenting the "purpose" of my notes, although he has recognized how important it is to ascertain this correctly, and in this instance he has done so again. I will put my text and his explanation, upon the basis of which he analyses the note, in juxtaposition, italicising part of my own statement which he altogether disregards:

DR. LIGHTFOOT.

"Further examination and more comprehensive knowledge of the subject have confirmed earlier doubts, and a large mass of critics recognize that the authenticity of none of these Epistles can be established, and that they can only be considered later and spurious compositions."

"References to twenty authorities are then given, as belonging to the 'large mass of critics' who recognize that the Ignatian Epistles 'can only be considered later and spurious compositions.'"¹

There are here, in order to embrace a number of references, two approximate states of opinion represented: the first, which leaves the Epistles in permanent doubt, as sufficient evidence is not forthcoming to establish their authenticity; and the second, which positively pronounces them to be spurious. Out of the twenty authorities referred to, Dr. Lightfoot objects to six as contradictory or not confirming what he states to be the purpose of the note. He seems to consider that a reservation for the possibility of a genuine substratum which cannot be defined invalidates my reference. I maintain, however, that it does not. It is quite possible to consider that the authenticity of the extant letters cannot be established without denying that there may have been some original nucleus upon which these actual documents may have been based. I will analyse the six references.

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 345.

Bleek.—Dr. Lightfoot says: "Of these Bleek (already cited in a previous note) expresses no definite opinion."

Dr. Lightfoot omits to mention that I do not refer to Bleek directly, but by "Cf." merely request consideration of his opinions. I have already partly stated Bleek's view. After pointing out some difficulties, he says generally: "It comes to this, that the origin of the Ignatian Epistles themselves is still very doubtful." He refuses to make use of a passage because it is only found in the Long Recension, and another which occurs in the Shorter Recension he does not consider evidence, because, first, he says, "The authenticity of this Recension also is by no means certain," and, next, the Cureton Epistles discredit the others. "Whether this Recension (the Curetonian) is more original than the shorter Greek is certainly not altogether certain, but . . . in the highest degree probable." In another place he refuses to make use of reminiscences in the "Ignatian Epistles," "because it is still very doubtful how the case stands as regards the authenticity and integrity of these Ignatian Epistles themselves, in the different Recensions in which we possess them."¹ In fact, he did not consider that their authenticity could be established. I do not, however, include him here at all.

Gfrörer.—Dr. Lightfoot, again, omits to state that I do not cite this writer like the others, but by a "Cf." merely suggest a reference to his remarks.

Harless, according to Dr. Lightfoot, "avows that he must 'decidedly reject with the most considerable critics of older and more recent times' the opinion maintained by certain persons that the Epistles are 'altogether spurious,' and proceeds to treat a passage as genuine because it stands in the Vossian letters as well as in the Long Recension."

This is a mistake. Harless quotes a passage in connection with Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians with the distinct remark: "In this case the disadvantage of the uncertainty regarding the Recensions is *in part* removed through the circumstance that both Recensions have the passage." He recognizes that the completeness of the proof that ecclesiastical tradition goes back beyond the time of Marcion is somewhat wanting from the uncertainty regarding the text of Ignatius. He did not in fact venture to consider the Ignatian Epistles evidence even for the first half of the second century.

Schliemann, Dr. Lightfoot states, "says that 'the external testi-

¹ Einl. N. T., p. 144 f., p. 233.

monies oblige him to recognize a genuine substratum,' though he is not satisfied with either existing recension."

Now what Schliemann says is this: "Certainly neither the Shorter and still less the Longer Recension in which we possess these Epistles can lay claim to authenticity. Only if we must, nevertheless, without doubt suppose a genuine substratum," &c. In a note he adds: "The external testimonies oblige me to recognize a genuine substratum—Polycarp already speaks of the same in Ch. xiii. of his Epistle. But that in their present form they do not proceed from Ignatius the contents sufficiently show."

Hase, according to Dr. Lightfoot, "commits himself to no opinion."

If he does not deliberately and directly do so, he indicates what that opinion is with sufficient clearness. The Long Recension, he says, bears the marks of later manipulation, and excites suspicion of an invention in favour of Episcopacy, and the shorter text is not fully attested either. The Curetonian Epistles with the shortest and least hierarchical text give the impression of being an epitome. "But even if no authentic kernel lay at the basis of these Epistles, yet they would be a significant document at latest out of the middle of the second century." These last words are a clear admission of his opinion that the authenticity cannot be established.

Lechler candidly confesses that he commenced with a prejudice in favour of the authenticity of the Epistles in the Shorter Recension, but on reading them through, he says that an impression unfavourable to their authenticity was produced upon him which he had not been able to shake off. He proceeds to point out their internal improbability, and other difficulties connected with the supposed journey, which make it "still more improbable that Ignatius himself can really have written these Epistles in this situation." *Lechler* does not consider that the Curetonian Epistles strengthen the case; and although he admits that he cannot congratulate himself on the possession of "certainty and cheerfulness of conviction" of the inauthenticity of the Ignatian Epistles, he at least very clearly justifies the affirmation that the authenticity cannot be established.

Now what has been the result of this minute and prejudiced attack upon my notes? Out of nearly seventy critics and writers in connection with what is admitted to be one of the most intricate questions of Christian literature, it appears that—much to my

regret—I have inserted one name totally by accident, overlooked that the doubts of another had been removed by the subsequent publication of the Short Recension and consequently erroneously classed him, and I withdraw a third whose doubts I consider that I have overrated. Mistakes to this extent in dealing with such a mass of references, or a difference of a shade more or less in the representation of critical opinions, not always clearly expressed, may, I hope, be excusable, and I can only say that I am only too glad to correct such errors. On the other hand, a critic who attacks such references, in such a tone, and with such wholesale accusations of "misstatement" and "misrepresentation," was bound to be accurate, and I have shown that Dr. Lightfoot is not only inaccurate in matters of fact, but unfair in his statements of my purpose. I am happy however to be able to make use of his own words and say: "I may perhaps have fallen into some errors of detail, though I have endeavoured to avoid them, but the main conclusions are, I believe, irrefragable."¹

There are further misstatements made by Dr. Lightfoot to which I must briefly refer before turning to other matters. He says, with unhesitating boldness:

"One highly important omission is significant. There is no mention, from first to last, of the Armenian version. Now it happens that this version (so far as regards the documentary evidence) *has been felt to be the key to the position, and around it the battle has raged fiercely since its publication.* One who (like our author) maintains the priority of the Curetonian letters, was especially bound to give it some consideration, for it furnishes the most formidable argument to his opponents. This version was given to the world by Petermann in 1849, the same year in which Cureton's later work, the *Corpus Ignatianum*, appeared, and therefore was unknown to him. Its bearing occupies a more or less prominent place in all, or nearly all, the writers who have specially discussed the Ignatian question during the last quarter of a century. This is true of Lipsius and Weiss and Hilgenfeld and Uhlhorn, whom he cites, not less than of Merx and Denzinger and Zahn, whom he neglects to cite."

Now first as regards the facts. I do not maintain the priority of the Curetonian Epistles in this book myself. Indeed I express no personal opinion whatever regarding them which is not contained in that general declaration of belief, the decision of which excites the wrath of my diffident critic. That the Epistles in no form have "any value as evidence for an earlier period than the end of the second or beginning of the third century, even if they have any value at all." I merely represent the opinion of others regarding those Epistles. Dr. Lightfoot very greatly exaggerates the importance attached to the Armenian version, and I call special attention to the passages in the above quotation which

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 183.

I have taken the liberty of italicising. I venture to say emphatically that, so far from being considered the "key of the position," this version has, with some exceptions, played a most subordinate and insignificant part in the controversy, and as Dr. Lightfoot has expressly mentioned certain writers, I will state how the case stands with regard to them. Weiss, Lipsius, Uhlhorn, Merx, and Zahn certainly "more or less prominently" deal with them. Denzinger, however, only refers to Petermann's publication, which appeared while his own *brochure* was passing through the press, in a short note at the end, and in again writing on the Ignatian question, two years after,¹ he does not even allude to the Armenian version. Beyond the barest historical reference to Petermann's work, Hilgenfeld does not discuss the Armenian version at all. So much for the writers actually mentioned by Dr. Lightfoot.

As for "the writers who have specially discussed the Ignatian question during the last quarter of a century;" Cureton apparently did not think it worth while to add anything regarding the Armenian version of Petermann after its appearance; Bunsen refutes Petermann's arguments in a few pages of his "*Hippolytus*;"² Baur, who wrote against Bunsen and the Curetonian letters, and, according to Dr. Lightfoot's representation, should have found this "the most formidable argument" against them, does not anywhere, subsequent to their publication, even allude to the Armenian Epistles; Ewald, in a note of a couple of lines,³ refers to Petermann's Epistles as identical with a post-Eusebian manipulated form of the Epistles which he mentions in a sentence in his text; Dressel devotes a few unfavourable lines to them;⁴ Hefele⁵ supports them at somewhat greater length; but Bleek, Volkmar, Tischendorf, Böhringer, Scholten, and others have not thought them worthy of special notice, at any rate none of these nor any other writers of any weight have, so far as I am aware, introduced them into the controversy at all.

The argument itself did not seem to me of sufficient importance to introduce into a discussion already too long and complicated, and I refer the reader to Bunsen's reply to it, from which, however, I may quote the following lines:

"But it appears to me scarcely serious to say: there are the Seven Letters in Armenian, and I maintain, they prove that Cureton's text is an incomplete extract, because, I think, I have found some Syriac idioms in the Armenian

¹ Theolog. Quartalschrift, 1851 p. 359 ff.

² Hippolytus and his Age, 1852, i, p. 60, note, iv, p. vi. ff.

³ Gesch. d. v. Isr. vii. p. 321 anm., 1.

⁴ Patr. Apost. Proleg., 1863, p. xxx.

⁵ Patr. Apost. ed. 4th, 1855. In a review of Denzinger's work in the Theolog. Quartalschrift, 1849, p. 683 ff., Hefele devotes eight lines to the Armenian version (p. 685 f.).

text! Well, if that is not a joke, it simply proves, according to ordinary logic, that the Seven Letters must have once been translated into Syriac. But how can it prove that the Greek original of this supposed Syriac version is the genuine text, and not an interpolated and partially forged one?"¹

Dr. Lightfoot blames me for omitting to introduce this argument, on the ground that "a discussion which, while assuming the priority of the Curetonian letters, ignores this version altogether, has omitted a vital problem of which it was bound to give an account." Now all this is sheer misrepresentation. I do not assume the priority of the Curetonian Epistles, and I examine all the passages contained in the seven Greek Epistles which have any bearing upon our Gospels.

Passing on to another point, I say :

"Seven Epistles have been selected out of fifteen extant, all equally purporting to be by Ignatius, simply because only that number were mentioned by Eusebius."²

Another passage is also quoted by Dr. Lightfoot, which will be found a little further on, where it is taken for facility of reference. Upon this he writes as follows :

"This attempt to confound the seven Epistles mentioned by Eusebius with the other confessedly spurious Epistles, as if they presented themselves to us with the same credentials, ignores all the important facts bearing on the question. (1.) Theodoret, a century after Eusebius, betrays no knowledge of any other Epistles, and there is no distinct trace of the use of the confessedly spurious Epistles till late in the sixth century at the earliest. (2.) The confessedly spurious Epistles differ widely in style from the seven Epistles, and betray the same hand which interpolated the seven Epistles. In other words, they clearly formed part of the Long Recension in the first instance. (3.) They abound in anachronisms which point to an age later than Eusebius as the date of their composition."³

Although I do not really say in the above that no other pleas are advanced in favour of the seven Epistles, I contend that, reduced to its simplest form, the argument for that special number rests mainly, if not altogether, upon their mention by Eusebius. The very first reason (1) advanced by Dr. Lightfoot to refute me is a practical admission of the correctness of my statement, for the eight Epistles are put out of court because even Theodoret, a century after Eusebius, does not betray any knowledge of them, but the "silence of Eusebius," the earlier witness, is infinitely more important, and it merely receives some increase of significance from the silence of Theodoret.

¹ Hippolytus, 1852, i. p. 60, note. Cf. iv. p. vi. ff. S. R. i. p. 264.

² "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 347.

Suppose, however, that Eusebius had referred to any of them, how changed their position would have been! The Epistles referred to would have attained the exceptional distinction which his mention has conferred upon the rest. The fact is, moreover, that, throughout the controversy, the two divisions of Epistles are commonly designated the "pre-" and "post-Eusebian," making him the turning-point of the controversy. Indeed, further on, Dr. Lightfoot himself admits: "The testimony of Eusebius first differentiates them."¹ The argument (2 and 3) that the eight rejected Epistles betray anachronisms and interpolations, is no refutation of my statement, for the same accusation is brought by the majority of critics against the Vossian Epistles.

The fourth and last argument seems more directly addressed to a second paragraph quoted by Dr. Lightfoot, to which I refer above, and which I have reserved till now, as it requires more detailed notice. It is this:

"It is a total mistake to suppose that the seven Epistles mentioned by Eusebius have been transmitted to us in any special way. These Epistles are mixed up in the Medicean and corresponding ancient Latin MSS. with the other eight Epistles, universally pronounced to be spurious, without distinction of any kind, and all have equal honour."²

I will at once give Dr. Lightfoot's comment on this in contrast with the statement of a writer equally distinguished for learning and orthodoxy—Dr. Tregelles:

DR. LIGHTFOOT.

(4). "It is not strictly true that the seven Epistles are mixed up with the confessedly spurious Epistles. In the Greek and Latin MSS., as also in the Armenian version, the spurious Epistles come after the others; and this circumstance, combined with the facts already mentioned, plainly shows that they were a later addition, borrowed from the Long Recension to complete the body of Ignatian letters."³

DR. TREGELLES.

"It is a mistake to speak of seven Ignatian Epistles in Greek having been transmitted to us, for no such seven exist, except through their having been selected by editors from the Medicean MS. which contains so much that is confessedly spurious;—a fact which some who imagine a diplomatic transmission of seven have overlooked."⁴

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 348.

² S. R. i. p. 265.

³ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 347. Dr. Lightfoot makes the following important admission in a note:—

"The Roman Epistle indeed has been separated from its companions, and is embedded in the Martyrology which stands at the end of this collection in the Latin Version, where doubtless it stood also in the Greek, before the MS. of this latter was mutilated. Otherwise the Vossian Epistles come together, and are followed by the confessedly spurious Epistles in the Greek and Latin MSS. In the Armenian all the Vossian Epistles are together, and the confessedly spurious Epistles follow. See Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, p. 111."

⁴ Note to "Horne's Int. to the Holy Scriptures," 12th ed., 1869. iv. p. 332, note 1. The italics are in the original.

I will further quote the words of Cureton, for as Dr. Lightfoot advances nothing but assertions, it is well to meet him with the testimony of others rather than the mere reiteration of my own statement. Cureton says:

"Again, there is another circumstance which will naturally lead us to look with some suspicion upon the recension of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, as exhibited in the Medicean MS., and in the ancient Latin version corresponding with it, which is, that the Epistles presumed to be the genuine production of that holy Martyr are mixed up with others, which are almost universally allowed to be spurious. Both in the Greek and Latin MSS. all these are placed upon the same footing, and no distinction is drawn between them; and the only ground which has hitherto been assumed for their separation has been the specification of some of them by Eusebius and his omission of any mention of the others."¹

"The external evidence from the testimony of manuscripts in favour of the rejected Greek Epistles, with the exception of that to the Philippians, is certainly greater than that in favour of those which have been received. They are found in all the manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, in the same form; while the others exhibit two distinct and very different recensions, if we except the Epistle to Polycarp, in which the variations are very few. Of these two recensions the shorter has been most generally received: the circumstance of its being shorter seems much to have influenced its reception; and the text of the Medicean Codex and of the two copies of the corresponding Latin version belonging to Gains College, Cambridge, and Corpus Christi College, Oxford, has been adopted. . . . In all these there is no distinction whatever drawn between the former and latter Epistles: all are placed upon the same basis; and there is no ground whatever to conclude either that the arranger of the Greek recension or the translator of the Latin version esteemed one to be better or more genuine than another. Nor can any prejudice result to the Epistles to the Tarsians, to the Antiochians, and to Hero, from the circumstance of their being placed after the others in the collection; for they are evidently arranged in chronological order, and rank after the rest as having been written from Philippi, at which place Ignatius is said to have arrived after he had despatched the previous Letters. So far, therefore, as the evidence of all the existing copies, Latin as well as Greek, of both the recensions is to be considered, it is certainly in favour of the rejected Epistles, rather than of those which have been retained."²

Proceeding from counter-statements to actual facts, I will very briefly show the order in which these Epistles have been found in some of the principal MSS. One of the earliest published was the ancient Latin version of eleven Epistles edited by J. Faber Stapulensis in 1498, which was at least quoted in the ninth century, and which in the subjoined table I shall mark A,³ and which also exhibits the order of Cod. Vat. 859, assigned to the eleventh century.⁴ The next (B) is a Greek MS. edited by Valentinus Paccus in 1557,⁵ and the order at the same time represents

¹ The Ancient Syrian Version, &c., 1845, p. xxiv. f.

² Corpus Ignat., p. 338.

³ *Ib.*, p. ii.

⁴ Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. lvi.

⁵ Cureton, *Corp. Ign.*, p. iii.

that of the Cod. Pal. 150.¹ The third (C) is the ancient Latin translation, referred to above, published by Archbishop Usher.² The fourth (D) is the celebrated Medicean MS. assigned to the eleventh century, and published by Vossius in 1646.³ This also represents the order of the Cod. Casanatensis G. V. 14.⁴ I italicise the rejected Epistles :

A. FABER STAP.	B. VAL. PACÆUS.	C. USHER.	D. VOSSIUS.
1. Trallians	<i>Mar. Cass.</i>	Smyrn.	Smyrn.
2. Magn.	Trallians	Polycarp	Polycarp
3. <i>Tarsians</i>	Magnes.	Ephes.	Ephes.
4. <i>Philip.</i>	<i>Tarsians</i>	Magnes.	Magnes.
5. Philad.	<i>Philip.</i>	Philad.	Philad.
6. Smyrn.	Philad.	Trallians	Trallians
7. Polycarp	Symrn.	<i>Mar. ad Ign.</i>	<i>Mar. ad Ign.</i>
8. <i>Antioch.</i>	Polycarp	<i>Ign. ad Mar.</i>	<i>Ign. ad Mar.</i>
9. <i>Hero</i>	<i>Antioch.</i>	<i>Tarsians</i>	<i>Tarsians.</i>
10. Ephes.	<i>Hero</i>	<i>Antioch</i>	
11. Romans	Ephes.	<i>Hero</i>	
12	Romans	<i>Mart. Ign.</i>	
13.		Romans	

I have given the order in MSS. containing the "Long Recension" as well as the Vossian, because, however much some may desire to exclude them, the variety of arrangement is notable, and presents features which have an undeniable bearing upon this question. Taking the Vossian MS., it is obvious that, without any distinction whatever between the genuine and the spurious, it contains three of the false Epistles, and *does not contain the so-called genuine Epistle to the Romans at all.* The Epistle to the Romans, in fact, is, to use Dr. Lightfoot's own expression, "embedded in the Martyrology," which is as spurious as any of the epistles. This circumstance alone would justify the assertion which Dr. Lightfoot contradicts.

¹ Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. lvii. f.

² Cureton, *Corp. Ignat.*, p. vii. f.

³ Cureton, *Corp. Ign.*, p. xi.; Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. xxxi.; cf., p. lxii.; Jacobson, *Patr. Ap. i.*, p. lxxiii.; Vossius, *Ep. gen. S. Ign. Mart.*, Amstel. 1646.

⁴ Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. lxi.

I must now, in order finally to dispose of this matter of notes, turn for a short time to consider objections raised by Dr. Westcott. Whilst I have to thank him for greater courtesy, I regret that I must point out serious errors into which he has fallen in his statements regarding my references which, as matters of fact, admit of practical test. Before proceeding to them I may make one or two general observations. Dr. Westcott says :

"I may perhaps express my surprise that a writer who is quite capable of thinking for himself should have considered it worth his while to burden his pages with lists of names and writings, arranged for the most part, alphabetically, which have in very many cases no value whatever for a scholar, while they can only oppress the general reader with a vague feeling that all 'profound' critics are on one side. The questions to be discussed must be decided by evidence and by argument and not by authority."¹

Now the fact is that hitherto, in England, argument and evidence have almost been ignored in connection with the great question discussed in this work, and it has practically been decided by the authority of the Church, rendered doubly potent by force of habit and transmitted reverence. The orthodox works usually written on the subject have, to a very great extent, suppressed the objections raised by a mass of learned and independent critics, or treated them as insignificant, and worthy of little more than a passing word of pious indignation. At the same time, therefore, that I endeavour, to the best of my ability, to decide these questions by evidence and argument, in opposition to mere ecclesiastical authority, I refer readers desirous of further pursuing the subject to works where they may find them discussed. I must be permitted to add, that I do not consider I uselessly burden my pages by references to critics who confirm the views in the text or discuss them, for it is right that earnest thinkers should be told the state of opinion, and recognize that belief is not so easy and matter of course a thing as they have been led to suppose, or the unanimity quite so complete as English divines have often seemed to represent it. Dr. Westcott, however, omits to state that I as persistently refer to writers who oppose, as to those who favour, my own conclusions.

Dr. Westcott proceeds to make the accusation which I now desire to investigate. He says :

"Writers are quoted as holding on independent grounds an opinion which is involved in their characteristic assumptions. And more than this, the references are not unfrequently actually misleading. One example will show that I do not speak too strongly."²

¹ A Few Words on "Supernatural Religion," Pref. to Hist. of the Canon, 4th ed., 1874, p. xix.

² *Ib.* p. xix. f.

Dr. Westcott has scrutinized this work with great minuteness, and, as I shall presently explain, he has selected his example with evident care. The idea of illustrating the vast mass of references in these volumes by a single instance is somewhat startling, but to insinuate that a supposed contradiction pointed out in one note runs through the whole work, as he does, if I rightly understand his subsequent expressions, is scarcely worthy of Dr. Westcott, although I am sure he does not mean to be unfair. The example selected is as follows :

"It has been demonstrated that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself on the 20th December, A.D., 115,³ when he was condemned to be cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre, in consequence of the fanatical excitement produced by the earthquake which took place on the 13th of that month. ⁴"

The references in support of these statements are the following :

³ Baur, *Urspr. d. Episc. Tub. Zeitschr. f. Theol.* 1838, H. 3, p. 155 ann.; Dietrich, *Probabilia*, &c., p. 185; Bleek, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 144; Guericke, *H'buch. K. G.*, i. p. 148; Hagenbach, *K. G.*, i. p. 113 f.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 19; Mayerhoff, *Einkl. petr. Schr.* p. 79; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 40, p. 50 f.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 52; *H'buch Einkl. Apocr.*, i. p. 121 f. p. 136.

⁴ Volkmar, *H'buch Einkl. Apocr.*, i. p. 121 ff., 136 f.; *Der Ursprung*, p. 52 ff.; Baur, *Urspr. d. Episc. Tub. Zeitschr. f. Th.* 1838, H. 3, p. 149 f.; *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, 1863, i. p. 440, ann. 1.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 19; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 51 f.; cf. Francke, *Zur Gesch. Trajans*, u. s. w. 1840, p. 253 f.; Helgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 214.

Upon this Dr. Westcott remarks :

"Such an array of authorities, drawn from different schools, cannot but appear overwhelming; and the fact that about half of them are quoted twice over emphasizes the implied precision of their testimony as to the two points affirmed."²

Dr. Westcott, however, has either overlooked or omitted to state the fact that, although some of the writers are quoted twice, the two notes differ in almost every particular, many of the names in note 3 being absent from note 4, other names being inserted in the latter which do not appear in the former, an alteration being in most cases made in the place referred to, and the order in which the authorities are placed being significantly varied. For instance in note 3 the reference to Volkmar is the last, but it is the first in note 4; whilst a similar transposition of order takes place in his works, and alterations in the pages. The references in note 3 a fact, are given for the date occurring in the course of the sentence, whilst those in note 4, placed at the end, are intended to support the whole statement which is made. I must, however, explain an omission, which is pretty obvious, but which

¹ S. R., i. p. 268.

² On the Canon, Preface, 4th ed., p. xx.

I regret may have misled Dr. Westcott in regard to note 3, although it does not affect note 4. Readers are probably aware that there has been, amongst other points, a difference of opinion not only as to the place, but also the date of the martyrdom of Ignatius. I have in every other case carefully stated the question of date, and my omission, in this instance is, I think, the only exception in the book. The fact is, that I had originally in the text the words which I now add to the note: The martyrdom has been variously dated A.D. 107, or A.D. 115-116, but whether assigning the event to Rome or to Antioch a majority of critics of all shades of opinion have adopted the latter date." Thinking it unnecessary, under the circumstances, to burden the text with this, I removed it with the design of putting the statement at the head of the note 3, with reference to "A.D. 115" in the text, but unfortunately an interruption at the time prevented the completion of this intention, as well as the addition of some fuller references to the writers quoted, which had been omitted, and the point, to my infinite regret, was overlooked. The whole of the authorities in note 3, therefore, do not support the apparent statement of martyrdom in Antioch, although they all confirm the date, for which I really referred to them. With this explanation, and marking the omitted references¹ by placing them within brackets, I proceed to analyze the two notes in contrast with Dr. Westcott's statements.

NOTE 3 FOR THE DATE A.D. 115-116.

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

¹ 1. Baur, *Urspr. d. Episc. Tub. Zeitschr.*, 1838, ii. 3, p. 155 anm. In this note, which is too long to quote, *there is nothing*, so far as I see, in any way bearing upon the history² except a passing supposition 'wenn . . . Ignatius im J. 116 an ihn [Polycarp] . . . schrieb. . . .'

THE TRUTH.

Baur, *Urspr. d. Episc. Tub. Zeitschr.*, 1838, H. 3 (p. 149 anm.)

Baur states as the date of the Parthian war, and of Trajan's visit to Rome, "during which the above order" (the sentence against Ignatius) is said to have been given, A.D. 115 and not A.D. 107.

Ib., p. 155 anm.

After showing the extreme improbability of the circumstances under which the letters to the Smyrnaeans and to Polycarp are said to have been written, Baur points out the additional difficulty in regard to the latter that, if Polycarp died in A.D. 167 in his 86th year, and Ignatius

¹ These consist only of an additional page of Baur's work first quoted, and a reference to another of his works quoted in the second note, but accidentally left out of the note 3.

² I take the liberty of putting these words in italics to call attention to the assertion opposed to what I find in the note.

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

"2. Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, x. p. 185. 'Pergamus ad Ignatium qui circa annum cxxvi obiisse dicitur.'

"3. Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 144 [p. 142 ed. 1862] '... In den Briefen des Ignatius Bischofes von Antiochien, der unter Trajan gegen 115 zu Rom als Märtyrer starb.'

"4. Guericke, *Handb. K. G.*, i. p. 148 [p. 177 ed. 3, 1838, the edition which I have used]. 'Ignatius, Bischoff von Antiochien (Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 36), welcher wegen seines standhaften Bekenntnisses Christi unter Trajan 115 nach Rom geführt, und hier 116 im Colosseum von Löwen zerrissen wurde (vgl. § 23, i.)' [where the same statement is repeated].

"5. Hagenbach, *K. G.*, i. 113 f. [I have not been able to see the book referred to, but in his *Lectures Die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1853 [pp. 122 ff.] Hagenbach mentions the difficulty which has been felt as to the execution at Rome, while an execution at Antioch might have been simpler and more impressive, and then quotes Gieseler's solution, and passes on with 'Wei dem auch see.']

¹ It is the same work, I believe, subsequently published in an extended form. The work I quote is entitled "Kirchengeschichte der ersten sechs Jahrhunderte," Dritte, umgearbeitete Auflage, 1869, and is part of a course of lectures carrying the history to the 19th century.

THE TRUTH.

wrote to him as already Bishop of Smyrna in A.D. 116, he must have become Bishop at least in his 35th year, and continued so for upwards of half a century. The inference is clear that if Ignatius died so much earlier as A.D. 107 it involves the still greater improbability that Polycarp must have become Bishop of Smyrna at latest in his 26th year, which is scarcely to be maintained, and the later date is thus obviously supported.

(*Ib.*, *Gesch. christl. Kirche*, i. p. 440 ann. 1).

Baur supports the assertion that Ignatius suffered martyrdom in Antioch, A.D. 115.

The same.

Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 144.

Ignatius suffered martyrdom at Rome under Trajan, A.D. 115.

Guericke, *H'buch K. G.*, i. p. 148.

Ignatius was sent to Rome, under Trajan, A.D. 115, and was destroyed by lions in the Coliseum, A.D. 116.

Hagenbach, *K. G.*, 1869, p. 113 f.

"He (Ignatius) may have filled his office about 40 years when the Emperor, in the year 115 (according to others still earlier) came to Antioch. It was during his war against the Parthians." [Hagenbach states some of the arguments for and against the martyrdom in Antioch, and the journey to Rome, the former of which he seems to consider more probable.]

1
'ar
'w
'be
'by
'oc
'Ej
[Fo
aut
'
p. 7
'ten
'litt
'
p. 4
nati
lette
'ein
'nac
'erk
'dur
'det
'lich
'lich
'fehl
'son
'Ful
'ber
'als
'Vol
'ber
'den
'liefe
'g
52.
not
secon
repea
the n
"10
Apoc
'Hau
'Igna
'dort
'zem
'in F
'vom
'Apo

1 I
sume
shows

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

"6. Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 19. 'All [the Epistles of Ignatius] are posterior to Ignatius himself, who was not thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome by command of Trajan, but at Antioch on December 20, A.D. 115. The Epistles were written after 150 A.D.' [For these peremptory statements no authority whatever is adduced].

"7. Mayerhoff, *Einl. Patr. Schr.*, p. 79. '... Ignatius, der spätestens 117 zu Rom den Märtyrertod litt.

"8. Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 40, mentions 115 as the year of Ignatius' death: p. 50 f. The Ignatian letters are rejected partly 'weil sie eine Märtyrer-reise des Ignatius nach Rom melden, derens schon früher erkanntes ungeschichtliches Wesen durch Volkmar's nicht ungegründete Vermuthung um so wahrscheinlicher wird. Darnach scheint nämlich Ignatius nicht zu Rom auf Befehl des sanftmüthigen Trajans, sondern zu Antiochia selbst, in Folge eines am dreizehnten December 115 eingetretenen Erdbebens, als Opfer eines abergläubischen Volkswahns am zwanzigsten December dieses Jahres im Amphitheater den wilden Thieren zur Beute überliefert worden zu sein.'

"9. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 52. [p. 52 ff.] [This book I have not been able to consult, but from secondary references I gather that it repeats the arguments given under the next reference.]

"10. Volkmar, *Handb. Einl. Apocr.*, p. 121 f., p. 136. 'Ein Haupt der Gönneinde zu Antiochia, Ignatius, wurde während Trajan dortselbst überwinterte, am 20. Dezember den Thieren vorgeworfen, in Folge der durch das Erdbeben vom 13. Dezember 115 gegen die Götter erweckten Volkswuth, ein Op-

THE TRUTH.

Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 19. The same as opposite.

These 'peremptory statements' are of course based upon what is considered satisfactory evidence, though it may not be adduced here.

Mayerhoff, *Einl. petr. Schr.* p. 79. Ignatius suffered martyrdom in Rome at latest A.D. 117.

Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 40, states A.D. 115 as the date of Ignatius' death. At p. 50 he repeats this statement, and gives his support to the view that his martyrdom took place in Antioch on the 20th December, A.D. 115.

Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 52, affirms the martyrdom at Antioch, 20th December, 115.

Th., *H'buch Einl. Apocr.*, p. 121 f., affirms the martyrdom at Antioch, 20th December, 115.

I do not know why Dr. Westcott adds the "ff" to my reference, but I presume it is taken from note 4, where the reference is given to "p. 52 ff." This shows how completely he has failed to see the different object of the two notes.

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

¹ für zugleich der Siegesfeste des Parthicus, welche die Judith-Erzählung (i. 16) andeutet, Dio (c. 24 f. vgl. c. 10) voraussetzt. . . .
 "p. 136. The same statement is repeated briefly."

THE TRUTH.

Ib., p. 136. The same statement, with fuller chronological evidence.

It will thus be seen that the whole of these authorities confirm the later date assigned to the martyrdom, and that Baur, in the note in which Dr. Westcott finds "nothing in any way bearing upon the history except a passing supposition," really advances a weighty argument for it and against the earlier date, and as Dr. Westcott considers, rightly, that argument should decide everything, I am surprised that he has not perceived the propriety of my referring to arguments as well as statements of evidence.

To sum up the opinions expressed, I may state that whilst all the nine writers support the later date, for which purpose they were quoted three of them (Bleek, Guericke, and M^r rhoff) ascribe the martyrdom to Rome, one (Bretschneider) takes no place, one (Hagenbach) is doubtful, but leans to Antioch, and the other four declare for the martyrdom in Antioch. Nothing, however, could show more conclusively the purpose of note 3, which I have explained, than this very contradiction, and the fact that I claim for the general statement in the text, regarding the martyrdom in Antioch itself in opposition to the legend of the journey to and death in Rome, only the authorities in note 4, which I shall now proceed to analyse in contrast with Dr. Westcott's statements, and here I beg the favour of the reader's attention.

NOTE 4.

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

1. Volkmar : see above.

THE TRUTH.

Volkmar, H**'**buch Einl. Apoc., i. p. 121 ff., 136 f.

It will be observed on turning to the passage "above" (10), to which Dr. Westcott refers, that he quotes a single sentence containing merely a concise statement of facts, and that no indication is given to the reader that there is anything beyond it. At p. 136 "the same statement is repeated briefly." Now either Dr. Westcott, whilst bringing a most serious charge against my work, based upon this "one example," has actually not taken the trouble to

¹ On the Canon, Pref. 4th ed. p. xxi. f.

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

THE TRUTH.

examine my reference to "pp. 121 ff., 136 f.," and p. 50 ff., 'o which he would have found himself there directed, or he has acted towards me with a want of fairness which I venture to say he will be the first to regret, when he considers the facts.

Would it be divined from the words opposite, and the sentence "above" that Volkmar enters into an elaborate argument, extending over a dozen closely printed pages, to prove that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself on the 20th December, A. D. 115, probably as a sacrifice to the superstitious fury of the people against the *Severan*, excited by the earthquake which occurred on the thirteenth of that month? I shall not here attempt to give even an epitome of the reasoning, as I shall presently reproduce some of the arguments of Volkmar and others in a more condensed and consecutive form.

Ib., Der Ursprung, p. 52 ff.

Volkmar repeats the affirmations which he had fully argued in the above work and elsewhere.

Baur, Urspr. d. Episc., Tüb. Zeitschr., 1838, H. 3, p. 149 f.

Baur enters into a long and minute examination of the historical character of the martyrdom of Ignatius, and of the Ignatian Epistles, and pronounces the whole to be fabulous, and more especially the representation of his sentence and martyr-journey to Rome. He shows that, while isolated cases of condemnation to death, under certain circumstances, which occurred during Trajan's reign may justify the mere tradition that he suffered martyrdom, there is no instance recorded in which a Christian was condemned to be sent to Rome to be cast to the beasts; that such a sentence is opposed to all historical data of the reign of Trajan, and to all that is known of his character and principles; and that the whole of the statements

2. Baur, *Ursprung d. Episc.*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1838, ii. H. 3, p. 149 f.

In this passage Baur discusses generally the historical character of the martyrdom, which he considers, as a whole, to be 'doubtful and incredible.' To establish this result he notices the relation of Christianity to the Empire in the time of Trajan, which he regards as inconsistent with the condemnation of Ignatius; and the improbable circumstances of the journey. The personal characteristics, the letters, the history of Ignatius, are, in his opinion, all a mere creation of the imagination. The utmost he allows is that he may have suffered martyrdom. (p. 169.)

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

3. Baur, *Geech. chr. Kirche*, 1863, i. p. 440 anm. 1.

Die Verurtheilung ad bestias und die Abführung dazu nach Rom . . . mag auch unter Trajan nichts zu ungewöhnliches gewesen sein, aber . . . bleibt die Geschichte seines Märtyrertums auch nach der Vertheidigung derselben von Lipsius . . . höchst unwahrscheinlich. Das Factische ist wohl nur das Ignatius im J. 115, als Trajan in Antiochien überwinterte, in Folge des Erdbebens in diesem Jahr, in Antiochien selbst als ein Opfer der Volkswuth zum Märtyrer wurde.

4. Davidson : see above.

5. Scholten : see above.

6. Franke, *Zur Geschr. Trajan's*,

THE TRUTH.

regarding the supposed journey directly discredit the story. The argument is much too long and elaborate to reproduce here, but I shall presently make use of some parts of it.

Ib., *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, 1863, i. p. 440 anm. 1.

"The reality is 'wohl nur' that in the year 115, when Trajan wintered in Antioch, Ignatius suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself, as a sacrifice to popular fury consequent on the earthquake of that year. The rest was developed out of the reference to Trajan for the glorification of martyrdom."

Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 19.

"All (the Epistles) are posterior to Ignatius himself, who was not thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome by command of Trajan, but at Antioch, on December 20th, A.D. 115.

Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 51f.

The Ignatian Epistles are declared to be spurious for various reasons, but partly "because they mention a martyr-journey of Ignatius to Rome, the unhistorical character of which, already earlier recognized (see *Baur*, *Urspr. des Episc.*, 1838, p. 147 ff., *Die ign. Briefe*, 1848, *Schwegler*, *Nachap. Zeitalt.*, ii. p. 159 ff., *Hilgenfeld*, *Apost. Väter*, p. 210 ff., *Révillé*, *Le Lien*, 1856, No. 18—22), is made all the more probable by Volkmar's not groundless conjecture. According to it Ignatius is reported to have become the prey of wild beasts on the 20th December, 115, not in the amphitheatre in Rome by order of the mild Trajan, but in Antioch itself, as the victim of superstitious popular fury consequent on an earthquake which occurred on the 1st December of that year."

"Cf. *Franke*, *Zur Gesche. Trajan's*

DR. WESTCOTT'S STATEMENTS.

1840 [1837], p. 253 f. [A discussion of the date of the beginning of Trajan's Parthian war, which he fixes in A.D. 115, but he decides nothing directly as to the time of Ignatius' martyrdom.]

7. Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 214 [pp. 210 ff.]. Hilgenfeld points out the objection to the narrative in the Acts of the Martyrdom, the origin of which he refers to the period between Eusebius and Jerome: setting aside this detailed narrative he considers the historical character of the general statements in the letters. The mode of punishment by a provincial governor causes some difficulty: 'bedenklich' he continues, 'ist jedenfalls der andre Punkt, die Versendung nach Rom.' Why was the punishment not carried out at Antioch? Would it be likely that under an Emperor like Trajan a prisoner like Ignatius would be sent to Rome to fight in the amphitheatre? The circumstances of the journey as described are most improbable. The account of the persecution itself is beset by difficulties. Having set out these objections he leaves the question, casting doubt (like Baur) upon the whole history, and gives no support to the bold affirmation of a martyrdom "at Antioch, on December 20th, A.D. 115."

THE TRUTH.

1840. This is a mere comparative reference to establish the important point of the date of the Parthian war and Trajan's visit to Antioch. Dr. Westcott omits the "Cf."

Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 214 ff. Hilgenfeld strongly supports Baur's argument which is referred to above, and while declaring the whole story of Ignatius, and more especially the journey to Rome, incredible, he considers the mere fact that Ignatius suffered martyrdom the only point regarding which the possibility has been made out. He shows¹ that the martyrology states the 20th December as the day of Ignatius' death, and that his remains were buried at Antioch, where they still were in the days of Chrysostom and Jerome. He argues from all that is known of the reign and character of Trajan, that such a sentence from the Emperor himself, is quite unsupported and inconceivable. A provincial Governor might have condemned him *ad bestias*, but in any case the transmission to Rome is more doubtful. He shows, however, that the whole story is inconsistent with historical facts, and the circumstances of the journey incredible.

It is impossible to give even a sketch of this argument, which extends over five long pages, but although Hilgenfeld does not directly refer to the theory of the martyrdom in Antioch itself, his reasoning forcibly points to that conclusion, and forms part of the converging trains of reasoning which result in that "demonstration" which I assert. I will presently make use of some of his arguments.

At the close of this analysis Dr. Westcott sums up the result as follows:

"In this case, therefore, again, Volkmar alone offers any arguments in support of the statement in the text; and the final result of the references is,

¹ p. 213.

that the alleged 'demonstration' is, at the most, what Scholten calls 'a not groundless conjecture.'¹

It is scarcely possible to imagine a more complete misrepresentation of the fact than the statement that "Volkmar alone offers any argument in support of the statement in the text," and it is incomprehensible upon any ordinary theory. My mere sketch cannot possibly convey an adequate idea of the elaborate arguments of Volkmar, Baur, and Hilgenfeld, but I hope to state their main features, a few pages on. With regard of Dr. Westcott's remark on the "alleged 'demonstration,'" it must be evident that when a writer states anything to be "demonstrated" he expresses his own belief. It is impossible to secure absolute unanimity of opinion, and the only question in such a case is whether I refer to writers, in connection with the circumstances which I affirm to be demonstrated, who advance arguments and evidence bearing upon it. A critic is quite at liberty to say that the arguments are insufficient, but he is not at liberty to deny that there are any arguments at all when the elaborate reasoning of men like Volkmar, Baur and Hilgenfeld is referred to. Therefore, when he goes on to say:

"It seems quite needless to multiply comments on these results. Anyone who will candidly consider this analysis will, I believe, agree with me in thinking that such a style of annotation, which runs through the whole work, is justly characterized as frivolous and misleading."²

Dr. Westcott must excuse my retorting that, not my annotation, but his own criticism of it, endorsed by Professor Lightfoot, is, "frivolous and misleading," and I venture to hope that this analysis, tedious as it has been, may once for all establish the propriety and substantial accuracy of my references.

As Dr. Westcott does not advance any further arguments of his own in regard to the Ignatian-controversy, I may now return to Dr. Lightfoot, and complete my reply to his objections; but I must do so with extreme brevity, as I have already devoted too much space to this subject, and must now come to a close. To the argument that it is impossible to suppose that soldiers such as the "ten leopards" described in the Epistles would allow a prisoner, condemned to wild beasts for professing Christianity, deli-

¹ On the Canon, Preface 4th ed. p. xxiv. Dr. Westcott adds, in a note, "It may be worth while to add that in spite of the profuse display of learning in connexion with Ignatius, I do not see even in the second edition any reference to the full and elaborate work of Zahn." I might reply to this that my MS. had left my hands before Zahn's work had reached England, but, moreover, the work contains nothing new to which reference was necessary.

² On the Canon, Preface, 4th ed. p. xxv.

berately to write long epistles at every stage of his journey, promulgating the very doctrines for which he was condemned, as well as to hold the freest intercourse with deputations from the various Churches, Dr. Lightfoot advances arguments, derived from Zahn, regarding the Roman procedure in cases that are said to be "known." These cases, however, are neither analogous, nor have they the force which is assumed. That Christians imprisoned for their religious belief should receive their nourishment, while in prison from friends, is anything but extraordinary, and that bribes should secure access to them in many cases, and some mitigation of suffering, is possible. The case of Ignatius, however, is very different. If the meaning of *οἱ καὶ εἰσπυροῦμενοι χεῖρας γίνονται* be that, although receiving bribes, the "ten leopards" only became more cruel, the very reverse of the leniency and mild treatment ascribed to the Roman procedure is described by the writer himself as actually taking place, and certainly nothing approaching a parallel to the correspondence of pseudo-Ignatius can be pointed out in any known instance. The case of Saturus and Perpetua, even if true, is no confirmation, the circumstances being very different; ¹ but in fact there is no evidence whatever that the extant history was written by either of them; ² but on the contrary, I maintain every reason to believe that it was not.

Dr. Lightfoot advances the instance of Paul as a case in point of a Christian prisoner treated with great consideration and who "writes letters freely, receives visits from his friends, communicates with churches and individuals as he desires." It is scarcely possible to imagine two cases more dissimilar than those of pseudo-Ignatius and Paul, as narrated in the "Acts of the Apostles," although doubtless the story of the former has been framed upon some of the lines of the latter. Whilst Ignatius is condemned to be cast to the wild beasts as a Christian, Paul is not condemned at all, but stands in the position of a Roman citizen, rescued from infuriated Jews (xxiii. 27), repeatedly declared by his judges to have done nothing worthy of death or of bonds (xxv. 25, xxvi. 31), and who might have been set at liberty but that he had appealed to Caesar (xxv. 11 f., xxvi. 32). His position was one which secured the sympathy of the Roman soldiers. Ignatius "fights with beasts from Syria even unto Rome," and is cruelly treated by his "ten leopards," but Paul is represented as receiving very different treatment. Felix commands that his own people should be allowed to come and minister to him (xxiv. 23), and when the voyage is commenced it is said that

¹ *Ruinart, Acta Mart.*, p. 137 ff.; cf. *Baronius, Mart. Rom.*, 1631, p. 152.

² Cf. *Lardner, Credibility, &c. Works*, iii. p. 3.

³ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 349.

Julius, who had charge of Paul, treated him courteously, and gave him liberty to go to see his friends at Sidon (xxvii. 3). At Rome he was allowed to live by himself with a single soldier to guard him (xxviii. 16), and he continued for two years in his own hired house (xxviii. 28). These circumstances are totally different from those under which the Epistles of Ignatius are said to have been written.

"But the most powerful testimony," Dr. Lightfoot goes on to say, "is derived from the representations of a heathen writer."¹ The case of Peregrinus, to which he refers, seems to me even more unfortunate than that of Paul. Of Peregrinus himself, historically, we really know little or nothing, for the account of Lucian is scarcely received as serious by any one. Lucian narrates that this Peregrinus Proteus, a cynic philosopher, having been guilty of parricide and other crimes, found it convenient to leave his own country. In the course of his travels he fell in with Christians and learnt their doctrines, and according to Lucian, the Christians soon were mere children in his hands, so that he became in his own person, "prophet, high-priest, and ruler of a synagogue," and further "they spoke of him as a god, used him as a law-giver, and elected him their chief man."² After a time he was put in prison for his new faith, which Lucian says was a real service to him afterwards in his impostures. During the time he was in prison, he is said to have received those services from Christians which Dr. Lightfoot quotes. Peregrinus was afterwards set at liberty by the Governor of Syria, who loved philosophy,³ and travelled about living in great comfort at the expense of the Christians, until at last they quarrelled in consequence, Lucian thinks, of his eating some forbidden food. Finally, Peregrinus ended his career by throwing himself into the flames of a funeral pile during the Olympian games. An earthquake is said to have taken place at the time; a vulture flew out from the pile crying out with a human voice; and shortly after Peregrinus rose again and appeared clothed in white raiment unhurt by the fire.

Now this writing, of which I have given the barest sketch, is a direct satire upon Christians, or even, as Baur affirms, "a parody of the history of Jesus."⁴ There are no means of ascertaining that any of the events of the Christian career of Peregrinus were true, but it is obvious that Lucian's policy was to exaggerate the facility of access to prisoners, as well as the assiduity and attention of the Christians to Peregrinus, the ease with which they were duped being the chief point of the satire.

¹ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 350.

² *De Morte Peregr.*, 11.

³ *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i. p. 410 f.

³ *Ib.*, 14.

There is another circumstance which must be mentioned. Lucian's account of Peregrinus is claimed by supporters of the Ignatian Epistles as evidence for them.¹ "The singular correspondence in this narrative with the account of Ignatius, combined with some striking coincidences of expression," they argue, show "that Lucian was acquainted with the Ignatian history, if not with the Ignatian letters." These are the words of Dr. Lightfoot, although he guards himself, in referring to this argument, by the words: "if it be true," and does not express his own opinion; but he goes on to say: "At all events it is conclusive for the matter in hand, as showing that Christian prisoners were treated in the very way described in these epistles."² On the contrary, it is in no case conclusive of anything. If it were true that Lucian employed, as the basis of his satire, the Ignatian Epistles and Martyrology, it is clear that his narrative cannot be used as independent testimony for the truth of the statements regarding the treatment of Christian prisoners. On the other hand, as this cannot be shown, his story remains a mere satire with very little historical value. Apart from all this, however, the case of Peregrinus, a man confined in prison for a short time, under a favourable governor, and not pursued with any severity, is no parallel to that of Ignatius condemned *ad bestias* and, according to his own express statement, cruelly treated by the "ten leopards;" and further the liberty of pseudo-Ignatius, must greatly have exceeded all that is said of Peregrinus, if he was able to write such epistles, and hold such free intercourse as they represent.

I will now, in the briefest manner possible, indicate the arguments of the writers referred to in the note³ attacked by Dr. Westcott, in which he cannot find any relevancy, but which, in my opinion, demonstrate that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself. The reader who wishes to go minutely into the matter must be good enough to consult the writers there cited, and I will only sketch the case here, without specifically indicating the source of each argument. Where I add any particulars I will, when necessary, give my authorities. The Ignatian Epistles and martyrologies set forth that, during a general persecution of Christians, in Syria, at least, Ignatius was condemned by Trajan, when he wintered in Antioch during the Parthian War, to be taken to Rome and cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. Instead of being sent to Rome by the short sea voyage, he is represented as taken thither by the long and incom-

¹ See for instance, *Denzinger, Ueber die Aechtheit d. bish. Textes d. Ignat. Briefe*, 1849, p. 87 ff.; *Zahn, Ignatius v. Ant.*, 1873, p. 517 ff.

² "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 350 f.

³ S. R., i. p. 268, note 4.

parably more difficult land route. The ten soldiers who guard him are described by himself as only rendered more cruel by the presents made to them to secure kind treatment for him, so that not in the amphitheatre only, but all the way from Syria to Rome, by night and day, by sea and land, he "fights with beasts." Notwithstanding this severity, the Martyr freely receives deputations from the various Churches, who, far from being molested, are able to have constant intercourse with him, and even to accompany him in his journey. He not only converses with these freely, but he is represented as writing long Epistles to the various Churches which, instead of containing the last exhortations and farewell words which might be considered natural from the expectant martyr, are filled with advanced views of Church government, and the dignity of the episcopate. These circumstances at the outset, excite grave suspicions of the truth of the documents, and of the story which they set forth.

When we inquire whether the alleged facts of the case are supported by historical data, the reply is emphatically adverse. All that is known of the treatment of Christians during the reign of Trajan, as well as of the character of the Emperor, is opposed to the supposition that Ignatius could have been condemned by Trajan himself, or even by a provincial governor, to be taken to Rome and there cast to the beasts. It is well known that under Trajan there was no general persecution of Christians, although there may have been instances in which prominent members of the body were either punished or fell victims to popular fury and superstition.¹ An instance of this kind was the martyrdom of Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, reported by Hegesippus. He was not condemned *ad bestias*, however, and much less deported to Rome for the purpose. Why should Ignatius have been so exceptionally treated? In fact, even during the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius, although Christians in Syria were frequently enough cast to the beasts, there is no instance recorded in which any one condemned to this fate was sent to Rome. Such a sentence is quite at variance with the clement character of Trajan and his principles of government. Neander, in a passage quoted by Baur, says: "As he (Trajan), like Pliny, considered Christianity mere fanaticism, he also probably thought that if severity were combined with clemency, if too much noise were not made about it, the open demonstration not left unpunished but also minds not stirred up by persecution, the fanatical enthusiasm would

¹ Dean Milman says: "Trajan, indeed, is absolved, at least by the almost general voice of antiquity, from the crime of persecuting the Christians." In a note, he adds: "Excepting of Ignatius, probably of Simeon of Jerusalem, there is no authentic martyrdom in the reign of Trajan."—Hist. of Christianity, 1867, ii. p. 103.

most easily cool down, and the matter by degrees come to an end."¹ This was certainly the policy which mainly characterized his reign. Now not only would such a severe sentence have been contrary to such principles, but the agitation excited would have been enormously increased by sending the martyr a long journey by land through Asia, and allowing him to pass through some of the principal cities, hold constant intercourse with the various Christian communities, and address long epistles to them. With the fervid desire for martyrdom then prevalent, such a journey would have been a triumphal progress, spreading everywhere excitement and enthusiasm. It may not be out of place, as an indication of the results of impartial examination, to point out that Neander's inability to accept the Ignatian epistles largely rests on his disbelief of the whole tradition of this sentence and martyr-journey. "We do not recognize the Emperor Trajan in this narrative," (the martyrology) he says, "therefore cannot but doubt everything which is related by this document, as well as that, during this reign, Christians can have been cast to the wild beasts."²

If, for a moment, we suppose that, instead of being condemned by Trajan himself, Ignatius received his sentence from a provincial governor, the story does not gain greater probability. It is not credible that such an official would have ventured to act so much in opposition to the spirit of the Emperor's government. Besides, if such a governor did pronounce so severe a sentence, why did he not execute it in Antioch? Why send the prisoner to Rome? By doing so he made all the more conspicuous a severity which was not likely to be pleasing to the clement Trajan. The cruelty which dictated a condemnation *ad bestias* would have been more gratified by execution on the spot, and there is besides no instance known, even during the following general persecution, of Christians being sent for execution in Rome. The transport to Rome is in no case credible, and the utmost that can be admitted is, that Ignatius, like Simeon of Jerusalem, may have been condemned to death during this reign, more especially if the event be associated with some sudden outbreak of superstitious fury against the Christians, to which the martyr may at once have fallen a victim. We are not without indications of such a case operating in the case of Ignatius.

It is generally admitted that the date of Trajan's visit to Antioch is A.D. 115, when he wintered there during the Parthian war. An earthquake occurred on the 13th December of that year, which was well calculated to excite popular superstition. It may not be out of place to quote here the account of the earthquake given

¹ K. G., 1842, i. p. 171.

² K. G. i. p. 172 *adm.*

by Dean Milman, who, although he mentions a different date, and adheres to the martyrdom in Rome, still associates the condemnation of Ignatius with the earthquake. He says: "Nevertheless, at that time there were circumstances which account with singular likelihood for that sudden outburst of persecution in Antioch. . . . At this very time an earthquake, more than usually terrible and destructive, shook the cities of the East. Antioch suffered its most appalling ravages—Antioch, crowded with the legionaries prepared for the Emperor's invasion of the East, with ambassadors and tributary kings from all parts of the East. The city shook through all its streets; houses, palaces, theatres, temples fell crashing down. Many were killed; the Consul Peto died of his hurts. The Emperor himself hardly escaped through a window, and took refuge in the Circus, where he passed some days in the open air. Whence this terrible blow but from the wrath of the Gods, who must be appeased by unusual sacrifices? This was towards the end of January; early in February the Christian Bishop, Ignatius, was arrested. We know how, during this century, at every period of public calamity, whatever that calamity might be, the cry of the panic-stricken Heathens was, 'The Christians to the lions!' It may be that, in Trajan's humanity, in order to prevent a general massacre by the infuriated populace, or to give greater solemnity to the sacrifice, the execution was ordered to take place, not in Antioch, but in Rome."¹ I contend that these reasons, on the contrary, render execution in Antioch infinitely more probable. To continue however: the earthquake occurred on the 13th, and the martyrdom of Ignatius took place on the 20th December, just a week after the earthquake. His remains, as we know from Chrysostom and others, were, as an actual fact, interred at Antioch. The natural inference is that the martyrdom, the only part of the Ignatian story which is credible, occurred not in Rome but in Antioch itself, in consequence of the superstitious fury against the *ἀθεοὶ* aroused by the earthquake.

I will now go more into the details of the brief statements I have just made, and here we come for the first time to John Malalas. In the first place he mentions the occurrence of the earthquake on the 13th December. I will quote Dr. Lightfoot's own rendering of his further important statement. He says:

"The words of John Malalas are:

"The same king Trajan was residing in the same city (Antioch) when the visitation of God (i.e. the earthquake) occurred. And at that time the holy Ignatius, the bishop of the city of Antioch, was martyred (or bore testimony,

¹ Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 101 f.

μ
he
m
m.
a
wh
of
ev
the
Dr
ma
the
irri
it i
Tra
may
even
the
theo
it.
trao
" p
easy
whos
rupi
earlie
the ex
'durin
writen
Th
shoul
expla
that
the N
of th
before
applie
instan
so imp
points
1 p. 2
2 Ib.
3 "Co
4 Ib.,

μαρτύρησε) before him (ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ); for he was exasperated against him, because he reviled him."¹

Dr. Lightfoot endeavours in every way to discredit this statement. He argues that Malalas tells foolish stories about other matters, and, therefore, is not to be believed here; but so simple a piece of information may well be correctly conveyed by a writer who elsewhere may record stupid traditions.² If the narrative of foolish stories and fabulous traditions is to exclude belief in everything else stated by those who relate them, the whole of the Fathers are disposed of at one fell swoop, for they all do so. Dr. Lightfoot also asserts that the theory of the cause of the martyrdom advanced by Volkmar "receives no countenance from the story of Malalas, who gives a wholly different reason—the irritating language used to the Emperor."³ On the other hand, it in no way contradicts it, for Ignatius can only have "reviled" Trajan when brought before him, and his being taken before him may well have been caused by the fury excited by the earthquake, even if the language of the Bishop influenced his condemnation; the whole statement of Malalas is in perfect harmony with the theory in its details, and in the main, of course, directly supports it. Then Dr. Lightfoot actually makes use of the following extraordinary argument:

"But it may be worth while adding that the error of Malalas is capable of easy explanation. He has probably misinterpreted some earlier authority, whose language lent itself to misinterpretation. The words *μαρτυρεῖν*, *μαρτυρία*, which were afterwards used especially of martyrdom, had in the earlier ages a wider sense, including other modes of witnessing to the faith: the expression *ἐπὶ Τραϊάνου* again is ambiguous and might denote either 'during the reign of Trajan,' or 'in the presence of Trajan.' A blundering writer like Malalas might have stumbled over either expression."⁴

This is a favourite device. In case his abuse of poor Malalas should not sufficiently discredit him, Dr. Lightfoot attempts to explain away his language. It would be difficult indeed to show that the words *μαρτυρεῖν*, *μαρτυρία*, already used in that sense in the New Testament, were not, at the date at which any record of the martyrdom of Ignatius which Malalas could have had before him was written, employed to express martyrdom, when applied to such a case, as Dr. Lightfoot indeed has in the first instance rendered the phrase. Even Zahn, whom Dr. Lightfoot so implicitly follows, emphatically decides against him on both points. "The *ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ* together with *τότε* can only signify 'coram

¹ p. 276 (Ed. Boun). "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 352.

² *Ib.*, p. 353 f.

³ "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 352.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 353 f.

Trajanō ('in the presence of Trajan'), and *ἐπαρτήθη* only the execution."¹ Let any one simply read over Dr. Lightfoot's own rendering, which I have quoted above, and he will see that such quibbles are excluded, and that, on the contrary, Malalas seems excellently well and directly to have interpreted his earlier authority.

That the statement of Malalas does not agree with the reports of the Fathers is no real objection, for we have good reason to believe that none of them had information from any other source than the Ignatian Epistles themselves, or tradition. Eusebius evidently had not. Irenæus, Origen, and some later Fathers tell us nothing about him. Jerome and Chrysostom clearly take their accounts from these sources. Malalas is the first who, by his variation, proves that he had another and different authority before him, and in abandoning the martyr-journey to Rome, his account has infinitely greater apparent probability. Malalas lived at Antioch, which adds some weight to his statement. It is objected that so also did Chrysostom, and at an earlier period, and yet he repeats the Roman story. This, however, is no valid argument against Malalas. Chrysostom was too good a churchman to doubt the story of Epistles so much tending to edification, which were in wide circulation, and had been quoted by earlier Fathers. It is in no way surprising that, some two centuries and a half after the martyrdom, he should quietly have accepted the representations of the Epistles purporting to have been written by the martyr himself, and that their story should have shaped the prevailing tradition.

The remains of Ignatius, as we are informed by Chrysostom and Jerome, long remained interred in the cemetery of Antioch, but finally,—in the time of Theodosius, it is said,—were translated with great pomp and ceremony to a building which,—such is the irony of events,—had previously been a Temple of Fortune. The story, told, of course, is that the relics of the martyr had been carefully collected in the Coliseum and carried from Rome to Antioch. After reposing there for some centuries, the relics, which are said to have been transported from Rome to Antioch, were, about the seventh century, carried back from Antioch to Rome.² The natural and more simple conclusion is that, instead of this double translation, the bones of Ignatius had always remained in Antioch, where he had suffered martyrdom, and the tradition that they had been brought back from Rome was merely the explanation which reconciled the fact of their actually being in Antioch with the legend of the Ignatian Epistles.

¹ Ignatius v. Ant., p. 66 ann. 3.

² I need not refer to the statement of Nicephorus that those relics were first brought from Rome to Constantinople and afterwards translated to Antioch.

The 20th of December is the date assigned to the death of Ignatius in the Martyrology,¹ and Zahn admits that this interpretation is undeniable.² Moreover, the anniversary of his death was celebrated on that day in the Greek Churches and throughout the East. In the Latin Church it is kept on the 1st of February. There can be little doubt that this was the day of the translation of the Relics to Rome, and this was evidently the view of Ruinart, who, although he could not positively contradict the views of his own Church, says "*Ignatii festum Græci vigesima die mensis Decembris celebrant, quo ipsum passum fuisse Acta testantur; Latini vero die prima Februarii, an ob aliquam sacrarum ejus reliquiarum translationem? plures enim fuisse constat.*"³ Zahn⁴ states that the Feast of the translation in later calendars was celebrated on the 29th January, and he points out the evident ignorance which prevailed in the West regarding Ignatius.⁵

On the one hand, therefore, all the historical data which we possess regarding the reign and character of Trajan discredit the story that Ignatius was sent to Rome to be exposed to beasts in the Coliseum; and all the positive evidence which exists, independent of the Epistles themselves, tends to establish the fact that he suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself. On the other hand, all the evidence which is offered for the statement that Ignatius was sent to Rome is more or less directly based upon the representations of the letters, the authenticity of which is in discussion, and it is surrounded with improbabilities of every kind. And what is the value of any evidence emanating from the Ignatian Epistles and martyrologies? There are three martyrologies which, as Ewald says, are "the one more fabulous than the other." There are fifteen epistles all equally purporting to be by Ignatius, and most of them handed down together in MSS., without any distinction. Three of these, in Latin only, are universally rejected, as are also other five Epistles, of which there are Greek, Latin, and other versions. Of the remaining seven there are two forms, one called the Long Recension and another shorter, known as the Vossian Epistles. The former is almost unanimously rejected as shamefully interpolated and falsified;

¹ *Ruinart, Acta Mart.*, pp. 59, 69.

² *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 68.

³ *Ruinart, Acta Mart.*, p. 56. Baronius makes the anniversary of the martyrdom 1st February, and that of the translation 17th December. *Mart. Rom.* p. 87, 776 ff.

⁴ *Ignatius v. Ant.*, p. 27, p. 68 ann. 2.

⁵ There is no sufficient evidence for the statement that in Chrysostom's time, the day dedicated to Ignatius was in June. The mere allusion, in a Homily delivered in honour of Ignatius, that "recently" the feast of Sta. Pelagia (in the Latin Calendar 9 June) had been celebrated, by no means justifies such a conclusion, and there is nothing else to establish it.

and a majority of critics assert that the text of the Vossian Epistles is likewise very impure. Besides these there is a still shorter version of three Epistles only, the Curetonian, which many able critics declare to be the only genuine letters of Ignatius, whilst a still greater number, both from internal and external reasons, deny the authenticity of the Epistles in any form. The second and third centuries teem with pseudonymic literature, but I venture to say that pious fraud has never been more busy and conspicuous than in dealing with the martyr of Antioch. The mere statement of the simple and acknowledged facts regarding the Ignatian Epistles is ample justification of the assertion, which so mightily offends Dr. Lightfoot, that "the whole of the Ignatian literature is a mass of falsification and fraud." Even my indignant critic himself has not ventured to use as genuine more than the three short Syriac letters¹ out of this mass of forgery which he rebukes me for holding so cheap. Documents which lie under such grave and permanent suspicion cannot prove anything. As I have shown, however, the Vossian Epistles, whatever the value of their testimony, so far from supporting the claims advanced in favour of our Gospels, rather discredit them.

I have now minutely followed Professor Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott in their attacks upon me in connection with Eusebius and the Ignatian Epistles, and I trust that I have shown once for all that the charges of "misrepresentation" and "misstatement" so lightly and liberally advanced, far from being well-founded, recoil upon themselves. It is impossible in a work like this, dealing with such voluminous materials, to escape errors of detail, as both of these gentlemen bear witness, but I have at least conscientiously endeavoured to be fair, and I venture to think that few writers have ever more fully laid before readers the actual means of judging of the accuracy of every statement which has been made.

Before closing, I must say a few words regarding another of my critics, who is, however, of a very different order. My system of criticism is naturally uncongenial to Mr. Matthew Arnold, but while he says so with characteristic vigour, he likewise speaks of this work with equally characteristic generosity, and I cordially thank him. I could only be classed by mistake amongst the "objectors" to "Literature and Dogma," and however different may be the procedure in "Supernatural Religion," there is fundamental agreement between the two works, and the one may be considered the complement of the other. Some one must do the "pounding," if religion is to be a matter of belief and not of mere

¹ St Paul's Ep. to the Phillipians, 3rd ed., 1873, p. 232, note. Cf. "Contemporary Review," February, 1875, p. 358 f.

shifty opinion. We really address two distinct classes of readers. The reader who "has read *and accepted*" Mr. Matthew Arnold's "half dozen lines about the composition of the Gospels," and his "half dozen pages about miracles," may in one sense be "just in the same position as when he has read" the whole of this work¹ but I have written for those who do not accept them, and who,—as I think rightly,—distrust the conclusions merely forced upon them by ordinary "reflection and experience," and in such important matters demand evidence of a much more tangible kind. I would put it to Mr. Arnold whether, in seeming to depreciate any attempt to systematize and carry to logical conclusions the whole argument regarding the reality of Miracles and Divine Revelation, he does not do himself injustice, and enunciate a dangerous doctrine. No doubt his own clear insight and wide culture have enabled him to discern truth more surely, and with less apparent effort, than most of those whom he addresses, but in encouraging, as he thus practically does, the adoption by others of religious views with very little trouble or thought, which have certainly cost himself years of training and study, he both cheapens his own intellectual labour, and advocates a superficiality which already has too many attractions. Whether he address readers whose belief is already established, or those who are ready to accept it second hand from himself, it seems to me that no work should be unwelcome which supplies evidence of the results, which it has suited his own immediate purpose merely to assume.

Mr. Matthew Arnold objects that my book leaves the reader "with the feeling that the Bible stands before him like a fair tree all stripped, torn and defaced, not at all like a tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations,"² but if this be the case, I submit that it is a necessary process through which the Bible must go, before it can be successfully transplanted into that healthy soil, in which alone its leaves can truly be for the healing of any one. Under such circumstances, destructive must precede constructive criticism. It is only when we clearly recognize that the Bible is not, in any ecclesiastical sense, the word of God, that we can worthily honour and "enjoy" it as the word of Man. Mr. Matthew Arnold finely says, with regard to what Jesus said and did, that: "his reporters were incapable of rendering it, he was so much above them"; and he rightly considers that the governing idea of our criticism of the four Evangelists should be "to make out what in their report of Jesus, is Jesus, and what is the reporters." I hold, however, that it is only after such an examination as I have endeavoured to carry out, and which for the time

¹ "Contemporary Review," March, 1875, p. 502.

² "Contemporary Review," October, 1874, p. 798.

must seem hard and wanting in sympathetic appreciation, that most persons educated in Christendom can rightly put any such governing idea into practice. It is only when we are entitled to reject the theory of miraculous Divine Revelation that the Bible attains its full beauty, losing the blots and anomalies which it presented in its former character, and acquiring wondrous significance as the expression of the hopes and aspirations of humanity, from which every man may learn wisdom and derive inspiration. The value of such a Book seems to me indestructible. I heartily sympathise with Mr. Arnold's desire to secure due appreciation for the venerable volume, of the beauty of which he has so fine and delicate a perception. A truer insight into its meaning may certainly be imparted by such eloquent and appreciating criticism, and no one is a better judge than Mr. Matthew Arnold of the necessity to plead for the Book, with those who are inclined thoughtlessly to reject it along with the errors which have grown with and been based upon it. But, in the end, every man who has a mind and a heart must love and honour the Bible, and he who has neither is beyond the reach of persuasion.

This work has been revised throughout.¹ It was, as I stated at the time, originally carried through the press under very great difficulties, and the revision of details, upon which I had counted, was not only prevented, but, beyond a careful revision of the First Part for the second edition, circumstances have until now even prevented my seriously reading through the work since it has been in print. To those who have been good enough to call my attention to errors, or to suggest improvements, I return very sincere thanks. In making this revision I have endeavoured to modify unimportant points, in some of which I have been misunderstood, so as to avoid as far as possible raising difficulties, or inviting discussion without real bearing upon the main argument. As I knew the alacrity with which some critics seize upon such points as serious concessions, I beg leave to say that I have not altered anything from change of opinion. I trust that greater clearness and accuracy may have been secured.

March 15th, 1845.

¹ It is right to mention that, whilst I have examined a great many of the references, I have not had time to verify them all.

PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE present work is the result of many years of earnest and serious investigation, undertaken in the first instance for the regulation of personal belief, and now published as a contribution towards the establishment of Truth in the minds of others who are seeking for it. The author's main object has been conscientiously and fully to state the facts of the case, to make no assertions the grounds for which are not clearly given, and as far as possible to place before the reader the materials from which a judgment may be intelligently formed regarding the important subject discussed.

The great Teacher is reported to have said :—" Be ye approved money-changers," wisely discerning the gold of Truth, and no man need hesitate honestly to test its reality, and unflinchingly to reject base counterfeits. It is obvious that the most indispensable requisite in regard to Religion is that it should be true. No specious hopes or flattering promises can have the slightest value unless they be genuine and based upon substantial realities. Fear of the results of investigation, therefore, should deter no man, for the issue in any case is gain : emancipation from delusion, or increase of assurance. It is poor honour to sequester a creed from healthy handling, or to shrink from the serious examination of its doctrines. That which is true in Religion cannot be shaken ; that which is false no one can desire to preserve.

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE author has taken advantage of the issue of a second edition to revise this work. He has re-written portions of the first part, and otherwise re-arranged it. He hopes that the argument has thus been made more clear and consecutive.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION.

INTRODUCTION.

THEORETICALLY, the duty of adequate inquiry into the truth of any statement of serious importance before believing it is universally admitted. Practically, no duty is more universally neglected. This is more especially the case in regard to Religion, in which our concern is so great, yet the credentials of which so few personally examine. The difficulty of such an investigation and the inability of most men to pursue it whether from want of opportunity or want of knowledge, are no doubt the chief reasons for this neglect; but another, and scarcely less potent, obstacle has probably been the odium which has been attached to any doubt regarding the dominant religion, as well as the serious, though covert, discouragement of the Church to all critical examination of the title-deeds of Christianity. The spirit of doubt, if not of intelligent inquiry, has, however, of late years, become too strong for repression, and, at the present day, the pertinency of the question of a German writer: "Are we still Christians?" receives unconscious illustration from many a popular pulpit, and many a social discussion.

The prevalent characteristic of popular theology in England, at this time, may be said to be a tendency to eliminate from Christianity, with thoughtless dexterity, every supernatural element which does not quite accord with current opinion, and yet to ignore the fact that, in so doing, ecclesiastical Christianity has practically been altogether abandoned. This tendency is fostered with profoundly illogical zeal by many distinguished men within the Church itself, who endeavour to arrest for a moment the pursuing wolves of doubt and unbelief which press upon it, by, practically throwing to them, scrap by scrap, the very doctrines which constitute the claims of Christianity to be regarded as a Divine-

Revelation at all. The moral Christianity which they hope to preserve, noble though it be, has not one feature left to distinguish it as a miraculously communicated religion.

Christianity itself distinctly pretends to be a direct Divine Revelation of Truths beyond the natural attainment of the human intellect. To submit the doctrines thus revealed, therefore, to criticism, and to clip and prune them down to the standard of human reason, whilst at the same time their supernatural character is maintained, is an obvious absurdity. Christianity must either be recognized to be a Divine Revelation beyond man's criticism, and in that case its doctrines must be received even though Reason cannot be satisfied, or the claims of Christianity to be such a Divine Revelation must be disallowed, in which case it becomes the legitimate subject of criticism like every other human system. One or other of these alternatives must be adopted, but to assert that Christianity is Divine, and yet to deal with it as human, is illogical and wrong.

When we consider the vast importance of the interests involved, therefore, it must be apparent that there can be no more urgent problem for humanity to solve than the question: Is Christianity a supernatural Divine Revelation or not? To this we may demand a clear and decisive answer. The evidence must be of no uncertain character which can warrant our abandoning the guidance of Reason, and blindly accepting doctrines which, if not supernatural truths, must be rejected by the human intellect as monstrous delusions. We propose in this work to seek a conclusive answer to this momentous question.

It appears to us that at no time has such an investigation been more requisite. The results of scientific inquiry and of Biblical criticism have created wide-spread doubt regarding the most material part of Christianity considered as a Divine Revelation. The mass of intelligent men in England are halting between two opinions, and standing in what seems to us the most unsatisfactory position conceivable: they abandon, before a kind of vague and indefinite, if irresistible, conviction, some of the most central supernatural doctrines of Christianity; they try to spiritualize or dilute the rest into a form which does not shock their reason; and yet they cling to the delusion, that they still retain the consolation and the hope of truths which, if not divinely revealed, are mere human speculation regarding matters beyond reason. They have, in fact, as little warrant to abandon the one part as they have to retain the other. They build their house upon the sand, and the waves which have already carried away so much may any day engulf the rest. At the same time, amid this general eclipse of faith, many an earnest mind, eagerly seeking for

truth
free
and
time
wou
pers
regi
W
quin
like
muc
at a
The
ther
and
be n
fact
the p
eithe
curie
waft
at th
much
loudl
and t
If
only
Chris
which
Or
two
the B
party
it con
suffici
its au
extern
feeling
men
orthoc
is tota
a mon
of God
anity

1 W.
Times, 1

truth, endures much bitter pain,—unable to believe—unable freely to reject—and yet without the means of securing any clear and intelligent reply to the inquiry: “What is truth?” Any distinct assurance, whatever its nature, based upon solid grounds, would be preferable to such a state of doubt and hesitation. Once persuaded that we have attained truth, there can be no permanent regret for vanished illusions.

We must, however, by careful and impartial investigation, acquire the right to our belief, whatever it may be, and not float like a mere waif into the nearest haven. Flippancy unbelief is much worse than earnest credulity. The time is ripe for arriving at a definite conviction as to the character of Christianity. There is no lack of materials for a final decision, although hitherto they have been beyond the reach of most English readers, and a careful and honest examination of the subject, even if it be not final, cannot fail to contribute towards a result more satisfactory than the generally vague and illogical religious opinion of the present day. Even true conclusions which are arrived at either accidentally or by wrong methods are dangerous. The current which by good fortune led to-day to truth may to-morrow waft us to falsehood. That such an investigation cannot, even at the present time, be carried on in England without incurring much enmity and opposition need scarcely be remarked, however loudly the duty and liberty of inquiry be theoretically proclaimed, and the reason is obvious.

If we look at the singular diversity of views entertained, not only with regard to the doctrines, but also to the evidences, of Christianity, we cannot but be struck by the helpless position in which Divine Revelation is now placed.

Orthodox Christians at the present day may be divided into two broad classes, one of which professes to base the Church upon the Bible, and the other the Bible upon the Church. The one party assert that the Bible is fully and absolutely inspired, that it contains God's revelation to man, and that it is the only and sufficient ground for all religious belief; and they maintain that its authenticity is proved by the most ample and irrefragable external as well as internal evidence. What then must be the feeling of any ordinary mind on hearing, on the other hand, that men of undoubted piety and learning, as well as unquestioned orthodoxy, within the Church of England, admit that the Bible is totally without literary or historical evidence, and cannot for a moment be upheld upon any such grounds as the revealed word of God; that none of the great doctrines of ecclesiastical Christianity can be deduced from the Bible alone;¹ and that “if it be

¹ W. J. Irons, D.D., *The Bible and its Interpreters*, 1865; cf. *Tracts for the Times*, No. lxxxv.

impossible to accept the literary method of dealing with Holy Scripture, the usual mode of arguing the truth of Revelation, *ab extra*, merely from what are called 'Evidences'—whether of MIRACLES done or PROPHECIES uttered thousands of years ago,—must also be insufficient." ¹ It cannot be much comfort to be assured by them that, notwithstanding this absence of external and internal evidence, this Revelation stands upon the sure basis of the inspiration of a Church, which has so little ground in history for any claim to infallibility. The unsupported testimony of a Church which in every age has vehemently maintained errors and denounced truths which are now universally recognized is no sufficient guarantee of Divine Revelation. Obviously, there is no ground for accepting from a fallible Church and fallacious tradition doctrines which, avowedly, are beyond the criterion of reason, and therefore require miraculous evidence.

With belief based upon such uncertain grounds, and with such vital difference of views regarding evidence, it is not surprising that ecclesiastical Christianity has felt its own weakness, and entrenched itself against the assaults of investigation. It is not strange that intellectual vigour in any direction should, almost unconsciously, have been regarded as dangerous to the repose and authority of the Church, and that, instead of being welcomed as a virtue, religious inquiry has almost been repelled as a crime. Such inquiry, however, cannot be suppressed. Mere scientific questions may be regarded with apathy by those who do not feel their personal bearing. It may possibly seem to some a matter of little practical importance to them to determine whether the earth revolves round the sun, or the sun round the earth; but no earnest mind can fail to perceive the immense personal importance of Truth in regard to Religion—the necessity of investigating, before accepting, dogmas, the right interpretation of which is represented as necessary to salvation,—and the clear duty before abandoning reason for faith, to exercise reason, in order that faith may not be mere credulity. As Bacon remarked, the injunction: "Hold fast that which is good," must always be preceded by the maxim: "Prove all things." Even Archbishop Trenchard has said: "Credulity is as real, if not so great, a sin as unbelief," applying the observation to the duty of demanding a "sign" from any one professing to be the utterer of a revelation: "Else might he lightly be persuaded to receive that as from God, which, indeed, was only the word of man."² The acceptance of any revelation or dogma, however apparently true in itself, without "sign"—

¹ W. J. Irons, D.D., *On Miracles and Prophecy*, vii.

² *Notes on Miracles*, 8th edition, 1866, p. 27.

without evidence satisfying the reason, is absolute credulity. Even the most thorough advocate of Faith must recognise that reason must be its basis, and that faith can only legitimately commence where reason fails. The appeal is first to reason if afterwards to faith, and no man pretending to intellectual conscience can overlook the primary claim of reason. If it is to be more than a mere question of priority of presentation whether we are to accept Buddhism, Christianity, or Mahometanism, we must strictly and fearlessly examine the evidence upon which they profess to stand. The neglect of examination can never advance truth, as the severest scrutiny can never retard it, but belief without discrimination can only foster ignorance and superstition.

It was in this conviction that the following inquiry into the reality of Divine Revelation was originally undertaken, and that others should enter upon it. An able writer, who will not be suspected of exaggeration on this subject, has said: "The majority of mankind, perhaps, owe their belief rather to the outward influence of custom and education, than to any strong principle of faith within; and it is to be feared that many if they came to perceive how wonderful what they believed was, would not find their belief so easy, and so matter-of-course a thing as they appear to find it."¹ To no earnest mind can such inquiry be otherwise than a serious and often a painful task, but, dismissing preconceived ideas and preferences derived from habit and education, and seeking only the Truth, holding it, whatever it may be, to be the only object worthy of desire, or capable of satisfying a rational mind, the quest cannot but end in peace and satisfaction. In such an investigation, however, to quote words of Archbishop Whately: "It makes all the difference in the world whether we place Truth in the first place or in the second place,"—for if truth acquired do not compensate for every pet illusion dispelled, the path is thorny indeed, although it must still be faithfully trodden.

¹ *J. B. Mozley, B.D., on Miracles; Bampton Lectures, 1865, 2nd ed. p. 4.*

R

At
of
tura
whi
It i
app
to t
hum
eith
at c
mai
nat
turn
prob

T
Chri
cept
had
sear
othe
Chri
anti
scho
not

AN INQUIRY INTO THE REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.

At the very outset of inquiry into the origin and true character of Christianity we are brought face to face with the Supernatural. Christianity professes to be a Divine Revelation of truths which the human intellect could not otherwise have discovered. It is not a form of religion developed by the wisdom of man and appealing to his reason, but a system miraculously communicated to the human race, the central doctrines of which are either superhuman or untenable. If the truths said to be revealed were either of an ordinary character or naturally attainable they would at once discredit the claim to a Divine origin. No one could maintain that a system discoverable by Reason would be supernaturally communicated. The whole argument for Christianity turns upon the necessity of such a Revelation and the consequent probability that it would be made.

There is nothing singular, it may be remarked, in the claim of Christianity to be a direct Revelation from God. With the exception of the religions of Greece and Rome, which, however, also had their subsidiary supposition of divine inspiration, there has scarcely been any system of Religion in the world proclaimed otherwise than as a direct divine communication. Long before Christianity claimed this character, the religions of India had anticipated the idea. To quote the words of an accomplished scholar:—"According to the orthodox views of Indian theologians, not a single line of the Veda was the work of human authors.

The whole Veda is in some way or other the work of the Deity; and even those who received it were not supposed to be ordinary mortals, but beings raised above the level of common humanity, and less liable, therefore, to error in the reception of revealed truth.¹ The same origin is claimed for the religion of Zoroaster, whose doctrines, beyond doubt, exercised great influence at least upon later Jewish theology, and whose Magian followers are appropriately introduced beside the cradle of Jesus, as the first to do honour to the birth of Christianity. In the same way Mahomet announced his religion as directly communicated from heaven.

Christianity, however, as a religion professing to be divinely revealed is not only supernatural in origin and doctrine, but its claim to acceptance is necessarily based upon supernatural evidence; for it is obvious that truths which require to be miraculously communicated do not come within the range of our intellect, and cannot, therefore, be intelligently received upon internal testimony. "And, certainly," says a recent able Bampton Lecturer, "if it was the will of God to give a revelation, there are plain and obvious reasons for asserting that miracles are necessary as the guarantee and voucher for that revelation. A revelation is, properly speaking, such only by virtue of telling us something which we could not know without it. But how do we know that that communication of what is undiscoverable by human reason is true? Our reason cannot prove the truth of it, for it is by the very supposition beyond our reason. There must be, then, some note or sign to certify to it and distinguish it as a true communication from God, which note can be nothing else than a miracle."² In another place the same Lecturer stigmatizes the belief of the Mahometan "as in its very principle irrational," because he accepts the account which Mahomet gave of himself, without supernatural evidence.³ The belief of the Christian is contrasted with it as rational, "because the Christian believes in a supernatural dispensation upon the proper evidence of such a dispensation, viz., the miraculous."⁴ Mahomet is reproached with having "an utterly barbarous idea of evidence, and a total miscalculation of the claims of reason," because he did not consider miraculous evidence necessary to attest a supernatural dispensation; "whereas the Gospel is adapted to perpetuity for this cause especially, with others, that it was founded upon a true calculation,

¹ *M. Müller*, *Chips from a German Workshop*, 1867, vol. i. p. 18.

² *J. B. Mozley*, B.D., *Bampton Lecturer in 1865*, on *Miracles*, 2nd ed., 1867, p. 6 f.

³ *Ib.*, p. 30, cf. *Butler*, *Analogy of Religion*, Pt. ii. ch. vii. § 3; *Paley*, *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*, ed. Whately, 1859, p. 324 ff.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 31.

and
adu
sity
and
T
alwa
logi
relig
But
man
wou
atte
clud
guish
Ma
asser
reali
cles a
ment
notio
been
cient
the I
not b
selves
mirac
case v
made
His a
but m
another
tion, h
comes
princi
kind o
which

¹ *J. B.*
p. 32.

² *The*

³ *Ib.*

⁴ *Ib.*

⁵ *A V*

⁶ *Ib.*

⁷ *Mor*
calls mir
introduc

and a foresight of the permanent need of evidence; our Lord admitting the inadequacy of His own mere word, and the necessity of a rational guarantee to His revelation of His own nature and commission."¹

The spontaneous offer of miraculous evidence, indeed, has always been advanced as a special characteristic of Christianity, logically entitling it to acceptance in contradistinction to all other religions. "It is an acknowledged historical fact," says Bishop Butler, "that Christianity offered itself to the world, and demanded to be received, upon the allegation, *i. e.*, as unbelievers would speak, upon the pretence, of miracles, publicly wrought to attest the truth of it in such an age; . . . and Christianity, including the dispensation of the Old Testament, seems distinguished by this from all other religions."²

Most of the great English divines have clearly recognized and asserted the necessity of supernatural evidence to establish the reality of a supernatural revelation. Bishop Butler affirms miracles and the completion of prophecy to be the "direct and fundamental proofs" of Christianity.³ Elsewhere he says: "The notion of a miracle, considered as a proof of a divine mission, has been stated with great exactness by divines, and is, I think, sufficiently understood by every one. There are also invisible miracles, the Incarnation of Christ, for instance, which, being secret, cannot be alleged as a proof of such a mission; but require themselves to be proved by visible miracles. Revelation itself, too, is miraculous; and miracles are the proof of it."⁴ Paley states the case with equal clearness: "In what way can a revelation be made but by miracles? In none which we are able to conceive."⁵ His argument in fact is founded upon the principle that: "nothing but miracles could decide the authority" of Christianity.⁶ In another work he asserts that no man can prove a future retribution, but the teacher "who testifies by miracles that his doctrine comes from God."⁷ Bishop Atterbury, again, referring to the principal doctrines of ecclesiastical Christianity, says: "It is this kind of Truth that God is properly said to reveal; Truths, of which, unless revealed, we should have always continued igno-

¹ J. B. Mozley, B.D., Bampton Lecturer in 1865, on *Miracles*, 2nd ed., 1867, p. 32.

² *The Analogy of Religion*, Pt. ii. ch. vii. § 3.

³ *Ib.*, Pt. ii., ch. vii.

⁴ *Ib.*, Pt. ii., ch. ii. § 1.

⁵ *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*. Preparatory Considerations, p. 12.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 14.

⁷ *Moral Philosophy*, Book v. Speaking of Christianity, in another place, he calls miracles and prophecy, "that splendid apparatus with which its mission was introduced and attested." Book iv.

rant; and 'tis in order only to prove these Truths to have been really revealed, that we affirm Miracles to be Necessary."¹

Dr. Heurtley, the Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, after pointing out that the doctrines taught as the Christian Revelation are such as could not by any possibility have been attained by the unassisted human reason, and that, consequently, it is reasonable that they should be attested by miracles, continues: "Indeed, it seems inconceivable how without miracles—including prophecy in the notion of a miracle,—it could sufficiently have commended itself to men's belief? Who would believe, or would be justified in believing, the great facts which constitute its substance on the *ipse dixit* of an unaccredited teacher? and how, except by miracles, could the first teacher be accredited? Paley, then, was fully warranted in the assertion

that, 'we cannot conceive a revelation'—such a revelation of course as Christianity professes to be, a revelation of truths which transcend man's ability to discover,—'to be substantiated without miracles.' Other credentials, it is true, might be exhibited *in addition* to miracles,—and such it would be natural to look for,—but it seems impossible that miracles could be dispensed with."² Dr. Mansel, the late Dean of St. Paul's, bears similar testimony: "A teacher who proclaims himself to be specially sent by God, and whose teaching is to be received on the authority of that mission, must, from the nature of the case, establish his claim by proofs of another kind than those which merely evince his human wisdom or goodness. A superhuman authority needs to be substantiated by superhuman evidence; and what is superhuman is miraculous."³

Dr. J. H. Newman, in discussing the idea and scope of miracles says: "A Revelation, that is, a direct message from God to man, itself bears in some degree a miraculous character; . . . And as a Revelation itself, so again the evidences of a Revelation may all more or less be considered miraculous. . . . It might even be said that, strictly speaking, no evidence of a Revelation is conceivable which does not partake of the character of a miracle; since nothing but a display of power over the existing system of things can attest the immediate presence of Him by whom it was originally established."⁴

Dr. Mozley has stated in still stronger terms the necessity that Christianity should be authenticated by the evidence of miracles.

¹ Sermons, &c., Sermon viii., Miracles the most proper way of proving any Religion. Vol. iii., 1766, p. 199.

² Replies to Essays and Reviews, 1862, p. 151.

³ Aids to Faith, 4th ed., 1863, p. 35.

⁴ Two Essays on Scripture Miracles and on Ecclesiastical, by John H. Newman, 2nd ed., 1870, p. 6 f.

He
nes
him
of t
form
tak
doc
be t
son
pers

be a
cles
anno
the v
the v
noun
are t
"Chr
by hu
salvat

In a
gion e
and n
an abs
religio
are ma
astical
anity i
mitted
Revela
of the
miracle
tianty
the real
we hav
lished,
be suffi
ral Rev
jected.
This
divines
regard t

¹ Bampton

He supposes the case that a person of evident integrity and loftiness of character had appeared eighteen centuries ago announcing himself as pre-existent from all eternity, the Son of God, Maker of the world, who had come down from heaven and assumed the form and nature of man in order to be the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, and so on, enumerating other doctrines of Christianity. Dr. Mozley then asks: "What would be the inevitable conclusion of sober reason respecting that person? The necessary conclusion of sober reason respecting that person would be that he was disordered in his understanding.

By no rational being could a just and benevolent life be accepted as a proof of such astonishing announcements. Miracles are the necessary complement, then, of the truth of such announcements, which, without them, are purposeless and abortive, the unfinished fragments of a design which is nothing unless it is the whole. They are necessary to the justification of such announcements, which indeed, unless they are supernatural truths, are the wildest delusions."¹ He, therefore, concludes that:—"Christianity cannot be maintained as a revelation undiscoversable by human reason, a revelation of a supernatural scheme for man's salvation, without the evidence of miracles."²

In all points, Christianity is emphatically a Supernatural Religion claiming to be divine in its origin, superhuman in its essence, and miraculous in its evidence. It cannot be accepted without an absolute belief in Miracles, and those who profess to hold the religion whilst they discredit its supernatural elements—and they are many at the present day—have widely seceded from ecclesiastical Christianity. Miracles, it is true, are external to Christianity in so far as they are evidential, but inasmuch as it is admitted that miracles alone can attest the reality of Divine Revelation they are still inseparable from it; and as the contents of the Revelation are so to say more miraculous than its attesting miracles, the supernatural enters into the very substance of Christianity and cannot be eliminated. It is obvious, therefore, that the reality of miracles is the vital point in the investigation which we have undertaken. If the reality of miracles cannot be established, Christianity loses the only evidence by which its truth can be sufficiently attested. If miracles be incredible the supernatural Revelation and its miraculous evidence must together be rejected.

This fact is thoroughly recognized by the ablest Christian divines. Dean Mansel, speaking of the position of miracles in regard to Christianity, says: "The question, however, assumes a

¹ Bampton Lectures for 1865, p. 14.

² *Ib.*, p. 23.

very different character when it relates, not to the comparative importance of miracles as evidences, but to their reality as facts, and as facts of a supernatural kind. For if this is denied, the denial does not merely remove one of the supports of a faith which may yet rest securely on other grounds. On the contrary, the whole system of Christian belief with its evidences . . . all Christianity in short, so far as it has any title to that name, so far as it has any special relation to the person or the teaching of Christ, is overthrown at the same time." ¹ A little further on he says: "If there be one fact recorded in Scripture which is entitled, in the fullest sense of the word, to the name of a Miracle, the RESURRECTION OF CHRIST is that fact. Here, at least, is an instance in which the entire Christian faith must stand or fall with our belief in the supernatural." ² He, therefore, properly repudiates the view, "which represents the question of the possibility of miracles as one which merely affects the *external accessories* of Christianity, leaving the *essential doctrines* untouched." ³ Dr. Mozley, in a similar manner argues the inseparable union of miracles with the Christian faith. "Indeed not only are miracles conjoined with doctrine in Christianity, but miracles are inserted in the doctrine and are part of its contents. A man cannot state his belief as a Christian in the terms of the Apostles' Creed without asserting them. Can the doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation be disjoined from one physical miracle? Can the doctrine of His justification of us and intercession for us, be disjoined from another? . . . If a miracle is incorporated as an article in a creed, that article of the creed, the miracle, and the proof of it by a miracle, are all one thing. The great miracles, therefore, upon the evidence of which the Christian scheme rested, being thus inserted in the Christian Creed, the belief in the Creed was of itself the belief in the miraculous evidence of it. . . . Thus miracles and the supernatural contents of Christianity must stand or fall together." ⁴ Dr. Heurtley, referring to the discussion of the reality of miracles, exclaims: "It is not too much to say therefore that the question is vital as regards Christianity." ⁵ Canon Westcott not less emphatically makes the same statement. "It is evident," he says, "that if the claim to be a miraculous religion is essentially incredible apostolic Christianity is simply false. . . . The essence of Christianity lies in a miracle; and if it can be shown that a miracle is either impossible or incredible, all further inquiry into the details of its history is superfluous in a religious

¹ Aids to Faith, 1863, p. 3.

Ib., p. 4.

² *Ib.*, p. 5.

³ Bampton Lectures for 1865, p. 21 f.

⁴ Replies to "Essays and Reviews," 1862, p. 143.

⁵ The
⁶ The
p. 25
⁷ Judge

point of view."¹ Similarly, a recent Hulsean lecturer, Dr. Farrar, has said: "However skilfully the modern ingenuity of semi-belief may have tampered with supernatural interpositions, it is clear to every honest and unsophisticated mind that, if miracles be incredible, Christianity is false. If Christ wrought no miracles, then the Gospels are untrustworthy; . . . if the Resurrection be merely a spiritual idea, or a mythicized hallucination, then our religion has been founded on an error."²

It has been necessary clearly to point out this indissoluble connection between ecclesiastical Christianity and the supernatural, in order that the paramount importance of the question as to the credibility of miracles should be duly appreciated. Our inquiry into the reality of Divine Revelation, then, whether we consider its contents or its evidence, practically reduces itself to the very simple issue: Are miracles antecedently credible? Did they ever really take place? We do not intend to confine ourselves merely to a discussion of the abstract question, but shall also endeavour to form a correct estimate of the value of the specific allegations which are advanced.

2.

Having then ascertained that miracles are absolutely necessary to attest the reality of Divine Revelation we may proceed to examine them more closely, and for the present we shall confine ourselves to the representations of these phenomena which are given in the Bible. Throughout the Old Testament the doctrine is inculcated that supernatural communications must have supernatural attestation. God is described as arming his servants with power to perform wonders, in order that they may thus be accredited as his special messengers. The Patriarchs and the people of Israel generally are represented as demanding "a sign" of the reality of communications said to come from God, without which, we are led to suppose, they not only would not have believed, but would have been justified in disbelieving, that the message actually came from him. Thus Gideon³ asks for a sign that the Lord talked with him, and Hezekiah⁴ demands proof of the truth of Isaiah's prophecy that he should be restored to health. It is, however, unnecessary to refer to instances, for it may be affirmed that upon all occasions miraculous evidence of an alleged divine mission is stated to have been required and accorded.

¹ The Gospel of the Resurrection, 3rd ed., 1874, p. 34.

² The Witness of History to Christ, Hulsean Lectures for 1870, 2nd ed., 1872, p. 25.

³ Judges vi. 17.

⁴ 2 Kings xx. 8 f.

The startling information is at the same time given, however, that miracles may be wrought to attest what is false as well as to accredit what is true. In one place,¹ it is declared that if a prophet actually gives a sign or wonder and it comes to pass, but teaches the people, on the strength of it, to follow other gods, they are not to hearken to him, and the prophet is to be put to death. The false miracle is, here,² attributed to God himself: "For the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." In the book of the Prophet Ezekiel, the case is stated in a still stronger way, and God is represented as directly deceiving the prophet: "And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel."³ God, in fact, is represented as exerting his almighty power to deceive a man and then as destroying him for being deceived. In the same spirit is the passage⁴ in which Micah describes the Lord as putting a lying spirit into the mouths of the prophets who incited Ahab to go to Ramoth-Gilead. Elsewhere,⁵ and notably in the New Testament, we find an ascription of real signs and wonders to another power than God. Jesus himself is represented as warning his disciples against false prophets, who work signs and wonders: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?" of whom he should say: "I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."⁶ And again in another place: "For false prophets shall arise, and shall work signs and wonders, (*σημεία καὶ τέρατα*) to seduce, if it were possible, the elect."⁷ Also, when the Pharisees accuse him of casting out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils, Jesus asks: "By whom do your children cast them out?"⁸ a reply which would lose all its point if they were not admitted to be able to cast out devils. In another passage John is described as saying: "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, who followeth not us, and we forbade him."⁹ Without multiplying instances, however, there can be no doubt of the fact that the reality of false miracles and lying wonders is admitted in the Bible.

¹ Deut. xiii. 1 ff.

² Deut. xiii. 3.

³ Ezek. xiv. 9. The narrative of God's hardening the heart of Pharaoh in order to bring other plagues upon the land of Egypt is in this vein.

⁴ 1 Kings, xxii. 14-23.

⁵ The counter miracles of the Egyptian sorcerers need not be referred to as instances. Ex. vii. 11, 12, 22.

⁶ Matt. vii. 22, 23.

⁸ Matt. xii. 27.

⁷ Mark xiii. 22.

⁹ Mark ix. 38.

Th
that
alwa
them
said
Ahni
whic
affirm
sume
is imp
any t
New
terly
that o
that t
assert
—can
perly
sary to
consist
the ex
we are
that u
acles d
of natu
if they
And it
ering M
created
most li
in oppo
24; 2
various
tion be
or by r
determi
spirits
demoni
tion.

1 Tertu
miracles
of God;
Christ's w
had work
iii. 3.

2 Two

The obvious deduction from this representation of miracles is that the source and purpose of such supernatural phenomena must always be exceedingly uncertain.¹ Their evidential value is, therefore, profoundly affected, "it being," as Dr. Newman has said of ambiguous miracles, "antecedently improbable that the Almighty should rest the credit of His Revelation upon events which but obscurely implied His immediate presence."² As it is affirmed that other supernatural beings exist, as well as an assumed Personal God, by whose agency miracles are performed, it is impossible to argue with reason that such phenomena are at any time specially due to the intervention of the Deity. Dr. Newman recognises this, but passes over the difficulty with masterly lightness of touch. After advancing the singular argument that our knowledge of spirits is only derived from Scripture, and that their existence cannot be deduced from nature, whilst he asserts that the being of a God—a Personal God be it remembered—can be so discovered, and that, therefore, miracles can only properly be attributed to him, he proceeds: "Still it may be necessary to show that on our own principles we are not open to inconsistency. That is, it has been questioned whether, in admitting the existence and power of Spirits on the authority of Revelation, we are not in danger of invalidating the evidence upon which that authority rests. For the cogency of the argument for Miracles depends on the assumption, that interruptions in the course of nature must ultimately proceed from God; which is not true, if they may be effected by other beings without His sanction. And it must be conceded, that, explicit as Scripture is in considering Miracles as signs of divine agency, it still does seem to give created Spirits some power of working them; and even, in its most literal sense, intimates the possibility of their working them in opposition to the true doctrine. (Deut. xiii, 1-3; Matt. xxiv, 24; 2 Thes. ii, 9-11.)"³ Dr. Newman repudiates the attempts of various writers to overcome this difficulty by making a distinction between great miracles and small, many miracles and few, or by referring to the nature of the doctrine attested in order to determine the author of the miracle, or by denying the power of spirits altogether, and explaining away Scripture statements of demoniacal possession and the narrative of the Lord's Temptation. "Without having recourse to any of these dangerous

¹ Tertullian saw this difficulty, and in his work against Marcion he argues that miracles alone, without prophecy, could not sufficiently prove Christ to be the Son of God; for he points out that Jesus himself forewarned his disciples that false Christs would come with signs and wonders, like the miracles which he himself had worked, whom he enjoined them beforehand not to believe. *Adv. Marc.* iii. 3.

² Two Essays on Miracles, p. 31.

³ *Ib.*, p. 50.

modes of answering the objection," he says, "it may be sufficient to reply, that, since, agreeably to the antecedent sentiment of reason, God has adopted miracles as the seal of a divine message, we believe He will never suffer them to be so counterfeited as to deceive the humble inquirer." ¹ This is the only reply which even so powerful a reasoner as Dr. Newman can give to an objection based on distinct statements of Scripture itself. He cannot deny the validity of the objection, he can only hope or believe in spite of it. Personal belief independent of evidence is the most common and the weakest of arguments: at the best it is prejudice masked in the garb of Reason. It is perfectly clear that miracles being thus acknowledged to be common both to God and to other spirits they cannot be considered a distinctive attestation of divine intervention; and, as Spinoza finely argued, not even the mere existence of God can be inferred from them, for as a miracle is a limited act, and never expresses more than a certain and limited power, it is certain that we cannot learn such an effect, conclude even the existence of a cause whose power is infinite. ²

This dual character obviously leads to many difficulties in defining the evidential function and force of miracles, and we may best appreciate the dilemma which is involved by continuing to follow the statements and arguments of divine themselves. To the question whether miracles are absolutely to command the obedience of those in whose sight they are performed, and whether upon their attestation the *dear* and his doctrine are to be accepted as of God, Archbishop Trench unhesitatingly replies: "It cannot be so, for side by side with the miracles which serve for the furthering of the kingdom of God runs another line of wonders, the counter-workings of him who is over the age of the Most High." ³ The deduction is absolutely logical and cannot be denied. "This fact," he says, "that the kingdom of lies has its wonders no less than the kingdom of truth, is itself sufficient evidence that miracles cannot be appealed to absolutely and finally, in proof of the doctrine which the worker of them proclaims." This being the case, it is important to discover how miracles perform their function as the indispensable evidence for a Divine Revelation, for with this disability they do not seem to possess much potentiality. Archbishop Trench, then, offers the following definition of the function of miracles: "A miracle does not prove the truth of a

¹ Two Essays on Scripture Miracles, &c., p. 311.

² Porro quamvis ex miraculis aliquid concludere possemus, nullo tamen modo Dei existentiam inde posset concludi. Nam quum miraculum opus limitatum sit, nec unquam nisi certam et limitatam potentiam exprimat, certum est, non ex tali effectu non posse concludere existentiam causæ, cujus potentia sit infinita. &c. Opera, ed. Tschwitz, vol. iii., cap. vi. 24.

³ Notes on the Miracles of our Lord, 8th ed., 1866, p. 22.

doct
whic
to :
hel
bein
the f
natu
their
mira
is go
witne
have
On th
in de
in the
pel. th
shoul
ling a
aloof,
consci
more
christ
than
that S
be an
And I
witness
that a
second
The
but are
them v
affirms
winge

Notes
among
times
when
the
trange
but of a
there is n
most near
Notes on
abridged j
Notes
He, p

doctrine, or the divine mission of him that brings it to pass. That which alone it claims for him at the first is a right to be listened to: it puts him in the alternative of being from heaven or from hell. The doctrine must first commend itself to the conscience as being *good*, and only then can the miracle seal it as *divine*. But the first appeal is from the doctrine to the conscience, to the moral nature of man.¹¹ Under certain circumstances, he maintains, their evidence is utterly to be rejected. "But the purpose of the miracle," he says, "being, as we have seen, to confirm that which is good, so, upon the other hand, where the mind and conscience witness against the doctrine, not all the miracles in the world have a right to demand submission to the word which they seal. On the contrary, the great act of faith is to believe, against, and in despite of them all, in what God has revealed to, and implanted in the soul of the holy and the true; not to believe another Gospel, though an Angel from heaven, or one transformed into such, should bring it (Deut. xiii. 3; Gal. i. 8); and instead of compelling assent, miracles are then rather warnings to us that we keep aloof, for they tell us that not merely lies are here, for to that the conscience bore witness already, but that he who utters them is more than a common deceiver, is eminently *'a liar and an Anti-christ'*, a false prophet:—standing in more immediate connection than other deceived and evil men to the kingdom of darkness, so that Satan has given him his power (Rev. xiii. 2), is using him to be an especial organ of his, and to do a special work for him."¹² And he lays down the distinct principle that: "The miracle must witness for itself, and the doctrine must witness for itself, and then and then only, the first is capable of witnessing for the second."

These opinions are not peculiar to the Archbishop of Dublin, but are generally held by divines, although Dr. Trench expresses them with unusual absence of reserve. Dr. Mozley emphatically affirms the same doctrine when he says: "A miracle cannot engage us to accept any doctrine which is contrary to our moral

Notes on Miracles, p. 25. Dr. Trench's views are of considerable eccentricity, and he assumes to reproduce in some degree the Platonic theory of Reminiscence. He continues: "For all revelation presupposes in man a power of recognising the truth which is shown him, that it will find an answer in him, that he will trace in it the elements of a friend, though it a friend from whom he has been long estranged, and whom he has well nigh forgotten. It is the finding of a treasure, but of a treasure which he himself and no other had lost. The denial of this, that there is in man any organ by which truth may be recognised, opens the door to the most boundless scepticism, is indeed the denial of all that is God-like in man." Notes on Miracles, p. 25. This is choice! The archbishop would probably be shocked if we suggested that the god-like organ of which he speaks is Reason.

¹¹ Notes on Miracles of our Lord, 8th ed., 1866, p. 27 f.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 33.

nature, or to a fundamental principle of religion."¹ Dr. Mansel speaks to the same effect: "If a teacher claiming to work miracles proclaims doctrines contradictory to previously established truths, whether to the conclusions of natural religion or to the teaching of a former revelation, such a contradiction is allowed even by the most zealous defenders of the evidential value of miracles, to invalidate the authority of the teacher. But the right conclusion from this admission is not that true miracles are invalid as evidences, but that the supposed miracles in this case are not true miracles at all; *i.e.*, are not the effects of Divine power, but of human deception or of some other agency."² A passage from a letter written by Dr. Arnold which is quoted by Dr. Trench in support of his views, both illustrates the doctrine and the necessity which has led to its adoption: "You complain," says Dr. Arnold, writing to Dr. Hawkins, "of those persons who judge of a revelation not by its evidence, but by its substance. It has always seemed to me that its substance is a most essential part of its evidence; and that miracles wrought in favour of what was foolish or wicked would only prove Manicheism. We are so perfectly ignorant of the unseen world, that the character of any supernatural power can only be judged by the moral character of the statements which it sanctions. Thus only can we tell whether it be a revelation from God or from the Devil."³ In another place Dr. Arnold declares: "Miracles must be allowed to overrule the Gospel; for it is only through our belief in the Gospel that we accord our belief to them."⁴

¹ Bampton Lectures for 1865, p. 25, vol. I.

² Aids to Faith, p. 32.

³ Life of Arnold, ii., p. 226.

⁴ Lectures on Modern History, p. 137. Those who hold such views forget that the greatest miracles of ecclesiastical Christianity are not external to it, but are the essence of its principal dogmas. If the "signs" and "wonders" which form what may be called the collateral miracles of Christianity, are only believed in consequence of belief in the Gospel, upon what basis does belief in the miraculous birth, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, Ascension, and other leading dogmas rest? These are themselves the Gospel. Dr. J. H. Newman, the character of whose mind leads him to believe every miracle the evidence against which does not absolutely prohibit his doing so, rather than only those the evidence for which constrains him to believe, supports Ecclesiastical Miracles somewhat at the expense of those of the Gospels. He points out that only a few of the latter now fulfil the purpose of evidence for a Divine Revelation, and the rest are sustained and authenticated by those few; that: "The many never have been evidence except to those who saw them, and have but held the place of doctrine ever since; like the truths revealed to us about the unseen world, which are matters of faith, not means of conviction. They have no existence, as it were, out of the record in which they are found." He then proceeds to refer to the criterion of a miracle suggested by Bishop Douglas: "We may suspect miracles to be false, the account of which was not published at the time or place of their alleged occurrence, or if so published, yet without careful attention being paid to them." Dr. Newman then adds: "Yet St. Mark is said to have written at Rome, St. Luke in Rome or Greece, and St. John,

It
lished
which
and
doctr
the c
other
Mira
super
on th
edly
whom
eviden
any p
part
charac
respec
the ev
the re
an obj

We
such a
fully q
nature
the au
charge
doctrin
acle."²
modes
point o
ance of
them a
opinion
Miracle
are allo
reject,
Doubtful

at Ephesus
recorded,
it be that
it did not
it." Two
marks mid
ecclesiastical

¹ Dr. Newman
token of a
² Two E

It is obvious that the mutual dependence which is thus established between miracles and the doctrines in connection with which they are wrought destroys the evidential force of miracles, and that the first and the final appeal is made to reason. The doctrine in fact proves the miracle instead of the miracle attesting the doctrine. Divines of course attempt to deny this, but no other deduction from their own statements is logically possible. Miracles, according to Scripture itself, are producible by various supernatural beings and may be Satanic as well as Divine; man, on the other hand, is so ignorant of the unseen world that avowedly he cannot, from the miracle itself, determine the agent by whom it was performed; the miracle, therefore, has no intrinsic evidential value. How, then, according to divines, does it attain any potentiality? Only through a favourable decision on the part of Reason or the "moral nature in man" regarding the character of the doctrine. The result of the appeal to Reason respecting the morality and credibility of the doctrine determines the evidential status of the miracle. The doctrine, therefore, is the real criterion of the miracle which, without it, is necessarily an object of doubt and suspicion.

We have already casually referred to Dr. Newman's view of such a relation between Miracle and doctrine, but may here more fully quote his suggestive remarks. "Others by referring to the nature of the doctrine attested," he says, "in order to determine the author of the miracle, have exposed themselves to the plausible charge of adducing, first the miracle to attest the divinity of the doctrine, and then the doctrine to prove the divinity of the Miracle."² This argument he characterizes as one of the "dangerous modes" of removing a difficulty, although he does not himself point out a safer, and, in a note, he adds: "There is an appearance of doing honour to the Christian doctrines in representing them as *intrinsically* credible, which leads many into supporting opinions which, carried to their full extent, supersede the need of Miracles altogether. It must be recollected, too, that they who are allowed to praise have the privilege of finding fault, and may reject, according to their *à priori* notions, as well as receive. Doubtless the divinity of a clearly immoral doctrine could not be

at Ephesus; and the earliest of the Evangelists wrote some years after the events recorded, while the latest did not write for sixty years; and moreover, true though it be that attention was called to Christianity from the first, yet it is true also that it did not succeed at the spot where it arose, but principally at a distance from it." Two Essays on Miracles, &c., 2nd ed., 1870, p. 232 f. How much these remarks might have been extended and strengthened by one more critical and less ecclesiastical than Dr. Newman need not here be stated.

¹ Dr. Newman says of a miracle: "Considered by itself, it is at most, but the token of a superhuman being."

² Two Essays, &c., p. 51.

evidenced by Miracles; for our belief in the moral attributes of God is much stronger than our conviction of the negative proposition, that none but He can interfere with the system of nature.¹ But there is always the danger of extending this admission beyond its proper limits, of supposing ourselves adequate judges of the *tendency* of doctrines; and, because unassisted Reason informs us what is moral and immoral in our own case, of attempting to decide on the abstract morality of actions. . . . These remarks are in nowise inconsistent with using (as was done in a former section) our actual knowledge of God's attributes, obtained from a survey of nature and human affairs, in determining the probability of certain professed Miracles having proceeded from Him. It is one thing to infer from the experience of life, another to imagine the character of God from the gratuitous conceptions of our own minds."² Although Dr. Newman apparently fails to perceive that he himself thus makes reason the criterion of miracles and therefore incurs the condemnation with which our quotation opens, the very indecision of his argument illustrates the dilemma in which divines are placed. Dr. Mozley, however, still more directly condemns the principle which we are discussing—that the doctrine must be the criterion of the miracle—although he also, as we have seen elsewhere substantially affirms it. He says: "The position that the revelation proves the miracles, and not the miracles the revelation, admits of a good qualified meaning; but taken literally, it is a double offence against the rule, that things are properly proved by the proper proof of them; for a supernatural fact *is* the proper proof of a supernatural doctrine; while a supernatural doctrine, on the other hand, is certainly *not* the proper proof of a supernatural fact."³

This statement is obviously true, but it is equally undeniable that, their origin being uncertain, miracles have no distinctive evidential force. How far, then, we may inquire in order

¹ In another place, however, Dr. Newman, contrasting the "rationalistic" and "Catholic" tempers, and condemning the former, says, "Rationalism is a certain abuse of Reason; that is, a use of it for purposes for which it never was intended, and is unfitted. To rationalise in matters of Revelation is to make our reason the standard and measure of the doctrines revealed; to stipulate that those doctrines should be such as to carry with them their own justification; to reject them if they come in collision with our existing opinions or habits of thought, or are with difficulty harmonised with our existing stock of knowledge." (Essays, Crit. and Hist., 1872, vol. i, p. 31); and a little further on: "A like desire of judging for one's self is discernible in the original fall of man. Eve did not believe the Tempter any more than God's word, till she perceived 'the fruit was good for food.'" (*Ib.*, p. 33). Dr. Newman, of course, wishes to limit his principle precisely to suit his own convenience, but in permitting the rejection of a supposed Revelation in spite of miracles, on the ground of our disapproval of its morality, it is obvious that the doctrine is substantially made the final criterion of the miracle.

² Two Essays, &c., p. 51 f., note (k).

³ Bampton Lectures for 1865, p. 19.

¹ Serm.
² Bishop
"heaven,"
³ Bampton

thoroughly to understand the position, can doctrines prove the reality of miracles or determine the agency by which they are performed? In the case of moral truths within the limits of reason, it is evident that doctrines which are in accordance with our ideas of what is good and right do not require miraculous evidence at all. They can secure acceptance by their own merits alone. At the same time it is universally admitted that the truth or goodness of a doctrine is in itself no proof that it emanates directly from God, and consequently the most obvious wisdom and beauty in the doctrine could not attest the divine origin of a miracle. Such truths, however, have no proper connection with revelation at all. "*These truths*," to quote the words of Bishop Atterbury, "were of themselves sufficiently obvious and plain, and needed not a Divine Testimony to make them plainer. But the Truths which are necessary in this Manner to be attested, are those which are of Positive Institution; those, which if God had not pleased to reveal them, Human Reason could not have discovered; and those, which, even now they are revealed, Human Reason cannot fully account for, and perfectly comprehend."¹ How is it possible then that Reason or "the moral nature in man" can approve as good, or appreciate the fitness of, doctrines which in their very nature are beyond the criterion of reason?² What reply, for instance, can Reason give to any appeal to it regarding the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Incarnation? If doctrines the truth and goodness of which are apparent do not afford any evidence of Divine Revelation, how can doctrines which Reason can neither discover nor comprehend attest the Divine origin of miracles? Dr. Mozley clearly recognizes that they cannot do so. "The proof of a revelation," he says, and we may add, the proof of a miracle—itsself a species of revelation—"which is contained in the substance of a revelation has this inherent check or limit in it: viz. that it cannot reach to what is undiscoverable by reason. Internal evidence is itself an appeal to reason, because at every step the test is our own appreciation of such and such an idea or doctrine, our own perceptibility of its fitness: but human reason cannot in the nature of the case prove that which, by the very hypothesis, lies beyond human reason."³ It naturally follows that no doctrine which lies beyond reason, and therefore requires the attestation of miracles, can possibly afford that indication of the source and reality of miracles which is necessary to endow them with evidential value, and the supernatural doctrine

¹ Sermons, 8th ed., 1766, vol. iii., p. 198.

² Bishop Butler says: "Christianity is a scheme, quite beyond our comprehension." *Analogy of Religion*, Part II., ch. iv., § 1.

³ *Bampton Lectures for 1865*, p. 15.

must, therefore, be rejected in the absence of miraculous evidence of a decisive character.

Canon Mozley labours earnestly, but unsuccessfully, to restore to Miracles as evidence some part of that potentiality of which these unfortunate limitations have deprived them. Whilst on the one hand he says: "We must admit, indeed, an inherent modification in the function of a miracle as an instrument of proof,"¹ he argues that this is only a limitation, and no disproof of it, and he contends that: "The evidence of miracles is not negated because it has conditions."² His reasoning, however, is purely apologetic, and attempts by the unreal analogy of supposed limitations of natural principles and evidence to excuse the disqualifying limitation of the supernatural. He is quite conscious of the serious difficulty of the position: "The question," he says, "may at first sight create a dilemma—If a miracle is nugatory on the side of one doctrine, what cogency has it on the side of another? Is it legitimate to accept its evidence when we please, and reject it when we please?" The only reply he seems able to give to these very pertinent questions is the remark which immediately follows them: "But in truth a miracle is never without an argumentative force, although that force may be counterbalanced."³ In other words, a miracle is always an argument although it is often a bad one. It is scarcely necessary to go to the supernatural for bad arguments.

It might naturally be expected that the miraculous evidence selected to accredit a Divine Revelation should possess certain unique and marked characteristics. It must, at least, be clearly distinctive of Divine power, and exclusively associated with Divine truth. It is inconceivable that the Deity, deigning thus to attest the reality of a communication from himself of truths beyond the criterion of reason, should not make the evidence simple and complete, because the doctrines proper to such a revelation not being appreciable from internal evidence, it is obvious that the external testimony for them—if it is to be of any use—must be unmistakable and decisive. The evidence which is actually produced, however, so far from satisfying these legitimate anticipations, lacks every one of the qualifications which reason antecedently declares to be necessary. Miracles are not distinctive of Divine power but are common to Satan, and they are admitted to be performed in support of falsehood as well as in the service of truth. They bear, indeed, so little upon them the impress of their origin and true character, that they are dependent for their recognition upon our judgment of the very doctrines to attest which they are said to have been designed.

¹ Bampton Lectures for 1865, p. 25.

² *Ib.*, p. 25.

³ *Ib.*, p. 25.

Even taking the representation of miracles, therefore, which divines themselves give, they are utterly incompetent to perform their contemplated functions. If they are superhuman they are not super-satanic, and there is no sense in which they can be considered miraculously evidential of anything. To argue, as theologians do, that the ambiguity of their testimony is deliberately intended as a trial of our faith is absurd, for Reason being unable to judge of the nature either of supernatural fact or supernatural doctrine, it would be mere folly and injustice to subject to such a test beings avowedly incapable of sustaining it. Whilst it is absolutely necessary, then, that a Divine Revelation should be attested by miraculous evidence to justify our believing it the testimony so called seems in all respects unworthy of the name, and presents anomalies much more suggestive of human invention than Divine originality. We are, in fact, prepared even by the Scriptural account of miracles to expect that further examination will supply an explanation of such phenomena which will wholly remove them from the region of the supernatural.










IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503



CHAPTER II.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE.

WITHOUT at present touching the question as to their reality, it may be well to ascertain what miracles are considered to be, and how far, and in what sense it is asserted that they are supernatural. We have, hitherto, almost entirely confined our attention to the arguments of English divines, and we must for the present continue chiefly to deal with them, for it may broadly be said, that they alone, at the present day, maintain the reality and supernatural character of such phenomena. No thoughtful mind can fail to see that, considering the function of miracles, this is the only logical and consistent course.¹ The insuperable difficulties in the way of admitting the reality of miracles, however, have driven the great majority of continental, as well as very many English theologians who still pretend to a certain orthodoxy, either to explain the miracles of the Gospel naturally, or to suppress them altogether. Since Schleiermacher denounced the idea of Divine interruptions of the order of nature, and explained away the supernatural character of miracles, by defining them as merely relative: miracles to us, but in reality mere anticipations of human knowledge and power, his example has been more or less followed throughout Germany, and almost every expedient has been adopted, by would-be orthodox writers, to reduce or altogether eliminate the miraculous elements. The attempts which have been made to do this, and yet to maintain the semblance of unshaken belief in the main points of ecclesiastical Christianity, have lamentably failed, from the hopeless nature of the task and the fundamental error of the conception. The endeavour of Paulus and his school to get rid of the supernatural by a bold naturalistic interpretation of the language of the Gospel narratives, whilst the credibility of the record was represented as intact, was too glaring an outrage upon common sense to be successful, but it was scarcely more illogical than subsequent efforts to suppress the miraculous, yet retain the creed. The great majority of modern German critics, however, reject the miraculous altogether, and consider the ques-

¹ Dr. J. H. Newman writes: "Nay, if we only go so far as to realize what Christianity is, when considered merely as a creed, and what stupendous overpowering facts are involved in the doctrine of a Divine Incarnation, we shall feel that no miracle can be great after it, nothing strange or marvellous, nothing beyond expectation." *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles, &c.*, 1870, p. 185.

tion
not
devic
feebl
ther
when
Ar
mach
mirac
be me
and
mirac
lay in
ther
of a
which
hither
When
acter
volum
casual
where,

It n
most pro
his great
all the
ii., p. 88
belie his
Jesus (v.
denies th
culous ex
Reasrec
ples (Ban
natural so
disease w
of the sici
disease, a
Ewald ap
tely lost.
ence of hi
working i
based on a
and means
who came
of life—v
v. p. 442
of suspend
von Gott,
he extend
as to the r
Notes

tion as no longer worthy of discussion, and most of those who have not distinctly expressed this view either resort to every linguistic device to evade the difficulty, or betray, by their hesitation, the feebleness of their belief.¹ In dealing with the question of miracles, therefore, it is not to Germany we must turn, but to England, where their reality is still maintained.

Archbishop Trench rejects with disdain the attempts of Schleiermacher and others to get rid of the miraculous elements of miracles, by making them relative, which he rightly considers to be merely "a decently veiled denial of the miracle altogether;"² and he will not accept any reconciliation which sacrifices the miracle, "which," he logically affirms, "is, in fact, no miracle if it lay in nature already, if it was only the evoking of forces latent therein, not a new thing, not the bringing in of the novel powers of a higher world; if the mysterious processes and powers by which those works were brought about had been only undiscovered hitherto, and not undiscoverable by the efforts of human inquiry."³ When Dr. Trench tries to define what he considers the real character of miracles, however, he becomes, as might be expected, voluminous and obscure. He says: "An extraordinary Divine casualty, and not that ordinary which we acknowledge everywhere, and in everything belongs, then, to the essence of the

¹ It may be well to refer more particularly to the views of Ewald, one of the most profound scholars, but, at the same time, arbitrary critics, of this time. In his great work, "*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*," he rejects the supernatural from all the "miracles" of the Old Testament (Cf. III. Ausg. 1864, Band i., p. 385 ff., ii., p. 38 f., 101 ff.), and in the fifth volume, "*Christus n.s. Zeit*," he does not belie his previous opinions. He deliberately repudiates the miraculous birth of Jesus (v. p. 236), rejects the supernatural from the birth of John the Baptist, and denies the relationship (Luke i. 36) between him and Jesus (p. 230 ff.). The miraculous events at the Crucifixion are mere poetical imaginations (p. 581). The Resurrection is the creation of the pious longing and excited feeling of the disciples (Band vi. *Gesch. des Apost. Zeitalters*, 1858 p. 71 f.), and the Ascension, its natural sequel (vi. p. 95 f.). In regard to the miracles of Jesus, his treatment of disease was principally mental and by the exercise of moral influence on the mind of the sick, but he also employed external means, inquired into the symptoms of disease, and his action was subject to the laws of Divine order (v. pp. 291—299). Ewald spiritualizes the greater miracles until the physical basis is almost completely lost. In the miracle at the marriage of Cana, "water itself, under the influence of his spirit, becomes the best wine," as it still does wherever his spirit is working in full power (v. p. 329). The miraculous feeding of 5000 is a narrative based on some tradition of an occasion in which Jesus, "with the smallest external means, but infinitely more through his spirit and word and prayer, satisfied all who came to him,"—an allegory in fact of the higher satisfying power of the bread of life—which in course of time grew to the consistency of a physical miracle (v. p. 442). The raising of the son of the widow of Nain is represented as a case of suspended animation (v. p. 424). In his latest work, "*Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*," Ewald eliminates all the miraculous elements from Revelation, which he extends to all historical religions (with the exception of Mahometanism) as well as to the religion of the Bible (i. p. 18, § 8).

² Notes on Miracles, p. 74.

³ *Ib.* p. 75.

miracle; powers of God other than those which have always been working; such, indeed, as most seldom or never have been working before. The unresting activity of God, which at other times hides and conceals itself behind the veil of what we term natural laws, does in the miracle unveil itself; it steps out from its concealment, and the hand which works is laid bare. Beside and beyond the ordinary operation of nature, higher powers (higher, not as coming from a higher source, but as bearing upon higher ends) intrude and make themselves felt even at the very springs and sources of her power."¹ "Not, as we shall see the greatest theologians have always earnestly contended, *contra naturam*, but *præter naturam*, and *supra naturam*."² Further on he adds: "*Beyond* nature, *beyond* and *above* the nature which we know, they are, but not *contrary* to it."³ Newman, in a similar strain, though with greater directness, says: "The miracles of Scripture are undeniably beyond nature;" and he explains them as "wrought by persons consciously exercising, under Divine guidance, a power committed to them for definite ends, professing to be immediate messengers from heaven, and to be evidencing their mission by their miracles."⁴

Miracles are here described as "beside," and "beyond," and "above" nature, but a moment's consideration must show that, in so far as these terms have any meaning at all, they are simply evasions, not solutions, of a difficulty. Dr. Trench is quite sensible of the danger in which the definition of miracles places them, and how fatal to his argument it would be to admit that they are contrary to the order of nature. "The miracle," he protests, "is not thus *unnatural*; nor could it be such, since the unnatural, the contrary to order, is of itself the ungodly, and can in no way, therefore, be affirmed of a Divine work, such as that with which we have to do."⁵ The archbishop in this, however, is clearly arguing from nature to miracles, and not from miracles to nature. He does not, of course, know what miracles really are, but as he recognizes that the order of nature must be maintained, he is forced to assert that miracles are not contrary to nature. He repudiates the idea of their being natural phenomena, and yet attempts to deny that they are unnatural. They must either be the one or the other. The archbishop, besides, forgets that he ascribes miracles to Satan as well as to God. The whole argument is a mere quibble of words to evade a palpable dilemma. Dr. Newman does not fall into this error, and more boldly faces

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 12.

² *Ib.*, p. 12, note 2.

³ *Ib.*, p. 14.

⁴ Two Essays on Scripture Miracles, &c., p. 116.

⁵ Notes on Miracles, p. 15.

the
upo
the
or
Inde
with
Dr.
Ta
Five
sinal
twelv
in ex
"We
fishes
Word
tion o
the or
It wil
omnip
five b
order
there
of wh
natu
Unde
the arc
tions o
contin
and pu
harmon
jarred
for one
higher
wheat
theory
perceive
fancy.

¹ Two es

² *Ib.*, p.

³ Matt.

⁴ Notes o

⁵ Newma

upon the co

Scripture,"

mitigate th

substance,

⁶ Notes of

the difficulty. He admits that the Scripture miracles "innovate upon the impressions which are made upon us by the order and the laws of the natural world;"¹ and that "walking on the sea, or the resurrection of the dead, is a plain reversal of its laws."² Indeed, that his distinction is purely imaginary, and inconsistent with the alleged facts of Scriptural miracles, is apparent from Dr. Trench's own illustrations.

Take, for instance, the multiplication of loaves and fishes. Five thousand people are fed upon five barley loaves and two small fishes: "and they took up of the fragments which remained twelve baskets full."³ Dr. Trench is forced to renounce all help in explaining this miracle from natural analogies, and he admits: "We must simply behold in the multiplying of the bread" (and fishes?) "an act of Divine omnipotence on His part who was the Word of God,—not, indeed, now as at the first, of absolute creation out of nothing, since there was a substratum to work on in the original loaves and fishes, but an act of creative accretion."⁴ It will scarcely be argued by any one that such an "act of Divine omnipotence" and "creative accretion" as this multiplication of five baked loaves and two small fishes is not contrary to the order of nature.⁵ For Dr. Trench has himself pointed out that there must be interposition of man's art here, and that "a grain of wheat could never by itself, and according to the laws of natural development, issue in a loaf of bread."⁶

Undaunted by, or rather unconscious of, such contradictions the archbishop proceeds with his argument, and with new definitions of the miraculous. So far from being disorder of nature, he continues with audacious precision: "the true miracle is a higher and purer nature coming down out of the world of untroubled harmonies into this world of ours, which so many discords have jarred and disturbed, and bringing this back again, though it be for one mysterious prophetic moment, into harmony with that higher."⁷ In that "higher and purer nature" can a grain of wheat issue in a loaf of bread? We have only to apply this theory to the miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes to perceive how completely it is the creation of Dr. Trench's poetical fancy.

¹ Two essays on Scripture Miracles, &c., p. 154.

² *Ib.*, p. 158.

³ Matt. xiv. 20.

⁴ Notes on Miracles, p. 274 f.

⁵ Newman referring to this amongst other miracles as "a far greater innovation upon the economy of nature than the miracles of the Church upon the economy of Scripture," says: "There is nothing, for instance, in nature at all to parallel and mitigate the wonderful history of the multiplication of an artificially prepared substance, such as bread." Two Essays, p. 157 f.

⁶ Notes on Miracles, p. 274.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 15.

These passages fairly illustrate the purely imaginary and arbitrary nature of the definitions which those who maintain the reality and supernatural character of miracles give of them. That explanation is generally adopted which seems most convenient at the moment, and none ever passes, or indeed ever can pass, beyond the limits of assumption. The favourite hypothesis is that which ascribes miracles to the action of unknown law. Archbishop Trench naturally adopts it: "We should see in the miracle," he says, "not the infraction of a law, but the neutralizing of a lower law, the suspension of it for a time by a higher;" and he asks with indignation, whence we dare conclude that, because we know of no power sufficient to produce miracles, none exist. "They exceed the laws of *our* nature; but it does not therefore follow that they exceed the laws of *all* nature."¹ It is not easy to follow the distinction here between "*our* nature" and *all* nature," since the order of nature, by which miracles are judged, is, so far as knowledge goes, universal, and we have no grounds for assuming that there is any other.

The same hypothesis is elaborated by Dr. Mozley. Assuming the facts of miracles, he proceeds to discuss the question of their "referribleness to unknown law," in which expression he includes both "*unknown law*, or unknown connection with *known law*."²

Taking first the supposition of *unknown* connection with known law, Dr. Mozley fairly argues that, as a law of nature, in the scientific sense, cannot possibly produce single or isolated facts, it follows that no isolated or exceptional event can come under a law of nature *by direct observation*, but, if it comes under it at all, it can only do so by some *explanation*, which takes it out of its isolation and joins it to a class of facts, whose recurrence indeed constitutes the law. Now Dr. Mozley admits that no explanation can be given by which miracles can have an unknown connection with known law. Taking the largest class of

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 16. Canon Liddon writes on the evidential purpose of miracles and their nature, as follows: "But how is man enabled to identify the Author of this law within him" (which the highest instincts of the human conscience derive from the Christian Revelation and the life of Christ), "perfectly reflected as it is, in the Christ, with the Author of the law of the Universe without him? The answer is, by miracle. Miracle is an innovation upon physical law,—or at least a suspension of some lower physical law by the intervention of a higher one,—in the interests of moral law. The historical fact that Jesus Christ rose from the dead identifies the Lord of physical life and death with the Legislator of the Sermon on the Mount. Miracle is the certificate of identity between the Lord of Nature and the Lord of Conscience,—the proof that he is really a Moral Being who subordinates physical to moral interests. Miracle is the meeting-point between intellect and the moral sense, because it announces the answer to the efforts and yearnings alike of the moral sense and the intellect; because it announces revelation." Some Elements of Religion, Lent Lectures, 1870. H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Pauls, 1872, p. 74, f.

² Rampton Lectures, 1865, p. 145.

¹ Rampton
² 16., p.
³ 16., p.

miracles, bodily cures, the correspondence between a simple command or prophetic notification and the cure is the chief characteristic of miracles, and distinguishes them from mere marvels. No violation of any law of nature takes place in either the cure or the prophetic announcement taken separately, but the two, taken together, are the proof of superhuman agency. Dr. Mozley confesses that no physical hypothesis can be framed accounting for the superhuman knowledge and power involved in this class of miracles, supposing the miracles to stand as they are recorded in Scripture.¹

Being obliged, therefore, to abandon the attempt to explain the Gospel miracles upon the theory of unknown connection with known law, Dr. Mozley shifts the inquiry to the other and different question, whether miracles may not be instances of laws which are as yet wholly unknown.² This is generally called a question of "higher law,"—that is to say, a law which comprehends under itself two or more lower or less wide laws. And the principle would be applicable to miracles by supposing the existence of an unknown law, hereafter to be discovered, under which miracles would come, and then considering whether this new law of miracles, and the old law of common facts, might not both be reducible to a still more general law which comprehended them both. Now a law of nature, in the scientific sense, cannot exist without a class of facts which comes under it, and in reality constitutes the law; but Dr. Mozley of course recognizes that the discovery of such a law of miracles would necessarily involve the discovery of fresh miracles, for to talk of a law of miracles without miracles would be an absurdity.³ The supposition of the discovery of such a law of miracles, however, would be tantamount to the supposition of a future new order of nature, from which it immediately follows that the whole supposition is irrelevant and futile as regards the present question.⁴ For no new order of things could make the present order different, and a miracle, could we suppose it becoming the ordinary fact of another different order of nature, would not be less a violation of the laws of nature in the present one.⁵ Dr. Mozley is, therefore, constrained to abandon also this explanation. We are bound to say, and we do so with sincere pleasure and respect, that Dr. Mozley conducts his argument with great fairness and ability, and displays his own love of truth by the impartiality with which he discusses and relinquishes many a favourite, but untenable, hypothesis.

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, pp. 145—153.

² *Ib.*, pp. 153—159.

³ *Ib.*, p. 154 f.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 156.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 157.

We pause here to remark that, throughout the whole inquiry into the question of miracles, we meet with nothing from theologians but mere assumptions, against which the invariability of the known order of nature steadily opposes itself. The facts of the narrative of the miracle are first assumed, and so are the theories by which it is explained. Known law refuses to recognize such astounding statements as those affirming the resurrection of an absolutely dead man, a bodily ascension, or the miraculous multiplication of loaves and fishes; unknown law is equally obdurate, so other assumptions of an even more daring description are the only resource of those who maintain and desire to account for them. Narrative and assumption are crushed beneath the weight of the alleged facts. Now, with regard to every theory which seeks to explain miracles by assumption, we may quote words applied by one of the ablest defenders of miracles to some conclusion of straw, which he placed in the mouth of an imaginary antagonist in order that he might refute it; "But the question is," said the late Dean of St. Paul's, "not whether such a conclusion has been asserted, as many other absurdities have been asserted, by the advocates of a theory, but whether it has been established on such scientific grounds as to be entitled to the assent of all duly cultivated minds, whatever their own conscience may say to the contrary."¹ Divines are very strict in demanding absolute demonstrations from men of science and others, but we do not find them at all ready to furnish conclusions of similar accuracy regarding dogmatic theology.

Immediately after this indignant demand for scientific accuracy of demonstration, Dr. Mansel proceeds to argue as follows: In the will of man we have the solitary instance of an efficient cause, in the highest sense of the term, acting among the physical causes of the material world, and producing results which could not have been brought about by any mere sequence of physical causes. If a man of his own will throw a stone into the air, its motion, as soon as it has left his hand, is determined by a combination of purely material laws; but by what *law* came it to be thrown at all? The law of gravitation, no doubt, remains constant and unbroken, whether the stone is lying on the ground, or moving through the air, but all the laws of matter could not have brought about the particular result without the interposition of the free will of the man who throws the stone. Substitute the will of God for the will of man, and the argument becomes applicable to the whole extent of Creation and to all the phenomena which it embraces.²

It is evident that Dr. Mansel's argument merely tends to prove

¹ Mansel, *Aids to Faith*, p. 19.

² *Ib.*, p. 20.

³ Through
presentia
⁴ *Ib.*, p. 20.
⁵ *Ib.*, p. 20.

that every effect must have a cause, a proposition too hackneyed to require any argument at all. If a man had not thrown the stone, the stone would have remained lying on the ground. No one doubts this. We have here, however, this "solitary instance of an efficient cause acting among the physical causes of the material world," producing the results which are wholly determined by material laws,¹ and incapable of producing any opposed to them. If, therefore, we substitute, as Dr. Mansel desires, "the will of God" for "the will of man," we arrive at no results which are not in harmony with the order of nature. We have no ground whatever for assuming any efficient cause acting in any other way than in accordance with the laws of nature. It is, however, one of the gross fallacies of this argument, as applied to miracles, to pass from the efficient cause producing results which are strictly in accordance with natural laws, and determined by them, to an assumed efficient cause producing effects which are opposed to natural law. As an argument from analogy it is totally false, and it is moreover based upon mere assumption. The restoration to life of a decomposed human body and the multiplication of loaves and fishes are opposed to natural laws, and no assumed efficient cause conceivable to which they may be referred can harmonize them.

Dr. Mozley continues his argument in a similar way. He inquires: "Is the suspension of physical and material laws by a Spiritual Being inconceivable? We reply that, however inconceivable this kind of suspension of physical law is, it is a fact. Physical laws are suspended any time an animate being moves any part of its body; the laws of matter are suspended by the laws of life."² He goes on to maintain that, although it is true that his spirit is united with the matter in which it moves in a way in which the Great Spirit who acts on matter in the miracle is not, yet the action of God's Spirit in the miracle of walking on the water is no more inconceivable than the action of his own spirit in holding up his own hand. "Antecedently, one step on the ground and an ascent to heaven are alike incredible. But this appearance of incredibility is answered in one case literally *ambulando*. How can I place any reliance upon it in the other?"³ From this illustration, Dr. Mozley, with a haste very unlike his previous careful procedure, jumps at the following conclusions: "The constitution of nature, then, disproves the incredibility of the Divine suspension of physical law; but more than this, it creates a presumption for it."⁴ The laws of life of which we have experience,

¹ Throughout this argument we use the term "law" in its popular sense as representing the series of phenomena to which reference is made.

² Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 164.

³ *Ib.*, p. 164.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 164.

he argues, are themselves in an ascending scale. First come the laws which regulate unorganized matter; next the laws of vegetation; then the laws of animal life, with its voluntary motion; and above these again, the laws of moral being. A supposed intelligent being whose experience was limited to one or more classes in this ascending scale of laws would be totally incapable of conceiving the action of the higher classes. The progressive succession of laws is perfectly conceivable backward, but an absolute mystery forward. "Analogy," therefore, when in this ascending series we arrive at man, leads us to expect that there is a higher sphere of law as much above *him* as he is above the lower natures in the scale, and "supplies a presumption in favour of such a belief."¹ And so we arrive at the question whether there is or is not a God, a Personal Head in nature, whose free will penetrates the universal frame invisibly to us, and is an omnipresent agent. If there be, Dr. Mozley concludes, then, every miracle in Scripture is as natural an event in the universe as any chemical experiment in the physical world.²

This is precisely the argument of Dr. Mansel, regarding the "Efficient Cause," somewhat elaborated, but, however ingeniously devised, it is equally based upon assumption and defective in analogy. We may observe, in the first place, that it is a fundamental error to speak in such a sense of an ascending scale of laws. There is no standard by which we have any right thus to graduate phenomena. The "classes of law" to which the Bampton Lecturer refers work harmoniously side by side, regulating the matter to which they apply. Unorganized matter, vegetation, and animal life, may each have special conditions modifying phenomena, but they are all equally subject to the same general laws. Man is as much under the influence of gravitation as a stone is. The special operation of physical laws is less a modification of law than that law acting under different conditions. The law of gravitation suffers no alteration, whether it cause the fall of an apple or shape the orbit of a planet. The reproduction of the plant and of the animal is regulated by the same fundamental principle acting through different organisms. The harmonious action of physical laws, and their adaptability to an infinite variety of forms, constitutes the perfection of that code which produces the order of nature.³ The mere superiority of man over lower forms of organic and inorganic matter does not lift him

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 165.

² *Ib.*, p. 165.

³ We pass over at present Dr. Mozley's reference to "the laws of moral being," as involving questions too intricate for treatment here, and as apart from the argument.

above
forbi
exen
If
"effi
the p
of pl
the i
existe
the f
effect
in na
life"
one p
to an
into a
come
weigh
precis
raised
soon a
the w
anoma
we kn
in no
constit
No ex
other b
more t
the ba
Moses,
arms t
favour
contrar
valence
su¹ the,
nature,
one wh
of anot
The
set the
instanc
the bat
into ex
from th

above physical laws, and the analogy of every grade in nature forbids the presumption that higher forms may exist which are exempt from their control.

If in animated beings we have the solitary instance of an "efficient cause" acting among the forces of nature, and possessing the power of initiation, this efficient cause produces no disturbance of physical law. Its existence is as much a recognized part of the infinite variety of form within the order of nature as the existence of a crystal or a plant; and although the character of the force exercised by it may not be clearly understood, its effects are regulated by the same laws as govern all other forces in nature. If "the laws of matter are suspended by the laws of life" each time an animated being moves any part of its body, one physical law is suspended in precisely the same manner, and to an equivalent degree, each time another physical law is called into action. The law of gravitation, for instance, is equally overcome by the law of magnetism each time a magnet suspends a weight in the air. In each case, a law is successfully resisted precisely to the extent of the force employed. The arm that is raised by the animated being falls again, in obedience to law, as soon as the force which raised it is exhausted, quite as certainly as the weight descends when the magnetic current fails. The only anomaly is our ignorance of the nature of the vital force; but do we know much more of the physical? The introduction of life in no way changes the relation between cause and effect, which constitutes the order of nature, and proceeds according to its law. No exercise of will can overcome the laws of gravitation, or any other law, to a greater extent than the actual force exerted, any more than the magnetic current can do so beyond the force of the battery. Will has no power against exhaustion. Even a Moses, in the sublimest moments of faith, could not hold up his arms to heaven after his physical force was consumed. Life favours no presumption for the suspension of law, but, on the contrary, whilst acting in nature, universally exhibits the prevalence and invariability of law. The "laws of life" may be subtle, but they are but an integral portion of the great order of nature, working harmoniously with the laws of matter, and not one whit more independent of them than any one natural law is of another.

The "Efficient Cause," if it have a moment of initiatory will to set the forces of life in motion—as the force of magnetism, for instance, is rendered active when a touch connects the coil with the battery—is singularly circumscribed by law. It is brought into existence by the operation of immutable physical laws, and from the cradle to the grave it is subject to those laws. So

inseparably is it connected with matter, and consequently with the laws which regulate matter, that it cannot even become conscious of its own existence without the intervention of matter. The whole process of life is dependent on obedience to natural laws, and so powerless is this efficient cause to resist their jurisdiction, that, in spite of its highest efforts, it pines or ceases to exist in consequence of the mere natural operation of law upon the matter with which it is united, and without which it is impotent. It cannot receive an impression from without that is not conveyed in accordance with law, and perceived by an exquisitely ordered organism, in every part of which law reigns supreme; nor can it communicate from within except through channels equally ordered by law. A slight injury may derange the delicate mechanical contrivances of eye, ear, and vocal chords, and may further destroy the reason and paralyze the body, reducing the animated being, by the derangement of those channels to which physical law limits its action, to a mere smouldering spark of life, without consciousness and without expression. The "laws of life" act amongst the laws of matter, but are not independent of them, and after the initiatory impulse the action of both classes of law is regulated by precisely the same principles.

Dr. Mozley's affirmation, that *antecedently* one step on the ground and an ascent to heaven are alike incredible, does not help him. In that sense it follows that there is nothing that is not antecedently incredible, nothing credible until it has happened. This argument, however, while it limits us to actual experience, prohibits presumptions with regard to that which is beyond experience. To argue that, because a step on the ground and an ascent to heaven are antecedently alike incredible, yet we subsequently make that step, therefore the ascent to heaven, which we cannot make, from incredible becomes credible, although it has not happened, is a contradiction in terms. If the ascent be antecedently incredible, it cannot at the same time be antecedently credible. That which is incredible cannot become credible because something else quite different becomes credible. It is apparent that such an argument is vicious. The proposition simply amounts to an assertion that everything before it has happened is incredible, and that because one thing antecedently considered incredible has happened, therefore everything else becomes credible. Experience comes with sober wisdom to check such reasoning. We believe in our power to walk because we can exercise it, and have been able to exercise it antecedently to our power to reason about the step, but everything prohibits belief in bodily ascensions. The step is part of the recognized

order
mirac
The c
exha
volum
belief
to wh

The
may s
the in
does
of an
of nat
is, fro
laws
even l
to the
anythi
himself
unkno
law; a
distinc
univers
miracle
to laws
far as
prevail
tion, it
could s
the mi
leaves
of an
favouri
produce
presum
gous to
furnish
the oth
wisdom
of law,
phic, an

order of nature, and has none of the elements in it of the miraculous. An automaton can make the same step as a man. The only difference is in the character of the force employed and exhausted in each. But if, in the exercise of our power of voluntary motion, we leap into the air on the brink of a precipice, belief in an ascent to heaven is shattered to pieces at the bottom to which the law of gravitation infallibly drags us.

There is absolutely nothing in the constitution of nature, we may say, reversing Dr. Mozley's assertion, which does not prove the incredibility of a Divine suspension of physical laws, and does not create a presumption against it. The solitary instance of an efficient cause, if it be distinguished from the other forces of nature by the possession of the power of an initiatory impulse, is, from the moment that power is exerted, subject to physical laws like all other forces, and there is no instance producible, or even logically conceivable, of any power whose effects are opposed to the ultimate ruling of the laws of nature. The occurrence of anything opposed to those laws is incredible. Dr. Mozley has himself shown that miracles cannot be explained either by unknown connection with known law, or by reference to unknown law; and he renounces the explanation of "higher law." His distinction between the laws of nature and the "laws of the universe,"¹ by which he nevertheless endeavours to make a miracle credible, is one which is purely imaginary. We know of no laws of the universe differing from the laws of nature. So far as the human intellect can range, the laws of nature alone prevail. But, even adopting for a moment Dr. Mozley's distinction, it would still be inconceivable that any "laws of the universe" could so modify the laws of nature as to explain, for instance, the miracle of the multiplication of an artificial product into loaves of bread. A consideration of the solitary instance known of an efficient cause acting among the forces of nature, so far from favouring the presumption of a still higher efficient cause unknown producing such results, presents on the contrary, the strongest presumption against it. No exertion of force in any way analogous to that exercised by animated beings, however great, could furnish the requisite explanation of such complex miracles. On the other hand, our highest attainable conception of infinite wisdom and power is based upon the universality and invariability of law, and inexorably excludes, as unworthy and anthropomorphic, any idea of its fitful suspension.

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 163.

2.

The proposition with which Dr. Mozley commences these Bampton Lectures, and for which he contends to their close, is this: "That miracles, or visible suspensions of the order of nature for a providential purpose, are not in contradiction to reason."¹ He shows that the purpose of miracles is to attest a supernatural revelation, which, without them, we could not be justified in believing. "Christianity," he distinctly states, "cannot be maintained as a revelation undiscoverable by human reason—a revelation of a supernatural scheme for man's salvation without the evidence of miracles."² Out of this very admission he attempts to construct an argument in support of miracles: "Hence it follows," he continues, "that upon the supposition of the Divine design of a revelation, a miracle is not an anomaly or irregularity, but part of the system of the universe; because, though an irregularity and an anomaly in relation to either part, it has a complete adaptation to the whole. There being two worlds, a visible and invisible, and a communication between the two being wanted, a miracle is the instrument of that communication."³

Here, again, the argument is based upon mere assumption. The supposition of the Divine design of a revelation is the result of a foregone conclusion in its favour, and not suggested by antecedent probability. Divines assume that a communication of this nature is in accordance with reason, and was necessary for the salvation of the human race, simply because they believe that it took place, and no evidence worthy of the name is ever offered in support of the assumption. A revelation having, it is supposed, been made, that revelation is consequently supposed to have been contemplated, and to have justified any suspension of the order of nature. The proposition for which evidence is demanded is viciously employed as evidence for itself. The considerations involved in an assumption of the necessity and reasonableness of such a revelation, however, are antecedently incredible, and contrary to reason. We are asked to believe that God made man in his own image, pure and sinless, and intended him to continue so, but that scarcely had this, his noblest work, left the hands of the Creator, than man was tempted into sin by Satan, an all-powerful and persistent enemy of God, whose existence and antagonism to a Being in whose eyes sin is abomination are not accounted for and are incredible.⁴ Adam's fall brought a curse upon the earth,

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 6.² *Ib.*, p. 23.³ *Ib.*, p. 23.⁴ The history of the gradual development of the idea of the existence and personality of the Devil is full of instruction, and throws no small light upon the question of Revelation.

and incurred the penalty of death for himself and for the whole of his posterity. The human race, although created perfect and without sin, thus disappointed the expectations of the Creator, and became daily more wicked, the Evil Spirit having succeeded in frustrating the designs of the Almighty, so that God repented that he had made man, and at length destroyed by a deluge all the inhabitants of the earth, with the exception of eight persons who feared him. This sweeping purification, however, was as futile as the original design, and the race of men soon became more wicked than ever. The final and only adequate remedy devised by God for the salvation of his creatures, become so desperately and hopelessly evil, was the incarnation of himself in the person of "the Son," the second person in a mysterious Trinity of which the Godhead is said to be composed (who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary), and his death upon the cross as a vicarious expiation of the sins of the world, without which supposed satisfaction of the justice of God his mercy could not possibly have been extended to the frail and sinful work of his own hands. The crucifixion of the incarnate God was the crowning guilt of a nation whom God himself had selected as his own peculiar people, and whom he had condescended to guide by constant direct revelations of his will, but who, from the first, had displayed the most persistent and remarkable proclivity to sin against him, and, in spite of the wonderful miracles wrought on their behalf, to forsake his service for the worship of other gods. We are asked to believe, therefore, in the frustration of the Divine design of creation, and in the fall of man into a state of wickedness hateful to God, requiring and justifying the Divine design of a revelation, and such a revelation as this, as a preliminary to the further proposition that, on the supposition of such a design, miracles would not be contrary to reason.

Antecedently, nothing could be more absolutely incredible or contrary to reason than these statements, or the supposition of such a design. Dr. Mozley himself admits that, as human announcements, the doctrines of Christianity would be the "wildest delusions," which we could not be justified in believing, and that such a scheme could not be maintained without miraculous evidence. The supposition of the Divine design of the revelation is solely derived from the doctrines supposed to have been revealed, and, indeed, that design forms part of them. Until they are proved to be Divine truths, these statements must obviously be considered human announcements, and consequently they are antecedently incredible, and the "wildest delusions." As Dr. Mozley does not pretend that there is anything antecedently credible

upon which he can base an assertion that there was actually any "Divine design of a revelation," or that any "communication between the two worlds" was requisite, it is therefore clear that his argument consists merely of assumptions admitted to be antecedently incredible. It advances a supposition of that which is contrary to reason to justify supposed visible suspensions of the order of nature, which are also contrary to reason. Incredible assumptions cannot give probability to incredible evidence. Tertulian's audacious paradox: "Credo quia impossibile," of which such reasoning is illustrative, is but a cry of enthusiastic credulity.

The whole theory of this abortive design of creation, with such impotent efforts to amend it, is emphatically contradicted by the glorious perfection and invariability of the order of nature. It is difficult to say whether the details of the scheme, or the circumstances which are supposed to have led to its adoption, are more shocking to reason or to moral sense. The imperfection ascribed to the Divine work is scarcely more derogatory to the power and wisdom of the Creator, than the supposed satisfaction of his justice in the death of himself incarnate, the innocent for the guilty, is degrading to the idea of his moral perfection. The supposed necessity for repeated interference to correct the imperfection of the original creation, the nature of the means employed, and the triumphant opposition of Satan, are anthropomorphic conceptions totally incompatible with the idea of an Infinitely Wise and Almighty Being. The constitution of nature, so far from favouring any hypothesis of original perfection and subsequent deterioration, bears everywhere the record of systematic upward progression. Not only is the assumption, that any revelation of the nature of ecclesiastical Christianity was necessary, excluded upon philosophical grounds, but it is contradicted by the whole operation of natural laws, which contain in themselves inexorable penalties against natural retrogression, or even unprogressiveness, and furnish the only requisite stimulus to improvement.¹ The

¹ We venture to add a passage from Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics," which we have met with for the first time since this work was published, in illustration of this assertion. Mr. Spencer affirms "the evanescence of evil" and the perfectibility of man, upon the ground that: "All evil results from the non-adaptation of constitution to conditions." After an elaborate demonstration of this, he resumes as follows: "If there be any conclusiveness in the foregoing arguments, such a faith is well founded. As commonly supported by evidence drawn from history, it cannot be considered indisputable. The inference that as advancement has hitherto the rule, it will be the rule henceforth, may be called a plausible speculation. But when it is shown that this advancement is due to the working of a universal law; and that in virtue of that law it must continue until the state we call perfection is reached, then the advent of such a state is removed out of the region of probability into that of certainty. If any one demurs to this let him point out the error. Here are the several steps of the argument.

All imperfection is unfitness to the conditions of existence.

surv
varia
nece
The
bring
law
there
ed by
the la
pre
law,
laws,

This
in havi
A fac
ercise t
tence d
But
not allo
excessi
And
crease o
Final
disappea
Thus
as any c
men wil
immense
then as
in maxim
and hist
else we c
continue
deduced
its condi
Progre
being art
embryo o
and are s
and prov
same, th
comes bu
same clas
as its hal
and the s
sighted in
tain a me
ing and c
tone am
grows by
conscience
efficacy in
tice; so a
social stat
surely mu

survival only of the fittest is the stern decree of nature. The invariable action of law itself eliminates the unfit. Progress is necessary to existence; extinction is the doom of retrogression. The highest effect contemplated by the supposed Revelation is to bring man into perfect harmony with law, and this is ensured by law itself acting upon intelligence. Only in obedience to law is there life and safety. Knowledge of law is imperatively demanded by nature. Ignorance of it is a capital offence. If we ignore the law of gravitation we are dashed to pieces at the foot of a precipice, or are crushed by a falling rock; if we neglect sanatory law, we are destroyed by a pestilence; if we disregard chemical laws, we are poisoned by a vapour. There is not, in reality, a

This unfitness must consist either in having a faculty or faculties in excess; or in having a faculty or faculties deficient; or in both.

A faculty in excess is one which the conditions of existence do not afford full exercise to; and a faculty that is deficient is one from which the conditions of existence demand more than it can perform.

But it is an essential principle of life that a faculty to which circumstances do not allow full exercise diminishes; and that a faculty on which circumstances make excessive demands increases.

And so long as this excess and this deficiency continue, there must continue decrease on the one hand, and growth on the other.

Finally all excess and all deficiency must disappear, that is, all unfitness must disappear; that is, all imperfection must disappear.

Thus the ultimate development of the ideal man is logically certain—as certain as any conclusion in which we place the most implicit faith: for instance, that all men will die. For why do we infer that all men will die? Simply because, in an immense number of past experiences, death has uniformly occurred. Similarly then as the experiences of all people in all times—experiences that are embodied in maxims, proverbs, and moral precepts, and that are illustrated in biographies and histories, go to prove that organs, faculties, powers, capacities, or whatever else we call them grow by use and diminish by disuse, it is inferred that they will continue to do so. And if this inference is unquestionable, then is the one above deduced from it—that humanity must in the end become completely adapted to its conditions—unquestionable also.

Progress, therefore, is not an accident, but a necessity. Instead of civilization being artificial, it is a part of nature; all of a piece with the development of the embryo or the unfolding of a flower. The modifications mankind have undergone, and are still undergoing, result from a law underlying the whole organic creation; and provided the human race continues, and the constitution of things remains the same, those modifications must end in completeness. As surely as the tree becomes bulky when it stands alone, and slender if one of a group; as surely as the same creature assumes the different forms of cart-horse and race-horse, according as its habits demand strength or speed; as surely as a blacksmith's arm grows large, and the skin of a labourer's hand thick; as surely as the eye tends to become long-sighted in the sailor, and short-sighted in the student; as surely as the blind attain a more delicate sense of touch; as surely as a clerk acquires rapidity in writing and calculation; as surely as the musician learns to detect an error of a semitone amidst what seems to others a very babel of sounds; as surely as a passion grows by indulgence and diminishes when restrained; as surely as a disregarded conscience becomes inert, and one that is obeyed active; as surely as there is any efficacy in educational culture, or any meaning in such terms as habit, custom, practice; so surely must the human faculties be moulded into complete fitness for the social state; so surely must the things we call evil and immorality disappear; so surely must man become perfect." *Social Statics*, stereotyped ed. 1868, p. 78 f.

gradation of breach of law that is not followed by an equivalent gradation of punishment. Civilization is nothing but the knowledge and observance of natural laws. The savage must learn them or be extinguished; the cultivated must observe them or die. The balance of moral and physical development cannot be deranged with impunity. In the spiritual as well as the physical sense only the fittest eventually can survive in the struggle for existence. There is, in fact, an absolute upward impulse to the whole human race supplied by the invariable operation of the laws of nature acting upon the common instinct of self-preservation. As, on the one hand, the highest human conception of infinite wisdom and power is derived from the universality and invariability of law, so that universality and invariability, on the other hand, exclude the idea of interruption or occasional suspension of law for any purpose whatever, and more especially for the correction of supposed original errors of design which cannot have existed, or for the attainment of objects already provided for in the order of nature.

Upon the first groundless assumption of a Divine design of such a revelation follows the hypothetical inference that, for the purpose of making the communication from the unseen world, a miracle or visible suspension of the order of nature is no irregularity, but part of the system of the universe. This, however, is a mere assertion, and no argument,—an avowed assumption which is contrary to experience. It is simply absurd to speak of a visible suspensor of the order of nature being part of the system of the universe. Such a statement has no meaning whatever within the range of human conception. Moreover, it must be remembered that miracles—or “visible suspensions of the order of nature,”—are ascribed indifferently to Divine and to Satanic agency. If miracles are not an anomaly or irregularity on the supposition of the Divine design of a revelation, upon what supposition do Satanic miracles cease to be irregularities? Is the order of nature, which it is asserted is under the personal control of God, at the same time at the mercy of the Devil?

Archbishop Trench has, as usual, a singular way of overcoming the difficulty. He says:—“So long as we abide in the region of nature, miraculous and improbable, miraculous and incredible may be admitted as convertible terms. But once lift up the whole discussion into a higher region, once acknowledge something higher than nature, a kingdom of God, and men the intended denizens of it, and the whole argument loses its strength and the force of its conclusions, . . . He who already counts it likely that God will interfere for the higher welfare of men, who believes that there is a nobler world-order than that in which

we
for
regi
are
pow
if w
grea

lieve
lieve
concl
not l
we s
are s
the r
and i
to lif
out h

¹ Not
the con
which
reasoni
miracle
but the
and the
was int
lower;
shall on
ing on t
harmon
gravitat
his pow
he is aw
attest.
works a
gravity,

we live and move, and that it would be the blessing of blessings for that nobler to intrude into and to make itself felt in the region of this lower, who has found that here in this world we are bound by heavy laws of nature, of sin, of death, which no powers that we now possess can break, yet which must be broken if we are truly to live,—he will not find it hard to believe the great miracle, the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, &c.

And as he believes that greatest miracle, so will he believe all other miracles, &c.¹ in other words, if we already believe the premises we shall not find it difficult to adopt the conclusions—if we already believe the greatest miracle we shall not hesitate to believe the less—if we already believe the dogmas we shall not find it hard to believe the evidence by which they are supposed to be authenticated. As we necessarily do abide in the region of nature, in which Dr. Trench admits that miraculous and incredible are convertible terms, it would seem rather difficult to lift the discussion into the higher region here described without having already abandoned it altogether.

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 71 f. Archbishop Trench believes that exemption from the control of the law of gravitation, &c., is a "lost prerogative" of our race, which we may one day recover. It would be difficult to produce a parallel to his reasoning in modern times. He says: "It has been already observed that the miracle, according to its true idea, is not a violation, nor yet suspension of law, but the incoming of a higher law, as of a spiritual in the midst of natural laws, and the momentary assertion, for that higher law, of the predominance which it was intended to have, and but for man's fall it would always have had, over the lower; and with this a prophetic anticipation of the abiding prevalence which it shall one day recover. Exactly thus was there here" (in the miracle of the Walking on the Sea) "a sign of the lordship of man's will, when that will is in absolute harmony with God's will, over external nature. In regard to this very law of gravitation, a feeble, and for the most part unconsciously possessed, remnant of his power survives to man in the well-attested fact that his body is lighter when he is awake than sleeping; a fact which every nurse who has carried a child can attest. From this we conclude that the human consciousness, as an inner centre, works as an opposing force to the attraction of the earth and the centripetal force of gravity, however unable now to overbear it" (!). Notes on Miracles, p. 292.

CHAPTER III.

REASON IN RELATION TO THE ORDER OF NATURE.

THE argument of those who assert the possibility and reality of miracles generally takes the shape of an attack upon our knowledge of the order of nature. To establish an exception they deny the rule. "Whatever difficulty there is in believing in miracles in general," says Dr. Mozley, who conducts such an attack with unusual force and ability, "arises from the circumstance that they are in contradiction to or unlike the order of nature. To estimate the force of this difficulty, then, we must first understand what kind of belief it is which we have in the order of nature; for the weight of the objection to the miraculous must depend on the nature of the belief to which the miraculous is opposed."¹ Dr. Mozley defines the meaning of the phrase, "order of nature" as the *connection* of that part of the order of nature of which we are ignorant with that part of it which we know, the former being expected to be such and such, *because* the latter is. But how do we justify this expectation of *likeness*?² We cannot do so, and all our arguments are mere statements of the belief itself, he affirms, and not reasons to account for it. It may be said, *e. g.* that when a fact of nature has gone on repeating itself a certain time, such repetition shows that there is a permanent cause at work, and that a permanent cause produces permanently recurring effects. But what is there to show the existence of a permanent cause? Nothing. The effects which have taken place show a cause at work to the extent of these effects, but not further. That this cause is of a more permanent nature we have no evidence. Why then do we expect the further continuance of these effects?³ We can only say: because we believe the future will be like the past. After a physical phenomenon has even occurred every day for years we have nothing but the past repetition to justify our certain expectation of its future repetition.⁴ Do we think it giving a reason for our confidence in the future to say that, though no man has had experience of what *is* future, every man has had experience of what *was* future? It is true that what *is* future becomes at every step of our advance what *was* future, but that which is now *still* future is not the least al-

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 23.

² *Ib.*, p. 34.

³ *Ib.*, p. 36.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 37.

tered by that circumstance; it is as invisible, as unknown, and as unexplored as if it were the very beginning and the very starting-point of nature. At this starting-point of nature what would a man know of its future course? Nothing. At this moment he *knows* no more.¹ What ground of reason, then, can we assign for our expectation that any part of the course of nature will the *next* moment be like what it has been up to *this* moment, *i. e.*, for our belief in the uniformity of nature? None. It is without a reason. It rests upon no rational ground, and can be traced to no rational principle.² The belief in the order of nature being thus an "unintelligent impulse" of which we cannot give any rational account, Dr. Mozley concludes, the ground is gone upon which it could be maintained that miracles, as opposed to the order of nature, were opposed to reason. A miracle in being opposed to our experience is not only not opposed to necessary reasoning, but to any reasoning.³ We need not further follow the Bampton Lecturer, as with clearness and ability he applies this reasoning to the argument of "Experience," until he pauses triumphantly to exclaim: "Thus step by step has philosophy loosened the connection of the order of nature with the ground of reason, befriending, in exact proportion as it has done this, the principle of miracles."⁴

Dr. Mozley, however, acknowledges that the principle of argument from experience is that "which makes human life practicable; which utilizes all our knowledge; which makes the past anything more than an irrelevant picture to us; for of what use is the experience of the past to us unless we believe the future will be like it?"⁵ Our knowledge in all things is relative, and there are sharp and narrow limits to human thought. It is, therefore, evident that, in the absence of absolute knowledge, our belief must be accorded to that of which we have more full cognizance rather than to that which is contradicted by all that we do know. It may be "irrational" to feel entire confidence that the sun will "rise" to-morrow, or that the moon will continue to wax and wane as in the past, but we shall without doubt retain this belief, and reject any assertion, however positive, that the earth will stand still to-morrow, or that it did so some thousands of years ago. Evidence must take its relative place in the finite scale of knowledge and thought, and if we do not absolutely know anything whatever, so long as one thing is more fully established than another, we must hold to that which rests upon the more certain basis. Our belief in the invariability of the order of nature, therefore, being based upon more certain grounds

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 38.

³ *Ib.*, p. 48.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 49.

² *Ib.*, p. 39.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 58.

than any other human opinion, we must of necessity refuse credence to a statement supported by infinitely less complete testimony, and contradicted by universal experience, that phenomena subversive of that order occurred many years ago, or we must cease to believe anything at all. If belief based upon unvarying experience be irrational, how much more irrational must belief be which is opposed to that experience. According to Dr. Mozley, it is quite irrational to believe that a stone dropped from the hand, for instance, will fall to the ground. It is true that all the stones we ourselves have ever dropped, or seen dropped, have so fallen, and equally true that all stones so dropped as far back as historic records, and those still more authentic and ancient records of earth's crust itself go, have done the same, but that does not justify our belief, upon any grounds of reason, that the next stone we drop will do so. If we be told, however, that upon one occasion a stone so dropped, instead of falling to the ground, rose up into the air and continued there, we have only two courses open to us: either to disbelieve the fact, and attribute the statement to error of observation, or to reduce the past to a mere irrelevant picture, and the mind to a blank page equally devoid of all belief and of all intelligent reasoning. It is impossible to do the latter, and it is equally impossible not to do the former.

Dr. Mozley's argument, however, is fatal to his own cause. It is admitted that miracles, "or visible suspensions of the order of nature,"¹ cannot have any evidential force unless they be supernatural, and out of the natural sequence of ordinary phenomena. Now, unless there be an actual order of nature, how can there be any exception to it? If our belief in it be not based upon any ground of reason,—as Dr. Mozley maintains, in order to assert that miracles or visible suspensions of that order are not contrary to reason,—how can it be asserted that miracles are supernatural? If we have no rational ground for believing that the future will be like the past, what rational ground can we have for thinking that anything which happens is exceptional, and out of the common course of nature? Because it has not happened before? That is no reason whatever; because the fact that a thing has happened ten millions of times is no rational justification of our expectation that it will happen again. If the reverse of that which had happened previously took place on the ten million and first time we should have no rational ground for surprise, and no reason for affirming that it did not occur in the most natural manner. Because we cannot explain its cause? We cannot explain the cause of anything. Our belief that there is any per-

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 6.

manent cause is a mere unintelligent impulse. We can only say that there is a cause sufficient to produce an isolated effect, but we do not know the nature of that cause, and it is a mere irrational instinct to suppose that any cause produces continuous effects, or is more than momentary. A miracle, consequently, becomes a mere isolated effect from an unknown cause in the midst of other merely isolated phenomena from unknown causes, and it is as irrational to wonder at the occurrence of what is new, as to expect the recurrence of what is old. In fact, an order of nature is at once necessary, and fatal, to miracles. If there be no order of nature, miracles cannot be considered supernatural occurrences, and have no evidential value; if there be an order of nature, the evidence for its immutability must consequently exceed the evidence for these isolated deviations from it. If we are unable rationally to form expectations of the future from unvarying experience in the past, it is still more irrational to call that supernatural which is merely different from our past experience. Take, for instance, the case of supposed exemption from the action of the law of gravitation, which Archbishop Trench calls "a lost prerogative of our race:"¹ we cannot rationally affirm the next week we may not be able to walk on the sea, or ascend bodily into the air. To deny this because we have not hitherto been able to do so is unreasonable; for as Dr. Mozley maintains, it is a mere irrational impulse which expects that which has hitherto happened, when we have made such attempts, to happen again next week. If we cannot rationally deny the possibility, however, that we may be able at some future time to walk on the sea or ascend into the air, the statement that these phenomena have already occurred loses all its force, and such occurrences cease to be in any way supernatural. If, on the other hand, it would be irrational to affirm that we may next week become exempt from the operation of the law of gravitation, it can only be so by the admission that unvarying experience forbids the entertainment of such a hypothesis, and in that case it equally forbids belief in the statement that such acts ever actually took place. If we deny the future possibility on any ground of reason, we admit that we have grounds of reason for expecting the future to be like the past, and therefore contradict Dr. Mozley's conclusion; and if we cannot deny it upon any ground of reason, we extinguish the claim of such occurrences in the past to any supernatural character. Any argument which could destroy faith in the order of nature would be equally destructive to miracles. If we have no right to believe in a rule, there can be no right to

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 32 f., p. 291 f.

speak of exceptions. The result in any case is this, that whether the principle of the order of nature be established or refuted, the supernatural pretensions of miracles are disallowed.

2.

Throughout the whole of his argument against the rationality of belief in the order of nature, the rigorous precision which Dr. Mozley unrelentingly demands from his antagonists is remarkable. They are not permitted to deviate by a hair's breadth from the line of strict logic, and the most absolute exactness of demonstration is required. Anything like an assumption or argument from analogy is excluded; induction is allowed to add no reason to bare and isolated facts; and the belief that the sun will rise to-morrow morning is, with pitiless severity, written down as mere unintelligent impulse. Belief in the return of day, based upon the unvarying experience of all past time, is declared to be without any ground of reason. We find anything but fault with strictness of argument; but it is fair that equal precision should be observed by those who assert miracles, and that assumption and inaccuracy should be excluded. Hitherto, as we have frequently pointed out, we have met with very little or nothing but assumption in support of miracles; but encouraged by the inflexible spirit of Dr. Mozley's attack upon the argument from experience, we may look for similar precision from himself.

Proceeding, however, from his argument against the rationality of belief in the order of nature to his more direct argument for miracles, we are astonished to find a total abandonment of the rigorous exactness imposed upon his antagonists, and a complete relapse into assumptions. Dr. Mozley does not conceal the fact. "The peculiarity of the argument of miracles," he frankly admits, "is, that it begins and ends with an assumption; I mean relatively to that argument."¹ Such an argument is no argument at

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 94. In a lecture on the Miraculous Testimony to Christianity, one of a course delivered at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, and published under the title of "Modern Scepticism," Dr. Stoughton, with a happy unconsciousness of the nature of the arguments he is using, after describing the reasoning which he puts into the mouths of those who deny miracles as mere assumption, then triumphantly puts his own case: "But when all assumptions are denied, the whole question presents another aspect. Given the fundamental distinction between things physical and things moral; given the higher nature of man, the personal existence of God, a moral element in the Divine rule, the immortality of the human soul, and the present vicinity of invisible spiritual realms; and immediately, miracles wrought by the Divine will for men's moral welfare are completely removed out of the sphere of the impossible," p. 193 (6th edition). Dr. Stoughton does not appear to have the slightest suspicion that there is any assumption at all among his points; but the whole lecture betrays the most astonishing confusion of ideas regarding the subject with which he is dealing.

all;
The
degr
par
wise
exer
that
is to
game
No
we m
isten
gious
is at
suspe
"que
end o
that
with
the r
power
suspe
of an
trary
accoun
compl
pensi
a Pers
usurp
the p
positi
interv
by the
beings
cogniz
cogene
tion, th
procee
other b
leads t
known

Dr.

¹ Bam
² Two

all; it is a mere *petitio principii*, incapable of proving anything. The nature of the assumptions obviously does not in the slightest degree affect this conclusion. It is true that the statement of the particular assumptions may constitute an appeal to belief otherwise derived, and evolve feelings which may render the calm exercise of judgment more difficult, but the fact remains absolute, that an argument which "begins and ends with an assumption" is totally impotent. It remains an assumption, and is not an argument at all.

Notwithstanding this unfortunate and disqualifying "peculiarity" we may examine the argument. It is as follows: "We assume the existence of a Personal Deity prior to the proof of miracles in the religious sense; but with this assumption the question of miracles is at an end; because such a Being has necessarily the power to suspend those laws of nature which He has Himself enacted."¹ The "question of miracles," which Dr. Mozley here asserts to be at an end on the assumption of a "Personal Deity," is of course merely that of the *possibility* of miracles; but it is obvious that, even with the precise definition of Deity which is assumed, instead of the real "question" being at an end, it only commences. The power to suspend the laws of nature being assumed, the will to suspend them has to be demonstrated, and the actual occurrence of any such suspension, which, it has already been shown, is contrary to reason. It is absurd to assume what is beyond reason to account for what is opposed to reason. The subject is, moreover, complicated by the occurrence of Satanic as well as Divine suspensions of the order of nature, and by the necessity of assuming a Personal Devil as well as a Personal Deity, and his power to usurp that control over the laws of nature, which is assumed as the prerogative of the Deity, and to suspend them in direct opposition to God. The express ascription of miracles to the special intervention of a Personal God is also, as we have seen, excluded by the Scriptural admission that there are other supernatural beings capable of performing them. Even Dr. Newman has recognized this, and, in a passage already quoted, he says: "For the cogency of the argument from Miracles depends on the assumption, that interruptions in the course of nature must ultimately proceed from God; which is not true, if they may be effected by other beings without His sanction."² The first assumption, in fact, leads to nothing but assumptions connected with the unseen, unknown and supernatural, which are beyond the limits of reason.

Dr. Mozley is well aware that his assumption of a "Personal"

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 94.

² Two Essays, &c., p. 50.

Deity is not susceptible of proof; ¹ indeed, this is admitted in the statement that the definition is an "assumption." He quotes the obvious reply which must be made regarding this assumption: "Everybody must collect from the harmony of the physical universe the existence of a God, but in acknowledging a God, we do not thereby acknowledge this peculiar doctrinal conception of a God. We see in the structure of nature a mind—a universal mind—but still a mind which only operates and expresses itself by law. Nature only does and only can inform us of mind in nature, the partner and correlative of organized matter. Nature, therefore, can speak to the existence of a God in this sense, and can speak to the omnipotence of God in a sense coinciding with the actual facts of nature; but in no other sense does nature witness to the existence of an Omnipotent Supreme Being. Of a universal Mind out of nature, nature says nothing, and of an Omnipotence which does not possess an inherent limit in nature, she says nothing either. And, therefore, that conception of a Supreme Being which represents him as a Spirit independent of the physical universe, and able from a standing-place external to nature to interrupt its order, is a conception of God for which we must go elsewhere. That conception is obtained from revelation which is asserted to be proved by miracles. But that being the case, this doctrine of Theism rests itself upon miracles, and, therefore, miracles cannot rest upon this doctrine of Theism."² With his usual fairness, Dr. Mozley, while questioning the correctness of the premiss of this argument, admits that, if established, the consequence stated would follow, "and more, for miracles being thrown back upon the same ground on which Theism is, the whole evidence of revelation becomes a vicious circle, and the fabric is left suspended in space, revelation resting on miracles and miracles resting on revelation."³ He not only recognizes, however, that the conception of a "Personal" Deity cannot be proved, but he distinctly confesses that it was obtained from revelation,⁴ and from nowhere else, and these necessary admissions obviously establish the correctness of the premiss, and involve the consequence pointed out, that the evidence of revelation is a mere vicious circle. Dr. Mozley attempts to argue that although the idea was first obtained

¹ Canon Westcott frankly admits this. "Christianity, therefore," he says, "as the absolute religion of man assumes as its foundation the existence of an Infinite Personal God and a finite human will. This antithesis is assumed and not proved. No argument can establish it. It is a primary intuition and not a deduction. It is capable of illustration from what we observe around us; but if either term is denied no reasoning can establish its truth." *The Gospel of the Resurrection*, 3rd ed., 1874, p. 19 f.

² Bampton Lectures for 1865, p. 95 f.

³ *Ib.*, p. 96.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 97 f.

throat
ground
tion?
tion?
nature
which
From
Mozley
his na
absenc
"Not,
reason
us tha
stance
experi
he con
it must
fide an
aware
otherw
and wh
trust in

It is
denying
ence, ar
—who
stinct t
morning
argue.
for mira
ment be
for thou
lecturer
"Faith,
has not
expectan
"hypoth
argumen
the fact
exercise
It doe
divines

¹ Bampton
² *Ib.*, p.

⁴ Cf. Bar

through this channel, "the truth once possessed is seen to rest upon grounds of natural reason."¹ Why, then, does he call it an assumption? The argument by which he seeks to show that the conception is seen to rest upon grounds of natural reason is: "We naturally attribute to the design of a Personal Being a contrivance which is directed to the existence of a Personal Being . . . From personality at one end I infer personality at the other." Dr. Mozley's own sense of the weakness of his argument, however, and his natural honesty of mind oblige him continually to confess the absence of evidence. A few paragraphs further on he admits:—"Not, however, that the existence of a God is so clearly seen by reason as to dispense with faith;"² but he endeavours to convince us that faith is reason, only reason acting under peculiar circumstances: when reason draws conclusions which are not backed by experience, reason is then called faith.³ The issue of the argument, he contends, is so amazing, that if we do not tremble for its safety it must be on account of a practical principle, which makes us confide and trust in reasons, and that principle is faith. We are not aware that conviction can be arrived at regarding any matter otherwise than by confidence in the correctness of the reasons, and what Dr. Mozley really means by faith, here, is confidence and trust in a conclusion for which there are no reasons.

It is almost incredible that the same person who had just been denying grounds of reason to conclusions from unvarying experience, and excluding from them the results of inductive reasoning—who had denounced as unintelligent impulse and irrational instinct the faith that the sun, which has risen without fail every morning since time began, will rise again to-morrow, could thus argue. In fact, from the very commencement of the direct plea for miracles, calm logical reasoning is abandoned, and the argument becomes entirely *ad hominem*. Mere feeling is substituted for thought, and in the inability to be precise and logical, the lecturer appeals to the generally prevailing inaccuracy of thought.⁴ "Faith, then," he concludes, "is *unverified* reason; reason which has not yet received the verification of the final test, but is still expectant." In science this, at the best, would be called mere "hypothesis," but accuracy can scarcely be expected where the argument continues: "Indeed, does not our heart bear witness to the fact that to believe in a God"—*i. e.*, a Personal God—"is an exercise of faith?" &c.⁵

It does not help Dr. Mozley that Butler, Paley, and all other divines have equally been obliged to commence with the same

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 99.

² *Ib.*, p. 100.

⁴ Cf. Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 101, ff.

³ *Ib.*, p. 101.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 104.

assumption; and, indeed, as we have already remarked, Dr. Mozley honestly admits the difficulty of the case, and while naturally making the most of his own views, he does not disguise the insecurity of the position. He deprecates that school which maintains that any average man taken out of a crowd, who has sufficient common sense to manage his own affairs, is a fit judge, and such a judge as was originally contemplated, of the Christian evidences;¹ and he says: "It is not, indeed, consistent with truth, nor would it conduce to the real defence of Christianity, to under-rate the difficulties of the Christian evidence; or to disguise the characteristic of it, that the very facts which constitute the evidence of revelation have to be accepted by an act of faith themselves, before they can operate as a proof of that further truth."² Such evidence is manifestly worthless. After all his assumptions, Dr. Mozley is reduced to the necessity of pleading: "A probable fact is a probable evidence. I may, therefore, use a miracle as evidence of a revelation, though I have only probable evidence for the miracle."³ The probability of the miracle, however, is precisely what is denied, as opposed to reason and experience, and incompatible with the order of nature. A cause is, indeed, weak when so able an advocate is reduced to such reasoning.

The deduction which is drawn from the assumption of a "Personal" Deity is, as we have seen, merely the possibility of miracles. "Paley's criticism," said the late Dean of St Paul's, "is, after all, the true one—'once believe that there is a God, and miracles are not incredible.'"⁴ The assumption, therefore, although of vital importance in the event of its rejection, does not very materially advance the cause of miracles if established. We have already seen that the assumption is avowedly incapable of proof, but it may be well to examine it a little more closely in connection with the inferences supposed to be derivable from it. We must, however, in doing so carefully avoid being led into a metaphysical argument, which would be foreign to the purpose of this inquiry.

In his Bampton Lectures on "The Limit of Religious Thought," delivered in 1858, Dr. Mansel, the very able editor and disciple of Sir William Hamilton, discussed this subject with great minuteness, and although we cannot pretend here to follow him through the whole of his singular argument—a theological application of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy—we must sufficiently represent it. Dr. Mansel argues: We are absolutely incapable of conceiving or proving the existence of God as he is; and so far is human

¹ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 140.

² *Ib.*, p. 138.

³ *Mansel, Aids to Faith*, p. 30.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 138 f.

rea
rev
the
of
fin
vo
ma
ali
Ab
no
am
not
abl
for
mar
ear
it i
and
mys
tics
doub
God
facu
arab
of co
Else
cong
and
an e
anal
able

1 M
2 W
thing
3 M
coti s
for th
laugu
We sp
and y
ception
For us
will ;
notion
The G
4 M
5 Ib
6 M

reason from being able to construct a theology independent of revelation that it cannot even read the alphabet out of which that theology must be formed.¹ We are compelled, by the constitution of our minds, to believe in the existence of an Absolute and Infinite Being; but the instant we attempt to analyse, we are involved in inextricable confusion.² Our moral consciousness demands that we should conceive him as a Personality, but personality, as we conceive it, is essentially a limitation; to speak of an Absolute and Infinite Person is simply to use language to which no mode of human thought can possibly attach itself.³ This amounts simply to an admission that our knowledge of God does not satisfy the conditions of speculative philosophy, and is incapable of reduction to an ultimate and absolute truth.⁴ It is, therefore, reasonable that we should expect to find that the revealed manifestation of the Divine nature and attributes should likewise carry the marks of subordination to some higher truth, of which it indicates the existence, but does not make known the substance; and that our apprehension of the revealed Deity should involve mysteries inscrutable, and doubts insoluble by our present faculties, while at the same time it inculcates the true spirit in which doubt should be dealt with by warning us that our knowledge of God, though revealed by himself, is revealed in relation to human faculties, and subject to the limitations and imperfections inseparable from the constitution of the human mind.⁵ We need not, of course, point out that the reality of revelation is here assumed. Elsewhere, Dr. Mansel maintains that philosophy, by its own incongruities, has no claim to be accepted as a competent witness; and, on the other hand, human personality cannot be assumed as an exact copy of the Divine, but only as that which is most nearly analogous to it among finite things.⁶ As we are, therefore, incapable on the one hand of a clear conception of the Divine Being,

¹ *Mansel, Bampton Lectures*, 1858 (Murray, 4th ed., 1859), p. 40.

² We do not interrupt the course of Dr. Mansel's argument to contradict anything.

³ *Mansel, Bampton Lectures*, 1858 (Murray, 4th ed., 1859), p. 56. Canon Westcott says upon this point: "But though we appeal to the individual consciousness for the recognition of the truth of the assumptions which have been made, the language in which one term of the antithesis is expressed requires explanation. We speak of God as Infinite and Personal. The epithets involve a contradiction, and yet they are both necessary. In fact the only approximately adequate conception which we can form of a Divine Being is under the form of a contradiction. For us personality is only the name for special limitation exerting itself through will; and will itself implies the idea of resistance. But as applied to God the notions of limitation and resistance are excluded by the antithetic term infinite."

The Gospel of the Resurrection, 1874, p. 2...

⁴ *Mansel, Bampton Lectures*, 1858 (Murray, 4th ed., 1859), p. 94 f.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 95.

⁶ *Mansel, The Philosophy of the Conditioned* (Strahan, 1866), p. 143 f.

and have only analogy to guide us in conceiving his attributes, we have no criterion of religious truth or falsehood, enabling us to judge of the ways of God, represented by revelation,¹ and have no right to judge of his justice, or mercy, or goodness, by the standard of human morality.

It is impossible to conceive an argument more vicious, or more obviously warped to favour already accepted conclusions of revelation:—As finite beings we are not only incapable of proving the existence of God, but even of conceiving him as he is; therefore we may conceive him as he is not. To attribute personality to him is a limitation totally incompatible with the idea of an Absolute and Infinite Being, in which "we are compelled by the constitution of our minds to believe;" and to speak of him as a personality is "to use language to which no mode of human thought can possibly attach itself;" but, nevertheless, to satisfy supposed demands of our moral consciousness, we are to conceive him as a personality. Although we must define the Supreme Being as a personality to satisfy our moral consciousness, we must not, we are told, make the same moral consciousness the criterion of the attributes of that personality. We must not suppose him to be endowed, for instance, with the perfection of morality according to our ideas of it; but, on the contrary, we must hold that his moral perfections are at best only analogous, and often contradictory, to our standard of morality.² As soon as we conceive a Personal Deity to satisfy our moral consciousness, we have to abandon the personality which satisfies that consciousness, in order to accept the characteristics of a supposed Revelation, to reconcile certain statements of which we must admit that we have no criterion of truth or falsehood enabling us to judge of the ways of God.

Now, in reference to the assumption of a Personal Deity as a preliminary to the proof of miracles, it must be clearly remembered that the peculiarities of the revelation which miracles are to authenticate cannot have any weight. Antecedently, then, it

¹ *Mansel*, *The Philosophy of the Conditioned* (Strahan, 1866), p. 144 f. In another place Dean Mansel says: "Ideas and images which do not represent God as He is may nevertheless represent Him as it is our duty to regard Him. They are not in themselves true; but we must nevertheless believe and act as if they were true. A finite mind can form no conception of an Infinite Being which shall be *speculatively* true, for it must represent the Infinite under finite forms; nevertheless a conception which is *speculatively* untrue may be *regulatively* true. A regulative truth is thus designed not to satisfy our reason, but to guide our practice; not to tell us what God is, but how He wills that we should think of Him." *Man's conception of Eternity; an examination of Mr. Maurice's Theory of a Fixed State out of Time*, in a letter to the Rev. L. T. Bernays, by Rev. H. L. Mansel, B. D., p. 9 f.

² *Mansel*, *Philosophy of the Conditioned*, p. 143 f.; *Bampton Lectures*, 1858, pp. 131–175, pp. 94–130.

is ad
exclu
stitut
be ra
and t
absur
by th
admit
derive
mirac
that t
be all
first i
been
possib
best, t
plausi
ment
the lat
Revel
possib
upon,
for acc
assum

As v
ture o
omorp
careful
which
to the
aband
ousnes
God o
are ma
as we
in our
Supren

¹ Baun
² Sir V
philosoph
as we can
in a certa
and high
To the m
wood and
³ Cf. A
Werke,

is admitted that personality is a limitation which is absolutely excluded by the ideas of the Deity, which, it is asserted, the constitution of our minds compels us to form. It cannot, therefore, be rationally assumed. To admit that such a conception is false, and then to base conclusions upon it, as though it were true, is absurd. It is child's play to satisfy our feeling and imagination by the conscious sacrifice of our reason. Moreover, Dr. Mansel admits that the conception of a Personal Deity is really derived from the revelation, which has to be rendered credible by miracles; therefore the consequence already pointed out ensues, that the assumption cannot be used to prove miracles. "It must be allowed that it is not through reasoning that men obtain the first intimation of their relation to the Deity; and that, had they been left to the guidance of their intellectual faculties alone, it is possible that no such intimation might have taken place; or at best, that it would have been but as one guess out of many equally plausible, and equally natural." The vicious circle of the argument is here again apparent, and the singular reasoning by which the late Dean of St. Paul's seeks to drive us into an acceptance of Revelation is really the strongest argument against it. The impossibility of conceiving God as he is, which is rightly insisted upon, instead of being a reason for assuming his personality, or for accepting Jewish conceptions of him, totally excludes such an assumption.

As we are avowedly incapable of adequately conceiving the nature of the Supreme Being,² and too naturally fall into anthropomorphic modes of representing him to ourselves, surely we should carefully avoid forming views of God, from foregone conclusions, which are opposed to our highest moral sense, and contradictory to the teaching of the universe and its laws.³ The instant we abandon the only true guides we have—Reason and Moral Conscience—we must inevitably go astray, and frame for ourselves a God out of mere fancy, of whom it can neither be said that we are made in his image nor even he in ours. Putting aside, then, as we must do, all foregone conclusions, it is perfectly certain that in our admitted incompetency to form any conception of the Supreme Being as he is, we have only two alternatives: 1. To

¹ Hampton Lectures, 1858, p. 68.

² Sir William Hamilton says: "True therefore are the declarations of a pious philosophy. 'A God understood would be no God at all.' 'To think that God is as we can think Him to be is blasphemy. The Divinity, in a certain sense, is revealed; in a certain sense is concealed: He is at once known and unknown. But the last and highest consecration of all true religion must be an altar—*Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ*—To the unknown and unknowable God.'" Discussions on Philosophy, 3rd ed., Blackwood and Sons, 1866, p. 15, note.

³ Cf. Kant, Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft. Sammtl. Werke, ed. Hartenstein, 1867, vi. p. 267 ff.

renounce all attempts to gain fuller knowledge of him, and to rest in the mere belief that there is a Supreme Being of whose nature we cannot know anything,—and this would exclude the possibility of the assumption which the argument for miracles requires; or, 2. To gain such knowledge of the Supreme Being as we may from study of the order of nature, aided by our highest perceptions of morality,—and this would equally destroy the argument. It is obvious that either alternative is fatal to miracles. In order, however, to account for certain occurrences which are reported to have taken place, but which they do not understand and are unable to explain, theologians adopt an assumption, which dwarfs the Supreme Being, of whom they admit that we cannot even form a conception, into an arbitrary Personal God constantly interfering with the order of nature.¹

This "great religious assumption" is not suggested by any antecedent considerations, but is required to account for miracles, and is derived from the very Revelation which miracles are to attest. "In nature and from nature," to quote words of Professor Baden Powell, "by science and by reason, we neither have nor can possibly have any evidence of a *Deity working* miracles;—for that we must go out of nature and beyond science. If we could have any such evidence *from nature*, it could only prove extraordinary *natural* effects, which would not be *miracles* in the old theological sense, as isolated, unrelated, and uncaused; whereas no *physical* fact can be conceived as unique, or without analogy and relation to others, and to the whole system of natural causes."² Being, therefore, limited to Reason for any feeble conception of the Divine Being of which we may be capable, and Reason being totally opposed to the idea of an order of nature so imperfect as to require or permit repeated interference, and rejecting the supposition of arbitrary suspensions of Law, such a conception of the Deity as is proposed by theologians must be pronounced irrational and derogatory to the wisdom and perfection which we recognize in the invariable order of nature. It is impossible for us to conceive the Supreme Being acting otherwise than we actually see in

¹ Dr. Mozley, however, does not overlook the peculiarities of the case, and he condemns the class of writers who speak of miracles as though they stood on a par with other events as matters of credit, and were accepted upon the same testimony as ordinary facts of history. Against such a theory he says: "But this is to forget the important point that a miracle is on one side of it not a fact of this world, but of the invisible world; the Divine interposition in it being a supernatural and mysterious act: that therefore the evidence for a miracle does not stand exactly on the same ground as the evidence of the witness box, which only appeals to our common sense as men of the world and actors in ordinary life; but that it requires a great religious assumption in our minds to begin with, without which no testimony in the case can avail." Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 128.

² Study of the Evidences of Christianity, "Essays and Reviews," 9th ed p. 141 f.

natu
nite
of a
see
men
as I
high
with
requ
giver
take
of a
of vi
him
whic
have
of his
asks
matte
of his
word
the c
these
mutal
to the
of Go
Six
Colop
morph
of the

"TH
W

Bu
W

1 Aid
2 Ib.,
3 Bac
4 Aid
5 "N
intellig
ordine."
6 Ib.,
7 Cler
phanes,
sense is
Al. Str

nature, and if we recognize in the universe the operation of his infinite wisdom and power, it is in the immutable order and regularity of all phenomena, and in the eternal prevalence of Law, that we see their highest manifestation. This is no conception based merely upon observation of law and order in the material world, as Dr. Mansel insinuates,¹ but it is likewise the result of the highest exercise of mind. Dr. Mansel "does not hesitate" to affirm with Sir William Hamilton "that the class of phenomena which requires that kind of cause we denominate a Deity is exclusively given in the phenomena of mind; that the phenomena of matter, taken by themselves, do not warrant any inference to the existence of a God."² After declaring the Supreme Being, from every point of view, inconceivable by our finite minds, it is singular to find him thrusting upon us, in consequence, a conception of that Being which almost makes us exclaim with Bacon: "It were better to have no opinion of God at all than such an opinion as is unworthy of him; for the one is unbelief, the other is contumely."³ Dr. Mansel asks: "Is matter or mind the truer image of God?"⁴ But both matter and mind unite in repudiating so unworthy a conception of him, and in rejecting the idea of suspensions of Law. In the words of Spinoza: "From miracles we can neither infer the nature, the existence, nor the providence of God, but, on the contrary, these may be much better comprehended from the fixed and immutable order of nature;"⁵ indeed, as he adds, "miracles, as contrary to the order of nature, would rather lead us to doubt the existence of God."⁶

Six centuries before our era, a noble thinker, Xenophanes of Colophon, whose pure mind soared far above the base anthropomorphic mythologies of Homer and Hesiod, and anticipated some of the highest results of the Platonic philosophy, finely said:

"There is one God supreme over all gods, diviner than mortals,
Whose form is not like unto man's, and as unlike his nature;

But vain mortals imagine that gods like themselves are begotten,
With human sensations, and voice, and corporeal members;⁷

¹ *Aids to Faith*, p. 25.

² *Ib.*, p. 25. Cf. *Hamilton, Lectures on Metaphysics*, vol. i. p. 26.

³ Bacon's *Essays*, xvii. ed. Whately, p. 183.

⁴ *Aids to Faith*, p. 25.

⁵ "Nos ex miraculis nec Dei essentiam nec existentiam, nec providentiam possintelligere, sed contra hæc longe melius percipi ex fixo atque immutabili natura ordine." *Tract. Theolog. Polit.* c. vi. § 16, ed. Tauchnitz.

⁶ *Ib.*, vi. § 19.

⁷ Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the whole of this passage from Xenophanes, makes a separation here from the succeeding lines, by καὶ πάλιν; but the sense is evidently continuous, and the fragments are generally united. Cf. *Clem. Al. Strom.*, v. 14, § 110.

So if oxen or lions had hands and could work in man's fashion,
And trace out with chisel or brush their conception of Godhead,
Then would horse depict gods like horses, and oxen like oxen,
Each kind the Divine with its own form and nature endowing."¹

He illustrates this profound observation by pointing out that the Ethiopians represent their deities as black with flat noses, while the Thracians make them blue-eyed with ruddy complexions, and, similarly, the Medes and the Persians and Egyptians portray their gods like themselves.² The Jewish idea of God was equally anthropomorphic; but their highest conception was certainly that which the least resembled themselves, and which described the Almighty as "without variableness or shadow of turning," and as giving a law to the universe which shall not be broken.³

3.

None of the arguments with which we have yet met have succeeded in making miracles in the least degree antecedently credible. On the contrary they have been based upon mere assumptions incapable of proof and devoid of probability. On the other hand there are the strongest reasons for affirming that such phenomena are antecedently incredible. Dr. Mozley's attack on the argument from experience which we discussed in the first part of this chapter, and which, of course, was chiefly directed against Hume's celebrated essay, never seriously grappled the doctrine at all. The principle which opposes itself to belief in

¹ Εἰς θεὸς ἔν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος,
Οὐ τι δέμας ἡγητοῖσιν ὁμοῖος οὐδὲ νόημα.

Ἄλλὰ βροτοὶ δοκέουσι θεοὺς γεννᾶσθαι
τὴν σφετέρην δ' ἐσθῆτα ἔχειν, φωνὴν τε δέμας τε.^{*}
Ἄλλ' εἴτοι χεῖρας εἶχον, βόες, ἢ λέοντες,
ἢ γράψαι χεῖρ' ὅδ' ἔργα τελεῖν ἀπὲρ ἄνδρες.
ἴπποι μὲν ἵπποισι, βόες δὲ τε βουσὶν ὁμοῖοι,
καὶ κὲ θεῶν ἰδέας ἔγραφον, καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν
τοιαῦθ' οἷον περ καὶ τοὶ δέμας εἶχον ὁμοῖον.

² Τοὺς μὲν γὰρ Αἰθίοπας, μέλαρας καὶ σιμοὺς γράφειν ἔφησε τοὺς οἰκίους θεοὺς, ὅποιοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ πεφύκασιν· τοὺς δὲ γε Ἰρᾶκας, γλαυκοὺς τε καὶ ἐρυθροὺς καὶ μὲν τοὶ καὶ Μήδους, καὶ Πέρσας σφίειν αὐτοῖς ἐοικότας· καὶ Αἰγυπτίους ὠδαύτως αὐτοῖς διαμορφοῦν πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν μορφήν.

³ Ps. cxlviii.

^{*} Theodoret gives a different version of these two lines, not unsupported by others.

Ἄλλ' οἱ βροτοὶ δοκοῦσι γεννᾶσθαι θεοὺς,
καὶ ἴδην αἰσθῆσιν τ' ἔχειν, φωνὴν τε δέμας τε.

We have preferred the reading of the latter line, and have translated accordingly, instead of adopting ἐσθῆτα.

miracles is very simple. Whatever is contradictory to universal and invariable experience is antecedently incredible, and as that sequence of phenomena which is called the order of nature is established and in accordance with universal experience, miracles or alleged violations of that order are antecedently incredible. The preponderance of evidence for the invariability of the order of nature, in fact, is so enormous that it is impossible to credit the reality of such variations from it, and reason and experience concur in attributing the ascription of a miraculous character to any actual occurrence which may have been witnessed to imperfect observation, mistaken inference, or some other of the numerous sources of error. Any allegation of the interference of a new and supernatural agent, upon such an occasion, to account for results, in contradiction of the known sequence of cause and effect, is excluded by the very same principle, for invariable experience being as opposed to the assertion that such interference ever takes place as it is to the occurrence of miraculous phenomena, the allegation is necessarily disbelieved.

Apologists find it much more convenient to evade the simple but effective arguments of Hume than to answer them, and where it is possible they dismiss them with a sneer, and hasten on to less dangerous ground. For instance, a recent Hulsean Lecturer, arguing the antecedent credibility of the miraculous, makes the following remarks: "Now, as regards the inadequacy of testimony to establish a miracle, modern scepticism has not advanced one single step beyond the blank assertion. And it is astonishing that this assertion should still be considered cogent, when its logical consistency has been shattered to pieces by a host of writers as well sceptical as Christian (Mill's *Logic*, ii. 157—160). For, as the greatest of our living logicians has remarked, the supposed recondite and dangerous formula of Hume—that it is more probable that testimony should be mistaken than that miracles should be true—reduces itself to the very harmless proposition that anything is incredible which is contrary to a complete induction. It is in fact a flagrant *petitio principii*, used to support a wholly unphilosophical assertion."¹ It is much more astonishing that so able a man as Dr. Farrar could so misunderstand Hume's argument and so misinterpret and mis-state Mr. Mill's remarks upon it. So far from shattering to pieces the logical consistency of Hume's reasoning, Mr. Mill substantially confirms it, and pertinently remarks that "it speaks ill for the state of philosophical speculation on such subjects" that so simple and evident a doctrine should have been accounted a dangerous heresy.

¹ "The Witness of History to Christ," Hulsean Lectures, 1870, by the Rev. F. W. Farrar, M.A., F.R.S., &c., &c., 2nd ed., 1872, p. 26 f.

Mr. Mill states the evident principle, that—"If an alleged fact be in contradiction, not to any number of approximate generalizations, but to a completed generalization grounded on a rigorous induction, it is said to be impossible, and is to be disbelieved totally." Mr. Mill continues: "This last principle, simple and evident as it appears, is the doctrine which, on the occasion of an attempt to apply it to the question of the credibility of miracles, excited so violent a controversy. Hume's celebrated doctrine, that nothing is credible which is contradictory to experience or at variance with laws of nature, is merely this very plain and harmless proposition, that whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible."¹ He then proceeds to meet possible objections: "But does not (it may be asked) the very statement of the proposition imply a contradiction? An alleged fact according to this theory is not to be believed if it contradicts a complete induction. But it is essential to the completeness of an induction that it should not contradict any known fact. Is it not, then, a *petitio principii* to say, that the fact ought to be disbelieved because the induction to it is complete? How can we have a right to declare the induction complete, while facts, supported by credible evidence, present themselves in opposition to it? I answer, we have that right whenever the scientific canons of induction give it to us; that is, whenever the induction can be complete. We have it, for example, in a case of causation in which there has been an *experimentum crucis*." It will be remarked that Dr. Farrar adopts Mr. Mill's phraseology in one of the above questions to affirm the reverse of his opinion. Mr. Mill decides that the proposition is not a *petitio principii*; Dr. Farrar says, as in continuation of his reference to Mr. Mill, that it is a flagrant *petitio principii*. Mr. Mill proceeds to prove his statement, and he naturally argues that, if observations or experiments have been repeated so often, and by so many persons, as to exclude all supposition of error in the observer, a law of nature is established; and so long as this law is received as such, the assertion that on any particular occasion the cause A took place and yet the effect B did not follow, *without any counteracting cause*, must be disbelieved. In fact, as he winds up this part of the argument by saying: "We cannot admit a proposition as a law of nature, and yet believe a fact in real contradiction to it, we must disbelieve the alleged fact, or believe that we were mistaken in admitting the supposed law."² Mr. Mill points out, however, that, in order that any alleged fact should be contradictory to a law of causation, the allegation must be not simply that the cause existed without being followed by

¹ A System of Logic, by John Stuart Mill, 8th ed., 1872, ii. p. 165.

² *Ib.*, ii. p. 166 f.

the
cou
asse
defe
caus
bein
who
pow
able
the
be in
quac
only
is the
conti
there
sider
our k
that s
us,) n
vious
tural
charac
his ha
Mill p
believe
exister
ary fac
mony;
still a
some n
comple
ting th
Those,
hypothe
tural ag
most pr
an impo
the resi
characte
ledge w
of natur
pelled to

the effect, but that this happened in the absence of any adequate counteracting cause. "Now, in the case of an alleged miracle, the assertion is the exact opposite of this. It is, that the effect was defeated, not in the absence, but in consequence of a counteracting cause, namely, a direct interposition of an act of the will of some being who has power over nature; and in particular of a Being, whose will being assumed to have endowed all the causes with the powers by which they produce their effects, may well be supposed able to counteract them."¹ A miracle, then, is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is merely a new effect supposed to be introduced by the introduction of a new cause; "of the adequacy of that cause *if present*," there can be no doubt; and the only antecedent improbability which can be ascribed to the miracle is the improbability that any such cause existed." Mr. Mill then continues, resuming his criticism on Hume's argument: "All, therefore, which Hume has made out, and this he must be considered to have made out, is that (at least in the imperfect state of our knowledge of natural agencies, which leaves it always possible that some of the physical antecedents may have been hidden from us,) no evidence can prove a miracle to any one who did not previously believe the existence of a being or beings with supernatural power; or who believes himself to have full proof that the character of the Being whom he recognizes is inconsistent with his having seen fit to interfere on the occasion in question." Mr. Mill proceeds to enlarge on this conclusion. "If we do not already believe in supernatural agencies, no miracle can prove to us their existence. The miracle itself, considered merely as an extraordinary fact, may be satisfactorily certified by our senses or by testimony; but nothing can ever prove that it is a miracle: there is still another possible hypothesis, that of its being the result of some unknown natural cause: and this possibility cannot be so completely shut out as to leave no alternative but that of admitting the existence and intervention of a being superior to nature. Those, however, who already believe in such a being have two hypotheses to choose from, a supernatural, and an unknown natural agency; and they have to judge which of the two is the most probable in the particular case. In forming this judgment, an important element of the question will be the conformity of the result to the laws of the supposed agent; that is, to the character of the Deity as they conceive it. But, with the knowledge which we now possess of the general uniformity of the course of nature, religion, following in the wake of science, has been compelled to acknowledge the government of the universe as being on

¹ Mill, *Logic*, ii. p. 137.

² The italics are ours.

the whole carried on by general laws, and not by special interpositions. To whoever holds this belief, there is a general presumption against any supposition of divine agency not operating through general laws, or, in other words, there is an antecedent improbability in every miracle, which, in order to outweigh it, requires an extraordinary strength of antecedent probability derived from the special circumstances of the case."¹ Mr. Mill rightly considers that it is not more difficult to estimate this than in the case of other probabilities. "We are seldom, therefore, without the means (when the circumstances of the case are at all known to us) of judging how far it is likely that such a cause should have existed at that time and place without manifesting its presence by some other marks, and (in the case of an unknown cause) without having hitherto manifested its existence in any other instance. According as this circumstance, or the falsity of the testimony, appears more improbable, that is, conflicts with an approximate generalization of a higher order, we believe the testimony, or disbelieve it; with a stronger or weaker degree of conviction, according to the preponderance: at least until we have sifted the matter further."² This is precisely Hume's argument weakened by the introduction of reservations which have no cogency.

We have wished to avoid interrupting Mr. Mill's train of reasoning by any remarks of our own, and have, therefore, deferred till now the following observations regarding his criticism on Hume's argument.

In reducing Hume's celebrated doctrine to the very plain proposition that whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible, Mr. Mill in no way diminishes its potency against miracles; and he does not call that proposition "harmless" in reference to its bearing on miracles, as Dr. Farrar evidently supposes, but merely in opposition to the character of a recondite and "dangerous heresy" assigned by dismayed theologians to so obvious and simple a principle. The proposition, however, whilst it reduces Hume's doctrine in the abstract to more technical terms, does not altogether represent his argument. Without asserting that experience is an absolutely infallible guide, Hume maintains that—"A wise man proportions his belief to the evidence. In such conclusions as are founded on an infallible experience, he expects the event with the last degree of assurance, and regards his past experience as a full *proof* of the future existence of that event. In other cases he proceeds with more caution, he weighs the opposite experience: he considers which side is supported by the greater number of experiments: to that side he inclines with doubt and

¹ *Mill, Logic*, ii. p. 168 f.

² *Ib.*, ii. p. 169.

¹ *David*
² *Ib.* p.

hesitation; and when at last he fixes his judgment, the evidence exceeds not what we properly call *probability*. All probability, then, supposes an opposition of experiments and observations, where the one side is found to overbalance the other, and to produce a degree of evidence proportioned to the superiority.¹ After elaborating this proposition, Hume continues: "A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. Why is it more than probable that all men must die; that lead, cannot of itself, remain suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood, and is extinguished by water; unless it be that these events are found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these laws, or, in other words, a miracle, to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle if it ever happen in the common course of nature. It is no miracle that a man seemingly in good health should die on a sudden; because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle that a dead man should come to life; because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must, therefore, be an uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And as an uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full *proof*, from the nature of the fact, against the existence of any miracle; nor can such a proof be destroyed, or the miracle rendered credible, but by an opposite proof which is superior. The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention), 'That no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish: and even in that case there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior.' When any one tells me that he saw a dead man restored to life, I immediately consider with myself whether it be more probable that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact which he relates should really have happened. I weigh the one miracle against the other; and according to the superiority which I discover, I pronounce my decision, and always reject the greater miracle. If the falsehood of his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates, then, and not till then, can he pretend to command my belief or opinion."²

¹ David Hume, *Philosophical Works*, Boston and Edinburgh, 1854, iv., p. 126.

² *Ib.* p. 130 ff.

The ground upon which Mr. Mill admits that a miracle may not be contradictory to complete induction is that it is not an assertion that a certain cause was not followed by a certain effect, but an allegation of the interference of an adequate counteracting cause. This does not, however, by his own showing, remove a miracle from the action of Hume's principle, but simply modifies the nature of the antecedent improbability. Mr. Mill qualifies his admission regarding the effect of the alleged counteracting clause, by the all-important words "if present;" for, in order to be valid, the reality of the alleged counteracting cause must be established, which is impossible, therefore the allegations fall to the ground. No one knows better than Mr. Mill that the assertion of a Personal Deity working miracles, upon which a miracle is allowed for a moment to come into court, cannot be proved, and therefore, that it cannot stand in opposition to complete induction which Hume takes as his standard.

In admitting that Hume has made out, that no evidence can prove a miracle to any one who does not previously believe in a being of supernatural power willing to work miracles, Mr. Mill concedes everything to Hume, for his only limitation is based upon a supposition of mere personal belief in something which is not capable of proof, and which belief, therefore, is not more valid than any other purely imaginary hypothesis. The belief may seem substantial to the individual entertaining it, but, not being capable of proof, it cannot have weight with others, or in any way affect the value of evidence in the abstract. That mere individual belief, apart from proof, should thus be advanced in limitation of a logical principle, seems to us most unwarranted, and at the most it can only be received as a statement of what practically takes place amongst illogical reasoners.

The assumption of a Personal Deity working miracles, is, in fact, excluded by Hume's argument, and, although Mr. Mill apparently overlooks the fact, Hume has not only anticipated but refuted the reasoning which is based upon it. In the succeeding chapter on a Particular Providence and a Future State, he directly disposes of such an assumption, but he does so with equal effect also in the Essay which we are discussing. Taking an imaginary miracle as an illustration, he argues: "Though the being to whom the miracle is ascribed be in this case Almighty, it does not, upon that account, become a whit more probable; since it is impossible for us to know the attributes or actions of such a Being, otherwise than from the experience which we have of his productions in the usual course of nature. This still reduces us to past observation, and obliges us to compare the instances of the violation of truth in the testimony of men, with those of the violation of the laws

of n
like
in t
ceri
the
reso
spee
anyt
strei
credi
for t

Th
reaso
of r
that
of a
he ad
that
ante
argu
believ
"and
refuta
final
doctri

"B
of eve
Mr. H
posed
it upo
there
ceed i
If two
shoul
a mira
ble th
hearin
presen
postur
with o
or imp
them
execut

¹ Hume
² Paley

of nature by miracles, in order to judge which of them is most likely and probable. As the violations of truth are more common in the testimony concerning religious miracles than in that concerning any other matter of fact, this must diminish very much the authority of the former testimony, and make us form a general resolution never to lend any attention to it, with whatever specious pretence it may be covered."¹ A person who believes anything contradictory to a complete induction merely on the strength of an assumption which is incapable of proof is simply credulous, but such an assumption cannot affect the real evidence for that thing.

The argument of Paley against Hume is an illustration of the reasoning suggested by Mr. Mill. Paley alleges the interposition of a Personal Deity in explanation of miracles, but he protests that he does not assume the attributes of the Deity or the existence of a future state in order to *prove* their reality. "That reality," he admits, "always must be proved by evidence. We assert only that in miracles adduced in support of revelation there is not such antecedent improbability as no testimony can surmount." His argument culminates in the short statement: "In a word, once believe that there is a God" (*i.e.*, a Personal God working miracles), "and miracles are not incredible."² We have already quoted Hume's refutation of this reasoning, and we may at once proceed to the final argument by which Paley endeavours to overthrow Hume's doctrine, and upon which he mainly rests his case.

"But the short consideration," he says, "which, independently of every other, convinces me that there is no solid foundation in Mr. Hume's conclusion, is the following: When a theorem is proposed to a mathematician, the first thing he does with it is to try it upon a simple case, and if it produces a false result, he is sure there must be some mistake in the demonstration. Now, to proceed in this way with what may be called Mr. Hume's theorem. If twelve men, whose probity and good sense I had long known, should seriously and circumstantially relate to me an account of a miracle wrought before their eyes, and in which it was impossible that they should be deceived; if the governor of the country, hearing a rumour of this account, should call these men into his presence, and offer them a short proposal, either to confess the imposture or submit to be tied up to a gibbet; if they should refuse with one voice to acknowledge that there existed any falsehood or imposture in the case; if this threat was communicated to them separately, yet with no different effect; if it was at last executed; if I myself saw them, one after another, consenting to

¹ Hume, *Philos. Works*, iv. p. 148.

² Paley. *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*. Preparatory Considerations.

be racked, burned, or strangled, rather than give up the truth of their account,—still, if Mr. Hume's rule be my guide, I am not to believe them. Now I undertake to say that there exists not a sceptic in the world who would not believe them, or who would defer such incredulity."¹

It is obvious that this reasoning, besides being purely hypothetical, is utterly without cogency against Hume's doctrine. In the first place, it is clear that no assertion of any twelve men would be sufficient to overthrow a law of nature, which is the result of a complete induction, and in order to establish the reality of a miracle or the occurrence on one occasion of an unprecedented effect, from any cause, not in accordance with natural law, no smaller amount of evidence would suffice than would serve to refute the complete induction. The allegation of such an intervening cause as a Personal Deity working miracles is excluded as opposed to a complete induction. So long as we maintain the law, we are necessarily compelled to reject any evidence which contradicts it. We cannot at the same time believe the contradictory evidence, and yet assert the truth of the law. The specific allegation, moreover, is completely prohibited by the Scriptural admission that miracles are also performed by other supernatural beings in opposition to the Deity. The evidence of the twelve men, however, simply amounts to a statement that they saw, or fancied that they saw, a certain occurrence in contradiction to the law, but that which they actually saw was only an external phenomenon, the real nature of which is a mere inference, and an inference which, from the necessarily isolated position of the miraculous phenomenon, is neither supported by other instances capable of forming a complete counter induction, nor by analogies within the order of nature.² The bare inference from an occurrence supposed to have been witnessed by twelve men is all that is opposed to the law of nature, which is based upon a complete induction, and it is, therefore, incredible.

If we proceed to examine Paley's "simple case" a little more closely, however, we find not only is it utterly inadmissible as a hypothesis, but that as an illustration of the case of Gospel miracles it is completely devoid of relevancy and argumentative force. The only point which gives a momentary value to the supposed instance is the condition attached to the account of the miracle related by the twelve men, that not only was it wrought before their eyes, but that it was one, "in which it was impossible that they should be deceived." Now this qualification of infallibility on the part of the twelve witnesses is as incredible as the

¹ *Paley*, l. c.

² Cf. *Mill*, *System of Logic*, ii. p. 166 f.

miracles which they are supposed to attest. The existence of twelve men incapable of error or mistake is as opposed to experience as the hypothesis of a miracle in which it is impossible for the twelve men to be deceived is contradictory to reason. The exclusion of all error in the observation of the actual occurrence and its antecedents and consequences, whose united sum constitutes the miracle, is an assumption which deprives the argument of all potency. It cannot be entertained. On the other hand, the moment the possibility of error is admitted, the reasoning breaks down, for the probability of error on the part of the observers, either as regards the external phenomena, or the inferences drawn from them, being so infinitely greater than the probability of mistake in the complete induction, we must unquestionably hold by the law and reject the testimony of the twelve men.

It need scarcely be said that the assertion of liability to error on the part of the observers by no means involves any insinuation of wilful "falsehood or imposture in the case." It is quite intelligible that twelve men might witness an occurrence which might seem to them and others miraculous,—but which was susceptible of a perfectly natural explanation,—and truthfully relate what they believed to have seen, and that they might, therefore, refuse "with one voice to acknowledge that there existed any falsehood or imposture in the case," even although the alternative might be death on a gibbet. This, however, would in no way affect the character of the actual occurrence. It would not convert a natural, though by them inexplicable, phenomenon into a miracle. Their constancy in adhering to the account they had given would merely bear upon the truth of their own statements, and the fact of seeing them "one after another consenting to be racked, burned, or strangled, rather than give up the truth of their account," would not in the least justify our believing in a miracle. Even martyrdom cannot transform imaginations into facts. The truth of a narrative is no guarantee for the correctness of an inference. It seems almost incredible that arguments like these should for so many years have been tolerated in the text-book of a University.

As regards the applicability of Paley's illustration to the Gospel miracles, the failure of his analogy is complete. We shall presently see the condition of the people amongst whom these miracles are supposed to have occurred, and that, so far from the nature of the phenomena, and the character of the witnesses, supporting the inference that it was impossible that the observers could have been deceived, there is every reason for concluding with certainty that their ignorance of natural laws, their proneness to superstition, their love of the marvellous, and their

extreme religious excitement, rendered them peculiarly liable to incorrectness in the observation of the phenomena, and to error in the inferences drawn from them. We shall likewise see that we have no serious and circumstantial accounts of those miracles from eye-witnesses of whose probity and good sense we have any knowledge, but that, on the contrary, the narratives of them which we possess were composed by unknown persons, who were not eye-witnesses at all, but wrote very long after the events related, and in that mythic period "in which reality melted into fable, and invention unconsciously trespassed on the province of history." The proposition: "That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labours, dangers, and sufferings voluntarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief of these accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct," is made by Paley the argument of the first nine chapters of his work, as the converse of the proposition, that similar attestation of other miracles cannot be produced, is of the following two. This shows the importance which he attaches to the point; but, notwithstanding, even if he could substantiate this statement, the cause of miracles would not be one whit advanced.

We have freely quoted these arguments in order to illustrate the real position of miracles; and no one who has seriously considered the matter can doubt the necessity for very extraordinary evidence, even to render the report of such phenomena worthy of a moment's attention. The argument for miracles, however, has hitherto proceeded upon the merest assumption, and as we shall further see, the utmost that they can do who support miracles, under the fatal disadvantage of being contradictory to uniform experience, is to refer to the alleged contemporaneous nature of the evidence for their occurrence, and to the character of the supposed witnesses. Mr. Mill has ably shown the serious misapprehension of so many writers against Hume's "Essay on Miracles," which has led them to what he calls "the extraordinary conclusion, that nothing supported by credible testimony ought ever to be disbelieved."¹ In regard to historical facts, not contradictory to all experience, simple and impartial testimony may be sufficient to warrant belief, but even such qualities as these can go but a very small way towards establishing the reality of an occurrence which is opposed to complete induction."² It is admitted that the evidence requisite to establish the reality of a supernatural Divine Revelation of doc-

¹ *Mill, Logic*, ii. pp. 173, 175.

² *Cf. ib.*, ii. p. 168.

trines beyond human reason, and comprising in its very essence such stupendous miracles as the Incarnation, Resurrection, and Ascension, must be miraculous. The evidence for the miraculous evidence, which is scarcely less astounding than the contents of the Revelation itself, must, logically, be miraculous also, for it is not a whit more easy to prove the reality of an evidential miracle than of a dogmatic miracle. It is evident that the resurrection of Lazarus, for instance, is as contradictory to complete induction as the resurrection of Jesus. Both the Supernatural Religion, therefore; and its supernatural evidence labour under the fatal disability of being antecedently incredible.

CHAPTER IV.

THE AGE OF MIRACLES.

LET us now, however, proceed to examine the evidence for the reality of miracles, and to inquire whether they are supported by such an amount of testimony as can in any degree outweigh the reasons which, antecedently, seem to render them incredible. It is undeniable that belief in the miraculous has gradually been dispelled, and that, as a general rule, the only miracles which are now maintained are limited to brief and distant periods of time. Faith in their reality, once so comprehensive, does not, except amongst a certain class, extend beyond the miracles of the New Testament and a few of those of the Old,¹ and the countless myriads of ecclesiastical and other miracles, for centuries devoutly and implicitly believed, are now commonly repudiated, and have sunk into discredit and contempt. The question is inevitably suggested how so much can be abandoned and the remnant still be upheld.

As an essential part of our inquiry into the value of the evidence for miracles, we must endeavour to ascertain whether those who are said to have witnessed the supposed miraculous occurrences were either competent to appreciate them aright, or likely to

¹ Dr. Irons, a Prebendary of St Paul's, in his work "On Miracles and Prophecy," lays down the rule that we are not bound to believe in any miracle narrated in the Old Testament which has not been confirmed by the direct reference to it of Jesus. By this means he quietly gets rid of the difficulties involved in such miracles, for instance, as the sun and moon standing still at the order of Joshua, and that of Balaam, p. 30 ff. The whole argument of Dr. Irons is an amazing one. In the "Bible and its Interpreters," he abandons altogether the popular theory that the Bible and the doctrines supposed to be derived from it can be established by literary evidence; and after thus cutting away all solid ground, he attempts to stand upon nothing, in the shape of the vague feeling that the records are supernatural. His admissions as to the insufficiency of the evidence are creditable to his honesty as a scholar, but his conclusion is simply lame and impotent. (Dr. Irons repudiates the insinuation—none was made in the preceding note, which is reprinted without alteration,—that his book is "of the nature of an admission to which his candour was reluctantly driven," and explains that "it is a vindication of the only possible grounds on which Revelation could rest," for "the only 'Revelation' he can ever imagine is that which has possessed the mind and conscience of the advanced portion of our race these 1800 years—the Church of the Saints of all Christendom." The admission to which we refer, whether willingly or unwillingly, is, nevertheless, fully made, and after showing Revelation to be totally unsupported by anything worthy of the name of evidence, he affirms the Religion and the Book to be Supernatural because he feels—Dr. Irons generally italicizes the word as the main prop of his theory—that they are so. No one who does not feel as he does receives much help from the theory of Dr. Irons.)

report them without exaggeration. For this purpose, we must consider what was known of the order of nature in the age in which miracles are said to have taken place, and what was the intellectual character of the people amongst whom they are reported to have been performed. Nothing is more rare, even amongst intelligent and cultivated men, than accuracy of observation and correctness of report, even in matters of sufficient importance to attract vivid attention, and in which there is no special interest unconsciously to bias the observer. It will scarcely be denied, however, that in persons of fervid imagination, and with a strong natural love of the marvellous, whose minds are not only unrestrained by specific knowledge, but predisposed by superstition towards false conclusions, the probability of inaccuracy and exaggeration is enormously increased. If we add to this such a disturbing element as religious excitement, inaccuracy, exaggeration, and extravagance are certain to occur. The effect of even one of these influences, religious feeling, in warping the judgment, is admitted by one of the most uncompromising supporters of miracles. "It is doubtless the tendency of religious minds," says Dr. Newman, "to imagine mysteries and wonders where there are none; and much more, where causes of awe really exist, will they unintentionally mis-state, exaggerate, and embellish, when they set themselves to relate what they have witnessed or have heard;" and he adds: "and further, the imagination, as is well known, is a fruitful cause of apparent miracles."¹ We need not offer any evidence that the miracles which we have to examine were witnessed and reported by persons exposed to the effects of the strongest possible religious feeling and excitement, and our attention may, therefore, be more freely directed to the inquiry how far this influence was modified by other circumstances. Did the Jews at the time of Jesus possess such calmness of judgment and sobriety of imagination as to inspire us with any confidence in accounts of marvellous occurrences, unwitnessed except by them, and limited to their time, which contradict all knowledge and all experience? Were their minds sufficiently enlightened and free from superstition to warrant our attaching weight to their report of events of such an astounding nature? and were they themselves sufficiently impressed with the exceptional character of any apparent supernatural and miraculous interference with the order of nature?

Let an English historian and divine, who will be acknowledged as no prejudiced witness, bear testimony upon some of these points.

¹ J. H. Newman, *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles and on Ecclesiastical*, 1870, p. 171. This passage occurs in a reply to the argument against admitting Ecclesiastical Miracles as a whole, or against admitting certain of them, that certain others are rejected on all hands as fictitious or pretended.

"Nor is it less important," says the late Dean Milman, "throughout the early history of Christianity, to seize the spirit of the times. Events which appear to us so extraordinary, that we can scarcely conceive that they should either fail in exciting a powerful sensation, or ever be obliterated from the popular remembrance in their own day might pass off as of little more than ordinary occurrence. During the whole life of Christ, and the early propagation of the religion, it must be borne in mind that they took place in an age, and among a people, which superstition had made so familiar with what were supposed to be preternatural events, that wonders awakened no emotion, or were speedily superseded by some new demand on the ever-ready belief. The Jews of that period not only believed that the Supreme Being had the power of controlling the course of nature, but that the same influence was possessed by multitudes of subordinate spirits, both good and evil. Where the pious Christian of the present day would behold the direct agency of the Almighty, the Jews would invariably have interposed an angel as the author or ministerial agent in the wonderful transaction. Where the Christian moralist would condemn the fierce passion, the ungovernable lust, or the inhuman temper, the Jew discerned the workings of diabolical possession. Scarcely a malady was endured, or crime committed, but it was traced to the operation of one of these myriad demons, who watched every opportunity of exercising their malice in the sufferings and sins of men."¹

Another English divine, of certainly not less orthodoxy, but of much greater knowledge of Hebrew literature, bears similar testimony regarding the Jewish nation at the same period. "Not to be more tedious, therefore, in this matter" (regarding the Bath Kol, a Jewish superstition), "let two things only be observed: I. That the nation, under the second Temple, was given to magical arts beyond measure; and, II. That it was given to an easiness of believing all manner of delusions beyond measure."² And in another place: "It is a disputable case, whether the Jewish nation were more mad with superstition in matters of religion, or with superstition in curious arts:—I. There was not a people upon earth that studied or attributed more to dreams than they. II. There was hardly any people in the whole world that more used, or were more fond of, amulets, charms, mutterings, exorcisms, and all kinds of enchantments. We might here produce innumerable instances."³ We shall presently see that these statements are far from being exaggerated.

¹ History of Christianity, by H. H. Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. Murray, 1867, i. p. 84 f.

² John Lightfoot, D.D., Master of Catharine Hall, Cambridge. *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Works (ed. Pitman), xi. p. 81, cf. p. 170.

³ *Ib.*, xi. p. 299 f. Cf. Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, 173, p. 474.

No reader of the Old Testament can fail to have been struck by the singularly credulous fickleness of the Jewish mind. Although claiming the title of the specially selected people of Jehovah, the Israelites exhibited a constant and inveterate tendency to forsake his service for the worship of other gods. The mighty "signs and wonders" which God is represented as incessantly working on their behalf, and in their sight, had apparently no effect upon them. The miraculous even then had, as it would seem, already lost all novelty, and ceased, according to the records, to excite more than mere passing astonishment. The leaders and prophets of Israel had a perpetual struggle to restrain the people from "following after" heathen deities, and whilst the burden of the prophets is one grand denunciation of the idolatry into which the nation was incessantly falling, the verdict of the historical books upon the several kings and rulers of Israel proves how common it was, and how rare even the nominal service of Jehovah. At the best the mind of the Jewish nation rarely, if ever, attained the idea of a perfect monotheism, but added to the belief in Jehovah the recognition of a host of other gods, over whom it merely gave him supremacy.¹ This is apparent even in the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" and the necessity for such a law received its illustration from a people who were actually worshipping the golden calf, made for them by the complaisant Aaron, during the very time that the great Decalogue was being written on the Mount by his colleague Moses.² It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that, at a later period, and throughout patristic days, the gods of the Greeks and other heathen nations were so far gently treated, that, although repudiated as Deities, they were recognized as Demons. In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, where "idols" are spoken of in the Hebrew, the word is sometimes translated "demons;" as, for instance, Psalm xcvi. 5 is rendered: "For all the gods of the nations are demons."³ The national superstition betrays itself in this

¹ This is unconsciously expressed throughout the Bible in such passages as Deuter. x. 17—"For the Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible," &c. Cf. Joshua xxii. 22, Deut. xi. 28, xii. 2 ff., Ps. lxxxix. 6, 7, and a host of other passages.

² An admirable inquiry into the religion of the Jewish nation is to be found in Dr. A. Kuenen's very able work, "De Godsdiens van Israel," Haarlem. Erste deel, 1869; tweede deel, 1879.

³ *ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνων δαιμόνια* (Ps. xcvi. 5, Sept.). This is not to be wondered at, when in so many other passages the Israelites are represented in the Hebrew as sacrificing to Devils when they worshipped other gods: cf. Levit. xvii. 7; Deut. xxxii. 17; Ps. cvi. (Sept. cv.) 37. In Isaiah lxx. 11, the words translated in the English version "that prepare a table for that troop" are referred to demons in the Septuagint: *καὶ ἐτοιμάζοντες τῷ δαιμονίῳ τράπεζαν*. In Ps. xcvi. 7 the word translated "gods" in the English version becomes *αγγελοι αὐτοῦ* in the Sept. (xcvi. 7).

and many other passages of this version, which so well represented the views of the first ages of the Church that the Fathers regarded it as miraculous. Irenæus relates how Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, brought seventy of the elders of the Jews together to Alexandria in order to translate the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, but fearing that they might agree among themselves to conceal the real meaning of the Hebrew, he separated them, and commanded each to make a translation. When the seventy translations of the Bible were completed and compared, it was found that, by the inspiration of God, the very same words and the very same names from beginning to end had been used by them all.¹ The same superstition is quite as clearly expressed in the New Testament. The Apostle Paul, for instance, speaking of things sacrificed to idols, says: "But (I say) that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God; and I would not that ye should be partakers with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the Lord's table, and of the table of demons."²

The apocryphal Book of Tobit affords some illustration of the opinions of the more enlightened Jews during the last century before the commencement of the Christian era.³ The angel Raphael prescribes, as an infallible means of driving a demon out of man or woman so effectually that it should never more come back, fumigation with the heart and liver of a fish.⁴ By this exorcism the demon Asmodeus, who from love of Sara, the daughter of Raguel, has strangled seven husbands who attempted to marry her,⁵ is overcome, and flies into "the uttermost parts of Egypt," where the angel binds him.⁶ The belief in demons, and in the necessity of exorcism, is so complete that the author sees no incongruity in describing the angel Raphael, who has been sent, in answer to prayer, specially to help him, as instructing Tobias to adopt such means of subjecting demons. Raphael is described in this book as the angel of healing,⁷ the office generally assigned to

¹ Irenæus, Adv. Hæc. iii. 21, § 2, 3. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., ed. Burton, Oxon. v. 8, cf. Philo Judæus, De Vita Mosis, lib. ii. §§ 5, 6, 7. The author of the Hortatory Address to the Greeks gives the same account as Irenæus, with additional details. Cohort. ad Græcos, § 13.

² 1 Cor. x. 20: ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν τὰ ἔθνη, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ θύουσιν οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γινέσθαι. 21. οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων.

³ There is much discussion as to the date of this book. It is variously ascribed to periods ranging from two centuries B.C., and even earlier, to one century after Christ. Cf. Bertholdt, Einl. A. und N. Bundes, 1816, vi. p. 2498 f.; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, 1869, vii. p. 59 f.; Davidson, Introd. O. T., 1863, iii. p. 371 f.; Eickhorn, Einl. Apoc. Sehr. A. T., p. 408, Anm. i.; Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Isr., 1864, iv. p. 269 ff.; Fabricius, Liber Tobie, &c., p. 4; De Wette, Einl. A. T. 7te Ausg. § 311, p. 412.

⁴ Tobit, vi. 7. ⁵ Ib., iii. 7 f.; vi. 14. ⁶ Ib., viii. 2 f. ⁷ Ib., iii. 17.

him by the Fathers. He is also represented as saying of himself that he is one of the seven holy angels which present the prayers of the saints to God.¹

There are many curious particulars regarding angels and demons in the Book of Enoch.² This work, which is quoted by the author of the Epistle of Jude,³ and by some of the Fathers, as inspired Scripture,⁴ was supposed by Tertullian to have survived the universal deluge, or to have been afterwards transmitted by means of Noah, the great-grandson of the author Enoch.⁵ It may be assigned to about a century before Christ, but additions were made to the text, and more especially to its angelology, extending probably to after the commencement of our era.⁶ It undoubtedly represents views popularly prevailing about the epoch in which we are interested. The author not only relates the fall of the angels through love for the daughters of men, but gives the names of twenty-one of them and of their leaders; of whom Jegun was he who seduced the holy angels, and Ashbeël it was who gave them evil counsel and corrupted them.⁷ A third, Gadreël,⁸ was he who seduced Eve. He also taught to the children of men the use and manufacture of all murderous weapons, of coats of mail, shields, swords, and of all the implements of death. Another evil angel, named Pênemuê, taught them many mysteries of wisdom. He instructed men in the art of writing with paper (*χαρτης*) and ink, by means of which, the author remarks many fall into sin even to the present day. Kaodejâ, another evil angel, taught the human race all the wicked practices of spirits and demons,⁹ and also magic and exorcism.¹⁰ The offspring of the fallen angels and of the daughters of men were giants, whose height was 3000 ells;¹¹ of these are the demons working evil upon earth.¹² Azazel taught men various arts: the making of bracelets and ornaments; the

¹ Tobit, xii. 15. *Origen* also states that the archangel Michael presents the prayers of the saints to God. Hom. xiv. in Num., Opp. ii. p. 323.

² *Dillmann*, Das Buch Henoch; *Fabricius*, Cod. Vet. Test., i. p. 179 ff.

³ v. 14 f.

⁴ Cf. *Fabricius*, Cod. Vet. Test., i. p. 160 ff.

⁵ *Tertullian*, De Cultu fem., i. 3.

⁶ *Dillmann*, Das Buch Henoch, 1853, p. x. ff., xliii. ff.; *Ewald*, Ueber d. ath. Buch Henoch, 1854, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., iv. p. 451 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. des Heils, 1838, i. p. 93 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die jud. Apokalyptik, 1857, p. 93 ff.; *Hoffmann*, Zeitschr. deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch. 1852, vi. p. 87; *Küstlin*, Theol. Jahrb. 1856, pp. 240—279, —370, —386; *Lücke*, Einl. Offenb. Johannes, 2te Aufl. p. 142f.; *Weisse*, Die Evangelienfrage, 1856, p. 215 ff.

⁷ Cap. lxix. i. ff., cf. vi.

⁸ In the extract preserved by *George Syncellus* in his Chronography (p. 11), the angel who taught the use of weapons of war, &c., is called Azael or Azazel.

⁹ Enoch, c. lxix.

¹⁰ c. vii.

¹¹ c. vii. 2. One MS. has 300. *Dillmann*, p. 3, cf. c. ix. xv.

¹² c. xv., cf. *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. des Heils, i. p. 380 f.

use of cosmetics, the way to beautify the eyebrows; precious stones, and all dye-stuffs and metals; whilst other wicked angels instructed them in all kinds of pernicious knowledge.¹ The elements and all the phenomena of nature are controlled and produced by the agency of angels. Uriel is the angel of thunder and earthquakes; Raphael, of the spirits of men; Raguel is the angel who executes vengeance on the world and the stars; Michael is set over the best of mankind, *i.e.*, over the people of Israel;² Saraqâel, over the souls of the children of men, who are misled by the spirits of sin; and Gabriel is over serpents and over Paradise, and over the Cherubim.³ Enoch is shown the mystery of all the operations of nature, and the action of the elements, and he describes the spirits which guide them, and control the thunder and lightning and the winds; the spirit of the seas, who curbs them with his might, or tosses them forth and scatters them through the mountains of the earth; the spirit of hoar frost, and the spirit of hail, and the spirit of snow. There are, in fact, special spirits set over every phenomenon of nature—frost, thaw, mist, rain, light, and so on.⁴ The heavens and the earth are filled with spirits. Raphael is the angel set over all the diseases and wounds of mankind, Gabriel over all powers, and Fanuel over the penitence and the hope of those who inherit eternal life.⁵ The decree for the destruction of the human race goes forth from the presence of the Lord, because men know all the mysteries of the angels, all the evil works of Satan, and all the secret might and power of those who practise the art of magic and the power of conjuring, and such arts.⁶ The stars are represented as animated beings.⁷ Enoch sees seven stars bound together in space like great mountains, and flaming as with fire; and he inquires of the angel who leads him, on account of what sin they are so bound? Uriel informs him that they are stars which have transgressed the commands of the Highest God, and they are thus bound until ten thousand worlds, the number of the days of their transgression, shall be accomplished.⁸ The belief that sun, moon and stars were living entities possessed of souls was generally held by the Jews at the beginning of our era, along with Greek philosophers, and we shall presently see it expressed by the Fathers. Philo Judæus considers the stars spiritual beings full of virtue and perfection,⁹ and that to them is granted lordship over other heavenly bodies,

¹ c. viii.² cf. Daniel x. 13, 21; xii. 1.³ c. xx.⁴ Enoch, c. lx. 12 ff., cf. xli. xxxiv.⁵ c. xl., 9 f., cf. xxxix.⁶ c. lxxv. 6 ff.⁷ Cf. *Hilgenfeld*, *Die jud. Apok.*, p. 108, Anm. 2; *Gfrörer*, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, i. p. 362 f., cf. p. 394 f., p. 406.⁸ c. xxi., cf. xviii. 13 f.⁹ *De Mundo opificio*, § 48; *De Gigantibus*, § 2, cf. *De Somniis*, i. § 4 f., § 22.

not absolute, but as viceroys under the Supreme Being.¹ We find a similar view regarding the nature of the stars expressed in the Apocalypse,² and it constantly appears in the Talmud and Targums.³ An angel of the sun and moon is described in the Ascensio Isaie.⁴

We are able to obtain a full and minute conception of the belief regarding angels and demons and their influence over cosmical phenomena, as well as of other superstitions current amongst the Jews at the time of Jesus,⁵ from the Talmud, Targums, and other Rabbinical sources. We cannot, however, do more, here, than merely glance at these voluminous materials. The angels are perfectly pure spirits, without sin, and not visible to mortal eyes. When they come down to earth on any mission, they are clad in light and veiled in air. If, however, they remain longer than seven days on earth, they become so clogged with the earthly matter in which they have been immersed that they cannot again ascend to the upper heavens.⁶ Their multitude is innumerable,⁷ and new angels are every day created, who in succession praise God and make way for others.⁸ The expression, "host of heaven," is a common one in the Old Testament, and the idea was developed into a heavenly army. The first Gospel represents Jesus as speaking of "more than twelve legions of angels."⁹ Every angel has one particular duty to perform, and no more; thus of the three angels who appeared to Abraham, one was sent to announce that Sarah should have a son, the second to rescue Lot, and the third to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah.¹⁰ The angels serve God in the administration of the universe, and to special angels are assigned the different parts of nature. "There is not a thing in the world, not even a little herb, over which there is not an angel set, and everything happens according to the

¹ De Monarchia, i. § 1.

² Rev. i. 20, iii. 1, iv. 5, ix. 1, &c.

³ Targum Hieros. Deut. ii. 25, Gen. i. 16; Tract Beracoth, 32, 1; Chollin, 60, 2; Shefoth, 9, 1. Pirke Elieser, vi., cf. Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, 1700, i. p. 311 f.; ii. p. 384 f. Gfrörer, Das Jahrh. d. Heils, i. p. 362 f., 394 f.

⁴ e. iv. 18. This work referred to by Origen (Ep. ad Africanum), Epiphanius (Hær. xl. 2, lxvii. 3), Jerome (in Isaie, lxiv. 4), and others (cf. Fabricius, Cod. Vet. Test., i. p. 1086 ff.), as 'Avaßarukly 'Hsalou, is dated variously from the middle of the 1st to the beginning of the 3rd century. The work, long lost, was discovered and published by Lawrence, in 1819.

⁵ Lightfoot, Horæ Heb. et. Talm., Works, xi., Dedication; Schoettgen, Horæ Hebr. et. Talm. Prefatio; Gfrörer, Das Jahrh. d. Heils, i. p. 5 ff.; Bretschneider, Hist. Dogm. Ausl. des N. T., 1806, p. 110 ff., 141 ff.

⁶ Sohar, Genesis. p. 124, p. 366; Pirke Elieser, xlvii.; Eisenmenger Entd. Jud. ii. p. 387 f.; Gfrörer, Das Jahrh. d. Heils, i. p. 356.

⁷ Hieros. Targ. Exod., xii. 12, xxxiii. 23; Deut. xxxiv. 5, &c., &c.

⁸ Chagigah Bab., p. 14, 1, 2; Eisenmenger, ib. ii. p. 371 ff.

⁹ Matt. xxvi. 53.

¹⁰ Hieros. Targ. Genes. xvii. 2; Gfrörer, ib., i. p. 363 f.

command of these appointed angels."¹ It will be remembered that the agency of angels is frequently introduced in the Old Testament, and still more so in the Septuagint version, by alterations of the text. One notable case of such agency may be referred to, where the pestilence which is sent to punish David for numbering the people is said to be caused by an angel, whom David even sees. The Lord is represented as repenting of the evil, when the angel was stretching forth his hand against Jerusalem, and bidding him stay his hand after the angel had destroyed seventy thousand men by the pestilence.² This theory of disease has prevailed until comparatively recent times. The names of many of the superintending angels are given, as, for instance: Jehuel is set over fire, Michael over water, Jechiel over wild beasts, and Anpiel over birds. Over cattle Hariel is appointed, and Sammiel over created things moving in the waters, and over the face of the earth; Messamahel over reptiles, Deliel over fish. Ruchiel is set over the winds, Gabriel over thunder and also over fire, and over the ripening of fruit, Nuriel over hail, Makturiel over rocks, Alpiel over fruit-bearing trees, Soroel over those which do not bear fruit, and Sandalfon over the human race; and under each of these there are subordinate angels.³ It was believed that there were two angels of Death, one for those who died out of the land of Israel, who was an evil angel, called Samael (and at other times Satan, Asmodeus, &c.), and the other, who presided over the dead of the land of Israel, the holy angel Gabriel; and under these there was a host of evil spirits and angels.⁴ The Jews were unanimous in asserting that angels superintend the various operations of nature, although there is some difference in the names assigned to these angels.⁵ The *Sohar* on Numbers states that "Michael, Gabriel, Nuriel, Raphael are set over the four elements, water, fire, air, earth."⁶ We shall presently see how general this belief regarding angels was amongst the Fathers, but it is also expressed in the New Testament. In the Apocalypse there appears an angel who has power over fire,⁷

¹ Jalkut Chadash, p. 147, 3; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* ii. p. 376 ff. *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 369.

² 2 Sam. xxiv. 15 f.

³ Berith Minucha, p. 37, 1; cf. Tract. Pesachim, p. 118, 1, 2; Sanhedrin, 95, 2; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* ii. p. 378 ff.; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 369. The Targum upon 1 Kings, xix. 11, 12, reads: "A host of the angels of the wind, a host of the angels of commotion, a host of the angels of fire; and after the host of the angels of fire, the voice of the silent singers." *Lightfoot*, *Horæ Heb. et Talm. Works*, xii. p. 35.

⁴ Bava Mezia, 36, 1; Succah, 53, 1; Bava Bathra, 16, 1; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 821 f., p. 854 ff.; *Lightfoot*, *ib.*, xii. p. 428, p. 567 f.; *Schoettgen*, *Horæ Heb. et Talm.*, p. 935.

⁵ *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 369.

⁶ p. 417; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 370.

⁷ c. xiv. 18.

and in another place four angels have power to hurt the earth and the sea.¹ The angels were likewise the instructors of men, and communicated knowledge to the Patriarchs. The angel Gabriel taught Joseph the seventy languages of the earth.² It appears, however, that there was one language—the Syriac—which the angels do not understand, and for this reason men were not permitted to pray for things needful, in that tongue.³ Angels are appointed as princes over the seventy nations of the world; but the Jews consider the angels set over Gentile nations merely demons.⁴ The Septuagint translation of Deuteronomy xxxii. 8 introduces the statement into the Old Testament. Instead of the Most High, when he divided to the nations their inheritance, setting the bounds of the people “according to the number of the children of Israel,” the passage becomes, “according to the number of the angels of God” (κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ). The number of the nations was fixed at seventy, the number of the souls who went down into Egypt.⁵ The Jerusalem Targum on Genesis xi. 7, 8, reads as follows: “God spake to the seventy angels which stand before him: Come, let us go down and confound their language that they may not understand each other. And the Word of the Lord appeared there (at Babel), with the seventy angels, according to the seventy nations, and each had the language of the people which was allotted to him, and the record of the writing in his hand, and scattered the nations from thence over the whole earth, in seventy languages, so that the one did not understand what the other said.”⁶ Michael was the Angel of the people of Israel,⁷ and he is always set in the highest place amongst the angels, and often called the High Priest of Heaven.⁸ It was believed that the angels of the nations fought in heaven when their allotted peoples made war on earth. We see an allusion to this in the Book of Daniel,⁹ and in the Apocalypse there is “war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought, and his angels.”¹⁰ The Jews of the

¹ c. vii. 2, cf. ix. 11, xix. 17.

² Tract. Sotah, 33, 1; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 366 ff; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* ii. p. 365 p. 374 f.

³ Beracoth, c. 2; Bab. Schabbath, 12, 2; Sotah, 33, 1; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 22; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 675 f.; ii. p. 392 f.

⁴ *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 805 ff., p. 816 ff.

⁵ Gen. xli. 27, Exod. i. 5, Deut. x. 22. Seventy Disciples were therefore chosen to preach the Gospel, Luke x. 1. f. Of course we need not here speak of the import of this number.

⁶ Cf. Pirke Elieser, xxiv.; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 370 f.; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 810.

⁷ Cf. Daniel, x. 21.

⁸ Bab. Menachoth, 110, 1; Beracoth, 4, 2; Sohar, Genes., fol. 17, col. 66; Thosaphthah Chollin, ii. 6; Jalkut Robeni, 80, 1, 92. 4; Sevachim, 62, 1; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 371 f.; *Schoettgen*, *ib.* p. 1219 ff.

⁹ x. 10 ff., and more especially verse 13.

¹⁰ c. xii. 7.

time of Jesus not only held that there were angels set over the nations, but also that each individual had a guardian angel.¹ This belief appears in several places in the New Testament. For instance, Jesus is represented as saying of the children: "For I say unto you that their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."² Again, in the Acts of the Apostles, when Peter is delivered from prison by an angel, and comes to the house of his friend, they will not believe the maid who had opened the gate and seen him, but say: "It is his angel" (*ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἴσταν*).³ The passage in the epistle to the Hebrews will likewise be remembered, where it is said of the angels: "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth for ministry on account of them who shall be heirs of salvation?"⁴ There was at the same time a singular belief that when any person went into the private closet, the guardian angel remained at the door till he came out again, and in the Talmud a prayer is given for strenght: and help under the circumstances, and that the guardian angel may wait while the person is there. The reason why the angel does not enter is that such places are haunted by demons.⁵

The belief in demons at the time of Jesus was equally emphatic and comprehensive, and we need scarcely mention that the New Testament is full of references to them.⁶ They are in the air, on earth, in the bodies of men and animals, and even at the bottom of the sea.⁷ They are the offspring of the fallen angels who loved the daughters of men.⁸ They have wings like the angels, and can fly from one end of heaven to another; they obtain a knowledge of the future, like the angels, by listening behind the veil of the Temple of God in Heaven.⁹ Their number is infinite. The earth is so full of them that if man had power to see he could not exist, on account of them; there are more demons than men, and they are about as close as the earth thrown up out of a newly-made grave.¹⁰ It is stated that each man has 10,000 demons at his right hand, and 1,000 on his left, and the passage continues: "The crush on the Sabbath in the Synagogue arises from them, also the

¹ Hieros. Targ. Genes. xxxiii. 10, xlviii. 16.

² Acts xii. 15.

³ Hieros. Beracoth, ix. 5; Bab. Beracoth, 60, 1; Gittin, 70, 1; Eisenmenger, *ib.*, ii. p. 449 f.; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 374 f.; *Moïse Schwab*, *Traité des Berakhoth*, 1871, p. 169.

⁴ Passing over the synoptic Gospels, in which references to demons abound, cf. 1 Cor. x. 20, 21; James ii. 19; 1 Tim. iv. 1; Eph. ii. 2, cf. iv. 12; Rev. ix. 20, xvi. 14, xviii. 2.

⁵ Eisenmenger, *ib.* ii. p. 437 f.

⁶ *ib.* i. p. 380 f.

⁷ Bab. Chagigah, 16, 1; *Schoetgen*, *ib.* p. 1049; Eisenmenger, *ib.* ii. p. 415.

⁸ Beracoth, 6, 1; Sohar, Genes. p. 171; *ib.* Numbers, p. 291; Eisenmenger, *ib.* ii. p. 446, p. 461 f.; *Moïse Schwab*, *Traité des Berakhoth*, 1871, p. 239.

⁹ Matt. xviii. 10.

¹⁰ Heb. i. 14.

1 Ba
represe
cock's
409; J.
2 Sol
3 Sa
432.
4 Sol
5 Sch
6 Pes
7 Cha
Lightfo
8 Bab
9 ab
Schwab,
10 Ba
p. 227.
11 Ma
12 Vaj

dresses of the Rabbins become so soon old and torn through their rubbing; in like manner they cause the tottering of the feet. He who wishes to discover these spirits must take sifted ashes and strew them about his bed, and in the morning he will perceive their footprints upon them like a cock's tread. If any one wish to see them, he must take the afterbirth of a black cat, which has been littered by a first-born black cat, whose mother was also a first-birth, burn and reduce it to powder, and put some of it in his eyes, and he will see them."¹ Sometimes demons assume the form of a goat. Evil spirits fly chiefly during the darkness, for they are children of night.² For this reason the Talmud states that men are forbidden to greet any one by night, lest it might be a devil,³ or to go out alone even by day, but much more by night, into solitary places.⁴ It was likewise forbidden for any man to sleep alone in a house, because any one so doing would be seized by the she-devil Lilith, and die.⁵ Further, no man should drink water by night on account of the demon Schafriri, the angel of blindness.⁶ An evil spirit descended on any one going into a cemetery by night.⁷ A necromancer is defined as one who fasts and lodges at night amongst tombs in order that the evil spirit may come upon him.⁸ Demons, however, take more especial delight in foul and offensive places, and an evil spirit inhabits every private closet in the world.⁹ Demons haunt deserted places, ruins, graves, and certain kinds of trees.¹⁰ We find indications of these superstitions throughout the Gospels. The possessed are represented as dwelling among the tombs, and being driven by the unclean spirits into the wilderness, and the demons can find no rest in clean places.¹¹ Demons also frequented springs and fountains.¹² The episode of the angel who is said to descend at certain seasons and trouble the water of the pool of Bethesda, so that he who first

¹ Bab. Beracoth, 6, 1. In the Tract. Gittin (68, 2) of the Talmud, Asmodeus is represented as coming to Solomon's wives by night, with slippers on to conceal his cock's feet. Eisenmenger, *ib.* i. p. 356, p. 424 f.; ii. p. 445; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. pp. 407, 409; *Moïse Schwab*, *Traité des Berakhoth*, 1871, p. 239 f.

² Sohar, *Exod.*, i. 67, col. 267; *Schoettgen*, *ib.* p. 316; cf. *Ephes.* vi. 12.

³ Sanhedrin, 44, 1; Megillah, 3, 1; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 408; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* ii. p. 452.

⁴ Sohar, *Genes.* 387; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* ii. p. 451 f.

⁵ Schabbath, 151, 2.

⁶ Pesachim, 112, 1; Avoda Sarah, 12, 2; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 426 f.; ii. p. 452.

⁷ Chagigah, 3, 2; Trumoth, 40, 2; Bava Bathra, 100, 2; Bab. Sanhedrin, 65, 2; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. pp. 160, 176, xii. pp. 134, 349; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 408.

⁸ Bab. Sanhedrin, 65, 2; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 170, xii. p. 134 f.

⁹ *ib.* Schabbath, 67, 1; Bab. Beracoth, 62, 1; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* ii. p. 449 f.; *Schwab*, *Traité des Berakhoth*, p. 495 f.

¹⁰ Bab. Beracoth, 3, 1; Pesachim, iii. 2; Targ. Hieros. Deut. xxx. 10; *Schwab*, *ib.* p. 227.

¹¹ Matt. viii. 28, xii. 43; Mark v. 3, 5; Luke viii. 27, 29, xi. 24 f.

¹² Vajicra Rabba, § 24; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xii. p. 282.

stepped in was cured of whatever disease he had, may be mentioned here in passing, although the passage is not found in the older MSS. of the fourth Gospel,¹ and it is argued that it was probably a later interpolation. There were demons who hurt those who did not wash their hands before meat. "Shibta is an evil spirit which sits upon men's hands in the night; and if any touch his food with unwashed hands, that spirit sits upon that food, and there is danger from it."² The demon Asmodeus is frequently called the king of the devils,³ and it was believed that he tempted people to apostatize; he it was who enticed Noah into his drunkenness, and led Solomon into sin.⁴ He is represented as alternately ascending to study in the School of the heavenly Jerusalem, and descending to study in the school of the earth.⁵ The injury of the human race in every possible way was believed to be the chief delight of evil spirits. The Talmud and other Rabbinical writings are full of references to demoniacal possession, but we need not enter into details upon this point, as the New Testament itself presents sufficient evidence regarding it. Not only one evil spirit could enter into a body, but many took possession of the same individual. There are many instances mentioned in the Gospels, such as Mary Magdalene, "out of whom went seven demons" (*δαίμονια ἑπτὰ*),⁶ and the man whose name was Legion, because "many demons" (*δαίμονια πολλὰ*) were entered into him.⁷ Demons likewise entered into the bodies of animals, and in the narrative to which we have just referred, the demons on being expelled from the man, request to be allowed to enter into the herd of swine, which being permitted, "the demons went out of the man into the swine, and the herd ran violently down the cliff into the lake, and were drowned,"⁸ the evil spirits, as usual, taking pleasure only in the destruction and injury of man and beast. Besides "possession," all the diseases of men and animals were ascribed to the action of the devil and of demons.⁹ In the Gospels,

¹ John v. 3, 4.

² Bab. Taanith, 20, 2; Sohar, Bereschith; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 215.

³ Gittin, 68, 1.

⁴ *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xii. p. 111.

⁵ Gittin, 68, 1; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 351. *Schoettgen*, *ib.* p. 1233, § iv. *Schoettgen* gives minute details from the Talmud, &c., regarding the "Academia Celestis," its constitution, and the questions discussed in it, pp. 1230—1236. The representation of Satan, in the book of Job, will not be forgotten.

⁶ Luke viii. 2; cf. Mark xvi. 9.

⁷ Luke viii. 30 ff. The name Legion does not only express a great number, but to the word was attached the idea of an unclean company, for a Legion passing from place to place and entering a house rendered it "unclean." The reason was: "For there is no legion which hath not some carcaphelion" (*καρκαφαλὴν*), that is to say, the skin of the head pulled off from a dead person, and used for enchantments. Cf. Chollin, 123, 1; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 394.

⁸ Luke viii. 33.

⁹ Bab. Joma, 83, 2; Bab. Gittin, 67, 2; Hieros. Schabbath, 14, 3; Mischna, Gittin, vii. 1; Gemara, 67, 2; Sohar, Genes. 42; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 411 f.; *Eisen-*

for instance, the woman with a spirit of infirmity, who was bowed together and could not lift herself up, is described as "bound by Satan," although the case was not one of demoniacal possession.¹

As might be expected from the universality of the belief in demons and their influence over the human race, the Jews at the time of Jesus occupied themselves much with the means of conjuring them. "There was hardly any people in the whole world," we have already heard from a great Hebrew scholar, "that more used, or were more fond of, amulets, charms, mutterings, exorcisms, and all kinds of enchantments."² Schoettgen bears similar testimony: "Cæterum Judæos magicis artibus admodum deditos esse, notissimum est."³ All competent scholars are agreed upon this point, and the Talmud and Rabbinical writings are full of it. The exceeding prevalence of such arts alone proves the existence of the grossest ignorance and superstition. There are elaborate rules in the Talmud with regard to dreams, both as to how they are to be obtained and how interpreted.⁴ Fasts were enjoined in order to secure good dreams, and these fasts were not only observed by the ignorant, but also by the principal Rabbins, and they were permitted even on the Sabbath, which was unlawful in other cases.⁵ Indeed, the interpretation of dreams became a public profession.⁶ It would be impossible within our limits to convey an adequate idea of the general superstition prevalent amongst the Jews regarding things and actions lucky and unlucky, or the minute particulars in regard to every common act prescribed for safety against demons and evil influences of all kinds. Nothing was considered indifferent or too trifling, and the danger from the magical movements or omissions to which men were supposed to be exposed from the malignity of evil spirits was believed to be great. Amulets, consisting of roots, or pieces of paper with charms written upon them, were hung round the neck of the sick, and considered efficacious for their cure. Charms, mutterings, and spells were commonly said over wounds, against unlucky meetings, to make people sleep, to heal diseases, and to avert enchantments.⁸

¹ Schoettgen, *ib.* ii. p. 454; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 237, f.; xii. p. 134 f. Shitba, whom we have already met with, was said to take hold of the necks of infants, and to dry up and contract their nerves. *Aruch*, in Shitba; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 237.

² Luke xiii. 11 ff.; cf. Mark ix. 25; Matt. xii. 22, ix. 32; Luke xi. 14.

³ *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 208.

⁴ Horæ Hebr. et talm. p. 474; cf. *Edzard*, *Avoda Sarah*, ii. pp. 311-356; *Qfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 413.

⁵ Bab. Beracoth, 56 ff.; *Schwab*, *Traité des Berakoth*, p. 457 ff.

⁶ Bab. Schabbath, 11, 1; Beracoth, 14, 1; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 299 f., p. 163.

⁷ Bab. Beracoth, 55, 2, 56, 1; Maasar Sheni, 52, 2, 3; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 300; *Schwab*, *Traité des Berakoth*, p. 457 ff.

⁸ See, for instance, Bab. Beracoth, 51, 1; *Schwab*, *Traité des Berakoth*, p. 433 f.

⁹ *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 301 f.

The Talmud gives forms of enchantments against mad dogs, for instance, against the demon of blindness, and the like, as well as formulæ for averting the evil eye, and mutterings over diseases.¹ So common was the practice of sorcery and magic that the Talmud enjoins "that the senior who is chosen into the Council ought to be skilled in the arts of astrologers, jugglers, diviners, sorcerers, &c., that he may be able to judge of those who are guilty of the same."² Numerous cases are recorded of persons destroyed by means of sorcery.³ The Jewish women were particularly addicted to sorcery, and indeed the Talmud declares that they had generally fallen into it.⁴ The New Testament bears abundant testimony to the prevalence of magic and exorcism at the time at which its books were written. In the Gospels, Jesus is represented as arguing with the Pharisees, who accuse him of casting out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. "If I by Beelzebub cast out the demons (τὰ δαιμόνια), by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore let them be your judges."⁵

The thoroughness and universality of the Jewish popular belief in demons and evil spirits, and in the power of magic, is exhibited in the ascription to Solomon, the monarch in whom the greatness and glory of the nation attained its culminating point, of the character of a powerful magician. The most effectual forms of invocation and exorcism, and the most potent spells of magic, were said to have been composed by him, and thus the grossest superstition of the nation acquired the sanction of their wisest king. Rabbinical writings are never weary of enlarging upon the magical power and knowledge of Solomon. He was represented as not only king of the whole earth, but also as reigning over devils and evil spirits, and having the power of expelling them from the bodies of men and animals, and also of delivering people to them.⁶ It was indeed believed that the two demons Asa and Asael taught Solomon all wisdom and arts.⁷ The Talmud relates many instances of his power over evil spirits, and amongst others how he made them assist in building the Temple. Solomon desired to have the help of the worm Schamir in preparing the stones for the sacred building, and he conjured up a devil and a she-devil to inform him where Schamir was to be

¹ See references, *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 301; *Bab. Beracoth*, 57, 2, &c.; *Schwab*, *ib.* p. 302, p. 456 f., &c., &c.

² *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 301.

³ *Pieroz. Schab.*, 14, 3; *Sanhedr.*, 18, 3; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 301 f.

⁴ *Hieros. Sanhedr.*, 23, 3; *Bab. Sanhedr.*, 44, 2; *Bab. Beracoth*, 53, 1; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 302; *Gfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 413; *Schwab*, *ib.* p. 444.

⁵ *Matt.* xii. 27; cf. *Luke* xi. 13, ix. 49; *Mark* ix. 38; *Acts* xix. 13 ff.

⁶ *Gittin*, 68, 1, 2; *Succah*, 53, 1; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. pp. 355, 358; ii. pp. 416, 440; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xii. p. 428.

⁷ *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 361 f.

foun
capt
the
told
was
ever
Char
Parv
of m
Th
gifts
to ex
He c
left l
effect
Josep
himse
peopl
pasia
one o
and d
omon
no me
the p
sel fu
as he
says J
manif
exorci
great
Tryph
the Ge
and he
asserts
such n
Kings
do so
Isaac,

¹ Gitt
414 f.;
Shamir.
² Glos
³ Davi
Bab. Tsa
ib. i. 14
⁴ Anti

found. They referred him to Asmodeus, whom the King craftily captured, and by whom he was informed that Schamir is under the jurisdiction of the Prince of the Seas, and Asmodeus further told him how he might be secured. By his means the Temple was built, but, from the moment it was destroyed, Schamir for ever disappeared.¹ It was likewise believed that one of the Chambers of the second Temple was built by a magician called Parvah, by means of magic.² The Talmud narrates many stories of miracles performed by various Rabbins.³

The Jewish historian, Josephus, informs us that, amongst other gifts, God bestowed upon King Solomon knowledge of the way to expel demons, an art which is useful and salutary for mankind. He composed incantations by which diseases are cured, and he left behind him forms of exorcism by which demons may be so effectually expelled that they never return, a method of cure, Josephus adds, which is of great efficacy to his own day. He himself had seen a countryman of his own, named Eliezer, release people possessed of devils in the presence of the Emperor Vespasian and his sons, and of his army. He put a ring containing one of the roots prescribed by Solomon to the nose of the demoniac, and drew the demon out by his nostrils, and, in the name of Solomon, and reciting one of his incantations, he adjured it to return no more. In order to demonstrate to the spectators that he had the power to cast out devils, Eliezer was accustomed to set a vessel full of water a little way off, and he commanded the demon as he left the body of the man to overturn it, by which means, says Josephus, the skill and wisdom of Solomon were made very manifest.⁴ Jewish Rabbins, generally were known as powerful exorcisers, practising the art according to the formulæ of their great monarch. Justin Martyr reproaches his Jewish opponent, Tryphon, with the fact that his countrymen use the same art as the Gentiles, and exorcise with fumigations and charms (*κατάδεσμοι*), and he shows the common belief in demoniacal influence when he asserts that, while Jewish exorcists cannot overcome demons by such means, or even by exorcising them in the name of their Kings, Prophets, or Patriarchs, though he admits that they might do so if they adjured them in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, yet Christians at once subdued demons by ex-

¹ Gittin, 68, 1, 2; Sotah, 48, 2; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. p. 350 ff.; *Gjfrörer*, *ib.* i. p. 414 f.; *Bartorff*, *Lexic. Talmud.* p. 2455. Moses is also said to have made use of Schamir. *Fabritius*, *Cod. Vet. Test.* ii. p. 112.

² Gloss on Middoth, cap. 5, hal. 3; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 301.

³ Bava Mezia, 59, 1, 2; Bab. Beracoth, 33, 34, 54, 1; Hieros. Sanhedr., 25, 4; Bab. Taanith, 24; Juchas., 20, 1; 56, 2; *Lightfoot*, *ib.* xi. p. 301 f.; *Eisenmenger*, *ib.* i. 14 f.; *Schaeub*, *ib.* p. 353 ff., p. 448 f.

⁴ *Antiq.* viii. 2, § 5.

orcising them in the name of the Son of God.¹ The Jew and the Christian were quite agreed that demons were to be exorcised, and merely differed as to the formulæ of exorcism. Josephus gives an account of a root potent against evil spirits. It is called Baaras, and is flame-coloured, and in the evening sends out flashes like lightning. It is certain death to touch it, except under peculiar conditions. One mode of securing it is to dig down till the smaller part of the root is exposed, and then to attach the root to a dog's tail. When the dog tries to follow its master from the place and pulls violently, the root is plucked up, and may then be safely handled, but the dog instantly dies, as the man would have done had he plucked it up himself. When the root is brought to sick people, it at once expels demons.² According to Josephus, demons are the spirits of the wicked dead; they enter into the bodies of the living, who die, unless succour be speedily obtained.³ This theory, however, was not general, demons being commonly considered the offspring of the fallen angels and of the daughters of men.

The Jewish historian gives a serious account of the preternatural portents which warned the Jews of the approaching fall of Jerusalem, and he laments the infatuation of the people, who disregarded these Divine denunciations. A star in the shape of a sword, and also a comet, stood over the doomed city for the space of a whole year. Then, at the feast of unleavened bread, before the rebellion of the Jews which preceded the war, at the ninth hour of the night a great light shone round the altar and the Temple, so that for half an hour it seemed as though it were brilliant daylight. At the same festival other supernatural warnings were given. A heifer, as she was led by the high-priest to be sacrificed, brought forth a lamb in the Temple; moreover, the eastern gate of the inner court of the Temple, which was of brass, and so ponderous that twenty men had much difficulty in closing it, and which was fastened by heavy bolts descending deep into the solid stone floor, was seen to open of its own accord, about the sixth hour of the night. The ignorant considered some of these events good omens, but the priests interpreted them as portents of evil. Another prodigious phenomenon occurred, which Josephus supposes would be considered incredible were it not reported by those who saw it, and were the subsequent events not of sufficient importance to merit such portents: before sunset chariots and troops of soldiers in armour were seen among the clouds, moving about, and surrounding cities. And further, at the feast of Pen-

¹ Dial. c. Tryph., 85; cf. Apol., ii. 6; Acts xix. 13 ff.

² De Bello Jud., vii. 6, § 3.

³ Ib. vii. 9, § 3.

tecoss
to per
a grea
" Let
mine

If v
super
iacal
Marty
ments
things
howev
of the
have
μυρρίκη
have i
which
siders
the wi
seize t
angels,
tion of
placed
tribute
individ
that G
giazin
tain po
agents
sophy
that it
tioch,
by den
of belie
ters ar
selves a

1 De B
3 Apol
5 Dial.
7 Stron
9 Stron
11 Stron
13 Ad A
repulsive
pains of
Genesis,

tecost, as the priests were entering the inner court of the Temple to perform their sacred duties, they felt an earthquake, and heard a great noise, and then the sound as of a great multitude saying: "Let us remove hence."¹ There is not a shadow of doubt in the mind of Josephus as to the reality of any of these wonders.

If we turn to patristic literature, we find, everywhere, the same superstitions and the same theories of angelic agency and demoniacal interference in cosmical phenomena. According to Justin Martyr, after God had made the world and duly regulated the elements and the rotation of the seasons, he committed man and all things under heaven to the care of angels. Some of these angels, however, proved unworthy of this charge, and, led away by love of the daughters of men, begat children, who are the demons who have corrupted the human race, partly by magical writings (*διὰ μαγικῶν γραφῶν*) and partly by fears and punishments, and who have introduced wars, murders, and other evils amongst them, which are ignorantly ascribed by poets to God himself.² He considers that demoniacs are possessed and tortured by the souls of the wicked dead,³ and he represents evil spirits as watching to seize the soul at death.⁴ The food of the angels is manna.⁵ The angels, says Clement of Alexandria, serve God in the administration of earthly affairs.⁶ The host of angels and of gods (*θεῶν*) is placed under subjection to the Logos.⁷ Presiding angels are distributed over nations and cities, and perhaps are also deputed to individuals,⁸ and it is by their agency, either visible or invisible, that God gives all good things.⁹ He accuses the Greeks of plagiarizing their miracles from the Bible, and he argues that if certain powers do move the winds and distribute showers, they are agents subject to God.¹⁰ Clement affirms that the Son gave philosophy to the Greeks by means of the inferior angels,¹¹ and argues that it is absurd to attribute it to the devil.¹² Theophilus of Antioch, on the other hand, says that the Greek poets were inspired by demons.¹³ Athenagoras states, as one of the principal points of belief among Christians, that a multitude of angels and ministers are distributed and appointed by the Logos to occupy themselves about the elements, and the heavens, and the universe and

¹ De Bello Jud., vi. 5, § 3.

² Apol., i. 18.

³ Dial., 57, cf. 131.

⁴ Strom., vii. 2, § 5.

⁵ Strom., vi. 17, § 161.

⁶ Strom., vii. 2, § 6.

⁷ Ad Autolyceum, ii. 8. Theophilus sees the punishment of the serpent in the

repulsive way in which he crawls on his belly and eats the dust. This and the pains of women in childbirth are proofs of the truth of the account of the fall in Genesis. Ad Autol., ii. 23.

⁸ Apol., ii. 5; cf. Apol., i. 5, 14.

⁹ Dial. c. Tryph., 105.

¹⁰ Stromata, vii. 1, § 3.

¹¹ Strom., vii. 2, § 6, vi. 17, § 157.

¹² Strom., vi. 3, § 30.

¹³ Strom., vi. 17, § 159.

the things in it, and the regulating of the whole.¹ For it is the duty of the angels to exercise providence over all that God has created; so that God may have the universal care of the whole, but the several parts be ministered to by the angels appointed over them. There is freedom of will amongst the angels as among human beings, and some of the angels abused their trust, and fell through love of the daughters of men, of whom were begotten those who are called Giants.² These angels who have fallen from heaven busy themselves about the air and the earth; and the souls of the Giants,³ which are the demons that roam about the world, work evil according to their respective natures.⁴ There are powers which exercise dominion over matter, and by means of it, and more especially one, who is opposed to God. This Prince of matter exerts authority and control in opposition to the good designed by God.⁵ Demons are greedy for sacrificial odours and the blood of the victims, which they lick; and they influence the multitude to idolatry by inspiring thoughts and visions which seem to come from idols and statues.⁶ According to Tatian, God made everything which is good, but the wickedness of demons perverts the productions of nature for bad purposes, and the evil in these is due to demons and not to God.⁷ None of the demons have bodies; they are spiritual, like fire or air, and can only be seen by those in whom the Spirit of God dwells. They attack men by means of lower forms of matter, and come to them whenever they are diseased, and sometimes they cause disorders of the body, but when they are struck by the power of the word of God, they flee in terror, and the sick person is healed.⁸ Various kinds of roots, and the relations of bones and sinews, are the material elements through which demons work.⁹ Some of those who are called gods by the Greeks, but are in reality demons, possess the bodies of certain men, and then by publicly leaving them they destroy the disease they themselves had created, and the sick are restored to health.¹⁰ Demons, says Cyprian of Carthage, lurk under consecrated statues, and inspire false oracles, and control the lots and omens.¹¹ They enter into human bodies and feign various maladies in order to induce men to offer sacrifices for their recovery that they may gorge themselves with the fumes,

¹ Legatio pro Christ., x. ; cf. xxiv.

² Legatio pro Christ., xxiv.

³ It is said in the Clementine Recognitions that the giants were born in the ninth generation of the human race, and that their bones are still preserved in some places; i. 29. Cf. *Clement, Hom.*, viii. 15.

⁴ Leg. p. Christ., xxv.

⁵ *Ib.*, xxiv., xxv.

⁶ *Ib.*, xxvi., xxvii.

⁷ Orat. ad Græcos, 12.

⁸ *Ib.*, 16.

⁹ *Ib.*, 17.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, 18; cf. *Tertullian, Apol.*, § 22; *Origen, Contra Cels.*, viii. 31 f.

¹¹ Cf. *Tertullian, De Spectaculis* § 12, 13; *Clem. Recog.* iv. 19 ff.

and the
miracle
Tertu
mons.
work is
and oth
souls.
their w
enables
palpabl
They bl
some m
nip ther
way the
same wa
corrupti
crifice to
peculiar
angel or
moment.
takes ple
lity. Th
stance is
of effects
are of th
of the fu
selves up
From in
and comp
lestial ph
already f
of disease
and en
either no
ing the c
one posses
affirms th
once conf
discover
waters in

¹ *Cyprian, Apol.*, 22; *A*
² *Tertullian, Apol.*, §
³ *Apol.*, §
⁴ *De Idol.*

and then they heal them. They are really the authors of the miracles attributed to heathen deities.¹

Tertullian enters into minute details regarding angels and demons. Demons are the offspring of the fallen angels, and their work is the destruction of the human race. They inflict diseases and other painful calamities upon our bodies, and lead astray our souls. From their wonderful subtleness and tenuity they find their way into both parts of our composition. Their spirituality enables them to do much harm to men, for being invisible and impalpable they appear rather in their effects than in their action. They blight the apples and the grain while in the flower, as by some mysterious poison in the breeze, and kill them in the bud, or nip them before they are ripe, as though in some inexpressible way the tainted air poured forth its pestilential breath. In the same way demons and angels breathe into the soul and excite its corruptions, and especially mislead men by inducing them to sacrifice to false deities in order that they may thus obtain their peculiar food of fumes of flesh and blood. Every spirit, whether angel or demon, has wings; therefore they are everywhere in a moment. The whole world is but one place to them, and all that takes place anywhere they can know and report with equal facility. Their swiftness is believed to be divine because their substance is unknown, and thus they seek to be considered the authors of effects which they merely report, as, indeed, they sometimes are of the evil, but never of the good. They gather intimations of the future from hearing the Prophets read aloud, and set themselves up as rivals of the true God by stealing His divinations. From inhabiting the air, and from their proximity to the stars and commerce with the clouds, they know the preparation of celestial phenomena, and promise beforehand the rains which they already feel coming. They are very kind in reference to the cure of diseases, Tertullian ironically says, for they first make people ill, and then, by way of performing a miracle, they prescribe remedies either novel or contrary to common experience, and then, removing the cause, they are believed to have healed the sick.² If any one possessed by a demon be brought before a tribunal, Tertullian affirms that the evil spirit, when ordered by a Christian, will at once confess that he is a demon.³ The fallen angels were the discoverers of astrology and magic.⁴ Unclean spirits hover over waters in imitation of the brooding (*gestatio*) of the Holy Spirit

¹ Cyprian, *De Idol. Vanitate*, § 7; cf. Minutius Felix, *Octavus*, § 27; Tertullian *Apol.*, 22; Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, vii. 16.

² Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, § 22; cf. 23, *ad Scapulam*, § 2.

³ *Apol.*, § 23.

⁴ *De Idolatria*, § 9; *De Cultu Fem.*, i. § 2.

in the beginning, as, for instance, over dark fountains and solitary streams, and cisterns in baths and dwelling-houses, and similar places, which are said to carry one off (*rapere*), that is to say, by the force of the evil spirit.¹ The fallen angels disclosed to the world unknown material substances and various arts, such as metallurgy, the properties of herbs, incantations, and interpretation of the stars; and to women specially they revealed all the secrets of personal adornment.² There is scarcely any man who is not attended by a demon; and it is well known that untimely and violent deaths, which are attributed to accidents, are really caused by demons.³ Those who go to theatres may become specially accessible to demons. There is the instance, the Lord is witness (*domino teste*), of the woman who went to a theatre and came back possessed by a demon; and, on being cast out, the evil spirit replied that he had a right to act as he did, having found her within his limits. There was another case, also well known, of a woman who, at night, after having been to a theatre, had a vision of a winding sheet (*linteum*), and heard the name of the tragedian whom she had seen mentioned with reprobation, and, five days after, the woman was dead.⁴ Origen attributes augury and divination through animals to demons. In his opinion certain demons, offspring of the Titans or Giants, who haunt the grosser parts of bodies and the unclean places of the earth, and who, from not having earthly bodies, have some power of divining the future, occupy themselves with this. They secretly enter the bodies of the more brutal and savage animals, and force them to make flights or indications of divination to lead men away from God. They have a special leaning to birds and serpents, and even to foxes and wolves, because the demons act better through these in consequence of an apparent analogy in wickedness between them.⁵ It is for this reason that Moses, who had either been taught by God what was similar in the nature of animals and their kindred demons, or had discovered it himself, prohibited as unclean the particular birds and animals most used for divination. Therefore each kind of demon seems to have an affinity with a certain kind of animal. They are so wicked that demons even assume the bodies of weasels to foretell the future.⁶ They feed on the blood and odour of the victims sacrificed in idol

¹ De Baptismo, § 5.

² De Cultu Fem., i. § 2, 10. Cf. *Commodianus*, *Instit.*, § 3; *Lactantius*, *Instit.*, Div., ii. 16; *Clem. Rom.*, viii. 14.

³ De Anima, § 57.

⁴ De Spectaculis, § 26.

⁵ Contra Cels., iv. 92; cf. viii. 11.

⁶ *Ib.*, iv. 93; cf. iii. 29, 35, 36, v. 5; *Barnabas*, *Epist.*, x.; *Clemens Al.*, *Pædag.*, ii. 10.

temp
chres
place
and
some
jured
eat b
drink
ceived
witho
Origen
not de
and h
Not d
earth,
for our
becaus
the fu
strangl
Origen
he cats
in hono
the air
everyw

Not c
and den
Jews¹⁰ a
animate
referenc
stars are
knowled
eternal l
passage
not pure
that this
the spirit
into exis
viously,
leased fr
world.

¹ Contra C
² *Ib.*, vii.
⁴ *Ib.*, viii.
⁶ *Ib.*, viii.
⁸ *Hieron.*
¹⁰ Cf. *Phil*

temples.¹ The spirits of the wicked dead wander about sepulchres and sometimes for ages haunt particular houses, and other places.² The prayers of Christians drive demons out of men, and from places where they have taken up their abode, and even sometimes from the bodies of animals, which are frequently injured by them.³ In reply to a statement of Celsus that we cannot eat bread or fruit or drink wine or even water without eating and drinking with demons, and that the very air we breathe is received from demons, and that, consequently, we cannot inhale without receiving air from the demons who are set over the air.⁴ Origen maintains on the contrary, that the angels of God, and not demons, have the superintendence of such natural phenomena, and have been appointed to communicate all these blessings. Not demons, but angels, have been set over the fruits of the earth, and over the birth of animals, and over all things necessary for our race.⁵ Scripture forbids the eating of things strangled because the blood is still in them, and blood, and more especially the fumes of it, is said to be the food of demons. If we ate strangled animals, we might have demons feeding with us,⁶ but in Origen's opinion a man only eats and drinks with demons when he eats the flesh of idol sacrifices, and drinks the wine poured out in honour of demons.⁷ Jerome states the common opinion that the air is filled with demons.⁸ Chrysostom says that angels are everywhere in the atmosphere.⁹

Not content, however, with peopling earth and air with angels and demons, the Fathers also shared the opinion common to Jews¹⁰ and heathen philosophers, that the heavenly bodies were animated beings. After fully discussing the question, with much reference to Scripture, Origen determines that sun, moon, and stars are living and rational beings, illuminated with the light of knowledge by the wisdom which is the reflection (*ἀντανύσµα*) of eternal light. They have free will, and as it would appear from a passage in Job (xxv. 5) they are not only liable to sin, but actually not pure from the uncleanness of it. Origen is careful to explain that this has not reference merely to their physical part, but to the spiritual; and he proceeds to discuss whether their souls came into existence at the same time with their bodies or existed previously, and whether, at the end of the world, they will be released from their bodies or will cease from giving light to the world. He argues that they are rational beings because their

¹ *Contra Cels.*, vii. 35, cf. 5, viii. 61, cf. 60.

² *Ib.*, vii. 5.

³ *Ib.*, viii. 23, 31.

⁴ *Ib.*, viii. 30.

⁵ *Hieron.* Epist. ad. Ephes., iii. 6.

⁶ Cf. *Philo.* De Somniis, i. § 22.

⁷ *Ib.*, vii. 67.

⁸ *Ib.*, viii. 57, 31, f.

⁹ *Ib.*, viii. 31, cf. 57.

¹⁰ In *Ascens.* J. C.

motions could not take place without a soul. "As the stars move with so much order and method," he says, "that under no circumstances whatever does their course seem to be disturbed, is it not the extreme of absurdity to suppose that so much order, so much observance of discipline and method could be demanded from or fulfilled by irrational beings?"¹ They possess life and reason, he decides, and he proves from Scripture that their souls were given to them not at the creation of their bodily substance, but like those of men implanted strictly from without, after they were made.² They are "subject to vanity" with the rest of the creatures, and "wait for the manifestation of the sons of God."³ Origen is persuaded that sun, moon, and stars pray to the Supreme Being through His only begotten Son.⁴ To return to angels, however, Origen states that the angels are not only of various orders of rank, but have apportioned to them specific offices and duties. To Raphael, for instance, is assigned the task of curing and healing; to Gabriel the management of wars; to Michael the duty of receiving the prayers and the supplications of men. Angels are set over the different churches, and have charge even of the least of their members. These offices were assigned to angels by God agreeably to the qualities displayed by each.⁵ Elsewhere, Origen explains that it is necessary for this world that there should be angels set over beasts and over terrestrial operations, and also angels presiding over the birth of animals, and over the propagation and growth of shrubs, and, again, angels over holy works, who eternally teach men the perception of the hidden ways of God, and knowledge of divine things; and he warns us not to bring upon ourselves those angels who are set over beasts, by leading an animal life, nor those which preside over terrestrial works, by taking delight in fleshly and mundane things, but rather to study how we may approximate to the companionship of the Archangel Michael, to whose duty of presenting the prayers of the saints to God he here adds the office of presiding over medicine.⁶ It is through the ministry of angels that the water-

¹ "Stellæ vero cum tanto ordine ac tanta ratione moveantur, ut in nullo prorsus cursus earum aliquando visus sit impeditus quomodo non est ultra omnem stoliditatem tantum ordinem tantamque disciplinam ac rationis observantiam dicere ab irrationalibus exigi vel expleri?" De Principiis, i. 7, § 3; cf. Contra Cels., v. 10, 11.

² De Principiis, i. 7, § 4.

³ *Ib.*, i. 7, § 5; cf. iii. 5 § 4. Origen applies to sun, moon, and stars, the wish of Paul, Phil. i. 23. Tatian likewise ascribes spirituality to stars, plants, and waters, but although one and the same with the soul in angels and animals, there are certain differences. Orat. ad Græcos, 12; cf. Eusebius, Prep. Evang., vii. 15.

⁴ Contra Cels., v. 11.

⁵ De Principiis, i. 8, § 1, cf. § 4; Contra Cels., v. 4, 5. Cf. Hermas, Pastor, ii. Mand. vi. § 1, 2; Tertullian, De Orat., § 12; De Anima, § 37; Clemens A., Strom., v. 14, § 92, vii. 13, § 81.

⁶ Hom. xiv. in Num. Opp. ii. p. 323

¹ Contra.
² i. Visio.
³ Hieron.
⁴ Cf. Mat.
⁵ Apolog.
⁶ Clem., i.
⁷ *Ib.*, iv.

springs in fountains and running streams refresh the earth, and that the air we breathe is kept pure.¹ In the "Pastor" of Hermas, a work quoted by the Fathers as inspired Scripture, which was publicly read in the churches, which almost secured a permanent place in the New Testament canon, and which appears after the canonical books in the Codex Sinaiticus, the oldest extant MS. of the New Testament, mention is made of an angel who has rule over beasts, and whose name is Hegrin.² Jerome also quotes an apocryphal work in which an angel of similar name is said to be set over reptiles, and in which fishes, trees, and beasts are assigned to the care of particular angels.³

Clement of Alexandria mentions without dissent the prevailing belief that hail-storms, tempests, and similar phenomena do not occur merely from material disturbance, but also are caused by the anger of demons and evil angels.⁴ Origen states that while angels superintend all the phenomena of nature, and control what is appointed for our good, famine, the blighting of vines and fruit trees, and the destruction of beasts and of men, are, on the other hand, the personal works⁵ of demons, they, as public executioners, receiving at certain times authority to carry into effect divine decrees.⁶ We have already quoted similar views expressed by Tertullian,⁷ and the universality and permanence of such opinions may be illustrated by the fact that, after the lapse of many centuries, we find St. Thomas Aquinas as solemnly affirming that disease and tempests are the direct work of the devil;⁸ indeed, this belief prevailed throughout the middle ages until very recent times. The Apostle Peter, in the Recognitions of Clement, informs Clement that when God made the world He appointed chiefs over the various creatures, even over the trees and the mountains and springs and rivers, and over everything in the universe. An angel was set over the angels, a spirit over spirits, a star over the stars, a demon over the demons, and so on.⁹ He provided different offices for all His creatures, whether good or bad,¹⁰ but certain angels having left the course of their proper order, led men into sin and taught them that demons could, by magical invocations, be made to obey man.¹¹ Hain was the discoverer of the art of magic.¹² Astrologers suppose that evils happen in consequence of the motions of the heavenly bodies, and represent certain climacteric periods

¹ Contra Cels., viii 57, 31.

² i. Visio, iv. 2; *Cotelerius*, in the Greek version, gives the name, "Αγγελον.

³ *Hieron.*, in Habacuc, i. 1, 14.

⁴ Cf. Matth. viii. 31 ff.

⁵ Apolog. § 22 f.

⁶ *Clem.*, Recog. i. 45.

⁷ *Ib.*, iv. 26.

⁸ *Stromata*, vi. 3, § 31.

⁹ Contra Cels., viii. 31.

¹⁰ *Summa Theolog.*, I, quæst. 80, § 2.

¹¹ *Ib.*, iv. 25.

¹² *Ib.*, iv. 27.

as dangerous, not knowing that it is not the course of the stars, but the action of demons that regulates these things.¹ God has committed the superintendence of the seventy-two nations into which He has divided the earth to as many angels.² Demons insinuate themselves into the bodies of men, and force them to fulfil their desires;³ they sometimes appear visibly to men, and by threats or promises endeavour to lead them into error; they can transform themselves into whatever forms they please.⁴ The distinction between what is spoken by the true God through the prophets or by visions, and that which is delivered by demons is this: that what proceeds from the former is always true, whereas that which is foretold by demons is not always true.⁵ Lactantius says that when the number of men began to increase, fearing that the Devil should corrupt or destroy them, God sent angels to protect and instruct the human race, but the angels themselves fell beneath his wiles, and from being angels they became the satellites and ministers of Satan. The offspring of these fallen angels are unclean spirits, authors of all the evils which are done, and the Devil is their chief. They are acquainted with the future, but not completely. The art of the magi is altogether supported by these demons and at their invocation they deceive men with lying tricks, making men think they see things which do not exist. These contaminated spirits wander over all the earth, and console themselves by the destruction of men. They fill every place with frauds and deceits, for they adhere to individuals, and occupy whole houses, and assume the name of genii, as demons are called in the Latin language, and make men worship them. On account of their tenuity and impalpability they insinuate themselves into the bodies of men, and through their *viscera* injure their health, excite diseases, terrify their souls with dreams, agitate their minds with phrensies, so that they may by these evils drive men to seek their aid.⁶ Being adjured in the name of God, however, they leave the bodies of the possessed, uttering the greatest howling, and crying out that they are beaten, or are on fire.⁷ These demons are the inventors of astrology, divination, oracles, necromancy, and the art of magic.⁸ The universe is governed by God through the medium of angels. The demons have a fore-knowledge of the purposes of God, from having been His ministers, and interposing in what is being done, they ascribe the credit to themselves.⁹ The sign of

¹ *Clem.*, *Eclog.*, ix. 12.² *Ib.*, ii. 42.³ *Ib.*, iv. 15 ff.⁴ *Ib.*, iv. 19.⁵ *Ib.*, iv. 21.⁶ *Instit. Div.*, ii. 14; cf. *inst. Epit. ad. Pentad.*, 27 f.⁷ *Ib.*, ii. 15; cf. *iv.* 27. v. 21; cf. *Arnobius*, *Adv. Gentes*, i. 46.⁸ *Ib.*, ii. 15.⁹ *Ib.*, ii. 16.

the e
from
gods,
cross
litani

Eu
and o
he say
which
which
cires
light i
rise fr
whethe
plunge
race ha
moted
the fur
tions co
and by
their na
they re
roduce
count of
another
Nataliu
at last h
was bro
ashes, h
Bishop
had rec
into con
inhabit
ing then
tions, th
in the
Δαίμονες
perience
much mo
hand wh
with str
only Sen

Instit.
2 Prop.
4 De Civ

the cross is a terror to demons, and at the sight of it they flee from the bodies of men. When sacrifices are being offered to the gods, if one be present who bears on his forehead the sign of the cross, the sacred rites are not propitious (*sacra nullo modo litant*), and the oracle gives no reply.¹

Eusebius, like all the Fathers, represents the gods of the Greeks and other heathen nations as merely wicked demons. Demons, he says, whether they circulate in the dark and heavy atmosphere which encircles our sphere, or inhabit the cavernous dwellings which exist within it, find charms only in tombs and in the sepulchres of the dead, and in impure and unclean places. They delight in the blood of animals, and in the putrid exhalations which rise from their bodies, as well as in earthly vapours. Their leaders, whether as inhabitants of the upper regions of the atmosphere, or plunged in the abyss of hell, having discovered that the human race had deified and offered sacrifices to men who were dead, promoted the delusion in order to savour the blood which flowed and the fumes of the burning flesh. They deceived men by the motions conveyed to idols and statues, by the oracles they delivered, and by healing diseases, with which, by the power inherent in their nature, they had before invisibly smitten bodies, and which they removed by ceasing to torture them. These demons first introduced magic amongst men.² We may here refer to the account of a miracle which Eusebius seriously quotes, as exemplifying another occasional function of the angels. The heretical Bishop Natalius having in vain been admonished by God in dreams, was at last lashed through the whole of a night by holy angels, till he was brought to repentance, and, clad in sackcloth and covered with ashes, he at length threw himself at the feet of Zephyrinus, then Bishop of Rome, pointing to the marks of the scourges which he had received from the angels, and implored to be again received into communion with the church.³ Augustine says that demons inhabit the atmosphere as in a prison, and deceive men, persuading them by their wonderful and false signs, or doings, or predictions, that they are gods.⁴ He considers the origin of their name in the sacred Scriptures worthy of notice: they are called *Δαίμονες* in Greek on account of their knowledge.⁵ By their experience of certain signs which are hidden from us, they can read much more of the future, and sometimes even announce beforehand what they intend to do. Speaking of his own time, and with strong expressions of assurance, Augustine says that not only Scripture testifies that angels have appeared to men with

¹ Instit. Div., iv. 27; cf. *Arnobius*, Adv. Gentes, i. 46.

² Prep. Evang., v. 2 f.

³ De Civitate Dei, viii. 22.

⁴ H. E., v. 28.

⁵ Cf. *Lactantius*, Instit. Div. ii. 14.

bodies which could not only be seen, but felt; but, what is more, it is a general report, and many have personal experience of it, or have learned it from those who have knowledge of the fact, and of whose truth there is no doubt, that satyrs and fauns, generally called "Incubi," have frequently perpetrated their peculiar wickedness;¹ and also that certain demons called by the Gauls *Dusii* every day attempt and effect the same uncleanness, as witnesses equally numerous and trustworthy assert, so that it would be impertinence to deny it.²

Lactantius, again, ridicules the idea that there can be antipodes, and he can scarcely credit that there can be any one so silly as to believe that there are men whose feet are higher than their heads, or that grain and trees grow downwards, and rain, snow, and hail fall upwards to the earth. After jesting at those who hold such ridiculous views, he points out that their blunders arise from supposing that the heaven is round, and the world, consequently round like a ball, and enclosed within it. But if that were the case, it must present the same appearance to all parts of heaven, with mountains, plains, and seas, and consequently there would be no part of the earth uninhabited by men and animals. Lactantius does not know what to say to those who, having fallen into such an error, persevere in their folly (*stultitia*), and defend one vain thing by another, but sometimes he supposes that they philosophize in jest, or knowingly defend falsehoods to display their ingenuity. Space alone prevents his proving that it is impossible for heaven to be below the earth.³ St. Augustine, with equal boldness, declares that the stories told about the antipodes, that is to say, that there are men whose feet are against our footsteps, and in whom the sun rises when it sets to us, are not to be believed. Such an assertion is not supported by any historical evidence, but rests upon mere conjecture based on the rotundity of the earth. But those who maintain such a theory do not consider that even if the earth be round, it does not follow that the opposite side is not covered with water. Besides, if it be not, why should it be inhabited, seeing that on the one hand it is in no way possible that the Scriptures can lie, and on the other, it is too absurd (*nimisq[ue] absurdum est*) to affirm that any men can

¹ "Improbos saepe exstitisse mulieribus, et earum appetisse ac peregrisse concubitum."

² De Civ. Dei, xv. 23. So undeniable was the existence of these evil spirits, *Incubi* and *Succubi*, considered, and so real their wicked practices, that Pope Innocent VIII. denounced them in a Papal Bull in 1484. Burton most seriously believed in them, as he shows in his Anatomy of Melancholy (iii. 2). Similar demons are frequently mentioned in the Talmudic literature. Cf. Eisenmenger, Entd. Judenthum, i. p. 374; ii. p. 421 ff., 426 ff.

³ Instit. Div., iii. 24.

hav
race
C
Ph
tr
luc
Fro
bein
and
flies
pare
and
On
retu
Clen
Tert
like
the
the
while
cauti
men
creat
creat
Clem
bas, e
ing c
eaten,
ber of

¹ De
mony
the low
it." E
"Clem
the Gre
neither
cross o
Such vic
² The
of death
created
men for

³ Ep.
⁴ De I
⁵ v. 7.
⁶ Conf
also by
⁷ Cate
⁸ "Ode

have traversed such an immensity of ocean to establish the human race there from that one first man Adam.¹

Clement of Rome had no doubt of the truth of the story of the Phoenix,² that wonderful bird of Arabia and the adjoining countries, which lives 500 years; at the end of which time, its dissolution being at hand, it builds a nest of spices, in which it dies. From the decaying flesh, however, a worm is generated, which being strengthened by the juices of the bird, produces feathers, and is transformed into a Phoenix. Clement adds, that it then flies away with the nest containing the bones of its defunct parent to the city of Heliopolis in Egypt, and in full daylight, and in the sight of all men, it lays them on the altar of the sun. On examining their registers, the priests find that the bird has returned precisely at the completion of the 500 years. This bird, Clement considers, is an emblem of the Resurrection.³ So does Tertullian, who repeats the story with equal confidence.⁴ It is likewise referred to in the Apostolic Constitutions.⁵ Celsus quotes the narrative in his work against Christianity as an instance of the piety of irrational creatures, and although Origen, in reply, while admitting that the story is indeed recorded, puts in a cautious "if it be true," he proceeds to account for the phenomenon on the ground that God may have made this isolated creature, in order that men might admire, not the bird, but its creator.⁶ Cyril of Jerusalem, likewise, quotes the story from Clement.⁷ The author of the almost canonical Epistle of Barnabas, explaining the typical meaning of the code of Moses regarding clean and unclean animals which were or were not to be eaten, states, as a fact, that the hare annually increases the number of its *foramina*, for it has as many as the years it lives.⁸ He

¹ De Civ. Dei, xvi. 9. The Roman Clement, in an eloquent passage on the harmony of the universe, speaks of "the unsearchable and indescribable abysses of the lower world," and of "the ocean, impassable to man, and the worlds beyond it." Ep. ad. Corinth., xx. Origen refers to this passage in the following terms: "Clement, indeed a disciple of the Apostles, makes mention also of those whom the Greeks call *Περικύβοτες*, and of those parts of the orb of the earth to which neither can any of our people approximate, nor can any of those who are there cross over to us, which he called 'worlds,' saying," &c. De Principiis, ii. 3, § 6. Such views, however, were general.

² The Talmud speaks frequently of the Phoenix. It is not subject to the angel of death, but is immortal, because, when Eve offered it, together with all other created things, the forbidden fruit to eat, it alone refused. See authorities, *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Jwd., i. p. 371, p. 367 ff.

³ Ep. ad Corinth., xxix.

⁴ De Resurr., § 13.

⁵ v. 7.

⁶ Contra Gens., iv. 98. The same fable is referred to by *Herodotus* (ii. 73), and also by *Pliny* (Nat. Hist., x. 2).

⁷ Catech. xviii. 8.

⁸ *Ὅσα γὰρ ἐστὶ ζῷα, τοσαύτας ἔχει τρύπας.* c. x.

also mentions that the hyena changes its sex every year, being alternately male and female.¹ Tertullian also points out as a recognized fact the annual change of sex of the hyena, and he adds: "I do not mention the stag, since itself is the witness of its own age; feeding on the serpent, it languishes into youth from the working of the poison."² The geocentric theory of the Church, which elevated man into the supreme place in the universe, and considered creation in general to be solely for his use, naturally led to the misinterpretation of all cosmical phenomena. Such spectacles as eclipses and comets were universally regarded as awful portents of impending evil, signs of God's anger, and forerunners of national calamities.³ We have already referred to the account given by Josephus of the portents which were supposed to announce the coming destruction of the Holy City, amongst which were a star shaped like a sword, a comet, and other celestial phenomena. Volcanoes were considered openings into hell, and not only does Tertullian hold them to be so, but he asks who will not deem these punishments sometimes inflicted upon mountains as examples of the judgments which menace the wicked.⁴

¹ c. x. He also says of the weasel: *Tò γὰρ ζῷον τοῦτο τῷ ὅρῳ αὐτοῦ ἀνέμει.* Cf. *Origen, Contra Celso*, iv. 93; *Clement of Alex.* refers to the common belief regarding these animals. *Pedag.*, ii. 10.

² "Hyena, si observet, sexus annalis est, marem et feminam alternat. Taceo cervum quod et ipse ætatis suæ arbiter, serpente pastus, veneno languescit in juventutem." *De Pallio*, § 3.

³ Cf. *Tertullian, Ad Scap.*, § 3; *Sozomen, H. E.*, viii. 4, iv. 5.

⁴ *De Penitentia*, § 12. Gregory the Great gives a singular account (*Dial.* iv. 30), which he had heard of a hermit, who had seen Theodoric, and one of the Popes, John, in chains, cast into the crater of one of the Lipari volcanoes, which were believed to be entrances into hell.

T
We ha
and su
books
seen, e
centur
few de
lars, an
and in
quired
dense i
impossi
rences
picion.
admits
also; th
or who
of his c
science
under t
siasm,
number
these "
among
spring f
a soil to
characte
ened if
the affai
those da
novelty,
common
characte
ders wel
of daily
miracles
as the att

CHAPTER V.

THE PERMANENT STREAM OF MIRACULOUS PRETENSION.

WE have given a most imperfect sketch of some of the opinions and superstitions prevalent at the time of Jesus, and when the books of the New Testament were written. These, as we have seen, continued, with little or no modification, throughout the first centuries of our era. It must, however, be remembered that the few details we have given, omitting most of the grosser particulars, are the views deliberately expressed by the most educated and intelligent part of the community, and that it would have required infinitely darker colours adequately to have portrayed the dense ignorance and superstition of the mass of the Jews. It is impossible to receive the report of supposed marvellous occurrences from an age and people like this without the gravest suspicion. Even so thorough a defender of miracles as Dr. Newman admits that: "Witnesses must be not only honest, but competent also; that is, such as have ascertained the facts which they attest, or who report after examination;"¹ and although the necessities of his case oblige him to assert that "the testimony of men of science and general knowledge" must not be required, he admits, under the head of "deficiency of examination," that—"Enthusiasm, ignorance, and habitual credulity are defects which no number of witnesses removes."² We have shown how rank were these "defects" at the commencement of the Christian era, and among the chief witnesses for Christianity. Miracles which spring from such a hot-bed of superstition are too natural in such a soil to be objects of surprise, and, in losing their exceptional character, their claims upon attention are proportionately weakened if not altogether destroyed. Prematural interference with the affairs of life and the phenomena of nature was the rule in those days, not the exception, and miracles, in fact, had lost all novelty, and through familiarity had become degraded into mere commonplace. The Gospel miracles were not original in their character, but were substantially mere repetitions of similar wonders well known amongst the Jews, or commonly supposed to be of daily occurrence even at that time. In fact the idea of such miracles in such an age, and performed amongst such a people, as the attestation of a supernatural Revelation, may with singular

¹ Two Essays, &c., p. 78.

² *Ib.* p. 81.

propriety be ascribed to the mind of that period, but can scarcely be said to bear any traces of the divine. Indeed, anticipating for a moment a part of our subject regarding which we shall have more to say hereafter, we may remark that, so far from being original either in its evidence or form, almost every religion which has been taught in the world has claimed the same divine character as Christianity, and has surrounded the person and origin of its central figure with the same supernatural mystery. Even the great heroes of history, long before our era, had their immaculate conception and miraculous birth.

There can be no doubt that the writers of the New Testament shared the popular superstitions of the Jews. We have already given more than one instance of this, and now we have only to refer for a moment to one class of these superstitions, the belief in demoniacal possession and origin of disease, involving clearly both the existence of demons and their power over the human race. It would be an insult to the understanding of those who are considering this question to pause here to prove that the historical books of the New Testament speak in the clearest and most unmistakable terms of actual demoniacal possession. Now, what has become of this theory of disease? The Archbishop of Dublin is probably the only one who asserts the reality of demoniacal possession formerly and at the present day,¹ and in this we must say that he is consistent. Dean Milman, on the other hand, who spoke with the enlightenment of the 19th century, "has no scruple in avowing *his* opinion on the subject of demoniacs to be that of Joseph Mede, Lardner, Dr. Mead, Paley, and all the learned modern writers. It was a kind of insanity . . . and nothing was more probable than that lunacy should take the turn and speak the language of the prevailing superstition of the times."² The Dean, as well as "all the learned modern writers" to whom he refers, felt the difficulty, but in seeking to evade it they sacrifice the Gospels. They overlook the fact that the writers of these narratives not only themselves adopt "the prevailing superstition of the times," but represent Jesus as doing so with equal completeness. There is no possibility, for instance, of evading such statements as those in the miracle of the country of the Gadarenes, where the objectivity of the demons is so fully recognized that, on being cast out of the man, they are represented as requesting to be allowed to go into the herd of swine, and being permitted by Jesus to do so, the entry of the demons into the swine is at once signalized by the herd running violently down

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 164 f.

² Hist. of Christianity, i. p. 217, note (c).

the c
adop
Lord
such
perso
alien
the n
clude
the v
pose
all th
langu
very
urged
duce
disbel
of the
comm
error,
His w
Saddu
of pop
refer
said to
bishop
Jewish
Satan
men, th
between
sists."¹
or of th
the mo
Christi
adopt
langu
worthy
diagnos
lous cur
Dr. T
demonin

¹ Lake
the mirac
two demon
² Notes
³ Milma
⁴ Notes

the cliff into the lake, and being drowned.¹ Archbishop Trench adopts no such ineffectual evasion, but rightly objects: "Our Lord himself uses language which is not reconcilable with any such explanation. He everywhere speaks of demoniacs not as persons of disordered intellects, but as subjects and thralls of an alien spiritual might; He addresses the evil spirit as distinct from the man; 'Hold thy peace and come out of him;' " and he concludes that "our idea of Christ's absolute veracity, apart from the value of the truth which He communicated, forbids us to suppose that He could have spoken as he did, being perfectly aware all the while that there was no corresponding reality to justify the language which He used."² The Dean, on the other hand, finds "a very strong reason," which he does not remember to have seen urged with sufficient force, "which may have contributed to induce our Lord to adopt the current language on the point. The disbelief in these spiritual influences was one of the characteristics of the unpopular sect of the Sadducees. A departure from the common language, or the endeavour to correct this inveterate error, would have raised an immediate outcry against Him from His watchful and malignant adversaries as an unbelieving Sadducee."³ Such ascription of politic deception for the sake of popularity might be intelligible in an ordinary case, but when referred to the central personage of a Divine Revelation, who is said to be God incarnate, it is perfectly astounding. The Archbishop, however, rightly deems that if Jesus knew that the Jewish belief in demoniacal possession was baseless, and that Satan did not exercise such power over the bodies or spirits of men, there would be in such language "that absence of agreement between thoughts and words in which the essence of a lie consists."⁴ It is difficult to say whether the dilemma of the Dean or of the Archbishop is the greater,—the one obliged to sacrifice the moral character of Jesus, in order to escape the admission for Christianity of untenable superstition, the other obliged to adopt the superstition in order to support the veracity of the language. At least the course of the Archbishop is consistent and worthy of respect. The attempt to eliminate the superstitious diagnosis of the disease, and yet to preserve intact the miraculous cure, is quite ineffectual.

Dr. Trench anticipates the natural question, why there are no demoniacs now, if there were so many in those days,⁵ and he is

¹ Luke viii. 26, 33; Mark v. 12, 13; cf. Matt. viii. 28, 34. In the latter Gospel the miracle is said to be performed in the country of the Gergesenes, and there are two demoniacs instead of one.

² Notes on Miracles, p. 152 f.

³ Milman, Hist. of Christianity, i. p. 218, note.

⁴ Notes on Miracles, p. 154.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 163.

logically compelled to maintain that there may still be persons possessed. "It may well be a question, moreover," he says, "if an apostle, or one with apostolic discernment of spirits, were to enter into a mad-house now, how many of the sufferers there he might not recognize as possessed?"¹ There can scarcely be a question upon the point at all, for such a person issuing direct from that period, without subsequent scientific enlightenment, would most certainly pronounce them all "possessed." It did not, however, require an apostle, nor even one with apostolic discernment of spirits, to recognize the possessed at that time. All those who are represented as being brought to Jesus to be healed are described by their friends as having a devil or being possessed, and there was no form of disease more general or more commonly recognized by the Jews. For what reason has the recognition of, and belief in, demoniacal possession passed away with the ignorance and superstition which were then prevalent?

It is important to remember that the theory of demoniacal possession, and its supposed cure by means of exorcism and invocations, was most common among the Jews long before the commencement of the Christian era. As casting out devils was the most common type of Christian miracles, so it was the commonest belief and practice of the Jewish nation. Christianity merely shared the national superstition, and changed nothing but the form of exorcism. Christianity did not, through a "clearer perception of spirits," therefore, originate the belief in demoniacal possession, nor first recognize its victims; nor did such superior enlightenment accompany the superior morality of Christianity as to detect the ignorant fallacy. In the Old Testament we find the most serious evidence of the belief in demonology and witchcraft. The laws against them set the example of that unrelenting severity with which sorcery was treated for so many centuries. We read in Exodus xxii. 18: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Levit. xix. 31: "Regard not them which have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them." Levit. xx. 6: "And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards to go a-whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and cut him off from among his people;" and verse 27: "A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones; their blood shall be upon them." Deut. xviii. 10: "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 165. In a note, the Archbishop says that "he understands that Esquirol recognizes demoniacs now, and that there could not be a higher authority."

fire,
with
all t
The
craft
here
valer
ages
conse
conti
throu
the C
It
Gosp
realit
of m
living
the c
of the
teems
their
tianit
placed
was a
shape
and th
questi
from t
tating
munit
power
perstit
the be
solemn
Patrist
against
tising
Popes
of it.
became
accused
erate, b
lied i

¹ Greg.
² Theod.

fire, or an enchanter, or a witch; 11. Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer; 12. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord," &c. The passages which assert the reality of demonology and witchcraft, however, are much too numerous to permit their citation here. But not only did Christianity thus inherit the long-prevalent superstition, but it transmitted it intact to succeeding ages; and there can be no doubt that this demonology, with its consequent and inevitable belief in witchcraft, sorcery, and magic, continued so long to prevail throughout Christendom, as much through the authority of the sacred writings and the teaching of the Church as through the superstitious ignorance of Europe.

It would be impossible to select for illustration any type of the Gospel miracles, whose fundamental principle,—belief in the reality, malignant action, and power of demons, and in the power of man to control them,—has received fuller or more permanent living acceptance from posterity, down to very recent times, than the cure of disease ascribed to demoniacal influence. The writings of the Fathers are full of the belief; the social history of Europe teems with it. The more pious the people, the more firm was their conviction of its reality. From times antecedent to Christianity, until medical science slowly came into existence, and displaced miracle cures by the relics of saints, every form of disease was ascribed to demons. Madness, idiocy, epilepsy, and every shape of hysteria, were the commonest forms of their malignity; and the blind, the dumb, and the deformed were regarded as unquestionable victims of their malice. Every domestic calamity, from the convulsions of a child to the death of a cow, was unhesitatingly attributed to their agency. The more ignorant the community, the greater the number of its possessed. Belief in the power of sorcery, witchcraft, and magic was inherent in the superstition, and the universal prevalence shows how catholic was the belief in demoniacal influence. The practice of these arts is solemnly denounced as sin in the New Testament and throughout Patristic literature, and the church has in all ages fulminated against it. No accusation was more common than that of practising sorcery, and no class escaped from the fatal suspicion. Popes were charged with the crime, and bishops were found guilty of it. St. Cyprian was said to have been a magician before he became a Christian and a Father of the Church.¹ Athanasius was accused of sorcery before the Synod of Tyre.² Not only the illiterate, but even the learned, in the estimation of their age, believed in it. No heresy was ever persecuted with more unrelent-

¹ *Greg. Nazianz., Orat. xviii.*

² *Theodoret, H. E., i. 30; cf. Milman, Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 378.*

ing hatred. Popes have issued bulls vehemently anathematising witches and sorcerers, councils have proscribed them, ecclesiastical courts have consigned tens of thousands of persons suspected of being such to the stake, monarchs have written treatises against them and invented tortures for their conviction, and every nation in Europe, and almost every generation, have passed the most stringent laws against them. Upon no point has there ever been greater unanimity of belief. Church and State have vied with each other for the suppression of the abominable crime. Every phenomenon of nature, every unwelcome occurrence of social life, as well as every natural disease, has been ascribed to magic and demons. The historical records of Europe are filled with the deliberate trial and conviction, upon what was deemed evidence, of thousands of sorcerers and witches. Hundreds have been found guilty of exercising demoniacal influence over the elements, from Sopater the philosopher, executed under Constantine for preventing, by adverse winds, the arrival of corn ships at Constantinople, to Dr. Fian and other wife¹ horribly tortured and burnt for causing a stormy passage on the return of James I. from Denmark.² Thousands of men and tens of thousands of women have been done to death by every conceivable torment for causing sickness or calamity by sorcery, or for flying through the air to attend the witches' sabbath. When scepticism as to the reality of the demoniacal powers of sorcery tardily began to arise, it was fiercely reprobated by the Church as infidelity. Even so late as the 17th century, a man like Sir Thomas Browne not only did not include the belief amongst the vulgar errors which he endeavoured to expose, but, on the contrary, wrote: "For my part, I have ever believed, and do now know, that there are witches. They that doubt of them, do not only deny them, but spirits; and are obliquely, and upon consequence, a sort not of infidels, but atheists."³ In 1664, Sir Thomas Hale, in passing sentence of death against two women convicted of being witches, declared that the reality of witchcraft was undeniable, because "first, the Scriptures had affirmed so much; and secondly, the wisdom of all nations had provided laws against such persons, which is an argument of their confidence of such a crime."⁴ Even the 18th century was stained with the blood of persons tortured and executed for sorcery.

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials of Scotland, i. pp. 213, 223.

² *Religio Medici*, Works (Bohn), ii, p. 43 f.

³ Collection of Rare and curious tracts relating to Witchcraft, London, 1838. Cf. *Lecky*, Hist. of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, 3rd ed., 1866, i. p. 120. The reader is referred to this able work, as well as to Buckle's Hist. of Civilization, for much interesting information regarding Magic and Witchcraft, as well as religious superstition and miraculous pretensions generally.

Not
we as
posse
Medi
writer
and su
sally
count
suppos
victim
mass o
world
nature
disease
At the
agency
underst
pect, on
science,
as regard
not only
sion or
repudiat
eases re
the actio
from pu
ignoranc
day, Th
and, wit
was as b
educated
It is a
theory o
largest c
exploded
said to b
be a me
miracles,
objectivit
ing their
ter of me
stitious tr
sober and

Notwithstanding all this persistent and unanimous confirmation, we ask again: What has now become of the belief in demoniacal possession and sorcery? It has utterly disappeared. "Joseph Mele, Lardner, Dr. Mead, Paley, and all the learned modern writers," with Dean Milman, as we have seen, explain it away, and such a theory of disease and elemental disturbance is universally recognized to have been a groundless superstition. The countless number of persons tormented and put to death for the supposed crime of witchcraft and sorcery were mere innocent victims to ignorance and credulity. Mr. Buckle has collected a mass of evidence to show that "there is in every part of the world an intimate relation between ignorance respecting the nature and proper treating of a disease, and the belief that such disease is caused by supernatural power, and is to be cured by it."¹ At the commencement of our era, every disease was ascribed to the agency of demons, simply because the nature of disease was not understood, and the writers of the Gospels were not, in this respect, one whit more enlightened than the Jews. The progress of science, however, has not only dispelled the superstitious theory as regards disease in our time; its effects are retrospective. Science not only declares the ascription of disease to demoniacal possession or malignity to be an idle superstition now, but it equally repudiates the assumption of such a cause at any time. The diseases referred by the Gospels, and by the Jews of that time, to the action of devils, exist now, but they are known to proceed from purely physical causes. The same superstition and medical ignorance would enunciate the same diagnosis at the present day. The superstition and ignorance, however, have passed away, and, with them, the demoniacal theory. In that day the theory was as baseless as in this. This is the logical conclusion of every educated man.

It is obvious that, with the necessary abandonment of the theory of "possession" and demoniacal origin of disease, the largest class of miracles recorded in the Gospels is at once exploded. The asserted cause of the diseases of this class, said to have been miraculously healed, must be recognized to be a mere vulgar superstition, and the narratives of such miracles, ascribing, as they do, in perfect simplicity, distinct objectivity to the supposed "possessing" demons, and reporting their very words and actions, at once assume the character of mere imaginative and fabulous writings based upon superstitious tradition, and cannot for a moment be accepted as the sober and intelligent report of eye-witnesses. We shall presently

¹ Hist. of Civilization, Longmans, 1867, i. p. 204, note.

see how far this inference is supported by the literary evidence regarding the date and composition of the Gospels.

The deduction, however, does not end here. It is clear that, this large class of Gospel miracles being due to the superstition of an ignorant and credulous age, the insufficiency of the evidence for any of the other supposed miraculous occurrences narrated in the same documents becomes at once apparent. Nothing but the most irrefragable testimony could possibly warrant belief in statements of supernatural events which contradict all experience, and are opposed to all science. When these statements, however, are not only rendered, *à priori*, suspicious by their proceeding from a period of the grossest superstition and credulity, but it becomes evident that a considerable part of them is due solely to that superstition and credulity, by which, moreover, the rest may likewise be most naturally explained, it is obvious that they cannot stand against the opposing conviction of invariable experience. The force of the testimony is gone. We are far from using this language in an offensive sense concerning the Gospel narratives, which, by the simple faith of the writers, present the most noble aspect of the occurrences of which superstition is capable. Indeed, viewed as compositions gradually rising out of pious tradition, and representing the best spirit of their times, the Gospels, even in ascribing such miracles to Jesus, are a touching illustration of the veneration excited by his elevated character. Devout enthusiasm surrounded his memory with the tradition of the highest exhibitions of power within the range of Jewish imagination, and that these conceptions represent merely an idealized form of prevalent superstition was not only natural but inevitable. We shall hereafter fully examine the character of the Gospels, but it will be sufficient here to point out that none of these writings lays claim to any special inspiration, or in the slightest degree pretends to be more than a human composition,¹ and subject to the errors of human history.

2.

We have seen how incompetent those who lived at the time when the Gospel miracles are supposed to have taken place were to furnish reliable testimony regarding such phenomena; and the gross mistake committed in regard to the largest class of these miracles, connected with demoniacal possession, seems altogether to destroy the value of the evidence for the rest, and to connect

¹ See, for instance, the reasons for the composition of the third Gospel stated in the first four verses. It was clearly intended, in the first instance, to be a private document for the use of Theophilus.

the w
stition
furthe
the m
in fac
which
We
is sup
from
speak,
revelat
Old T
types
commo
the Ch
disease
doubte
not onl
formed
ians we
explicat
ence be
and the
preterna
the acco
universa
of denyi
them to
own. T
Every n
with hum
credulity
the orde
tory of i
out many
credence
suspicion
rences, as
phenomen
miracles
connectio
those alon
No att
to all time
the conclu

the whole, as might have been expected, with the general superstition and ignorance of the period. It may be well to inquire further, whether there is any valid reason for excepting any of the miracles of Scripture from the fate of the rest, and whether, in fact, there was any special "Age of Miracles" at all, round which a privileged line can be drawn on any reasonable ground.

We have already pointed out that the kind of evidence which is supposed to attest the Divine revelation of Christianity, so far from being invented for the purpose, was so hackneyed, so to speak, as scarcely to attract the notice of the nation to which the revelation was, in the first instance, addressed. Not only did the Old Testament contain accounts of miracles of every one of the types related in the New, but most of them were believed to be commonly performed both before and after the commencement of the Christian era. That demons were successfully exorcised, and diseases cured, by means of spells and incantations, was never doubted by the Jewish nation. Satanic miracles, moreover, are not only recognized throughout the Old and New Testaments, but formed a leading feature of the Patristic creed. The early Christians were not more ready than the heathen to ascribe every inexplicable occurrence to supernatural agency, and the only difference between them was as to the nature of that agency. The Jews and their heathen neighbours were too accustomed to supposed preternatural occurrences to feel much surprise or incredulity at the account of Christian miracles; and it is characteristic of the universal superstition of the period that the Fathers did not dream of denying the reality of Pagan miracles, but merely attributed them to demons, whilst they asserted the Divine origin of their own. The reality of the powers of sorcery was never questioned. Every marvel and every narrative of supernatural interference with human affairs seemed matter of course to the superstitious credulity of the age. However much miracles are exceptions to the order of nature, they have always been the rule in the history of ignorance. In fact, the excess of belief in them throughout many centuries of darkness is almost fatal to their claims to credence now. The Christian miracles are rendered almost as suspicious from their place in a long sequence of similar occurrences, as they are by being exceptions to the sequence of natural phenomena. It would, indeed, be extraordinary if whole cycles of miracles occurring before and since those of the Gospels, and in connection with every religion, could be repudiated as fables, and those alone maintained as genuine.

No attempt is made to deny the fact that miracles are common to all times and to all religious creeds. Dr. Newman states, amongst the conclusions of his essay on the miracles of early ecclesiastical

history: "That there was no Age of Miracles, after which miracles ceased; that there have been at all times true miracles and false miracles, true accounts and false accounts; that no authoritative guide is supplied to us for drawing the line between the two."¹ Dr. Mozley also admits that morbid love of the marvellous in the human race "has produced a constant stream of miraculous pretension in the world, which accompanies man wherever he is found, and is a part of his mental and physical history."² Ignorance and its invariable attendant, superstition, have done more than the mere love of the marvellous to produce and perpetuate belief in miracles, and there cannot be any doubt that the removal of ignorance always leads to the cessation of miracles.³ The Bampton lecturer proceeds: "Heathenism had its running stream of supernatural pretensions in the shape of prophecy, exorcism, and the miraculous cures of diseases, which the temples of Eserapius recorded with pompous display."⁴ So far from the Gospel miracles being original, and a presentation, for the first time, of phenomena until then unknown, and unlikely to suggest themselves to the mind, "Jewish supernaturalism was, indeed, going on side by side with our Lord's miracles." Dr. Mozley, however, rebuts the inference which has been drawn from this: "That His miracles could not, in the very nature of the case, be evidences of His distinctive teaching and mission, inasmuch as miracles were common to Himself and His opponents," by the assertion that a very marked distinction exists between the Gospel miracles and all others.⁵ He perfectly recognizes the consequence if such a distinction cannot be clearly demonstrated. "The criticism, therefore, which *evidential* miracles, or miracles which serve as evidence of a revelation, must come up to, if they are to accomplish the object for which they are designed, involves at the outset this condition,—that the evidence of such miracles must be distinguishable from the evidences of this permanent stream of marvellous pretension in the world; that such miracles must be separated by an interval not only from the facts of the order of nature, but also from the common running marvellous, which is the simple offshoot of human nature. Can evidential miracles be inserted in this promiscuous mass, so as not to be confounded with it, but to assert their own truth and distinctive source? If they cannot, there is an end to the proof of a revelation by miracles; if they can, it remains to see whether the Christian miracles are

¹ Two Essays on Scripture Miracles, &c., 1870. p. 100.

² Bampton Lectures, p. 206.

³ Cf. *Buckle*, Hist. of Civilization, i. p. 373 ff.; cf. p. 122 ff.; iii., p. 35.

⁴ Bampton Lectures, p. 216.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 209.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 209.

thus di
their ev
Divine
Now
miracles
fluenced
natural
the trad
character
devotion
written
limits.
miracles
said to h
parative
person ra
with mon
main fact
in the acc
the perso
the resur
facts alone
trusting t
more imp
a whist les
Gospel na
that it is
of those m
the history
ever had
sublimest
in the case
of read
brought of
by a toyet
and not
and mo
to a dead
the relics
not anteq
and word
being supe
although th

thus distinguishable, and whether their nature, their object, and their evidence vindicate their claim to this distinctive truth and Divine source."¹

Now, regarding this distinction between Gospel and other miracles, it must be observed that the religious feeling which influenced the composition of the Scripture narratives of miracles naturally led to the exclusion of all that was puerile or ignoble in the traditions preserved regarding the Great Master. The elevated character of Jesus afforded no basis for what was petty, and the devotion with which he was regarded when the Gospels were written insured the noblest treatment of his history within certain limits. We must, therefore, consider the bare facts composing the miracles rather than the narrative of the manner in which they are said to have been produced, in order rightly to judge of the comparative features of different miracles. If we take the case of a person raised from the dead, literary skill may invest the account with more or less of dramatic interest and dignity, but whether the main fact be surrounded with pathetic and picturesque details, as in the account of the raising of Lazarus in the fourth Gospel, or the person be simply restored to life without them, it is the fact of the resurrection which constitutes the miracle, and it is in the facts alone that we must seek distinction, disregarding and distrusting the accessories. In the one case the effect may be much more impressive, but in the other the bare raising of the dead is not a whit less miraculous. We have been accustomed to read the Gospel narratives of miracles with so much special veneration, that it is now difficult to recognize how much of the distinction of these miracles is due to the composition, and to their place in the history of Jesus. No other miracles, or account of miracles, ever had such collateral advantages. As works attributed to our sublimest Teacher, described with simple eloquence, and, especially in the case of those in the fourth Gospel, with artistic perfection, and read generally with reverential wonder untempered by a thought of criticism, these miracles have seemed to be surrounded by a mystic halo certainly not emanating from themselves. It must not be forgotten, therefore, that the miracle lies in the bare act and not in its dramatic arrangement. The restoration of life to a dead man is the very same miracle whether it be effected by the relics of a saint or by the word of an apostle. A miracle is not antecedently more credible because of the outstretched arm and word of command, than it is in the silence of the shrine. Being supernatural, the real agency is not seen in either case, although the human mind is more satisfied by the presentation of

¹ Bampton Lectures, p. 208.

an apparent cause in the one case, which seems to be absent in the other. In preferring the former type, we are not only influenced by a more dramatic narrative, but we select for belief the miracle from which we can unconsciously eliminate more of the miraculous elements, by tracing it to a visible natural cause which cannot be seen in the latter. The antecedent incredibility of miracles, however, is not affected by literary skill, and is independent of scenic effect.

The Archbishop of Dublin says: "Few points present greater difficulties than the attempt to fix accurately the moment when these miraculous powers were withdrawn from the Church;" and he argues that they were withdrawn when it entered into what he calls its permanent state, and no longer required "these props and strengthenings of the infant plant."¹ That their retrocession was gradual he considers natural, and he imagines the fulness of Divine power as gradually waning as it was subdivided, first amongst the Apostles, and then amongst the ever-multiplying members of the Church, until by sub-division it became virtually extinct, leaving as a substitute "the standing wonder of a Church."² This, of course, is not argument, but merely the Archbishop's fanciful explanation of a serious difficulty. The fact is, however, that the Gospel miracles were preceded and accompanied by others of the same type, and we may here merely mention exorcism of demons and the miraculous cure of disease as popular instances; they were also followed by a long succession of others, quite as well authenticated, whose occurrence only became less frequent in proportion as the diffusion of knowledge dispelled popular credulity. Even at the present day a stray miracle is from time to time reported in outlying districts, where the ignorance and superstition which formerly produced so abundant a growth of them are not yet entirely dispelled.

Papias of Hierapolis narrates a wonderful story, according to Eusebius, which he had heard from the daughters of the Apostle Philip, who lived at the same time in Hierapolis: "For he relates that a dead man was restored to life in his day."³ Justin Martyr speaking of his own time frequently asserts that Christians still receive the gift of healing, of foreknowledge, and of prophecy⁴ and he points out to the Roman Senate, as a fact happening under their own observation, that many demoniacs throughout all the world

¹ Notes on Miracles, p. 54.

² *Ib.*, p. 55.

³ ὅς δὲ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὁ Παπῖος γεροντερός διηγεῖται παρὰ θυγατέρας βασιλικῶν ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Φιλίππου θυγατέρων μνησθῆναι, τὰ νῦν σημειώσαντες. Νεκρὸν γὰρ ἀνδράσιν κατ' αὐτὸς γενομένην ἰδοῦναι. κ τ. λ. Eusebius, H. E. iii., 39.

⁴ Cf. Dial. c. Tryph. xxxix., lxxxvii., lxxxviii., &c., &c., &c.

(Δαίμονες)
have be
among
them in
possessi
with ine
Antioch
Irenaeus
the conti
the mira
ascribes t
can acith
hearing, t
themselv
the paral
has been
But so fa
them and
hood, wh
much fasti
turn, and
the saints
Canon M
weaken t
miracles, s
"But the
as testir
seems at p
belongs, of
just as any
or historica
so far as sp
referred to
to express

1 Apol. ii.
Ad. Antol
See enim
demonos effu
neque debiles,
santos: quon
Pagan
hymen, qui o
dicitur ad
paganos: ut
quod est, qui d
Hav. ii. 11, §
1 Hampton

(*Δαίμονιοι λήπτους πολλοὺς κατὰ πάντα τὸν κόσμον*) and in their own city have been healed and are healed, many of the Christian men among us (*πολλοὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνθρώπων τῶν Χριστιανῶν*) exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, subduing and expelling the possessing demons out of the man, although all the other exorcists with incantations and spells had failed to do so.¹ Theophilus of Antioch likewise states that to his day demons are exorcised.² Irenæus in the clearest manner claims for the Church of his time the continued possession of the Divine *χαρίσματα*. He contrasts the miracles of the followers of Simon and Carpocrates, which he ascribes to magical illusions, with those of Christians. "For they can neither give sight to the blind," he continues, "nor to the deaf hearing, nor cast out all demons, but only those introduced by themselves, if they can even do that; nor heal the sick, the lame, the paralytic, nor those afflicted in other parts of the body, as has been often done in regard to bodily infirmity. . . . But so far are they from raising the dead,—as the Lord raised them and the Apostles by prayer, and as frequently in the brotherhood, when the whole Church in a place made supplication with much fasting and prayer, the spirit of the dead was constrained to return, and the man was freely restored in answer to the prayers of the saints—that they do not believe this can possibly be done."³ Simon Mozley, who desires for the purpose of his argument to weaken the evidence of patristic belief in the continuance of miracles, says, regarding this last passage on raising the dead:—"But the reference is so vague that it possesses but little weight as testimony."⁴ We should be sorry to think that the vice, which seems at present to characterize the Church to which Dr. Mozley belongs, of making simple language mean anything or nothing just as any one happens to wish, should be introduced into critical or historical studies. The language of Irenæus is vague only in so far as specific detailed instances are not given of the miracles referred to; but no language could be more definite or explicit to express the meaning of Irenæus, namely, the assertion that the

¹ *Apol.* ii. 6, cf. *Dial. c.* *Tryphon.* xxx., lxxvi., lxxxv., &c., &c., &c.

Ad. Autolycom. ii. 8.

² Nec enim cæcis possunt donare visum, neque surdis auditum, neque omnes domones effugare, præter eos qui ab ipsis immittuntur, si tamen et hoc faciunt; neque debiles, aut claudos aut paralyticos curare, vel alia quodam parte corporis læsatos; quomodo enim sæpe evenit fieri secundum corporalem infirmitatem, &c.

³ Τοδοῦτον δὲ ἀποδεῖναι τὸν νεκρὸν ἐξέρχεται, καθὼς ὁ Κύριος ἤγειρε, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι διὰ προσευχῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀδελφότητι πολλοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἀνάρχους τῆς κατὰ τὸν κόσμον ἐκκλησίας πῶς ἀντισταθμίζουσιν κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ λαοὺς πολλὰς, ἐπεὶ τῶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἐκτελευτη-
καὶ οὐκ ἐχρησθῆναι ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοῖς εἰρηαῖς τοῖς ἀρχαῖς. *Irenæus, Adv.*
Hæc. ii. 31, § 2; *Eusebius*, II. 6, s. 7.

⁴ *Bampton Lectures*, Note i. on *Lecture viii.* (p. 210), p. 371.

plation and representation of those fires (of hell) they (demons) also depart at our command out of bodies, reluctant and complaining, and put to shame in your presence."¹ He declares that although dreams are chiefly inflicted upon us by demons, yet they are also sent by God, and, indeed, "almost the greater part of mankind derive their knowledge concerning God from visions."² He, elsewhere, states that he himself knows that a brother was severely castigated by a vision the same night on which his slaves had, without his knowledge, done something reprehensible."³ He narrates as an instance of the continued possession of spiritual *charismata* by Christians: "There is at this day among us a sister who has the gift of revelations, which she receives in church amidst the solemnities of the Lord's day by ecstacy in the spirit: she converses with angels, and sometimes also with the Lord, and she both hears and sees mysteries (*sacramenta*), and she reads the hearts of some men, and prescribes medicines to those who are in need."⁴ Tertullian goes on to say that, after the people were dismissed from the Church, this sister was in the regular habit of reporting what she had seen, and that most diligent inquiries were made in order to test the truth of her communications;⁵ and after narrating a vision of a disembodied soul vouchsafed to her, he states: "This is the vision, God being witness, and the Apostle⁶ having foretold that such spiritual gifts should be in the Church."⁷ Further on Tertullian relates another story within his own knowledge: "I know the case of a woman, born within the fold of the Church, who was in the prime of life and beauty. After being but once, and only a short time, married, having been asleep in peace, in the interval before interment when the priest began to pray as she was being made ready for burial, at the first breath of prayer she removed her hands from her sides, folded them in the attitude of supplication, and again, when the last rites were over, restored them to their former posi-

¹ Ita de contra tu deque afflato - isto, contemplatio - et representatione ignis illius correpti, etiam de corporibus nostris imperia exeunt inviti et dolentes, et obis presentibus erubescunt. Apologeticus, § 23. et. De Idol., § 11; De Spectac., § 29; De Exil., Castil., § 10. Ad Scapulam, § 4; De Anima, § 57.

² Et major pars ex hominibus ex visionibus deum cognit. De Anima, § 47; De Idol., § 15.

³ De Idol., § 15.

⁴ Est talis - ista - quod nos revelationum - charismata sortita, quas in ecclesia donum spiritus sancti per ecstasim in spiritu patitur conversatur cum angelis, - audio - tamquam dominum, et videt et audit sacramenta, et quorundam corda percipit, et medicinas desiderantibus prescribit. De Anima, § 9.

⁵ Nam et diligentissime digeruntur ut etiam - restituantur, &c.

⁶ 1 Cor. xii. 1 ff.

⁷ Hec visio est. Hec visio - et apostolus charismatum in ecclesia futurorum idem sponsor; &c. De Anima, § 9.

tion."¹ He then mentions another story known amongst them; that a dead body in a cemetery moved itself in order to make room beside it for another body;² and then he remarks: "If similar cases are also reported amongst the heathen, we conclude that God displays signs of his power for the consolation of his own people, and as a testimony to others."³ Again, he mentions cases where Christians had cured persons of demoniacal possession, and adds: "And how many men of position (for we do not speak of the vulgar) have been delivered either from devils or from diseases."⁴ Tertullian in the same place refers to the miracle of the "Thundering Legion,"⁵ and he exclaims: "When indeed have not droughts been removed by our prayers and fastings."⁶ Minucius Felix speaks of the casting out of devils from sick persons by Christians in his own day, as a matter of public notoriety even among Pagans.⁷ St. Cyprian echoes the same assertions.⁸ He likewise mentions cases of miraculous punishment inflicted upon persons who had lapsed from the Christian faith. One of these, who ascended the Capitol to make denial of Christ, suddenly became dumb after he had spoken the words.⁹ Another, a woman, was seized by an unclean spirit even at the baths, and bit with her own teeth the impious tongue which had eaten the idolatrous food, or spoken the words, and she shortly expired in great agony.¹⁰ He likewise maintains that Christians are admonished by God in dreams and by visions, of which he mentions instances.¹¹ Origen claims for Christians the power still to expel demons, and to heal diseases in the name of Jesus,¹² and he states that he had seen many persons so cured of madness and countless other evils, which could not be otherwise cured by men or devils.¹³ Lactantius repeatedly asserts the power of Christians over demons; they make them flee from bodies when they adjure them in the name of God.¹⁴

¹ Scio feminam quandam vornaclum ecclesie, forma et aetate integra functam, post annum et breve matrimonium, cum in pace dormisset et morante adhuc sepultura interim oratione presbyteri componeretur, ad primum habitum orationis manus a lateribus dimotas in habitum supplicum conformasse rursusque condita pace situ suo reddidisse. De Anima, § 51.

² Est et alia relatio apud nostros, in cimiterio corpus corpori juxta collocando spatium recessu communicasse. De Anima, § 51.

³ Si et apud ethnicoes tale quid traditur, utique deus potestatis sue signa proponit eum in solitum, extraneis in testimonium. De Anima, § 51.

⁴ Et quanti honesti viri de vulgaribus enim non dicemus aut a demoniis aut valetudinibus remediati sunt. Ad Scapulam, § 4.

⁵ Cf. Eusebius, H. E. vi. 5.

⁶ Ad Scapulam, § 4.

⁷ Octavius, § 27.

⁸ Tract. 56, De Idol. Vanitate, § 7, Ad Demetrianum, § 15.

⁹ De lapsis, § 24.

¹⁰ *Id.*, § 24, cf. §§ 25, 26.

¹¹ Ep. lrii. §§ 1-5, lxi. § 17, lxviii. §§ 9, 10 (ad Aliphan), De Mortalitate, § 19.

¹² Contra Gds., i. 67, 2, 6, 10, ii. 33, iii. 24, 28, 36.

¹³ Contra Gds. - iii. 24.

¹⁴ Instit. Div., ii. 16, iv. 27, v. 22.

Passio
centurie
in the pa
rences.
salem, of
the great
whereup
bouring
over the
been pres
having sp
continued
death by
respective
in each ca
invoked.²
Rome was
rested upo
Saviour.³
which Eus
erected by
destal grov
ment, whic
coupled as t

Gregory
performed
called *Tha*
sessed and
the John ap
as to the d
of Mary, th
faith did no
pagan pries
which he h
until he g
averted an
the possess
passed the n
was found d

¹ Eusebius, l
cf. H. E.
Julian, l
Greg. N. s
p. 530
p. 548
Gregory to S
H. E. p. 555

Passing over the numerous apocryphal writings of the early centuries of our era, in which many miracles are recorded, we find in the pages of Eusebius narratives of many miraculous occurrences. Many miracles are ascribed to Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, of which Eusebius relates several. Whilst the vigils of the great watch of the Passover were being kept, the oil failed, whereupon Narcissus commanded that water from the neighbouring well should be poured into the lamps. Having prayed over the water, it was changed into oil, of which a specimen had been preserved until that time.¹ On another occasion, three men having spread some vile slanders against Narcissus, which they confirmed by an oath, and with imprecations upon themselves of death by a miserable disease, of death by fire, and of blindness, respectively, if their statements were not true, omnipotent justice in each case inflicted upon the wretches the curse which each had invoked.² The election of Fabianus to the Episcopal chair of Rome was marked by the descent of a dove from on high, which rested upon his head, as the Holy Ghost had descended upon our Saviour.³ At Caesarea Philippi there is a statue of Jesus Christ which Eusebius states that he himself had seen, said to have been erected by the woman healed of the bloody issue, and on the pedestal grows a strange plant, as high as the hem of the brazen garment, which is an antidote to all diseases.⁴ Great miracles are recorded as taking place during the persecutions in Caesarea.⁵

Gregory of Nyssa gives an account of many wonderful works performed by his namesake Gregory of Neo-Caesarea, who was called *Thaumaturgus* from the miraculous power which he possessed and very freely exercised. The Virgin Mary and the Apostle John appeared to him, on one occasion, when he was in doubt as to the doctrine which he ought to preach, and, at the request of Mary, the Apostle gave him all needful instructions.⁶ If his faith did not move mountains, it moved a huge rock to convert a pagan priest.⁷ He drove a demon out of a heathen temple in which he had taken refuge, and the evil spirit could not re-enter until he gave permission.⁸ Nyssen relates how St. Gregory averted an armed contest of two brothers, who quarrelled about the possession of a lake on their father's property. The saint passed the night in prayer beside the lake, and in the morning it was found dried up.⁹ On another occasion, he rescued the country

¹ *Roschini*, H. E., vi. 9.

² *Ib.*, vi. 9.

³ *Ib.*, vi. 29.

⁴ *Ib.*, H. E. vii. 18; cf. *Sozomen*, H. E., v. 21.

⁵ *Eusebius*, De Martyr. Palest., iv., ix.; cf. *Theodoret*, H. E., iv. 22.

⁶ *Greg. N.*, ex. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. Tom. iii. p. 545, f.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 550.

⁸ *Ib.*, p. 548 f. Cf. *Socrates*, H. E., iv. 27. He gave this permission in writing:

"Gregory to Satan: Enter."—*Ἐπιτομή τῶν Συναγᾶν Ἐξέλεθ.*

⁹ *Ib.*, p. 555 f.

from the devastation of a mountain stream, which periodically burst the dykes by which it was restrained, and inundated the plain. He went on foot to the place, and, invoking the name of Christ, fixed his staff in the earth at the place where the torrent had broken through. The staff took root and became a tree, and the stream never again burst its bounds. The inhabitants of the district were converted to Christianity by this miracle. The tree was still living in Nyssen's time, and he had seen the bed of the lake covered with trees, pastures, and cottages.¹ Two vagabond Jews once attempted to deceive him. One of them lay down and pretended to be dead, while the other begged money from the saint wherewith to buy him a shroud. St. Gregory quietly took off his cloak and laid it on the man, and walked away. His companion found that he was really dead.² St. Gregory expelled demons from persons possessed, healed the sick, and performed many other miracles;³ and his signs and wonders are not only attested by Gregory of Nyssa, but by St. Basil,⁴ whose grandmother, St. Macrina, was brought up at Neo-Cæsarea by the immediate followers of the saint.

Athanasius, in his memoir of St. Anthony, who began to lead the life of a recluse about A.D. 270, gives particulars of many miracles performed by the saint. Although he possessed great power over demons, and delivered many persons possessed by them, Satan tormented him sadly, and he was constantly beset by legions of devils. One night Satan with a troop of evil spirits so belaboured the saint that he lay on the ground speechless, and almost dead from their blows.⁵ We have already referred to the case of Natalius, who was scourged by angels during a whole night, till he was brought to repentance.⁶ Upon one occasion when St. Anthony had retired to his cell, resolved to pass a time in perfect solitude, a certain soldier came to his door and remained long there knocking and supplicating the saint to come and deliver his daughter, who was tormented by a demon. At length St. Anthony addressed the man and told him to go, and if he believed in Jesus Christ and prayed to God, his prayer should be fulfilled. The man believed, invoked Jesus Christ, and his daughter was delivered from the demon.⁷ As Anthony was once travelling across the

¹ *Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Greg. Thaum.*, iii. p. 558 ff.

² *Ib.*, p. 561 f. The same story is related of St. Epiphanius, of Cyprus, and Sozomen sees no ground for doubting the veracity of either account. He states that St. Epiphanius also performed many other miracles, H. E., vii. 27.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 541, 551, 552, 553, 566, 567, 577.

⁴ *De Spir. Sancto*, c. 29, tom. iii., pp. 62, 63; *Bened.*, cf. Ep. 204, p. 306.

⁵ *S. Athanasii, Vita et Convers. S. Antonii*, §§ 8, Opp. tom. i. pars. ii. p. 802 ff. *Bened.*

⁶ *Eusebius*, H. E., v. 28; see p. 135 f.

⁷ *Vita*, § 48, p. 832.

deser
them
groun
sweet
was l
lepros
into K
but be
man v
was m
at Ale
leaving
daugh
to stop
request
woman
Antho
the gir
evil sp
had co
making
the nar
instanc
disease
who wa
protest
having
Hilar
raeles,
restored
ten year
eases. I
his pow
was bur
perfect
perfume
were he
Egyptia
convinced
Martin,

¹ *Vita*, §

² *Ib.*, §

³ Cf. *Ib.*

⁴ *παύσι*

⁵ *Sozome*

desert to visit another monastery, the water of the caravan failed them, and his companions in despair threw themselves on the ground. St. Anthony, however, retired a little apart, and in answer to his prayer, a spring of water issued at the place where he was kneeling.¹ A man named Fronto, who was afflicted with leprosy, begged his prayers, and was ordered by the saint to go into Egypt, where he should be healed. Fronto at first refused, but being told that he could not be healed if he remained, the sick man went believing, and as soon as he came in sight of Egypt he was made whole.² Another miracle was performed by Anthony at Alexandria, in the presence of St. Athanasius. As they were leaving the city a woman cried after him, "Man of God, stay; my daughter is cruelly troubled by a demon;" and she entreated him to stop lest she herself should die in running after him. At the request of Athanasius and the rest, the saint paused, and as the woman came up her daughter fell on the ground convulsed. St. Anthony prayed in the name of Jesus Christ, and immediately the girl rose perfectly restored to health, and delivered from the evil spirit.³ He astonished a number of pagan philosophers, who had come to dispute with him, by delivering several demoniacs, making the sign of the cross over them three times, and invoking the name of Jesus Christ.⁴ It is unnecessary, however, to multiply instances of his miraculous power to drive out demons and heal diseases,⁵ and to perform other wonderful works. St. Athanasius, who was himself for a long time a personal follower of St. Anthony, protests in his preface to the biography his general accuracy, he having everywhere been mindful of the truth.⁶

Hilarion, again, a disciple of St. Anthony, performed many miracles, an account of some of which is given by St. Jerome. He restored sight to a woman who had been blind for no less than ten years; he cast out devils, and miraculously cured many diseases. Rain fell in answer to his prayers; and he further exhibited his power over the elements by calming a stormy sea. When he was buried, ten months after his death, not only was his body as perfect as though he had been alive, but it emitted a delightful perfume. He was so favoured of God that, long after, diseases were healed and demons expelled at his tomb.⁷ St. Macarius, the Egyptian, is said to have restored a dead man to life in order to convince an unbeliever of the truth of the Resurrection.⁸ St. Martin, of Tours, restored to life a certain catechumen, who had

¹ Vita, § 54, p. 836 f.

² *Ib.*, § 57, p. 839.

³ *Ib.*, § 71, p. 849.

⁴ *Ib.*, § 72, p. 849.

⁵ Cf. *Ib.*, §§ 55, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 70, &c., &c.

⁶ *πανταχοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας φροντισίας*, *ib.*, p. 797.

⁷ *ζωοποιη*, H. E. iii. 14.

⁸ *Ib.*, H. E., iii. 14.

died of a fever, and Sulpicius, his disciple, states that the man, who lived for many years after, was known to himself, although not until after the miracle. He also restored to life a servant who had hung himself.¹ He performed a multitude of other miracles, to which we need not here more minutely refer. The relics of the two martyrs Protavius and Gervasius, whose bones, with much fresh blood, the miraculous evidence of their martyrdom and identity, were discovered by St. Ambrose, worked a number of miracles. A man suffering from demoniacal possession indicated the proximity of the relics by his convulsions. St. Augustine states that he himself was in Milan when a blind man, who merely touched the cloth which covered the two bodies as they were being moved to a neighbouring church, regained his sight.² Paulinus relates many miracles performed by his master, St. Ambrose, himself. He not only cast out many demons and healed the sick,³ but he also raised the dead. Whilst the saint was staying in the house of a distinguished Christian friend, his child, who, a few days before, had been delivered from an unclean spirit, suddenly expired. The mother, an exceedingly religious woman, full of faith and the fear of God, carried the dead boy down and laid him on the saint's bed during his absence. When St. Ambrose returned, filled with compassion for the mother and struck by her faith, he stretched himself, like Elisha, on the body of the child, praying, and restored him living to his mother. Paulinus relates this miracle with minute particulars of name and address.⁴

St. Augustine asserts that miracles are still performed in his day in the name of Jesus Christ, either by means of his sacraments or by the prayers or relics of his saints, although they are not so well-known as those of old, and he gives an account of many miracles which had recently taken place.⁵ After referring to the miracle performed by the relics of the two martyrs upon the blind man in Milan, which occurred when he was there, he goes on to narrate the miraculous cure of a friend of his own, named Innocent, formerly advocate of the prefecture, in Carthage, where Augustine was, and beheld it with his own eyes (*ubi nos interfuimus et oculis aspersimus nostris*). A lady of rank in the same city was miraculously healed of an incurable cancer, and St. Augustine is indignant at the apathy of her friends, which allowed so great a miracle to be so little known.⁶ An inhabitant of the

¹ *Sulpicius*, Vita S. Mart. Cf. *Sozomen*, H. E. iii. 14.

² *Ambrose*, Epist. Class. i. 22; *August.*, De Civ. Dei. xxii. 8; *Paulinus*, Vita S. Ambrosii, § 14 f.

³ Vita S. Amb., §§ 21, 43, 44.

⁴ De Civ. Dei, xxi. 8.

⁵ *Ib.*, § 28.

⁶ Hoc ego cum audissem, et vehementer stomacharer, in illa civitate atque in illa persona, non utique obscura, factum tam ingens miraculum sic latere, hinc eam et admonendam et pene objurgandam p. avr, &c., &c. De Civ. Dei, xxii. 8.

neighbouring town of Curubis, was cured of paralysis and other ills by being baptized. When Augustine heard of this, although it was reported on very good authority, the man himself was brought to Carthage by order of the holy bishop Aurelius, in order that the truth might be ascertained. Augustine states that, on one occasion during his absence, a tribunitian man amongst them, named Hesperius, who had a farm close by, called Zabedi, in the Fussalian district, begged one of the Christian presbyters to go and drive away some evil spirits whose malice sorely afflicted his servants and cattle. One of the presbyters accordingly went, and offered the sacrifice of the body of Christ with earnest prayer, and by the mercy of God the evil was removed. Now Hesperius happened to have received from one of his friends a piece of the sacred earth of Jerusalem, where Jesus Christ was buried and rose again the third day, and he had hung it up in a room to protect himself from the evil spirits. When his house had been freed from them, however, he begged St. Augustine and his colleague Maximinus, who happened to be in that neighbourhood, to come to him, and after telling them all that had happened, he prayed them to bury the piece of earth in some place where Christians could assemble for the worship of God. They consented, and did as he desired. A young peasant of the neighbourhood, who was paralytic, hearing of this, begged to be carried without delay to the holy spot, where he offered up prayer, and rose up and went away on his feet perfectly cured. About thirty miles from Hippo, at a farm called Victoriana, there was a memorial to the two martyrs Protavius and Gervasius. To this, Augustine relates, was brought a young man who, having gone one summer day at noon to water his horse in the river, was possessed by a demon. The lady to whom the place belonged came, according to her custom in the evening, with her servants and some holy women to sing hymns and pray. On hearing them the demoniac started up and seized the altar with a terrible shudder, without daring to move, and as if bound to it, and the demon praying with a loud voice for mercy, confessed where and when he had entered into the young man. At last the demon named all the members of his body, with threats to cut them off as he made his exit, and, saying these words, came out of him. In doing so, however, the eye of the youth fell from its socket on to his cheek, retained only by a small vein as by a root, while the pupil became altogether white. Well pleased, however, that the young man had been freed from the evil spirit, they returned the eye to its place as well as they could, and bound it up with a handkerchief, praying fervently, and one of his relatives said: "God who drove out the demon at the prayer of his saints, can also restore the sight." On removing the bandage seven days










IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

4.5 28 2.5
3.6 3.2 2.2
2.0 2.0 1.8

10
0.1

after, the eye was found perfectly whole. St. Augustine knew a girl of Hippo, who was delivered from a demon by the application of oil with which had mingled the tears of the presbyter who was praying for her. He also knew a bishop who prayed for a youth possessed by a demon, although he had not even seen him, and the young man was at once cured.

Augustine further gives particulars of many miracles performed by the relics of the most glorious martyr Stephen.¹ By their virtue the blind receive their sight, the sick are healed, the impenitent converted, and the dead are restored to life. "Andurus is the name of an estate," Augustine says, "where there is a church and in it a shrine dedicated to the martyr Stephen. A certain little boy was playing in the court, when unruly bullocks drawing a waggon crushed him with the wheel, and immediately he lay in the agonies of death. Then his mother raised him up, and placed him at the shrine, and he not only came to life again, but had manifestly received no injury."² A certain religious woman, who lived in a neighbouring property called Caspalianus, being dangerously ill and her life despaired of, her tunic was carried to the same shrine, but before it was brought back she had expired. Nevertheless, her relatives covered the body with this tunic, and she received back the spirit and was made whole.³ At Hippo, a certain man named Bassus, a Syrian was praying at the shrine of the same martyr for his daughter who was sick and in great peril, and he had brought her dress with him; when lo! some of his household came running to announce to him that she was dead. But as he was engaged in prayer they were stopped by his friends, who prevented their telling him, lest he should give way to his grief in public. When he returned to his house, which already resounded with the wailing of his household, he cast over the body of his daughter her mantle, which he had with him, and immediately she was restored to life.⁴ Again, in the same city, the son

¹ De Civ. Dei, xxii. 8.

² Andurus nomen est fundi, ubi ecclesia est, et in ea memoria Stephani martyris. Puerum quemdam parvulum, cum in area luderet, exorbitantes boves qui vehiculum trahebant, rota obriverunt, et confestim palpitavit expirans. Hunc mater arreptum ad eandem memoriam posuit; et non solum revixit, verum etiam illaesus apparuit.

³ Sanctimonialis quædam in vicina possessione, quæ Caspaliana dicitur, cum ægritudine laboraret, ac desperaretur, ad eandem memoriam tunica ejus allata est: quæ antequam revocaretur, illa defuncta est. Hac tamen tunica operuerunt cadaver ejus parentes, et recepto spiritu salva facta est.

⁴ Apud Hipponem Bassus quidam Syrus ad memoriam ejusdem martyris orabat pro ægrotante et periclitante filia, eoque secum vestem ejus attulerat; cum ecce pueri de domo cucurrerunt, qui ei mortuam nuntiarent. Sed cum, orante illo, ab amicis ejus exciperentur, prohibuerunt eos illi dicere, ne per publicum plangeret. Qui cum domum redisset jam suorum ejulatibus personantem, et vestem filie quam ferebat, super eam projecisset, red'ita est vitæ.

of a ce
became
paring
consoli
oil from
life aga
formerl
sicknes
suburbs
child liv

We s
argume
long aft
some ca
prayer
But tho
of detai
prayer
life aga
represen
kind.
cannot l
of the d
sunt, ib
nentium
antibus
aliisque
difficult
a fidelib
them, th
charius
ligarent
reportat
tunica,
then Dr.
continui
quoted, t

¹ Rursus
est. Cumq
pararentur
ejusdem m
² Itemqu
suburbano
orationem,
xii. 8.

³ Bampton

of a certain man among us named Irenæus, a collector of taxes, became sick and died. As the dead body lay, and they were preparing with wailing and lamentation to bury it, one of his friends consoling him suggested that the body should be anointed with oil from the same martyr. This was done, and the child came to life again.¹ In the same way a man amongst us named Eleusinus, formerly a tribune, laid the body of his child, who had died from sickness, on a memorial of the martyr which is in his villa in the suburbs, and after he had prayed, with many tears, he took up the child living.²

We shall meet with more of these miracles in considering the arguments of Dr. Mozley. In a note he says: "Augustine again, long after, alludes in his list of miracles (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8) to some cases in which persons had been raised to life again by prayer and the intercession of martyrs, whose relics were applied. But though Augustine relates with great particularity and length of detail some cases of recoveries from complaints in answer to prayer, his notices of the cases in which persons had been raised to life again, are so short, bare and summary, that they evidently represent no more than mere report, and report of a very vague kind. Indeed, with the preface which he prefixes to his list, he cannot be said even to profess to guarantee the truth or accuracy of the different instances contained in it. '*Hæc autem, ubicunque sunt, ibi sciuntur vix a tota ipsa civitate vel quocumque commanentium loco. Nam plerumque etiam ibi paucissimi sciunt, ignorantibus cæteris, maxime si magna sit civitas; et quando alibi aliisque narratur, non tantum ea commendat auctoritas, ut sine difficultate vel dubitatione credantur, quamvis Christianis fidelibus a fidelibus indicentur.*' He puts down the cases as he receives them, then, without pledging himself to their authenticity. '*Eucharius presbyter . . . mortuus sic jacebat ut ei jam pollices ligarentur: opitulatione memorati martyris, cum de memoria ejus reportata fuisset missa ipsius presbyteri tunica, suscitatus est . . . Andurus nomen est,*' &c."³ and then Dr. Mozley gives the passage already quoted by us. Before continuing, we must remark with regard to the passages just quoted, that, in the miracle of Eucharius, Dr. Mozley, without ex-

¹ Rursus ibidem apud nos Irenæi, cujusdam collectarii filius, ægritudine extinctus est. Cumque corpus jaceret exanime, atque a lugentibus et lamentantibus exsequiæ pararentur, amicorum ejus quidam inter aliorum consolantium verba suggerait, ut ejusdem martyris oleo corpus perungeretur. Factum est, et revixit.

² Itemque apud nos vir tribunitius Eleusinus super memoriam Martyris, quæ in suburbano ejus est, ægritudine exanimatum posuit infantulum filium: et post orationem, quam multis cum lacrymis ibi fudit, viventem levavit. *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8.

³ Bampton Lectures, 1865, p. 372 f.

planation, omits details. The whole passage is as follows: "Eucharis, a presbyter from Spain, resided at Calama, who had for a long time suffered from stone. By the relics of the same martyr, which the Bishop Possidius brought to him, he was made whole. The same presbyter, afterwards succumbing to another disease, lay dead, so that they were already binding his hands. Succour came from the relics of the martyr, for the tunic of the presbyter being brought back from the relics and placed upon his body he revived."¹ A writer who complains of the bareness of narratives should certainly not curtail their statements. Dr. Mozley continues: "There are three other cases of the same kind, in which there is nothing to verify the death from which the return to life is said to take place, as being more than mere suspension of the vital powers; but the writer does not go into particulars of description or proof, but simply inserts them in his list as they have been reported to him."²

Dr. Mozley is anxious to detract from the miracles described by Augustine, and we regret to be obliged to maintain that in order to do so he misrepresents, no doubt unintentionally, Augustine's statements, and, as we think, also unduly depreciates the comparative value of the evidence. We shall briefly refer to the two points in question. I. That "his notices of the cases in which persons had been raised to life again are so short, bare, and summary that they evidently represent no more than mere report, and report of a very vague kind." II. "That with the preface which Augustine prefixes to his list, he cannot be said even to profess to guarantee the truth or accuracy of the different instances contained in it."

It is true that in several cases Augustine gives the account of miraculous cures at greater length than those of restoration to life. It seems to us that this is almost inevitable at all times, and that the reason is obvious. Where the miracle consists merely of the cure of disease, details are naturally given to show the nature and intensity of the sickness, and they are necessary not only for the comprehension of the cure but to show its importance. In the cases of restoration to life, the mere statement of the death and assertion of the subsequent resurrection exclude all need of details. The pithy *reddita est vite*, or *factum est et revixit* is more striking than any more prolix narrative. In fact, the greater the miracle the more natural is conciseness and simplicity;

¹ Eucharis est presbyter ex Hispania, Calamae habitat, veteri morbo calculi laborabat; per memoriam supradicti martyris, quam Possidius illo adrexit episcopus, salvus factus est. Idem ipse postea morbo alio praevalente, &c., &c. E. Civ. Det. xxii 8.

² Bampton Lectures. p. 372 f.

and pra
verbose
tant wi
cases of
dead are
judge w
that not
details
In every
been c's
and in h
fact of
terms.
tention o
thought
his state
compare
them defi
is in the
have rais
been aban
theologian
sinct and
but sleep
account in
which, str
although,
more high
literary, a
given than
toration to
place at
resided.
require him
to state by
the Life of
thing. For
artistic nar
scribed to
Evangelists
cures, woul
heard of it.

¹ Matt. ix. 1.

² Luke vii. 1.

and practically, we find that Augustine gives a more lengthy and verbose report of trifling cures, whilst he relates the more important with greater brevity and force. He narrates many of his cases of miraculous cure, however, as briefly as those in which the dead are raised. We have quoted the latter, and the reader must judge whether they are unduly curt. One thing may be affirmed, that nothing of importance is omitted, and in regard to essential details they are as explicit as the mass of other cases reported. In every instance names and addresses are stated, and it will have been observed that all these miracles occurred in, or close to Hippo, and in his own diocese. It is very certain that in every case the fact of the miracle is asserted in the most direct and positive terms. There can be no mistake either as to the meaning or intention of the narrative, and there is no symptom whatever of a thought on the part of Augustine to avoid the responsibility of his statements, or to give them as mere vague report. If we compare these accounts with those of the Gospels, we do not find them deficient in any essential detail common to the latter. There is in the synoptic Gospels only one case in which Jesus is said to have raised the dead. The raising of Jairus' daughter¹ has long been abandoned, as a case of restoration to life, by all critics and theologians, except the few who still persist in ignoring the distinct and positive declaration of Jesus, "The damsel is not dead but sleepeth." The only case, therefore, in the Synoptics is the account in the third Gospel of the raising of the widow's son,² of which, strange to say, the other Gospels know nothing. Now, although, as might have been expected, this narrative is much more highly coloured and picturesque, the difference is chiefly literary, and, indeed, there are really fewer important details given than in the account by Augustine, for instance, of the restoration to life of the daughter of Bassus the Syrian, which took place at Hippo, of which he was bishop, and where he actually resided. Augustine's object in giving his list of miracles did not require him to write picturesque narratives. He merely desired to state bare facts, whilst the authors of the Gospels composed the Life of their Master, in which interesting details were everything. For many reasons we refrain here from alluding to the artistic narrative of the raising of Lazarus, the greatest miracle ascribed to Jesus, yet so singularly unknown to the other three Evangelists, who, so readily repeating the accounts of trifling cures, would most certainly not have neglected this had they ever heard of it.

¹ Matt. ix. 18, 19, 23—26; Mark v. 22, 24, 35—43; Luke viii. 41, 42, 49—56.

² Luke vii. 11—16.

Dr. Mozley complains of the absence of verification and proof of actual death in these cases, or that they were more than mere suspension of the vital powers. We cordially agree with him in the desire for such evidence, not only in these, but in all miracles. We would ask, however, what verification of the death have we in the case of the widow's son which we have not here? If we apply such a test to the miracles of the Gospels, we must reject them as certainly as those of St. Augustine. In neither case have we more than a mere statement that the subjects of these miracles were dead or diseased. So far are we from having any competent medical evidence of the reality of the death, or of the disease, or of the performance of the supposed cures in the Gospels, that we have little more than the barest reports of these miracles by writers who, even if their identity were established, were not, and do not pretend to have been eye-witnesses of the occurrence which they relate. Take, for instance, this very raising of the widow's son in the third Gospel, which is unknown to the other Evangelists, and the narrative of which is given only in a Gospel which is not attributed to a personal follower of Jesus.

Now we turn to the second statement of Dr. Mozley, "that with the preface which Augustine prefixes to his list, he cannot be said even to profess to guarantee the truth or accuracy of the different instances contained in it." This extraordinary assertion is supported by a quotation given above, which Dr. Mozley has separated from what precedes and follows it, so that its real meaning is scarcely apparent. We shall as briefly as possible state what is actually the "preface" of St. Augustine to his list of miracles, and his avowed object for giving it. In the preceding chapter, Augustine has been arguing that the world believed in Christ by virtue of divine influence and not by human persuasion. He contends that it is ridiculous to speak of the false divinity of Romulus when Christians speak of Christ. If, in the time of Romulus, some 600 years before Cicero, people were so enlightened that they refused to believe anything of which they had not experience, how much more, in the still more enlightened days of Cicero himself, and notably in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, would they have rejected belief in the resurrection and ascension of Christ, if divine truth and the testimony of miracles had not proved, not only that such things could take place, but that they had actually done so. When the evidence of prophecy joined with that of miracles, and showed that the new doctrines were only contrary to experience and not contrary to reason, the world embraced the faith.¹ "Why, then, say they, do these

¹ De Civ. Dei, xxii. 7.

¹ Nam et per orationem ut tanta quæ definitum est populorum.

miracles, which you declare to have taken place formerly, not occur now-a-days?" Augustine, in replying, adopts a common rhetorical device: "I might, indeed, answer," he says, "that miracles were necessary before the world believed, in order that the world might believe. Any one who now requires miracles in order that he may believe, is himself a great miracle in not believing what all the world believes. But, really, they say this in order that even those miracles should not be believed either." And he reduces what he considers to be the position of the world in regard to miracles and to the supernatural dogmas of Christianity to the following dilemma: "Either things incredible which nevertheless occurred, and were seen, led to belief in something else incredible, which was not seen; or that thing was in itself so credible that no miracles were required to establish it, and so much more is the unbelief of those who deny confuted. This might I say to those most frivolous objectors." He then proceeds to affirm that it cannot be denied that many miracles attest the great miracle of the ascension in the flesh of the risen Christ, and he points out that the actual occurrence of all these things is not only recorded in the most truthful books, but the reasons also given why they took place. These things have become known that they might create belief; these things by the belief they have created have become much more clearly known. They are read to the people, indeed, that they may believe; yet, nevertheless, they would not be read to the people if they had not been believed. After thus stating the answer which he might give, Augustine now returns to answer the question directly:—"But furthermore," he continues, "miracles are performed now in his name, either by means of his sacraments, or by the prayers or relics of his saints, but they are not brought under the same strong light as caused the former to be noised abroad with so much glory; inasmuch as the canon of sacred scriptures, which must be definite, causes those miracles to be everywhere publicly read, and become firmly fixed in the memory of all peoples;"¹ and then follows Dr. Mozley's quotation: "but these are scarcely known to the whole of a city itself in which they are performed, or to its neighbourhood. Indeed, for the most part, even there very few know of them, and the rest are ignorant more especially if the city be large; and when they are related elsewhere and to others, the authority does not so commend them as to make them

¹ Nam etiam nunc fiunt miracula in ejus nomine, sive per sacramenta ejus sive per orationes vel memorias sanctorum ejus, sed non eadem claritate illustrantur, ut tanta quanta illa gloria diffamantur. Canon quippe Sacrarum Literarum, quem definitum esse oportebat, illa facit ubique recitari, et memorie cunctorum inherere populorum: &c. De Civ. Dei, xxii. 8.

be believed without difficulty or doubt, albeit they are reported by faithful Christians to be faithful." He illustrates this by pointing out in immediate continuation, that the miracle in Milan by the bodies of the two martyrs, which took place when he himself was there, might reach the knowledge of many, because the city is large, and the Emperor and an immense crowd of people witnessed it, but who knows of the miracle performed at Carthage upon his friend Innocent, when he was there also, and saw it with his own eyes? Who knows of the miraculous cure of cancer, he continues, in a lady of rank in the same city? at the silence regarding which he is so indignant. Who knows of the next case he mentions in his list? the cure of a medical man of the same town, to which he adds: "We, nevertheless, do know it, and a few brethren to whose knowledge it may have come."¹ Who out of Curubus, besides the very few who may have heard of it, knows of the miraculous cure of the paralytic man, whose case Augustine personally investigated? and so on. Observe that there is merely a question of the comparative notoriety of the Gospel miracles and those of his own time, not a doubt as to the reality of the latter. Again, towards the end of his long list, immediately after the narrative of the restoration to life of the child of Eleusinus, which we have quoted, Augustine says:—"What can I do? The promise of the completion of this work is pressing, so that I cannot here recount all (the miracles) that I know; and without doubt many of our brethren when they read this work will be grieved that I have omitted so very much, which they know as well as I do. This I even now beg that they will pardon, and consider how long would be the task of doing that which, for the completion of the work, it is thought necessary not to do. For if I desired to record merely the miracles of healing, without speaking of others, which have been performed by this martyr, that is to say, the most glorious Stephen, in the district of Calama, and in ours of Hippo, many volumes must be composed, yet will it not be possible to make a complete collection of them, but only of such as have been published for public reading. For that was our object, since we saw repeated in our time signs of divine power similar to those of old, deeming that they ought not to be lost to the knowledge of the multitude. Now this relic has not yet been two years at Hippo-Regius, and accounts of many of the miracles performed by it have not been written, as is most certainly known to us, yet the number of those which have been published, up to the time this is written, amounts to

¹ Nos tamen novimus, et paucissimi fratres ad quos id potuit pervenire. *Ib.* xxii. 8.

about s
been lo
parably
his kno
by the
Utica, a
himself
list with
in his o
whole e
—"Man
the same
these by
neither l
of mind
by frequ
is now t
benefit s
only one
were pres
and scare
heard to
So far
the "Pre
These "s
real and i

¹ Quid fac
commemora
dolebunt me
ut ignoscant
facere suscep
ea tantum
Stephanum,
libri: nec ta
qui recitaren
similia divini
debere multo
Hipponen-R
non datis libe
aginta ferme
ipsa memoria
erant. De C
² Fiant ergo
quemadmodu
eunt, neque
duntur. Nar
qui beneficia
erique non ad
mente retinea
cognoverit, in

about seventy. At Calama, however, where these relics have been longer, and more of the miracles were recorded, they incomparably exceed this number.¹ Augustine goes on to say that, to his knowledge, many very remarkable miracles were performed by the relics of the same martyr also at Uzali, a district near to Utica, and of one of these, which had recently taken place when he himself was there, he gives an account. Then, before closing his list with the narrative of a miracle which took place at Hippo, in his own church, in his own presence, and in the sight of the whole congregation, he resumes his reply to the opening question:—"Many miracles, therefore," he says, "are also performed now, the same God who worked those of which we read, performing these by whom he wills and as he wills; but these miracles neither become similarly known, nor, that they may not slip out of mind, are they stamped, as it were like gravel, into memory, by frequent reading. For even in places where care is taken, as is now the case amongst us, that accounts of those who receive benefit should be publicly read, those who are present hear them only once, and many are not present at all, so that those who were present do not, after a few days, remember what they heard, and scarcely a single person is met with who repeats what was heard to one whom he may have known to have been absent."²

So far from casting doubt upon the miracles which he narrates, the "Preface" of Augustine is clearly intended to establish them. These "signs of divine power similar to those of old," are not less real and important, but merely less known, because the eyes of

¹ Quid faciam? Urget hujus operis implendi promissio, ut non hic possim omnia commemorare quæ scio: et procul dubio plerique nostrorum, cum hæc legent, dolebunt me tam multa prætermisisse, quæ utique necum sciunt. Quos jam nunc, ut ignoscant, rogo; et cogitent quam prolixi laboris sit facere, quod me hic non facere suscepti operis necessitas cogit. Si enim miracula sanitarum, ut alia taceam ea tantummodo velim scribere, quæ per hunc martyrem, id est, gloriocissimum Stephanum, facta sunt in colonia Calamensi, et in nostra, plurimi conficiendi sunt libri: nec tamen omnia colligi poterunt, sed tantum de quibus libelli dati sunt, qui recitarentur in populis. Id namque fieri volumus; cum videremus antiqua similia divinarum signa virtutum etiam nostris temporibus frequentari; et ea non debere multorum notitiæ deperire. Nondum est autem biennium, ex quo apud Hipponem-Regium cepit esse ista memoria, et multis, quod nobis certissimum est, non datis libellis, de iis quæ mirabiliter facta sunt, illi ipsi qui dati sunt ad septuaginta ferme numerum pervenerant quando ista conscripsi. Calamæ vero, ubi et ipsa memoria prius esse cepit et crebrius dantur, incomparabili multitudine superant. De Civ. Dei, xxii. 8.

² Fiunt ergo etiam nunc multa miracula, eodem Deo faciente per quos vult, et quemadmodum vult, qui et illa quæ legimus fecit: sed ista nec similiter innotescunt, neque, ut non excidant animo, quasi glares memorie, crebra lectione tunduntur. Nam et ubi diligentia est, quæ nunc apud nos esse cepit, ut libelli eorum qui beneficia percipiunt, recitentur in populo, semel hoc audiunt qui adsunt pluresque non adsunt ut nec illi qui adfuerunt, post aliquot dies, quod audierunt, mente retineant, et vix quisquam reperiat illorum, qui ei quem non adfuisse cognoverit, indicet quod audivit. De Civ. Dei, xxii. 8.

the world are not directed to them, and they have not the advantage of being everywhere published abroad by means of canonical scriptures constantly read to the people and acknowledged as authoritative. Dr. Mozley's statement is quite unwarranted, and it seems to us gratuitously injurious to St. Augustine. This Father of the Church and Bishop must have had as little good faith as good sense, if he did what such a statement implies. In order to demonstrate the truth of his assertion that miracles were still performed in his day, Dr. Mozley represents Augustine as deliberately producing a long list of instances of which "he cannot even be said to guarantee the truth," and the more important cases in which "evidently represent no more than mere report, and report of a very vague kind." We have furnished the reader with the materials for forming an opinion on these points. The judgment of Dr. Mozley may with equal justice be applied to the authors of the synoptic Gospels. They certainly do not guarantee the truth of the miracles they relate in any more precise way than Augustine. Like him, they merely narrate them as facts, and he as evidently believes what he states as they do. Indeed, as regards comparative fulness of testimony, the advantage is altogether on the side of the miracles reported by St. Augustine. These miracles occurred within two years of the time at which he wrote, and were at once recorded with the names of the subjects and of the places at which they occurred; most of them were performed in his own diocese, and several of them in his own presence; some, of which he apparently did not feel sure, he personally investigated; he states his knowledge of others, and he narrates the whole of them with the most direct and simple affirmation of the facts, without a single word indicating hesitation, or directly or indirectly attributing the narrative to mere report. Moreover, he not only advances these miracles deliberately and in writing, in support of his positive assertion that miracles were still performed, but these accounts of them had in the first instance been written that they might be publicly read in his own church for the edification of Christians, almost on the very spot where they are stated to have occurred. We need scarcely say that we do not advance these reasons in order to urge the reality of the miracles themselves, but simply to maintain that, so far from his giving the account of them as mere report, or not even professing to vouch for their truth, St. Augustine both believed them himself, and asked others to believe them as facts, and that they are as unhesitatingly affirmed as any related in the Gospels.

We shall not attempt any further detailed reference to the myriads of miracles with which the annals of the Church teem up

to very
dence.
puted
landis
saints
work
conside
conferr
daily p
number
from ap
the Ch
similar
dreds o
to point
tion the
of Assi
Xavier,
might
Church.
peared,
picture,
gin, con
earth, m

1 Acta
coni contin

to very recent times. The fact is too well known to require evidence. The saints in the Calendar are legion. It has been computed that the number of those whose lives are given in the Bollandist Collection¹ amounts to upwards of 25,000, although, the saints being arranged according to the Calendar, the unfinished work only reaches the twenty-fourth of October. When it is considered that all those upon whom the honour of canonization is conferred have worked miracles, many of them, indeed, almost daily performing such wonders, some idea may be formed of the number of miracles which have occurred in unbroken succession from apostolic days, and have been believed and recognized by the Church. Vast numbers of these miracles are in all respects similar to those narrated in the Gospels, and they comprise hundreds of cases of restoration of the dead to life. If it be necessary to point out instances in comparatively recent times, we may mention the miracles of this kind liberally ascribed to St. Francis of Assisi, in the 13th century, and to his namesake St. Francis Xavier, in the 16th, as pretty well known to all, although we might refer to much more recent miracles authenticated by the Church. At the present day such phenomena have almost disappeared, and, indeed, with the exception of an occasional winking picture, periodical liquefaction of blood, or apparition of the Virgin, confined to the still ignorant and benighted corners of the earth, miracles are extinct.

¹ *Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur; collegit, &c., Joannes Bollandus, cum contin., Henschenii, 54 vol. fol. Venetiis, 1734—1861.*

CHAPTER VI.

MIRACLES IN RELATION TO IGNORANCE AND SUPERSTITION

WE have maintained that the miracles which are reported after apostolic days, instead of presenting the enormous distinction which Dr. Mozley asserts, are precisely of the same types in all material points as the earlier miracles. Setting aside miracles of a trivial and unworthy character, there remains a countless number cast in the same mould as those of the Gospels—miraculous cures of diseases, expulsion of demons, transformation of elements, supernatural nourishment, resurrection of dead—of many of which we have quoted instances. Dr. Mozley anticipates an objection and says: "It will be urged, perhaps, that a large portion even of the Gospel miracles are of the class here mentioned as ambiguous; cures, visions, expulsions of evil spirits; but this observation does not affect the character of the Gospel miracles as a body, because we judge of the body or whole from its highest specimen, not from its lowest." He takes his stand upon, "*e.g.* our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension."¹ Now, without discussing the principle laid down here, it is evident that the great distinction between the Gospel and other miracles is thus narrowed to a very small compass. It is admitted that the mass of the Gospel miracles are of a class characterized as ambiguous, because "the current miracles of human history" are also chiefly of the same type, and the distinctive character is derived avowedly only from a few high specimens, such as the Resurrection. We have already referred to the fact that in the synoptic Gospels there is only one case, reported by the third Gospel alone, in which Jesus is said to have raised the dead. St. Augustine alone, however, chronicles several cases in which life was restored to the dead. Post-apostolic miracles, therefore, are far from lacking this ennobling type. Observe that Dr. Mozley is here not so much discussing the reality of the subsequent miracles of the Church, as contrasting them and other reputed miracles with those of the Gospel, and from this point of view it is impossible to maintain that the Gospels have a monopoly of the highest class of miracles. Such miracles are met with long before the dawn of Christianity, and continued to occur long after apostolic times.

Much stress is laid upon the form of the Gospel miracles; but as

¹ Bampton Lectures, p. 214.

we have
for inst
more or
fected,
rary ski
mar the
the dead
had the
seven ti
ably hav
said to
body; bu
tistic, th
There is
make a
cribed to
to their
miracles,
The case
was resto
as they w
Moabites
when the
revived, a
ing asund
stance.²
Jesus in t
sel" of th
Jesus, or e
the shadow
effect,³ an
acles of no
body were
diseases d
them."⁴
The argu
Gospel and
in the Chu
an article o
who are m

¹ 2 Kings x
² 2 Kings ii
laid on the ch
³ Mark v. 2
⁴ Matt. xiv.
⁵ Acts v. 1

we have already shown, it is the actual resurrection of the dead, for instance, which is the miracle, and this is not affected by the more or less dramatic manner in which it is said to have been effected, or in which the narrative of the event is composed. Literary skill, and the judicious management of details, may make or mar the form of any miracle. The narrative of the restoration of the dead child to life by Elisha might have been more impressive, had the writer omitted the circumstance that the child sneezed seven times before opening his eyes, and Dr. Mozley would probably have considered the miracle greater had the prophet merely said to the child, "Arise!" instead of stretching himself on the body; but setting aside human cravings for the picturesque and artistic, the essence of the miracle would have remained the same. There is one point, however, regarding which it may be well to make a few remarks. Whilst a vast number of miracles are ascribed to direct personal action of saints, many more are attributed to their relics. Now this is no exclusive characteristic of later miracles, but Christianity itself shares it with still earlier times. The case in which a dead body which touched the bones of Elisha was restored to life will occur to every one. "And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold, they spied a band of Moabites; and they cast a man into the sepulchre of Elisha: and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet."¹ The mantle of Elijah smiting asunder the waters before Elisha may be cited as another instance.² The woman who touches the hem of the garment of Jesus in the crowd is made whole,³ and all the sick and "possessed" of the country are represented as being healed by touching Jesus, or even the mere hem of his garment.⁴ It was supposed that the shadow of Peter falling on the sick as he passed had a curative effect,⁵ and it is very positively stated: "And God wrought miracles of no common kind by the hands of Paul; so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."⁶

The argument which assumes an enormous distinction between Gospel and other miracles betrays the prevalent scepticism, even in the Church, of all miracles except those which it is considered an article of faith to maintain. If we enquire how those think who are more logical and thorough in their belief in the superna-

¹ 2 Kings xiii. 21.

² 2 Kings ii. 14, cf. 8. In raising the dead child, Elisha sends his staff to be laid on the child.

³ Mark v. 27 ff.; cf. Luke viii. 44 ff.; Matt. ix. 20 ff.

⁴ Matt. xiv. 36; cf. Luke vi. 19; Mark iii. 10.

⁵ Acts v. 15.

⁶ *Jh.*, xix. 11, 12.

tural, we find the distinction denied. "The question," says Dr. Newman, "has hitherto been argued on the admission, that a distinct line can be drawn, in point of character and circumstances, between the miracles of Scripture and those of Church history; but this is by no means the case. It is true, indeed, that the miracles of Scripture, viewed as a whole, recommend themselves to our reason, and claim our veneration beyond all others, by a peculiar dignity and beauty; but still it is only as a whole that they make this impression upon us. Some of them, on the contrary, fall short of the attributes which attach to them in general; nay, are inferior in these respects to certain ecclesiastical miracles, and are received only on the credit of the system of which they form part. Again, specimens are not wanting in the history of the Church, of miracles as awful in their character, and as momentous in their effects, as those which are recorded in Scripture."¹ Now here is one able and thorough supporter of miracles denying the enormous distinction between those of the Gospel and those of human history, which another admits to be essential to the former as evidence of a revelation.

Dr. Mozley, however, meets such a difficulty by asserting that there would be no disadvantage to the Gospel miracles, and no doubt regarding them involved, if for some later miracles, there was evidence as strong, as for those of the Gospel. "All the result would be," he says, "that we should admit these miracles over and above the Gospel ones."² He denies the equality of the evidence, however, in any case. "Between the evidence, then, upon which the Gospel miracles stand, and that for later miracles, we see a broad distinction arising, not to mention again the nature and type of the Gospel miracles themselves—from the contemporaneous date of the testimony to them, the character of the witnesses, the probation of the testimony; especially when we contrast with these points the false doctrine and audacious fraud which rose up in later ages, and in connection with which so large a portion of the later miracles of Christianity made their appearance."³ We consider the point touching the type of the Gospel miracles disposed of, and we may, therefore, confine ourselves to the rest of this argument. If we look for any external evidence of the miracles of Jesus in any material effect produced by them at the time they are said to have occurred, we find anything but confirmation of the statements of the Gospels. It is a notorious fact that, in spite of these miracles, very few of the Jews amongst whom they were performed believed in Jesus, and that Christianity made its chief converts not where the supposed

¹ *J. H. Newman, Two Essays on Miracles*, p. 160 f.

² *Bampton Lectures*, p. 231.

³ *Ib.*, p. 220 f.

miracles given by of power on the s a few lon the Jews long after tive of t writers.

Dr. Mozley great and all antece "That th which had tion of ou What the Mozley st ter of the that the which the have take broad dist Athanasius claimed w publicity a been perfor duced to v much as e contemporane Christianit which they a thorough tives, their so far to an evidence, D of the test dicted by t the most Gospels new ter of a cer there is not until very long—that

miracles took place, but where an account of them was alone given by enthusiastic missionaries. Such astounding exhibitions of power as raising the dead, giving sight to the blind, walking on the sea, changing water into wine, and indefinitely multiplying a few loaves and fishes, not only did not make any impression on the Jews themselves, but were never heard out of Palestine until long after the events are said to have occurred, when the narrative of them was slowly disseminated by Christian teachers and writers.

Dr. Mozley refers to the contemporary testimony "for certain great and cardinal Gospel miracles, which, if granted, clear away all antecedent objection to the reception of the rest," and he says: "That the first promulgators of Christianity asserted, as a fact which had come under the cognizance of their senses, the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead is as certain as anything in history."¹ What they really did assert, so far from being so certain as Dr. Mozley states, must, as we shall hereafter see, be considered matter of the greatest doubt. But if the general statement be taken that the Resurrection, for instance, was promulgated as a fact which the early preachers of Christianity themselves believed to have taken place, the evidence does not in that case present the broad distinction he asserts. The miracles recounted by St. Athanasius and St. Augustine, for example, were likewise proclaimed with equal clearness, and even greater promptitude and publicity at the very spot where many of them were said to have been performed, and the details were much more immediately reduced to writing. The mere assertion in neither case goes for much as evidence, but the fact is that we have absolutely no contemporaneous testimony at all as to what the first promulgators of Christianity actually asserted, or as to the real grounds upon which they made such assertions. We shall presently enter upon a thorough examination of the testimony for the Gospel narratives, their age and authenticity, but we may here be permitted so far to anticipate, as to remark that, applied to documentary evidence, Dr. Mozley's reasoning from the contemporaneous date of the testimony, and the character of the witnesses, is contradicted by the whole history of New Testament literature. Whilst the most uncritically zealous assertors of the antiquity of the Gospels never venture to date the earliest of them within a quarter of a century from the death of Jesus, every tyro is aware that there is not a particle of evidence of the existence of our Gospels until very long after that interval—hereafter we shall show how long—that two of our synoptic Gospels at least were not, in any

¹ Bampton Lectures, p. 219.

case, composed in their present form by the writers to whom they are attributed; that there is, indeed, nothing worthy of the name of evidence that any one of these Gospels was written at all by the person whose name it bears; that the second Gospel is attributed to one who was not an eye-witness, and of whose identity there is the greatest doubt even amongst those who assert the authorship of Mark; that the third Gospel is an avowed later compilation,¹ and likewise ascribed to one who was not a follower of Jesus himself; and that the authorship of the fourth Gospel and its historical character are amongst the most unsettled questions of criticism, not to use here any more definite terms. This being the state of the case it is absurd to lay such emphasis on the contemporaneous date of the testimony, and on the character of the witnesses, since it has not even been determined who those witnesses are, and two even of the supposed evangelists were not personal eye-witnesses at all.² Surely the testimony of Athanasius regarding the miracles of St. Anthony, and that of Augustine regarding his list of miracles occurring in or close to his own diocese, within two years of the time at which he writes, or, to refer to more recent times, the evidence of Pascal for the Port-Royal miracles, must be admitted, not only not to present the broad distinction of evidence of which Dr. Mozley speaks, but on the contrary to be even more unassailable than that of the Gospel miracles. The Church, which is the authority for those miracles, is also the authority for the long succession of such works wrought by the saints. The identity of the writers we have instanced has never been doubted; their trustworthiness, in so far as stating what they believe to be true is concerned, has never been impugned; the same could be affirmed of writers in every age who record such miracles. The broad distinction of evidence for which Dr. Mozley contends, does not exist; it does not lie within the scope of his lectures either to define or prove it, and he does not of course commit the error of assuming the inspiration of the records. The fact is that theologians demand evidence for later miracles which they have not for those of the Gospels, and which transmitted reverence forbids their requiring. They strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

Dr. Mozley points to the life of sacrifice and suffering of the Apostles as a remarkable and peculiar testimony to the truth of the Gospel miracles, and notably of the Resurrection and Ascen-

¹ Luke i. 1—4.

² We need scarcely point out that Paul, to whom so many of the writings of the New Testament are ascribed, and who practically is the author of ecclesiastical Christianity, not only was not an eye-witness of the Gospel miracles, but never even saw Jesus.

sion.¹
those
sacrifice
except
not pro
high rel
and fam
no exclu
its mart
enduran
ful persi
ism? or
wheels o
creed?
melies o
death by
of the tr
in their
ing argu
tianty?
stake by
what sho
ness of th
of the re
error and
persecuti
ing so in
instead o
means of
fore, can
question
no means
Now th
an import
we believ
Church hi
pel mirac
Revelatio
tianty" a
from such
from mira
continuati
ceded and

sion.¹ Without examining, here, how much we really know of those lives and sufferings, one thing is perfectly evident: that sacrifice, suffering, and martyrdom itself are evidence of nothing except of the personal belief of the person enduring them; they do not prove the truth of the doctrines believed. No one doubts the high religious enthusiasm of the early Christians, or the earnest and fanatical zeal with which they courted martyrdom, but this is no exclusive characteristic of Christianity. Every religion has had its martyrs, every error its devoted victims. Does the marvellous endurance of the Hindoo, whose limbs wither after years of painful persistence in vows to his Deity, prove the truth of Brahmanism? or do the fanatical believers who cast themselves under the wheels of the car of Jagganath establish the soundness of their creed? Do the Jews, who for centuries bore the fiercest contumelies of the world, and were persecuted, hunted, and done to death by every conceivable torture for persisting in their denial of the truth of the Incarnation, Resurrection, and Ascension, and in their rejection of Jesus Christ, do they thus furnish a convincing argument for the truth of their belief and the falsity of Christianity? Or have the thousands who have been consigned to the stake by the Christian Church herself for persisting in asserting what she has denounced as damnable heresy, proved the correctness of their views by their sufferings and death? History is full of the records of men who have honestly believed every kind of error and heresy, and have been steadfast to the death, through persecution and torture, in their mistaken belief. There is nothing so inflexible as superstitious fanaticism, and persecution, instead of extinguishing it, has invariably been the most certain means of its propagation. The sufferings of the Apostles, therefore, cannot prove anything beyond their own belief, and the question what it was they really did believe and suffered for is by no means so simple as it appears.

Now the long succession of ecclesiastical and other miracles has an important bearing upon those of the New Testament, whether we believe or deny their reality. If we regard the miracles of Church history to be in the main real, the whole force of the Gospel miracles, as exceptional supernatural evidence of a Divine Revelation, is annihilated. The "miraculous credentials of Christianity" assume a very different aspect when they are considered from such a point of view. Admitted to be scarcely recognizable from miracles wrought by Satanic agency, they are seen to be a continuation of wonders recorded in the Old Testament, to be preceded and accompanied by pretension to similar power on the part

¹ Bampton Lectures, p. 225.

of the Jews and other nations, and to be succeeded by cycles of miracles, in all essential respects the same, performed subsequently for upwards of fifteen hundred years. Supernatural evidence of so common and prodigal a nature certainly betrays a great want of force and divine speciality. How could that be considered as express evidence for a new Divine Revelation which was already so well known to the world, and which is scattered broad-cast over so many centuries, as well as successfully simulated by Satan?

If, on the other hand, we dismiss the miracles of later ages as false, and as merely the creations of superstition or pious imagination, how can the miracles of the Gospel, which are precisely the same in type, and not better established as facts, remain unshaken? The Apostles and Evangelists were men of like passions, and also of like superstitions with others of their time, and must be measured by the same standard. Dr. Mozley will not admit that, even in such a case, the difficulty of distinguishing the true miracles amongst the mass of spurious justifies the rejection of all, and he demands a judicial process in each case, and settlement according to the evidence in that case.¹ We might reply that if the great mass of asserted miracles be determined to be spurious, there is no reason shown for entering upon a more minute consideration of pretensions, which knowledge and experience free us *à priori* to regard as incredible, and which examination, in so many cases, has proved to be delusion. Even if the plea, that "the evidence of the Gospel miracles is a special case which must be decided on its own grounds," be admitted, it must be apparent that the rejection of the mass of other miracles is serious presumptive evidence also against them.

2.

It must be confessed that the argument for the reality of miracles receives very little strength from the character of either the early or the later ages of Christianity. "It is but too plain," says Dr. Mozley, "in discussing ecclesiastical miracles, that in later ages, as the Church advanced in worldly power and position, besides the mistakes of imagination and impression, a temper of deliberate and audacious fraud set itself in action for the spread of certain doctrines, as well as for the great object of the concentration of Church power in one absolute monarchy."² We have already quoted words of Dean Milman regarding the frame of mind of the early Church, and it may not be out of place to add

Bampton Lectures, p. 234 f.

² *ib.*, p. 228.

few line
first age
legends
principle
on the p
in a Chr
itself. F
that imag
nightly v
tural wor
ference of
which ho
belief, tha
dent beca
of a good
formed, in
sciously tr
upon this
miracles, a
instances i
that, settin
vivid and
itself the m
but was eq
istic of the
says: "Dm
of the relig
an age, an
familiar w
that wonde
by some ne
period not c
of controllin
was possess
evil."² Betw
"pious fraud
cious fraud
natural exp
such an ext
or supposing
facts, whilst
It is certa
miracles are

few lines from the same writer. Speaking of the writings of the first ages of Christianity, he says: "That some of the Christian legends were deliberate forgeries can scarcely be questioned; the principle of pious fraud appeared to justify this mode of working on the popular mind; it was admitted and avowed. To deceive in Christianity was so valuable a service as to hallow deceit itself. But the largest portion was probably the natural birth of that imaginative excitement which quickens its day-dreams and nightly visions into reality. The Christian lived in a supernatural world; the notion of the divine power, the perpetual interference of the Deity, the agency of the countless invisible beings which hovered over mankind, was so strongly impressed upon the belief, that every extraordinary, and almost every ordinary incident became a miracle, every inward emotion a suggestion either of a good or an evil spirit. A mythic period was thus gradually formed, in which reality melted into fable, and invention unconsciously trespassed on the province of history."¹ Whether we look upon this picture or on that, the result is equally unfavourable to miracles, and a ready explanation both of the earlier and later instances is suggested. We must, however, again recall the fact that, setting aside for the present the effect of pious fraud, this vivid and superstitious imagination, which so freely created for itself the miraculous, was not merely developed by Christianity, but was equally rampant before it, and was a marked characteristic of the Jews. The same writer, in a passage already quoted, says: "During the whole life of Christ, and the early propagation of the religion, it must be borne in mind that they took place in an age, and among a people which superstition had made so familiar with what were supposed to be preternatural events, that wonders awakened no emotion, or were speedily superseded by some new demand on the ever ready belief. The Jews of that period not only believed that the Supreme Being had the power of controlling the course of nature, but that the same influence was possessed by multitudes of subordinate spirits, both good and evil."² Between the "superstition," "imaginative excitement," and "pious fraud" of the early Church, and the "deliberate and audacious fraud" of the later, we have abundant material for the natural explanation of all supposed miracles, without going to such an extreme hypothesis as exceptions to the order of Nature, or supposing that a few miracles can be accepted as supernatural facts, whilst all the rest must be discarded as human fables.

It is certain that throughout the whole period during which miracles are said to have been performed, gross ignorance and

¹ *Milman, History of Christianity*, iii. p. 503.

² *Ib.*, p. 85.

superstition prevailed, and nowhere more so than amongst the Jews where those miracles occurred. Almost every operation of nature was inexplicable, and everything which was inexplicable was considered supernatural. Miracles seemed as credible to the mind of that age as deviations from the order of nature seem incredible in ours. It is a suggestive fact that miracles are limited to periods when almost every common incident was readily ascribed to supernatural agency. There is, however, one remarkable circumstance which casts some light upon the origin of narratives of miracles. Throughout the New Testament, patristic literature, and the records of ecclesiastical miracles, although we have narratives of countless wonderful works performed by others than the writers, and abundant assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church, there is no instance whatever, that we can remember, in which a writer claims to have himself performed a miracle. Wherever there has existed even the comparatively accurate means of information which a person who himself performed a miracle might possess, the miraculous entirely fails, and it is found only where faith or credulity usurps the place of knowledge. Pious men were perfectly ready to believe the supposed miracles of others, and to report them as facts, who were too veracious to imagine any of their own. Even if apostles and saints had chronicled their own miraculous deeds, the argument for their reality would not have been much advanced; but the uniform absence of such personal pretension enables us more clearly to trace such narratives to pious credulity or superstition.

If we consider the particular part which miracles have played in human history, we find precisely the phenomena which might have been expected if miracles, instead of being considered as real occurrences, were recognized as the mistakes or creations of ignorance and superstition during that period in which "reality melted into fable, and invention unconsciously trespassed on the province of history." Their occurrence is limited to ages which were totally ignorant of physical laws, and they have been numerous or rare precisely in proportion to the degree of imagination and love of the marvellous characterizing the people amongst whom they are said to have occurred. Instead of a few evidential miracles taking place at one epoch of history, and filling the world with surprise at such novel and exceptional phenomena, we find miracles represented as taking place in all ages and in all countries. The Gospel miracles are set in the midst of a series of similar wonders, which commenced many centuries before the dawn of Christianity and continued, without interruption, for fifteen hundred years after it. They did not in the most remote degree originate the belief in miracles, or give the first suggestion

of spu
truly s
No di
accred
history
superst
came m
of the l
the real
traordin
evidence
able of a
viewed
on the o
tive exc
extinctio
gave pla
As an
miracles
tion and
fused th
supernatu
found in
and rende
Miracles a
or La Sal
the mass
it. Mirac
centuries
medical s
the natur
demoniac
pelled, an
tively exp
sorecery, th
are known
superstitio
les légende
French wr
une critiqu
affirmer des
on peut as
conviction
ties par la
pour peu qu

of spurious imitation. It may, on the contrary, be much more truly said that the already existing belief created these miracles. No divine originality characterized the evidence selected to accredit the Divine Revelation. The miracles with which the history of the world is full occurred in ages of darkness and superstition, and they gradually ceased when enlightenment became more generally diffused. At the very time when knowledge of the laws of nature began to render men capable of judging of the reality of miracles, these wonders entirely failed. This extraordinary cessation of miracles, precisely at the time when their evidence might have acquired value by an appeal to persons capable of appreciating them, is perfectly unintelligible if they be viewed as the supernatural credentials of a Divine Revelation. If, on the other hand, they be regarded as the mistakes of imaginative excitement and ignorance, nothing is more natural than their extinction at the time when the superstition which created them gave place to knowledge.

As an historical fact, there is nothing more certain than that miracles and the belief in them disappeared exactly when education and knowledge of the operation of natural laws became diffused throughout Europe, and that the last traces of belief in supernatural interference with the order of nature are only to be found in localities where ignorance and superstition still prevail, and render delusion or pious fraud of that description possible. Miracles are now denied to places more enlightened than Naples or La Salette. The inevitable inference from this fact is fatal to the mass of miracles, and it is not possible to protect them from it. Miracle cures by the relics of saints, upheld for fifteen centuries by all the power of the Church, utterly failed when medical science, increasing in spite of persecution, demonstrated the natural action of physiological laws. The theory of the demoniacal origin of disease has been entirely and forever dispelled, and the host of miracles in connection with it retrospectively exploded by the progress of science. Witchcraft and sorcery, the belief in which reigned supreme for so many centuries, are known to have been nothing but the delusions of ignorant superstition. "À l'époque où les faits merveilleux qui s'y (dans les légendes) trouvent consignés étaient rapportés," asks an able French writer, "possédait-on les lumières suffisantes pour exercer une critique véritable et sérieuse sur des témoignages que venaient affirmer des faits en contradiction avec nos connaissances? Or, on peut assurer hardiment que non. Au moyen-âge, l'intime conviction que la nature voit très fréquemment ses lois intervenir par la volonté divine régnait dans les esprits, en sorte que pour peu qu'un fait se présentât avec des apparences extraordinaires

aires, on se hâtait de le regarder comme un miracle, comme l'œuvre directe de la divinité. Aujourd'hui on cherche au contraire à tout rapporter à la loi commune; on est tellement sobre de faits miraculeux, que ceux qui paraissent tels sont écartés comme des fables ou tenus pour des faits ordinaires mal expliqués. La foi aux miracles a disparu. En outre, au moyen-âge le cercle des connaissances qu'on possédait sur la nature était fort restreint, et tout ce qui n'y rentrait pas était regardé comme surnaturel. Actuellement ce cercle s'agrandit sans cesse; et loin d'en avoir arrêté définitivement la limite, on le déclare infini." In a note the writer adds: "On voit par là que le nombre des miracles doit être en raison inverse du nombre des lois connues de la nature, et, qu'à mesure que celles-ci nous sont révélées les faits merveilleux ou miraculeux s'évanouissent."¹ These remarks are equally applicable to the commencement of the Christian era. On the one hand, we have no other testimony for the reality of miracles than that of ages in which not only the grossest superstition and credulity prevailed, but in which there was such total ignorance of natural laws that men were incapable of judging of that reality, even if they desired impartially to investigate such occurrences, which they did not; on the other hand, we have the sober testimony of science declaring such phenomena violations of the invariable laws of nature, and experience teaching us a perfectly simple and natural interpretation of the legends regarding them. Are we to believe ignorance and superstition or science and unvarying experience? Science has already demonstrated the delusion involved in the largest class of miracles, and has so far established the superiority of her testimony.

In an early part of his discussion Dr. Mozley argues: "Christianity is the religion of the civilized world, and it is believed upon its miraculous evidence. Now, for a set of miracles to be accepted in a rude age, and to retain their authority throughout a succession of such ages, and over the ignorant and superstitious part of mankind, may be no such great result for the miracle to accomplish, because it is easy to satisfy those who do not inquire. But this is not the state of the case which we have to meet on the subject of the Christian miracles. The Christian being the

¹ L. F. Alfred Maury. *Essai sur les Légendes Pieuses du Moyen-âge*, 1843, p. 234 f., and p. 235, note (1).

The same arguments are employed by the late Mr. Buckle. "Hence it is that, supposing other things equal, the superstition of a nation must always bear an exact proportion to the extent of its physical knowledge. This may be in some degree verified by the ordinary experience of mankind. For if we compare the different classes of society, we shall find that they are superstitious in proportion as the phenomena with which they are brought in contact have or have not been explained by natural laws." *Hist. of Civilization*, 1867, i. p. 375.

most
are ac
and co
is bel
here s
that su
uneduc
the ad
have n
dividua
quence
tianity
the kno
the acc
rant sup
natural
come so
the grea
son than
little mo
men, eve
to enable
can criti
miracles
are the id
of the chi
or the ne
wards in
a crime.
So far
rious that
and who l
"thinking
as a body;
tween sci
surely doe
eritics and
Europe, w
have long
religion.
part of Dr.
no great re
by, and ret

most intelligent, the civilized portion of the world, these miracles are accepted by the Christian body as a whole, by the thinking and educated as well as the uneducated part of it, and the Gospel is believed upon that evidence."¹ The picture of Christendom here suggested is purely imaginary. We are asked to believe that succeeding generations of thinking and educated as well as uneducated men, since the commencement of the period in which the adequate inquiry into the reality of miracles became possible, have made that adequate inquiry and have intelligently and individually accepted miracles and believed the Gospel in consequence of their attestation. The fact, however, is that Christianity became the religion of Europe before men either possessed the knowledge requisite to appreciate the difficulties involved in the acceptance of miracles, or minds sufficiently freed from ignorant superstition to question the reality of the supposed supernatural interference with the order of nature, and belief had become so much a matter of habit that, in this nineteenth century, the great majority of men have professed belief for no better reason than that their fathers believed before them. Belief is now little more than a transmitted quality or hereditary custom. Few men, even now, have either the knowledge or the leisure requisite to enable them to enter upon such an examination of miracles as can entitle Dr. Mozley to affirm that they intelligently accept miracles for themselves. We have shown, moreover, that so loose are the ideas even of the clergy upon the subject, that dignitaries of the church fail to see either the evidential purpose of miracles or the need for evidence at all, and the first intelligent step towards inquiry—doubt—has generally been stigmatized almost as a crime.

So far from Dr. Mozley's statement being correct, it is notorious that the great mass of those who are competent to examine, and who have done so, altogether reject miracles. Instead of the "thinking and educated" men of science accepting miracles, they, as a body, distinctly deny them, and hence the antagonism between science and ecclesiastical Christianity, and Dr. Mozley surely does not require to be told how many of the profoundest critics and scholars of Germany, and of all other countries in Europe, who have turned their attention to Biblical subjects, have long ago rejected the miraculous elements of the Christian religion. Such being the case we necessarily revert to the first part of Dr. Mozley's representation, and find with him, that it is no great result for miracles to accomplish, merely to be accepted by, and retain authority over, a succession of ignorant and super-

¹ Pampton Lectures, p. 27.

stitutional ages, "because it is easy to satisfy those who do not inquire."

It is necessary that we should now refer to the circumstance that all the arguments which we have hitherto considered in support of miracles, whether to explain or account for them, have proceeded upon an assumption of the reality of the alleged phenomena. Had it been first requisite to establish the truth of facts of such an astounding nature, the necessity of accounting for them might never have arisen. It is clear, therefore, that an assumption which permits the argument to attain any such position begs almost the whole question. Facts, however astounding, which, it is admitted, did actually occur, claim a latitude of explanation, which a mere narrative of those alleged facts, written by an unknown person some eighteen centuries ago, could not obtain. If, for instance, it be once established as an absolute fact that a man actually dead, and some days buried, upon whose body decomposition had already made some progress,¹ had been restored to life, the fact of his death and of his subsequent resurrection being so absolutely proved that the possibility of deception or of mistake on the part of the witnesses was totally excluded—if such conclusive evidence be supposed possible in such a case—it is clear that an argument, as to whether such an occurrence were to be ascribed to known or unknown laws, would assume a very different character indeed from that which it would have borne if the argument merely sought to account for so astounding a phenomenon of whose actual occurrence there was no reliable evidence.

It must not be forgotten, therefore, that, as the late Professor Baden Powell pointed out: "At the present day it is not a *miracle*, but the *narrative of a miracle*, to which any argument can refer, or to which faith is accorded."² The discussion of miracles, then, is not one regarding miracles actually performed within our own knowledge, but merely regarding miracles said to have been performed eighteen hundred years ago, the reality of which was not verified at the time by any scientific examination, and whose occurrence is merely reported in the Gospels. Now, although Dr. Mozley rightly and logically maintains that Christianity requires, and should be believed only upon, its miraculous evidence, the fact is that popular Christianity is not believed because of miracles, but miracles are accepted because they are related in the Gospels which are supposed to contain the doctrines of Christianity. The Gospels have for many generations been given to the child as inspired records, and doubt of miracles has, therefore, either never

¹ Cf. John xi. 39.

² Order of Nature, p. 285.

arisen
are re
wise, f
testim
believe
son, w
believe
cles wh
vey the
accredi
The im
testime
ed.¹ W
nature
not the
were en
this we
decepti
the valu
tives of
inflamed
and sup
ous occur
pious me
and simp
the narra
so charac
and reve
circumsta
How few
to apprec
feeling a
curacy of
last quali
ianity.
themselves
have one

¹ Dr. Far
at this point
a question of
ian miracles
recorded,"
lar that after
tion of the g
his purpose,
existed at th
the events n

arisen or has been instantly suppressed, simply because miracles are recorded in the sacred volume. It could scarcely be otherwise, for in point of fact the Gospel miracles stand upon no other testimony. We are therefore in this position: We are asked to believe astounding announcements beyond the limits of human reason, which, as Dr. Mozley admits, we could only be justified in believing upon miraculous evidence, upon the testimony of miracles which are only reported by the records which also alone convey the announcements which those miracles were intended to accredit. There is no other contemporary evidence whatever. The importance of the Gospels, therefore, as the almost solitary testimony to the occurrence of miracles can scarcely be exaggerated.¹ We have already made an anticipatory remark regarding the nature of these documents, to which we may add that they are not the work of perfectly independent historians, but of men who were engaged in disseminating the new doctrines, and in saying this we have no intention of accusing the writers of conscious deception; it is, however, necessary to state the fact in order that the value of the testimony may be fairly estimated. The narratives of miracles were written by ardent partizans, with minds inflamed by religious zeal and enthusiasm, in an age of ignorance and superstition, a considerable time after the supposed miraculous occurrences had taken place. All history shows how rapidly pious memory exaggerates and idealizes the traditions of the past, and simple actions might readily be transformed into miracles, as the narratives circulated, in a period so prone to superstition and so characterized by love of the marvellous. Religious excitement and reverence for the noblest of Teachers could not, under such circumstances and in such an age, have escaped this exaggeration. How few men in more enlightened times have been able soberly to appreciate, and accurately to record exciting experiences, where feeling and religious emotion have been concerned. Prosaic accuracy of observation and of language, at all times rare, are the last qualities we could expect to find in the early ages of Christianity. In the certain fact that disputes arose among the Apostles themselves so shortly after the death of their great Master, we have one proof that even amongst them there was no accurate ap-

¹ Dr. Farrar, winding up the antecedent discussion, says: "... we arrive at this point—that the credibility of miracles is in each instance simply and solely a question of evidence, and consequently that our belief or rejection of the Christian miracles must mainly depend on the character of the Gospels in which they are recorded." *The Witness of History to Christ*, 1872, p. 51. It is somewhat singular that after such a declaration he considers it unnecessary to enter into the question of the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels, deeming it sufficient for his purpose, that Strauss and Reisan admit that some portion of these documents existed at the beginning of the second century, or earlier, in the country where the events narrated took place.

preciation of the teaching of Jesus,¹ and the frequent instances of their misunderstanding of very simple matters, and of their want of enlightenment, which occur throughout the Gospels are certainly not calculated to inspire much confidence in their intelligence and accuracy of observation.

Now it is apparent that the evidence for miracles requires to embrace two distinct points: the reality of the alleged facts, and the accuracy of the inference that the phenomena were produced by Supernatural Agency. The task would even then remain of demonstrating the particular Supernatural Being by whom the miracles were performed, which is admitted to be impossible. We have hitherto chiefly confined ourselves to a consideration of the antecedent credibility of such events, and of the fitness of those who are supposed to have witnessed them to draw accurate inferences from the alleged phenomena. Those who have formed any adequate conception of the amount of testimony which would be requisite in order to establish the reality of occurrences in violation of an order of Nature, which is based upon universal and invariable experience, must recognize that, even if the earliest asserted origin of our four Gospels could be established upon the most irrefragable grounds, the testimony of the writers—men of like ignorance with their contemporaries, men of like passions with ourselves—would be utterly incompetent to prove the reality of miracles. We have already sufficiently discussed this point, more especially in connection with Hume's argument, and need not here resume it. Every consideration, historical and philosophical, has hitherto discredited the whole theory of miracles, and further inquiry might be abandoned as unnecessary. In order, however, to render our conclusion complete, it remains for us to see whether, as affirmed, there be any special evidence regarding the alleged facts entitling the Gospel Miracles to exceptional attention. If, instead of being clear, direct, the undoubted testimony of known eye-witnesses free from superstition, and capable, through adequate knowledge, rightly to estimate the alleged phenomena, we find that the actual accounts have none of these qualifications, the final decision with regard to Miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation will be easy and conclusive. We shall now, therefore, carefully examine the evidence as to the date, authorship, and character of the four Gospels.

¹ *v. g.*, Gal. ii. 11 ff.

PART II.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

INTRODUCTION.

BEFORE commencing our examination of the evidence as to the date, authorship, and character of the Gospels, it may be well to make a few preliminary remarks. We propose to examine all the writings of the early Church for traces of the Gospels. It is very important, however, that the silence of early writers should receive as much attention as any supposed allusions to the Gospels. When such writers, quoting largely from the Old Testament and other sources, deal with subjects which would naturally be assisted by reference to our Gospels, and still more so by quoting such works as authoritative,—and yet we find that not only they do not show any knowledge of those Gospels, but actually quote passages from unknown sources, or sayings of Jesus derived from tradition,—the inference must be that our Gospels were either unknown or not recognized as works of any authority at the time.

It is still more important that we should constantly bear in mind, that a great number of Gospels existed in the early Church which are no longer extant, and of most of which even the names are lost. We need not here do more than refer, in corroboration of this fact, to the preliminary statement of the author of the third Gospel: "Forasmuch as many ($\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$) have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are surely believed among us," &c.¹ It is therefore evident that before our third Synoptic was written many similar works were already in circulation. Looking at the close similarity of large portions of the three Synoptics, it is almost certain that many of the $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ here mentioned bore a close analogy to each

¹ Luke i. 1.

other and to our Gospels, and this is known to have been the case, for instance, amongst the various forms of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," distinct mention of which we meet with long before we hear anything of our Gospels. When, therefore, in early writings, we meet with quotations closely resembling, or we may add, even identical with passages which are found in our Gospels, the source of which, however, is not mentioned, nor is any author's name indicated, the similarity or even identity, cannot by any means be admitted as evidence that the quotation is necessarily from our Gospels, and not from some other similar work now no longer extant, and more especially not, when in the same writings there are other quotations from apocryphal sources different from our Gospels. Whether regarded as historical records or as writings embodying the mere tradition of the early Christians, our Gospels cannot for a moment be recognized as the exclusive depositories of the genuine sayings and doings of Jesus; and so far from the common possession by many works, in early times, of such words of Jesus in closely similar form being either strange or improbable, the really remarkable phenomenon is that such material variation in the report of the more important historical teachings should exist amongst them. But whilst similarity to our Gospels in passages quoted by early writers from unnamed sources cannot prove the use of our Gospels, variation from them would suggest or prove a different origin, and at least it is obvious that quotations which do not agree with our Gospels cannot in any case indicate their existence. We shall in the course of the following pages more fully illustrate this, but such a statement is necessary at the very outset from the too general practice of referring every quotation of historical sayings of Jesus exclusively to our Gospels, as though they were the only sources of such matter which had ever existed.

It is unnecessary to add that, in proportion as we remove from apostolic times without positive evidence of the existence and authenticity of our Gospels, so does the value of their testimony dwindle away. Indeed, requiring as we do clear, direct, and irrefragable evidence of their integrity, authenticity, and historical character, any doubt or obscurity on these points must inevitably be fatal to them as sufficient testimony,—if they could, under any circumstances be considered sufficient testimony,—for miracles and a direct Divine Revelation like ecclesiastical Christianity.

We propose to examine first, the evidence for the three Synoptics, and, then, separately, the testimony regarding the fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER I.

CLEMENT OF ROME—THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS—THE PASTOR OF HERMAS.

THE first work which presents itself for examination is the so-called first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which, together with a second Epistle to the same community, likewise attributed to Clement, is preserved to us in the Codex Alexandrinus, a MS. assigned by the most competent judges to the second half of the fifth, or beginning of the sixth century, in which these Epistles follow the books of the New Testament. The second Epistle, which is evidently not epistolary, but really the fragment of a Homily,¹ although it thus shares with the first the honour of a canonical position in one of the most ancient codices of the New Testament, is not mentioned at all by the earlier fathers who refer to the first;² and Eusebius,³ who is the first writer who mentions it, expresses doubt regarding it, while Jerome⁴ and Photius⁵ state that it was rejected by the ancients. It is now universally regarded as spurious,⁶ and dated about the end of the second

¹ *Anger*, Synopsis Evang., 1852, p. xx. f.; *Baur*, Vorles. chr. Dogmengesch., 1865, i. i. p. 249; *Dodwell*, Dissert. i. in Irenæum, § 29; *Grabe*, Spicil. Patr., 1798, i. p. 268; *Guericke*, H'buch Kirchengesch., 1869, i. p. 145; *Hagenbach*, Kirchengesch., 1869, i. p. 107; *Hilgenfeldt*, Die apost. Vater, 1853, p. 111 f.; *Lange*, Das apost. Zeitalter, 1854, ii. p. 478; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. in d. petr. Schriften, 1835, p. 195; *Westcott*, On the Canon of the N. T., 1866, p. 155 f.

² *Dionysius*, Cor. in Euseb., H. E., iv. 23; *Clemens A.*, Stromata, iv. 17, § 107, i. 7, § 38, v. 12, § 81, vi. 8, § 65; *Origen*, De Princip., ii. 3, 6, in Ezech. 8; *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær., iii. 3; cf. *Cyril*, Hieros., Catech., xviii. 8; *Epiphanius*, Hær., xxvii. 6.

³ H. E., iii. 38, cf. iii. 16.

⁴ De Vir. Illust., § 15.

⁵ Cod., 113.

⁶ *Anger*, Synopsis Ev., p. xx. f.; *Baur*, Vorles. chr. Dogmengesch., i. i. p. 249; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., 1856, p. 681; *Bunsen*, Ignatius v. Ant. u. s. Zeit, 1847, p. 95; *Credner*, Peitragie Einl. in d. bibl. Schr., 1832, i. p. 13 f.; *Donaldson*, Crit. Hist. of Chr. Lit. and Doctr., 1866, i. p. 99 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., 1820, i. p. 129, p. 133 ff.; *Erdeld*, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., 1868, vii. p. 320, anm. 3, p. 355 f.; *Grabe*, Spicil. Patr., i. p. 266 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Allg. Kirchengesch., 1841, i. p. 302; *Guericke*, Gesamtimgesch. d. N. T., 1854, p. 221; *Hefele*, Patr. Ap., p. xxx. f.; *Hilgenfeldt*, Die ap. Vater, p. 111 f.; *Hagenbach*, K. G., i. p. 107; *Horne*, Intr. N. T., ed. Tregelles, 1869, iv. p. 332; *Lange*, Das Apost. Zeitalter, 1854, ii. p. 478; *Ludwig*, Credibility, &c., Works, 1788, ii. p. 28 f.; *Lechler*, Das apost. u. nachap. Zeitalter, 1857, pp. 442, 476; *Lightfoot*, St. Clement of Rome, 1869, p. 14 f.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 195; *Révillé*, Essais de Critiques religieuses, 1860, p. 62; *Ritsch*, Entst. alkath. Kirche, 1857, p. 286; *Schott*, Isagoge Hist. Crit., 1830, p. 25, 3, 27, 3; *Schotten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse betreff. d. Schr. N. T. übers. v. C. Man-ehot, 1867, p. 4; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, 1846, i. p. 448 ff.; *Thiersch*, Versuch z. Herstell. d. hi. l. Standp. Krit. d. neutest. Schr., 1845, p. 440; Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., 1858, p. 347, p. 365; *Volkmar*, Das Evang. Marcions, 1852, p. 177; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 21 f.; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgeschichte, 1854, p. 9.

century,¹ or later.² We shall hereafter see that many other pseudographs were circulated in the name of Clement, to which, however, we need not further allude at present.

There has been much controversy as to the identity of the Clement to whom the first Epistle is attributed. In early days he was supposed to be the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3),³ but this is now generally doubted or abandoned,⁴ and the authenticity of the Epistle has, indeed, been called in question both by earlier and later critics.⁵ It is unnecessary for us to detail the various traditions regarding the supposed writer, but we must point out that the Epistle itself makes no mention of the author's name. It merely purports to be addressed by "The Church of God which sojourns at Rome to the Church of God sojourning at Corinth;" but in the Codex Alexandrinus, the title of "The first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians" is added at the end. Clement of Alexandria calls the supposed writer the "Apostle Clement;"⁶ Origen reports that many also ascribed to him the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews;⁷ and Photius mentions that he was likewise said to be the writer of the Acts of the Apostles.⁸ We know that until a comparatively late date this Epistle was quoted as Holy Scripture,⁹ and was publicly read in the churches at the Sunday meetings of Christians.¹⁰ It has, as we have seen, a place amongst the canonical books of the New Testament in the Codex Alexandrinus, but it did not long retain that position in the canon, for although in the "Apostolic Canons"¹¹ of the sixth or seventh

¹ *Anger*, Synopsis Evang., p. xx. f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., vii. p. 330, ann. 3, p. 357 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Vater, p. 115 ff.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 286 f.; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 4; *Schweyler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 449; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 156.

² *Grabe* assigns it to the middle of the third century. *Spicil. Patr.*, i. p. 269; and *Lardner* thinks that date probable, *Works*, ii. p. 29.

³ *Eucl. H. E.*, iii. 15, 16; *Hieron.*, de Vir. Ill., 15; *Photius*, Bibl. Cod., 113.

⁴ *Davies*, Introd. N. T., 1868, i. p. 201; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Vater, p. 98 f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. d. heil. Schr. N. T., 1864, § 235, p. 234; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, 1844, p. 109; *Schweyler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 125 ff.; cf. *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 20.

⁵ *Ammon*, Leben Jesu, i. p. 33; *S. Aler*, Einl. Baumgarten's Unters. Theol. Streit., ii. p. 15; *Michaelis*, Einl. göttl. Schr. N. B., i. p. 34 f.; *Baur*, Paulus 1866, ii. p. 66 ff.; *Schweyler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 125 ff.; *Volkmar*, Theol. Jahrb., 1856, Der Ursprung u. s. w., p. 64.

⁶ *Nel mēn ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ ἐ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης*, κ. τ. λ. *Strom.*, iv. 17, § 107.

⁷ *Eusebius*, H. E., vi. 25; cf. *Bertholdt*, Einl. Schr. A. u. N. T., 1819, vi. p. 2957 ff.

⁸ *Quaest. Amphil. Gallandi*, Bibl. Patr., 1765, xiii. p. 722; *Credner*, Einl. N. T. 1836, i. p. 271.

⁹ *Iren.*, Adv. I'ar., iv. 3; *Clemens Al.*, *Strom.*, i. c.

¹⁰ *Dionys.*, Cor. in *Euseb.* H. E., iv. 22, iii. 16; *Epiphanius*, Hæc., xxx. 15; *Hieron.*, de Vir. Ill., 15.

¹¹ *Can.* 76 (85); *Bausen*, Anl. Ante-Nic., ii. c. 30; *Gieseler*, K. G., I. p. 357.

century both Epistles appear, yet in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, a work of the ninth century, derived, however, as Credner¹ has demonstrated, from a Syrian catalogue of the fifth century, both Epistles are classed among the Apocrypha.²

Great uncertainty prevails as to the date at which the Epistle was written. Reference is supposed to be made to it by the so-called Epistle of Polycarp,³ but, owing to the probable inauthenticity of that work itself, no weight can be attached to this circumstance. The first certain reference to it is by Hegesippus, in the second half of the second century, mentioned by Eusebius.⁴ Dionysius of Corinth, in a letter ascribed to him addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome, is the first who distinctly mentions the name of Clement as the author of the Epistle.⁵ There is some difference of opinion as to the order of his succession to the Bishopric of Rome. Irenæus⁶ and Eusebius⁷ say that he followed Anacletus, and the latter adds the date of the twelfth year of the reign of Domitian (A.D. 91-92), and that he died nine years after, in the third year of Trajan's reign (A.D. 100).⁸ Internal evidence⁹ shows that the Epistle was written after some persecution of the Roman Church, and the selection lies between the persecution under Nero, which would suggest the date A.D. 64-70, or that under Domitian, which would assign the letter to the end of the first century, or to the beginning of the second. Those who adhere to the view that the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians is the author, maintain that the Epistle was written under Nero.¹⁰ One of their principal arguments for this conclusion is a remark occurring in Chapter xli.: "Not everywhere, brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered up, or the votive offerings, or the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings, but only in Jerusalem. But even there they are not offered in every place, but only at the altar before the Sanctuary, examination of the sacrifice offered being first made by the High Priest and the ministers already mentioned."¹¹ From

¹ Zur. Gesch. des Kanons, 1847, p. 97 ff.

² Credner, *ib.*, p. 122.

³ Gallandi, Bibl. Patr., i. § xiii.; *Hefele*, Patr. Apost., p. xxii.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 296, ann. 3; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 292; *Lumper* Hist. Theol. Crit. de Vita Scriptis. &c., SS. Patrum, 1783, cap. ii. § 1.

⁴ H. E., iii. 16, iv. 22.

⁵ Euseb., H. E., iv. 23.

⁶ Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 3; *Euseb.*, H. E. V. 6.

⁷ H. E., iii. 5, cf. 14.

⁸ H. E., iii. 15, 34.

⁹ Ch. i.

¹⁰ *Le Clerc*, Hist. Ecclési., A.D. 69. N. vi.; *Dodwell*, Dissert. de Rom. Pont. Success., p. 153; *Pearson*, Dissert. de Serie et Success. Prim. Romæ Episc. Opera post., p. 172; *Grabe*, Spicil. Patr., i. p. 254 ff.; *Pagi*, In Crit. Baronii ad Ann. 70. § 3; *Gallandi*, Bibl. Patr., i. p. 19, § ix.; *Hefele*, Patr. Ap., xviii. f.; *Schenkel*, De Eccles. Corinth., 1838, p. 105 f.; *Unthoru*, in *Niedner's Zeitschr. f. Hist. Theol.*, 1851, p. 322; *Wieseler*, Unters. ub. d. Hebraerbrief, i. 1861, p. 3 f.

¹¹ Οὐ πανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσιάαι ἐν δολειχισμοῦ, ἢ εὐχῶν, ἢ περ ἀναργίας καὶ πλημμελείας, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν Ἱερουδαλῆμ μόνῃ. καὶ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ

this it is concluded that the Epistle was written before the destruction of the Temple. It has, however, been shown that Josephus,¹ the author of the "Epistle to Diognetus" (c. 3), and others, long after the Jewish worship of the Temple was at an end, continually speak in the present tense of the Temple worship in Jerusalem; and it is evident, as Cotelier long ago remarked, that this may be done with propriety even in the present day. The argument is therefore recognized to be without value.² Tischendorf, who systematically adopts the earliest possible or impossible dates for all the writings of the first two centuries, decides without stating his reasons, that the grounds for the earlier date, about A.D. 69, as well as for the episcopate of Clement from A.D. 68-77³ are conclusive; but he betrays his more correct impression, by classing Clement, in his index, along with Ignatius and Polycarp, as representatives of the period: "First and second quarters of the second century:"⁴ and in the Prologomena to his New Testament he dates the episcopate of Clement "ab anno 92 usque 102."⁵ The earlier episcopate assigned to him by Hefele upon most insufficient grounds is contradicted by the direct statements of Irenæus, Eusebius, Jerome, and others who give the earliest list of Roman Bishops,⁶ as well as by the internal evidence of the Epistle itself. In Chapter xlv. the writer speaks of those appointed by the apostles to the oversight of the Church, "or afterwards by other notable men, the whole Church consenting . . . who have for a long time been commended by all, &c.,"⁷ which indicates successions of Bishops since apostolic days. In another place (Chap. xlvii.) he refers the Corinthians to the Epistle addressed to them by Paul "in the beginning of the Gospel" (*ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*), and speaks of "the most steadfast and ancient Church of the Corinthians" (*τὴν βεβαιωτάτην καὶ ἀρχαίαν Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίαν*), which would be absurd in an Epistle written about A.D.

θυσιαστήριον, μαρτυροῦσιν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν. Cap. xli.

¹ Antiq., iii. 6. 12; Contra Apion., i. 7, ii. 23.

² Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 84 f.; Nov. Test. extra Can. recept., 1866, p. 87 f.; Cotelier, Patr. Ap., i. p. 140 f.; Wieseler, Hebraebr., i. p. 6; Ekker, Disq. Crit. et Hist. de Clementis Rom. priore ad Cor. ep., 1854, p. 95; Lipsius, de Clementis Rom. epist., &c., 1855, p. 144 f.; Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 24 f.; Schlusmann, Die Clementinen, p. 409, 1.

³ He refers in a note particularly to Hefele, Patr. Ap., 1855, p. 33 ff.

⁴ "Erstes und zweites Viertel des 2. Jahrh. Clemens v. Rom. Ignatius und Polycarp." Wann wurden uns. Evangelien verfasst? 4th Aufl. 1866, p. 20, cf. Uebersicht des Inhalts.

⁵ Nov. Test. Graece, Lips. Sumpt. Ad. Winter, Ed. septima Crit. min. Proleg., p. cxxix.

⁶ Cf. Lipsius, Chronologie der rom. Bischöfe, 1869.

⁷ Τοῦς οὖν κατασθέντας ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἰσχυρίων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκῶσας τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης. . . . μαρτυρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὲρ πάντων, κ. τ. λ. C. xlv.

69. Moreover, an advanced episcopal form of Church Government is indicated throughout the letter, which is quite inconsistent with such a date. The great mass of critics, therefore, have decided against the earlier date of the episcopate of Clement, and assign the composition of the Epistle to the end of the first century (A.D. 95-100).¹ Others, however, date it still later. There is no doubt that the great number of Epistles and other writings falsely circulated in the name of Clement may well excite suspicion as to the authenticity of this Epistle also, which is far from unsupported by internal proofs. Of these, however, we shall only mention one. We have already incidentally remarked that the writer mentions the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, the only instance in which any New Testament writing is referred to by name; but along with the Epistle of the "blessed Paul" (τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου) the author also speaks of the "blessed Judith" (ἡ μακαρία),² and this leads to the inquiry: When was the Book of Judith written? Hitzig, Volkmar, and others contend that it must be dated A.D. 117-118,³ and if this be admitted, it follows of course that an Epistle which already shows acquaintance with the book of Judith cannot have been written before A.D. 120-125 at the earliest, which many, for this and other reasons, affirm to be the case with the Epistle of pseudo-Clement.⁴ Whatever

¹ *Anger*, Synops. Ev., p. xx. f.; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 513, Hebräerbr. i. 91 f., 433; *Runsen*, Ignatius u. s. Zeit., p. 95 f., 103; *Cotelier*, Patr. Ap., i. p. 141; *Dressel*, Patr. Ap., p. xix.; *Davidson* (A.D. 100-125), Introd. N. T., ii. p. 508; *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., 1864, i. p. 110; *Ekker*, Disq. de Clem. Rom., &c., p. 99 f.; *Ewald* (A.D. 90-100) Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 297; *Giesel*, F. G., i. i. p. 123; *Guericke*, H'buch. K. G., i. p. 14' f.; *Guntbert*, Zeitschr. f. d. luth. Theol. 1853, h. 4, 1854, h. 1, 3; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 84; *Jacobson*, Patr. Apost., 1863, i. p. xii. f.; *Küstlin*, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 243 f.; *Lardner*, Credibility &c., Works, ii. p. 24 ff.; *Lange*, Das apost. Zeit., ii. p. 478; *Lechler*, Das apost. u. d. nachapost. Zeitalter, p. 476, p. 387; *Lipsius*, de Clementis Rom., &c., 1853, p. 137 ff.; *Chronologie d. röm. Bischöfe*, p. 149; *Lumpert*, Hist. Theol. Crit. de Vita, &c., SS. Patr., 1783, c. i. ii. §§ 1, 3; *Lightfoot*, St. Clement of Rome, 1869, p. 5; *J. C. M. Laurent*, Clementis Rom. ad Corinth., 1870; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., 1835, p. 77; *Neander*, Kirch. Gesch., 1843, ii. p. 1136; *Reuss*, Gesch. d. heil. Schr. N. T., 1864, § 235, p. 233 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 274; *Réville*, Essais de Critiques Rel., 1860, p. 62 f.; *Schollen*, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 4; *Schliemann*, Die Clementiner 409 f.; *Tholuck*, Hebräerbrief, 3. Aufl., p. 2 ff.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im. ap. Zeit., p. 338 ff.; *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'Hist. Ecclés., 1701, ii. p. 557 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 22, note 2; *Zeller* (beginning of 2nd century), Die Apostelgeschichte, 1854, p. 7.

² c. lv.

³ *Hitzig*, Zur Kritik d. apokr. Bücher d. A. T., Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 240 ff.; *Volkmar*, Theol. Jahrb., 1856, p. 362 ff., 1857, p. 441 ff. H'buch. Einl. in d. Apokr., 1860, i. p. 278; *Gretz*, Gesch. d. Juden von Unterg. d. jüd. Staates u. s. w., 1866, p. 132 ff.; *Baur*, Lehrb. chr. Dogmengeschichte, 1858, p. 82 anm.

⁴ *Volkmar*, Theol. Jahrb., 1856, p. 287 ff., Die Religion Jesu, 1857, p. 391 f., Der Ursprung, p. 64; *Baur*, Lehrb. chr. Dogmengesch., p. 82, Vorles. chr. Dogmengesch., I. i. p. 249; *Schollen*, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 4; *Stap*, Etudes sur les origines du Christianisme, 1866, p. 232; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 125 ff.

date be assigned to it, however, there can be no doubt that the Epistle is much interpolated.¹

It is important to ascertain whether or not this ancient Christian Epistle affords any evidence of the existence of our Synoptic Gospels at the time when it was written. Tischendorf, who is ever ready to claim the slightest resemblance in language as a reference to New Testament writings, states that although this Epistle is rich in quotations from the Old Testament, and that Clement here and there also makes use of passages from Pauline Epistles, he nowhere refers to the Gospels.² This is perfectly true, but several passages occur in this Epistle which are either quotations from Evangelical works different from ours, or derived from tradition,³ and in either case they have a very important bearing upon our inquiry.

The first of these passages occurs in Ch. xiii., and for greater facility of comparison, we shall at once place it both in the Greek and in translation, in juxtaposition with the nearest parallel readings in our Synoptic Gospels; and, as far as may be, we shall in the English version indicate differences existing in the original texts. The passage is introduced thus: "Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, which he spake teaching gentleness and long-suffering. For thus he said:"⁴—

EPISTLE, XIII.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
(α) Be pitiful, that ye may be pitied;	v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful, for they shall obtain pity.	vi. 36. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful.
(β) forgive, that it may be forgiven to you;	vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, &c.	vi. 37. . . . pardon ⁵ and ye shall be pardoned.
(γ) as ye do, so shall it be done to you;	vii. 12. Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.	vi. 31. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

¹ Neander, K. G., 1843, ii. p. 1136; Anger, Synops. Evang., p. xx.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 127; Mosheim, Instit. Hist. Chr. p. 212 ff.; Clericus, in notis edit. Patr. Apost.; Colclier, 1724; Ittig, Bibl. Patr., 1699.

² "Aber nirgends auf die Evangelien." Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 20 f.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 27; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 19; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., 1864, i. p. 148 ff.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 129 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 104; Jacobson, Patr. Ap., i. p. 55, p. 175; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 162; Hist. du Canon des S. Ecritures, 1863, p. 26 f.; Schotten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 5; Tischendorf, Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 20 f.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 8; cf. Lardner, Works, ii. p. 31 f., p. 47.

⁴ . . . μάλιστα μνησθέντες τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν δὲ δάσκαλον ἐπιεικείαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν.

⁵ We use this word not as the best equivalent of ἀπολύετε, but merely to indicate to readers unacquainted with Greek, the use of a different word from the ἀφῆτε of the first Gospel, and from the ἀφίετε of the Epistle, and this system we shall adopt as much as possible throughout.

that the

ent Chris-
Synoptic
rf, who is
uage as a
ough this
, and that
u Pauline
perfectly
are either
or derived
important

for greater
the Greek
est parallel
be, we shall
the original
membering
gentleness

KE.

Be ye there-
ful, as your
is merciful.
pardon
l be pardon-

And as ye
men should
do ye also to
ise.

x.; Schwegler,
ff.; Clericus,

20 f.
aldson, Hist.
129 ff.; Hil-
Reuss, Gesch.
ollen, Die ält-
er, Die Apos-

ως ἐλάληθεν

merely to in-
word from the
ad this system

EPISTLE, XIII.

(δ) as ye give, so shall
it be given to you ;

(ε) as ye judge, so
shall it be judged to you ;

(ζ) as ye show kind-
ness shall kindness be
shown to you ;

(η) with what measure
ye mete, with the same
shall it be measured to
you.

EPISTLE, XIII.

(α) Ἐλεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεη-
θῇτε.

(β) ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ
ὑμῖν.

(γ) ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτως
ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

(δ) ὡς διδοτε, οὕτως
δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

(ε) ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως
κριθήσεται ὑμῖν.

(ζ) ὡς χρηστεύεσθε,
οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

(η) ὃν μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε,
ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται
ὑμῖν.¹

MATTHEW.

vii. 2. For with what
judgment ye judge, ye
shall be judged,

and

with what measure ye
mete, it shall be mea-
sured to you.

MATTHEW.

v. 7 Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεη-
μονες ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεη-
θήσονται.

vi. 14 Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῇτε
τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ
παραπτώματα αὐτῶν,
κ.τ.λ.

vii. 12 Πάντα οὖν ὅσα
ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν
ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕ-
τως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε
αὐτοῖς.

vii. 2 ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρι-
ματι κρίνετε κριθή-
σεσθε,

καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ με-
τρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

LUKE.

vi. 38. . . . give, and
it shall be given to you.

vi. 37. Judge not,
and ye shall not be
judged.

vi. 38. For with the
same measure that ye
mete withal, it shall be
measured to you again.

LUKE.

vi. 36 γίνεσθε οὐκ
οικτιρμονες, κ.τ.λ.

vi. 37 ἀπολύετε, καὶ
ἀπολυθήσεσθε.

vi. 31 καὶ καθὼς,
θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν
ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ
ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς
ὁμοίως.

vi. 38 διδοτε, καὶ
δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

vi. 37 καὶ μὴ κρίνετε
καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθήτε.

vi. 38 τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ
μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε ἀντι-
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Of course it is understood that, although for convenience of com-
parison we have broken up this quotation into these phrases, it is
quite continuous in the Epistle. It must be evident to any one
who carefully examines the parallel passages, that "the words of
the Lord Jesus" in the Epistle cannot have been derived from
our Gospels. Not only is there no similar consecutive discourse
in them, but the scattered phrases which are pointed out as pre-
senting superficial similarity with the quotation are markedly
different both in thought and language. In it, as in the "beati-
tudes" of the "Sermon on the Mount" in the first Gospel, the
construction is peculiar and continuous: "Do this in
order that (ἵνα)"; or, "As (ὡς) ye do
so (οὕτως)". The theory of a combination

¹ Cf. Mark iv. 24. Cf. Hom. Clem. xviii. 16.

of passages from memory, which is usually advanced to explain such quotations, cannot serve here, for thoughts and expressions occur in the passage in the Epistle which have no parallel at all in our Gospels, and such dismembered phrases as can be collected from our first and third Synoptics, for comparison with it, follow the course of the quotation in the ensuing order: Matt. v. 7, vi. 14, part of vii. 12, phrase without parallel, first part of vii. 2, phrase without parallel, last part of vii. 2; or, Luke vi. 36, last phrase of vi. 37, vi. 31, first phrase of vi. 38, first phrase of vi. 37, phrase without parallel, last phrase of vi. 38.

The only question with regard to this passage, therefore, is whether the writer quotes from an unknown written source or from tradition. He certainly merely professes to repeat "words of the Lord Jesus," and does not definitely indicate a written record, but it is much more probable from the context, that he quotes from a gospel now no longer extant than that he derives this teaching from oral tradition. He introduces the quotation not only with a remark implying a well known record: "Remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which he spake, teaching, &c." but he reiterates: "For *thus* he said," in a way suggesting careful and precise quotation of the very words; and he adds at the end: "By this injunction and by these instructions let us establish ourselves, that we may walk in obedience to his holy words, thinking humbly of ourselves."¹ It seems impossible that the writer should so markedly have indicated a precise quotation of words of Jesus, and should so emphatically have commended them as the rule of life to the Corinthians, had these precepts been mere floating tradition, until then unstamped with written permanence. The phrase: "As ye show kindness (*χρηστεύεσθε*)," &c., which is nowhere found in our Gospels, recalls an expression quoted by Justin Martyr from a Gospel different from ours, and frequently repeated by him in the same form: "Be ye kind and merciful (*χρηστοὶ καὶ ὀκτίρμονοι*) as your Father also is kind (*χρηστός*) and merciful."² In the very next chapter of the Epistle a similar reference again occurs: "Let us be kind to each other (*χρηστευσώμεθα αὐτοῖς*) according to the mercy and benignity of our Creator."³ Without, however, going more minutely into this question, it is certain from its essential variations in language, thought and order, that the passage in the Epistle was not compiled from our Gospels, and we shall presently see that this conclusion is confirmed by the fact, that some of the expressions which are foreign

¹ Ταύτη τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασι τοῦτοις στήρίζωμεν ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς τὸ πορεύεσθαι ὑπηρετοῦν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ταπεινοφρονοῦντες. c. xiii.

² Apol., i. 15, and again twice in Dial. 96.

³ c. xiv.

to our Gospels are elsewhere quoted by other Fathers, and there is reason to believe that these "words of the Lord Jesus" were not derived from tradition but from a written source different from our Gospels.¹ When the great difference which exists between the parallel passages in the first and third Synoptics, and still more between these and the second, is considered, it is easy to understand that other Gospels, may have contained a version differing as much from them as they do from each other.

We likewise subjoin the next passage to which we must refer, with the nearest parallels in our Synoptics. We may explain that the writer of the Epistle is rebuking the Corinthians for strifes and divisions amongst them, and for forgetting that they "are members one of another," and he continues: "Remember the words of our Lord Jesus; for he said:"²

EPISTLE, XLVI.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
Woe to that man ;	xxvi. 24. Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is delivered up ;	xvii. 1 . . but woe . . through whom they (offences) come.
(it were) well for him if he had not been born than that he should offend one of my elect ;	(it were) well for him if that man had not been born.	
(it were) better for him (that) a millstone should be attached (to him) and he should be drowned in the sea, than that he should offend one of my little ones.	xviii. 6. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were profitable for him that a great millstone were suspended upon his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.	xvii. 2. It were advantageous for him that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast in the sea, than that he offend one of these little ones.

Mark xiv. 21 . . . but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is delivered up, (it were) well for him if that man had not been born . . . ix. 42. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it is well for him rather that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he thrown in the sea.

EPISTLE, XLVI.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.
Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐνείκῳ.	XXVI. 24 οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ διὸ οὐ παραδίδοται	XVII. 1 οὐαὶ δὲ διὸ οὐ ἔρχεται. (τὰ δὲ κἀν-ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου δαλά) ³

¹ Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Vater, p. 103 f.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 8 f., Theol. Jahrb., 1848, p. 530; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 27, anm. 1; Eichorn, Einl. N. T. i., p. 129 ff.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 5; Ekker, Disq. de Clem. R., p. 60; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 148 f.; Jacobson, Zatr. Ap., i. p. 55, i. c., &c., &c.

² Μνησθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, εἶπε γάρ. C. xlvii.

³ The Cod. Sin. and Cod. D. (Bezae,) insert πλὴν before οἱ αὐ.

EPISTLE, XLVI.

καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ
ἐγεννήθη.

ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν
μου σκανδαλίσει·

κρίττον ἦν αὐτῷ
περιτεθεῖναι μύλον,

καὶ καταποντισθῆναι

εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν,
ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν
μου σκανδαλίσει.

MATTHEW.

καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ
ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ἐκεῖνος. XVIII. 6 δὲ δ'

ἂν σκανδαλίῃ ἕνα
τῶν μικρῶν τούτων
τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς
ἐμὲ, θυμῶν αὐτῷ
ἕνα κρεσσῶν μύλος
ὀνικός περὶ τὸν τρά-
χηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατα-
ποντισθῇ

ἐν τῷ πελάγῃ
τῆς θαλάσσης.

LUKE.

XVII. 2

Λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ
μύλος ὀνικός περικει-
ται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐρρίπτει

εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν,
ἢ ἕνα σκανδαλίῃ ἕνα
τῶν μικρῶν τούτων.

This quotation is clearly not from our Gospels, but is derived from a different written source. The writer would scarcely refer the Corinthians to such words of Jesus if they were merely traditional. The slightest comparison of the passage with our Gospels is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind that it is neither a combination of texts, nor a quotation from memory. The language throughout is markedly different, and to present even a superficial parallel, it is necessary to take a fragment of the discourse of Jesus at the Last Supper regarding the traitor who should deliver him up (Matth. xxvi. 24), and join it to a fragment of his remarks in connection with the little child whom he set in the midst (xviii. 6). The parallel passage in Luke has not the opening words of the passage in the Epistle at all, and the portion which it contains (xvii. 2), is separated from the context in which it stands in the first Gospel, and which explains its meaning. If we contrast the parallel passages in the three Synoptics, their differences of context are very suggestive, and without referring to their numerous and important variations in detail, the confusion amongst them is evidence of very varying tradition.³ This alone would make the existence of another form like that quoted in the Epistle before us more than probable. We are not, however, without other indications of such a reading as that of our quotation. Tertullian states that Marcion's Gospel read the parallel passage to the opening of Luke xvii. as follows: "Conversus ibidem ad discipulos, vae dicit auctori scandalorum, *expedisse ei, si natus non fuisset*, aut si molino saxo ad collum deligato precipitatus esset in profundum," &c.⁴ This gives the phrase, "it were better for him if he had not been born," (Λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ

¹ Cod. Sin. and D. read *λίθος μυλινός* instead of *μύλος*.

² The Vatican (B.) and Sinaitic, as well as most of the other, Codices put *ἕνα* at the end of the phrase.

³ Cf. Mat. xviii. 1-8; Mark ix. 33-43; Luke ix. 46-48, 49-50, xvii. 1-3.

⁴ Tertullian, Adv. Marc. iv. 35.

ἐγενήθη ἡ μίλος ὀνικός περὶ τὸν τράχλον αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ.) in the same connection as in the Epistle, with some variation only of language, and this reading is met with in several codices.¹

Tischendorf, in a note to his statement that Clement nowhere refers to the Gospels, quotes the passage we are now considering, the only one to which he alludes, and says: "These words are expressly cited as 'words of Jesus our Lord;' but they denote much more oral apostolic tradition than a use of the parallel passages in Matthew (xxvi. 24, xviii. 6) and Luke (xvii. 2)."² It is now, of course, impossible to determine finally whether the passage was actually derived from tradition or from a written source, different from our Gospels, but in either case the fact is, that the Epistle not only does not afford the slightest evidence for the existence of any of our Gospels, but from only making use of tradition or an apocryphal work as the source of information regarding words of Jesus, it is decidedly opposed to the pretensions made on behalf of the Synoptics.

Before passing on, we may, in the briefest way possible, refer to one or two other passages, with the view of further illustrating the character of the quotations in this Epistle. There are many passages cited which are not found in the Old Testament, and others which have no parallels in the New. At the beginning of the very chapter in which the words which we have just been considering occur, there is the following quotation: "It is written: Cleave to the holy, for they who cleave to them shall be made holy,"³ the source of which is unknown. In a previous chapter the writer says: "And our Apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there will be contention regarding the name, (ὄνοματος, office, dignity?) of the episcopate."⁴ What was the writer's authority for this statement? We find Justin Martyr quoting, as an express prediction of Jesus: "There shall be schisms and heresies,"⁵ which is not contained in our gospels, but evidently

¹ Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter p. 106; Die Evv. Justins, u. s. w., 1850, p. 423; Hahn, Das Evang. Marcion's u. s. w., 1823, p. 188; Thilo, Cod. Apoc. Novi Test., 1832, i. p. 456; Volkmar, Das Ev. Marcion's, 1852, p. 109; Ritschl, Das Ev. Marcion's 1846, p. 72.

² Diese Worte werden ausdrücklich als "Worte Jesu unsers Herrn," angeführt; aber sie verrathen weit mehr die mündliche apostolische Ueberlieferung als einen Gebrauch von den vergleichbaren Stellen bei Matthäus (26, 24; 18, 6), und Lukas (17, 2). Wann wurden, u. s. w. p. 21, anm. 2.

³ Γέγραπται γάρ: "Κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται." c. xlv., cf. c. xxx. A similar expression occurs in Clement of Alexandria, Strom. v. 8 § 53.

⁴ Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐγνώσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἐρὶς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. C. xlv. cf. xlv., xlv.

⁵ Ἔδονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρέσεις. Dial. c. Tryph. 35, cf. 51.

derived from an uncanonical source,¹ a fact rendered more apparent by the occurrence of a similar passage in the Clementine Homilies, still more closely bearing upon our Epistle: "For there shall be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, heresies, desires for supremacy."² Hegesippus also speaks in a similar way: "From these came the false Christs, false prophets, false apostles who divided the unity of the Church."³ As Hegesippus, and in all probability Justin Martyr, and the author of the Clementine made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or to Peter, it is almost certain that these Gospels contained passages to which the words of the Epistle may refer.⁴ It may be well to point out that the author also cites a passage from the Fourth Book of Ezra, ii. 16: "And I shall remember the good day, and I shall raise you from your tombs."⁵ Ezra reads: "Et resuscitabo mortuos de locis suis et de monumentis educam illos," &c. The first part of the quotation in the Epistle, of which we have only given the latter clause above, is taken from Isaiah xxvi. 20, but there can be no doubt that the above is from this apocryphal book,⁷ which, as we shall see, was much used in the early Church.

2.

We now turn to the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," another interesting relic of the early Church, many points in whose history have considerable analogy with that of the Epistle of pseudo-Clement. The letter itself bears no author's name, is not dated from any place, and is not addressed to any special community. Towards the end of the second century, however, tradition began to ascribe it to Barnabas, the companion of Paul.⁸ The first writer who mentions it is Clement of Alexandria, who calls its author several times the "Apostle Barnabas;"⁹ and Eusebius says that he

¹ *Semii n*, Die apost. Denkwürdigk. d. Märt. Justinus, 1848, p. 390 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justins, p. 232 f.; Die ap. Väter, p. 106; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 246, p. 318 f.

² Ἐσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἰρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι Clem. Hom. xvi. 21; cf. Constit. Apost., vi. 13; Clem. Recog. iv. 34.

³ Ἀπὸ τούτων ψευδοχριστοὶ, ψευδοπροφῆται, ψευδαπόστολοι, οἵτινες ἐμέρισαν τὴν ἑνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, κ. τ. λ. Eusebius, H. E., iv. 22.

⁴ See other instances in Chapters xvii., xxiii., xxvi., xxx., xlii., xlvii., &c.

⁵ II. Eadras of the English authorised Apocrypha.

⁶ καὶ μνησθήσομαι ἡμερᾶς ἀγαθῆς, καὶ ἀναστήσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν θηκῶν ὑμῶν. c. L.

⁷ Jacobson, Patr. Ap., i. p. 189; Cotelier, Patr. Ap. 1. c.; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 147.

⁸ Acts iv. 35, xi. 22 f., 30, xii., 25, &c.

⁹ Stromata ii., 6, § 31, 7, § 35, 20, § 116, v. 10, § 64, cf. 15, § 67, 18, § 84, v. § 52.

gave an account of it in one of his works now no longer extant.¹ Origen also refers to it, calling it a "Catholic Epistle," and quoting it as Scripture.² We have already seen in the case of the Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome, and, as we proceed, we shall become only too familiar with the fact, the singular facility with which, in the total absence of critical discrimination, spurious writings were ascribed by the Fathers to Apostles and their followers. In many cases such writings were deliberately inscribed with names well known in the Church, but both in the case of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and the letter we are now considering, no such pious fraud was attempted, nor was it necessary. Credulous piety, which attributed writings to every Apostle, and even to Jesus himself, soon found authors for each anonymous work of an edifying character. To Barnabas, the friend of Paul, not only this Epistle was referred, but he was also reported by Tertullian and others to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews;³ and an apocryphal "Gospel according to Barnabas," said to have had close affinity with our first Synoptic, is condemned along with many others in the decretal of Gelasius.⁴ Eusebius, however, classes the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas" amongst the spurious books (*ἐν τοῖς νόθοις*),⁵ and elsewhere also speaks of it asuncanonical.⁶ Jerome mentions it as read amongst apocryphal writings.⁷ Had the Epistle been seriously regarded as a work of the "Apostle" Barnabas, it could scarcely have failed to attain canonical rank. That it was highly valued by the early Church is shown by the fact that it stands, along with the Pastor of Hermas, after the Canonical books of the New Testament in the Codex Sinaiticus, which is probably the most ancient MS. of them now known. In the earlier days of criticism, some writers, without much question, adopted the traditional view as to the authorship of the Epistle,⁸ but the great mass of critics are now agreed in asserting

¹ H. E., vi. 14, cf. 13.

² γέγραπται δὲ ἐν τῇ Βαρνάβα καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ κ. τ. λ. *Contra Cels.*, 63, cf. *De Princip.*, iii. 2, § 4.

³ *De Pudic.* § 20; *Hieron.*, *De vir.* ill. 5. Many modern writers have supported the tradition. Cf. *Credner*, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 175 ff.; *Ritschl*, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1865, p. 89; *Thiersch*, *Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 199 ff.; *Ullmann*, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1828, p. 377 ff.; *Wieseler*, *Unters. üb. d. Hebräerbrief*, 1861, i. p. 32 ff.

⁴ *Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, in *Credner*, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, 1847, p. 215; cf. *Fabricius*, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, i. p. 341; *Grabe*, *Spicil. Patr.*, i. p. 303.

⁵ H. E., iii. 25.

⁶ H. E., vi. 14 cf. 13.

⁷ *Hieron.*, *De vir.* ill. 6, *Comment. in Ezech.*, xliii. 19.

⁸ *Heuke*, *De Epist. quæ Barnab. tribuitur, authenticæ*, 1827; *Gallandi*, *Vet. Patr. Biblioth.*, 1765, i. p. xxix. f.; *Laribier*, *Credibility, &c.*, *Works*, ii. p. 13; *Du Pin*, *Bibl. des auteurs*, &c. i.; *Schenkel* considered parts to be by Barnabas, with much added by others, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1837, p. 652 ff.; *Pearson*, *Care*, and others, maintained the authenticity.

that the composition, which itself is perfectly anonymous, cannot be attributed to Barnabas the friend and fellow-worker of Paul.¹ Those who maintain the former opinion date the Epistle about A.D. 70—73, or even earlier, but this is scarcely the view of any living critic. There are many indications in the Epistle which render such a date impossible, but we do not propose to go into the argument minutely, for it is generally admitted that, whilst there is a clear limit further back than which the Epistle cannot be set,² there is little or no certainty how far into the second century its composition may not reasonably be advanced. Critics are divided upon the point; a few are disposed to date the Epistle about the end of the first century;³ others at the beginning of the second century;⁴ while a still greater number assign it to the reign of Adrian (A.D. 117—138);⁵ and others, not without reason,

¹ *Anger*, Synops. Ev., p. xx.; *Basnage*, Ann. Pol. Eccles., A.D. 50, n. 52 f.; *Baur*, Lehrb. Dogmengesch., p. 30 f., ann. Vorles. chr. Dogmengesch., 1., i. p. 248 f.; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., 1866, pp. 550, 681; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, 1866, viii. p. 520; *Credner*, Gesch., N. T. Kanon, p. 119; *Cotelier*, Patr. Ap., 1724, i. p. 5 f.; *R. Ceillier*, Hist. gén. des auteurs sacrés et Ecclés., i. p. 498 ff.; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., i. p. 218; *Donaldson*, Hist., Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 204 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 156 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 302; *Guericke*, H'buch K. G., i. p. 143; *Hase*, Lehrb. K. G., 1848, p. 36 ff.; *Hagenbach*, K. G., i. p. 106, an. i.; *Hejels*, Das Sendschreiben des Ap. Barnabas, 1840, Patr. Ap. p. vii. ff.; *Horne*, Introd. N. T. ed. *Tregelles*, 1869, iv. p. 333; *Ittig*, Select. Cap. Hist. Eccles., Sec. 1. i. p. 20; *Lechler*, Das ap. n. nachap. Zeitalter, p. 482 f.; *Lumpfer*, Hist. theol. crit. de vita, &c., SS. Patr., 1783, i. p. 149 f.; *Le Moigne*, Varia Sacra, i. proleg. *Mosheim*, Instit. hist. Christ., p. 161; *Ménard*, Praef. ad Epist. S. Barnab. cur. L. Dacherio, 1645, Clericus, Patr. Ap. 1724, i. p. 8 ff.; *Müller*, Erkl. d. Barnabasbr., p. 16 ff.; *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1398 ff.; *Mynster*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1829, ii. p. 323; *Neander*, K. G., 1843, ii. p. 1136; *Natalis*, Hist., Eccles., Sec. 1., c. 12, § 8; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 254, p. 294; *Semler*, Hist. Einl. in Baumgarten's Unters. theol. Streitigk., 1763, ii. p. 2 ff.; *Tillemont*, Mémoires, &c., i. p. 414; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 91; *Ullmann*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., i. p. 381; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 37 f.; *Winer*, Bibl. Realwörterb. s. v. Barnabas. &c., &c., &c.

² Chap. xvi.

³ *Fichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 129; *Reuss*, Gesch. h. Schr. N. T. § 234, p. 232 f., cf. Hist. de la Théol. Chrétienne au Siècle Apost., 1864, ii. p. 306; *Scholten*, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 76; *Riggenbach*, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Joh., 1866, p. 89; *Weizsäcker*, Zur Krit. d. Barnabasbr.

⁴ *Ewald*, Die Johan. Schriften, 1862, ii. p. 384; Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 156 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 36 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 482; *Lücke*, Einl. in d. Offenb. Johan., 1852, i. p. 318; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 55, p. 294; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 334; *Tischendorf* (A.D. 90—110), Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 92; *Ullmann*, Stud. u. Krit., i. p. 381; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 38; *Winer*, Bibl. Realwörterb. s. v. Barnabas; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 7.

⁵ *Anger*, Synops. Ev., p. xx.; *Baur*, Lehrb. Dogmengesch., p. 80 f., ann.; Vorles. chr. Dogmengesch., 1. i. p. 248 f.; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 522; *Cotelier*, Patr. Ap., p. 5 ff.; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., i. pp. 268, 513; *Hejels*, Patr. Ap. Proleg., p. vii. ff.; Sendschr. d. Ap. Barn., p. 141 f.; *Horne* (first quarter of second century) Introd. N. T. ed. *Tregelles*, 1869, iv. p. 333; *Köstlin*, Der Ursprung synopt. Evv., p. 121; *Keim* (A.D. 120—130), Jesu v. Nazara, 1867, i. p. 143; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexicon, s. v. Barnabas, 1869, i. p. 372; *Müller*, Erkl.

consider that it exhibits marks of a still later period.¹ There can be no doubt that it is more or less interpolated.² Until the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., a portion of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was only known through an ancient Latin version, the first four and a half chapters of the Greek having been lost. The Greek text, however, is now complete, although often very corrupt. The author quotes largely from the Old Testament, and also from apocryphal works.³ He nowhere mentions any book or writer of the New Testament, and with one asserted exception, which we shall presently examine, he quotes no passage agreeing with our Gospels. We shall refer to these, commencing at once with the most important.

In the ancient Latin translation of the Epistle, the only form, as we have just said, in which until the discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus the first four and a half chapters were extant, the following passage occurs: "Adtendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati pauci electi inveniamur."⁴ "Let us therefore, beware lest we should be found, as it is written: Many are called, few are chosen." These words are found in our first Gospel (xxii. 14), and as the formula by which they are here introduced—"it is written," is generally understood to indicate a quotation from Holy Scripture, it was and is argued by some that here we have a passage from one of our Gospels quoted in a manner which shows that, at the time the Epistle of Barnabas was written, the "Gospel according to Matthew was already considered Holy Scripture."⁵ Whilst this portion of the text existed only in the Latin version, it was argued that the "sicut scriptum est," at least, must be an interpolation, and in any case that it could not be deliberately applied, at that date, to a passage in any writings of the New Testament. On the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., however, the words were found in the Greek text in that Codex: προσέχωμεν, μήποτε, ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὑρεθώμεν. The question, therefore, is so far modified that, however much we may suspect the Greek text of interpolation, it must be accepted as the basis of discussion that this passage, whatever its value, exists in the oldest, and indeed only (and this point must not be forgotten) complete MS. of the Greek Epistle.

¹ Barnabasbr., 1869, pp. 18, 109; Neander, K. G., 1843, p. 1133 ff.; Schneckenburger, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1859, p. 294; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 240 f.; Volkmar, Die Religion Jesu, 1857, p. 392 ff.; Hübner Einl. in. d. Apoc., 1863, ii., pp. 290, 376 f.; Der Ursprung, p. 143 ff.; Die Evangelien, 1870, p. 631; Wieseler, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1870, p. 289.

² Donaldson (later than the first quarter, but before end of second century), Hist. of Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 220 ff.

³ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 221 ff.; Schenkel, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1837, p. 652 ff.

⁴ Cf. chap. ii., iv., vi., ix., xii., xvi., &c.

⁵ Tischendorf, Wasm wurden, u. s. w., p. 92 ff.

⁶ Ch. iv.

Now with regard to the value of the expression "it is written," it may be remarked that in no case could its use in the Epistle of Barnabas indicate more than individual opinion, and it could not, for reasons to be presently given, be considered to represent the decision of the Church. In the very same chapter in which the formula is used in connection with the passage we are considering, it is also employed to introduce a quotation from the Book of Enoch,¹ *περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, ὡς Ἐνὼχ λέγει*, and elsewhere (c. xii.) he quotes from another apocryphal book² as one of the prophets.³ Again, he refers to the Cross of Christ in another prophet saying: "And when shall these things come to pass? and the Lord saith: When, &c.

ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγουσι λέγει Κύριος κ.τ.λ." He also quotes (ch. vi.) the apocryphal "Book of Wisdom" as Holy Scripture, and in like manner several other unknown works. When it is remembered that the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, the Pastor of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas itself, and many other apocryphal works have been quoted by the Fathers as Holy Scripture, the distinctive value of such an expression may be understood. With this passing remark, however, we proceed to say that this supposed quotation from Matthew as Holy Scripture, by proving too much, absolutely destroys its value as evidence. The generality of competent and impartial critics are agreed, that it is impossible to entertain the idea that one of our Gospels could have held the rank of Holy Scripture at the date of this Epistle, seeing that, for more than half a century after, the sharpest line was drawn between the writings of the Old Testament and of the New, and the former alone quoted as, or accorded the consideration of, Holy Scripture.⁴ If this were actually a quotation from our first Gospel, already in the position of Holy Scripture, it would indeed be astonishing that

¹ Enoch, lxxxix. 61 f., xc. 17. This book is again quoted in ch. xvi.

² Cf. IV Ezra iv. 33, v. 5.

³ Hilgenfeld, Nov. Test. extra Can. receptum, Fasc. ii. p. 75; Die Proph. Ezra und Daniel, 1863, p. 70; Die ap. Väter, p. 47; Wiesler, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1870, p. 290; Müller, Erkl. d. Barnabasbriefes, p. 272; Le Moigne, Varia Sacra, ii. p. 836; Hefele, Sendschr. d. Barnab., p. 225; Cotelier, Patr., Ap., p. 38; Volkmar, H'buch in d. Apocr., ii. p. 24; Holtzmann, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1871, p. 340; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 159, ann. 1; Riggenbach, Zeugn. Ev. Joh., p. 87; Lücke, Einl. Offenb. Joh., p. 151 f.; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 244 f. Those of the above critics who do not admit that the quotation is absolutely taken from IV. Ezra, at least fully recognize it to be from an apocryphal source, which is sufficient for our present argument.

⁴ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 28; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. p. 513; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 246; Dressel, Patr. Ap., p. 7; Eichhorn, Eial. N. T., i. p. 127; Orelli, Selecta Patr., 1820, p. 5 f.; Rumpf, N. Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 364; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 10 ff.; Weiss, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1864, p. 145; Weizsäcker, Zur Kr. d. Barnabasbr., p. 34 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 119, H'buch Einl. Apocr., ii. p. 590 f.

the Epistle, putting out of the question other Christian writings for half a century after it, teeming as it does with extracts from the Old Testament, and from known, and unknown, apocryphal works, should thus limit its use of the Gospel to a few words, totally neglecting the rich store which it contains, and quoting, on the other hand, words of Jesus not recorded at all in any of our Synoptics. It is impossible that, if the author of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was acquainted with any of our Gospels, and considered it an inspired and canonical work, he could have neglected it in such a manner. The peculiarity of the quotation which he is supposed to make, which we shall presently point out, renders such limitation to it doubly singular upon any such hypothesis. The unreasonable nature of the assertion, however, will become more apparent as we proceed with our examination, and perceive that all the early writers avoid our Gospels, if they knew them at all, and systematically make use of other works, and that the inference that Matthew was considered Holy Scripture, therefore, rests solely upon this quotation of half a dozen words.

The application of such a formula to a supposed quotation from one of our Gospels, in so isolated an instance, led to the belief that, even if the passage were taken from our first Synoptic, the author of the Epistle in quoting it laboured under the impression that it was derived from some prophetic book.¹ We daily see how difficult it is to trace the source even of the most familiar quotations. Instances of such confusion of memory are frequent in the writings of the Fathers, and many can be pointed out in the New Testament itself. For instance, in Matt. xxvii. 9 f. the passage from Zechariah xi. 12-13 is attributed to Jeremiah; in Mark i. 2, a quotation from Malachi iii. 1 is ascribed to Isaiah. In 1 Corinthians ii. 9, a passage is quoted as Holy Scripture which is not found in the Old Testament at all, but which is taken, as Origen and Jerome state, from an apocryphal work, "The Revelation of Elias,"² and the passage is similarly quoted by the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (xxxiv). Then in what prophet did the author of the first Gospel find the words (xiii. 35): "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet,³ saying: I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world?"

¹ Orelli, *Selecta Patr.*, p.; Weissäcker, *Zur Kr. Barnabasbr.*, p. 34 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 10 f.; Weiss, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1864, p. 145; Hilgenfeld, *Die Prophet. Ezra u. Daniel*, p. 70; Volkmar, *H'buch Einl. Apocr.*, ii., p. 290 f.

² Origen, *Tract. xxxv.*, § 17 in Matth.; Hieron. ad Isaia, lxiv., *Epist. ci.*; cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr.*, N. T., i. p. 342*; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 102; Jacobson, *Patr. Ap.*, i. p. 126 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 11.

³ In the Cod. Sinaiticus a later hand has here inserted "Isaiah."

Orelli,¹ afterwards followed by many others,² suggested that the quotation was probably intended for one in IV Ezra viii. 3: "Nam multi creati sunt, pauci autem salvabuntur."³ "For many are created, but few shall be saved." Bretschneider proposed as an emendation of the passage in Ezra the substitution of "*vocati*" for "*creati*," but, however plausible, his argument did not meet with much favour.⁴ Along with this passage was also suggested a similar expression in IV Ezra ix. 15: "Plures sunt qui pereunt, quam qui salvabuntur." "There are more who perish than who shall be saved."⁵ The Greek of the three passages may read as follows:—

Matt. xxii. 14.	Πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
Ep. Bar. iv.	Πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.
Ezra, viii. 3	Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐγεννήθησαν, ὀλίγοι δὲ σωθήσονται.

The. In be no doubt that the sense of the reading in IV. Ezra is exactly that of the Epistle, and for the rest, we must not forget that the original Greek⁶ is lost, and that we are wholly dependent on the translations and versions extant, regarding whose numerous variations and great corruption there are no differences of opinion. We have, therefore, no certainty as to the Greek text which the authors of the Epistle and of the first Gospel may have had before them, and the sense of the passage with its contents must, therefore, have all the greater weight.

On examining the passage as it occurs in our first Synoptic, we are at the very outset struck by the singular fact, that this short saying appears twice in that Gospel with a different context, and in each case without any propriety of application to what precedes it, whilst it is not found at all in either of the other two Synoptics. The first time we meet with it is at the close of the parable of the labourers in the vineyard.⁷ The householder engages the labourers at different hours of the day, and pays those who had worked but one hour the same wages as those who had borne the burden and heat of the day, and the reflection at the close is, xx.

¹ Selecta Patr., p. 5.

² Hilgenfeldt, Die Proph. Ezra u. Dan., p. 61 f., cf. Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1868, p. 32; Strauss, Das Leben Jesu, Aufl. 5, p. 55; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 11; cf. Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 116; Hübner Einl. Apocr., ii. p. 105; Weissäcker, Zur. Kr. Barnabasbr., p. 34.

³ Cf. Volkmar, Hübner Einl. Apocr. ii. p. 105.

⁴ Cf. Müller, Erkl. d. Barnabasbr., p. 127; Lücke, Einl. Offenb. Joh., 1852, p. 153 f.

⁵ We might also point to the verse x. 97, "For thou art blessed above many, and art called near to the Most High, and so are but few." "Tu enim beatus es pra multis, et vocatus es apud Altissimum, sicut et pauci."

⁶ Volkmar, Hübner Einl. Apocr., ii. p. 279, p. 317 ff.; Fritzsche, Exeg. Hübner, i. p. 10 ff.; Hilgenfeldt, Die Proph. Ezra u. Dan., p. 8 f.

⁷ Matt. xx. v—16.

16: "Thus the last shall be first and the first last; for many are called but few chosen." It is perfectly evident that neither of these sayings, but especially not that with which we are concerned, has any connection with the parable at all. There is no question of many or few, or of selection or rejection; all the labourers are engaged and paid alike. If there be a moral at all to the parable, it is the justification of the master: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" It is impossible to imagine a saying more irrelevant to its context than "many are called but few chosen," in such a place. The passage occurs again (xxii. 14) in connection with the parable of the king who made a marriage for his son. The guests who are at first invited refuse to come, and are destroyed by the king's armies; but the wedding is nevertheless "furnished with guests" by gathering together as many as are found in the highways. A new episode commences when the king came in to see the guests (v. 11). He observes a man there who has not on a wedding garment, and he desires the servants to (v. 13) "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness without," where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth;" and then comes our passage (v. 14): "For many are called but few chosen." Now, whether applied to the first or to the latter part of the parable, the saying is irrelevant. The guests first called were in fact chosen as much as the last, but themselves refused to come, and of all those who, being "called" from the highways and byways, ultimately furnished the wedding with guests in their stead, only one was rejected. It is clear that the facts here distinctly contradict the moral that "few are chosen." In both places the saying is, as it were, "dragged in by the ear." On examination, however, we find that the oldest MSS. of the New Testament omit the sentence from Matthew xx. 16. It is neither found in the Sinaitic nor Vatican codices, and whilst it has not the support of the Codex Alexandrinus, which is defective at the part, nor of the Dublin rescript (z), which omits it, many other MSS. are also without it. The total irrelevancy of the saying to its context, its omission by the oldest authorities from Matthew xx. 16, where it appears in later MSS., and its total absence from both of the other Gospels, must at once strike everyone as peculiar, and as very unfortunate, to say the least of it, for those who make extreme assertions with regard to its supposed quotation by the Epistle of Barnabas. Weizäcker, with great probability, suggests that in this passage we have merely a well-known proverb, which the author of the first gospel has introduced

¹ This is not the place to criticize the expectation of finding a wedding garment on a guest hurried in from highways and byways, or the punishment inflicted for such an offence, as questions affecting the character of the parable.

into his work from some uncanonical or other source, and placed in the mouth of Jesus.¹ Certainly under the circumstances it can scarcely be maintained in its present context as a historical saying of Jesus. Ewald, who naturally omits it from Matthew xx. 16, ascribes the parable xx. 1—46 as well as that xxii. 1—14, in which it stands, originally to the Spruchsammlung² or collection of discourses, out of which, with intermediate works, he considers that our first Gospel was composed.³ However, this may be, there is, it seems to us, every reason for believing that it was not originally a part of these parables, and that it is not in that sense historical; and there is, therefore, no ground for asserting that it may not either have been derived from the original text of IV Ezra by the Gospel, or by both from some older works from which also it may have come into the "Epistle of Barnabas."

In the IV. Book of Ezra the saying is perfectly in keeping with its context, and, as we shall see, with the context of the Epistle. In IV. Ezra vii. the angel discourses with Ezra of God's dealings with man, and more especially with Israel, and of the difficulty of securing salvation. He speaks in parables (v. 3—5). The sea is wide and deep, but if the entrance to it be narrow like a river, a man must go through the narrow to the wide (v. 6—9). A city built in broad plain is full of good things, but can only be approached by one narrow path, by which only one man can pass at a time, beset by dangers on either hand. If this city be given to a man for his inheritance, must he not pass the danger set before it in order to obtain the inheritance? v. 10, "And I said: It is so Lord." Then said he unto me: "Even so is Israel's portion." And then he goes on to say that God made the world for Israel, and to describe the consequences of Adam's fall, laying down in various forms the maxim that man must *labour* to enter into the inheritance. v. 20, "For there be many that perish in this life, because they despise the law of God that is set before them," and deny his covenants. Then Ezra points out that (v. 36 ff.) Abraham and Moses, Samuel, David, Elias, and Ezechias, prayed for others at various times, "and the righteous have prayed for the ungodly; wherefore," he asks, "shall it not be so known also?" The angel answers at much length, and after describing the final judgment of God, the punishment of the wicked, and the blessedness of the just, he winds up with the statement regarding the future life (v. 59): "For this is life whereof Moses spake unto the people while he lived, saying, Choose thee life, that thou mayest live (v. 63). Nevertheless they believed not him, nor yet the prophets after him, no nor me, which

¹ Zur Kr. des Barnabasbr., p. 34 f.

² Die drei ersten Evv., 1850.

³ Jahrb. bibl. Wiss. ii. 1849, p. 191 ff.

have spoken unto them," &c. Ezra replies that he knows God is gracious and merciful, for if he did not forgive (v. 70), "There should be very few left peradventure in an innumerable multitude (ch. viii. 1). And he answered me, saying, the Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few (v. 2). I will tell thee a similitude, Esdras; As when thou askest the earth, it shall say unto thee, that it giveth much mould whereof earthen vessels are made, but little dust that gold cometh of: even so is the course of this present world (v. 3). There be many created, but few shall be saved." In the Epistle of Barnabas (ch. iv.) the author commences by an exhortation to flee from iniquity and set our affection on the world to come, seeing that the final judgment is at hand; and he quotes the book of Enoch: "For on account of this the Lord has cut short the times and the days, that his Beloved may hasten; and He will come to His inheritance." After some other passages on the latter times, he warns those whom he addresses not to deceive themselves, saying that "the covenant was both theirs (Israel's) and ours," for they finally lost it after Moses had already received it. After enlarging on this, and on the conduct which should be adopted in view of the last days, the writer winds up: "The Lord will judge the world without respect of persons. Each will receive as he has done, &c., &c. But give heed to this, my brethren, the more, when ye perceive that after such great signs and wonders wrought in Israel they were thus abandoned. Let us, therefore, beware lest we should be found as it is written: Many are called but few are chosen." Now the saying here is not employed in any connection similar to the parables with which it is associated in our Gospel, but on the other hand it is decidedly and markedly employed in the same spirit as in IV Ezra, and with similar context. It is almost impossible, in view of all the circumstances, to avoid the conclusion that the Epistle either quotes from a form of Ezra, or from an original work from which the author of that apocalyptic writing derived it, and that not only it was not quoted from our Synoptic, but that the saying is not rightfully part of that Gospel at all, but has been introduced thither without reason or propriety from some other work.

This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the author of the Epistle quotes other passages from IV Ezra, and that the work was much used by the early Christians. We have already mentioned that it is quoted in the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. In ch. xii. of the Epistle of Barnabas, the following passage, to which we have partially referred, occurs: "In like manner he refers to the cross in another prophet, saying: 'And when shall these things come to pass?' And the Lord

saith, 'When a tree shall be bent and arise, and when blood shall flow out of wood.'¹ In IV Ezra we find (ch. iv. 33) "And when shall these things come to pass?" (ch. v. 5.) "And blood shall drop out of wood, &c."² It is to be regretted that we no longer have the original of IV Ezra, but the quotation so far corresponds perfectly with the passage above, and was evidently derived from it. Although there is no similar phrase to: "When a tree shall be bent and arise," in our text, it may have originally existed, or have been added from some other apocryphal book no longer extant.³ There is, however, another passage which deserves to be mentioned. The Epistle has the following quotation: "Again, I will show thee how, in regard to us, the Lord saith, He made a new creation in the last times. The Lord saith: Behold I make the first as the last."⁴ Now even Tischendorf does not pretend that this is a quotation of Matth. xx. 16,⁵ "Thus the last shall be first and the first last," (οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ πρότοι ἔσχατοι) the sense of which is quite different. The application of the saying in this place in the first Synoptic Gospel is evidently quite false, and depends merely on the ring of words and not of ideas. Strange to say it is not found in either of the other Gospels, but, like the famous phrase which we have been considering, it nevertheless appears twice, quite irrelevantly, in two places of the first Gospel. In xix. 30 it is quoted again with slight variation: "But many first shall be last and last first" (πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρότοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρότοι), but without relevancy to the context. Now it will be remembered that at xx. 16 it occurs in several MSS. in connection with "Many are called but few are chosen," although the oldest codices omit the latter passage, and the separate quotation of these two passages by the author of the Epistle, with so marked a variation in the second, renders it almost certain that he found both in the source from which he quotes. The irrelevant use made of both in the Gospel seems clearly to indicate that they were introduced into it from some other work, without perfect

¹ Ομοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀρίζει ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι Καὶ τότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; Λέγει κύριος· Ὅταν ξύλον κλήθῃ καὶ ἀνστή, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα σταῇ. c. xii.

² Quando hæc? . . . et de ligno sanguis stillabit. Volkmar, H'buch Einl. Apocr., ii. p. 18, p. 24; cf. Habakkuk, ii. 11.

³ Müller, Erkl. d. Barnabasbr., p. 272, cf. 271; Volkmar, H'buch Einl. Apocr., ii. p. 24; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 229; Hilgenfeld, N. T. extra can. recept. Fasc., ii. p. 75, Die Proph. Ezra u. Dan., p. 70; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 28; Holtzmann, Zeitscha. Wiss. Theol., 1871, p. 340; Hefele, Sendschr. d. Arn., p. 225; Wieseler, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1770, p. 290; cf. Ewald, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., vii. p. 159, num. 1.

⁴ Πάλιν σοι ἐπιδείξω, πῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγει κύριος· δευτέραν πλάσιν ἐν ἔσχατον ἐποίησεν. λέγει κύριος· Ἰοῦ, ποιῶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρότα. c. vi.

⁵ Canon Westcott does not make any reference to it either.

understanding of their connection. The passage in the Epistle is referred by many also to IV Ezra, v. 42, but we quote the preceding and following verses, for the sake of showing the context: (v. 41) "And I said, Behold, Lord, yet art thou nigh unto them that be reserved till the end: and what shall they do that have been before me, or we that be now, or they that shall come after us?" (v. 42) "And he said unto me, I will liken my judgment unto a ring; like as there is no slackness of the last, even so there is no swiftness of the first. (v. 43) So I answered and said: Couldst thou not make those that have been made, and be now, and that are to come, at once, &c., &c." Without dwelling on this, the passage clearly is not referable to our first Gospel. We have, however, more than sufficiently considered, the famous "Many are called, &c." We believe that the passage was most certainly not quoted from our Synoptic. Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that it might have been derived from the Gospel, what would that do towards proving its authenticity or veracity? No Gospel is named, and no author indicated; and even assuming it to have been derived from the first Gospel, nothing but its mere existence could thence be inferred. But even this inference would be unwarrantable from such evidence, for supposing the saying to be historical, which those who quote the Gospel as evidence for miracles must maintain, the mere quotation of a historical saying without indication of source, which might equally have been found in a dozen other works then extant, could not form proof even of the existence of any one special Gospel.

There can be no doubt that many Scriptural texts have crept into early Christian writings which originally had no place there; and where attendant circumstances are suspicious, it is always well to remember the fact. An instance of the interpolation of which we speak is found in the "Epistle of Barnabas." In one place the phrase: "Give to every one that asketh of thee" (*μὴν τὸ αἰτοῦντι τε δίδον*)¹ occurs, not as a quotation, but merely woven into the Greek text as it existed before the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. This phrase is the same as the precept in Luke vi. 30, although it was argued by some that, as no other trace of the third Gospel existed in the Epistle, it was more probably an alteration of the text of Matth. v. 42. Omitting the phrase from the passage in the Epistle, the text read as follows: "Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou murmur when thou givest . . . so shalt thou know who is the good Recompenser of the reward." The supposed quotation, inserted where we have left a blank, really interrupted the sense and repeated the previous in-

¹ Ch. xix.

junction. The oldest MS., the "Codex Sinaiticus," omits the quotation, and so ends the question, but it is afterwards inserted by another hand. Some pious scribe, in fact, seeing the relation of the passage to the Gospel, had added the words in the margin as a gloss, and they afterwards found their way into the text. In this way very many similar glosses have crept into the text which they were originally intended to illustrate.

Tischendorf, who does not allude to this, lays much stress upon the following passage: "But when he selected His own apostles, who should preach His Gospel, who were sinners above all sin, in order that He might show that He came not to call the righteous but sinners, then He manifested Himself to be the Son of God."¹ We may remark that, in the common Greek text, the words "to repentance" were inserted after "sinners," but they are not found in the Sinaitic MS. In like manner, many Codices insert them in Matth. ix. 13 and Mark ii. 17, but they are not found in some of the oldest MSS., and are generally rejected. Tischendorf considers them a later addition both to the text of the Gospel and of the Epistle.² But this very fact is suggestive. It is clear that a supposed quotation has been deliberately adjusted to what was considered to be the text of the Gospel. Why should the whole phrase not be equally an interpolation? We shall presently see that there is reason to think that it is so. Although there is no quotation in the passage, who, asks Tischendorf,³ could mistake the words as they stand in Matthew ix. 13, "For I came not to call the righteous but sinners?" Now this passage is referred to by Origen in his work against Celsus, in a way which indicates that the supposed quotation did not exist in his copy. Origen says: "And as Celsus has called the Apostles of Jesus infamous men, saying that they were tax-gatherers and worthless sailors, we have to remark on this, that, &c. . . . Now in the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas from which, perhaps, Celsus derived the statement that the Apostles were infamous and wicked men, it is written that 'Jesus selected his own Apostles, who were sinners above all sin,'"⁴ —and then he goes on to quote the expression of Peter to Jesus (Luke v. 8), and then 1 Timothy i. 15, but he nowhere refers to the supposed quotation in the Epistle. Now, if we read the passage without the quotation, we have: "But when he selected his own Apostles who should preach his Gospel, who

¹ Ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίου ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο, ὄντας ὑπὲρ πάντας ἀμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοὺς, τότε ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ. c. v.

² Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 86, anm. 1.

³ *Ib.* p. 96.

⁴ Contra Cels., i. 63.

were sinners above all sin. . . . then he manifested himself to be the Son of God." Here a pious scribe very probably added in the margin the gloss: "in order that he might show that he came not to call the righteous but sinners," to explain the passage, and as in the case of the phrase: "Give to every one that asketh of thee," the gloss became subsequently incorporated with the text. The Epistle, however, goes on to give the only explanation which the author intended, and which clashes with that of the scribe. "For if he had not come in the flesh, how could men have been saved by beholding him? Seeing that looking on the sun that shall cease to be, the work of his hands, they have not even power to endure his rays. Accordingly, the Son of Man came in the flesh for this, that he might bring to a head the number of their sins who had persecuted to death his prophets."¹

The argument of Origen bears out this view, for he does not at all take the explanation of the gloss as to why Jesus chose his disciples from such a class, but he reasons: "What is there strange, therefore, that Jesus being minded to manifest to the race of men his power to heal souls, should have selected infamous and wicked men, and should have elevated them so far, that they became a pattern of the purest virtue to those who were brought by their persuasion to the Gospel of Christ.² The argument, both of the author of the Epistle and of Origen, is different from that suggested by the phrase under examination, and we consider it a mere gloss introduced into the text; which, as the *εἰς μετάνοιαν* shows, has in the estimation of Tischendorf himself, been deliberately altered. Even if it originally formed part of the text, however, it would be wrong to affirm that it affords any proof of the use or existence of the first Gospel. The words of Jesus in Matt. ix. 12—14, evidently belong to the oldest tradition of the Gospel, and, in fact, Ewald ascribes them, apart from the remainder of the chapter, originally to the Spruchsammlung, from which, with two intermediate books, he considers that our present Matthew was composed.³ Nothing can be more certain than that

¹ *Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί, πῶς ἂν ἐσώθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι βλέποντες αὐτόν; ὅτι τὸν μέλλοντα μὴ εἶναι ἥλιον, ἔργον τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχοντα, ἐμβλέποντες οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν εἰς τὰς ἀκτῖνας αὐτοῦ ἀγροφθαλμεῖν, οὐκ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκί, ἵνα τὸ τέλειον τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀνακεφαλαιώσῃ τοῖς διώξασιν ἐν θανάτῳ τοὺς προφῆτας αὐτοῦ.* c. v.

² *Τὶ οὖν ἀποπον, βουλόμενον παραστῆσαι τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὁπλήτην ἔχει ψυχῶν λατρικῆν, τοὺς ἐπιρρήτους καὶ πονηροτάτους ἐπιλέξασθαι, καὶ τοὺς προαγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὥστ' αὐτοὺς παραδείγματα εἶναι ἡθους καθαρωτάτου τοῖς δι' αὐτῶν προβαλλομένοις τῷ Χριστοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ.* Contra Cels., i. 63.

³ Die drei ersten Evv., p. 15, p. 1.

such sayings, if they be admitted to be historical at all, must have existed in many other works, and the mere fact of their happening to be also in one of the Gospels which has survived, cannot prove its use, or even its existence at the time the Epistle of Barnabas was written, more especially as the phrase does not occur as a quotation, and there is no indication of the source from which it was derived.

Tischendorf, however, finds a further analogy between the Epistle and the Gospel of Matthew, in ch. xii. "Since, therefore, in the future, they were to say that Christ is the son of David, fearing and perceiving clearly the error of the wicked," David himself prophesies—"The Lord said unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool."¹ Tischendorf upon this inquires: "Could Barnabas so write without the supposition, that his readers had Matthew, xxii. 41 ff., before them, and does not such a supposition likewise infer the actual authority of Matthew's Gospel?"² Such rapid argument and extreme conclusions are startling indeed, but, in his haste, our critic has forgotten to state the whole case. The author of the Epistle has been elaborately showing that the Cross of Christ is repeatedly typified in the Old Testament, and at the commencement of the chapter, after quoting the passage in IV Ezra, iv. 33, v. 5, he points to the case of Moses, to whose heart "the spirit speaks that he should make a form of the cross," by stretching forth his arms in supplication, and so long as he did so Israel prevailed over their enemies; and again he typified the cross, when he set up the brazen serpent upon which the people might look and be healed. Then that which Moses, as a prophet, said to Joshua (Jesus) the son of Nave, when he gave him that name, was solely for the purpose that all the people might hear that the Father would reveal all things regarding his Son to the son of Nave. This name being given to him when he was sent to spy out the land, Moses said: "Take a book in thy hands, and write what the Lord saith, that the Son of God will in the last days cut off by the roots all the house of Amalek." This, of course, is a falsification of the passage, Exodus xvii. 14, for the purpose of making it declare Jesus to be the "Son of God." Then proceeding in the same strain, he says: "Behold again Jesus is not the Son of Man, but the Son of God, manifested in the type and in the flesh. Since, therefore, in the future, they were to say that Christ is the

¹ Ἐπεὶ οὖν μέλλουσιν λέγειν, ὅτι Χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυὶδ ἐστίν, αὐτοὶ προφητεύει Δαυὶδ, φοβούμενος καὶ συνίων τὴν πλάνην τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν. Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. c. xii.

² Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 96.

son of David," (and here follows the passage we are discussing) "fearing and perceiving clearly the error of the wicked, David himself prophesied: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' And again, thus speaks Isaiah: 'The Lord said to Christ my Lord, whose right hand I have held, that the nations may obey Him, and I will break in pieces the strength of kings.' Behold how David calleth Him Lord, and the Son of God." And here ends the chapter and the subject. Now it is quite clear that the passage occurs, not as a reference to any such dilemma as that in Matthew xxii. 41 ff., but simply as one of many passages which, at the commencement of our era, were considered prophetic declarations of the divinity of Christ, in opposition to the expectation of the Jews that the Messiah was to be the son of David,¹ and, as we have seen, in order to prove his point the author alters the text. To argue that such a passage of a Psalm, quoted in such a manner in this epistle, proves the use of our first Synoptic, is simply preposterous.

We have already pointed out that the author quotes apocryphal works as Holy Scripture; and we may now add that he likewise cites words of Jesus which are nowhere found in our Gospels. For instance, in ch. ii. we meet with the following expressions directly attributed to Jesus. "Thus he says: 'Those who desire to behold me, and to attain my kingdom, must through tribulation and suffering receive me.'"² Hilgenfeld³ compares this with another passage, similar in sense, in IV Ezra, vii. 14; but in any case it is not a quotation from our Gospels;⁴ and with so many passages in them suitable to his purpose, it would be amazing, if he knew and held Matthew in the consideration which Tischendorf asserts, that he should neglect their stores, and go elsewhere for such quotations. There is, however, nothing in this epistle worthy of the name of evidence even of the existence of our Gospels, and, on the contrary, Reuss⁵ has pointed out a passage at the end of ch. xv., which is in contradiction with Matthew, the Gospel which the author is supposed to know, and with Mark, although it agrees with the third Synoptic, which, however, is itself in apparent contradiction with the Acts of the Apostles, generally ascribed to the same author. The epistle

¹ Cf. *Gfrörer*, *Das Jahrh. des Heils*, ii. p. 219 ff., 258 ff., 212 ff.

² Οὕτω, φησὶν, οἱ θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν καὶ ἀψαθῆναι μου τῆς βασιλείας, ὑπελλουσὶν βलिβέντες καὶ παθόντες λαβεῖν με. c. vii.

³ *Die Proph. Ezra u. Daniel*, p. 70.

⁴ *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 27, anm. 1; *Eichhorn*, *Eintl. N. T.*, i. p. 123; *Hilgenfeld*, *Nov. Test. ex can. receptum*, Fasc. ii. p. 70; *Fabrics*, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i. p. 331*; cf. *Lardner*, *Credibility, &c.*, Works, ii. p. 15.

Gesch. h. Schr. N. T., p. 233.

says: "We keep the eighth day with joy, on which Jesus rose again from the dead, and when he had manifested himself, ascended into the heavens." In making the Resurrection, appearances to the Disciples, and the Ascension take place in one day, the author is in agreement with Justin Martyr,¹ who made use of a Gospel different from ours.

3

The Pastor of Hermas is another work which very nearly secured permanent canonical rank with the writings of the New Testament. It was quoted as Holy Scripture by the Fathers and held to be divinely inspired, and it was publicly read in the Churches.² It has a place, with the "Epistle of Barnabas," in the Sinaitic Codex, after the canonical books. In early times it was attributed to the Hermas who is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, xiv. 14, in consequence of a mere conjecture to that effect by Origen;³ but the Canon of Muratori⁴ confidently ascribes it to a brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, and at least there does not seem any ground for the statement of Origen.⁵ It may have been written about the middle of the second century or a little earlier.⁶

Tischendorf dismisses this most important memorial of the early Christian Church with a note of two lines, for it has no

¹ *Apol.*, i. 67, 50.

² *Irenæus*, *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 20, § 2; *Clemens Al.*, *Strom.*, i. 29, § 181, ii. 1, § 3, vi. 15, § 131; *Tertullian*, *De Orat.*, 12. He rejected it later. *De Pudic.*, 10; *Origen*, *Comm. in Rom.*, lib. x. 31, *Hom.*, viii. in *Num.*, *Hom.* i. in *Psaln* 37, *De Princip.*, ii. 1, § 3, iii. 2, § 4; cf. *Eusebius*, *H. E.*, iii. 3, v. 8; iii. 25; *Cotelier*, *Patr. Ap.*, i. 68.

³ *Puto autem quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur, quæ scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et at puto divinitus, inspirata.* In *Rom.* lib. x. 31.

⁴ *Routh*, *Reliq. Sacre*, i. p. 386; *Tregelles*, *Canon Murat.*, p. 20.

⁵ *Credner*, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.*, p. 90 f.; *Anger*, *Synops. Ev.*, p. xxiv.; *Bunsen*, *Hippolytus*, i. p. 428; *Gratz*, *Disq. in Past. Hermæ*, 1820, part. i. p. 8 f.; *Hefele*, *Patr. Ap.*, p. lxii. f.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T.*, p. 272; *Ritschl*, *Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 297; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 173.

⁶ *Anger*, *Synopsis Evang.*, p. xxiv.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T.*, p. 271 f.; *Credner*, *Gesch. des N. T. Kanon*, p. 37; *Ritschl*, *Die Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 238 ff., 402; *Bunsen*, *Hippolytus*, i. p. 428; *Baur*, *Vorles. Dogmengesch.* I. i. p. 251; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 173; *Tregelles*, *Canon Murat.*, p. 64; *Lücke*, *Einkl. Offenb. Job.* 1852, p. 337 f.; *Lipsius*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 283; *Keim*, *Jesu von Nazara*, i. p. 143; *Hofstede de Groot*, *Basilides*, 1868, p. 108; *Gratz*, *Disq. in Past. Hermæ*, p. 1; *Hefele*, *Patr. Ap.*, p. lxii. ff.; *Ewald* (A.D. 110-120), *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 340; *Zeller* (first 10 years 2nd century), *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 7; *Schweyler*, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. pp. 328 ff.; *Hilgenfeld* (A.D. 117-138), *Die ap. Väter*, p. 160 f., cf. p. 127; *Voßmar* (A.D. 130), *Der Ursprung*, p. 64; *Einkl. Apocr.*, ii. p. 297; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 6; *Lechler*, *Das ap. u. nachap. Zeitalter*, p. 489.

quotations either from the Old or New Testament.¹ He does not even venture to insinuate that it contains any indications of acquaintance with our Gospels. The only direct quotation in the "Pastor" is from an apocryphal work which is cited as Holy Scripture: "The Lord is nigh unto them who return to him, as it is written in Eldad and Modat, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness."² This work, which appears in the Stichometry of Nicephorus amongst the apocrypha of the Old Testament, is no longer extant.³

¹ Wani. wurden, u. s. w., p. 182; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 175; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 48 f.

² Ἐγγὺς κυριὸς τοῖς ἐπιστρεφουμένοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδαδ καὶ Μωδατ, τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. Vis. ii. 3; cf. Numbers xi. 26 f., Sept. Vers.

³ Cf. Credner, Zur Gesch. d. Kan., p. 119 ff., 145.

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS—THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP.

ALTHOUGH, in reality, appertaining to a very much later period, we shall here refer to the so-called "Epistles of Ignatius," and examine any testimony which they afford regarding the date and authenticity of our Gospels. There are in all fifteen epistles bearing the name of Ignatius. Three of these, addressed to the Virgin Mary and the Apostle John (2), exist only in a Latin version, and these, together with five others directed to Mary of Cassobolita, to the Tarsians, to the Antiochans, to Hero of Antioch, and to the Philippians, of which there are versions both in Greek and Latin, are universally admitted to be spurious, and may, so far as their contents are concerned, be at once dismissed from all consideration.¹ They are not mentioned by Eusebius, nor does any early writer refer to them. Of the remaining seven epistles, addressed to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Romans, Philadelphians, Smyrneans, and to Polycarp, there are two distinct versions extant, one long version, of which there are both Greek and Latin texts, and another much shorter, and presenting considerable variations, of which there are also both Greek and Latin texts. After a couple of centuries of discussion, critics almost without exception have finally agreed that the longer version is nothing more than an interpolated version of the shorter and more ancient form of the Epistles. The question regarding the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles, however, was re-opened and complicated by the publication, in 1845, by Dr. Cureton, of a Syriac version of three epistles only—to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans—in a still shorter form, discovered amongst a large number of MSS. purchased by Dr. Tattam from the monks of the Desert of Nitria. These three Syriac epistles have been subjected to the severest scrutiny, and many of the ablest critics have pronounced them to be the only authentic Epistles of Ignatius, whilst others, who do not admit that even these are genuine letters emanating from Ignatius, still prefer them to the version of seven Greek

¹ *Anger*, *Synops. Ev.*, p. xxxi.; *Guericke*, *H'buch K. G.*, i. p. 148; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml. N. T.*, p. 486; *Lardner*, *Works*, ii. p. 68; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 50 f.; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 21; *Jacobson*, *Patr. Ap.*, i. p. xxv. ff.; *Hefele*, *Patr. Ap.*, p. xxxvi.; *Dressel*, *Patr. Apost.*, 1863, p. xxiv.; *Zahn*, *Ignatius von Antioch*, 1873, p. 75 ff.

epistles, and consider them the most ancient form of the letters which we possess.¹ As early as the sixteenth century, however, the strongest doubts were expressed regarding the authenticity of any of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius. The Magdeburg Centuriators first attacked them, and Calvin declared them to be spurious,² an opinion fully shared by Dallæus, and others; Chemnitz regarded them with suspicion; and similar doubts, more or less definite, were expressed throughout the seventeenth century,³ and onward to comparatively recent times,⁴ although the means of forming a judgment were not so complete as now. That the epistles were interpolated there was no doubt. Fuller examination and more comprehensive knowledge of the subject have confirmed earlier doubts, and a large mass of critics either recognize that the authenticity of none of these epistles can be established,

¹ Bunsen, *Ignatius v. Ant. u. s. Zeit*, 1847; *Die drei ächt. u. d. vier unächt. Br. des Ignat.*, 1847; Hippolytus and his age, 1852, i. p. 59 f. note, iv. p. vi. ff., *Bleek*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 145; *Böhringer*, *K. G. in Biograp.*, 2 Aufl., p. 16; *Cureton*, *The Ancient Syriac Version of Eps. of St. Ignatius, &c.*, 1845; *Vindiciæ Ignat.*, 1846; *Corpus Ignatianum*, 1849; *Ewald*, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 313; *Lipsius*, *Ächtheit d. Syr. Recens. Ign. Br. in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1856, H. i., 1857, Abhandl. d. deutsche-morgenl. Gesellschaft, i. 5, 1859, p. 7, *Urspr. u. Gebr. d. Christennamens*, 1873, p. 7, *anm.*; *Milman*, *Hist. of Chr.*, ii. p. 102; *Ritschl*, *Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 403, *anm.*; *Weiss*, *Reuter's Repertorium*, Sept., 1852. *De Pressensé*, *Hist. des Trois prem. Siècles de l'Écl. Chrét.* 1^{re} Série, 2^e ed. ii. p. 388, p. 500 ff.; *Tregelles*, note to *Horne's Intr. to the N. Script.* 12th ed. iv. p. 332, note 1. It must be remembered that many critics, who had previously declared themselves in favour of the shorter Greek version of the seven Epistles, have not re-examined the subject since the discovery of the three Syriac Epistles, or have not expressed any further opinion, while others had previously died.

² "Nihil minus illis, quæ sub Ignatio nomine editæ sunt, putidius. Quod minus tolerabilis est eorum impudentia qui talibus rebus credendum re-instant." *Instit. Chr. Rel. lib.*, i. 13 § 29.

³ By Bochartus, Aubertin, Blondel, Basnage, Casaubon, Compans, Dufresne, Salmasius, Scaliger, Socinus (Faustus), Parker, Petau, &c., &c., cf. *Jackson Patr. Apost.*, i. p. xxv.; *Cureton*, *Vindiciæ Ignitiane*, 1846, appendix.

⁴ *J. Owen*, *Enquiry into original nature, &c.*, *Evang. Church*, Works, 1833, vol. xx, p. 147; *Oudin*, *Comm. de Script. Eccles.*, 1722, p. 88; *Lampe*, *Comm. analyt. ex. Evang. Joan.*, 1724, i. p. 184; *Lange*, *Credibility*, &c., Works, ii. p. 68 f.; *Beausobre*, *Hist. Crit. de Manichee*, &c., 1744, i. p. 378, note 3; *Ernesti*, *N. Theol. Biblioth.*, 1761, ii. p. 489; *Mosheim*, *de Rebus Christ.*, p. 159 f.; *Heumann*, *Consp. Reipub. Lit.*, 1763, p. 492; *Schroeder*, *Chr. Kirchengesch.*, 1775, ii. p. 341; *Rösler*, *Bibl. der Kirchen-Vater*, 1776, p. 67 ff.; *Griesbach*, *Opuscula Academ.*, 1824, i. p. 26; *Rosenmüller*, *Hist. repr. Libr. Sac. in Eccles.*, 1794, i. p. 116; *Semler*, *Paraphr. in Epist. ii. Petri*, 1784, *Præf.*; *Ziegler*, *Versuch ein. prag. Gesch. d. kirchl. Verfassungs-formen*, u. s. w., 1798, p. 16; *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *Versuch ub. d. gedopp. Recens. d. Br. S. Ignat.*, in *Heuke's Mag. f. Rel. Phil.*, u. s. w., 1795; cf. *Biblioth. f. Krit.*, u. s. w., N. T., i. p. 463 ff., *Urspr. kath. Kirche*, II. i. p. 1 f.; *H'buch Chr. K. G.*, i., p. 200; *Kestner*, *Comm. de Eusebii H. E. condit.*, 1816, p. 63; *Henke*, *Allg. Gesch. chr. Kirche*, 1818, i. p. 96; *Neander*, *K. G.*, 1843, i. p. 327, *anm.* 1, ii. p. 1140; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, *Lehrb. chr. Dogmengesch.*, 1822, p. 83, cf. *Comp. chr. Dogmæ gesch.*, 1840, p. 79; *Nieder*, *Gesch. chr. K.*, p. 196; *Thiersch*, *Die K. im. ap. Zeit*, p. 321 f.; *Hagenbach*, *K. G.*, i. p. 115 f.; cf. *Cureton*, *Vind. Ign. append.*

or that they can only be considered later and spurious compositions.¹

Omitting for the present the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, the earliest reference to any of these epistles, or to Ignatius himself, is made by Irenæus, who quotes a passage which is found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv.), without, however, any mention of name, introduced by the following words: "As a certain man of ours said, being condemned to the wild beasts on account of his testimony to God: 'I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of beasts I am ground, that I may be found pure bread.'" ² Origen likewise quotes two brief sentences which he refers to Ignatius. The first is merely: "But my love is crucified,"³ which is likewise found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. vii.); and the other quoted as "out of one of the Epistles" of the martyr Ignatius: "From the Prince of this world was concealed the virginity of Mary,"⁴ which is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xix.). Eusebius mentions seven epistles,⁵ and quotes one passage from the Epistle to the Romans (ch. v.), and a few words from an apocryphal Gospel contained in the Epistle to the Smyrneans (ch. iii.), the source of which he says that he does not know, and he cites from Irenæus the brief quotation given above, and refers to the mention of the epistles in the letter of Polycarp which we reserve. Elsewhere,⁶ he further quotes a short sentence found in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. xix.), part of which had previously been cited by Origen. It will be observed that all these quotations, with the exception

¹ Baur, Die sogenannt. Pastoralbr., p. 81 ff., Zeitschr. f. Theol., 1836, iii. p. 199 ff., 1838, iii. p. 148 ff.; Die Ignat. Br., p. 5 ff.; Gesch. chr. Kirche, 1863, i. p. 275 f., ann. 3p. 440 ann.; Vorles. Dogmengesch. I. i. p. 252; cf. Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 144 f. p. 233; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. p. 19; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 81 f.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 142 f.; Hausrath, Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, 1874, iii. p. 392, ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Vater, p. 187 ff., Der Paschastreit, 1860, p. 199; Einl. N. T., 1875, p. 72; Hase, K. G. 9. Ausg., p. 65 f.; Keim, Celsus wahres Wort, 1873, p. 145 ann.; Küstlin, Der Ursprung synopt. Evv., p. 126; Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 163, &c.; Krabbe, Urspr. d. apost. Constit., p. 267; Lipsius, Verhältnis d. Textes d. drei Syr. Br., u. s. w., 1859; Ueber Ursprung u. d. alt. Gebrauch d. Christennamens, 1873, p. 7, ann.; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 521 f. ann. 2; Netz, Stud. u. Krit., 1835, p. 581 ff.; Rumpf, N. Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 8; Réville, Le Lien, 1856, Nos. 19—22; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 421, ann. 18; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 40 ff., 50 ff.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 159 ff.; Strauss, Das Leben Jesu, p. 54; Taylor, The Fourth Gospel, p. 56; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 52 ff.; Die Evangelien, p. 636; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 51, ann. 2; Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 585 f. Cf. Gfrörer, Allg. K. G., i. p. 302 f.; Harless, Comm. ab. Br. Pauli and. Eph., 1834, p. xxxiv.

² Irenæus, Adv. Hær., v. 28, p. 4; Eusebius, H. E., iii. 36. Lardner expresses a doubt whether this is a quotation at all.

³ Prolog. in Cantic. Canticor.

⁴ Hom. vi. in Lucam.

⁵ H. E. iii. 36.

⁶ Quæst. ad. Steph.; cf. Cureton, Corp. Ign. p. 164.

of that from Irenæus, are taken from the three Epistles which exist in the Syriac translation, and they are found in that version; and the first occasion on which any passage attributed to Ignatius is quoted which is not in the Syriac version of the three Epistles occurs in the second half of the fourth century, when Athanasius, in his Epistle regarding the Synods of Ariminum and Selucia,¹ quotes a few words from the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. vii.); but although foreign to the Syriac text, it is to be noted that the words are at least from a form of one of the three epistles which exist in that version.² It is a fact, therefore, that up to the second half of the fourth century no quotation ascribed to Ignatius, except one by Eusebius, exists, which is not found in the three short Syriac letters.

As we have already remarked, the Syriac version of the three epistles is very much shorter than the shorter Greek version, the Epistle to the Ephesians, for instance, being only about one-third of the length of the Greek text. Those who still maintain the superior authenticity of the Greek shorter version argue that the Syriac is an epitome of the Greek. This does not, however, seem tenable when the matter is carefully examined. Although so much is absent from the Syriac version, not only is there no interruption of the sense and no obscurity or undue curtness in the style, but the epistles read more consecutively, without faults of construction or grammar, and passages which in the Greek text were confused and almost unintelligible have become quite clear in the Syriac. The interpolations of the text, in fact, had been so clumsily made, that they had obscured the meaning, and their mere omission, without any other alteration of grammatical construction, has restored the epistles to clear and simple order.³ It is, moreover, a remarkable fact that the passages which, long before the discovery of the Syriac epistles were pointed out as chiefly determining that the epistles were spurious, are not found in the Syriac version at all.⁴ Archbishop Usher, who only admitted the authenticity of six epistles, showed that much interpolation of these letters took place in the sixth century,⁵ but this very fact increases the probability of much earlier interpolation also, at which the various existing versions most clearly point. The interpolations can be explained upon the most palpable dogmatic grounds, but not so the omissions upon the hypothesis of the Syriac version being an abridgement upon

¹ Opera, Bened. ed., i. p. 761.

² Cureton, The Ancient Syriac Version, &c., p. xxxiv.

³ *Ib.*, p. xxvi. f.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. xix. f.; cf. *Dallous*, De Scriptis, &c., p. 386 ff.

⁵ Dissert., ch. vi. p. xxxiii.

any conceivable dogmatic principle, for that which remains renders the omissions for dogmatic reasons ineffectual. There is no ground of interest upon which the portions omitted and retained by the Syriac version can be intelligently explained.¹ Finally, here, we may mention that the MSS. of the three Syriac epistles are more ancient by some centuries than those of any of the Greek versions of the seven epistles.² The strongest internal, as well as other evidence, into which space forbids our going in detail, has led the majority of critics to recognize the Syriac version as the most ancient form of the letters of Ignatius extant, and this is admitted by many of those who nevertheless deny the authenticity of any of the epistles.

Seven epistles have been selected out of fifteen extant all equally purporting to be by Ignatius, simply because only that number was mentioned by Eusebius, from whom for the first time, in the fourth century,—except the general reference in the so-called Epistle of Polycarp, to which we shall presently refer,—we hear of them. Now neither the silence of Eusebius regarding the eight epistles, nor his mention of the seven, can have much weight in deciding the question of their authenticity. The only point which is settled by the reference of Eusebius is that, at the date of which he wrote, seven epistles were known to him which were ascribed to Ignatius. He evidently knew little or nothing regarding the man or the Epistles, beyond what he had learnt from themselves,³ and he mentions the martyr-journey to Rome as a mere report: "It is said that he was conducted from Syria to Rome to be cast to wild beasts on account of his testimony to Christ."⁴ It would be absurd to argue that no other epistles existed, simply because Eusebius did not mention them; and on the other hand it would be still more absurd to affirm that the seven epistles are authentic merely because Eusebius, in the fourth century,—that is to say, some two centuries after they are supposed to have been written,—had met with them. Does anyone believe the letter of Jesus to Agbarus, Prince of Edessa, to be genuine, because Eusebius inserts it in his history⁵ as an authentic document out of the public records of the city of Edessa? There is, in fact, no evidence that the brief quotations of Irenæus and Origen are taken from either of the extant Greek versions of the epistles; for, as we have mentioned, they exist

¹ Cureton, Dissert., ch. vi. p. xvi. ff.

² Cureton, The Anc. Syr. Vers., p. xl.

³ Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 210.

⁴ Λόγος δ' ἔχει τοῦτον ἀπὸ Συρίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν, κ. τ. λ. H. E., iii. 36.

⁵ H. E., i. 13.

in the Syriac epistles, and there is nothing to show the original state of the letters from which they were derived. Nothing is more certain than the fact that, if any writer wished to circulate letters in the name of Ignatius, he would insert such passages as were said to have been quoted from genuine epistles of Ignatius, and supposing these quotations to be real, all that could be said on finding such passages would be that at least so much might be genuine.¹ It is a total mistake to suppose that the seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius have been transmitted to us in any special way. These epistles are mixed up in the Medicean and corresponding ancient Latin MSS. with the other eight epistles, universally pronounced to be spurious, without distinction of any kind, and all have equal honour.² The recognition of the number seven may, therefore, be ascribed simply to the reference to them by Eusebius, and his silence regarding the rest.

What, then, is the position of the so-called Ignatian Epistles? Towards the end of the second century, Irenæus makes a very short quotation from a source unnamed, which Eusebius, in the fourth century, finds in an epistle attributed to Ignatius. Origen, in the third century, quotes a very few words which he ascribes to Ignatius, although without definite reference to any particular epistle; and, in the fourth century, Eusebius mentions seven epistles ascribed to Ignatius. There is no other evidence. There are, however, fifteen epistles extant, all of which are attributed to Ignatius, of all of which, with the exception of three which are only known in a Latin version, we possess both Greek and Latin versions. Of seven of these epistles—and they are these mentioned by Eusebius—we have two Greek versions, one of which is very much shorter than the other; and finally we now possess a Syriac version of three epistles only³ in a form still shorter than the shorter Greek version, in which are found all the quotations of the Fathers, without exception, up to the fourth century. Eight of the fifteen epistles are universally rejected as spurious. The longer Greek version of the remaining seven epistles is almost unanimously condemned as grossly interpolated; and the great majority of the critics recognize that the shorter Greek version is also much interpolated; whilst the Syriac version, which so far as MSS. are concerned is by far the most ancient text of any of the letters which we possess, reduces their number

¹ Cureton, *The Ancient Syriac Version*, &c., p. xxxi. ff.

² *Ib.* p. xxv. f.; *Corpus Ignat.* p. lxxvii. f. p. 337 ff.; *Tregelles*, note to *Horne's* *Introd. N. T.*, iv. p. 332.

³ It is worthy of remark that at the end of the Syriac version the subscription is: "Here end the three Epistles of Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr;" cf. *Cureton*, *The Ancient Syriac Version*, &c., p. 25.

to three, and their contents to a very small compass indeed. It is not surprising that the vast majority of critics have expressed doubt more or less strong regarding the authenticity of all of these epistles, and that so large a number have repudiated them altogether. One thing is quite evident,—that amidst such a mass of falsification, interpolation, and fraud, the Ignatian Epistles cannot in any form be considered evidence on any important point.¹

We have not, however, finished. All of these epistles, including the three of the Syriac recension, profess to have been written by Ignatius during his journey from Antioch to Rome, in the custody of Roman soldiers, in order to be exposed to wild beasts, the form of martyrdom to which he had been condemned. The writer describes the circumstances of his journey as follows: "From Syria even unto Rome I fight with wild beasts, by sea and by land, by night and by day; being bound amongst ten leopards, which are the band of soldiers: who even receiving benefits become worse."² Now, if this account be in the least degree true, how is it possible to suppose that the martyr could have found means to write so many long epistles, entering minutely into dogmatic teaching, and expressing the most deliberate and advanced views regarding ecclesiastical government? Indeed, it may be asked why Ignatius should have considered it necessary in such a journey, even if the possibility be for a moment conceded, to address such epistles to communities and individuals to whom, by the showing of the letters themselves, he had just had opportunities of addressing his counsels in person.³ The epistles themselves bear none of the marks of composition under such circumstances, and it is impossible to suppose that soldiers such as the quotation above describes would allow a prisoner, condemned to wild beasts for professing Christianity, deliberately to write long epistles at every stage of his journey, promulgating the very doctrines for which he was condemned. And not only this, but on his way to martyrdom, he has, according to the epistles,⁴ perfect freedom to see his friends. He receives the bishops, deacons, and members of various Christian communities, who come with greetings to

¹ *J. J. Tayler*, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1867, p. 56; *Weizsäcker*, *Unters. evangelische Gesch.*, p. 234.

² Ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ, διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐνδοδεμένους δέκα λεοπαρδοῖς, ὃ ἐστὶ στρατιωτῶν τῶμα: οἱ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χεῖρους γίνονται. *Ep. Ad. Rom.*, v.

³ *Baur*, *Urspr. d. Episcopats*, Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol., 1838, H. 3, p. 15 f.; *Die Ignat. Br.*, p. 61; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 217; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii. p. 160.

⁴ Cf. *ad Ephes.* i. ii., *ad Magnes.* ii. xv., *ad Trall.* i., *ad Rom.* x., *ad Philadelph.* xi., *ad Smyrn.* x. xiii., &c.

¹ *Bar*
Hilgenfeld
ii. (1844)

² The
ther ass
opinion
f. Theol
1; Bret
Hilgenfeld

³ *Vol*
32 ff.; *A*
chr. Kir
alt. Zeu
Hilgenfeld

⁴ *Dre*
⁵ *Eua*
ff.; *Miln*
Chhorn
⁶ *War*

him, and devoted followers accompany him on his journey. All this without hindrance from the "ten leopards," of whose cruelty he complains, and without persecution or harm to those who so openly declare themselves his friends and fellow believers. The whole story is absolutely incredible.¹ This conclusion, irresistible in itself, is, however, confirmed by facts arrived at from a totally different point of view. It has been demonstrated that Ignatius was not sent to Rome at all, but suffered martyrdom in Antioch itself on the 20th December, A.D. 115,² when he was condemned to be cast to wild beasts in the amphitheatre, in consequence of the fanatical excitement produced by the earthquake which took place on the 13th of that month.³ There are no less than three martyrologies of Ignatius,⁴ giving an account of the martyr's journey from Antioch to Rome, but they are all recognized to be mere idle legends, of whose existence we do not hear till a very late period.⁵ In fact, the whole of the ignatian literature is a mass of falsification and fraud.

We might well spare our readers the trouble of examining further the contents of the Epistles of pseudo-Ignatius, for it is manifest that they cannot afford testimony of any value whatever, on the subject of our inquiry. We shall, however, briefly point out all the passages contained in the seven Greek Epistles which have any bearing upon our Synoptic Gospels, in order that their exact position may be more fully appreciated. Tischendorf⁶ refers to a passage in the Epistle to the Romans, c. vi., as a verbal quotation of Matthew xvi. 26, but he neither gives the context nor states the facts of the case. The passage reads as follows: "The pleasures of the world shall profit me nothing, nor the kingdoms

¹ Baur, Urspr. des Episcopats, Tüb. Zeitsch. f. Theol., 1838, H. 3, p. 154 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 216 f.; cf. Neander, K. G., 1842, i. p. 327, anm. 1, ii. (1843), p. 1140.

² The martyrdom has been variously dated about A.D. 107 or 125-216, but whether assigning the event to Rome or to Antioch a majority of critics of all shades of opinion have adopted the latter date. Cf. Baur, Urspr. d. Episc., Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol., 1838, H. 3, p. 149, anm., 155 anm., Gesch. chr. Kirche, i. p. 440, anm. 1; Bretschneider, Probabilia, &c. p. 185; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 144; Guericke, H'buch, K. G., i. p. 148; Hagenbach, K. G., i. p. 113 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. p. 19; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 79; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 40, p. 50 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 52; H'buch Einl. Apocr., i. p. 121 f., p. 136.

³ Volkmar, H'buch Einl. Apocr., i. p. 49 ff., p. 121 ff., 136 f., Der Ursprung, p. 52 ff.; Baur, Urspr. d. Episc., Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Th., 1838, H. 3, p. 149 ff.; Gesch. chr. Kirche, 1863, i. p. 440 anm. 1; Davidson, Introd. N. T. i. p. 19; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 51 f. Cf. Francke, Zur Gesch. Trajans, u. s. w., 1840, p. 253 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 213 ff.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1874, p. 97 ff.

⁴ Dressel, Patr. Ap., p. 208 ff., 350 ff., 391 ff.

⁵ Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 314, anm. 1; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 213 ff.; Milman, Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 101; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 51; Chhorn, Das Verhältn. &c., in Niedner's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol., 1851, p. 252 f.

⁶ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 22.

of this time; it is better for me to die for Jesus Christ, than to reign over the ends of the earth. For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world, but lose his soul."¹ Now this quotation not only is not found in the Syriac version of the Epistle, but it is also omitted from the ancient Latin version, and is absent from the passage in the work of Timotheus of Alexandria against the Council of Chalcedon, and from other authorities. It is evidently a later addition, and is recognized as such by most critics.² It was probably a gloss, which subsequently was inserted in the text. Of these facts, however, Tischendorf does not say a word.³

The next passage to which he refers is in the Epistle to the Smyrneans, c. i., where the writer says of Jesus: "He was baptized by John, in order that all righteousness might be fulfilled by Him,"⁴—which Tischendorf considers a reminiscence of Matthew iii. 15, "For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."⁵ The phrase, besides being no quotation, has again all the appearance of being an addition; and when in ch. iii. of the same Epistle we find a palpable quotation from an apocryphal Gospel, which Jerome states to be the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," to which we shall presently refer, a Gospel which we know to have contained the baptism of Jesus by John, it is not impossible, even if the Epistle were genuine, which it is not, to base any such conclusion upon these words. There is not only the alternative of tradition, but the use of the same apocryphal Gospel, elsewhere quoted in the Epistle, as the source of the reminiscence.

Tischendorf does not point out any more supposed references to our Synoptic Gospels, but we proceed to notice all the other passages which have been indicated by others. In the Epistle to Polycarp, c. ii., the following sentence occurs: "Be thou wise as a serpent in everything, and harmless as the dove." This is, of course, compared with Matth. x. 16, "Be ye, therefore, wise as serpents and innocent as doves." The Greek of both read as follows:

¹ Οὐδέν μοι ὠφελήσει τὰ τερπνὰ τοῦ κόσμου, οὐδὲ αἱ βασιλείαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. Καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ βασιλεύειν τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς. Τι γὰρ ὠφελείται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιώσῃ; c. vi.

² Cureton, Ancient Syriac Version, &c., p. 42 ff.; Grabe, Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 16; Jacobson, Patr. Ap., ii. p. 402; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 84, anm. 6; Anger, Synops. Ev., p. 119 f., Dressel, Patr., Ap., p. 170; &c., &c.

³ Canon Westcott does not refer to the passage at all.

⁴ βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. c. i.

⁵ οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρωθῆαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην.

EPISTLE.

Φρονιμος γινου ως ὅφις ἐν ἁπ-
σιν, καὶ ἀκέραιος ως ἡ περιδτετρα.

MATTH. x. 16.

Ἰνέσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ως οἱ
ὄφεις¹ καὶ ἀκέραιοι ως αἱ περιδ-
τετραί.

In the Syriac version, the passage reads: "Be thou wise as the serpent in everything, and harmless as to those things which are requisite as the dove."² It is unnecessary to add that no source is indicated for the reminiscence. Ewald assigns this part of our first Gospel originally to the Spruchsammlung,³ and even apart from the variations presented in the Epistle there is nothing to warrant exclusive selection of our first Gospel as the source of the saying. The remaining passages we subjoin in parallel columns.

EP. TO THE EPHESIANS V.

For if the prayer of one or two has such power, how much more that of the bishop and of all the Church.⁴

EP. EPHESIANS VI.

For every one whom the Master of the house sends to be over his own household we ought to receive as we should him that sent (πέμψαντα) him.

Πάντα γὰρ ὃν πέμπει ὁ οἰκοδεσ-
πότης εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, οὕτως
δεῖ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι, ὡς αὐτὸν
τὸν πέμψαντα.

EP. TO TRALLIANS XI.

For these are not a planting of the Father.

Οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ εἰσιν φυτεία
πατρός.

EP. TO SMYRNEANS VI.

He that receiveth it let him receive it.

Ὁ χωρὼν χωρεῖτω.

MATTH. XVIII. 19.

Again I say unto you that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask it shall be done for them by my Father. v. 20. For when two or three are gathered together, &c., &c.,

MATTH. x. 40.

He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent (ἀποστεί-
λαντα) me.

Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται,
καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχομενος δέχεται τὸν
ἀποστείλαντα με.

MATTH. XV. 13.

Every plant which my heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted up.

Πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν
ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκρίζω-
θήσεται.

MATTH. XIX. 12.

He that is able to receive it let him receive it.

Ὁ δυναμενος χωρεῖν χωρεῖτω.

¹ The Cod. Sin. alone reads here.

² Cf. Cureton, The Ancient Syriac Version, &c., p. 5, p. 72.

³ Die drei ersten Evv.

⁴ Εἰ γὰρ ἐνός καὶ δευτέρου προσευχῇ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, πόσω μᾶλλον ἢ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας;

None of these passages are quotations, and they generally present such marked linguistic variations from the parallel passages in our first Gospel, that there is not the slightest ground for specially referring them to it. The last words cited are introduced without any appropriate context. In no case are the expressions indicated as quotations from, or references to, any particular source. They may either be traditional, or reminiscences of some of the numerous Gospels current in the early Church, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews. That the writer made use of one of these cannot be doubted. In the Epistle to the *Syriac*, means, c. iii., there occurs a quotation from an apocryphal Gospel to which we have already, in passing, referred: "for I know that also after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe he is so now. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them: Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am an incorporeal spirit (*δαμόνιον*). And immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and spirit."¹ Eusebius, who quotes this passage, says that he does not know whence it is taken.² Origen, however, quotes it from a work well known in the early Church, called "The Doctrine of Peter," (*Διδασχὴ Πέτρου*);³ and Jerome found it in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," in use among the Nazarenes,⁴ which he translated, as we shall hereafter see. It was, no doubt, in both of those works. The narrative, Luke xxiv. 39 f., being neglected, and an apocryphal Gospel used here, the inevitable inference is clear and very suggestive. As it is certain that this quotation was taken from a source different from our Gospels, there is reason to suppose that the other passages which we have cited are reminiscences of the same work. The passage on the three mysteries in the Epistle to the Ephesians, c. xix., is evidently another quotation from an uncanonical source.⁵

We must, however, again point out that, with the single exception of the short passage in the Epistle to Polycarp, c. ii., which is not a quotation, differs from the reading in Matthew, and may well be from any other source, none of these supposed reminiscences of our Synoptic Gospels are found in the *Syriac* version of the three epistles. The evidential value of the seven Greek epistles is

¹ Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀναστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς: "Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαμόνιον ἀσώματον." Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἠψάντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κρατηθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπουθεν ῥητοῖς συγκέχρηται. H. E., iii. 36.

³ De Princip. Præf., § 8.

⁴ De vir. ill., 16; cf. Comm. in Is. lib. xviii. præf.

⁵ Cf. Ewald, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., vii. p. 318, ann. 1.

clearly stated by an English historian and divine: "My conclusion is, that I should be unwilling to claim historical authority for any passage not contained in Dr. Cureton's Syriac reprint."¹ We must, however, go much further, and assert that none of the Epistles have any value as evidence for an earlier period than the end of the second or beginning of the third century, if indeed they possess any value at all. The whole of the literature ascribed to Ignatius is, in fact, such a tissue of fraud and imposture, and the successive versions exhibit such undeniable marks of the grossest interpolation, that even if any small original element exist referable to Ignatius, it is impossible to define it, or to distinguish with the slightest degree of accuracy between what is authentic and what is spurious. The Epistles do not, however, in any case afford evidence even of the existence of our Synoptic Gospels.

2.

We have hitherto deferred all consideration of the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, from the fact that, instead of proving the existence of the Epistles of Ignatius, with which it is intimately associated, it is itself discredited in proportion as they are shown to be inauthentic. We have just seen that the martyr-journey of Ignatius to Rome is, for cogent reasons, declared to be wholly fabulous, and the epistles purporting to be written during that journey must be held to be spurious. The Epistle of Polycarp, however, not only refers to the martyr-journey (c. ix.), but to the Ignatian Epistles which are inauthentic (c. xiii.) and the manifest inference is that it also is spurious.

Polycarp, who is said by Irenæus¹ to have been in his youth a disciple of the Apostle John, became Bishop of Smyrna, was deputed to Rome c. A.D. 160, as representative of the Churches of Asia, for the discussion respecting the day on which the Christian Passover should be celebrated,² and ended his life by martyrdom, A. D. 167. Some critics who affirm the authenticity of the Epistle attributed to him, but who certainly do not justify their conclusions by any arguments nor attempt to refute adverse reasons, date the Epistle before A.D. 120.³ But the preponderance of opinion amongst those who have most profoundly examined the matter, whether

¹ Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. p. 257, note (b).

² Adv. Hær., iii. 3, p. 47 cf. Eusebius, H. E., v. 20.

³ Irenæus, Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, H. E., iv. 14.

⁴ Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 310; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 23; Bleek, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 234; Lardner, *Works*, ii. p. 89; Anger, *Synops Ev.*, p. xxiii.

declaring the Epistle spurious or authentic, assigns it to the latter half of the second century, in so far as any genuine part of it is concerned.¹ Doubts of its authenticity, and of the integrity of the text, were very early expressed,² and the close scrutiny to which later and more competent criticism has subjected it, has led very many to the conclusion that the Epistle is either largely interpolated,³ or altogether spurious.⁴ The principal argument in favour of its authenticity is the fact that the Epistle is mentioned by Irenæus,⁵ who in his youth was acquainted with Polycarp. But the testimony of Irenæus is not, on that account, entitled to much weight, inasmuch as his intercourse with Polycarp was evidently confined to a short period of his extreme youth,⁶ and we have no reason to suppose that he had any subsequent communication with him. This certainly does not entitle Irenæus to speak more authoritatively of an epistle ascribed to Polycarp, than any one else of his day.⁷ In the Epistle itself, there are many anachronisms. In ch. ix. the "blessed Ignatius" is referred to as already a considerable time dead, and he is held up with Zosimus and Rufus, and also with Paul and the rest of the Apostles, as examples of patience: men who have not run in vain, but are with the Lord; but in ch. xiii. he is spoken of as living, and information is requested regarding him, "and those who are with him."⁸ Moreover, although thus spoken of as alive, the writer already knows of his Epistles, and refers, in the plural, to those written by him "to us, and all the rest which we have by us."⁹ The reference here, it will be observed, is not only to the

¹ A. D. 167, *Hilgenfeld* Die ap. Väter, p. 274; A. D. 160—165, *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 46; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 512; *Schotten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 43; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. p. 154; A. D. 140—168, *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 604 ff.; after A. D. 167, *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 52; middle of 2nd century, *Bunsen*, Ignatius u. s. Zeit, p. 107 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 151.

² *Magdeburg. Centur.*, Eccles. Hist. i., cent. ii., cap. 10; *Dallaus*, De Scriptis, &c., lib. ii., c. 32, p. 428 ff.; *Rösler*, Bibl. d. Kirchen Väter, p. 93 ff.; *Semler*, Zu Baumgarten's Unters. Theol. Streitigk., ii. p. 36 f.; *Mosheim*, De Rebus Christ., p. 161; *Ullmann*, Der zweite Br. Petri, p. 3, anm.

³ *Bunsen*, Ignat. v. Ant., p. 107 ff.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 604 ff.; *Schotten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 40 f.; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 42 ff.; *Davidson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 184.

⁴ *Hilgenfeld* Die ap. Väter, p. 271 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 154 ff.; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 52, anm. 1; Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 586 f., 1847, p. 144; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 151; cf. *Lücke*, Comment. Br. Johann. p. 3; *Taylor*, The Fourth Gospel, 1867, p. 55.

⁵ Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 4.

⁶ *Εν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ. κ.τ.λ.* Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 4, *Eusebius*, H. E., iv. 14, cf. v. 20.

⁷ Cf. *Zeller*, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 52, anm. 1.

⁸ Et de ipso Ignatio, et de his qui cum eo sunt, quod certius agnoveritis, significate.

⁹ *Τὰς ἐπιστολάς Ἰγνατίου τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλας οὕτως εἰχόμεν παρ' ἡμῖν, κ.τ.λ.*

Epistles to the Smyræans, and to Polycarp himself, but to other spurious epistles which are not included in the Syriac version. Lallaus¹ pointed out long ago, that ch. xiii. abruptly interrupts the conclusion of the Epistle, and most critics, including those who assert the authenticity of the rest of the Epistle, reject it at least, although many of these likewise repudiate ch. ix. as interpolated.² Many of these, however, consider that the letter is quite consistent with the later date, which, according to internal evidence, must be assigned to the Epistle. The writer vehemently denounces,³ as already widely spread, the Gnostic heresy and other forms of false doctrine which did not exist until the time of Marcion, to whom and to whose followers he refers in unmistakable terms. An expression is used in ch. vii. in speaking of these heretics, which Polycarp is reported by Irenæus to have actually applied to Marcion in person, during his stay in Rome about A.D. 160. He is said to have called Marcion the "first-born of Satan," (*πρωτότοκος τοῦ Σατανᾶ*),⁴ and the same term is employed in this epistle with regard to every one who holds such false doctrines. The development of these heresies, therefore, implies a date for the composition of the Epistle, at earliest, after the middle of the second century, a date which is further confirmed by other circumstances.⁵ The writer evidently assumes a position in the Church, to which Polycarp could only have attained in the latter part of his life, and of which we first have evidence about A.D. 160, when he was deputed to Rome for the Paschal discussion, and, throughout, the Epistle depicts the developed ecclesiastical organization of that period.⁶ Hilgenfeld has pointed out, as another indication of the same date, the injunction "Pray for the kings" (*Orate pro regibus*), which in 1 Peter ii. 17, is "Honour the king" (*τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε*), which, he argues, accords with the period after Antoninus Pius had elevated Marcus Aure-

¹ De Scriptis, &c., 427 ff.

² Bunsen, Ignatius v. Ant. u. s. Zeit, p. 108 ff.; Dalbous, De Scriptis, &c., p. 427 ff.; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 184; Ritschl, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 606 ff.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 41; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 267 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 154 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 44 ff.

³ Cf. Ch. vi., vii.

⁴ Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, H. E., iv. 14.

⁵ Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., p. 155 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 272 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 44 ff.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 41 ff. Schweigler and Hilgenfeld consider the insertion of this phrase, actually used in Rome against Marcion, as proof of the inauthenticity of the Epistle. They argue that the well-known saying was inserted to give an appearance of reality to the forgery. In any case it shows that the Epistle cannot have been written earlier than the second half of the second century.

⁶ Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 158; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 273; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 42.

lius to joint sovereignty (A.D. 147), or better still, with that in which Marcus Aurelius appointed Lucius Verus his colleague, A.D. 161. However this may be, either date is within that period of the life of Polycarp, when other circumstances render the composition of the Epistle alone possible. Upon no internal ground can any part of this Epistle be pronounced genuine; there are potent reasons for considering it spurious, and there is no evidence of any value whatever supporting its authenticity. In any case it could only be connected with the very latest years of Polycarp's life.

We shall now examine all the passages in this Epistle which are pointed out as indicating any acquaintance with our Synoptic Gospels.¹ The first occurs in ch. ii., and we subjoin it in contrast with the nearest parallel passages of the Gospels, but although we break it up into paragraphs, it will of course be understood that the quotation is continuous in the Epistle.

EPISTLE, C. II.

Remembering what the Lord said, teaching :

Judge not that ye be not judged ;

forgive and it shall be forgiven to you ;

be pitiful that ye may be pitied ;

with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again ; and that blessed are the poor and those that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God.

EPISTLE, C. II.

Μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων·

Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.
ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε·

ἐν ᾧ μέτρω μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

καὶ ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

MATTHEW.

vii. 1.

Judge not that ye be not judged.

vi. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive you : (cf. Luke vi. 37. . . . pardon and ye shall be pardoned.)

v. 7. Blessed are the pitiful, for they shall obtain pity.

vii. 2. With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you.

v. 3. Blessed are the poor in spirit.

. . . v. 10. Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

MATTHEW.

vii. 1.

Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε.

vi. 14. Ἐάν γὰρ ἀφῇτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, κ. τ. λ. (cf. Luke vi. 37, Ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε).

v. 7. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.

vii. 2. ἐν ᾧ μέτρω μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

v. 3. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι—10. μακ. οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

¹ Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 23 f; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 48, note.

It will be remembered that an almost similar direct quotation of words of Jesus occurs in the so-called Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, c. xiii., which we have already examined.¹ There, the passage is introduced by the same words, and in the midst of brief phrases which have parallels in our Gospel there occurs in both Epistles the same expression, "Be pitiful that ye may be pitied," which is not found in any of our Gospels. In order to find any parallels for the quotation, upon the hypothesis of a combination of texts, we have to add together portions of the following verses in the following order: Matthew vii. 1, vi. 14 (although with complete linguistic variations, the sense of Luke vi. 37 is much closer), v. 7, vii. 2, v. 3, v. 10. Such fragmentary compilation is in itself scarcely conceivable in an epistle of this kind, but when in the midst we find a passage foreign to our Gospels, but which occurs in another work in connection with so similar a quotation, it is reasonable to conclude that the whole is derived from tradition or from a Gospel different from ours.² In no case is such a passage the slightest evidence of the existence of any one of our Gospels.

Another passage which is pointed out occurs in ch. vii., "beseeching in our prayers the all-searching God not to lead us into temptation, as the Lord said: The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."³ This is compared with the phrase in "the Lord's Prayer" (Matthew vi. 13), or the passage (xxvi. 41): "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."⁴ The second Gospel, however, equally has the phrase (xiv. 38), and shows how unreasonable it is to limit any of these historical sayings to any single Gospel. The next passage is of a similar nature (c. vi.): "If, therefore, we pray the Lord that he may forgive us, we ought also ourselves to forgive."⁵ The thought but not the language of this passage corresponds with Matthew vi. 12—14, but equally so with Luke xi. 4. Now we must repeat that all such sayings of Jesus were the common property of the early Christians—were no doubt orally current amongst them, and still more certainly were recorded by many of the numerous Gospels then in circula-

¹ p. 223 f.

² Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 52; Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 27, anm. 1; Renss *Gesch. h. Schr. N. T.*, p. 162; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 151 f.; cf. Kirchhofer, *Quellen-samm.*, p. 85, anm. 2.

³ δεῖξασθιν αἰτούμενοι τὸν παντεπόπτην θεόν, μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος: τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σαρὶς ἀσθενής. c. vii.

⁴ γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχετε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σαρὶς ἀσθενής. Matt. xxvi. 41.

⁵ Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῇ, ἐφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι. c. vi.

tion, as they are by several of our own. In no case is there any written source indicated from which these passages are derived; they are simply quoted as words of Jesus, and being all connected either with the "Sermon on the Mount" or the "Lord's Prayer," the two portions of the teaching of Jesus which were most popular, widely known, and characteristic, there can be no doubt, that they were familiar throughout the whole of the early Church, and must have formed a part of most or all of the many collections of the words of the Master. To limit them to our actual Gospels, which alone survive, would be absurd, and no reference to them, without specification of the source, can be received as evidence even of the existence of our Synoptics. We shall fully demonstrate this in considering the origin and composition of our present Gospels, but we may here briefly illustrate the point from the Synoptics themselves. Assuming the parable of the Sower to be a genuine example of the teaching of Jesus, as there is every reason to believe, it may with certainty be asserted that it must have been included in many of the records circulating among early Christians, to which reference is made in the prologue to the third Gospel. It would not be permissible to affirm that no part of that parable could be referred to by an early writer without that reference being an indication of acquaintance with our Synoptic Gospels. The parable is reported in closely similar words in each of those three Gospels,¹ and it may have been, and probably was, recorded similarly in a dozen more. Confining ourselves, however, for a moment to the three Synoptics: what could a general allusion to the parable of the Sower prove regarding their existence and use, no mention of a particular source being made? Would it prove that all the three were extant, and that the writer knew them all, for each of them containing the parable would possess an equal claim to the reference? Could it with any reason be affirmed that he was acquainted with Matthew and not with Mark? or with Mark and not with Matthew and Luke? or with the third Gospel and not with either of the other two? The case is the very same if we extend the illustration, and along with the Synoptics include the numerous other records of the early Church. The anonymous quotation of historical expressions of Jesus cannot prove the existence of one special document among many to which we may choose to trace it. This is more especially to be insisted on from the fact, that hitherto we have not met with any mention of any one of our Gospels, and have no right even to assume their existence from any evidence which has been furnished.

¹ Matt. xiii. 3-23; Mark iv. 2-29; Luke viii. 4-15.

CHAPTER III.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

WE shall now consider the evidence furnished by the works of Justin Martyr, regarding the existence of our Synoptic Gospels at the middle of the second century, and we may remark, in anticipation, that whatever differences of opinion may finally exist regarding the solution of the problem which we have to examine, at least it is clear that the testimony of Justin Martyr is not of a nature to establish the date, authenticity, and character of Gospels professing to communicate such momentous and astounding doctrines. The determination of the source from which Justin derived his facts of Christian history has for a century attracted more attention, and excited more controversy, than almost any other similar question in connection with patristic literature, and upon none have more divergent opinions been expressed.

Justin, who suffered martyrdom about A.D. 166—167,¹ under Marcus Aurelius, probably at the instigation of the cynical philosopher, Crescens, was born in the Greek-Roman colony, Flavia Neapolis,² established during the reign of Vespasian, near the ancient Sichem in Samaria. By descent he was a Greek, and during the earlier part of his life a heathen, but after long and disappointed study of Greek philosophy, he became a convert to Christianity³ strongly tinged with Judaism. It is not necessary to enter into any discussion as to the authenticity of the writings which have come down to us bearing Justin's name, many of which are undoubtedly spurious, for the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho, with which we have almost exclusively to do, are generally admitted to be genuine. It is true that there has been a singular controversy regarding the precise relation to each other of the two Apologies now extant, the following contradictory views having been maintained: that they are the two

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 16. Chron. Pasch. A.D. 165; Anger, Synops. Evan., p. xxvi.; Baum, Vorles. Chr. Dogmengesch. I. i. p. 253; Bleek, Einl. N.T., p. 228; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 100; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doct., ii. p. 73; Eichhorn (c. A.D. 163), Einl. N.T., i. p. 84; Guericke, H'buch K.G., p. 150, p. 377; Milman, Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 134 f.; Reuss, Gesch. b. Schr. N.T., p. 288; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 20; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 25; De Wette (c. 163), Einl. N.T., 1860, p. 104.

² Apol. i. 1.

³ Dial. c. Tryph., ii. ff.

Apologies mentioned by Eusebius, and in their original order; that they are Justin's two Apologies, but that Eusebius was wrong in affirming that the second was addressed to Marcus Aurelius; that our second Apology was the preface or appendix to the first, and that the original second is lost. The shorter Apology contains nothing of interest connected with our inquiry.

There has been much controversy as to the date of the two Apologies, and much difference of opinion still exists on the point. Many critics assign the larger to about A.D. 138—140, and the shorter to A.D. 160—161.¹ A passage, however, occurs in the longer Apology, which indicates that it must have been written about a century and a half after the commencement of the Christian era, or, according to accurate reckoning, about A.D. 147. Justin speaks, in one part of it, of perverted deductions being drawn from his teaching "that Christ was born 150 years ago under Cyrenius."² Those who contend for the earlier date have no stronger argument against this statement than the unsupported assertion, that in this passage Justin merely speaks "in round numbers," but many important circumstances confirm the date which Justin thus gives us. In the superscription of the Apology, Antoninus is called "Pius," a title which was first bestowed upon him in the year 139. Moreover, Justin directly refers to Marcion, as a man "now living and teaching his disciples . . . and who has by the aid of demons caused many of all nations to utter blasphemies, &c."³ Now the fact has been established that Marcion did not come to Rome, where Justin himself was, until A.D. 139—142,⁴ when his prominent public career commenced, and it is apparent that the words of Justin indicate a period when his

¹ *Auger*, Synops. Ev., p. xxvi.; *Bansen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 553; *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 85; *Delitzsch*, Neue Unters. Entst. Kan. Ev., 1853, p. 30; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vii. p. 513; *Guericke*, H'buch K.G., p. 151.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 505; *Niedner*, Gesch. d. chr. Kirche, p. 206; *Neander*, K.G., ii. p. 1147; *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, p. 53; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marcion's, 1846, p. 146; *Semisch*, Die apost. Denkw. Des Märt. Justinus, 1848, p. 3 f.; *Tholuck*, Glaubwürdigkeit d. evang. Gesch., 1838, p. 272; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 26.

² ἵνα δὲ μηδὲν ἀλογιστάινοντες εἰς ἀποτροπὴν τῶν δεδιδυγμένων ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἰπωσὶ, πρὸ ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν πενήνηντα γεγεννησθαι τὸν Χριστὸν λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, κ.τ.λ. Apol. i. 46.

³ Μαρκιῶνα δὲ τινὰ Ποντικόν, ὃς καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ διδασκῶν τοὺς πεποιημένους, . . . ὃς κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων συλληψεως, πολλοὺς πεποίηκε βλασφημίας λέγειν, κ.τ.λ. Apol. i. 26.

⁴ *Auger*, Synops. Ev., p. xxiv, f.; *Baur*, Gesch. chr. K., i. p. 196; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 126; *Bansen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 562; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 40 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Der Canon, p. 21 f.; *Lipsius*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1867, p. 75 ff.; *Krim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 138, ann. 2; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 244; *Scholten*, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 73; *Schleiermacher*, Sammlt. Werke, 1840, xi. p. 107; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 57; *Volkmar*, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 120, 1855, p. 270 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 273.

doctrines had already become widely diffused. For these and many other strong reasons, which need not here be detailed, the majority of competent critics agree in more correctly assigning the first Apology to about A.D. 147.¹ The Dialogue with Trypho as internal evidence shows,² was written after the longer Apology and it is therefore generally dated some time within the first decade of the second half of the second century.³

In these writings Justin quotes very copiously from the Old Testament, and he also very frequently refers to facts of Christian history and to sayings of Jesus. Of these references, for instance, some fifty occur in the first Apology, and upwards of seventy in the Dialogue with Trypho, a goodly number, it will be admitted, by means of which to identify the source from which he quotes. Justin himself frequently and distinctly says that his information and quotations are derived from the "Memoirs of the Apostles" (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*), but except upon one occasion which we shall hereafter consider, when he indicates Peter, he never mentions an author's name. Upon examination it is found that, with only one or two brief exceptions, the numerous quotations from these Memoirs differ more or less widely from parallel passages in our Synoptic Gospels, and in many cases differ in the same respects as similar quotations found in other writings of the second century, the writers of which are known to have made use of uncanonical Gospels, and further, that these passages are quoted several times, at intervals, by Justin with the same variations. Moreover, sayings of Jesus are quoted from these Memoirs which are not found in our Gospels at all, and facts in the life of Jesus and circumstances of Christian history derived from the same source, not only are not found in our Gospels, but are in contradiction with them.

These peculiarities have, as might have been expected, created much diversity of opinion regarding the nature of the "Memoirs of the Apostles." In the earlier days of New Testament criticism more especially, many of course at once identified the Memoirs

¹ *Beur.* Vorles. chr. Dogmengesch., I. i. p. 254, cf. 151, ann. 2; *Böhringer*, Kirchengesch. in Biographien, 2. Aufl. I. i. p. 117; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 104; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 374; *Hilgenfeld*, Der Kanon, p. 24; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 336; *Lipsius*, Gnosticismus, p. 39 f.; *Zur Quellenkr. des. Epi. phanius*, p. 59 f.; *Riggenbach*, Die Zeugnisse, f. d. Evang. Johan., p. 18 f.; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 21 f., p. 160, ann. 2; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 216 ff., cf. p. 342 f., p. 359; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 89 f., p. 162, Theol. Jahrb., 1855, p. 270 ff.

² *Dial. c. Tr.*, cxx.
³ *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 553; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 104; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 374; *Quericke*, H'buch K. G., p. 151; *Hilgenfeld*, Der Kanon, p. 24; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 138, ann. 2; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 152, p. 490 f.; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 23; *Das. Evang. Johannes*, p. 9, 11; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 93 f., p. 108 f., and p. 163; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1865, p. 465.

with our Gospels exclusively, and the variations were explained by conveniently elastic theories of free quotation from memory, imperfect and varying MSS., combination, condensation and transposition of passages, with slight additions from tradition, or even from some other written source, and so on.¹ Others endeavoured to explain away difficulties by the supposition that they were a simple harmony of our Gospels,² or a harmony of the Gospels, with passages from some apocryphal work.³ A much greater number of critics, however, adopt the conclusion that, along with our Gospels, Justin made use of one or more apocryphal Gospels, and more especially of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or according to Peter, and also perhaps of tradition.⁴ Others assert that he made use of a special unknown Gospel, or of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or according to Peter, with a subsidiary use of a version of one or two of our Gospels to which, however, he did not attach much importance, preferring the apocryphal work;⁵ whilst others have concluded that Justin did not make use of our Gospels at all, and that his quotations are either from the

¹ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 330 f.; *Semisch*, *Die Apost. Denkwürdigk. des Mär. Justinus*, 1848, p. 96 ff., p. 389 ff.; *Lange*, *Ausf. Gesch. d. Dogmen.*, 1796, i. p. 132, p. 184; *Michaelis*, *Einkl. N. B.* 1788, i. p. 32 f.; *Tregelles*, *Canon Murat.*, 1867, p. 70 ff.; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 93—145; *Hug*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1847, ii. p. 92 ff., i. p. 132; *Winer*, *Justinum Mart. evang. Canon usum, fuisse ostendit*, 1819; *Scholz*, *Nov. Test. Græce*, i., proleg. p. v.; *Olshausen*, *Die Echth. d. vier kan. Evv.* 1823, p. 279 ff.; *Münster*, *Theol. Schriften*, 1825, p. 1 ff.; *Bindemann*, *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1842, p. 355 ff., p. 468 ff.; *Ritschl*, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, 1846, pp. 130—151; *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 482 ff.; *Delitzsch*, *Unters. üb. Entst. Kan. Evv.* 1853, i. p. 25 ff.; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.* p. 27 f. p. 76 ff.

² *Paulus*, *Ob uas Ev. Just. das Ev. nach. d. Hebräern sei.*, *Exeg. Kr. Abhandl.*, 1784, p. 1—35; *Theol. exeg. Conservator.*, 1822, p. 52—72.

³ *Gratz*, *Krit. Unters. üb. Justin's ap. Denkw.*, 1814.

⁴ *Bleek*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 229 ff., 314 f., 637; *Beiträge Zur Ev. Krit.*, 1846, p. 220 ff.; *Bunsen*, *Bibelwerk*, viii. p. 553 ff.; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 19 f., p. 111, p. 374 f.; *Dodwell*, *Dissert. in Irenæum*, 1689, p. 70 f.; *Ewald*, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.* 1853—54, p. 59 ff., *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* vii., p. 512; *Eckermann*, *Theol. Beiträge*, 1796, v. 2, p. 168 f., p. 214; *Grabe*, *Spicil. Patr.*, i. p. 16, p. 19; *Guericke*, *Gesamtgesch. N. T.*, 1854, p. 222 ff., p. 570 f.; *Holtzmann*, *Die synopt. Evv.* 1863, p. 372, p. 402; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Nazara*, i. pp. 30, 51, 85, &c.; *Köstlin*, *Der Ursprung synopt. Evv.*, p. 372 f.; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 34, p. 89 ff., p. 103 f.; *Meyer*, *Kr. ex. H'buch Ev. Johann.* 5 aufl. p. 7 ff.; *Neudecker*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1840, p. 52 ff.; *Schotten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 21 f.; *Das alt. Evang.*, 1869, p. 248; *Schott*, *Isaoge Hist. Crit. in lib. N. Fæd.*, 1830, p. 18 ff.; *De Wette*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 6 aufl., p. 111 ff., p. 113; *Wülke*, *Tradition u. Mythe*, 1837, p. 30 f.; *Lücke*, *Comm. Ev. des Johannes*, 1840, i. p. 44 f., anm. 4.

⁵ *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 91 f.; *Die Evangelien*, p. 631, p. 634 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. Justin's* u. s. w., 1850, p. 252—304, p. 263 ff., p. 284; *Die Evangelien*, 1854, p. 58, cf. p. 239 f., p. 346; *Der Canon*, p. 24 f.; *J. G. C. Schmidt*, *Hist. crit. Einkl. N. T.*, 1804, p. 218; *Storr*, *Ueb. Zweck d. Evang. Gesch.* u. Br. Johan., 1786, p. 363—375; *Müncher*, *H'buch chr. Dogmengesch.*, 1804, i. p. 218—221; *Baur*, *Kr. Unters. ü. d. kan. Evv.*, 1847, p. 572 ff.; *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, 1863, i. p. 140; *Zeller*, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 26—51; *Reuss*, *Gesch. h. Schr. N. T.*, p. 192 f.; cf. *Hist. du Canon* p. 54 ff.

Gospel according to the Hebrews or according to Peter, or from some other special apocryphal Gospel now no longer extant.¹

Evidence permitting of such wide diversity of results to serious and laborious investigation of the identity of Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles, cannot be of much value towards establishing our Gospels, and in the absence of any specific mention of our Synoptics any very elaborate examination of the Memoirs might be considered unnecessary, more especially as it is admitted almost universally by competent critics, that Justin did not himself consider the Memoirs of the Apostles inspired, or of any dogmatic authority, and had no idea of attributing canonical rank to them.² In pursuance of the system which we desire invariably to adopt of enabling every reader to form his own opinion, we shall as briefly as possible state the facts of the case, and furnish materials for a full comprehension of the subject.

Justin himself, as we have already stated, frequently and distinctly states that his information regarding Christian history and his quotations are derived from the Memoirs of the Apostles (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*), to adopt the usual translation although the word might more correctly be rendered "Recollections," or "Memorabilia." It has frequently been surmised that this name was suggested by the *ἀπομνημονεύματα Σωκράτους* of Xenophon, but, as Credner has pointed out, the similarity is purely accidental, and to constitute a parallel the title should have been "Memoirs of Jesus."³ The word *ἀπομνημονεύματα* is here evidently used merely in the sense of records written from memory, and is so employed by Papias in the passage preserved by Eusebius regarding Mark, who, although he had not himself followed the Lord, yet recorded his words from what he heard from Peter, and who,

¹ Corrodi, Versuch Beleucht. d. jud. u. chr. Bibel Kanons, 1792, ii. p. 153 ff.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 258 ff., Gesch. N. T. Kanons, p. 7. ff., p. 17, p. 22; Bertholdt, Einl. A. u. N. T., 1813, iii. p. 1213; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T. i. p. 20, p. 84-116; Gieseler, Hist. krit. Versuch d. d. Entst. schr. Evv., 1818, p. 132, p. 182 f.; Mayenhoff, Einl. petr. Schr. p. 242 ff. p. 302 f.; M. Nicolas, Etudes sur les Evang. apocr. 1866, p. 50 ff., Etudes crit. sur la Bible: N. T., 1864, p. 314 ff.; Rosenmüller, Hist. interpret. libr. sacr., 1795, i. p. 154 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 205 ff.; Stroth, Fragm. d. Evang. u. d. Hebräern aus Just. Mär. im. Repert. f. bibl. u. morgenl. Litt. 1771, i. p. 1-59; Wegscheider, Versuch Frl. in d. Ev. d. Johannes, 1806, p. 113 f.

- Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 635 ff.; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 540; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 106 ff., Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 21; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 332; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr. vii. p. 512; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's p. 304, Der Kanon. p. 26; Nicolas, Etudes Crit. sur la Bible: N. T. p. 299 ff., p. 314 ff. Scherer, Rev. de Théologie, 1855, x. p. 207, 215-217; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 22 f., 38 and 62, Das Evang. n. Johan. übers. Lang. p. 11; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 230 f.; Weiss, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1864, p. 147; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 149; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 92; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 51 f. Gesch. h. Schr. N. T., p. 289.

² Credner, Beiträge, p. 105.

ained
mory,
and
on, or
ndea-
they
e Gos-
reater
g with
ospels,
ews, or
assert
Gospel
idiary
wever,
ryphal
ake use
om the

e Apost.
f. Gesch.
p. 32 f.;
45; Hug,
ng. Canon
; Olshau-
ten, 1825,
; Ritschl,
Delitzsch,
den, u. s.
Abhandl.,

p. 220 ff.;
11, p. 374
iss. 1853
1796, v.
untgesch.
p. 372, p.
g synopt.
eyer, Kr.
p. 52 ff.;
choy, Isa-
6 aul., p.
n. Ev. des

Hilgenfeld
vangelien,
Hist. crit.
r. Johan.
218-221;
e, 1863, i.
T., p. 192

having done so without order, is still defended for "thus writing some things as he remembered them" (οὕτως ἐν τῇ γράφῃ ὥς ἀπεμνημόνευεν).¹ In the same way Irenæus refers to the "Memoirs of a certain Presbyter of apostolic times" (ἀπομνημονεύματα ἀποστολικῶν τινὸς πρεσβυτέρου)² whose name he does not mention; and Origen still more closely approximates to Justin's use of the word when, expressing his theory regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the phraseology and the composition are of one recording what the Apostle said (ἀπομνημονεύσας τινὸς τὰ ἀποστολικὰ), and as of one writing at leisure the dictation of his master.³ Justin himself speaks of the authors of the Memoirs as οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες,⁴ and the expression was then and afterwards constantly in use amongst ecclesiastical and other writers.⁵

The title, "Memoirs of the Apostles," however, although most appropriate to mere recollections of the life and teaching of Jesus, evidently could not be applied to works ranking as canonical Gospels, but in fact excludes such an idea; and the whole of Justin's view regarding Holy Scripture prove that he saw in the Memoirs merely records from memory to assist memory.⁶ He does not call them γράφαι, but adheres always to the familiar name ἀπομνημονεύματα, and whilst his constant appeals to a written source show very clearly his abandonment of oral tradition, there is nothing in the name of his records which can identify them with our Gospels.

Justin designates the source of his quotations ten times, the "Memoirs of the Apostles,"⁷ and five times he calls it simply the "Memoirs."⁸ He says, upon one occasion, that these Memoirs were composed "by his Apostles and their followers,"⁹ but except in one place, to which we have already referred, and which we shall hereafter fully examine, he never mentions the author's name, nor does he ever give any more precise information regarding their composition. It has been argued that, in saying that these Memoirs were recorded by the Apostles and their followers,

¹ Eusebius, H. E. iii, 39.

² *Ib.* v. 8.

³ *Ib.* vi. 25.

⁴ Apol., i. 33.

⁵ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 105 f., Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 12; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 53 f.; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 95, note 1. The Clementine Recognitions (ii. 1), make the Apostle Peter say: In consuetudine habui verba domini mei, quæ ab ipso audieram revocare ad memoriam.

⁶ Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 12 f.; Beiträge, i. p. 106 f.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 226 f.

⁷ Apol. i. 66, 67, cf. i. 33; Dial. c. Tr., 88, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and twice in 106.

⁸ Dial. 103, 105, thrice 107.

⁹ Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθήσαντων συντετάχθαι, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 103.

Justin intentionally and literally described the four canonical Gospels, the first and fourth of which are ascribed to Apostles, and the other two to Mark and Luke, the followers of Apostles;¹ but such an inference is equally forced and unfounded. The language itself forbids this explanation, for Justin does not speak indefinitely of the Memoirs of Apostles and their followers, but of Memoirs of the Apostles, invariably using the article, which refers the Memoirs to the collective body of the Apostles.² Moreover the incorrectness of such an inference is manifest from the fact that circumstances are stated by Justin as derived from these Memoirs, which do not exist in our Gospels at all, and which, indeed, are contradictory to them. Vast numbers of spurious writings, moreover, bearing the names of Apostles and their followers, and claiming more or less direct apostolic authority, were in circulation in the early Church: Gospels according to Peter,³ to Thomas,⁴ to James,⁵ to Judas,⁶ according to the Apostles, or according to the Twelve,⁷ to Barnabas,⁸ to Matthias,⁹ to Nicodemus,¹⁰ &c., and ecclesiastical writers bear abundant testimony to the early and rapid growth of apocryphal literature.¹¹ The very names of most of such apocryphal Gospels are lost, whilst of others we possess considerable information; but

¹ *Semisch*, Die ap. Denkwürdigk. Matt. Just., p. 80 f.

² *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's p. 12 f.; cf. *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1853--54, p. 59 f.; *Bleek* Einl. N. T., p. 637, ann.

³ *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 3, 25, vi. 12; *Hieron.*, De Vir Ill., 1; *Origen*, in Matth. x. 17.

⁴ *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 25; *Origen*, Ho. a. i. in Lucam; *Irenaeus*, Adv. Hær., i. 20; cf. *Tischendorf*, Evang. Apocr., 1853, proleg., p. xxxviii. ff.; Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 89 f.; *Hieron.*, Pref. in Matth.

⁵ *Tischendorf*, Evang. Apocr., proleg. p. xii. ff.; *Epiphanius*, Hær., lxxix. § 5, &c.

⁶ *Irenaeus*, Adv. Hær., i. 31, § 1; *Epiphanius*, Hær., xxxviii. § 1; *Theodoret*, Fab. Hær., i. 15.

⁷ *Origen*, Hom. i. in Lucam; *Hieron.*, Pref. in Matth., Adv. Pelagianus, iii. 1; *Fabrieus*, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 339 f.

⁸ *Decret. Gelasii*, vi. § 10; *Credner*, Zur Gesch. d. Kanons, p. 215.

⁹ *Origen*, Hom. i. in Lucam; *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 25, *Decret. Gelasii*, vi. 8; *Credner*, Zur Gesch. d. Kanons, p. 215; *Hieron.*, Pref. in Matth.

¹⁰ If this be not its most ancient title, the Gospel is in the Prologue directly ascribed to Nicodemus. The superscription which this apocryphal Gospel bears in the form now extant *Ἐκλογὴ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμεῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, recalls the title of Justin's Memoirs. *Tischendorf*, Evang. Apocr., p. 203 f., cf. Proleg. p. liv. ff.; *Fabrieus*, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 213 ff.; *Thilo*, Cod. Apocr. N. T., p. cxviii.--cxlii., p. 487 ff.

¹¹ *Luke* i. 1; *Irenaeus*, Adv. Hær., i. 20, § 1; *Origen*, Hom. i. in Lucam. *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 3, 25, iv. 22, vi. 12; *Fabrieus*, Cod. Apocr. N. T.; *Thilo*, Cod. Apocr. N. T.; *Tischendorf*, Evang. Apocr.; cf. *Milman*, Hist. of Christianity iii. p. 358, f., *Decret. Gelasii*, vi.; *Credner*, Zur Gesch. d. Kan., p. 215 f., *Gesch. d. N. T. Kanon*, p. 241 f., 279 f., 290 f., Beiträge, i. p. 107--268 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 52 ff., 77 f., 199 ff., 294 f.; *De Wette*, Lehrb. Einl. N. T., 1860, § 63 ff., §§ 73--74; *Reuss*, Gesch. h. Schr. N. T., §§ 245--250; *Gieseler*, Entst. schr. Evv., 1818, p. 8 ff.

nothing is more certain than the fact, that there existed many works bearing names which render the attempt to interpret the title of Justin's Gospel as a description of the four in our canon a mere absurdity. The words of Justin evidently imply simply that the source of his quotations is the collective recollections of the Apostles, and those who followed them, regarding the life and teaching of Jesus.

The title "Memoirs of the Apostles" by no means indicates a plurality of Gospels.¹ A single passage has been pointed out, in which the Memoirs are said to have been called *εὐαγγέλια* in the plural: "For the Apostles in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels,"² &c. The last expression *καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια*, as many scholars have declared, is a manifest interpolation. It is, in all probability, a gloss on the margin of some old MS. which some copyist afterwards inserted in the text.³ If Justin really stated that the Memoirs were called Gospels, it seems incomprehensible that he should never call them so himself. In no other place in his writings does he apply the plural to them, but, on the contrary, we find Trypho referring to the "so-called Gospel," which he states that he has carefully read,⁴ and which, of course, can only be Justin's "Memoirs;" and again, in another part of the same dialogue, Justin quotes passages which are written "in the Gospel"⁵ (*ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται*). The term "Gospel" is nowhere else used by Justin in reference to a written record.⁶ In no case, however, considering the numerous Gospels then in circulation, and the fact that many of these, different from the canonical Gospels, are known to have been exclusively used by distinguished contemporaries of Justin, and by various communities of Christians in that day, could such an expression be taken as a special indication of the canonical Gospels.⁷

Describing the religious practices amongst Christians, in another place, Justin states that, at their assemblies on Sundays, "the Memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are

¹ Cf. *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 233, ann. 3.

² Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, α καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. κ.τ.λ. *Apol.* i. 66.

³ An instance of such a gloss getting into the text occurs in *Dial.* 107, where in a reference to Jonah's prophecy that Nineveh should perish in three days, according to the version of the LXX, which Justin always quotes, there is a former marginal gloss "in other versions forty," incorporated parenthetically with the text.

⁴ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα. κ.τ.λ. *Dial.* c. Tr. 10.

⁵ *Dial.* 100.

⁶ There is one reference in the singular to the Gospel in the fragment *De Resurr.* 10, which is of doubtful authenticity.

⁷ *Credner* argues that, had Justin intended such a limitation, he must have said, α καλεῖται τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια. *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.* p. 10.

read
ident
know
canon
Justi
this.
was p
quote
Rome
was t
times.
Epist
readin
tinued
of He
cluded
early c
secure
Hebre
nites,
clusiv
their p

1 τὰ
προφητ
2 Cf. S
Hilgenfe
4 δηλο
αὐτῶν π
5 Haer
6 De V
7 Euseb
8 Socr
N. T. Ka
9 The
amongst
tanus (ed
the latter
together
(Credner,
received i
Church. (d
dort conj
Ep. of Ba
Codex Sin
10 Cf. I
xxiv. 7; J
f.; Theod
xii. 13; J
18, anni
Zeitalter,
p. 17 ff. ;

read as long as time permits."¹ This, however, by no means identifies the Memoirs with the canonical Gospels, for it is well known that many writings which have been excluded from the canon were publicly read in the Churches, until very long after Justin's day.² We have already met with several instances of this. Eusebius mentions that the Epistle of the Roman Clement was publicly read in most of the Churches in his time,³ and he quotes an Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth to Soter, the Bishop of Rome, which states that fact for the purpose of "showing that it was the custom to read it in the Churches, even from the earliest times."⁴ Dionysius likewise mentions the public reading of the Epistle of Soter to the Corinthians. Epiphanius refers to the reading in the Churches of the Epistle of Clement,⁵ and it continued to be so read in Jerome's day.⁶ In like manner the "Pastor" of Hermas,⁷ the "Apocalypse of Peter,"⁸ and other works excluded from the canon were publicly read in the Church in early days.⁹ It is certain that Gospels which did not permanently secure a place in the canon, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel according to Peter, the Gospel of the Ebionites, and many kindred Gospels, which in early times were exclusively used by various communities,¹⁰ must have been read at their public assemblies. The public reading of Justin's Memoirs,

¹ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκειται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Apol. i. 67.

² Cf. Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 228; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 91; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 19.

³ H. E., iii. 16.

⁴ δηλῶν ἀνέκαθεν ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἀναγνῶσιν αὐτῆς ποιῆσθαι. H. E. iv. 23.

⁵ Haer., xxx. 15.

⁶ De Vir. Ill., 15. . . . "que in nonnullis ecclesiis publice legitur."

⁷ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 3; Hieron. De Vir. Ill., 10.

⁸ Sozom., H. E., vii. 19; Canon Murator, Tregelles, p. 56 f.; cf. Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 157, 164; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 321 ff.

⁹ The "Pastor" of Hermas, and the "Apocalypse of Peter," are enumerated amongst the books of Holy Scriptures in the Stichometry of the Codex Charamontanus (ed. Tischendorf, p. 469; cf. Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 175 f.), and the latter is placed amongst the ἀντιλεγόμενα in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, together with the Apocalypse of John and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. (Credner, Zur Gesch. d. Kan., p. 117 ff.) In the Can. Murat. the Apoc. of Peter is received along with that of John, although some object to its being read in the Church. (Can. Murat., Tregelles, p. 65; Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 175 f.) Tischendorf conjectures that the Apocalypse of Peter may have been inserted between the Ep. of Barnabas and the Pastor of Hermas, where six pages are missing in the Codex Sinaiticus. (Nov. Test. Sinait., Lipsie, 1863, Proleg. p. xxxii.)

¹⁰ Cf. Irenæus, Adv. Hær., i. 26, § 2, iii. 11, § 7; Origen, Comm. in Exech., xiv. 7; Eusebius, H. E., iii. 25, 27, vi. 12; Epiphanius, Hær., xxix. 9, xxx. 3, 13 f.; Theodoret, Hær. Fab. ii. 22; Hieron., Adv. Pelag., iii. 2, Comm. in Matth. xii. 13; De Wette, Lehrb. Einl. N. T., p. 97 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 18, ann. 1; Gieseler, Entst. schrift. Evv., p. 10-26; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 258 ff., 234 ff.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 262 ff., Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 17 ff.; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 137 ff.

therefore, does not prove anything, for this practice was by no means limited to the works now in our canon.

The idea of attributing inspiration to the Memoirs, or to any other work of the Apostles, with the single exception, as we shall presently see, of the Apocalypse of John,¹ which, as prophecy, entered within his limits, was quite foreign to Justin, who recognized the Old Testament alone as the inspired word of God.² Indeed, as we have already said, the very name "Memoirs" in itself excludes the thought of inspiration,³ which Justin attributed only to prophetic writings; and he could not in any way regard as inspired the written tradition of the Apostles and their followers, or the mere record of words of Jesus. On the contrary, he held the accounts of the Apostles to be credible solely from their being authenticated by the Old Testament, and he clearly states that he believes the facts recorded in the Memoirs because the spirit of prophecy had already foretold them.⁴ According to Justin, the Old Testament contained all that was necessary for salvation, and its prophecies are the sole criterion of truth, the Memoirs, and even Christ himself, being merely its interpreters.⁵ He says that Christ himself commanded us not to put faith in human doctrines, but in those proclaimed by the holy prophets and taught by himself.⁶ Prophecy and the words of Christ himself are alone of dogmatic value, all else is human teaching.⁷ Indeed, from a passage quoted with approval by Irenæus, Justin, in his last work against Marcion, said: "I would not have believed the Lord himself, if he had proclaimed any other God than the Creator;" that is to say, the God of the Old Testament.⁸

That Justin does not mention the name of the author of the Memoirs would in any case render any argument as to their identity with our canonical Gospels inconclusive; but the total omission

¹ Dial. c. Tr., 81.

² *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 119 ff., 125 ff.; *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 14; *Is. nathbor*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 332; *Enault*, *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, vii. p. 512; *Gieseler*, *Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 174 ff., 182 f.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. h. Schr. N. T.*, p. 220; *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 92; *Weiss*, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1864, p. 117.

³ *Schaefer*, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 227; cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 106.

⁴ Apol., i. 33; cf. Dial. c. Tr., 119, Apol., i. 32, Dial. c. Tr., 48, 53.

⁵ Cf. Apol., i. 30, 32, 52, 53, 61; Dial. c. Tr., 32, 43, 46, 100; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 121 ff., *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 13 f.; *Donaldson*, *Hist. of Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 328; *Nicolas*, *Etudes sur les Ev. Apoc.*, p. 59; *Reuss*, *Gesch. h. Schr. N. T.*, p. 289, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 54; *Stroth*, *Richborn's Report*, p. 35, *Ann. c.*

⁶ Ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις διδάγματα κεκελεύσμεθα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Ἀποστόλου πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μαρτύρων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι' αὐτῶν διδασχέσθαι. Dial. c. Tr. 48.

⁷ *Reuss*, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 54.

⁸ Καὶ καλῶς ὁ Ἰουστίνος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα ἀνταγμῶτι φησὶ "Ὅτι αὐτῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ οὐδ' ἂν ἐπέσθην, ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς καταγγέλλωντι παρὰ τὸν δημιουργόν." Adv. Hæc. iv. 6, § 2. *Eusebius*, H. E. iv. 18.

to do
names
Semis
Justi
in wh
duced
inutili
therefo
tions. a
to be d
in the
specifi
be not
but als
that hi
theory
canonic
the div
greater
occasion
writing
as we h
butes to
tles of C
The mar
had been
Justin d
he does
and a fi
never ide
with the
It is pr
important

1 Semis
Westcott, on
2 H. no
that the loc
umption th
almost univ
course to o
Denkw. d. I
1842, p. 113
Ev. Justin
Beitrage ii
3 H. 2 p
ipostroph
Dial. c. Tr. 8
4 Schurze

to do so is the more remarkable from the circumstance that the names of Old Testament writers constantly occur in his writings. Semisch counts 197 quotations of the Old Testament, in which Justin refers to the author by name, or to the book, and only 117 in which he omits to do so,¹ and the latter number might be reduced by considering the nature of the passages cited, and the inutility of repeating the reference.² When it is considered, therefore, that notwithstanding the extremely numerous quotations, and references to facts of Christian history, all purporting to be derived from the "Memoirs," he absolutely never, except in the one instance referred to, mentions an author's name, or specifies more clearly the nature of the source, the inference must be not only that he attached small importance to the *Memoirs*, but also that he was actually ignorant of the author's name, and that his Gospel had no more definite superscription. Upon the theory that the Memoirs of the Apostles were simply our four canonical Gospels, the singularity of the omission is increased by the diversity of contents and of authors, and the consequently greater necessity and probability that he should, upon certain occasions, distinguish between them. The fact is, that the only writing of the New Testament to which Justin refers by name is, as we have already mentioned, the Apocalypse, which he attributes to "a certain man whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation made to him," &c.³ The manner in which John is here mentioned, after the Memoirs had been so constantly indefinitely referred to, clearly shows that Justin did not possess any Gospel also attributed to John. That he does name John, however, as author of the Apocalypse, and so frequently refers to Old Testament writers by name, yet never identifies the author of the Memoirs, is quite irreconcilable with the idea that they were the canonical Gospels.⁴

It is perfectly clear, however, and this is a point of very great importance upon which critics of otherwise widely diverging

¹ Semisch, *Denkwürd. Justinus*, p. 84; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 17; Wuttroff, *on the Canon*, p. 105; Eichhorn, *Einkl. N. T. I.* p. 102 f.

² It is not requisite that we should in detail refute the groundless argument that the looseness of Justin's quotations from the Old Testament justifies the assumption that his evangelical quotations, notwithstanding their looseness and almost universal inaccuracy, are taken from our Gospels. Those, however, who desire to examine the theory further, may be referred to Semisch, *Die ap. Denkw. d. Mart. Justinus*, pp. 239-273, and Bindemann, *Th. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1842, p. 114 ff., on the affirmative side, and to its refutation by Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's* pp. 16-62, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1850, pp. 385-439, 567-578; and Credner, *Beiträge* ii.

³ *Καὶ περὶ τῆς κατὰ πατρὶς ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησίας, ὃ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένης αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ.* *Ibid.* c. Tr. 81.

⁴ Schwegler, *Das Nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 233, *ann.* 3.

views are agreed, that Justin quotes from a *written* source, and that oral tradition is excluded from his system.¹ He not only does not, like Papias, attach value to tradition, but, on the contrary, he affirms that in the Memoirs is recorded "*everything* that concerns our Saviour Jesus Christ."² He constantly refers to them directly, as the source of his information regarding the history of Jesus, and distinctly states that he has derived his quotations from them. There is no reasonable ground whatever for affirming that Justin supplemented or modified the contents of the Memoirs by oral tradition. It must, therefore, be remembered, in considering the nature of these Memoirs, that the facts of Christian history and the sayings of Jesus are derived from a determinate written source, and are quoted as Justin found them there. Those who attempt to explain the divergences of Justin's quotations from the canonical Gospels, which they still maintain to have been his Memoirs, on the plea of oral tradition, defend the identity at the expense of the authority of the Gospels. For nothing could more forcibly show Justin's disregard and disrespect for the Gospels, than would the fact that, possessing them, he not only never names their authors, but considers himself at liberty continually to contradict, modify, and revise their statements.

As we have already remarked, when we examine the contents of the Memoirs of the Apostles, through Justin's numerous quotations, we find that many parts of the Gospel narratives are apparently quite unknown, whilst, on the other hand, we meet with facts of evangelical history, which are foreign to the canonical Gospels, and others which are contradictory of Gospel statements. Justin's quotations, almost without exception, vary more or less from the parallels in the canonical text, and often these variations are consistently repeated by himself, and are found in other works about his time. Moreover, Justin quotes expressions of Jesus which are not found in our Gospels at all. The omissions, though often very singular, supposing the canonical Gospels before him, and almost inexplicable when it is considered how important they would often have been to his argument, need not, as merely negative evidence, be dwelt on here, but we shall briefly illustrate the other peculiarities of Justin's quotations.

The only genealogy of Jesus which is recognised by Justin is traced through the Virgin Mary. She it is who is descended

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 129 ff., 220; Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 144; Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1853-54, p. 60; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 29 L, Der Kanon, p. 25; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 193, Hist. du Canon, p. 55; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 95.

² οὐ ἀπονημινομένους πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔδιδασκεν. Apol. i. 33.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 130.

fro
and
of
(
bor
han
fath
Jew
fore
of J
ealog
solely
Davi
ing i
That
the fi
Mary
angel
as "J
accord
tural c
name
ever, is
that no
but his
descent
third C
which
lineage
"to Be
Judah
that Ju
canonies

¹ Dial. c.
1-16;
² εἰς τὸ
Japhet H.
³ Dial. c.
⁴ Jid. p.
ἐνέειμι π
ἀναγινώσκ
λογιστέον
δογμα οὐδ
⁵ Mat. i.
⁶ Mat. i.
⁷ Luke i.
⁸ Dial. c.

from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and from the house of David, and Joseph is completely set aside.' Jesus "was born of a virgin of the lineage of Abraham and tribe of Judah and of David, Christ the Son of God."² "Jesus Christ the Son of God has been born without sin of a virgin sprung from the lineage of Abraham."³ "For of the virgin of the seed of Jacob, who was the father of Judah, who, as we have shown, was the father of the Jews, by the power of God was he conceived; and Jesse was his forefather according to the prophecy, and he (Jesus) was the son of Jacob and Judah according to successive descent."⁴ The genealogy of Jesus in the canonical Gospels, on the contrary, is traced solely through Joseph, who alone is stated to be of the lineage of David.⁵ The genealogies of Matthew and Luke, though differing in several important points, at least agree in excluding Mary. That of the third Gospel commences with Joseph, and that of the first ends with him: and Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."⁶ The angel who warns Joseph not to put away his wife, addresses him as "Joseph, thou son of David,"⁷ and the angel Gabriel, who, according to the third Gospel, announces to Mary the supernatural conception, is sent "to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David."⁸ So persistent, however, is Justin in ignoring this Davidic descent through Joseph, that not only does he at least eleven times trace it through Mary, but his Gospel materially differs from the canonical, where the descent of Joseph from David is mentioned by the latter. In the third Gospel, Joseph goes to Judaea "unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David."⁹ Justin, however, simply states that he went "to Bethlehem . . . for his descent was from the tribe of Judah which inhabited that region."¹⁰ There can be no doubt that Justin not only did not derive his genealogies from the canonical Gospels, but that on the contrary the Memoirs, from

¹ Dial. c. Tr. 23, 43 twice, 45 thrice, 100 twice, 101, 120, Apol. i. 32; cf. Matth. i. 1-16; Luke iii. 23-28.

² εἰς τὸν διὰ τῆς ἀπο τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Ἰακώβ Παθέριου γεννηθέντα υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν. Dial. c. Tr. 44.

³ Dial. c. Tr. 23.

⁴ Ἰδὲ γὰρ παθέριον τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰακώβ, τοῦ γεννημένου πατρός Ἰούδα, τοῦ δεδηλωμένου Ἰουδαίου πατρός, διὰ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ ἀνενυβήν καὶ Ἰεσοῦ προπάτωρ μὲν κατὰ τὸ λογικὸν γεννηταὶ τοῦ δὲ Ἰακώβ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα κατὰ γένους, διαδοχὴν υἱὸς ὤπρηχεν. Apol. i. 32.

⁵ Matth. i. 1-16; cf. Luke iii. 23-28.

⁶ Matth. i. 16; cf. Luke iii. 23.

⁷ Luke i. 27.

⁸ Dial. c. Tr. 78.

⁷ Matth. i. 20

Luke ii. 4.

which he did learn the Davidic descent through Mary only, differed persistently and materially from them.¹

Many traces still exist to show that the view of Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles of the Davidic descent of Jesus through Mary instead of through Joseph, as the canonical Gospels represent it, was anciently held in the Church. Apocryphal Gospels of early date, based without doubt upon more ancient evangelical works, are still extant, in which the genealogy of Jesus is traced, as in Justin's Memoirs, through Mary. One of these is the Gospel of James, commonly called the *Protevangelium*, a work referred to by ecclesiastical writers of the third and fourth centuries,² and which Tischendorf even ascribes to the first three decades of the second century,³ in which Mary is stated to be of the lineage of David.⁴ She is also described as of the royal race and family of David in the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary,⁵ and in the Gospel of pseudo-Matthew her Davidic descent is prominently mentioned.⁶ There can be no doubt that all of these works are based upon earlier originals,⁷ and there is no reason why they may not have been drawn from the same source from which Justin derived his version of the genealogy in contradiction of the Synoptics.⁸

¹ Cf. Gredner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 297 f. & 215; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 140, 148, 156 ff.

² Clemens, *Al.*, Strom., vi. 16, § 26; *Prolog*, Comm. in Matth. iii.; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxxix. § 5; of *Fabrianus*, *cod. Apoc. N. T.*, i. p. 39 ff.; *Thilo*, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, proleg. xiv. ff.

³ Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 75 ff. cf. *Protevangelium Apoc. Prolog*, p. xii. ff.

⁴ Καὶ ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ τῇ ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς τοῦ δαυὶδ, ὅτι ἦν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς δαβὶδ, u. s. l. *Protevangelium Jacobi*, x.; Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apoc.*, p. 19 f.; *Fabrianus*, *l.c.*, *Apoc. N. T.*, i. p. 50.

⁵ *Maria de stirpe regis et familia David oriunda*. *Evangelium de Nativitate Mariæ*, i., *Fabrianus*, *l.c.*, *Apoc. N. T.*, i. p. 19; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apoc.*, p. 106.

⁶ *Pseudo-Matth. Evangelium*, i. c. 1, *l.c.*; Tischendorf, *Ev. Apoc.*, p. 54, 73. cf. *Hist. de Peter. Mar. et de Ep. Jacobi*, *l.c.*; *Thilo*, *Cod. ap. N. T.*, p. 374. Regarding the antiquity of some of these works of Tischendorf, *Ev. Apoc. proleg.*, p. xxv. ff.

⁷ Hilgenfeld, *l.c.*, *Justin's*, p. 148 ff. Hilgenfeld conjectures that the *Protevangelium* may have been based upon the Gnostic work, the *Evangelium Mariæ* mentioned by Epiphanius, or in the Gospel according to Peter, *l.c.*, p. 159 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 84 ff.; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 78 ff.

⁸ Several of the Fathers in like manner assert the Davidic descent through Mary. Irenæus states that she was "of the lineage of David" (οἱ τῶς δαβὶδ τῆς γενεᾆς τῆς πατρὸς τοῦ δαυὶδ). Adv. Hær., iii. 21, § 5, and he argues that the Davidic descent through her is clearly indicated by prophecy. The same argument is taken up by Tertullian, who distinctly traces the descent of Christ through Mary (ex stirpe autem Jesse computatum per Mariam inde generandum. Adv. Marcionem, iii. 17. Eundem ex genere David secundum Mariam censum, *l.c.*, iv. 1, cf. v. 8). It is most probable that both Irenæus and Tertullian, who were well acquainted with the writings of Justin, followed him in this matter, for they very closely adopt his arguments. They may, however, have known apocryphal works containing the Davidic descent through Mary. They certainly did not derive it from the canonical Gospels.

In the narrative of the events which preceded the birth of Jesus, the first Gospel describes the angel as appearing only to Joseph and explaining the supernatural conception,¹ and the author seems to know nothing of any announcement to Mary.² The third Gospel, on the contrary, does not mention any such angelic appearance to Joseph, but represents the angel as announcing the conception to Mary herself alone.³ Justin's Memoirs know of the appearances both to Joseph and to Mary, but the words spoken by the angel on each occasion differ materially from those of both Gospels.⁴ In this place, only one point, however, can be noticed. Justin describes the angel as saying to Mary: "'Behold, thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost, and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called the Son of the highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins,' as they taught who recorded everything that concerns our Saviour Jesus Christ."⁵ Now this is a clear and direct quotation, but besides distinctly differing in form from our Gospels, it presents the important peculiarity that the words, "for he shall save his people from their sins," are not, in Luke, addressed to Mary at all, but that they occur in the first Gospel in the address of the angel to Joseph.⁶

These words, however, are not accidentally inserted in this place, for we find they are joined in the same manner to the address of the angel to Mary in the *Protevangelium of James*: "For the power of the Lord will overshadow thee: wherefore also that holy thing which is born of thee shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."⁷ Tischendorf states his own opinion that this passage is a recollection of the *Protevangelium* unconsciously added by Justin to the account in Luke,⁸ but the arbitrary nature of the limitation "unconsciously" (ohne dass er sich dessen bewusst war) here is evident. There is a point in connection with this which merits a moment's attention. In the text of the *Protevangelium*, edited by Tischendorf, the angel commences his address to Mary by saying: "Fear not, Mary, for thou

¹ Matth. i. 20 f.

² Cf. Matth. i. 18.

³ Luke i. 26 f., cf. ii. 5-6.

⁴ Apol. i. 33, Dial. c. Tr. 78, 100.

⁵ Ἰδοὺ συλλαβὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς ὀφείσκει κληθῆναι καὶ καλέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ὡς ὁ ἀποκεκρυμμένος πάντα τὰ πρὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰδ/αξ/α/ρ. Apol. i. 33.

⁶ Matth. i. 21.

⁷ Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ὑποτίθει σοι δὴ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐν σοὶ ἅγιον, κληθήσεται υἱὸς ὀφείσκει καὶ καλέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. Protev. Jacobi, xl; Tischendorf, Evang. Apocr., p. 22; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 93.

Wanwarden, u. s. w. p. 77.

hast found favour before the Lord, and thou shalt conceive of his Word" (καὶ συλλήψῃ ἐκ λόγου αὐτοῦ).¹ Now Justin, after quoting the passage above, continues to argue that the Spirit and the power must not be misunderstood to mean anything else than the Word, who is also the first born of God as the prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the Virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive.² The occurrence of the singular expression in the Protevangelium and the similar explanation of Justin immediately accompanying a variation from our Gospels, which is equally shared by the apocryphal work, strengthens the suspicion of a similarity of origin. Justin's divergences from the Protevangelium prevent our supposing that, in its present form, it could have been the actual source of his quotations, but the wide differences which exist between the extant MSS. of the Protevangelium show that even the most ancient does not present it in its original form. It is much more probable that Justin had before him a still older work, to which both the Protevangelium and the third Gospel were indebted.³

Justin's account of the removal of Joseph to Bethlehem is peculiar, and evidently is derived from a distinct uncanonical source. It may be well to present his account and that of Luke side by side.

JUSTIN, DIAL. C. TR. 78.

On the occasion of the first census which was taken in Judaea (ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ)

under Cyrenius (first Procurator (ἐπίτροπος) of Judaea. Apol. i. 34), Joseph had gone up from Nazareth, where he dwelt, to Bethlehem, from whence he was, to enrol himself; for his descent was from the tribe of Judah, which inhabited that region.⁴

LUKE II. 1-5.

1. . . . there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world (πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην) should be enrolled.

2. And this census was first made when Cyrenius was Governor (ἡγεμὼν) of Syria. 4. And Joseph went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; because he was of the house and lineage of David; 5. to enrol himself.

¹ Protev. Jac., xi.; Tischendorf, Evang. Apoc., p. 21 f. The peculiar expression is wanting in most of the other known MSS.

² Τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῶσι θεοίς, ἢ τὸν λόγον, ὃς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ θεῷ ἐστίν, ὡς Μωσὴς ὁ προδεδιωμένος προφήτης ἐμήνυσε. Καὶ τοῦτο, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐπισκιάσας, κ.τ.λ. Apol. i. 33.

³ Cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 154 ff.; Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1853-54, p. 60 f.; Ritsehl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 145 f.

⁴ . . . Ἄλλῃ, ἀπογραφῇς αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης, πικρυμένη, ἀνελήλυθε ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, ἐνθα ὤκει ἐν Βηθλέμ, ὅθεν ἐν, ἀπογραφῇσθαι πρὸ γὰρ τῆς κατοικουμένης τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης αὐτῆς Ἰουδα τὸ γένος ἦν. Dial. 78.

Atto
whic
Mar
seen
tine
of Jo
possi
trary
hold
of the
of the
ations
into a
the co
Justin
narrat
tending
nius a
careful
Joseph
Hae
view
have
pel, al
little
howev
with I
being t
opposit
but wa
such, w
ment o
institut
ment in
the Kin
same sp
ties, wh
the Kin
" under
narrative

1 Cf. Cr
2 Hilgen
Ritsehl, Di
kenburger,
Antiq., xv,
3 Apol.,

Attention has already been drawn to the systematic manner in which the Davidic descent of Jesus is traced by Justin through Mary, and to the suppression in this passage of all that might seem to indicate a claim of descent through Joseph. As the continuation of a peculiar representation of the history of the infancy of Jesus, differing materially from that of the Synoptics, it is impossible to regard this, with its remarkable variations, as an arbitrary correction by Justin of the canonical text, and we must hold it to be derived from a different source, perhaps, indeed, one of those from which Luke's Gospel itself first drew the elements of the narrative, and this persuasion will increase as further variations in the earlier history, presently to be considered, are taken into account. It is not necessary to enter into the question of the correctness of the date of this census, but it is evident that Justin's Memoirs clearly and deliberately modify the canonical narrative. The limitation of the census to Judæa, instead of extending it to the whole Roman Empire; the designation of Cyrenius as ἐπίτροπος of Judæa instead of ἡγεμὼν of Syria; and the careful suppression of the Davidic element in connection with Joseph indicate a peculiar written source from the Synoptics.¹

Had Justin departed from the account in Luke with the view of correcting inaccurate statements, the matter might have seemed more consistent with the use of the third Gospel, although, at the same time, it might have evinced but little reverence for it as a canonical work. On the contrary, however, the statements of Justin are still more inconsistent with history than those in Luke, inasmuch as; so far from being the first procurator of Judæa, as Justin's narrative states in opposition to the third Gospel, Cyrenius never held that office, but was really, later, the imperial proconsul over Syria, and as such, when Judæa became a Roman province after the banishment of Archelaus, had the power to enrol the inhabitants, and instituted Coponius as first Procurator of Judæa. Justin's statement involves the position that at one and the same time Herod was the King, and Cyrenius the Roman Procurator of Judæa.² In the same spirit, and departing from the usual narrative of the Synoptics, which couples the birth of Jesus with "the days of Herod the King," Justin in another place states that Christ was born "under Cyrenius."³ Justin evidently adopts without criticism a narrative which he found in his Memoirs, and does not merely

¹ Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 229 ff.; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 144 ff.

² Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol., 1865, p. 408, Die Ev. Justin's, p. 147 f.; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 144 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 231 ff.; Schneckenburger, Vorles. ü. N. T. Zeitgesch., ed. Löhlein, 1862, p. 199 ff.; Joseph., Antiq., xviii. 1, § 1; Tertullian, Adv. Marc., iv. 19.

³ Apol., i. 46.

correct and remodel a passage of the third Gospel, but, on the contrary, seems altogether ignorant of it.¹

The genealogies of Jesus in the first and third Gospels differ irreconcilably from each other. Justin differs from both. In this passage another discrepancy arises. While Luke seems to represent Nazareth as the dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary, and Bethlehem as the city to which they went solely on account of the census,² Matthew, who seems to know nothing of the census, makes Bethlehem, on the contrary, the place of residence of Joseph,³ and on coming back from Egypt, with the evident intention of returning to Bethlehem, Joseph is warned by a dream to turn aside into Galilee, and he goes and dwells, apparently for the first time, "in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene."⁴ Justin, however, goes still further than the third Gospel in his departure from the data of Matthew, and where Luke merely infers, Justin distinctly asserts Nazareth to have been the dwelling-place of Joseph (*ἐνθα ὤκει*) and Bethlehem, in contradistinction, the place from which he derived his origin (*ᾧθεν ἦν*).⁵

The same view is to be found in several apocryphal Gospels still extant. In the Protevangelium of James again, we find Joseph journeying to Bethlehem with Mary before the birth of Jesus.⁶ The census here is ordered by Augustus, who commands: "That all who were in Bethlehem of Judaea, should be enrolled,"⁷ a limitation worthy of notice in comparison with that of Justin. In like manner the Gospel of the Nativity. This Gospel represents the parents of Mary as living in Nazareth, in which place she was born,⁸ and it is here that the Angel Gabriel announces to her the supernatural conception.⁹ Joseph goes to Bethlehem to set his house in order and prepare what is necessary for the marriage, but then returns to Nazareth, where he remains with Mary

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 230 ff.; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 144 f.; cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 147 f.

² Luke ii. 4.

³ Matt. ii. 1; cf. Alford, Greek Test., i. p. 14.

⁴ Matt. ii. 22 f. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the author of the first Gospel quotes some apocryphal work; and that the last word is a total misconception of the phrase. The word *Ναζωραῖος* should have been *Ναζιραῖος*, and the term has nothing whatever to do with the town of Nazareth. Cf. Ewald, Die drei ersten Evv., p. 176 f.; Alford, Greek Test., i. p. 17 f.

⁵ Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 216 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T. ii. p. 26; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 148 f.

⁶ Protev. Jac., xvii., cf. xxi.; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T., 1. p. 103; Tischendorf, Die Evang. Apocr., p. 30, p. 39.

⁷ *Κελευσὶς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου βασιλέως ἀπογράφεσθαι πάντας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας.* Protev. Jac., xvii.

⁸ Evang. de Nativ. Mariae, i. and viii.; cf. Evang. Thomae Lat., iii.; Tischendorf, Evang. Apocr., p. 158.

⁹ Ev. de Nat. Mariae, ix.

until
taken
of Be
recalls
As
we me
ical G
indica

But t
Bethle
able to
lodged
village,
there M
Christ
manger,

At le
place in
because
from ou
his theo
quoting
adopted
self dist
are man
ten sour
passages
Justin d
referred

1 Ev. de
2 Joseph
unde ipse c
i. p. 37; T
ib., i. p. 16
lehem, his
3 Cf. His
Joseph eun
Juda et de
4 Γεννηθ
ἐν τῇ καί
καὶ καὶ
Χριστὸν,
5 καὶ ἐτ
αὐτὸν κα
ἐν τῷ κα
6 Denkwi
7 Wenn u
ward und d

until her time was nearly accomplished,¹ "when Joseph having taken his wife with whatever else was necessary went to the city of Bethlehem, whence he was."² The phrase "*unde ipse erat*" recalls the *ὅθεν ἦν* of Justin.³

As we continue the narrative of the birth and infancy of Jesus, we meet with further variations from the account in the canonical Gospels for which the preceding have prepared us, and which indicate that Justin's Memorials certainly differed from them.

JUSTIN. DIAL. 78.

But the child having been born in Bethlehem,—for Joseph, not being able to find a lodging in the village, lodged in a certain cave near the village, and then while they were there Mary had brought forth the Christ and had placed him in a manger, &c.⁴

LUKE II. 7.

And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes and laid him in the manger; because there was no room in the inn.⁵

At least it is clear that the birth of Jesus here,—not taking place in Bethlehem itself, but in a cave (*ἐν σπηλαίῳ*) near the village, because Joseph could not find a lodging there,—are not derived from our Gospels, and here even Semisch⁶ is forced to abandon his theory that Justin's variations arise merely from imperfectly quoting from memory, and to conjecture that he must have adopted tradition. It has, however, been shown that Justin himself distinctly excludes tradition, and in this case, moreover, there are many special reasons for believing that he quotes from a written source. Ewald rightly points out that here, and in other passages, where in common with ancient ecclesiastical writers, Justin departs from our Gospels, the variation can in no way be referred to oral traditions;⁷ and, moreover, that when Justin

¹ Ev. de Nat. Mariæ, viii. ix.

² Joseph, uxore cum aliis quæ necessaria erant assumpta Bethlehem civitatem, unde ipse erat, tetendit. Evang. de Nat. Mar., x.; *Fabricsius*, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 37; *Tischendorf*, Ev. Apocr., p. 114, cf. Evang. infantie Arab., ii.; *Fabricsius*, ib., i. p. 169; *Tischendorf*, ib., p. 171. Here Joseph goes from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, his native city.

³ Cf. Hist. de Nat. Mar. et de Inf. Salv. xiii. "Necesse autem fuerat, ut et Joseph cum Maria proficisceretur in Bethlehem, quia exinde erat, et Maria de tribu Juda et de domo ac patria David." *Thilo*, Cod. Apocr. N. T., p. 374.

⁴ Γεννηθέντος δὲ τότε τοῦ παιδίου ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, ἐπειδὴ Ἰωσήφ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ καὶ ἐκείνῃ ποῦ καταλῦσαι, ἐν δὲ σπηλαίῳ τινὶ συνεγγυς τῆς καὶ καταλῦσε καὶ τότε αὐτῶν ὄντων ἐκεῖ, ἐτετόκει ἡ Μαρία τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ αὐτὸν ἐθεθεῖκε κ.τ.λ. Dial. 78.

⁵ καὶ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἱσπαργανώσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ, διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι. Luke ii 7.

⁶ Deukwürdigk. d. Märk. Just., p. 390 f.

⁷ Wenn nämlich Jesu nach Justin's rede in einer höhle bei Bätthlehem geboren ward und dasselbe auch sonst von alten kirchlichen schriftstellern erzähl't wird.

proves¹ from Isaiah xxxiii. 16, that Christ *must* be born in a cave, he thereby shows how certainly he found the fact of the cave in his written Gospel.² The whole argument of Justin excludes the idea that he could avail himself of mere tradition. He maintains that everything which the prophets had foretold of Christ had actually been fulfilled, and he perpetually refers to the Memoirs and other written documents for the verification of his assertions. He either refers to the prophets for the confirmation of the Memoirs, or shows in the Memoirs the narrative of facts which are the accomplishment of prophecies, but in both cases it is manifest that there must have been a record of the facts which he mentions. There can be no doubt that the circumstances we have just quoted, and which are not found in the canonical Gospels, must have been narrated in Justin's Memoirs.

We find, again, the same variations as in Justin in several extant apocryphal Gospels. The Protevangelium of James represents the birth of Jesus as taking place in a cave;³ so also the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy,⁴ and several others.⁵ This uncanonical detail is also mentioned by several of the Fathers, Origen and Eusebius both stating that the cave and the manger were still shown in their day.⁶ Tischendorf does not hesitate to affirm that Justin derived this circumstance from the Protevangelium.⁷ Justin, however, does not distinguish such a source, and the mere fact that we have a form of that Gospel, in which it occurs, still extant, by no means justifies such a specific conclusion, when so many other works, now lost, may equally have contained it. If the fact be derived from the Prote-

so kann man dieses sowie anders worin er von unsern Evangelien abweicht keineswegs aus einer mündlichen sage ableiten welche ihm zugekommen wäre: *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.* 1853-54, p. 60.

¹ Dial 71, cf. 70.

² Wenn aber Justinus (c. 78, vgl. 70) dass Christus in einer höhle geboren werden musste aus Jes. 33, 16, beweist, so zeigt sich damit nur wie gewiss er die höhle in seinen evang. schriften gefunden hatte. *Ib.*, p. 60, anm. 1.

³ Protev. Jac., xviii.; *Fabricius*, Cod. Apocr. N.T., i. p. 105; *Tischendorf*, Evang. Apocr., p. 32.

⁴ Evang. Infantie Arab., ii. iii.; *Fabricius*, *ib.*, i. p. 169 f.; *Tischendorf*, *ib.*, p. 171 f.

⁵ Pseudo-Matth. Ev., xiii. xiv.; *Tischendorf*, *ib.*, p. 74 f.; *Historia Josephi* Fab. Lign. vii.; *Tischendorf*, *ib.* p. 118; *Hist. de Nat. Mar. et de Inf. Salv.*, xiv.; *Thilo*, Cod. Apocr. N.T., p. 381.

⁶ *Origen*, Contra Cels., ii. 51. *Eusebius*, Vita Const., iii. 40 f. Their only variation from Justin's account is that they speak of the cave as in Bethlehem, while Justin describes it as near the village. Credner remarks that the sacredness of the spot might by that time have attracted people, and led to the extension of the town in that direction, till the site might have become really joined to Bethlehem. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 235; cf. *Socrates*, H. E., i. 17; *Sozomen*, H. E., ii. 2; *Epiphanius*, Hær., xx. 1; *Hieron.*, Ep., lviii., ad Paul,

⁷ Evang. Apocr. Proleg., p. xiii. Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 76 ff.

vange
have
of the
sion
ical G
the m
perhap
doubt
count
Justin
suppos
case it
from o

Just
shepher
rated in

To th
but in
"Magi
them as
punctili
"from
mention
introduc
times c
pression
the term
common

It is imp
tained t
Gospels.

Again
(ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ)

¹ Cf. *Eusebius*, p. 1

² Cf. *Eusebius*

³ *Bunsen*, Th.

mann, Th.

158 f., 259

p. 57; *Rite*

111, p. 113

p. 104, ann

⁵ *Matth.* i.

⁷ *Dial.* 77

⁸ *Dial.* 76

⁹ *Credner*

Hist. du Ca

vangelium, that work, or whatever other apocryphal Gospel may have supplied it, must be admitted to have at least formed part of the Memoirs of the Apostles, and with that necessary admission ends all special identification of the Memoirs with our canonical Gospels. Much more probably, however, Justin quotes from the more ancient source from which the Protevangelium, and perhaps Luke drew their narrative.¹ There can be very little doubt that the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained an account of the birth in Bethlehem, and as it is, at least, certain that Justin quotes other particulars from it, there is fair reason to suppose that he likewise found this fact in that work.² In any case it is indisputable that he derived it from a source different from our canonical Gospels.³

Justin does not apparently know anything of the episode of the shepherds of the plain, and the angelic appearance to them, narrated in the third Gospel.⁴

To the cave in which the infant Jesus is born came the Magi, but instead of employing the phrase used by the first Gospel, "Magi from the East,"⁵ (μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν) Justin always describes them as "Magi from Arabia," (μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας). Justin is so punctilious that he never speaks of these Magi without adding "from Arabia," except twice, where, however, he immediately mentions Arabia as the point of the argument for which they are introduced; and in the same chapter in which this occurs he four times calls them directly Magi from Arabia.⁶ He uses this expression not less than nine times.⁷ That he had no objection to the term "the East," and that with a different context it was common to his vocabulary, is proved by his use of it elsewhere.⁸ It is impossible to resist the conviction that Justin's Memoirs contained the phrase "Magi from Arabia," which is foreign to our Gospels.⁹

Again, according to Justin, the Magi see the star "in heaven" (ἐν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ),¹⁰ and not "in the East" (ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ) as the first

¹ Cf. *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1853-54, p. 60 f.; *Ritschl*, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 146.

² Cf. *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1853-54, p. 60 f., also ann. 1, and p. 61, ann. 2; *Schreyer*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 239.

³ *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 555; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 217 f., 235; *Binde-mann*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1842, p. 468; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 148 f., 158 f., 259; *Nicolas*, Etudes sur les Ev. Apocr., p. 52 f.; *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, p. 57; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 143 ff.; *De Wette*, Lehrb. Einl. N.T., p. 111, p. 113; *Semisch*, Denkw. d. M. Just., p. 390 ff.; *Kirchhafer*, Quellensamm., p. 104, ann. 32.

⁴ Luke ii. 8, 20.

⁵ Matt. ii. 1.

⁶ Dial. c. Tr., 78.


⁷ Dial. 77, 78 four times, 88, 102, 103, 106.

⁸ Dial. 76, 120, 121, 126, 140, &c.; cf. *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 149.




⁹ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 214; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 148; *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, p. 57.

¹⁰ Dial. 106.





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



Photographic Sciences Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

18
20
22
25
28
32
36
40
44
48
52
56
60
64
68
72
76
80
84
88
92
96
100

10
01

Gospel has it:¹ "When a star rose in heaven (*ἐν οὐρανῷ*) at the time of his birth as is recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles."² He apparently knows nothing of the star guiding them to the place where the young child was.³ Herod, moreover, questions the elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*)⁴ as to the place where the Christ should be born, and not the "chief priests and scribes of the people" (*ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ*).⁵ These divergences, taken in connection with those which are interwoven with the whole narrative of the birth, can only proceed from the fact that Justin quotes from a source different from ours.⁶

Justin relates that when Jesus came to Jordan he was believed to be the son of Joseph the carpenter, and he appeared without comeliness, as the Scriptures announced; "and being considered a carpenter,—for when he was amongst men, he made carpenter's works, ploughs and yokes (*ἀροτρα καὶ ζυγά*); by these both teaching the symbols of righteousness and an active life."⁷ These details are foreign to the canonical Gospels. Mark has the expression: "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?"⁸ but Luke omits it altogether.⁹ The idea that the Son of God should do carpenter's work on earth was very displeasing to many Christians, and attempts to get rid of the obnoxious phrase are evident in Mark. Apparently the copy which Origen used had omitted even the modified phrase, for he declares that Jesus himself is nowhere called a carpenter in the Gospels current in the Church.¹⁰ A few MSS. still extant are without it, although it is found in all the more ancient Codices.

Traces of these details are found in several apocryphal works, especially in the Gospel of Thomas, where it is said: "Now his father was a carpenter and made at that time ploughs and yokes" (*ἀροτρα καὶ ζυγούς*).¹¹ an account which, from the similarity of language was in all probability derived from the same source as that of Justin. The explanation which Justin adds: "by which

¹ Matt. ii 2, cf. ii. 9; cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. 216.

² Dial. 106.

³ Matt. ii. 9.

⁴ Dial. 78.

⁵ Matt. ii. 4.

⁶ *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 151.

⁷ . . . καὶ τέκτονος νομιζομένου ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τέκτονικὰ ἔργα ἐργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὡν, ἀροτρα καὶ ζυγά διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σημεῖα διδάσκων, καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον. Dial. 88.

⁸ οὐχ οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας; Mark vi. 3.

⁹ Cf. Luke iii, 23.

¹⁰ . . . ὅτι οὐδαμῶς τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων τέκτων αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναγγέλλεται. — Contra Cels., vi. 36; cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 239; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 152.

¹¹ Ὁ δὲ πατήρ αὐτοῦ τέκτων ἦν, καὶ ἐποίει ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀροτρα καὶ ζυγούς. Evang. Thomæ Græce, A. xiii; *Tischendorf*, Ev. Apoc., p. 144 cf.; Evang. Thomæ Lat., xi; *Tischendorf*, ib., p. 166; Pseudo-Matth. Ev., xxxvii; *Tischendorf*, ib., p. 99; Evang. Infant. Arab., xxxviii; *Tischendorf*, ib., p. 193; *Fabricius*, Cod. Apoc. N. T., p. 200.

he tau
indica
detail,
the ai

In C
which
Thrice
as he s
Jordan
liar ex
from a
dicted
"And
should
ἐλπίσας
words o
to those
indeed,
howeve
Now th
as Justi
of Justi
are so m
appears

When
arities o
water, a
up from
the apos
the same
my son,
The in
our Gosp
differ fro

1 ὅστις
2 ἐστὶ αὐ
3 τῶν
4 *Credner*
5 Dial. 4
6 Beitrage
7 *Credner*
162, ann. 2
8 . . .
9 τὸ δὲ ἀν
10 ἅγιον Π
11 τούτου τ
ἐληλθε

he taught the symbols of righteousness and an active life," clearly indicates that he refers to a written narrative containing the detail, already, perhaps, falling into sufficient disfavour to require the aid of symbolical interpretation.

In the narrative of the baptism there are many peculiarities which prove that Justin did not derive it from our Gospels. Thrice he speaks of John sitting by the river Jordan: "He cried as he sat by the river Jordan;"¹ "While he still sat by the river Jordan;"² and "For when John sat by the Jordan."³ This peculiar expression so frequently repeated must have been derived from a written Gospel.⁴ Then Justin, in proving that Jesus predicted his second coming and the re-appearance of Elijah, states: "And therefore our Lord in his teaching announced that this should take place, saying Elias also should come" (*εἰπὼν καὶ Ἠλίαν εἰσεσθαι*). A little lower down he again expressly quotes the words of Jesus: "For which reason our Christ declared on earth to those who asserted that Elias must come before Christ: Elias, indeed, shall come," &c. (*Ἠλίας μὲν εἰσέσται, κ. τ. λ.*).⁵ Matthew, however, reads: "Elias indeed cometh." *Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται, κ. τ. λ.*⁶ Now there is no version in which *εἰσέσται* is substituted for *ἔρχεται* as Justin does, but, as Credner has pointed out,⁷ the whole weight of Justin's argument lies in the use of the future tense. As there are so many other variations in Justin's context, this likewise appears to be derived from a source different from our Gospels.⁸

When Jesus goes to be baptized by John many striking peculiarities occur in Justin's narrative: "As Jesus went down to the water, a fire also was kindled in the Jordan; and when he came up from the water, the Holy Spirit like a dove fell upon him, as the apostles of this very Christ of ours wrote . . . and at the same time a voice came from the heavens . . . Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee."⁹

The incident of the fire in Jordan is of course quite foreign to our Gospels, and further the words spoken by the heavenly voice differ from those reported by them, for instead of the passage

¹ ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμὸν καθεζόμενος, ἐβόα κ.τ.λ. Dial. 49.

² ἐν αὐτοῦ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 51.

³ Ἰωάννου γὰρ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 88.

⁴ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 218; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 47, ann. 1.

⁵ Dial. 49.

⁶ xvii. 11. Many MSS, add *πρῶτον*.

⁷ Beiträge, i. p. 219.

⁸ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 219 f., cf. 218; cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 162, ann. 2.

⁹ . . . κατελόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πῦρ ἀνηφθῆ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ καὶ ἀναδύντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὡς περιστέρην τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐπιπτήναι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν . . . καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτὸν ἔφημει. . . "Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ" ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε." Dial. 88.

from Psalm ii. 7, the Gospels have: "Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased."¹ Justin repeats his version a second time in the same chapter, and again elsewhere he says regarding the temptation; "For this devil also at the time when he (Jesus) went up from the river Jordan, when the voice declared to him: 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee,' it is written in the Memoirs of the Apostles, came to him and tempted him," &c.²

In both of these passages, it will be perceived that Justin directly refers to the Memoirs of the Apostles as the source of his statements. Some have argued that Justin only appeals to them for the fact of the descent of the Holy Ghost, and not for the rest of the narrative.³ It has of course been felt that, if it can be shown that Justin quotes from the Memoirs words and circumstances which are not to be found in our canonical Gospels, the identity of the two can no longer be maintained. It is, however, in the highest degree arbitrary to affirm that Justin intends to limit his appeal to the testimony of the Apostles to one-half of his sentence. To quote authority for one assertion and to leave another in the same sentence, closely connected with it and part indeed of the very same narrative, not only unsupported, but indeed weakened by direct exclusion, would indeed be singular, for Justin affirms with equal directness and confidence the fact of the fire in Jordan, the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the words spoken by the heavenly voice. If in the strictest grammatical accuracy there may be no absolute necessity to include in that which the Apostles wrote more than the phrase immediately preceding, there is not on the other hand anything which requires or warrants the exclusion of the former part of the sentence. The matter must therefore be decided according to fair inference and reasonable probability, and not to suit any foregone conclusion, and these as well as all the evidence concerning Justin's use of the Memoirs irresistibly point to the conclusion that the whole passage is derived from one source. In the second extract given above, it is perfectly clear that the words spoken by the heavenly voice, which Justin again quotes, and which are not in our Gospels, were recorded in the Memoirs, for otherwise Justin could not have referred to them for an account of the temptation at the

¹ *Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.* Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22. The first Gospel has a slight variation: "This is my son, &c., in whom, &c." *Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου, κ.τ.λ. . . ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.* Matt. iii. 17; cf. 2 Peter i. 17, which agrees with Matt.

² Dial. 103.

³ *Grabe*, Spicil. Patr. i. 19; *Bindemann*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1842, p. 471; *Schmisch*, Ap. Denk. d. M. Just., p. 450 f.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 137 f.; *Paulus*, Theol. Exeg. Conservatorium, i. p. 18.

time w
"Thou
and w
to don
fire in
the tel
collecti

Of o
words t
would c
he actu
pre-exis
the Vir
ted to li
power o
replies t
because
Scriptur
phet.³ T
was born
even at
had grow
came to
went int
Holy Gh
because
but beca
of death.
could hav
heaven a
thee I am
strengthe
and, as h
these wor
liged to c
my son;
in them

¹ Dial. 103.
Gospels, but

² Cf. *Cred*
and ann. 2;
Denkw. d. M.
seems to asc

96, ann. 16,
³ Dial. 87.

⁴ Kai ya

time when Jesus went up from Jordan and the voice said to him: "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee," if these facts and words were not recorded by them at all.¹ It is impossible to doubt, after impartial consideration, that the incident of the fire in Jordan, the words spoken by the voice from heaven, and the temptation were taken from the same source: they must collectively be referred to the Memoirs.²

Of one thing we may be sure: had Justin known the form of words used by the voice from heaven according to our Gospels, he would certainly have made use of it in preference to that which he actually found in his Memoirs. He is arguing that Christ is pre-existing God, become incarnate through God's will through the Virgin Mary, and Trypho demands how he can be demonstrated to have been pre-existent, who is said to be filled with the power of the Holy Ghost, as though he had required this. Justin replies that these powers of the Spirit have come upon him not because he had need of them, but because they would accomplish Scripture, which declared that after him there should be no prophet.³ The proof of this, he continues, is that, as soon as the child was born, the Magi from Arabia came to worship him, because even at his birth he was in possession of his power,⁴ and after he had grown up like other men by the use of suitable means, he came to the river Jordan where John was baptizing, and as he went into the water a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and the Holy Ghost descended like a dove. He did not go to the river because he had any need of baptism or of the descent of the Spirit, but because of the human race which had fallen under the power of death. Now if, instead of the passage actually cited, Justin could have quoted the words addressed to Jesus by the voice from heaven according to the Gospels: "Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased," his argument would have been greatly strengthened by such direct recognition of an already existing, and, as he affirmed, pre-existent divinity in Jesus. Not having these words in his Memoirs of the Apostles, however, he was obliged to be content with those which he found there: "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee;"—words which, in fact, in themselves destroyed the argument for pre-existence, and

¹ Dial. 103. The quotations regarding the temptation do not agree with our Gospels, but they will be referred to later.

² Cf. *Credner*, Beiträge i. p. 219 f., p. 221; *Hilgenfeld*, Die F. v. Justin's, p. 164, and ann. 2; *De Wette*, Lehrb. Einl. N. T., p. 111, p. 115. Even *Semiich* (Ap. Denk. d. M. Just., p. 390 f.) admits that they cannot be from our Gospels, and seems to ascribe them to traditional sources. Cf. *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 96, ann. 16, p. 104, ann. 33.

³ Dial. 87.

⁴ Καὶ γὰρ γεννηθεὶς, δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἔσχε. Dial. 88.

dated the divine begetting of Jesus as the son of God that very day. The passage, indeed, supported those who actually asserted that the Holy Ghost first entered into Jesus at this baptism. These considerations, and the repeated quotation of the same words in the same form, make it clear that Justin quotes from a source different from our Gospel.¹

In the scanty fragments of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" which have been preserved, we find both the incident of the fire kindled in Jordan and the words of the heavenly voice as quoted by Justin. "And as he went up from the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove which came down and entered into him. And a voice came from heaven saying: 'Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased;' and again: 'This day have I begotten thee.' And immediately a great light shone round about the place."² Epiphanius extracts this passage from the version in use among the Ebionites, but it is well known that there were many other varying forms of the same Gospel; and Hilgenfeld³ with all probability, conjectures that the version known to Epiphanius was no longer in the same purity as that used by Justin, but represents the transition stage to the Canonical Gospels,—adopting the words of the voice which they give without yet discarding the older form. Jerome gives another form of the words from the version in use amongst the Nazarenes: "Factum est autem cum ascendisset Dominus de aquâ, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum, et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus Prophetis expectabam te ut venires et requiescerem in te, tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in sempiternum."⁴ This supports Justin's reading. Regarding the Gospel according to the Hebrews, more must be said hereafter, but when it is remembered that Justin, a native of Samaria, probably first knew Christianity through believers in Syria to whose Jewish view of Christianity he all his life adhered, and

¹ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 219 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 30 f., 104 f., 109, 156; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 165 f.; Die Evangelien, p. 57 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1857, p. 411 f.; *Ritschl*, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 133 f.; *Folkmar*, Die Evangelien, 1870, p. 42 ff.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 57; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 111, p. 113; *Semisch* attributes both peculiarities to tradition. Ap. Denkw. Just., p. 390 f., 395 f.; cf. *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 137 f.

² Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἰδεί περιστερᾶς καὶ εἰσελευσάσης εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα, Σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ἡδωκῶσα καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. *Epiphanius*, Har. xxx. 13.

³ Die Evv. Justin's p. 165 f., anm. 1.

⁴ *Hieron.*, Comm. in Esaie. xi. 2.

that th
various
like th
certain
foreign
contain
baptism
accordi
ceded t
brethren
for the
baptized
I shoul
critics a
and the
accordin
every pr
differing
The in
cient wo
forcibly
brews, w
are found
Credner
fire or li
bably ros
in Jordan
used by
pel accor

¹ *Origen*,
E, iii. 27;
² *Ecce ma*
in remission
peccavi ut v
est. *Hieron.*
³ *Evahl*,
219 ff., 237 f.
Justin's, p. 1
Folkmar, Die
⁴ In quo li
nies Christu
pene invitun
super aquam
Baptismate
⁵ *Sibyll.* C
Die. Evv. Ju
vol. vii. p. 23
⁶ *Credner*,
mar, Die Eva

that these Christians almost exclusively used this Gospel¹ under various forms and names, it is reasonable to suppose that he also like them knew and made use of it, a supposition increased to certainty when it is found that Justin quotes words and facts foreign to the canonical Gospels which are known to have been contained in it. The argument of Justin that Jesus did not need baptism may also be compared to another passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews preserved by Jerome, and which preceded the circumstances narrated above, in which the mother and brethren of Jesus say to him that John the Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins, and propose that they should go to be baptized by him. Jesus replies, "In what way have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him?"² The most competent critics agree that Justin derived the incidents of the fire in Jordan and the words spoken by the heavenly voice from the Gospel according to the Hebrews or some kindred work,³ and there is every probability that the numerous other quotations in his works differing from our Gospels are taken from the same source.

The incident of the fire in Jordan likewise occurs in the ancient work "Prædicatio Pauli,"⁴ coupled with a context which forcibly recalls the passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which has just been quoted, and apparent allusions to it are found in the Sibylline Books and early Christian literature.⁵ Credner has pointed out that the marked use which was made of fire or lights at Baptism by the Church, during early times, probably rose out of this tradition regarding the fire which appeared in Jordan at the baptism of Jesus.⁶ The peculiar form of words used by the heavenly voice according to Justin and to the Gospel according to the Hebrews was also known to several of the

¹ Origen, Comment in Ezech., xxiv. 7; Epiphanius, Hær. xxx. 3; Eusebius, H. E. iii. 27; Hieron., Adv. Pelag., ii. 1 f.

² Ecce mater Domini et Fratres ejus dicebant ei: Johannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum, eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi ut vadam et baptizemur ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est. Hieron., Ad. Pelag., iii. 2.

³ Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss. 1853-54, p. 61, cf. p. 38 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 219 ff., 237 f., 259 f.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 111, p. 113; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 164 ff., et. 270 ff., p. 304; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 133 f.; Volkmar, Die Evangelien, i. 42 ff. &c., &c.

⁴ In quo libro contra omnes Scripturas et de peccato proprio confitendum invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptismata pene invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsum; item, cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum. Quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum. Auctor tract. d. Rebaptismate; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr., i. p. 800.

⁵ Sibyll. Oracula, lib. vii. viii.; cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 237 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 167 ff.; Reuss, Les Sibylles Chrétiennes, N., Rev. de Théol., vol. vii. p. 235, 238.

⁶ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 237; cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 167 f.; Volkmar, Die Evangelien, p. 43.

Fathers.¹ Augustine mentions that some MSS. in his time contained that reading in Luke iii. 22, although without the confirmation of more ancient Greek codices.² It is still extant in the Codex Bezae (D). The Itala version adds to Matthew iii. 15: "and when he was baptized a great light shone round from the water, so that all who had come were afraid" (et cum baptizaretur, lumen ingens circumfulsit de aqua, ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant); and again at Luke iii. 22 it gives the words of the voice in a form agreeing at least in sense with those which Justin found in his Memoirs of the Apostles.

These circumstances point with certainty to an earlier original corresponding with Justin, in all probability the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and to the subsequent gradual elimination of the passage from the Gospels finally adopted by the Church for dogmatic reasons, as various sects based on the words doctrines which were at variance with the ever-enlarging belief of the majority.³

Then Justin states that the men of his time asserted that the miracles of Jesus were performed by magical art (*μαγικὴ φαντασία*), "for they ventured to call him a magician and deceiver of the people."⁴ This cannot be accepted as a mere version of the charge that Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub, but must have been found by Justin in his Memoirs.⁵ In the Gospel of Nicodemus or Acta Pilati, the Jews accuse Jesus before Pilate of being a magician,⁶ coupled with the assertion that he casts out demons through Beelzebub the prince of the demons; and again they simply say: "Did we not tell thee that he is a magician?"⁷ We shall presently see that Justin actually refers to certain acts of Pontius Pilate in justification of other assertions regarding the trial of Jesus.⁸ In the Clementine Recognitions, moreover, the

¹ *Clemens AL.*, *Pædag.*, i. 6; *Methodius*, *Conviv.* Virg. ix. *Lactantius*, *Instit.* Div. iv. 15; *Augustine*, *Enchirid.* ad Laurent., 49.

² Illud vero, quod nonnulli codices habent secundum Lucam, hoc illa voce sonuisse, quod in Psalmo scriptum est: Filius meus es tu; ego hodie genui te: quamquam in antiquioribus codicibus græcis non inveniri perhibeatur, &c. &c. *De Consensu Evang.*, ii. 14.

³ Cf. *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 241; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 170; *Grabe*, *Spicil. Patr.*, i. p. 327; *Volkmar*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 42 f.

⁴ Καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον. *Dial.* 69.

⁵ *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 255 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 207 ff., 258; *De Wette*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 111, 113. *Semisch* attributes it to tradition. *Die ap. Denkw.* Just., p. 391 ff.

⁶ λεγουσιν αὐτῷ Γόης ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ. *Evang. Nicod. sive Gesta Pilati*, Pars I. A. i.; *Tischendorf*, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 208; cf. *Fabricsius*, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i.; *Nicod. Evang. Lat.*, i. p. 239, xxvii. p. 206, cf. 417.

⁷ Μὴ οὐκ εἶπαμέν σοι ὅτι γόης ἐστίν; κ.τ.λ. c. ii.; *Tischendorf*, *Ev. Ap.* p. 214; *Fabricsius*, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i. p. 243.

⁸ *Apol.*, i. 35, 48.

same
did n
Celsus
opinio
we fin
There
Jesus

In sp
prophe
and sa
Canon
(lxv. 2,
to dra
"They
east lot
fulfilled
hands a
through
lots upo
tinues,
Pilate."
Acta for
or Gesta
which w
in the 5
work fre
dorf ma
Acta Pil
lation, v
Justin.¹⁰
elusion.

not conta
work doe
absurd to

¹ Et ecce
prodigia qu
² *Oriem*,

⁴ *Lightfoot*

⁵ Cf. *Auy*

305 ff.

⁶ Καὶ γὰρ
βλαπτός,

⁷ Καὶ τὰ
γενομένα

⁸ *Apol.*, i.

⁹ *Evang.*

p. 208 ff.

¹⁰ *Evang.*

same charge is made by one of the Scribes, who says that Jesus did not perform his miracles as a prophet, but as a magician.¹ Celsus makes a similar charge,² and Lactantius refers to such an opinion as prevalent among the Jews at the time of Jesus,³ which we find confirmed by many passages in Talmudic literature.⁴ There was indeed a book called "Magia Jesu Christi," of which Jesus himself, it was pretended, was the author.⁵

In speaking of the trial of Jesus, Justin says: "For also as the prophet saith, they reviled him and set him on the judgment seat and said: Judge for us,"⁶ a peculiarity which is not found in the Canonical Gospels. Justin had just quoted the words of Isaiah (lxv. 2, lviii. 2) . . . "They now ask of me judgment and dare to draw nigh to God," and then he cites Psalm xxii. 16, 22; "They pierced my hands and my feet, and upon my vesture they cast lots." He says that this did not happen to David, but was fulfilled in Christ, and the expression regarding the piercing the hands and feet referred to the nails of the cross which were driven through his hands and feet. And after he was crucified they cast lots upon his vesture. "And that these things occurred," he continues, "you may learn from the Acts drawn up under Pontius Pilate."⁷ He likewise upon another occasion refers to the same Acta for confirmation of statements.⁸ The Gospel of Nicodemus or Gesta Pilati, now extant, does not contain the circumstance to which we are now referring, but in contradiction to the statement in the fourth Gospel (xviii. 28, 29) the Jews in this apocryphal work freely go in to the very judgment seat of Pilate.⁹ Tischendorf maintains that the first part of the Gospel of Nicodemus, or Acta Pilati, still extant, is the work, with more or less of interpolation, which, existing in the second century, is referred to by Justin.¹⁰ A few reasons may here be given against such a conclusion. The fact of Jesus being set upon the judgment seat is not contained in the extant Acta Pilati at all, and therefore this work does not correspond with Justin's statement. It seems most absurd to suppose that Justin should seriously refer Roman Em-

¹ Et ecce quidam de Scribis de medio populi exclamans ait: Jesus veste signa et prodigia quæ fecit, ut magus non ut propheta fecit. i. 58; cf. p. 40.

² Origen, Contra Cels., ii. 50, 51.

³ Instit. Div., v. 3, et passim.

⁴ Lightfoot, Hore Hebraicæ, Works, xi. p. 195 ff.

⁵ Cf. August. de Consensu Evang., i. 9; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 305 ff.

⁶ Καὶ γὰρ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης, διαδύροντες αὐτὸν, ἐκάθισαν ἐπὶ βῆματος, καὶ εἶπον· Κρίνον ἡμῖν. Apol. i. 35.

⁷ Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἁγίων. Apol. i. 35.

⁸ Apol., i. 48. Cf. Tertullian, Apol. xxi.

⁹ Evang. Nicod. sive Gesta Pilati, Pars. i. A7, i. ii.; Tischendorf, Evang. Apocr. p. 208 ff.

¹⁰ Evang. Apocr. Proleg., p. lxiv. ff.; Wann Wurden, u. s. w., p. 82—39.

perors to a work of this description, so manifestly composed by a Christian, and the Acta to which he directs them must have been a presumed official document, to which they had access, as of course no other evidence could be of any weight with them.¹ The extant work neither pretends to be, nor has in the slightest degree the form of, an official report. Moreover, the prologue attached to it distinctly states that Ananias, a provincial warden in the reign of Flavius Theodosius (towards the middle of the fifth century), found these Acts written in Hebrew by Nicodemus, and that he translated them into Greek.² The work itself, therefore, only pretends to be a private composition in Hebrew, and does not claim any relation to Pontius Pilate. The Greek is very corrupt and degraded, and considerations of style alone would assign it to the fifth century, as would still more imperatively the anachronisms with which it abounds.³ Tischendorf considers that Tertullian refers to the same work as Justin, but it is evident that he infers an official report, for he says distinctly, after narrating the circumstances of the crucifixion and resurrection: "All these facts regarding Christ, Pilate . . . reported to the reigning Emperor, Tiberius."⁴ It is extremely probable that in saying this, Tertullian merely extended the statement of Justin. He nowhere states that he himself had seen this report, nor does Justin, and as is the case with the latter, some of the facts which Tertullian supposes to be reported by Pilate are not contained in the apocryphal work.⁵ There are still extant some apocryphal writings in the form of official reports made by Pilate of the trial, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus,⁶ but none are of very ancient date. It is certain that, on the supposition that Pilate may have made an official report of events so important in their estimation, Christian writers, with greater zeal than conscience, composed fictitious reports in his name, in the supposed interest of their religion, and there was in that day little or no critical sense to detect and discredit such forgeries. There is absolutely no evidence to show that Justin was acquainted with any official report of Pilate to the Roman Emperor, nor, indeed, is it easy to understand how he could possibly have been, even if such a document existed, and it is most probable, as Scholten conjectures, that Justin merely re-

¹ Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 161; *Nicolas*, *Études sur les Evang. Apocr.* p. 360.

² *Evang. Nicod. Proleg.*; *Tischendorf*, *Ev. Apocr.* p. 203 f.

³ Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 172 f.

⁴ *Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus . . . Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit.* *Apol.* xxi.

⁵ Cf. Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 163 ff.

⁶ Cf. *Fabrieus*, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, i, p. 298 ff.; *Thilo*, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, p. 796 ff.; *Tischendorf*, *Evang. Apocr.* p. 411.

ferre
ten,
as it
fulfil
narra
to J
assu
In
tions.
out a
melti
occur
the M
I say,
sweat
sible,
direct
ferene
tions
"as it

L
Jes

In add
empha
and wh
moirs.
phrases
apuros
and un
over, L
intensit
express
sweat
poured
reading
also so
reads:

LUKE.
JUSTIN.

In Matt

¹ Scholte
² D. ap.

ferred to documents which tradition supposed to have been written, but of which, he himself had no personal knowledge.¹ Be this as it may, as he considered the incident of the judgment seat a fulfilment of prophecy, there can be little or no doubt that it was narrated in the Memoirs which contained "everything relating to Jesus Christ," and finding it there he all the more naturally assumed that it must have been mentioned in any official report.

In narrating the agony in the Garden, there are further variations. Justin says: "And the passage: 'All my bones are poured out and dispersed like water; my heart has become like wax melting in the midst of my belly,' was a prediction of that which occurred to him that night when they came out against him to the Mount of Olives to seize him. For in the Memoirs composed, I say, by his Apostles and their followers, it is recorded that his sweat fell down like drops while he prayed, saying: 'If possible, let this cup pass.'"² It will be observed that this is a direct quotation from the Memoirs, but there is a material difference from our Gospels. Luke is the only Gospel which mentions the bloody sweat, and there the account reads (xxii. 44), "as it were drops of blood falling down to the ground."

LUKE. ὡς εἰ ῥόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

JUSTIN. ὡς εἰ ῥομβοὶ κατεχεῖτο.

In addition to the other linguistic differences Justin omits the emphatic αἷματος which gives the whole point to Luke's account, and which evidently could not have been in the text of the Memoirs. Semisch argues that ῥόμβοι alone, especially in medical phraseology, meant "drops of blood," without the addition of αἷματος;³ but the author of the third Gospel did not think so, and undeniably makes use of both, and Justin does not. Moreover, Luke introduces the expression ῥόμβοι αἵματος to show the intensity of the agony, whereas Justin evidently did not mean to express "drops of blood" at all, his intention in referring to the sweat being to show that the prophecy: "All my bones are poured out, &c., like water," had been fulfilled, with which the reading in his Memoirs more closely corresponded. The prayer also so directly quoted decidedly varies from Luke xxii. 42, which reads: "Father, if thou be willing to remove this cup from me":

LUKE. Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τοῦτο το ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

JUSTIN. Παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατόν, το ποτήριον τοῦτο.

In Matthew xxvi. 39, this part of the prayer is more like the

¹ Schotten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 165 ff.

² Dial. 103.

³ D. ap. Denkw. Just., p. 146.

reading of Justin: "Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from me"—*Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστίν, παρελθέτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο* but that Gospel has nothing of the sweat of agony which excludes it from consideration. In another place Justin also quotes the prayer in the Garden as follows: "He prayed, saying: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;' and besides this, praying, he said: 'Not as I wish, but as thou wiltest.'"¹ The first phrase in this place, apart from some transposition of words, agrees with Matthew; but even if this reading be preferred of the two, the absence of the incident of the sweat of agony from the first Gospel renders it impossible to regard it as the source; and, further, the second part of the prayer which is here given differs materially both from the first and third Gospels.

MATTH. Nevertheless not as I will but as thou.

LUKE. Nevertheless not my will but thine be done.

JUSTIN. Not as I wish but as thou wiltest.

MATTH. *πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ.*

LUKE. *πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.*

JUSTIN. *μὴ ὡς ἐγὼ βούλομαι, ἀλλ' ὡς σὺ θέλεις.*

The two parts of this prayer, moreover, seem to have been separate in the Memoirs, for not only does Justin not quote the latter portion at all in Dial. 103, but here he markedly divides it from the former. Justin knows nothing of the episode of the Angel who strengthens Jesus, which is related in Luke xxii. 43. There is, however, a still more important point to mention: that although verses 43, 44, with the incidents of the angel and the bloody sweat, are certainly in the greater number of MSS., they are omitted by the oldest Codices, as for instance the Sinaitic² and Vatican MSS. It is evident that in this part Justin's Memoirs differed from our first and third Gospels much in the same way that they do from each other.

In the same chapter Justin states that when the Jews went out to the Mount of Olives to take Jesus, "there was not even a single man to run to his help as a guiltless person."³ This is in direct contradiction with all the Gospels,⁴ and Justin not only completely ignores the episode of the ear of Malchus, but in this

¹ Dial. 99.

² They are added by a later hand.

³ *Οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὐδὲ μέχρις ἐνός ἀνθρώπου βοηθεῖν αὐτῷ ὡς ἀναμαρτήτῳ βοηθὸς ὑπήρχε.* Dial. 103.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 51 ff.; Mark xiv. 46 ff.; Luke xxii. 49 ff.; John xviii. 10 f.

passage
Luke
about
saw w
with t
of the
lows i
prayer
very sa
further
differen
It is
Justin
(the Ap
(who, a
by him
suffer th
repente
while re
evident
peatedly
him, an
twelve.
affirmati
him and
which p
indicate
they saw
to his M
Gospels
fixion.⁷
given by

¹ Credner;
1; Ritschl,
ff.; Magerh
² Luke xx
³ *Μετὰ
ἀποστόλων*
⁴ (ὅτι τιν
αὐτοῦ, ὅτι
πᾶσιν, κα
ἡβαν ἐπὶ
διαγων,
ἀποστόλων
Dial. 53; d
⁵ Matt. x
⁶ Credner
⁷ Luke xx

passage excludes it, and his Gospel could not have contained it.¹ Luke is specially marked in generalizing the resistance of those about Jesus to his capture. "When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him: Lord, shall we smite with the sword? And a certain one of them smote the servant of the high priest and cut off his right ear."² As this episode follows immediately after the incident of the bloody sweat and prayer in the Garden, and the statement of Justin occurs in the very same chapter in which he refers to them, this contradiction further tends to confirm the conclusion that Justin employed a different Gospel.

It is quite in harmony with the same peculiar account that Justin states that, "after he (Jesus) was crucified, all his friends (the Apostles) stood aloof from him, having denied him"³ . . . (who, after he rose from the dead, and after they were convinced by himself that before his passion he had told them that he must suffer these things, and that they were foretold by the prophets, repented of their flight from him when he was crucified), and while remaining among them he sang praises to God, as is made evident in the Memoirs of the Apostles."⁴ Justin, therefore, repeatedly asserts that *after* the crucifixion all the Apostles forsook him, and he extends the denial of Peter to the whole of the twelve. It is impossible to consider this distinct and reiterated affirmation a mere extension of the passage: "They all forsook him and fled" (*πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον*),⁵ when Jesus was arrested, which proceeded mainly from momentary fear.⁶ Justin seems to indicate that the disciples withdrew from and denied Jesus when they saw him crucified, from doubts which consequently arose as to his Messianic character. Now, on the contrary, the Canonical Gospels represent the disciples as being together after the Crucifixion.⁷ Justin does not exhibit any knowledge of the explanation given by the angels at the sepulchre as to Christ having foretold

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 228 f.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 232, ann. 1; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 148; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 238 ff.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 292; cf. Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 39.

² Luke xxii. 49, 50.

³ Μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν, καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν, ἀρνησάμενοι αὐτόν. Apol. i. 50.

⁴ [οἱ τινὲς μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ πεισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ παθεῖν ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ταῦτα αὐτὸν δεῖ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι προεκεκήρυκτο ταῦτα, μετενόησαν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀφίστασθαι αὐτοῦ ὅτε ἐσταυρώθη], καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν διαγων, ὤμνησε τὸν Θεόν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων δηλοῦται γεγενημένον, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 106; cf. Apol. i. 50; Dial. 53; de Resurr. 9.

⁵ Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50.

⁶ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 257; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 246 f.

⁷ Luke xxiv. 9-12, 33; Mark xvi. 10; John xx. 18, 19; cf. Luke xxxiii. 49.

all that had happened,¹ but makes this proceed from Jesus himself. Indeed, he makes no mention of these angels at all.

There are some traces elsewhere of the view that the disciples were offended after the Crucifixion.² Hilgenfeld points out the appearance of special Petrine tendency in this passage, in the fact that it is not Peter alone, but all the Apostles who are said to deny their master; and he suggests that an indication of the source from which Justin quoted may be obtained from the kindred quotation in the Epistle to the Smyræans (iii.) by pseudo-Ignatius: "For I know that also after his resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe that he is so now. And when he came to those that were with Peter he said to them: Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit. And immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and spirit." Jerome, it will be remembered, found this in the Gospel according to the Hebrews used by the Nazarenes, which he translated,³ from which we have seen that Justin in all probability derived other particulars differing from the Canonical Gospels, and with which we shall constantly meet, in a similar way, in examining Justin's quotations. Origen also found it in a work called the "Doctrine of Peter" (Διδαχὴ Πέτρου),⁴ which must have been akin to the "Preaching of Peter" (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου).⁵ Hilgenfeld suggests that, in the absence of more certain information, there is no more probable source from which Justin may have derived his statement than the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is known to have contained so much in the same spirit.⁶

It may well be expected that, at least in touching such serious matters as the Crucifixion and last words of Jesus, Justin must adhere with care to authentic records, and not fall into the faults of loose quotation from memory, free handling of texts, and careless omissions and additions, by which those who maintain the identity of the Memoirs with the Canonical Gospels seek to explain the systematic variations of Justin's quotations from the text of the latter. It will, however, be found that here also marked discrepancies occur. Justin says, after referring to numerous prophecies regarding the treatment of Christ "And again, when he says: 'They spake with their lips, they gazed the head,

¹ Luke xxiv. 4-8; Matt. xxviii. 5-7; Mark xvi. 5-7.

² In the "Ascensio Isaie," iii. 14, the following passage occurs: "Et duodecim, qui cum eo, offensionem accipient in eum, et eustodes constituentur, qui custodient sepulchrum." Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 246, ann. 2.

³ *De Vir. Ill.*, 16.

⁴ *Grabe, Spicil. Patr.*, i. p. 56.

⁵ *De Princ. proem.*

⁶ Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 248 ff.; cf. *Oredner, Beiträge*, i. p. 265 f.; *Volkmar, Die Evangelien*, p. 631, p. 634.

saying
to the
was h
saying
in an
tion o
saw h
distort
irony
written
Son of
save h
written
the fir
the act
seems
rived fr
very m
tained i
tin: "I
ἀγγέλους
cate a v
he shou
fers as
effectua

¹ Καὶ π
λέγοντες
Ἰουδαίους
ἐξέστρεψ
ἀντιείπα
² Οἱ γὰρ
ἐκείνου,
διεμνοῦν
μοῖσι τοῖν
καταβὰς
³ Some w
35.

⁴ Canon
the exact w
found in ou
closely conn
a specimen
or Father k
tin's, "if it
made for th
the Canon,
⁵ The nea
let him save
ἐσώσεν, ὅτι
⁶ Hilgenfe

saying: Let him deliver himself. That all these things happened to the Christ from the Jews, you can ascertain. For when he was being crucified they shot out the lips, and wagged their heads, saying: 'Let him who raised the dead deliver himself.'¹ And in another place, referring to the same Psalm (xxii.) as a prediction of what was to happen to Jesus, Justin says: "For they who saw him crucified also wagged their heads, each one of them, and distorted (*διέστρεφον*) their lips, and sneeringly and in scornful irony repeated among themselves those words which are also written in the Memoirs of his Apostles: He declared himself the Son of God (let him) come down, let him walk about; let God save him."² In both of these passages Justin directly appeals to written authority. The *μαθεῖν δύνασθε* may leave the source of the first uncertain,³ but the second is distinctly stated to contain the actual words "written in the Memoirs of his Apostles," and it seems reasonable to suppose that the former passage is also derived from them. It is scarcely necessary to add that both differ very materially from the Canonical Gospels.⁴ The taunt contained in the first of these passages is altogether peculiar to Justin: "Let him who raised the dead deliver himself" (*Ὁ νεκροῦς ἀνγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτὸν*);⁵ and even if Justin did not himself indicate a written source, it would not be reasonable to suppose that he should himself for the first time record words to which he refers as the fulfilment of prophecy.⁶ It would be still more ineffectual to endeavour to remove the difficulty presented by such

¹ Καὶ παλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐλάλησαν ἐν χεῖλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν, λέγοντες· ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτὸν. Ἄτινα πάντα ὡς γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῷ Χριστῷ, μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Σταυρωθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ, ἐδέστρεφον τὰ χεῖλη, καὶ ἐκίουν τὰς κεφαλὰς, λέγοντες· Ὁ νεκροῦς ἀνγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτὸν. *Apol. i. 38.*

² Οἱ γὰρ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν ἐσταυρωμένον καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑκαστος ἐκίουν, καὶ τὰ χεῖλη διέστρεφον, καὶ τοῖς μυζητήρσιν ἐν ἄλλοις διεκρινόντες ἔλεγον εἰρωνευόμενοι ταῦτα· καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ γέγραπται· Ὁ Θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐλεγε κατὰ βίας περιπατεῖτω· σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός." *Dial. 101.*

³ Some writers consider that this is a reference to the *Acta Pilati* as in *Apol. i. 35.*

⁴ Canon Westcott admits that in the latter passage Justin does profess to give the exact words which were recorded in the Memoirs, and that they are not to be found in our Gospels; "but," he apologetically adds, "we do find these others so closely connected with them that few readers would feel the difference!" This is a specimen of apologetic criticism. Dr. Westcott goes on to say that as no MS. or Father known to him has preserved any reading more closely resembling Justin's, "if it appear not to be deducible from our Gospels, due allowance being made for the object which he had in view, its source must remain concealed." On the Canon, p. 114 f. Cf. *Matt. xvii. 39-43; Mark xv. 29-32; Luke xlii. 34-37.*

⁵ The nearest parallel in our Gospels is in *Luke xxiii. 35.* "He saved others, let him save himself if this man be the Christ of God, his chosen." Ἄλλους ἰσώσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτὸν, κ.τ.λ.

⁶ Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 244 f.

a variation by attributing the words to tradition, at the same time that it is asserted that Justin's Memoirs were actually identical with the Gospels. No aberration of memory could account for such a variation, and it is impossible that Justin should prefer tradition regarding a form of words, so liable to error and alteration, with written Gospels within his reach. Besides, to argue that Justin affirmed that the truth of his statement could be ascertained (*μαθεῖν δύνασθε*), whilst the words which he states to have been spoken were not actually recorded, would be against all reason.

The second of the mocking speeches¹ of the lookers-on is referred distinctly to the Memoirs of the Apostles, but is also, with the accompanying description, foreign to our Gospels. The nearest approach to it occurs in our first Gospel, and we subjoin both passages for comparison.

JUSTIN, DIAL. 101.

He declared himself the Son of God;
(let him) come down, let him walk
about; let God save him.

Τὸν θεοῦ ἐαυτὸν ἔλεγε κατα-
βάς περιπατεῖν· σωσάτω αὐτὸν
ὁ θεός.

MATT. XXVII. 40, AND 42, 43.

40. Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself; if thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross.

42. He saved others, himself he cannot save. He is the King of Israel; let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe in him.

43. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, I am the Son of God.

42. . . . καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. 43. πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν αὐτόν·² εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ υἱοῦ εἶμι.

It is evident that Justin's version is quite distinct from this, and cannot have been taken from our Gospels,³ although professedly derived from the Memoirs of the Apostles.

Justin likewise mentions the cry of Jesus on the Cross, "O God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" ("Ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;")⁴ as a fulfilment of the words of the Psalm,

¹ Semisch argues that both forms are quotations of the same sentence, and that there is consequently a contradiction in the very quotations themselves; but there can be no doubt whatever that the two phrases are distinct parts of the mockery, and the very same separation and variation occur in each of the Canonical Gospels. Die ap. Denk. Märt. Just., p. 282; cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 234.

² The Cod. Sin. omits αὐτόν.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 212; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 244; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 295.

⁴ Dial. 99.

which
of the
howev
that h
quotat
that it
parent
lana s
give th
Justin,
threw x
'O θεός,
mention
to the c
said: 'E
said thi
form as
giving u
I comm
Justin's
first two
ever, giv
should h
trace of
ground f
third Go
that thes
course th
a dozen
bability
the prolo
in the Go
has alrea
edited by
In the Co
voice, Jes
preted: 'i

¹ Dial. 98.

² Matt. xx.

³ Καὶ φωνή

παράθεμεν

xxii. 46.

⁴ Καὶ γὰρ

χειρὰς σου

μαρτῶν καὶ

⁵ Matt. xxv.

which he quotes here, and elsewhere,¹ with the peculiar addition of the Septuagint version, "attend to me" (*πρόσχε μοι*), which, however, he omits when giving the cry of Jesus, thereby showing that he follows a written source which did not contain it, for the quotation of the Psalm, and of the cry which is cited to show that it refers to Christ, immediately follow each other. He apparently knows nothing whatever of the Chaldaic cry "Eli, Eli, lama sabaethani" of the Gospels.² The first and second Gospels give the words of the cry from the Chaldaic differently from Justin, from the version of the LXX., and from each other. Matthew xxvii. 46, *Θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με εγκατέλιπες*; Mark xv. 34, *Ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί με εγκατέλιπες*; the third Gospel makes no mention at all of this cry, but instead has one altogether foreign to the other Gospels: "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'; and having said this he expired."³ Justin has this cry also, and in the same form as the third Gospel. He says: "For when he (Jesus) was giving up his spirit on the cross, he said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' as I have also learned from the Memoirs."⁴ Justin's Gospel, therefore, contained both cries, and as even the first two Synoptics mention a second cry of Jesus⁵ without, however, giving the words, it is not surprising that other Gospels should have existed which included both. Even if we had no trace of this cry in any other ancient work, there would be no ground for asserting that Justin must have derived it from the third Gospel, for if there be any historical truth in the statement that these words were actually spoken by Jesus, it follows of course that they may have been, and probably were, reported in a dozen Christian writings now no longer extant, and in all probability they existed in some of the "many" works referred to in the prologue to the third Gospel. Both cries, however, are given in the Gospel of Nicodemus, or Gesta Pilati, to which reference has already so frequently been made. In the Greek versions edited by Tischendorf we find only the form contained in Luke. In the Codex A, the passage reads: "And crying with a loud voice, Jesus said: Father, Baddach ephkid rouchi, that is interpreted: 'into thy hands I commend my spirit,' and having said

¹ Dial. 98.

² Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.

³ Καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖρας σου παρατίθεται τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xxi. 46.

⁴ Καὶ γὰρ ἀποδιδούς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ, εἶπε, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖρας σου παρατίθεται τὸ πνεῦμά μου ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων καὶ τοῦτο ἔμαθον. Dial. 103.

⁵ Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37.

this he gave up the ghost."¹ In the Codex B, the text is: "Then Jesus having called out with a loud voice: 'Father, into thy hands will I commend my spirit,' expired."² In the ancient Latin version, however, both cries are given: "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Hely, Hely, lama zabac-thani, which interpreted is: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.' And after this, Jesus said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit'; and saying this he gave up the ghost."³

One of the Codices of the same apocryphal work likewise gives the taunting speeches of the Jews in a form more nearly approaching that of Justin's Memoirs than any found in our Gospels. "And the Jews that stood and looked, ridiculed him, and said: If thou saidst truly that thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross, and at once, that we may believe in thee. Others ridiculing, said: He saved others, he healed others, and restored the sick, the paralytic, lepers, demoniacs, the blind, the lame, the dead, and himself he cannot heal."⁴ The fact that Justin actually refers to certain Acta Pilati in connection with the Crucifixion renders this coincidence all the more important. Other texts of this Gospel read: "And the Chief Priests and the rulers with them, derided him, saying: He saved others, let him save himself; if he is the Son of God, let him come down from the cross."⁵

It is clear from the whole of Justin's treatment of the narrative, that he followed a Gospel adhering more closely than the Canonical to the Psalm xxii., but yet with peculiar variations from it.

¹ Καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Πατήρ, βαδδάχ ἐφ' ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθω τὸ πνεῦμά μου, καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Evang. Nicod., Pars. I. a. sive Gesta Pilati, xi.; Tischendorf, Evang. Apocr., p. 233; cf. Thilo, Cod. Apocr. N. T., p. 590 f.

² Ἐπειτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθωμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, ἀπέπνευσε. Ev. Nicod., Pars. I. a., sive Acta Pilati v., vi.; Tischendorf, Ev. Apocr., p. 287.

³ "Et circa horam nonam exclamavit Jesus voce magna dicens: Hely, Hely, lama zabac-thani, quod est interpretatum; Deus meus, Deus meus, ut quid dereliquisti me? Et post hæc dicit Jesus: Pater in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum. Et hæc dicens emisit spiritum." Nicod. Ev., xi.; Fabricius, Cod. Ap. N. T., i. p. 261; cf. Thilo, Cod. Apocr. N. T., p. 591 f.

⁴ Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ἰστάμενοι καὶ βλέποντες κατεγέλωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐὰν ἀληθῶς ἔλεγες ὅτι υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ παρενθὺς ἵνα πιστευώμεν εἰς σε. Ἄλλοι ἐλεγον καταγελῶντες Ἄλλους ἔδωκεν, ἄλλους ἰθεὺς πέμψεν, καὶ ἰατὰ τοῦ ἀδενεῖς, παραλελυμένους, λεπρούς, δαιμονιζομένους, τυφλοὺς, χωλοὺς, νεκρωμένους, καὶ αὐτοὺς οὐ δύναται θεραπεῦσαι. Evang. Nicod., Pars. I. a., sive Acta Pilati, v. x.; Tischendorf, Ev. Apocr., p. 286.

⁵ Ev. Nicod., Pars. I. a. x.; Tischendorf, Ev. Apocr., p. 232; cf. Thilo, Cod. Apocr. N. T., p. 584; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 259; Tischendorf, ib., p. 340. There are differences between all these texts—indeed there are scarcely two MSS. which agree—clearly indicating that we have now nothing but corrupt versions of a more ancient text.

Our G
of the
charac
his sys
but the
ing ou
arbitra
ments.

Upon
persons
tians.
ascende
you (th
commit
Jerusale
atheistic
a certain
disciples
laid whe
men, say
heaven."
but, reite
in all pro
passage f
the infor

These
already o
from the
Gospel hi
some case
solemn ev
variations
now be ne
Memoirs v
opens befo
with these
impossible
over, is un
who maint
out two or
agree with

¹ Dial. 17.

² Ib., 103.

³ receding.

⁴ De Wette,

Our Gospels differ very much from each other; Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles in like manner differed from them. It had its characteristic features clearly and sharply defined. In this way his systematic variations are natural and perfectly intelligible, but they become totally inexplicable if it be supposed that, having our Gospels for his source, he thus persistently and in so arbitrary a way ignored, modified, or contradicted their statements.

Upon two occasions Justin distinctly states that the Jews sent persons throughout the world to spread calumnies against Christians. "When you knew that he had risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven, as the prophets had foretold, not only did you (the Jews) not repent of the wickedness which you had committed, but at that time you selected and sent forth from Jerusalem throughout the land chosen men, saying that the atheistic heresy of the Christians had arisen," &c.¹ . . . "from a certain Jesus, a Galilean impostor, whom we crucified, but his disciples stole him by night from the tomb where he had been laid when he was unloosed from the cross, and they now deceive men, saying that he has risen from the dead and ascended into heaven."² This circumstance is not mentioned by our Gospels, but, reiterated twice by Justin in almost the same words, it was in all probability contained in the Memoirs. Eusebius quotes the passage from Justin, without comment, evidently on account of the information which it conveyed.

These instances, which, although far from complete, have already occupied too much of our space, show that Justin quotes from the Memoirs of the Apostles many statements and facts of Gospel history which are not only foreign to our Gospels, but in some cases contradictory to them, whilst the narrative of the most solemn events in the life of Jesus presents distinct and systematic variations from parallel passages in the Synoptic records. It will now be necessary to compare his general quotations from the same Memoirs with the Canonical Gospels, and here a very wide field opens before us. As we have already stated, Justin's works teem with these quotations, and to take them all in detail would be impossible within the limits of this work. Such a course, moreover, is unnecessary. It may be broadly stated that even those who maintain the use of the Canonical Gospels can only point out two or three passages out of this vast array which verbally agree with them.³ This extraordinary anomaly—on the supposi-

¹ Dial. 17.

² *Ib.*, 103. This passage commences with statements to the same effect as the preceding.

³ *De Wette*, *Lehrb. Einl. N. T.*, p. 104 f.; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 34 f.,

tion that Justin's Memoirs were in fact our Gospels—is, as we have mentioned, explained by the convenient hypothesis that Justin quotes imperfectly from memory, interweaves and modifies texts, and in short freely manipulates these Gospels according to his argument. Even strained to the uttermost, however, could this be accepted as a reasonable explanation of such systematic variation, that only twice or thrice out of the vast number of his quotations does he literally agree with passages in them? In order to illustrate the case with absolute impartiality we shall first take the instances brought forward as showing agreement with our Synoptic Gospels.

Tischendorf only cites two passages in support of his affirmation that Justin makes use of our first Gospel.¹ It might be supposed that, in selecting these, at least two might have been produced literally agreeing, but this is not the case, and this may be taken as an illustration of the almost universal variation of Justin's quotations. The first of Tischendorf's examples is the supposed use of Matthew viii. 11, 12; "Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down," &c., &c. (Πόλλοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἕξουσιν, κ.τ.λ.) Now this passage is repeated by Justin no less than three times in three very distinct parts of his Dialogue with Trypho,² but each time with a uniform variation from the text of Matthew—"They shall come from the west and from the east," &c., &c. (Ἡξουσιν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀνατολῶν, κ.τ.λ.)³ That a historical saying of Jesus should be reproduced in many Gospels, and that no particular work can have any prescriptive right to it, must be admitted, so that even if the passage in Justin agreed literally with our first Synoptic, it would not afford any proof of the actual use of that Gospel; but when on the contrary Justin upon three several occasions, and at distinct intervals of time, repeats the passage with the same persistent variations from the reading in Matthew, not only can it not be ascribed to that Gospel, but there is absolute reason to conclude that Justin derived it from another source. It may be added that πολλοὶ is anything but a word uncommon in the vocabulary of Justin, and that elsewhere, for instance, he twice quotes

p. 89; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 106, f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 222 f.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 229; *Semisch*, Die ap. Denkw. M. Just. p. 149 f.; *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, p. 56; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, i. 252 ff., p. 255.

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 27, anm. 2.

² Dial. 76, 120, 140.

³ In some MSS., Dial. 76 omits "from the west" altogether, and it has elsewhere been reinserted to accord with the Synoptic—but there can be no doubt that the omission originally gave the opportunity for adjusting the text of some MSS. according to orthodox views, and that in all three places the reading of Justin was the same.

a pass
variati
of the
The
quotat
the na
and of

And
the thir
is writte
of your
"Show
them :
ration se
shall no
(αὐτοῖς)
(λαοῖς).
Καὶ ὁ
ἀναστρε
καὶ, γέ
μονευσ
εὐαγγ
οἱ, "Δ
ἀπεκρί
κ.τ.λ.

Now
from the
ted; bu
your nat
it recalls
passage,
20 ff.,² th
different
in the re
able. W
sages in
other wo
variation
exclude t
thing poi
This is
enlarging
ample of
returning

¹ Apol. i.
² Cf. Mar

a passage similar to one in Matthew, in which, amongst other variations, he reads "*Many* shall come (πολλοὶ ἔξουσιν)," instead of the phrase found in that Gospel.¹

The second example adduced by Tischendorf is the supposed quotation of Matthew xii. 39; but in order fully to comprehend the nature of the affirmation, we quote the context of the Gospel and of Justin in parallel columns—

JUSTIN. DIAL. 107.

And that he should rise again on the third day after the crucifixion, it is written in the Memoirs that some of your nation questioning him said: "Show us a sign;" and he answered them: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to them (αὐτοῖς) but the sign of Jonah (Ἰωνᾶ)."

Καὶ ὅτι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔμελλεν ἀναστῆθαι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι, γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονευμασιν, ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν διζητοῦντες αὐτῷ ἔλεγον, ὅτι, "Δεῖσον ἡμῖν σημεῖον." καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ, κ.τ.λ.

MATTHEW XII. 38, 39

38. Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying: Master, we would see a sign from thee.

39. But he answered and said unto them: An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it (αὐτῇ), but the sign of the prophet Jonah (Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου).

Τότε ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σου σημεῖον ἰδεῖν." ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Γενεὰ πονηρὰ, κ.τ.λ.

Now it is clear that Justin here directly professes to quote from the Memoirs, and consequently that accuracy may be expected; but passing over the preliminary substitution of "some of your nation," for "certain of the scribes and Pharisees," although it recalls the "some of them," and "others," by which the parallel passage, otherwise so different, is introduced in Luke xi. 15, 16, 29 ff.,² the question of the Jews, which should be literal, is quite different from that of the first Gospel, whilst there are variations in the reply of Jesus, which, if not so important, are still undeniable. We cannot compare with the first Gospel the parallel passages in the second and third Gospels without recognizing that other works may have narrated the same episode with similar variations, and whilst the distinct differences which exist totally exclude the affirmation that Justin quotes from Matthew, everything points to the conclusion that he makes use of another source. This is confirmed by another important circumstance. After enlarging during the remainder of the chapter upon the example of the people of Nineveh, Justin commences the next by returning to the answer of Jesus, and making the following state-

¹ Apol. i. 16, Dial. 35; cf. Matt. vii. 15.

² Cf. Mark viii. 11.

ment: "And though all of your nation were acquainted with these things which occurred to Jonah, and Christ proclaimed among you that he would give you the sign of Jonah, exhorting you at least after his resurrection from the dead to repent of your evil deeds, and like the Ninevites to supplicate God, that your nation and city might not be captured and destroyed as it has been destroyed; yet not only have you not repented on learning his resurrection from the dead, but as I have already said,¹ you sent chosen² and select men throughout all the world, proclaiming that an atheistic and impious heresy had arisen from a certain Jesus, a Galilean impostor," &c., &c.³ Now not only do our Gospels not mention this mission, as we have already pointed out, but they do not contain the exhortation to repent at least after the resurrection of Jesus here referred to, and which evidently must have formed part of the episode in the Memoirs.

Tischendorf does not produce any other instances of supposed quotations of Justin from Matthew, but rests his case upon these. As these are the best examples apparently which he can point out, we may judge of the weakness of his argument. De Wette divides the quotations of Justin which may be compared with our first and third Gospels into several categories. Regarding the first class, he says: "Some agree quite literally, which, however, is seldom:"⁴ and under this head he can only collect three passages of Matthew and refer to one of Luke. Of the three from Matthew the first is that, viii. 11, 12,⁵ also brought forward by Tischendorf, of which we have already disposed. The second is Matt. v. 20: "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." A parallel passage to this exists in Dial. 105, a chapter in which there are several quotations not found in our Gospels at all, with the exception that the first words, "For I say unto you that," are not in Justin. We shall speak of this passage presently. De Wette's third passage is Matt. vii. 19: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire," which, with the exception of one word, "but," at the commencement of the sentence in Justin, also agrees with his quotation.⁶ In these two short passages there are no peculiarities specially pointing to the first Gospel as their source, and it cannot be too often repeated that the mere coincidence of short historical sayings in two works by no means war-

¹ Dial. 17. The passage quoted above, p. 340.

² χειροτονήσαντες. Literally, "elected by a show of hands,"—by vote.

³ Dial. 108.

⁴ Manche stimmen ganz wörtlich überein, was aber selten ist. De Wette, Lehrb. Einl. N. T., p. 104.

⁵ Dial. 76, 120, 140; cf. p. 347.

⁶ Apol. i. 16.

rants
order
the v
also a
select
readin
sages
shoul
Apost
Tak
find th
examp
with v
were u
power
ception
quotat
with th
at pres
Justin
stars.
passag
parison

a. Ap
thua of
gaze on
bath con
the hear
β. An
thee cut
for it is
into the
one eye
to be thr

¹ Βασιλ
σοφιστη
How con
Gospel of
no knowle
² It nee
the text o
the reader
sible to in
course be
Where it i
for the ask
tin, we sh
in order to
Meant.

rants the conclusion that the one is dependent on the other. In order, however, to enable the reader to form a correct estimate of the value of the similarity of the two passages above noted, and also at the same time to examine a considerable body of evidence, selected with evident impartiality, we propose to take all Justin's readings of the Sermon on the Mount, from which the above passages are taken, and compare them with our Gospels. This should furnish a fair test of the composition of the Memoirs of the Apostles.

Taking first, for the sake of continuity, the first Apology, we find that Chapters xv, xvi, xvii, are composed almost entirely of examples of what Jesus himself taught, introduced by the remark with which Chapter xiv. closes, that: "Brief and concise sentences were uttered by him, for he was not a sophist, but his word was the power of God."¹ It may broadly be affirmed that, with the exception of the few words quoted above by De Wette, not a single quotation of the words of Jesus in these three chapters agrees with the Canonical Gospels. We shall however confine ourselves at present to the Sermon on the Mount. We must mention that Justin's text is quite continuous, except where we have inserted stars. We subjoin Justin's quotations, together with the parallel passages in our Gospels, side by side, for greater facility of comparison.²

JUSTIN.

α. Apol., i. 15. He (Jesus) spoke thus of chastity: Whosoever may gaze on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already in the heart before God.

β. And, if thy right eye offend thee cut it out, for it is profitable for thee to enter into the kingdom of heaven with one eye (rather) than having two to be thrust into the everlasting fire.

GOSPEL.

Matt. v. 28. But I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

29. But if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

¹ Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγονόσιν. Οὐ γὰρ δοκίμητος ἐπήχεον, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν. Apol. i. 14. How completely this description contradicts the representation of the fourth Gospel of the discourses of Jesus. It seems clearly to indicate that Justin had no knowledge of that Gospel.

² It need not be said that the variations between the quotations of Justin and the text of our Gospels must be looked for only in the Greek. For the sake of the reader unacquainted with Greek, however, we shall endeavour as far as possible to indicate in translation where differences exist, although this cannot of course be fully done, nor often, without being more literal than is desirable. Where it is not necessary to amend the authorized version of the New Testament for the sake of more closely following the text, and marking differences from Justin, we shall adopt it. We divide the quotations where desirable by initial letters, in order to assist reference at the end of our quotations from the Sermon on the Mount.

JUSTIN.

α. Περὶ μὲν οὖν σωφροσύνης τοσοῦτον εἶπεν. Ὅς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ᾗδ' ἐμοίχῃ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

β. Καὶ³ Εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτόν·

συμφέρει γὰρ σοὶ μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἢ μετὰ τῶν δύο πεμφθῆναι εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ.

γ. And, Whoever marieth a woman divorced from another man committeth adultery.

Καὶ, Ὅς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμένην ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός, μοιχᾷται.

δ. And regarding our affection for all, he taught thus:

If ye love them which love you what new thing do ye; for even the fornicators do this; but I say unto you: Pray for your enemies and

GOSPEL.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων¹ γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ᾗδ' ἐμοίχῃ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.

Εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἐξέλε² αὐτόν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σου· συμφέρει γὰρ σοὶ ἵνα ἀποληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Matt. xviii. 9 4 . . . καλὸν σοὶ ἔστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός.

Matt. v. 32. And whosoever shall marry a woman divorced

committeth adultery.

Matt. v. 46.

For if ye should love them which love you what reward have ye! do not even the publicans the same! v. 44.⁶ But I say unto you: Love

¹ Origen repeatedly uses ὁ δὲ ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ, and only once πᾶς ὁ βλέπων. Griesbach, *Symb. Criticæ*, 1785, ii., p. 251.

² Clem. Al. reads ἔκκοψον like Justin. Griesbach, *ib.*, ii. p. 252.

³ The "καὶ" here forms no part of the quotation, and seems to separate the two passages, which were, therefore, probably distinct in Justin's Memoirs, although consecutive verses in Matthew.

⁴ Matt. v. 29, 30, it will be remembered, are repeated with some variation and also reversed in order, and with a totally different context, Matt. xviii. 8, 9. The latter verse, the Greek of the concluding part of which we give above, approximates more nearly in form to Justin's but is still widely different. "And if thine eye ('right' omitted) offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee; it is good for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." The sequence of Matt. v. 28, 29, points especially to it. The double occurrence of this passage, however, with a different context, and with the order reversed in Matthew, renders it almost certain that the two passages α. and β. were separate in the Memoirs. The reading of Mark ix. 47, is equally distinct from Justin's: And if thine eye offend thee cast it out (ἐκβάλε αὐτόν); it is good for thee (καλὸν ἔστιν σε) to enter into the kingdom of God (τοῦ θεοῦ) with one eye rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell. (ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς γέενναν.)

⁵ Cf. Matt. xix. 9, Luke xvi. 18. The words ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός are peculiar to Justin. The passage in Luke has ἀπὸ ἀνδρός, but differs in the rest.

⁶ It will be observed that here again Justin's Gospel reverses the order in which the parallel passage is found in our Synoptics. It does so indeed with a clearness of design which, even without the actual peculiarities of diction and construction, would indicate a special and different source. The passage varies throughout from our Gospels, but Justin repeats the same phrases in the same order elsewhere. In Dial. 133, he says: "While we all pray for you, and for all men as our Christ and Lord taught us to do, enjoining us to pray even for our enemies, and to love them that hate us, and to bless them that curse us," (εὐχεσθαι καὶ ὑπερ τῶν ἐχθρῶν

love th
them w
them w

Περὶ
ταύτη
ἀγαπῶ
εἶτε;
ποιοῦσι
Εὐχόμε
καὶ ἄγε
καὶ εἰς
ὑμῖν, κα
ρεαζόντ

ε. An
cate to t
praise, h
Give ye t
from him
turn not

lend to th
receive, w
even the

But ye, l
upon the
rust doth
through,
but by up
in the he
nor rust d

For wha
shall gain
destroy hi

καὶ ἄγαπ
again, in A
(ἐπερ τῶν
tion is there

¹ The two
are only sup
ject them.

² The par
Matt., thou
³ In the fi
compared wi
ralled passag
vi. 34 above,
a parallel for
from Matt. v

JUSTIN.

love them which hate you, and bless them which curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you.

Περὶ δὲ τῶν στέργειν ἅπαντας, ταῦτα διδάσκειν· Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῶν λέγω· Εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρασάντων ὑμᾶς.

ε. And that we should communicate to the needy and do nothing for praise, he said thus: Give ye to every one that asketh, and from him that desireth to borrow turn not ye away; for if ye

lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what new things do ye? for even the publicans do this.

But ye, lay not up for yourselves upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and robbers break through, but lay up for yourselves in the heavens, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt.

For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, but destroy his soul? or what shall he

GOSPEL.

your enemies! (bless them which curse you, do good to them which hate you), and pray for them which (despitefully use you and) persecute you.²

v. 46.

Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσῃτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι οὕτως ποιοῦσιν;

v. 44. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῶν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς), καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν¹ (ἐπηρασάντων καὶ ὀκνηόντων ὑμᾶς).

Matt. v. 42.

Give thou to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.³

Cf. Luke vi. 34.

And if ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye; for sinners lend, &c., &c.

Matt. vi. 19.

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal;

vi. 20. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.

Matt. xvi. 26. For what shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world, but lose his soul? or

καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τοῖς μισοῦντας, καὶ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς καταρωμένους). And again, in Apol. i. 14, he uses the expression that Christians pray for their enemies (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχόμενοι) according to the precepts of Christ. The variation is therefore not accidental, but from a different text.

¹ The two passages within brackets are not found in any of the oldest MSS., and are only supported by Codices D, E, and a few obscure texts. All modern critics reject them.

² The parallel passage in Luke vi. 32, 27, 28, presents similar variations from Matt., though not so great as those of Justin from them both.

³ In the first Gospel the subject breaks off at the end of v. 42. v. 46 may be compared with Justin's continuation, but it is fundamentally different. The parallel passages in Luke vi. 30, 34, present still greater variations. We have given vi. 34 above, as nearer Justin than Matt. v. 46. It will be remarked that to find a parallel for Justin's continuation, without break, of the subject, we must jump from Matt. v. 42, 46, to vi. 19, 20.

JUSTIN.

give in exchange for it? Lay up, therefore, in the heavens, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt.¹

Ἦς δὲ τὸ κοινωνεῖν τοῖς δεικνύουσιν, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς θυξάν ποιῇν, ταῖς ἐφ' ἡμῶν.

Πάντι τῷ αἰτοῦντι δίδετε, καὶ τὸν βουλούμενον δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε.

εἰ γὰρ δανεῖζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν.

Ἔμεῖς δὲ μὴ ὑποδανίζετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρώδεις ἀφανίζονται, καὶ ληστέα διορύσσουσιν.

ὑποδανίζετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε βρώδεις ἀφανίζονται.

Τὴ γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν, αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσῃ; ἢ τί δώσει αὐτῇ ἀντάλλαγμα;

ὑποδανίζετε οὖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρώδεις ἀφανίζονται.²

ζ. And: Be ye kind and merciful as your Father also is kind and merciful, and maketh his sun to rise on sinners, just and evil.³

GOSPEL.

what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

Matt. v. 42.

Τῷ αἰτοῦντι σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σου δανείσασθαι, μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.

Cf. Luke vi. 34.

Καὶ ἐὰν δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανείζουσιν, κ.τ.λ.

Matt. vi. 19.

Μὴ ὑποδανίζετε ἐμὴν ὑπόστασιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρώδεις ἀφανίζονται, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσιν καὶ κλέπτουσιν.

vi. 20. ὑποδανίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν ὑπόστασιν ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρώδεις ἀφανίζονται, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν.

xvi. 26. Τί γὰρ ὠφεληθήσεται ἄνθρωπος, εἰάν τον κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;

Luke vi. 36.³ Be ye merciful even as your Father also is merciful. Matt. v. 45.⁴ . . . for he maketh his sun to rise on evil and good and sendeth rain on just and unjust.

¹ See next note (2).

² This phrase, it will be observed, is also introduced higher up in the passages, and its repetition in such a manner, with the same variations, emphatically demonstrates the unity of the whole question.

³ There is no parallel to this in the first Gospel. Matt. v. 48, is too remote in sense as well as language.

⁴ The first part of v. 45 is quite different from the context in Justin: "That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh," &c., &c.

⁵ This passage (ζ) is repeated with the peculiar *χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτ.* twice in Dial. 96, and in connection with the same concluding words, which are quite separate in our Synoptics. In that place, however, in paraphrasing and not quoting, he adds, "and sending rain on holy and evil." Critics conjecture with much probability that the words *καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δόξους* have been omitted above after *δικαίους* by a mistake either of the transcriber or of Justin. In the *Clementine Homilies* (iii. 57) a similar combination to that of Justin's occurs together with a

But
ent an

Are
and t
them.

wha
ye sha

for yo
that y
but see
vens,
added u

for whe
the min

Kal,
τιμονε
χρηστός
καὶ τ
ἐπὶ ἀμα
πονηρο

Mῆ μ
τί ἐν δ

οὐχ ὅ
θηρίων
τρέφει

duplicatio
Γινέσθ
ἀνατέλλ
of a simila
xxiii. 10.

§ 1. These
as quoted

1 There
2 Cf. Lu

The differ
8 In the
hand.

4 The Co
the part.

JUSTIN.

But be not careful what ye shall eat and what ye shall put on.

Are ye not better than the birds and the beasts? And God feedeth them.

Therefore be not careful what ye shall eat, or what ye shall put on,

for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things, but seek ye the kingdom of the heavens, and all these things shall be added unto you,

for where the treasure is there is also the mind of the man.

Kai, l'ineσθε δε χρηστοι και οικτιρμονες, ως και ο πατήρ υμών χρηστός ἐστι καὶ οικτιρμών, και τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ ἀμαρτωλοὺς και δικαίους καὶ πονηροὺς.

Μη μεριμνᾶτε δε τί φάγητε, ἢ τί ἐνδύσθητε.

οὐχ υμεῖς τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν θηρίων διαφέρετε; και ο θεός τρέφει αὐτά.

GOSPEL.

Matt. vi. 25.

Therefore I say unto you, Be not careful for your life what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on. . . .

vi. 26. Behold the birds of the air that they sow not, &c., &c., yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?

vi. 21.¹ Therefore be not careful, saying what shall we eat? or what shall we drink, or with what shall we be clothed?

vi. 32. For after all these things do the Gentiles seek: for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all these things.

vi. 33. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

vi. 21.² For where thy treasure is there will thy heart be also.

Luke vi. 36. *l'ineσθε οὖν οικτιρμονες, καθως και ο πατήρ υμών οικτιρμών ἐστιν.*

Matt. v. 45. . . . *ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς και ἀγαθοὺς και βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους και ἀδίκους.*³

Matt. vi. 25.

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μη μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ υμών τί φάγητε και τί πίητε,⁴ μηδὲ τῷ σώματι υμών τί ἐνδύσθητε . . .

vi. 26. *Εμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κ.τ.λ. και ο πατήρ υμών ο οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά: οὐχ υμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν;*

duplication recalling that of Justin, although ἀγαθοὶ is substituted for χρηστοὶ. *l'ineσθε ἀγαθοὶ και οικτιρμονες ως ο πατήρ ο ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὅς ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς, κ.τ.λ.* Epiphanius also twice makes use of a similar combination, although with variations in language, cf. Har. lxi. 22, xxxiii. 10. Origen likewise combines Matt. v. 48 and 45; cf. *de Princip.*, ii. 4, § 1. These instances confirm the indication of an ancient connection of the passage as quoted by Justin.

¹ There is a complete break here in the continuity of the parallel passage.

² Cf. Luke xii. 22-34, which, however, is equally distinct from Justin's text. The difference of order will not have escaped notice.

³ In the Cod. Sinaiticus the last six words are omitted, but added by another hand.

⁴ The Cod. Sinaiticus omits *και τί πίητε*. Codices A, C, and D are defective at the part. Cod. B and most other MSS. have the words.

JUSTIN.

Μη οὖν μεριμνήσητε τί φάγητε,

ἢ τί ἐνδύσῃθε.

οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐρα-
νίος, ὅτι τούτων χρεῖαν ἔχετε·

ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν
οὐρανῶν,
καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται
ὑμῖν.

Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θεσαυρὸς ἐστίν, ἐκεῖ
καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

η. And: Do not these things to be
seen of men, otherwise ye have no re-
ward of your Father which is in hea-
ven.

καὶ, Μη ποιῇτε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ
θεασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰ
δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ
τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς.

Apol. i. 16.

θ. And regarding our being patient
under injuries, and ready to help all,
and free from anger, this is what he
said: Unto him striking thy cheek
offer the other also;
and him who carrieth off thy cloak or
thy coat do not thou prevent.

But whosoever shall be angry is in
danger of the fire.

But every one who compelleth thee
to go a mile, follow twain.

And let your good works shine
before men so that, perceiving, they
may adore your Father which is in
heaven.

* * * *

GOSPEL.

vi. 31. μη οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέ-
γοντες

Τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίωμεν

ἢ τί περιβαλωμεθα;

vi. 32. πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ
ἐθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὁ
πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, ὅτι χρῆ-
ζετε τούτων ἀπάντων.

vi. 33. ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν
βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαι-
οσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα
προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

vi. 21. Ὅπου γὰρ ἐστίν ὁ θησαυ-
ρὸς σου, ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ καρδί-
α σου.

Matt. vi. 1.

But take heed that ye do not your
righteousness before men to be seen of
them, otherwise ye have no re-
ward from your Father which is in
heaven.

vi. 1. Προσέχετε δὲ τὴν δικαιοσ-
ύνην ὑμῶν μη ποιεῖν ἐμπροσθεν
τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεασθῆναι
αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ
ἔχετε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς.

Matt. v. 39.

But I say unto you that ye resist
not evil,² but whosoever shall smite
thee on thy right cheek turn to him
the other also.

v. 40. And to him who would sue
thee at law and take away thy coat
let him have thy cloak also.

v. 22.³ But I say unto you that
every one who is angry with his bro-
ther shall be in danger of the judg-
ment, &c., &c.

v. 41. And whosoever shall compel
thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

v. 16. Even so let your light
shine before men that they may see
your good works and glorify your
Father which is in heaven.

¹ A few MSS. read "alma," ἐλεημοσύνην, here, but the Cod. Sin. Vat., and all the older Codices have the reading of the text which is adopted by all modern editors.

² It is apparent that if Justin could have quoted this phrase it would have suited him perfectly.

³ That part of Matt. v. 22 intrudes itself betw^{en} parallels found in v. 40 and 41, will not have been overlooked.

JUSTIN.

GOSPEL.

Matt. v. 39.¹

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιδ-
τῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε
βαπτίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου διαγ-
χόντα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλ-
λην.

v. 40. καὶ τῷ βέλοντι σοὶ κριθῆ-
ναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν,
ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον·

v. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς
ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ²
ἐνοχλὸς ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· κ.τ.λ.

v. 41. Καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει
μίλιον ἔν, ὑπάγε μετ' αὐτοῦ διό.

v. 16. Οὕτως λαμψάτω τὶ φῶς
ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
ὥπως ἰδῶσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα
καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν
τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

* * * *

i. And regarding our not swearing
at all, but ever speaking the truth, he
thus taught :

Ye may not swear at all, but let your
yea be yea, and your nay nay, for
what is more than these (is) of the
evil one.

Matt. v. 34.

But I say unto you swear not at all,
neither by heaven, &c., &c.

v. 38. But let your speech be yea
yea, nay nay, for what is more than
these is of the evil one.

Matt. v. 34.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὁμῶσαι
ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, κ.τ.λ.

v. 37. Ἐστὼ δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν
ναὶ ναὶ, οὐ οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν
τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.

* * * *

¹ The parallel passage Luke vi. 29, is closer to Justin's, but still presents distinct variations : "Unto him smiting thee on the cheek offer the other also, and from him that carrieth off thy coat do not thou withhold (μὴ κωλύσῃς) thy cloak also." Τῷ τύποντι σε ἐπὶ τὴν διαχόνα, πάρχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς. The whole context however excludes Luke ; cf. Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 272.

² *καὶ* being omitted from Cod. Sin. Vat., and other important MSS. we do not insert it.

³ Clement of Alexandria has in one place λαμψ. σου τὰ ἔργα, and again τὰ ἀγαθὰ ὑμῶν ἔργα λαμψάτω. Cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., ii. p. 250.

⁴ This agrees with a passage which occurs twice in the Clementine Homilies. The version in Ep. of James v. 12, is evidently a quotation from a source different from Matthew, and supports Justin. Clement Al. twice uses a similar expression, and Epiphanius does so once, though probably following the Ep. of James. The Apostolic Constitutions also quotes in similar manner. The context of the Cle-

JUSTIN.

κ. For not those who merely make profession but those who do the works, as he said, shall be saved. For he spake thus,

κ 1. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, shall, &c., &c.

κ 2. For whosoever heareth me and doeth what I say, heareth him that sent me.

κ 3. But many will say to me; Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in thy name and do wonders?

κ 4. And then I will say unto them: Depart from me workers of iniquity.

κ 5. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when indeed the righteous shall shine as the sun, but the wicked are sent into everlasting fire.

κ 6. For many shall arrive in my name, outwardly, indeed, clothed in sheep skins, but inwardly being ravening wolves.

κ 7. Ye shall know them from their works.

κ 8. And every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

GOSPEL.

Matt. vii. 21.

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall, &c., &c.

Luke x. 16.¹ He hearing you heareth me, and he despising you, &c., &c., and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

Matt. vii. 22.

Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name do many wonders.

vii. 23. And then will I confess unto them that: I never knew you: Depart from me ye that work iniquity.

Matt. xiii. 42.

and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.

xiii. 43. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

Matt. vii. 15.

But beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves.

vii. 16. Ye shall know them by their fruit. Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles?

vii. 19. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

mentine Homilies corresponds with that of Justin, but not so the others. We contrast all these passages below—

James v. 12 . . .	ἡ ῥω	ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Clemen. Hom. iii. 55 . . .	ἔστω	ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Ib., xix. 2 . . .	ἔστω	ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Justin Apol. i. 16 . . .	ἔστω δὲ	ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Clem. Al. Strom. v. 14, § 100 . . .	ἔστω	ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Epiph. Har. xix. 6 . . .	ἡ ῥω	ὁ ὑμῶν τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Constit. Ap. v. 12 . . .	εἰναι δὲ	τὸ καὶ καὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.

¹ Cf. Matt. x. 40; Mark ix. 27; Luke ix. 48, which are still more remote. In Matt. vii. 24, however, we find: "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them (καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτοῦς), I will liken him unto, &c., &c." This however, the continuation of v. 21—23 quoted above immediately before this passage, is very abrupt, but it seems to indicate the existence of such a passage as we find in Justin's Memoirs.

JUSTIN.

κ1. Ὡς πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.¹

κ2. Ὡς γὰρ ἀκούει μου, καὶ ποιεῖ ὃ λέγω, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.²

κ3. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐροῦσί μοι· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποίησαμεν;

κ4. Καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς. Ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐργαται τῆς ἀνομίας.⁴

κ5. Τότε κλαυθμὸς ἔσται καὶ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων· ὅταν οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι λαμφώσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ὀδόντων.

GOSPEL.

Matt. vii. 21.

Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.

Luke x. 16.

Ὁ ἀκούων ἐμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.³

Matt. vii. 22.

Πολλοὶ ἐρῶ· ὁὶν μοι, ἐξέλιγναι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, κύριε, κύριε, ὃ δὲ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποίησαμεν;

vii. 23. Καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ἐμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.⁵

Matt. xiii. 42.

καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κῆμινον τοῦ πυρὸς· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

¹ This is one of the passages quoted by De Wette [Einl. N. T., p. 105] as agreeing except in a single word.

² Justin repeats part of this passage, omitting however, "and doeth what I say," in Apol. i. 63: "As our Lord himself also says: He that heareth me heareth him that sent me." Justin, however, merely quotes the portion relative to his subject. He is arguing that Jesus is the Word, and is called Angel and Apostle, for he declares whatever we require to know, "as our Lord himself also says, &c.," and therefore the phrase omitted is a mere suspension of the sense and unnecessary.

³ Cod. D. (Bezae) reads for the last phrase ὁ δὲ ἐμῶν ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με· but all the older MSS. have the above. A very few obscure MSS. and some translations add: "He hearing me, heareth him that sent me." καὶ ὁ ἐμῶν ἀκούων, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

⁴ In Dial 76, Justin makes use of a similar passage. "And many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in thy name, and prophecy and cast out devils. And I will say to them, Depart from me." καὶ Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προεφητεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν; Καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. This is followed by one which differs from our Gospels in agreement with one in the Clementine Homilies, and by others varying also from our Gospels. Although Justin may quote these passages freely, he is persistent in his departure from our Synoptics, and the freedom of quotation is towards his own peculiar source, for it is certain that neither form agrees with the Gospels.

⁵ The parallel passage, Luke xiii. 26, 27, is still more remote. Origen in four places, in Joh. xxxii. 7, 8, Contra Cels. ii. 49, de Principiis, quotes a passage nominally from Matt., more nearly resembling Justin's: πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι σου ἐφάγομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι σου ἐπίομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι σου δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, κ.τ.λ. Cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., ii. p. 61 f.; Origen may have here confused the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Matthew.

JUSTIN.

οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι πέμπωνται εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ.

κ 6. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἤξουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐξώθεν μὲν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἐξώθεν δὲ ὄντες λύκοι ἄρπαγες.³

κ 7. ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

κ 8. Πάν δὲ δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκοπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

* * * *

Apol. i. 17.

Λ. As Christ declared saying: To whom God gave more, of him shall more also be demanded again.

... ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμήνυσεν εἰπών· Ὡς πλέον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός, πλέον καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ.⁶

GOSPEL.

43. Τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.²

Matt. vii. 15.

Προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων, ἐξώθεν δὲ εἰδὲν λύκοι ἄρπαγες.

16. Ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ.

19. Πάν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκοπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.⁴

Luke xii. 48 (not found in Matthew).

For unto whom much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will demand a greater amount.

Luke xii. 48.

... Παντὶ δὲ ὃ ἔδωκεν πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὃ παρένευτο πολὺ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτον.

¹ The Cod. D. (Beza) has λαμψουσιν, and so also quotes Origen. Cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., ii. p. 278.

² The corresponding passage in Luke (xiii. 26-28) much more closely follows the order which we find in Justin, but linguistically and otherwise it is remote from his version, although in connection of ideas more similar than the passage in the first Gospel. In Luke the weeping and gnashing of teeth are to be when the wicked see the righteous in heaven whilst they are excluded; whereas in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, the weeping, &c., are merely a characteristic of the furnace of fire, and the shining forth of the righteous is mentioned as a separate circumstance. Matt. xiii. 42, 43 has a different context, and is entirely separate from the parallel passage in Justin, which precedes and naturally introduces this quotation.

³ Justin makes use of this passage with the same variations from our Gospel in Dial. c. Tr. 35. Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐξώθεν ἐνδεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἐξώθεν δὲ εἰδὲν λύκοι ἄρπαγες. With only a separation; καὶ, Justin proceeds to quote a saying of Jesus not found in our Gospels at all, "And: There shall be schisms and heresies," "Καὶ ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρεσεις." And then with merely another separating "And," he quotes another passage similar to the above, but differing from Matt. "And: Beware of false prophets who shall come to you outwardly clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly are ravening wolves,"—and with another separating "And," he ends with another saying not found in our Gospels: "Many false Christs and false Apostles shall arise, and shall deceive many of the faithful, καὶ ἄνασθ' ὄνται πολλοὶ ψευδοχριστοὶ καὶ ψευδοαποστόλοι, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. Both passages must have been in his Memoirs and both differ from our Gospels.

⁴ This passage occurs in Matthew iii. 10, and Luke iii. 8, literally, as a saying of John the Baptist, so that in Matt. vii. 19, it is a mere quotation.

⁵ The Codex D. (Beza) reads πλέον ἀπαιτηθήσουσιν instead of περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν.

⁶ Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, ii. 23, § 146) has this passage as follows: ὡς πλέον ἔδωκεν, οὗτος καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται. Cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., ii.

JUSTIN.

Dial. c. Tr. 105.

u. Except your righteousness shall
exceed, &c., &c.

GOSPEL.

Matt. v. 20.

For I say unto you¹ that except
your righteousness shall exceed, &c.,
&c.²

We have taken the whole of Justin's quotations from the Sermon on the Mount not only because, adopting so large a test, there can be no suspicion that we select passages for any special purpose, but also because on the contrary, amongst these quotations are more of the passages claimed as showing the use of our Gospels than any series which could have been selected. It will have been observed that most of the passages follow each other in unbroken sequence in Justin, for with the exception of a short break between γ and δ the whole extract down to the end of θ is continuous, as indeed, after another brief interruption at the end of ι, it is again to the close of the very long and remarkable passage κ. With two exceptions, therefore, the whole of these quotations from the Sermon on the Mount occur consecutively in two succeeding chapters of Justin's first Apology, and one passage follows in the next chapter. Only a single passage comes from a distant part of the dialogue with Trypho. These passages are bound together by clear unity of idea and context, and as, where there is a separation of sentences in his Gospel, Justin clearly marks it by καί, there is every reason to decide that those quotations which are continuous in form and in argument were likewise consecutive in the Memoirs. Now the hypothesis that these quotations are from the Canonical Gospels requires the assumption of the fact that Justin, with singular care, collected from distant and scattered portions of those Gospels a series of passages in close sequence to each other, forming a whole unknown to them but complete in itself, and yet, although this is carefully performed, he at the same time with the most systematic carelessness misquoted and materially altered almost every precept he professes to cite. The order of the Canonical Gospels is as entirely set at naught as their language is disregarded. As Hilgenfeld has pointed out, throughout the whole of this portion of his quotations the undeniable endeavour after accuracy, on the one hand, is in the most glaring contradiction with the monstrous carelessness on the other, if it be supposed that our Gospels are

p. 350. This version more nearly approximates to Justin's, though still distinct from it.

¹ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι &c. wanting in Justin.

² This passage quoted by De Wette, was referred to p. 345, and led to this examination.

the source from which Justin quotes. Nothing is more improbable than the conjecture that he made use of the Canonical Gospels, and we must accept the conclusion that Justin quotes with substantial correctness the expressions in the order in which he found them in his peculiar Gospel.¹

It is a most arbitrary proceeding to dissect a passage, quoted by Justin as a consecutive and harmonious whole, and finding parallels more or less approximate to its various phrases scattered up and down distant parts of our Gospels, scarcely one of which is not materially different from the reading of Justin, to assert that he is quoting these Gospels freely from memory, altering, excising, combining, and interweaving texts, and introverting their order, but nevertheless making use of them and not of others. It is perfectly obvious that such an assertion is nothing but the merest assumption. Our Synoptic Gospels themselves condemn it utterly, for precisely similar differences of order and language exist in them and distinguish between them. Not only the language but the order of a quotation must have its due weight, and we have no right to dismember a passage, and discovering fragmentary parallels in various parts of the Gospels to assert that it is compiled from them and not derived as it stands from another source.² As an illustration from our Gospels, let us for a moment suppose the "Gospel according to Luke" to have been lost like the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and so many others. In the works of one of the Fathers we discover the following quotation from an unnamed evangelical work: "And he said unto them (ἐλεγεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς): The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: (ἐπάγγετε) behold I send you forth as lambs (ἀγνῶς) in the midst of wolves." Following the system adopted in regard to Justin, apologetic critics would of course maintain that this was a compilation from memory of passages quoted freely from our first Gospel, that is to say Matt. ix. 37. "Then saith he unto his disciples (τότε λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ) the harvest," &c., and Matt. x. 16, "Behold I (ἐγὼ) send you forth as sheep (πρόβατα) in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore," &c., which, with the differences which we have indicated, agree. It would probably be in vain to argue that the quotation indicated a continuous

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 129 f.; Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 259.

² For the arguments of apologetic criticism, the reader may be referred to Canon Westcott's work *On the Canon*, p. 112-139. Dr. Westcott does not, of course, deny the fact that Justin's quotations are different from the text of our Gospels, but he accounts for his variations on grounds which seem to us purely imaginary. It is evident that, so long as there are such variations to be explained away, at least no proof of identity is possible.

order, and the variations combined to confirm the probability of a different source, and still more so to point out that, although parts of the quotation separated from their context might to a certain extent correspond with scattered verses in the first Gospel, such a circumstance was no proof that the quotation was taken from that and from no other Gospel. The passage, however, is a literal quotation from Luke x. 2, 3, which, as we have assumed, had been lost.

Again, still supposing the third Gospel no longer extant, we might find the following quotation in a work of the Fathers: "Take heed to yourselves (*ἐαυτοῖς*) of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy (*ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις*). For there is nothing covered up (*συγκαλυμμένον*) which shall not be revealed, and hid which shall not be known." It would of course be affirmed that this was evidently a combination of two verses of our first Gospel quoted almost literally, with merely a few very immaterial slips of memory in the parts we note, and the explanatory words "which is hypocrisy" introduced by the Father, and not a part of the quotation at all. The two verses are Matt. xvi. 6: "Beware and (*ὁρᾶτε καὶ*) take heed of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (*καὶ Σαδδουκαίων*) and Matt. x. 26 "For (*γὰρ*) there is nothing covered (*κεκαλυμμένον*) that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known." The sentence would in fact be divided as in the case of Justin, and each part would have its parallel pointed out in separate portions of the Gospel. How wrong such a system is—and it is precisely that which is adopted with regard to Justin—is clearly established by the fact that the quotation instead of being such a combination is simply taken from the Gospel according to Luke xii. 1, 2, as it stands.

To give one more example, and such might easily be multiplied, if our second Gospel had been lost, and the following passage were met with in one of the Fathers without its source being indicated, what would be the argument of those who insist that Justin's quotations, though differing from our Gospels, were yet taken from them? "If any one have (*εἰ τις ἔχει*) ears to hear let him hear. And he said unto them: Take heed what (*τί*) ye hear: with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you: and more shall be given unto you. For he (*ὃς*) that hath to him shall be given, and he (*καὶ ὃς*) that hath not from him shall be taken even that which he hath." Upon the principle on which Justin's quotations are treated, it would certainly be affirmed positively that this passage was a quotation from our first and third Gospels combined and made from memory. The exigencies of the occasion might probably cause the assertion to be made that the words: "And he said to them," really indicated a separation of

the latter part of the quotation from the preceding, and that the Father thus showed that the passage was not consecutive; and as to the phrase: "and more shall be given unto you," that it was evidently an addition of the Father. The passage would be dissected, and its different members compared with scattered sentences, and declared almost literal quotations from the Canonical Gospels: Matt. xiii. 9. He that hath (ὁ ἔχων) ears to hear let him hear."¹ Luke viii. 18, "Take heed therefore how (ὅντως) ye hear." Matt. vii. 2 . . . "with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you."² Matt. xiii. 12: "For whosoever (ὁσους) hath, to him shall be given (and he shall have abundance); but whosoever (ὁσους δὲ) hath not from him shall be taken even that which he hath."³ In spite of these ingenious assertions, however, the quotation in reality is literally and consecutively taken from Mark iv. 23-25.

These examples may suffice to show that any argument which commences by the assumption that the order of a passage quoted may be entirely disregarded, and that it is sufficient to find parallels scattered irregularly up and down the Gospels to warrant the conclusion that the passage is compiled from them, and is not a consecutive quotation from some other source, is utterly unfounded and untenable. The supposition of a lost Gospel which has just been made to illustrate this argument is, however, not a mere supposition as applied to Justin but a fact, for we no longer have the Gospel according to Peter nor that according to the Hebrews, not to mention the numerous other works in use in the early Church. The instances we have given show the importance of the order as well as the language of Justin's quotations, and while they prove the impossibility of demonstrating that a consecutive passage which differs not only in language but in order from the parallels in our Gospels must be derived from them, they likewise prove the probability that such passages are actually quoted from a different source.

If we examine further, however, in the same way, quotations which differ merely in language, we arrive at the very same conclusion. Supposing the third Gospel to be lost, what would be the source assigned to the following quotation from an unnamed Gospel in the work of one of the Fathers? "No servant (οὐδὲς οἰκέτης) can serve two lords, for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Of course the passage would be claimed as a quotation from memory of Matt. vi.

¹ Cf. Matt. ix. 15; Luke viii. 8.

³ Cf. Matt. xxv. 29; Luke viii. 18, xix. 26.

² Cf. Luke vi. 38.

24, with which it perfectly corresponds with the exception of the addition of the second word *οἰκείας*, which, it would no doubt be argued, is an evident and very natural amplification of the simple *οἰδείς* of the first Gospel. Yet this passage, only differing by the single word from Matthew, is a literal quotation from the Gospel according to Luke xvi. 13. Or, to take another instance, supposing the third Gospel to be lost, and the following passage quoted, from an unnamed source, by one of the Fathers: "Beware (*προσέχετε*) of the Scribes which desire to walk in long robes, and love (*φιλοῦντων*) greetings in the markets, and chief seats in the synagogues and uppermost places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation." This would without hesitation be declared a quotation from memory of Mark xii. 38-40. ". . . . Beware (*Βλέπετε*) of the Scribes which desire to walk in long robes and greetings in the markets, and chief seats in the synagogues and uppermost places at feasts: which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive," &c. It is however a literal quotation of Luke xx. 46, 47; yet probably it would be in vain to submit to apologetic critics that possibly, not to say probably, the passage was not derived from Mark but from a lost Gospel. To quote one more instance, let us suppose the "Gospel according to Mark" no longer extant, and that in some early work there existed the following quotation: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye (*τρνμαλιᾶς*) of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." This would of course be claimed as a quotation from memory of Matt. xix. 24,¹ with which it agrees with the exception of the substitution of *τρνπήματος* for the *τρνμαλιᾶς*. It would not the less have been an exact quotation from Mark x. 25.²

We have repeatedly pointed out that the actual agreement of any saying of Jesus, quoted by one of the early Fathers from an unnamed source, with a passage in our Gospels is by no means conclusive evidence that the quotation was actually derived from that Gospel. It must be apparent that literal agreement in reporting short and important sayings is not in itself so surprising

¹ Cf. Luke xviii. 25.

² For further instances compare—

Luke xiv. 11, with Matt. xxiii. 12, and Luke xviii. 14.

" xvii. 37, " " xxiv. 28.

" vi. 41, " " vii. 3.

Mark vi. 4, " " xiii. 57.

" viii. 34, " Luke ix. 23.

Matt. xviii. 11, " " xix. 10.

" xxiv. 37, " " xiii. 34.

" xxiv. 34-36, with Mark xiii. 30-32, and Luke xxi. 32-33.

as to constitute proof that, occurring in two histories, the one must have copied from the other. The only thing which is surprising is that such frequent inaccuracy should occur. When we add, however, the fact that most of the larger early evangelical works, including our Synoptic Gospels, must have been compiled out of the same original sources, and have been largely indebted to each other, the common possession of such sayings becomes a matter of natural occurrence. Moreover, it must be admitted even by apologetic critics that, in a case of such vast importance as the report of sayings of Jesus, upon the verbal accuracy of which the most essential doctrines of Christianity depend, it cannot be a wonder, to the extent of proving plagiarism so to say, if various Gospels report the same saying of Jesus in the same words. Practically, the Synoptic Gospels differ in their reports a great deal more than is right or desirable; but we may take them as an illustration of the fact, that identity of passages, where the source is unnamed, by no means proves that such passages in a work of the early Fathers were derived from one Gospel, and not from any other. Let us suppose our first Gospel to have been lost, and the following quotation from an unnamed source to be found in an early work: "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." This being in literal agreement with Luke iii. 9, would certainly be declared by modern apologists conclusive proof that the Father was acquainted with that Gospel, and although the context in the work of the Father might for instance be: "Ye shall know them from their works, and every tree," &c., &c., and yet, in the third Gospel, the context is: "And now also, the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: and every tree," &c., that would by no means give them pause. The explanation of combination of texts, and quotation from memory, is sufficiently elastic for every emergency. Now the words in question might in reality be a quotation from the lost Gospel according to Matthew, in which they twice occur, so that here is a passage which is literally repeated three times, Matthew iii. 10, vii. 19, and Luke iii. 9. In Matthew iii. 10, and in the third Gospel, the words are part of a saying of John the Baptist; whilst in Matthew vii. 19, they are given as part of the Sermon on the Mount, with a different context. This passage is actually quoted by Justin (κ 8), with the context, "Ye shall know them from their works," which is different from that in any of the three places in which the words occur in our Synoptics, and on the grounds we have clearly established it cannot be considered in any case as necessarily a quotation from our Gospels, but on the contrary, there are good reasons for the very opposite conclusion.

Another illustration of this may be given, by supposing the Gospel of Luke to be no longer extant, and the following sentence in one of the Fathers: "And ye shall be hated by all men, for my name's sake." These very words occur both in Matthew x. 22, and Mark xiii. 13, in both of which places there follow the words: "But he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved." There might here have been a doubt, as to whether the Father derived the words from the first or second Gospel, but they would have been ascribed either to the one or to the other, whilst in reality they were taken from a different work altogether, Luke xxi. 17. Here again, we have the same words in three Gospels. In how many more may not the same passage have been found? One more instance to conclude. The following passage might be quoted from an unnamed source by one of the Fathers: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." If the Gospel according to Mark were no longer extant, this would be claimed as a quotation either from Matthew xxiv. 35, or Luke xxi. 33, in both of which it occurs, but, notwithstanding, the Father might not have been acquainted with either of them, and simply have quoted from Mark xiii. 31.¹ And here again, the three Gospels contain the same passage without variation.

Now in all these cases, not only is the selection of the Gospel from which the quotation was actually taken completely an open question, since they all have it, but still more is the point uncertain, when it is considered that many other works may also have contained it, historical sayings being naturally common property. Does the agreement of the quotation with a passage which is equally found in the three Gospels prove the existence of all of them? and if not, how is the Gospel from which it was actually taken to be distinguished? If it be difficult to do so, how much more when the possibility and probability, demonstrated by the agreement of the three extant, that it might have formed part of a dozen other works is taken into account. In the case of Justin, it is simply absurd and unreasonable, in the face of his persistent variation from our Gospels, to assert positively that his quotations are derived from them.

It must have been apparent to all that, throughout his quotation from the "Sermon on the Mount," Justin follows an order which is quite different from that in our Synoptic Gospels, and as might have been expected, the inference of a different source, which is naturally suggested by this variation in order, is more than confirmed by persistent and continuous variation in language. If it be true, that examples of confusion of quotation are

¹ Cf. Matt. vii. 7—8, with Luke xi. 9—10; Matt. xi. 25, with Luke x. 21.

to be found in the works of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other Fathers, it must at the same time be remembered, that these are quite exceptional, and we are scarcely in a position to judge how far confusion of memory may not have arisen from reminiscences of other forms of evangelical expressions occurring in apocryphal works, with which we know the Fathers to have been well acquainted. The most vehement asserter of the identity of the Memoirs with our Gospels, however, must absolutely admit as a fact, explain it as he may, that variation from our Gospel readings is the general rule in Justin's quotations, and agreement with them the very rare exception.¹ Now, such a phenomenon is elsewhere unparalleled in those times, when memory was more cultivated than with us in these days of cheap printed books, and it is unreasonable to charge Justin with such universal want of memory and carelessness about matters which he held so sacred, merely to support a foregone conclusion, when the recognition of a difference of source, indicated in every direction, is so much more simple, natural, and justifiable.

There are very many of the quotations of Justin which bear unmistakable marks of exactness and verbal accuracy, but which yet differ materially from our Gospels, and most of his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount are of this kind. For instance, Justin introduces the passages which we have marked α , β , γ , with the words: "He (Jesus) spoke thus of Chastity,"² and after giving the quotations, α , β , and γ , the first two of which, although finding a parallel in two consecutive verses, Matthew v. 28, 29, are divided by the separating *καὶ*, and therefore do not appear to have been united in his Gospel, Justin continues: "Just as even those who with the sanction of human law contract a second marriage are sinners in the eye of our Master, so also are those who look upon a woman to lust after her. For not only he who actually commits adultery is rejected by Him, but also he who desires to commit adultery, since not our acts alone are open before God, but also our thoughts."³ Now it is perfectly clear that Justin here professes to give the actual words of Jesus, and then moralizes upon them; and both the quotation and his own subsequent paraphrase of it lose all their significance, if we suppose that Justin did not correctly quote in the first instance, but actually

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 209 f.

² p. 289 f.

³ Ὅσπερ καὶ οἱ νόμῳ ἀνθρωπίνῳ διαγαμίας ποιούμενοι, ἀμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ διδασκάλῳ εἶσι, καὶ οἱ προσβλέποντες γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὁ μοιχεύων ἔργῳ ἐκβέβηται παρ' αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μοιχεύσαι βουλόμενος· ὥς οὐ τῶν ἔργων φανερῶν μόνον τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων. Apol. i. 15. After the passages α , β , γ , and before the above, there is another quotation compared with Matt. xix. 12, but distinctly different from it.

¹ Cf. J.
² p. 29

commences by altering the text.¹ These passages α , β , and γ , however, have all marked and characteristic variations from the Gospel text, but as we have already shown, there is no reason for asserting that they are not accurate verbal quotations from another Gospel.

The passage δ is likewise a professed quotation,² but not only does it differ in language, but it presents deliberate transpositions in order which clearly indicate that Justin's source was not our Gospels. The nearest parallels in our Gospels are found in Matthew v. 46, followed by 44. The same remarks apply to the next passage ϵ , which is introduced as a distinct quotation,³ but which, like the rest, differs materially, linguistically and in order, from the Canonical Gospels. The whole of the passage is consecutive, and excludes the explanation of a mere patchwork of passages loosely put together, and very imperfectly quoted from memory. Justin states that Jesus taught that we should communicate to those who need, and do nothing for vain glory, and he then gives the very words of Jesus in an unbroken and clearly continuous discourse. Christians are to give to all who ask, and not merely to those from whom they hope to receive again, which would be no new thing—even the publicans do that; but Christians must do more. They are not to lay up riches on earth, but in heaven, for it would not profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his soul; therefore, the Teacher a second time repeats the injunction that Christians should lay up treasures in heaven. If the unity of thought which binds this passage so closely together were not sufficient to prove that it stood in Justin's Gospel in the form and order in which he quotes it, the requisite evidence would be supplied by the repetition at its close of the injunction: "Lay up, therefore, in the heavens," &c. It is impossible that Justin should, through defect of memory, quote a second time in so short a passage the same injunction, if the passage were not thus appropriately terminated in his Gospel. The common sense of the reader must at once perceive that it is impossible that Justin, professedly quoting words of Jesus, should thus deliberately fabricate a discourse rounded off by the repetition of one of its opening admonitions, with the addition of an argumentative "therefore." He must have found it so in the Gospel from which he quotes. Nothing indeed but the difficulty of explaining the marked variations presented by this passage, on the supposition that Justin must quote from our Gospels, could lead apologists to insinuate such a process of compilation, or question the consecu-

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld *Die Evv. Justin's* p. 131.

² p. 290.

³ p. 291 f.

tive character of this passage. The nearest parallels to the dismembered parts of this quotation, presenting everywhere serious variations, however, can only be found in the following passages in the order in which we cite them, Matthew v. 42, Luke vi. 34, Matthew vi. 19, 20, xvi. 26, and a repetition of part of vi. 20, with variations. Moreover, the expression: "What new thing do ye?" is quite peculiar to Justin. We have already met with it in the preceding section δ. "If ye love them which love you, what *new* thing do ye? for ever," &c. Here, in the same verse, we have: "If ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what *new* thing do ye? for ever," &c. It is evident, both from its repetition and its distinct dogmatic view of Christianity as a new teaching in contrast to the old, that this variation cannot have been the result of defective memory, but must have been the reading of the Memoirs, and, in all probability, it was the original form of the teaching. Such antithetical treatment is clearly indicated in many parts of the Sermon on the Mount: for instance, Matthew v. 21, "Ye have heard that it hath been said *by them of old* . . . but *I* say unto you," &c., cf. v. 33, 38, 43. It is certain that the whole of the quotation ε differs very materially from our Gospels, and there is every reason to believe that not only was the passage not derived from them, but that it was contained in the Memoirs of the Apostles substantially in the form and order in which Justin quotes it.¹

The next passage (ζ)² is separated from the preceding merely by the usual καί, and it moves on to its close with the same continuity of thought and the same peculiarities of construction which characterize that which we have just considered. Christians are to be kind and merciful (χρηστοὶ καὶ οἰκτίρμονες) to all as their Father is, who makes his sun to shine alike on the good and evil, and they need not be anxious about their own temporal necessities: what they shall eat and what put on; are they not better than the birds and beasts whom God feedeth? therefore they are not to be careful about what they are to eat and what put on, for their heavenly Father knows they have need of these things; but they are to seek the kingdom of heaven, and all these things shall be added: for where the treasure is—the thing he seeks and is careful about—there will also be the mind of the man. In fact, the passage is a suitable continuation of ε, inculcating, like it, abstraction from worldly cares and thoughts in reliance on the heavenly Father, and the mere fact that a separation is made where it is between the two passages ε and ζ shows fur-

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. pp. 221—226; Hilgenfeld, Die. Evv. Justin's p. 178 ff.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 264 ff.

² p. 292 f.

ther that each of those passages was complete in itself. There is absolutely no reason for the separating *καὶ*, if these passages were a mere combination of scattered verses. This quotation, however, which is so consecutive in Justin, can only find distant parallels in passages widely divided throughout the Synoptic Gospels, which have to be arranged in the following order: Luke vi. 36, Matt. v. 45, vi. 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, vi. 21, the whole of which presents striking differences from Justin's quotation. The repetition of the injunction "be not careful" again with the illative, "therefore" is quite in the spirit of ε. This admonition: "Therefore, be not careful," &c., is reiterated no less than three times in the first Gospel (vi. 25, 31, 34), and confirms the characteristic repetition of Justin's Gospel, which seems to have held a middle course between Matthew and Luke, the latter of which does not repeat the phrase, although the injunction is made a second time in more direct terms. The repetition of the passage: "Be ye kind and merciful," &c., in Dial. 96, with the same context and peculiarities, is a remarkable confirmation of the natural conclusion that Justin quotes the passage from a Gospel different from ours. The expression *χηροὶ καὶ οὐκ ἰσχυροὶ* thrice repeated by Justin himself, and supported by a similar duplication in the Clementine Homilies (iii. 57)¹ cannot possibly be an accidental departure from our Gospels.² For the rest it is undeniable that the whole passage ζ differs materially both in order and language from our Gospels, from which it cannot without unwarrantable assumption be maintained to have been taken either collectively or in detail, and strong internal reasons lead us to conclude that it is quoted substantially as it stands from Justin's Gospel, which must have been different from our Synoptics.³

In θ again, we have an express quotation introduced by the words: "And regarding our being patient under injuries and ready to help all, and free from anger, this is what he said;" and then he proceeds to give the actual words.⁴ At the close of the quotation he continues: "For we ought not to strive, neither would he have us be imitators of the wicked, but he has exhorted us by patience and gentleness to lead men from shame and the love of evil," &c., &c.⁵ It is evident that these observations, which are a

¹ See p. 292, note 5.

² *Delitzsch* admits the very striking nature of this triple quotation, and of another (in our passage κ 3 and 4), although he does not accept them as necessarily from a different source. "Auffällig, aber allerdings sehr auffällig sind nur folgende 2 citate *πνεῦμα χηροὶ, κ.τ.λ.* Apol. i. 15; Dial. 96, und *Κύριε, κύριε, κ.τ.λ.* Apol. i. 16, Dial. 76; Unters. u. d. Entst. d. Matth. Evang., 1853, p. 34.

³ *Crudaer*, Beiträge, i. p. 23, p. 241 f.; *Hilgenfeldt*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 189 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Fial. petr. Schr., p. 266 ff.

⁴ P. 294 f.

⁵ Apol. i. 16.

mere paraphrase of the text, indicate that the quotation itself is deliberate and precise. Justin professes first to quote the actual teaching of Jesus, and then makes his own comments; but if it be assumed that he began by concocting out of stray texts, altered to suit his purpose, a continuous discourse, the subsequent observations seem singularly useless and out of place. Although the passage forms a consecutive and harmonious discourse, the nearest parallels in our Gospels can only be found by uniting parts of the following scattered verses: Matthew v. 39, 40, 22, 41, 16. The Christian who is struck on one cheek is to turn the other, and not to resist those who would take away his cloak or coat; but if, on the contrary, he be angry, he is in danger of fire; if then, he be compelled to go one mile, let him show his gentleness by going two, and thus let his good works shine before men that, seeing them, they may adore his Father which is in heaven. It is evident that the last two sentences, which find their parallels in Matt. by putting v. 16 after 41, the former verse having a different context in the Gospel, must have so followed each other in Justin's text. His purpose is to quote the teaching of Jesus, "regarding our being patient under injuries, and ready to help all and free from anger," but his quotation of "Let your good works shine before men," &c., has no direct reference to his subject, and it cannot reasonably be supposed that Justin would have selected it from a separate part of the Gospel. Coming as it no doubt did in his Memoirs in the order in which he quotes it, it is quite appropriate to his purpose. It is impossible, for instance, to imagine why Justin further omitted the injunction in the parallel passage, Matthew v. 39, "that ye resist not evil," when supposed to quote the rest of the verse, since his express object is to show that "we ought not to strive," &c. The whole quotation presents the same characteristics as those which we have already examined, and in its continuity of thought and wide variation from the parallels in our Gospels, both in order and language, we must recognize a different and peculiar source.¹

The passage, again, is professedly a literal quotation, for Justin prefaces it with the words: "And regarding our not swearing at all, but ever speaking the truth, he taught thus;" and having in these words actually stated what Jesus did teach, he proceeds to quote his very words.² In the quotation there is a clear departure from our Gospel, arising not from accidental failure of memory, but from difference of source. The parallel passages in our Gospels, so far as they exist at all, can only be found by tak-

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 222, p. 226; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 176 f.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr. p. 270 ff.

² P. 295 f.

ing part of Matthew v. 34 and joining it to v. 37, omitting the intermediate verses. The quotation in the Epistle of James v. 12, which is evidently derived from a source different from Matthew, supports the reading of Justin. This, with the passage twice repeated in the Clementine Homilies in agreement with Justin, and, it may be added, the peculiar version found in early ecclesiastical writings,¹ all tend to confirm the belief that there existed a more ancient form of the injunction which Justin no doubt found in his Memoirs.² The precept, terse, simple, and direct, as it is here, is much more in accordance with Justin's own description of the teaching of Jesus, as he evidently found it in his Gospel, than the diffused version contained in the first Gospel, v. 33—37.

Another remarkable and characteristic illustration of the peculiarity of Justin's Memoirs is presented by the long passage κ , which is also throughout consecutive and bound together by clear unity of thought.³ It is presented with the context: "For not those who merely make professions but those who do the works, as he (Jesus) said, shall be saved. For he spake thus." It does not, therefore, seem possible to indicate more clearly the deliberate intention to quote the exact expressions of Jesus, and yet not only do we find material difference from the language in the parallel passages in our Gospels, but those parallels, such as they are, can only be made by patching together the following verses in the order in which we give them: Matt. vii. 21, Luke x. 16, Matt. vii. 22, 23, xiii. 42, 43, vii. 15, part of 16, 19. It will be remarked that the passage (κ 2) Luke x. 16, is thrust in between two consecutive verses in Matthew, and taken from a totally different context as the nearest parallel to κ 2 of Justin, although it is widely different from it, omitting altogether the most important words: "and doeth what I say." The repetition of the same phrase: "He that heareth me heareth him that sent me," in Apot. I., 63,⁴ makes it certain that Justin accurately quotes his Gospel, whilst the omission of the words in that place: "and doeth what I say," evidently proceeds from the fact that they are an interruption of the phrase for which Justin makes the quotation, namely, to prove

¹ P. 295, note 1.

² *Hilgenfeld* Die Evv. Justin's p. 175 f.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 211; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr. p. 246; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit. i. p. 209, anm. 1.

Canon Westcott considers that "the coincidence between Justin and the Clementine Gospel illustrates still more clearly the existence of a traditional as well as of an evangelical form of Christ's words." On the Canon, p. 32. But why merely a "traditional," if by that he means oral tradition? Luke i. 1, shows how many written versions there may have been; cf. *Tischendorf*, Wann Wurden, u. s. w., p. 28 f., and anm. 1, p. 29.

³ p. 295 ff.

⁴ See p. 297, note 2.

that Jesus is sent forth to reveal the Father.¹ It may be well to compare Justin's passage, κ 1—4, with one occurring in the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, iv. "Let us not, therefore, only call him Lord, for that will not save us. For he saith: 'Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall be saved, but he that worketh righteousness.' . . . the Lord said: 'If ye be with me gathered together in my bosom, and do not my commandments, I will cast you off and say to you: Depart from me; I know you not, whence you are, workers of iniquity.'"² The expression *ἐργάται ἀνομίας* here strongly recalls the reading of Justin.³ This passage, which is foreign to our Gospels, at least shows the existence of others containing parallel discourses with distinct variations. Some of the quotations in this Epistle are stated to be taken from the "Gospel according to the Egyptians,"⁴ "which was in all probability a version of the Gospel according to the Hebrews."⁵ The variations which occur in Justin's repetition, in Dial. 76, of his quotation κ 3 are not important, because the more weighty departure from the Gospel in the words "did we not eat and drink in thy name," (*οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν*) is deliberately repeated,⁶ and if, therefore, there be freedom of quotation it is free quotation not from the canonical, but from a different Gospel.⁷ Origen's quotation⁸ does not affect this conclusion, for the repetition of the phrase (*οὐ τῷ ὀνόματί σου*) has the form of the Gospel, and besides, which is much more important, we know that Origen was well acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other apocryphal works from which this may have been a reminiscence.⁹ We must add, moreover, that the passage in Dial. 76 appears in connection with others widely differing from our Gospels. The passage κ 5 not only materially varies from the parallel in Matt. xiii. 42, 43 in language but in connection of ideas.¹⁰ Here also

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 186.

² *Μὴ μόνον οὖν αὐτὸν καλῶμεν Κύριον· οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο σώσει ἡμᾶς. Λέγει γὰρ· "Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, κυριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλὰ ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην."* . . . *Διὰ τοῦτο, ταῦτα ἡμῶν πραξόντων εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· "Ἐάν ἦτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου, καὶ μὴ ποιῇτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν· Ἐπάγει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, ποῦ ἐστέ, ἐργάται ἀνομίας."*

³ Cf. Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 245.

⁴ Cf. Clemens *Al.*, *Strom.*, iii. 9, § 63, 13, § 93.

⁵ Compare the quotation Clem. 11 ad Corinth., ii. 9, with the quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Epiphanius, *Haer.*, xxx. 14.

⁶ Delitzsch admits the very striking character of this repetition. *Unters. Entst. Matth. Ev.*, p. 34, see back, p. 309, note 2.

⁷ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 186 f.

⁸ Cf. p. 297, note 5.

⁹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 187.

¹⁰ p. 297, cf. note 5.

upon examination we must conclude that Justin quotes from a source different from our Gospels, and moreover, that his Gospel gives with greater correctness the original form of the passage.¹ The weeping and gnashing of teeth are distinctly represented as the consequence when the wicked see the bliss of the righteous while they are sent into everlasting fire, and not as the mere characteristics of hell. It will be observed that the preceding passages κ 3 and 4, find parallels to a certain extent in Matt. vii. 22, 23, although Luke xiii. 26, 27, is in some respects closer to the reading of Justin. κ 5, however, finds no continuation, of parallel in Matt. vii., from which the context comes, but we have to seek it in xiii. 42, 43. K 5, however, does find its continuing parallel in the next verse in Luke xiii. 28, where we have, "There shall be (the) weeping and (the) gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham," &c. There is here, it is evident, the connection of ideas which is totally lacking in Matt. xiii. 42, 43, where the verses in question occur as the conclusion to the exposition of the Parable of the Tares. Now, although it is manifest that Luke xiii. 28, cannot possibly have been the source from which Justin quotes, still the opening words and the sequence of ideas demonstrate the great probability that other Gospels must have given, after κ 4, a continuation which is wanting after Matt. vii. 23, but which is indicated in the parallel Luke xiii. (26, 27) 28, and is somewhat closely followed in Matt. xiii. 42, 43. When such a sequence is found in an avowed quotation from Justin's Gospel, it is absolutely certain that he must have found it there substantially as he quotes it. The passage κ 6,² "For many shall arrive," &c., is a very important one, and it departs emphatically from the parallel in our first Gospel. Instead of being, like the latter, a warning against false prophets, it is merely the announcement that many deceivers shall come. This passage is rendered more weighty by the fact that Justin repeats it with little variation in Dial. 35, and immediately after quotes a saying of Jesus of only five words which is not found in our Gospels, and then he repeats a quotation to the same effect in the shape of a warning, "Beware of false prophets," &c. like that in Matt. vii. 15, but still distinctly differing from it.³ It is perfectly clear that Justin quotes two separate passages.⁴ It is impossible that he could intend to repeat the same quotation at an interval of only five words; it is equally impossible that, having quoted it in the one form, he could so immediately quote it in the other through error of memory.⁵ The simple and very natural

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, 187 f.; *Mayerhoff*, *Einl. petr. Schr.*, p. 276 f.

² p. 296.

³ Cf. p. 298, note 3.

⁴ Cf. *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 246.

⁵ Cf. *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 188 ff.

ὡς εἰ
εἰ, ἀλλὰ ὁ
παρόντων
ὁλπω μου,
ἡ γὰρ εἰ

atations from
nters. Entst.

conclusion is that he found both passages in his Gospel. The object for which he quotes would more than justify the quotation of both passages, the one referring to the many false Christians and the other to the false prophets of whom he is speaking. That two passages so closely related should be found in the same Gospel is not in the least singular. There are numerous instances of the same in our Synoptics.¹ The actual facts of the case then are these: Justin quotes in the Dialogue, with the same marked deviations from the parallel in the Gospel, a passage quoted by him in the Apology, and after an interval of only five words he quotes a second passage to the same effect, though with very palpable difference in its character, which likewise differs from the Gospel, in company with other texts which still less find any parallels in the Canonical Gospels. The two passages, by their differences, distinguish each other as separate, whilst by their agreement in common variations from the parallel in Matthew, they declare their common origin from a special Gospel, a result still further made manifest by the agreement between the first passage in the Dialogue and the quotations in the Apology. In κ 7,² Justin's Gospel substitutes *ἔργων* for *καρπῶν*, and is quite in the spirit of the passage θ. "Ye shall know them from their *works*" is the natural reading. The Gospel version clearly introduces "fruit" prematurely, and weakens the force of the contrast which follows. It will be observed, moreover, that in order to find a parallel to Justin's passage κ 7, 8, only the first part of Matt. vii. 16, is taken, and the thread is only caught again at vii. 19, κ 8 being one of the two passages indicated by De Wette which we are considering, and it agrees with Matt. vii. 19, with the exception of the single word *δέ*. We must again point out, however, that this passage in Matt. vii. 19, is repeated no less than three times in our Gospels, a second time in Matt. iii. 10, and once in Luke iii. 19. Upon two occasions it is placed in the mouth of John the Baptist, and forms the second portion of a sentence the whole of which is found in literal agreement both in Matt. iii. 10, and Luke iii. 9, "But now the axe is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore every tree," &c., &c. The passage pointed out by De Wette as the parallel to Justin's anonymous quotation, Matt. vii. 19—a selection which is of course obligatory from the context—is itself a mere quotation by Jesus of part of the saying of the Baptist, presenting,

¹ Cf. Matt. v. 29, 30, with xviii. 98.

xix. 30, with xx. 16.

xiii. 12 "xxv. 29.

iii. 10 "vii. 19.

xx. 16 "xxii. 14; and viii. 12, xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, and xxv.

30, together; Luke xiv. 11, with xviii. 14, &c., &c.

² p. 296.

therefore, double probability of being well-known; and as we have three instances of its literal reproduction in the Synoptics, it would indeed be absurd to affirm that it was not likewise given literally in other Gospels.

The passage λ^1 is very emphatically given as a literal quotation of the words of Jesus, for Justin cites it directly to authenticate his own statements of Christian belief. He says: "But if you disregard us both when we entreat, and when we set all things openly before you, we shall not suffer loss, believing, or rather being fully persuaded, that every one will be punished by eternal fire according to the desert of his deeds, and in proportion to the faculties which he received from God will his account be required, as Christ declared when he said: To whom God gave more, of him shall more also be demanded again." This quotation has no parallel in the first Gospel, but we add it here as part of the Sermon on the Mount. The passage in Luke xii. 48, it will be perceived, presents distinct variation from it, and that Gospel cannot for a moment be maintained as the source of Justin's quotation.

The last passage, μ^2 is one of those advanced by De Wette which led to this examination.³ It is likewise clearly a quotation, but as we have already shown, its agreement with Matt. v. 20, is no evidence that it was actually derived from that Gospel. Occurring as it does as one of numerous quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, whose general variation both in order and language from the parallels in our Gospel points to the inevitable conclusion that Justin derived them from a different source, there is no reason for supposing that this sentence also did not come from the same Gospel.

No one who has attentively considered the whole of these passages from the Sermon on the Mount, and still less those who are aware of the general rule of variation in his mass of quotations as compared with parallels in our Gospels, can fail to be struck by the systematic departure from the order and language of the Synoptics. The hypothesis that they are quotations from our Gospels involves the accusation against Justin of an amount of carelessness and negligence which is quite unparalleled in literature. Justin's character and training, however, by no means warrant any such aspersion,⁴ and there are no grounds whatever for it. Indeed, but for the attempt arbitrarily to establish the identity of the "Memoirs of the Apostles" with our Gospels, such a charge would never have been thought of. It is impossible to suppose that avowed and deliberate quotations of sayings of Jesus, made for the express purpose of furnishing authentic writ-

¹ p. 298.² p. 299.³ Cf. p. 345.⁴ Cf. *Eusebius* H. E., iv, 11, 18.

ten proof of Justin's statements regarding Christianity, can as an almost invariable rule be so singularly incorrect. The idea is monstrous, more especially when it is considered that these quotations occur in an elaborate apology for Christianity addressed to the Roman emperors, and in a careful and studied controversy with a Jew in defence of the new faith. The simple and natural conclusion, supported by many strong reasons, is, that Justin derived his quotations from a Gospel which was different from ours, although naturally by subject and design it must have been related to them. His Gospel, in fact, differs from our Synoptics as they differ from each other.

We now return to Tischendorf's statements with regard to Justin's acquaintance with our Gospels. Having examined the supposed references to the first Gospel, we find that Tischendorf speaks much less positively with regard to his knowledge of the other two Synoptics. He says: "There is the greatest probability that in several passages he also follows Mark and Luke."¹ First taking Mark, we find that the only example which Tischendorf gives is the following. He says: "Twice (Dial. 76 and 100) he quotes as an expression of the Lord: 'The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Scribes and Pharisees (Ch. 100 by the 'Pharisees and Scribes'), and be crucified and the third day rise again.'² This agrees better with Mark viii. 31 and Luke ix. 22 than with Matt. xvi. 21, only in Justin the 'Pharisees' are put instead of the 'Elders and Chief Priests' (so Matthew, Mark, and Luke), likewise 'be crucified' instead of 'be killed.'³ This is the only instance of similarity with Mark that Tischendorf can produce, and we have given his own remarks to show how thoroughly weak his case is. The passage in Mark viii. 31, reads: "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Elders and the Chief Priests (ἐπὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων), and the Scribes and be killed (καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι), and after three days (καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας) rise again." And the following is the reading of Luke ix. 22: "Saying that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the Elders and Chief Priests (ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων) and Scribes and be killed (καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι), and the third day rise again." It will be perceived that, different as it also is, the passage in Luke is nearer than that of Mark, which cannot in any case have been the source of Jus-

¹ Dass er an mehreren Stellen auch den Markus und den Lukas befolge dafür hat sich die grösste Wahrscheinlichkeit herausgestellt—Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 25.

² Δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἐπὶ τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. (Dial. 76, c. 100, Φαρισαίων καὶ Γραμματέων.)

³ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 28, anm. 1.

tin's quotation. Tischendorf, however, does not point out that Justin, elsewhere, a third time refers to this very passage in the very same terms. He says: "And Christ . . . having come . . . and himself also preached, saying . . . that he must suffer many things from the Scribes and Pharisees and be crucified, and the third day rise again."¹ Although this omits the words "and be rejected," it gives the whole of the passage literally as before. And thus there is the very remarkable testimony of a quotation three times repeated, with the same marked variations from our Gospels, to show that Justin found those very words in his Memoirs.² The persistent variation clearly indicates a different source from our Synoptics. We may, in reference to this reading, compare Luke xxiv. 6: "He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee (v. 7), saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, *and be crucified*, and the third day rise again." This reference to words of Jesus, in which the words *καὶ σταυρωθῆναι* occurred, as in Justin, indicates that although our Gospels do not contain it some others may well have done so. In one place Justin introduces the saying with the following words: "For he exclaimed before the crucifixion, the Son of Man," &c.³ both indicating a time for the discourse, and also quoting a distinct and definite saying in contradistinction to this report of the matter of his teaching, which is the form in which the parallel passage occurs in the Gospels. In Justin's Memoirs it no doubt existed as an actual discourse of Jesus, which he verbally and accurately quoted.

With regard to the third Gospel, Tischendorf says: "It is in reference to Luke (xxii. 44) that Justin recalls in the Dialogue (103) the falling drops of the sweat of agony on the Mount of Olives, and certainly with an express appeal to the 'Memoirs composed by his Apostles and their followers.'"⁴ Now we have already seen⁵ that Justin, in the passage referred to, does not make use of the peculiar expression which gives the whole of its character to the account in Luke, and that there is no ground for affirming that Justin derived his information from that Gospel. The only other reference to passages proving the "probability" of Justin's use of Luke or Mark is that which we have just discussed—"The Son of Man must," &c. From this the character of Tischendorf's assumptions may be inferred. De Wette does not

¹ ὅτι δει αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. Dial. 51.

² Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 256; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's p. 201 ff.

³ Dial. 76.

⁴ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 28, anm. 1.

⁵ p. 328 f.

advance any instances of verbal agreement either with Mark or Luke.¹ He says, moreover: "The historical references are much freer still (than quotations), and combine in part the accounts of Matthew and Luke; some of the kind, however, are not found at all in our Canonical Gospels."² This we have already sufficiently demonstrated.

We might now well terminate the examination of Justin's quotations, which has already taken up too much of our space, but before doing so it may be well very briefly to refer to another point. In his work "On the Canon," Dr. Westcott adopts a somewhat singular course. He evidently feels the very great difficulty in which any one who asserts the identity of the source of Justin's quotations with our Gospels is placed by the fact that, as a rule, these quotations differ from parallel passages in our Gospels; and whilst on the one hand maintaining that the quotations generally are from the Canonical Gospels, he on the other endeavours to reduce the number of those which profess to be quotations at all. He says: "To examine in detail the whole of Justin's quotations would be tedious and unnecessary. It will be enough to examine (1) those which are alleged by him as quotations, and (2) those also which, though anonymous, are yet found repeated with the same variations either in Justin's own writings, or (3) in heretical works. It is evidently on these quotations that the decision hangs."³ Now under the first category Dr. Westcott finds very few. He says: "In seven passages only, as far as I can discover, does Justin profess to give the exact words recorded in the Memoirs; and in these, if there be no reason to the contrary, it is natural to expect that he will preserve the exact language of the Gospels which he used, just as in anonymous quotations we may conclude that he is trusting to memory."⁴ Before proceeding further, we may point out the straits to which an apologist is reduced who starts with a foregone conclusion. We have already seen a number of Justin's professed quotations; but here, after reducing the number to seven only, our critic prepares a way of escape even out of these. It is difficult to understand what "reason to the contrary" can possibly justify a man "who professes to give the exact words recorded in the Memoirs" for not doing what he professes; and further, it lessens our comprehension to understand why, in anonymous

¹ We may point out, however, that he says: "Andere wörtliche Uebereinstimmungen kommen mitten unter Abweichungen vor, wie Apol. ii. p. 75, vgl. Matt. i. 21, wo Luc. i. 35, damit combinirt ist." Einl. N. T., p. 105; but a single phrase combined with a passage very like one in a different Gospel is a very poor argument.

² Einl. N. T., p. 111.

³ On the Canon, p. 112 f.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 114.

quotations, "we may conclude that he is trusting to memory." The cautious exception is as untenable as the gratuitous assumption. Dr. Westcott continues as follows the passage which we have just interrupted:—"The result of a first view of the passages is striking. Of the seven, five agree verbally with the text of St. Matthew or St. Luke, exhibiting indeed three slight variations not elsewhere found, but such as are easily explicable; the sixth is a compound summary of words related by St. Matthew; the seventh alone presents an important variation in the text of a verse, which is, however, otherwise very uncertain."¹ The italics of course are ours. The "first view" of the passages and of the above statement is indeed striking. It is remarkable how easily difficulties are overcome under such an apologetic system. The striking result, to summarize Canon Westcott's own words, is this: out of seven professed quotations from the Memoirs, in which he admits we may expect to find the exact language preserved, five present three variations; one is a compressed summary, and does not agree verbally at all; and the seventh presents an important variation. Dr. Westcott, on the same easy system, continues: "Our inquiry is thus confined to the two last instances; and it must be seen whether their disagreement from the Synoptic Gospel is such as to outweigh the agreement of the remaining five."² Before proceeding to consider these seven passages admitted by Dr. Westcott, we must point out that in a note to the statement of the number, he mentions that he excludes other two passages as "not merely quotations of words, but concise narratives."³ But surely this is a most extraordinary reason for omitting them, and one the validity of which cannot for a moment be admitted. As Justin introduces them deliberately as quotations, why should they be excluded simply because they are combined with a historical statement? We shall produce them. The first is in Apol. i. 66: "For the Apostles, in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels,⁴ handed down that it was thus enjoined on them, that Jesus, having taken bread and given thanks, said: 'This do in remembrance of me. This is my body.' And similarly, having taken the cup and given thanks, he said: 'This is my blood,' and delivered it to them alone."⁵ This passage, it will be remembered, occurs in an elaborate

¹ On the Canon, p. 113 f.

² *Ib.*, p. 114.

³ *Ib.*, p. 113, note 1.

⁴ We have already discussed these words, p. 293.

⁵ Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντεταλῆαι αὐτοῖς· τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου. Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι. Apol. i. 66.

borate apology for Christianity addressed to the Roman emperors, and here Justin is giving an account of the most solemn sacrament of his religion. Here, if ever, we might reasonably expect accuracy and care, and Justin, in fact, carefully indicates the source of the quotation he is going to make. It is difficult to understand any ground upon which so direct a quotation from the "Memoirs of the Apostles" could be set aside by Canon Westcott. Justin distinctly states that the Apostles in these Memoirs have "thus" (οὕτως) transmitted what was enjoined on us by Jesus, and then gives the precise quotation. Had the quotation agreed with our Gospels, would it not have been claimed as a professedly accurate quotation from them? Surely no one can reasonably pretend, for instance, that when Justin, after this preamble, states that having taken bread, &c., *Jesus said*: "This do in remembrance of me: this is my body;" or having taken the cup, &c., *he said*: "This is my blood"—Justin does not deliberately mean to quote what Jesus actually did say? Now the account of the episode in Luke is as follows (xxii. 17): "And he took a cup, gave thanks, and said: Take this, and divide it among yourselves. 18. For I say unto you; I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. ¹ And he took bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it unto them, saying: This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. 20. And in like manner the cup after supper, saying: This is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."¹ Dr. Westcott of course only compares this passage of Justin with Luke, to which and the parallel in 1 Cor. xi. 24, wide as the difference is, it is closer than to the accounts in the other two Gospels. That Justin professedly quoted literally from the Memoirs is evident, and is rendered still more clear by the serious context by which the quotation is introduced, the quotation in fact being made to authenticate by actual written testimony the explanations of Justin. His dogmatic views, moreover, are distinctly drawn from a Gospel, which, in a more direct way than our Synoptics do, gave the expressions: "This is my body," and "This is my blood," and it must have been observed that Luke, with which Justin's reading alone is compared, not only has not: Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου, at all

¹ 17. Καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς· 18. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. 19. Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20. Καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. ἐκχυννόμε· ον. Luke xxii. 17-20; cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 ff.; Mark xiv. 22 ff.

but instead makes use of a totally different expression: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you."

The second quotation from the Memoirs which Dr. Westcott passes over is that in Dial. 103, compared with Luke xxii. 42, 43,¹ on the Agony in the Garden, which we have already examined,² and found at variance with our Gospel, and without the peculiar and distinctive expressions of the latter.

We now come to the seven passages which Canon Westcott admits to be professed quotations from the Memoirs, and in which "it is natural to expect that he will preserve the exact words of the Gospels which he used." The first of these is a passage in the Dialogue, part of which has already been discussed in connection with the fire in Jordan and the voice at the Baptism, and found to be from a source different from our Synoptics.³ Justin says: "For even he, the devil, at the time when he also (Jesus) went up from the river Jordan when the voice said unto Him: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' is recorded in the Memoirs of the Apostles to have come to him and tempted him even so far as saying to him: 'Worship me;' and Christ answered him (καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν), 'Get thee behind me, Satan' (Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ), 'thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'⁴ This passage is compared with the account of the temptation in Matt. iv. 9, 10: "And he said unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. 10. Then saith Jesus unto him (τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς), Get thee hence, Satan (Ὑπαγε Σατανᾶ): it is written. Thou shalt worship, &c. All the oldest Codices, it should be stated, omit the ὀπίσω μου, as we have done, but Cod. D. (Bezae) and a few others of infirm authority, insert these two words. Canon Westcott, however, justly admits them to be "probably only a very early interpolation."⁵ We have no reason whatever for supposing that they existed in Matthew during Justin's time. The oldest Codices omit the whole phrase from the parallel passage, Luke iv. 8, but Cod. A. is an exception, and reads: Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. The best modern editions, however, reject this as a mere recent addition to Luke. A comparison of the first and third Gospels with Justin clearly shows that the Gospel which he used followed the former more closely than

¹ On the Canon, p. 113, note 1.

² p. 277 f.

³ p. 273 f.

⁴ Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος, ὁ διάβολος, ἄμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ λεχθείσης, "Γιὸς μου εἶ σύ· ἐγώ σημεῖον γεγέννηκά σε" ἐν τοῖς ἀποκηρυγμοῦσι τῶν ἀποστόλων γεγραπταὶ προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ, "Προσκύνησον μοι," καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν, Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. Dial. 103.

⁵ On the Canon, p. 113, note 2, i.

βετε τοῦτο
ω ἀπὸ τοῦ
ἡγ. 19. καὶ
ἡγ. τοῦτο
ἵτε εἰς τὴν
δεικνύσαι,
αὐτὸν μου, τὸ
26 ff.; Mark

Luke. Matthew makes the climax of the temptation the view of all the kingdoms of the world, and the offer to give them to Jesus if he will fall down and worship Satan. Luke, on the contrary, makes the final temptation the suggestion to throw himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. Justin's Gospel, as the words, "so far as saying to him" (*μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ*), &c., clearly indicate, had the same climax as Matthew. Now the following points must be observed. Justin makes the words of Satan "Worship me" (*Προσκυνήσον μοι*) a distinct quotation; the Gospel makes Satan offer all that he has shown "if thou wilt fall down and worship me" (*ἐὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι*). Then Justin's quotation proceeds: "And Christ answered him" (*καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν*); whilst Matthew has, "Then Jesus saith to him" (*τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*), which is a marked variation.¹ The *ὑπίσχω μὲν* of Justin is not found in any of the older Codices of Matthew. Then the words: "it is written," which form part of the reply of Jesus in our Gospels, are omitted in Justin's; but we must add that, in Dial. 125, in again referring to the temptation, he adds, "it is written." Still, in that passage he also omits the whole phrase, "Get thee behind me, Satan," and commences: "For he answered him: It is written, Thou shalt worship," &c.

We must, however, again point out the most important fact, that this account of the temptation is directly connected with another which is foreign to our Gospels. The Devil is said to come at the time Jesus went up out of the Jordan and the voice said to him: "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee"—words which do not occur at all in our Gospels, and which are again bound up with the incident of the fire in Jordan. It is altogether unreasonable to assert that Justin could have referred the fact which he proceeds to quote from the Memoirs, to the time those words were uttered, if they were not to be found in the same Memoirs. The one incident was most certainly not derived from our Gospels, inasmuch as they do not contain it, and there are the very strongest reasons for asserting that Justin derived the account of the temptation from a source which contained the other. Under these circumstances every variation is an indication, and those which we have pointed out are not accidental, but clearly exclude the assertion that the quotation is from our Gospels.

The second of the seven passages of Canon Westcott is one of those from the Sermon on the Mount, Dial. 105, compared with Matt. v. 20, adduced by De Wette, which we have already considered.² With the exception of the opening words, *λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῷ ὄντι*, the two sentences agree, but this is no proof whatever

¹ Luke iv. 12, reads, *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς*.

² Cf. pp. 288, 315.

that Justin derived the passage from Matthew; while on the contrary, the persistent variation of the rest of his quotations from the Sermon on the Mount, both in order and language, forces upon us the conviction that he derived the whole from a source different from our Gospels.

The third passage of Dr. Westcott is that regarding the sign of Jonas the prophet, Matt. xii. 39, compared with Dial. 107, which was the second instance adduced by Tischendorf. We have already examined it,¹ and found that it presents distinct variations from our first Synoptic, both linguistically and otherwise, and that many reasons lead to the conclusion that it was quoted from a Gospel different from ours.

The fourth of Canon Westcott's quotations is the following, to part of which we have already had occasion to refer:² "For which reason our Christ declared on earth to those who asserted that Elias must come before Christ: Elias indeed shall come (*Ἰλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται*) and shall restore all things: but I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him (*αὐτῷ*) whatsoever they listed. And it is written that then the disciples understood that he spoke of John the Baptist."³ The "express quotation" in this passage, which is compared with Matt. xvii. 11—13, is limited by Canon Westcott to the last short sentence⁴ corresponding with Matt. xvii. 13, and he points out that Credner admits that it must have been taken from Matthew. It is quite true that Credner considers that if any passage of Justin's quotations proves a necessary connection between Justin's Gospels and the Gospel according to Matthew, it is this sentence: "And it is written that then the disciples, &c." He explains his reason for this opinion as follows: "These words can only be derived from our Matthew, with which they literally agree; for it is thoroughly improbable that a remark on so special a description could have been made by two different and independent individuals so completely alike."⁵ We totally differ from this argument, which is singularly opposed to Credner's usual clear and thoughtful mode of reasoning.⁶ No doubt if such Gospels could

¹ 287 f.

² p. 269.

³ *ὁ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς εἰρήμει ἐπὶ γῆς τότε τοῖς λέγουσι πρὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰλίας δεῖν ἔλθειν. "Ἰλίας μὲν ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἰλίας ἤδη ἦλθε, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν." Καὶ γέγραπται ὅτι τότε συνήκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.* Dial. 49.

⁴ On the Canon, p. 114, note 4.

⁵ Diese Worte können nur aus unserm Matthäus, mit welchem sie buchstäblich übereinstimmen, entnommen sein; denn es ist durchaus unwahrscheinlich, dass eine Bemerkung so specieller Art von zwei verschiedenen und von einander unabhängigen Individuen so ganz auf dieselbe Weise gemacht worden sei. Credner, *Beiträge*, I. p. 237.

⁶ Cf. *Mayerhoff*, *Einkl. petr. Schr.*, p. 280 f.

be considered to be absolutely distinct and independent works, deriving all their matter from individual and separate observation of the occurrences narrated by their authors and personal report of the discourses given, there might be greater force in the argument, although even in that case it would have been far from conclusive here, inasmuch as the observation we are considering is the mere simple statement of a fact necessary to complete the episode, and it might well have been made in the same terms by separate reporters. The fact is, however, that the numerous Gospels current in the early Church cannot have been, and our Synoptic Gospels most certainly are not, independent works, but are based upon earlier evangelical writings no longer extant, and have borrowed from each other. The Gospels did not originate full fledged as we now have them, but are the result of many revisions of previously existing materials. Critics may differ as to the relative ages and order of the Synoptics, but almost all are agreed that in one order or another they are dependent on each other, and on older forms of the Gospel. Now such an expression as Matt. xvii. 13 in some early record of the discourse might have been transferred to a dozen of other Christian writings. Ewald assigns the passage to the oldest Gospel, Matthew in its present form being fifth in descent.¹

Our three canonical Gospels are filled with instances in which expressions still more individual are repeated, and these show that such phrases cannot be limited to one Gospel, but, if confined in the first instance to one original source, may have been transferred to many subsequent evangelical works. Take, for instance, a passage in Matt. vii. 28, 29: " . . . the multitudes were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as their scribes."² Mark i. 22 has the very same passage³ with the mere omission of "the multitudes" (*οἱ ὄχλοι*) which does not in the least affect the argument; and Luke iv. 32: "And they were astonished at his teaching: for his word was power."⁴ Although the author of the third Gospel somewhat alters the language, it is clear that he follows the same original, and retains it in the same context as the second Gospel. Now the occurrence of such a passage as this in one of the Fathers, if either the first or second Gospels were lost, would, on Credner's grounds, be at-

¹ Die drei ersten Evangelien, p. 34, c^t. p. 1; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1849, p. 100 ff.

² . . . ἐξεπλήσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν. Matt. vii. 28, 29.

³ The final αὐτῶν is omitted from the end of the passage in Matthew in many MSS., and added by others in Mark.

⁴ καὶ ἐξεπλήσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. Luke iv. 32.

tributed from the
Another
these thi
without a
\$3, 34, "
them. . .
The part
is literall
the end o
stance, in
agony in
and he
equally i
Another
young ma
sions," is f
ples' migh
passages c
be limited

Now th
ility, as E
of the Gos
works deri
the Gospel
nearly rela
we have sl
dividual, b
simply bec
contains it
which we l
sion καὶ γέ
sentence is
he has pro
derived fro
this opinio
written" s
identificatio
the impress
Now the w
characterist

¹ Cf. Matt.
3, 4, Mark vi.
Matt. xxii. 3
² Credner, E

tributed undoubtedly to the survivor, although in reality derived from the Gospel no longer extant, which likewise contained it. Another example may be pointed out in Matt. xiii. 34: "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitudes in parables; and *without a parable spake he not unto them*," compared with Mark iv. 33, 34, "And with many such parables spake he the word unto them. . . . and without a parable spake he not unto them." The part of this very individual remark which we have italicised is literally the same in both Gospels, as a personal comment at the end of the parable of the grain of mustard seed. Then, for instance, in the account of the sleep of the three disciples during the agony in the Garden (Matt xxvi. 43, Mark xiv. 40), the expression "and he found them asleep, *for their eyes were heavy*," which is equally individual, is literally the same in the first two Gospels. Another special remark of a similar kind regarding the rich young man: "he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions," is found both in Matt. xix. 22 and Mark x. 22. Such examples might be multiplied, and they show that the occurrence of passages of the most individual character cannot in Justin's time be limited to any single Gospel.

Now the verse we are discussing, Matt. xvii. 13, in all probability, as Ewald supposes, occurred in one or more of the older forms of the Gospel from which our Synoptics and many other similar works derived their matter, and nothing is more likely than that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which in many respects was nearly related to Matthew, may have contained it. At any rate we have shown that such sayings cannot be apparently individual, be considered evidence of the use of a Gospel simply because it happens to be the only one now extant which contains it. Credner, however, whilst expressing this opinion, which we have quoted likewise adds his belief that by the expression *καὶ γέγραπται*, Justin seems expressly to indicate that this sentence is taken from a different work from what precedes it, and he has proved that the preceding part of the quotation was not derived from our Gospels.² We cannot, however, coincide with this opinion either. It seems to us that the expression "and it is written" simply was made use of by Justin to show that the identification of Elias with John the Baptist is not his, but was the impression conveyed at the time by Jesus to his disciples. Now the whole narrative of the baptism of John in Justin bears characteristic marks of being from a Gospel different from ours,³

¹ Cf. Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 2, 3, Luke iii. 4; Matt. iii. 5, 6; Mark i. 5; Matt. xiv. 3, 4, Mark vi. 17, 18; Matt. xiv. 9, Mark vi. 26; Matt. xxvii. 14, Mark xv. 5; Matt. xxvii. 39; Mark xv. 29, &c., &c.

² Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 237.

³ p. 269 ff.

and in the first part of this very quotation we find distinct variation. Justin first affirms that Jesus in his teaching had proclaimed that Elias should also come (*καὶ Ἠλίαν εἰσεῖσθαι*), and then further on he gives the actual words of Jesus: *Ἠλίας μὲν εἰσεύεται, κ.τ.λ.*, which we have before us, whilst in Matthew the words are: *Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται*, and there is no MS. which reads *εἰσεύεται* for *ἔρχεται*, and yet, as Credner remarks, the whole force of the quotation rests upon the word, and Justin is persistent in his variation from the text of our first Synoptic. It is unreasonable to say that Justin quotes loosely the important part of his passage, and then about a few words at the close pretends to be so particularly careful. Considering all the facts of the case we must conclude that this quotation also is from a source different from our Gospels.¹

Another point, however, must be noted. Dr. Westcott claims this passage as an express quotation from the Memoirs, apparently for no other reason than that the few words happen to agree with Matt. xvii. 13, and that he wishes to identify the Memoirs with our Gospels. Justin, however, does not once mention the Memoirs in this chapter; it follows, therefore, that Canon Westcott who is so exceedingly strict in his limitation of express quotations, assumes that all quotations of Christian history and words of Jesus in Justin are to be considered as derived from the Memoirs whether they be mentioned by name or not. We have already seen that amongst these there are not only quotations differing from the Gospels, and contradicting them, but others which have no parallels at all in them.

The fifth of Dr. Westcott's express quotations occurs in Dial. 105, where Justin says: "For when he (Jesus) was giving up his spirit on the cross he said: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' as I have also learned from the Memoirs." This short sentence agrees with Luke xxiii. 46, it is true, but as we have already shown,² Justin's whole account of the Crucifixion differs so materially from that in our Gospels, that it cannot have been derived from them.

We see this forcibly in examining the sixth of Canon Westcott's quotations, which is likewise connected with the Crucifixion. "For they who saw him crucified also wagged their heads each one of them, and distorted their lips, and sneeringly and in scornful irony repeated among themselves those words which are also written in the Memoirs of his Apostles: He declared himself the son of God: (let him) come down, let him walk about: let God save him."³ We have ourselves already quoted and discussed this pas-

¹ Cf. *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Scr. r. p. 280

² p. 281 ff.

³ Dial. 101.

sage
noti
of t
wor
close
ferer
case
mits
Men
and
Cano
comm
tion
as we
resen
from
he ha
add t
objec
accu
tion i
this p
not ta
and t
cifixi
expec
the co
Gospe
ceives
The
he sta
with

Just
And
is writ
All
deliver
Father
eth (y
ther bu
the Son
and

¹ p. 2
² On
³ Mos
favour

sage,² and need not further examine it here. Canon Westcott has nothing better to say regarding this quotation, in an examination of the accuracy of parallel passages, than this: "These exact words do not occur in our Gospels, but we do find there others so closely connected with them that few readers would feel the difference!"³ When criticism descends to language like this, the case is indeed desperate. It is clear that, as Canon Westcott admits, the words are expressly declared to be a quotation from the Memoirs of the Apostles, but they do not exist in our Gospels, and consequent'y our Gospels are not identical with the Memoirs. Canon Westcott refers to the taunts in Matthew and then with commendable candor he concludes his examination of the quotation with the following words: "No manuscript or Father (so far as we know) has preserved any reading of the passage more closely resembling Justin's quotation; and if it appear not to be deducible from our Gospels, due allowance being made for the object which he had in view, its source must remain concealed."³ We need only add that it is futile to talk of making "due allowance" for the object which Justin had in view. His immediate object was accurate quotation, and no allowance can account for such variation in language and thought as is presented in this passage. That this passage, though a professed quotation from the Memoirs, is not taken from our Gospels is certain both from its own variations and the differences in other parts of Justin's account of the Crucifixion, an event whose solemnity and importance might well be expected to secure reverential accuracy. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles were not our Gospels, and the systematic variation of his quotations thus receives its natural and reasonable explanation.

The seventh and last of Dr. Westcott's express quotations is, as he states, "more remarkable." We subjoin the passage in contrast with the parallel texts of the first and third Gospels.

JUSTIN, DIAL. 100.

And in the Gospel it is written that he said:

All things have been delivered to me by the Father, and no one knoweth (*γινώσκει*) the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father and

MATT. XI. 27.

All things were delivered to me by the Father, and no one knoweth (*ἐπιγινώσκει*) the Son but the Father, nor knoweth (*ἐπιγινώσκει*) anyone the Father but

LUKE X. 22.

All things were delivered to me by my Father, and no one knoweth (*γινώσκει*) who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son,

¹ p. 281 ff.

² On the Canon, p. 115.

³ Most Codices read "my," but the Cod. Sin. having "the," we give it as more favourable.

² On the Canon, p. 114 f.

JUSTIN. DIAL. 100.*

those to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him.

*Καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ
δὲ γέγραπται εἰπών·
Πάντα μοι παραδέδο-
ται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς
καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει
τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός·
οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ
πατήρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς
ἀποκαλύψῃ.*

MATT. XI. 27.

the Son, and he to whom-
soever the son is minded
to reveal him.

*Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη
ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς,¹ καὶ
οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει
τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ,
οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις
ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ
υἱὸς καὶ ὃς ἂν βούλη-
ται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκα-
λύψαι.*

LUKE x. 22.

and he to whomsoever
the Son is minded to re-
veal him.

*Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη
ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου,
καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει
τίς ἐστίν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ
ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστίν
ὁ πατήρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς
καὶ ὃς ἂν βούληται ὁ
υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.*

It is apparent that Justin's quotation differs very materially from our Gospels in language, in construction, and in meaning. These variations, however, acquire very remarkable confirmation and significance from the fact that Justin in two other places² quotes the latter and larger part of the passage from *οὐδὲς* in precisely the same way, with the sole exception that, in both of these quotations, he uses the aorist *ἔγνω* instead of *γινώσκει*. This three-fold repetition in the same peculiar form clearly stamps the passage as being a literal quotation from his Gospel, and the one exception to the verbal agreement of the three passages, in the substitution of the present for the aorist in the Dialogue, does not in the least remove or lessen the fundamental variation of the passage from our Gospel. As the *ἔγνω* is twice repeated it was probably the reading of his text. Now it is well known that the peculiar form of the quotation in Justin occurred in what came to be considered heretical Gospels, and constituted the basis of important Gnostic doctrines.³ Canon Westcott speaks of the use of this passage by the Fathers in agreement with Justin in a manner which, unintentionally we have no doubt, absolutely misrepresents important facts. He says: "The transposition of the words still remains; and how little weight can be attached to that will appear upon an examination of the various forms in which the text is quoted by Fathers like Origen, Irenæus and Epiphanius, who admitted our Gospels exclusively. It occurs in them, as will be seen from the table of readings,⁴ with almost every possible variation. Irenæus in the course of one chapter

¹ See Note 4 on preceding page.

² Apol., i. 63.

³ Canon Westcott merely alludes to this in the briefest way in a note. On the Canon, p. 115, note 2.

⁴ In the few readings given in this table, Dr. Westcott does not distinguish the writers at all. Cf. On the Canon, p. 116, note 3.

quo
the
aga
the
as i
fere
that
neq
vela
sini
ever
verse
nisi
"The
befor
by th
No
vit,"
his tr
thing
argue
of Go
cogno
cunqu
the Fa
other
third
the fo
appare
the ac
fourth
dedica
Irenæu
neque
Here t
excepti
1 On th
2 Adv.
3 Sic et
not point
all.
4 "Et i
adventum
Christi."
5 Duce
nisi eum
6 Adv. I

quotes the verse first as it stands in the canonical text; then in the same order, but with the last clause like Justin's; and once again altogether as he has given it. Epiphanius likewise quotes the text seven times in the same order as Justin, and four times as it stands in the Gospels.¹ Now in the chapter to which reference is made in this sentence Irenæus commences by stating that the Lord had declared "Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; neque Patrem quis cognoscit nisi Filius, et cui voluerit Filius revelare,"² as he says, "Thus Matthew has set it down and Luke similarly, and Mark the very same."³ He goes on to state, however, that those who would be wiser than the apostles write this verse as follows: "Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius; nec Filium nisi Pater, et cui voluerit Filius revelare." And he explains: "They interpret it as though the true God was known to no man before the coming of our Lord; and that God who was announced by the Prophets they affirm not to be the Father of Christ."⁴

Now in this passage we have the *εἶναι* of Justin in the "cognovit," in contradistinction to the "cognoscit" of the Gospel, and his transposition of order as not by any possibility an accidental thing, but as the distinct basis of doctrines. Irenæus goes on to argue that no one can know the Father unless through the Word of God, that is through the Son, and this is why he said: "'Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius; neque Filium nisi Pater, et quibuscunque Filius revelaverit.'" Thus teaching that he himself also is the Father, as indeed he is, in order that we may not receive any other Father except him who is revealed by the Son."⁵ In this third quotation Irenæus alters the *εἶναι* into *γινώσκει*, but retains the form, for the rest, of the Gnostics and of Justin, and his aim apparently is to show that adopting his present tense instead of the aorist the transposition of words is of no importance. A fourth time, however, in the same chapter, which in fact is wholly dedicated to this passage and to the doctrines based upon it, Irenæus quotes the saying "Nemo cognoscit Filium nisi Pater; neque Patrem nisi Filius, et quibuscunque Filius revelaverit."⁶ Here the language and order of the Gospel are followed with the exception that "cui voluerit revelare" is altered to the "quibus-

¹ On the Canon, p. 116.

² Adv. Hær., iv. 6, § 1.

³ Sic et Mathæus pœuit, et Lucas similiter, et Marcus idem ipsum. We need not point out that this is a misstatement, for our Mark has not got the passage at all.

⁴ "Et interpretatur, quasi a nullo cognitus sit verus Deus ante Domini nostri adventum: et eum Deum, qui a prophetis sit annuntiatus, dicunt non esse Patrem Christi." Adv. Hær., iv. 6, § 1.

⁵ Docens semetipsum et Patrem, sicut est, ut alterum non recipiamus Patrem, nisi eum qui a Filio revelatur. *Ib.*, iv. 6, § 3.

⁶ Adv. Hær., iv. 6, § 7.

cunque revelaverit" of Justin; and that this is intentional is made clear by the continuation: "For *revelaverit* was said not with reference to the future alone,"¹ &c.

Now in this chapter we learn very clearly that, although the canonical Gospels by the express declaration of Irenæus had their present reading of the passage before us, other Gospels of considerable authority even in his time had the form of Justin, for again in a fifth passage he quotes the opening words: "He who was known, therefore, was not different from him who declared: 'No one knoweth the Father,' but one and the same."² With the usual alteration of the verb to the present tense, Irenæus in this and in one of the other quotations of this passage just cited, gives some authority to the transposition of the words "Father" and "Son," although the reading was opposed to the Gospels, but he invariably adheres to γινώσκει, and condemns ἔγνω, the reading maintained by those who in the estimation of Irenæus "would be wiser than the Apostles." Elsewhere, descending on the passages of Scripture by which heretics attempt to prove that the Father was unknown before the advent of Christ, Irenæus, after accusing them of garbling passages of Scripture,³ goes on to say of the Marcionians and others; "Besides these, they adduce a countless number of apocryphal and spurious works which they themselves have forged to the bewilderment of the foolish, and of those who are not versed in the Scriptures of truth."⁴ He also points out passages occurring in our Gospels to which they give a peculiar interpretation, and amongst these, that quoted by Justin. He says: "But they adduce as the highest testimony, and as it were the crown of their system the following passage. . . . 'All things were delivered to me by my Father, and no one knew (ἔγνω) the Father but the Son, and the Son but the Father, and he to whomsoever (ὃς αὐν) the Son shall reveal (ἀποκαλύψει).'"⁵ In these words they assert that he clearly demonstrated that the Father of truth

¹ Revelaverit enim, non solum in futurum dictum est, &c.; *Ih.*, iv. 6, § 7.

² Non ergo alius erat qui cognoscebatur, et alius qui dicebat: "Nemo cognoscit Patrem:" sed unus et idem, &c.; *Ih.*, iv. 6, § 7. In another place Irenæus again quotes the passage in the same order, with the same careful adherence to the present tense. *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 6, § i.

³ *Adv. Hær.*, i. 19, § 1.

⁴ Πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις ἀνύβητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν, αὐτοὶ ἐπλασαν, παρεισφेरουσιν εἰς κατάπληξιν τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ τῶν ἀληθείας μὴ ἐπισταμένων γραμματα. *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 1.

⁵ *Adv. Hær.*, i. 20, § 3. And again, referring to Valentinus and his followers, and endeavouring to show the inconsistency of their views, he says: "Salvator ergo, secundum eos, erit mentitus, dicens: 'Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.' Si enim cognitus est vel a matre, vel a semine ejus; solum est illud, quod, 'nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.'" *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 14, § 7. Irenæus then endeavours out of their own form of the text to confute their doctrines.

whom they have invented was known to no one before his coming ; and they desire to interpret the words as though the Maker and Creator had been known to all, and the Lord spoke these words regarding the Father unknown to all whom they proclaim."¹ Here we have the exact quotation twice made by Justin, with the *ἐγώ* and the same order, set forth as the reading of the Gospels of the Marcosians and other sects, and the highest testimony to their system. It is quite impossible that Justin could have altered the passage by an error of memory to this precise form, but it must be regarded as the reading of his Memoirs.² The evidence of Irenæus is clear : The Gospels had the reading which we now find in them, but apocryphal Gospels on the other hand had that which we find twice quoted by Justin, and the passage was as it were the text upon which a large sect of the early Church based its most fundamental doctrine. The *ἐγώ* is invariably repudiated, but the transposition of the words "Father" and "Son" was apparently admitted to a certain extent, although the authority for this was not derived from the Gospels recognized by the Church, which contained the contrary order.

We must briefly refer to the use of this passage by Clement of Alexandria. He quotes portions of the text eight times, and although with some variation of terms he invariably follows the order of the Gospels. Six times he makes use of the aorist *ἐγώ*,³ once of *γινώσκει*,⁴ and once of *ἐπιγινώσκει*.⁵ He only once quotes the whole passage,⁶ but on this occasion, as well as six others in which he only quotes the latter part of the sentence,⁷ he omits *βοῦληται*, and reads "and he to whom the Son shall reveal," thus supporting the *ἀποκαλύψῃ* of Justin. Twice he has "God" instead of "Father,"⁸ and once he substitutes *μηδεὶς* for *οὐδεὶς*.⁹ It is evident from the loose and fragmentary way in which Clement interweaves the passage with his text, that he is more concerned with the sense than the verbal accuracy of the quotation, but the result of his evidence is that he never departs from the Gospel order of "Father" and "Son," although he frequently makes use of *ἐγώ* and also employs *ἀποκαλύψῃ* in agreement with Justin, and therefore, he shows the prevalence of forms approximating to,

¹ Adv. Her., i. 20, § 3.

² Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 210, f., 248 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 201; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 245.

³ Pæd., i. 9, § 88; i. 5, § 20; Strom., i. 28, § 178; v. 13, § 95, vii. 10, § 58; Cohort.

i. 10.

⁴ Strom., vii. 18, § 109.

⁵ Quis Div. Salv., 9.

⁶ Strom., i. 28, § 178.

⁷ Coh., i. § 10; Pæd., i. 5, § 20; Strom., v. 13, § 85; vii. 10, § 58; vi. 18, § 109; Quis. Div. Salv., 8.

⁸ Coh., i. § 10; Pæd., i. 5, § 20.

⁹ Strom. v. 13, § 85.

though always presenting material difference from, the reading of Justin.

Epiphanius refers to this passage no less than ten times,¹ but he only quotes it fully five times, and upon each of these occasions with variations. Of the five times to which we refer, he thrice follows the order of the Gospel;² as he does likewise in another place, where he does not complete the sentence.³ On the remaining two occasions he adopts the same order as Justin, with variations from his reading, however, to which we shall presently refer;⁴ and where he only partially quotes he follows the same order on other three occasions,⁵ and in one other place the quotation is too fragmentary to allow us to distinguish the order.⁶ Now in all of these ten quotations, with one exception, Epiphanius substitutes *οὐδε* for *ἐπεμύσκει* at the commencement of the passage in Matthew, and only thrice does he repeat the verb in the second clause as in that Gospel, and on these occasions he twice makes use of *οὐδε*⁷ and once of *ἐγνώ*.⁸ He once uses *ἐγνώ* with the same order as Justin, but does not complete the sentence.⁹ Each time he completes the quotation he uses *ὡς ἐάν* with the Gospel, and *ἀποκαλύψει* with Justin,¹⁰ but only once out of the five complete quotations does he insert *ὁ υἱὸς* in the concluding phrase. It is evident from this examination, which we must not carry further, that Epiphanius never verbally agrees with the Gospel in his quotation of this passage and never verbally with Justin, but mainly follows a version different from both. It must be remembered, however, that he is writing against various heresies, and it does not seem to us improbable that he reproduces forms of the passage current amongst those sects.

In his work against Marcion, Tertullian says: "With regard to the Father, however, that he was never seen, the Gospel which is common to us will testify, as it was said by Christ: *Nemo cognovit patrem nisi filius*,"¹¹ but elsewhere he translates "*Nemo scit*,"¹² evidently not fully appreciating the difference of *ἐγνώ*.¹³ The passage in Marcion's Gospel reads like Justin's: *οὐδεὶς ἐγνώ τον*

¹ Hær., liv. 4, ed. Petav. p. 466; lxiv. 9, p. 532; lxv. 6, p. 613; lxix. 43, p. 766; lxxiv. 4, p. 891, 10, p. 898; lxxvi. 7, p. 943, 29, p. 977, 32, p. 981.

² Hær., lxxvi. p. 943; liv. 4, p. 466; lxv. 6, p. 613.

³ Hær., lxvi. 9, p. 532.

⁴ Hær., lxxiv. 4, p. 891; lxxvi. 29, p. 977.

⁵ Hær., lxix. 43, p. 766; lxxiv. 10, p. 898; lxxvi. 32, p. 981.

⁶ Hær., lxxvi. 32, p. 981.

⁷ Hær., liv. 4, p. 466; lxix. 45, p. 766.

⁸ Hær., lxv. 6, p. 613.

⁹ Hær., lxxiv. 10, p. 898.

¹⁰ Except once when he has *ἀποκαλύπτει*. Hær., lxxiv. 4, p. 891.

¹¹ Adv. Marc. i. 27.

¹² *Ib.*, iv. 25, cf. 6.

¹³ Cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's p. 202 f.

πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις γινώσκει, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.¹ The use of *ἔγω* as applied to the Father and *γινώσκει* as regards the Son in this passage is suggestive. Origen almost invariably uses *ἔγω*, sometimes adopting the order of the Gospels, sometimes that of Justin, and always employing *ἀποκαλύψω*.² The Clementine Homilies always read *ἔγω*, and always follow the same order as Justin, presenting other and persistent variations from the form in the Gospels. Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν τις εἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.³ This reading occurs four times. The Clementine Recognitions have the aorist with the order of the Gospels.⁴

There only remain a few more lines to add to those already quoted to complete the whole of Dr. Wescott's argument regarding this passage. He continues and concludes thus: "If, indeed, Justin's quotations were made from memory, no transposition could be more natural; and if we suppose that he copied the passage directly from a manuscript, there is no difficulty in believing that he found it so written in a manuscript of the Canonical St. Matthew, since the variation is excluded by no internal improbability, while it is found elsewhere and its origin is easily explicable."⁵ It will be observed that Canon Westcott does not attempt any argument, but simply confines himself to suppositions. If such explanations were only valid, there could be no difficulty in believing anything, and every embarrassing circumstance would indeed be easily explicable.

The facts of the case may be briefly summed up as follows: Justin deliberately and expressly quotes from his Gospel, himself calling it "Gospel," he it observed a passage whose nearest parallel in our Gospels is Matt. xi. 27. This quotation presents material variations from our Canonical Gospel both in form and language. The larger part of the passage he quotes twice in a different work written years before in precisely the same words as the third quotation, with the sole exception that he uses the aorist instead of the present tense of the verb. No MS. of our Gospel extant approximates to the reading in Justin, and we are expressly told by Irenæus that the present reading of our Matthew was that existing in his day. On the other hand, Irenæus states with equal distinctness that Gospels used by Gnostic sects had the reading of Justin, and that the passage was "the crown of their system,"

¹ Dial. de recta in Deum fide, 1; Origen, Op., i. p. 817 D; Thilo, Cod. Apoc. N. T., p. 433; Hahn, Das Evang. Marcion's, p. 160.

² Cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., p. 271, 373.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 250.

⁴ Clem. Hom., xvii. 4; xviii. 4, 13, 20; xviii, 11.

⁵ Clem. Recog., ii. 47.

⁶ On the Canon, p. 117.

and one upon whose testimony they based their leading doctrines. Here, then, is the clear statement that Justin's quotation disagrees with the form in the Gospels, and agrees with that of other Gospels. The variations occurring in the numerous quotations of the same passage by the Fathers, which we have analysed, show that they handled it very loosely, but also indicate that there must have been various readings of considerable authority then current. It has been conjectured with much probability that the form in which Justin quotes the passage twice in his *Apology* may have been the reading of older Gospels, and that it was gradually altered by the Church to the form in which we now have it, for dogmatic reasons, when Gnostic sects began to base doctrines upon it inconsistent with the prevailing interpretation.¹ Be this as it may, Justin's Gospel clearly had a reading different from ours, but in unison with that known to exist in other Gospels, and this express quotation only adds additional proof to the mass of evidence already adduced that the *Memoirs of the Apostles* were not our Canonical Gospels.²

We have already occupied so much space even with this cursory examination of Justin's quotations, that we must pass over in silence passages which he quotes from the *Memoirs* with variations from the parallels in our Gospels which are also found in the *Clementine Homilies* and other works emanating from circles in which other Gospels than ours were used.³ We shall now only briefly refer to a few sayings of Jesus expressly quoted by Justin, which are altogether unknown to our Gospels. Justin says: "For the things which he foretold would take place in his name, these we see actually coming to pass in our sight. For he said: 'Many shall come,' &c., &c.,⁴ and 'There shall be schisms and heresies,'⁵ and 'Beware of false prophets,'⁶ &c., and 'Many false Christs and false Apostles shall arise and shall deceive many of the faithful.'"⁷ Neither of the two prophecies here quoted are to be found anywhere in our Gospels, and to the second of them Justin repeatedly refers. He says in one place that Jesus "foretold that in the interval of his coming, as I previously said,⁸ here-

¹ *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 245; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 254 ff.; *Delitzsch*, N. Unters. Kan. Evv. p. 35 f.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 250 f.

² Cf. *Scholten*, Het. Paulin. Evangelie, 1870, p. 103 f., p. 406.

³ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 210 f., 248 f.; *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., 1847, p. 576; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 201 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 245; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 48.

⁴ Cf. p. 298, note 3, p. 313 f.

⁵ εἶπε γὰρ . . . Ἔδονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρεσεις. Dial. 35.

⁶ Cf. 298, note 3, p. 313 f.

⁷ Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδοχριστοὶ, καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν. Dial. 35; cf. *Apol.*, i. 12.

⁸ Dial. 35.

sies and false prophets would arise in his name.¹ It is admitted that these prophecies are foreign to our Gospels.² It is very probable that the Apostle Paul refers to the prophecy, "There shall be schisms and heresies" in 1 Cor. xi. 18-19, where it is said, ". . . I hear that schisms exist amongst you; and I partly believe it. For there must also be heresies amongst you, &c. (ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω. δὲ γὰρ καὶ αἵρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, κ.τ.λ.)³ We find also elsewhere traces both of this saying and that which accompanies it. In the Clementine Homilies, Peter is represented as stating, "For there shall be, as the Lord said, *false apostles*, false prophets, *heresies*, desires for supremacy," &c. ἔσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἵρέσεις, φιλαρχίαι, κ.τ.λ.)⁴ We are likewise reminded of the passage in the Epistle attributed to the Roman Clement xlv.: "Our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be contention regarding the dignity of the episcopate."⁵ In our Gospel there is no reference anywhere to schisms and heresies, nor are false Apostles once mentioned, the reference being solely to "false Christs" and "false prophets." The recurrence here and elsewhere of the peculiar expression "false apostles" is very striking,⁶ and the evidence for the passage as a saying of Jesus is important. Hegesippus, after enumerating a vast number of heretical sects and teachers, continues: "From these sprang the false Christs, false prophets, *false apostles*, who divided the union of the Church by corrupting doctrines concerning God and concerning his Christ."⁷ It will be remembered that Hegesippus made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the Clementine literature points to the same source. In the Apostolic Constitutions we read: "For these are false Christs and false prophets, and *false apostles*, deceivers, and corrupters, &c.,⁸ and in the Clementine Recognitions the Apostle Peter is represented as saying that the devil, after the temptation, terrified by the final answer of Jesus, "hastened immediately to send forth

¹ Καὶ ἐν τῷ μεταξύ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ χρόνῳ, ὡς προέφην, γενήσονται αἱρέσεις καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προεμνηνύσε, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 51; cf. 82.

² Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 212, 246; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 232 f.; Semisch, Die Ap. Denkw. d. M. Just., p. 391, u. anm. 2; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 59; Kirchhofer, Quellensamm., p. 103, anm. 28 (Kirchhofer thinks the first may be from the Ebionitish Gospel). Cf. Westcott, On the Canon, p. 140.

³ Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 246.

⁴ Hom. xvi. 21.

⁵ xlv. See Greek passage quoted, p. 236, note 1.

⁶ Semisch, Die Ap. Denkw. d. Mart. Just., p. 391, anm. 2.

⁷ Ἀπὸ τούτων ψευδόχριστοι, ψευδοπροφῆται, ψευδαπόστολοι, οἵτινες ἐκέρσαν την ἐνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας φθοριμαίους λόγους κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. Eusebius, H. E., iv. 22.

⁸ Οὗτοι γὰρ εἰσὶ ψευδόχριστοι, καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ ψευδαπόστολοι, πλανοὶ καὶ φθορεῖς, κ.τ.λ. Constit. Apost., vi. 13; cf. vi. 18.

into this world false prophets, and *false apostles*, and false teachers, who should speak in the name of Christ indeed, but should perform the will of the demon.¹ Justin's whole system forbids our recognizing in these two passages mere tradition, and we must hold that we have here quotations from a Gospel different from ours.

Elsewhere Justin says: "Out of which (affliction and fiery trial of the Devil) again Jesus, the Son of God, promised to deliver us, and to put on us prepared garments, if we do his commandments, and he is proclaimed as having provided an eternal kingdom for us."² This promise is nowhere found in our Gospel.³

Immediately following the passage (κ 3 and 4) which we have discussed⁴ as repeated in the Dialogue: "Many shall say to me, &c., &c., and I will say to them, Depart from me," Justin continues: "And in other words by which he will condemn those who are unworthy to be saved, he said that he will say: Begone into the darkness without, which the Father hath prepared for Satan and his angels."⁵ The nearest parallel to this is in Matt. xxv. 41: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand: Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels."

JUSTIN, DIAL. 76.

Καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις οἷς καταδικάζειν τοὺς ἀναζήτους μὴ σώζεσθαι μέλλει, εἶπεν ἔρειν· Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ τῷ Σατανᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

MATT. XXV. 41.

Τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ καταραμένοι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοίμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

It is apparent that Justin's quotation differs very widely from the reading of our Gospel. The same reading, with the exception of a single word, is found in the Clementine Homilies (xix. 2), that is to say, that "Devil" is substituted for "Satan," and this variation is not important. The agreement of the rest, on the other hand, establishes the quotation to be from a written Gospel different from ours,⁶ and here we have further strong indications of Justin's use of the Ebionite Gospel.

Another of the sayings of Jesus which are foreign to our Gos-

¹ Recog. iv. 34.

² ἐξ ὧν καὶ πάντων ἀποσπᾶν ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνδύσας ἡμᾶς τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα ἐνδύματα, ἐὰν πράξωμεν αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς, ὑπέσχετο, καὶ αἰώνιον βασιλείαν προνοῆσαι ἐπηγγέλται. Dial. 116.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 255; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 59; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 99.

⁴ p. 297, note 4.

⁵ Dial. 76.

⁶ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 211; Hilgenfeldt, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 233 f.; Mayrhoft, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 245 f.

pels is one in reference to the man who falls away from righteousness into sin, of whom Justin says: "Wherefore also our Lord Jesus Christ said: In whatsoever things I may find you, in these I shall also judge you."¹ (Διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν· "὘ν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.") A similar expression is used by some of the Fathers, and in some cases is ascribed to the prophets.² Clement of Alexandria has quoted a phrase closely resembling this without indicating the source. Εφ' οἷς γὰρ ἂν εἰρω ὑμᾶς, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.³ Grabe was of opinion that Justin derived the passage from the Gospel according to the Hebrews,⁴ an opinion shared by the greater number of modern critics, and which we are prepared to accept from many previous instances of agreement. Even the warmest asserters of the theory that the Memoirs are identical with our Gospels are obliged to admit that the saying of Jesus is not contained in them, and that it must have been derived from an extra-canonical source.⁵

Other passages of a similar kind might have been pointed out, but we have already devoted too much space to Justin's quotations, and must hasten to a conclusion. There is one point, however, to which we must refer. We have more than once alluded to the fact that, unless in one place, Justin never mentions an author's name in connection with the Memoirs of the Apostles. The exception to which we referred is the following. Justin says: "The statement also that he (Jesus) changed the name of Peter, one of the Apostles, and that this is also written in *his* Memoirs as having been done, together with the fact that he also changed the name of other two brothers, who were sons of Zebedee, to Boanerges, that is, sons of Thunder," &c.⁶ According to the usual language of Justin, and upon strictly critical grounds, the αὐτοῦ in this passage must be referred to Peter; and Justin, therefore, seems to ascribe the Memoirs to that Apostle, and to speak consequently of a Gospel of Peter. Some critics maintain that the αὐτοῦ does not refer to Peter, but to Jesus, or, more

¹ Dial. 47.

² Grabe, Spicil. patr. ii. p. 327; Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., i. p. 333 f. ii. p. 524.

³ Quis Div. Salv., 40.

⁴ Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 327.

⁵ Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., i. p. 333 f.; Semech, Die Ap. Denkw. Just., p. 330, 334; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 111; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 140; Kirchofer, Quellensammlung, p. 103; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 59; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 247, cf. p. 212; Hilgenfeld, Die Ev. Justin's, p. 233; Donaldson, Hist. of Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 330.

⁶ Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετανομασθῆναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφοὺς υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας μετανομασθῆναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱὸς βροντῆς, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 106.

probably still, that it should be amended to *αὐτῶν*, and applied to the Apostles.¹ The great majority, however, are forced to admit the reference of the Memoirs to Peter, although they explain it as we shall see, in different ways. It is argued by some that this expression is used when Justin is alluding to the change of name not only of Peter but of the sons of Zebedee, the narrative of which is only found in the Gospel according to Mark. Now Mark was held by many of the Fathers to have been the mere mouth-piece of Peter, and to have written at his dictation;² so that, in fact, in calling the second Gospel by the name of the Apostle Peter, they argue, Justin merely adopted the tradition current in the early Church, and referred to the Gospel now known as the Gospel according to Mark.³ It must be evident, however, that after admitting that Justin speaks of the Memoirs "of Peter," it is indeed hasty in the extreme to conclude from the fact that the mention of the sons of Zebedee being surnamed Boanerges is only recorded in Mark iii. 17, and not in the other canonical Gospels, that therefore the "Memoirs of Peter" and our Gospel according to Mark are one and the same. We shall, hereafter, in examining the testimony of Papias, see that the Gospel according to Mark, of which the Bishop of Hierapolis speaks was not our canonical Mark at all. It would be very singular indeed on this hypothesis that Justin should not have quoted a single passage from the only Gospel whose author he names, and the number of times he seems to quote from a Petrine Gospel, which was quite different from Mark, confirms the inference that he cannot possibly here refer to our second Gospel. It is maintained, therefore, by numerous other critics that Justin refers to a Gospel according to Peter, or according to the Hebrews, and not to Mark.

¹ Otto Justinii Opp., ii. p. 360 f.; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 315; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 55; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 329; Semisch, Die Ap. Denkw. d. M. Just., p. 150 ff.; Neudecker, Lehrb. Einl. N. T. p. 66 f.; Obhausen, Echth. sämmtl. Schr. N. T. p. 290, 304; Gieseler, Versuch Entst. schr. Evv. pp. 14, 58; Gratz, Krit. Unters., p. 50 f.; Delitzsch, N. Unters. Entst. kan. Evv., p. 26.

² Eusebius, H. E., ii. 15; iii. 39, v. 8, vi. 14, 25; Irenaeus, Adv. Hær., iii. l. § 1; Tertullian, Adv. Marc. iv. 5; Hieron., De Vir. Ill., 1; cf. Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., i. p. 375; Schweigler, Das. nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 221; Semisch, Die Ap. Denkw. d. Mart. Just., p. 152.

³ J. P. Lange, Das Evang. nach Markus, 1868, p. 6; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv. p. 372; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 99; Storr, Zweck d. Evang. Gesch., p. 366 f.; Hug, Einl. N. T., 1847, ii. p. 58, cf. 97; Winer, Just. Mart., p. 18.

Some who admit that, rightly, the *αὐτῶν* applies to Peter are prevented by other considerations from pronouncing judgment clearly. Cf. De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 114; Bindemann, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1842, p. 407 f.; Delitzsch, Entst. kan. Evv., p. 26; Reuss, Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T., p. 192; Weiss, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1861, p. 677.

⁴ Bertholdt Einl. A. und N. Test. iii. p. 1213, Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 132; Davidson, introd. N. T., ii. p. 111; Hülgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 23 f., 261 ff.; cf.

We
Antio
ing to
foun
mitted
he sub
and co
Saviou
ing to
with th
Gospel
doret s
to Peter
that th
accordi
Gospel
all critic
various
to the
modifica
circulate
tion occu
to which

Die Evange
Einl. N. T.
p. 248; Sch
p. 234 ff.;
p. 104, ann
¹ Eusebius

² Ad. Ma
tevangeliu

³ Hæret.
xii. 13; De
them in agre

⁴ Eusebius
I, ad Matt.
Proem. Ev.

347 f., 385 f.
Das nachap.
ann. 17, p. 4

viii. p. 541 ff
Ent. Entst. l

hoff, Einl. pet
p. 345 ff., Die
Gesch. heil. S

i. p. 29 ff.; J
Nicolas, Etud
N. T. p. 21;

Evang. d. Ag
i. p. 340 ff.; E
Entst. schrift

We learn from Eusebius that Serapion, who became Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190, composed a book on the "Gospel according to Peter" (*περὶ τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου*), which he found in circulation in his diocese. At first Serapion had permitted the use of this Gospel, as it evidently was much prized, but he subsequently condemned it as a work favouring Docetic views, and containing many things superadded to the doctrine of the Saviour.¹ Origen likewise makes mention of the Gospel according to Peter (*τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου*) as agreeing with the tradition of the Hebrews.² But its relationship to the Gospel according to the Hebrews becomes more clear when Theodoret states that the Nazarenes made use of the Gospel according to Peter,³ for we know by the testimony of the Fathers generally that the Nazarene Gospel was that commonly called the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Εβραίων*). The same Gospel was in use amongst the Ebionites, and, in fact, as almost all critics are agreed, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, under various names, such as the Gospel according to Peter, according to the Apostles, the Nazarenes, Ebionites, Egyptians, &c., with modifications certainly, but substantially the same work, was circulated very widely throughout the early Church.⁴ A quotation occurs in the so-called Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyræans, to which we have already referred, which is said by Origen to be

Die Evangelien, p. 147 f.; Köstlin, Urspr. synot. Evv. p. 99, p. 368 f.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 107; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 40 f.; Schotten, Das ält. Evang., p. 248; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 220 f.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 234 ff.; Weiss, Die evangelische Gesch., i. p. 64; Feilmoser, Einl. N. T., 2 auf p. 104, ann. *; Schott, Isagoge, p. 86, ann. 1.

¹ Euseb., H. E., vi. 12; cf. Hieron., De Vir. Ill., 41.

² Ad. Matt. xiii. 54—56. He couples it with the Book of James, or the Protevangelium Jacobi.

³ Har. Fab., ii. 2; cf. Hieron., lib. vi. Comment. in Ezech. xviii., in Matt. xii. 13; De Vir. Ill. 2. The Marcians also used this Gospel, and we have seen them in agreement with Justin's quotation; cf. p. 406 ff.

⁴ Euseb., H. E., iii. 25; Epiphanius, Har. xxx 13; Hieron., Adv. Pelag., iii. 1, ad Matt. vi. 11, xii. 13, xxiii. 35; Theodoret, Har. Fab., ii. 2; Ambrose, Proem. Ev. Lucae; Auger, Synops. Ev., p. xii. ff.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 331, 347 f., 383 f., 391 f., 409 ff.; Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 9, p. 17, p. 21; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 197 ff., 234 ff.; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 452, ann. 17, p. 465, ann. 1; Ebrard, Die evang. Gesch., p. 769 ff.; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 541 ff., 559 ff.; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 215 ff.; Delitzsch, N. Unt. Entst. kan. Evv. p. 20 ff.; Baur, Unters. üb. kan. Evv., p. 572 ff.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 238 ff., 303 f.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1863, p. 345 ff., Die Evv. Just., p. 11 ff.; Volkmar, Die Evangelien, p. 42; Reuss, Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T., p. 191 ff. Hist. du Canon, p. 63; Keim, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 29 ff.; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 99 ff.; Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1854, p. 36 ff.; Nicolas, Etudes sur les Evang. Apocr., p. 23 ff., 60 ff., 95 ff., 118; Hertwig, Einl. N. T. p. 21; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 96 ff., 138 f.; Schneckenburger, Ueb. d. Evang. d. Egypt., 1834, Urspr. erst. kan. Evang.; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T., i. p. 340 ff.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 9 f., 14 ff.; Schott, Isagoge, p. 3 ff.; Gieseler, Entst. schrift. Ev., p. 9 ff.; Neudecker, Einl. N. T., 1840, p. 24 ff.

in the work called the doctrine of Peter¹ (Διδαχὴ Πέτρου), but Jerome states that it is taken from the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes.² Delitzsch finds traces of the Gospel according to the Hebrews before A.D. 130 in the Talmud.³ Eusebius⁴ informs us that Papias narrated a story regarding a woman accused before the Lord of many sins which was contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.⁵ The same writer likewise states that Hegesippus, who came to Rome and commenced his public career under Anicetus, quoted from the same Gospel.⁶ The evidence of this "ancient and apostolic" man is very important, for although he evidently attaches great value to tradition, knew of no canonical Scriptures of the New Testament, and, like Justin, rejected the Apostle Paul,⁷ he still regarded the Gospel according to the Hebrews with respect, and probably made use of no other. The best critics consider that this Gospel was the evangelical work used by the author of the Clementine Homilies.⁸ Cerinthus and Carpocrates made use of a form of it,⁹ and there is good reason to suppose that Tatian, like his master Justin, used the same Gospel; indeed his "Diatessaron," we are told, was by some called the Gospel according to the Hebrews.¹⁰ Clement of Alexandria quotes it as an authority with quite the same respect as the other Gospels. He says: "So also in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, 'He who wonders shall reign,' it is written, 'and he who

¹ De Princ. Praef., § 8.

² Hieron., Proem. in Isaia, xviii., DeVir. III., 16; cf. Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., i. p. 359 f. A similar passage was in the *Κηρυγμα Πέτρου*, cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Ev. Justin's, p. 249. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 407 f.

³ Tract. Sabbath, f. 116; Delitzsch, N. Unters. Enst. kan. Evv., p. 18.

⁴ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 39.

⁵ This is generally believed to be the episode inserted in the fourth Gospel, viii. 1—11, but not originally belonging to it.

⁶ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 22.

⁷ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 222 f.; Gesch. chr. Kirche, i. p. 83 f.; Hilgenfeld, Der Kanon, p. 27 ff.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 91 f., 132; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 22 f.; Das Evang. nach. Johan., p. 11; Reuss, Gesch. h. Schr. N. T., p. 289; Nicolas, Et. sur. les Ev. Apoc., p. 58; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 173 ff. See further the following pages and the next chapter.

⁸ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 330 ff.; Neander, Genet. Entw. d. vorn. Gnost. Syst. p. 418; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., p. 207; Hilgenfeld, Die Ev. Just., p. 371 f.; Reuss, Gesch. h. Schr. N. T., p. 192 f.; Baur, Unters. üb. kan. Evv., p. 573; cf. Anger, Synops. Evang., p. xvi.

⁹ Epiphanius, Haer., xxvii. 5, cf. xxx. 26, xxx. 14; cf. De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 116 f., 119; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit. p. i. 20.

¹⁰ Epiphanius, Haer., xlv. 1; cf. De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 116, 119. Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 208; Schneckenburger, Das Evang. d. Egypt., p. 36 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 444; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 28, 120 ff.; Schmidt, Einl. N. T., p. 124 ff.; Gratz, K. Unt. Just. Denkw., p. 814; Baur, Unt. kan. Ev. p. 773; Reuss, Gesch. h. Schr. N. T., p. 193; Querieke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 227 f.

reigns,
Egypti
Rome,
wise of
the Gos
great c
Theodor
also ann
fourth c
ous boo
John;⁵
serts it,
the Ant
ment, al
mony to
indeed h
Gospel a
rest.¹⁰ I
tian com
of the Gr
ites used
Apostle I
know fro
could not
both Cle
ording to
identifies
Ireneus,
the Epist
an apost

1 ὁ αὐτὸς
γέγονα
§ 43.

3 Evangelii
et Origenes
Matt. xix. 11

4 Fab. Haer.

5 Eusebius,
Guericke, Ges.

6 De Vir. I.

7 Cf. Credner

8 Adv. Haer.

11 Origen, C.

12 Strom., i.

13 In Joh. t.

vii. 6; in Es.

reigns, shall rest.'"¹ A form of this Gospel, "according to the Egyptians," is quoted in the second Epistle of pseudo-Clement of Rome, as we are informed by the Alexandrian Clement, who likewise quotes the same passage.² Origen frequently made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews,³ and that it long enjoyed great consideration in the Church is proved by the fact that Theodoret found it in circulation not only among heretics, but also amongst orthodox Christian communities;⁴ and even in the fourth century Eusebius does not class this Gospel amongst spurious books, but in the second class along with the Apocalypse of John;⁵ and later still Jerome translated it;⁶ whilst Nicephorus inserts it, in his *Stichometry*, not amongst the Apocrypha, but amongst the Antilegomena, or merely doubtful books of the New Testament, along with the Apocalypse of John.⁷ Eusebius bears testimony to the value attached to it by the Jewish Christians,⁸ and indeed he says of the Ebionites that, "making use only of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they took little account of the rest."⁹ In such repute was this Gospel amongst the earliest Christian communities, that it was generally believed to be the original of the Greek Gospel of Matthew. Irenaeus states that the Ebionites used solely the Gospel according to Matthew and reject the Apostle Paul, asserting that he was an apostate from the law.¹⁰ We know from statements regarding the Ebionites¹¹ that this Gospel could not have been our Gospel according to Matthew, and besides, both Clement¹² of Alexandria and Origen¹³ call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Eusebius, however, still more clearly identifies it, as we have seen above. Repeating the statements of Irenaeus, he says: "These indeed (the Ebionites) thought that all the Epistles of the Apostle (Paul) should be rejected, calling him an apostate from the law; making use only of the Gospel accord-

¹ ἡ καὶ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγελίῳ "ὁ θανατῶν βασιλεύσει," γέγραπται, "καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύησεται." *Clem. Al., Strom., ii. 9, § 43.*

² 2 Ep. ad Corinth., xii.; cf. *Clem. Al., Strom., iii. 9 § 13.*

³ Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos et Origenes saepe utitur. *Hieron., De Vir. Ill., 2; Origen, in Joh., vol. iv. 63, Matt. xix. 19, vol. iii., p. 771, &c.*

⁴ *Fab. Haer., i. 20; cf. Epiphanius, Haer., xli. 1.*

⁵ *Eusebius, iii. 25; cf. Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 211, anm. 1; Grætz, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 215 f.; Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., i. p. 351 f., p. 355 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Nov. Test. extra Can. recept. Fasc., iv. p. 5 ff.*

⁶ *De Vir. Ill., 2.*

⁷ *U. Crelier, Zur Gesch. des Kan. p. 120.*

⁸ *H. E., iii. 25.*

⁹ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίων λεγομένῳ χρωμένοι, τῶν λοιπῶν δικρὸν ἐποιούνο λόγοι. *H. E., iii. 27.*

¹⁰ *Adv. Haer., i. 26, § 2; cf. iii. 12, § 7.*

¹¹ *Origen, Contra Cels., v. 61; Eusebius, H. E., iii. 27.*

¹² *Strom., ii. 9, § 45.*

¹³ In Joh., t. ii. 6 (Op. iv. p. 63 f.), Hom. in Jerem., xv. 4; cf. *Hieron., in Mich. vii. 6; in Es. xl. 12, De Vir. Ill., 2.*

ing to the Hebrews, they took little account of the rest."¹ Epiphanius calls both the single Gospel of the Ebionites and of the Nazarenes the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and also the Gospel according to Matthew,² as does also Theodoret.³ Jerome translated the Gospel according to the Hebrews both into Greek and Latin,⁴ and it is clear that his belief was that this Gospel, a copy of which he found in the library collected at Caesarea by the Martyr Pamphilus (+ 309), was the Hebrew original of Matthew; and in support of this view he points out that it did not follow the version of the LXX. in its quotations from the Old Testament, but quoted directly from the Hebrew.⁵ An attempt has been made to argue that, later, Jerome became doubtful of this view, but it seems to us that this is not the case, and certainly Jerome in his subsequent writings states that it was generally held to be the original of Matthew.⁶ That this Gospel was not identical with the Greek Matthew is evident both from the quotations of Jerome and others, and also from the fact that Jerome considered it worth while to translate it twice. If the Greek Gospel had been an accurate translation of it, of course there could not have been inducement to make another.⁷ As we shall hereafter see, the belief was universal in the early Church that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Attempts have been made to argue that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was first written in Greek and then translated into Hebrew,⁸ but the reasons advanced seem quite

¹ H. E., iii. 27.

² Hæf., xxx. 3; cf. Hæf. xxix. 9, xxx. 14.

³ Hæf. Fab., ii. 1.

⁴ Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in grecum latinumque sermonem translatus est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur, &c. Hieron., De Vir. Ill. 2; c. Adv. Pelag., 1.

⁵ Porro ipsum hebraicum (Matthæi) habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit, mihi quoque a Nazareis qui in Berea, urbe Syriæ hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit, in quo animadvertendum, quod ubicunque Evangelista sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris veteris Scripturæ testimoniis utitur, non sequatur LXX. translatorum auctoritatem sed hebraicam, &c., &c. De Vir. Ill. 3.

⁶ In Evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum quod et in Cæsariensi habetur Bibliotheca, narrat historia, &c., &c. Hieron., Adv. Pelag., iii. 2; cf. Comment. in Esaie, xi. 2, ad. Matt. xii. 13; cf. Anger, Synops. Evv., p. xii. f.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1863, p. 352; Schneegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 216; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. p. 472 f.; Schneckenburger, Urspr. erst. kan. Evv., passim, et 171; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 24 ff.

⁷ Schneegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 246; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1863, p. 351; Anger, Synops. Evv., p. xii. ff.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 24 ff.

⁸ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 345 f., 379, 405; cf. Einl. N. T., i. § 45, p. 89; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 102 f.; Delitzsch, Entst. kan. Evv., p. 26 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 117; Volkmar, Die Religion Jesu, p. 406 f.; Paulus, Exeget. Conserv., i. p. 143; Theile, Winer's N. Krit. Journal, i. p. 291; Schott, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 181; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 110 f.

insufficient and arbitrary,¹ and it is contradicted by the whole tradition of the Fathers.

It is not necessary for our purpose to enter fully here into the question of the exact relation of our canonical Gospel according to Matthew to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It is sufficient for us to point out that we meet with the latter before Matthew's Gospel, and that the general opinion of the early church was that it was the original of the canonical Gospel. This opinion, as Schwegler² remarks, is supported by the fact that tradition assigns the origin of both Gospels to Palestine, and that both were intended for Jewish Christians and exclusively used by them. That the two works, however originally related, had by subsequent manipulation become distinct, although still amidst much variation preserving some substantial affinity, cannot be doubted, and in addition to evidence already cited we may point out that in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, the Gospel according to Matthew is said to have 2500 *στίχοι*, whilst that according to the Hebrews has only 2200.³

Whether this Gospel formed one of the *πολλοί* of Luke it is not our purpose to inquire, but enough has been said to prove that it was one of the most ancient⁴ and most valued evangelical works, and to show the probability that Justin Martyr, a Jewish Christian living amongst those who are known to have made exclusive use of this Gospel, may well, like his contemporary Hegesippus, have used the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and this probability is, as we have seen, greatly strengthened by the fact that many of his quotations agree with passages which we know to have been contained in it; whilst, on the other hand, almost all differ from our Gospels, presenting generally, however, a greater affinity to the Gospel according to Matthew, as we might expect, than to the other two. It is clear that the title "Gospel accord-

¹ Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 474 ff.; Sieffert, *Urspr. erst. kan. Evv.*, p. 33; Schneckenburger, *Urspr. erst. kan. Ev.*, p. 139 ff.; Meyer, *Kr. ex. H'buch üb. Ev. d. Matth.*, 5 anll., p. 18 f.; Renss, *Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T.*, p. 191 f.; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 572 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1853-54, p. 42; Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter*, p. 183 f.; Eichhorn, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 13 ff.; Ebrard, *Krit. d. evang. Gesch.*, p. 778, ann. 18.

² Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 241.

³ Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 120; *Gesch. d. N. T. Kan.*, p. 243.

⁴ Cf. De Wette, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 97, p. 138; Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 199; Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 409 ff.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 483; Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1853-54, p. 40 ff.; Delitzsch, *Entst. kan. Evv.*, p. 18 ff.; Guericke, *Gesamtgesch. N. T.*, p. 215 ff.; Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, viii. p. 542, 547 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.* 1863, p. 345 ff.; Mayerhoff, *Einkl. petr. Schr.*, p. 234 ff.; Bleek, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 99 ff.; Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 29; Nicolas, *Etudes sur les Ev. Apocr.*, p. 23 ff.; Hug, *Einkl. N. T.*, ii. p. 19 ff.; Schneckenburger, *Urspr. erst. kan. Ev.*, p. 105 ff.; Eichhorn, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 7, p. 18 ff.; Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 8 ff.; Neudecker, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 24 ff.

ing to the Hebrews" cannot have been its actual superscription, but merely was a name descriptive of the readers for whom it was prepared or amongst whom it chiefly circulated, and it is most probable that it originally bore no other title than "The Gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), to which were added the different designations under which we find it known amongst different communities.¹ We have already seen that Justin speaks of "The Gospel" and seems to refer to the "Memoirs of Peter," both distinguishing appellations of this Gospel, but there is another of the names borne by the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," which singularly recalls the "Memoirs of the Apostles," by which Justin prefers to call his evangelical work. It was called the "Gospel according to the Apostles"² (εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους), and, in short, comparing Justin's Memoirs with this Gospel, we find at once similarity of contents and even of name.³

It is not necessary, however, for the purposes of this examination to dwell more fully upon the question as to what specific Gospel now no longer extant Justin employed. We have shown that there is no evidence that he made use of any of our Gospels,⁴ and he cannot, therefore, be cited even to prove their existence, and much less to attest the authenticity and character of records whose authors he does not once name. On the other hand it has been made evident that there were other Gospels, now lost, but which then enjoyed the highest consideration, from which his quotations might have been, and probably were, taken. We have seen that Justin's Memoirs of the Apostles contained many facts of Gospel history unknown to, or contradictory of, our Gospels, which were contained in apocryphal works and in the Gospel according to the Hebrews; that they contained matter otherwise contradictory to our Gospels, and sayings of Jesus not contained in them; and that his quotations, although so numerous, syste-

¹ *Schwegler*, das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 202; *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 573.

² In evangelio juxta Hebræos quo utantur usque hodie Nazarenæ secundum apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Mattheum. *Hieron.* Adv. Pelag., lib. 2. Cf. *Origen*, Hom. in Luc.; *Epiphanius*, Hær., xxx. 13; *Ambros.* in Proem. Com. in Luc.; *Guericke*, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 216; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 393; *Schneckenburger*, Urspr. erst. kan. Ev., p. 156; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 9 ff., p. 108 f.; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 25 f.; *Gieseler*, Vers. Entst. schr. Evv., p. 9 ff., cf. p. 57 ff.; *Reithmayer*, Einl. N. T., 1852, p. 46 f.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 24 ff.

³ *Schwegler* rightly remarks that if it can be shown that Justin even once made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or any other uncanonical source, there is no ground for asserting that he may not always have done so. Das nachap. Zeit. i. p. 229 f.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 229; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 256.

⁴ The peculiarities of language of our Synoptic Gospels are entirely wanting in Justin. Cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 213 f.

matically vary from similar passages in our Gospels. No theory of quotation from memory can account for these phenomena, and the reasonable conclusion is that Justin did not make use of our Gospels, but quoted from another source. In no case can the testimony of Justin afford the requisite support to the Gospels as records of miracles and of a Divine Revelation.

CHAPTER IV.

HEGESIPPUS—PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS.

WE now turn to Hegesippus, one of the contemporaries of Justin, and, like him, a Palestinian Jewish Christian. Most of our information regarding him is derived from Eusebius, who however fortunately gives rather copious extracts from his writings. Hegesippus was born in Palestine of Jewish parents,¹ and in all probability belonged to the primitive community of Jerusalem.² In order to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the state of the Church, he travelled widely and came to Rome when Anicetus was Bishop. Subsequently he wrote a work of historical Memoirs, ἱστορικὰ, in five books, and thus became the first ecclesiastical historian of Christianity. This work is lost, but portions have been preserved to us by Eusebius, and one other fragment is also extant.³ It must have been, in part at least, written after the succession of Eleutherus to the Roman bishopric (A.D. 177-193), as that event is mentioned in the book itself, and his testimony is allowed by all critics to date from an advanced period of the second half of the second century.⁴

The testimony of Hegesippus is of great value, not only as that of a man born near the primitive Christian tradition, but also as that of an intelligent traveller amongst many Christian communities. Eusebius evidently held him in high estimation as recording the unerring tradition of the Apostolic preaching in the most simple

¹ *Eusebius*, H. E., iv. 22; *Credner*, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 34; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 136; *Ewald*, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 17, ann. 1; *Lechler*, *Das apost. u. nachap. Zeitalter*, p. 462; *Donaldson*, *Hist. of Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 186.

² *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 136; *Credner*, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 34.

³ *Eusebius*, H. E., iv. 22; cf. iv. 11.

⁴ *De Witte*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 139; *Baur*, *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i. p. 84; *Reuss*, *Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T.*, p. 290; *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 51; *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 77; *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 573; *Schotten*, *Het Paulin. Evangelie*, p. 3; *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 19 f.; *Lechler*, *Das apost. u. nachap. Zeitalter*, p. 296, p. 463; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 462, ii. p. 160; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.* iii. p. 183; *Ritschl*, *Entst. altkath. Kirche*, p. 268; *Ewald*, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, p. 17 f.; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 19, ann. 1; *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 164, p. 57 f.; *Anger*, *Synops. Ev.* p. xiii. not. 4, p. xvi; *Horne*, *Introd. to H. S.*, 12th ed. ed. Tregelles, iv. p. 423; *Lardner*, *Credibility &c.*, Works, ii. p. 141.

style of composition, and as a writer of authority who was "contemporary with the first successors of the Apostles" (ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γεγόμενος διαδοχῆς). Any indications, therefore, which we may derive from information regarding him, and from the fragments of his writings, which survive, must be of peculiar importance for our inquiry.

As might have been expected from a convert from Judaism¹ (πεπιστευκὸς ἐξ Ἑβραίων), we find in Hegesippus manifest evidences of general tendency to the Jewish side of Christianity. For "James the brother of the Lord" was the chief of the Apostles, and he states that he had received the government of the Church after the death of Jesus.² The account which he gives of him is remarkable. "He was holy from his mother's womb. He drank neither wine nor strong drink, nor ate he any living thing. A razor never went upon his head, he anointed not himself with oil, and did not use a bath. He alone was allowed to enter into the Holies. For he did not wear woollen garments, but linen. And he alone entered into the Sanctuary and was wont to be found upon his knees seeking forgiveness on behalf of the people; so that his knees became hard like a camel's, through his constant kneeling in supplication to God, and asking forgiveness for the people. In consequence of his exceeding great righteousness he was called Righteous and 'Oblias,' that is, Protector of the people and Righteousness, as the prophets declare concerning him,"³ and so on. Throughout the whole of his account of James, Hegesippus describes him as a mere Jew, and as frequenting the temple, and even entering the Holy of Holies as a Jewish High Priest. Whether the account be apocryphal or not is of little consequence here; it is clear that Hegesippus sees no incongruity in it, and that the difference between the Jew and the Christian was extremely small. The head of the Christian community

¹ τὴν ἀπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος ἀπλουστάτην ἀντιτάξει γραφῆς ὑπομνηματισάμενος, κ.τ.λ. Eusebius, iv. 8.

² Eusebius, H. E., ii. 23; cf. Hieron, De Vir. Ill. 22.

³ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 22.

⁴ Eusebius, H. E., ii. 23.

⁵ Οὗτος δὲ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ἅγιος ἦν. Οἶνον καὶ σκευὰ οὐκ ἔπιεν, οὐδὲ ἐνψυχον ἔφαγε. Ξυρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἔλαιον οὐκ ἠλείψατο, καὶ βαλανεῖον οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. Τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔρπουσιν ἐνθόρει, ἀλλὰ σινδόνας. Καὶ μόνος εἰσῆρχετο εἰς τὸν ναόν, ἠνέρισκετο τε κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι, καὶ αἰτούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἁφειν, ὡς ἀπεκλημέναι τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ δίκην καμήλου, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ κἄμπειν προσκυνούντα τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι ἁφειν τῷ λαῷ. Διὰ γὰρ τοὺς ὑπερβολὰς τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἐκαλεῖτο δίκαιος καὶ ὁβλίας ὁ ἑστὶν Ἑλληνιστὶ περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη, ὡς οἱ προφῆται δηλοῦσι περὶ αὐτοῦ. Euseb., H. E., ii. 23.

could assume all the duties of the Jewish High Priest,¹ and his Christian doctrines did not offend more than a small party amongst the Jews.²

We are not, therefore, surprised to find that his rule (*κανόν*) of orthodoxy in the Christian communities which he visited, was "the Law, the Prophets, and the Lord." Speaking of the result of his observations during his travels, and of the succession of Bishops in Rome, he says: "The Corinthian Church has continued in the true faith until Primus, now Bishop of Corinth. I conversed with him on my voyage to Rome, and stayed many days with the Corinthians, during which time we were refreshed together with true doctrine. Arrived in Rome I composed the succession until Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. After Anicetus, succeeded Soter, and afterwards Eleutherus. But with every succession, and in every city, that prevails which the Law, and the Prophets, and the Lord enjoin."³ The test of true doctrine (*ὁρθὸς λόγος*) with Hegesippus as with Justin, therefore, is no New Testament Canon, which does not yet exist for him, but the Old Testament, the only Holy Scriptures which he acknowledges, and the words of the Lord himself,⁴ which, as in the case of Jewish Christians like Justin, were held to be established by and in direct conformity with the Old Testament.⁵ He carefully transmits the unerring tradition of apostolic preaching (*τὴν ἀπλανή παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος*), but he knows nothing of any canonical series even of apostolic epistles.

The care with which Eusebius searches for information regarding the books of the New Testament in early writers, and his anxiety to produce any evidence concerning their authenticity, renders his silence upon the subject almost as important as his distinct utterance when speaking of such a man as Hegesippus. Now, while Eusebius does not assert that Hegesippus refers to any of our Canonical Gospels or Epistles, he very distinctly states that he made use in his writings of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (*ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου . . . τὰν τῶν*), and when he adds, "And other things he records as from unwritten Jewish tradition,"⁶ and then mentions the Proverbs of Solo-

¹ Epiphanius also has the tradition that James alone as High Priest once a year went into the Holy of Holies. Har. lxxviii. 13; cf. 14; xxix. 4.

² Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. 136 ff., 342 ff.

³ Eusebius, H. E., ix. 22.

⁴ Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 19 f.; Cradner, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 76 ff.; Beiträge, i. p. 51; Ritschl, *Entst. altkath. Kirche*, p. 268; Reuss, *Gesch. heil. Schr. N. T.*, p. 290; Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 206 f., 238 f.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 462.

⁵ Cradner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 30, p. 33.

⁶ Καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὡς ἂν ἐξ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγράφου παραδόσεως μνημονεύει. Euseb., H. E., iv. 22.

mon and certain apocrypha, Eusebius shows that he has sought and here details all the sources from which Hegesippus quotes, or regarding which he expresses opinions. It may be well, however, to give his remarks in a consecutive form. "He sets forth some matters from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac, and particularly from the Hebrew language, showing that he was a convert from among the Hebrews, and other things he records as from unwritten Jewish tradition. And not only he, but also Ireneus, and the whole body of the ancients, called the Proverbs of Solomon: all-virtuous Wisdom. And regarding the so-called Apocrypha, he states that some of them had been forged in his own time by certain heretics."¹

It is certain that Eusebius, who quotes with so much care the testimony of Papias, a man of whom he speaks disparagingly, regarding the composition of the first two Gospels, would not have neglected to have availed himself of the evidence of Hegesippus, for whom he has so much respect, had that writer furnished him with any opportunity, and there can be little doubt that he exclusively made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, together with unwritten tradition.² In the passage regarding the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as even Lardner³ conjectures, the text of Eusebius is in all probability confused, and he doubtless said what Jerome later found to be the fact, that "the Gospel according to the Hebrews is written in the Chaldaic and Syriac (or Syro-Chaldaic) language, but with Hebrew characters."⁴ It is in this sense that Rufinus translates it. It may not be inappropriate to point out that fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which have been preserved, show the same tendency to give some pre-eminence to James amongst the Apostles which we observe in Hegesippus.⁵ It has been argued by a few that the words, "and regarding the so-called Apocrypha, he states that

¹ Ἐκ τε τοῦ καὶ Ἑβραίων εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδοῦ διαλέκτου τινὰ τῶν ἐν ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἑβραίων ἐαυτὸν πιστευμέναι καὶ ἄλλα, δὲ ὡς ἂν ἐξ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγραφῆς παραδόσεως μνημονεύει, οὐ μόνος δὲ οὗτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Εἰρηναῖος καὶ ὁ πᾶς τῶν ἀρχαίων χορὸς, πανάρετον σοφίαν τὰς Σολομῶνος παροιμίας ἐκάλουν. καὶ περὶ τῶν λεγομένων δὲ ἀποκρύφων διαλαμβάνων, ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ χρόνων πρὸς τινῶν αἰρετικῶν ἀναπεπλάσθαι τινὰ τούτων ἱστορεῖ. H. E., iv. 22.

² Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 206 f.; Credner, Gesch. N. T. Canon, p. 35, p. 143; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 57 f., p. 132 f., p. 164; cf. Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 19; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 42; cf. Auger, Synops. Ev. p. xi., nota 4.

³ Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 144.

⁴ In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed hebraicis literis scriptum est, &c. Adv. Pelag. iii. 1.

⁵ Cf. Hieron., De Vir. Ill., 2; cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 398, 406 f.; Neander, Darstellung d. chr. Kirche, p. 430, ann. 2.

that thou respectest not persons."¹ Canon Westcott points out that *καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον* only occurs in Luke xx. 21, and Galatians ii. 6;² but the similarity of this single phrase, which is not given as a quotation, but in a historical form put into the mouth of those who are addressing James, cannot for a moment be accepted as evidence of a knowledge of Luke. The episode of the tribute money is generally ascribed to the oldest form of the Gospel history, and although the other two Synoptics³ read *βλέπεις εἰς* for *λαμβάνεις*, there is no ground for asserting that many of the *πολλοί* who preceded Luke did not use the latter form, and as little for asserting that it did not so stand in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The employment of the same expression in the Epistle, moreover, at once deprives the Gospel of any individuality in its use.

Hegesippus represents the dying James as kneeling down and praying for those who were stoning him: "I beseech (thee), Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (*Παρακαλῶ, κύριε Θεὲ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς: οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦντι*).⁴ This is compared with the prayer which Luke⁵ puts into the mouth of Jesus on the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (*Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς: οὐ γὰρ οἶδουσιν τί ποιοῦντι*), and it is assumed from this partial coincidence that Hegesippus was acquainted with the third of our canonical Gospels. We are surprised to see an able and accomplished critic like Hilgenfeld adopting such a conclusion without either examination or argument of any kind.⁶ Such a deduction is totally unwarranted by the facts of the case, and if the partial agreement of a passage in such a Father with a historical expression in a Gospel which alone out of many previously existent has come down to us can be considered evidence of the acquaintance of the Father with that particular Gospel, the function of criticism is at an end.

It may here be observed that the above passage of Luke xxiii. 34 is omitted altogether from the Vatican MS. and Codex D (Beza), and it is erased from the Codex Sinaiticus, in which its position is of a very doubtful character. The Codex Alexandri-

¹ *Θηλαίς γὰρ πορευομένην σοὶ καὶ παῖς ὁ λαός, ὅτι δίκαιός εἶ, καὶ ὅτι πρόσωπον οὐ λαμβάνεις, κ.τ.λ.* Euseb., H. E., ii. 23.

² On the Canon, p. 182, note 4.

³ Matt. xxiii. 16; Mark xii. 14.

⁴ xxiii. 34.

⁵ Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1863, p. 354, p. 360, ann. 1; Die Evv. Justin's, p. 369; Der Canon, p. 28. In each of these places the bare assertion is made, and the reader is referred to the other passages. In fact there is merely a circle of references to mere unargued assumptions. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, viii. p. 543) repeats the assertion of Hilgenfeld, and refers to the passages above, where, however, as we have stated, no attempt whatever is made to establish the truth of the assumption. Cf. Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 19; Het Paulin. Evangelie, p. 3.

⁶ Euseb., H. E., ii. 23.

nus which avowedly in existence writing ces.³ If it is natural some of the ed. No only one erous to according supposition will not do such a pre should have his brother from Luke the original written Gospel mind of the community gesippus would have been transmitted. No saying both from circumstances for limiting omission of their weakness these gospels undoubted as uttering third Gospel this merely rather provision of his purpose, and not give the

1 The Clementine canon (c. 15) etc.
2 The passage author of our the three gospels.
3 Ganz an Evv., p. 36.

nus which contains it omits the word *πάτερ*.¹ Luke's Gospel was avowedly² composed after many other similar works were already in existence, and we know from our Synoptics how closely such writings often followed each other, and drew from the same sources.³ If any historical character is conceded to this prayer of Jesus it is natural to suppose that it must have been given in at least some of these numerous Gospels which have unfortunately perished. No one could reasonably assert that our third Gospel is the only one which ever contained the passage. It would be preposterous to affirm, for instance, that it did not exist in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Hegesippus employed. On the supposition that the passage is historical, which apologists at least will not dispute, what could be more natural or probable than that such a prayer, "emanating from the innermost soul of Jesus,"⁴ should have been adopted under similar circumstances by James, his brother and successor, who certainly could not have derived it from Luke. The tradition of such words, expressing so much of the original spirit of Christianity, setting aside for the moment written Gospels, could scarcely fail to have remained fresh in the mind of the early Church, and more especially in the primitive community amongst whom they were uttered, and of which Hegesippus was himself a later member; and they would certainly have been treasured by one who was so careful a collector and transmitter of "the unerring tradition of the apostolic preaching." No saying is more likely to have been preserved by tradition, both from its own character, brevity, and origin, and from the circumstances under which it was uttered, and there can be no reason for limiting it amongst written records to Luke's Gospel. The omission of the prayer from very important codices of Luke further weakens the claim of that Gospel to the passage. Beyond these general considerations, however, there is the important and undoubted fact that the prayer which Hegesippus represents James as uttering does not actually agree with the prayer of Jesus in the third Gospel. So far from proving the use of Luke, therefore, this merely fragmentary and partial agreement, on the contrary, rather proves that he did not know that Gospel, for on the supposition of his making use of the third Synoptic at all for such a purpose, and merely fabricating a prayer for his hero, why did he not give the prayer as he found it in Luke?

¹ The Clementine Homilies give the prayer of Jesus. *Ἡμεῖς, ἀποφασίζομεν ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ὡς ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.* Hom., xi. 20.

² i. e.

³ The passage we are considering was certainly not an original addition by the author of our present third gospel, but was derived from earlier sources. (Cf. *Ewald*, *Die drei ersten Evv.*, p. 156.)

⁴ "Ganz aus dem innersten Geiste Jesus' geschöpft." *Ewald*, *Die drei ersten Evv.*, p. 36.

We have still to consider a fragment of Hegesippus preserved to us by Stephanus Gobarus, a learned monophysite of the sixth century, which reads as follows: "That the good things prepared for the righteous neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor have they entered into the heart of man. Hegesippus, however, an ancient and apostolic man, how moved I know not, says in the fifth book of his Memoirs that these words are vainly spoken, and that those who say these things give the lie to the divine writings and to the Lord saying: Blessed are your eyes that see, and your ears that hear," &c. Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὅτι ἀκούοντες, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.¹ We believe that we have here an expression of the strong prejudice against the Apostle Paul and his teaching which continued for so long to prevail amongst Jewish Christians and which is apparent in many writings of that period.² The quotation of Paul, 1 Corinthians ii. 9, differs materially from the Septuagint version of the passage in Isaiah lxiv. 4, and, as we have seen, the same passage quoted by "Clement of Rome,"³ differs both from the version of the LXX, and from the Epistle, although Clement took from the former. Jerome, however, found the passage in the *apocrypha* which he called "Ascensio Isaie,"⁴ and Origen, Jerome, and others ascribe it to the Apocalypse of Elia.⁵ This, however, does not concern us here, and we have merely to examine the meaning of the Lord," which Hegesippus opposes to the passage. *Blessed are your eyes that see and your ears that hear.*" This is compared with Matt. xiii. 16. But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. Ὅτι οὖν καὶ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὅτι ἀκούοντες, and also with Luke x. 23. "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," &c. We need not point out that the saying referred to by Hegesippus whilst conveying the same sense as that in the two Gospels, differs materially from them both as they do from each other, and as we might expect a quotation taken from a different though kindred source like the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to do. The whole of the passages which we have examined, indeed, states the same natural variation.

We have already referred to the expressions of Hegesippus regarding the heresies in the early Church: From these sprang the false Christs, and false prophets, and false apostles who divided the unity of the Church by corrupting doctrine - corrupting

¹ Photius, Bibl. Cod., 232, vol. 893.

² Baur, Gesch. chr. Kirche, i. p. 84 f.; Paulus, p. 252 ff. B. p. 111 f.; Bauer, Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 35 f.; Schenck, Die apocryphen Zehn, i. p. 153 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 132 f.; p. 57 f. 164 f.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse p. 19 f.; Hilgenfeld, Der Kanon, p. 28 f.

³ Ep. ad Corinth. xxiv.

⁴ Comm. Is., lxiv. 4.

⁵ Cf. Cotelierus, Patr. Apost., in notis ad Constit. post., vi. 16.

God and
in J's
with s
Consti
discuss
circle
Hebrew
illustra
Tisch
imagina
New T
of a sh
posed to
evidenc
able. E
nonical
of the C
tion than
the Hebr
of the op
travels th
purpose
ment Can
in A.D. 10
Hegesipp
pel accor
together

THE tes
conts of
tics) with
composed
no questio
the elect

Koch, p.
11, 12, 13
Wand w
Koch, p.
11, 12, 13
Koch, p.
11, 12, 13
Koch, p.
11, 12, 13
Koch, p.
11, 12, 13

God and his Christ."¹ We have shown how this recalls quotations in Justin of sayings of Jesus foreign to our Gospels, in common with similar expressions in the Clementine Homilies,² Apostolic Constitutions,³ and Clementine Recognitions,⁴ and we need not discuss the matter further. This community of reference, in a circle known to have made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to matters foreign to our Synoptics, furnishes collateral illustration of the influence of that Gospel.

Tischendorf, who so eagerly searches for every trace, real or imaginary, of the use of our Gospels and of the existence of a New Testament Canon, passes over in silence, with the exception of a short note⁵ devoted to the denial that Hegesippus was opposed to Paul, this first writer of Christian Church history, whose evidence, could it have been adduced, would have been so valuable. He does not pretend that Hegesippus made use of the Canonical Gospels, or knew of any other Holy Scriptures than those of the Old Testament, and, on the other hand, he does not mention that he possessed, and quoted from, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Nothing is more certain than the fact that, in spite of the opportunity for collecting information afforded him by his travels through so many Christian communities for the express purpose of such inquiry, Hegesippus did not find any New Testament Canon, or that such a rule of faith did not yet exist in Rome in A.D. 160-170.⁶ There is no evidence whatever to show that Hegesippus recognized any other evangelic work than the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as the source of his knowledge, together with tradition, of the words of the Lord.⁷

2.

THE testimony of Papias is of great interest and importance in connection with our inquiry, inasmuch as he is the first ecclesiastical writer who mentions the tradition that Matthew and Mark composed written records of the life and teaching of Jesus; but no question has been more continuously contested than that of the identity of the works to which he refers with our actual

¹ *Evangel.*, II. E. iv. 22.

² *ibid.*, cf. 18.

³ *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 19.

⁴ *Kanon, Der Ursprung*, p. 57 f.; *Uredner, Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 76 ff.; *Monte, i. p. 51*; *Schotten, Die alt. Zeugnisse*, 19; *Ritschl, Entsteh. altk. Kirche*.

⁵ *ibid.*, *Neu. Jhr.*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 206 f., 238 f., 343 ff.; *Reuss, Gesch.*

⁶ *N. T.*, p. 290; cf. *Westcott, On the Canon*, p. 184.

⁷ *ibid.*, *Neu. Jhr.*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 206; *Uredner, Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 80, p. 143.

² xvi. 21.

³ iv. 34.

Canonical Gospels. Papias was Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia¹ in the first half of the second century, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius about A.D. 164-167.² About the middle of the second century³ he wrote a work in five books, entitled, "Exposition of the Lord's Oracles"⁴ (*Δογματικὴν ἐξηγήσιν*), which, with the exception of a few fragments preserved chiefly to us by Eusebius and Irenæus, is, unfortunately, no longer extant. This work was less based on written records of the teaching of Jesus than on that which Papias had been able to collect from tradition,⁵ which he considered more authentic, for, like his contemporary Hegesippus, Papias avowedly prefers tradition to any written works with which he was acquainted. In the preface to his book he himself stated: "I shall not hesitate to set beside my interpretations all that I rightly learnt from the Presbyters, and rightly remembered, earnestly testifying to its truth. For I was not, like the multitude, delighting in those who speak much, but in those who teach the truth, nor in those who record alien commandments but in those who recall those delivered by the Lord to faith, and which come from truth itself. If it happened that any one came who had followed the Presbyters, I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord say, for I held that what was to be derived from books did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice (of tradition)."⁶ (*Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτον με ὠφελεῖν ἐπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης*). It is clear from this that, even if Papias knew any of our Gospels, he attached little or no value to them,⁷ and that he knew absolutely

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 36, 39; Hieron., De Vir Ill., 18.

² Chron. Pasch., i. 481.

³ Anger, Synops. Evv., p. xiii. n. 4; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 94 f.; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 97; Delitzsch, Unters. Entst. Matth. Ev., p. 8, p. 10; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 226, ann. I; Guericke, H'buch Kirchengesch., p. 204, ann. I; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 344; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv., p. 248; Neolaus, Études crit. N. T., p. 16, note 2; Renan, Vie de Jésus, xii^e. ed. p. 6; Scholten, Das alt. Evang., p. 249; Thiersch, Versuch, p. 438; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 105, p. 113; Volkmar, Die Evangelien, 1870, p. 548, Der Ursprung, p. 59, p. 163; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 60, note 1; Weissäcker, Unters. üb. d. evang. Gesch., p. 27; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 222; Zahn, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 668.

⁴ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 39.

⁵ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 23 f.; Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 27 f.; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 94; Stettin, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1868, p. 67 ff.; Weissäcker, Evang. Gesch., p. 27 f.; Zahn, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 673 f.

⁶ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 39.

⁷ With reference to this last sentence of Papias, Tischendorf asks: "What books does he refer to here, perhaps our Gospels? According to the expression

nothing
work
tion o
viously
dicated
κυριακῶν
The
served
ing tha
by Ari
John, E
commun
to the i
been the
was a to
opinions
"the her
of Polyc
but this
that, in t
he was h

this is not
degree impr
of the "wh
our Gospels
claration of
statement of
1 Baur, U
Beitrage, i.
Theol., 186
nopt. Evv.,
heff, Einl. p
30 f.; Rena
p. 15 ff.; B
u. s. w., p. 1
2 Credner,
3 Graber,
Klostermann
Johann., 186
Krit., 1866,
4 Bleek, Ein
T. i. p. 314;
Gesch., p. 70
Voices Isr.,
f., Der Kanon
N. T., p. 175
Evang., p. 24
Unters. üb.
note 5; Hug
4; cf. Gueric
u., p. lxxii. n
Einl. Offenb.
3 Adv. Hae

nothing of Canonical Scriptures of the New Testament.¹ His work was evidently intended to furnish a more complete collection of the discourses of Jesus from oral tradition than any previously existing, with his own expositions, and this is plainly indicated by his own words, and by the title of his work, *Λογίων κυριακών ἐξηγήσεις*.²

The most interesting part of the work of Papias which is preserved to us is that relating to Matthew and Mark. After stating that Papias had inserted in his book accounts of Jesus given by Aristion, of whom nothing is known, and by the Presbyter John, Eusebius proceeds to extract a tradition regarding Mark communicated by the latter. There has been much controversy as to the identity of the Presbyter John, some affirming him to have been the Apostle,³ but the great majority of critics deciding that he was a totally different person.⁴ Irenæus, who, sharing the Chiliastic opinions of Papias, held him in high respect, boldly calls him "the hearer of John" (meaning the Apostle) "and a companion of Polycarp" (*ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος γεγονώς*);⁵ but this is expressly contradicted by Eusebius, who points out that, in the preface to his book, Papias by no means asserts that he was himself a hearer of the Apostles, but merely that he re-

this is not impossible, but from the whole character of the book in the highest degree improbable." (*Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 109.) We know little or nothing of the "whole character" of the book, and what we do know is contradictory to our Gospels. The natural and only reasonable course is to believe the express declaration of Papias, more especially as it is made, in this instance, as a prefatory statement of his belief.

¹ *Baur*, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 537, *Das Markus Evang.*, p. 191 f.; *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 23 f.; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 468; *Hilgenfeld*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 334 f.; *Der Kanon*, p. 13 ff., p. 20, p. 147; *Holtzmann*, *Die synopt. Evv.*, p. 249 ff.; *Gieseler*, *Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 171 f., 178 ff., 199; *Mayerhoff*, *Einkl. petr. Schr.*, p. 235, *ann.*, 1; *Nicolas*, *Et. crit. N. T.*, p. 15 ff., 20 ff., 30 f.; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, xiii^{me} ed. p. li., p. liv. f.; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 15 ff.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 176, p. 164. cf. *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 102, p. 109 f.

² *Credner*, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 27 f.

³ *Grahe*, *Spicil. Patr.*, ii. p. 17; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 30, *ann.* 2; *Klostermann*, *Das Markusevang.*, p. 326; *Riggenbach*, *Die Zeugn. f. das Ev. Johanna*, 1866, p. 110 ff.; *Routh*, *Reliq. Sacre*, i. p. 22 f.; *Zahn*, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 665.

⁴ *Beck*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 95; *Credner*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 69; *Davidson*, *Introc. N. T.*, p. 314; *Deitzsch*, *Unters. Entst. kan. Evv.*, p. 8; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. krit. ev. Gesch.*, p. 767, *ann.* 2, p. 786; *Ewald*, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1849, p. 205, *Gesch. Volkes Isr.*, vi. p. 169 ff., vii. p. 226, *ann.* 1; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 339 f., *Der Kanon*, p. 13, p. 214, *ann.* 1; *Nicolas*, *Et. cr. N. T.*, p. 14 f.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 175 ff.; *Steitz*, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, p. 71 ff.; *Scholten*, *Das ält. Evang.*, p. 241; *Schott*, *authen. d. kan. Ev. n. Matth.*, 1837, p. 87; *Weizsäcker*, *Unters. dñ. evang. Gesch.*, p. 28 f., *ann.* 2; *Westcott*, *on the Canon*, p. 59, and *note 5*; *Hay*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 57; *Meyer*, *Kr. ex. H'buch Ev. Matth.*, 5 *auf.* p. 4; cf. *Guericke*, *Gesammitg.*, p. 147 f., *ann.* 3; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, xiii^{me} ed. p. xl., p. lxxii. *note 1*; *Hengstenberg*, *Die Offenbarung Joh. ii. 2*, p. 101 ff.; *Lücke*, *Einkl. Offenb. Joh.*, 2 *auf.* ii. p. 540 ff.

⁵ *Adv. Har.*, v. 33, § 4; *Eusebius*, *H. E.*, iii. 39.

ceived the doctrines from those who had personally known them ;¹ and after making the quotation from Papias which we have given above, he goes on to point out that the name of John is twice mentioned, once together with Peter, James, and Matthew, and the other Apostles, "evidently the Evangelist," and the other John he mentions separately, ranking him amongst those who are not Apostles, and placing Aristion before him, distinguishing him clearly by the name of Presbyter.² He further refers to the statement of the great Bishop of Alexandria, Dionysius,³ that at Ephesus there were two tombs, each bearing the name of John, thereby leading to the inference that there were two men of the name.⁴ There can be no doubt that Papias himself in the passage quoted mentions two persons of the name of John, distinguishing the one from the other, and classing the one amongst the Apostles and the other after Aristion, an unknown "disciple of the Lord," and, but for the phrase of Irenæus, so characteristically uncritical and assumptive, there probably never would have been any doubt raised as to the meaning of the passage. The question is not of importance to us, and we may leave it, with the remark that a writer who suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, c. A.D. 165, can scarcely have been a hearer of the Apostles.⁵

The account which the Presbyter John is said to have given of Mark's Gospel is as follows: "This also the Presbyter said: Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately whatever he remembered, though he did not arrange in order the things which were either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord, nor followed him; but afterwards, as I said, accompanied Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and not as making a consecutive record of the Lord's discourses. Mark, therefore, committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For of one point he was careful, to omit none of the things which he heard, and not to narrate any of them falsely.' These facts Papias relates concerning Mark."⁶ The

¹ Adv. Hær., v. 33, § 4; *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 39.

² *Euseb.*, H. E., iii. 39; cf. *Hieron.*, De Vir. Ill., 18.

³ *Ib.*, H. E., vii. Proem.

⁴ *Ib.*, vii. 25; cf. *Hieron.*, De Vir. Ill., 9.

⁵ *Ewald*, Gesch. Volkes Isr., vii. p. 226, ann. 1; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 105.

⁶ "Καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε. Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρον γενομένος, ὅσα ἐκηρυχόμενα, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οἱ μὲν τὰ ταῦτα τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Οὐτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ· ἕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφη, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγιον, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτι Μάρκος, οὕτως ἐν τῇ γράφῃ, ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποιοῦντο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς." Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰσθόρηται τῷ Παπῇ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. *Euseb.*, H. E., iii. 39.

quest
Canon

The
the in
secrets
or doe
tive of
positio
tion is
Gospel
Church
the evi
ical Go
Paul),
in writ
quotes
lished
The cau
was this
and pro
being m
and rem
spoken;
those w
ther abs
the same
lished m

publish
"The so

¹ Most e
Anmerk. z.
p. 47 ff.;
p. 1280.

² *Irenæus*
iv. 5; *Orig*
iii. 7.

⁴ *Metā*
Πέτρον, κ
δεδώκε.

⁵ Το δὲ λ
ρον δημο
γέλιον ἐξ
Μάρκου, ὁ
λεχθέντων
μεταδοῦν
πρεπτικῶς

⁶ *Iloet et*
Capit magis

question to decide is, whether the work here described is our Canonical Gospel or not.

The first point in this account is the statement that Mark was the interpreter of Peter (*ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου*). Was he merely the secretary of the Apostle writing in a manner from his dictation, or does the passage mean that he translated the Aramaic narrative of Peter into Greek? ¹ The former is the more probable supposition and that which is most generally adopted, but the question is not material here. The connection of Peter with the Gospel according to Mark was generally affirmed in the early Church, as was also that of Paul with the third Gospel, ² with the evident purpose of claiming apostolic origin for all the Canonical Gospels. ³ Irenæus says: "After their decease (Peter and Paul), Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing that which had been preached by Peter." ⁴ Eusebius quotes a similar tradition from Clement of Alexandria, embellished however with further particulars. He says: ". . . The cause for which the Gospel according to Mark was written was this: When Peter had publicly preached the word at Rome, and proclaimed the Gospel by the spirit, those who were present being many, requested Mark, as he had followed him from afar, and remembered what he had said, to write down what he had spoken; and when he had composed the Gospel, he gave it to those who had asked it of him; which when Peter knew he neither absolutely hindered nor encouraged it." ⁵ Tertullian repeats the same tradition. He says: "And the Gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was. . . for it may rightly appear that works which disciples publish are of their masters." ⁶ We have it again from Origen: "The second (Gospel) is according to Mark, written as Peter

¹ Most critics agree to the former, but the following assert the latter: *Volkmar*, *Anmerk. z. Credner's Gesch.* N. T. Kanon, p. 136, *Geschichtstreue Theol.*, 1858, p. 47 ff.; *Valesius*, *Not. ad Euseb.*, H. E. iii. 39; *Bertholdt*, *Einl. A. u. N. T.* iii. p. 1280.

² *Irenæus*, *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 1; cf. *Eusebius*, H. E., v. 8; *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 5; *Origen*, ap. *Euseb.*, H. E., vi. 25; *Eusebius*, H. E. iii. 4; *Hieron*, *De Vir.* iii., 7.

³ Cf. *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

⁴ Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἐξοδὸν, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ἐπὶ Πέτρου κηρύσσοντα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παρέδωκε. *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, § 1; *Euseb.*, H. E., v. 8.

⁵ Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ταύτην ἐσχημέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν. Τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ Πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεπύργως, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μερμηρμένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅπερ ἐπιγινόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρέπων αὐτὸν μὴτε κωλύσαι μὴτε προτρέψασθαι. *Euseb.*, H. E., vi. 14.

⁶ Licet et Marcus quod edidit Petri affirmetur, ejus interpretes Marcus. *Capit magistrorum videri, que discipuli promulgant.* *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5.

directed him.¹ Eusebius gives a more detailed and advanced version of the same tradition. So much, however, did the effulgence of piety illuminate the minds of those (Romans) who heard Peter, that it did not content them to hear but once, nor to receive only the unwritten doctrine of the divine teaching, but with reiterated entreaties they besought Mark, to whom the Gospel is ascribed, as the companion of Peter, that he should leave them a written record of the doctrine thus orally conveyed. Nor did they cease their entreaties until they had persuaded the man, and thus became the cause of the writing of the Gospel called according to Mark. They say, moreover, that the Apostle (Peter) having become aware, through revelation to him of the Spirit, of what had been done, was delighted with the ardour of the men, and ratified the work in order that it might be read in the churches. This narrative is given by Clement in the sixth book of his Institutions, whose testimony is supported by that of Papias the Bishop of Hierapolis.² The account given by Clement, however, by no means contained these details, as we have seen. In his "Demonstration of the Gospel" Eusebius, referring to the same tradition, affirms that it was the modesty of Peter which prevented his writing a Gospel himself.³ Jerome almost repeats the preceding account of Eusebius: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, being entreated by the brethren of Rome, wrote a short Gospel according to what he had received from Peter, which when Peter heard, he approved, and gave his authority for its being read in the Churches, as Clement writes in the sixth book of his Institutions,"⁴ &c. Jerome moreover says that Peter had Mark for an interpreter, "whose Gospel was composed: Peter narrating and he writing (cujus evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est.)" It is evident that all these writers merely repeat with variations the tradition regarding the first two Gospels which Papias originated.⁵ Irenæus dates the

¹ δευτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ, ποιήσαντα. Comment. in Matt. Euseb., H. E., vi. 25.

² . . . τοῦτο δ' ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκορατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διακοαῖς εὐσεβείας φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἰκανῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοή, μηδὲ τῇ ἀγνέφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ, παρακληθεῖσι δὲ παντοδατοῖς Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκολουθεῖν ὅσα Πέτρον διπαρήσθαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγον παραδεδειγμένης αὐτοῖς καταλείψει διδασκαλίας, μὴ προτερόν τε ἀνεῖναι, ἢ κατεργάσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ταύτη αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. Γινόντα δὲ τὸ πράξιν φασὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον, ἀποκαλεψάντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ, κυράσθαι τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἐντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (Κλήμης ἐν ἐκτῷ τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων παρατίθεται τὴν ἱστορίαν, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Πάπιας) κ.τ.λ. Euseb., H. E., ii. 15.

³ Demonstr. Evang. iii. 5.

⁴ De Vir. Ill., 8.

⁵ Ad Hedib., c. 2.

⁶ Hug., Einl. N. T. ii. § 8—12; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 237, ann. 1; Baur, Das Markus Evang., 1851, p. 129; Cellerier, Introd. au N. T., p. 234 f.

writin
Cleme
tle pr
howev
and a
taking
of bein
his aut
the sa
repeats
dition
petuate
overloo
to the
In a
Papias
expect
cxamin
of the
ancy b
on Pete
instanc
the dist
omitted
lous dri
in the th
of "Pet
it is "in
name be

¹ A simi
the Gospel
Chrysostom
the second
tradition a
argued for
the diseas
² Cf. Rev
Einl. N. T.
³ Alford
133 ff., Un
trad. N. T.
ment, qua
Gieseler, Ed
290, ann. 1
dev. Gesch
Neudecker,
⁴ Dem. E
i. p. 123.
⁵ Cf. Mar
⁷ Mark i.

writing of Mark after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome. Clement describes Mark as writing during Peter's life, the Apostle preserving absolute neutrality. By the time of Eusebius, however, the tradition has acquired new and miraculous elements and a more decided character—Peter is made aware of the undertaking of Mark through a revelation of the Spirit, and instead of being neutral is delighted and lends the work the weight of his authority. Eusebius refers to Clement and Papias as giving the same account, which they do not, however, and Jerome merely repeats the story of Eusebius without naming him, and the tradition which he had embellished thus becomes endorsed and perpetuated. Such is the growth of tradition;¹ it is impossible to overlook the mythical character of the information we possess as to the origin of the second Canonical Gospel.²

In a Gospel so completely inspired by Peter as the tradition of Papias and of the early Church indicates, we may reasonably expect to find unmistakable traces of Petrine influence, but on examination it will be seen that they are totally wanting.³ Some of the early Church did not fail to remark this singular discrepancy between the Gospel and the tradition of its dependence on Peter, and in reply Eusebius adopts an apologetic tone.⁴ For instance, in the brief account of the calling of Simon in Mark, the distinguishing addition: "called Peter," of the first Gospel is omitted,⁵ and still more notably the whole narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes, which gives the event such prominence in the third Gospel.⁶ In Matthew, Jesus goes into the house of "Peter" to cure his wife's mother of a fever, whilst in Mark it is "into the house of Simon and Andrew," the less honourable name being still continued.⁷ Matthew commences the catalogue

¹ A similar discrepancy of tradition is to be observed as to the place in which the Gospel was written, Irenaeus and others dating it from Rome, and others (as Chrysostom, in Matth. Homil. i.), assigning it to Egypt. Indeed some MSS. of the second Gospel have the words *εγγραφη εν Αλεξανδρεια* in accordance with this tradition as to its origin. Cf. Scholz, Einl. N. T., i. p. 201. Various critics have argued for its composition at Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. We do not go into the discussion as to whether Peter ever was in Rome.

² Cf. Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 178; Baur, Das Markus Evang., p. 133; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 589 ff.

³ Alford, Greek Test., 1868, Proleg. i. p. 34 f.; Baur, Das Marcus Evang., p. 133 ff., Unters. kan. Evv., p. 539; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 123; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 83; Eichhorn Einl. N. T. i. p. 602 ff., 610 ff.; Griesbach, Comment. qua Marci Evang. totum e Matth. et Luc. Comm. decerpt. esse demonstratur; Gieseler, Entst. sehr. K. v. p. 152 f.; Hülgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1864, p. 290, ann. 1; Schleiermacher, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1832, p. 758 ff.; Storr, Zweck d. ev. Gesch. u. Br. Johann., p. 249 ff., 366 ff.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 203 ff.; Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 227 ff.; Wilcke, Tradition and Myth., 1837, p. 52 f.


⁴ Dem. Ev., iii. 3; cf. Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 539; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 123.

⁵ Cf. Mark i. 16, 17; Matt iv. 18.



⁷ Mark i. 29.

⁶ Luke v. 1—11.






**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**




6'



Photographic Sciences Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503



15
14
13
12
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

of the twelve by the pointed indication: "The first, Simon, who is called Peter,"¹ thus giving him precedence, whilst Mark merely says: "And Simon he surnamed Peter."² The important episode of Peter's walking on the sea of the first Gospel³ is altogether ignored by Mark. The enthusiastic declaration of Peter: "Thou art the Christ,"⁴ is only followed by the chilling injunction to tell no one, in the second Gospel,⁵ whilst Matthew not only gives greater prominence to the declaration of Peter, but gives the reply of Jesus: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona," &c.,—of which Mark apparently knows nothing,—and then proceeds to the most important episode in the history of the Apostle, the celebrated words by which the surname of Peter was conferred upon him: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church," &c.⁶ The Gospel supposed to be inspired by Peter, however, totally omits this most important passage; as it also does the miracle of the finding the tribute money in the fish's mouth, narrated by the first Gospel.⁷ Luke states that "Peter and John" are sent to prepare the Passover, whilst Mark has only "two disciples;"⁸ and in the account of the last Supper, Luke gives the address of Jesus to Peter: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (all) that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."⁹ Of this Mark does not say a word. Again, after the denial, Luke reads: "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter, and Peter remembered the word of the Lord, &c., and Peter went out and wept bitterly;"¹⁰ whereas Mark omits the reproachful look of Jesus, and makes the penitence of Peter depend merely on the second crowing of the cock, and further modifies the penitence by the omission of "bitterly"—"And when he thought thereon he wept."¹¹ There are other instances to which we need not refer. Not only are some of the most important episodes in which Peter is represented by other Gospels as a principal actor altogether omitted, but throughout the Gospel there is the total absence of anything which is specially characteristic of Petrine influence and teaching. The argument that these omissions are due to the modesty of Peter is quite untenable, for not only does Irenæus, the most ancient authority on the point, state that this Gospel was only written after the death of Peter,¹² but also there is no modesty in

¹ Matt. x. 2.² Mark iii. 16.³ Matt. xiv. 22—33.⁴ Matt. xxi. 15; "the son of the living God," xvi. 16.⁵ Mark viii. 27—30; cf. *Baur*, *Das Mareus Ev.*, p. 133.⁶ Matt. xvi. 16—19.⁷ Matt. xvii. 24—27.⁸ Luke xxii. 8; Mark xiv. 13.⁹ Luke xxii. 31, 32.¹⁰ *Ib.*, 61, 62; cf. Matt. xxvi. 75.¹¹ Mark xiv. 27.¹² *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1. § 1; *Euseb.*, *H. E.*, v. 8. See quot., p. 359, note 3.

omitting passages of importance in the history of Jesus, simply because Peter himself was in some way concerned in them, or, for instance, in decreasing his penitence for such a denial of his master, which could not but have filled a sad place in the Apostle's memory. On the other hand, there is no adequate record of special matter, which the intimate knowledge of the doings and sayings of Jesus possessed by Peter might have supplied, to counterbalance the singular omissions. There is infinitely more of the spirit of Peter in the first Gospel than there is in the second. The whole internal evidence, therefore, shows that this part of the tradition of the Presbyter John transmitted by Papias does not apply to our Gospel.

The discrepancy, however, is still more marked when we compare with our actual second Gospel the account of the work of Mark which Papias received from the Presbyter. Mark wrote down from memory some parts (*ἔνα*) of the teaching of Peter regarding the life of Jesus, but as Peter adapted his instructions to the actual circumstances (*πρὸς τὰς χρείας*), and did not give a consecutive report (*σύνταξις*) of the discourses or doings of Jesus, Mark was only careful to be accurate, and did not trouble himself to arrange in historical order (*τάξις*) his narrative of the things which were said and done by Jesus, but merely wrote down facts as he remembered them. This description would lead us to expect a work composed of fragmentary reminiscences of the teaching of Peter, without regular sequence or connection. The absence of orderly arrangement is the most prominent feature in the description, and forms the burden of the whole. Mark writes "what he remembered;" "he did not arrange in order the things that were either said or done by Christ;" and then follow the apologetic expressions of explanation—he was not himself a hearer or follower of the Lord, but derived his information from the occasional preaching of Peter, who did not attempt to give a consecutive narrative. Now it is impossible in the work of Mark here described to recognize our present second Gospel, which does not depart in any important degree from the order of the other two Synoptics, and which, throughout, has the most evident character of orderly arrangement. The Gospel opens formally, and after presenting John the Baptist as the Messenger sent to prepare the way of the Lord, proceeds to the baptism of Jesus, his temptation, his entry upon public life, and his calling of the disciples. Then after a consecutive narrative of his teaching and works, the history ends with a full and consecutive account of the last events in the life of Jesus, his trial, crucifixion, and resurrection. There is in the Gospel every characteristic of artistic and orderly arrangement, from the striking introduction by

the prophetic voice crying in the wilderness to the solemn close of the marvellous history.¹ The great majority of critics, therefore, are agreed in concluding that the account of the Presbyter John recorded by Papias does not apply to our second Canonical Gospel at all.² Many of those who affirm that the description of Papias may apply to our second Gospel³ do so with hesitation, and few maintain that we now possess the original work without considerable subsequent alteration. Some of these critics, however, feeling the difficulty of identifying our second Gospel with the work here described, endeavour to reconcile the discrepancy by a fanciful interpretation of the account of Papias. They suggest that the first part, in which the want of chronological order is pointed out, refers to the rough notes which Mark

¹ Augustine calls Mark the follower and abbreviator of Matthew. "Tanquam pedisequus et breviator Matthæi." De Consensu Evang. i. 2.

² Baur, Unters. kann. Evv., p. 536 ff.; Das Markus Ev., pp. 118, 128—133; Bertholdt, Einl. A. u. N. T., iii. p. 1278 ff.; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 123, p. 205; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 80 ff.; cf. i. p. 464; Theol. Rev. iv., 1867, p. 498; Delitzsch, Entst. d. Matt. Ev., p. 110 f.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 596 ff.; Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss. 1849, p. 205 ff., cf. 207; Gfrörer Urchristenthum, II. i. p. 13 ff.; Allg. K. G., 1841, i. p. 166 ff.; Griesbach, Comment. qua. Mar. Ev. tot. e Matt. et Luc. Comment. decrept. esse demonstratur; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv., p. 252 ff., cf. 367 ff.; A. Kayser, Rev. de Théol., viii. 1854, p. 107; Köstlin, Urspr. synopt. Evv., pp. 99, 358, 385; Lachmann, De Ordine narr. in Evang. Synopt. Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1835; Mayerhoff, Einl., petr. Schr. p. 235 ann. 1; Neander, Pflanz. d. chr. Kirche, 5. Aufl. p. 464 f., ann. 2; Neudecker, Einl. N. T. p. 232 ff.; Nicolas, Et. crit. N. T. p. 41, p. 88 ff.; Réville, Et. crit. sur l'Ev. selon S. Matt.; Renan, Vie de Jésus, xiii^{me} ed. p. lii. f.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 177 f.; N. Rev. de Théol., ii. 1858, p. 62 f.; Rumpf, N. Rev. de Théol., v. 1867, p. 32, p. 360; Saunier, Ueb. Quell. des Ev. Marci, 1825; Scherer, N. Rev. de Théol., iii. 1859, p. 307, viii. 1861, p. 295 ff.; Schleiermacher, Stud. u. Krit., 1832, p. 758 ff.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 15 ff.; Das alt. Evang., p. 245 ff., p. 248; Das Ev. nach Joh., p. xxiii. f.; Strauss, Das Leben Jesu, p. 50 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. pp. 457—460; Storr, Zweck d. evang. Gesch. u. Br. Joh., p. 249 ff., 265 ff.; Semler, Zusätze zu Townson's Abh. üb. 4 Ev., i. p. 21; Thilke, Zur Biographie Jesu, p. 33 f.; Weizsäcker, Unters. üb. evang. Gesch., p. 118 ff.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 204 f.; Zeller, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1865, p. 406.

³ Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 118; Ebrard, Wiss. krit. ev. Gesch., p. 793 ff.; Feilmoser, Einl. N. T., 2. ausg. p. 103 f.; Gieseler, Entst. sehr. Evv., p. 122 ff.; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 147, ff.; cf. Beitr. Einl. N. T. 1828, p. 47 f.; Hilgenfeldt, Die Evangelien, p. 148 f.; Das Markus Ev., 103 ff.; cf. 118; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1864, p. 290, ann. 1; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 32, ann. 5, 6; Klostermann, Das Markus Ev., p. 341 f.; Horne, Introd. H. S., 1869, iv. p. 434 f.; Lücke, Stud. u. Krit., 1833, p. 499 ff.; Meyer, Kr. ex. H'buch Evv. d. Markus, u. Luk. 6. Aufl. p. 3 ff., 10 ff.; H'buch Matth., p. 35 ff.; Reithmayr, Einl. can. Bücher N. B., 1852, p. 381 ff.; Steitz, Stud. u. Krit., 1868, p. 38 ff.; Schenkel, Das Charakterbild Jesu, 1864, p. 332 f.; Thiersch, Versuch z. Herst. hist. Standp. d. Krit. N. T., Schr. p. 179 ff., 193, 212 f., 340; cf. Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 105; Tholuck, Glaubw. d. ev. Gesch., pp. 239—267, 262 ff.; Tischenorff, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 106; Weiss, Stud. u. Krit., 1861, p. 672 ff.; Jahrb. deutsche Theol., 1865, ii. p. 287 f.; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 63 f.; Weiss, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 2^e ff., 56 ff.; Evangelienfrage, p. 144 ff.; Zahn, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 690 ff.; cf. Hug, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 111 ff.; Wülke, Tradition und Mythe, 1837, p. 47 ff.

made
the la
remod
arbitr
by ap
It li
duced
one of
Gospe
of Jes
of the
the di
seems
of Pet
Cleme
nounc
was h
Nazia
althou
one of
probab
tine ho
describ
Rome i
It must
ascriber
of Pete

¹ H. A.
178 ff.; D.
p. 332.

² Bleek
ity of the
amongst t

³ Baur,
ff.; Credn
N. T., ii.

⁴ Schwe
⁵ Origen
⁶ Strom

351 ff.)
⁷ The w
the preach

⁸ De Pr
⁹ Ep. xv

Beiträge,
petr. Schr.

¹⁰ Credne
Schweigler,
Mayerhoff,
¹¹ Credne
Reuss, Ges

made during the actual preaching and lifetime of Peter, and that the latter part applies to our present Gospel, which he later remodelled into its present shape.¹ This most unreasonable and arbitrary application of the words of Papias is denounced even by apologists.²

It has been well argued that the work here described as produced by Mark in the character of *ἑρμηνεύς Πέτρον* is much more one of the same family as the Clementine Homilies than of our Gospels.³ The work was no systematic narrative of the history of Jesus, nor report of his teaching, but the dogmatic preaching of the Apostle, illustrated and interspersed with passages from the discourses of Jesus or facts from his life.⁴ Of this character seems actually to have been that ancient work "The Preaching of Peter" (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρον*), which was used by Heracleon⁵ and by Clement⁶ of Alexandria as an authentic canonical work,⁷ denounced by Origen⁸ on account of the consideration in which it was held by many, but still quoted with respect by Gregory of Nazianzum.⁹ There can be no doubt that the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρον*, although it failed to obtain a permanent place in the canon, was one of the most ancient works of the Christian Church, dating probably from the first century, from which indeed the Clementine homilies themselves were produced,¹⁰ and, like the work described by Papias, it also was held to have been composed in Rome in connection with the preaching there of Peter and Paul.¹¹ It must be noted, moreover, that Papias does not call the work ascribed to Mark a Gospel, but merely a record of the preaching of Peter.

¹ H. A. W. Meyer, Komm. z. Matt., 5. Aufl. p. 38 ff.; Thiersch, Versuch, p. 178 ff.; Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 105; cf. Schenkel, Das Charakterbild Jesu, p. 332.

² Bleek, Beiträge, p. 171 f. Bleek expresses much doubt as to the applicability of the account of Papias to our second Gospel, although we have classed him amongst those who adopt it. Cf. Einl. N. T., pp. 118, 120.

³ Baur, Unters. üb. kan. Evv. p. 536; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 459 ff.; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 123; cf. Beiträge, i. p. 284 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 82 f. Cf. Hilgenfeld, Das Markus Ev., p. 115.

⁴ Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 459 f.

⁵ Origen, Comment. in Joan., xiii. 17.

⁶ Strom., i. 29, § 182, vi. 5, § 39, 6, § 48, 15 § 128; cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 351 ff.

⁷ The work is generally quoted by the latter with the introduction "Peter in the preaching says:" *Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κήρυγματι λέγει, κ.τ.λ.*

⁸ De Princip. Pref., 8.

⁹ Ep. xvi. (ad Cesar. i.); cf. Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T., i. p. 812; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 350; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 54; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr. p. 304 ff.

¹⁰ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 349 f.; Gfrörer, Allg. K. G., 1841, i. p. 257 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 30 ff.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 249 ff.; cf. Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 311 ff.

¹¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 360 f.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 31 f.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 250.

It is not necessary for us to account for the manner in which the work to which the Presbyter John referred disappeared, and the present Gospel according to Mark became substituted for it. The merely negative evidence that our actual Gospel is not the work described by Papias is sufficient for our purpose. Any one acquainted with the thoroughly uncritical character of the Fathers, and with the literary history of the early Christian Church, will readily conceive the facility with which this can have been accomplished. The great mass of intelligent critics are agreed that our Synoptic Gospels have assumed their present form only after repeated modifications by various editors of earlier evangelical works. These changes have not been effected without traces being left by which the various materials may be separated and distinguished, but the more primitive Gospels have entirely disappeared, supplanted by the later and amplified versions. The critic, however, who distinguishes between the earlier and later matter is not bound to perform the now impossible feat of producing the originals, or accounting in any but a general way for the disappearance of the primitive Gospel. In our investigation it is still less necessary to attempt such an explanation, for if our present Gospel cannot be proved to be the very work referred to by the Presbyter John, as most certainly it cannot, the evidence of Papias becomes fatal to the claims of the second Canonical Gospel.

Tischendorf asks: "How then has neither Eusebius nor any other theologian of Christian antiquity thought that the expressions of Papias were in contradiction with the two Gospels (Mt. and Mk.)?"¹ The absolute credulity with which these theologians accepted any fiction, however childish, which had a pious tendency, and the frivolous character of the tradition of Papias to our Gospels anything but singular, and it, is only surprising to find their silent acquiescence elevated into an argument. We have already in the course of these pages seen something of the singularly credulous and uncritical character of the Fathers, and we cannot afford space to give instances of the absurdities with which their writings abound. No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent, for their unsuspicious acceptance, if it assumed a pious form or tended to edification. No period in the history of the world ever produced so many spurious works as the first two or three centuries of our era. The name of every Apostle, or Christian teacher, not excepting that of the great Master himself, was freely attached to every description of religious forgery. False gospels, epistles, acts, martyrologies, were unscrupulously circulated, and such pious falsification was not

¹ Wann Wurden, u. s. w., p. 107.

even
sake
that
pious
works
is one
inquin
value,
of no
copies
matter
what
the pla
The
is as fo
dialect
are div
regardi
merely
account
ing wo
regardi
states t
byter, a
ing Ma
Eusebiu
—howe
reasona
from th
it is clea

¹ Canoni
more diffi
"The spi
7 f.

² Marc
'Houj' ve
³ Anger
Davidson,
439; Ebra
1834, 2, p.
1832, p. 1
187 f.; W

⁴ Celléri
cf. Das M
synopt. Ev
Matth., 18
⁵ Taurin
rou Marc

even intended or regarded as a crime, but perpetrated for the sake of edification. It was only slowly and after some centuries that many of these works, once, as we have seen, regarded with pious veneration, were excluded from the canon; and that genuine works shared this fate, whilst spurious ones usurped their places, is one of the surest results of criticism. The Fathers omitted to inquire critically when such investigation might have been of value, and mere tradition credulously accepted and transmitted is of no critical value.¹ In an age when the multiplication of copies of any work was a slow process, and their dissemination a matter of difficulty and even danger, it is easy to understand with what facility the more complete and artistic Gospel could take the place of the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου* as the work of Mark.

The account given by Papias of the work ascribed to Matthew is as follows: "Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able."² Critics are divided in opinion as to whether this tradition was, like that regarding Mark, derived from the Presbyter John,³ or is given merely on the authority of Papias himself.⁴ Eusebius joins the account of Mark to that given by Matthew merely by the following words: "These facts Papias relates concerning Mark; but regarding Matthew he has said as follows:"⁵ Eusebius distinctly states that the account regarding Mark is derived from the Presbyter, and the only reason for ascribing to him also that concerning Matthew is that it is not excluded by the phraseology of Eusebius, and the two passages being given by him consecutively—however they may have stood in the work of Papias—it is reasonable enough to suppose that the information was derived from the same source. The point is not of much importance, but it is clear that there is no absolute right to trace this statement

¹ Canon Westcott himself admits that "the proof of the Canon is rendered more difficult by the uncritical character of the first two centuries." He says: "The spirit of the ancient world was essentially uncritical." On the Canon, p. 7 f.

² Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμηνεύει δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατός ἕκαστος. Euseb., H. E., iii. 39.

³ Anger, Synops. Ev., p. 265 f.; Credner, Gesch. d. N. T. Canon, p. 27 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. p. 467; Delitzsch, Zeitschr. luther. Theol. 1850, p. 479; Ehrhard, Wiss. krit. ev. Gesch., p. 767; Kern, Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1834, 2, p. 5; Scholten, Das alt. Evang., p. 241; Sieffert, Urspr. erst. kan. Ev. 1832, p. 14 ff.; Thiersch, Versuch z. Herstell. Standp. d. Krit. N. T., 1845, p. 187 f.; Weiss, Die evang. Gesch., i. p. 30; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 62.

⁴ Crétier, Introd. au. N. T., p. 233; Hilgenfeld, Der Canon, p. 214, ann. 1; cf. Das Markus Ev., p. 109, ann. 3; Die Evangelien, p. 119; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv., p. 249; Hug, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 16; Meyer, Kr. ex. H'buch Ev. Matth., 1864, p. 4, ann.; Tholuck, Glaubw. evang. Gesch., 2 aufl. p. 239.

⁵ Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστορεῖται τῷ Παπῖα περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται. Euseb., H. E., iii. 39.

to the Presbyter John, as there is in the case of the tradition about Mark.

This passage has excited even more controversy than that regarding Mark, and its interpretation and application are still keenly debated. The intricacy and difficulty of the questions which it raises are freely admitted by some of the most earnest defenders of the Canonical Gospels, but the problem, so far as our examination is concerned, can be solved without much trouble. The dilemma in which apologists find themselves when they attempt closely to apply the description of this work given by Papias to our Canonical Gospel is the great difficulty which complicates the matter and prevents a clear and distinct solution of the question. We shall avoid minute discussion of details, contenting ourselves with the broader features of the argument, and seeking only to arrive at a just conclusion as to the bearing of the evidence of Papias upon the claim to authenticity of our Canonical Gospel.

The first point which we have to consider is the nature of the work which is here described. Matthew is said to have composed the *λόγια* or Oracles, and there can be little doubt from the title of his own book: "Exposition of the Lord's Oracles" (*Δογματῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*), that these oracles referred to by Papias were the Discourses of Jesus. Does the word *λόγια*, however, mean strictly Oracles or discourses alone, or does it include within its fair signification also historical narrative? Were the "*λόγια*" here referred to a simple collection of the discourses of Jesus, or a complete Gospel like that in our Canon bearing the name of Matthew? That the direct and natural interpretation of the word is merely "Discourses" is indirectly admitted, even by the most thorough apologists, when they confess the obscurity of the expression—obscurity, however, which simply appears to exist from the difficulty of straining the word to make it apply to the Gospel. "In these sentences," says Tischendorf, referring to the passage about Matthew, "there is much obscurity; for instance, it is doubtful whether we have rightly translated 'Discourses of the Lord,'¹ and he can only extend the meaning to include historical narrative by leaving the real meaning of the word and interpreting it by supposed analogy.

There can be no doubt that the direct meaning of the word *λόγια* anciently and at the time of Papias was simply: words or oracles of a sacred character, and however much the signification became afterwards extended, that it was not then at all applied to doings as well as sayings. There are many instances of this

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 106 f.

origin
there
at tha
of Jes
any r
sense.
sage u
cated.
Peter,
done b
apolog
lowed,
a conse
it is sa
doings,
be und
former
many c
our act
tained
histori
which t
based u
passage
interpre

1 "Unt
iii. 2. "
Heb. v. 1
II. Cf. J
2 Credu
1844, p. 2
p. 251 ff.
1835, p. 5
T., p. 175
S. Matth.
Theol. Stu
Das Chara
180 f.; St
Wieseler, C
Gesch., p.
3 Baur,
Introd. N.
Wiss. kr. d
amtgesch
Evangel. Tü
v. Nazara,
p. 119 f.; S
Vereuch z.
Tischendorf
b.; Westcot
Zahn, Th. 3

original and limited signification in the New Testament,¹ and there is no linguistic precedent for straining the expression, used at that period, to mean anything beyond a collection of sayings of Jesus which were estimated as oracular or divine, nor is there any reason for thinking that τὰ λόγια was used in any other sense.² It is argued, on the other hand, that in the preceding passage upon Mark, a more extended meaning of the word is indicated. The Presbyter John says that Mark, as the interpreter of Peter, wrote without order "the things which were either said or done by Christ" (τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), and then, apologizing for him, he goes on to say that Peter, whom he followed, adapted his teaching to the occasion, "and not as making a consecutive record of the discourses (λογίων) of the Lord." Here, it is said, the word λογίων is used in reference both to sayings and doings, and therefore in the passage on Matthew τὰ λόγια must not be understood to mean only λεχθέντα, but also includes, as in the former case, the πραχθέντα. For these and similar reasons,—in very many cases largely influenced by the desire to see in these λόγια our actual Gospel according to Matthew—many critics have maintained that τὰ λόγια in this place may be understood to include historical narrative as well as discourses.³ The arguments by which they arrive at this conclusion, however, seem to us to be based upon thorough misconception of the direct meaning of the passage. Few or none of these critics would deny that the simple interpretation of τὰ λόγια at that period was oracular sayings or

¹ "Unto them were committed the oracles of God," τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 2. "The first principles of the oracles of God," τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. v. 12. "Let him speak as the oracles of God," ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ, 1 Pet. iv. 11. Cf. *Suicer*, Thes. Eccles., ii. p. 247 f.

² *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 91, p. 752; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Comm. lib. Matth. 1844, p. 26 f.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss. 1849, p. 202; *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., p. 251 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. der synopt. Evv. p. 56; *Lachmann*, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1835, p. 577 ff.; *Mayer*, Kr. ex H'buch Evang. d. Matth., 11 f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 175 ff.; *N. Rev. de Théol.*, 1858, p. 46; *Révillat*, Etudes crit. sur l'Ev. selon S. Matth., pp. 1—13; *Rumpf*, N. Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 32; *Schleiermacher*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1832, d. 735 ff.; *Scholten*, Das alt. Ev., p. 240 f.; *Schenkel*, Das Charakterb. Jesu, p. 335; *Schneckenburger*, Urspr. erst. kan. Evang., 1834, p. 160 f.; *Steitz*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1868, p. 68 f.; *Weisse*, Evang. Gesch., i. p. 34 ff.; *Wieseler*, Chron. Synops. d. vier Evv., p. 300; *Weisäcker*, Unters. üb. evang. Gesch., p. 32.

³ *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 580 f.; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 96 f.; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., i. p. 467; *Delitzsch*, Unters. Entst. d. Matth. Ev., p. 10 f.; *Ehrhard*, Wiss. kr. evang. Gesch., p. 767 f.; *Feilmoser*, Einl. N. T., p. 76; *Guericke*, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 111; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 119; *Kern*, Urspr. erst. Evang. Tüb. Zeitschr., 1834, 2, p. 8 ff.; *Kuhn*, Leben Jesu, i. p. 18; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 56; *Lücke*, Stud. u. Krit., 1833, p. 499 ff.; *Nicolas*, Et. crit. N. T., p. 119 f.; *Schott*, Authen. d. kan. Ev. n. Matth., benannt 1837, p. 96 f.; *Thiersch*, Versuch z. Herst. d. Kr., &c., p. 186 ff.; *Die Kirche im apost. Zeit.*, p. 180 ff.; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 107; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 179, anm. b.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 62, note 2. (He admits the difficulty, however.) *Zahn*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 694.

discourses.¹ Papias shows his preference for discourses in the very title of his lost book, "Exposition of the *λογίων* of the Lord," and in the account which he gives of the works attributed to Mark and Matthew, the discourses evidently attracted his chief interest. Now, in the passage regarding Mark, instead of *λογίων* being made the equivalent of *λεχθέντα* and *πραχθέντα*, the very reverse is the fact. The Presbyter says Mark wrote what he remembered of the things which were said or done by Christ, although not in order, and he apologizes for his doing this on the ground that he had not himself been a *hearer* of the Lord, but merely reported what he had heard from Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and did not attempt to give a consecutive record of the discourses (*λογίων*) of the Lord. Mark, therefore, could not do so either. Matthew, on the contrary, he states, did compose the discourses (*τὰ λόγια*). There is an evident contrast made: Mark wrote *ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα* because he had not the means of writing the discourses, but Matthew composed the *λόγια*.² Papias clearly distinguishes the work of Mark, who had written reminiscences of what Jesus had said and done, from that of Matthew, who had made a collection of his discourses.³

It is impossible upon any but arbitrary grounds, and from a foregone conclusion, to maintain that a work commencing with a detailed history of the birth and infancy of Jesus, his genealogy, and the preaching of John the Baptist, and concluding with an equally minute history of his betrayal, trial, crucifixion, and resurrection, and which relates all the miracles, and has for its evident aim throughout the demonstration that Messianic prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus could be entitled *τὰ λόγια*: the oracles or discourses of the Lord.⁴ For these and other reasons, some of which shall presently be referred to, the great majority of critics deny that the work described by Papias can be the same as the Gospel in our canon bearing the name of Matthew;⁵ whilst of

¹ *Tischendorf* himself in a note says: "Rufinus translates the word *λόγια* according to the old linguistic usage by *oracula*. It is in the highest degree probable that in fact the book of Papias, according to the Millenarian standing-point of the man, was dedicated specially to prophecies of the Lord. Christian linguistic usage, however, gave the word a wider signification, so that the sayings of the Lord and of the Apostles, even when they had not the particular character of prophecy, were so called, and Holy Scripture was designated *ὅσα λόγια*." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 102, note 1.

² Cf. *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 752.

³ *Schollen*, Das. Alt. Evang., p. 240.

⁴ *Weiss*, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1861, p. 88.

⁵ *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 97 ff., p. 286 ff.; *Beiträge*, p. 60 ff.; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Comment. ub. Matth., 1844, p. 26 f.; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 91 ff., 203, 752; *Gesch.* N. T. Kanous, p. 6; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., i. p. 482 l., 490 l., ii. p. 5; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 461 ff.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1849, p. 201 f.; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 167 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 119 f.; *Holtzman*, Die

those
speak
very
manif
lation
before
origin

The
descri
or Ar
dialec
accor
is obli
Gospe
recogn
gists,
which
have b

synopt.
synopt.
Krit., U
Neunden
Schott's
Conserv.
i. 46, p.
N. Rev.
ff.; Schl
erst, kar
Schenkel
68 ff.; S
Kan. Ev
liam, p.
Journal,
evang. G
p. 78, 14
1864, i. p.
305, ann
p. 6 ff.;
1 *Augu*
iii. p. 8;
ff.; *Delitz*
p. 766 ff.
912 ff.;
N. T., p.
Horne, I
Tüb. Zeit
Quellens
Matth., p.
pos. Ev.
N. T., p.
dorf, War
Westcott,
2 *Tische*

those who admit that the (Aramaic) original of which Papias speaks may have been substantially similar to it in construction, very few affirm that the work did not receive much subsequent manipulation, addition, and alteration, not to speak here of translation, before it assumed the form in which the Gospel now lies before us, and many of them altogether deny its actual apostolic origin.¹

The next most important and obvious point is that the work described in this passage was written by Matthew in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect, and each one who did not understand that dialect was obliged to translate as best he could. Our Gospel according to Matthew, however, is in Greek. Tischendorf, who is obliged to acknowledge the Greek originality of our actual Gospel, and that it is not a translation from another language, recognizes the inevitable dilemma in which this fact places apologists, and has, with a few other critics, no better argument with which to meet it than the simple suggestion that Papias must have been mistaken in saying that Matthew wrote in Hebrew.²

synopt. Evv., p. 248 ff.; *Kleuer*, De Authen. Ev. Matth., 1832; *Kostlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv. p. 45 ff., 130 ff.; *Lachmann*, De Ord. Narr. in Ev. Synopt. Th. Studien u. Krit., 1835, p. 577 ff.; *Meyer*, Kr. ex H'buch Ev. Des. Matth., 5. Aufl., p. 11 ff.; *Neander*, Gesch. Pflanz. christl. Kirche, p. 464, anm. 2; *Niemeyer*, Recens. Schott's Isagoge. Haller litt. Zeitung, 1832, März, No. 57, p. 454; *Paulus*, Exeg. Conserv., i. p. 143; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 175 ff.; N. Rev. De Théol., ii. 1858, p. 46, p. 71; *Reville*, Et. crit. sur l'Ev. selon S. Matth., p. 53 ff., 336 ff.; *Rumpp*, N. Rev. de Théol., v. 1867, p. 32, p. 360; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiii^{me} ed., p. 411 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1832, p. 735 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Urspr. erst. kan. Ev., 1834, p. 158 ff.; *Scherer*, N. Rev. de Théol., viii. 1861, p. 203 ff.; *Schenkel*, Charakterbild Jesu, 1864, p. 334 ff.; *Stritz*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1868, p. 68 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. pp. 243—259; *Stieffert*, Urspr. erst. Kan. Evang., 1832, p. 22 ff.; *Scholten*, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 15 f.; Das ält. Evangelium, p. 240 ff., 248 ff.; Das Ev. nach Johann., p. xxiii. f.; *Theile*, Winer's n. kr. Journal, 1824, i. p. 291; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T. p. 196 ff.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. evang. Gesch., p. 29 ff.; *Weisse*, Die evang. Gesch., i. p. 34 ff.; Evangelienfrage, p. 78, 141 ff.; *Weiss*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1861, p. 88 ff.; Jahrb. deutsche Theol., 1864, i. p. 49 ff., iii. p. 287 ff.; *Wieseler*, Chronol. Synops. d. 4 Evv., 1843, p. 300, 305, anm. 1; *Wilke*, Die Urevangelist, 1838, p. 691 f.; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 6 ff.; *Gratz*, N. Versuch Entst. d. 3 erst. Evv. zu erklären, 1812.

¹ *Anger*, Ratio qua loci Vet. Test. in Evang. Matth. laudatur, &c., 1862, part iii. p. 8; *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 580 ff.; *Bengel*, Gnomon N. T., 1742, p. 1 ff.; *Delitzsch*, Entst. Matth. Evang., p. 10 ff.; *Ebrard*, Wiss. krit. evang. Gesch., p. 766 ff.; *Feilmoser*, Einl. N. T., p. 76; *Frommann*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1840, p. 912 ff.; *Gieseler*, Versuch Entst. schr. Evv., p. 121 ff.; *Guericke*, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 111 ff.; *Harless*, Lucubr. Evang. can. spect., pars 1, 1841, p. 4 ff.; *Horne*, Introd. H. S., 1869, iv. p. 420; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 56; *Kern*, Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Th., 1834, 2, p. 8 ff.; *Kuhn*, Das Leben Jesu, i. p. 18; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 38, anm. 6; *J. P. Lange*, Bibelwerk, N. T., i.; Das Ev. n. Matth., p. 3; *Lücke*, Th. Stud. und Krit., 1833, p. 499 ff.; *Luthardt*, De Compos. Ev. Matth., 1861, p. 5; *Nicholas*, Et. cr. N. T., p. 119 ff.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 102 anm.; *Olshausen*, Apost. Ev. Matth. origo defenditur, 1835; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 106 ff.; *Thiersch*, Versuch, p. 186 ff., 222 ff., 348; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 62; *Zahn*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 690 ff.

² *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 107 f.; cf. *Bleek*, Beiträge, i. p. 62;

Just as much of the testimony as is convenient or favourable is eagerly claimed by such apologists, and the rest, which destroys its applicability to our Gospel, is set aside as a mistake. Tischendorf perceives the difficulty, but not having arguments to meet it, he takes refuge in feeling. "In this," he says, "there lies before us one of the most complicated questions, whose detailed treatment would here not be in place. For our part, we are fully at rest concerning it, in the conviction that the assumption by Papias of a Hebrew original text of Matthew, which already in his time cannot have been limited to himself and was soon repeated by other men, arises only from a misunderstanding.¹ It is difficult to comprehend why it should be considered out of place in a work specially written to establish the authenticity of the Gospels to discuss fully so vital a point, and its wilful and deliberate evasion in such a manner alone can be deemed out of place on such an occasion.²

We may here briefly remark that Tischendorf and others³ repeat with approval the disparaging expressions against Papias which Eusebius, for dogmatic reasons, did not scruple to use, and in this way they seek somewhat to depreciate his testimony, or at least indirectly to warrant their free handling of it. It is true that Eusebius says that Papias was a man of very limited comprehension⁴ (σφόδρα γάρ τοι συμκρὸς ὦν τὸν νοῦν), but this is acknowledged to be on account of his Millenarian opinions,⁵ to which Eusebius was vehemently opposed. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Chiliastic passage from Papias quoted by Irenæus, and in which he certainly saw nothing foolish, is given on

Einkl. N. T., p. 112; Cellérier, *Introd. au N. T.*, p. 233 ff., p. 256; Hug, Einkl. N. T., ii. p. 16 ff., p. 51.

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 107 f.

² Canon Westcott evades the whole difficulty by not referring to it at all, and indeed on all the other points which are inconvenient in the evidence of Papias regarding Matthew's work he preserves complete silence, and assumes without a hint of doubt or uncertainty the orthodox conclusions. On the Canon, pp. 59-62.

³ Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., pp. 106-111; Cellérier, *Introd. au N. T.*, 1823, p. 233; Guericke, *Gesamtgesch.*, N. T., p. 111, ann. 2; Hug, Einkl. N. T., ii. p. 14 f.

⁴ H. E., iii. 39. The passage (iii. 36) in which, on the contrary, Papias is called "a man in all respects most learned" (ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λόγιωτάτος) is doubtful, as it is not found in the St. Petersburg Syriac edition, nor in several other old Greek MSS.; but treated even as an ancient note by some one acquainted with the writings of Papias it may be mentioned here.

⁵ Credner, Einkl. N. T., i. p. 90; Delitzsch, *Unters. Entst. Matth. Ev.*, p. 8; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 466; Ehrhard, *Wiss. kr. evang. Gesch.*, p. 783; Gieseler, *Versuch Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 122 f.; Holtzmann, *Die synopt. Evv.*, p. 264; Kern, *Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol.*, 1834, 2, p. 13; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamm.*, p. 29, ann. 1; Meyer, *Kr. ex. H'buch Matth.*, p. 5; Michaelis, Einkl. N. T., ii. p. 952 ff.; Neudecker, Einkl. N. T., p. 190, ann.; Reithmayr, Einkl. N. T., 1859 v. 360, ann. 1; Réville, *Et. sur l'Ev. selon S. Matth.*; Scholten, *Das ält. Evv.*, p. 241.

the
any
a ve
main
we h
quis
ple f
such
admi
Th
thers
threw
any
eaten
that
write
writ
that
infer
ings:
Chur
tainly
him:
penet
that l
delive
Chris
had p
letters
γραφ
this.
Apost
Jesus
writte
which
quite
new,
from t

1 Cf.
1834, 2.
2 O u
γραφ
εγγ
Euseb.
3 Euseb.
4 De

the authority of the Presbyter John, to whom, and not to Papias, any criticism upon it must be referred. If the passage be not of a very elevated character, it is quite in the spirit of that age. The main point, however, is that in regard to the testimony of Papias we have little to do with his general ability, for all that was requisite was the power to see, hear, and accurately state very simple facts. He repeats what is told him by the Presbyter, and in such matters we presume that the Bishop of Hierapolis must be admitted to have been competent.¹

There is no point, however, on which the testimony of the Fathers is more invariable and complete than that the work of Matthew was written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The first mention of any work ascribed to Matthew occurs in the account communicated by Papias, in which, as we have seen, it is distinctly said that Matthew wrote "in the Hebrew dialect." Irenæus, the next writer who refers to the point, says: "Matthew also produced a written Gospel amongst the Hebrews in their own dialect;" and that he did not derive his information solely from Papias may be inferred from his going on to state the epoch of Matthew's writings: "when Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome."² The evidence furnished by Pantænus is certainly independent of Papias. Eusebius states with regard to him: "Of these Pantænus is said to have been one, and to have penetrated as far as India (Southern Arabia), where it is reported that he found the Gospel according to Matthew, which had been delivered before his arrival to some who had the knowledge of Christ, to whom Bartholomew, one of the Apostles, as it is said, had preached, and left them that writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters" (*αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλείψαι γραφὴν*).³ Jerome gives a still more circumstantial account of this. "Pantænus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve Apostles, had there (in India) preached the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Hebrew letters (*quod Hebraicis literis scriptum*), and which on returning to Alexandria he brought with him."⁴ It is quite clear that this was no version specially made by Bartholomew, for had he translated the Gospel according to Matthew from the Greek, for the use of persons in Arabia, he certainly

¹ Cf. Eichhorn, Einl., N. T., i. p. 504 f.; Kern, Tubing. Zeitschr. f. Theol., 1834, 2, p. 13 f.

² Ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφῇ ἐξηγεῖται εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελισμένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Adv. Hæc., iii. 1, § 1; Euseb., H. E., v. 8.

³ Euseb., H. E., v. 10.

⁴ De Vir. Ill., 36.

would not have done so into Hebrew.¹ Origen, according to Eusebius, "following the ecclesiastical canon," states what he has understood from tradition (*ἐν παραδόσει*) of the Gospels, and says: "The first written was that according to Matthew once a publican, but afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language."² Eusebius in another place makes a similar statement in his own name: "Matthew having first preached to the Hebrews when he was about to go also to others, delivered to them his Gospel written in their native language, and thus compensated those from whom he was departing for the want of his presence by the writing."³ Cyril of Jerusalem says: "Matthew, who wrote the Gospel, wrote it in the Hebrew language."⁴ Epiphanius, referring to the fact that the Nazarenes called the only Gospel which they recognized the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," continues: "As in very truth we can affirm that Matthew alone in the New Testament set forth and proclaimed the Gospel in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew characters;"⁵ and elsewhere he states that "Matthew wrote the Gospel in Hebrew."⁶ The same tradition is repeated by Chrysostom,⁷ Augustine,⁸ and others.

Whilst the testimony of the Fathers was thus unanimous as to the fact that the Gospel ascribed to Matthew was originally written in Hebrew, no question ever seems to have arisen in their minds as to the character of the Greek version; much less was any examination made with the view of testing the accuracy of the translation. "Such inquiries were not in the spirit of Christian learned men generally of that time,"⁹ as Tischendorf remarks in connection with the belief current in the early Church, and afterwards shared by Jerome, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the original of the Greek Gospel according to Mat-

¹ Davison, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 469 f.

² πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ τελώνην, ἔσχατον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστευούσιν, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον. Euseb., H. E., vi. 25.

³ Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὥς ἡμελλεν καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέροισι ἵναται, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδούς τε καὶ αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ λείπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ τοῖς ἡσυχάζουσιν ἐτελέσθη, διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ἀνεπλήρου. Euseb., H. E., iii. 24.

⁴ Ματθαῖος δ' ἔγραψε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Ἑβραϊδὶ γλώσσῃ τοῦτο ἔγραψεν. Catech., 14.

⁵ ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐκθεσίαν τε καὶ κηρυγμῶν. Hier., xxx. 3; ed. Petav., p. 127.

⁶ . . . ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ. Hier., li. 5; ed. Pet., p. 426.

⁷ Hom. in Matth., i.

⁸ De Consensu Evang., i. 2.

Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 108.

thew
sing
He s
lica
Chris
those
after
It wa
that
Jame
Th
λόγω)
been
accou
by en
one a
best l
Other
which
tians
the st
ἐρμην
that t
among
the pi
tion, c
uages,
self on
Presby

i Matt
qui ex c
compos
Hieron.
2 Cf. Z
aius, C
N. T. G
3 Tu.
4 Th
p. 189 ff
5 Bau
499.
6 Luc
468, 491
N. T., ii
1788, ii.
7 Ebra
42 f.; W
beonant,
Jahrb. b

thew. The first who directly refers to the point, frankly confessing the total ignorance which generally prevailed, was Jerome. He states: "Matthew, who was also called Levi, who from a publican became an Apostle, was the first who wrote a Gospel of Christ in Judæa in Hebrew language and letters, on account of those from amongst the circumcision who had believed; but who afterwards translated it into Greek is not sufficiently certain."¹ It was only at a much later period, when doubt began to arise, that the translation was wildly ascribed to the Apostles John, James, and others.²

The expression in Papias that "everyone interpreted them (the λόγια) as he was able" (ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος) has been variously interpreted by different critics, like the rest of the account. Schleiermacher explained the ἡρμήνευσε as translation by enlargement: Matthew merely collected the λόγια, and everyone added the explanatory circumstances of time and occasion as best he could.³ This view, however, has not been largely adopted. Others consider that the expression refers to the interpretation which was given on reading it at the public meetings of Christians for worship,⁴ but there can be no doubt that, coming after the statement that the work was written in the Hebrew dialect, ἡρμηνεύειν can only mean simple translation.⁵ Some maintain that the passage infers the existence of many written translations, amongst which very probably was ours;⁶ whilst others affirm that the phrase merely signifies that as there was no recognized translation, each one who had but an imperfect knowledge of the language, yet wished to read the work, translated the Hebrew for himself orally as best he could.⁷ Some consider that Papias or the Presbyter use the verb in the past tense, ἡρμήνευσε, as contrasting

¹ Mattheus, qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judæa, propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebræicis litteris verbisque composuit. quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Hieron., De Vir. Ill., 3.

² Cf. Theophylact., Com. in Matth. Proem.; Auctor Synops. Script. Sacr.; Athanasius, Opp. Paris., ii. p. 155; Evang. sec. Matth. ed. Matthæi, p. 10; Scholz, N. T. Græce, i. p. xxx., p. 107; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 72 f.

³ Tu. Studien u. Krit., 1832, p. 735 f.

⁴ Thiersch, Versuch, u. s. w., p. 193, 222 ff., 348; Die Kirche im apost. Zeitalt., p. 189 ff.

⁵ Baur, Krit. Unters. kan. Evv., p. 581; Lücke, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1833, p. 499.

⁶ Lücke, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1833, p. 499 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. pp. 468, 491; Weizsäcker, Unters. evang. Gesch., p. 31; Bleek, Beiträge, p. 60; Einl. N. T., ii. p. 95; Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1849, p. 202; Michaelis, Einl. N. T., 1783, ii. p. 932.

⁷ Ebrard, Wiss. krit. evang. Gesch., p. 785, anm. 6; Feilmoser, Einl. N. T., p. 42 f.; Weiss, Die evang. Gesch., p. 36 f.; Schott, Authen. kan. Ev. u. Matth. bennant, 1837, p. 86 f., cf. 93; Sieffert, Urspr. erst. kan. Ev. p. 20 f.; cf. Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1849, p. 202.

the time when it was necessary for each to interpret as best he could with the period when, from the existence of a recognized translation, it was no longer necessary for them to do so;¹ whilst others deny that any written translation of an authentic character was known to Papias at all.² Now the words in Papias are simply: "Matthew composed the λόγια in the Hebrew dialect,³ and everyone interpreted them as he was able." The statement is perfectly simple and direct, and it is at least quite clear that it conveys the fact that translation was requisite, and as each one translated "as he was able," that no recognized translation existed to which all might have recourse. There is absolutely not a syllable which warrants the conclusion that Papias was acquainted with an authentic Greek version, although it is possible that he may have known of the existence of some Greek translations of no authority. The words used, however, imply that, if he did, he had no respect for any of them.

Thus the account of Papias, supported by the perfectly unanimous testimony of the Fathers, declares that the work composed by Matthew was written in the Hebrew or Aramaic dialect. The only evidence which asserts that Matthew wrote any work at all, therefore, equally asserts that he wrote it in Hebrew. It is quite impossible to separate the statement of the authorship from the language. The two points are so indissolubly united that they stand or fall together. If it be denied that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, it cannot be asserted that he wrote at all. It is therefore perfectly certain from this testimony that Matthew cannot be declared the direct author of the Greek canonical Gospel bearing his name.⁴ At the very best it can only be a translation, by an unknown hand, of a work the original of which was early lost. None of the Fathers ever ventured a conjecture as to how, when, or by whom the translation was effected. Jerome explicitly states that the translator of the work was unknown. The deduction is clear: our Greek Gospel, in so far as it is associated with Matthew at all, cannot at the utmost be more than a translation, but as the work of an unknown translator, there cannot, in the ab-

¹ Ebrard, *Wiss. kr. evang. Gesch.*, p. 785, anm. 6, p. 786 f. anm. 8; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 62; Delitzsch, *Entst. d. Matth. Ev.*, p. 11.

² Baar, *Unters. kan. Ev.* p. 582; Bleek, *Beiträge*, p. 60; Credner, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 91; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 15; Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.* p. 175 ff.; Holtzmann, *Die synopt. Evv.*, p. 265; Schott, *Authen. d. kan. Ev. n. Matth. benannt*, p. 87; cf. Sieffert, *Urspr. erst. kan. Ev.*, p. 31 f., p. 20 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1849, p. 202.

³ In connection with this it may be of interest to remember that, in the account of his conversion and the vision which he saw on his way to Damascus which Paul gives to King Agrippa in the Acts of the Apostles, he states that Jesus spoke to him "in the Hebrew dialect" (Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ), Acts xxxvi. 14.

⁴ Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1849, p. 202.

sence
assur
Matth
Apost
nized
have
ascrib
that i
missed
Manic
time o
as to t
ticated
The
marke
being
Greek
Ecclar
showed
scholar
tain th
here to
that th
Canoni

1 Einkl.
2 Augu
3 Sictu
4 Alber
Proleg. i.
Einkl. N.
ment. Ev.
Adnot. M.
8; Calcin
in quat. I.
i. p. 92 ff.
mus, Ad.
bibl. Wis
Flaccius,
Einkl. N. T.
Gerhard,
de l'Ev. d.
Evang. ca
mann, Die
p. 129 ff.,
705 ff.; H
marks on
ff.; Köstli
1766; Kuh
pp. 46-61
eing, Theol
sprache d.

sence of the original, or even of testimony of its accuracy, be any assurance that the translation faithfully renders the work of Matthew, or accurately conveys the sense of the original. All its Apostolical authority is gone. Even Michaelis long ago recognized this: "If the original text of Matthew be lost, and we have nothing but a Greek translation: then, frankly, we cannot ascribe any divine inspiration to the words: yea, it is possible that in various places the true meaning of the Apostle has been missed by the translator."¹ This was felt and argued by the Manicheans in the fourth century,² and by the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation.³ A wide argument might be opened out as to the dependence of the other two Gospels on this unauthenticated work.

The dilemma, however, is not yet complete. It was early remarked that our first Canonical Gospel bore no real marks of being a translation at all, but is evidently an original independent Greek work. Even men like Erasmus, Calvin, Cajetan, and Ecclampadius, began to deny the statement that our Gospels showed any traces of Hebrew origin, and the researches of later scholars have so fully confirmed their doubts that few now maintain the primitive belief in a translation. We do not propose here to enter fully into this argument. It is sufficient to say that the great majority of competent critics declare that our first Canonical Gospel is no translation, but an original Greek text;⁴

¹ Einl. N. T., ii. p. 997, cf. p. 1003.

² Augustin., Contra Faust., 32, 2; 33, 3.

³ Sixtus Senensis, Bibl. Sancta, vii. 2, p. 924.

⁴ Alber, Hermeneut. Novi Test., i. p. 239 ff.; Alford, Nov. Test. Gr., 1868, Proleg. i. p. 29; Anger, Ratio qua loci V. T. in Ev. Matth. laudantur, 1861; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 286 ff., p. 106 ff.; Beiträge, p. 62 ff.; Baumgarten-Crusius, Comment. Ev. d. Matth., 1844, p. 23; Basnage, Annal. Ad. A. C. 64, p. 729; Bezna, Adnot. Maj. N. T.; Buslav, Dissert. de lingua orig. Evang., sec. Matth., 1826, 8; Calvin, Comment. in N. T.; Cellérier, Introd. au N. T., p. 256; Clericus, Diss. in quat. Evang., § 1; Cajetan, Comment. in quat. Evang.; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 92 ff.; Delitzsch, Unters. üb. Entst. d. Matth. Ev., p. 12 ff., 111 ff.; Erasmus, Ad. Matth., viii. Schol. ad Hieron. Catal. Script. Eccles. v.; Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1849, p. 210; Fabricius, Bibl. Græca ed. Harless, iv. 4, 7, p. 700 ff.; Floccius, N. T. ex vers. D. Erasmi emend. &c., 1570, p. 1 ff.; (cf. Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 195, aum. 1); Fritzsche, Evang. Matthæi recens. 1826, p. xviii. ff.; Gerhard, Annot. posth. in Ev. Matth., 1650, p. 33 ff.; Grawitz, Sur la langue orig. de l'Ev. de St. Matth., 1827; Grotius, Annotat. ad Matth., i. 1; Harless, Lucubr. Evang. can. spect., pars. i., 1841; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 115 ff.; Holtmann, Die synopt. Ev., p. 264 ff.; Heydenreich, in Winer's Kr. Journal, iii. 1825, p. 129 ff., 385 ff.; Hug, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 52 ff.; Heidegger, Enchiridion, 1681, p. 705 ff.; Hofmann, Ad. Pritii Introd. in Lect. N. T., 1764, p. 307 ff.; Jortin, Remarks on Eccl. Hist., 2d. ed. i. p. 309 f.; Keim, Gesch. Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 54 ff.; Köstlin, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 43; Koecher, Analecta philol. et exeg. &c., 1766; Kuhn, Das Leben Jesu, i.; Lardner, Suppl. to Credibility, &c., Works, vi. pp. 46-65; Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. ad Matth., i. 23; Works, xi. p. 21 ff.; Leasing, Theolog. Nachlass, pp. 45-72; Vermischte Schr., vi. p. 50; Masch, Grundsprache d. Ev. Matth., 1755-8; Majus, Exam. Hist. Crit. Textus N. T. 1694, ch.

whilst of those who consider that they find traces of translation and of Hebrew origin, some barely deny the independent originality of the Greek Gospel, and few assert more than substantial agreement with the original, with more or less variation and addition often of a very decided character.¹ The case, therefore, stands thus: The whole of the evidence which warrants our believing that Matthew wrote any work at all, distinctly, invariably, and emphatically asserts that he wrote that work in Hebrew or Aramaic; a Greek Gospel, therefore, as connected with Matthew, can only be a translation by an unknown hand, whose accuracy we have not, and never have had, the means of verifying. Our Greek Gospel, however, being an independent original Greek text, there is no ground whatever for ascribing it to Matthew at all, the whole evidence of antiquity being emphatically opposed, and even the Gospel itself laying no claim, to such authorship.

v. vi.; *Moldenhauer*, *Introd. ad. Libr. Canon.*, p. 247 ff.; *Neudöcker*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 200 ff.; *Paulus*, *Introd. in N. T. Cap. Select.*, 1799, p. 279; *Theol. exeg. Conservatorium*, 1822, i. p. 159 ff.; *Exeg. H'buch*, i. 1, p. 36 f.; *Pritius*, *Introd. in Lect. N. T.*, 1764; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 189 ff.; *Ritschl*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, p. 536 ff.; *Rumpéus*, *Com. Crit. in N. T.*, p. 81 ff.; *Schott*, *Isagoge*, p. 68 ff.; *Authent. d. kan. Ev. n. Matth. benannt*, p. 83 ff., 105 ff.; *Schubert*, *Disa. qua in Sermon. qua Ev. Matth. conscript. fuerit inquiritur*, 1810; *C. F. Schmidt*, *Hist. Antiq. et vindicatio Canonis*, 1775, p. 435 ff.; *Schroeder*, *De lingua Matth. Authen.*, 1701; *Schollen*, *Das alt. Evang.*, p. 249 f.; *Steitz*, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, p. 85 ff.; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 107 ff.; *Theile*, in *Winer's N. Kr. Journal*, 1824, i. p. 198 ff.; *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 6 ff.; *Viser*, *Herm. Sacr. N. T.*, pars ii. p. 344 ff.; *Vogel*, *Entst. drei erst. Evv. Gabler's Journal f. auserl. Theol. Lit.*, 1804, i. 1; *De Wette*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 196 ff.; *Weizsäcker*, *Unters. üb. evang. Gesch.*, p. 31; *Weiss*, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1861, p. 86 ff.; *Wilke*, *Der Urevangelist*, 1838, p. 691 f., et passim; *Wilke*, *Tradition und Mythe*, p. 34 ff.; *Wetstein*, *Nov. Test. Gr.*, i. p. 224. We do not pretend to give complete lists.

¹ *Baur*, *Unters. üb. kan. Evv.*, p. 580 ff. (a translation which by alterations and additions has more and more lost its original character); *Bertholdt*, *Einkl. A. und N. T.*, 1813, iii. p. 1114 ff., 1175 ff., 1257 ff.; *Botten*, *Bericht d. Matth. v. Jesu der Messia*, 1792-8 Vorrede; *Corrodi*, *Beleucht. d. Gesch. d. Bibel-Kanons*, ii. p. 149 ff.; *Eckermann*, *Erklär. all. dunkl. Stellen N. T.*, i. p. xi.; *Eichhorn*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 502 ff.; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. kr. evang. Gesch.*, p. 780 ff.; *Fischer*, *Einkl. in d. Dogm. d. evang.-luth. Kirche*, 1828, p. 115 ff.; *Feilmoser*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 2. ausg. p. 38 ff.; *Gieseler*, *Vorstich Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 120 ff.; *Gratz*, *N. Versuch Entst. 3. erst. Evv. zu erklären*, 1812; *Hänelin*, *H'buch Einkl. N. T.*, iii. p. 30, 75 ff.; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 33, anm. 6; *Kern*, *Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol.*, 1834, 2, p. 14 ff., 43 ff., 122 ff.; cf. 1838, 2, p. 14 f.; *Kleuer*, *Recent. de Authentia Ev. Matth. quæst. recensentur*, &c., 1852; *Kuinoel*, *Comm. N. T.*, 1807, i. xvi.; *Luthardt*, *De Compos. ev. Matth.*, 1861; *Meyer*, *Kr. ex. H'buch üb. d. Ev. des Matth.*, 5te Aufl. p. 4 ff.; *Michaelis*, *Einkl. N. T.*, ii. p. 946 ff.; *Niemeyer*, *Allg. Litteraturzeit.*, 1832, No. 37; *Osiander*, *Tüo. Zeitschr.*, 1836, 4, p. 77 f.; *Reithmayr*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1852, p. 346 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, *Urspr. erst. kan. Ev.*, 1834, p. 105 ff., 171; *Schulz*, *Beiträge z. Lehre, v. heil. Abendmahl*, 1. ausg. p. 302 ff.; *Schulthess*, *Rosenmüller's Repert.*, 1824, ii. p. 172 f.; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 241 ff.; *Semler*, *Uebersetz. v. Townson's Abh. üb. 4. Evv.*, 1783, i. p. 146 ff.; *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *In Henko's Magazin*, 1795, iv. p. 576; *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 60 ff.; *Simon*, *Hist. crit. du N. T.*, p. 47 ff.; *Storr*, *Zweck d. evang. Gesch. u. Br. Johannis*, p. 360 f.; *Tregelles*, *Orig. language St. Matth. Gospel*,

One
Gospe
Neith
Greek
well r
zeal th
difficul
in Heb
made o
There
sertion
of emb
It is
the He
that ou
position
pel. W
tic and
Apostol
wisfully
stantial

1850. No.
Comment.
5, 41, 51;
Kanons, 1
ii. p. 150
Zahn, Th.
1 Benge
Religion,
Gesammt.
Lange, Da
Ev., 1822
Sanct. vii.
i. p. 30 ff.;
ii. p. 665.
Cf. *Matth.*
2 Ebrard
ples of Ma
lecta Patr.
3 Axford
p. 572; G
i. p. 257;
krit. evang
Proleg. in
Guericke, H
Gerhard, A
nal, iii., 18
1828, p. 20
Enechiridion
ii. p. 4 ff.,
21; Kirchh
Matth., p. 2

One or other of these alternatives must be adopted for our first Gospel, and either is absolutely fatal to its direct Apostolic origin. Neither as a translation from the Hebrew nor as an original Greek text can it claim Apostolic authority. This has been so well recognized, if not admitted, that some writers, with greater zeal than discretion, have devised fanciful theories to obviate the difficulty. These maintain that Matthew himself wrote both in Hebrew and in Greek,¹ or at least that the translation was made during his own lifetime and under his own eye,² and so on. There is not, however, a particle of evidence for any of these assertions, which are merely the arbitrary and groundless conjectures of embarrassed apologists.

It is manifest that upon this evidence both those who assert the Hebrew original of Matthew's work and those who maintain that our Gospel is not a translation but an original Greek composition, should logically deny the apostolicity of our actual Gospel. We need not say that this is not done, and that for dogmatic and other foregone conclusions many profess belief in the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel, although in doing so they wilfully ignore the facts, and in many cases merely claim a substantial but not absolute Apostolic origin for the work.³ A much

1850. Note to Horne's *Introd.* to H. S., 12th ed., iv. p. 420; *Thiess*, N. Krit. Comment. N. T., i., Einl. p. 18 ff.; *Venturini*, *Gesch. d. Urchristenthums*, ii. p. 8. 41, 51; *Weisse*, *Die evang. Gesch.*, i. v. 45 ff.; *Weber*, *Beiträge z. Gesch. N. T. Kanons*, 1791, p. 21 ff.; *Versuch einer Beleucht. d. Gesch. d. Bibel Kanons*, 1792, ii. p. 150 ff.; *Vestcott*, *Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, 1872, p. 223 f. note 2; *Zahn*, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, p. 693 ff.

¹ *Bengel*, *Gnomon N. T.*, 1742, p. 3; *Benson*, *Hist. of First Planting of Christ. Religion*, i. p. 257; *Guericke*, *Beiträge*, 1828, p. 36 ff.; *Einl. N. T.*, 2. Aufl. p. 115; *Gesamm. Gesch. N. T.*, p. 114 ff.; *Horne*, *Introd. to H. S.*, 1869, iv. p. 420; *Lange*, *Das Ev. Matth.*, p. 3; *Bibelwerk*, 1868, i.; *Olshausen*, *Echtheit d. 4 kan. Evv.*, 1823, p. 18 ff.; *Apost. Ev. Matth. origo def.*, 1835; *Sixtus Sen.*, *Biblioth. Sanct.*, vii. p. 582; *Thiersch*, *Versuch, u. s. w.*, p. 190 ff., 348 ff.; *Townson*, *Works*, i. p. 30 ff.; *Schwarz*, *Solœcismi Discip.* J. C., 1730; *Hales*, *Analysis of Chronology*, ii. p. 665.

Cl. M'anan, *Hist. of Christianity*, 1867, i. p. 386; cf. p. 422.

² *Ebrard*, *Wiss. krit. evang. Gesch.*, p. 786; *Orelli* conjectures that two disciples of Matthew wrote the Gospel, the one in Aramaic, the other in Greek. *Selecta Patr. Eccles. Capita*, p. 10.

³ *Ajford*, *Greek Test.*, 1868, *Proleg.* i. p. 24; *Bengel*, *Archiv f. Theol.*, vi. 1824, p. 572; *Gnomon N. T.*, 1742, p. 3; *Benson*, *Hist. First Planting of Chr. Religion*, i. p. 257; *Delitzsch*, *Entst. d. Matth. Evang.*, p. 110, cf. p. 7 f.; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. krit. evang. Gesch.*, p. 787 ff.; *Feilmoser*, *Einl. N. T.*, 2. Ausg. p. 71 ff.; *Fritzsche*, *Proleg. in Matth.*, 1826, d. 18 ff.; *Gieseler*, *Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 120 ff.; *Guericke*, *Beiträge*, pp. 23—36; *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115; *Gesamm. Gesch.*, p. 109 ff.; *Gerhard*, *Annot. posth. in Evang. Matth.*, p. 38; *Heydenreich*, *Winer's Kr. Journal*, iii., 1825, p. 129 ff., p. 385 ff.; *Zeitschr. Predigerwiss.* v. Heyden u. Huffel, 1823, p. 10 ff.; *Hegstenberg*, *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1858, p. 627 ff.; *Heidegger*, *Enechiridion*, p. 707; *Horne*, *Introd. to H. S.*, iv. p. 421; *Hug*, *Einl. N. T.*, 1847, ii. p. 4 ff., 90 ff., 111 f.; *Kern*, *Tübinger Zeitschr. f. Theol.*, 1855, 2, p. 122 f.; cf. 21; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 33, ann. 6; *Lange*, *Bibelwerk N. T.*, i., *Ev. in Matth.*, p. 2 ff.; *Olshausen*, *Apost. Ev. Matth. origo def.*, 1835; *Bibl. Commentar.*

greater number of the most able and learned critics, however, both from external and internal evidence deny the Apostolic origin of our first Canonical Gospel.¹

There is another fact to which we may briefly refer, which from another side shows that the work of Matthew with which Papias was acquainted was different from our Gospel. In a fragment from the fourth book of his lost work which is pre-

1830, p. 11 f.; *Reithmayr*, Einl. N. T., 1852, p. 351 ff.; *Tischendorf*, Wann, wurden, u. s. w., passim; *Thiersch*, Versuch, u. s. w., p. 190 ff., 348 ff.; *Townson*, Works, i. p. 30 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 62, et passim; *Schwartz*, Soloeicium Discip. J. C., &c., 1730; *Hales*, Analysis of Chronology, ii. p. 665.

¹ *Baur*, Krit. Unters. üb. kan. Evv., p. 571 ff.; *B. Bauer*, Krit. d. evang. Gesch. d. Synopt., 1846; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., 1866, § 110, p. 286 ff.; Beiträge, 1846, p. 62 ff.; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Comment. ub. Ev. Matth., 1844, p. 24 ff.; *Bertholdt*, Einl. A. und N. T., 1813, iii. § 332, p. 1265 ff.; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 97 f.; cf. p. 38; *Corrodi*, Versuch einer Beleucht. d. Gesch. J. u. Chr. Bibel-Kanons, ii. p. 149 ff.; *Christianus*, Das Evang. des Reichs, 1859; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. § 47, p. 97 f.; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., i. p. 484 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., 1820, i. § 100 ff., p. 461 ff.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ii., 1849, p. 209 ff.; *Fischer*, Einl. in d. Dogmatik, 1828, p. 115 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Gesch. d. Urchristenthums, i. p. 7, 114 f.; Allgemeine Kirchengesch., 1841, i. p. 166; *Gratz*, N. Versuch Entst. 3 erst. Evv. zu erklären, 1812; *Herder*, Regel d. zusamm. uns. Evv., &c.; Von Gottes Sohn, u. s. w., 1791, xii.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, pp. 106—120; *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., § 18, p. 264 ff., 359 ff.; *Kleuer*, Recent. de authent. Evang. Matth. quæst., 1832; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 63 ff., 67 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. d. synopt., p. 43 ff., 69 ff.; *Lachmann*, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1835, p. 577 ff.; *Lücke*, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1833, p. 497 ff.; *Lessing*, Theolog. nachlass, 1784, p. 45 ff.; *Meyer*, Kr. exeg. H'buch üb. d. Ev. des. Matth., 5te Aufl. § 2, p. 3 ff.; *Neander*, Leben Jesu, p. 11; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., § 27, p. 209 ff.; *Nicolas*, Etudes crit. sur la Bible, N. T., p. 28 ff., 43, p. 153 ff.; *Niemeyer*, Allgem. Literaturzeit., 1832, No. 37; *Orelli*, Selecta Patr. Eccles. Cap. 1821, p. 10; *Plitt*, De Comp. Evang. Synopt., 1860; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiii^{me} ed. p. 1 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., § 195, p. 188; N. Rev. de Théol., ii. 1853, p. 46; *Révillé*, Etudes crit. sur l'Ev. selon S. Matth., 1862; *Rumpf*, N. Rev. de Théol., v. 1867, p. 32; *Rüdiger*, Symbole quædam ad N. T. pertinentes, 1827; *Schleiermacher*, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1832, p. 735 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Urspr. erst kan. Evang., 1834, p. 3 ff., 90 ff.; Beiträge, p. 24; *Scherer*, N. Rev. de Théol., 1861, viii. p. 292 ff.; *J. E. C. Schmidt*, Entwurf, u. s. w., Hencke's Mag., iv. p. 576 ff.; Einl. N. T., i. p. 68 ff.; *Schenkel*, Das Charakterbild Jesu, 1864, p. 333 ff.; *Schweyler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 241 ff.; *Schotten*, Das ält. Evangelium, p. 240 ff., 248 ff.; cf. Die ält. Zeugnisse, u. s. w., p. 15 f.; *Schultz*, Bemerk. üb. Verf. d. Ev. n. Matth. Beit. z. Christ. Lehre v. heil. Abendmahl, 1. ausg., 1824, pp. 302—322; *Schott*, Authent. des kan. Ev. benannt nach Matth., 1837, herausg. v. Danz., p. 93 ff., 106 ff.; *Schulthes*, Rosenmüller's Bibl. exeg. Repertorium, 1824, ii. p. 172 f.; *Semler*, Vorrede z. Baumgarten's Untera. Theol. Streitigkeit, 1762, p. 52; Uebersetz. v. Townson's Abhandl. 4 Evv., 1783, i. p. 146 ff., 221, 290; *Sieffert*, Ursprung d. erst. kan. Evv., 1832, p. 123 ff., 138 ff., 169 ff.; *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 48 ff.; *Stroth*, Interpol. in Evang. Matth. in Eichhorn's Repertorium f. bibl. u. morgenl. Litt., ix. p. 99 ff.; *Theile*, Zur Biographie Jesu, 1836, p. 35; *Tobler*, Die Evangelienfrage, 1858; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, u. s. w., p. 6 ff. *Venturini*, Gesch. des Urchristenthums, ii. p. 1 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., § 98, a. b., 201 ff.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. üb. evang. Gesch. 26 ff., 104 ff., 129 ff.; *Weisse*, Evang. Gesch., i. p. 29 ff.; Die Evangelienfrage, p. 89 ff., 141 ff.; *Weiss*, Th. Studien u. Krit., 1861, p. 88 ff.; *Wilke*, Der Urevangelist, p. 691, et passim; *Wilke*, Tradition u. Mythe, 1837, § 19, p. 38 ff.; *Wieseler*, Chronolog. Synopsis d. 4 Ev., 1843, p. 300, 304 ff.; Beiträge z. apok. Litt., p. 182.

served
circum
in con
xxvi
down
and h
"Jude
for his
gon w
by the
connec
taken
cessive
could n
perceiv
and the
maggot
whose
to puni
that he
what M
delibera
he been
tained i

It has
blance h
quoted
acquain
less than
is not a
assertion
say abou

¹ In Act
the vario
² Méya
τοῖς ἀπ
ἡν, ἀπ
ἐν κατ
³ Luth.
⁴ Credne
cott, On
⁵ Cf. Cre
wiss. Theol
⁶ Davidso
N. Rev. de
Het Paulin
Ursprung,
On the Can

served to us by Œcumenius and Theophylact, Papias relates the circumstances of the death of Judas Iscariot in a manner which is in contradiction to the account in the first Gospel. In Matthew xxvii. 5, the death of the traitor is thus related: "And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple and departed and went and hanged himself."¹ The narrative in Papias is as follows: "Judas walked about in this world a great example of impiety; for his body having swollen so that, on an occasion, when a wagon was moving on its way, he could not pass it, he was crushed by the chariot and his bowels gushed out."² Theophylact, in connection with this passage, adds other details also apparently taken from the work of Papias, as for instance that, from his excessive corpulency, the eyes of Judas were so swollen that they could not see, and so sunk in his head that they could not be perceived even by the aid of the optical instruments of physicians; and that the rest of his body was covered with running sores and maggots, and so on in the manner of the early Christian ages, whose imagination conjured up the wildest "special providences" to punish the enemies of the faith.³ As Papias expressly states that he eagerly inquired what the Apostles, and amongst them what Matthew, said, we may conclude that he would not have deliberately contradicted the account given by that Apostle had he been acquainted with any work attributed to him which contained it.⁴

It has been argued, from some very remote and imaginary resemblance between the passage from the preface to the work of Papias quoted by Eusebius with the prologue to Luke, that Papias was acquainted with that Gospel;⁵ but nothing could be more groundless than such a conclusion based upon such evidence, and there is not a word in our fragments of Papias which warrants such an assertion.⁶ Eusebius, who never fails to state what the Fathers say about the works of the New Testament, does not mention

¹ In Acts i. 18 f., an account is given which again contradicts both Matthew and the version of Papias.

² Μέγα ἀσθενείας ὑπόδειγμα ἐν τούτῳ τῷ νόσῳ περιεπλήθηεν τοῦδ' ἀνδρός· γὰρ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τὴν σάρκα, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι διελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ῥαδίως διερχομένης, ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμαξῆς ἐπιέσθη, ὥστε τὰ ἔγκυα αὐτοῦ ἐκμενέσθηναι. Œcumenius, Comm. in Acta Apost., cap. ii.

³ Euth., Reliq. Sacra, 1846, i. pp. 9, 23 f., 25 ff.

⁴ Credner, Einl. N. T., p. 91; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv. p. 251 f.; cf. Westcott, On the Canon, p. 66.

⁵ Cf. Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 202; Hilgenfeld, Der Canon, p. 15 f.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1861, p. 202.

⁶ Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 19; Nicolas, Et. crit. N. T., p. 21 f.; Reuss, N. Rev. de Théol., ii. 1858, p. 45, note 5; Schotten, Die ält. Zengn., p. 16 f.; Het Paulin. Evangelie, p. 2 f.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 11; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 60 f.; cf. Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 117 f.; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 65 f.

that Papias knew either the third or fourth Gospels. Is it possible to suppose that if Papias had been acquainted with those Gospels he would not have asked for information about them from the Presbyters, or that Eusebius would not have recorded it as he did that regarding the works ascribed to Matthew and Mark? Eusebius states, however, that Papias "made use of testimonies from the first Epistle of John and, likewise, from that of Peter."¹ As Eusebius, however, does not quote passages from Papias, we must remain in doubt whether he did not, as elsewhere, assume from some similarity of wording that the passages were quotations from these Epistles, whilst in reality they might not be. Eusebius made a similar statement with regard to the use of the Epistle of Peter in the so-called Epistle of Polycarp² upon no more definite grounds than an apparent resemblance of expressions.³ Andrew, a Cappadocian bishop of the fifth century, mentions that Papias, amongst others of the Fathers, considered the Apocalypse inspired.⁴ No reference is made to this by Eusebius, but although from his Millenarian tendencies it is very probable that Papias regarded the Apocalypse with peculiar veneration as a prophetic book, this evidence is too vague and isolated to be of much value.

We find, however, that Papias, like Hegesippus and others of the Fathers, was acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Eusebius says: "He (Papias) has likewise related another history of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews."⁵ This is generally believed to be the episode inserted in the later MSS. of the fourth Gospel viii. 1—11. This Gospel, of which, as we have seen, we find much more ancient and distinct traces than any other, there is, therefore, good reason to believe, was used by Papias.⁶

Whatever books Papias knew, however, it is certain, from his own express declaration, that he ascribed little importance to them, and preferred tradition as a more reliable source of information regarding evangelical history. "For I held that what was to be

¹ *Euseb.*, H. E., iii. 39.

² *Ad. Phil.*, vii.; *Euseb.*, H. E., iv. 14.

³ *Baur*, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 350, *anm.*; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, xiii^{me} ed., p. lxxv. note 4; *Scholten*, *Das Evang. n. Johannes*, p. 8.

⁴ *Proleg. Comment. in Apocalypsin*; *Routh*, *Reliq. Sacre*, 1846, i. p. 15.

⁵ Ἐκτεθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς, ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἀμαρτίαις διαβληθεῖσας ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου. Ἦν τὸ κατ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει. H. E., iii. p. 39.

⁶ *Delitzsch*, *Entst. d. Matth. Evang.*, p. 24; *Eichhorn*, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 21 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 119; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 33, *anm.* 8; *Scholten*, *Das alt. Evang.*, p. 242; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 205; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 110.

derive
the li
could
any
accom
docum
that P
could
what
had kr
deliber
threw v
courses
himself
pias is
who m
written
accord
them, h
come w
of our C

¹ *Euseb.*
² We m
λογία an
distinctly

derived from books," he says, "did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice (of tradition)."¹ If, therefore, it could even have been shown that Papias was acquainted with any of our Canonical Gospels, it could only have been with the accompanying fact that he did not recognize them as authoritative documents. It is manifest from the evidence adduced, however, that Papias did not know our Gospels. It is not possible that he could have found it better to inquire "what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord . . . say" if he had known of Gospels such as ours actually written by them, deliberately telling him what they had to say. The work of Matthew which he mentions being, however, a mere collection of discourses of Jesus, he might naturally inquire what the Apostle² himself said of the history of the Master. The evidence of Papias is in every respect most important. He is the first writer who mentions that Matthew and Mark were believed to have written any works at all; but whilst he shows that he does not accord any canonical authority even to the works attributed to them, his description of those works and his general testimony come with crushing force against the pretensions made on behalf of our Gospels to Apostolic origin and authenticity.

¹ Euseb., H. E., iii. 39.

² We may merely remark that Papias does not call the Matthew who wrote the *Logia* an Apostle. In this passage he speaks of the Apostle, but he does not distinctly identify him with the Matthew of the other passage.

ed., p.

ἀμαρ-
ἐλίον

i. p. 21
3, ann.
p. 205;

CHAPTER V.

THE CLEMENTINES—THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

WE must now as briefly as possible examine the evidence furnished by the apocryphal religious romance generally known by the name of "The Clementines," and assuming, falsely of course,¹ to be the composition of the Roman Clement. The Clementines are composed of three principal works, the Homilies, Recognitions, and a so-called Epitome. The Homilies, again, are prefaced by a pretended epistle addressed by the Apostle Peter to James, and another from Clement. These Homilies were only known in an imperfect form till 1853, when Dressel² published a complete Greek text. Of the Recognitions we only possess a Latin translation by Rufinus (A.D. 402). Although there is much difference of opinion regarding the claims to priority of the Homilies, and Recognitions, many critics assigning that place to the Homilies,³ whilst others assert the earlier origin of the Recognitions,⁴ all are agreed that the one is merely a version of the other, the former being embodied almost word for word in the latter, whilst the Epitome is a blending of the other two, probably intended to purge them from heretical doctrine. These works, however, which are generally admitted to have emanated from the Ebionitic party of the early Church,⁵ are supposed to be based upon older

¹ Baur, Dogmengesch., 1865, I. i. p. 155; Bunsen, Hippolytus, i. p. 431; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 183; Guericke, H'buch K. G., i. p. 117, anm. 2; Hilgenfeld, Der Kanon, p. 30, p. 204, anm. 1; Die apost. Väter, p. 287; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 461, anm. 47; Lechler, Das apost. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 434, 500; Nicolas, Et. sur les Ev. Apocr., 1866, p. 87 ff.; Ritschl, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 204 f.; Cotelerius, Patr. Apost., i. p. 490, 606; Gallandi, Patr. Bibl., ii Proleg., p. lv.

² Clementis R. quæ feruntur Homiliæ xx. nunc primum integræ. Ed. A. R. M. Dressel.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 280 f.; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 183, anm. 2; Engelhardt, Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol., 1852, i. p. 104 f.; Guericke, H'buch K. G. i. p. 117, anm. 2; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 254; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 481; Schliemann, Die Clement. Recog., 1843, p. 68—72; Tischendorf, Wann wurden u. s. w., p. vii., anm. 1; Uhlhorn, Die Homil. u. Recog., p. 343 ff.; Dörner, Lehre von d. Person Christi, 1845, i. p. 348, anm. 192; Lücke, Comment. Ev. Joh., i. p. 225, &c., &c., &c.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 288 f.; Zeitschr. f. weiss. Theol., 1869, p. 353 ff.; Köstlin, Hallische Alleg. Lit. Zeitung, 1849, No. 73—77; Nicolas, Etudes Crit. sur les Ev. Apocr., p. 77, note 2; Ritschl, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 264, anm. 1; cf. p. 451, anm. 1; Thiersch, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 341 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 62, p. 137, &c., &c., &c.

⁵ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 381 f.; Unters. kan. Evv., p. 562; Credner, Beiträge, i. p.

Petri
Hérpo
neces
of th
entire
Simon
and C
city f
repres
course
saying
exam
The
only h
from a
work
has as
passag
ment
upon t
tirely
our at
We
Homil
mony
deed,
this p
crease
most c
person
eviden
a char

279 ff.;
anm. 47
p. 87; A
Entst. a
On the C
1 Baur
Credner,
Markus
361 ff.;
1851, p.
f.; Ritsc
340 f.;
2 Cred
genfeld,
2; Zeller
Westcott,

Petrine writings, such as the "Preaching of Peter" (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*), and the "Travels of Peter" (*Περίοδοι Πέτρου*).¹ It is not necessary for our purpose to go into any analysis of the character of the Clementines. It will suffice to say that they almost entirely consist of discussions between the Apostle Peter and Simon the Magician regarding the identity of the true Mosaic and Christian religions. Peter follows the Magician from city to city for the purpose of exposing and refuting him, the one, in fact, representing Apostolic doctrine and the other heresy, and in the course of these discussions occur the very numerous quotations of sayings of Jesus and of Christian history which we have to examine.

The Clementine Recognitions, as we have already remarked, are only known to us through the Latin translation of Rufinus; and from a comparison of the evangelical quotations occurring in that work with the same in the Homilies, it is evident that Rufinus has assimilated them in the course of translation to the parallel passages of our Gospels. It is admitted, therefore, that no argument regarding the source of the quotations can rightly be based upon the Recognitions, and that work may, consequently, be entirely set aside,² and the Clementine Homilies alone need occupy our attention.

We need scarcely remark that, unless the date at which these Homilies were composed can be ascertained, their value as testimony for the existence of our Synoptic Gospels is very small indeed. The difficulty of arriving at a correct conclusion regarding this point, great under almost any circumstances, is of course increased by the fact that the work is altogether apocryphal, and most certainly not held by any one to have been written by the person whose name it bears. There is, in fact, nothing but internal evidence by which to fix the date, and that internal evidence is of a character which admits of very wide extension down the course

279 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 288 ff.; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 461, ann. 47; *Lechler*, D. ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 500; *Nicolas*, Etudes sur les Ev. Ap., p. 87; *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, 1863, p. 63, note 1; Gesch. N. T., p. 253; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 204 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 363 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 251; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgeschichte, 1854, p. 53.

¹ *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 536 ff.; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 560 ff.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 331 f.; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 256 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Das Markus Ev., p. 113 f.; Die ap. Väter, p. 289 ff.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1869, p. 361 ff.; *Köslin*, Der Ursprung synopt. Evv., p. 395; *Kayser*, Rev. de Théol., 1851, p. 131; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 314 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 251 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 264 ff.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 340 f.; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 62.

² *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 280 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 481 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv., Justins, p. 370 f.; *Nicolas*, Et. sur les Ev. Apocr., p. 69, note 2; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 60; *Scholten*, Die alt Zeugnisse, p. 55 f., ann. 10; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 251.

of time, although a sharp limit is set beyond which it cannot mount upwards. Of external evidence there is almost none, and what little exists does not warrant an early date. Origen, it is true, mentions *Περίοδοι Κλήμεντος*,¹ which, it is conjectured, may either be the same work as the *Ἀναγνωρισμός*, or Recognitions, translated by Rufinus, or related to it; and Epiphanius and others refer to *Περίοδοι Πέτρου*;² but our Clementine Homilies are not mentioned by any writer before pseudo-Athanasius.³ The work, therefore, can at the best afford no substantial testimony to the antiquity and apostolic origin of our Gospels. Hilgenfeld, following in the steps of Baur, arrives at the conclusion that the Homilies are directed against the Gnosticism of Marcion (and also, as we shall hereafter see, against the Apostle Paul), and he, therefore, necessarily assigns to them a date subsequent to A.D. 160. As Reuss, however, inquires: upon this ground, why should a still later date not be named, since even Tertullian wrote vehemently against the same Gnosis?⁴ There can be little doubt that the author was a representative of Ebionitic Gnosticism, which had once been the purest form of primitive Christianity, but later, through its own development, though still more through the rapid growth around it of Paulinian doctrine, had assumed a position closely verging upon heresy. It is not necessary for us, however, to enter upon any exhaustive discussion of the date at which the Clementines were written; it is sufficient to show that there is no certain ground upon which a decision can be based, and that even an approximate conjecture can scarcely be reasonably advanced. Critics variously date the composition of the original Recognitions from about the middle of the second century to the end of the third, though the majority are agreed in placing them at least in the latter century.⁵ They assign to the Homilies an origin at different dates within a period commencing about the middle of the second century, and extending to a century later.⁶

¹ Comment. in Genesin Philoc., 22.

² Hilgenfeld, considers Recog. iv.—vi., Hom. vii.—xi. a version of the *περίοδοι Πέτρου*. Die ap. Väter, p. 291 ff.; Ritschl does not consider that this can be decidedly proved, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 204 f.; so also Uhlhorn, Die Hom. u. Recog., p. 71 ff.

³ Synopsis. Sac. Script., sub finem.

⁴ Gesch. N. T., p. 254.

⁵ A.D. 150, Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 163, cf. 93 f., 108 f. Circa A.D. 140—150, Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 297, ann. 11; Der Paschastreit, p. 194. After A.D. 170, Maran., Divinit. D. N. J. C., lib. ii., cap. 7, § 4, p. 250 ff. Beginning 3rd century, Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 254; Zeller, Die Apostolgesch., p. 64; Bleek, Beiträge, p. 277; Dörner, Lehre von d. Person Christi, 1845, i. p. 348, ann. 192. Between A.D. 212—230, Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 481; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, 1844, p. 326 f. Not before A.D. 216, Gallandi, Vet. Patr. Bibl., ii. Proleg., p. lv. Between A.D. 218—231, Dodwell, Dissert. vi. in Iren., § xi., p. 443. End 3rd century, Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 281.

⁶ Before middle 2nd century, Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 45; cf. Beiträge,

In the Homilies there are very numerous quotations of expressions of Jesus and of Gospel history, which are generally placed in the mouth of Peter, or introduced with such formulae as: "The teacher said," "Jesus said," "He said," "The prophet said," but in no case does the author name the source from which these sayings and quotations are derived. That he does, however, quote from a written source, and not from tradition, is clear from the use of such expressions as "in another place (*ἄλλῃ που*)¹ he has said," which refer not to other localities or circumstances, but another part of a written history.² There are in the Clementine Homilies upwards of a hundred quotations of expressions of Jesus or references to his history, too many by far for us to examine in detail here; but, notwithstanding the number of these passages, so systematically do they vary more or less from the parallels in our canonical Gospels, that, as in the case of Justin, Apologists are obliged to have recourse to the elastic explanation, already worn so threadbare, of "free quotation from memory" and "blending of passages" to account for the remarkable phenomena presented. It must, however, be evident that the necessity for such an apology at all shows the absolute weakness of the evidence furnished by these quotations. De Witte says: "The quotations of evangelical works and histories in the pseudo-Clementine writings, from their nature free and inaccurate, permit only an uncertain conclusion to be drawn as to their source."³ Critics have maintained very different and conflicting views regarding that source. Apologists, of course, assert that the quotations in

i. p. 281. Middle 2nd century, *Ritschl*, *Entst. altk. K.*, p. 264, 451; cf. p. 65; *Kern*, *Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1835, H. 2, p. 112; *Gfrörer*, *Allg. K. G.*, i. p. 256; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden u. s. w.*, p. 90; *Réville*, *Essais de Crit. Religieuse*, 1860, p. 35. Soon after middle 2nd century, *Schliemann*, *Die Clementinen*, p. 548 f.; A. D. 160, *Lechler*, *Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit.*, p. 461. A. D. 150—170, *Schotten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 55. A. D. 150—160, *Renan*, *St. Paul*, 1869, p. 303, note 8. Before A. D. 180, *Kayser*, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1851, p. 155. A. D. 161—180, *Hilgenfeld*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1869, p. 353, ann. 1; cf. *Die ap. Väter*, p. 301; *Der Paschastreit*, p. 194. A. D. 175—180, *Falkner*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 164; cf. 137, 63. Second half 2nd century, *Dorn*, *Lehre Person Christi*, i. p. 341, ann. 190. End of 2nd century, *Baur*, *Dogmengesch.*, 1865, I., i. p. 155; *Ewald*, *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, vii. p. 183; cf. 386, ann. 1; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 254; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 406; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellenanml.*, p. 461, ann. 47; *Lücke*, *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, 1840, i. p. 225; *Gieseler*, *Kirchengeschichte*, *Neander*, *Genet. Entw. Gnost. Systeme*, p. 370; *Zimmermann*, *Lebensgesch. d. Kirche J. C.* 2 Ausg., ii. p. 118. A. D. 250, *Gallandi*, *Vet. Petr. Bibl. Proleg.*, p. lv.; *Müll.*, *Proleg. N. T. Gr.*, § 670. Fourth century, *Leitz*, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. p. 58. Their groundwork 2nd or 3rd century, *Gericke*, *HBuch K. G.*, p. 146. About A. D. 160, *Mansel*, *The Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, p. 222 f.

¹ See several instances, Hom. xix. 2.

² *Crohn*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 283.

³ Die Anführungen evangelischer Werke und Geschichten in den pseudo-clementinischen Schriften, ihrer Natur nach frei und ungenau, lassen nur unsichere auf ihre schriftliche Quelle zurückschliessen. *Einl. N. T.*, p. 115.

the Homilies are taken from our Gospels only.¹ Others ascribe them to our Gospels, with a supplementary apocryphal work: the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the Gospel according to Peter.² Some, whilst admitting a subsidiary use of some of our Gospels, assert that the author of the Homilies employs, in preference, the Gospel according to Peter;³ whilst others, recognizing also the similarity of the phenomena presented by these quotations with those of Justin's, conclude that the author does not quote our Gospels at all, but makes use of the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews.⁴ Evidence permitting of such divergent conclusions manifestly cannot be of a decided character. We may affirm, however, that few of those who are willing to admit the use of our Synoptics by the author of the Homilies along with other sources, make that concession on the strength of the absolute isolated evidence of the Homilies themselves, but they are generally moved by antecedent views on the point. In an inquiry like that which we have undertaken, however, such easy and indifferent judgment would obviously be out of place, and the point we have to determine is not whether an author may have been acquainted with our Gospels, but whether he furnishes testimony that he actually was in possession of our present Gospels and regarded them as authoritative.

We have already mentioned that the author of the Clementine Homilies never names the source from which his quotations are derived. Of these very numerous quotations we must distinctly state that only two or three, of a very brief and fragmentary character, literally agree with our Synoptics, whilst all the rest differ more or less widely from the parallel passages in those Gospels. Many of these quotations are repeated more than once with the same persistent and characteristic variations, and in several cases, as we have already seen, they agree with quotations of Justin from the Memoirs of the Apostles. Others, again, have

¹ *Lechler* Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 458, ann.; *Orelli*, Selecta Patr. Eccles., cap. 1821, p. 22; *Semisch*, Denkw. d. M. Just., p. 356 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 251; *Tischenhof*, Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 90.

² *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 533; *Franck*, Die evang. Citate in d. Clem. Hom., Stud. w. Geistlichkeit, 1847, 2, p. 144 ff.; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 461, ann. 47, 48; *Köstlin*, Der Ursprung synopt. Evv., p. 372 f.; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 58; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 115 f.; *Weisse*, Der evang. Gesch., i. p. 27, ann. * * *; *Uhlhorn*, Die Homilien u. Recog. d. Clem. Rom., 1854, p. 119-137; *Herzog's Realencyclop.*, Art. Clementinen.

³ *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 388; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 62; *Baur*, Unters. kan. E. v., p. 575 ff.; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 59.

⁴ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 330 ff.; *Neander*, Genetische Entw. der vorn. Gnost. Syst., p. 418 f.; *Nicolas*, Et. sur les Evang. Apocr., p. 69 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 193; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., n. 207.

Hilgenfeld, *Volkmar*, *Zeller*, and others consider that the author uses the same Gospel as Justin. See references in note 3.

no pa
are co
in the
senten
brief
agree
some
merely
in oth
quoted
Gospe
by an
system
petitic
no par
differ
furnish
Gospel

As i
tions i
with th
ready m
quotati
passage
gists de
which
they m
instanc

The
ties occ
me all
of Matt
by the
finding
cannot
The

¹ *Tisch*
only in co
tion. W
them ove
be "gene
from Mar
the fourth
2 *Diō*
rōgōv, c
iii. 52.
³ *Hilgen*

no parallels at all in our Gospels, and even apologists generally are compelled to admit the use also of an apocryphal Gospel. As in the case of Justin, therefore, the singular phenomenon is presented of a vast number of quotations of which only one or two brief phrases, too fragmentary to avail as evidence, perfectly agree with our Gospels; whilst of the rest all vary more or less, some merely resemble combined passages of two Gospels, others merely contain the sense, some present variations likewise found in other writers or in various parts of the Homilies are repeatedly quoted with the same variations, and others are not found in our Gospels at all. Such phenomena cannot be fairly accounted for by any mere theory of imperfect memory or negligence. The systematic variation from our Synoptics, variation proved by repetition not to be accidental, coupled with quotations which have no parallels at all in our Gospels, naturally point to the use of a different Gospel. In no case can the Homilies be accepted as furnishing evidence of any value even of the existence of our Gospels.

As it is impossible here to examine in detail all of the quotations in the Clementine Homilies, we must content ourselves with the distinct statement of their character which we have already made, and merely illustrate briefly the different classes of quotations, exhausting, however, those which literally agree with passages in the Gospels. The most determined of recent Apologists do not afford us an opportunity of testing the passages upon which they base their assertion of the use of our Synoptics, for they merely assume that the author used them without producing instances.¹

The first quotation which agrees with a passage in our Synoptics occurs in Hom. iii. 52: "And he cried, saying: Come unto me all ye that are weary," which agrees with the opening words of Matt. xi. 28, but the phrase does not continue, and is followed by the explanation, "that is, who are seeking the truth and not finding it."² It is evident, that so short and fragmentary a phrase cannot prove anything.³

The next passage occurs in Hom. xviii. 15: "For Isaiah said:

¹ *Tischendorf* only devotes a dozen lines, with a note, to the Clementines, and only in connection with our fourth Gospel, which shall hereafter have our attention. Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 90. In the same way Canon Westcott passes them over in a short paragraph, merely asserting the allusions to our Gospels to be "generally admitted," and only directly referring to one supposed quotation from Mark which we shall presently examine, and one which he affirms to be from the fourth Gospel. On the Canon, p. 251 f.

² Διό καὶ ἐβόα λέγων· 'Δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες.' τοῦ-
τίστιν, οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦντες καὶ μὴ εὕρισκοντες αὐτήν. Hom.
iii. 52.

³ *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, u. s. w., p. 351.

I will open my mouth in parables, and I will utter things that have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.¹ Now this passage, with a slightly different order of words, is found in Matt. xiii. 35. After giving a series of parables, the author of the Gospel says (v. 34), "All these things spake Jesus unto the multitudes in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them; (v. 35.) That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet (Isaiah), saying: I will open my mouth in parable, &c." There are two peculiarities which must be pointed out in this passage. It is not found in Isaiah, but in Psalm lxxviii. 2,² and it presents a variation from the version of the lxx. Both the variation and the erroneous reference to Isaiah, therefore, occur also in the Homily. The first part of the sentence agrees with, but the latter part is quite different from, the Greek of the lxx., which reads: "I will utter problems from the beginning," *φθέξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*.³

The Psalm from which the quotation is really taken is, by its superscription, ascribed to Asaph, who, in the Septuagint version of II Chronicles xxix. 30, is called a prophet.⁴ It was, therefore, early asserted that the original reading of Matthew was "Asaph," instead of "Isaiah."

Porphry, in the third century, twitted Christians with this erroneous ascription by their inspired evangelist to Isaiah of a passage from a Psalm, and reduced the Fathers to great straits. Eusebius, in his commentary on this verse of the Psalm, attributes the insertion of the words, "by the prophet Isaiah" to unintelligent copyists, and asserts that in accurate MSS. the name is not added to the word prophet. Jerome likewise ascribes the insertion of the name Isaiah for that of Asaph, which was originally written, to an ignorant scribe,⁵ and in the commentary on the Psalms, generally, though probably falsely, ascribed to him, the remark is made that many copies of the Gospel to that day had the name "Isaiah," for which Porphry had reproached Christians,⁶ and the writer of the same commentary actually allows himself to make the assertion that Asaph was found in all the old codices, but ignorant men had removed it.⁷ The fact is

¹ Καὶ τὸν Ἰσαΐαν εἰπεῖν· Ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα μου ἐν παραβολαῖς καὶ ἐξερευνῶμαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. Hom. xviii. 13.

² The Vulgate reads: *aperiam in parabolis os meum: loquar propositiones ab initio.* Ps. lxxviii. 2.

³ Ps. lxxvii. 2.

⁴ ἐν λόγοις Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἀσάφ τοῦ προφήτου.

⁵ Comment. Matt. xiii. 35.

⁶ Multi evangelia usque hodie ita habent: Ut impleretur, quod scriptum est per Isaiam prophetam, &c., &c. Hieron. Opp., vii. p. 270 f.

⁷ Asaph invenitur in omnibus veteribus codicibus; sed homines ignorantes tulerunt illud. To this *Credner* pertinently remarks: "Die Noth, in welcher die guten Kirchen-

that t
MS, a
obscu
in the
MS. e
proph
erased
The
Gospe
the co
impos
passag
sion be
takes t
God, a
man kn
maine
Son; a
the Pa
unjust,
thank
from th
gues th
&c.," he
from h
conceal
himself
admit,
conceal
went to
but, on
quoted
Testam
and not
marked
whethe
does no
and whe
ment
originat
occurre

väter dirc
ja: in ma
111. C
2 Hom.

that the reading "Asaph" for "Isaiah" is not found in any extant MS., and, although "Isaiah" has disappeared from all but a few obscure codices, it cannot be denied that the name anciently stood in the text.¹ In the Sinaitic Codex, which is probably the earliest MS. extant, and which is assigned to the fourth century, "the prophet *Isaiah*" stands in the text by the first hand, but is erased by the second (B).

The quotation in the Homily, however, is clearly not from our Gospel. It is introduced by the words "For Isaiah says:" and the context is so different from that in Matthew, that it seems impossible that the author of the Homily could have had the passage suggested to him by the Gospel. It occurs in a discussion between Simon the Magician and Peter. The former undertakes to prove that the Maker of the world is not the highest God, and amongst other arguments he advances the passage: "No man knew the Father, &c.," to show that the Father had remained concealed from the Patriarchs, &c., until revealed by the Son; and in reply to Peter he retorts, that if the supposition that the Patriarchs were not deemed worthy to know the Father was unjust, the Christian teacher was himself to blame, who said: "I thank thee, Lord of heaven and earth, that what was concealed from the wise thou hast revealed to suckling babes." Peter argues that in the statement of Jesus: "No man knew the Father, &c.," he cannot be considered to indicate another God and Father from him who made the world, and he continues: "For the concealed things of which he spoke may be those of the Creator himself; for Isaiah says: 'I will open my mouth, &c.' Do you admit, therefore, that the prophet was not ignorant of the things concealed,"² and so on. There is absolutely nothing in this argument to indicate that the passage was suggested by the Gospel, but, on the contrary, it is used in a totally different way, and is quoted not as an evangelical text, but as a saying from the Old Testament, and treated in connection with the prophet himself, and not with its supposed fulfilment in Jesus. It may be remarked, that in the corresponding part of the Recognitions, whether that work be of older or more recent date, the passage does not occur at all. Now, although it is impossible to say how and where this erroneous reference to a passage of the Old Testament first occurred, there is no reason for affirming that it originated in our first Synoptic, and as little for asserting that its occurrence in the Clementine Homilies, with so different a con-

väter durch Porphyrius gekommen waren, erlaubte auch eine Lüge. Sie geschah ja: in *majorum Dei gloriam*. Beiträge, i. p. 304.

¹ Cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 303 f.

² Hom. xviii. 1—15.

text and object, involves the conclusion that their author derived it from the Gospel, and not from the Old Testament or some other source. On the contrary, the peculiar argument based upon it in the Homilies suggests a different origin, and it is very probable that the passage, with its erroneous reference, was derived by both from another and common source.

Another passage is a phrase from the "Lord's Prayer," which occurs in Hom. xix. 2: "But also in the prayer which he commended to us, we have it said: Deliver us from the evil one" (*Ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*). It need scarcely be said, however, that few Gospels can have been composed without including this prayer, and the occurrence of this short phrase demonstrates nothing more than the mere fact, that the author of the Homilies was acquainted with one of the most universally known lessons of Jesus, or made use of a Gospel which contained it. There would have been cause for wonder had he been ignorant of it.

The only other passage which agrees literally with our Gospels is also a mere fragment from the parable of the Talents, and when the other references to the same parable are added, it is evident that the quotation is not from our Gospels. In Hom. iii. 65, the address to the good servant is introduced: "Well done, good and faithful servant" (*Εὖ, εὖλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστὲ*), which agrees with the words in Matt. xxv. 21. The allusion to the parable of the Talents in the context is perfectly clear, and the passage occurs in an address of the Apostle Peter to overcome the modest scruples of Zaccheus, the former publican, who has been selected by Peter as his successor in the Church of Caesarea, when he is about to leave in pursuit of Simon the Magician. Anticipating the possibility of his hesitating to accept the office, Peter, in an earlier part of his address, however, makes fuller allusions to the same parable of the Talents, which we must contrast with the parallel in the first Synoptic. "But if any of those present, having the ability to instruct the ignorance of men, shrink back from it, considering only his own ease, then let him expect to hear:"

HOM. III. 61.

Thou wicked and slothful servant ;

thou oughtest to have put out my money with the exchangers, and at my coming I should have exacted mine own.

Cast ye the unprofitable servant into the darkness without.

MATT. XXV. 26—30.

v. 26. Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather from where I strawed not.

v. 27. Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

v. 28, 29. Take therefore, &c., &c.

v. 30. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into the darkness without ; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Δου-
προβα-
καὶ ἐ-
λυόν-
ἐν β-
τὸ δὲ

The
not fo
'it is t
to pro
another
Gospel
more
proved
from t
peculia
additio
ing the
by our
for the
parable

Then
literall
ring th
variatio
ings.
applied
sages f
Homili
regard
and po
Gospels
those f
followi
widely
hav: al
first is f

¹ Luke
² Καὶ
ἀπολύτο:
³ Hom.
⁴ Cre. 2m

HOM. III. 61.

δοῦλε πονηρὲ καὶ ὀκνηρὲ,

ἔδει σε τὸ ἀργυρίον μου
προβαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζιτῶν,
καὶ ἐγὼ ἂν ἐλθὼν ἐπραξα τὸ
ἐμὸν.

ἐκβάλετε τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον εἰς
τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.

MATT. XXV. 26—30.

v. 26. Πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ ὀκνηρὲ,
ἦδεις ὅτι ἑρρίζω, κ.τ.λ.

v. 27. ἔδει σε οὖν βαλεῖν τὸ ἀρ-
γυρίον μου τοῖς τραπεζιταῖς, καὶ
ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομιδάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν
σὺν τόκῳ.

v. 28, 29. ἄρατε οἶν, κ.τ.λ.
v. 30. καὶ τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον
ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτε-
ρον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς, κ.τ.λ.

The Homily does not end here, however, but continues in words not found in our Gospels at all: "And reasonably: 'For,' he says, 'it is thine, O man, to put my words as silver with exchangers, and to prove them as money.'"² This passage is very analogous to another saying of Jesus, frequently quoted from an apocryphal Gospel, by the author of the Homilies, to which we shall hereafter more particularly refer, but here merely point out: "Be ye approved money-changers" (γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δοκιμοί).³ The variations from the parallel passages in the first and third Gospels, the peculiar application of the parable to the words of Jesus, and the addition of a saying not found in our Gospels, warrant us in denying that the quotations we are considering can be appropriated by our canonical Gospels, and, on the contrary, give good reason for the conclusion, that the author derived his knowledge of the parable from another source.

There is no other quotation in the Clementine Homilies which literally agrees with our Gospels, and it is difficult, without incurring the charge of partial selection, to illustrate the systematic variation in such very numerous passages as occur in these writings. It would be tedious and unnecessary to repeat the test applied to the quotations of Justin, and give in detail the passages from the Sermon on the Mount which are found in the Homilies. Some of these will come before us presently, but with regard to the whole, which are not less than fifty, we may broadly and positively state that they all more or less differ from our Gospels. To take the severest test, however, we shall compare those further passages which are specially adduced as most closely following our Gospels, and neglect the vast majority which most widely differ from them. In addition to the passages which we have already examined, Credner⁴ points out the following. The first is from Hom. xix. 2.⁵ "If Satan cast out Satan he is divided

¹ Luke xix. 23, substitutes ἐπραξα for ἐκομιδάμην.

² Καὶ εὐλόγως. Σοὺ γάρ, ῥηδὶν, ἀνθρώπε, τοὺς λόγους μου ὡς ἀργυρίον ἐπὶ τραπεζιτῶν βαλεῖν, καὶ ὡς χρήματα δοκιμάσθαι. Hom. iii. 61.

³ Hom. iii. 50. ii. 51, &c., &c.

⁴ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 285; cf. p. 302.

⁵ Cf. Matt. xii. 26.

against himself: how then can his kingdom stand?" In the first part of this sentence, the Homily reads, ἐκβάλλη for the ἐκβάλλει of the first Gospel, and the last phrase in each is as follows:

Hom. πῶς οὖν αὐτοῦ στήκη ἡ βασιλεία;

Matt. πῶς οὖν σταθισεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;

The third Gospel differs from the first as the Homily does from both. The next passage is from Hom. xix. 7.¹ "For thus said our Father, who was without deceit: out of abundance of heart mouth speaketh." The Greek compared with that of Matt. xii. 34.

Hom. Ἐκ περισσέυματος καρδίας στόμα λαλεῖ.

Matt. Ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσέυματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ.

The form of the Homily is much more proverbial. The next passage occurs in Hom. iii. 52: "Every plant which the heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted up." This agrees with the parallel in Matt. xv. 13, with the important exception that, although in the mouth of Jesus, "the heavenly Father" is substituted for the "my heavenly Father" of the Gospel. The last passage pointed out by Credner is from Hom. viii. 4: "But also 'many,' he said, 'called, but few chosen,'" which may be compared with Matt. xx. 16, &c.

Hom. Ἀλλὰ καὶ, πολλοί, φησὶν, κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

Matt. πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

We have already fully discussed this passage of the Gospel in connection with the "Epistle of Barnabas,"² and need not say more here.

The variations in these passages, it may be argued, are not very important. Certainly, if they were the exceptional variations amongst a mass of quotations perfectly agreeing with parallels in our Gospels, it might be exaggeration to base upon such divergences a conclusion that they were derived from a different source. When it is considered, however, that the very reverse is the case, and that these are passages selected for their closer agreement out of a multitude of others either more decidedly differing from our Gospels or not found in them at all, the case entirely changes, and variations being the rule instead of the exception, these, however slight, become evidence of the use of a Gospel different from ours. As an illustration of the importance of slight variations in connection with the question as to the source from which quotations are derived, the following may at random be pointed out. The passage "See thou say nothing to any man, but

¹ Cf. Matt. xii. 34.

² P. 215 ff.

go th
ἀλλὰ
lies w
ferred
ception
actual
Then,
so ma
follow
except
ἀίματος
would
Mark
The o
συγγεν
or def
words
erased
deriva
lished.
Gospe
We
clusive
in the
pursua
passag
The fir
sees si
speak
3: "T
therefo
join th
Hom
Matt
That th
the Go
"Hear
kingdo
1 ἰδοὺ
and other
2 Cf. M
3 Eini.
4 It is
various
mains the

go thy way, show thyself to the priest" ("Ορα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἶπης, ἀλλὰ ἑπαγε σεαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ) occurring in a work like the Homilies would, supposing our second Gospel no longer extant, be referred to Matt. viii. 4, with which it entirely agrees with the exception of its containing the one extra word *μηδέν*. It is, however, actually taken from Mark i. 44, and not from the first Gospel. Then, again, supposing that our first Gospel had shared the fate of so many others of the πολλοί of Luke, and in some early work the following passage were found: "A prophet is not without honour except in his own country and in his own house" (Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄνθρωπος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ,¹ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ), this passage would undoubtedly be claimed by apologists as a quotation from Mark vi. 4, and as proving the existence and use of that Gospel. The omission of the words "and among his own kin" (καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ) would at first be explained as mere abbreviation, or defect of memory, but on the discovery that part or all of these words are omitted from some MSS., that for instance the phrase is erased from the oldest manuscript known, the Cod. Sinaiticus, the derivation from the second Gospel would be considered as established. The author notwithstanding might never have seen that Gospel, for the quotation is taken from Matt. xiii. 57.²

We have already quoted the opinion of De Wette as to the inclusive nature of the deductions to be drawn from the quotations in the pseudo-Clementine writings regarding their source, but in pursuance of the plan we have adopted we shall now examine the passages which he cites as most nearly agreeing with our Gospels.³ The first of these occurs in Hom. iii. 18: "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit upon Moses' seat; all things, therefore, whatsoever they speak to you, hear them," which is compared with Matt. xxiii. 2, 3: "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit upon Moses' seat; all things, therefore, whatsoever they say to you, do and observe." We subjoin the Greek of the latter half of these passages.

Hom. πάντα οὖν ὅσα λέγωσιν ὑμῖν, ἀκούετε αὐτῶν.

Matt. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εἰπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε.⁴

That the variation in the Homily is deliberate and derived from the Gospel used by the author is clear from the continuation: "Hear them (αὐτῶν), he said, as entrusted with the key of the kingdom, which is knowledge, which alone is able to open the

¹ *ἰδίᾳ*, though not found in all MSS., has the authority of the Cod. Sinaiticus and other ancient texts.

² Cf. Matt. viii. 19—22; Luke ix. 57—60, &c., &c.

³ Eul. N. T., p. 115.

⁴ It is unnecessary to point out the various readings of the three last words in various MSS. Whether shortened or inverted, the difference from the Homily remains the same.

gate of life, through which alone is the entrance to eternal life. But verily, he says: They possess the key indeed, but to those who wish to enter in they do not grant it."¹ The *αὐτῶν* is here emphatically repeated, and the further quotation and reference to the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees continues to differ distinctly both from the account in our first and third Gospels. The passage in Matt. xxiii. 13, reads: "But woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye go not in yourselves neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in."² The parallel in Luke xi. 52 is not closer. There the passage regarding Moses' seat is altogether wanting, and in ver. 52, where the greatest similarity exists, the "lawyers" instead of the "Scribes and Pharisees" are addressed. The verse reads: "Woe unto you, Lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."³ The first Gospel has not the direct image of the key at all: the Scribes and Pharisees "shut the kingdom of heaven;" the third has "the key of knowledge" (*κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως*) taken away by the lawyers, and not by the Scribes and Pharisees, whilst the Gospel of the Homilies has the key of the kingdom (*κλεῖδα τῆς βασιλείας*), and explains that this key is knowledge (*ἥτις ἐστὶ γνώσις*). It is apparent that the first Gospel uses an expression more direct than the others, whilst the third Gospel explains it, but the Gospel of the Homilies has in all probability the simpler original words: the "key of the kingdom," which both of the others have altered for the purpose of more immediate clearness. In any case it is certain that the passage does not agree with our Gospel.⁴

The next quotation referred to by De Wette is in Hom. iii. 31: "And also that he said: 'I am not come to destroy the law . . . the heaven and the earth will pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law.'" This is compared with Matt. v. 17, 18:⁵ "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. (v. 18) For verily I say unto you: Till heaven and earth pass away one jot or one

¹ *Αὐτῶν δὲ, εἶπεν, ὡς τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς βασιλείας πεπιστευμένων, ἥτις ἐστὶ γνώσις, ἢ μόνῃ τὴν πύλιν τῆς ζωῆς ἀνοίξει δύναται, δι' ἧς μόνῃ εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν ἐστιν. Ἀλλὰ ναί, φησὶν, κρατοῦσι μὲν τὴν κλεῖδιν, τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις εἰσελθεῖν οὐ παρέχουσιν.* Hom. iii. 18: cf. Hom. iii. 70, xviii. 15, 16.

² *Οὐαὶ, κ.τ.λ. . . . ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐμπαροῦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχετε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσέρχοντο ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν.* Matt. xxⁱ. 13.

³ *Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσέλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσέρχοντο ἐκωλύσατε.* Luke xi. 52.

⁴ *Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 317 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 366 f.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 57 f.*

⁵ Cf. Luke xvi. 17.

tittle
Gree

Tō

Οὐκ

Οὐκ
ἴωτα
παρέλ

That
denta
litera
lies, in
the sa
that
Hilge
Homil
The G
assign

The
quotat
which
Jesus
nothin
Lord,
with I
the th

Τί μ
οὐ ποί

This p
singula
in the
the use
saying
"Lord
the Mo
The

1 § ii.

3 P. 38

4 Cf. M

little shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The Greek of both passages reads as follows:—

HOM. III. 51.

Τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτόν·

Οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον.

* * * * *
Οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται
ἰῶτα δὲ ἐν ἡ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ
παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου.

MATT. v. 17, 18.

Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον κατα-
λῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας·
οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πλη-
ρῶσαι.

v. 18. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως
ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ,
ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλ-
θῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα
γένηται.

That the omissions and variations in this passage are not accidental is proved by the fact that the same quotation occurs again literally in the Epistle from Peter,¹ which is prefixed to the Homilies, in which the *παρελεύσονται* is repeated, and the sentence closes at the same point. The author in that place adds: "This he said that all might be fulfilled" (*τοῦτο δὲ εἶρηκεν, ἵνα τὰ πάντα γίνηται*). Hilgenfeld considers this Epistle of much more early date than the Homilies, and that the agreement bespeaks a particular text.² The quotation does not agree with our Gospels, and must be assigned to another source.

The next passage pointed out by De Wette is the erroneous quotation from Isaiah which we have already examined.³ That which follows is found in Hom. viii. 7: "For on this account our Jesus himself said to one who frequently called him Lord, yet did nothing which he commanded: Why dost thou say to me Lord, Lord, and doest not the things which I say?" This is compared with Luke vi. 46:⁴ "But why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

HOM. VIII. 7.

Τί με λέγεις, Κύριε, κύριε, καὶ
οὐ ποιεῖς ὅ ἔλεγον;

LUKE VI. 46.

Τί δέ με καλεῖτε Κύριε, κύριε,
καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ὅ ἔλεγον;

This passage differs from our Gospels in having the second person singular instead of the plural, and in substituting *λέγεις* for *καλεῖτε* in the first phrase. The Homily, moreover, in accordance with the use of the second person singular, distinctly states that the saying was addressed to a person who frequently called Jesus "Lord," whereas in the Gospels it forms part of the Sermon on the Mount with a totally impersonal application to the multitude.

The next passage referred to by De Wette is in Hom. xix. 2:

¹ § ii.

² Die Evv. Justin's, p. 340.

³ P. 390. Cf. Hom. xviii. 15; Matt. xiii. 35.

⁴ Cf. Matt. vii. 21.

"And he declared that he saw the evil one as lightning fall from heaven." This is compared with Luke x. 18, which has no parallel in the other Gospels: "And he said to them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

HOM. IX. 22.

Καὶ ὅτι ἐώρακε τὸν
πονηρὸν ὡς ἀστραπὴν πεδόντα ἐκ
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐδήλωσεν.

LUKE X. 18.

Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐθεώρουν τὸν
σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐ-
ρανοῦ πεδόντα.

The substitution of τὸν πονηρὸν for τὸν σατανᾶν, had he found the latter in his Gospel, would be all the more remarkable from the fact that the author of the Homilies has just before quoted the saying "If Satan cast out Satan,"¹ &c., and he continues in the above words to show that Satan had been cast out, so that the evidence would have been strengthened by the retention of the word in Luke had he quoted that Gospel. The variations, however, indicate that he quoted from another source.²

The next passage pointed out by De Wette likewise finds a parallel only in the third Gospel. It occurs in Hom. ix. 22: "Nevertheless, though all demons with all the diseases flee before you, in this only is not to be your rejoicing, but in that, through grace, your names, as of the ever-living, are recorded in heaven." This is compared with Luke x. 20: "Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in the heavens."

HOM. IX. 22.

Ἀλλ' ὅμως καὶ πάντες δαίμονες
μετὰ πάντων τῶν παθῶν ὑμᾶς
φεύγουσιν, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν τούτῳ
μόνῳ χαίρειν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ δι' εὐα-
ρεστίας τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐν οὐ-
ρανῷ ὡς αἱ ζώντων ἀναγραφῆναι.

LUKE X. 20.

Πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε, ὅτι
τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῶν ὑποτάσσεται,
χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν
ἐγγεγραπταὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The differences between these two passages are too great and the peculiarities of the Homily too marked to require any argument to demonstrate that the quotation cannot be successfully claimed by our third Gospel. On the contrary, as one of so many other passages systematically varying from the canonical Gospels, it must be assigned to another source.

De Wette says: "A few others (quotations) presuppose (voransetzen) the Gospel of Mark,"³ and he gives them. The first occurs in Hom. ii. 19: "There is a certain Justa⁴ amongst us, a Syro-phœnician, a Canaanite by race, whose daughter was affected by

¹ See p. 393.² Cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 346 f.³ Einl. N. T., p. 115.⁴ Cf. Hom. iii. 73; xiii. 7.

a son
cating
by u
from
in th
heari
the s
take
desir
vii. 2
phen
unim
fore,
that t
no ot
fore d
the na
the us
does n
langui
and th
(vii. 2
in Ma
(κακῶς
disease
nothin
Matth
(ἡρώτων
whilst
in the
gives t
filled:
cast it

1 "τοῦ
τό ἡν
προσῆλ
ὅ δὲ,
ἐκκοτα
δομένης
τοῦτο ἄ
των συμ
τῆς βασι
Hom. ii.
2 Cf. M
3 "The
Ἑλληνίς
(γενή X.
Matt.

a sore disease, and who came to our Lord crying out and supplicating that he would heal her daughter. But he being also asked by us, said: 'It is not meet to heal the Gentiles, who are like dogs from their using different meats and practices, whilst the table in the kingdom has been granted to the sons of Israel.' But she, hearing this and exchanging her former manner of life for that of the sons of the kingdom, in order that she might, like a dog, partake of the crumbs falling from that same table, obtained, as she desired, healing for her daughter."¹ This is compared with Mark vii. 24-30,² as it is the only Gospel which calls the woman a Syrophenician. The Homily, however, not only calls her so, a very unimportant point, but gives her name as "Justa." If, therefore, it be argued that the mention of her nationality supposes that the author found the fact in his Gospel, and that, as we know no other but Mark³ which gives that information, he therefore derived it from our second Gospel, the additional mention of the name of "Justa" on the same grounds necessarily points to the use of a Gospel which likewise contained it, which our Gospel does not. Nothing can be more decided than the variation in language throughout this whole passage from the account in Mark, and the reply of Jesus is quite foreign to our Gospels. In Mark (vii. 25) the daughter has "an unclean spirit" (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον); in Matthew (xv. 22) she is "grievously possessed by a devil" (κακῶς δαμονιζέται), but in the Homily she is "affected by a sore disease" (ἐπὶ χαλεπῆς νόσου συνέχετο). The second Gospel knows nothing of any intercession on the part of the disciples, but Matthew has: "And the disciples came and besought him (ἤρώτων αὐτὸν) saying: 'Send her away, for she crieth after us,'"⁴ whilst the Homily has merely "being also asked by us," (ἀξιωθεὶς) in the sense of intercession in her favour. The second Gospel gives the reply of Jesus as follows: "Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the bread of the children, and to cast it to the dogs. And she answered and said unto him: 'Yea,

¹ Ἰουδαῖα τις ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶ Συροφονικισσα, τὸ γένος Χανανίτις, ἥς τὸ θυγάτριον ἐπὶ χαλεπῆς νόσου συνέχετο, ἣ καὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν προσήλθε βοᾷσα καὶ κτερεύουσα, ὅπως αὐτῆς τὸ θυγάτριον ἡραπεύσῃ. Ὁ δὲ, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡμῶν ἀξιωθείς, εἶπεν· Οὐκ ἐξεστὶν ἰάσθαι τὰ ἔθνη, ὅσατα κύνων, διὰ τὸ διαφόροις χρήσθαι τροφαῖς καὶ πραξέσιν, ἀποδεδομένης τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τραπέζης τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ. Ἡ δὲ τοῦτο ἀκούσασα, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς τραπέζης, ὥς κύνων ψυχῶν ἀπιπιπτόντων συμμεταλαμβάνειν μεταθεύνη ὅπερ ἦν, τῷ ὁμοίως διαιτᾶσθαι τοῖς τῆς βασιλείας υἱοῖς, τῆς εἰς τὴν θυγατέρα, ὥς ἡξιώσεν ἐντυχεν ἰάσεως. Hom. ii. 19.

² Cf. Matt. xv. 21-28.

³ "The woman was a Greek, a Syrophenician by nation" (ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἕλληνίς, Σύρα Φοινικισσα τῷ γένει), Mark vii. 26. "A woman of Canaan" (γυνὴ Χαναναία), Matt. xv. 22.

Matt. xv. 23.

Lord, for the dogs also eat under the table of the crumbs of the children.' And he said unto her: For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter."¹ The nature of the reply of the woman is, in the Gospels, the reason given for granting her request; but in the Homily the woman's conversion to Judaism,² that is to say Judeo-Christianity, is prominently advanced as the cause of her successful pleading. It is certain from the whole character of this passage, the variation of the language, and the reply of Jesus which is not in our Gospels at all, that the narrative was not derived from them, but from another source.³

The last of De Wette's⁴ passages is from Hom. iii. 57: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord thy⁵ God is one Lord." This is a quotation from Deuteronomy vi. 4, which is likewise quoted in the second Gospel, xii. 29, in reply to the question, "Which is the first Commandment of all? Jesus answered: The first is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God," &c., &c. In the Homily, however, the quotation is made in a totally different connection, for there is no question of commandments at all, but a clear statement of the circumstances under which the passage was used, which excludes the idea that this quotation was derived from Mark xii. 29. The context in the Homily is as follows: "But to those who were beguiled to imagine many gods as the Scriptures say, he said: Hear, O Israel," &c., &c.⁶ There is no hint of the assertion of many gods in the Gospels; but, on the contrary, the question is put by one of the scribes in Mark to whom Jesus says: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God."⁷ The quotation, therefore, beyond doubt, must have been taken from a different Gospel.

We may here refer to the passage, the only one pointed out by him in connection with the Synoptics, the discovery of which Canon Westcott affirms "has removed the doubts which had long been raised about those (allusions) to St. Mark."⁸ The discovery referred to is that of the Codex Ottobonianus by Dressel, which contains the concluding part of the Homilies, and which was first published by him in 1853. Canon Westcott says: "Though St.

¹ Mark vii. 27-29. Ἀφ' ὧν πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα· οἱ γὰρ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυνarioῖς βαλεῖν. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδίων. κ.τ.λ.

² Cf. Hom. xiii. 7.

³ Cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 352 f.

⁴ Einl. N. T., p. 115.

⁵ Although most MSS. have σου in this place, some, as for instance that edited by Cotelerius, read ὑμῶν.

⁶ Τοῖς δὲ ἡπατημένοις πολλοῖς θεοὺς ὑπονοεῖν, ὡς αἱ Γραφαὶ λέγουσιν, εἶπεν, Ἀκούε, Ἰσραὴλ, κ.τ.λ. Hom. iii. 57.

⁷ Mark xii. 34.

⁸ On the Canon, p. 251.

Mar
in th
follow
eiple
This
own

Διδ
διδ
βυδλ

We h
Westo
tion:
pels.
xix. 3
that

referen
such a
Homil
Mark.
teries
μωττιμ

Dr. W
θεοῖ.
apologi
cicles t
mences
Teache
and the
disciple

here is
the phr
at all,
The ph
with al

It mi

1 Cf. O
2 Dr. V
Sinaiticus
read for
the passa
3 On th
4 Καὶ
ἐντελλο
μου φυλ

Mark has few peculiar phrases, one of these is repeated verbally in the concluding part of the 19th Homily."¹ The passage is as follows: Hom. xix. 20: "Wherefore also he explained to his disciples privately the mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens." This is compared with Mark iv. 34. . . . "and privately to his own disciples he explained all things."

HOM. XIX. 20.

Διό καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπέλυε τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια.

MARK IV. 34.

. . . κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.²

We have only a few words to add to complete the whole of Dr. Westcott's remarks upon the subject. He adds after the quotation: "This is the only place where *ἐπλύω* occurs in the Gospels."³ We may, however, point out that it occurs also in Acts xix. 39 and 2 Peter i. 20. It is upon the coincidence of this word that Canon Westcott rests his argument that this passage is a reference to Mark. Nothing, however, could be weaker than such a conclusion from such an indication. The phrase in the Homily presents a very marked variation from the passage in Mark. The "all things" (πάντα) of the Gospel reads: "The mysteries of the kingdom of the heavens" (τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια) in the Homily. The passage in Mark iv. 11, to which Dr. Westcott does not refer, reads τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θωῦ. There is one very important matter, however, which our apologist has omitted to point out, and which, it seems to us, decides the case—the context in the Homily. The chapter commences thus: "And Peter said: We remember that our Lord and Teacher, as commanding, said to us: 'Guard the mysteries for me, and the sons of my house.' Wherefore also he explained to his disciples privately," &c.⁴ And then comes our passage. Now, here is a command of Jesus, in immediate connection with which the phrase before us is quoted, which does not appear in our Gospels at all, and which clearly establishes the use of a different source. The phrase itself, which differs from Mark as we have seen, may with all right be referred to the same unknown Gospel.

It must be borne in mind that all the quotations which we have

¹ Cf. On the Canon, p. 252.

² Dr. Westcott quotes this reading, which is supported by the Codices B, C, Sinaiticus and others. The Codex Alexandrinus and a majority of other MSS. read for τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς,—"τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ," which is closer to the passage in the Homily. It is fair that this should be pointed out.

³ On the Canon, p. 252, note 1.

⁴ Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος· Μεμνήμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ Διδασκάλου, ὡς ἐντελλόμενος, εἶπεν ἡμῖν· Τὰ μυστήρια ἔμοι καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε. κ.τ.λ. Hom. xix. 20.

hitherto examined are those which have been selected as most closely approximating to passages in our Gospels. Space forbids our giving illustrations of the vast number which so much more widely differ from parallel texts in the Synoptics. We shall confine ourselves to pointing out in the briefest possible manner some of the passages which are persistent in their variations or recall similar passages in the Memoirs of Justin. The first of these is the injunction in Hom. iii. 55: "Let your yea be yea, your nay nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of the evil one." The same saying is repeated in Hom. xix. with the sole addition of "and." We subjoin the Greek of these, together with that of the Gospel and Justin with which the Homilies agree.

Hom. iii. 55.	Ἐστῶ	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ καὶ	τὸ οὐ οὐ.
Hom. xix. 2.	Ἐστῶ	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ καὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.	
Apel. i. 16.	Ἐστῶ δὲ	ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ καὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.	
Matt. v. 37.	Ἐστῶ δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν	καὶ καὶ	οὐ οὐ.

As we have already discussed this passage¹ we need not repeat our remarks here. That this passage comes from a source different from our Gospels is rendered more apparent by the quotation in Hom. xix. 2 being preceded by another which has no parallel at all in our Gospels. "And elsewhere he said, 'He who sowed the bad seed is the devil' ('Ο δὲ τὸ κακὸν σπέρμα σπείρας ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος²); and again: 'Give no pretext to the evil one'³ (Μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ.) But in exhorting he prescribes: 'Let your yea be yea,' &c. The first of these phrases differs markedly from our Gospels; the second is not in them at all; the third, which we are considering, differs likewise in an important degree in common with Justin's quotation, and there is every reason for supposing that the whole were derived from the same unknown source.³

In the same Homily, xix. 2, there occurs also the passage which exhibits variations likewise found in Justin, which we have already examined,⁴ and now merely point out. "Begone into the darkness without, which the Father hath prepared for the devil and his angels."⁵ The quotation in Justin (Dial. 76) agrees exactly with this, with the exception that Justin has Σατανᾶ instead of διαβόλω, which is not important, whilst the agree-

¹ P. 295, p. 310 f.

² Cf. Matt. xiii. 39.

³ Cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 306; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 360.

⁴ P. 336 f.

⁵ Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἑξώτερον, ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Πατήρ τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ. Hom. xix. 2; cf. Matt. xxv. 41.

men
pel
W
"No
know
mine
in fo
read
aoris
ties
Chun
them
varia
writte
the a
same
these
and t
sourc
An
not k
count
with
Script

Διὰ
τα ἀλ
ἀγνοῦ

The
20, an
conne
tures,
and so
by rea
a dou
a Gos

¹ Hil
330; M
² P. 3
³ Iren
⁴ Hon
⁵ Hil
248 E, 3
p. 48; A
Cf.

ment in the marked variation from the parallel in the first Gospel establishes the fact of a common source different from ours.¹

We have also already² referred to the passage in Hom. xvii. 4: "No one knew (ἐγνώ) the Father but the Son, even as no one knoweth the Son but the Father and those to whom the Son is minded to reveal him." This quotation differs from Matt. xi. 27 in form, in language, and in meaning, but agrees with Justin's reading of the same text, and, as we have shown, the use of the aorist here, and the transposition of the order, were characteristics of Gospels used by Gnostics and other parties in the early Church, and the passage with these variations was regarded by them as the basis of some of their leading doctrines.³ That the variation is not accidental, but a deliberate quotation from a written source, is proved by this, and by the circumstance that the author of the Homilies repeatedly quotes it elsewhere in the same form.⁴ It is impossible to suppose that the quotations in these Homilies are so systematically and consistently erroneous, and the only natural conclusion is that they are derived from a source different from our Gospels.⁵

Another passage occurs in Hom. iii. 50: "Wherefore ye do err, not knowing the true things of the Scriptures; and on this account ye are ignorant of the power of God." This is compared with Mark xii. 24: "Do ye not therefore err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God?"

HOM. III. 50.

Διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾷσθε μὴ εἰδότες
τα ἀληθῆ τῶν γραφῶν, οὐ εἶνεκεν
ἀγνοεῖτε τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

MARK XII. 24.

Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾷσθε μὴ
εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν
τοῦ Θεοῦ;

The very same quotation is made both in Hom. ii. 51 and xviii. 20, and in each case in which the passage is introduced it is in connection with the assertion that there are true and false Scriptures, and that, as there are in the Scriptures some true sayings and some false, Jesus by this saying showed to those who erred by reason of the false the cause of their error. There cannot be a doubt that the author of the Homilies quotes this passage from a Gospel different from ours, and this is demonstrated both by

¹ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, pp. 369, 233 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 211, p. 330; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 245 f.

² P. 327 ff.

³ Irenæus, Adv. Hær., iv. 6, §§ 1, 3, 7; cf. p. 330 f.

⁴ Hom. xviii. 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 20.

⁵ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 201 ff., 351; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 210 f., 248 f., 314, 330; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 245; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch. p. 48; Baur, Unters. kan. F.vv., p. 576.

Cf. Matt. xxii. 29, which is still more remote.

the important variation from our text and also by its consistent repetition and by the context in which it stands.¹

Upon each occasion, also, that the author of the Homilies quotes the foregoing passage he likewise quotes another saying of Jesus which is foreign to our Gospels: "Be ye approved money-changers," *γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δοκιμοί*.² The saying is thrice quoted without variation, and each time, together with the preceding passage, it refers to the necessity of discrimination between true and false sayings in the Scriptures, as for instance: "And Peter said: If, therefore, of the Scriptures some are true and some are false, our Teacher rightly said: 'Be ye approved money-changers,' as in the Scriptures there are some approved sayings and some spurious."³ This is one of the best known of the apocryphal sayings of Jesus, and it is quoted by nearly all the Fathers,⁴ by many as from Holy Scripture, and by some ascribed to the Gospel of the Nazarenes, or the Gospel according to the Ebionites. There can be no question here that the author quotes an apocryphal Gospel.⁵

There is, in immediate connection with both the preceding passages, another saying of Jesus quoted which is not found in our Gospels: "Why do ye not discern the good reason of the Scriptures?" *Διὰ τί οὐ νοεῖτε τὸ εὖλογον τῶν γραφῶν*;⁶ This passage also comes from a Gospel different from ours,⁷ and the connection and sequence of these quotations is very significant.

One further illustration, and we have done. We find the following in Hom. iii. 55: "And to those who think that God tempts, as the Scriptures say, he said: 'The evil one is the tempter,' who also tempted himself."⁸ This short saying is not found in our Gospels. It probably occurred in the Gospel of the Homilies in connection with the temptation of Jesus. It is not improbable that the writer of the Epistle of James, who shows acquaintance with a Gospel different from ours,⁹ also knew th.

¹ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 365.

² Hom. ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20.

³ Hom. ii. 51.

⁴ Apost. Constit., ii. 36; cf. 37; Clem. Al., Strom., i. 28, § 177; cf. ii. 4, § 15, vi. 10, § 81, vii. 15, § 90; Origen, in Joan. T. xix., vol. iv., p. 289; Epiphanius, Hær., xlv. 2, p. 382; Hieron., Ep. ad Minerv. et Alex., 119 (al. 152); Comm. in Ep. ad Ephes., iv.; Grabe, Spicil. Patr., i. p. 13 f., 326; Cotelerius, Patr. Ap., i. p. 247 f.; Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T., ii. p. 524.

⁵ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 326 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 369; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 115, ann. f.

⁶ Hom. iii. 50.

⁷ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 326; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 365; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 115, ann. f.; Cotelerius, Not. ad Clem. Hom., iii. 50.

⁸ Τοῖς δὲ οἰομένοις ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πειράζει, ὥς αἱ Γραφαὶ λέγουσιν ἔφη· Ὁ πονηρὸς ἐστὶν ὁ πειράζων, ὁ καὶ αὐτὸν πειράσας. Hom. iii. 55.

⁹ Cf. ch. v. 12.

saying
Certa
our C
Th
time
the e
have
specia
have
favou
adequ
the g
the H
of the
agree
shown
Gospel
all wit
Gospel
tions i
the sar
tions o
Upon
such sy
astoun
agreem
prove
even u
a great
inaccu
having
truthfu
The na
the ineq
Gospel
named
tion of
the Cle
the orig
fact, in
the esta
of the d

¹ Cf. ch.

² Credn

saying.¹ We are here again directed to the Ebionite Gospel. Certainly the quotation is derived from a source different from our Gospels.²

These illustrations of the evangelical quotations in the Clementine Homilies give but an imperfect impression of the character of the extremely numerous passages which occur in the work. We have selected for our examination the quotations which have been specially cited by critics as closest to parallels in our Gospels, and have thus submitted the question to the test which was most favourable to the claims of our Synoptics. Space forbids our adequately showing the much wider divergence which exists in the great majority of cases between them and the quotations in the Homilies. To sum up the case: Out of more than a hundred of these quotations only four brief and fragmentary phrases really agree with parallels in our Synoptics, and these, we have shown, are either not used in the same context as in our Gospels or are of a nature far from special to them. Of the rest, all without exception systematically vary more or less from our Gospels, and many in their variations agree with similar quotations in other writers, or on repeated quotation always present the same peculiarities, whilst others, professed to be direct quotations of sayings of Jesus, have no parallels in our Gospels at all. Upon the hypothesis that the author made use of our Gospels, such systematic divergence would be perfectly unintelligible and astounding. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the agreement of a few passages with parallels in our Gospels cannot prove anything. The only extraordinary circumstance is that, even using a totally different source, there should not have been a greater agreement with our Synoptics. But for the universal inaccuracy of the human mind, every important historical saying, having obviously only one distinct original form, would in all truthful histories have been reported in that one unvarying form. The nature of the quotations in the Clementine Homilies leads to the inevitable conclusion that their author derived them from a Gospel different from ours. The source of the quotations is never named throughout the work, and there is not the faintest indication of the existence of our Gospels. These circumstances render the Clementine Homilies, in any case, of no evidential value as to the origin and authenticity of the canonical Gospels. This mere fact, in connection with a work written a century and a half after the establishment of Christianity, and abounding with quotations of the discourses of Jesus, is in itself singularly suggestive.

¹ Cf. ch. i. 13.

² Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 306; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 339.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the author of the Homilies has no idea whatever of any canonical writings but those of the Old Testament, though even with regard to these some of our quotations have shown that he held peculiar views, and believed that they contained spurious elements. There is no reference in the Homilies to any of the Epistles of the New Testament.¹

One of the most striking points in this work, on the other hand, is its determined animosity against the Apostle Paul. We have seen that a strong anti-Pauline tendency was exhibited by many of the Fathers, who, like the author of the Homilies, made use of Judeo-Christian Gospels different from ours. In this work, however, the antagonism against the "Apostle of the Gentiles" assumed a tone of peculiar virulence. There cannot be a doubt that the Apostle Paul is attacked in this religious romance, as the great enemy of the true faith, under the hated name of Simon the Magician,² whom Peter follows everywhere for the purpose of unmasking and confuting him. He is robbed of his title of "Apostle of the Gentiles," which, together with the honour of founding the Church of Antioch, of Laodiceæ, and of Rome, is ascribed to Peter. All that opposition to Paul which is implied in the Epistle to the Galatians and elsewhere³ is here realized and exaggerated, and the personal difference with Peter to which Paul refers⁴ is widened into the most bitter animosity. In the Epistle of Peter to James which is prefixed to the Homilies, Peter says, in allusion to Paul: "For some among the Gentiles have rejected my lawful preaching and accepted certain lawless and foolish teaching of the hostile man."⁵ First expounding a doctrine of duality, as heaven and earth, day and night, life and death,⁶ Peter asserts that in nature the greater things come first, but amongst men the opposite is the case, and the first is worse and the second better.⁷ He then says to Clement that it is easy according to this order to

¹ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 252, note 2; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 57.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 97 ff., 148, ann. 1, p. 250; K. G. d. 3. erst. Jahrh., p. 87 ff., 93, ann. 1; Tubinger Zeitschr. f. Th., 1831, h. 4, p. 136 f.; Dogmengesch. I., i. p. 155; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 286 f.; Gfrörer, Allg. K. G., i. p. 257 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Clem. Recogn. u. Hom., p. 319; Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol., 1869, p. 353 ff.; Der Kanon, p. 11 f.; A. Kayser, Rev. de Théol., 1851, p. 142 f.; Lechler, Das apost. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 457 f., p. 500; Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 1875, p. 231; Réville, Essais de Crit. Relig., 1860, p. 35 f.; Renan, St. Paul, 1869, p. 303, note 8; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 63, note 1; Ritschl, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 277 ff.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugn., p. 57; Schweigger, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 372 ff.; Uhlhorn, Die Homilien, n. s. w., 1854, p. 297; Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1856, p. 279 f.; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 252, note 2; Zeller, Apostelgeschichte, p. 158 f.

³ 1 Cor. i. 11, 12; 2 Cor. xi. 13, 20 f.; Philip. i. 15, 16.

⁴ Gal. ii. 11; cf. 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.

⁵ Epist. Petri ad Jacobum, § 2. Canon Westcott quotes this passage with the observation, "There can be no doubt that St. Paul is referred to as 'the enemy.'"

On the Canon, p. 252, note 2.

⁶ Hom. ii. 15.

⁷ *Ib.*, ii. 16.

discer
to the
and h
ignor
been
know
hater
welco
as a
deceiv
more
indica
of Sim
Peter,
hath
one
follow
avoid
accur
brothe
the Ch
shoul
preach
semin
mainta
teachi
natura
senses
to you
as an
visions
then v
year to
that h
you, w
seen an
preach
not me
against
1 Hom
2 *Ib.*,
4 We
5 Hom
7 Cf. I
Cf. Galat
taught it

discern to what class Simon (Paul) belongs, "who came before me to the Gentiles, and to which I belong who have come after him, and have followed him as light upon darkness, as knowledge upon ignorance, as health upon disease."¹ He continues: "If he had been known he would not have been believed, but now, not being known, he is wrongly believed; and though by his acts he is a hater, he has been loved; and although an enemy, he has been welcomed as a friend; and though he is death, he has been desired as a saviour: and though fire, esteemed as light; and though a deceiver, he is listened to as speaking the truth."² There is much more of this acrimonious abuse put into the mouth of Peter.³ The indications that it is Paul who is really attacked under the name of Simon are much too clear to admit of doubt. In Hom. xi. 35, Peter, warning the Church against false teachers, says: "He who hath sent us, our Lord and Prophet, declared to us that the evil one . . . announced that he would send from amongst his followers apostles⁴ to deceive. Therefore above all remember to avoid every apostle, or teacher, or prophet, who first does not accurately compare his teaching with that of James called the brother of my Lord, and to whom was confided the ordering of the Church of the Hebrews in Jerusalem," &c., lest this evil one should send a false preacher to them, "as he has sent to us Simon preaching a counterfeit of truth in the name of our Lord and disseminating error."⁵ Further on he speaks more plainly still. Simon maintains that he has a truer appreciation of the doctrines and teaching of Jesus because he has received his inspiration by supernatural vision, and not merely by the common experience of the senses,⁶ and Peter replies: "If, therefore, our Jesus indeed appeared to you in a vision, revealed himself, and spoke to you, it was only as an irritated adversary. . . . But can any one through visions become wise in teaching? And if you say: 'It is possible,' then wherefore did the Teacher remain and discourse for a whole year to us who were awake? And how can we believe your story that he appeared to you? And in what manner did he appear to you, when you hold opinions contrary to his teaching? But if seen and taught by him for a single hour you became his apostle: ⁷ preach his words, interpret his sayings, love his apostles, oppose not me who consorted with him. For you have set yourself up against me who am a firm rock, the foundation of the Church. I

¹ Hom. ii. 17.² *Ib.*, ii. 18.³ Cf. Hom. iii. 59; vii. 2, 4, 10, 11.⁴ We have already pointed out that this declaration is not in our Gospels.⁵ Hom. xi. 35; cf. Galat. i. 7 ff.⁶ *Ib.*, xvii. 13 ff.⁷ Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1 ff. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" Cf. Galat. i. 1; i. 12, "For neither did I myself receive it by man, nor was I taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ."

you were not an opponent you would not calumniate me, you would not revile my teaching in order that, in declaring what I have myself heard from the Lord, I may not be believed, as though I were condemned. . . . But if you call me condemned, you speak against God who revealed Christ to me,"¹ &c. This last phrase: "If you call me condemned" (Ἡ εἰ κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις) is an evident allusion to Galat. ii. 11: "I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned" (ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν).

We have digressed to a greater extent than we intended, but it is not unimportant to show the general character and tendency of the work we have been examining. The Clementine Homilies, —written perhaps about the end of the second century, which never name or indicate a single Gospel as the source of the author's knowledge of evangelical history, whose quotations of sayings of Jesus, numerous as they are, systematically differ from the parallel passages of our Synoptics, or are altogether foreign to them, which denounce the Apostle Paul as an impostor, enemy of the faith, and disseminator of false doctrine, and therefore repudiate his Epistles, at the same time equally ignoring all the other writings of the New Testament,—can scarcely be considered as giving much support to any theory of the early formation of the New Testament Canon, or as affording evidence even of the existence of its separate books.

2.

Among the writings which used formerly to be ascribed to Justin Martyr, and to be published along with his general works, is the short composition commonly known as the "Epistle to Diognetus." The ascription of this composition to Justin arose solely from the fact that in the only known MS. of the letter there is an inscription Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Διόγνητον which from its connection was referred to Justin.² The style and contents of the work, however, soon convinced critics that it could not possibly be written by Justin,³ and although it has been ascribed by vari-

¹ Hom. xvii. 19.

² Otto, Ep. ad Diognetum, &c., 1852, p. 11 f.

³ Baur, Dogmengesch. I., i. p. 255; Gesch. chr. Kirche, i. p. 373; Bunsen, Analecta Ante-Nic., i. p. 103 ff.; Christianity and Mankind, i. p. 170 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 50; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 399; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 138 ff.; Ewald, Gesch. Volkes Isr., vii. p. 251; Guericke, H'buch K. G., p. 152; C. D. a. Grossheim, De ep. ad Diogn. Comm., 1828; Hollenberg, Der Br. ad Diogn., 1853; Hilgenfeld, Die ap. Väter, p. 1, cf. 9 f.; Kayser, Rev. de Théol., xiii., 1856, p. 258 ff.; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 36, ann. 1.; Müller, Ueb. d. Br. an Diogn. Werke, 1839, i. p. 19 ff.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 289; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 191; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 40; Tillemont, Mém. eccl., tom. ii. pt. 1, p. 366, 493, note 1; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 74 f.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 50.

ous
othe
criti
of th
St
of as
extre
cultu
and
neius
conse
the p
mous
a sing
and t
and l
wide
altho
ing p
end o
centu
gery.
date
to act
only
absen
in a s
and w
1 Don
p. 36, a
2 Cred
Donald
251; am
Reuss, C
3 C. D.
Isr., vii.
xiii. 185
u. s. w.,
Mankin
Der Kai
gosis, p.
gefeld
1 of no
Apostelg
250-310.
4 Don
first edit
Constant
141 f. S
time of C

ous isolated writers to Apollos, Clement, Marcion, Quadratus, and others, none of these guesses have been seriously supported, and critics are almost universally agreed in confessing that the author of the Epistle is entirely unknown.

Such being the case, it need scarcely be said that the difficulty of assigning a date to the work with any degree of certainty is extreme, if it be not absolutely impossible to do so. This difficulty, however, is increased by several circumstances. The first and most important of these is the fact that the Epistle to Diognetus is neither quoted nor mentioned by any ancient writer, and consequently there is no external evidence whatever to indicate the period of its composition.¹ Moreover, it is not only anonymous but incomplete, or, at least, as we have it, not the work of a single writer. At the end of Chapter x. a break is indicated, and the two concluding chapters are unmistakably by a different and later hand.² It is not singular, therefore, that there exists a wide difference of opinion as to the date of the first ten chapters, although all agree regarding the later composition of the concluding portion. It is assigned to various periods between about the end of the first quarter of the second century to the end of that century,³ whilst others altogether denounce it as a modern forgery.⁴ Nothing can be more insecure in one direction than the date of a work derived alone from internal evidence. Allusions to actual occurrences may with certainty prove that a work could only have been written after they had taken place. The mere absence of later indications in an anonymous Epistle only found in a single MS. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, however, and which may have been and probably was written expressly in

¹ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 126; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 36, ann. 1.

² *Credner*, *Der Kanon*, p. 59 ff., 67, 76; *Donaldson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 339; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 142; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 251, ann. 1; *Hilgenfeldt*, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 1; *Otto*, *Just. Mart.*, ii. p. 201 n.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 290; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 75.

³ c. A.D. 117, *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 76. A.D. 120-130, *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 252. *Between Hadrian and Marc. Aurel.* *Kayser*, *Rev. de Théol.*, xiii. 1850, p. 258. *An elder contemporary of Justin.* *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 49. A.D. 133-135, *Otto*, *De Ep. ad Diogn.*, 1845; *Bunsen*, *Chr. and Mankind*, i. p. 170. A.D. 135, *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 289. A.D. 140, *Credner*, *Der Kanon*, p. 59; cf. *Beiträge*, i. p. 50. After A.D. 170, *Schotten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 101. Hardly before A.D. 180, *Donaldson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 339. *Hilgenfeldt* excludes it from the 2nd century. *Die ap. Väter*, p. 9 f. *Zeller* considers it of no value, even if it contained quotations, on account of its late date. *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 51; *Theol. Jahrb.*, iv. p. 619 f. *Zahn* dates it between A.D. 250-310, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1873, 3, 5, 10 f.

⁴ *Donaldson* is inclined to consider it either a forgery by H. Stephanus, the first editor, or, more likely, a composition by Greeks who came over to Italy when Constantinople was threatened by the Turks. *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 141 f. So also *Overbeck* decides it to be a fictitious production written after the time of Constantine; *Ueb. d. pseudojust. Br. an Diognet. Programm.* 1872.

imitation of early Christian feeling, cannot furnish any solid basis for an early date. It must be evident that the determination of the date of this Epistle cannot therefore be regarded as otherwise than doubtful and arbitrary. It is certain that the purity of its Greek and the elegance of its style distinguish it from all other Christian works of the period to which so many assign it.¹

The Epistle to Diognetus, however, does not furnish any evidence even of the existence of our Synoptics, for it is admitted that it does not contain a single direct quotation from any evangelical work.² We shall hereafter have to refer to this Epistle in connection with the fourth Gospel, but in the meantime it may be well to add that in Chapter xii., one of those it will be remembered which are admitted to be of later date, a brief quotation is made from 1 Cor. viii. 1, introduced merely by the words, *ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει*.

¹ *Scholten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 102; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 399; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 134 ff.; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 253; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 74 f.; *Kayser*, *Rev. de Théol.*, xiii., 1856, p. 257.

² *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 50; *Kayser*, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1856, p. 257; *Reuss*, *Hist. du Canon*, p. 40 f.; *Scholten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 102; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 40; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 78.

We m
eviden
by th
first of
a syst
125 of
ments,
and al
second
doctrin
with, a
most b
inaccu
liable

Euse
tion of
twenty
Tische
ronecu
our fo
can sea
the tre
"It ap
'Life o
'The E
truth o
them
timony
sive an

¹ *Euseb*
N. T., ii
Zeit., p.
s. w., p.
² *Grat*
³ *Φησ*
ραζαι β
⁴ *Wann*
⁵ *Theo*

CHAPTER VI.

BASILIDES—VALENTINUS.

WE must now turn back to an earlier period and consider any evidence regarding the Synoptic Gospels which may be furnished by the so-called heretical writers of the second century. The first of these who claims our attention is Basilides, the founder of a system of Gnosticism, who lived in Alexandria about the year 125 of our era.¹ With the exception of a very few brief fragments,² none of the writings of this Gnostic have been preserved, and all our information regarding them is therefore derived at second-hand from ecclesiastical writers opposed to him and his doctrines, and their statements, especially where acquaintance with, and the use of, the New Testament Scriptures are assumed, must be received with very great caution. The uncritical and inaccurate character of the Fathers rendered them peculiarly liable to be misled by foregone devout conclusions.

Eusebius states that Agrippa Castor, who had written a refutation of the doctrines of Basilides, "Says that he had composed twenty-four books upon the Gospel."³ This is interpreted by Tischendorf, without argument, and in a most arbitrary and erroneous manner, to imply that the work was a commentary upon our four canonical Gospels;⁴ a conclusion the audacity of which can scarcely be exceeded. This is, however, almost surpassed by the treatment of Canon Westcott, who writes regarding Basilides: "It appears, moreover, that he himself published a Gospel—a 'Life of Christ' as it would perhaps be called in our days, or 'The Philosophy of Christianity'—but he admitted the historic truth of all the facts contained in the canonical Gospels, and used them as Scripture. For, in spite of his peculiar opinions, the testimony of Basilides to our 'acknowledged' books is comprehensive and clear. In the few pages of his writings which remain

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 7, 8, 9; Baur, Gesch. chr. K., i. p. 196; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 388; Guericke, H'buch K. G., i. p. 182; Lechler, Das ap. und nachap. Zeit., p. 498; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 64; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 50. From A. D. 117 to 138, Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, p. 145.

² Grabe, Spicil. Patr., ii., p. 39 ff., 65 ff.

³ Φησὶν αὐτὸν εἰς μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τέσσαρα πρὸς τοῖς εἰκοσὶ συντάξει βιβλία. H. E., iv. 7.

⁴ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 51 f.

⁵ These names are pure inventions of Dr. Westcott's fancy, of course.

there are certain references to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John,"¹ &c. Now in making, in such a manner, these assertions: in totally ignoring the whole of the discussion with regard to the supposed quotations of Basilides in the work commonly ascribed to Hippolytus and the adverse results of learned criticism: in the unqualified assertions thus made and the absence either of explanation of the facts or the reasons for the conclusion: this statement must be condemned in the strongest manner as unworthy of a scholar, and only calculated to mislead readers who must generally be ignorant of the actual facts of the case.

We know from the evidence of antiquity that Basilides made use of a Gospel, written by himself it is said, but certainly called after his own name.² An attempt has been made to explain this by suggesting that perhaps the Commentary mentioned by Agrippa Castor may have been mistaken for a Gospel;³ but the fragments of that work which are still extant⁴ are of a character which precludes the possibility that any work of which they formed a part could have been considered a Gospel.⁵ Various opinions have been expressed as to the exact nature of the Gospel of Basilides. Neander affirmed it to be the Gospel according to the Hebrews which he brought from Syria to Egypt;⁶ whilst Sehneckenburger held it to be the Gospel according to the Egyptians.⁷ Others believe it to have at least been based upon one or other of these Gospels.⁸ There seems most reason for the hypothesis that it was a form of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which we have found so generally in use amongst the Fathers.

We have already quoted the passage in which Eusebius states, on the authority of Agrippa Castor, whose works are no longer extant, that Basilides had composed a work in twenty-four books

¹ On the Canon, p. 255 f.

² Ausus fuit et Basilides scribere Evangelium et suo illud nomine titolare. *Origen*, Hom. i. in Lucam. Ausus est etiam Basilides Evangelium scribere quod dicitur secundum Basilidem. *Ambros.*, Comment in Luc. Proem. *Hieron.*, Pref. in Matt.; cf. *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 37; *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 11; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 568; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 389; *Kirchofer*, Quellensamml., p. 414, ann. 3, p. 475; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., 1840, p. 85 f.; *Schott*, Isagoge, p. 23; *Schotten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 64.

³ *Kirchofer*, Quellensamml., p. 414, ann. 3; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 52, ann. 1; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 255 f., note 4; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 340, ann.***; *Nicolas*, Et. sur les Ev. Apoc., p. 134.

⁴ *Grabe*, Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 39 ff., 65 ff.; *Clemens Al.*, Strom., iv. 12.

⁵ Dr. Westcott admits this. On the Canon, p. 255, note 4.

⁶ *Gnost. Syst.*, p. 84; cf. K. G., 1843, ii. p. 709, ann. 2; *Nicolas*, Et. sur les Ev. Apoc., p. 134.

⁷ Ueb. d. Ev. d. Ägypt., 1834; cf. *Gieseler*, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 19.

⁸ *Gieseler*, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 19; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 568; Cf. *Fabrics*, Cod. Ap. N. T., i. p. 343, note m.

on the Gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), and we have mentioned the unwarranted inference of Tischendorf that this must have been a work on our four Gospels. Now, so far from deriving his doctrines from our Gospels or other New Testament writings or acknowledging their authority, Basilides on the contrary professed that he received his knowledge of the truth from Glaucias, "the interpreter of Peter," whose disciple he claimed to be,¹ and he thus sets Gospels aside and prefers tradition.² In mentioning this fact Canon Westcott says: "At the same time he appealed to the authority of Glaucias, who, as well as St. Mark, was 'an interpreter of St. Peter.'"³ Now we have here again an illustration of the same misleading system which we have already condemned, and shall further refer to, in the introduction after "Glaucias" of the words "*who as well as St. Mark was 'an interpreter of St. Peter.'*" The words in italics are the gratuitous addition of Canon Westcott himself. The positive form given to Clement's simple mention of the claim made by Basilides, and the introduction of the words: "as well as St. Mark," cannot fail to convey to general readers an impression regarding Basilides which is not warranted by the facts of the case. Dr. Westcott can scarcely intend himself to affirm that Glaucias, of whom nothing whatever is known, actually was, with Mark, 'an interpreter of Peter,'⁴ but added to his other extraordinary and unqualified statements, these touches seem to complete a portrait which no one acquainted with the real circumstances could recognize as that of Basilides the heretic.

Basilides also claimed to have received from a certain Matthias the report of private discourses which he had heard from the Saviour for his special instruction.⁵ Agrippa Castor further stated, according to Eusebius, that in his ἐκκλησιαστικὰ Basilides named Barcabbas and Barcoph (Parchor⁶) as prophets, as well as invented others for himself who never existed, and claimed their authority for his doctrines.⁷ With regard to all this Canon Westcott writes:

¹ . . . καθάπερ ὁ Βασιλείδης καὶ Γλαυκίαν ἐπιγραφεται διδασκαλον, ὡς ἀνέχουσιν αὐτοὶ, τὸν Πέτρου ἐρμηνέα. *Clemens Al., Strom.*, vii. 17, § 106.

² *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 37; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 340; *Schollen*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 64; cf. *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 568.

³ On the Canon, p. 255.

⁴ We may add that the "Saint" inserted before Peter neither belongs to Clement nor to Basilides, but is introduced into the quotation by Dr. Westcott.

⁵ Βασιλείδης τοῖνον καὶ Ἰσίδωρος, ὁ Βασιλείδου παῖς γνήδιος καὶ μαθητὴς, φασὶν εἰρηκέναι Μαθίαν αὐτοῖς λόγους ἀποκρυφούς, οὓς ἤκουσε παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος πατρὶ ἰδίαν διδασχθεῖς. *Hippolytus*, Refut. Omn. Hær., vii. 20; ed. *Duncker* et *Schneidewin*, 1859.

⁶ *Isidorus*, his son and disciple, wrote a commentary on the prophecy of Parchor (*Clem. Al., Strom.*, vi. 6, § 53), in which he further refers to the "prophecy of Cham." Cf. *Neander*, Allg. K. G., 1843, ii. p. 703 ff.

⁷ . . . προφήτας δὲ αὐτῷ ὀνομάσι Βαρκαββάν καὶ Βαρκωφ καὶ ἄλλους ἀνυπάρχτους τινὰς αὐτῷ συστήσαντων, κ.τ.λ. *Euseb.*, H. E., iv. 7.

"Since Basilides lived on the verge of the apostolic times, it is not surprising that he made use of other sources of Christian doctrine besides the canonical books. The belief in Divine Inspiration was still fresh and real,"¹ &c. It is apparent, however, that Basilides, in basing his doctrines on these Apocryphal books as inspired, and upon tradition, and in having a special Gospel called after his own name, which, therefore, he clearly adopts as the exponent of his ideas of Christian truth, absolutely ignores the canonical Gospels altogether, and not only does not offer any evidence for their existence, but proves that he did not recognize any such works as of authority. Therefore there is no ground whatever for Tischendorf's assumption that the Commentary of Basilides "on the Gospel" was written upon our Gospels, but that idea is on the contrary negated in the strongest way by all the facts of the case.² The perfectly simple interpretation of the statement is that long ago suggested by Valesius,³ that the Commentary of Basilides was composed upon his own Gospel,⁴ whether it was the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the Egyptians.

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that Basilides used the word "Gospel" in a peculiar technical way. Hippo⁵ 'us, in the work usually ascribed to him, writing of the Basilidæ and describing their doctrines, says: "When therefore it was necessary, he (?) says, that we, the children of God, should be revealed, in expectation of whose revelation, he says, the creation groaned and travailed, the Gospel came into the world, and passed through every principality and power and dominion, and every name that is named."⁶ "The Gospel, therefore, came first from the Sonship, he says, through the Son, sitting by the Archon, to the Archon, and the Archon learnt that he was not the God of all things but begotten,"⁷ &c. "The Gospel, according to them, is the knowledge of supramundane matters,"⁸ &c. This may not be very intelligible, but it is sufficient to show that "the Gospel" in a technical sense

¹ On the Canon, p. 255.

² Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 389; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 64; *Credner*, *Der Kanon*, p. 24.

³ Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, i. p. 343, not. m.

⁴ Neudecker, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 85; Nicolas, *Et. sur les Ev. Apoc.*, p. 134.

⁵ Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔδει ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, φησὶν, ἡμᾶς τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, περὶ ὧν ἐδεδίκαζε, φησὶν, ἡ κτίσις καὶ ὡδινεν, ἀπειδεχομένη τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν, ἦλθε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ διήλθε διὰ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, κ.τ.λ. Hippolytus, *Refut. Omn. Hær.*, vii., 25.

⁶ Ἦλθεν οὖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῆς νιότητος, φησὶ, διὰ τοῦ παρακαθημένου τῷ ἀρχοντι υἱοῦ πρὸς τὸν ἀρχοντα, καὶ ἐμαθεν ὁ ἀρχων, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν θεὸς τῶν ὅλων, ἀλλὰ ἦν γεννητός, κ.τ.λ. *Ib.*, vii., 26; cf. 27, &c.

⁷ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτοῦς ἡ τῶν ὑπερκosμίων γυνῶσις, κ.τ.λ. *Ib.*, vii., 27.

⁸ Canon Westcott admits this technical use of the word, of course. On the Canon, p. 255 f., note 4.

formed a very important part of the system of Basilides. Now there is nothing whatever to show that the twenty-four books which he composed "on the Gospel" were not in elucidation of the Gospel as technically understood by him, illustrated by extracts from his own special Gospel and from the tradition handed down to him by Glaucias and Matthias.

The emphatic assertion of Canon Westcott that Basilides "admitted the historic truth of all the facts contained in the canonical Gospels," is based solely upon the following sentence of the work attributed to Hippolytus. "Jesus, however, was generated according to these (followers of Basilides) as we have already said.¹ But when the generation which has already been declared had taken place, all things regarding the Saviour, according to them, occurred in like manner as they have been written in the Gospel."² There are, however, several important points to be borne in mind in reference to this passage. The statement in question is not made in connection with Basilides himself, but distinctly in reference to his followers, of whom there were many in the time of Hippolytus and long after him. It is, moreover, a general observation the accuracy of which we have no means of testing, and upon the correctness of which there is no special reason to rely. The remark, made at the beginning of the third century, however, that the followers of Basilides believed that the actual events of the life of Jesus occurred in the way in which they have been written in the Gospels, is no proof whatever that either they or Basilides used or admitted the authority of our Gospels. The exclusive use by any one of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, would be perfectly consistent with the statement. No one who considers what is known of that Gospel, or who thinks of the use made of it in the first half of the second century by perfectly orthodox Fathers before we hear anything of our Gospels, can doubt this. The passage is, therefore, of no weight as evidence for the use of our Gospels. Canon Westcott is himself obliged to admit that in the extant fragments of Isidorus, the son and disciple of Basilides, who "maintained the doctrines of his father," he has "noticed nothing bearing on the books of the New Testament."³ On the supposition that Basilides actually wrote a Commentary on our Gospels, and used them as Scripture, it is indeed passing strange that we have so little evidence on the point.

¹ He refers to a mystical account of the incarnation.

² Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γεγέννηται κατ' αὐτοῦς ὡς προειρήκαμεν. Γεγεννημένης δὲ τῆς γενέσεως τῆς προδεδηλωμένης, γέγονε πάντα ὁμοίως κατ' αὐτοῦς τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ὡς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις γέγραπται. Hippolytus, Ref. Omn. Hær., vii. 27.

³ On the Canon, p. 257.

We must now, however, examine in detail all of the quotations, and they are few, alleged to show the use of our Gospels, and we shall commence with those of Tischendorf. The first passage which he points out is found in the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria. Tischendorf guards himself, in reference to these quotations, by merely speaking of them as "Basilidan" (*Basilidianisch*),¹ but it might have been more frank to have stated clearly that Clement distinctly assigns the quotation to the followers of Basilides (*οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Βασιλείδου*),² and not to Basilides himself.³ The supposed quotation, therefore, however surely traced to our Gospels, could really not prove anything in regard to Basilides. The passage itself compared with the parallel in Matt. xix. 11, 12, is as follows:—

STROM. III. 1, § 1.

They say the Lord answered : All men cannot receive this saying.

For there are some who are eunuchs from birth, others by constraint (are made so).

Οὐ' πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον
τούτου, εἰδὼ γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι, οἱ
μὲν ἐκ γενετῆς, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης.

MATT. XIX. 11, 12.

v. 11. But he said unto them : All men cannot receive this saying, but only they to whom it is given.

v. 12. For there are eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb ; and there are eunuchs which were made eunuchs by men, &c., &c.

Οὐ' πάντες χωροῦσιν τὸν λόγον
τούτου, ἀλλ' οἷς δίδεται
εἶδιν γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες ἐκ
κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως,
καὶ εἶδιν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες
εὐνοχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
κ.τ.λ.

Now this passage in its affinity to, and material variation from, our first Gospel might be quoted as evidence for the use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, but it is simply preposterous to point to it as evidence for the use of Matthew. Apologists in their anxiety to grasp at the faintest analogies as testimony seem altogether to ignore the history of the creation of written Gospels, and to forget the very existence of the *πολλοὶ* of Luke.⁴

The next passage referred to by Tischendorf⁵ is one quoted by Epiphanius,⁶ which we subjoin in contrast with the parallel in Matt. vii. 6:—

¹ Wann. wurden, u. s. w., p. 51.

² *Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Βασιλείδου πηγουμένων φασὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων μὴ ποτε ἄμεινόν ἐστι τὸ μὴ γαμεῖν ἀποκρίνασθαι λέγουσι τὸν κύριον, κ.τ.λ.* Strom., iii. 1, § 1.

³ Canon Westcott does not refer to this quotation at all.

⁴ Cf. *Evangel.* Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1849, p. 208.

⁵ Wann. wurden, u. s. w., p. 51.

⁶ *Haer.*, xxiv. 5, p. 72.

HÆR. XXIV. 5.

And therefore he said :
Cast not ye pearls before swine, nei-
ther give that which is holy unto
dogs.

Μὴ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας
ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μηδὲ δότε
τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶ.

MATT. VII. 6.

Give not that which is holy unto
dogs, neither cast ye your pearls be-
fore swine, lest they trample them
under their feet, and turn again and
rend you.

Μὴ δότε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν,
μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας
ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, κ.τ.λ.

Here again the variation in order is just what one might have expected from the use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or a similar work, and there is no indication whatever that the passage did not end here, without the continuation of our first Synoptic. What is still more important, although Tischendorf does not mention the fact, nor otherwise hint a doubt than by the use again of an unexplained description of this quotation as "Basili-
dianisch" instead of a more direct ascription of it to Basilides himself, this passage is by no means attributed by Epiphanius to that heretic. It is introduced into the section of his work directed against the Basilidians, but he uses, like Clement, the indefinite *ἡρεσι*, and as in dealing with all these heresies there is continual interchange of reference to the head and the later followers, there is no certainty who is referred to in these quotations, and in this instance nothing to indicate that this passage is ascribed to Basilides himself. His name is mentioned in the first line of the first chapter of this "heresy," but not again before this *ἡρεσι* occurs in chapter v. Tischendorf does not claim any other quotations.

Canon Westcott states: "In the few pages of his (Basilides') writings which remain there are certain references to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke,"¹ &c. One might suppose from this that the "certain" references occurred in actual extracts made from his works, and that the quotations therefore appeared set in a context of his own words. This impression is strengthened when we read as an introduction to the instances: "The following examples will be sufficient to show his method of quotation."² The fact is, however, that these examples are found in the work of Hippolytus, in an epitome of the views of the school by that writer himself, with nothing more definite than a subjectless *ἡρεσι* to indicate who is referred to. The only examples Canon Westcott can give of these "certain references" to our first and third Synoptics, do not show his "method of quotation" to much advantage. The first is not a quotation at all, but a mere reference to the Magi and the Star

On the Canon, p. 256.

² *Ib.*, p. 256, note 3.

"But that every thing, he says (*φησὶ*), has its own seasons, the Saviour sufficiently teaches when he says: . . . and the Magi having seen the star,"¹ &c. This of course Canon Westcott considers a reference to Matt. ii. 1, 2, but we need scarcely point out that this falls to the ground instantly, if it be admitted, as it must be, that the Star and the Magi may have been mentioned in other Gospels than the first Synoptic. We have already seen, when examining the evidence of Justin, that this is the case. The only quotation asserted to be taken from Luke is the phrase: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee,"² which agrees with Luke i. 35. This again is introduced by Hippolytus with another subjectless "he says," and apart from the uncertainty as to who "he" is, this is very unsatisfactory evidence as to the form of the quotation in the original text, for it may easily have been corrected by Hippolytus, consciously or unconsciously, in the course of transfer to his pages. We have already met with this passage as quoted by Justin from a Gospel different from ours, and this again would lead us to the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

As we have already stated, however, none of the quotations which we have considered are directly referred to Basilides himself, but they are all introduced by the utterly vague expression, "he says," (*φησὶ*) without any subject accompanying the verb. Now it is admitted that writers of the time of Hippolytus, and notably Hippolytus himself, made use of the name of the founder of a sect to represent the whole of his school, and applied to him, apparently, quotations taken from unknown and later followers.³ The passages which he cites, therefore, and which appear to indicate the use of Gospels, instead of being extracted from the works of the founder himself, in all probability were taken from writings of Gnostics of his own time. Canon Westcott himself admits the possibility of this, in writing of other early heretics. He says: "The evidence that has been collected from the documents of these primitive sects is necessarily somewhat vague. It would be more satisfactory to know the exact position of their

¹ *Οτι δὲ, φησὶν, ἕκαστον ἰδίους ἔχει καιροῦς, ἵκανὶς ὁ σωτὴρ λέγων* . . . καὶ οἱ μάγοι τὸν ἀστέρα τεθεαμένοι. Hippolytus, Ref. Omn. Hæc., vii. 27.

² *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελευσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοί.* Hippolytus, Ref. Omn. Hæc., vii. 26.

³ Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 148 ff.; Die Apostelgesch., p. 63 f.; Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 108 ff.; Hippolytus, u. d. röm. Zeitgenossen, 1855, p. 167; Der Ursprung, p. 70 f.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 65 f.; Das Ev. n. Johan., p. 427; Rumpf, Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 17 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 388 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 345 f., ann. 5; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 287; J. J. Tayler, The Fourth Gospel, 1867, p. 57; Luthardt, Der jehann. Ursprung d. viert. Ev., 1874, p. 85 f.

auth
possi
in his
the
the g
to the
It is
and C
writin
does i
thor b
ing fro
the sa
say,"
tation
pointe
or son
the su
of Mar
refers
and all
procee
ences i
method
as to th
the oth
gnostic
these q
that w
1 On th
2 Ib., v
3 Hippo
Scholten,
ann. Introd.
7 Theol
8 Hippo
9 Hippo
10 Schol
Theol. Ja
Introd. N
11 Hilge
Zeitschr.
genossen,
Scholten,
Allg. Enzy
Zundert,
Urspr. d.
Hilgenfeld
p. 121 ff.;
Gnost. ex
System, u

authors, and the precise date of their being composed. It is just possible that Hippolytus made use of writings which were current in his own time without further examination, and transferred to the apostolic age forms of thought and expression which had been the growth of two, or even of three generations." ¹ So much as to the reliance to be placed on the work ascribed to Hippolytus. It is certain, for instance, that in writing of the sect of Naaseni and Ophites, Hippolytus perpetually quotes passages from the writings of the school, with the indefinite *φησί*,² as he likewise does in dealing with the Peratici,³ and Docetæ,⁴ no individual author being named; yet he evidently quotes various writers, passing from one to another without explanation, and making use of the same unvarying *φησί*. In one place,⁵ where he has "the Greeks say," (*φασιν οἱ Ἕλληνες*) he gives, without further indication, a quotation from Pindar.⁶ A still more apt instance of his method is that pointed out by Volkmar,⁷ where Hippolytus, writing of "Marcion, or some one of his hounds," uses, without further explanation, the subjectless *φησί* to introduce matter from the later followers of Marcion.⁸ Now, with regard to Basilides, Hippolytus directly refers not only to the heretic chief, but also to his disciple Isidorus and all their followers,⁹ (*καὶ Ἰσίδωρος καὶ πᾶς ὁ τούτων χορός*) and then proceeds to use the indefinite "he says," interspersed with references in the plural to these heretics, exhibiting the same careless method of quotation, and leaving the same complete uncertainty as to the speaker's identity as in the other cases mentioned.¹⁰ On the other hand, it has been demonstrated by Hilgenfeld, that the gnosticism ascribed to Basilides by Hippolytus, in connection with these quotations, is of a much later and more developed type than that which Basilides himself held,¹¹ as shown by the actual frag-

¹ On the Canon, p. 252.

² Hippolytus, Ref. Omn. Hær. i. 63.

³ *Ib.*, v. 16, 17.

⁴ *Ib.*, viii. 9, 10.

⁵ *Ib.*, v. 7.

⁶ Hippol., Ref. Omn. Hær. ed. Duncker et Schneidewin not. in loc. c. 193, Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 65 f.; Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 149 f.

⁷ Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 108 ff.; Der Ursprung, p. 70.

⁸ Hippolytus, Ref. Omn. Hær., vii. 10; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 66.

⁹ Hippolytus, *ib.*, vii. 20; cf. 22.

¹⁰ Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 65; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 71 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 108 f.; Rumpf, Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 18 f.; Introd. N. T., ii. p. 388; Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 148 ff.

¹¹ Hilgenfeld, Theol. Jahrb., 1856, p. 86 ff., 786 ff.; Die jud. Apok., 1857, p. 287 ff.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1862, p. 452 ff.; Volkmar, Hippolytus u. d. rom. Zeitgenossen, p. 167; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 295 ff.; Der Ursprung, p. 70; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 66; Lipsius, Der Gnosticismus. Ersch. u. Gruber's Allg. Encyclop., i. sect. 71, 1860, p. 90, 152; Guericke, H'buch K. G., i. p. 184; Zundert, Zeitschr. luth. Theol., 1855, h. 2, 1856, h. 1, 3; Luthardt, Der johann. Crspr. d. viert. Ev., 1874, p. 85 f. The following differ from the view taken by Hilgenfeld: Baur, Die chr. Kirche 3 erst. Jahrb., p. 187 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1856, p. 124 ff.; Busen, Hippolytus u. a. Zeit., 1852, i. p. 65 f.; Jacobi, Basilides Phil. Gnost. ex Hippolyti lib. nuper reperto illustr., 1852; Uhlhorn, Das Basilidianische System, u. a. w., 1855.

ments of his own writings which are still extant, and as reported by Irenæus,¹ Clement of Alexandria,² and the work "Adversus omnes Hæreses," annexed to the "Præscriptio hæreticorum," of Tertullian, which is considered to be the epitome of an earlier work of Hippolytus. The fact probably is that Hippolytus derived his views of the doctrines of Basilides from the writings of his later followers, and from them made the quotations which are attributed to the founder of the school.³ In any case there is no ground for referring these quotations with an indefinite *φησὶ* to Basilides himself.

Of all this there is not a word from Canon Westcott,⁴ but he ventures to speak of "the testimony of Basilides to our 'acknowledged' books," as "comprehensive and clear."⁵ We have seen, however, that the passages referred to have no weight whatever as evidence for the use of our Synoptics. The formulæ (as τὸ εἰρημένον to that compared with Luke i. 35, and ὡς γέγραπται, ἡ γραφή with references compared with some of the Epistles) which accompany these quotations, and to which Canon Westcott points as an indication that the new Testament writings were already recognized as Holy Scripture,⁶ need no special attention, because, as it cannot be shown that the expressions were used by Basilides himself at all, they do not come into question. If anything, however, were required to complete the evidence that these quotations are not from the works of Basilides himself, but from later writings by his followers, it would be the use of such formulæ, for as the writings of pseudo-Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Papias Hegesippus, and others of the Fathers in several ways positively demonstrate, the New Testament writings were not admitted, even amongst orthodox Fathers, to the rank of Holy Scripture, until a very much later period.⁷

2.

Much of what has been said with regard to the claim which is laid to Basilides, by some apologists, as a witness for the Gospels and the existence of a New Testament Canon, and the manner in which that claim is advanced, likewise applies to Valentinus, another Gnostic leader, who, about the year 140, came from

¹ Adv. Hær., i. 24.

² Stromata, vi. 3.

³ Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 66; Folkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 69 ff.; Rumpf, Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 18 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 388 ff.; Zeller, Apostelgesch., p. 65 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 148 ff.

⁴ And very little from Tischendorf.

⁵ On the Canon, p. 256.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 256.

⁷ Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 69; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 65, ann. 3; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 148.

Alex
little
only
work
prese
more
tion t
Tis
serts,
other
ance o
Canon
possib
temati
treatm
of Dr.
garding
the fo
Tischer
stateme
which
case of
and the
filled w
account
thieves
falsifica
"There
ence of
being) f
Saviour

¹ Irenæu
Kirche, i.
227; Cre
Hbach K.
p. 243; T
255 f.; M
Hilgen
2 "Die
führt einz
deutlichst
Propheten
und thöric
Erklärer: A
Wann wur
4 Παρ
αποστολων
αποστ, λεγ

Alexandria to Rome and flourished till about A.D. 160.¹ Very little remains of the writings of this Gnostic, and we gain our only knowledge of them from a few short quotations in the works of Clement of Alexandria, and some doubtful fragments preserved by others. We shall presently have occasion to refer more directly to these, and need not here more particularly mention them.

Tischendorf, the self-constituted modern Defensor fidei,² asserts, with an assurance which can scarcely be characterized otherwise than as an unpardonable calculation upon the ignorance of his readers, that Valentinus used the whole of our four Canonical Gospels. To do him full justice, we shall as much as possible give his own words; and, although we set aside systematically all discussion regarding the fourth Gospel for separate treatment hereafter, we must, in order to convey the full sense of Dr. Tischendorf's proceeding, commence with a sentence regarding that Gospel. Referring to a statement of Irenæus, that the followers of Valentinus made use of the fourth Gospel, Tischendorf continues: "Hippolytus confirms and completes the statement of Irenæus, for he quotes several expressions of John which Valentinus employed. This most clearly occurs in the case of John x. 8; for Hippolytus writes: 'Because the prophets and the law, according to the doctrine of Valentinus, were only filled with a subordinate and foolish spirit, Valentinus says: On account of this, the Saviour says: All who came before me were thieves and robbers.'"³ Now this, to begin with, is a practical falsification of the text of the *Philosophumena*, which reads: "Therefore all the Prophets and the Law spoke under the influence of the Demiurge, a foolish God, he says, (they themselves being) foolish, knowing nothing. On this account, he says, the Saviour saith: All who came before me," &c., &c.⁴ There is no men-

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 11; Baur, *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i. p. 196; Anger, *Synops. Ev. Proleg.*, p. xxxv.; Bleek, *Eint. N. T.*, p. 27; Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 38; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 390; Guericke, *Hilch K. G.*, i. p. 184; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 67; Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 243; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 43; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 238 f.; Mause, *The Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, p. 166.

² Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, p. 329.

³ "Die Angabe des Irenæus bestärkt und vervollständigt Hippolytus, denn er führt einzelne Johanneische Aussprüche an, welche Valentin benutzt hat. Am deutlichsten geschieht dies mit Joh. x. 8; denn Hippolytus schreibt: Weil die Propheten und das Gesetz, nach Valentins Lehr, nur von einem untergeordneten und thörichten Geiste erfüllt waren, so sagt Valentin: Eben deshalb spricht der Erlöser: Alle die vor mir gekommen sind, sind Diebe und Mörder gewesen." *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 44.

⁴ Πάντες οὖν οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, μωροῦ λέγει θεοῦ, μωροὶ οὐδὲν εἰδότες. Διὰ τοῦτο, φησί, λέγει ὁ σωτήρ· Πάντες, κ.τ.λ. Hippolytus, *Ref. Omn. Hær.*, vi. 35.

tion whatever of the name of Valentinus in the passage, and, as we shall presently show, there is no direct reference in the whole chapter to Valentinus himself. The introduction of his name in this manner into the text, without a word of explanation, is highly reprehensible. It is true that in a note Tischendorf gives a closer translation of the passage, without, however, any explanation; and here again he adds, in parenthesis to the "says he," "namely, Valentinus." Such a note, however, which would probably be unread by a majority of readers, does not rectify the impression conveyed by so positive and emphatic an assertion as is conveyed by the alteration in the text.

Tischendorf continues: "And as the Gospel of John, so also were the other Gospels used by Valentinus. According to the statement of Irenæus (I. 7, § 4), he found the said subordinate spirit, which he calls Demiurge, Masterworker, emblematically represented by the Centurion of Capernaum (Matt. viii. 9, Luke vii. 8); in the dead and resuscitated daughter of Jairus, when twelve years old (Luke viii. 41), he recognized a symbol of his 'Wisdom' (Achamoth), the mother of the Masterworker (I. 8, § 2); in like manner he saw represented in the history of the woman who had suffered twelve years from the bloody issue, and was cured by the Lord (Matt. ix. 20), the sufferings and salvation of his twelfth primitive spirit (Æon) (I. 3, § 3); the expression of the Lord (Matt. v. 18) on the numerical value of the iota ('the smallest letter') he applied to his ten æons in repose." ¹ Now, in every instance where Tischendorf here speaks of Valentinus by the singular "he," Irenæus uses the plural "they," referring not to the original founder of the sect, but to his followers in his own day, and the text is thus again in every instance falsified by the pious zeal of the apologist. In the case of the Centurion: "they say" (λέγουσι) that he is the Demiurge: ² "they declare" (δηγοῦνται) that the daughter of Jairus is the type of Achamoth; ³ "they say" (λέγουσι) that the apostasy of Judas points to the passion in connection with the twelfth æon, and also the fact that Jesus suffered in the twelfth month after his baptism; for they will have it (βούλονται) that he only preached for one year. The case of the woman with the bloody issue for twelve years, and the power which went forth from the Son to heal her, "they will have to be Horos" (εἶναι δὲ ταύτην τὸν Ὅρον θελοῦσιν). ⁴ In like manner they assert that the ten æons are indicated (σημαίνεσθαι λέγουσι) by the letter "Iota," mentioned in the Saviour's expression, Matt. v. 18. ⁵ At the end of these and numerous other similar

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 44 f.

² Irenæus, Adv. Hær., i. 7, § 4.

³ *Ib.*, i. 8, § 2.

⁴ *Ib.*, i. 3, § 3.

⁵ *Ib.*, i. 3, § 2.

refer
passa
ειρη
Tis
is sup
refer
himse
Valen
says.
what
witho
the d
maste
the fir
Irenæ
quite
tion, I
questi
Gnosti
ments
middle
writin
author
them, a
views,
propou
the bo
belong
testim
also to
In t
clearly
says:
(ἐπομή
and ha
quired
and he
of thos
the foll
school

¹ Irenæ

² αὐτοὶ
βαλῶν,

references in this chapter to New Testament expressions and passages, Irenæus says: "Thus they interpret," &c. (*ἐρμηνεύουσιν εἰρησβαί*).¹ The plural "they" is employed throughout.

Tischendorf proceeds to give the answer to his statement which is supposed to be made by objectors. "They say: all that has reference to the Gospel of John was not advanced by Valentinus himself, but by his disciples. And in fact, in Irenæus, 'they—the Valentinians—say,' occurs much oftener than 'he—Valentinus—says.' But who is there so sapient as to draw the line between what the master alone says, and that which the disciples state without in the least repeating the master?"² Tischendorf solves the difficulty by referring everything indiscriminately to the master. Now, in reply to these observations, we must remark in the first place, that the admission here made by Tischendorf, that Irenæus much more often uses "they say" than "he says" is still quite disingenuous, inasmuch as invariably, and without exception, Irenæus uses the plural in connection with the texts in question. Secondly, it is quite preposterous to argue that a Gnostic, writing about A.D. 185—195, was not likely to use arguments which were never thought of by a Gnostic, writing at the middle of the second century. At the end of the century, the writings of the New Testament had acquired consideration and authority, and Gnostic writers had therefore a reason to refer to them, and to endeavour to show that they supported their peculiar views, which did not exist at all at the time when Valentinus propounded his system. Tischendorf, however, cannot be allowed the benefit even of such a doubt as he insinuates, as to what belongs to the master and what to the followers. Such doubtful testimony could not establish anything, but it is, in point of fact, also totally excluded by the statement of Irenæus himself.

In the preface to the first book of his great work, Irenæus clearly states the motives and objects for which he writes. He says: "I considered it necessary, having read the commentaries (*ὑπομνήματα*) of the disciples of Valentinus, as they call themselves, and having had personal intercourse with some of them and acquired full knowledge of their opinions, to unfold to thee," &c.; and he goes on to say that he intends to set forth "the opinions of those who are now teaching heresy; I speak particularly of the followers of Ptolemæus, whose system is an off-shoot of the school of Valentinus."³ Nothing could be more explicit than this

¹ Irenæus, Adv. Hær., i. 3, § 4.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 45.

³ . . . ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην, ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν, ἐνίοις δὲ αὐτῶν παῖ συμ- βαλῶν, καὶ κατελαβόμενος τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν, μηνῦσαι σοί, κ.τ.λ. . . . τὴν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, λέγω

statement that Irenæus neither intended nor pretended to write upon the works of Valentinus himself, but upon the commentaries of his followers of his own time, with some of whom he had had personal intercourse, and that the system which he intended to attack was that actually being taught in his day by Ptolemæus and his school, the off-shoot from Valentinus. All the quotations to which Tischendorf refers are made within a few pages of this explicit declaration. Immediately after the passage about the Centurion, he says: "such is their system" (τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς ὑποθέσεως αὐτῶν οὐσίης), and three lines below he states that they derive their views from unwritten sources (ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγνώσκοντες).¹ The first direct reference to Valentinus does not occur until after these quotations, and is for the purpose of showing the variation of opinion of his followers. He says: "Let us now see the uncertain opinions of these heretics, for there are two or three of them, how they do not speak alike of the same things, but contradicted one another in facts and names." Then he continues: "For the first of them, Valentinus, having derived his principles from the so-called Gnostic heresy, and adapted them to the peculiar character of his school, declared this:" &c., &c.² And after a brief description of his system, in which no Scriptural allusion occurs, he goes on to compare the views of the rest, and in chap. xii. he returns to Ptolemæus and his followers ('Ο Πτολεμαῖος, καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ.).

In the preface to Book ii., he again says that he has been exposing the falsity of the followers of Valentinus (qui sunt a Valentino) and will proceed to establish what he has advanced; and everywhere he uses the plural "they," with occasional direct references to the followers of Valentinus (qui sunt a Valentino).³ The same course is adopted in Book iii., the plural being systematically used, and the same distinct definition introduced at intervals.⁴ And again, in the preface to Book iv. he recapitulates that the preceding books had been written against these, qui sunt a Valentino" (§ 2). In fact, it would almost be impossible for any writer more frequently and emphatically to show that he

δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, κ.τ.λ. Irenæus, Adv. Hæc. Pref., i. § 2.

¹ *Ib.*, Adv. Hæc., i. 8, § 1.

² Ἰδωμεν νῦν καὶ τὴν τούτων ἄσφατον γνώμην, δύο πού καὶ τριῶν ὄντων, πῶς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐναντία ἀποφαινόνται. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Γνωστικῆς αἰρέσεως τὸς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτήρα διδάσκαλίου μεβαρμόδας Οὐαλεντίνος, οὕτως ἐξηροφόρησεν, κ.τ.λ. Irenæus, Adv. Hæc., i. 11, § 1.

³ As, for instance, ii. 16, § 4.

⁴ For instance, "Secundum autem eos qui sunt a Valentino," iii. 11, § 2. "Secundum autem illos," § 3; "ab omnibus illos," § 3. "Hi autem qui sunt a Valentino," &c., § 7; *ib.*, § 9, &c., &c.

is not, as he began by declaring, dealing with the founder of the school himself, but with his followers living and teaching at the time at which he wrote.

Canon Westcott, with whose system of positively enunciating unsupported and controverted statements we are already acquainted, is only slightly outstripped by the German apologist in his misrepresentation of the evidence of Valentinus. It must be stated, however, that, acknowledging, as no doubt he does, that Irenæus never refers to Valentinus himself, Canon Westcott passes over in complete silence the supposed references upon which Tischendorf relies as his only evidence for the use of the Synoptics by that Gnostic. He, however, makes the following extraordinary statement regarding Valentinus: "The fragments of his writings which remain show the same natural and trustful use of Scripture as other Christian works of the same period; and there is no diversity of character in this respect between the quotations given in Hippolytus and those found in Clement of Alexandria. He cites the Epistle to the Ephesians as 'Scripture,' and refers clearly to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, to the Epistles to the Romans,"¹ &c.

We shall now give the passages which he points out in support of these assertions.² The first two are said to occur in the *Stromata* of the Alexandrian Clement, who professes to quote the very words of a letter of Valentinus to certain people regarding the passions, which are called by the followers of Basilides "the appendages of the soul." The passage is as follows: "But one only is good, whose presence is the manifestation through the Son, and through him alone will the heart be enabled to become pure, by the expulsion of every evil spirit from the heart. For many spirits dwelling in it do not allow it to be pure, but each of them, while in divers parts they riot in unseemly lusts, performs its own works. And, it seems to me, the heart is somewhat like an inn. For that, also, is both bored and dug into, and often filled with the ordure of men, who abide there in revelry, and bestow not one single thought upon the place, seeing it is the property of another. And in such wise is it with the heart, so long as no thought is given to it, being impure, and the dwelling-place of many demons, but as soon as the alone good Father has visited it, it is sanctified and shines through with light, and the possessor of such a heart becomes so blessed that he shall see God."³ Ac-

¹ On the Canon, p. 259 f.

² *Ib.*, p. 260, note 2.

³ *Eis δὲ ἐστὶν ἀγαθός, οὗ παρρησία (Grabe—Spiel. Patr. ii. p. 52—suggests παρουσία, which we adopt) ἡ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ φανέρωσις, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ μόνου δύναται ἂν ἡ καρδιά καθαρά γενέσθαι παντός πονηροῦ πνεύματος ἐξωθουμένου τῆς καρδιάς. πολλὰ γὰρ ἐνοικούντα αὐτῇ πνεύματα οὐκ ἐὰν καθαρεύειν, ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ ἴδια*

according to Canon Westcott, this passage contains two of the "clear references" to our Gospels upon which he bases his statement, namely, to Matt. v. 8, and to Matt. xix. 17.

Now it is clear that there is no actual quotation from any evangelical work in this passage from the Epistle of Valentinus, and the utmost for which the most zealous apologist could contend is, that there is a slight similarity with some words in the Gospel, and Canon Westcott himself does not venture to call them more than "references." That such distant coincidences should be quoted as the only evidence for the use of the first Gospel shows how weak is his case. At best such vague references could not prove anything, but when the passages to which reference is supposed to be made are examined, it will be apparent that nothing could be more unfounded or arbitrary than the claim of reference specially to our Gospel, to the exclusion of the other Gospels then existing, which to our knowledge contained both passages. We may, indeed, go still further, and affirm that if these coincidences are references to any Gospel at all, that Gospel is not the canonical, but one different from it.

The first reference alluded to consists of the following two phrases: "But one only is good (*εἰς δὲ ἐστὶν ἀγαθός*). . . . the alone good Father" (*ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς πατήρ*). This is compared with Matt. xix. 17:¹ "Why askest thou me concerning good? there is one that is good" (*εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός*).² Now the passage in the epistle, if a reference to any parallel episode, such as Matt. xix. 17, indicates with certainty the reading: "One is good the Father" *εἰς ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατήρ*. There is no such reading in any of our Gospels. But although this reading does not exist in any of the Canonical Gospels, it is well known that it did exist in uncanonical Gospels no longer extant, and that the passage was one upon which various sects of so-called heretics laid great stress. Irenæus quotes it as one of the texts to which the Marcosians, who made use of apocryphal Gospels,³ and notably of the Gospel according

ἐκτελεῖ ἔργα πολλὰ καὶ ἐνυβρίζοντων ἐπιθυμίαις οὐ προσηκούσαις. καὶ μοι δοκεῖ ὁμοίον τι πάσχειν τῷ πανδοχείῳ ἢ παρδία· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνο κατατιτράται τε καὶ οὐρύττεται καὶ πολλάκις κόπρου πίμπλαται ἀνθρώπων ἀδελγῶς ἐμμενόντων καὶ μηδὲ μίαν πρόνοιαν ποιουμένων τοῦ χωρίου, καθάπερ ἀλλοτρίου καθεστῶτος τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον καὶ ἡ παρδία μέχρι μὴ προνοίας τυγχάνει, ἀκάθαρτος οὖσα, πολλῶν οὖσα δαιμόνων οικητήριον, ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐπισκῆψῃται αὐτήν ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς πατήρ, ἡγιασθαι καὶ φωτὶ διαλάμπει, καὶ οὕτω μακαρίζεται ὁ ἔχων τὴν τοιαύτην καρδίαν, ὅτι ὁφείτω τὸν θεόν. *Clem. Al., Strom., ii. 20, § 114.*

¹ Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 260, note 2.

² Mark x. 18, and Luke xviii. 18, are linguistically more distant. "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but God only." *οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς ἐμὶ εἰς ὁ θεός.*

³ Adv. Hær., i. 20, § 1.

to th
Epip
the
rem
prop
in E
quot
pels,
reper
wise
ιστιν,
Alex
ence
in an
Th
is go
come
good
light,
he sh
ὄφρα
are th
τῇ καρ
quite
even i
is mo
much
pels,¹⁰
Hebr
Churc
dence

¹ Ad
² Ep
³ De
v. 11; 4
⁴ Hil
⁵ Ap
⁶ Hil
⁷ He
⁸ οὐδ
ἀγαθ
⁹ We
¹⁰ Ew
¹¹ The
iv. 13, §
necessa
all of th
becomes
correct

to the Hebrews, gave a different colouring: *εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ.*¹ Epiphanius also quotes this reading as one of the variations of the Marcionites: *εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ θεός, ὁ πατήρ.*² Origen, likewise, remarks that this passage is misused by some Heretics: "Velut proprie sibi datum scutum putant (hæretici) quod dixit Dominus in Evangelio: Nemo bonus nisi unus Deus pater."³ Justin Martyr quotes the same reading from a source different from our Gospels,⁴ *εἰς ἔστιν ἀγαθός ὁ πατήρ μου, κ.τ.λ.,*⁵ and in agreement with the repeated similar readings of the Clementine Homilies, which likewise derived it from an extra-canonical source,⁶ *ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθός εἰς ἔστιν, ὁ πατήρ.*⁷ The use of a similar expression by Clement of Alexandria,⁸ as well as by Origen, only serves to prove the existence of the reading in extinct Gospels, although it is not found in any MS. of any of our Gospels.

The second of the supposed references is more diffuse: "One is good and through him alone will the heart be enabled to become pure (*ἡ καρδιά καθαρὰ γενέσθαι*) . . . but when the alone good Father has visited it, it is sanctified and shines through with light, and the possessor of such a heart becomes so blessed, that he shall see God" (*καὶ οὕτω μακαρίζεται ὁ ἔχων τὴν τοιαύτην καρδίαν, ὅτι ὀψεται τὸν θεόν*). This is compared⁹ with Matthew v. 8: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (*μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεόν ὀψονται*). It might be argued that this is quite as much a reference to Psalm xxiv. 3-6 as to Matt. v. 8, but even if treated as a reference to the Sermon on the Mount, nothing is more certain than the fact that this discourse had its place in much older forms of the Gospel than our present Canonical Gospels,¹⁰ and that it formed part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other evangelical writings in circulation in the early Church. Such a reference as this is absolutely worthless as evidence of special acquaintance with our first Synoptic.¹¹

¹ Adv. Her., i. 20, § 2.

² Epiphanius, Hær., xlii.; Schol. L. ed. Pet., p. 339.

³ De Principiis, i. 2, § 13; cf. de Orat., 15; Exhort. ad Mart., 7; Contra Cels., v. 11; cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., ii. p. 305, 349, 388.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 220 ff.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 243 ff.

⁵ Apol., i. 16.

⁶ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 362 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 321.

⁷ H. n. xviii. 1; 3.

⁸ οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου, κ.τ.λ. Pædag., i. 8, § 72, cf. § 74; εἰς ἀγαθός ὁ πατήρ. Strom., v. 10, § 64.

⁹ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 260, note 2.

¹⁰ Ewald assigns it to the Spruchsammlung. Die drei erst. Evv., p. 7.

¹¹ The supposed reference to the Ep. to the Romans i. 20; cf. Clem. Al., Strom., iv. 13, § 91, 92, is much more distant than either of the preceding. It is not necessary for us to discuss it, but as Canon Westcott merely gives references to all of the passages without quoting any of the words, a good strong assertion becomes a powerful argument, since few readers have the means of verifying its correctness.

Tischendorf does not appeal at all to these supposed references contained in the passages preserved by Clement, but both the German and the English apologist join in relying upon the testimony of Hippolytus,¹ with regard to the use of the Gospels by Valentinus, although it must be admitted that the former does so with greater fairness of treatment than Canon Westcott. Tischendorf does refer to, and admit, some of the difficulties of the case, as we shall presently see, whilst Canon Westcott, as in the case of Basilides, boldly makes his assertion, and totally ignores all adverse facts. The only Gospel reference which can be adduced even in the *Philosophumena*, exclusive of one asserted to be to the fourth Gospel, which will be separately considered hereafter, is advanced by Canon Westcott, for Tischendorf does not refer to it, but confines himself solely to the supposed reference to the fourth Gospel. The passage is the same as one also imputed to Basilides: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" which happens to agree with the words in Luke i. 35; but, as we have seen in connection with Justin, there is good reason for concluding that the narrative to which it belongs was contained in other Gospels.² In this instance, however, the quotation is carried further, and presents an important variation from the text of Luke. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore the thing begotten of thee shall be called holy"³ (δὲ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον κληθήσεται). The reading of Luke is: "Therefore also the holy thing begotten shall be called the Son of God" (δὲ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ). It is probable that the passage referred to in connection with the followers of Basilides may have ended in the same way as this, and been derived from the same source. Nothing, however, can be clearer than the fact that this quotation, by whoever made, is not from our third Synoptic, inasmuch as there does not exist a single MS. which contains such a passage. We again, however, come to the question: Who really made the quotations which Hippolytus introduces so indefinitely?

We have already, in speaking of Basilides, pointed out the loose manner in which Hippolytus and other early writers, in dealing with different schools of heretics, indifferently quote the founder or his followers without indicating the precise person quoted. This practice is particularly apparent in the work of

¹ By a misprint Canon Westcott ascribes all his references of Valentinus to the N. T., except three, to the extracts from his writings in the *Stromata* of Clement, although he should have indicated the work of Hippolytus. Cf. *On the Canon*, 1866, p. 260, note 2.

² Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 141 ff.

³ Hippolytus, *Adv. Hær.*, vi. 35.

Hipp
Tisc
thou
not
of th
it do
ral f
(and
quot
only
posit
Vale
writ
of th
of J
from
sions
fine
made
cann
testi
the C
&c.
to hi
No
vi. 3
tion
ther
says
equal
Weiz
cribe
in th
a pa
After
verse
thus
great
their

1 W
zisch
liegend
2 W
3 W
Johann
4 P.

Hippolytus when the followers of Valentinus are in question. Tischendorf himself is obliged to admit this. He says "Even though it be also incontestable that the author (Hippolytus) does not always sharply distinguish between the sect and the founder of the sect, does this apply to the present case?"¹ He denies that it does in the instance to which he refers, but he admits the general fact. In the same way another apologist of the fourth Gospel (and as the use of that Gospel is maintained in consequence of a quotation in the very same chapter as we are now considering, only a few lines higher up, both third and fourth are in the same position) is forced to admit: "The use of the Gospel of John by Valentinus cannot so certainly be proved from our refutation-writing (the work of Hippolytus). Certainly in the statement of these doctrines it gives abstracts, which contain an expression of John (x. 8), and there cannot be any doubt that this is taken from some writing of the sect. But the apologist, in his expressions regarding the Valentinian doctrines, does not seem to confine himself to one and the same work, but to have alternately made use of different writings of the school, for which reason we cannot say anything as to the age of this quotation, and from this testimony, therefore, we merely have further confirmation that the Gospel was early² (?) used in the School of the Valentinians,"³ &c. Of all this not a word from Canon Westcott, who adheres to his system of bare assertion.

Now we have already quoted⁴ the opening sentence of Book vi. 35, of the work ascribed to Hippolytus, in which the quotation from John x. 8, referred to above, occurs, and ten lines further on, with another intermediate and equally indefinite "he says" (*φησὶ*), occurs the supposed quotation from Luke i. 35, which, equally with that from the fourth Gospel, must, according to Weizsäcker, be abandoned as a quotation which can fairly be ascribed to Valentinus himself, whose name is not once mentioned in the whole chapter. A few lines below the quotation, however, a passage occurs which throws much light upon the question. After explaining the views of the Valentinians regarding the verse: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee," &c., the writer thus proceeds: "Regarding this there is among them (*αὐτοῖς*) a great question, a cause both of schism and dissension. And hence their (*αὐτῶν*) teaching has become divided, and the one teaching

¹ Wenn nun auch unbestreitbar ist, dass der Verfasser nicht immer streng zwischen der Sekte sondert und dem Urheber der Sekte, findet dies auf den vorliegenden Fall Anwendung? Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 46.

² Why "early"? since Hippolytus writes about A.D. 225.

³ Weizsäcker, Unters. üb. d. evang. Gesch., 1864, p. 224. Cf. Luthardt, Der Johann. Urspr. viert. Ev., 1874, p. 88 f.

⁴ P. 421, "Therefore all the Prophets," &c.

according to them (*κατ' αὐτούς*) is called Eastern (*ἀνατολική*) and the other Italian. They from Italy, of whom is Heracleon and Ptolemaeus, say (*φασί*) that the body of Jesus was animal, and on account of this, on the occasion of the baptism, the Holy Spirit like a dove came down—that is, the Logos from the Mother above, Sophia—and became joined to the animal, and raised him from the dead. This, *he says* (*φησί*), is the declaration (*τὸ ἐρρημένον*),—and here, be it observed, we come to another of the “clear references” which Canon Westcott ventures, deliberately and without a word of doubt, to attribute to Valentinus himself,¹—“This, *he says*, is the declaration: ‘He who raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies,’² that is animal. For the earth has come under a curse: ‘For dust, *he says* (*φησί*), thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.’³ On the other hand, those from the East (*οἱ δ' αὖ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς*), of whom is Axionicus and Bardesanes, say (*λέγουσιν*) that the body of the Saviour was spiritual, for the Holy Spirit came upon Mary, that is the Sophia and the power of the Highest,”⁴ &c.

In this passage we have a good illustration of the mode in which the writer introduces his quotations with the subjectless “*he says*.” Here he is conveying the divergent opinions of the two parties of Valentinians, and explaining the peculiar doctrines of the Italian school “of whom is Heracleon and Ptolemaeus,” and he suddenly departs from the plural “*they*” to quote the passage from Romans viii. 12, in support of their views with the singular “*he says*.” Nothing can be more obvious than that “*he*” cannot possibly be Valentinus himself, for the schism is represented as taking place amongst his followers, and the quotation is evidently made by one of them to support the views of his party in the schism, but whether Hippolytus is quoting from Heracleon or Ptolemaeus or some other of the Italian⁵ school, there is no means

¹ On the Canon, p. 260.

² Cf. Rom. viii. 11.

³ Cf. Gen. iii. 19.

⁴ Περὶ τοῦτου ζητηθεὶς μεγάλη ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς καὶ σχισμάτων καὶ διαφορᾶς ἀφορμή. Καὶ γέγονεν ἐντεῦθεν ἡ διδασκαλία αὐτῶν διρρημένη, καὶ καλεῖται ἡ μὲν ἀνατολικὴ τὴς διδασκαλίας κατ' αὐτούς, ἡ δὲ Ἰταλιωτικὴ. Οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος, ψυχικὸν φασὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰ κατεβήκε, τούτεστιν ὁ λόγος ὁ τῆς μητρὸς ἀνῶθεν τῆς σοφίας, καὶ γέγονε τῷ ψυχικῷ, καὶ ἐγγήγεκεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ταῦτο ἐστὶ, φησί, τὸ ἐρρημένον· Ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σῶματα ὑμῶν, ἧτοι ψυχικά. Ὁ, χεῖς γὰρ ὑπὸ κατάραν ἔλαβεν. Ἢ γὰρ, φησὶν, εἰ, καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελευσθῇ. Οἱ δ' αὖ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς λέγουσιν, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἀχιόνικος καὶ Ἀρδισιάνης, ὅτι πνευματικὸν ἦν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος· πνεῦμα γὰρ ἄγιον ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Μαρίαν, τούτεστιν ἡ σοφία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου, κ.τ.λ. Hippolytus, Ref. Oma. Her., vi. 35.

⁵ The quotation from an Epistle to the Romans by the Italian school is appropriate.

of knowing. Of all this, again, nothing is said by Canon Westcott, who quietly asserts, without hesitation or argument, that Valentinus himself is the person who here makes the quotation.

We have already said that the name of Valentinus does not occur once in the whole chapter (vi. 35) which we have been examining, and if we turn back we find that the preceding context confirms the result at which we have arrived, that the *φησί* has no reference to the Founder himself, but is applicable only to some later member of his school, most probably contemporary with Hippolytus. In vi. 21, Hippolytus discusses the heresy of Valentinus, which he traces to Pythagoras and Plato, but in Ch. 29 he passes from direct reference to the Founder to deal entirely with his school. This is so manifest, that the learned editors of the work of Hippolytus, Professors Duncker and Schneidewin, alter the preceding heading at that part from "Valentinus" to "Valentiniani." At the beginning of Ch. 29 Hippolytus writes: "Valentinus, therefore, and Heraclion and Ptolemæus and the whole school of these (heretics) . . . have laid down as the fundamental principle of their teaching the arithmetical system. For according to these," &c. And a few lines lower down: "There is discernible amongst them, however, considerable difference of opinion. For many of them, in order that the Pythagorean doctrine of Valentinus may be wholly pure, suppose, &c., but others," &c. He shortly after says that he will proceed to state their doctrines as they themselves teach them (*μνημονεύσαντες ὡς ἐκείνοι διδάσκουσιν ἐροῦμεν*). He then continues: "There is, he says (*φησί*), &c., &c., quoting evidently one of these followers who want to keep the doctrine of Valentinus pure, or of the "others," although without naming him; and three lines further on again, without any preparation, returning to the plural "they say" (*λέγουσι*) and so on through the following chapters, "he says" alternating with the plural, as the author apparently has in view something said by individuals or merely expresses general views. In the chapter (34) preceding that which we have principally been examining, Hippolytus begins by referring to "the Quaternion according to Valentinus," but after five lines on it, he continues: "This is what they say: *ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ λέγουσιν*,"¹ and then goes on to speak of "their whole teaching" (*τὴν πᾶσαν αὐτῶν διδασκαλίαν*), and lower down he distinctly sets himself to discuss the opinions of the school in the plural: "Thus these (Valentinians) subdivide the contents of the Pleromā," &c. (*οὕτως οὗτοι*, κ.τ.λ.), and continues with an occasional "according to them" (*κατ' αὐτοὺς*) until, without any name being mentioned, he makes use of the indefinite "he says" to introduce the quotation referred to by Canon Westcott

¹ vi. 34.

as a citation by Valentinus himself of "the Epistle to the Ephesians as Scripture."¹ "This is, he says, what is written in Scripture," and there follows a quotation which, it may merely be mentioned as Canon Westcott says nothing of it, differs considerably from the passage in the Epistle iii. 14-18. Immediately after, another of Canon Westcott's quotations from 1 Cor. ii. 14 is given, with the same indefinite "he says," and in the same way, without further mention of names, the quotations in Ch. 35 compared with John x. 8 and Luke i. 35. There is, therefore, absolutely no ground whatever for referring these *φησὶ* to Valentinus himself; but, on the contrary, Hippolytus shows in the clearest way that he is discussing the views of the later writers of the sect, and it is one of these, and not the Founder himself, whom in his usual indefinite way he thus quotes.

We have been forced by these bald and unsupported assertions of apologists to go at such length into these questions at the risk of being very wearisome to our readers, but it has been our aim as much as possible to make no statements without placing before those who are interested the materials for forming an intelligent opinion. Any other course would be to meet mere assertion by simple denial, and it is only by bold and unsubstantiated statements which have been simply and in good faith accepted by ordinary readers who have not the opportunity, if they have even the will, to test their veracity, that apologists have so long held their ground. Our results regarding Valentinus so far may be stated as follows: the quotations which without any explanation are so positively and disingenuously imputed to Valentinus are not made by him, but by later writers of his school;² and, moreover, the passages which are indicated by the English apologist as references to our two Synoptic Gospels not only do not emanate from Valentinus, but do not agree with our Gospels, and are derived from other sources.³

The remarks of Canon Westcott with regard to the connection of Valentinus with our New Testament are on a par with the rest of his assertions. He says: "There is no reason to suppose that Valentinus differed from Catholic writers on the Canon of the New Testament."⁴ We might ironically adopt this sentence,

¹ On the Canon, p. 260.

² Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 68 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 345, ann. 5; Rumpf, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1867, p. 17 ff.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 390, p. 516; Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 65 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 151 ff.; Bretschneider, *Probabilia de Evang. et Ep. Joannis*, 1820, p. 212 ff.; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 387, ann. 1; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 70 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 108 ff., 125 f.; Weissäcker, *Unters. evang. Gesch.*, p. 234; J. J. Tayler, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1867, p. 57.

³ Cf. Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 67 f.; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 357, ann. 1.

⁴ On the Canon, p. 259.

for a
seen,
did n
Cano
here,
fully
tinua
this
' the
cion n
very
the v
with
make
modif
the w
mento
of Va
all?
ginal,
Justin
have l
there
certain
small f
by his
emenda
as of ca
upon c
All t
lowers
of the C
howeve
have di
a discip
which l
not hav
affirms
Plato, a

¹ De P

² Schol

³ Adv.

⁴ Baur.

⁵ Hist. du

⁶ Credo

⁷ Stron

for as no writer whatever of the time of Valentinus, as we have seen, recognized any New Testament Canon at all, he certainly did not in this respect differ from the other writers of that period. Canon Westcott relies upon the statement of Tertullian, but even here, although he quotes the Latin passage in a note, he does not fully give its real sense in his text. He writes in immediate continuation of the quotation given above: "Tertullian says that in this he differed from Marcion, that he at least professed to accept 'the whole instrument,' perverting the interpretation, where Marcion mutilated the text." Now the assertion of Tertullian has a very important modification, which to any one acquainted with the very unscrupulous boldness of the "Great African" in dealing with religious controversy, is extremely significant. He does not make the assertion positively and of his own knowledge, but modifies it by saying: "Nor, indeed, if Valentinus seems to use the whole instrument, (neque enim si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur)," ¹ &c. Tertullian evidently knew very little of Valentinus himself, and had probably not read his writings at all.² His treatise against the Valentinians is avowedly not original, but, as he himself admits, is compiled from the writings of Justin, Miltiades, Irenæus, and Proclus.³ Tertullian would not have hesitated to affirm anything of this kind positively, had there been any ground for it, but his assertion is at once too uncertain, and the value of his statements of this nature much too small for such a remark to have any weight as evidence.⁴ Besides, by his own showing Valentinus altered Scripture (sine dubio emendans),⁵ which he could not have done had he recognized it as of canonical authority.⁶ We cannot, however, place any reliance upon criticism emanating from Tertullian.

All that Origen seems to know on this subject is that the followers of Valentinus (τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου) have altered the form of the Gospel (μεταχαράξαντες τὸ εὐαγγέλιον).⁷ Clement of Alexandria, however, informs us that Valentinus, like Basilides, professed to have direct traditions from the Apostles, his teacher being Theodas, a disciple of the Apostle Paul.⁸ If he had known any Gospels which he believed to have apostolic authority, there would clearly not have been any need of such tradition. Hippolytus distinctly affirms that Valentinus derived his system from Pythagoras and Plato, and "not from the Gospels" (οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων), and that

¹ De Præscrip. Hær., 38.

² Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 67; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 390.

³ Adv. Valent., 5.

⁴ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 357; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 390; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 70.

⁵ De Præscrip. Hær., 30.

⁶ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 38.

⁷ Contra Cels., ii. 27.

⁸ Strom., vii. 17, § 106.

consequently he might more properly be considered a Pythagorean and Platonist than a Christian.¹ Irenæus, in like manner, asserts that the Valentinians derive their views from unscriptural sources (*ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγνώσκοντες*),² and he accuses them of rejecting the Gospels, for after enumerating them,³ he continues: "When, indeed, they are refuted out of the Scriptures, they turn round in accusation of these same Scriptures, as though they were not correct, nor of authority . . . For (they say) that it (the truth) was not conveyed by written records but by the living voice."⁴ In the same chapter he goes on to show that the Valentinians not only reject the authority of Scripture, but also reject ecclesiastical tradition. He says: "But, again, when we refer them to that tradition which is from the Apostles, which has been preserved through a succession of Presbyters in the Churches, they are opposed to tradition, affirming themselves wiser not only than Presbyters, but even than the Apostles, in that they have discovered the uncorrupted truth. For (they say) the Apostles mixed up matters which are of the law with the words of the Saviour, &c. . . . It comes to this, they neither consent to Scripture nor to tradition. (Evenit itaque, neque Scripturis jam, neque Traditioni consentire eos.)"⁵ We find, therefore, that even in the time of Irenæus the Valentinians rejected the writings of the New Testament as authoritative documents, which they certainly would not have done had the Founder of their sect himself acknowledged them. So far from this being the case, there was absolutely no New Testament Canon for Valentinus himself to deal with,⁶ and his perfectly orthodox contemporaries recognized no other Holy Scriptures than those of the Old Testament.

Irenæus, however, goes still further, and states that the Valentinians of his time not only had many Gospels, but that they possessed one peculiar to themselves. "Those indeed who are followers of Valentinus," he says, "again passing beyond all fear, and putting forth their own compositions, boast that they have more Gospels than there actually are. Indeed they have proceeded so far in audacity that they entitle their not long written work the Gospel of Truth, agreeing in nothing with the Gospels of the Apostles, so that there is not any Gospel among them which is free from blasphemy."⁷ It follows clearly, from the very

¹ Ref. Onn. Hær., vi. 29; cf. vi. 21.

² Adv. Hær., i. 8, § 1.

³ *Ib.*, iii. 1, § 1.

⁴ Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate. . . . Non enim per litteras traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem, &c. *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær., iii. 2, § 1.

⁵ *Ib.*, iii. 2, § 2.

⁶ *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, p. 69 f.; *Credner*, Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 24.

⁷ Hi vero, qui sunt a Valentino, iterum existentes extra omnem timorem, suas conscriptiones proferentes, plura habere gloriantur, quam sint ipsa Evangelia.

nam
othe
this.
Gosp
deliv
is de
been
Thes
comm
sugge
Gosp
case,
anyth
pelled
him v
dence

Siquiden
est, veri
acc Eva
11, § 9.
1 Cred
3 Bleck

name of the Valentinian Gospel, that they did not consider that others contained the truth,¹ and indeed Irenæus himself perceived this, for he continues: "For if what is published by them be the Gospel of Truth, but is dissimilar from those which have been delivered to us by the Apostles, any may perceive who please, as is demonstrated by these very Scriptures, that that which has been handed down from the Apostles is not the Gospel of Truth."² These passages speak for themselves, and we need not further comment upon the statements of Canon Westcott. It has been suggested that the "Gospel of Truth" was a harmony of the four Gospels.³ This, however, cannot by any possibility have been the case, inasmuch as Irenæus distinctly says that it did not agree in anything with the Gospels of the Apostles. We have been compelled to devote too much space to Valentinus, and we now leave him with the certainty that in nothing does he afford any evidence even of the existence of our Synoptic Gospels.

Siquidem in tantum processerunt audacia, uti quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, veritatis Evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens apostolorum Evangelis, ut nec Evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemia. Irenæus, Adv. Hær., iii. 11, § 9.

¹ *Credner, Beiträge*, i. p. 38 f.

² *Irenæus, Adv. Hær.*, iii. 11, § 9.

³ *Bleek, Einl. N. T.*, p. 638.

CHAPTER VII.

MARCION.

WE must now turn to the great Heresiarch of the second century, Marcion, and consider the evidence regarding our Gospels which may be derived from what we know of him. The importance, and at the same time the difficulty, of arriving at a just conclusion from the materials within our reach, have rendered Marcion's Gospel the object of very elaborate criticism, and the discussion of its actual character has continued with fluctuating results for nearly a century.

Marcion was born at Sinope, in Pontus, of which place his father was Bishop,¹ and although it is said that he aspired to the first place in the Church of Rome,² the Presbyters refused him communion on account of his peculiar views of Christianity. We shall presently more fully refer to his opinions, but here it will be sufficient to say that he objected to what he considered the debasement of true Christianity by Jewish elements, and he upheld the teaching of Paul alone, in opposition to that of all the other Apostles, whom he accused of mixing up matters of the law with the Gospel of Christ, and falsifying Christianity,³ as Paul himself had protested.⁴ He came to Rome about A.D. 139-142,⁵ and continued teaching for some twenty years.⁶ His high per-

¹ Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xlii. 1 ed. Pöcav., p. 302; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 125; Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 40 f.; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 57; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 272.

² Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 1.

³ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 2. § 2; cf. 12, § 12; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2, 3; cf. i. 20; Origen, in Joann. T. v., § 4; Neander, *Allg. K. G.*, 1843, ii. p. 815 f.; cf. p. 795; Schleiermacher, *Lit. nachlass* iii. *Sämmtl. Werke*, viii.; *Einl. N. T.*, 1845, p. 214 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 273 f.

⁴ Gal. i. 6 ff.; cf. ii. 4 ff., 11 ff.; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 1 ff.

⁵ Anger, *Synops. Ev.*, p. xxiv.; Baur, *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i. p. 196; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 126; Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, viii. p. 562; Burton, *Lectures on Eccl. History of first Three Centuries*, ii. p. 105 ff.; Credner, *Beiträge*, i. p. 40 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Der Kanon*, p. 21 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 75 ff.; Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 244; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 73; Schleiermacher, *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, *Sämmtl. Werke*, 1840, xi. 1 abth., p. 107; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 57; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 120, *ib.*, 1855, p. 270 ff.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 273. The accounts of the Fathers are careless and conflicting. Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, i. 19; Epiph., *Hær.*, xlii. 1; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 4, § 3; Clem. Al., *Strom.*, vii. 17, A.D. 140-150, Bertholdt, *Einl. A. und N. T.*, i. p. 103.

⁶ Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 244; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 75 ff.; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, p. 270 ff.

sonal
upon
afterw
nounc
adopte
be fou
Mar
doctri
Paul,
Epistle
Ephesi
ceans"
other
ment w
the old
trace,
than th
been im
these v
divine
pressed
The
Marcion
and ide
discusse
varying
extant,
and ver
borne n
which e
our first

1 Credne
1845, p. 64
2 Epiph.
3 Tertull
4 Tertull
the order
5 Credne
the Canon
6 Baur,
Wann wur
7 Credne
werk, viii.
Kistlin, Th
du Canon
Zeugnisse,
8 Credne
9 Schweig

sonal character and elevated views produced a powerful effect upon his time,¹ and, although during his own lifetime and long afterwards vehemently and with every opprobrious epithet denounced by ecclesiastical writers, his opinions were so widely adopted that in the time of Epiphanius his followers were said to be found throughout the whole world.²

Marcion is said to have recognized as his sources of Christian doctrine, besides tradition, a single Gospel and ten Epistles of Paul, which in his collection stood in the following order;—Epistle to Galatians, Corinthians (2), Romans, Thessalonians (2), Ephesians (which he had with the superscription "to the Laodiceans"),³ Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon.⁴ None of the other books which now form part of the canonical New Testament were either mentioned or recognized by Marcion.⁵ This is the oldest collection of Apostolic writings of which there is any trace,⁶ but there was at that time no other "Holy Scripture" than the Old Testament, and no New Testament Canon had yet been imagined. Marcion neither claimed canonical authority for these writings,⁷ nor did he associate with them any idea of divine inspiration.⁸ We have already seen the animosity expressed by contemporaries of Marcion against the Apostle Paul.

The principal interest in connection with the collection of Marcion, however, centres in his single Gospel, the nature, origin, and identity of which have long been actively and minutely discussed by learned men of all shades of opinion with very varying results. The work itself is unfortunately no longer extant, and our only knowledge of it is derived from the bitter and very inaccurate opponents of Marcion. It seems to have borne much the same analogy to our third Canonical Gospel which existed between the Gospel according to the Hebrews and our first Synoptic.⁹ The Fathers, whose uncritical and, in such

¹ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 40; *Schleiermacher*, Sämmtl. Werke, viii.; Einl. N. T., 1845, p. 64; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 272 f.

² *Epiph.*, Hær., xlii. 1.

³ *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., v. 11, 17; *Epiph.*, Hær., xlii. 9; cf. 10, Schol. xl.

⁴ *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., v.; *Epiph.*, Hær., xlii. 9. (Epiphanius transposes the order of the last two Epistles.)

⁵ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 42; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 68 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 275.

⁶ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 277 f.; *Reuss*, Hist. du Canon, p. 76 f.; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 57; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 272.

⁷ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 42 f., 44 f.; *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 23; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 563; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 126; *Hilgenfeldt*, Der Canon, p. 22 f.; *Kästlin*, Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 151; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 244, p. 286; *Hist. du Canon*, p. 72; *Ritschl*, Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 529; *Schotten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 74; *Het Paulinisch Evangelie*, p. 6.

⁸ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 45 f.

⁹ *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 260.

matters, prejudiced character led them to denounce every variation from their actual texts as a mere falsification, and without argument to assume the exclusive authenticity and originality of our Gospels, which towards the beginning of the third century had acquired wide circulation in the Church, vehemently stigmatized Marcion as an audacious adulterator of the Gospel, and affirmed his evangelical work to be merely a mutilated and falsified version of the "Gospel according to Luke."¹

This view continued to prevail, almost without question or examination, till towards the end of the eighteenth century, when Biblical criticism began to exhibit the earnestness and activity which have ever since more or less characterized it. Semler first abandoned the prevalent tradition, and, after analyzing the evidence, he concluded that Marcion's Gospel and Luke's were different versions of an earlier work,² and that the so-called heretical Gospel was one of the numerous Gospels from amongst which the Canonical had been selected by the Church.³ Griesbach about the same time also rejected the ruling opinion, and denied the close relationship usually asserted to exist between the two Gospels.⁴ Löffler⁵ and Corrodi⁶ strongly supported Semler's conclusion, that Marcion was no mere falsifier of Luke's Gospel, and J. E. C. Schmidt⁷ went still further, and asserted that Marcion's Gospel was the genuine Luke, and our actual Gospel a later version of it with alterations and additions. Eichhorn,⁸ after a fuller and more exhaustive examination, adopted similar views; he repudiated the statements of Tertullian regarding Marcion's Gospel as utterly untrustworthy, asserting that he had not that work itself before him at all, and he maintained that Marcion's Gospel was the more original text and one of the sources of Luke. Bolten,⁹ Bertholdt,¹⁰ Schleiermacher,¹¹ and D. Schulz¹² likewise maintained that Marcion's Gospel was by no

¹ *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær., i. 27, § 2; iii. 12, § 12; *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 2-6; *Epiphanius*, Hær., xlii. 9, 11; *Origen*, Contra Cels., ii. 27; *Theodoret*, Hær., fab., i. 24.

² Vorrede zu Townson's Abhandl. üb. d. vier Evv., 1783.

³ Neuer Versuch, die Gemeinnützige Auslegung u. anwend. der N. T. zu befördern, 1786, p. 102 f.; cf. Prolegg. in Ep. ad Galatas.

⁴ *Curæ in hist. textus epist. Pauli*, 1799, sect. iii., *Opuscula Academica*, ii. p. 124 ff.

⁵ *Marcionem Pauli epist. et Lucæ evang. adulterasse dubitatur*, 1788, in Velthusen Kuinzel et Ruperti Comment. Theologicæ, 1794, i. pp. 180-218.

⁶ Versuch einer Beleuchtung d. Gesch. des jüd. u. Christl. Bibelkanons, 1792, ii. p. 158 ff., 169.

⁷ Ueber das ächte Evang. des Lucas, in Henke's Mag. für Religions-philos., u. s. w., iii. 1796, p. 468 ff., 482 f., 507 f.

⁸ Einl. N. T., 1820, i. pp. 43-84.

⁹ Bericht des Lucas van Jesu dem Messia. Vorbericht, 1796, p. 29 f.

¹⁰ Einl. A. u. N. T., 1813, iii. p. 1293 ff.

¹¹ Sammtl. Werke, viii.; Einl. N. T., 1845, p. 64 f., 197 f., 214 f.

¹² Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1829, 3, pp. 586-595.

mean-
indep
at by
and a
out of
On
Storr,
little
sought
before
arguin
Gospel
howev
blem,
the sta
conclus
alterati
of the
result,
argume
Wette,

1 Entst.
2 Recen
K. G., i.
3 Zweek
4 Ueber
5 Einl.
6 Genet
1843, ii. p.
7 Krit.
8 Theol.
9 Das E
10 The r
11 Die E
12 Beiträ
13 Einl. 3
14 The fo
have main
Luke. B
135; Bun
Collèrie
Ebrard, V
p. 48; Gu
Allg. K. G
1349; Kir
Komment
i. p. 40; N
1866, p. 13
1834; Rev
Rev. de Th
Die Alt. Ze
Westcott. O
Zeller, Die

means a mutilated version of Luke, but, on the contrary, an independent original Gospel. A similar conclusion was arrived at by Gieseler,¹ but later, after Hahn's criticism, he abandoned it, and adopted the opinion that Marcion's Gospel was constructed out of Luke.²

On the other hand, the traditional view was maintained by Storr,³ Arneth,⁴ Hug,⁵ Neander,⁶ and Gratz,⁷ although with little originality of investigation or argument; and Paulus⁸ sought to reconcile both views by admitting that Marcion had before him the Gospel of Luke, but denying that he mutilated it, arguing that Tertullian did not base his arguments on the actual Gospel of Marcion, but upon his work, the "Antitheses." Hahn,⁹ however, undertook a more exhaustive examination of the problem, attempting to reconstruct the text of Marcion's Gospel¹⁰ from the statements of Tertullian and Epiphanius, and he came to the conclusion that the work was a mere version, with omissions and alterations made by the Heresiarch in the interest of his system, of the third Canonical Gospel. Olshausen¹¹ arrived at the same result, and with more or less of modification but no detailed argument, similar opinions were expressed by Credner,¹² De Wette,¹³ and others.¹⁴

¹ *Entst. schr. Evv.*, 1818, p. 24 ff.

² *Recons. d. Hahn's Das Ev. Marcion's in Hall. Allg. Litt. Z.*, 1823, p. 225 ff.; *K. G.*, i. § 45.

³ *Zweck d. Evang. Gesch. u. Br. Johan.*, 1786, pp. 254—265.

⁴ *Ueber d. Bekanntsch. Marcion's mit. u. Kanon, u. s. w.*, 1809.

⁵ *Einkl. N. T.*, 1847, i. p. 64 ff.

⁶ *Genet. Entwickl. d. vorn. Gnost. Syst.*, 1818, p. 311 ff.; cf. *Allg. K. G.*, 1843, ii. pp. 792—816.

⁷ *Krit. Unters. üb. Marcion's Evang.*, 1818.

⁸ *Theol. exeg. Conserv.*, 1822, Lief. i. p. 115 ff.

⁹ *Das Evang. Marcion's in seiner ursprüngl. Gestalt*, 1823.

¹⁰ The reconstructed text also in Thilo's *Cod. Apocr. N. T.*, 1832, pp. 403—486.

¹¹ *Die Echtheit der vier kan. Evv.*, 1823, pp. 107—215.

¹² *Beiträge*, i. p. 43.

¹³ *Einkl. N. T.*, 6th ausg., 1860, p. 119 ff.

¹⁴ The following writers, either before Hahn's work was written or subsequently, have maintained the dependence, in one shape or another, of Marcion's Gospel on Luke. *Becker*, *Exam. Crit. de l'Ev. de Marcion*, 1837; *Bleek*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 135; *Bunsen*, *Bibelwerk*, viii. p. 565 f.; *Anger*, *Synopsis Ev. Proleg.*, xxiv. ff.; *Cellerier*, *Introd. Crit. N. T.*, 1823, p. 25 f.; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 51 f.; *Ehrard*, *Wiss. krit. evang. Gesch.*, p. 816; *Ewald*, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1853—54, p. 48; *Guericke*, *Gesammtgesch. N. T.*, p. 231; *H'buch K. G.*, i. p. 190; *Gfrörer*, *Allg. K. G.*, i. p. 363 ff.; *Harting*, *Quæst. de Marcione Lucani, Evangelii, &c.*, 1848; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 48, p. 361, anm. 10; *Meyer*, *Krit.-exeg. Kommentar N. T.*, 1867, 1 abth. 2 hälftte, p. 228; *Michaelis*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1788, i. p. 40; *Neudecker*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1840, p. 68 ff.; *Nicolas*, *Et. sur les Ev. Apocr.*, 1866, p. 157 f.; *Rhode*, *Prolegg. ad Quæst. de evang. Marcionis denuo instit.*, 1834; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 244 f.; *Rev. de Théol.*, 1857, p. 4 f.; *Rumpf*, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1867, p. 20 f.; *Schott*, *Isagoge*, 1830, p. 13 ff., note 7; *Scholten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 73 f.; *Tischendorf*, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, pp. 56—65; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 272 ff.; *Wilcke*, *Tradition u. Mythe*, 1837, p. 28; *Zeller*, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 12 ff.

Not satisfied, however, with the method and results of Hahn and Olshausen, whose examination, although more minute than any previously undertaken, still left much to be desired, Ritschl¹ made a further thorough investigation of the character of Marcion's Gospel, and decided that it was in no case a mutilated version of Luke, but, on the contrary, an original and independent work, from which the Canonical Gospel was produced by the introduction of anti-Marcionitish passages and readings. Baur² strongly enunciated similar views, and maintained that the whole error lay in the mistake of the Fathers, who had, with characteristic assumption, asserted the earlier and shorter Gospel of Marcion to be an abbreviation of the later Canonical Gospel, instead of recognizing the latter as a mere extension of the former. Schwegler³ had already, in a remarkable criticism of Marcion's Gospel, declared it to be an independent and original work, and in no sense a mutilated Luke, but, on the contrary, probably the source of that Gospel. Köstlin,⁴ while stating that the theory that Marcion's Gospel was an earlier work and the basis of that ascribed to Luke was not very probable, affirmed that much of the Marcionitish text was more original than the Canonical, and that both Gospels must be considered versions of the same original, although Luke's was the later and more corrupt.

These results, however, did not satisfy Volkmar,⁵ who entered afresh upon a searching examination of the whole subject, and concluded that whilst, on the one hand, the Gospel of Marcion was not a mere falsified and mutilated form of the canonical Gospel, neither was it, on the other, an earlier work, and still less the original Gospel of Luke, but merely a Gnostic compilation from what, so far as we are concerned, may be called the oldest codex of Luke's Gospel, which itself is nothing more than a similar Pauline edition of the original Gospel. Volkmar's analysis, together with the arguments of Hilgenfeld, succeeded in convincing Ritschl,⁶ who withdrew from his previous opinions, and, with those critics, merely maintained some of Marcion's readings to be more original than those of Luke,⁷ and generally defended Marcion from the aspersions of the Fathers, on the ground that his procedure with regard to Luke's Gospel was precisely that of the Canonical Evangelists to each other;⁸ Luke himself being clearly dependent both on Mark and Matthew.⁹ Baur was like-

¹ Das Evangelium Marcion's, 1846.

² Krit. Unters. kan. Evv., 1847, p. 397 ff.

³ Das nachap. Zeit., 1846, i. p. 260 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1843, pp. 575—590.

⁴ Der Ursprung d. synopt. Evv., 1853, p. 303 ff.

⁵ Theol. Jahrb., 1850, pp. 110—138, pp. 185—235.

⁶ Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 528 ff.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 529.

⁸ *Ib.*, p. 530 ff.

⁹ *Ib.*, p. 534 ff.

wise
his vi
Marc
dogm
form
Marc
them
it; th
this s
a fur
cion, i
but w
the m
and, l
of Ma
readin
Gospe
that t
though
These
vestig
This
pied t
tion of
any de
more t
most o
Marcio
and th
third s
commo
ample
from t
We ar
closed
tial ju
the abs
lately
be shov
very st

¹ Das N
² *Ib.*, p.
³ Das N
⁴ Ueb.
⁵ Theol

wise induced by Volkmar's and Hilgenfeld's arguments to modify his views;¹ but although for the first time he admitted that Marcion had altered the original of his Gospel frequently for dogmatic reasons, he still maintained that there was an older form of the Gospel without the earlier chapters, from which both Marcion and Luke directly constructed their Gospels;—both of them stood in the same line in regard to the original; both altered it; the one abbreviated, the other extended it.² Encouraged by this success, but not yet satisfied, Volkmar immediately undertook a further and more exhaustive examination of the text of Marcion, in the hope of finally settling the discussion, and he again, but with greater emphasis, confirmed his previous results.³ In the meantime Hilgenfeld⁴ had seriously attacked the problem, and, like Hahn and Volkmar, had sought to reconstruct the text of Marcion, and, whilst admitting many more original and genuine readings in the text of Marcion, he had also decided that his Gospel was dependent on Luke, although he further concluded that the text of Luke had subsequently gone through another, though slight, manipulation before it assumed its present form. These conclusions he again fully confirmed after a renewed investigation of the subject.⁵

This brief sketch of the controversy which has so long occupied the attention of critics will at least show the insecure position of the matter, and the uncertainty of the data upon which any decision is to be based. We have not attempted to give more than the barest outlines, but it will appear as we go on that most of those who decide against the general independence of Marcion's Gospel, at the same time admit his partial originality and the superiority of some of his readings over those of the third Synoptic, and justify his treatment of Luke as a procedure common to the Evangelists, and warranted not only by their example but by the fact that no Gospels had in his time emerged from the position of private documents in limited circulation. We are, however, very far from considering the discussion as closed; but, on the contrary, we believe that a just and impartial judgment in the case must lead to the conclusion that if, in the absence of sufficient data, Marcion's Gospel cannot be absolutely proved to be a special and original Gospel, still less can it be shown to be a mutilated version of Luke's Gospel. There are very strong reasons for considering it to be either an independent

¹ Das Markusevang. Anhang züb. das Ev. Marcion's, 1851, p. 191 ff.

² *Ib.*, p. 225 f.

³ Das Evang. Marcion's, 1852.

⁴ Ueb. die Evv. Justin's der Clem. Hom. und Marcion's, 1850, p. 389 ff.

⁵ Theol. Jahrb., 1853, pp. 192—244.

work, derived from the same sources as our third Synoptic, or a more primitive version of that Gospel.

Marcion's Gospel not being any longer extant, it is important to establish clearly the nature of our knowledge regarding it, and the exact value of the data from which various attempts have been made to reconstruct the text. It is manifest that the evidential force of any deductions from a reconstructed text is almost wholly dependent on the accuracy and sufficiency of the materials from which that text is derived.

The principal sources of our information regarding Marcion's Gospel are the works of his most bitter denouncers Tertullian and Epiphanius, who, however, it must be borne in mind, wrote long after his time,—the work of Tertullian against Marcion having been composed about A.D. 208,¹ and that of Epiphanius a century later. We may likewise merely mention here the "*Dialogus de recta in deum fide*," commonly attributed to Origen, although it cannot have been composed earlier than the middle of the fourth century.² The first three sections are directed against the Marcionites, but only deal with a late form of their doctrines.³ As Volkmar admits that the author clearly had only a general acquaintance with the "Antitheses," and principal proof passages of the Marcionites, but, although he certainly possessed the Epistles, had not the Gospel of Marcion itself,⁴ we need not now more particularly consider it.

We are, therefore, dependent upon the "dogmatic and partly blind and unjust adversaries" ⁵ of Marcion for our only knowledge of the text they stigmatize; and when the character of polemical discussion in the early centuries of our era is considered, it is certain that great caution must be exercised, and not too much weight attached to the statements of opponents who regarded a heretic with abhorrence, and attacked him with an acrimony which carried them far beyond the limits of fairness and truth. Their religious controversy bristles with misstatements, and is turbid with pious abuse. Tertullian was a master of this style, and the vehement vituperation with which he opens⁶ and often interlards his work against "the impious and sacrilegious Marcion" offers anything but a guarantee of fair and legitimate criticism. Epiphanius was, if possible, still more passionate and exaggerated in his representations against him.⁷ Undue importance must not, therefore, be attributed to their statements.⁸

¹ Cf. Tertullian, Adv. Marc., i. 15; Neander, Antignosticus, 1849, p. 398; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 75.

² *Ib.*, p. 52 f.

³ Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 120.

⁴ Cf. De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 122.

⁵ Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 71, 72; Gieseler, Entw. schr. Evv., p. 25; Scholten,

⁶ Volkmar, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 52.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 53.

⁸ Adv. Marc., i. 1.

No
repre
parti
whos
whos
Reuss
L'on
bruta
même
quele
oublic
Dialec
L'inju
genre
de fail
armes.
l'époqu
gnostic
monde
The
is first
with s
Epipha
the sec
their o
ted, can
the rea
clusive
led the
evangel
argume
Gospels
ancient
torical
Die ält. 2
Canon, p.
1 Bour
Schreeger
2 Reuss
1875, p. 2
3 Et sup
Irenaeus,
4 Adv.
5 Hær.,
6 Hilgen
Volkmar,
7 Adv.
8 Eichho

Not only should there be caution exercised in receiving the representations of one side in a religious discussion, but more particularly is such caution necessary in the case of Tertullian, whose trustworthiness is very far from being above suspicion, and whose inaccuracy is often apparent.¹ "Son christianisme," says Reuss, "est ardent, sincère, profondément ancré dans son âme. L'on voit qu'il en vit. Mais ce christianisme est âpre, insolent, brutal, ferraillleur. Il est sans onction et sans charité, quelquefois même sans loyauté, dès qu'il se trouve en face d'une opposition quelconque. C'est un soldat qui ne sait que se battre et qui oublie, tout en se battant, qu'il faut aussi respecter son ennemi. Dialecticien subtil et rusé, il excelle à ridiculiser ses adversaires. L'injure, le sarcasme, un langage qui rappelle parfois le genre de Rabelais, une effronterie d'affirmation dans les moments de faiblesse qui frise et atteint même la mauvaise foi, voilà ses armes. Je sais ce qu'il faut en cela mettre sur le compte de l'époque. . . . Si, au second siècle, tous les partis, sauf quelques gnostiques, sont intolérants, Tertullian l'est plus que tout le monde."²

The charge of mutilating and interpolating the Gospel of Luke is first brought against Marcion by Irenæus,³ and it is repeated with still greater vehemence and fulness by Tertullian,⁴ and Epiphanius;⁵ but the mere assertion by Fathers at the end of the second and in the third centuries, that a Gospel different from their own was one of the Canonical Gospels falsified and mutilated, can have no weight whatever in itself in the inquiry as to the real nature of that work.⁶ Their arbitrary assumption of exclusive originality and priority for the four Gospels of the Church led them, without any attempt at argument, to treat every other evangelical work as an off-shoot or falsification of these. The arguments by which Tertullian endeavours to establish that the Gospels of Luke and the other Canonical Evangelists were more ancient than that of Marcion⁷ show that he had no idea of historical or critical evidence.⁸ We are, however, driven back upon

Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 75; Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 120; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 276; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 122.

¹ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., 1847, p. 357; Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1857, p. 67 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 278 f.

² Reuss, Rev. de Théol., xv. 1857, p. 67 f. Cf. Mansel, the Gnostic Heresies, 1875, p. 250, p. 259 f.

³ Et super hæc, id quod est secundum Lucam Evangelium circumcidens. . . . Irenæus, Adv. Hær., i. 27, § 2; cf. iii. 11, § 7; 12, § 12; 14, § 4.

⁴ Adv. Marc., iv. 1, 2, 4 et passim.

⁵ Hær., xlii. 9, 10 et passim.

⁶ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 446 f., 448; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 72 f.; Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 120; Ritschl, Das Evang. Marcion's p. 23 ff.

⁷ Adv. Marc., iv. 5.

⁸ Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 73; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 276.

such actual data regarding the text and contents of Marcion's Gospel as are given by the Fathers, as the only basis, in the absence of the Gospel itself, upon which any hypothesis as to its real character can be built. The question therefore is: Are these data sufficiently ample and trustworthy for a decisive judgment from internal evidence? if indeed internal evidence in such a case can be decisive at all.

All that we know, then, of Marcion's Gospel is simply what Tertullian and Epiphanius have stated with regard to it. It is, however, undeniable, and indeed is universally admitted, that their object in dealing with it at all was entirely dogmatic, and not in the least degree critical.¹ The spirit of that age was indeed so essentially uncritical² that not even the canonical text could waken it into activity. Tertullian very clearly states what his object was in attacking Marcion's Gospel. After asserting that the whole aim of the Heresiarch was to prove a disagreement between the Old Testament and the New, and that for this purpose he had erased from the Gospel all that was contrary to his opinion, and retained all that he had considered favourable, Tertullian proceeds to examine the passages retained,³ with the view of proving that the Heretic has shown the same "blindness of heresy" both in that which he has erased and in that which he has retained, inasmuch as the passages which Marcion has allowed to remain are as opposed to his system, as those which he has omitted. He conducts the controversy in a free and discursive manner, and whilst he appears to go through Marcion's Gospel with some regularity, it will be apparent, as we proceed, that mere conjecture has to play a large part in any attempt to reconstruct, from his data, the actual text of Marcion. Epiphanius explains his aim with equal clearness. He had made a number of extracts from the so-called Gospel of Marcion which seemed to him to refute the heretic, and after giving a detailed and numbered list of these passages, which he calls *σχόλια*, he takes them consecutively and to each adds his "Refutation." His intention is to show how wickedly and disgracefully Marcion has mutilated and falsified the Gospel, and how fruitlessly he has done so, inasmuch as he has stupidly, or by oversight, allowed much to remain in his Gospel by which he may be completely refuted.⁴

¹ Kirchhofer, *Quellensamm.*, p. 361, ann. 10, p. 362 f., ann. 12, 15, 16, 17; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ev. Justin's* p. 447 f.; *Reuss*, *Rev. de Théol.*, xv. 1857, p. 43; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 120; *Das Evang. Marcion's*, 1852, pp. 29, 31; De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 123; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, n. s. w.*, p. 62.

² Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 8.

³ *Hæc convenimus, hæc amplectemur, si nobiscum magis fuerint, si Marcionis presumptionem pereusserint. Tunc et illa constabit eodem vitio hæreticæ cæcitatæ erasa quo et hæc reservata. Sic habebit intentio et forma opusculi nostri, &c. &c.* Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 6. ⁴ Epiphanius, *Hæc*, xli. 9 f.

As it is impossible within our limits fully to illustrate the procedure of the Fathers with regard to Marcion's Gospel, and the nature and value of the materials they supply, we shall as far as possible quote the declarations of critics, and more especially of Volkmar and Hilgenfeld, who, in the true and enlightened spirit of criticism, impartially state the character of the data available for the understanding of the text. As these two critics have, by their able and learned investigations, done more than any others to educe and render possible a decision of the problem, their own estimate of the materials upon which a judgment has to be formed is of double value.

With regard to Tertullian Volkmar explains that his desire is totally to annihilate the most dangerous heretic of his time,—first (Books i.—iii.), to overthrow Marcion's system in general as expounded in his "Antitheses,"—and then (Book iv.) to show that even the Gospel of Marcion only contains Catholic doctrine (he concludes, "*Christus Jesus in Evangelio tuo meus est*," c. 43); and therefore he examines the Gospel only so far as may serve to establish his view and refute that of Marcion. "To show," Volkmar continues, "wherein this Gospel was falsified or mutilated, i.e., varied from his own, on the contrary, is in no way his design, for he perceives that Marcion could retort the reproach of interpolation, and in his time proof from internal grounds was hardly possible, so that only exceptionally, where a variation seems to him remarkable, does he specially mention it."¹ On the other hand Volkmar remarks that Tertullian's Latin rendering of the text of Marcion which lay before him,—which, although certainly in general free and naturally having chiefly the substance in view, still in weightier passages is verbally accurate,—directly indicates important variations in that text. He goes on to argue that the silence of Tertullian may be weighty testimony for the fact that passages which exist in Luke, but which he does not mention, were missing in Marcion's Gospel, but he does so with considerable reservation. "But his silence alone," he says, "can only under certain conditions represent with diplomatic certainty an omission in Marcion. It is indeed probable that he would not lightly have passed over a passage in the Gospel of Marcion which might in any way be contradictory to its system, if one altogether similar had not preceded it, all the more as he frequently drags in by force such proof passages from Marcion's text, and often plainly with but a certain sophistry tries to refute his adversary out of the words of his own Gospel. But it remains always possible that in his eagerness he has overlooked much; and besides, he believes that by his replies to particular passages he has already

¹ Volkmar, *Das Evang. Marcion's*, p. 29.

sufficiently dealt with many others of a similar kind; indeed, avowedly, he will not willingly repeat himself. A certain conclusion, therefore, can only be deduced from the silence of Tertullian when special circumstances enter."¹ Volkmar, however, deduces with certainty from the statements of Tertullian that, whilst he wrote, he had not before him the Gospel of Luke, but intentionally laid it aside, and merely referred to the Marcionitish text, and further that, like all the Fathers of the third century, he preferred the Gospel according to Matthew to the other Synoptics, and was well acquainted with it alone, so that in speaking of the Gospel generally he only has in his memory the sense, and the sense alone of Luke except in so far as it agrees or seems to agree with Matthew."²

With regard to the manner in which Tertullian performed the work he had undertaken, Hilgenfeld remarks: "As Tertullian, in going through the Marcionitish Gospel, has only the object of refutation in view, he very rarely states explicitly what is missing in it; and as, on the one hand, we can only venture to conclude from the silence of Tertullian that a passage is wanting, when it is altogether inexplicable that he should not have made use of it for the purpose of refutation; so, on the other, we must also know how Marcion used and interpreted the Gospel, and should never lose sight of Tertullian's refutation and defence."³

Hahn substantially expresses the same opinions. He says: "Inasmuch as Tertullian goes through the Marcionitish text with the view of refuting the heretic out of that which he accepts, and not of critically pointing out all variations, falsifications, and passages rejected, he frequently quotes the falsified or altered Marcionitish text without expressly mentioning the variations."⁴

Yet he cannot refrain—although this was not his object—occasionally, from noticing amongst other things any falsifications and omissions which, when he perhaps examined the text of Luke or had a lively recollection of it, struck and too grievously offended him."⁵

Volkmar's opinion of the procedure of Epiphanius is still more unfavourable. Contrasting it with that of Tertullian, he characterizes it as "more superficial," and he considers that its only merit is its presenting an independent view of Marcion's Gospel. Further than this, however, he says: "How far we can build upon his statements, whether as regards their completeness or their trustworthiness, is not yet made altogether clear."⁶ Volk-

¹ Volkmar, *Das Evang. Marcion's*, p. 29 f.; cf. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, p. 237.

² *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 31.

³ *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 397.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 98.

⁴ *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 96.

⁶ Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 32, cf. p. 43.

mar goes on to show how thoroughly Epiphanius intended to do his work, and yet that, although from what he himself leads us to expect, we might hope to find a complete statement of Marcion's sins, the Father himself disappoints such an expectation by his own admission of incompleteness. He complains generally of his free and misleading method of quotation, such, for instance, as his alteration of the text without explanation; alteration of the same passage on different occasions in more than one way; abbreviations, and omissions of parts of quotations; the sudden breaking off of passages just commenced with the indefinite *καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς* or *καὶ τὸ λοιπόν*, without any indication how much this may include.¹

Volkmar, indeed, explains that Epiphanius is only thoroughly trustworthy where, and *so far as*, he wishes to state in his Scholia an omission or variation in Marcion's text from his own Canonical Gospel, in which case he minutely registers the smallest point, but this is to be clearly distinguished from any charge of falsification brought against Marcion in his Refutations; for only while earlier drawing up his Scholia had he the Marcionitish Gospel before him and compared it with Luke; but in the case of the Refutations, on the contrary, which he wrote later, he did not at least again compare the Gospel of Luke. "It is, however, altogether different," continues Volkmar, "as regards the statements of Epiphanius concerning the part of the Gospel of Luke which is preserved in Marcion. Whilst he desires to be *strictly literal* in the account of the *variations*, and also with two exceptions *is* so, he so generally adheres *only to the purport* of the passages retained by Marcion, that altogether literal quotations are quite exceptional; *throughout*, however, where passages of greater extent are referred to, these are not merely abbreviated, but also are quoted in *very free* fashion, and nowhere can we reckon that the passage in Marcion ran verbally as Epiphanius quotes it."² And to this we may add a remark made further on: "We cannot in general rely upon the accuracy of his statements in regard to that which Marcion had in common with Luke."³ On the other hand Volkmar had previously said: "Absolute completeness in regard to that which Marcion's Gospel did not contain is not to be reckoned upon in his Scholia. He has certainly not intended to pass over anything, but in the eagerness which so easily renders men superficial and blind much has escaped him."⁴

¹ Volkmar, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 33 f.; cf. Hahn, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 193 ff.

² *Ib.*, p. 43 f.; cf. p. 34.

³ *Ib.*, p. 45.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 33; cf. Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 75 ff.; Hahn, Das Ev. Marcion's,

Hahn bears similar testimony to the incompleteness of Epiphanius. "It was not his purpose," he says, "fully to notice all falsifications, variations, and omissions, although he does mark most of them, but merely to extract from the Gospel of Marcion, as well as from his collection of Epistles, what seemed to him well suited for refutation."¹ But he immediately adds: "When he quotes a passage from Marcion's text, however, in which such falsifications occur, he generally,—but not always,—notes them more or less precisely, and he had himself laid it down as a subsidiary object of his work to pay attention to such falsifications."² A little further on he says: "In the quotations of the remaining passages which Epiphanius did not find different from the Gospel of Luke, and where he therefore says nothing of falsification or omission, he is often very free, neither adhering strictly to the particular words, nor to their arrangement, but his favourite practice is to give their substance and sense for the purpose of refuting his opponent. He pre-supposes the words known from the Gospel of Luke."³

It must be stated, however, that both Volkmar⁴ and Hilgenfeld⁵ consider that the representations of Tertullian and Epiphanius supplement each other and enable the contents of Marcion's Gospel to be ascertained with tolerable certainty. Yet a few pages earlier Volkmar had pointed out that "The ground for a certain fixture of the text of the Marcionitish Gospel, however, seems completely taken away by the fact that Tertullian and Epiphanius, in their statements regarding its state, not merely repeatedly seem to, but in part actually do, directly contradict each other."⁶ Hahn endeavours to explain some of these contradictions by imagining that later Marcionites had altered the text of their Gospel, and that Epiphanius had the one form and Tertullian another;⁷ but such a doubt only renders the whole of the statements regarding the work more uncertain and insecure. That it is not without some reason, however, appears from the charge which Tertullian brings against the disciples of Marcion: "for they daily alter it (their Gospel), as they are daily refuted by us."⁸ In fact, we have no assurance whatever that the work

p. 114 f.; De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 123; Kirchhofer, *Quellensamml.*, p. 361, ann. 10, p. 362 f., ann. 15, 16, 17.

¹ Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 121.

² *Ib.*, p. 122.

³ *Ib.*, p. 45 ff.

⁴ Die *Ev. Justin's*, p. 287 f.

⁵ Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 22 f., p. 40 ff.; Theol. *Sahle*, 1854, p. 106.

⁷ Hahn, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 130 f., p. 169, p. 224 ff.; cf. Neudecker, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 82.

⁸ Nam et quotidie reformat illud, prout a nobis quotidie revincuntur. Adv. Marc., iv, 5; cf. Dial. de recta in deum fide, § 5; Orig., *Opp.*, i, p. 867.

upon
Marcion
origin
on the

The
Epiph
they w
mencin
"Marc
it."³

hypoth
ance, b
versial
seen th
compar
ceded t
in prof
approx
of the
by the
with cr
in Luke
must al
the lost
take th
known,
"Great
impress
he had
Gospel,
come to
which l

8. 106
Eichh
chap. 2
Nam
quem
Hilgen
do's, p. 40
Schwe
ann. i,
cion's, p. 2
Matt
Marc
domus l
Cristos
Hoc en

upon which Tertullian and Epiphanius base their charge against Marcion of falsification and mutilation of Luke was Marcion's original Gospel at all, and we certainly have no historical evidence on the point.¹

The question even arises, whether Tertullian, and indeed Epiphanius, had Marcion's Gospel in any shape before them when they wrote, or merely his work, the "Antitheses."² In commencing his onslaught on Marcion's Gospel, Tertullian says: "Marcion seems (videtur) to have selected Luke, to mutilate it."³ This is the first serious introduction of his "mutilation hypothesis," which he thenceforward presses with so much assurance, but the expression is very uncertain for so decided a controversialist, if he had been able to speak more positively.⁴ We have seen that it is admitted that Epiphanius wrote without again comparing the Gospel of Marcion with Luke, and it is also conceded that Tertullian at least had not the Canonical Gospel, but in professing to quote Luke evidently does so from memory, and approximates his text to Matthew, with which Gospel, like most of the Fathers, he was better acquainted. This may be illustrated by the fact that both Tertullian and Epiphanius reproach Marcion with erasing passages from the Gospel of Luke, which never were in Luke at all.⁵ In one place Tertullian says: "Marcion, you must also remove this from the Gospel: 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' and: 'It is not meet to take the children's bread, and give it to dogs,'⁷ in order, be it known, that Christ may not seem to be an Israelite."⁸ The "Great African" thus taunts his opponent, evidently under the impression that the two passages were in Luke, immediately after he had accused Marcion of having actually expunged from that Gospel, "as an interpolation,"⁹ the saying that Christ had not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them,¹⁰ which likewise never formed part of it. He repeats a similar

¹ *S. p. l.* Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 262 f.; cf. Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 100.

² Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 45, anm. i.; cf. p. 77 f., p. 83; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 279 f.

³ Nam ex his commentatoriis, quos habemus, Ineam videtur Marcion elegisse, quem evolveret. Adv. Marc., iv. 2.

⁴ Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 78, anm. ii. p. 83; cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 417, anm. i.

⁵ Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 278 f.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 45 f., anm. i., cf. p. 77; Volkmar, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 43; cf. Hahn, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 264.

⁶ Matt. xv. 24.

⁷ Ib. xv. 26.

⁸ Marcion, aufer obiam illud de evangelio: non sum missus, nisi ad oves perditas domus Israel: et: non est auferre panem filijs et dare eum canibus, ne scilicet Christus Israelis videretur. Adv. Marc., iv. 7.

⁹ Hic enim Marcion ut additum erasit. Adv. Marc., iv. 7.

¹⁰ Matt. v. 17.

charge on several other occasions.¹ Epiphanius commits the same mistake of reproaching Marcion with omitting from Luke what is only found in Matthew.² We have, in fact, no guarantee of the accuracy or trustworthiness of their statements.

We have said enough, we trust, to show that the sources for the reconstruction of a text of Marcion's Gospel are most unsatisfactory, and no one who attentively studies the analysis of Hahn, Ritschl, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, and others, who have examined and systematized the data of the Fathers, can fail to be struck by the uncertainty which prevails throughout, the almost continuous vagueness and consequent opening, nay, necessity, for conjecture, and the absence of really certain indications. The Fathers had no intention of showing what Marcion's text actually was, and their object being solely dogmatic and not critical, their statements are very insufficient for the purpose.³ The materials have had to be ingeniously collected and sifted from polemical writings whose authors, so far from professing to furnish them, were only bent upon seeking in Marcion's Gospel such points as could legitimately, or by sophistical skill, be used against him. Passing observations, general remarks, as well as direct statements, have too often been the only indications guiding the patient explorers, and, in the absence of certain information, the silence of the angry Fathers has been made the basis for important conclusions. It is evident that, not only is such a procedure necessarily uncertain and insecure, but it rests upon assumptions with regard to the intelligence, care and accuracy of Tertullian and Epiphanius, which are not sufficiently justified by that part of their treatment of Marcion's text which we can examine and appreciate. And when all these doubtful landmarks have failed, too many passages have been left to the mere judgment of critics, as to whether they were too opposed to Marcion's system to have been retained by him, or too favourable to have been omitted. The reconstructed texts, as might be expected, differ from each other, and one Editor finds the results of his predecessors incomplete or unsatisfactory,⁴ although naturally at each successive attempt, the materials previously collected and adopted, have contributed to an apparently more complete result. After complaining of the incompleteness and uncertainty of the statements of Tertullian and Epiphanius, Ritschl affirms that they furnish so little solid material on which to base a hypothesis, that rather by means of

¹ Adv. Marc., iv. 9. 12; ii. 17, iv. 17, 36.

² Har., xlii. p. 322 f., Ref. 1; cf. Luke v. 14; Matt. viii. 4.

³ Kirchhofer, Quellenanmil., p. 361, ann. 10, p. 362 f.; ann. 15, 16, 17.

⁴ Ritschl, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 55 f.; Volkmar, Das Ev. Marc., p. 5 f., p. 19 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die v. Justin's, p. 444 f., p. 394 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 194 f., p. 211 f.

a hypo-
Tertull-
at least
case ca-
general
This m-
wantin-
compre-
is no w-
so little
have co-
itself,—
has foun-
tion on
rested.”
incompl-
Marcion
the que-
Volkmar
of the c-
desirabl-
sible th-
origin a-
even by
sently s-
successi-
gradual-
exhibit
lightly s-
dered a
of Luke
Before
and the
briely t-
sonal ch-
time,⁵ and

⁵ Ritschl

⁶ Hilgen

⁷ Volkmar

⁸ Bleek

⁹ Jahrb., 18

Marcion's

S. T., p.

alter, i. p.

Marcion's

¹⁰ Credm

\$45, p. 6

a hypothesis must we determine the remains of the Gospel from Tertullian.¹ Hilgenfeld quotes this with approval, and adds, that at least Ritschl's opinion is so far right, that all the facts of the case can no longer be settled from external data, and that the general view regarding the Gospel only can decide many points.² This means of course that hypothesis is to supply that which is wanting in the Fathers. Volkmar, in the introduction to his last comprehensive work on Marcion's Gospel, says: "And, in fact, it is no wonder that for so long a time critics have substantially to so little effect disputed regarding the protean question, for we have continued so uncertain as to the very basis (Fundament) itself,—the precise text of the remarkable document,—that Baur has found full ground for rejecting, as unfounded, the presumption on which that finally-attained decision (his previous one) rested."³ Critics of all shades of opinion are forced to admit the incompleteness of the materials for any certain reconstruction of Marcion's text, and, consequently, for an absolute settlement of the question from internal evidence,⁴ although the labours of Volkmar and Hilgenfeld have materially increased our knowledge of the contents of his Gospel. We must contend, however, that, desirable and important as it is to ascertain as perfectly as possible the precise nature of Marcion's text, the question of its origin and relation to Luke, would not by any means be settled even by its final reconstruction. There would, as we shall presently show, remain unsolved the problem of its place in that successive manipulation of materials by which a few Gospels gradually absorbed and displaced the rest. Our own synoptics exhibit unmistakable traces of the process, and clearly forbid our lightly setting aside the claim of Marcion's Gospel to be considered a genuine work, and no mere falsification and abbreviation of Luke.

Before proceeding to a closer examination of Marcion's Gospel and the general evidence bearing upon it, it may be well here briefly to refer to the system of the Heresiarch whose high personal character exerted so powerful an influence upon his own time,⁵ and whose views continued to prevail widely for a couple

¹ *Ritschl*, Das Evv. Marcion's, p. 55.

² *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 445.

³ *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marcion's, 1852, p. 19 f.

⁴ *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 126; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 565; *Hilgenfeld*, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 194 ff., 211 ff.; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 58 ff.; cf. *Hahn*, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 114 f.; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamm., p. 361, ann. 10; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 75 ff.; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1857, p. 3; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 262 f.; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 60 f.; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marcion's, 19 ff., 22 ff.

⁵ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 40; *Schleiermacher*, Sämmtl. Werke, viii.; Einl. N. T., 845, p. 64; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 272 f.

of centuries after his death. It was the misfortune of Marcion to live in an age when Christianity had passed out of the pure morality of its infancy, when, untroubled by complicated questions of dogma, simple faith and pious enthusiasm had been the one great bond of Christian brotherhood, into a phase of ecclesiastical development in which religion was fast degenerating into theology, and complicated doctrines were rapidly assuming that rampant attitude which led to so much bitterness, persecution, and schism. In later times Marcion might have been honoured as a reformer, in his own he was denounced as a heretic.¹ Austere and ascetic in his opinions, he aimed at superhuman purity, and although his clerical adversaries might scoff at his impracticable doctrines regarding marriage and the subjugation of the flesh, they have had their parallels amongst those whom the Church has since most delighted to honour, and at least the whole tendency of his system was markedly towards the side of virtue.² It would of course be foreign to our purpose to enter upon any detailed statement of its principles, and we must confine ourselves to such particulars only as are necessary to an understanding of the question before us.

As we have already frequently had occasion to mention, there were two broad parties in the primitive Church, and the very existence of Christianity was in one sense endangered by the national exclusiveness of the people amongst whom it originated. The one party considered Christianity a mere continuation of the Law, and dwarfed it into an Israelitish institution, a narrow sect of Judaism; the other represented the glad tidings as the introduction of a new system applicable to all and supplanting the Mosaic dispensation of the Law by a universal dispensation of grace. These two parties were popularly represented in the early Church by the two Apostles, Peter and Paul, and their antagonism is faintly revealed in the Epistle to the Galatians. Marcion, a gentile Christian, appreciating the true character of the new religion and its elevated spirituality, and profoundly impressed by the comparatively degraded and anthropomorphic features of Judaism, drew a very sharp line of demarcation between them, and represented Christianity as an entirely new and separate system abrogating the old and having absolutely no connection with it. Jesus was not to him the Messiah of the Jews, the son of David come permanently to establish the Law and the Prophets,

¹ Cf. *Neander*, *Allg. K. G.*, 1843, ii. p. 792, 815 f.; *Schleiermacher*, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1845, p. 64.

² *Gfrörer*, *Allg. K. G.*, i. p. 134 f.; *Hagenbach*, *K. G.*, 1839, i. p. 134 f.; *Huy*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 56 ff.; *Milman*, *Hist. of Chr.*, 1867, ii. p. 77 ff.; *Neander*, *Allg. K. G.*, ii. p. 791 ff.; *Volkmar*, *Das Ev. Marc.*, p. 25 ff.

but a d
religion
The Cro
fer-nt
Truth,
the Jew
to the C
purity
Judaism
were fo
and pec
dispens
be kept
which v

Marc
he contr
with the
he main
time. T
his treat
its detai
yelping
your qu
gnaw!"
keeps pa
Old Test
evil, wh
ceived h
sin and
deceit, t
both sev
forth in
into a sl
man is
talion
tooth, st
vention
to spoil
and silv

¹ Rev. x
² Jam h
in deum v
ii. 5.
³ Tertul
⁴ *Ib.*, ii.
⁵ *Ib.*, ii.

but a divine being sent to reveal to man a wholly new spiritual religion, and a hitherto unknown God of goodness and grace. The Creator (*Δημιουργός*), the God of the Old Testament, was different from the God of grace who had sent Jesus to reveal the Truth, to bring reconciliation and salvation to all, and to abrogate the Jewish God of the World and of the Law, who was opposed to the God and Father of Jesus Christ as Matter is to Spirit, impurity to purity. Christianity was in distinct antagonism to Judaism, the Spiritual God of heaven, whose goodness and love were for the Universe, to the God of the World, whose chosen and peculiar people were the Jews, the Gospel of Grace to the dispensation of the Old Testament. Christianity, therefore, must be kept pure from the Judaistic elements humanly thrust into it, which were so essentially opposed to its whole spirit.

Marcion wrote a work called "Antitheses" (*Ἀντιθέσεις*), in which he contrasted the old system with the new, the God of the one with the God of the other, the Law with the Gospel, and in this he maintained opinions which anticipated many held in our own time. Tertullian attacks this work in the first three books of his treatise against Marcion, and he enters upon the discussion of its details with true theological vigour: "Now, then, ye hounds, yelping at the God of truth, whom the Apostle casts out,¹ to all your questions! These are the bones of contention which ye gnaw!"² The poverty of the "Great African's" arguments keeps pace with his abuse. Marcion objected: If the God of the Old Testament be good, prescient of the future, and able to avert evil, why did he allow man, made in his own image, to be deceived by the devil, and to fall from obedience of the Law into sin and death?³ How came the devil, the origin of lying and deceit, to be made at all?⁴ After the fall, God became a judge both severe and cruel; woman is at once condemned to bring forth in sorrow and to serve her husband, changed from a help into a slave, the earth is cursed which before was blessed, and man is doomed to labour and to death.⁵ The law was one of retaliation and not of justice—*lex talionis*—eye for eye, tooth for tooth, stripe for stripe.⁶ And it was not consistent, for in contravention of the Decalogue, God is made to instigate the Israelites to spoil the Egyptians, and fraudulently rob them of their gold and silver;⁷ to incite them to work on the Sabbath by ordering

¹ Rev. xii. 15.

² Jam hinc ad questiones omnes, canes, quos foras apostolus expellit, latrantes in deum veritatis. Hæc sunt argumentationum ossa, quæ obroditis. Adv. Marc., ii. 5.

³ Tertullian, Adv. Marc., ii. 5; cf. 9.

⁴ *Ib.*, ii. 10.

⁵ *Ib.*, ii. 11.

⁶ *Ib.*, ii. 18.

⁷ *Ib.*, ii. 20. Tertullian introduces this by likening the Marcionites to the cattle

them to carry the ark for eight days round Jericho;¹ to break the second commandment by making and setting up the brazen serpent and the golden cherubim.² Then God is inconstant, electing men, as Saul and Solomon, whom he subsequently rejects;³ repenting that he had set up Saul, and that he had doomed the Ninevites,⁴ and soon. God calls out: Adam, where art thou? inquires whether he had eaten the forbidden fruit, asks of Cain where his brother was, as if he had not yet heard the blood of Abel crying from the ground, and did not already know all these things.⁵ Anticipating the results of modern criticism, Marcion denies the applicability to Jesus of the so-called Messianic prophecies. The Emmanuel of Isaiah (vii. 14, cf. viii. 4) is not Christ;⁶ the "Virgin" his mother is simply a "young woman" according to Jewish phraseology;⁷ and the sufferings of the Servant of God (Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 9) are not predictions of the death of Jesus.⁸ There is a complete severance between the Law and the Gospel, and the God of the latter is the Antithesis of that of the former.⁹ "The one was perfect, pure, beneficent, passionless; the other, though not unjust by nature, infected by matter,—subject to all the passions of man,—cruel, changeable; the New Testament, especially as remodelled by Marcion,¹⁰ was holy, wise, amiable; the Old Testament, the Law, barbarous, inhuman, contradictory, and detestable."¹¹

Marcion ardently maintained the doctrine of the impurity of matter, and he carried it to its logical conclusion, both in speculation and practice. He, therefore, asserting the incredibility of an incarnate God, denied the corporeal reality of the flesh of Christ. His body was a mere semblance and not of human substance, was not born of a human mother, and the divine nature was not degraded by contact with the flesh.¹² Marcion finds in Paul the purest promulgator of the truth as he understands it, and emboldened by the Epistle to the Galatians, in which that Apostle rebukes even Apostles for "not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," he accuses the other Apostles of having depraved the pure form of the Gospel doctrines delivered to them

fish, like which "they vomit the blackness of blasphemy" (*tenebras blasphemie intervomunt*), l. c.

¹ *Ib.*, ii. 21.

² *Ib.*, ii. 23.

³ *Ib.*, ii. 25.

⁴ *Ib.*, iii. 13.

⁵ *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 1.

¹⁰ We give this quotation as a *résumé* by an English historian and divine, but the idea of the "New Testament remodelled by Marcion," is a mere ecclesiastical imagination.

¹¹ *Milman*, *Hist. of Christianity*, 1867, ii. p. 77 f.

¹² *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 8. ff.

² *Ib.*, ii. 22.

⁴ *Ib.*, ii. 24.

⁶ *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 12.

⁸ *Ib.*, iii. 17, 18.

by Jer
Savior

Ter
he ch
which
encou
"the G
the F
on the
own v
in dra
this:
Testam
Create
phets.
ever v
Create
thing
that M
in fact
he sho
garble
his sym
for tan
of a r
double
the va
Gospel
with t
with i
At t
that
omitti
what
what
proved

1 Adv
2 Apo
Adv. I
3 Adv
4 Cer
cogit,
sum
Certe
quasi
Adv. N

by Jesus,¹ "mixing up matters of the Law with the words of the Saviour."²

Tertullian accuses Marcion of having written the work in which he details the contrasts between Judaism and Christianity, of which we have given the briefest sketch, as an introduction and encouragement to belief in his Gospel, which he ironically calls "the Gospel according to the Antitheses;"³ and the charge which the Fathers bring against Marcion is that he laid violent hands on the Canonical Gospel of Luke, and manipulated it to suit his own views. "For certainly the whole object at which he laboured in drawing up the 'Antitheses,'" says Tertullian, "amounts to this: that he may prove a disagreement between the Old and New Testament, so that his own Christ may be separated from the Creator, as of another God, as alien from the Law and the Prophets. For this purpose it is certain that he has erased whatever was contrary to his own opinion and in harmony with the Creator, as if interpolated by his partisans, but has retained everything consistent with his own opinion."⁴ The whole hypothesis that Marcion's Gospel is a mutilated version of our third Synoptic in fact rests upon this accusation. It is obvious that if it can not be shown that Marcion's Gospel was our Canonical Gospel merely garbled by the Hæresiarch for dogmatic reasons in the interest of his system,—for there could not be any other conceivable reason for tampering with it,—the claim of Marcion's Gospel to the rank of a more original and authentic work than Luke's acquires double force. We must, therefore, inquire into the character of the variations between the so-called heretical, and the Canonical Gospels, and see how far the hypothesis of the Fathers accords with the contents of Marcion's Gospel so far as we are acquainted with it.

At the very outset we are met by the singular phenomenon, that both Tertullian and Epiphanius, who accuse Marcion of omitting everything which was unfavourable, and retaining only what was favourable to his views, undertake to refute him out of what remains in his Gospel. Tertullian says: "It will then be proved that he has shown the same defect of blindness of heresy

¹ Adv. Marc., iv. 3.

² Apostolos enim admiscuisse ea quæ sunt legalia salvatoris verbis. *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær., iii. 2, § 2; cf. iii. 12, § 12.

³ Adv. Marc., iv. 1.

⁴ Certe enim totum, quod elaboravit, etiam Antitheses præstruendo, in hoc cogit, ut veteris et novi testamenti diversitatem constituat, proinde Christum suum a creatore separaturus ut dei alterius, ut alienum legis et prophetarum. Certe propterea contraria quæque sententiæ suæ erasit, conspirantia cum creatore, quasi ab adversariis ejus, intexta; competentia autem sententiæ suæ reservavit. Adv. Marc., iv. 6.








IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEAVER, N. Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

1.8 2.0 2.2 2.5 2.8 3.2 3.6 4.0 4.5 5.0 5.6 6.3 7.1 8.0 9.0 10.0 11.2 12.5 14.0 16.0 18.0 20.0 22.4 25.0 28.0 31.5 36.0 40.0 45.0 50.0 56.0 63.0 71.0 80.0 90.0 100.0

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

both in that which he has erased and that which he has retained." Epiphanius also confidently states that, out of that which Marcion has allowed to remain of the Gospel, he can prove his fraud and imposture, and thoroughly refute him.² Now if Marcion mutilated Luke to so little purpose as this, what was the use of his touching it at all? He is known as an able man, the most influential and distinguished of all the heretical leaders of the second century, and it seems unreasonable to suppose that, on the theory of his erasing or altering all that contradicted his system, he should have done his work so imperfectly.³ The Fathers say that he endeavours to get rid of the contradictory passages which remain by a system of false interpretation; but surely he would not have allowed himself to be driven to this extremity, leaving weapons in the hands of his opponents, when he might so easily have excised the obnoxious texts along with the rest? It is admitted by critics, moreover, that passages said to have been omitted by Marcion are often not opposed to his system at all, and sometimes, indeed, even in favour of it;⁴ and, on the other hand, that passages which were retained are contradictory to his views.⁵ This is not intelligible upon any theory of arbitrary garbling of a Gospel in the interest of a system.

It may be well to give a few instances of the anomalies presented, upon this hypothesis, by Marcion's text. It is generally agreed that the verses Luke vii. 29—35, were wanting in Marcion's Gospel.⁶ Hahn accounts for the omission of verses 29, 30, regarding the baptism of John, because they represented the relation of the Baptist to Jesus in a way which Marcion did not admit.⁷ But as he allowed the preceding verses to remain, such a proceeding was absurd. In verse 26 he calls John a prophet, and much more than a prophet, and in the next verse (27) quotes

¹ *Tunc et illa constabit eodem vitio hereticæ cecitatis crassa, quo et hæc reservata.* Adv. Marc., iv. 6. ² Har., xlii. 9 f., p. 310 f.

³ Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 75.

⁴ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 423 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Just., p. 444 ff.; Nicolas, Et. sur les Ev. Apocr., p. 151; Ritschl, Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 529 f.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 263 ff., 273 ff.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 132; Volkmar, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 74 ff., p. 107 ff., p. 175 f.; cf. Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 214 f.

⁵ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 423 ff.; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 231, ann. 1; cf. Ehrhard, Wiss. krit. d. evang. Gesch., p. 810, ann. 2; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 75 ff.; Kirchofer, Quellensamml., p. 362, ann. 13; Neander, Allg. K. G., ii. p. 816; Nicolas, Et. sur les Ev. Apocr., p. 151 ff.; Ritschl, Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 529 f.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 263 ff., 273 ff.; Volkmar, Das Ev. Marcion's, p. 107 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 444 ff.

⁶ Tertullian and Epiphanius pass them over in silence. Cf. Hahn, Ev. Marc. in Thilo, Cod. Apocr. N. T., p. 418, ann. 24; Ritschl, Das Ev. Marc., p. 78 f.; Volkmar, Das Ev. Marc., p. 156 f.; Hilgenfeld, though somewhat doubtful, seems to agree: Die Evv. Justin's, p. 407, cf. 441; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 125.

⁷ Das Ev. Marc., p. 147.

respecting him the words of Malachi iii. 1: "This is he of whom it is written: Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee." It is impossible on any reasonable ground to account for the retention of such honourable mention of the Baptist, if verses 29, 30 were erased for such dogmatic reasons.¹ Still more incomprehensible on such a hypothesis is the omission of Luke vii. 31—35, where that generation is likened unto children playing in the market-place and calling to each other: "We piped unto you and ye danced not," and Jesus continues: "For John is come neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil (34). The Son of Man is come, eating and drinking; and ye say: Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." Hahn attributes the omission of these verses to the sensuous representation they give of Jesus as eating and drinking.² What was the use of eliminating these verses when he allowed to remain unaltered verse 36 of the same chapter,³ in which Jesus is invited to eat with the Pharisee, and goes into his house and sits down to meat? or v. 29—35,⁴ in which Jesus accepts the feast of Levi, and defends his disciples for eating and drinking against the murmurs of the Scribes and Pharisees? or xv. 2,⁵ where the Pharisees say of him: "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them?" How absurdly futile the omission of the one passage for dogmatic reasons, while so many others were allowed to remain unaltered.⁶

The next passage to which we must refer is one of the most important in connection with Marcion's Docetic doctrine of the person of Jesus. It is said that he omitted viii. 19: "And his mother and his brethren came to him, and could not come at him for the crowd," and that he inserted in verse 21, *τίς μου μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί*; making the whole episode in his Gospel read (20): "And it was told him by certain which said: Thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to see thee: 21. But he answered and said unto them: Who are my mother and brethren?"

¹ *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marc., p. 78 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeitalter, i. p. 263; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 132; cf. *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marcion, p. 156; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 406 f.; *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 18; *Epiphanius*, Haer., xlii., Sch. viii. f.; Ref. xlii. f.

² Das Ev. M., p. 147; *Evang. Marc. in Thilo*, Cod. ap. N. T., p. 418, ann. 24, 33; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marc., p. 156; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marc., p. 78 f.; cf. *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 407.

³ *Hahn*, Evang. Marc. *Thilo*, p. 418, 419, ann. 25; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marc., p. 151.

⁴ *Hahn*, Ev. Marc. in *Thilo*, p. 408; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marc., p. 155; *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 11.

⁵ *Hahn*, Ev. M. in *Thilo*, p. 451; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marc., p. 162; cf. *Tertullian*, Adv. M., iv. 32.

⁶ *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 263; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 132.

My mother and my brethren are these," &c.¹ The omission of verse 19 is said to have been made because, according to Marcion, Christ was not born like an ordinary man, and consequently had neither mother nor brethren.² The mere fact, however, that Marcion retains verse 20, in which the crowd simply state as a matter fully recognized, the relationship of those who were seeking Jesus, renders the omission of the preceding verse useless,³ except on the ground of mere redundancy.

Marcion is reported not to have had the word *αἰώνιον* in x. 25,⁴ so that the question of the lawyer simply ran: "Master, what shall I do to inherit life?" The omission of the word is supposed to have been made in order to make the passage refer back to the God of the Old Testament, who promises only long life on earth for keeping the commandments, whilst it is only in the Gospel that *eternal* life is promised.⁵ But in the corresponding passage, xviii. 18,⁶ the *αἰώνιον* is retained, and the question of the ruler is: "Good master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" It has been argued that the introduction of the one thing still lacking (verse 22) after the keeping of the law and the injunction to sell all and give to the poor, changes the context and justifies the use there of *eternal* life as the reward for fulfilment of the higher commandment.⁷ This reasoning, however, seems to us without grounds, and merely an ingenious attempt to account for an embarrassing fact. In reality the very same context occurs in the other passage, for, explaining the meaning of the word "neighbour," love to whom is enjoined as part of the way to obtain "life," Jesus inculcates the very same duty as in xviii. 22, of distributing to the poor (cf. x. 28—37). There seems, therefore, no reasonable motive for omitting the word from the one passage whilst retaining it in the other.⁸

The passage in Luke xi. 29—32, from the concluding words of verse 29, "but the sign of the prophet Jonah," was not found in

¹ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 421, ann. 26; Volkmar, *Das Ev. Marc.*, p. 150; *Epiph.*, *Hær.*, xlii., Sch. 12; *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 19, de carne Christi, § 7; *De Wette*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 125; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 408 f., 441; *Baur*, *Das Markusev.*, p. 192 f.

² Hahn, *Das Ev. M.*, v. 148 f.; *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 421, ann. 27; cf. Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 56 f.

³ Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 264.

⁴ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 434; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 159; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 441; *De Wette*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 126.

⁵ Hahn, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 161; *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 435, ann. 42; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 58, p. 159; *Tertullian*, *Adv. M.* iv. 25; *Baur*, *Das Markusev.*, p. 193.

⁶ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 461; *Epiph.*, *Hær.*, xlii. Sch. 50; *Tertullian*, *Adv. M.* iv. 36.

⁷ Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.* p. 58; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. Just.*, p. 426; *Baur*, *Das Markusev.*, p. 193.

⁸ Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 264.

Marcion's Gospel.¹ This omission is accounted for on the ground that such a respectful reference to the Old Testament was quite contrary to the system of Marcion.² Verses 49—51 of the same chapter, containing the saying of the "Wisdom of God," regarding the sending of the prophets that the Jews might slay them, and their blood be required of that generation, were also omitted.³ The reason given for this omission is, that the words of the God of the Old Testament are too respectfully quoted and adopted to suit the views of the Heretic.⁴ Both Hilgenfeld⁵ and Baur⁶ agree that the words in verses 31—32, "And a greater than Solomon—than *Jonah* is here," might well have been allowed to remain in the text, and indeed the superiority of Christ over the kings and prophets of the Old Testament which is asserted directly suits and supports the system of Marcion. How much less, however, is the omission of these passages to be explained upon any intelligent dogmatic principle, when we find in Marcion's text the passage in which Jesus justifies his conduct on the Sabbath by the example of David (vi. 3—4),⁷ and that in which he assures the disciples of the greatness of their reward in heaven for the persecutions they were to endure: "For behold your reward is great in heaven: for after the same manner did their fathers unto the prophets" (vi. 23).⁸ As we have seen, Jesus is also allowed to quote an Old Testament prophecy (vii. 27) as fulfilled in the coming of John to prepare the way for himself. The questions which Jesus puts to the Scribes (xx. 41—44) regarding the Christ being David's son, with the quotation from Ps. ex. 1, which Marcion is stated to have retained,⁹ equally refute the supposition as to his motive for "omitting" xi. 29 ff. It has been argued with regard to the last passage that Jesus merely uses the words of the Old Testament to meet his own theory,¹⁰ but the dilemma in which Jesus places the Scribes is clearly not the real object of his question: its aim is a suggestion of the true character of the Christ. But amongst his other sins with regard to Luke's Gospel, Marcion is also accused of interpolating it. And

¹ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, 438, ann. 46; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 151; De Witte, *Bibl. N. T.*, p. 126; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 441; *Epiph.*, *Har.*, xlii. Sch. 25; cf. Ref. It is conjectured that the words *πονηρὰ ἔδει* were also wanting. Epiphanius does not use them, but he is thought to be quoting "freely." The words, however, equally fail in Codex 235.

² Hahn, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 163; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 56.

³ Hahn, *Das Ev. M. in Thilo*, 439, ann. 47; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 151.

⁴ Hahn, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 165; *Ev. M. in Thilo*, 440, ann. 47; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 58 f.

⁵ *Die Evv. J.*, p. 453.

⁶ *Das Markusev.*, p. 194.

⁷ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, 410; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, 155.

⁸ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, 412; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, 156.

⁹ Hahn, *in Thilo*, 468; Volkmar, *ib.*, p. 165.

¹⁰ Volkmar, *ib.*, p. 59 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ev. J.*, p. 453.

in what way? Why the Heresiarch who is so averse to all references to the Old Testament that he is supposed to erase them, actually, amongst his few interpolations, adds a reference to the Old Testament. Between xvii. 14 and 15 (some critics say in verse 18) Marcion introduced the verse which is found in Luke iv. 27: "And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman, the Syrian."¹ Now is it conceivable that a man who inserts, as it is said, references to the Old Testament into his text so gratuitously, can have been so inconsistent as to have omitted these passages because they contain similar references? We must say that the whole of the reasoning regarding these passages omitted and retained and the fine distinctions which are drawn between them, are anything but convincing. A general theory being adopted, nothing is more easy than to harmonize everything with it in this way; nothing is more easy than to assign some reason, good or bad, apparently in accordance with the foregone conclusion, why one passage was retained, and why another was omitted, but in almost every case the reasoning might with equal propriety be reversed if the passages were so, and the retention of the omitted passages as well as the omission of that retained be quite as reasonably justified. The critics who have examined Marcion's Gospel do not trouble themselves to inquire if the general connection of the text be improved by the absence of passages supposed to be omitted, but simply try whether the supposed omissions are explainable on the ground of a dogmatic tendency in Marcion. In fact, the argument throughout is based upon foregone conclusions, and rarely upon any solid grounds whatever. The retention of such passages as we have quoted above renders the omission of the other for dogmatic reasons quite purposeless.²

The passage, xii. 6, 7, which argues that as the sparrows are not forgotten before God, and the hairs of our head are numbered, the disciples need not fear, was not found in Marcion's Gospel.³ The supposed omission is explained on the ground that, according to Marcion's system, God does not interest himself about such trifles as sparrows and the hairs of our head, but merely about souls.⁴ That such reasoning is absurd, however, is apparent from

¹ *Epiph.*, Har., xlii. Sch. 48; *Tertullian*, Adv. M., iv. 35; *Hahn*, Ev. M. in *Thilo*, p. 457, ann. 67; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 128 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. J., p. 424; *Baur*, Das Markusev., p. 213; *Volkmar*, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 131; Das Ev. M., p. 163, p. 82 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., p. 77.

² *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., p. 264; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. M., p. 87 f.

³ *Hahn*, Ev. M. in *Thilo*, p. 441; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. M., p. 151, cf. 94; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. J., p. 441; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 204.

⁴ *Hahn*, Das Ev. M., p. 167; Ev. M. in *Thilo*, p. 441, ann. 49.

the fact, that Marcion's text had verse 24 of the same chapter: ¹ "Consider the ravens," &c., &c., and "God feedeth them," &c., and also v. 28: ² "But if God so clothe the grass," &c., &c., "how much more will he clothe you, O! ye of little faith?" As no one ventures to argue that Marcion limited the providence of God to the ravens, and to the grass, but excluded the sparrows and the hair, no dogmatic reason can be assigned for the omission of the one, whilst the other is retained.³

The first nine verses of ch. xiii. were likewise absent from Marcion's text,⁴ wherein Jesus declares that like the Galileans, whose blood Pilot had mixed with their sacrifices (v. 1, 2), and the eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell (v. 4), 'except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish,' (v. 3 and 5), and then recites the parable of the unfruitful fig-tree (v. 6—9), which the master of the vineyard orders to be cut down (v. 7), but then spares for a season (v. 8, 9). The theory advanced to account for the asserted "omission" of these verses is that they could not be reconciled with Marcion's system, according to which the good God never positively punishes the wicked, but merely leaves them to punish themselves in that, by not accepting the proffered grace, they have no part in the blessedness of Christians.⁵ In his earlier work, Volkmar distinctly admitted that the whole of this passage might be omitted without prejudice to the text of Luke, and that he could not state any ground, in connection with Marcion's system, which rendered its omission either necessary or even conceivable. He then decided that the passage was not contained at all in the version of Luke which Marcion possessed, but was inserted at a later period in our Codices.⁶ It was only on his second attempt to account for all omissions on dogmatic grounds that he argued as above. In like manner Hilgenfeld also, with Rettig, considered that the passage did not form part of the original Luke, so that here again Marcion's text was free from a very abrupt passage, not belonging to the more pure and

¹ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 442.

² Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 443, ann. 51; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 160; De Wette, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 127. This verse was wanting according to *Epiph.*, Sch. 31, but was in the text by the decided statement of *Tertullian*, *Adv. M.*, iv. 29; Volkmar (*Das Ev. M.*, 46 ff.), and Hilgenfeld (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 204), agree that this arose solely from an accidental absence of the verse in the copy of Epiphanius.

³ Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 265; Ritschl, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 91; cf. De Wette, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 132.

⁴ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 446; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 151. (He omits xiii. 1—10); Hilgenfeld, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 204. (He had previously, —*Die Ev. J.*, p. 441,—only admitted the absence of xiii. 1—5). De Wette, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 125 f.

⁵ Hahn, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 175; *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 446, ann. 55; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 64 f.

⁶ *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 207 f.

primitive Gospel.¹ Baur recognizes not only that there is no dogmatic ground to explain the omission, but on the contrary, that the passage fully agrees with the system of Marcion.² The total insufficiency of the argument to explain the omission, however, is apparent from the numerous passages, which were allowed to remain in the text, which still more clearly outraged this part of Marcion's system. In the parable of the great supper, xiv. 15—24, the Lord is angry (v. 21), and declares that none of those who were bidden should taste of his supper (v. 24). In xii. 5, Jesus warns his own disciples: "Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you: fear him." It is not permissible to argue that Marcion here understands the God of the Old Testament, the Creator, for he would thus represent his Christ as forewarning his own disciples to fear the power of that very Demiurge, whose reign he had come to terminate. Then again, in the parable of the wise steward, and the foolish servants, xii. 41 ff., he declares (v. 46), that the lord of the foolish servant "will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers," and (vs. 47, 48) that the servants shall be beaten with stripes, in proportion to their fault. In the parable of the nobleman who goes to a far country and leaves the ten pounds with his servants, xix. 11 ff., the lord orders his enemies, who would not that he should reign over them, to be brought and slain before him (v. 27). Then how very much there was in the Epistles of Paul, which he upheld, of a still more contradictory character. There is no dogmatic reason for such inconsistency.³

Marcion is accused of having falsified xiii. 28 in the following manner: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see *all the just* (*πάντας τοὺς δικαίους*) in the kingdom of God, but you yourselves being thrust, *and bound* (*καὶ κρατούμενους*) without." The substitution of "all the just" for "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets," is one of those variations which the supporter of the dogmatic theory greedily lays hold of, as bearing evident tokens of falsification in antijudaistic interest.⁴ But Marcion had in his Gospel the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, xvi. 19—31, where the beggar is carried up into Abraham's bosom.⁵ And again, there was the account of the

¹ Die Ev. J., p. 470.

² Das Markusev., p. 195 f.

³ Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 265; Baur, Das Markusev., p. 195.

⁴ Hahn, Das Ev. M., p. 177; Ev. M. in Thilo, p. 448, ann. 58; cf. Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 62 f., and Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 420, who explain the omission differently, and consider Hahn in error.

⁵ Tertullian (Adv. M., iv. 34) gives an elaborate explanation of the interpretation by which Marcion does away with the offensive part of the parable, but in this and every case erasure was surely more simple than explanation if Marcion crased anything at all.

Tran
conv
dog
hav
and
is ev
vers
alter
of b
theo
weal
M
Son,
sally
part
nant
the
have
the s
the
Chris
great
woul
sent
plete
a tim
teach
Apos
Any

¹ H
"stoo
from t
M. iv.
Hahn
Epiph
mar (L
f.), pr
cion's
instru
² H
Das Ev
³ H
Die Ev
42; T
⁴ H
Etheit
second
Gentile
the omi

Transfiguration, ix. 28—36, in which Moses and Elias are seen in converse with Jesus.¹ The alteration of the one passage for dogmatic reasons, whilst the parable of Lazarus is retained, would have been useless. Hilgenfeld, however, in agreement with Baur and Ritschl, has shown that Marcion's reading πάντας τοὺς δικαίους is evidently the contrast to the ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας of the preceding verse, and is superior to the canonical version, which was either altered after Matth. viii. 12, or with the anti-Marcionitish object of bringing the rejected Patriarchs into recognition.² The whole theory in this case again goes into thin air, and it is consequently weakened if not destroyed in all.

Marcion's Gospel did not contain the parable of the Prodigal Son, xv. 11—23.³ The omission of this passage, which is universally recognized as in the purest Paulinian spirit, is accounted for partly on the ground that a portion of it (v. 22—32) was repugnant to the ascetic discipline of Marcion, to whom the killing of the fatted calf, the feasting, dancing and merry-making, must have been obnoxious, and, partly because, understanding under the similitude of the elder son the Jews, and of the younger son the Gentiles, the identity of the God of the Jews and of the Christians would be recognized.⁴ There is, however, the very greatest doubt admitted as to the interpretation which Marcion would be likely to put upon this parable, and certainly the representation which it gives of the Gentiles, not only as received completely on a par with the Jews, but as only having been lost for a time, and found again, is thoroughly in harmony with the teaching of Paul, who was held by Marcion to be the only true Apostle. It could not, therefore, have been repugnant to him. Any points of disagreement could very easily have been explained

¹ Hahn, in verse 30 reads συνέστησαν for συνελάλουν, the two men "stood" with him instead of "talked" with him, as in Luke. This he derives from the obscure words of Tertullian, which, however, really refer to v. 32 (Adv. M. iv. 22), but Epiphanius (Sch. 17) has very distinctly the reading of Luke. Hahn omits v. 31 altogether, on the very undecided evidence of Tertullian and Epiphanius; Hahn, Ev. M. in Thilo, p. 427, anm. *; Das Ev. M., p. 154; Volkmar (Das Ev. Marc., p. 158, cf. 151), and Hilgenfeld, (Die Evv. J., p. 411 f., 466 f.), prove that the reading was unaltered in v. 30, and that v. 31 stood in Marcion's text. The whole discussion, as showing the uncertainty of the text, is very instructive. Cf. Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 80 ff.

² Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 470; Baur, Das Markusev., p. 206 f.; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 94 f.

³ Hahn, Ev. M. in Thilo, p. 452; Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 162; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 441; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 128; Epiphanius, Hær., xlii. Sch. 42; Tertullian, (Adv. Marc., iv. 32) passes it over in silence.

⁴ Hahn, Das Ev. M., p. 182; Ev. M. in Thilo, p. 452, anm. 62; Olshausen, Ethik d. vier. Can. Evv., 1823, p. 208 f. Hahn and Olshausen did not hold the second part of this explanation, but applied the parable merely to Judaic and Gentile Christians, under which circumstances critics would not admit reason for the omission. Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 66; Baur, Das Markusev., p. 194 f.

away, as his critics are so fond of asserting to be his practice in other passages.¹ As to the supposed dislike of Marcion for the festive character of the parable, what object could he have had for omitting this, when he retained the parable of the great supper, xiv. 15—24; the feast in the house of Levi, v. 27—32; the statements of Jesus eating with the Pharisees, vii. 36, xv. 2? If Marcion had any objection to such matters, he had still greater to marriage, and yet Jesus justifies his disciples for eating and drinking by the similitude of a marriage feast, himself being the bridegroom: v. 34, 35, "Can ye make the sons of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them: then will they fast in those days." And he bids his disciples to be ready "like men that wait for their lord, when he shall return from the wedding" (xii. 36), and makes another parable on a wedding feast (xiv. 7—10). Leaving these passages, it is impossible to see any dogmatic reason for excluding the others.²

The omission of a passage in every way so suitable to Marcion's system as the parable of the vineyard, xx. 9—16, is equally unintelligible upon the dogmatic theory.

Marcion is accused of falsifying xvi. 17, by altering τοῦ νόμου to τῶν λόγων μου,³ making the passage read: "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of my words to fail." The words in the canonical Gospel, it is argued, were too repugnant to him to be allowed to remain unaltered, representing as they do the permanency of "the Law" to which he was opposed.⁴ Upon this hypothesis why did he leave x. 25. f. (especially v. 26) and xviii. 18 ff., in which the keeping of the law is made essential to life? or xvii. 14, where Jesus bids the lepers conform to the requirements of the law? or xvi. 29, where the answer is given to the rich man pleading for his relatives: "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them"?⁵ Hilgenfeld, however, with others, admits that it has been fully proved that the reading in Marcion's text is not an arbitrary alteration at all, but the original expression, and that the version in Luke xvi. 17, on the contrary, is a variation of the original introduced to give the passage an

¹ Volkmar, talks of the intentional omission of the parable by Marcion as being "fully conceivable" (völlig begreiflich), but it is almost impossible to find anything for which a reason cannot be discovered if the question asked be: "Is the intentional omission on any ground conceivable?"

² Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeitalter*, i. p. 266 f.; Nicolas, *Et. sur les Ev. apocr.*, p. 153; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ev. J.*, p. 454.

³ Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 151; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ev. J.*, p. 441; Hahn, reads τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου. *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 454; *Das Ev. M.*, p. 183.

⁴ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 454, ann. 63; *Das Ev. M.*, p. 185; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 65 f.

⁵ Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 267; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 75.

anti-Marcionitish tendency.¹ Here, again, it is clear that the supposed falsification is rather a falsification on the part of the editor of the third canonical Gospel.²

One more illustration may be given. Marcion is accused of omitting from xix. 9 the words: "forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham," (*καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ἐστίν*) leaving merely: "And Jesus said unto him: This day is salvation come to this house."³ Marcion's system, it is said, could not tolerate the phrase which was erased.⁴ It was one, however, eminently in the spirit of his Apostle Paul, and in his favourite Epistle to the Galatians he retained the very parallel passage, iii. 7, "Ye know therefore that they which are of faith, these are the sons of Abraham."⁵ How could he, therefore, find any difficulty in such words addressed to the repentant Zacchæus, who had just believed in the mission of Christ? Moreover, why should he have erased the words here, and left them standing in xiii. 16, in regard to the woman healed of the "spirit of infirmity:" "and ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo! these eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?"⁶ No reasoning can explain away the substantial identity of the two phrases. Upon what principle of dogmatic interest, then, can Marcion have erased the one while he retained the other?⁷

We have taken a very few passages for illustration, and treated them very briefly, but it may roundly be said that there is scarcely a single variation of Marcion's text regarding which similar reasons are not given, and which do not present similar anomalies in consequence of what has elsewhere been retained.⁷

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Die Ev. J.*, p. 470; Ritschl, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 97 f.; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 402; Das Markusev., p. 196 ff. Baur, in the last-mentioned work, argues that even Tertullian himself (*Adv. M.*, iv. 33) represents Marcion's reading as the original.

² Ritschl, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 98.

³ Hahn, *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 463; Volkmar, *Das. Ev. M.*, p. 152; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 442.

⁴ Hahn, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 195; *Ev. M. in Thilo*, p. 463, anm. 74. "Quæ non potuit, ferre Marcion, enjus Christus potius servavit eum quem filii Abrahami damnabant."

⁵ Cf. Rom. iv. 11, 12, 16. It has been argued from Tertullian's obscure reference that Marcion omitted the last phrase of Gal. iii. 7, but Epiph. does not say so, and the statement of Jerome (*Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.*) was evidently not from the direct source, but was probably derived from a hasty perusal of Tertullian, and there is no real ground whatever for affirming it. Even Tertullian himself does not positively do so. Ritschl, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 154 ff.; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 412 ff.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 274.

⁶ Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 268; Ritschl, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 98 f.; cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 427.

⁷ Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 411 ff.; Das Markusev., p. 191 f.; Nicolas, *Et. sur les Ev. apoc.*, p. 155; Ritschl, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, p. 530 ff.; cf. *Das Ev. M.*, p. 46; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 274 f.

As we have already stated, much that is really contradictory to Marcion's system was found in his text, and much which either is not opposed or is favourable to it is omitted and cannot be set down to arbitrary alteration. Moreover, it has never been shown that the supposed alterations were made by Marcion himself,¹ and till this is done the pith of the whole theory is wanting. There is no principle of intelligent motive which can account for the anomalies presented by Marcion's Gospel, considered as a version of Luke mutilated and falsified in the interest of his system. The contrast of what is retained with that which is omitted reduces the hypothesis *ad absurdum*. Marcion was too able a man to do his work so imperfectly, if he had proposed to assimilate the Gospel of Luke to his own views. As it is avowedly necessary to explain away by false and forced interpretations requiring intricate definitions,² very much of what was allowed to remain in his text, it is inconceivable that he should not have cut the Gordian knot with the same unscrupulous knife with which it is asserted he excised the rest. The ingenuity of most able and learned critics endeavouring to discover whether a motive in the interests of his system cannot be conceived for every alteration, is, notwithstanding the evident scope afforded by the procedure, often foiled. Yet a more elastic hypothesis could not possibly have been advanced, and that the text obstinately refuses to fit into it, is even more than could have been expected. Marcion is like a prisoner at the bar without witnesses, who is treated from the first as guilty, attacked by able and passionate adversaries who warp every possible circumstance against him, and yet who cannot be convicted. The foregone conclusion by which every supposed omission from his Gospel is explained, is, as we have shown, almost in every case contradicted by passages which have been allowed to remain, and this is rendered more significant by the fact, which is generally admitted, that Marcion's text contains many readings which are manifestly superior to, and more original than, the form in which the passages stand in our third Synoptic.³ The only one of these to which we shall refer is the interesting variation from the passage in Luke xi. 2, in the substitution of a prayer for the

¹ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 274.

² Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 443 f.

³ Baur, Das Markusev., p. 195 ff.; p. 223 ff.; Anger, Synops. Ev. Proleg. p. xxv. ff.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 473; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 222 ff.; Die Evangelien, p. 30; Köstlin, Der Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 303; Michaelis, Einl. N. T., 1788, i. p. 40, p. 342 f., p. 751; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 72 ff.; Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1857, p. 4; Ritschl, Theol. Jahrb., 1851, p. 530 ff.; Das Ev. M., p. 46; Bertholdt, Einl., 1813, iii. p. 1294 ff.; Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 187—199, p. 256 f.; Der Ursprung, p. 75; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 132 ff.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 13 ff., p. 23 ff.; cf. Westcott, On the Canon, p. 55.

Holy
evangel
is re
eviden
Marc
Th
ogy t
is, ho
in th
whic
most
tionsl
a line
by a
there
The w
third,
of the
mence
and 24
import
xv. 11-
9—19,
35—38
verses
with v.
Luke,⁴
the ope
had an
ceptanc
briefly
Marc
"In the
down t

¹ Ritschl, M., p. 19
415 f.; A

² Eichhorn, 3 Volkmar

N. T., p.

⁴ Cf. Ej

Volkmar,

⁵ Reuss,

rick, Gesa

⁶ Hahn

Thilo, p.

Ev., p. 40

Holy Spirit for the "hallowed be thy name,"—*ἐλθέτω το ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς* instead of *ἀγιασθήτω το ὄνομά σου*. The former is recognized to be the true original reading. This phrase is evidently referred to in v. 13. We are, therefore, indebted to Marcion for the correct version even of "the Lord's Prayer."¹

There can be no doubt that Marcion's Gospel bore great analogy to our Luke, although it was very considerably shorter. It is, however, unnecessary to repeat that there were many Gospels in the second century which, although nearly related to those which have become canonical, were independent works, and the most favourable interpretation which can be given of the relationship between our three Synoptics leaves them very much in a line with Marcion's work. His Gospel was chiefly distinguished by a shorter text,² but besides large and important omissions there are a few additions,³ and very many variations of text. The whole of the first two chapters of Luke, as well as all the third, was wanting, with the exception of part of the first verse of the third chapter, which, joined to iv. 31, formed the commencement of the Gospel. Of chapter iv. verses 1—13, 17—20 and 24 were likewise probably absent. Some of the other more important omissions are xi. 29—32, 49—51, xiii. 1—9, 29—35, xv. 11—32, xvii. 5—10 (probably), xviii. 31—34, xix. 29—48, xx. 9—19, 37—38, xxi. 1—4, 18, 21—22, xxii. 16—18, 28—30, 35—38, 49—51, and there is great doubt about the concluding verses of xxiv. from 44 to the end, but it may have terminated with v. 49. It is not certain whether the order was the same as Luke,⁴ but there are instances of decided variation, especially at the opening. As the peculiarities of the opening variations have had an important effect in inclining some critics towards the acceptance of the mutilation hypothesis,⁵ it may be well for us briefly to examine the more important amongst them.

Marcion's Gospel is generally said to have commenced thus: "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Jesus came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee."⁶ There are various

¹ Ritschl, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 71; Baur, *Das Markusev.*, p. 207; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 197 f., p. 256 f.; Der Ursprung, p. 75; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 441, p. 415 f.; Anger, *Synops. Ev.*, p. 41; cf. *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 26.

² Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T. i.*, p. 53 ff., p. 58 ff.; 68 ff.; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 2 ff.
³ Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 80 f.; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 77; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 128.

⁴ Cf. *Epiphanius*, *Hær.*, xlii., ed. Pet., p. 312; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 46; Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 141; Hilgenfeld, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 199.

⁵ Reuss, *Rev. de Théol.*, xv. 1857, p. 54; Baur, *Das Markusev.*, p. 209; Guericke, *Gesamtgesch.*, p. 232.

⁶ Hahn incorrectly reads, "God came down" (*ὁ θεὸς κατεβῆεν*) *Ev. M.* in *Thilo*, p. 403; cf. Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 150, anm. 3; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 406, anm. *; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 398, anm. 1.

slightly differing readings of this. Epiphanius gives the opening words, 'Εν τῷ πεντεκαίδεκατῷ ἔτει Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.¹ Tertullian has: "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberiani. . . descendisse in civitatem Galilææ Capharnaum."² The καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς of Epiphanius has permitted the conjecture that there might have been an additional indication of the time, such as "Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa,"³ but this has not been generally adopted.⁴ It is not necessary for us to discuss the sense in which the "came down" (κατέλθε) was interpreted, since it is the word used in Luke. Marcion's Gospel then proceeds with iv. 31: "and taught them on the Sabbath days (v. 32), and they were exceedingly astonished at his teaching, for his word was power." Then follow vs. 33—39 containing the healing of the man with an unclean spirit,⁵ and of Simon's wife's mother, with the important omission of the expression "of Nazareth" (Ναζαρεθ)⁶ after "Jesus" in the cry of the possessed (v. 34). The vs. 16—30⁷ immediately follow iv. 39, with important omissions and variations. In iv. 16, where Jesus comes to Nazareth, the words "where he had been brought up" are omitted, as is also the concluding phrase "and stood up to read."⁸ Verses 17—19, in which Jesus reads from Isaiah, are altogether wanting.⁹ Volkmar omits the whole of v. 20, Hilgenfeld only the first half down to the sitting down, retaining the rest; Hahn retains from "and he sat down" to the end.¹⁰ Of v. 21 only: "He began to speak to them"

¹ Hær., xlii., ed. Pet., p. 312.

² Adv. M., iv. 7.

³ Cf. Dial. de recta fide; Orig., Opp., i. p. 868; Irenæus, Adv. Hær., i. 27, § 2.

⁴ Volkmar has it, Das Ev. M., p. 154, 224, f. 126; Hahn omits it, Ev. M. in Thilo, l. c., as do also Baur, (Unters. kan. Ev., p. 406, who after the statement of Epiph. also rightly leaves open the τῆς ἡγεμονίας and καίσαρος), and Hilgenfeld (who conjectured the second date), Die Evv. J., p. 398; cf. Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 197.

⁵ Volkmar omits v. 37; Hahn, Hilgenfeld and others retain it. Ritschl rejects 38, 39, the healing of Simon's wife's mother, which he passed over in silence by Tertullian (Adv. M., iv. 8), Das Ev. M., p. 76 f., in which he is joined by Baur only. The whole of this examination illustrates the uncertainties of the text and of the data on which critics attempt to reconstruct it.

⁶ Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 150; cf. 56, 131; Hahn, in Thilo, p. 404, ann. 4; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 441; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 198.

⁷ Volkmar also includes the latter part of v. 14, and all of 15, "And there went out a fame of him," &c., &c. (Das Ev. M., p. 152, cf. 154), but in this he is unsupported by others. Cf. Tertullian, Adv. Marc., iv. 8.

⁸ Hahn, in Thilo, p. 404, 405, ann. 7; Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 150, cf. 154; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 441, cf. 399; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 124; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 76.

⁹ Hahn, in Thilo, 404; Das Ev. M., p. 136; Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 150; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., 76, ann. 1; Hilgenfeld, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199; In Die Evv. J., p. 399 (cf. 441), he considers it probable, but does not speak with certainty. Tertullian is silent, Adv. M., iv. 8.

¹⁰ Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 150, 154; Hilgenfeld, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199; Hahn, in Thilo, p. 404.

is ret
Is not
thy co
"A p
critics
are om
tained
lepro
at xvi
mar.
which
analys
of the
plays
the va
must e
there c
ing mo
than th
princip
reconci
more fi
It is
present
omits t
count i
which
the He
two ch
their or

1 Volk
has λέγ
Hilgenf
2 Hah
feld, Th
76, ann.
3 Hah
Jahrb., 1
4 Ib.
5 Hah
T., p. 12
6 Volk
7 Volk
p. 124; J
199 f.
8 Volk
p. 155.
9 Cf. B
10 Epiph

is retained.¹ From verse 22 the concluding phrase: "And said: Is not this Joseph's son" is omitted,² as are also the words "in thy country" from v. 23.³ Verse 24, containing the proverb: "A prophet has no honour" is wholly omitted,⁴ but the best critics differ regarding the two following verses 25—26; they are omitted according to Hahn, Ritschl and De Wette,⁵ but retained by Volkmar and Hilgenfeld.⁶ Verse 27, referring to the leprosy of Naaman, which, it will be remembered, is interpolated at xvii. 14, is omitted here by most critics, but retained by Volkmar.⁷ Verses 28—30 come next,⁸ and the four verses iv. 40—44, which then immediately follow, complete the chapter. This brief analysis, with the accompanying notes, illustrates the uncertainty of the text, and, throughout the whole Gospel, conjecture similarly plays the larger part. We do not propose to criticise minutely the various conclusions arrived at as to the state of the text, but must emphatically remark that where there is so little certainty there cannot be any safe ground for delicate deductions regarding motives and sequences of matter. Nothing is more certain than that, if we criticise and compare the Synoptics on the same principle, we meet with most startling results and the most irreconcilable difficulties.⁹ The opening of Marcion's Gospel is more free from abruptness and crudity than that of Luke.

It is not necessary to show that the first three chapters of Luke present very many differences from the other Synoptics. Mark omits them altogether, and they do not even agree with the account in Matthew. We know that some of the oldest Gospels of which we have any knowledge, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, are said not to have had the narrative of the first two chapters at all,¹⁰ and there is much more than doubt as to their originality. The mere omission of the history of the in-

¹ Volkmar reads, καὶ ἡρξάτο κηρύσσειν αὐτοῖς, Das Ev. M., p. 154; Hahn has λέγειν πρὸς αὐτούς, in Thilo, p. 404; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., 76, anm. 1; Hilgenfeld suggests λαλεῖν for λέγειν, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199.

² Hahn, Ev. M. in Thilo, p. 405; Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 150, 154; Hilgenfeld, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199; Die Evv. J., p. 441; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 76, anm. 1.

³ Hahn, in Thilo, p. 405; Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 150, 154; Hilgenfeld, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199.

⁴ Ib.

⁵ Hahn, in Thilo, p. 405; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., 76, anm. 1; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 124.

⁶ Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 154; Hilgenfeld, Th. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199.

⁷ Volkmar, Das Ev. M., p. 154; Hahn, in Thilo, 405; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 124; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 76, anm. 1; Hilgenfeld, Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 199 f.

⁸ Volkmar adds to "went his way" the words "to Capernaum," Das Ev. M., p. 155.

⁹ Cf. Baur, Das Markusev., p. 211 ff.; Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 126 ff.

¹⁰ Epiphanius, Har., xxix. 9; cf. xxx. 13 f.

fancy, &c., from Mark, however, renders it unnecessary to show that the absence of these chapters from Marcion's Gospel has the strongest support and justification. Now Luke's account of the early events and geography of the Gospel history is briefly as follows: Nazareth is the permanent dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary,¹ but on account of the census they travel to Bethlehem, where Jesus is born;² and after visiting Jerusalem to present him at the Temple,³ they return "to their own city Nazareth."⁴ After the baptism and temptation Jesus comes to Nazareth "where he had been brought up,"⁵ and in the course of his address to the people he says: "Ye will surely say unto me this proverb: Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum do also here in thy country."⁶ No mention, however, has before this been made of Capernaum, and no account has been given of any works done there; but, on the contrary, after escaping from the angry mob at Nazareth, Jesus goes for the first time to Capernaum, which, on being thus first mentioned, is particularized as "a city of Galilee,"⁷ where he heals a man who had an unclean spirit, in the synagogue, who addresses him as "Jesus of Nazareth;"⁸ and the fame of him goes throughout the country.⁹ He cures Simon's wife's mother of a fever,¹⁰ and when the sun is set they bring the sick and he heals them.¹¹

The account in Matthew contradicts this in many points, some of which had better be pointed out here. Jesus is born in Bethlehem, which is the ordinary dwelling-place of the family;¹² his parents fly thence with him into Egypt,¹³ and on their return, they dwell "in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene."¹⁴ After John's imprisonment, Jesus leaves Nazareth, and goes to dwell in Capernaum.¹⁵ From that time he begins to preach.¹⁶ Here then, he commences his public career in Capernaum.

In Mark, Jesus comes from Nazareth to be baptized,¹⁷ and after the imprisonment of John, he comes into Galilee preaching.¹⁸ In Capernaum, he heals the man of the unclean spirit, and Simon's

¹ Luke i. 26, ii. 4.

³ ii. 22.

⁶ iv. 23.

⁹ iv. 37.

¹² Matt. ii. 1, 5 ff.

¹⁴ ii. 33. We need not pause here to point out that there is no such prophecy known in the Old Testament. The reference may very probably be a singularly mistaken application of the word in Isaiah xi. 1, the Hebrew word for branch being נֶזֶר, Nazer.

¹⁵ iv. 12—13, for the fulfilment of another supposed prophecy, v. 14 ff.

¹⁶ iv. 17.

⁴ ii. 39; cf. 42, 51.

⁷ iv. 31.

¹⁰ iv. 38 f.

¹³ ii. 13 ff.

² ii. 4.

⁵ iv. 16.

⁸ iv. 33 ff.

¹¹ iv. 40—44.

¹⁸ i. 14 f.

¹⁷ Mark i. 9.

¹⁸ i. 14 f.

wife
som
it is
quot
It
able
of th
elast
cour
the
and
had
to j
viou
third
ing t
cion
Jesu
and
and
vion
secu
Th
pels
is no
and
third
twec
that
exist
muti
stand
vives
that
mere
Gree

1 M
3 ii
5 C
questi
or the
and th
eviden
based
6 11
p. 209

wife's mother,¹ and then retires to a solitary place,² returns after some days to Capernaum³ without going to Nazareth at all, and it is only at a later period that he comes to his own country, and quotes the proverb regarding a prophet.⁴

It is evident from this comparison, that there is very considerable difference between the three Synoptics, regarding the outset of the career of Jesus, and that there must have been decided elasticity in the tradition, and variety in the early written accounts of this part of the Gospel narrative. Luke alone commits the error of making Jesus appear in the synagogue at Nazareth, and refer to works wrought at Capernaum, before any mention had been made of his having preached or worked wonders there to justify the allusions and the consequent agitation. It is obvious that there has been confusion in the arrangement of the third Synoptic and a transposition of the episodes, clearly pointing to a combination of passages from other sources.⁵ Now Marcion's Gospel did not contain these anomalies. It represented Jesus as first appearing in Capernaum, teaching in the synagogue, and performing mighty works there, and *then* going to Nazareth, and addressing the people with the natural reference to the previous events at Capernaum, and in this it is not only more consecutive, but also adheres more closely to the other two Synoptics.

That Luke happens to be the only one of our canonical Gospels which has the words with which Marcion's Gospel commences, is no proof whatever that these words were original in that work, and not found in several of the πολλοί which existed before the third Synoptic was compiled. Indeed, the close relationship between the first three Gospels is standing testimony to the fact that one Gospel was built upon the basis of others previously existing. This, which has been called "the chief prop of the mutilation hypothesis,"⁶ has really no solid ground whatever to stand on beyond the accident that only one of three Gospels survives out of many which may have had the phrase. The fact that Marcion's Gospel really had the words of Luke, moreover, is mere conjecture, inasmuch as Epiphanius, who alone gives the Greek, shows a distinct variation of reading. He has: 'Εν τῷ πεν-

¹ Mark i. 21 ff.

² i. 35.

³ ii. 1.

⁴ vi. 1-6; cf. Matt. xiii. 54.

⁵ Cf. Luke iv. 23; Matt. viii. 54; Mark vi. 1-6. We do not go into the question as to the sufficiency of the motives ascribed for the agitation at Nazareth, or the contradiction between the facts narrated as to the attempt to kill Jesus, and the statement of their wonder at his gracious words, v. 22, &c. There is no evidence where the various discrepancies arose, and no certain conclusions can be based upon such arguments.

⁶ "Die Hauptstütze der Verstümmelungshypothese." Baur, Das Markusev., p. 209.

τεκαδεκάτω ἔτει Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.¹ Luke reads: 'Ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος. We do not, of course, lay much stress upon this, but the fact that there is a variation should be noticed. Critics quietly assume, because there is a difference, that Epiphanius has abbreviated, but that is by no means sure. In any case, instances could be multiplied to show that if one of our Synoptic Gospels were lost, one of the survivors would in this manner have credit for passages which it had in reality either derived from the lost Gospel, or with it drawn from a common original source.

Now starting from the undeniable fact that the Synoptic Gospels are in no case purely original independent works, but are based upon older writings, or upon each other, each Gospel remodelling and adding to already existing materials, as the author of the third Gospel, indeed, very frankly and distinctly indicates,² it seems indeed a bold thing to affirm that Marcion's Gospel, whose existence is authenticated long before we have any independent evidence of Luke's,³ must have been derived from the latter. Ewald has made a minute analysis of the Synoptics, assigning the materials of each to what he considers their original source. We do not of course attach any very specific importance to such results, for it is clear that they must to a great extent be arbitrary and incapable of proof, but being effected without any reference to the question before us, it may be interesting to compare Ewald's conclusions regarding the parallel part of Luke with the first chapter of Marcion's Gospel. Ewald details the materials from which our Synoptic Gospels were derived, and the order of their composition, as follows, each Synoptic of course making use of the earlier materials: I. the oldest Gospel. II. the collection of Discourses (Spruchsammlung). III. Mark. IV. the Book of earlier History. V. our present Matthew. VI. the sixth recognizable book. VII. the seventh book. VIII. the eighth book; and IX. Luke.⁴ Now the only part of our third canonical Gospel corresponding with any part of the first chapter of Marcion's Gospel which Ewald ascribes to the author of our actual Luke is the opening date.⁵ The passage to which the few opening words

¹ Hær., xlii. ed. Pet., p. 312.

² Luke i. 1-4. He professes to write in order the things in which Theophilus had already been instructed, not to tell something new, but merely that he might know the certainty thereof.

³ Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 276; cf. Volkmar, *Das Ev. M.*, p. i., p. 175 ff.; *Der Ursprung*, p. 75.

⁴ *Euclid*, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1850, p. 1; cf. *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1848-49.

⁵ The verses iv. 14-15, which Volkmar wished to include, but which all other critics reject (see p. 468, note 7), from Marcion's text, Ewald likewise identifies as an isolated couple of verses by the author of our Luke inserted between episodes derived from other written sources. Cf. *Ewald*, l. c.

are jo
Gospo
and e
40—
imme
assign
25—
by E
mann
him t
there
older
abstra
pel of
rials
there
canon
The
is nee
nite
may
the at
struct
minat
there
arbitr
would
The p
under
the c
order
Synop
who a
have

¹ Eu
read co
would
more c
evenin
reth it
39, is t
no stat
ment v
passage
Theol.
² Eu
³ Eu

are joined, and which constitute the commencement of Marcion's Gospel, Luke iv. 31—39, is a section commencing with verse 31, and extending to the end of the chapter, thereby including verses 40—44, which Ewald assigns to Mark.¹ Verses 16—24, which immediately follow, also form a complete and isolated passage assigned by Ewald to the "sixth recognizable book."² Verses 25—27, also are the whole of another isolated section attributed by Ewald to the "Book of earlier history," whilst 28—30, in like manner form another complete and isolated episode, assigned by him to the "eighth recognizable book."³ According to Ewald, therefore, Luke's Gospel at this place is a mere patchwork of older writings, and if this be in any degree accepted, as in the abstract, indeed, it is by the great mass of critics, then the Gospel of Marcion is an arrangement different from Luke of materials not his, but previously existing, and of which, therefore, there is no warrant to limit the use and reproduction to the canonical Gospel.

The course pursued by critics, with regard to Marcion's Gospel, is necessarily very unsatisfactory. They commence with a definite hypothesis, and try whether all the peculiarities of the text may not be more or less well explained by it. On the other hand, the attempt to settle the question by a comparison of the reconstructed text with Luke's is equally inconclusive. The determination of priority of composition from internal evidence, where there are no chronological references, must as a general rule be arbitrary, and can rarely be accepted as final. Internal evidence would, indeed, decidedly favour the priority of Marcion's Gospel. The great uncertainty of the whole system, even when applied under the most favourable circumstances, is well illustrated by the contradictory results at which critics have arrived as to the order of production and dependence on each other of our three Synoptics. Without going into details, we may say that critics who are all agreed upon the mutual dependence of those Gospels have variously arranged them in the following order: I. Matthew

¹ Ewald, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 104 f.; cf. p. 1. We hold that Marcion's Gospel read continuously, v. 31—44, and that v. 16 ff. then immediately followed. This would make the reference at Nazareth to the works done at Capernaum much more complete, and would remove the incongruity of attributing v. 40—44 to the evening of the day of escape from Nazareth and return to Capernaum or to Nazareth itself. The only reason for not joining 40—44 to the preceding section 31—39, is the broken order of reference by *Tertullian* (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 8), but there is no statement that he follows the actual order of Marcion in this, and his argument would fully account for the order of his references without dividing this passage. Cf. *Volkmar*, *Das Ev. M.*, p. 146 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 462 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 198 f.

² Ewald, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 104, cf. p. 1; v. 24 is omitted.

³ Ewald, *ib.*, p. 104, cf. p. 1.

—Mark—Luke.¹ II. Matthew—Luke—Mark.² III. Mark—Matthew—Luke.³ IV. Mark—Luke—Matthew.⁴ V. Luke—Matthew—Mark.⁵ VI. All three out of common written sources.⁶ Were we to state the various theories still more in detail, we might largely increase the variety of conclusions. These, however, suffice to show the uncertainty of results derived from internal evidence.

It is always assumed that Marcion altered a Gospel to suit his own particular system, but as one of his most orthodox critics, while asserting that Luke's narrative lay at the basis of his Gospel, admits: "it is not equally clear that all the changes were due to Marcion himself;"⁷ and, although he considers that "some of the omissions can be explained by his peculiar doctrines," he continues: "others are unlike arbitrary corrections, and must be considered as various readings of the greatest interest, dating as they do from a time anterior to all other authorities in our possession."⁸ Now, undoubtedly, the more developed forms of the Gospel narrative were the result of additions, materially influenced by dogmatic and other reasons, made to earlier and more fragmentary works, but it is an argument contrary to general critical experience to affirm that a Gospel, the distinguishing characteristic of which is greater brevity, was produced by omissions in the interest of a system from a longer work. It is more simple and natural to suppose that the system was formed upon the Gospel as Marcion found it, than that the Gospel was afterwards fitted to the system. The latter hypothesis, as we have seen, involves absurd anomalies which are universally admitted. So imperfectly did Marcion do the work he is supposed to have

¹ Of course we only pretend to indicate a few of the critics who adopt each order. So Bengel, Bolton, Ebrard, Grotius, Hengstenberg, Hug, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Mill, Seiler, Townson, Wetstein.

² So Ammon, Baur, Bleek, Delitzsch, Fritzsche, Gfrörer, Griesbach, Kern, Köstlin, Neudecker, Saunier, Schwarz, Schwegler, Sieffert, Stroth, Theile, Owen, Paulus, De Wette, Augustine (de cons. Ev., i. 4).

³ So Credner, Hitzig, Lachmann, (?) Reuss, Ritschl, Meyer, Storr, Thiersch, Ewald.

⁴ R. Bauer, Hitzig, (?) Schneskenburger, Volkmar, Weiss, Wilke.

⁵ Bilschlag, Evanson.

⁶ Bertholdt, Clericus, Corrodi, Eichhorn, Gratz, Hanlein, Kninoel, Lessing, Marsh, Michaelis, Koppe, Niemeyer, Semler, Schleiermacher, Schmidt, Weber. This view was partly shared by many of those mentioned under other orders.

⁷ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 275. We do not pause to discuss Tertullian's insinuations (Adv. Marc., iv. 4), that Marcion himself admitted that he had amended St. Luke's Gospel, for the statement was repudiated by the Marcionites, abandoned practically by Tertullian himself, and has been rejected by the mass of critics. Cf. Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 23 ff.; Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 120; Das Ev. M., p. 4, anm. 2; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. J., p. 446 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. 283, anm. 2.

⁸ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 275.

undertaken that he is refuted out of his own manipulated document. This might well be the case if he had evolved his system from a Gospel independently composed, and which in the main seemed to support him, but not in a work upon which he had felt able freely to use the knife. On examination it is found that he omits what is favourable, retains what is contradictory, and actually interpolates passages contrary to his principles. A more senseless and absurd proceeding, judged by actual facts, was never ascribed to an able man.¹ The statement of the Fathers that Marcion's Gospel was no original work, but a mutilated version of Luke, was based merely upon their ecclesiastical theory that, being a canonical work adopted by the Church, Luke's Gospel must be the older work. Neither Tertullian nor Epiphanius advances any historical proof of the truth of their assumption, and their writings against Marcion, composed almost solely with the view of dogmatic refutation, have left the literary problem almost untouched for modern criticism. How difficult that problem is, must be apparent to all who are acquainted with the accepted history of written Gospels. It is an undeniable fact that beyond the accusations which we have cited, there is no independent external testimony connecting Marcion's Gospel with our third Synoptic in its present form.

Marcion's Gospel, we contend, may well have been one of the earlier evangelical works which, after the development of doctrine in the early Church had led to fuller and more elaborate versions, and to the introduction of elements from which the more crude primitive Gospels were formed, were doubtless treasured by some as a purer and simpler exposition of Christianity. No one of course would maintain that the instant a new edition of the Gospel, "with additions and improvements," was produced, the older and more fragmentary codices at once disappeared. They would probably gradually decline in favour, but many conservative minds, especially in distant districts, would long cling to their teaching in preference to the more elaborate but later productions. This view is supported by many considerations, and is rendered all the more probable by the fact that Marcion found his Gospel in the distant province of Pontus, which in the days when MSS. were but slowly multiplied and disseminated lay far from the centres of novelty. Tertullian delights in calling the Gospel of the Heresiarch the "*Evangelium Ponticum*,"² and the Marcionites maintained that their Gospel was that of which the Apostle Paul himself made use.³ The circumstance that it was

¹ Schwegler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 270 ff.; *Eichhorn*, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 75; cf. *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 43.

² Cf. *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2.

³ *Tertullian*, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 2; *Dial. de recta fide*, § 1; *Orig.*, *Opp.*, i. p. 807; cf. *Rom.* ii. 16, xvi. 25; *Gal.* i. 6.

actually brought by Marcion from Pontus, and the name given to it by Tertullian, however, show it to have been a work most probably in circulation amongst the Christians of that province, who no doubt had their special Gospel like all the early Christian communities. The Church in Pontus was strongly Paulinian, and it is therefore probable that they may have used a form of the Gospel narrative associated with that Apostle which, elsewhere, in circles of greater intellectual and Christian activity, had gradually become transformed and matured into larger proportions.¹ No one accuses Marcion of having written his own Gospel, nor did he, after the fashion of his time, call it after his own name.² On the contrary, it had no author's name attached to it, and its superscription was simply, "The Gospel," or "The Gospel of the Lord" (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* or *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου*).³ Schweigler has rightly remarked that this very namelessness is, as in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, strong evidence of its originality; a forger would certainly not have omitted to attach to his falsified Gospel some weighty name of apostolic times.⁴ That some importance should be attached to this point is evident from the fact that Tertullian reproaches Marcion with the anonymous character of his work, arising from the omission of the expedient too well known in his time. "And here already I might make a stand," he exclaims, at the very opening of his attack on the Gospel of Pontus, "contending that a work should not be recognized which does not hold its front erect . . . which does not give a pledge of its trustworthiness by the fulness of its title, and the due declaration of its author."⁵ The spurious and pseudonymic literature of the first centuries of our era prove only too well how little scruple there was to support pious fraud by plenitude of title, and the "Great African" himself was not unfrequently a victim to the practice. Not only did Marcion himself not in any way connect the name of Luke with his Gospel, but his followers

¹ *Bertholdt*, Einl. A. und N. T., 1813, iii. p. 1216 ff., 1294 ff. *Bertholdt* considers Marcion's Gospel an earlier Greek translation from the original Gospel which formed the basis of Luke. Luke edited in Greek the original Gospel which Paul used.

² *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 563; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 198; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 43; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 79 f.

³ Marcion Evangelio suo nullum adseribit auctorem. *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 2; Dial. de recta fide, § 1; *Bertholdt*, Einl., iii. p. 1293 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 126; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 563; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 43; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 79 f.; *Schweigler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 280 f., p. 261; *Schotten*, Het Panlin. Evangelie, p. 8; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 61; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 119 f.; *Hahn*, Ev. M. in *Thilo*, p. 403; Das Ev. M., p. 132; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 74, ann.

⁴ Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 281.

⁵ Et possem hic jam gradum figere, non agnoscendum contendens opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam constantiam præferat, nullam fidem reprobant de plenitudine tituli et professione debita auctoris. *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 2.

repudiated the idea that Luke was its author, and taunted the orthodox members of the Church for having their doctrines taught by four adulterated Gospels, whilst they received theirs from one, the Gospel of Christ.¹

If we turn to the Epistles of Paul, which Marcion acknowledged, for some help in deciding the question as to his Gospel, we find that in many respects as to selection, order, and readings, Marcion's collection is remarkably in unison with the results of modern criticism.² The information which we have regarding his text is very defective, but it is sufficient to show that many of the alterations which he is accused by his uncritical and ignorant adversaries of making in the interest of his system are really original and correct readings, whilst others are either merely unimportant natural variations, or merely accidental omissions from the copy in the hands of the Fathers.³ "Tertullian and Epiphanius," writes Canon Westcott, "agree in affirming that Marcion altered the texts of the books which he received to suit his own views; and they quote many various readings in support of the assertion. Those which they cite from the Epistles are certainly insufficient to prove the point; and on the contrary, they go far to show that Marcion preserved without alteration the text which he found in his manuscript. Of the seven readings noticed by Epiphanius, only two are unsupported by other authority; and it is altogether unlikely that Marcion changed other passages, when, as Epiphanius himself shows, he left untouched those which are most directly opposed to his system."⁴ Now the Epistles did not go through the process of development by which through successive additions and alterations the Gospels attained their present form. We are, therefore, able to determine with considerable accuracy the original state of their text. We find, then, that not only does Marcion leave untouched, even by the showing of Epiphanius himself, the passages most opposed to him, but that the falsifications of which he is accused by the Fathers are often more original readings supported by the best authorities, and in fact that he evidently had in no way tampered with his manuscript. Is it not reasonable to suppose that he had

¹ Dial. de recta fide, § 1; Bertholdt, Einl. iii. p. 1295, 1218 ff.; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 563; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 79 f.; Gieseler, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 25. The later Marcionites affirmed their Gospel to have been written by Christ himself, and the particulars of the Crucifixion, &c., to have been added by Paul.

² Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 420 ff.; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 77 ff.; Gesch. N. T., p. 286; Ritschl, Das Ev. M., p. 153 ff., p. 166; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 273; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 274; cf. De Wette, Einl. A. T., 1852, § 20, p. 25 f.

³ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 411 ff.; Reuss, Hist. du Canon, p. 72, note 3; Gesch. N. T., p. 370.

⁴ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 274.

equally preserved without alteration the text which he found in the manuscript of his Gospel? Any man of his eminence adopting and holding fast a comparatively primitive form of the Gospel found in circulation in a distant province like Pontus, and thus preserving it from the fate of other similar works, would soon find on comparing it with Gospels which had grown up and advanced with the progress of the Church, that it lacked many a passage which had crept into them. His Gospel had stood still on the outskirts of Christianity, whilst others in the more active religious centres had collected fresh matter and modified their original form. We have no reason to believe the accusation of the Fathers in regard to the Gospel, which we cannot fully test, better founded than that in regard to the Epistles, which we can test, and find unfounded. It is a significant fact that Justin Martyr, who attacks Marcion's system, never brings any accusation against him of mutilating or falsifying any Gospel, although, living at the time of the Heresiarch, he was in a position to know the facts much more certainly than Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius, who lived and wrote at a much later period.¹ There is good reason to conclude that Marcion made use of a Gospel in a more primitive and less mature state than our third Synoptic, and that, as he did with the Epistles, he preserved the text as he found it.

There is no evidence whatever that Marcion had any knowledge of the other canonical Gospels in any form.² None of his writings are extant, and no direct assertion is made even by the Fathers that he knew them, although from their dogmatic point of view they assume that these Gospels existed from the very first, and therefore insinuate that as he only recognized one Gospel, he rejected them.³ When Irenæus says: "He persuaded his disciples that he himself was more veracious than were the apostles who handed down the Gospel, though he delivered to them not the Gospel, but part of the Gospel,"⁴ it is quite clear that he speaks of the Gospel—the good tidings—Christianity—and not of specific written Gospels. In another passage which

¹ Cf. Apol. i. 26, 58. Justin is said to have written a work against Marcion, which is mentioned and quoted by *Irenæus* (Adv. Her., iv. 6, § 2), and after him by *Eusebius* (H. E., iv. 18), *Jerome* (De vir. ill. 23), and *Photius* (Bibl. 125). It may reasonably be presumed that, had Justin brought any such charge against Marcion, at least Irenæus, Tertullian, or Epiphanius would have mentioned it.

² *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 84; *Gieseler*, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 25; *Rumff*, Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 21; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 214 f.

³ *Irenæus*, Adv. Her., i. 27, § 2; cf. iii. 2; 12, § 12; *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 3; cf. De Carne Christi, 2, 3.

⁴ Semetipsum esse veraciorem, quam sunt hi, qui Evangelium tradiderunt, apostoli, enasit discipulis suis; non Evangelium, sed particulam Evangelii tradens eis. Adv. Her., i. 27, § 2.

is r
tha
Gos
the
apo
cou
at
Epi
ther
the
Val
here
thos
reje
cept
by a
Gos
thei
Th
the
the
Apo
Gos
Gos
thos
of A
be it
them
plyin
ing c
by th
to Jo
nized
even
speak
1 Et
gelium
et qui
totum
decurt
iii. 12,
2 Cf.
3 Sed
suggilla
tis pseu
endum
eduntur
Adv. M

is referred to by Apologists, Irenæus says of the Marcionites that they have asserted: "That even the apostles proclaimed the Gospel still under the influence of Jewish sentiments; but that they themselves are more sound and more judicious than the apostles. Wherefore also Marcion and his followers have had recourse to mutilating the Scriptures, not recognizing some books at all, but curtailing the Gospel according to Luke and the Epistles of Paul; these they say are alone authentic which they themselves have abbreviated."¹ These remarks chiefly refer to the followers of Marcion, and as we have shown, when treating of Valentinus, Irenæus is expressly writing against members of heretical sects living in his own day and not of the founders of those sects.² The Marcionites of the time of Irenæus no doubt rejected the Gospels, but although Marcion obviously did not accept any of the Gospels which have become canonical, it does not by any means follow that he knew anything of these particular Gospels. As yet we have not met with any evidence even of their existence at a much later period.

The evidence of Tertullian is not a whit more valuable. In the passage usually cited, he says: "But Marcion, lighting upon the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, in which he reproaches even Apostles for not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, as well as accuses certain false Apostles of perverting the Gospel of Christ, tries with all his might to destroy the status of those Gospels which are put forth as genuine and under the name of Apostles or at least of contemporaries of the Apostles, in order, be it known, to confer upon his own the credit which he takes from them."³ Now here again it is clear that Tertullian is simply applying, by inference, Marcion's views with regard to the preaching of the Gospel by the two parties in the Church, represented by the Apostle Paul and the "pillar" Apostles whose leaning to Jewish doctrines he condemned, to the written Gospels recognized in his day though not in Marcion's. "It is uncertain," says even Canon Westcott, "whether Tertullian in the passage quoted speaks from a knowledge of what Marcion may have written on

¹ Et apostolos quidem adhuc quæ sunt Judæorum sentientes, annuntiasse Evangelium; se autem sinceriores, et prudentiores apostolis esse. Unde et Marcion, et qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt Scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Evangelium, et Epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc sola legitima esse dicunt, quæ ipsi minoraverunt. Adv. Hær., iii. 12, § 12.

² Cf. Adv. Hær., i. Præf. § 2; iii. Præf., &c.

³ Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos augillantibus ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantibus pseudapostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum, quæ propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem, quam illis admittit, suo conferat. Adv. Marc., iv. 3; cf. de Carne Christi, 2, 3.

the subject, or simply from his own point of sight."¹ Any doubt is, however, removed on examining the context, for Tertullian proceeds to argue that if Paul censured Peter, John and James, it was for changing their company from respect of persons, and similarly, "if false apostles crept in," they betrayed their character by insisting on Jewish observances. "So that it was *not on account of their preaching*, but of their conversation that they were pointed out by Paul,"² and he goes on to argue that if Marcion thus accuses Apostles of having depraved the Gospel by their dissimulation, he accuses Christ in accusing those whom Christ selected.³ It is palpable, therefore, that Marcion, in whatever he may have written, referred to the preaching of the Gospel, or Christianity, by Apostles who retained their Jewish prejudices in favour of circumcision and legal observances, and not to written Gospels. Tertullian merely assumes, with his usual audacity, that the Church had the four Gospels from the very first, and therefore that Marcion, who had only one Gospel, knew the others and deliberately rejected them.

At the very best, even if the hypothesis that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated Luke were established, Marcion affords no evidence in favour of the authenticity or trustworthy character of our third Synoptic. His Gospel was nameless, and his followers repudiated the idea of its having been written by Luke; and regarded even as the earliest testimony for the existence of Luke's Gospel, that testimony is not in confirmation of its genuineness and reliability, but on the contrary condemns it as garbled and interpolated.

¹ On the Canon, p. 276, note 1.

² Adeo non de prædicatione, sed de conversatione a Paulo denotabantur. Adv. Marc., iv. 3.

³ Adv. Marc., iv. 3.

CHAPTER VIII.

TATIAN—DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH.

FROM Marcion we now turn to Tatian, another so-called heretic leader. Tatian, an Assyrian by birth,¹ embraced Christianity and became a disciple of Justin Martyr² in Rome, sharing with him, as it seems, the persecution excited by Crescens the Cynic³ to which Justin fell a victim. After the death of Justin, Tatian, who till then had continued thoroughly orthodox, left Rome, and joined the sect of the Enderites, of which, however, he was not the founder,⁴ and became the leading exponent of their austere and ascetic doctrines.⁵

The only one of his writings which is still extant is his "Oration to the Greeks" (*λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας*). This work was written after the death of Justin, for in it he refers to that event,⁶ and it is generally dated between A.D. 170—175.⁷ Tischendorf does not assert that there is any quotation in this address taken from the Synoptic Gospels;⁸ and Canon Westcott only affirms that it contains a "clear reference" to "a parable recorded by St. Matthew," and he excuses the slightness of this evidence by adding: "The absence of more explicit testimony to the books of the New Testament is to be accounted for by the style of his writing, and not by his unworthy estimate of their importance."⁹ This remark is without foundation, as we know nothing whatever with regard to Tatian's estimate of any such books.

¹ *Oratio ad Græcos*, ed Otto, § 42.

² *Ib.*, § 18.

³ *Ib.*, § 19.

⁴ *Anger*, Synops. Ev. Proleg., p. xxviii.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 437; *Folkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 34; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 277.

⁵ *Eusebius*, II. E., iv. 29; *Irenæus*, Adv. Hæc., i. 28; *Epiphanius*, Hæc., xlv. 1; *Hieron.*, De Vir. Illust., 29; *Theodoret*, Hæc. fab., i. 20; *Beausobre*, Hist. du Manichéisme, i. p. 303 f.; *Mutter*, Hist. du Christianisme, 2 ed., i. p. 172 f.; *Folkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 34; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 437 f.; *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 562; *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 3 ff.; *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 136 ff.

⁶ *Orat. ad Gr.*, § 19; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. 438; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 93; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 145; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16, ann. 1.

⁷ *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 145; *Tischendorf* (between 166—170), Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16, ann. 1, p. 17; *Folkmar* (between 165—175), Der Ursprung, p. 163; cf. p. 34 ff.; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 438; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 93; *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 10; *Lardner* (between 165—172), Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 139; *De Wette* († 176), Einl. A. T., 1852, p. 24.

⁸ Cf. Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16 f.

⁹ On the Canon, p. 278.

The supposed "clear reference" is as follows: "For by means of a certain hidden treasure (*ἀποκρύφου θησαυροῦ*) he made himself lord of all that we possess, in digging for which though we were covered with dust, yet we give it the occasion of falling into our hands and abiding with us."¹ This is claimed as a reference to Matt. xiii. 44: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hidden (*θησαυρὸς κεκρυμμένω*) in the field, which a man found and hid, and for his joy he goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field." So faint a similarity could not prove anything, but it is evident that there are decided differences here. Were the probability fifty times greater than it is that Tatian had in his mind the parable which is reported in our first Gospel, nothing could be more unwarrantable than the deduction that he referred to the passage in our Matthew, and not to any other of the numerous Gospels which we know to have early been in circulation. Ewald ascribes the parable in Matthew originally to the "Spruchsammlung" or collection of Discourses, the second of the four works out of which he considers our first Synoptic to have been compiled.² As evidence for the existence even of our first canonical Gospel no such reference could have the slightest value.

Although neither Tischendorf nor Canon Westcott think it worth while to refer to it, some apologists claim another passage in the Oration as a reference to our third Synoptic. "Laugh ye: nevertheless ye shall weep."³ This is compared with Luke vi. 25: "Woe unto you that laugh now: for ye shall mourn and weep."⁴ Here again it is impossible to trace a reference in the words of Tatian specially to our third Gospel, and manifestly nothing could be more foolish than to build upon such vague similarity any hypothesis of Tatian's acquaintance with Luke. If there be one part of the Gospel which was more known than another in the first ages of Christianity it was the Sermon on the Mount, and there can be no doubt that many evangelical works now lost contained versions of it. Ewald likewise assigns this passage of Luke originally to the *Spruchsammlung*,⁵ and no one can doubt that the saying was recorded long before the writer of the third Gospel undertook to compile evangelical history, as so many had done before him. It is one specially likely to have formed part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Further on, however, Canon Westcott says: "it can be gathered

¹ *Διὰ τινὸς γὰρ ἀποκρύφου θησαυροῦ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπεκράτησεν, ὃν οὐκ ὄντες κρηττοῦ μὲν ἡμεῖς ἐνεπλήσθημεν, τοῦ δὲ τοῦ συνεστάναι τὴν ἀφορμὴν παρέχοντες.* Orat. ad Gr., § 30.

² Die drei ersten Evv., l. c.

³ *Γέλᾳτε δὲ ὑμεῖς, ὡς καὶ κλαύδοντες.* Orat. ad Gr., § 32.

⁴ *οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ γελῶντες νῦν ὅτι: πενθήσετε καὶ κλαίσετε.* Luke vi. 25.

⁵ Die drei ersten Evv., l. c.

from
to d
the
the
me
is s
how
the
app
whe
βρῶν
"La
rust
Can
may
it w
refer
cont
degr
tion
tant
ence
who
No
coun
agre
deriv
remo
the s
Syn:
Ta
exist
—pr
Diat
been
and,
and
varic
Some
less,
nical

1 Or
3 Cf
4 Ju
5 Al
Th. St

from Clement of Alexandria . . . that he (Tatian) endeavoured to derive authority for his peculiar opinions from the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, and probably from the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Gospel of St. Matthew."¹ Allusion is here made to a passage in the Stromata of Clement, in which reference is supposed by the apologist to be made to Tatian. No writer, however, is named, and Clement merely introduces his remark by the words: "a certain person," (τις) and then proceeds to give his application of the Saviour's words "not to treasure upon earth where moth and rust corrupt" (ἐν τῇ γῆς μὴ θησαυρίζειν ὅπου σὺς καὶ βροῦτος ἀφαιεῖ).² The parallel passage in Matthew vi. 19, reads: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt," &c. (μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κ.τ.λ.). Canon Westcott, it is true, merely suggests that "probably" this may be ascribed to Tatian, but it is almost absolutely certain that it was not attributed to him by Clement. Tatian is several times referred to in the course of the same chapter, and his words are continued by the use of φησί or γράφει, and it is in the highest degree improbable that Clement should introduce another quotation from him in such immediate context by the vague and distant reference "a certain person" (τις). On the other hand reference is made in the chapter to other writers and sects, to one of whom with infinitely greater propriety this expression applies. No weight, therefore, could be attached to any such passage in connection with Tatian. Moreover the quotation not only does not agree with our Synoptic, but may much more probably have been derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.³ It will be remembered that Justin Martyr quotes the same passage, with the same omission of "θησαυροὺς" from a Gospel different from our Synoptics.⁴

Tatian, however, is claimed by apologists as a witness for the existence of our Gospels—more than this he could not possibly be—principally on the ground that his Gospel was called by some Diatessarar (διὰ τεσσάρων) or "by four," and it is assumed to have been a harmony of four Gospels. The work is no longer extant, and, as we shall see, our information regarding it is of the scantiest and most unsatisfactory description. Critics have arrived at very various conclusions with regard to the composition of the work. Some of course affirm, with more or less of hesitation nevertheless, that it was nothing else than the harmony of our four canonical Gospels;⁵ many of these, however, are constrained to admit

¹ On the Canon, p. 279.

² Strom. iii. 12, § 86.

³ Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 445.

⁴ Justin, Apol. i. 15, see Vol. i. p. 354 f., p. 376 f.

⁵ Anger, Synop. Ev. Proleg., p. xxviii.; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 231; Bindemann, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1842, p. 471 ff.; Célérier, Essai d'une Introd. N. T., p. 21; Delitzsch,

that it was also partly based upon the Gospel according to the Hebrews.¹ Others maintain that it was a harmony of our three Synoptics together with the Gospel according to the Hebrews;² whilst many deny that it was composed of our Gospels at all,³ and either declare it to have been a harmony of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with three other Gospels whose identity cannot be determined, or that it was simply the Gospel according to the Hebrews itself,⁴ by which name, as Epiphanius states, it was called by many in his day.⁵

Tatian's Gospel, however, was not only called Diatessaron, but, according to Victor of Capua, it was also called Diapente (*διὰ πέντε*) "by five,"⁶ a complication which shows the incorrectness of the ecclesiastical theory of its composition.

Tischendorf, anxious to date Tatian's Gospel as early as possible, says that in all probability it was composed earlier than the address to the Greeks.⁷ Of this, however, he does not offer any evidence, and upon examination it is very evident that the work was on the contrary composed or adopted after the Oration and his avowal of heretical opinions. Theodoret states that Tatian had in it omitted the genealogies and all other passages showing that Christ was born of David according to the flesh, and he condemned the work, and caused it to be abandoned on account of its evil design.⁸ If the assumption be correct, therefore, as Tischendorf maintains, that Tatian altered our Gospels, and did not merely from the first, like his master Justin, make use of Gospels different from those which afterwards became

Urspr. Mt. Ev., p. 30; *Feilmoser*, Einl. N. B., p. 276; *Guericke*, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 227; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 40 ff.; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 43, ann. 1; *Neudecker*, Lehrb. Einl. N. T., p. 45 f.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 279 ff.; *Tischendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16 f.; *Olshausen*, Echth. vier can. Evv., p. 336 ff.

¹ *Guericke*, Gesamtgesch., p. 227; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 44, ann. 1; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 116 f.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 45 f.; cf. *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1007 f., 1042; *Simon*, Hist. Crit. N. T., p. 74.

² *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 562; *Gratz*, Kr. Unters. Justin's Denkw.; *Scholten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 94; cf. 98.

³ *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 48, p. 443 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 120 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 193; *Schmidt*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 125 ff.; *Wilke*, Tradition u. Mythe, p. 15.

⁴ *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 573; *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 444; *Gesch. N. T. Kanons*, p. 17 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 123; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 193; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 235; *Nicolas*, Et. sur les Ev. apocr., p. 137.

⁵ *Epiphanius*, Haer., xlv. 1.

⁶ *Pref. ad anon. Harm. Evang.*; cf. *Fabricius*, Cod. N. T., i. p. 378; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml., p. 44; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 193; *Schott*, Isagoge, p. 22, ann. 3; *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1008; *Simon*, Hist. Crit. N. T., ch. vii.; *Beausobre*, Hist. du Manichéisme, i. p. 303 f.; *Nicolas*, Et. evang. apocr., p. 137; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 44 f., ann. p. 45 f., p. 47, ann. 2; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 397; *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 138 f.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 282, note 1.

⁷ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16, ann. 1.

⁸ *Haeret. fab.*, i. 20.

canonical, he must have composed the work after the death of Justin, up to which time he is stated to have remained quite orthodox.¹ The date may with much greater probability be set between A. D. 170—180.²

The earliest writer who mentions Tatian's Gospel is Eusebius,³ who wrote some century and a half after its supposed composition, without, however, having himself seen the work at all, or being really acquainted with its nature and contents.⁴ Eusebius says: "Tatian, however, their former chief, having put together a certain amalgamation and collection I know not how, of the Gospels, named this the Diatessaron, which even now is current with some."⁵ It is clear that this information is not to be relied on, for not only is it based upon mere hearsay, but it is altogether indefinite as to the character of the contents, and the writer admits his own ignorance (*οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως*) regarding them.

Neither Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, nor Jerome, who refer to other works of Tatian, make any mention of this one. Epiphanius, however, does so, but, like Eusebius, without having himself seen it.⁶ This second reference to Tatian's Gospel is made upwards of two centuries after its supposed composition. Epiphanius says: "It is said that he (Tatian) composed the Diatessaron, which is called by some the Gospel according to the Hebrews."⁷ It must be observed that it is not said that Tatian himself gave this Gospel the name of Diatessaron,⁸ but on the contrary the expression of Epiphanius implies that he did not do so,⁹ and the fact that it was also called by some the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and Diapente, shows that the work had no superscription from Tatian of a contradictory character. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (†457) is the next writer who mentions

¹ Irenæus, Adv. Hæc. i. 28; Eusebius, H. E., iv. 29.

² Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 164, p. 35.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 441; Feilmoser, Einl. N. B., p. 275; Hilgenfeldt, Der Kanon, p. 83, ann. 6; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 279.

⁴ Bunsen, Bibelwerk, viii. p. 562; Clément, Introd. N. T., p. 22; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 441 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 396; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 24; Feilmoser, Einl. N. B., p. 275; Hug, Einl. N. T., i. p. 42; Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 138; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 193; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 94; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 280 f., note 4.

⁵ Ὁ μὲντοι γε πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ὁ Τατιανὸς συνάφειαν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τούτω προσηνόμεσεν. Ὁ καὶ παρὰ τισὶν εἰδέτι νῦν φέρεται. H. E., iv., 29.

⁶ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 442; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 396; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 24.

⁷ Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι ὅπερ, κατὰ Ἑβραίους τινὲς καλοῦσι. Epiph., Hæc., xlv. 1.

⁸ Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 18; Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 47, ann. 2; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 95; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 34.

⁹ Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 397.

Tatian's Gospel, and he is the only one who had personally seen it. He says: "He (Tatian) also composed the Gospel which is called *Diatessaron*, excising the genealogies and all the other parts which declare that the Lord was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. This was used not only by those of his own sect, but also by those who held the apostolic doctrines, who did not perceive the evil of the composition, but made use of the book in simplicity on account of its conciseness. I myself found upwards of two hundred such books held in honour among our churches, and collecting them all together, I had them put aside, and instead introduced the Gospels of the four Evangelists." Again it must be observed that Theodoret does not say that the Gospel of Tatian was a *Diatessaron*, but merely that it was called so (*διὰ τῶν τεσσάρων καλούμενον*).¹

After quoting this passage, and that from Epiphanius, Canon Westcott says with an assurance which, considering the nature of the evidence, is singular:—"Not only then was the *Diatessaron* grounded on the four canonical Gospels, but in its general form it was so orthodox as to enjoy a wide ecclesiastical popularity. The heretical character of the book was not evident upon the surface of it, and consisted rather in faults of defect than in erroneous teaching. Theodoret had certainly examined it, and he, like earlier writers, regarded it as a compilation from the four Gospels. He speaks of omissions which were at least in part natural in a Harmony, but notices no such apocryphal additions as would have found place in any Gospel not derived from canonical sources."² Now it must be remembered that the evidence regarding Tatian's Gospel is of the very vaguest description. It is not mentioned by any writer until a century and a half after the date of its supposed composition, and then only referred to by Eusebius, who had not seen the work, and candidly confesses his ignorance with regard to it, so that a critic who is almost as orthodox as Canon Westcott himself acknowledges: "For the truth is that we know no more about Tatian's work than what Eusebius, who never saw it, knew."³ The only other writer who refers to it, Epiphanius, had

¹ Οὗτος καὶ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων καλούμενον συντέθεικεν εὐαγγέλιον, τὰς τε γενεαλογίας περικόψας, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα ἐν σπέρματός λαβὼ κατὰ δόγματα γεγενημένον τὸν κύριον δείκνυσιν. Ἐχρήσαντο δὲ τοῦτο οὐ μόνον οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου συμμορίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τοῖς ἀποστολικαῖς ἐπόμενοι δόγμασι, τὴν τῆς συνθήκης κακοουρίαν οὐκ ἔγνωκότες, ἀλλ' ἀπλούστερον ὡς συντόμῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ χρησάμενοι. Ἔκρον δὲ κατὰ πλείους ἢ διακοσίας βιβλούς τοιαύτας ἐν ταῖς παρ' ἡμῖν ἐκκλησίαις τετιμημένας, καὶ πάσας συναγωγῶν ἀπέθεμεν, καὶ τὰ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντίσθηλαγον εὐαγγέλια. Har. fab., i. 20.

² On the Canon, p. 281.

³ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 26.

not seen it either, and while showing that the title of Diatessaron had not been given to it by Tatian himself, he states the important fact that some called it the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Theodoret, the last writer who mentions it, and of whom Dr. Donaldson also says: "Theodoret's information cannot be depended upon,"¹ not only does not say that it is based upon our four Gospels, but, on the contrary, points out that Tatian's Gospel did not contain the genealogies and passages tracing the descent of Jesus through the race of David, which our Synoptics possess, and he so much condemned the mischievous design of the work that he confiscated the copies in circulation in his diocese as heretical. Canon Westcott's assertion that Theodoret regarded it as a compilation of our four Gospels is most unfounded and arbitrary. Omissions, as he himself points out, are natural to a Harmony, and conciseness certainly would be the last quality for which it could have been so highly prized, if every part of the four Gospels had been retained. The omission of the parts referred to, which are equally omitted from the canonical fourth Gospel, could not have been sufficient to merit the condemnation of the work as heretical, and had Tatian's Gospel not been different in various respects from our four Gospels, such treatment would have been totally unwarrantable. The statement, moreover, that in place of Tatian's Gospel, Theodoret "introduced the Gospels of the four Evangelists," seems to indicate clearly that the displaced Gospel was not a compilation from them, but different.

Speaking of the difficulty of distinguishing Tatian's Harmony from others which must, the writer supposes, have been composed in his time, Dr. Donaldson admits: "And then we must remember that the Harmony of Tatian was confounded with the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and it is not beyond the reach of possibility that Theodoret should have made some such mistake."² That is to say, that the only writer who refers to Tatian's Gospel who professes to have seen the work is not only "not to be depended on," but may actually have mistaken for it the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There is, therefore, no authority for saying that Tatian's Gospel was a harmony of four Gospels at all, and the name Diatessaron was not only not given by Tatian himself to the work, but was merely the usual foregone conclusion of the Christians of the third and fourth centuries, that everything in the shape of evangelical literature must be dependent on the Gospels adopted by the Church. Those, however, who called the Gospel used by Tatian the Gospel according to the Hebrews, must have read the work, and all that we know confirms their

¹ Donaldson, *Hist. of Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 25.

² *Ib.*, iii. p. 25.

en it.
called
which
ing to
t, but
t per-
ok in
wards
trehes,
nd in-
gain it
spel of
led so

Canon
nature
essaron
form it
y. The
surface
rroneous
he, like
ur Gos-
in part
al addi-
derived
red that
vaguest
l a cen-
composi-
had not
h regard
on West-
know no
er saw it.
nius, had

αγγελον,
τας λαβιδ
α δε τουτω
ροτολικας
αυτες, αλλ
δε παρω
ελληστικας
τετραρων

conclusion. The work was, in point of fact, found in wide circulation precisely in the places in which, earlier, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was more particularly current.¹ The singular fact that the earliest reference to Tatian's "Harmony," is made a century and a half after its supposed composition, that no writer before the fifth century had seen the work itself, indeed that only two writers before that period mention it at all, receives its natural explanation in the conclusion that Tatian did not actually compose any Harmony at all, but simply made use of the same Gospel as his master Justin Martyr, namely, the Gospel according to the Hebrews,² by which name his Gospel has been called by those best informed.

Although Theodoret, writing in the fifth century, says in the usual arbitrary manner of early Christian writers, that Tatian "excised" from his Gospel the genealogies and certain passages found in the Synoptics, he offers no proof of his assertion, and the utmost that can be received is that Tatian's Gospel did not contain them.³ Did he omit them or merely use a Gospel which never included them? The latter is the more probable conclusion. Now neither Justin's Gospel nor the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained the genealogies or references to the Son of David, and why, as Credner suggests, should Tatian have taken the trouble to prepare a Harmony with these omissions when he already found one such as he desired in Justin's Gospel? Tatian's Gospel, like that of his master Justin, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews, was different from, yet nearly related to, our canonical Gospels, and as we have already seen, Justin's Gospel, like Tatian's, was considered by many to be a harmony of our Gospels.⁴ No one seems to have seen Tatian's "Harmony," probably for the very simple reason that there was no such work, and the real Gospel used by him was that according to the Hebrews, as many distinctly and correctly called it. The name Diatessaron is first heard of in a work of the fourth century, when it is naturally given by people accustomed to trace every such work to our four Gospels, but as we have clearly seen, there is not up to the time of Tatian any evidence even of the existence of any one of our Gospels, and much less of a collection of the four. Here is an attempt to identify a supposed, but not demonstrated, harmony of Gospels whose separate existence has not been heard of. Even Dr. Westcott states that Tatian's Diatessaron "is apparently the

¹ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 445; cf. Westcott, On the Canon, p. 280, note 2.

² Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 443 ff.; Schmidt, Einl. N. T., i. p. 124 ff.; Schotten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 96 f.

³ Cf. Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., p. 121 f.; Hug, Einl. N. T., i. p. 42; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 35 f.

⁴ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 443 ff.

first recognition of a fourfold Gospel,"¹ but, as we have seen, that recognition emanates only from a writer of the fourth century who had not seen the work of which he speaks. No such modern ideas, based upon mere foregone conclusions, can be allowed to enter into a discussion regarding a work dating from the time of Tatian.

The fact that the work found by Theodoret in his diocese was used by orthodox Christians without consciousness of its supposed heterodoxy, is quite consistent with the fact that it was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which at one time was exclusively used by the Fathers, but in later times became gradually an object of suspicion and jealousy in the Church as our canonical Gospels took its place. The manner in which Theodoret dealt with Tatian's Gospel, or that "according to the Hebrews," recalls the treatment by Serapion of another form of the same work: the Gospel according to Peter. He found that work in circulation and greatly valued amongst the Christians of Rhossus, and allowed them peaceably to retain it for a time, until, alarmed at the Docetic heresy, he more closely examined the Gospel, and discovered in it what he considered heretical matter.² The Gospel according to the Hebrews, once probably used by all the Fathers, and which indeed narrowly missed a permanent place in the Canon of the Church, might well seem orthodox to the simple Christians of Cyrus, yet as different from, though closely related to, the Canonical Gospels, it would seem heretical to their Bishop. As different from the Gospels of the four evangelists, it was suppressed by Theodoret with perfect indifference as to whether it were called Tatian's Gospel or the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

It is obvious that there is no evidence whatever connecting Tatian's Gospel with those in our Canon. We know so little about that last work, indeed, that as Dr. Donaldson frankly admits, "we should not be able to identify it, even if it did come down to us, unless it told us something reliable about itself."³ Its earlier history is enveloped in obscurity, and as Canon Westcott observes: "The later history of the Diatessaron is involved in confusion."⁴ We have seen that in the sixth century it was described by Victor of Capua as Diapente, "by five," instead of "by four." It was also confounded with another Harmony written not long after Tatian's day by Ammonius of Alexandria (†243). Pionysius Bar-Salibi,⁵ a writer of the latter half of the twelfth century, mentions that the Syrian Ephrem, about the middle of the fourth century, wrote a commentary on the Diatessaron of Tatian, which

¹ On the Canon, p. 279.

³ Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 26.

⁵ *Jos. Sim. Assemani, Bibl. Orient.*, ii. p. 159 f.

² *Eusebius*, H. E., vi. 12.

⁴ On the Canon, p. 281.

Diatessaron commenced with the opening words of the fourth Gospel, "In the beginning was the word." The statement of Bar-Salibi, however, is contradicted by Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, Bishop of Tagrit, who says that Ephrem Syrus wrote his Commentary on the Diatessaron of Ammonius, and that this Diatessaron commenced with the words of the fourth Gospel: "In the beginning was the word."¹ The Syrian Ebed-Jesu (†1308) held Tatian and Ammonius to be one and the same person; and it is more than probable that Dionysius mistook the Harmony of Ammonius for that of Tatian. It is not necessary further to follow this discussion, for it in no way affects our question, and all critics are agreed that no important deduction can be derived from it.² We allude to the point for the mere sake of showing that up to the last we have no information which throws further light on the composition of Tatian's Gospel. All that we know of it,—what it did not contain—the places where it largely circulated, and the name by which it was called, identifies it with the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

For the rest, Tatian had no idea of a New Testament Canon, and evidently did not recognize as inspired, any Scriptures except those of the Old Testament.³ It is well known that the sect of the Eberatites made use of apocryphal Gospels until a much later period, and rejected the authority of the Apostle Paul, and although Tatian may have been acquainted with some of his Epistles, it is certain that he did not hold the Apostle in any honour, and permitted himself the liberty of altering his phraseology.⁴

2.

Dionysius of Corinth need not detain us long. Eusebius informs us that he was the author of seven Epistles addressed to various Christian communities, and also of a letter to Chrysophora, "a most faithful sister." Eusebius speaks of these writings as Catholic Epistles, and briefly characterizes each, but with the exception of a few short fragments preserved by him, none of

¹ *Assemani*, *Bibl. Orient.*, i. p. 57 f.

² *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 446 ff.; *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 19 ff.; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 25 f.; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 397; *Eichhorn*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 120 ann.; *Gieseler*, *Eutet. schr. Evv.*, p. 17; *Hug*, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 40 ff.; *Michaelis*, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 898; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 95 f.; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 281 f.

³ *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 47 f., p. 441; *Gesch. N. T. Kanons*, p. 21; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 98; *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 35.

⁴ *Epiphanius*, *Hær. xlvii.* 1; *Eusebius*, *H. E.*, iv. 29; *Hieron.*, *Præf. in Tit.*; *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 47, p. 438; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 97 f.; *Lardner*, *Credibility, &c.*, *Works*, ii. p. 138; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 278, 280, note 1.

these fruits of the "inspired industry" (ἐνθέου φιλοπονίας) of Dionysius are now extant.¹ These fragments are all from an Epistle said to have been addressed to Soter, Bishop of Rome, and give us a clue to the time at which they were written. The Bishopric of Soter is generally dated between A.D. 168—176,² during which years the Epistle must have been composed. It could not have been written, however, until after Dionysius became Bishop of Corinth in A.D. 170,³ and it was probably written some years after.⁴

No quotation from, or allusion to, any writing of the New Testament occurs in any of the fragments of the Epistles still extant; nor does Eusebius make mention of any such reference in the Epistles which have perished. As testimony for our Gospels, therefore, Dionysius is an absolute blank. Some expressions and statements, however, are put forward by apologists which we must examine. In the few lines which Tischendorf accords to Dionysius he refers to two of these. The first is an expression used, not by Dionysius himself, but by Eusebius, in speaking of the Epistles to the Churches at Amastris and at Pontus. Eusebius says that Dionysius adds some "expositions of Holy Scriptures" (γραφῶν θείων ἐξηγήσεις).⁵ There can be no doubt that this refers to the Old Testament only, and Tischendorf himself does not deny it.⁶

The second passage which Tischendorf⁷ points out, and which he claims with some other apologists as evidence of the actual existence of a New Testament Canon when Dionysius wrote, occurs in a fragment from the Epistle to Soter and the Romans which is preserved by Eusebius. It is as follows: "For the brethren having requested me to write Epistles, I wrote them. And the Apostles of the devil have filled these with tares, both taking away parts and adding others; for whom the woe is destined. It is not surprising then if some have recklessly ventured

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 23; Hieron., De Vir. Ill., 27; Grabe, Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 217 f.; Routh, Reliq. Sacre, i. p. 180 ff.

² Eusebius, H. E., iv. 19.

³ Anger, Synops. Ev. Proleg., p. xxxii.; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 479; Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 133; Hilgenfeld, Der Canon, p. 77; Reuss, Gesch. N. T. p. 290; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 107; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 18; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 164; cf. p. 37; Eusebius, in his Chronicon sets it in A.D. 171.

⁴ Anger places it between 173—177, Synops. Ev. Proleg., xxxii.; cf. Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 79. Jerome states that Dionysius flourished under M. Aurel. Verus and L. Aurel. Commodus. De Vir. Ill., 27.

⁵ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 23.

⁶ Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 18 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 38; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 217; Dr. Westcott's opinion is shown by his not even referring to the expression.

⁷ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 18 f.

to adulterate the Scriptures of the Lord when they have formed designs against these which are not of such importance.¹ Regarding this passage, Canon Westcott, with his usual boldness, says: "It is evident that the 'Scriptures of the Lord'—the writings of the New Testament—were at this time collected, that they were distinguished from other books, that they were jealously guarded, that they had been corrupted for heretical purposes."² Canon Westcott's imagination runs away with him. We have seen that there has not been a trace of any New Testament Canon in the writings of the Fathers before and during this age, and it is really discreditable that any critic, even though an "Apologist," acquainted with the history of the Canon should make a statement like this, and put such an interpretation upon the remark of Dionysius. Dr. Donaldson, with greater critical justice and reserve, remarks regarding the expression "Scriptures of the Lord:" "It is not easy to settle what this term means," although he adds his own personal opinion, "but most probably it refers to the Gospels as containing the sayings and doings of the Lord. It is not likely, as Lardner supposes, that such a term would be applied to the whole of the New Testament."³ The idea of our New Testament being referred to is simply preposterous, and although it is quite open to argument that Dionysius may have referred to evangelical works, it is obvious that there are no means of proving the fact, and much less that he referred to our Gospels specially; in fact the fragments of Dionysius present no evidence whatever of the existence of our Synoptics.

The term, however, does not of necessity apply to any Gospels or works of Christian history at all, and may with perfect propriety have indicated the Scriptures of the Old Testament. We find Justin Martyr complaining in the same spirit as Dionysius, through several chapters, that the Old Testament Scriptures, and more especially those relating to the Lord, had been adulterated, that parts had been taken away, and others added, with the intention of destroying or weakening their application to Christ.⁴ Justin's argument throughout is, that the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures refer to Christ, and Tryphon, his antagonist, the representative of Jewish opinion, is made to avow that the Jews not only wait for Christ, but, he adds: "We admit that all

¹ Ἐπιστολάς γάρ ἀδελφῶν ἀξιοῦσάντων με γράψαι, ἔγραψα. Καὶ ταύτας οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπόστολοι ἱεραίων γεγέμικαν, ἃ μὲν ἐξαιροῦντες, ἃ δὲ προστιθέντες. Οἷς τὸ οὐαὶ κεῖται. Οὐ βανιαστὸν ἄρα εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν ῥαδιουργῆσαι τινες ἐπιβέβληνται γραφῶν, ὅποτε καὶ ταῖς οἱ τοιαύταις ἐπιβεβουλευκάσι. Eusebius, H. E., iv. 23.

² On the Canon, p. 166.

³ Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 217.

⁴ Dial. c. Tryph., lxx. -lxxv.

the S
there
necte
we an
they
that
lation
Holy
Diony
the O
It is
the N
fact.

If
Gosp
ished
were
our G
used
comm
regar
Canon
prob
pseud
and a
Alex
doubt
class
first,
the th
Churc
whic
tion o
that i
the H
honou
Herm
perma
The F

1 Dia
2 Thi
3 Cf.
6 Cf.
9 Cf.
12 Th
fab., ii.

the Scriptures which you have cited refer to him." ¹ Not only, therefore, were the Scriptures of the Old Testament closely connected with their Lord by the Fathers, and, at the date of which we are treating, were the only "Holy Scriptures" recognised, but they made the same complaints which we meet with in Dionysius that these Scriptures were adulterated by omissions and interpolations.² The expression of Eusebius regarding "expositions of Holy or Divine Scriptures" (*γραφῶν θεῶν ἐξηγήσεις*) added by Dionysius, which applied to the Old Testament, tends to connect the Old Testament also with this term "Scriptures of the Lord." It is certain that had Dionysius said anything about books of the New Testament, Eusebius would as usual have stated the fact.

If the term "Scriptures of the Lord," however, be referred to Gospels, the difficulty of using it as evidence continues undiminished. We have no indication whatever what evangelical works were in the Bishop's mind. We have not yet met with any trace of our Gospels, whilst on the other hand we have seen other Gospels used by the Fathers, and in exclusive circulation amongst various communities, and even until much later times many works were regarded by them as divinely inspired which have no place in our Canon. The Gospel according to the Hebrews for instance was probably used by some at least of the Apostolic Fathers,³ by pseudo-Ignatius,⁴ Polycarp,⁵ Papias,⁶ Hegesippus,⁷ Justin Martyr,⁸ and at least employed along with our Gospels by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Jerome,⁹ whilst Eusebius states that some doubt was entertained whether it should be placed in the second class among the Antilegomena with the Apocalypse, or in the first, amongst the Homologumena.¹⁰ The fact that Serapion, in the third century allowed the Gospel of Peter to be used in the Church of Rhossus¹¹ shows at the same time the consideration in which it was held, and the incompleteness of the Canonical position of the New Testament writings. So does the circumstance that in the fifth century Theodoret found the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or Tatian's Gospel, widely circulated and held in honour amongst orthodox churches in his diocese.¹² The Pastor of Hermas, which was read in the Churches and nearly secured a permanent place in the Canon, was quoted as inspired by Irenæus.¹³ The Epistle of Barnabas was held in similar honour, and quoted

¹ Dial., lxxxix.

² This charge is made with insistence throughout the Clementine Homilies.

³ Cf. i. p. 223 ff., p. 230 ff.

⁴ Cf. i. p. 272 f.

⁵ Cf. i. p. 279.

⁶ Cf. i. p. 484.

⁷ Cf. i. p. 433 f.

⁸ Cf. i. p. 288 ff.

⁹ Cf. i. p. 422 f.

¹⁰ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 25.

¹¹ *Ib.*, vi. 12.

¹² Theodoret, Hær. fab., i. 20; cf. *Epiph.*, Hær., xlv. 1; cf. *Theodoret*, Hær. fab., ii. 2.

¹³ Adv. Hær., iv. 20, § 2; *Euseb.*, H. E., v. 8; cf. iii. 3.

as inspired by Clement of Alexandria¹ and by Origen,² as was likewise the Epistle of the Roman Clement. The Apocalypse of Peter was included by Clement of Alexandria in his account of the Canonical Scriptures and those which are disputed, such as the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic Epistles,³ and it stands side by side with the Apocalypse of John in the Canon of Muratori, being long after publicly read in the Churches of Palestine.⁴ Tischendorf indeed conjectures that a blank in the Codex Sinaiticus after the New Testament was formerly filled by it. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Lactantius quote the Sibylline books as the Word of God, and pay similiar honour to the Book of Hystaspes.⁵ So great indeed was the consideration and use of the Sibylline Books in the Church of the second and third centuries, that Christians from that fact were nicknamed Sibyllists.⁶ It is unnecessary to multiply, as might so easily be done, these illustrations; it is too well known that a vast number of Gospels and similar works which have been excluded from the Canon were held in the deepest veneration by the Church in the second century, to which the words of Dionysius may apply. So vague and indefinite an expression at any rate is useless as evidence for the existence of our Canonical Gospels.

Canon Westcott's deduction from the words of Dionysius, that not only were the writings of the New Testament already collected, but that they were "jealously guarded," is imaginative indeed. It is much and devoutly to be wished that they had been as carefully guarded as he supposes, even at a much later period, but it is well known that this was not the case, and that numerous interpolations have been introduced into the text. The whole history of the Canon and of Christian literature in the second and third centuries displays the most deplorable carelessness and want of critical judgment on the part of the Fathers. Whatever was considered as conducive to Christian edification was blindly adopted by them, and a vast number of works were launched into circulation and falsely ascribed to Apostles and others likely to secure for them greater consideration. Such pious fraud was rarely suspected, still more rarely detected in the early ages of Christianity, and several of such pseudographs have secured a place in our New Testament. The words of Dionysius need not receive any

¹ Strom., ii. 8, iv. 17.

³ Eusebius, H. E., vi. 14.

⁵ Justin, Apol., i. 20, 44; Clem. Al., Strom., vi. 5, §§ 42, 43; Lactantius, Instit. Div., i. 6, 7, vii. 15, 19. Clement of Alexandria quotes with perfect faith and seriousness some apocryphal book, in which, he says, the Apostle Paul recommends the Hellenic books, the Sibyl and the books of Hystaspes, as giving notably clear prophetic descriptions of the Son of God. Strom., vi. 5, § 42, 43.

⁶ Origen, Contra Cels., v. 6; cf. vii. 53.

² Philocal., 18.

⁴ Sozom., H. E., vii. 19.

widen
clear
that
which
ascrib
Epist
the so
we
lical
and
Paul
instan
which
Fathe
eredu
mista
Acto
not th
lack
other
Diony
or to
notin
eredit
Bel
Tisch
our fi
just q
Gospo
"the
suppo
sion v
permi
the ex
of wh
ing to
value.
Con
affirm
to the
bered

¹ The
Book of
Culte
2. Tes

wider signification than a reference to well-known Epistles. It is clear from the words of the Apostle Paul in 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17, that his Epistles were falsified, and setting aside some of those which bear his name in our Canon, spurious Epistles were long ascribed to him, such as the Epistle to the Laodiceans and a third Epistle to the Corinthians. We need not do more than allude to the second Epistle falsely bearing the name of Clement of Rome, as well as the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the spurious letters of Ignatius, the letters and legends of Abgarus quoted by Eusebius, and the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, in addition to others already pointed out, as instances of the wholesale falsification of that period, many of which gross forgeries were at once accepted as genuine by the Fathers, so slight was their critical faculty and so ready their credulity.¹ In one case the Church punished the author who, from mistaken zeal for the honour of the Apostle Paul, fabricated the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ* in his name,² but the forged production was not the less made use of in the Church. There was, therefore, no lack of falsification and adulteration of works of Apostles and others of greater note than himself to warrant the remark of Dionysius, without any forced application of it to our Gospels or to a New Testament Canon, the existence of which there is nothing to substantiate, but on the contrary every reason to discredit.

Before leaving this passage we may add that although even Tischendorf does not, Canon Westcott does find in it references to our first Synoptic, and to the Apocalypse. "The short fragment just quoted," he says, "contains two obvious allusions, one to the Gospel of St. Matthew, and one to the Apocalypse."³ The words: "the Apostles of the devil have filled these with tares," are, he supposes, an allusion to Matt. xiii. 24 ff. But even if the expression were an echo of the Parable of the Wheat and Tares, it is not permissible to refer it in this arbitrary way to our first Gospel, to the exclusion of the numerous other works which existed, many of which doubtless contained it, and notably the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Obviously the words have no evidential value.

Continuing his previous assertions, however, Canon Westcott affirms with equal boldness: "The allusion in the last clause"—to the "Scriptures of the Lord"—"will be clear when it is remembered that Dionysius warred against the heresy of Marcion and

¹ The Epistle of Jude quotes as genuine the Assumption of Moses, and also the Book of Enoch, and the defence of the authenticity of the latter by Tertullian (*de Cultu fem.*, i. 3) will not be forgotten.

² Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 17.

³ On the Canon, p. 167.

defended the rule of truth" (*παρίστασθαι κανόνι ἀλ.*).¹ Tischendorf, who is ready enough to strain every expression into evidence, recognizes too well that this is not capable of such an interpretation. Dr. Westcott omits to mention that the words, moreover, are not used by Dionysius at all, but simply proceed from Eusebius.² Dr. Donaldson distinctly states the fact that, "there is no reference to the Bible in the words of Eusebius: he defends the rule of the truth"³ (*τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας παρίσταται κανόνι*).

There is only one other point to mention. Canon Westcott refers to the passage in the Epistle of Dionysius, which has already been quoted in this work, regarding the reading of Christian writings in churches. "To-day," he writes to Soter, "we have kept the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your Epistle, from the reading of which we shall ever derive admonition, as we do from the former one written to us by Clement."⁴ It is evident that there was no idea, in selecting the works to be read at the weekly assembly of Christians, of any Canon of a New Testament. We here learn that the Epistles of Clement and of Soter were habitually read, and while we hear of this, and of similar readings of Justin's "Memoirs of the Apostles,"⁵ of the Pastor of Hermas,⁶ of the Apocalypse of Peter,⁷ and other apocryphal works, we do not at the same time hear of the public reading of our Gospels.

¹ On the Canon, p. 166 f.

² Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 217 f.

³ Euseb., H. E., iv. 23.

⁴ Euseb., H. E., iii. 3; Hieron., De Vir. ill., 10.

⁵ Sozom., H. E., vii. 9.

⁶ H. E., iv. 23.

⁷ Justin, Apol., i. 67.

MELP

WE
Sardi
of his
cited
zeal,
eviden
of Me
his ap
(μετὰ τ
mitted
Can
bius, M
lected
are sim
taken.
him 't
concern
desired
'havin
spot w
learned
list of
the Old
a writt
a famil
The "f
ing the
amazing
plication
posed a
Christia

¹ H. E.
² Euseb.
p. 63; La
n. p. 797.
cl. Donald
³ On the

CHAPTER IX.

MELITO OF SARDIS—CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS—ATHENAGORAS—THE EPISTLE OF VIENNE AND LYONS.

WE might here altogether have passed over Melito, Bishop of Sardis in Lydia, had it not been for the use of certain fragments of his writings made by Canon Westcott. Melito, naturally, is not cited by Tischendorf at all, but the English Apologist, with greater zeal, we think, than critical discretion, forces him into service as evidence for the Gospels and a New Testament Canon. The date of Melito, it is generally agreed, falls after A.D. 176, a phrase in his apology presented to Marcus Antoninus preserved in Eusebius¹ (*μετὰ τοῦ παυλοῦ*) indicating that Commodus had already been admitted to a share of the Government.²

Canon Westcott affirms that, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, Melito speaks of the books of the New Testament in a collected form. He says: "The words of Melito on the other hand are simple and casual, and yet their meaning can scarcely be mistaken. He writes to Onesimus, a fellow-Christian who had urged him 'to make selections for him from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and the faith generally, and furthermore desired to learn the accurate account of the Old (*παλαιῶν*) Books;' 'having gone therefore to the East,' Melito says, 'and reached the spot where [each thing] was preached and done, and having learned accurately the Books of the Old Testament, I have sent a list of them.' The mention of 'the Old Books'—'the Books of the Old Testament,' naturally implies a definite New Testament, a written antitype to the Old; and the form of language implies a familiar recognition of its contents."³ This is truly astonishing! The "form of language" can only refer to the words: "concerning the Saviour and the faith generally," which must have an amazing fulness of meaning to convey to Canon Westcott the implication of a "familiar recognition" of the contents of a supposed already collected New Testament, seeing that a simple Christian, not to say a Bishop, might at least know of a Saviour

¹ H. E., iv. 26.

² *Barage*, Ann. Polit. Eccles., 177, § 3; *Dupin*, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccl., i. p. 63; *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 147; *Tillemont*, Mém. Hist. Eccl., ii. p. 707, note 1 f.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 193, note 2; *Wocg*, De Melitone, § 5; cf. *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 229.

³ On the Canon, p. 193.

and the faith generally from the oral preaching of the Gospel, from a single Epistle of Paul, or from any of the πολλὰ of Luke. This reasoning forms a worthy pendant to his argument that because Melito speaks of the books of the Old Testament he implies the existence of a definite collected New Testament. Such an assertion is calculated to mislead a large class of readers.¹

The fragment of Melito is as follows: "Melito to his brother Onesimus, greeting. As thou hast frequently desired in thy zeal for the word (λόγος) to have extracts made for thee, both from the law and the prophets concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; nay, more, hast wished to learn the exact statement of the old books (παλαιῶν βιβλίων), how many they are and what is their order, I have earnestly endeavoured to accomplish this, knowing thy zeal concerning the faith, and thy desire to be informed concerning the word (λόγος), and especially that thou preferrest these matters to all others from love towards God, striving to gain eternal salvation. Having, therefore, gone to the East, and reached the place where this was preached and done, and having accurately ascertained the books of the Old Testament (τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία), I have, subjoined, sent a list of them unto thee, of which these are the names"—then follows a list of the books of the Old Testament, omitting, however, Esther. He then concludes with the words: "Of these I have made the extracts dividing them into six books."²

Canon Westcott's assertion that the expression "Old Books," "Books of the Old Testament," involves here by antithesis a definite *written* New Testament, requires us to say a few words as to the name of "Testament" as applied to both divisions of the Bible. It is of course well known that this word came into use originally from the translation of the Hebrew word "covenant" (בְּרִית), or compact made between God and the Israelites in the Septuagint version, by the Greek word Διαθήκη, which in the same sense also means a will or Testament,⁴ and that word is used throughout the New Testament.⁵ The Vulgate translation, *testamentum*,

¹ It must be said, however, that Canon Westcott merely follows and exaggerates Lardner here, who says: "From this passage I would conclude that there was then also a volume or collection of books called the New Testament, containing the writings of Apostles and Apostolic men, but we cannot from hence infer the names or the exact number of those books." *Credibility, &c.*, Works, ii. p. 148.

² *Eusebius*, H. E., iv. 26.

³ Cf. *Exod.* xxiv. 7.

⁴ The legal sense of διαθήκη as a Will or Testament is distinctly intended in *Heb.* ix. 16. "For where a Testament (διαθήκη) is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator" (διαθεμένον). The same word διαθήκη is employed throughout the whole passage. *Heb.* ix. 15-20.

⁵ *2 Cor.* iii. 14; *Heb.* viii. 6-13, xii. 24; *Rom.* ix. 4, xi. 26-28; *Gal.* iii. 14-17; *Ephes.* ii. 12, &c., &c.

stead of retaining the original Hebrew signification, translated the word in the Gospels and Epistles "*Testamentum*," and ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη became "*Vetus Testamentum*," instead of "*Vetus Fœdus*," and whenever the word occurs in the English version it is almost invariably rendered "*Testament*" instead of covenant. The expression "*Book of the Covenant*," or "*Testament*," βιβλος τῆς διαθήκης, frequently occurs in the LXX version of the Old Testament and its Apocrypha,¹ and in Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34,² the prophet speaks of making a "*new covenant*" (καινὴ διαθήκη) with the house of Israel, which is indeed quoted in Hebrews viii. 8. It is the doctrinal idea of the new covenant, through Christ confirming the former one made to the Israelites, which has led to the distinction of the Old and New Testaments. Generally the Old Testament was, in the first ages of Christianity, indicated by the simple expressions "*The Books*" (τὰ βιβλία), "*Holy Scriptures*" (τὰ γράμματα,³ or γράφαί ἁγία),⁴ or "*The Scriptures*" (αἱ γράφαί)⁵ but the preparation for the distinction of "*Old Testament*" began very early in the development of the doctrinal idea of the New Testament of Christ, before there was any part of the New Testament books written at all. The expression "*New Testament*," derived thus antithetically from the "*Old Testament*," occurs constantly throughout the second part of the Bible. In the Epistle to the Hebrews viii. 6-13, the Mosaic dispensation is contrasted with the Christian, and Jesus is called the Mediator of a better Testament (διαθήκη).⁶ The first Testament not being faultless, is replaced by the second, and the writer quotes the passage from Jeremiah to which we have referred regarding a New Testament, winding up his argument with the words, v. 13: "In that he saith a new (Testament) he hath made the first old." Again, in our first Gospel, during the Last Supper, Jesus is represented as saying: "This is my blood of the New Testament" (τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης);⁷ and in Luke he says: "This cup is the New Testament (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) in my blood."⁸ There is, therefore, a very distinct reference made to the two Testaments as "*New*" and "*Old*," and in speaking of the books of the Law and the Prophets as the "*Old Books*" and "*Books of the Old Testament*," after the general acceptance of the Gospel of Jesus as the New Testament or Covenant, there was no antithetical implication whatever of a written New Testament, but a mere reference to the doctrinal idea. We might multiply illustrations showing

¹ Cf. Exod. xxiv. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 2; 1 Maccab. i. 57; Sirach, xxiv. 23, &c., &c.

² In the Septuagint version, xxxviii. 31-34.

³ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

⁴ Rom. i. 2.

⁵ Cf. ix. 15, xii. 24.

⁷ Matt. xxvi. 28.

⁶ Matt. xxii. 29.

⁸ Luke xxii. 20.

how ever-present to the mind of the early Church was the contrast of the Mosaic and Christian Covenants as Old and New. Two more we may venture to point out. In Romans ix. 4, and Gal. iv. 24, the two Testaments or Covenants (αἱ δύο διαθήκαι), typified by Sinai and the heavenly Jerusalem, are discussed, and the superiority of the latter asserted. There is, however, a passage, still more clear and decisive. Paul says in 2 Corinthians iii. 6: "Who also (God) made us sufficient to be ministers of the New Testament (καυῆς διαθήκης) not of the letter, but of the spirit" (οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος). Why does not Canon Westcott boldly claim this as evidence of a definite written New Testament, when not only is there reference to the name, but a distinction drawn between the letter and the spirit of it, from which an apologist might make a telling argument? But proceeding to contrast the glory of the New with the Old dispensation, the Apostle, in reference to the veil with which Moses covered his face, says: "But their understandings were hardened; for until this very day remaineth the same veil in the reading of the Old Testament" (ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης);¹ and as if to make the matter still clearer he repeats in the next verse: "But even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil lieth upon their heart." Now here the actual reading of the *Old* Testament (παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) is distinctly mentioned, and the expression, quite as aptly as that of Melito, "implies a definite New Testament, a written anti-type to the Old," but even Canon Westcott would not dare to suggest that when the second Epistle to the Corinthians was composed, there was a "definite written New Testament" in existence. This conclusively shows that the whole argument from Melito's mention of the books of the Old Testament is absolutely groundless.

On the contrary, Canon Westcott should know very well that the first general designation for the New Testament collection was "The Gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελικόν, εὐαγγελικά) and "The Apostle" (ἀπόστολος, ἀποστολικόν, ἀποστολικά), for the two portions of the collection, in contrast with the divisions of the Old Testament, the Law and the Prophets (ὁ νόμος, οἱ προφῆται),² and the name New Testament occurs for the very first time in the third century, when Tertullian called the collection of Christian Scrip-

¹ Verse 14.

² Cf. *Irenæus*, Adv. Hæc., i. 3, § 6; *Clemens Al.*, Strom., v. 5, § 31; *Tertullian*, De Præscr., 36; Adv. Marc., iv. 2, Apolog., 18; *Origen*, Hom. xix. in Jerem. T. iii. p. 364. The Canon of Muratori says that the Pastor of Hermas can neither be classed "inter Prophetas neque inter Apostolos." In a translation of the *Clavis*, a spurious work attributed to Melito himself—and Dr. Westcott admits it to be spurious (p. 198, note 1)—the Gospels are referred to simply by the formula "in evangelio," and the Epistles generally "in apostolo."

tures *Novum Instrumentum* and *Novum Testamentum*.¹ The term ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη is not, so far as we are aware, applied in the Greek to the "New Testament" collection in any earlier work than Origen's *De Principiis*, iv. 1. It was only in the second half of the third century that the double designation τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος was generally abandoned.²

As to the evidence for a New Testament Canon, which Dr. Westcott supposes he gains by his unfounded inference from Melito's expression, we may judge of its value from the fact that he himself, like Lardner, admits: "But there is little evidence in the fragment of Melito to show what writings he would have included in the new collection."³ Little evidence? There is none at all.

There is, however, one singular and instructive point in this fragment to which Canon Westcott does not in any way refer, but which well merits attention as illustrating the state of religious knowledge at that time, and, by analogy, giving a glimpse of the difficulties which beset early Christian literature. We are told by Melito that Onesimus had frequently urged him to give him exact information as to the number and order of the books of the Old Testament, and to have extracts made for him from them concerning the Saviour and the faith. Now it is apparent that Melito, though a Bishop, was not able to give the desired information regarding the number and order of the books of the Old Testament himself, but that he had to make a journey to collect it. If this was the extent of knowledge possessed by the Bishop of Sardis of what was to the Fathers the only Holy Scripture, how ignorant his flock must have been, and how unfitted, both, to form any critical judgment as to the connection of Christianity with the Mosaic dispensation. The formation of a Christian Canon at a period when such ignorance was not only possible but generally prevailed, and when the zeal of believers led to the composition of such a mass of pseudonymic and other literature, in which every consideration of correctness and truth was subordinated to a childish desire for edification, must have been slow indeed and uncertain; and in such an age fortuitous circumstances must have mainly led to the canonization or actual loss of many a work. So far from affording any evidence of the ex-

¹ Adv. Prax., 15, 20; Adv. Marc., iv. 1. He says in the latter place "instrumenti," referring to Old and New Testaments, "vel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti."

² Bertholdt, Einl. A. u. N. Test., i. p. 22; Credner, Gesch. N. T., p. 23 ff.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., iv. p. 25 ff., p. 38 ff.; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 4 f.; Reithmeier, Einl. N. B., 1852, p. 22 ff.; Scholz, Einl. H. S. des A. u. N. T., 1845, i. p. 264; De Wette, Lehrb. Einl. A. T., 1852, p. 8 ff.

³ On the Canon, p. 194.

istence of a New Testament Canon, the fragment of Melito only shows the ignorance of the Bishop of Sardis as to the Canon even of the Old Testament.

We have not yet finished with Melito in connection with Canon Westcott, however, and it is necessary to follow him further in order fully to appreciate the nature of the evidence for the New Testament Canon, which, in default of better, he is obliged to offer. Eusebius gives what he evidently considers a complete list of the works of Melito, and in addition to the fragment already quoted, he extracts a brief passage from Melito's work on the Passion, and some much longer quotations from his Apology, to which we have in passing referred.¹ With these exceptions, none of Melito's writings are now extant. Dr. Cureton, however, has published a Syriac version, with translation, of a so-called "Oration of Meliton, the Philosopher, who was in the presence of Antoninus Caesar," together with five other fragments attributed to Melito.² With regard to this Syriac Oration Canon Westcott says: "Though if it be entire, it is not the Apology with which Eusebius was acquainted, the general character of the writing leads to the belief that it is a genuine book of Melito of Sardis;"³ and he proceeds to treat it as authentic. In the first place, we have so little of Melito's genuine compositions extant, that it is hazardous indeed to draw any positive deduction from the "character of the writing." Cureton, Bunsen, and others maintain that this Apology is not a fragment, and it cannot be the work mentioned by Eusebius, for it does not contain the quotations from the authentic Orations which he has preserved, and which are considerable. It is, however, clear from the substance of the composition that it cannot have been spoken before the Emperor,⁴ and moreover, it has in no way the character of an "Apology," for there is not a single word in it about either Christianity or Christians. There is every reason to believe that it is not a genuine work of Melito.⁵ There is no ground whatever for supposing that he wrote two Apologies, nor is this ascribed to him upon any other ground than the inscription of an unknown Syriac writer. This, however, is not the only spurious work attributed to Melito. Of this work Canon Westcott says: "Like other Apologies, this oration contains only indirect references to the Christian Scriptures. The allusions in it to the Gospels are

¹ *Euseb.*, H. E., iv. 26.

² *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. 41—56; *Pitra*, *Spicil. Solesm.*, 1855, ii. Proleg. xxxviii ff.

³ On the Canon, p. 194.

⁴ *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 234 f.

⁵ *Donaldson*, *ib.*, iii. p. 234; *Freppel*, *Les Apologistes*, 2 ser. p. 374 f.; *Donaldson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 478.

extremely rare, and except so far as they show the influence of St. John's writings, of no special interest."¹ It would have been more correct to have said that there are no allusions in it to the Gospels at all.

Canon Westcott is somewhat enthusiastic in speaking of Melito and his literary activity as evinced in the titles of his works recorded by Eusebius, and he quotes with great zest a fragment, said to be from a treatise "On Faith," amongst these Syriac remains, and which he considers to be "a very striking expansion of the early historic creed of the Church."² As usual, we shall give the entire fragment: "We have made collections from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may prove to your love that he is perfect Reason, the Word of God: who was begotten before the light; who was Creator together with the Father; who was the Fashioner of man; who was all in all; who among the Patriarchs was Patriarch; who in the Law was the Law; among the Priests chief Priest; among Kings Governor; among the Prophets the Prophet; among the Angels Archangel; in the voice the Word; among Spirits Spirit; in the Father the Son; in God God the King for ever and ever. For this was he who was Pilot to Noah; who conducted Abraham; who was bound with Isaac; who was in exile with Jacob; who was sold with Joseph; who was captain with Moses; who was the Divider of the inheritance with Jesus the son of Nun; who in David and the Prophets foretold his own sufferings; who was incarnate in the Virgin; who was born at Bethlehem; who was wrapped in swaddling clothes in the manger; who was seen of shepherds; who was glorified of angels; who was worshipped by the Magi; who was pointed out by John; who assembled the Apostles; who preached the kingdom; who healed the maimed; who gave light to the blind; who raised the dead; who appeared in the Temple; who was not believed by the people; who was betrayed by Judas; who was laid hold of by the Priests; who was condemned by Pilate; who was pierced in the flesh; who was hanged upon the tree; who was buried in the earth; who rose from the dead; who appeared to the Apostles; who ascended to heaven; who sitteth on the right hand of the Father; who is the Rest of those who are departed; the Recoverer of those who are lost; the Light of those who are in darkness; the Deliverer of those who are captives; the Finder of those who have gone astray; the Refuge of the afflicted; the Bridegroom of the Church; the Charioteer of the Cherubim; the Captain of the Angels; God who is of God; the Son

¹ On the Canon, p. 194.

² On the Canon, p. 196.

who is of the Father; Jesus Christ, the King for ever and ever. Amen."¹

Canon Westcott commences his commentary upon this passage with the remark: "No writer could state the fundamental truths of Christianity more unhesitatingly, or quote the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments with more perfect confidence."² We need not do more than remark that there is not a single quotation in the fragment, and that there is not a single one of the references to Gospel history or to ecclesiastical dogmas which might not have been derived from the Epistles of Paul, from any of the forms of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Protevangelium of James, or from many another apocryphal Gospel, or the oral teaching of the Church. It is singular, however, that the only hint which Canon Westcott gives of the more than doubtful authenticity of this fragment consists of the introductory remark, after alluding to the titles of his genuine and supposititious writings: "Of these multifarious writings very few fragments remain in the original Greek, but the general tone of them is so decided in its theological character as to go far to establish the genuineness of those which are preserved in the Syriac translation."³

Now, the fragment "On Faith" which has just been quoted is one of the five Syriac pieces of Dr. Cureton to which we have referred, and which even Apologists agree "cannot be regarded as genuine."⁴ It is well known that there were many writers in the early Church bearing the names of Melito and Miletus or Meletius,⁵ which were frequently confounded. Of these five Syriac fragments one bears the superscription: "Of Meliton, Bishop of the city of Attica," and another, "Of the holy Meliton, Bishop of Utica," and Cureton himself evidently leant to the opinion that they are not by our Melito, but by a Meletius or Melitius, Bishop of Sebastopolis in Pontus.⁶ The third fragment is said to be taken from a discourse "On the Cross," which is unknown to Eusebius, and from its doctrinal peculiarities was probably written after his time.⁷ Another fragment purports to be from a work on the "Soul and Body;" and the last one from the treatise "On Faith," which we are discussing. The last two works are mentioned by Eusebius, but these fragments, besides coming in such suspicious company, must for every reason be pronounced spurious.⁸ They have

¹ Cureton, *Spicil. Syriacum*, p. 53 f.; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 196 f.; *Pitra*, *Spicil. Solesm.*, ii. *Proleg.* lix. f.

² *On the Canon*, p. 197.

³ *On the Canon*, p. 196.

⁴ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 236.

⁵ Woog, *Dissert.*, i. § 2; cf. Donaldson, *ib.*, iii. p. 234, 236; Cureton, *Spicil. Syriac.*, p. 96 f.

⁶ *Spicil. Syriac.*, p. 96 f.

⁷ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 237.

⁸ *Ib.*, iii. p. 227.

in fact no attestation whatever except that of the Syriac translator, who is unknown, and which therefore is worthless, and, on the other hand, the whole style and thought of the fragments are unlike anything else of Melito's time, and clearly indicate a later stage of theological development.¹ Moreover, in the Mechitarist Library at Venice there is a shorter version of the same passage in a Syriac MS., and an Armenian version of the extract is given above, in both of which the passage is distinctly ascribed to Irenæus.² Besides the Oration and the five Syriac fragments, we have other two works extant falsely attributed to Melito, one, "De Transitu Virginis Mariæ," describing the miraculous presence of the Apostles at the death of Mary;³ and the other, "De Actibus Joannis Apostoli," relates the history of miracles performed by the Apostle John. Both are universally admitted to be spurious,⁴ as are a few other fragments also bearing his name. Melito did not escape from the falsification to which many of his more distinguished predecessors and contemporaries were victims, through the literary activity and unscrupulous religious zeal of the first three or four centuries of our era.

2.

Very little is known regarding Claudius Apollinaris, to whom we must now for a moment turn. Eusebius informs us that he was Bishop of Hierapolis,⁵ and in this he is supported by the fragment of a letter of Serapion Bishop of Antioch preserved to us by him, which refers to Apollinaris as the "most blessed."⁶ Tischendorf, without any precise date, sets him down as contemporary with Tatian and Theophilus (whom he calculates to have written his work addressed to Autolyceus about A.D. 180—181).⁷ Eusebius⁸ mentions that, like his somewhat earlier contemporary Melito of Sardis, Apollinaris presented an "Apology" to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, and he gives us further materials for a date⁹ by stating that Claudius Apollinaris, probably in his Apology, refers to the miracle of the "Thundering Legion," which

¹ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 236.

² They are given by *Pitra*, *Spicil. Solesm.*, i. p. 3 ff.

³ It is worthy of remark that the Virgin is introduced into all these fragments in a manner quite foreign to the period at which Melito lived.

⁴ Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 238; *Woog*, *Dissert.*, ii. § 25; *Pitra*, *Spicil. Solesm.*, ii. Proleg. xxxi. f.

⁵ H. E., iv. 21, 26.

⁶ *Ib.*, v. 19.

⁷ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16, ann. 1.

⁸ H. E., iv. 26, 27; cf. *Hieron.*, *De Vir.* III., 26.

⁹ Eusebius himself sets him down in his *Chronicle* as flourishing in the eleventh year of Marcus, or A.D. 171, a year later than he dates Melito.

is said to have occurred during the war of Marcus Antoninus against the Marcomanni in A.D. 174.¹ The date of his writings, may, therefore, with moderation be fixed between A.D. 177-180.²

Eusebius and others mention many works composed by him,³ none of which, however, are extant; and we have only to deal with two brief fragments in connection with the Paschal controversy, which are ascribed to Apollinaris in the Paschal Chronicle of Alexandria. This controversy, as to the day upon which the Christian Passover should be celebrated, broke out about A.D. 170, and long continued to divide the Church.⁴ In the preface to the Paschal Chronicle, a work of the seventh century, the unknown chronicler says: "Now even Apollinaris, the most holy Bishop of Hierapolis, in Asia, who lived near apostolic times, taught the like things in his work on the Passover, saying thus: 'There are some, however, who through ignorance raise contentions regarding these matters in a way which should be pardoned, for ignorance does not admit of accusation, but requires instruction. And they say that the Lord, together with his disciples, ate the lamb (τὸ πρόβατον) on the 14th Nisan, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread. And they state (διηγούνται) that Matthew says precisely what they have understood; hence their understanding of it is at variance with the law, and according to them the Gospels seem to contradict each other.'"⁵ The last sentence is interpreted as pointing out that

¹ Eusebius, H. E., v. 5; Mosheim, Inst. Hist. Eccles., Book i. cent. ii. part i. ch. i. § 9. Apollinaris states that in consequence of this miracle, the Emperor had bestowed upon the Legion the name of the "Thundering Legion." We cannot here discuss this subject, but the whole story illustrates the rapidity with which a fiction is magnified into truth by religious zeal, and is surrounded by false circumstantial evidence. Cf. Tertullian, Apol. 5, ad Scapulam, 4; Dion Cassius, lib. 55; Scaliger, Animadv. in Euseb., p. 223 f.; cf. Donathleon, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 241 f.

² Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 356; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 240; Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 294; Newman, Essays on Miracles, 1870, p. 241; Scholten, Das Evang. n. Johann., 1867, p. 14 ff.; Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 106; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 164, p. 31 f.

³ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 27; cf. 26, v. 19; Hieron., Epist. ad Magnum Ep., 83; Theodoret, Har. Fab., ii. 21, iii. 2; Photius, Biblioth. Cod., 14.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, Der Paschastreit, p. 250 ff.; Die Evangelien, p. 344 ff.; Baur, K. G. drei erst. Jahrh., p. 156 ff.; Unters. kan. Evv., p. 340 f., p. 356 f.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 31 f.

⁵ Καὶ Ἀπολινάριος δὲ ὁ ὀσιώτατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱεραπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας, ὁ ἐγγὺς τῶν ἀποστολικῶν χρόνων γεγωνῶς, ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα λόγῳ τὰ παραπληρσία ἐδίδαξε, λέγων οὕτως: Εἰδὼ τοίνυν οἱ δι' ἄγνοιαν φιλονεικοῦσι περὶ τούτων, συγγνωστὸν πρᾶγμα πεπονημένον ἄγνοια γὰρ οὐ κατηγορίαν ἀναδέχεται, ἀλλὰ διδαχῆς προσβέβηται. καὶ λέγουσιν ὅτι τῇ 14' τὸ πρόβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ Κύριος· τῇ δὲ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων αὐτὸς ἔπαθεν, καὶ διηγούνται Ματθαῖον οὕτω λέγειν ὡς νενοήκασιν· θύειν ἀδελφῶνός τε νόμος ἢ νόμοις αὐτῶν καὶ σταδίζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια. Prefat. Chron. Pasch. sive Alex. ed. Ducange, p. 6; Routh, Reliq. Sacra., i. p. 160.

the first synoptic Gospel is supposed to be at variance with our fourth Gospel. This fragment is claimed by Tischendorf¹ and others as evidence of the general acceptance at that time both of the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel. Canon Westcott, with obvious exaggeration, says: "The Gospels are evidently quoted as books certainly known and recognized; their authority is placed on the same footing as the Old Testament."² The Gospels are referred to merely for the settlement of the historical fact as to the day on which the last Passover had been eaten, a narrative of which they contained.

There are, however, very grave reasons for doubting the authenticity of the two fragments ascribed to Apollinaris, and we must mention that these doubts are much less those of German critics, who, on the whole, either do not raise the question at all, or hastily dispose of it, than doubts entertained by the most orthodox Apologists, who see little ground for accepting them as genuine.³ Eusebius, who gives a catalogue of the works of Apollinaris which had reached him,⁴ was evidently not acquainted with any writing of Apollinaris on the Passover. It is argued, however, that "there is not any sufficient ground for doubting the genuineness of these fragments 'On Easter,' in the fact that Eusebius mentions no such book by Apollinaris."⁵ It is quite true that Eusebius does not pretend to give a complete list of these works, but merely says that there are many preserved by many, and that he mentions those with which he had met.⁶ At the same time, entering with great interest, as he does, into the Paschal Controversy, and acquainted with the principal writings on the subject,⁷ it would indeed have been strange had he not met with the work itself, or at least with some notice of it in the works of others. That he knew nothing of it, however, either directly or indirectly, is clear, for he states that "the Churches of all Asia"⁸ kept the 14th Nisan, and Apollinaris as an eminent exception must have held a prominent position, and must have been quoted in most controversial works on the subject, had he

We need not quote the second fragment here, as it has nothing to do with our Synoptics; but, indeed, neither of the passages being by Apollinaris, it is scarcely necessary to refer to the other at all.

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 18.

² On the Canon, p. 199.

³ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 247 f.; Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 296; Tillemont, Mém. Hist. Eccles., ii. p. iii., p. 91; Routh, Reliq. Sacrae., i. p. 167 f.

⁴ H. E., iv. 27.

⁵ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 198, note 3; cf. Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 340 f. This is the only remark which Dr. Westcott makes as to any doubt of the authenticity of these fragments. Tischendorf does not mention a doubt at all.

⁶ Τοῦ δὲ Ἀπολλινάριου πολλῶν παρὰ πολλοῖς σωζομένων, τὰ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθόντα ἐστὶ τὰδε: κ.τ.λ. H. E., iv. 27.

⁷ Eusebius, H. E., v. 23, 24.

⁸ *Ib.*, v. 23.

really written anything on the subject or taken any part in the discussion. Eusebius was acquainted with the work of Melito on the Passover, and quotes it,¹ which must have referred to his contemporary and antagonist,² Apollinaris, had he written such a work as this fragment denotes. Not only, however, does Eusebius know nothing of his having composed such a work, but neither do Theodoret,³ Jerome,⁴ Photius,⁵ nor other writers who enumerate other of his works, nor is he mentioned in any way by Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, nor by any of those who took part in the great controversy.⁶

It is stated that all the Churches of Asia, including some of the most distinguished members of the Church, such as Polycarp, and his own contemporary Melito, celebrated the Christian festival on the 14th Nisan, the practice almost universal, therefore, in the country in which Claudius Apollinaris is supposed to write this fragment.⁷ How it is possible, therefore, that this isolated convert to the views of Victor and the Roman Church, could write of so vast and distinguished a majority as "some who through ignorance raised contention" on the point, when not only all the Asiatic Churches at the time were agreed to keep the fourteenth of Nisan, and in doing so raised no new contention at all, but as Polycrates represented, followed the tradition handed down to them from their Fathers, and authorized by the practice of the Apostle John himself?⁸ It is impossible that the "most holy Bishop of Hierapolis" could thus have written of the Bishops and Churches of Asia. There is literally no evidence whatever that Apollinaris sided in this discussion with the Roman party, and had he done so it is scarcely possible that so eminent an exception to the practice of the Asiatic Churches could have been passed over in total silence both by the advocates of the 14th Nisan and by those who opposed it.⁹

Whilst none of his contemporaries nor writers about his own time seem to have known that Apollinaris wrote any work from which these fragments can have been taken, or that he ever took any part in the Paschal controversy at all, the only ground we have for attributing them to him is the Preface to the Paschal Chronicle of Alexandria, written by an unknown author of the

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 26.

² Cf. Hilgenfeld, Der Paschastreit, p. 256.

³ Hæret. Fab., ii. 21, iii. 2.

⁴ Epist. ad Magnum Ep., p. 83.

⁵ Biblioth. Cod., 14.

⁶ Cf. Eusebius, H. E., v. 23, 24; cf. iv. 26; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 247 ff.

⁷ Eusebius, H. E., v. 23, 24; Hilgenfeld, Der Paschastreit, p. 274 ff.

⁸ Eusebius, H. E., v. 24; cf. Hilgenfeld, Der Paschastreit, p. 256; Baur, K. G. d. drei ersten Jahrh., p. 157.

⁹ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 247 f.

venth
linaris,
almost n
author
fragmen
Alexand
on East
hand the
fragmen
for belie
no later

We k
tioned b
derived
century,
the first
Hadrian
Apology,
disciple,
this statu
of Philip
spoken o
placed up
The or
called an
bassy of
concernin
ninus an
above all
rection of
in his w

¹ Donaldson
² Dr. Don
"questio
³ Tillemont
Works, ii. p.
Sacer, i. p. 1
⁴ Append.
an unknown
⁵ H. E., v
⁶ Basmage,
Hist. Chr. I

centh century, some five hundred years after the time of Apollinaris, whose testimony has rightly been described as "worth almost nothing."¹ Most certainly many passages preserved by this author are inauthentic, and generally allowed to be so.² The two fragments have by many been conjecturally ascribed to Pierius of Alexandria,³ a writer of the third century, who composed a work on Easter, but there is no evidence on the point. On the other hand there is such exceedingly slight reason for attributing these fragments to Claudius Apollinaris, and so many strong grounds for believing that he cannot have written them, that they have no material value as evidence for the antiquity of the Gospels.

3.

We know little or nothing of Athenagoras. He is not mentioned by Eusebius, and our only information regarding him is derived from a fragment of Philip Sidetes, a writer of the fifth century, first published by Dodwell.⁴ Philip states that he was the first leader of the school of Alexandria during the time of Hadrian and Antoninus, to the latter of whom he addressed his Apology, and he further says that Clement of Alexandria was his disciple, and that Pantenus was the disciple of Clement. Part of this statement we know to be erroneous, and the Christian History of Philip, from which the fragment is taken, is very slightly spoken of both by Socrates⁵ and Photius.⁶ No reliance can be placed upon this information.⁷

The only works ascribed to Athenagoras are an Apology—called an Embassy, *πρεσβεία*—bearing the inscription: "The Embassy of Athenagoras the Athenian, a philosopher and a Christian, concerning Christians, to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, Armeniaci Sarmatici and, above all, philosophers;" and further, a Treatise: "On the Resurrection of the Dead." A quotation from the Apology by Methodius in his work on the Resurrection of the Body, is preserved by

¹ Donaldson, *ib.*, iii. p. 247; Lardner, *Credibility*, &c., Works, ii. p. 296.

² Dr. Donaldson rightly calls a fragment in the Chronicle ascribed to Melito, "unquestionably spurious." *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 231.

³ Tillemont, *Mém. Hist. Eccles.*, ii. part iii. p. 91; Lardner, *Credibility*, &c., Works, ii. p. 296; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 248 f.; Routh, *Reliq. Sacre*, i. p. 167 f.

⁴ Append. ad *Diss. Iren.*, p. 488. The extract from Philip's History is made by an unknown author.

⁵ H. E., vii. 27.

⁶ *Bibl. Cod.*, xxxv. p. 21.

⁷ *Basnage*, *Ann. Polit. Eccl.*, 176, § 6; Lardner, Works, ii. p. 180; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 108 f.

Epiphanius¹ and Photius,² and this, the mention by Philip Sidetes, and the inscription by an unknown hand, just quoted, are all the evidence we possess regarding the Apology. We have no evidence at all regarding the treatise on the Resurrection, beyond the inscription. The authenticity of neither, therefore, stands on very sure grounds.³ The address of the Apology and internal evidence furnished by it, into which we need not go, show that it could not have been written before A.D. 176—177, the date assigned to it by most critics,⁴ although there are many reasons for dating it some years later.

In the six lines which Tischendorf devotes to Athenagoras, he says that the Apology contains "several quotations from Matthew and Luke,"⁵ without, however, indicating them. In the very few sentences which Canon Westcott vouchsafes to him, he says: "Athenagoras quotes the words of our Lord as they stand in St. Matthew four times, and appears to allude to passages in St. Mark and St. John, but he nowhere mentions the name of an Evangelist."⁶ Here the third Synoptic is not mentioned. In another place he says: "Athenagoras at Athens, and Theophilus at Antioch, make use of the same books generally, and treat them with the same respect;" and in a note: "Athenagoras quotes the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John."⁷ Here it will be observed that also the Gospel of Mark is quietly dropped out of sight, but still the positive manner in which it is asserted that Athenagoras quotes from "the Gospel of St. Matthew," without further explanation is calculated to mislead. We shall refer to each of the supposed quotations.

Athenagoras not only does not mention any Gospel, but singularly enough he never once introduces the name of "Christ" into the works ascribed to him, and all the "words of the Lord" referred to are introduced simply by the indefinite "he says," *ἐφ' ᾧ*, and without any indication whatever of a written source.⁸ The only exception to this is an occasion on which he puts into the mouth of "the Logos" a saying which is not found in any of the Gospels. The first passage to which Canon Westcott alludes is the following, which we contrast with the supposed parallel in the Gospel:—

¹ Her., lxi. 21.

² Bibl. Cod., ccxxxiv. p. 908.

³ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 114 f.

⁴ Anger, Synops. Ev. Proleg., xxxii.; Basnage, Annal. Polit. Eccles., 176, § 6; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 53; Fabricius (A.D. 177—180), Bibl. Græc., vi. p. 86; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 111 f.; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., p. 473; Lardner (A.D. 177—178), Works, ii. p. 181; Mosheim, Diss. de vera ætat. Apol. Athenag.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., 290; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 109; Tillmont, Mém. Hist. Eccles., t. ii. art. 8, note x.; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 19; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 34; De Wette († 180), Einl. N. T., 1852, p. 25.

⁵ On the Canon, p. 103.

⁶ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 19.

⁷ *Ib.*, p. 304, and note 2.

⁸ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 172.

ATHENAGORAS.

For we have learnt not only not to render a blow, nor to go to law (*δικάζεσθαι*) with those who spoil and plunder us, but even to those who should strike (us) on one side of the forehead (*κατὰ κόρυθης προσπηλακίζωσι*) to offer for a blow the other side of the head also; and to those who should take away (*ἀφαιροῦντο*) the coat, to give also (*ἐπιδιδόναι*) the cloke besides.¹

It is scarcely possible to imagine a greater difference in language conveying a similar idea than that which exists between Athenagoras and the first Gospel, and the parallel passage in Luke is in many respects still more distant. No echo of the words in Matthew has lingered in the ear of the writer, for he employs utterly different phraseology throughout, and nothing can be more certain than the fact that there is not a linguistic trace in it of acquaintance with our Synoptics.

The next passage which is referred to is as follows:

ATHENAGORAS.

What, then, are those precepts in which we are instructed?

I say unto you: love your enemies, bless them that curse,

pray for them that persecute you: that ye may be sons of your Father which is in the heavens who (*ὁς*) maketh his sun, &c.³

MATT. v. 39—40.

But I say unto you: that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek (*σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου διαγónα*) turn to him the other also. And if any man be minded to sue thee at the law (*κριθῆναι*) and take away (*λαβεῖν*) thy coat, let him have (*ἄφες αὐτῷ*) thy cloke also.²

MATT. v. 44—45.

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you,⁴ do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that⁵ persecute you: That ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for (*ὁς*) he maketh his sun, &c.⁶

¹ . . . οὐ μόνον τὸ ἀντιπαιεῖν, οὐδὲ μὴν δικάζεσθαι τοῖς ἄγροισι καὶ ἀρπαζουσιν ἡμᾶς, μεμάρηκότες· ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν, ἂν κατὰ κόρυθης προσπηλακίζωσι, καὶ τὸ ἔτερον παῖεν παρέχειν τῆς κεφαλῆς μέρος· τοῖς δὲ, εἰ τὸν χιτῶνα ἀφαιροῦντο, ἐπιδιδόναι καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον, κ.τ.λ. Legatio pro Christianis, § 1.

² Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντισθῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν σου διαγónα, στρέψ'· αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα σου λαβεῖν, ἀφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον. Matt. v. 39, 40; cf. Luke vi. 29.

³ λέγω ὑμῖν· Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταραζόμενους, προσευχέσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὁς τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει, κ.τ.λ. Leg. pro Christ., § 11.

⁴ The expressions εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταραζόμενους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," are omitted from some of the oldest MSS., but we do not know any in which the first of these two doubtful phrases is retained, as in Athenagoras, and the "do good to them that hate you," is omitted.

⁵ The phrase ἐπηρεάζοντων ὑμᾶς, "despitefully use you," is omitted from many ancient codices.

⁶ Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύ-

The same idea is continued in the next chapter, in which the following passage occurs:

ATHENAGORAS.

For if ye love (*ἀγαπάτε*), he says, (*φησί*) them which love, and lend to them which lend to you, what reward shall ye have? ¹

MATT. v. 46.

For if ye should love (*ἀγαπήσητε*) them which love you, what reward have ye? ²

There is no parallel at all in the first Gospel to the phrase "and lend to them that lend to you," and in Luke vi. 34, the passage reads: "and if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye?" (*καὶ ἐὰν δανίζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;*) It is evident, therefore, that there are decided variations here, and that the passage of Athenagoras does not agree with either of the Synoptics. We have seen the persistent variation in the quotations from the "Sermon on the Mount" which occur in Justin,³ and there is no part of the discourses of Jesus more certain to have been preserved by living Christian tradition, or to have been recorded in every form of Gospel. The differences in these passages from our Synoptic present the same features as mark the several versions of the same discourse in our first and third Gospels, and indicate a distinct source. The same remarks also apply to the next passage:

ATHENAGORAS.

For whosoever, he says (*φησί*), looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery (*μεμοίχυνκεν*) already in his heart.⁴

MATT. v. 28.

But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her (*ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν*) already in his heart.⁵

The omission of *αὐτήν*, "with her," is not accidental, but is an important variation in the sense, which we have already met with in the Gospel used by Justin Martyr.⁶ There is another passage, in the next chapter, the parallel to which follows closely on this in the great Sermon as reported in our first Gospel, to

χεοῖτε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει, κ.τ.λ. Matt. v. 44, 45.

¹ *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπάτε, φησί, τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας, καὶ δανείζετε τοῖς δανείζουσιν ὑμῖν, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε;* Leg. pro. Chr., § 12.

² *Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς μισθὸν ἔχετε;* Matt. v. 46.

³ Justin likewise has *ἀγαπάτε* for *ἀγαπήσητε* in this passage.

⁴ *Ὁ γὰρ βλέπων, φησί, γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς, ἥδη μεμοίχευσεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.* Leg. pro. Chr., § 32.

⁵ *Εγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν ἥδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.*

⁶ *Apol. i. 15.*

which Canon Westcott does not refer, but which we must point out :

ATHENAGORAS.

For whosoever, he says (*φησὶ*), shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery.¹

MATT. v. 32.

But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery : and whosoever shall marry her when divorced committeth adultery.²

It is evident that the passage in the Apology is quite different from that in the "Sermon on the Mount" in the first Synoptic. If we compare it with Matt. xix. 9, there still remains the express limitation *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, which Athenagoras does not admit, his own express doctrine being in accordance with the positive declaration in his text. In the immediate context, indeed, he insists that even to marry another wife after the death of the first is cloaked adultery. We find in Luke xvi. 18, the reading of Athenagoras,³ but with important linguistic variations :

ATHENAGORAS.

Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾷται.

LUKE XVI. 18.

Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει.

Athenagoras clearly cannot have derived this from Luke, but the sense of the passage in that Gospel, compared with the passage in Matthew xix. 9, makes it certain that the reading of Athenagoras was derived from some combining the language of the one and the thought of the other.

In Mark x. 11, the reading is nearer that of Athenagoras and confirms our conclusion, but the addition there of *ἐπ' αὐτὴν* "against her" after *μοιχεύει*, proves that his source was not that Gospel.

We may at once give the last passage which is supposed to be a quotation from our Synoptics, and it is that which is affirmed to be a reference to Mark. Athenagoras states in almost immediate context with the above : "for in the beginning God formed one man and one woman."⁴ This is compared with Mark x. 6 : "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female."

¹ Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, φησὶ, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾷται. Leg. pro Chr., § 33.

² Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἂν ἀπολύμεν γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾷται. Matt. v. 32. πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων is the older and better reading, but we give ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ as favouring the similarity.

³ Lardner, indeed, points to the passage as a quotation from the third Gospel. Works, ii. p. 183.

⁴ Leg. pro Chr., § 33.

ATHENAGORAS.

Ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Θεὸς ἔνα ἄνδρα
ἔπλασε καὶ μίαν γυναῖκα.

MARK X. 6.

Ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ
θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός.

Now this passage differs materially in every way from the second Synoptic. The reference to "one man" and "one woman" is used in a totally different sense, and enforces the previous assertion that a man may only marry one wife. Such an argument directly derived from the Old Testament is perfectly natural to one who, like Athenagoras, derived all his authority from it alone. It is simply absurd to claim it as evidence of the use of Mark.

Now we must repeat that Athenagoras does not name any source from which he derives his knowledge of the sayings of Jesus. These sayings are all from the Sermon on the Mount, and are introduced by the indefinite phrase *φησί*, and it is remarkable that all differ distinctly from the parallels in our Gospels. The whole must be taken together as coming from one source, and there is the clearest indication that his source was different from our Gospels. Dr. Donaldson states the case with great fairness: "Athenagoras makes no allusion to the inspiration of any of the New Testament writers. He does not mention one of them by name, and one cannot be sure that he quotes from any except Paul. All the passages taken from the Gospels are parts of our Lord's discourses, and may have come down to Athenagoras by tradition."¹ He might have added that they might also have been derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews or many another collection now unhappily lost.

One circumstance strongly confirming this conclusion is the fact already mentioned, that Athenagoras, in the same chapter in which one of these quotations occurs, introduces an apocryphal saying of the Logos, and connects it with previous sayings by the expression "The Logos *again* (*πάλιν*) saying to us." This can only refer to the sayings previously introduced by the indefinite *φησί*. The sentence, which is in reference to the Christian salutation of peace, is as follows: "The Logos again saying to us: 'If any one for this reason kiss a second time because it pleased him (he sins);' and adding: 'Thus the kiss or rather the salutation must be used with caution, as, if it be defiled even a little by thought, it excludes us from the life eternal.'"² This saying,

¹ Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 172.

De Wette says regarding Athenagoras: "The quotations of evangelical passages prove nothing." Einl. A. T., 1852, p. 25.

² Πάλιν ἡμῖν λέγοντ' τοῦ Λόγου· Ἐάν τις διὰ τοῦτο ἐν δευτέρῳ καταφιλήσῃ, ὅτι ἡρέσεν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐπιφέροντος· Οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβέστατον τὸ φίλημα, καὶ ἄλλον δὲ τὸ προσκίνημα δεῖ· ὥς εἶπον μικροῦ τῇ διανοίᾳ παραβολῶν, ἕξω ἡμᾶς τῆς αἰωνίου τιθέμενης ζωῆς. Leg. pro Christ., § 32.

which is directly attributed to the Logos, is not found in our Gospels. The only natural deduction is that it comes from the same source as the other sayings, and that source was not our synoptic Gospels.¹

The total absence of any allusion to New Testament Scriptures in Athenagoras,² however, is rendered more striking and significant by the marked expression of his belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament. He appeals to the prophets for testimony as to the truth of the opinions of Christians; men, he says, who spoke by the inspiration of God, whose Spirit moved their mouths to express God's will as musical instruments are played upon:³ "But since the voices of the prophets support our arguments, I think that you, being most learned and wise, cannot be ignorant of the writings of Moses, or of those of Isaiah and Jeremiah and of the other prophets, who being raised in ecstasy above the reasoning that was in themselves, uttered the things which were wrought in them, when the Divine Spirit moved them, the Spirit using them as a flute player would blow into the flute."⁴ He thus enunciates the theory of the mechanical inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament in the clearest manner,⁵ and it would indeed have been strange, on the supposition that he extended his views of inspiration to any of the Scriptures of the New Testament, that he never names a single one of them, nor indicates to the Emperors in the same way, as worthy of their attention, any of these Scriptures along with the Law and the Prophets. There can be no doubt that he nowhere gives reason for supposing that he regarded any other writings than the Old Testament as inspired or "Holy Scripture."⁶

4.

In the 17th year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, between the 7th March, 177-178, a fierce persecution was, it is said,⁷ commenced against the Christians in Gaul, and more especially at Vienne and Lyons, during the course of which the aged Bishop Pothinus, the predecessor of Irenæus, suffered martyrdom for the

¹ Cf. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 34; *Lardner*, Works, ii. p. 187, § xx. f.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 290; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 172 f.

² *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 172; *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 54 f.; *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 34.

³ *Leg. pro Christ.*, § 7.

⁴ *Ib.*, § 9.

⁵ *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 171 f.; *Schotten*, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 108 f.; *Credner*, *Beiträge*, i. p. 54 f.

⁶ In the treatise on the Resurrection there are no arguments derived from Scripture.

⁷ *Eusebius*, H. E., v. Proem.

faith. The two communities some time after addressed an Epistle to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, and also to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome,¹ relating the events which had occurred, and the noble testimony which had been borne to Christ by the numerous martyrs who had been cruelly put to death. The Epistle has in great part been preserved by Eusebius,² and critics generally agree in dating it about A.D. 177,³ although it was most probably not written until the following year.⁴

No writing of the New Testament is directly referred to in this Epistle,⁵ but it is asserted that there are "unequivocal coincidences of language"⁶ with the Gospel of Luke, and others of its books. The passage which is referred to as showing knowledge of our Synoptic is as follows. The letter speaks of a certain Vettius Epagathus, whose life was so austere that, although a young man, "he was thought worthy of the testimony (*μαρτυρία*) borne by the elder (*πρεσβυτέρου*) Zacharias. He had walked, of a truth, in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless, and was untiring in every kind of office towards his neighbour; having much zeal for God and being fervent in spirit."⁷ This is compared with the description of Zacharias and Elizabeth in Luke i. 6: "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."⁸ A little further on in the Epistle it is said of the same person: "Having in himself the advocate (*παράκλητον*), the spirit (*τὸ πνεῦμα*), more abundantly than Zacharias," &c.,⁹ which again is referred to Luke i. 67, "And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, saying," &c.¹⁰

¹ Eusebius, H. E., v. 3.

² *Ib.*, v. 1 f.

³ Anger, *Synops. Ev. Proleg.*, p. xxxii.; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 255 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Der Kanon*, p. 10, p. 32; Lipsius, *Chronologie d. röm. Bischöfe*, p. 185; Lardner, *Works*, ii. p. 149; Mosheim, *Observ. Sac. et Hist.*, i. 3, § 10; Neander, *K. G.*, i. p. 190 f.; Routh, *Reliq. Sacrae*, i. p. 289 f., p. 326 f.; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 110 f.; Tillemont, *Mém. Hist. Eccl.*, iii. art. 2, et note 1; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 80 f., an. 1; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 164, p. 156; Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 295.

⁴ Boronius dates the death of Pothinus in A.D. 179; Valesius, *ad Euseb. H. E.*, v. 5.

⁵ Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 295; Lardner, *Works*, ii. p. 153; Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 385.

⁶ Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 295.

⁷ . . . συνεξισούθαι τῇ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ζαχαρίου μαρτυρίᾳ, ἐπεκρίνετο γοῦν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασί τοῦ Κυρίου ἀμειπτός, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πρὸς τὸν πληθὺν λειτουργίᾳ ἀκνός, ζῆλον Θεοῦ πολὺν ἔχων, καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, κ.τ.λ. Euseb., H. E., v. 1.

⁸ ἦσαν δὲ δίκαιοι ἀμώτεροι ἐν ὧπτιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασί τοῦ κυρίου ἀμειπτοί. Luke i. 6.

⁹ ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τὸ πνεῦμα πλεῖον τοῦ Ζαχαρίου. Euseb., H. E., v. 1.

¹⁰ Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων, κ.τ.λ. Luke i. 67.

No written source is indicated in the Epistle for the reference to Zacharias, and, therefore, it cannot in any case be ascribed to one particular Gospel to the exclusion of others no longer extant. Let us, however, examine the matter more closely. Tischendorf does not make use of this Epistle at all as evidence for the Scriptures of the New Testament. He does, however, refer to it, and to these very allusions in it to Zacharias, as testimony to the existence and use of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, a work, it will be remembered, whose origin he dates so far back as the first three decades of the second century.¹ He points out that the first reference to the *Protevangelium* after Justin appears to be in this Epistle, as Hilgenfeld had already observed.² Tischendorf and Hilgenfeld, therefore, agree in affirming that the reference to Zacharias which we have quoted, indicates acquaintance with a different Gospel from our third Gospel, for it alludes to his martyrdom, which Luke does not mention. Hilgenfeld rightly maintains that the *Protevangelium Jacobi* in its present form is merely a version of an older work,³ which he conjectures to have been the Gospel according to Peter, or the Gnostic work *Évva Μαρίας*.⁴ Both Tischendorf and Hilgenfeld show that many of the Fathers⁵ were either acquainted with the *Protevangelium* or the works on which it was based, and Tertullian refers to the martyrdom of Zacharias which it relates.⁶ The first Gospel alludes to the same event⁷ in a manner which indicates a well-known history, but of which, with the exception of the account in the *Protevangelium*, we have no written narrative extant. There can be no doubt that the reference to Zacharias in Matthew, in the *Protevangelium* and in this Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, is not based upon Luke, in which there is no mention of his death, and there can be just as little doubt, and the *Protevangelium* is absolute evidence of the fact, that other works existed which included the Martyrdom of Zacharias, as well as the tradition of the birth of John the Baptist, which latter part we find reproduced in our third Synoptic Gospel, Ewald, who asserts the mythical character of that history in Luke,⁸ distinctly affirms that it is not a composition by the author of our third Synoptic, but is derived from a separate older work.⁹

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 76 ff., 80. ann. 1; cf. *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. f.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 80. ann. 1; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 154 f.

³ Die *Evv. Justin's*, p. 154 f.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 160 f.

⁵ Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 76 ff.; cf. *Evang. Apocr. Proleg.*, p. xii. f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. J.*, p. 154 f.

⁶ *Scorp. adv. Gnost.*, § 8. "Zacharias inter altare et ædem trucidatur perennes crucis sui maculas silicibus adsignans." Cf. *Protev. Jac.*, xxiv.

⁷ *Matt. xxiii. 35.*

⁸ *Christus u. s. Zeit*, p. 230 ff.; *Gesch. des V. Israels*, 1867, v.

⁹ Ewald, *Dei arci erst. Evv.*, p. 97 f.; cf. *i. p. 177 ff.*

The state of the case, then, is as follows: We find a coincidence in a few words in connection with Zacharias between the Epistle and our third Gospel, but so far from the Gospel being in any way indicated as their source, the words in question are, on the contrary, in association with a reference to events unknown to our Gospel, but which were indubitably chronicled elsewhere. It follows clearly, and few venture to doubt the fact, that the allusion in the Epistle is to a Gospel different from ours and not to our third Synoptic at all.

There is another point which may just be mentioned. In Luke i. 67, it is said that Zacharias "was filled with the Holy Spirit" (*ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου*). Now the Epistle which is supposed to recognise the Gospel as Holy Scripture says of Vettius Epagathus, that he was "more full of the Spirit than Zacharias" (*τὸ πνεῦμα πλεῖον τοῦ Ζαχαρίου*). Such an unnecessary and invidious comparison would scarcely have been made had the writer known our Gospel and regarded it as inspired Scripture.

CHAPTER X.

PTOLEMÆUS AND HERACLEON—CELSUS—THE CANON OF MURATORI—RESULTS.

WE have now reached the extreme limit of time within which we think it in any degree worth while to seek for evidence as to the date and authorship of the synoptic Gospels, and we might now proceed to the fourth Gospel; but before doing so it may be well to examine one or two other witnesses whose support has been claimed by apologists, although our attention may be chiefly confined to an inquiry into the date of such testimony, upon which its value, even if real, mainly depends so far as we are concerned. The first of these whom we must notice are the two Gnostic leaders, Ptolemæus and Heracleon.

Epiphanius has preserved a certain "Epistle to Flora" ascribed to Ptolemæus, in which, it is contended, there are "several quotations from Matthew, and one from the first chapter of John."¹ What date must be assigned to this Epistle? In reply to those who date it about the end of the second century, Tischendorf produces the evidence for an earlier period to which he assigns it. He says: "He (Ptolemæus) appears in all the oldest sources as one of the most important, most influential of the disciples of Valentinus. As the period at which the latter himself flourished falls about 140, do we say too much when we represent Ptolemæus as working at the latest about 160? Irenæus (in the 2nd Book) and Hippolytus name him together with Heracleon; likewise pseudo-Tertullian (in the appendix to *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*) and Philastrius make him appear immediately after Valentinus. Irenæus wrote the first and second books of his great work most probably (höchst wahrscheinlich) before 180, and in both he occupies himself much with Ptolemæus."² Canon Westcott, beyond calling Ptolemæus and Heracleon disciples of Valentinus, does not assign any date to either, and does not of course offer any further evidence on the point, although, in regard to Heracleon, he admits the ignorance in which we are as to all points of his history,³ and states generally, in treating of him, that "the exact chronology of the early heretics is very uncertain."⁴

¹ Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 46. Canon Westcott with greater caution says: "He quoted words of our Lord recorded by St. Matthew, the prologue of St. John's Gospel, &c." On the Canon, p. 267.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 46 f.

³ On the Canon, p. 263.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 264, note 2.

Let us, however, examine the evidence upon which Tischendorf relies for the date he assigns to Ptolemæus. He states in vague terms that Ptolemæus appears "in all the oldest sources" (in allen den ältesten Quellen) as one of the most important disciples of Valentinus. We shall presently see what these sources are, but must now follow the argument: "As the date of Valentinus falls about 140, do we say too much when we represent Ptolemæus as working at the latest about 160?" It is evident that there is no evidence here but merely assumption, and the manner in which the period "about 160" is begged, is a clear admission that there are no certain data. The year might with equal propriety upon those grounds have been put ten years earlier or ten years later. The deceptive and arbitrary character of the conclusion, however, will be more apparent when we examine the grounds upon which the relative dates 140 and 160 rest. Tischendorf here states that the time at which Valentinus flourished falls about A.D. 140, but the fact is that, as all critics are agreed,¹ and as even Tischendorf himself elsewhere states,² Valentinus came out of Egypt to Rome in that year, when his public career practically commenced, and he continued to flourish for at least twenty years after.³ Tischendorf's pretended moderation, therefore, consists in dating the period when Valentinus flourished from the very year of his first appearance, and in assigning the active career of Ptolemæus to 160, when Valentinus was still alive and teaching. He might on the same principle be dated 180, and even in that case there could be no reason for ascribing the Epistle to Flora to so early a period of his career. Tischendorf never even pretends to state any ground upon which Ptolemæus must be connected with any precise part of the public life of Valentinus, and still less for discriminating the period of the career of Ptolemæus at which the Epistle may have been composed. It is obvious that a wide limit for date thus exists.

After these general statements Tischendorf details the only evidence which is available. (1) "Irenæus (in the 2nd Book) and Hippolytus name him together with Heracleon; likewise (2) pseudo Tertullian (in the appendix to *De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*) and Philastrius make him appear immediately after Valentinus," &c. We must first examine these two points a little more closely in order to ascertain the value of such statements. With regard to the first (1) of these points, we shall presently see that the mention of the name of Ptolemæus along with that of

¹ See authorities, p. 421, note 1. Cf. *Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, p. 166.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 43. "Valentinus, der um 140 aus Ägypten nach Rom kam und darauf noch 20 Jahre gelebt haben mag."

³ Cf. *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær., iii. 4, § 3; *Eusebius*, H. E., iv. 11.

Here
view
he as
ing
that
well
Here
him
"Ire
neith
alon
by p
tural
case
mere
meas
tion
on w
merc
and
This
perfe
separ
from
tense
mak
of Pt
that
of w
shall
pseud
the f
could
thes
altog
scarc
mere
shall

1 W
3 Ip
Adv.
4 G
φασ.
5 Cl
6 In
work
thority

Heracleon throws no light upon the matter from any point of view, inasmuch as Tischendorf has as little authority for the date he assigns to the latter, and is in as complete ignorance concerning him, as in the case of Ptolemæus. It is amusing, moreover, that Tischendorf employs the very same argument, which sounds well although it means nothing, inversely to establish the date of Heracleon. Here, he argues: "Irenæus and Hippolytus name him (Ptolemæus) together with Heracleon;"¹ there, he reasons: "Irenæus names Heracleon together with Ptolemæus,"² &c. As neither the date assigned to the one nor to the other can stand alone, he tries to get them into something like an upright position by propping the one against the other, an expedient which, naturally, meets with little success. We shall in dealing with the case of Heracleon show how absurd is the argument from the mere order in which such names are mentioned by these writers; meantime we may simply say that Irenæus only once mentions the name of Heracleon in his works, and that the occasion on which he does so, and to which reference is here made, is merely an allusion to the Æons "of Ptolemæus himself, and of Heracleon, and all the rest who hold these views."³ This phrase might have been used, exactly as it stands, with perfect propriety even if Ptolemæus and Heracleon had been separated by a century. The only point which can be deduced from this mere coupling of names is that, in using the present tense, Irenæus is speaking of his own contemporaries. We may make the same remark regarding Hippolytus, for, if his mention of Ptolemæus and Heracleon has any weight at all, it is to prove that they were flourishing in his time: "Those who are of Italy, of whom is Heracleon and Ptolemæus, say . . ."⁴ &c. We shall have to go further into this point presently. As to (2) pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius we need only say that even if the fact of the names of the two Gnostics being coupled together could prove anything in regard to the date, the repetition by these writers could have no importance for us, their works being altogether based on those of Irenæus and Hippolytus,⁵ and scarcely, if at all, conveying independent information.⁶ We have merely indicated the weakness of these arguments in passing, but shall again take them up further on.

¹ Wann wurden u. s. w., p. 47.

² *Ih.*, p. 48.

³ *Ipsius Ptolemæi et Heracleonis, et reliquorum omnium qui eadem opinantur.* Adv. Hær., ii, 4, § 1.

⁴ *Οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος . . .* φασί. Ref. Omn. Hær., vi, 35.

⁵ Cf. *Lipsius*, Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius, 1865.

⁶ Indeed the direct and avowed dependence of Hippolytus himself upon the work of Irenæus deprives the *Philosophumena*, in many parts, of all separate authority.

The next and final consideration advanced by Tischendorf is the only one which merits serious attention. "Irenæus wrote the first and second book of his great work most probably before 180, and in both he occupies himself much with Ptolemæus." Before proceeding to examine the accuracy of this statement regarding the time at which Irenæus wrote, we may ask what conclusion would be involved if Irenæus really did compose the two books in A.D. 180 in which he mentions our Gnostics in the present tense? Nothing more than the simple fact that Ptolemæus and Heraclæon were promulgating their doctrines at that time. There is not a single word to show that they did not continue to flourish long after; and as to the "Epistle to Flora" Irenæus apparently knows nothing of it, nor has any attempt been made to assign it to an early part of the Gnostic's career. Tischendorf, in fact, does not produce a single passage nor the slightest argument to show that Irenæus treats our two Gnostics as men of the past, or otherwise than as heretics then actively disseminating their heterodox opinions, and, even taken literally, the argument of Tischendorf would simply go to prove that about A.D. 180 Irenæus wrote part of a work in which he attacks Ptolemæus and mentions Heraclæon.

When did Irenæus, however, really write his work against Heresies? Although our sources of reliable information regarding him are exceedingly limited, we are not without materials for forming a judgment on the point. Irenæus was born about A.D. 140, and is generally supposed to have died at the opening of the third century (A.D. 202).¹ We know that he was deputed by the Church of Lyons to bear to Eleutherus, then Bishop of Rome, the Epistle of that Christian community describing their sufferings during the persecution commenced against them in the seventeenth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (7th March, 177—178).² It is very improbable that this journey was undertaken, in any case, before the spring of A.D. 178 at the earliest, and, indeed, in accordance with the given data, the persecution itself may not have commenced earlier than the beginning of that year, so that his journey need not have been undertaken before the close of 178 or the spring of 179, to which epoch other circumstances might lead us.³ There is reason to believe that he remained some time in Rome. Baronius states that Irenæus was not appointed Bishop of Lyons till A.D. 180, for he says that the see remained vacant for that period after the death of Pothinus

¹ Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 118 f.; Tischendorf, *Wann Wurden*, u. s. w., p. 11, 12; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 24.

² Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 1; Pref. § 1, 3, 4.

³ Baronius (*Ann. Eccles.*) sets the death of Pothinus in A.D. 179.

in consequence of the persecution. Now certain expressions in his work show that Irenæus certainly did not write it until he became Bishop.¹ It is not known how long Irenæus remained in Rome, but there is every probability that he must have made a somewhat protracted stay, for the purpose of making himself acquainted with the various tenets of Gnostic and other heretics then being actively taught, and the preface to the first Book refers to the pains he took. He wrote his work in Gaul, however, after his return from this visit to Rome. This is apparent from what he himself states in the Preface to the first Book: "I have thought it necessary," he says, "after having read the Memoirs (*ἱστορίαι*) of the disciples of Valentinus as they call themselves, and having had personal intercourse with some of them and acquired full knowledge of their opinions, to unfold to thee,"² &c. A little further on he claims from the friend to whom he addresses his work indulgence for any defects of style on the score of his being resident amongst the Keltæ.³ Irenæus no doubt during his stay in Rome came in contact with the school of Ptolemæus and Heracleon, if not with the Gnostic leaders themselves, and shocked as he describes himself as being at the doctrines which they insidiously taught, he undertook, on his return to Lyons, to explain them that others might be exhorted to avoid such an "abyss of madness and blasphemy against Christ."⁴ Irenæus gives us other materials for assigning a date to his work. In the third Book he enumerates the bishops who had filled the Episcopal Chair of Rome, and the last whom he names is Eleutherus (A.D. 177—190), who, he says, "now in the twelfth place from the apostles, holds the inheritance of the episcopate."⁵ There is, however, another clue which, taken along with this, leads us to a close approximation to the actual date. In the same Book, Irenæus mentions Theodotus's version of the Old Testament: "But not as some of those say," he writes, "who now (*νῦν*) presume to alter the interpretation of the Scripture: 'Behold the young woman shall conceive, and bring forth a son,' as Theodotus, the Ephesian, has translated it, and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes."⁶ Now we are informed by Epiphanius that Theodotus published his translation during the reign of the Em-

¹ Cf. Adv. Hær., v. Præf.; Massuet, Dissert. in Iren., ii. art. ii. § 49; Lardner, Works, ii. p. 157.

² Adv. Hær., i. Præf. § 2. See the passage quoted, vol. ii. p. 60.

³ *ὅτι ἐπιζητήσεις δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐν Κελτοῖς διατριβόντων, κ.τ.λ.* Adv. Hær., i. Præf. § 3.

⁴ Adv. Hær., i. Præf. § 2.

⁵ Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 3; Eusebius, H. E., v. 6.

⁶ *Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐνίοι φασὶ τῶν νῦν τολμῶντων μεθερμηνεύειν τὴν γραφὴν . . . ὡς Θεοδοτίων ἡρμηνεύσεν ὁ Ἐφέσιος, καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Ποντικός, κ.τ.λ.* Adv. Hær., iii. 21, § 1. Euseb., H. E., v. 8.

peror Commodus¹ (A.D. 180—192). The Chronicon Paschale adds that it was during the Consulship of Marcellus, or as Massuet² proposes to read Marullus, who, jointly with Ælianus, assumed office A.D. 184. These dates decidedly agree with the passage of Irenæus and with the other data, all of which lead us to about the same period within the episcopate of Eleutherus († c. 190).³ We have here, therefore, a reliable clue to the date at which Irenæus wrote. It must be remembered that at that period the multiplication and dissemination of books was a very slow process. A work published about 184 or 185 could scarcely have come into the possession of Irenæus in Gaul till some years later, and we are, therefore, brought towards the end of the episcopate of Eleutherus as the earliest date at which the first three books of his work against Heresies can well have been written, and the rest must be assigned to a later period under the episcopate of Victor († 198—199).⁴

At this point we must pause and turn to the evidence which Tischendorf offers regarding the date to be assigned to Heracleon.⁵ As in the case of Ptolemæus, we shall give it entire and then examine it in detail. To the all-important question: "How old is Heracleon?" Tischendorf replies: "Irenæus names Heracleon, together with Ptolemæus II. 4, § 1, in a way which makes them appear as well-known representatives of the Valentinian school. This interpretation of his words is all the more authorized because he never again mentions Heracleon. Clement, in the 4th Book of his Stromata, written shortly after the death of Commodus (193), recalls an explanation by Heracleon of Luke xii. 8, when he calls him the most noted man of the Valentinian school (*ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντινίου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος* is Clement's expression). Origen,

¹ De Ponderib. et Mens., 17.

² Dissert. in Iren., ii. art. ii. xcvi. § 47.

³ Cf. Credner, Beiträge, ii. p. 253 ff.; De Wette, Einl. A. T., 1852, p. 61 ff., p. 62, ann. d.; Lardner, "He also speaks of the translation of Theodotion, which is generally allowed to have been published in the reign of Commodus." Works, ii. p. 156 f.; Massuet, Dissert. in Iren., ii. art. ii. xcvi. § 47.

⁴ Massuet, Dissert. in Iren., ii. art. ii. xcvi. (§ 47), xcix. (§ 50); Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 24; cf. De Wette, Einl. A. T., p. 62, ann. d. ("Er schrieb zw. 177—192"); cf. Credner, Beiträge, ii. p. 255. The late Dr. Mansel places the work "between A.D. 182 and 188." The Gnostic Heresies, p. 240. This date is partly based upon the mention of Eleutherus (cf. p. 240, note 2), which, it must be remembered, however, occurs in the third book. Jerome says: "Hoc ille scripsit ante annos circiter trecentos." Epist. ad Theod., § 33, al. 29. If instead of "trecentos," which is an evident slip of the pen, we read "ducentos," his testimony as to the date exactly agrees.

⁵ Canon Westcott adds no separate testimony. He admits that: "The history of Heracleon, the great Valentinian Commentator, is full of uncertainty. Nothing is known of his country or parentage." On the Canon, p. 263, and in a note: "The exact chronology of the early heretics is very uncertain," p. 264, note 2.

at the beginning of his quotation from Heracleon, says that he was held to be a friend of Valentinus (τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνῶριμον Ἡρακλέωνα). Hippolytus mentions him, for instance, in the following way: (vi. 29); 'Valentinus, and Heracleon, and Ptolemæus, and the whole school of these, disciples of Pythagoras and Plato. . . . Epiphanius says (Hær. 41): 'Cerdo (the same who, according to Irenæus III. 4, § 3, was in Rome under Bishop Hyginus with Valentinus) follows these (the Ophites, Kainites, Sethiani), and Heracleon.' After all this Heracleon certainly cannot be placed later than 150 to 160. The expression which Origen uses regarding his relation to Valentinus must, according to linguistic usage, be understood of a personal relation."¹

We have already pointed out that the fact that the names of Ptolemæus and Heracleon are thus coupled together affords no clue in itself to the date of either, and their being mentioned as leading representatives of the school of Valentinus does not in any way involve the inference that they were not contemporaries of Irenæus, living and working at the time he wrote. The way in which Irenæus mentions them in this the only passage throughout his whole work in which he names Heracleon, and to which Tischendorf pointedly refers, is as follows: "But if it was not produced, but was generated by itself, then that which is void is both like, and brother to, and of the same honour with, that Father who has before been mentioned by Valentinus; but it is really more ancient, and having existed long before, and more exalted than the rest of the Æons of Ptolemæus himself, and of Heracleon, and all the rest who hold these views."² We fail to recognize anything special, here, of the kind inferred by Tischendorf, in the way in which mention is made of the two later Gnostics. If anything be clear, on the contrary, it is that a distinction is drawn between Valentinus and Ptolemæus and Heracleon, and that Irenæus points out inconsistencies between the doctrines of the founder and those of his later followers. It is quite irrelevant to insist merely, as Tischendorf does, that Irenæus and subsequent writers represent Ptolemæus and Heracleon and other Gnostics of his time as of "the school" of Valentinus. The question simply is, whether in doing so they at all imply that these men were not contemporaries of Irenæus, or necessarily assign their period of independent activity to the lifetime of Valentinus, as Tischendorf appears to argue? Most certainly

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 48 f.

² Si autem non prolatum est, sed a se generatum est; et simile est, et fraternum, et ejusdem honoris id quod est vacuum, ei Patri qui prædictus est a Valentino: antiquius autem et multo ante existens, et honorificentius reliquis Æonibus ipsius Ptolemæi et Heracleonis, et reliquorum omnium qui eadem opinantur. Adv. Hær., ii. 4, § 1.

they do not, and Tischendorf does not attempt to offer any evidence that they do so. We may perceive how utterly worthless such a fact is for the purpose of affixing an early date by merely considering the quotation which Tischendorf himself makes from Hippolytus: "Valentinus therefore and Heraclion and Ptolemaeus, and the whole school of these, disciples of Pythagoras and Plato. . . ."¹ If the statement that men are of a certain school involves the supposition of coincidence of time, the three Gnostic leaders must be considered contemporaries of Pythagoras or Plato, whose disciples they are said to be. Again, if the order in which names are mentioned, as Tischendorf contends by inference throughout his whole argument, is to involve strict similar sequence of date, the principle applied to the whole of the early writers would lead to the most ridiculous confusion. Tischendorf quotes Epiphanius: "Cerdo follows these (Ophites, Kainites, Sethiani), and Heraclion." Why he does so it is difficult to understand, unless it be to give the appearance of multiplying testimonies, for two sentences further on he is obliged to admit: "Epiphanius has certainly made a mistake, as in such things not unfrequently happens to him, when he makes Cerdo, who, however, is to be placed about 140, follow Heraclion."² This kind of mistake is, indeed, common to all the writers quoted, and when it is remembered that such an error is committed where a distinct and deliberate affirmation of the point is concerned, it will easily be conceived how little dependence is to be placed on the mere mention of names in the course of argument. We find Irenaeus saying that "neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturninus, nor Basilides" possesses certain knowledge,³ and elsewhere: "of such an one as Valentinus, or Ptolemaeus, or Basilides."⁴ To base an argument as to date on the order in which names appear in such writers is preposterous.

Tischendorf draws an inference from the statement that Heraclion was said to be a *γνώριμος* of Valentinus, that Origen declares him to have been his friend, holding personal intercourse with him. Origen, however, evidently knew nothing individually on the point, and speaks upon mere hearsay, guardedly using the expression "said to be" *λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον*. But, according to the later and patristic use of the word, *γνώριμος* means nothing

¹ Οὐάλεντινός τσινυν καὶ Ἰρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τούτων σχολή, οἱ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος μαθηταί, κ.τ.λ. Rel. Omn. Har., vi. 29.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 49.

³ We do not here enter into the discussion of the nature of this error. (See Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 129 f.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 51; Riggenbach, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johan., 1866, p. 79.)

⁴ Adv. Her., ii. 28, § 6.

⁴ *Ib.*, ii. 28, § 9.

more than a "disciple," and it cannot here be necessarily interpreted into a "contemporary."¹ Under no circumstances could such a phrase, avowedly limited to hearsay, have any weight. The loose manner in which the Fathers repeat each other, even in serious matters, is too well known to every one acquainted with their writings to require any remark. Their inaccuracy keeps pace with their want of critical judgment. We have seen one of the mistakes of Epiphanius, admitted by Tischendorf to be only too common with him, which illustrates how little such data are to be relied on. We may point out another of the same kind committed by him in common with Hippolytus, pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius. Mistaking a passage of Irenæus,² regarding the sacred Tetrad (Kol-Arbas) of the Valentinian Gnosis, Hippolytus supposes Irenæus to refer to another heretic leader. He at once treats the Tetrad as such a leader named "Colarbasus," and after dealing (vi. 4) with the doctrines of Secundus, and Ptolemæus, and Heracleon, he proposes, § 5, to show "what are the opinions held by Marcus and Colarbasus."³ At the end of the same book he declares that Irenæus, to whom he states that he is indebted for a knowledge of their inventions, has completely refuted the opinions of these heretics, and he proceeds to treat Basilides, considering that it has been sufficiently demonstrated "whose disciples are Marcus and Colarbasus, the successors of the school of Valentinus."⁴ At an earlier part of the work he had spoken in a more independent way in reference to certain who had promulgated great heresies: "Of these," he says, "one is Colarbasus, who endeavours to explain religion by measures and numbers."⁵ The same mistake is committed by pseudo-Tertullian,⁶ and Philastrius,⁷ each of whom devotes a chapter to this supposed heretic. Epiphanius, as might have been expected, fell into the same error, and he proceeds elaborately to refute the heresy of the Colarbasians, "which is Heresy XV." He states that Colarbasus follows Marcus and Ptolemæus⁸ and after discussing the opinions of this mythical heretic he devotes the next chapter, "which is Heresy

¹ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 127; Schotten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 89; cf. Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 82; Stephanns, *Thesaurus Ling. Gr.*; Suidas, *Lexicon*, in voce.

² Adv. Hær., i. 14.

³ *Τίνα τὰ Μάρκου καὶ Κολαρβάσου νομισθέντα*. Ref. Omn. Hær., vi. § 5. There can be no doubt that a chapter on Colarbasus is omitted from the MS. of Hippolytus which we possess. Cf. Ruusden, *Hippolytus u. s. Zeit*, 1852, p. 54 f.

⁴ . . . *τίνων εἶεν μαθηταὶ Μάρκου τε καὶ Κολαρβάσου, οἱ τῆς Οὐαλεντινίου ὁχλοῦς διδασκοί γερόμενοι*, κ.τ.λ. Ref. Omn. Hær., vi. § 5.

⁵ *Ὁν εἶς μὲν Κολαρβάσος, ὃς διὰ μέτρων καὶ ἀριθμῶν ἐκτιθέσθαι θεοβέβαιαν ἐπιχειρεῖ*. Ref. Omn. Hær., iv. § 13.

⁶ Hær. 15.

⁷ *Ib.*, 43.

⁸ *Ib.*, xxxv. § 1, p. 258.

XVI," to the Heracleonites, commencing it with the information that: "A certain Heracleon follows after Colarbasus."¹ This absurd mistake² shows how little these writers knew of the Gnostics of whom they wrote, and how the one ignorantly follows the other.

The order, moreover, in which they set the heretic leaders varies considerably. It will be sufficient for us merely to remark here that while pseudo-Tertullian³ and Philastrius⁴ adopt the following order after the Valentinians: Ptolemæus, Secundus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Colarbasus, Epiphanius⁵ places them: Secundus, Ptolemæus, Marcossians, Colarbasus, and Heracleon; and Hippolytus⁶ again: Secundus, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Colarbasus. The vagueness of Irenæus had left some latitude here, and his followers were uncertain. The somewhat singular fact that Irenæus only once mentions Heracleon whilst he so constantly refers to Ptolemæus, taken in connection with this order, in which Heracleon is always placed after Ptolemæus, and by Epiphanius after Marcus, may be reasonably explained by the fact that whilst Ptolemæus had already gained considerable notoriety when Irenæus wrote, Heracleon may only have begun to come into notice. Since Tischendorf lays so much stress upon pseudo-Tertullian and Philastrius making Ptolemæus appear immediately after Valentinus, this explanation is after his own principle.

We have already pointed out that there is not a single passage in Irenæus, or any other early writer, assigning Ptolemæus and Heracleon to a period anterior to the time when Irenæus undertook to refute their opinions. Indeed, Tischendorf has not attempted to show that they do, and he has merely, on the strength of the general expression that these Gnostics were of the school of Valentinus, boldly assigned to them an early date. Now, as we have stated, he himself admits that Valentinus only came from Egypt to Rome in A.D. 140, and continued teaching till 160;⁷ and these dates are most clearly given by Irenæus himself.⁸ Why then should Ptolemæus and Heracleon, to take an extreme case, not have known Valentinus in their youth, and yet have flour-

¹ *Ἡρακλέων τις τοῦτον τὸν Κολαρβάσον διχδέχεται*, κ.τ.λ. *Hæc.* xxxvi. § 1, p. 262.

² *Volkmar*, Die Colarbasus-gnosis in Niedner's Zeitschr. hist. Theol., 1855; *Der Ursprung*, p. 128f.; *Baur*, K. G. d. drei erst. Jahrh., p. 204, anm. 1; *Lipsius*, Der Gnosticismus, in *Ersch. u. Grubers Real. Encykl.*; *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiph.*, p. 166 f., 168 f.; *Schotten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 91.

³ *Hæc.*, 13 ff.

⁴ *Ib.*, 39 ff.

⁵ *Ib.*, 32 ff.

⁶ *Ref. Omn. Hæc.*, vi § 3, 4, 5.

⁷ Tertullian also makes Heracleon follow Ptolemæus. *Adv. Val.*, 4.

⁸ *Wann wurde er*, u. s. w., p. 43.

⁹ *Adv. Hæc.*, iii. 4, § 3; *Euseb.*, H. E., iv. 11.

ished
Irena
dorf
Irena
abou
with
he hi
more
fluen
tury.
taugh
140—
not to
leon
their
perio
chiefly
Alt
Ptole
aus,
there
estab
in tre
work
wrote
to the
terco
finite
abilit
are n
of Pto
the s
Irena
at the
more
direct
Tis
coupl
that c
confir

1 Wa
2 Ib.,
4 P. 4
5 Car
6 See
7 Adv

ished chiefly during the last two decades of the second century? Irenæus himself may be cited as a parallel case, which Tischendorf at least cannot gainsay. He is never tired of telling us that Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp,¹ whose martyrdom he sets about A.D. 165, and he considers that the intercourse of Irenæus with the aged Father must properly be put about A.D. 150,² yet he himself dates the death of Irenæus, A.D. 202,³ and nothing is more certain than that the period of his greatest activity and influence falls precisely in the last twenty years of the second century. Upon his own data, therefore, that Valentinus may have taught for twenty years after his first appearance in Rome in A.D. 140—and there is no ground whatever for asserting that he did not teach for even a much longer period—Ptolemæus and Heracleon might well have personally sat at the feet of Valentinus in their youth, as Irenæus is said to have done about the very same period at those of Polycarp, and yet, like him, have flourished chiefly towards the end of the century.

Although there is not the slightest ground for asserting that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were not contemporaries with Irenæus, flourishing like him towards the end of the second century, there are, on the other hand, many circumstances which altogether establish the conclusion that they were. We have already shown, in treating of Valentinus,⁴ that Irenæus principally directs his work against the followers of Valentinus living at the time he wrote, and notably of Ptolemæus and his school.⁵ In the preface to the first book, having stated that he writes after personal intercourse with some of the disciples of Valentinus,⁶ he more definitely declares his purpose: "We will, then, to the best of our ability, clearly and concisely set forth the opinions of those who are now (*viv*) teaching heresy, *I speak particularly of the disciples of Ptolemæus* (*τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαίων*), whose system is an offshoot from the school of Valentinus."⁷ Nothing could be more explicit. Irenæus in this passage distinctly represents Ptolemæus as teaching at the time he is writing, and this statement alone is decisive, more especially as there is not a single known fact which is either directly or indirectly opposed to it.

Tischendorf lays much stress on the evidence of Hippolytus in coupling together the names of Ptolemæus and Heracleon with that of Valentinus; similar testimony of the same writer, fully confirming the above statement of Irenæus, will, therefore, have

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 25, p. 11.

² *Ib.*, p. 12.

³ P. 423 ff.

⁴ Canon Westcott admits this. On the Canon, p. 266 f.

⁵ See passage quoted, p. 423.

⁷ Adv. Har., i. Pref. § 2. See Greek quoted, p. 423, note 3.

the greater force. Hippolytus says that the Valentinians differed materially among themselves regarding certain points which led to divisions, one party being called the Oriental and the other the Italian. "They of the Italian party, of whom is Heracleon and Ptolemaeus, say, &c. . . . They, however, who are of the Oriental party, of whom is Axionicus and Bardesanes, maintain," &c.¹ Now Ptolemaeus and Heracleon are here quite clearly represented as being contemporary with Axionicus and Bardesanes, and without discussing whether Hippolytus does not, in continuation, describe them as all living at the time he wrote,² there can be no doubt that some of them were, and that this evidence confirms again the statement of Irenæus. Hippolytus, in a subsequent part of his work, states that a certain Prepon, a Marcionite, has introduced something new, and "now in our own time (*ἐν ταῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις νῦν*) has written a work regarding the heresy in reply to Bardesanes."³ The researches of Hilgenfeld have proved that Bardesanes lived at least over the reign of Heliogabalus (218—222), and the statement of Hippolytus is thus confirmed.⁴ Axionicus again was still flourishing when Tertullian wrote his work against the Valentinians (201—226). Tertullian says: "Axionicus of Antioch alone to the present day (*ad hodiernum*) respects the memory of Valentinus, by keeping fully the rules of his system."⁵ Although on the whole they may be considered to have flourished somewhat earlier, Ptolemaeus and Heracleon are thus shown to have been for a time at least contemporaries of Axionicus and Bardesanes.⁶

Moreover, it is evident that the doctrines of Ptolemaeus and

¹ Οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος . . . φασί . . .

Οἱ δ' αὖ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς λέγουσιν, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἀξιόνιος καὶ Βαρδανῆς, κ.τ.λ. Ref. Omn. Har., vi. 35.

² Tischendorf did not refer to these passages at all originally, and only does so in the second and subsequent editions of his book, in reply to Volkmar and others in the Vorwort (p. ix. f.), and in a note (p. 49, note 2). Volkmar argues from the opening of the next chapter (36), *Τὰυτα οὐκ ἐκείνοι ζητεῖσθαι κατ' αὐτοὺς* (Let those heretics, therefore, discuss these points amongst themselves), that they are represented as contemporaries of Hippolytus himself at the time he wrote (A.D. 225—235), *Der Ursprung*, p. 23, p. 130 f. It is not our purpose to pursue this discussion, but whatever may be the conclusion as regards the extreme deduction of Volkmar, there can be no doubt that the passage proves at least the date which was assigned to them against Tischendorf.

³ Ref. Omn. Har., vii. 31.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, Bardesanes, 1864, p. 11 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 131, p. 23; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 80 f.; Riggenbach, *Die Zeugnisse f. d. Ev. Johannis*, 1866, p. 78 f.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 90.

⁵ Adv. Val., 4; Hilgenfeld, Bardesanes, p. 15; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 130 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 81.

⁶ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 23 f., p. 130 f.; Lipsius, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 82; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 90.

Heracleon represent a much later form of Gnosticism than that of Valentinus. It is generally admitted that Ptolemæus reduced the system of Valentinus to consistency,¹ and the inconsistencies which existed between the views of the Master and these later followers, and which indicate a much more advanced stage of development, are constantly pointed out by Irenæus and the Fathers who wrote in refutation of heresy. Origen also represents Heracleon as amongst those who held opinions sanctioned by the Church,² and both he and Ptolemæus must indubitably be classed amongst the latest Gnostics.³ It is clear, therefore, that Ptolemæus and Heracleon were contemporaries of Irenæus⁴ at the time he composed his work against Heresies (185—195), both, and especially the latter, flourishing and writing towards the end of the second century.⁵

We mentioned, in first speaking of these Gnostics, that Epiphanius has preserved an Epistle, attributed to Ptolemæus, which is addressed to Flora, one of his disciples.⁶ This Epistle is neither mentioned by Irenæus nor by any other writer before Epiphanius. There is nothing in the Epistle itself to show that it was really written by Ptolemæus himself. Assuming it to be by him, however, the Epistle was in all probability written towards the end of the second century, and it does not, therefore, come within the scope of our inquiry. We may, however, briefly notice the supposed references to our Gospels which it contains. The writer of the Epistle, without any indication whatever of a written source from which he derived them, quotes sayings of Jesus for which parallels are found in our first Gospel. These sayings are introduced by such expressions as "he said," "our Saviour declared," but never as quotations from any Scripture. Now, in affirming that they are taken from the Gospel according to Matthew, Apologists exhibit their usual arbitrary haste, for we must clearly and decidedly state that there is not a single one of the passages which does not present decided variations from the parallel passages in our first Synoptic. We subjoin for com-

¹ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 276.

² In Joh., T. xvi. p. 236 f.; Grabe, Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 105.

³ Hilgenfeldt, Die Evangelien, p. 346; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 89 ff.; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 127 ff.; Lipsius, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1867, p. 82; Riggenbach, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann., p. 78.

⁴ Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 22 ff., p. 126 ff.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 88 ff.; Lipsius, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1867, p. 81, 83; Cellerier, Essai d'Intro. N. T., p. 27 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 391, note 1; Riggenbach, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann., p. 78.

⁵ Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 22 ff., 126 ff.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 88 ff.; Ebrard, Evang. Gesch., p. 874, § 142; Lipsius, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1867, p. 81 ff.

⁶ Epiphanius, Hær., xxxiii. 3—7.

parison in parallel columns the passages from the Epistle and Gospel:—

EPISTLE.

Οἰκία γὰρ ἡ πόλις μερισθεῖσα ἐφ' ἑαυτήν ὅτι μὴ δύναται στήναι, ὁ ὧτῆρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφώνητο.¹

Ἐφη αὐτοῖς ὅτι, Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέ-
τρεψε τὸ ἀπολύειν τὴν γυναῖκα
αὐτοῦ· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ οὐ γέγο-
γεν οὕτως. Θεὸς γὰρ, φησί, συνέ-
ξευξε ταύτην τὴν συζυγίαν, καὶ
ὁ συνεξευξεν ὁ κύριος, ἄνθρωπος μὴ
χωριζέτω, ἔφη.²

Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς, φησὶν, εἶπε, τίμα
τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα
σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται. Ὑμεῖς
δὲ, φησὶν, εἰρήκατε, τοῖς πρεσβυ-
τέροις λέγων, δῶρον τῷ θεῷ ὃ
ἔαν ὠφελήσῃς ἐξ ἐμοῦ,

καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ
θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν παραδόσιν ἱστῶν
πρεσβυτέρων ὑμῶν.

Τούτου δὲ Ἰβασίας ἐξεφώνησεν
εἰπών,

Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.³ . . .

τὸ γὰρ, Ὁφθαλ-
μον ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα
ἀντὶ ὀδόντος . . . ἐγὼ γὰρ λέγω
ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι ὅλως τῷ πο-
νηρῷ ἀλλὰ ἔαν τις σε βαπτίσῃ
στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην
διαγόναν.⁴

It must not be forgotten that Irenæus makes very explicit statements as to the recognition of other sources of evangelical truth than our Gospels by the Valentinians, regarding which we have fully written when discussing the founder of that sect.⁵ We know that they professed to have direct traditions from the Apostles through Theodas, a disciple of the Apostle Paul;⁷ and in the Epistle to Flora allusion is made to the succession of doctrine received by direct tradition from the Apostles.⁸ Irenæus says that

MATT. XII. 25.

. . . πᾶσα πόλις ἡ οἰκία μερι-
θεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθίσεται.

MATT. XIX. 8, and 6.

λέγει αὐτοῖς Ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς
τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέ-
τρεphen ὑμῖν ἀπολύσαι τὰς γυν-
αῖκας ὑμῶν· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ
γέγονεν οὕτως. 6. . . ὁ οὖν
ὁ θεὸς συνεξευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ
χωριζέτω.

MATT. XV. 4—8.

Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἐνετείλατο, λέγων·
Τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα,
καὶ ὁ κακολογῶν, κ.τ.λ.³ 5. Ὑμεῖς
δὲ λέγετε· Ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρί
ἡ τῇ μητρί, Δῶρον, ἢ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ
ὠφελήσῃς, καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμῇται τὸν
πατέρα αὐτοῦ, ἡ τὴν μητέρα αὐ-
τοῦ.

6. καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ
θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παραδόσιν ὑμῶν.

7. ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευ-
σεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἰβασίας, λέγων,

8. Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.

MATT. V. 38—39.

Ἰκονῶσατε ὅτι ἐρρήσῃ Ὁφθαλ-
μὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα
ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. 39. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω
ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι ᾧ πονηρῷ·
ἀλλ' ὅστις σε βαπτίσει ἐπὶ τὴν
δεξιάν σου διαγόναν, στρέψον αὐ-
τῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

¹ Epiph., Hær., xxxiii. 3.

² Ib., § 4.

³ This phrase, from Leviticus xx. 9, occurs further on in the next chapter.

⁴ Epiph., Hær., xxxiii. § 4.

⁵ Ib., § 6. In the next chapter, § 7, there is ἔνα γὰρ μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθὸν
θεὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα ὁ ὧτῆρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφώνητο, κ.τ.λ. cf. Matt
xix. 17. . . . εἰς ἑστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.

⁶ See p. 433 ff.

⁷ Clemens Al., Strom., vii. 17.

⁸ Epiphanius, Hær., xxxiii. 7.

the Valentinians profess to derive their views from unwritten sources,¹ and he accuses them of rejecting the Gospels of the Church,² but, on the other hand, he states that they had many Gospels different from what he calls the Gospels of the Apostles.³

With regard to Heracleon, it is said that he wrote Commentaries on the third and fourth Gospels. The authority for this statement is very insufficient. The assertion with reference to the third Gospel is based solely upon a passage in the Stromata of the Alexandrian Clement. Clement quotes a passage found in Luke xii. 8, 11, 12, and says: "Expounding this passage, Heracleon, the most distinguished of the school of Valentinus, says as follows," &c.⁴ This is immediately interpreted into a quotation from a Commentary on Luke.⁵ We merely point out that from Clement's remark it by no means follows that Heracleon wrote a Commentary at all, and further there is no evidence that the passage commented upon was actually from our third Gospel.⁶ The Stromata of Clement were not written until after A.D. 193, and in them we find the first and only reference to this supposed commentary. We need not here refer to the Commentary on the fourth Gospel, which is merely inferred from references in Origen (c. A.D. 225), but of which we have neither earlier or fuller information.⁷ We must, however, before leaving this subject, mention that Origen informs us that Heracleon quotes from the Preaching of Peter (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, *Prædicatio Petri*), a work which, as we have already several times mentioned, was largely cited by Clement of Alexandria as authentic and inspired Holy Scripture.⁸

The epoch at which Ptolemæus and Heracleon flourished would in any case render testimony regarding our Gospels of little value. The actual evidence which they furnish, however, is not of a character to prove even the existence of our Synoptics, and much less does it in any way bear upon their character or authenticity.

¹ Adv. Her., i. 8, § 1.

² *Ib.*, iii. 2, § 1.

³ *Ib.*, iii. 11, § 9.

⁴ Τοῦτον ἐξηγουμένου τὸν τόπον Ἡρακλέων, ὁ τῆς Οὐαλεντινίου σχολῆς δοκιμώτατος, κατὰ λέξιν φησιν, κ.τ.λ. Strom., iv. 9, § 73.

⁵ In Lucæ igitur Evangelium Commentaria edidit Heracleon, &c. Grabe, Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 83.

⁶ The second reference by Clement to Heracleon is in the fragment § 25; but it is doubted by apologists (cf. Westcott, On the Canon, p. 264). It would, however, tend to show that the supposed Commentary could not be upon our Luke, as it refers to an apostolic injunction regarding baptism not found in our Gospels.

⁷ Neither of the works, whatever they were, could have been written before the end of the second century. Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 22 f., 130 f., 165; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 91 f.; Ebrard, Evang. Gesch., p. 874, § 142; Lipsius, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1867, p. 81 f.

⁸ Clem. Al., Strom., vi. 5, § 39, 6, § 48, 7, § 58, 15, § 128. Canon Westcott states of Ptolemæus: "Two statements, however, which he makes are at variance with the Gospels: that our Lord's ministry was completed in a year; and that He continued for eighteen months with his disciples after his Resurrection." On the Canon, p. 268.

2.

A similar question of date arises regarding Celsus, who wrote a work, entitled *Λόγος ἀληθείης*, True Doctrine, which is no longer extant, against which Origen composed an elaborate refutation. The Christian writer takes the arguments of Celsus in detail, presenting to us, therefore, its general features, and giving many extracts; and as Celsus professes to base much of his accusation upon the writings in use amongst Christians, although he does not name a single one of them, it becomes desirable to ascertain what those works were, and the date at which Celsus wrote. As usual, we shall state the case by giving the reasons assigned for an early date.

Arguing against Volkmar and others, who maintain, from a passage at the close of his work, that Origen, writing about the second quarter of the third century, represents Celsus as his contemporary,¹ Tischendorf, referring to the passage, which we shall place in its place, proceeds to assign an earlier date upon the following grounds: "But indeed, even in the first book, at the commencement of the whole work, Origen says: 'Therefore, I cannot compliment a Christian whose faith is in danger of being shaken by Celsus, who yet does not even (οὐδὲ) still (ἔτι) live the common life among men, but already and long since (ἤδη καὶ πάλαι) is dead.' In the same first book Origen says: 'We have heard that there were two men of the name of Celsus, Epicureans, the first under Nero; this one' (that is to say, ours) 'under Hadrian and later.' It is not impossible that Origen mistakes when he identified his Celsus with the Epicurean living 'under Hadrian and later;' but it is impossible to convert the same Celsus of whom Origen says this into a contemporary of Origen. Or would Origen himself in the first book really have set his Celsus 'under Hadrian (117—138) and later,' yet in the eighth have said: 'We will wait (about 225), to see whether he will still accomplish this design of making another work follow?' Now, until some better discovery regarding Celsus is attained, it will be well to hold to the old opinion that Celsus wrote his book about the middle of the second century, probably between 150—160," &c.²

¹ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 80; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 99 f.

² Aber auch schon im ersten Buche zu Anfang der ganzen Schrift sagt Origenes: "Daher kann ich mich nicht eines Christen freuen, dessen Glaube Gefahr läuft durch Celsus wankend gemacht zu werden, der doch nicht einmal (οὐδὲ) mehr (ἔτι) das gemeine Leben unter den Menschen lebt, sondern bereits und längst (ἤδη καὶ πάλαι) verstorben ist." In demselben ersten Buche sagt Origenes: "Wir haben erfahren, dass zwei Männer Namens Celsus Epikuräer gewesen, der erste unter Nero, dieser" (d. h. der unsrige) "unter Hadrian und später." Ea

It is scarcely necessary to point out that the only argument advanced by Tischendorf bears solely against the assertion that Celsus was a contemporary of Origen, "about 225," and leaves the actual date entirely unsettled. He not only admits that the statement of Origen regarding the identity of his opponent with the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian "and later," may be erroneous, but he tacitly rejects it, and having abandoned the conjecture of Origen as groundless and untenable, he substitutes a conjecture of his own, equally unsupported by reasons, that Celsus probably wrote between 150—160. Indeed, he does not attempt to justify this date, but arbitrarily decides to hold by it until a better can be demonstrated. He is forced to admit the ignorance of Origen on the point, and he does not conceal his own.

Now it is clear that the statement of Origen in the preface to his work, quoted above, that Celsus, against whom he writes, is long since dead,¹ is made in the belief that this Celsus was the Epicurean who lived under Hadrian,² which Tischendorf, although he avoids explanation of the reason, rightly recognizes to be a mistake. Origen undoubtedly knew nothing of his adversary, and it obviously follows that, his impression that he is Celsus the Epicurean being erroneous, his statement that he was long since dead, which is based upon that impression, loses all its value. Origen certainly at one time conjectured his Celsus to be the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian, for he not only says so directly in the passage quoted, but on the strength of his belief in the fact, he accuses him of inconsistency: "But Celsus," he says, "must be convicted of contradicting himself; for he is discovered from other of his works to have been an Epicurean, but here, because he considered that he could attack the Word more effectively by not avowing the views of Epicurus, he pretends, &c. . . . Remark, therefore, the falseness of his mind," &c.³ And from time to time

ist nicht unmöglich, dass sich Origenes irrte, wenn er in seinem Celsus den "unter Hadrian und später" lebenden Epikuräer wiederfand; aber es ist unmöglich denselben Celsus, von welchem Origenes dies aussagt, zu einem Zeitgenossen des Origenes zu machen. Oder hatte wirklich gar Origenes selbst im 1. Buche seinen Celsus "unter Hadrian (117—138) und später" gesetzt, im 8. aber gesagt: "Wir wollen abwarten (um 225) ob er dieses Vorhaben, eine andere Schrift folgen zu lassen, noch ausführen werde? Nun so lange keine bessere Entdeckung über Celsus gelingt, wirds wol beim Alten bleiben mit der Annahme, dass Celsus um die Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts, vielleicht zwischen 150 und 160 sein Buch verfasst, &c." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 74.

¹ Contra Cels., prief., § 4.

² *Ib.*, i. 8.

³ Ἐλεγκτέον δὲ ὡς τὰ ἐναντία αὐτῷ λέγοντα τὸν Κέλσον. Εὐρίσκειται μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἄλλων συγγραμμάτων Ἐπικούρειος ὢν ἐνταῦθα δὲ διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν εὐλογώτερον κατηγορεῖν τοῦ λόγου, μὴ ὁμολογῶν τὰ Ἐπικούρου, προσποιεῖται, κ.τ.λ. . . . Ὅρα οὖν τὸ νόσον αὐτοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς, κ.τ.λ. Contra Cels., i. 8.

he continues to refer to him as an Epicurean,¹ although it is evident that in the writing before him he constantly finds evidence that he is of a wholly different school. Beyond this belief, founded avowedly on mere hearsay, Origen absolutely knows nothing whatever as to the personality of Celsus, or the time at which he wrote,² and he sometimes very naïvely expresses his uncertainty regarding him. Referring in one place to certain passages which seem to imply a belief in magic on the part of Celsus, Origen adds: "I do not know whether he is the same who has written several books against magic."³ Elsewhere he says: ". . . the Epicurean Celsus (if he be the same who composed two other books against Christians)," &c.⁴

Not only is it apparent that Origen knows nothing of the Celsus with whom he is dealing, however, but it is almost impossible to avoid the conviction that during the time he was composing his work his impressions concerning the date and identity of his opponent became considerably modified. In the earlier portion of the first book⁵ he has heard that his Celsus is the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian, but a little further on⁶ he confesses his ignorance as to whether he is the same Celsus who wrote against magic, which Celsus the Epicurean actually did. In the fourth book⁷ he expresses uncertainty as to whether the Epicurean Celsus had composed the work against Christians which he is refuting, and at the close of his treatise he seems to treat him as a contemporary. He writes to his friend Ambrosius, at whose request the refutation of Celsus was undertaken: "Know, however, that Celsus has promised to write another treatise after this one.

. . . If, therefore, he has not fulfilled his promise to write a second book, we may well be satisfied with the eight books in reply to his Discourse. If, however, he has commenced and finished this work also, seek it and send it in order that we may answer it also, and confute the false teaching in it," &c.⁸ From

¹ Cf. *Contra Cels.*, i. 10, 21, iii. 75, 80, iv. 36.

² *Neander*, K. G., 1842, i. p. 274.

³ Οὐκ οἶδα, εἰ ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν τῷ γράψαντι κατὰ μαγείας βιβλία πλείονα. *Contra Cels.*, i. 68.

⁴ . . . ὁ Ἐπικουρεύσιος Κέλσος (εἰ γε οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἄλλα δύο βιβλία συντάξας), κ.τ.λ. *Contra Cels.*, iv. 36. With regard to the word ἄλλα, the most competent critics have determined that the doubt expressed is whether the Epicurean Celsus wrote the work against Christians which Origen is here refuting. Such a remark applied to any books against Christians of which no information is given would be absurdly irrelevant. *Neander*, K. G., i. p. 273 *ann.* 2; *Baur*, K. G. d. drei erst. Jahrh., i. p. 383 f., *ann.* 1; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 99. We may point out that the opening passage of the 4th book of Origen's work, as well as subsequent extracts, seems to indicate a distinct division of the treatise of Celsus into two parts, which may fully explain the δύο βιβλία of this sentence.

⁵ i. 8.

⁶ i. 68.

⁷ iv. 36.

⁸ Ἰσθὶ μέντοι ἐπαγγελλόμενον τὸν Κέλσον ἄλλο σύνταγμα μετὰ

this passage, and supported by other considerations, Volkmar and others assert that Celsus was really a contemporary of Origen.¹ To this, as we have seen, Tischendorf merely replies by pointing out that Origen in the preface says that Celsus was already dead, and that he was identical with the Epicurean Celsus who flourished under Hadrian and later. The former of these statements, however, was made under the impression that the latter was correct, and as it is generally agreed that Origen was mistaken in supposing that Celsus the Epicurean was the author of the *Λόγος ἀληθής*,² and Tischendorf himself admits the fact, the two earlier statements, that Celsus flourished under Hadrian and consequently that he had long been dead, fall together, whilst the subsequent doubts regarding his identity not only stand, but rise into assurance at the close of the work in the final request to Ambrosius.³ There can be no doubt that the first statements and the closing paragraphs are contradictory, and whilst almost all critics pronounce against the accuracy of the former, the inferences from the latter retain full force, confirmed as they are by the intermediate doubts expressed by Origen himself.

Even those who, like Tischendorf, in an arbitrary manner assign an early date to Celsus, although they do not support their conjectures by any reliable reasons of their own, all tacitly set aside these of Origen.⁴ It is generally admitted by these, with

τοῦτο ποιῆσειν, . . . Εἰ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἔγραψεν ὑποσχόμενος τὸν δευτέρου λόγον, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι ἀρκεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἡκῶτα πρὸς τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ὑπαγορευθεῖσι βιβλίοις. Εἰ δὲ κακῶς ἀρξάμενος συνετέλεσε, ζητήσαν, καὶ πέμψον τὸ σύγγραμμα, ἵνα καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο . . . ὑπαγορεύσαντες, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῳ ψευδοδοξίαν ἀνατρέψωμεν κ.τ.λ. Contra Cels., viii. 76. We quote, above, the rendering of the passage referred to, p. 228, upon which Tischendorf (Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 73 f.) insists. We may mention that in strictness the original Greek reads: "promises" instead of "has promised"; "did not write" instead of "has not written"; and "commenced and finished," instead of "has commenced and finished." This, however, does not materially affect the argument of Volkmar.

¹ Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 80, cf. 165; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 100; cf. Riggenbach, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann., p. 83; Ueberwey, Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos. des Alterth., 1867, i. p. 237.

² Neander, K. G., i. p. 273 f.; Baur, K. G. d. drei erst. Jahrh., p. 383 f., ann. 1; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 80; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 99 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 398; Mosheim, Instit. Hist. Eccles., P. i. lib. i. sec. ii. cap. 2, § 8; De Rebus Christ. sæc. ii. § 19, note *; cf. Riggenbach, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann., p. 83; Keim, Celsus' Wahres Wort., 1873, p. 275 ff.

³ Contra Cels. viii. 76.

⁴ Kirchoff says that Origen himself does not assign a date to the work of Celsus: "but as he (Celsus) speaks of the Marcionites, he must, in any case, be set in the second half of the second century." Quellensamml., p. 330, ann. 1; Lardner decides that Celsus wrote under Marcus Aurelius, and chooses to date him A.D. 176. Works, viii. p. 6. Bindemann dates between 170—180; Zeitschr. f. d. Hist. Theol., 1842, H. 2, p. 60, 107 ff.; cf. Michaelis, Einl. N. B., 1788, i. p. 41; Anger, Synops. Ev. Proleg., p. xl.; Riggenbach, Die Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Johann., p. 83. Canon Westcott dates Celsus "towards the close of the second century." On the Canon, p. 356. Keim in his very recent work on Celsus dates the work about A.D. 178. Celsus' Wahres Wort, 1873, p. 261 ff.

Lardner¹ and Michaelis,² that the Epicurean Celsus to whom Origen was at one time disposed to refer the work against Christianity, was the writer of that name to whom Lucian, his friend and contemporary, addressed his *Alexander* or *Pseudomantis*, and who really wrote against magic,³ as Origen mentions.⁴ But although on this account Lardner assigns to him the date of A.D. 176, the fact is that Lucian did not write his *Pseudomantis*, as Lardner is obliged to admit,⁵ until the reign of the Emperor Commodus (180—193), and even upon the supposition that this Celsus wrote against Christianity, of which there is not the slightest evidence, there would be no ground whatever for dating the work before A.D. 180. On the contrary, as Lucian does not in any way refer to such a writing by his friend, there would be strong reason for assigning the work, if it be supposed to be written by him, to a date subsequent to the *Pseudomantis*. It need scarcely be remarked that the references of Celsus to the Marcionites,⁶ and to the followers of Marcellina,⁷ only so far bear upon the matter as to exclude an early date.⁸

It requires very slight examination of the numerous extracts from, and references to, the work which Origen seeks to refute, however, to convince any impartial mind that the doubts of Origen were well founded as to whether Celsus the Epicurean were really the author of the *Λόγος ἀληθής*. As many critics of all shades of opinion have long since determined, so far from being an Epicurean, the Celsus attacked by Origen, as the philosophical opinions which he everywhere expresses clearly show, was a Non-Platonist.⁹ Indeed, although Origen seems to retain some impression that his antagonist must be an Epicurean, as he had heard and frequently refers to him as such, he does not point out Epicurean sentiments in his writings, but on the contrary, not only calls upon him no longer to conceal the school to which he belongs and avow himself an Epicurean,¹⁰ which Celsus evidently does not, but accuses him of expressing views inconsistent with that

¹ Works, viii. p. 6.

² *Ψευδομαντῆς*, § 21.

³ Contra Cels., i. 68; Neander, K. G., p. 275; Baur, K. G. drei erst. Jahrh., p. 383, ann. 1; cf. Keim, Celsus' Wahres Wort, 1873, p. 275 ff.

⁴ Works, viii. p. 6; cf. Bindemann, Zeitschr. Hist. Theol. 1842, II. 2, p. 107.

⁵ Contra Cels., v. 62, vi. 53, 74.

⁶ *Ib.*, v. 62.

⁷ Irenæus says that Marcellinus came to Rome under Anicetus (157—168) and made many followers. *Adv. Hær.*, i. 25, § 6; cf. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxvii. 6.

⁸ Neander, K. G., i. p. 273 ff., 278 f.; Baur, K. G. drei erst. Jahrh., p. 383 ff., ann. 1; Mosheim, *Instit. Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i. sec. ii. p. i. cap. 2, § 8; De Rebus Christ., sec. ii. § 19 note *; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 30; Schotten, *Die alt-Zeugnisse*, p. 99; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 398. Cf. Keim, Celsus' Wahres Wort, 1873, p. 286 f.; Bindemann, *Zeitschr. Hist. Theol.*, 1842, II. 2, p. 62 ff., 108 f.

¹⁰ Contra Cels., iii. 80, iv. 54.

philosophy,¹ or of so concealing his Epicurean opinions that it might be said that he is an Epicurean only in name.² On the other hand, Origen is clearly surprised to find that he quotes so largely from the writings, and shows such marked leaning towards the teaching of Plato, in which Celsus indeed finds the original and purer form of many Christian doctrines,³ and Origen is constantly forced to discuss Plato in meeting the arguments of Celsus.

The author of the work which Origen refuted, therefore, instead of being an Epicurean as Origen supposed merely from there having been an Epicurean of the same name, was undoubtedly a Neo-Platonist, as Mosheim long ago demonstrated, of the School of Ammonius, who founded the sect at the close of the second century.⁴ The promise of Celsus to write a second book with practical rules for living in accordance with the philosophy he promulgates, to which Origen refers at the close of his work, confirms this conclusion, and indicates a new and recent system of philosophy.⁵ An Epicurean would not have thought of such a work—it would have been both appropriate and necessary in connection with Neo-Platonism.

We are, therefore, constrained to assign the work of Celsus to at least the early part of the third century, and to the reign of Septimius Severus. Celsus repeatedly accuses Christians, in it, of teaching their doctrines secretly and against the law, which seeks them out and punishes them with death,⁶ and this indicates a period of persecution. Lardner, assuming the writer to be the Epicurean friend of Lucian, from this clue supposes that the persecution referred to must have been that under Marcus Aurelius (+ 180), and practically rejecting the data of Origen himself, without advancing sufficient reasons of his own, dates Celsus A. D. 176.⁷ As a Neo-Platonist, however, we are more accurately led to the period of persecution which, from embers never wholly extinct since the time of Marcus Aurelius, burst into fierce flame more especially in the tenth year of the reign of Severus⁸ (A. D. 202), and continued for many years to afflict the Christians.

It is evident that the dates assigned by apologists are wholly arbitrary, and even if the evidence we have produced were very much less conclusive than it is for the later epoch, the total ab-

¹ *Contra Celso*, i. 8.

² *Ib.*, iv. 54.

³ *Ib.*, i. 32, iii. 63, iv. 54, 55, 83, vi. 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 47, vii. 28, 31, 42, 58 f., &c., &c.

⁴ *Inst. Hist. Ecclæ*, lib. i. sec. ii. p. i. cap. 2, § 8; *De Rebus Christ.*, sec. ii. § 19, § 27.

⁵ Cf. *Neuplaton*, K. G., i. p. 278.

⁶ *Origen, Contra Celso*, i. 1, 3, 7, viii. 60.

⁷ *Works*, viii. p. 6.

⁸ *Eusebius, H. E.*, vi. 1, 2.

sence of evidence for an earlier date would completely nullify any testimony derived from Celsus. It is sufficient for us to add that, whilst he refers to incidents of Gospel history and quotes some sayings which have parallels, with more or less of variation, in our Gospels, Celsus nowhere mentions the name of any Christian book, unless we except the Book of Enoch;¹ and he accuses Christians, not without reason, of interpolating the books of the Sibyl, whose authority, he states, some of them acknowledged.²

3.

The last document which we need examine in connection with the synoptic Gospels is the list of New Testament and other writings held in consideration by the Church, which is generally called, after its discoverer and first editor, the Canon of Muratori. This interesting fragment, which was published in 1740 by Muratori in his collection of Italian antiquities,³ at one time belonged to the monastery of Bobbio, founded by the Irish monk Columban, and was found by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan in a MS. containing extracts of little interest from writings of Eucherius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others. Muratori estimated the age of the MS. at about a thousand years, but so far as we are aware no thoroughly competent judge has since expressed any opinion upon the point. The fragment, which is defective both at the commencement and at the end, is written in an apologetic tone, and professes to give a list of the writings which are recognized by the Christian Church. It is a document which has no official character,⁴ but which merely conveys the private views and information of the anonymous writer, regarding whom nothing whatever is known. From any point of view, the composition is of a nature permitting the widest differences of opinion. It is by some affirmed to be a complete treatise on the books received by the Church, from which fragments have been lost;⁵ whilst others consider it a mere fragment in itself.⁶ It is written in Latin which by some is represented as most corrupt.⁷

¹ *Contra Cels.*, v. 54, 55.

² *Ib.*, vii. 53, 56.

³ *Antiquit. Ital. Med. Ævi.*, iii. p. 851 ff.

⁴ *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 303 f.; *Hist. du Canon*, p. 109; *Scholz*, *Einkl. A. u. N. T.*, i. p. 272; *Tregelles*, *Canon Muratorianus*, 1867, p. 1 ff.; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 186.

⁵ *Credner*, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 143; *Folkmar*, *Anhang*, p. 341 ff., p. 355.

⁶ *Hilgenfeldt*, *Der Canon*, p. 39; *Mayerhoff*, *Einkl. petr. Schr.*, p. 147; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 186, note 5; *Tregelles*, *Can. Murat.*, p. 29 f.

⁷ *M. & A.*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 640; *Credner*, *Zur Gesch. d. Kanons*, p. 72; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. und Doctr.*, iii. p. 205 ff.; *Guericke*, *Beiträge zur N. T.*, p. 13; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 303; *Scholz*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 271 f.; *Tregelles*, *Can. Murat.*, p. 6 f., p. 27 f.; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 185.

whilst others uphold it as most correct.¹ The text is further rendered almost unintelligible by every possible inaccuracy of orthography and grammar, which is ascribed diversely to the transcriber, to the translator, and to both.² Indeed such is the elastic condition of the text, resulting from errors and obscurity of every imaginable description, that by means of ingenious conjectures critics are able to find in it almost any sense they desire.³ Considerable difference of opinion exists as to the original language of the fragment, the greater number of critics maintaining that the composition is a translation from the Greek,⁴ whilst others assert it to have been originally written in Latin.⁵ Its composition is variously attributed to the Church of Africa⁶ and to a member of the Church in Rome.⁷

The fragment commences with the concluding portion of a sentence. . . . "quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit"—"at

¹ Volkmar considers it in reality the reverse of corrupt. After allowing for peculiarities of speech, and for the results of an Irish-English pronunciation by the monk who transcribed it, he finds the characteristic original Latin which is the old *lingua volgata*, which in the Roman Provinces, such as Africa, &c., was the written as well as the spoken language. Anhang zu Credner's Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 341 ff.

² Credner, Zur Gesch. d. Kanons, p. 72; Hilgenfeld, Der Kanon, p. 39 f.; Mayrhofer, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 147 f.; Scholz, Einl. A. u. N. T., i. p. 271 f.; Tregelles, Can. Murat., p. 2; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 185.

³ Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 303; Hist. du Canon, p. 101; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., iv. p. 34.

⁴ Bunsen, Analecta Ante-Nic., 1854, i. p. 137 f.; Bötticher, Zeitschr. f. d. gesammte luth. Theol. u. Kirche, 1854, p. 127 f.; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 497; cf. p. 349, ann. 2; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 593, ann.; Hilgenfeld, Der Kanon, p. 39 f.; Hug, Einl. N. T., i. p. 106; Muratori, Antiq. Ital., iii. p. 851 ff.; Nolte, Tüb. Quartalschr., 1860, p. 193 ff.; Routh, Rel. Sacr., i. p. 402; Scholz, Einl. A. u. N. T., i. p. 271 f.; Thiersch, Versuch. u. s. w., p. 385; Tregelles, Can. Murat., p. 4; Simon de Magistris, Daniel sec. lxx., iv. p. 467; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 28; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 185; cf. Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 204, p. 210 f.

⁵ Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 640; Credner, Zur Gesch. d. Kanons, p. 93; Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 144; Freindtaller, Apud Routh, Rel. Sacr., i. p. 401 f.; Herse, Das Murat. Fragment, 1873, p. 25 ff.; Laurent, Neutest. Stud., 1866, p. 198 f.; Mayrhofer, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 147; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 395; Stosch, Comm. Hist. Crit. de Litr. N. T. Can., 1755, §§ lvi. f.; cf. Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 210 f. If the fragment, as there is good reason to believe, was originally written in Latin, it furnishes evidence that it was not written till the third century. Canon Westcott, who concludes from the order of the Gospels, &c., that it was not written in Africa, admits that: "There is no evidence of the existence of Christian Latin Literature out of Africa till about the close of the second century."

⁶ Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kanon, p. 141 ff., p. 168 ff.; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr. iii. p. 211; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 303; Hist. du Canon, p. 109; cf. Volkmar, Anhang zu Credner's Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 341 f.

⁷ Guericke, Beiträge N. T., 1828, p. 7; Hilgenfeld, Der Kanon, p. 39; Meyer, Handl. Hebräerbr., 1867, p. 7; Reimayr, Einl. Can. B. N. B., p. 65; Scholz, Einl. A. u. N. T., i. p. 271; Tischendorf, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 9; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 27 f.; cf. Anh. z. Credner's Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 341 f.; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 186.

which nevertheless he was present and thus he placed it." The MS. then proceeds: "Third book of the Gospel according to Luke. Luke, that physician, after the ascension of Christ when Paul took him with him as studious of the right, wrote it in his name as he deemed best (*ex opinione*)—nevertheless he had not himself seen the Lord in the flesh,—and he too, as far as he could obtain information also begins to speak from the nativity of John." The text, at the sense of which this is a closely approximate guess, though several other interpretations might be maintained, is as follows: *Tertio evangelii librum secundo Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eo Paulus quasi ut juris studiosum secundum adsumsisset nomen suo ex opinione conscribet dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne et idem prout aequi potuit ita et ad nativitate Johannis incipet dicere.*

The MS. goes on to speak in more intelligible language "of the fourth of the Gospels of John, one of the disciples" (*Quartum evangelium Johannis ex discipulis*), regarding the composition of which the writer relates a legend, which we shall quote when we come to deal with that Gospel. The fragment then goes on to mention the Acts of the Apostles,—which is ascribed to Luke—thirteen apostles of Paul in peculiar order, and it then refers to an Epistle to the Laodiceans and another to the Alexandrians, forged, it the name of Paul, after the heresy of Marcion, "and many others which cannot be received by the Catholic Church as *all must not be mixed with vinegar.*" The Epistle to the Ephesians (the name of Epistle to the Laodiceans in the list of Marcion) and this may be a reference to it.¹ The Epistle to the Alexandrians is generally identified with the Epistle to the Hebrews,² although some critics think this doubtful, or deny the fact, and consider both Epistles referred to pseudographs attributed to the Apostle Paul.³ The Epistle of Jude, and two (the second and third) Epistles of John are, with some tone of doubt, mentioned amongst the received books, and so is the Book of Wisdom. The Apocalypses of John and of Peter only are received but some object to the latter being read in church.

The Epistle of James, both Epistles of Peter, the Epistle to

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Der Canon*, p. 42; Schulten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 129. Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 190, note 1. Cf. Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* Einl. N. T., 1832, p. 133 ff.; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* i. 11, 17. It will be remembered that reference is made in the Epist. to the Laodiceans to an Epistle to the Laodiceans which is a lost Col. iv. 16.

² Hilgenfeld, *Der Canon*, p. 42. Köstlin, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 416. Schulten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 129; Wiesner, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847, p. 840, 1857, p. 97 f., and so also, Eichhorn, Hug, Münster, Credner, Volkmar, Schleiermacher, Semler, &c., &c.

³ Guericke, *Seitrag*, N. T., p. 7 f. Thiersch, *Versuch*, u. s. w., p. 385. Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 190, note 1.

the Hebrews (which is probably indicated as the Epistle to the Alexandrians), and the first Epistle of John are omitted altogether, with the exception of a quotation which is supposed to be from the last-named Epistle, to which we shall hereafter refer. Special reference is made to the Pastor of Hermas, which we shall presently discuss, regarding which the writer expresses his opinion that it should be read privately but not publicly in the church, as it can neither be classed amongst the prophets nor among the apostles. The fragment concludes with the rejection of the writings of several heretics.¹

It is inferred that, in the missing commencement of the fragment, the first two Synoptics must have been mentioned. This, however, cannot be ascertained, and so far as these Gospels are concerned, therefore, the "Canon of Muratori" furnishes no evidence stronger than conjecture. The statement regarding the third Synoptic merely proves the existence of that Gospel at the time the fragment was composed, and we shall presently endeavour to form some idea of that date, but beyond this fact the information given anything but tends to establish the unusual credibility claimed for the Gospels. It is declared by the fragment, as we have seen, that the third Synoptic was written by Luke, who had not himself seen the Lord, but narrated the history as best he was able. It is worthy of remark, moreover, that even the Apostle Paul, who took Luke with him after the resurrection, had not been a follower of Jesus either, nor had seen him in the flesh, and certainly he did not, by the showing of his own Epistles, associate much with the other Apostles, so that Luke could not have had much opportunity while with him of acquiring from them any intimate knowledge of the events of Gospel history. It is undeniable that the third Synoptic is not the narrative of an eye-witness, and the occurrences which it records did not take place in the presence, or within the personal knowledge of the writer, but were derived from tradition, or other written sources. Such testimony, therefore, could not in any case be of much service to our third Synoptic; but when we consider the uncertainty of the date at which the fragment was composed, and the certainty that it could not have been written at an early period, it will become apparent that the value of the evidence is reduced to a minimum.

¹ The text of the fragment may be found in the following amongst many other books, of which we only mention some of the more accessible. *Credner*, *Zur Gesch. d. Kanons*, p. 73 ff.; *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 153 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Der Kanon*, p. 40 ff.; *Routh*, *Relig. Sacr.*, i. p. 394 ff.; *Kirchhofer*, *Quellensamml.*, p. 1 ff.; *Tregelles*, *Canon Murat.*, p. 17 ff.; *Bunsen*, *Analecta Ante-Nic.*, i. p. 125 ff.; *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 467 ff.

We have already incidentally mentioned that the writer of this fragment is totally unknown, nor does there exist any clue by which he can be identified. All the critics who have assigned an early date to the composition of the fragment have based their conclusion, almost solely, upon one statement made by the Author regarding the Pastor of Hermas. He says: "Hermas in truth composed the Pastor very recently in our times in the city of Rome, the Bishop Pius his brother, sitting in the chair of the church of the city of Rome. And certainly it should be read, but it cannot be published in the church to the people, neither being among the prophets, whose number is complete, nor amongst the apostles in the latter days."

"Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Romæ ecclesiæ Pio episcopus fratre ejus et ideo legi eum quidem oportet se publicare vero in ecclesia populo neque inter prophetas completum numero neque inter apostolos in fine temporum potest."¹

Muratori, the discoverer of the MS., conjectured for various reasons, which need not be here detailed, that the fragment was written by Caius the Roman Presbyter, who flourished at the end of the second (c. A.D. 196) and beginning of the third century, and in this he was followed by a few others.² The great mass of critics, however, have rejected this conjecture, as they have likewise negatived the fanciful ascription of the composition by Simon de Magistris to Papias of Hierapolis,³ and by Bunsen to Hegesippus.⁴ Such attempts to identify the unknown author are obviously mere speculation, and it is impossible to suppose that, had Papias, Hegesippus, or any other well-known writer of the same period composed such a list, Eusebius could have failed to refer to it, as so immediately relevant to the purpose of his work. Thiersch even expressed a suspicion that the fragment was a literary mystification on the part of Muratori himself.⁵

The mass of critics, with very little independent consideration, have taken literally the statement of the author regarding the composition of the Pastor "very recently in our times" (nuperrime temporibus nostris), during the Episcopate of Pius (A.D. 142—157), and have concluded the fragment to have been written towards the end of the second century.⁶ We need scarcely say that

¹ With the exception of a few trifling alterations we give these quotations as they stand in the MS.

² *Antiq. Ital.* iii. p. 854 ff.; *Gallandi, Bibl. Vet. Patr.*, 1788, ii. p. xxxiii.; *Friedländer*, apud *Routh*, *Rel. Sacr.*, i. p. 401; cf. *Hefele*, *Patr. Ap. Proleg.*, p. lxxii.

³ *David secundum* lxx. 1772; *Dissert.*, iv. p. 467 ff.

⁴ *Analecta Antæ-Nic.*, 1854, i. p. 125; *Hippolytus and his Age*, i. p. 314.

⁵ *Versuch*, ii. n. w., p. 387.

⁶ *Neck*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 640; *Einl. z. Hebräerbr.*, p. 121, ann.; *Credner*, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.*, p. 84, p. 92 f.; *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 167; *Corrodi*, *Versuch ein-*

a few writers would date it even earlier.¹ On the other hand, and we consider with reason, many critics, including men who will not be accused of opposition to an early Canon, assign the composition to a later period, between the end of the second or beginning of the third century and the fourth century.²

When we examine the ground upon which alone an early date can be supported, it becomes apparent how impossible it is to defend it. The only argument of any weight is the statement with regard to the composition of the Pastor, but with the exception of the few apologists who do not hesitate to assign a date totally inconsistent with the state of the Canon described in the fragment, the great majority of critics feel that they are forced to place the composition at least towards the end of the second century, at a period when the statement in the composition may agree with the actual opinions in the Church, and yet in a sufficient degree accord with the expression "very recently in our times," as applied to the period of Pius of Rome, 142—157. It must be evident that, taken literally, a very arbitrary interpretation is given to this indication, and in supposing that the writer may have appropriately used the phrase thirty or forty years after the time of Pius, so much licence is taken that there is absolutely no reason why a still greater interval may not be allowed. With this sole exception, there is not a single word or statement in the fragment which would oppose our assigning the composition to a late period of the third century. Volkmar has very justly pointed

Beleucht. d. Gesch. jüd. u. chr. Bibel-Kanons, 1792, ii. p. 219 f.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., i. p. 7; Feilmoser, Einl. N. T., p. 203, ann.; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 587 f.; Beiträge N. T., p. 7; Hilgenfeld, Der Canon, p. 39; Lumper, Hist. de Vita, Script., &c., SS. Patr., vii., 1790; p. 26 ff.; Lücke, Einl. Offenb. Joh., 1852, ii. p. 595; Mosheim, De Rebus Christ., p. 164 ff.; Meyer, Krit., ex. H'buch. üb. d. Hebraerbr., 1867, p. 7; Olshausen, Echth. d. vier kan. Evv., p. 281 ff.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 393, p. 305; Hist. du Canon, p. 108; Reithmayr, Einl. N. B., p. 65, ann. 1; Routh, Reliq. Sacr., i. p. 397 ff.; Chr. F. Schmid, Unters. Offenb. Joh., u. s. w., 1771, d. 101 ff.; Hist. Antiq. et Vindic. Canonis, 1775, p. 308 f.; Schroech, Chr. K. G., iii. 1777, p. 426 ff.; Stosch, Comment. His. Crit. de libris N. T. Can., 1755, §§ 1xi. ff.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 127; Scholz, Einl. A. u. N. T., i. p. 272; Thiersch, (if not spurious), Versuch, u. s. w., p. 384 f. cf. 315; Volkmar, (A. D. 190—200) Anh. zu: Credner's, Gesch. N. T. Kan., p. 359; Wieseler, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1847, p. 815 ff.

¹ Hesse (before Irenaeus, Clement Al., and Tertullian), Das Muratori'sche Fragment. 1873, p. 48; Ewald, (in late middle of 2nd century), Gesch. d. V. Isr., vii. p. 497; Tischendorf (A. D. 160—170), Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 9; Tregelles (c. A. D. 170), Canon Murat., p. 1 f., p. 4, note c.; Westcott, (not much later than A. D. 170), On the Canon, p. 185; Laurent (c. A. D. 160), Neutest. Studien, p. 198.

² Donaldson (end of first half of 3rd century), Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 212; Hug, (beginning 3rd century), Einl. N. T., i. p. 105 f.; end of 2nd, or beginning of 3rd century; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 147; Keil ad Fabric. Bibl. Grace, vii. 1801, p. 285; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., iv. p. 34; Tayler, The Fourth Gospel, 1867, p. 38; Zimmermann, Diss. Crit. Script., &c., &c., a Murat. rep. exhib., 1805, and to these may be added all those who assign the fragment to Caius.

out, however, that in saying "very recently in our times" the writer merely intended to distinguish the Pastor of Hermas from the writings of the Prophets and Apostles: It cannot be classed amongst the Prophets whose number is complete, nor amongst the Apostles, inasmuch as it was only written in our post-apostolic time. This is an accurate interpretation of the expression,¹ which might with perfect propriety be used a century after the time of Pius. We have seen that there has not appeared a single trace of any Canon in the writings of any of the Fathers whom we have examined, and that the Old Testament has been the only Holy Scripture they have acknowledged; and it is inadmissible to date this anonymous fragment, regarding which we know nothing earlier than the very end of the second or beginning of the third century, upon the interpretation of a phrase which would be equally applicable even a century later. There is, however, as we have said, nothing whatever requiring so early a date as that, and it is probable that the fragment was not written until an advanced period of the third century.² The expression used with regard to Pius: "Sitting in the chair of the church," is quite unprecedented in the second century or until a very much later date.³ It is argued that the fragment is imperfect, and that sentences have fallen out; and in regard to this, and to the assertion that it is a translation from the Greek, it has been well remarked by a writer whose judgment on the point will scarcely be called prejudiced: "If it is thus mutilated, why might it not also be interpolated? If moreover the translator was so ignorant of Latin, can we trust his translation? And what guarantee have we that he has not paraphrased and expanded the original? The force of these remarks is peculiarly felt in dealing with the paragraph which gives the date. The Pastor of Hermas was not well known to the Western Church, and it was not highly esteemed. It was regarded as inspired by the Eastern, and read in the Eastern Churches. We have seen, moreover, that it was extremely unlikely that Hermas was a real personage. It would be, therefore, far more probable that we have here an interpolation, or addition by a member of the Roman or African Church, probably by the translator, made expressly for the purpose of serving as proof that

¹ *Volkmar*, *Der Ursprung*, p. 28; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 212; *Lomann*, *Bijdragen ter Inleid. op de Joh. Schr.*, p. 29; *Schotten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 127.

² If the fragment, as there is good reason to believe, was originally written in Latin, this fact, we repeat, would point to the conclusion that it was composed in the third century. Dr. Westcott, who, with so many others, considers that it emanates from the Roman Church, himself says as an argument for a Greek original: "There is no evidence of the existence of Christian Latin Literature out of Africa till about the close of the second century." On the Canon, p. 188, note 1.

³ *Donaldson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 212.

the Pastor of Hermas was not inspired. The paragraph itself bears unquestionable mark of tampering."¹ &c.

It would take us too far were we to discuss the various statements of the fragment as indications of date, and the matter is not of sufficient importance. It contains nothing involving an earlier date than the third century. The facts of the case may be briefly summed up as follows, so far as our object is concerned. The third Synoptic is mentioned by a totally unknown writer, at an unknown, but certainly not early, date, in all probability during the third century, in a fragment which we possess in a very corrupt version very far from free from suspicion of interpolation in the precise part from which the early date is inferred. The Gospel is attributed to Luke, who was not one of the followers of Jesus, and of whom it is expressly said that "he himself had not seen the Lord in the flesh," but wrote "as he deemed best (ex opinione)," and followed his history as he was able (et idem prout assequi potuit).² If the evidence, therefore, even came within our limits as to date, which it does not, it could be of no value for establishing the trustworthiness and absolute accuracy of the narrative of the third Synoptic, but on the contrary it would distinctly tend to destroy its evidence, as the composition of one who undeniably was not an eye-witness of the miracles reported, but collected the materials, long after, as best he could.³

4.

We may now briefly sum up the results of our examination of the evidence for the synoptic Gospels. After having exhausted the literature and the testimony bearing on the point, we have not found a single distinct trace of any one of those Gospels during the first century and a half after the death of Jesus. Only once during the whole of that period do we find any tradition even, that any one of our Evangelists composed a Gospel at all, and that tradition, so far from favouring our Synoptics, is fatal to the claims of the first and second. Papias, about the middle of the

¹ Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 209.

² The passage is freely rendered thus by Canon Westcott: "The Gospel of St. Luke, it is then said, stands third in order [in the Canon], having been written by 'Luke the physician,' the companion of St. Paul, who, not being himself an eye-witness, based his narrative on such information as he could obtain, beginning from the birth of John." On the Canon, p. 187.

³ We do not propose to consider the Ophites and Peratici, obscure Gnostic sects towards the end of the second century. There is no direct evidence regarding them, and the testimony of writers in the third century, like Hippolytus, is of no value for the Gospels.

second century, on the occasion to which we refer, records that Matthew composed the Discourses of the Lord in the Hebrew tongue, a statement which totally excludes the claim of our Greek Gospel to apostolic origin. Mark, he said, wrote down from the casual preaching of Peter the sayings and doings of Jesus, but without orderly arrangement: as he was not himself a follower of the Master, and merely recorded what fell from the Apostle. This description, likewise, shows that our actual second Gospel could not, in its present form, have been the work of Mark. There is no other reference during the period to any writing of Matthew or Mark, and no mention at all of any work ascribed to Luke. If it be considered that there is any connection between Marcion's Gospel and our third Synoptic, any evidence so derived is of an unfavourable character for that Gospel, as it involves a charge against it, of being interpolated and debased by Jewish elements. Any argument for the mere existence of our Synoptics based upon their supposed rejection by heretical leaders and sects has the inevitable disadvantage, that the very testimony which would show their existence would oppose their authenticity. There is no evidence of their use by heretical leaders, however, and no direct reference to them by any writer, heretical or orthodox, whom we have examined. We need scarcely add that no reason whatever has been shown for accepting the testimony of these Gospels as sufficient to establish the reality of miracles and of a direct Divine Revelation.¹ It is not pretended that more than one of the synoptic Gospels was written by an eye-witness of the miraculous occurrence reported, and whilst no evidence has been, or can be, produced even of the historical accuracy of the narratives, no testimony as to the correctness of the inferences from the external phenomena exists, or is now even conceivable. The discrepancy between the amount of evidence required, and that which is forthcoming, however, is greater than under the circumstances could have been thought possible.

¹ A comparison of the contents of the three Synoptics would have confirmed this conclusion, but this is not at present necessary, and we must hasten on.

W
s
cited
denied
Gospel
Ap
fourth
Corin
A
Barna
Jesus
1 Ca
service
John.
grace
ven; t
excell
our dul
his mar
of the
"affirm
Hebrew
require
2 Lan

AN INQUIRY
INTO THE
REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION.

PART III.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

We shall now examine, in the same order, the witnesses already cited in connection with the Synoptics, and ascertain what evidence they furnish for the date and authenticity of the fourth Gospel.

Apologists do not even allege that there is any reference to the fourth Gospel in the so-called Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians.¹

A few critics² pretend to find a trace of it in the Epistle of Barnabas, in the reference to the brazen Serpent as a type of Jesus. Tischendorf states the case as follows :—

¹ Canon Westcott, however, cannot resist the temptation to press Clement into service. He says : " In other passages it is possible to trace the influence of St. John. 'The blood of Christ hath gained for the whole world the offer of the grace of repentance.' 'Through Him we look steadfastly on the heights of heaven ; through him we view as in a glass (*ἐν ὀπταζόμεθα*) His spotless and most excellent visage : through Him the eyes of our heart were opened ; through Him our dull and darkened understanding is quickened with new vigour on turning to his marvellous light.'" He does not indicate more clearly the nature and marks of the "influence" to which he refers. As he also asserts that the Epistle "affirms the teaching of St. Paul and St. James," and that the Epistle to the Hebrews is "wholly transfused into Clement's mind," such an argument does not require a single remark. On the Canon, p. 23 f.

² Lardner, Canon Westcott, and others do not refer to it at all.










IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

18
20
22
25
28
32
36
40

10

"And when in the same chapter xii. it is shown how Moses in the brazen serpent made a type of Jesus 'who should suffer (die) and yet himself make alive,' the natural inference is that Barnabas connected therewith John iii. 14, f., even if the use of this passage in particular cannot be proved. Although this connection cannot be affirmed, since the author of the Epistle, in this passage as in many others, may be independent, yet it is justifiable to ascribe the greatest probability to its dependence on the passage in John, as the tendency of the Epistle in no way required a particular leaning to the expression of John. The disproportionately more abundant use of express quotations from the Old Testament in Barnabas is, on the contrary, connected most intimately with the tendency of his whole composition."¹

It will be observed that the suggestion of reference to the fourth Gospel is here advanced in a very hesitating way, and does not indeed go beyond an assertion of probability. We might, therefore, well leave the matter without further notice, as the reference in no case could be of any weight as evidence. On examination of the context, however, we find that there is every reason to conclude that the reference to the brazen serpent is made direct to the Old Testament. The author who delights in typology is bent upon showing that the cross is prefigured in the Old Testament. He gives a number of instances, involving the necessity for a display of ridiculous ingenuity of explanation, which should prepare us to find the comparatively simple type of the brazen serpent naturally selected. After pointing out that Moses, with his arms stretched out in prayer that the Israelites might prevail in the fight, was a type of the cross, he goes on to say: "Again Moses makes a type of Jesus that he must suffer and himself make alive (*καὶ αὐτὸς ζωοποιήσῃ*) whom they will appear to have destroyed in a figure while Israel was falling;"² and connecting the circumstance that the people were bit by serpents and died with the transgression of Eve by means of the serpent, he goes on to narrate minutely the story of Moses and the brazen serpent, and then winds up with the words: "Thou hast in this the glory of Jesus; that in him are all things and for him."³ It is impossible for any one to read the whole passage without seeing that the reference is direct to the Old Testament.⁴ There is no ground

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., 96 f.

Πάλιν Μωϋσῆς ποιεῖ τύπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν παθεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸς ζωοποιήσῃ, ὃν διέξουσιν ἀπολωλέκεναι ἐν σήμερι, πικροντος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Ch. xii.

² *Ἐλεῖς πάλιν καὶ ἐν εὐτοῖς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν.* Ch. xii.; cf. Heb. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 36.

³ *Scholten*, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 14; *Volkmar*, Der Ursprung, p. 64 ff.; *Müller*, Das Barnabasbr., p. 281; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Vater, p. 50, ann. 8; *Theol. Jahrb.* 1850, p. 396; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1868, p. 215; *Scholten* rightly points out

for supposing that the author was acquainted with the fourth Gospel.

To the Pastor of Hermas Tischendorf devotes only two lines, in which he states that "it has neither quotations from the Old nor from the New Testament."¹ Canon Westcott makes the same statement,² but, unlike the German apologist, he proceeds subsequently to affirm that Hermas makes "clear allusions to St. John;" which few or no apologists support. This assertion he elaborates and illustrates as follows:—

"The view which Hermas gives of Christ's nature and work is no less harmonious with apostolic doctrine, and it offers striking analogies to the Gospel of St. John. Not only did the Son 'appoint angels to preserve each of those whom the Father gave to him;' but 'He himself toiled very much and suffered very much to cleanse our sins.' . . . And so when he himself had cleansed the sins of the people, he showed them the paths of life by giving them the Law which he received from his Father."³ He is 'a Rock higher than the mountains, able to hold the whole world, ancient, and yet having a new gate.'⁴ 'His name is great and infinite, and the whole world is supported by him.'⁵ 'He is older

that the distinguishing *ἰσοϋσθαι* of the fourth Gospel is totally lacking in the Epistle. Die ält. Zehn., p. 14. The brazen serpent is also referred to in the Wisdom of Solomon, xvi. 5, 6, and by Philo, Leg. Alleg., ii. § 20; De Agricultura, § 22; cf. Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 67 f.; Tobler, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1840, p. 199 f. Justin Martyr also refers to the type of the brazen serpent without any connection with the fourth Gospel, Dial., 91, 94.

¹ Wann wurden, ii. s. w., p. 20, ann. 1; Lucke makes no claim to its testimony, the analogies being "too slight and distant." Comment. Ev. Joh., 1840, i. p. 44, ann. 2.

² On the Canon, p. 175.

³ Καὶ αὐτὸς τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἠκαθάρισε πολλὰ κοπιῶσας καὶ πολλοὺς κόπους ἠντληκῶς. . . αὐτὸς οὖν καθάρισας τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς τρίβους τῆς ζωῆς, δούς αὐτοῖς τὸν νόμον ὃν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. Sim., v. 6.

⁴ τίς μέσσω δὲ τοῦ πεδίου ἔδειξέ μοι πέτραν μεγάλην λευκὴν ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου ἀναβεβρυμένην. ἡ δὲ πέτρα ὑψηλοτέρα ἦν τῶν ὄρεων, τριπλάσιος ὥστε δύνασθαι ὅλον τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι παλαιὰ δὲ ἢ ἡ πέτρα ἔκειντο, πύλην ἐκκεκομμένην ἔχουσαν ὡς προόφαιτος ἢ ἰδοὺ μοι εἶναι ἡ ἐκκόλαψις τῆς πύλης. ἡ δὲ πύλη οὕτως ἐστὶ λειβὼν ὡς τὸν ἡλίον, ὥστε με θάυμαζειν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσκησίᾳ τῆς πύλης. Simil., ix. 2.

⁵ ἡ πέτρα, φησὶν, αὕτη καὶ ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ. Πῶς, φησὶ, κίριε, ἡ πέτρα παλαιὰ ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ πύλη καινὴ; ἰκονε, φησὶ, καὶ οὕτω, ἀνέγερτε. Ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν, ὥστε σύμβουλον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παλαιὸς ἐστίν. ἡ δὲ πύλη διὰ τὴν καινὴν, φησὶ, κίριε; Ὅτι, φησὶν, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς οὐτελείας φανερός ἐγένετο, διὰ τοῦτο καινὴ ἐγένετο ἡ πύλη, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες σωθῆσθαι δι' αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέλθωσι τοῦ θεοῦ. Simil., ix. 12.

⁶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μέγα ἐστὶ καὶ ἀχώρητον καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον βαστάζει. Simil., ix. 14.

than Creation, so that he took counsel with the Father about the creation which he made.¹ 'He is the sole way of access to the Lord; and no one shall enter in unto him otherwise than by his Son.'²

This is all Canon Westcott says on the subject.³ He does not attempt to point out any precise portions of the fourth Gospel with which to compare these "striking analogies," nor does he produce any instances of similarity of language, or of the use of the same terminology as the Gospel in this apocalyptic allegory. It is evident that such evidence could in no case be of any value for the fourth Gospel.

When we examine more closely, however, it becomes certain that these passages possess no real analogy with the fourth Gospel, and were certainly not derived from it. There is no part of them that has not close parallels in writings antecedent to our Gospel, and there is no use of terminology peculiar to it. He does not even once use the term *Logos*. Canon Westcott makes no mention of the fact that the doctrine of the *Logos* and of the pre-existence of Jesus was enunciated long before the composition of the fourth Gospel, with almost equal clearness and fulness, and that its development can be traced through the Septuagint translation, the "Proverbs of Solomon," some of the Apocryphal works of the Old Testament, the writings of Philo, and in the Apocalypse, Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as the Epistles of Paul. To any one who examines the passages cited from the works of Hermas, and still more to any one acquainted with the history of the *Logos* doctrine, it will, we fear, seem wasted time to enter upon any minute refutation of such imaginary "analogies." We shall, however, as briefly as possible refer to each passage quoted.

The first is taken from an elaborate similitude with regard to true fasting, in which the world is likened to a vineyard, and in explaining his parable the Shepherd says: "God planted the vineyard, that is, he created the people and gave them to his Son: and the Son appointed his angels over them to keep them: and he himself cleansed their sins, having suffered many things and endured many labours. . . . He himself, therefore, having cleansed the sins of the people, showed them the paths of life by giving them the Law which he received from his Father."⁴

¹ Simil., ix. 12, quoted on preceding page.

² ἡ δὲ πύλη, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν. αὕτη μὲν εἰσοδος ἴσται πρὸς τὸν κύριον. ἀλλῶς οὖν οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ μὴ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. Sim., ix. 12.

³ On the Canon, p. 177 f. We give the Greek quotations as they stand in Canon Westcott's notes; and also the translations in his text, without, however, adopting them.

⁴ Simil., v. 6.

It is difficult indeed to find anything in this passage which is in the slightest degree peculiar to the fourth Gospel, or apart from the whole course of what is taught in the Epistles, and more especially the Epistle to the Hebrews. We may point out a few passages for comparison: Heb. i. 2—4; ii. 10—11; v. 8—9; vii. 12, 17—19; viii. 6—10; x. 10—16; Romans viii. 24—17; Matt. xxi. 33; Mark xii. 1; Isaiah v. 7, liii.

The second passage is taken from an elaborate parable on the building of the Church: (a) "and in the middle of the plain he showed me a great white rock which had risen out of the plain, and the rock was higher than the mountains, rectangular so as to be able to hold the whole world, but that rock was old having a gate (*πύλη*) hewn out of it, and the hewing out of the gate (*πύλη*) seemed to me to be recent."¹ Upon this rock the tower of the Church is built. Further on an explanation is given of the similitude, in which occurs another of the passages referred to. (β) "This rock (*πέτρα*) and this gate (*πύλη*) are the Son of God. 'How, Lord,' I said, 'is the rock old and the gate new?' 'Listen,' he said, 'and understand, thou ignorant man. (γ) The Son of God is older than all of his creation (*ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν*), so that he was a councillor with the Father in his work of creation; and for this is he old.' (δ) 'And why is the gate new, Lord?' I said; 'Because,' he replied, 'he was manifested at the last days (*ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*) of the dispensation; for this cause the gate was made new, in order that they who shall be saved might enter by it into the kingdom of God.'"²

And a few lines lower down the Shepherd further explains, referring to entrance through the gate, and introducing another of the passages cited: (ε) "In this way," he said, "no one shall enter into the kingdom of God unless he receive his holy name. If, therefore, you cannot enter into the City unless through its gate, so also," he said, "a man cannot enter in any other way into the kingdom of God than by the name of his Son beloved by him" . . . "and the gate (*πύλη*) is the Son of God. This is the one entrance to the Lord." In no other way, therefore, shall any one enter in to him, except through his Son."³

Now with regard to the similitude of the rock we need scarcely say that the Old Testament teems with it; and we need not point to the parable of the house built upon a rock in the first Gospel.⁴ A more apt illustration is the famous saying with

¹ Simil., ix. 2.

² *Ib.*, ix. 12. *Philo* represents the Logos as a Rock (*πέτρα*). *Quod det. potiori insid.*, 31, *Mangey*, i. 213.

Simil., ix. 12.

⁴ Matt. vii. 24.

regard to Peter; "And upon this rock (*πέτρα*) I will build my Church," upon which indeed the whole similitude of Hermas turns; and in 1 Cor. x. 4, we read: "For they drank of the Spiritual Rock accompanying them; but the Rock was Christ" (*ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός*). There is no such similitude in the fourth Gospel at all.

We then have the "gate," on which we presume Canon Westcott chiefly relies. The parable in John x. 1—9 is quite different from that of Hermas,¹ and there is a persistent use of different terminology. The door into the sheepfold is always *θύρα*, the gate in the rock always *πίλη*. "I am the door,"² (*ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα*) is twice repeated in the fourth Gospel. "The gate is the Son of God" (*ἡ πίλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν*) is the declaration of Hermas. On the other hand, there are numerous passages, elsewhere, analogous to that in the Pastor of Hermas. Every one will remember the injunction in the Sermon on the Mount: Matth. vii. 13, 14. "Enter in through the strait gate (*πίλη*), for wide is the gate (*πίλη*), &c., 14. Because narrow is the gate (*πίλη*) and straitened is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."³ The limitation to the one way of entrance into the kingdom of God; "by the name of his Son," is also found everywhere throughout the Epistles, and likewise in the Acts of the Apostles; as for instance: Acts iv. 12, "And there is no salvation in any other; for neither is there any other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

The reasons given why the rock is old and the gate new (γ. δ.) have anything but special analogy with the fourth Gospel. We are, on the contrary, taken directly to the Epistle to the Hebrews in which the pre-existence of Jesus is prominently asserted, and between which and the Pastor, as in a former passage, we find singular linguistic analogies. For instance, take the whole opening portion of Heb. i. 1: "God who at many times and in many manners spake in times past to the Fathers by the prophets, 2. At the end of these days (*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων*) hath spoken to us in the Son whom he appointed heir (*κληρονόμος*)⁴ of all things, by whom he also made the worlds, 3. Who being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his substance,

¹ Cf. Heb. ix. 24, 11—12, &c.

² John x. 7, 9.

³ Compare the account of the new Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 12 ff.; cf. xxii. 4, 14. In Siml. ix. 13, it is insisted that, to enter into the kingdom, not only "his name" must be borne, but that we must put on certain clothing.

⁴ We may remark that in the parable Hermas speaks of the son as the heir (*κληρονόμος*), and of the slave—who is the true son—also as co-heir (*συγκληρονόμος*), and a few lines below the passage above quoted, of the heirship (*κληρονομία*). This is another indication of the use of this Epistle, the peculiar expression in regard to the son "whom he appointed heir (*κληρονόμος*) of all things" occurring here. Cf. Siml., v. 2, 6.

and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made by himself a cleansing of our sins sat down at the right hand of Majesty on high, 4. Having become so much better than the angels," &c., &c.; and if we take the different clauses we may also find them elsewhere constantly repeated, as for instance: (γ) The son older than all his creation: compare 2 Tim. i. 9, Colossians i. 15 ("who is . . . the first born of all creation"—ὁ ἑστὼς . . . πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), 16, 17, 18, Rev. iii. 14, x. 6. The works of Philo are full of this representation of the Logos. For example: "For the Word of God is over all the universe, and the oldest and most universal of all things created" (καὶ ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπεράνω πάντος ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτατος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὄντα γέγονε).² Again, as to the second clause, that he assisted the Father in the work of creation, compare Heb. ii. 10, i. 2, xi. 3, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Coloss. i. 15, 16.³

The only remaining passage is the following: "The name of the Son of God is great and infinite and supports the whole world." For the first phrase, compare 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. i. 8; and for the second part of the sentence, Heb. i. 3, Coloss. i. 17, and many other passages quoted above.⁴

The whole assertion⁵ is devoid of foundation, and might well have been left unnoticed. The attention called to it, however, may not be wasted in observing the kind of evidence with which apologists are compelled to be content.

Tischendorf points out two passages in the Epistles of pseudo-Ignatius, which, he considers, show the use of the fourth Gospel.⁶

¹ Heb. i. 1. Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφῆταις ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, (2) ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, (3) ὃς ὢν ἀπαιγάσθαι τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμῶν ποιούμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, (4) τοσούτω κρείττω γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, κ.τ.λ.

² Leg. Alleg., iii. § 61, *Mangey*, i. p. 121; cf. De Confus. Ling., § 28, *Mang.*, i. p. 427, § 14, *ib.* i. p. 414; De Profugis, § 19, *Mang.*, i. 561; De Caritate, § 2, *Mang.*, ii. 385, &c., &c. The Logos is constantly called by Philo "the first-begotten of God" (πρωτόγονος Θεοῦ Λόγος); "the most ancient son of God" (πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς Θεοῦ).

³ Cf. Philo, Leg. Alleg., iii. § 31, *Mangey*, i. 106; De Cherubim, § 35, *Mang.*, i. 162, &c. &c.

⁴ Cf. Philo, De Profugis, § 20, *Mangey*, i. 562; *Frag. Mangey*, ii. 655; De Somniis, i. § 41, *Mang.*, i. 656.

⁵ Canon Westcott also says: "In several places also St. John's teaching on 'the Truth' lies at the ground of Hermas' words," and in a note he refers to "Mand. iii. = 1 John ii. 27; iv. 6," without specifying any passage of the book. (On the Canon, p. 176, and note 4.) Such unqualified assertions unsupported by any evidence cannot be too strongly condemned. This statement is quite unfounded.

⁶ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 22 f. *Lücke* does not attach much weight to any of the supposed allusions in these Epistles. Comm. Ev. Joh., i. p. 43.

They are as follows—Epistle to the Romans vii.: “I desire the bread of God, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was born at a later time of the seed of David and Abraham; and I desire the drink of God (πόμα θεοῦ), that is his blood, which is love incorruptible, and eternal life” (ἀένναος ζωῆ).¹ This is compared with John vi. 41: “I am the bread which came down from heaven” 48. . . . “I am the bread of life,” 51. . . . “And the bread that I will give is my flesh;” 54. “He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life” (ζωὴν αἰώνιον). Scholten has pointed out that the reference to Jesus as “born of the seed of David and Abraham” is not in the spirit of the fourth Gospel; and the use of πόμα θεοῦ for the πῶσις of vi. 55, and ἀένναος ζωῆ instead of ζωὴ αἰώνιος are also opposed to the connection with that Gospel.² On the other hand, in the institution of the Supper, the bread is described as the body of Jesus, and the wine as his blood; and reference is made there, and elsewhere, to eating bread and drinking wine in the kingdom of God,³ and the passage seems to be nothing but a development of this teaching.⁴ Nothing could be proved by such an analogy.⁵

The second passage referred to by Tischendorf is in the Epistle to the Philadelphians vii.: “For if some would have led me astray according to the flesh, yet the Spirit is not led astray, being from God, for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth, and detects the things that are hidden.”⁶ Tischendorf considers that these words are based upon John iii. 6—8, and the last phrase: “And detects the hidden things,” upon verse 20. The sense of the Epistle, however, is precisely the reverse of that of the Gospel, which reads: “The wind bloweth where it listeth; and thou hearest the sound thereof but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit;”⁷ whilst the Epistle does not refer to the wind at all, but affirms that the Spirit of God does not know whence it cometh,

¹ ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω, ἄρτον οὐράνιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς, ὅς ἐστιν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν ὑστέρῳ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἀβραάμ καὶ πῶμα θεοῦ θέλω, τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἀφάρτος, καὶ ἀένναος ζωῆ. Ad Rom., vii.

² Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 54.

³ Matt. xxvi. 26—29; Mark xiv. 22—25; Luke xxii. 17—20; 1 Cor. xi. 23—25; cf. Luke xiv. 15.

⁴ Cf. Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 54.

⁵ Cf. De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 225 f.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 54.

⁶ Εἰ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ σάρκα με τινες ᾤκνησαν πλανῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ θεοῦ ὅν' οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει. Ad Philadelph., vii.

⁷ τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. John iii. 8.

&c. The analogy in verse 20 is still more remote: "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be detected."¹ In 1 Cor. ii. 10, the sense is more closely found: "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God."² It is evidently unreasonable to assert from such a passage the use of the fourth Gospel.³ Even Tischendorf recognizes that in themselves the phrases which he points out in pseudo-Ignatius could not, unsupported by other corroboration, possess much weight as testimony for the use of our Gospels. He says: "Were these allusions of Ignatius to Matthew and John a wholly isolated phenomenon, and one which perhaps other undoubted results of inquiry wholly contradicted, they would hardly have any conclusive weight. But——"⁴ Canon Westcott says: "The Ignatian writings, as might be expected, are not without traces of the influence of St. John. The circumstances in which he was placed required a special enunciation of Pauline doctrine; but this is not so expressed as to exclude the parallel lines of Christian thought. Love is 'the stamp of the Christian.' (Ad Magn. v.) 'Faith is the beginning and love the end of life.' (Ad Ephes. xiv.) 'Faith is our guide upward' (*ἀναγωγὴς*), but love is the road that 'leads to God' (Ad Eph. ix.) 'The Eternal (*ἀίδιος*) Word is the manifestation of God' (Ad Magn. viii.), 'the door by which we come to the Father' (Ad Philad. ix., cf. John x. 7), 'and without Him we have not the principle of true life' (Ad Trall. ix.: *ὅτι χάρις τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν*, cf. Ad Eph. iii.: *ἡ Χ. τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι ἡμῶν ζῆν*). The true meat of the Christian is the 'bread of God, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ,' and his drink is 'Christ's blood, which is love incorruptible' (Ad Rom. vii., cf. John vi. 32, 51, 53). He has no love of this life; 'his love has been crucified, and he has in him no burning passion for the world, but living water (as the spring of a new life) speaking within him, and bidding him come to his Father' (Ad Rom. l. c.). Meanwhile his enemy is the enemy of his Master, even the 'ruler of this age.' (Ad Rom. l. c., *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*. Cf. John xii. 31, xvi. 11: *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, and see 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8.⁵)"

Part of these references we have already considered; others of them really do not require any notice whatever, and the only one to which we need to direct our attention for a moment may be

¹ *πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φιλῶν τὰ πρᾶδῶν μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*. John iii. 20.

² *τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ*. 1 Cor. ii. 10.

³ Cf. *De Wette*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 225 f.

⁴ *Wann wurden*, u. s. w., p. 23.

⁵ *Westcott*, *On the Canon*, p. 32 f., and notes. We have inserted in the text the references given in the notes.

the passage from the Epistle to the Philadelphians ix., which reads: "He is the door of the Father, by which enter in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the prophets, and the apostles, and the Church."¹ This is compared with John x. 7. "Therefore said Jesus again: Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the Sheep" (*ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων*). We have already referred, a few pages back,² to the image of the door. Here again it is obvious that there is a marked difference in the sense of the Epistle from that of the Gospel. In the latter Jesus is said to be the door into the Sheepfold;³ whilst in the Epistle, he is the door into the Father, through which not only the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles enter, but also the Church itself. Such distant analogy cannot warrant the conclusion that the passage shows any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel.⁴ As for the other phrases, they are not only without special bearing upon the fourth Gospel, but they are everywhere found in the canonical Epistles, as well as elsewhere. Regarding love and faith, for instance, compare Gal. v. 6, 14, 22; Rom. xii. 9, 10, viii. 39, xiii. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 9, viii. 3; Ephes. iii. 17, v. 1, 2, vi. 23; Philip. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 5; 1 Tim. i. 14, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13; Heb. x. 38 f., xi., &c., &c.

We might point out many equally close analogies in the works of Philo,⁵ but it is unnecessary to do so, although we may indicate one or two which first present themselves. Philo equally has "the Eternal Logos" (*ὁ αἰδιος Λόγος*),⁶ whom he represents as the manifestation of God in every way. "The Word is the likeness of God, by whom the universe was created" (*Λόγος δὲ ἔστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο*).⁷ He is "the vicegerent" (*ὑπαρχος*) of God,⁸ "the heavenly incorruptible food of the soul," "the bread (*ἄρτος*) from heaven." In one place he says: "and they who inquired what is the food of the soul . . . learnt at last that it is the Word of God, and the Divine Logos. . . . This is the heavenly nourishment, and it is mentioned in the holy Scriptures . . . saying, 'Lo! I rain upon you bread (*ἄρτος*)

¹ *Αὐτός ἐστὶν θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία.* Ad Philad., ix.
² P. 554 ff.

³ Compare the whole passage, John x. 1—16.

⁴ Cf. *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 225 f.; *Schooten*, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 54 f.; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 368 f.; *Lücke*, Com. Ev. Joh., i. p. 44, ann. 1.

⁵ Philo's birth is dated at least 20 to 30 years before our era, and his death about A.D. 40. His principal works were certainly written before his embassy to Caesars. *Delanay*, Philon d'Alexandrie, 1867, p. 11 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 239; *Gfrörer*, Gesch. des Urchristenthums I., i. p. 5, p. 37 ff., p. 45; *Dähne*, Gesch. Darstell. jüd. alex. Religious Philos., 1834, I abth. p. 98, ann. 2.

⁶ De plant. Nec, § 5, *Mang.*, i. 332; De Mundo, § 2, *Mang.*, ii. 604.

⁷ De Monarchia, ii. § 5; *Mang.*, ii. 225.

⁸ De Agricult., § 12, *Mang.*, i. 308; De Somniis, i. § 41, *Mang.*, i. 656; cf. Coloss. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

from heaven.' (Exod. xvi. 4.) 'This is the bread (*ἄρτος*) which the Lord has given them to eat.' (Exod. xvi. 15).¹ And again: "For the one indeed raises his eyes towards the sky, contemplating the manna, the divine Word, the heavenly incorruptible food of the longing soul."² Elsewhere: "... but it is taught by the Hierophant and Prophet Moses, who will say: 'This is the bread (*ἄρτος*), the nourishment which God gave to the soul'—that he offered his own Word and his own *Logos*; for this is bread (*ἄρτος*) which he has given us to eat, this is the Word (*τὸ ῥῆμα*).'"³ He also says: "Therefore he exhorts him that can run swiftly to strive with breathless eagerness towards the Divine Word who is above all things, the fountain of Wisdom, in order that by drinking of the stream, instead of death he may for his reward obtain eternal life."⁴ It is the *Logos* who guides us to the Father, God "By the same *Logos* both creating all things and leading up (*ἀνάγων*) the perfect man from the things of earth to himself."⁵ These are very imperfect examples, but it may be asserted that there is not a representation of the *Logos* in the fourth Gospel which has not close parallels in the works of Philo.

We have given these passages of the pseudo-Ignatian Epistles which are pointed out as indicating acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, in order that the whole case might be stated and appreciated. The analogies are too distant to prove anything, but were they fifty times more close, they could do little or nothing to establish an early origin for the fourth Gospel, and nothing at all to elucidate the question as to its character and authorship.⁶ The Epistles in which the passages occur are spuri-

¹ Ζητήσαντες καὶ τί τὸ τρέφον ἐστὶ τὴν ψυχὴν . . . ἐύρον μαθόντες ῥῆμα θεοῦ καὶ λόγον θεῖον . . . "Ὁ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ οὐράνιος τροφή, μνησεται δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀναγραφαῖς . . . λέγοντος. "Ὅν ἐγὼ εἶπα ὑμῖν ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ." De Profugis, § 25, Mangy, i. 566.

² "Ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ὄψεις ἀνατρέπει πρὸς αἰθέρα, ἀφορῶν τὸ μάννα, τὸν θεῖον λόγον, τὴν οὐράνιον φιλοθεάμονος ψυχῆς ἀσφαρτον τροφήν. Quis rerum Div. Heres., § 15, Mangy, i. 484: Quod det, potius insid., § 31, Mangy, i. 213 . . . Μάννα, τὸν πρὸςβύτατον τῶν ὄντων λόγον θεῖον, κ.τ.λ.

³ διδάσκειται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροφάντου καὶ προφήτου Μωσέως, ὅς ἐρεῖ: "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος, ἡ τροφή, ἣν ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ ψυχῇ." προγενέστεται τὸ ἐαυτοῦ ῥῆμα καὶ τὸν ἐαυτοῦ λόγον· οὗτος γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν δέδωκεν ἡμῖν φαγεῖν, τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα. Leg. Alleg., iii. § 60, Mangy, i. 121; cf. *ib.*, §§ 61, 62.

⁴ Προτρέπει δὲ εὖν τὸν μὲν ὠκυδορμεῖν ἱκανὸν συντείνειν ἀπνευστί πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω λόγον θεῖον, ὃς σοφίας ἐστὶ πηγὴ, ἵνα ἀρυσάμενος τοῦ γάρματος ἀντὶ θανάτου ζωὴν αἰδίου ἀθλοῦ εὕρηται. De Profugis, § 18, Mangy, i. 560.

⁵ . . . τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐργαζόμενος καὶ τὸν τέλειον ἀπὸ τῶν περιγέτων ἀνάγων ὡς ἐαυτόν. De Sacrif. Abelis et Caini, § 3; Mangy, i. 165.

⁶ In general the Epistles follow the Synoptic narratives, and not the account of

ous and of no value as evidence for the fourth Gospel. They are not found in the three Syriac Epistles, which alone have some claim to authenticity. We have already stated the facts connected with the so-called Epistles of Ignatius,¹ and no one who has attentively examined them can fail to see that the testimony of such documents cannot be considered of any historic weight.²

There are fifteen Epistles ascribed to Ignatius—of these eight are universally recognized to be spurious. Of the remaining seven, there are two Greek and Latin versions, the one much longer than the other. The longer version is almost unanimously rejected as interpolated. The discovery of a still shorter Syriac version of "the three Epistles of Ignatius," convinced the majority of critics that even the shorter Greek version of seven Epistles must be condemned, and that whatever matter could be ascribed to Ignatius himself, if any, must be looked for in these three Epistles alone. The three martyrologies of Ignatius are likewise universally repudiated as mere fictions. Amidst such a mass of forgery, in which it is impossible to identify even a kernel of truth, it would be preposterous to seek testimony to establish the authenticity of our Gospels.

It is not pretended that the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians contains any references to the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf, however, affirms that it is weighty testimony for that Gospel, inasmuch as he discovers in it a certain trace of the first "Epistle of John," and as he maintains that the Epistle and the Gospel are the works of the same author, any evidence for the one is at the same time evidence for the other.³ We shall hereafter consider the point of the common authorship of the Epistles and fourth Gospel, and here confine ourselves chiefly to the alleged fact of the reference.

The passage to which Tischendorf alludes we subjoin, with the supposed parallel in the Epistle.

EPISTLE OF POLYCARP, VII.

For whosoever doth not confess
that Jesus Christ hath come in the
flesh is Antichrist, and whosoever

1 EPISTLE OF JOHN, IV. 3.

And every spirit that confesseth
not the Lord Jesus come in the flesh
is not of God, and this is the (spirit)

the fourth Gospel. See for instance the reference to the anointing of Jesus, Ad Eph. xvii., cf. Matt. xxvi. 7 ff.; Mark xiv. 3 ff.; cf. John xii. 1 ff.

¹ P. 230 ff.

² Weizsäcker, *Unters. evang. Gesch.*, p. 234; Bleek, *Beiträge*, p. 224, p. 257 f.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 368; Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 50 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 39 ff.; cf. Riggenbach, *Die Zeugn. Ev. Johannis*. 101 f.; Böhlinger, *Die Kirche Chr. u. ihre Zeugn.*, I. i. 1860, p. 46.

³ Wann wurden, n. s. w., p. 24 f.

EPISTLE OF POLYCARP, VII.

doth not confess the martyrdom of the cross is of the devil, and whosoever doth pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and saith that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, he is the firstborn of Satan.

Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθῆναι, ἀντιχριστὸς ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἠπολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἐν τῷ διαβόλῳ ἐστίν· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς βδελύξεις, καὶ λέγῃ ἢ ἡγε ἀνάστασιν ἢ ἡγε κρίθιν εἶναι, ὁ τοῦ πρωτότοκου ἐστὶ τοῦ Σατάνᾳ.

1 EPISTLE OF JOHN, IV. 3.

of Antichrist of which we have heard that it should come, and now already is in the world.

Καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν κύριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, ἐν τῷ θεῷ οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ ἐκ ἀρχῆς οὐκ ἔρχεται, καὶ οὐκ ἔν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἰδὲν.

This passage does not occur as a quotation, and the utmost that can be said of the few words with which it opens is that a phrase somewhat resembling, but at the same time materially differing from, the Epistle of John is interwoven with the text of the Epistle to the Philippians. If this were really a quotation from the canonical Epistle,¹ would indeed be singular that, considering the supposed relations of Polycarp and John, the name of the apostle should not have been mentioned, and a quotation have been distinctly and correctly made.² On the other hand, there is no earlier trace of the canonical Epistle, and, as Volkmar argues, it may well be doubted whether it may not rather be dependent on the Epistle to the Philippians, than the latter upon the Epistle of John.³

We believe with Scholten that neither is dependent on the other, but that both adopted a formula in use in the early Church against various heresies,⁴ the superficial coincidence of which is without any weight whatever as evidence for the use of either Epistle by the writer of the other. Moreover, it is clear that the writers refer to different classes of heretics. Polycarp attacks the Docetae who deny that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, that is with a human body of flesh and blood; whilst the Epistle of John is directed against those who deny that Jesus who has come in the flesh is the Christ the Son of God.⁵ Volkmar points

¹ We give the text of the Sinaitic Codex as the most favourable. The great majority of the other MSS., and all the more important, present very marked difference from this reading.

² Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 46.

³ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.

⁴ Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 45 f.; cf. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 f.; cf. *Irenaeus*, *Adv. Haer.*, i. 24, § 4; *pseudo-Ignatius*, *Ad Smyrn.*, v., vi.

⁵ Scholten, *Die alt. Zeugnisse*, p. 46 ff.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 48 ff.; cf. 1 John ii. 22; iv. 2, 3; v. 1, 5 ff.

out that in Polycarp the word "Antichrist" is made a proper name, whilst in the Epistle the expression used is the abstract "Spirit of Antichrist." Polycarp in fact says that whoever denies the flesh of Christ is no Christian but Antichrist, and Volkmar finds this direct assertion more original than the assertion of the Epistle: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God,"¹ &c. In any case it seems to us clear that in both writings we have only the independent enunciation, with accented difference of language and sense, of a formula current in the Church, and that neither writer can be held to have originated the condemnation, in these words, of heresies which the Church had begun vehemently to oppose, and which were merely an application of ideas already well known, as we see from the expression of the Epistle in reference to the "Spirit of Antichrist, of which ye have heard that it cometh." Whether this phrase be an allusion to the Apocalypse xiii., or to 2 Thessalonians ii., or to traditions current in the Church, we need not inquire; it is sufficient that the Epistle of John avowedly applies a prophecy regarding Antichrist already known amongst Christians, which was equally open to the other writer and probably familiar in the Church. This cannot under any circumstances be admitted as evidence of weight for the use of the 1st Epistle of John. There is no testimony whatever of the existence of the Epistles ascribed to John previous to this date, and that fact would have to be established on sure grounds before the argument we are considering can have any value.

On the other hand we have already seen² that whilst there is strong reason to doubt the authenticity of the Epistle attributed to Polycarp, and a certainty that in any case it is, in its present form, considerably interpolated, it cannot, even if genuine in any part, be dated earlier than the last years of that Father, and it is apparent, therefore, that the use of the 1st Epistle of John, even if established, could not be of value for the fourth Gospel, of which the writing does not show a trace. So far indeed from there being any evidence that Polycarp knew the fourth Gospel, everything points to the opposite conclusion. In A.D. 160 we find him taking part in the Paschal controversy, contradicting the statements of the fourth Gospel,³ and supporting the Synoptic view, contending that the Christian festival should be celebrated on the 14th Nisan, the day on which he affirmed that the Apostle John himself had observed it.⁴ Irenæus, who represents Poly-

¹ Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 49 ff.; *Schottén*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 46 ff.

² P. 241 ff.

³ John xiii. 1, xvii. 28, xix. 14, 31; cf. Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 8.

⁴ Cf. *Irenæus*, *Adv. Hæc.*, iii. 3, § 4; *Eusebius*, *H. E.*, iv. 14, v. 24.

carp
Anic
beca
Lord
Not
but
the
cont
Th
evan
certa
four
read
attac
ing
W
use
less
Gosp
unce
the
shon
dress
type
from
cogn
four
cal
write
evid
Ti
a po
to c
fact
an m
tago
fully
quot
1 A
2 O
i. p.
by Ju
with
him.
tinus
sendl

carp as the disciple of John, says of him: "For neither was Anicetus able to persuade Polycarp not to observe it (on the 14th) because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the apostles with whom he consorted."¹ Not only, therefore, does Polycarp not refer to the fourth Gospel, but he is on the contrary a very important witness against it as the work of John, for he represents that apostle as practically contradicting the Gospel of which he is said to be the author.

The fulness with which we have discussed the character of the evangelical quotations of Justin Martyr renders the task of ascertaining whether his works indicate any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel comparatively easy. The detailed statements already made enable us without preliminary explanation directly to attack the problem, and we are freed from the necessity of making extensive quotations to illustrate the facts of the case.

Whilst apologists assert with some boldness that Justin made use of our Synoptics, they are evidently, and with good reason, less confident in maintaining his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel. Canon Westcott states: "His references to St. John are uncertain; but this, as has been already remarked, follows from the character of the fourth Gospel. It was unlikely that he should quote its peculiar teaching in apologetic writings addressed to Jews and heathens; and at the same time he exhibits types of language and doctrine which, if not immediately drawn from St. John, yet mark the presence of his influence and the recognition of his authority."² This apology for the neglect of the fourth Gospel seems based upon a consciousness of its unhistorical character; but we may merely remark that where such a writer is reduced to so obvious an admission of the scantiness of evidence furnished by Justin, his case is indeed weak.

Tischendorf, however, with his usual temerity, claims Justin as a powerful witness for the fourth Gospel. He says: "According to our judgment there are convincing grounds of proof for the fact that John also was known and used by Justin, provided that an unprejudiced consideration be not made to give way to the antagonistic predilection against the Johannine Gospel." In order fully and fairly to state the case which he puts forward, we shall quote his own words, but in order to avoid repetition we shall

¹ Eusebius, H. E., v. 24.

² On the Canon, p. 145. In a note Canon Westcott refers to *Credner*, Beiträge, i. p. 253 ff. *Credner*, however, pronounces against the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin. Dr. Westcott adds the singular argument: "Justin's acquaintance with the Valentinians proves that the Gospel could not have been unknown to him." (Dial. 35.) We have already proved that there is no evidence that Valentinus and his earlier followers knew anything of our Synoptics, and we shall presently show that this is likewise the case with the fourth Gospel.

permit ourselves to interrupt him by remarks and by parallel passages from other writings for comparison with Justin. Tischendorf says: "The representation of the person of Christ altogether peculiar to John as it is given particularly in his Prologue i. 1 ("In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"), and verse 14 ("and the word became flesh"), in the designation of him as Logos, as the Word of God, unmistakably re-echoes in not a few passages in Justin; for instance:¹ 'And Jesus Christ is alone the special Son begotten by God, being his Word and first-begotten and power.'

With this we may compare another passage of Justin from the second Apology. "But his son, who alone is rightly called Son, the Word before the works of creation, who was both with him and begotten when in the beginning he created and ordered all things by him,"² &c.

Now the same words and ideas are to be found throughout the Canonical Epistles and other writings, as well as in earlier works. In the Apocalypse,³ the only book of the New Testament mentioned by Justin, and which is directly ascribed by him to John,⁴ the term Logos is applied to Jesus "the Lamb," (xix. 13): "and his name is called the Word of God" (*καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*). Elsewhere (iii. 14) he is called "the Beginning of the Creation of God" (*ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*); and again in the same book (i. 5) he is "the first-begotten of the dead" (*ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν*). In Heb. i. 6 he is the "first-born" (*πρωτότοκος*), as in Coloss. i. 15 he is "the first-born of every creature" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*); and in 1 Cor. i. 24 we have: "Christ the power of God and the Wisdom of God" (*Χριστὸν θεοῦ δυνάμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν*), and it will be remembered that "Wisdom" was the earlier term which became an alternative with "Word" for the intermediate Being. In Heb. i. 2, God is represented as speaking to us "in the Son . . . by whom he also made

¹ Tischendorf uses great liberty in translating some of these passages, abbreviating and otherwise altering them as it suits him. We shall therefore give his German translation below, and we add the Greek which Tischendorf does not quote—indeed he does not, in most cases, even state where the passages are to be found.

² "Und Jesus Christus ist allein in einzig eigenthümlicher Weise als Sohn Gottes gezeugt worden, indem er das Wort (Logos) desselben ist." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 32.

Καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ γενένηται, Λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων καὶ πρωτότοκος καὶ δυνάμις. Apol., i. 23.

³ Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ Λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων, καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐκτίσσει καὶ ἐκόσμησε. Apol., ii. 6.

⁴ Written c. A.D. 68–69; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 704 f.; *Beiträge*, ii. p. 294; *Lücke*, Comm. Offenb. Joh., 1852, ii. p. 840 ff.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1852–53, p. 182; *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 643, &c., &c.

⁵ Dial., 81.

the worlds" (ἐν νύφ, . . . δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας). In 2 Tim. i. 9, he is "before all worlds" (πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων), cf. Heb. i. 10, ii. 10, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Ephes. iii. 9.

The works of Philo are filled with similar representations of the Logos, but we must restrict ourselves to a very few. God as a Shepherd and King governs the universe "having appointed his true Logos, his first-begotten Son, to have the care of this sacred flock, as the Vicegerent of a great King."¹ In another place Philo exhorts men to strive to become like God's "first-begotten Word" (τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ Λόγον),² and he adds, a few lines further on: "for the most ancient Word is the image of God" (θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν Λόγος ὁ πρωτόγονος). The high priest of God in the world is "the divine Word, his first-begotten son" (ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος Λόγος).³ Speaking of the creation of the world Philo says: "The instrument by which it was formed is the Word of God" (ὄργανον δὲ Λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατασκευάσθη).⁴ Elsewhere: "For the Word is the image of God by which the whole world was created" (Λόγος δὲ ἵσταν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο).⁵ These passages might be indefinitely multiplied.

Tischendorf's next passage is: "The first power (δύναμις) after the Father of all and God the Lord is the Son, the Word (Logos); in what manner having been made flesh (σαρκοποιηθεὶς) he became man, we shall in what follows relate."⁶

We find everywhere parallels for this passage without seeking them in the fourth Gospel. In 1 Cor. i. 24, "Christ the Power (δύναμις) of God and the Wisdom of God;" cf. Heb. i. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8; ii. 8. In Heb. ii. 14—18, there is a distinct account of his becoming flesh; cf. verse 7. In Phil. ii. 6—8: "Who (Jesus Christ) being in the form of God, deemed it not grasping to be equal with God, (7) But gave himself up, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men," &c. In Rom. viii. 3 we have: "God sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin," &c. (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν ἐπέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας.)

¹ . . . προσεθιγμένους τὸν ὄρθρον αὐτοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν, ὃς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης οἷά τις μεγάλου βασιλέως υπαρχὸς διαδέχεται. De Agricult., § 12, Mangey, i. 308.

² De Confus. ling., § 28, Mang., i. 427, cf. § 14, ib., i. 414; cf. De Migrat. Abrahami, § 1, Mang., i. 437; cf. Heb. i. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

³ De Somniis, i. § 37, Mang., i. 653.

⁴ De Cherubim, § 35, Mang., i. 62.

⁵ De Monarchia, ii. § 5, Mang., ii. 225.

⁶ "Die erste Urkraft (δύναμις) nach dem Vater des Alles und Gott dem Herrn ist der Sohn, ist das Wort (Logos); wie derselbe durch die Fleischwerdung (σαρκοποιηθεὶς) Mensch geworden, das werden wir in folgenden darthun." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 32.

⁷ Ἡ δὲ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὴν Πατέρα πάντων καὶ Δεσπότην θεῶν, καὶ υἱός, ὁ Λόγος ἐστίν, ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ἐν ἱστοίς, ἐξήγ., ἐρουμέν. Apol., i. 32.

It must be borne in mind that the terminology of John i. 14, "and the word became flesh" (σὰρξ ἐγένετο) is different from that of Justin, who uses the word *σαρκοποιηθεῖς*. The sense and language here is, therefore, quite as close as that of the fourth Gospel. We have also another parallel in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "Who (God) was manifested in the flesh" (ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί), cf. 1 Cor. xv. 4, 47.

In like manner we find many similar passages in the Works of Philo. He says in one place that man was not made in the likeness of the most high God the Father of the universe, but in that of the "Second God who is his Word" (ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεόν, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐκείνου Λόγος).¹ In another place the Logos is said to be the interpreter of the highest God, and he continues: "that must be God of us imperfect beings" (Οὗτος γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν ἄν εἴη θεός).² Elsewhere he says: "But the divine Word which is above these (the Winged Cherubim) . . . but being itself the image of God, at once the most ancient of all conceivable things, and the one placed nearest to the only true and absolute existence without any separation or distance between them;"³ and a few lines further on he explains the cities of refuge to be: "The Word of the Governor (of all things) and his creative and kingly power, for of these are the heavens and the whole world."⁴ "The Logos of God is above all things in the world, and is the most ancient and the most universal of all things which are."⁵ The Word is also the "Ambassador sent by the Governor (of the universe) to his subject (man)" (πρεσβυτέρης δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ἐπὶ ἡμῶν).⁶ Such views of the Logos are everywhere met with in the pages of Philo.

Tischendorf continues: "The Word (Logos) of God is his Son."⁷ We have already in the preceding paragraphs abundantly illustrated this sentence, and may proceed to the next: "But since they did not know all things concerning the Logos, which is Christ,

¹ Philo, Fragm. i. ex. Euseb., Præpar. Evang., vii. 13, *Mang.*, ii. 625; cf. De Somniis, i. § 41, *Mang.*, i. 656; Leg. Alleg. ii. § 21, *ib.*, i. 83.

² Leg. Alleg., iii. § 73, *Mang.*, i. 128.

³ Ὁ δὲ ὑπὲρ πάντων τούτων Λόγος θεός. . . . ἀλλ' αὐτὸς εἰκὼν ὑπάρχων θεοῦ, τῶν νοητῶν ἀπαξ ἀπάντων ὁ πρεσβύτερος, ὁ ἐγγυτάτω, μηδενὸς ἱντος μεθόριον διαστήματος, τοῦ μόνου ὁ ἐστὶν ἀφενδῶς ἀφιδρυμένος. De Profugia, § 19, *Mang.*, i. 561.

⁴ Ὁ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος Λόγος, καὶ ἡ ποιητικὴ καὶ βασιλικὴ δύναμις αὐτοῦ· τούτων γὰρ ὁ τε οὐρανὸς καὶ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ. De Profugia, § 19.

⁵ Καὶ ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ πάντων πάντες ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πρεσβύτερος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. Leg. Alleg., iii. § 61, *Mang.*, i. 121; cf. De Somniis, i. § 41, *Mang.*, i. 656.

⁶ Quia rerum div. Heres., § 42, *Mang.*, i. 501.

⁷ "Das Wort (Logos) Gottes ist der Sohn desselben." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 32.

Ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. Apol. i. 63.

they have frequently contradicted each other."¹ These words are used with reference to Lawgivers and philosophers. Justin, who frankly admits the delight he took in the writings of Plato² and other Greek philosophers, was well aware how Socrates and Plato had enunciated the doctrine of the Logos,³ although he contends that they borrowed it from the writings of Moses, and with a largeness of mind very uncommon in the early Church, and indeed, we might add, in any age, he held Socrates and such philosophers to have been Christians, even although they had been considered Atheists.⁴ As they did not of course know Christ to be the Logos, he makes the assertion just quoted. Now the only point in the passage which requires notice is the identification of the Logos with Jesus, which has already been dealt with, and as this was asserted in the Apocalypse xix. 13, before the fourth Gospel was written, no evidence in its favour is deducible from the statement. We shall have more to say regarding this presently.

Tischendorf continues: "But in what manner through the Word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour having been made flesh,"⁵ &c.

It must be apparent that the doctrine here is not that of the fourth Gospel which makes "the word become flesh" simply, whilst Justin, representing a less advanced form, and more uncertain stage, of its development, draws a distinction between the Logos and Jesus, and describes Jesus Christ as being made flesh by the power of the Logos. This is no accidental use of words, for he repeatedly states the same fact, as for instance: "But why through the power of the Word, according to the will of God the Father and Lord of all, he was born a man of a Virgin,"⁶ &c.

Tischendorf continues: "To these passages out of the short second Apology we extract from the first (cap. 33).⁷ By the Spirit, therefore, and power of God (in reference to Luke i. 35: 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest

¹ "Da sie nicht alles was dem Logos, welcher Christus ist, angehört erkannten, so haben sie oft einander widersprechendes gesagt."

² Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγνώρισαν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτοῖς πολλακίς εἶπον. Apol., ii. 10.

³ Apol., ii. 12; cf. Dial., 2 ff.

⁴ Apol., i. 60, &c., &c.; cf. 5.

⁵ Apol., i. 46.

⁶ "Vermittels des Worts (Logos) Gottes ist Jesus Christus unser Heiland Fleisch geworden (σάρκοποιησθαι)." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 32.

⁷ ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ Λόγου θεοῦ σάρκοποιησθαι Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ. Apol. i. 66.

⁸ δι' ἣν δυνάμειν διὰ δυνάμεως τοῦ Λόγου κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ βουλήν, διὰ παρένουν ἀνθρώπου σπερμῆν, κ.τ.λ. Apol., i. 46.

⁹ This is an error. Several of the preceding passages are out of the first Apology. No references, however, are given to the source of any of them. We have added them.

shall overshadow thee') we have nothing else to understand but the Logos, which is the first-born of God."¹

Here again we have the same difference from the doctrine of the fourth Gospel which we have just pointed out, which is, however, so completely in agreement with the views of Philo,² and characteristic of a less developed form of the idea. We shall further refer to the terminology hereafter, and meantime we proceed to the last illustration given by Tischendorf.

"Out of the Dialogue (c. 105): 'For that he was the only-begotten of the Father of all, in peculiar wise begotten of him as Word and Power (*δύναμις*), and afterwards became man through the Virgin, as we have learnt from the Memoirs, I have already stated.'"³

The allusion here is to the preceding chapters of the Dialogue, wherein, with special reference (c. 100) to the passage which has a parallel in Luke i. 35, quoted by Tischendorf in the preceding illustration, Justin narrates the birth of Jesus.

This reference very appropriately leads us to a more general discussion of the real source of the terminology and Logos doctrine of Justin. We do not propose, in this work, to enter fully into the history of the Logos doctrine, and we must confine ourselves strictly to showing, in the most simple manner possible, that not only is there no evidence whatever that Justin derived his ideas regarding it from the fourth Gospel, but that, on the contrary, his terminology and doctrine can be traced to another source. Now in the very chapter (100) from which this last illustration is taken, Justin shows clearly whence he derives the expression: "only-begotten." In chap. 97 he refers to the Ps. xxii. (Sept. xxi.) as a prophecy applying to Jesus, quotes the whole Psalm, and comments upon it in the following chapters; refers to Ps. ii 7: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," uttered by the voice at the baptism, in ch. 103, in illustration of

¹ "Unter dem Geiste nun und der Kraft von Gott (zu Luk. i. 35, 'der heilige Geist wird über dich kommen und die Kraft des Höchsten wird dich überschatten,') haben wir nichts anders zu verstehen als den Logos, welcher der Erstgeborne Gottes ist." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 32.

Τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμεις, ἢ τὸν Λόγον, ὅς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ θεῷ ἐστὶ, κ.τ.λ. Apol., i. 33.

² Cf. *Gfrörer*, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, 1835, I. i. pp. 229—243.

³ Aus dem Dialog (Kap. 105): "Dass derselbe dem Vater des Alls eingeboren in einziger Weise aus ihm heraus als Wort (Logos) und Kraft (*δύναμις*) gezeugt worden und hernach Mensch vermittle der Jungfrau Maria geworden, wie wir aus den Denkwürdigkeiten gelernt haben, das habe ich vorher dargelegt." Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 32.

Μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ Λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγεννημένος, καὶ ὑστερον ἀνθρώπος διὰ τῆς παρθένου γεινομένος, ὥς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων μαθήομεν, προεδήλωσα. Dial. c. Tryph., 105.

it; and in ch. 105 he arrives, in his exposition of it, at verse 20: "Deliver my soul from the sword, and my¹ only-begotten (*μονογενῆ*) from the hand of the dog." Then follows the passage we are discussing, in which Justin affirms that he has proved that he was the only-begotten (*μονογενής*) of the Father, and at the close he again quotes the verse as indicative of his sufferings. The Memoirs are referred to in regard to the fulfilment of this prophecy, and his birth as man through the Virgin. The phrase in Justin is quite different from that in the fourth Gospel, i. 14: "And the Word became flesh (*σὰρξ ἐγένετο*) and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father" (*ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*), &c. In Justin he is "the only-begotten of the Father of all" (*μονογενὴς τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων*), and he "became man (*ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος*) through the Virgin," and Justin never once employs the peculiar terminology of the fourth Gospel, *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, in any part of his writings.

There can be no doubt that, however the Christian doctrine of the Logos may at one period of its development have been influenced by Greek philosophy, it was in its central idea mainly of Jewish origin, and the mere application to an individual of a theory which had long occupied the Hebrew mind. After the original simplicity which represented God as holding personal intercourse with the Patriarchs, and communing face to face with the great leaders of Israel, had been outgrown, an increasing tendency set in to shroud the Divinity in impenetrable mystery, and to regard him as unapproachable and undiscernible by man. This led to the recognition of a Divine representative and substitute of the Highest God and Father, who communicated with his creatures, and through whom alone he revealed himself. A new system of interpretation of the ancient traditions of the nation was rendered necessary, and in the Septuagint translation of the Bible we are fortunately able to trace the progress of the theory which culminated in the Christian doctrine of the Logos. Wherever in the sacred records God had been represented as holding intercourse with man, the translators either symbolized the appearance or interposed an angel, who was afterwards understood to be the Divine Word. The first name under which the Divine Mediator was known in the Old Testament was Wisdom (*Σοφία*), although in its Apocrypha the term Logos was not unknown. The personification of the idea was very rapidly effected, and in the Book of Proverbs, as well as in the later Apocrypha based upon it: the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, "Ecclesiasticus:" we find it in ever increasing clearness and concretion. In the School of Alexandria the active Jewish intellect eagerly occupied

¹ This should probably be "thy."

itself with the speculation, and in the writings of Philo especially we find the doctrine of the Logos—the term which by that time had almost entirely supplanted that of Wisdom—elaborated to almost its final point, and wanting little or nothing but its application in an incarnate form to an individual man to represent the doctrine of the earlier Canonical writings of the New Testament, and notably the Epistle to the Hebrews,—the work of a Christian Philo,¹—the Pauline Epistles, and lastly the fourth Gospel.²

In Proverbs viii. 22 ff., we have a representation of Wisdom corresponding closely with the prelude to the fourth Gospel, and still more so with the doctrine enunciated by Justin: 22. "The Lord created me the Beginning of his ways for his works. 23. Before the ages he established me, in the beginning before he made the earth. 24. And before he made the abysses, before the springs of the waters issued forth. 25. Before the mountains were settled, and before all the hills he begets me. 26. The Lord made the lands, both those which are uninhabited and the inhabited heights of the earth beneath the sky. 27. When he prepared the heavens I was present with him, and when he set his throne upon the winds, 28, and made strong the high clouds, and the deeps under the heaven made secure, 29, and made strong the foundations of the earth, 30, I was with him adjusting, I was that in which he delighted; daily I rejoiced in his presence at all times."³ In the "Wisdom of Solomon" we find the writer addressing God: ix. 1 . . . "Who madest all things by thy Word" (ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου); and further on in the same chapter, v. 9, "And Wisdom was with thee who knoweth thy works, and was present when thou madest the world, and knew

¹ Ewald freely recognises that the author of this Epistle, written about A.D. 66, transferred Philo's doctrine of the Logos to Christianity. Apollos, whom he considers its probable author, impregnated the Apostle Paul with the doctrine. *Gesch. des V. Isr.*, vi., p. 474 f., p. 638 ff.; *Das Sendschr. an d. Hebräer*, p. 9 f.

² Compare generally *Gfrörer*, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, i. 1, 1 und 2 Abth., 1835; *Keferstein*, *Philo's Lehre v. d. göttl. Mittelwesen*, 1846; *Vacherot*, *Hist. crit. de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*, 1846, i. p. 125 ff.; *Delanay*, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, 1867, i. p. 40 ff.; *Franck*, *La Kabbale*, 1843, p. 269 ff., 293 ff.; *Hilgenfeldt*, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 292 ff.; *Niedner*, *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1849, h. 3, p. 337—381; *Lücke*, *Comm. Evang. Joh.*, i. p. 283 ff.; cf. p. 210 ff.

³ Proverbs viii. 22. Κύριος ἐκτίσέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ ἐς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, 23. πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐβελτίωσέ με, ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι, 24. καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τὰς ἀβύσσους ποιῆσαι, πρὸ τοῦ προελθεῖν τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων, 25. πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἐδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν, γεννᾷ με. 26. Κύριος ἐποίησε χώρας καὶ αἰκίητους, καὶ ἄκρα οἰκουμένα τῆς ὑπὲρ οὐρανῶν, 27. Ἰνδιὰ ἠνέμαζε τὸν οὐρανόν, συμπαρήμην αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅτε ἀφώριζε τὸν αἶνα τοῦ ὁρόνον ἐπὶ ἀνέμων, 28. καὶ ὡς ἰσχυρὰ ἐποίει τὰ ἀνω νέφη, καὶ ὡς ἀσφαλεῖς ἐτίθει πηγὰς τῆς ὑπὲρ οὐρανῶν, 29. καὶ ὡς ἰσχυρὰ ἐποίει τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς, 30. ἤμην παρ' αὐτῷ ἀρροζοῦσα ἰγῆ, ἤμην ἢ προσέχαιρε· καὶ ἡμέραν δὲ ευφραυνόμεν ἔν προσηπῶ αὐτοῦ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, κ.τ.λ. Sept. vers.

what was acceptable in thy sight, and right in thy commandments."¹ In verse 4, the writer prays: "Give me Wisdom that sitteth by thy throne" (*Δός μοι τὴν τῶν σὼν θρόνων πάρεδρον σοφίαν*).² In a similar way the Son of Sirach makes Wisdom say (*Ecclesiast.* xxiv. 9): "He (the Most High) created me from the beginning before the world, and as long as the world I shall not fail."³ We have already incidentally seen how these thoughts grew into an elaborate doctrine of the Logos in the works of Philo.

Now Justin, whilst he nowhere adopts the terminology of the fourth Gospel, and nowhere refers to its introductory condensed statement of the Logos doctrine, closely follows Philo and, like him, traces it back to the Old Testament in the most direct way, accounting for the interposition of the divine Mediator in precisely the same manner as Philo, and expressing the views which had led the Seventy to modify the statement of the Hebrew original in their Greek translation. He is, in fact, thoroughly acquainted with the history of the Logos doctrine and its earlier enunciation under the symbol of Wisdom, and his knowledge of it is clearly independent of, and antecedent to, the statements of the fourth Gospel.

Referring to various episodes of the Old Testament in which God is represented as appearing to Moses and the Patriarchs, and in which it is said that "God went up from Abraham,"⁴ or "The Lord spake to Moses,"⁵ or "The Lord came down to behold the town,"⁶ &c.,⁷ or "God shut Noah into the ark,"⁸ and so on, Justin warns his antagonist that he is not to suppose that "the unbegotten God" (*ἀγέννητος θεός*) did any of these things, for he has neither to come to any place, nor walks, but from his own place, wherever it may be, knows everything although he has neither eyes nor ears. Therefore he could not talk with anyone, nor be seen by anyone, and none of the Patriarchs saw the Father at all, but they saw "him who was according to his will both his Son (being God) and the Angel, in that he ministered to his purpose, whom also he willed to be born man by the Virgin, who became fire when he spoke with Moses from the bush."⁹ He refers through-

¹ Καὶ μετὰ σου ἡ σοφία ἡ εἰδὺνία τὰ ἔργα σου, καὶ παρούσα ἵτε ἐποιεῖς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπισταμένη τί ἀρεδύον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, καὶ τί εὐθὲς ἐν ἐντολαῖς σου. Wisdom of Solom., ix. 9.

² Cf. ch. viii.—xi.

³ Πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέ με, καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐ μὲ ἐκλίπω. *Ecclesiastic.* xxiv. 9.

⁴ Gen. xviii. 22.

⁵ Exod. vi. 29.

⁶ Gen. xi. 5.

⁷ Gen. vii. 16.

⁸ ἀλλ' ἐκείνον τὸν κατὰ βουλήν τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ θεὸν ὄντα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄγγελον ἐκ τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ, ὃν καὶ ἄνθρωπον γεννηθῆναι διὰ τῆς παρθένου βεβουλήται· ὃς καὶ πῦρ ποτε γέγονε τῇ πρὸς Μωϋσέα οὐιλίᾳ τῇ ἀπὸ τῆς βάτου. Dial. 127; cf. 123, 63; cf. Philo, De Somniis, i. §§ 11 f., Mang., i. 630 f.; § 31. id.,

out his writings to the various appearances of God to the Patriarchs, all of which he ascribes to the pre-existent Jesus, the Word,¹ and in the very next chapter, after alluding to some of these, he says: "he is called Angel because he came to men, since by him the decrees of the Father are announced to men At other times he is also called Man and human being, because he appears clothed in these forms as the Father wills, and they call him Logos because he bears the communications of the Father to mankind."²

Justin, moreover, repeatedly refers to the fact that he was called Wisdom by Solomon, and quotes the passage we have indicated in Proverbs. In one place he says, in proof of his assertion that the God who appeared to Moses and the Patriarchs was distinguished from the Father, and was in fact the Word (ch. 66—70): "Another testimony I will give you, my friends, I said, from the Scriptures that God begat before all of the creatures (πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων) a Beginning (ἀρχήν),³ a certain rational Power (δύναμιν λογικὴν) out of himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, then the Son, again Wisdom, again Angel, again God, and again Lord and Logos;" &c., and a little further on: "The Word of Wisdom will testify to me, who is himself this God begotten of the Father of the universe, being Word, and Wisdom, and Power (δύναμις), and the Glory of the Begetter," &c.,⁴ and he quotes, from the Septuagint version, Proverbs viii. 22—36, part of which we have given above, and indeed, elsewhere (ch. 129) he quotes the passage a second time as evid-

i. 648; §§ 33 ff., *ib.*, i. 649 ff.; §§ 39 ff., *ib.*, i. 655 ff. Nothing in fact could show more clearly the indebtedness of Justin to Philo than this argument (Dial. 100) regarding the inapplicability of such descriptions to the "unbegotten God." Philo in one treatise from which we are constantly obliged to take passages as parallels for those of Justin (*de Confusione linguarum*) argues from the very same text: "The Lord went down to see that city and tower," almost in the very same words as Justin, § 27. The passage is unfortunately too long for quotation.

¹ Dial. 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 126, 127, 128, &c., &c.; Apol., i. 62, 63; cf. *Philo*, Vita Mosi, §§ 12 ff., *Mangey*, i. 91 ff.; *Leg. Alleg.*, iii. §§ 25 ff., *ib.*, i. 103 f., &c., &c.

² . . . Ἄγγελον καλεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους προσῶν, ἐπειδὴ δι' αὐτῆς τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀγγέλλεται . . . ἀνδρὰ δὲ ποτε καὶ ἀνθρώπων καλεῖσθαι, ἐπειδὴ ἐν μορφῇς τοιαύταις σχηματίζομενος φαίνεται, αἰσπερ βούλεται ὁ Πατήρ καὶ Λόγον καλοῦσιν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁμιλίας φέρει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Dial. 128; cf. Apol. i. 63; Dial. 60.

³ Cf. Apoc., iii. 14.

⁴ Μαρτύριον δὲ καὶ ἄλλο ἔμην, ὃ φίλοι, ἔφην, ἀπο τῶν γραφῶν δώσω, ὅτι Ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ Θεὸς γεγέννηκε δύναμιν τινα ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν, ἵτις καὶ Δύξα Κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ Υἱός, ποτὲ δὲ Σοφία, ποτὲ δὲ Ἄγγελος, ποτὲ δὲ Θεός, ποτὲ δὲ Κύριος καὶ Λόγος. Μαρτυρήσει δὲ μοι ὁ λόγος τῆς σοφίας, αὐτοῦ ὧν οὗτός ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθεὶς, καὶ Λόγος, καὶ Σοφία, καὶ Δυναμὶς, καὶ Δόξα τοῦ γεννησαντος ὑπαρχων, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 61.

ence, with a similar context. Justin refers to it again in the next chapter, and the peculiarity of his terminology in all these passages, so markedly different from, and indeed opposed to, that of the fourth Gospel, will naturally strike the reader: "But this offspring (*γέννημα*) being truly brought forth by the Father was with the Father before all created beings (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων*), and the Father communes with him, as the Logos declared through Solomon, that this same, who is called Wisdom by Solomon, had been begotten of God before all created beings (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων*), both Beginning (*ἀρχή*) and Offspring (*γέννημα*)," &c.¹ In another place after quoting the words: "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son will reveal him," Justin continues: "Therefore he revealed to us all that we have by his grace understood out of the Scriptures, recognizing him to be indeed the first-begotten (*πρωτότοκος*) of God, and before all creatures (*πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων*) . . . and calling him Son, we have understood that he proceeded from the Father by his power and will before all created beings (*πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων*), for in one form or another he is spoken of in the writings of the prophets as Wisdom," &c.;² and again, in two other places he refers to the same fact.³

On further examination, we find on every side still stronger confirmation of the conclusion that Justin derived his Logos doctrine from the Old Testament and Philo, together with early New Testament writings. We have quoted several passages in which Justin details the various names of the Logos, and we may add one more. Referring to Ps. lxxii., which the Jews apply to Solomon, but which Justin maintains to be applicable to Christ, he says: "For Christ is King, and Priest, and God, and Lord, and Angel, and Man, and Captain, and Stone, and a Son born (*παιδίον γινόμενον*), &c., &c., as I prove by all of the Scriptures."⁴ Now these representations, which are constantly repeated throughout Justin's writings, are quite opposed to the Spirit of the fourth Gospel,

¹ Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο τὸ τῷ ὄντι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα, πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῷ Πατρί, καὶ τούτῳ ὁ Πατὴρ προσμιλεῖ, ὡς ὁ Λόγος διὰ τοῦ Σολομῶντος ἐδήλωσεν, ὅτι καὶ Ἀρχὴ πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων τοῦτ' αὐτό καὶ γέννημα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγενένητο, ὁ Σοφία διὰ Σολομῶντος καλεῖται, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 62.

² Ἀπεκαλύψεν οὖν ἡμῖν πάντα ὅσα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ γενοήκαμεν, γνόντες αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων . . . καὶ Τίον αὐτὸν λέγοντες, γενοήκαμεν, καὶ πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς δυνάμει αὐτοῦ βουλῇ προελθόντα, ὅς καὶ Σοφία, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 100.

³ Dial. 126, 129.

⁴ Ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς βασιλεὺς, καὶ Ἱερεὺς, καὶ Θεὸς, καὶ Κυριὸς, καὶ Ἀγγελὸς, καὶ Ἄνθρωπος, καὶ Ἀρχιδιτάκτης, καὶ Λίθος, καὶ Παιδίον γεγόμενον, κ.τ.λ. Dial. 34.

but are on the other hand equally common in the works of Philo, and many of them also to be found in the Philonian Epistle to the Hebrews. Taking the chief amongst them we may briefly illustrate them. The Logos as King, Justin avowedly derives from Ps. lxxii., in which he finds that reference is made to the "Everlasting King, that is to say Christ."¹ We find this representation of the Logos throughout the writings of Philo. In one place already briefly referred to,² but which we shall now more fully quote, he says: "For God as Shepherd and King governs according to Law and Justice like a flock of sheep, the earth, and water, and air, and fire, and all the plants and living things that are in them, whether they be mortal or divine, as well as the course of heaven, and the periods of sun and moon, and the variations and harmonious revolutions of the other stars; having appointed his true Word (τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον) his first-begotten Son (πρωτόγονον υἱόν) to have the care of this sacred flock as the Vicegerent of a great King;"³ and a little further on, he says: "very reasonably, therefore, he will assume the name of a King, being addressed as a Shepherd."⁴ In another place, Philo speaks of the "Logos of the Governor, and his creative and kingly power, for of these is the heaven and the whole world."⁵

Then if we take the second epithet, the Logos as Priest (ιερεὺς), which is quite foreign to the fourth Gospel, we find it repeated by Justin, as for instance: "Christ the eternal Priest" (ιερεὺς),⁶ and it is not only a favourite representation of Philo, but is almost the leading idea of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in connection with the episode of Melchisedec, in whom also both Philo,⁷ and Justin,⁸ recognize the Logos. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, vii. 3, speaking of Melchisedec: "but likened to the Son of God, abideth a Priest for ever;"⁹ again in iv. 14: "Seeing then that we have a great High

¹ Dial. 34.

² p. 563.

³ καθάπερ γὰρ τινα ποιμνὴν γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὅσα ἐν τοῦτοις φησὶ τε αὐτὸ καὶ ζῶσα, τὰ μὲν θνητὰ τὰ δὲ θεία, ἐπὶ δὲ οὐρανοῦ φύσιν καὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης περιόδους καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων τροπὰς τε αὐτὸ καὶ χορεῖας ἐναρμονίους ὡς ποιμὴν καὶ βασιλεὺς ὁ θεὸς ἀγεί κατὰ δίκην καὶ νόμον, προστησάμενος τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν, ὃς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀγέλης οἷα τις μεγάλου βασιλέως ὑπαρχὸς διαδέξεται. De Agricult., § 12, Mangey, i. 308.

⁴ Ἐκδοτῶς τοίνυν ὁ μὲν βασιλέως ὄνομα ὑποδύσεται, ποιμὴν προσαγορευθεὶς, κ.τ.λ. § 14, cf. De Profugis, § 20, Mang., i. 562; De Somniis, ii. § 37, Mang., i. 691.

⁵ Ὁ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος Λόγος, καὶ ἡ ποιητικὴ καὶ βασιλικὴ δύναμις αὐτοῦ· τούτων γὰρ ὁ τε οὐρανὸς καὶ σὺμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ. De Profugis, § 19, Mang., i. 561; cf. de Migrat. Abrahami, § 1, Mang., i. 437.

⁶ Dial., 42.

⁷ Legis Alleg., § 26, Mang., i. 104, &c., &c.

⁸ Dial., 34, 83, &c., &c.

⁹ . . . ἀφομοιωμένος δὲ τῷ νιῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. Heb. vii. 3.

Priest that is passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God," &c.;¹ ix. 11: "Christ having appeared a High Priest of the good things to come;"² vii. 21: "Thou art a Priest for ever."³ The passages are indeed far too numerous to quote.⁴ They are equally numerous in the writings of Philo. In one place already quoted,⁵ he says: "For there are as it seems two temples of God, one of which is this world, in which the High Priest is the divine Word, his first-begotten Son" (Δύο γὰρ, ὡς εἶκεν, ἱερὰ θεοῦ, ἐν μὲν ὁδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος Λόγος).⁶ Elsewhere, speaking of the period for the return of fugitives, the death of the high priest, which taken literally would embarrass him in his allegory, Philo says: "For we maintain the High Priest not to be a man, but the divine Word, who is without participation not only in voluntary but also in involuntary sins;"⁷ and he goes on to speak of this priest as "the most sacred Word" (ὁ ἱερώτατος Λόγος).⁸ Indeed, in many long passages he descants upon the "high priest Word" (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Λόγος).⁹

Proceeding to the next representations of the Logos as "God and Lord," we meet with the idea everywhere. In Hebrews i. 8: "But regarding the Son he saith: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος), &c., and again in the Epistle to the Philippians, ii. 6, "Who (Jesus Christ) being in the form of God, deemed it not grasping to be equal with God" (ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ ἴσαι ἑαυτὸν θεῷ), &c., &c.¹⁰ Philo, in the fragment preserved by Eusebius, to which we have already referred,¹¹ calls the Logos the "Second God" (δεύτερος θεός).¹² In another passage he has: "But he calls the most ancient God his present Logos," &c. (καλᾷ δὲ θέντων πρεσβύτατον αὐτῷ νυνὶ Λόγον);¹³ and a little further on, speaking of the inability of men to look on the Father himself: "thus

¹ ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερεῖα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ. Heb. iv. 14.

² Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, κ.τ.λ. Heb. ix. 11.

³ Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Heb. vii. 21.

⁴ Heb. vii. 11, 15, 17, 21 f., 26 ff.; viii. 1 ff.; ii. 6, 17; v. 5, 6, 10.

⁵ p. 565.

⁶ Philo, De Somniis, i. § 37, Mangey, i. 653.

⁷ Λέγουμεν γὰρ, τὸν ἀρχιερεῖα οὐκ ἀνθρώπον, ἀλλὰ Λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἐκουσίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίαν ὀδὴν ἡμῶν ἀμέτοχον. De Profugis, § 20, Mangey, i. 562. Philo continues: that this priest, the Logos, must be pure, "God indeed being his Father, who is also the Father of all things, and Wisdom his mother, by whom the universe came into being" (πατὴρ μὲν Θεοῦ, ἥς καὶ τῶν συνπάντων ἰστί πατήρ, μητὴρ δὲ Σοφίας, δι' ἣς τὰ ὅλα ἦλθεν εἰς γένεσιν.)

⁸ *Ib.*, § 21.

⁹ De Migrat. Abrahami, § 18, Mangey, i. 452.

¹⁰ Cf. verse 11.

¹¹ Fragm. i., Mangey, ii. 625; cf. Leg. Alleg., ii. § 21, Mangey, i. 83.

¹² Philo, De Somniis, i. 39, Mangey, i. 655.

they regard the image of God, his Angel Word, as himself" (οὕτως καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκόνα, τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ Λόγον, ὡς αὐτὸν κατανοοῦσαν).¹ Elsewhere discussing the possibility of God's swearing by himself, which he applies to the Logos, he says: "For in regard to us imperfect beings he will be a God, but in regard to wise and perfect beings the first. And yet Moses, in awe of the superiority of the unbegotten (ἀγεννήτου) God, says: 'And thou shalt swear by his name, not by himself; for it is sufficient for the creature to receive assurance and testimony by the Divine Word.'²

It is certain, however, that both Justin and Philo, unlike the prelude to the fourth Gospel i. 1, place the Logos in a secondary position to God the Father, another point indicating a less advanced stage of the doctrine. Both Justin and Philo apply the term *θεός* to the Logos without the article. Justin distinctly says that Christians worship Jesus Christ as the Son of the true God, holding him in the second place (ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες),³ and this secondary position is systematically defined through Justin's writings in a very decided way, as it is in the works of Philo by the contrast of the begotten Logos with the unbegotten God. Justin speaks of the Word as 'the first-born of the unbegotten God' (πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ),⁴ and the distinctive appellation of the "unbegotten God" applied to the Father is most common throughout his writings.⁵ We may in continuation of this remark point out another phrase of Justin which is continually repeated, but is thoroughly opposed both to the spirit and to the terminology of the fourth Gospel, and which likewise indicates the secondary consideration in which he held the Logos. He calls the Word constantly "the first-born of all created beings" (πρωτότοκος τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων,⁶ or πρωτότοκος πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων,⁷ or πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως),⁸ "the first-born of all creation," echoing the expression of Col. i. 15. (The Son) "who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation" (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως). This is a totally different view from that of the fourth Gospel, which in so emphatic a manner enunciates the doctrine: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God,

¹ De Somniis, i. § 41, *Mang.*, i. 656.

² Οὕτως γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν ἂν εἴη θεός, τῶν δὲ σοφῶν καὶ τελείων ὁ πρῶτος. Καὶ Μωϋσὴς μέντοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν θανατάς τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φησὶν. "Καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ εὐχῇ," οὐχὶ αὐτῷ. *Leg. Alleg.*, iii. § 73, *Mang.*, i. 128.

³ *Apol.*, i. 13, cf. 60, where he shows that Plato gives the second place to the Logos.

⁴ *Apol.*, i. 53, compare quotation from Philo, above, note 1.

⁵ *Apol.*, i. 49, *Apol.*, ii. 6, 13; *Dial.*, 126, 127.

⁶ *Dial.*, 62, 84, 100, &c., &c.

⁷ *Dial.*, 61, 100, 125, 129, &c., &c.

⁸ *Dial.*, 85, 138, &c.

and the Word was God," a statement which Justin, with Philo, only makes in a very modified sense.

To return, however, the next representation of the Logos by Justin is as "Angel." This perpetually recurs in his writings.¹ In one place, to which we have already referred, he says: "The Word of God is his Son, as we have already stated, and he is also called Messenger (*ἄγγελος*) and Apostle, for he brings the message of all we need to know, and is sent an Apostle to declare all the message contains."² In the same chapter reference is again made to passages quoted for the sake of proving: "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Apostle, being aforetime the Word and having appeared now in the form of fire, and now in the likeness of incorporeal beings;"³ and he gives many illustrations.⁴ The passages, however, in which the Logos is called Angel, are too numerous to be more fully dealt with here. It is scarcely necessary to point out that this representation of the Logos as Angel, is not only foreign to, but opposed to the spirit of, the fourth Gospel, although it is thoroughly in harmony with the writings of Philo. Before illustrating this, however, we may incidentally remark that the ascription to the Logos of the name "Apostle" which occurs in the two passages just quoted above, as well as in other parts of the writings of Justin,⁵ is likewise opposed to the fourth Gospel, although it is found in earlier writings, exhibiting a less developed form of the Logos doctrine; for the Epistle to the Hebrews iii. 1, has: "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus," &c. (*κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν*). We are, in fact, constantly directed by the remarks of Justin to other sources of the Logos doctrine, and never to the fourth Gospel, with which his tone and terminology in no way agree. Everywhere in the writings of Philo we meet with the Logos as Angel. He speaks "of the Angel Word of God" in a sentence already quoted,⁶ and elsewhere in a passage, one of many others, upon which the lines of Justin which we are now considering (as well as several similar passages)⁷ are in all proba-

¹ *Apol.*, i. 63; *Dial.*, 34, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 127; cf. *Apol.*, i. 6.

² *Ὁ Λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἴσθις ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ὡς προέφημεν· καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται, καὶ Ἀπόστολος. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλει ὅσα δεῖ γινώσκειν, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται μνηύων ὅσα ἀγγέλλεται, κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 63.*

³ *ὅτι υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός, ἴσθις· πρότερον Λόγος ὢν, καὶ ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ποτὲ φανείς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσώματων, κ.τ.λ. *Apol.*, i. 63.*

⁴ Cf. *Dial.*, 56—60, 127, 128.

⁵ *Apol.*, i. 12, &c.

⁶ *Philo*, *De Somniis*, i. § 41, *Many.*, i. 656, see p. 576.

⁷ For instance, in the quotations at p. 572 f. from *Dial.* 61, and also that from *Dial.* 62, in which the Logos is also called the Beginning (*ἀρχή*). Both Philo and Justin, no doubt, had in mind Prov. viii. 22. In *Dial.* 100, for example, there is a passage, part of which we have quoted, which reads as follows: "for in one

bility moulded. Philo calls upon men to "strive earnestly to be fashioned according to God's first-begotten Word, the eldest Angel, who is the Archangel bearing many names, for he is called the Beginning (*ἀρχή*), and Name of God, and Logos, and the Man according to his image, and the Seer of Israel."¹ Elsewhere, in a remarkable passage, he says: "To his Archangel and eldest Word, the Father, who created the universe, gave the supreme gift that having stood on the confine he may separate the creature from the Creator. The same is an intercessor on behalf of the ever wasting mortal to the immortal; he is also the ambassador of the Ruler to his subjects. And he rejoices in the gift, and the majesty of it he describes, saying: 'And I stood in the midst between the Lord and you' (Numbers xvi. 48); being neither unbegotten like God, nor begotten like you, but between the two extremes," &c.² We have been tempted to give more of this passage than is necessary for our immediate purpose, because it affords the reader another glimpse of Philo's doctrine of the Logos, and generally illustrates its position in connection with the Christian doctrine.

The last of Justin's names which we shall here notice is the Logos as "Man" as well as God. In another place Justin explains that he is sometimes called a Man and human being, because he appears in these forms as the Father wills.³ But here confining ourselves merely to the concrete idea, we find a striking representation

form or another he is spoken of in the writings of the prophets as Wisdom, and the Day, and the East, and a Sword, and a Stone, and a Rod, and Jacob, and Israel, &c." Now in the writings of Philo these passages in the Old Testament are discussed, and applied to the Logos, and one in particular we may refer to as an illustration. Philo says: "I have also heard of a certain associate of Moses having pronounced the following, saying: 'Behold a man whose name is the East.' (Zech. vi. 12.) A most novel designation if you consider it to be spoken regarding one composed of body and soul, but if regarding that incorporeal Being who does not differ from the divine image, you will agree that the name of the East is perfectly appropriate to him. For indeed the Father of the Universe caused this eldest son (*πρεσβύτερον υἱόν*) to rise (*ἀνέτειλε*), whom elsewhere he names his first-begotten (*πρωτόγονον*), &c." De Confus. Ling., § 14. Can it be doubted that Justin follows Philo in such exegesis?

1. . . . σπουδαζέτω καὶ μίθεσθαι κατὰ τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ Λόγον, τὸν ἀγγελον πρεσβύτερον, ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα καὶ γὰρ ἀρχή, καὶ ὄνομα θεοῦ, καὶ λόγος, καὶ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὁρῶν Ἰσραὴλ προσάγορεύεται. De Confus. Ling., § 28, Mang., i. 427; cf. De Migrat. Abrahami, § 31, Mang., i. 463.

2. Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτέρῳ Λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξαιρετικὴν ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθόμιος σῶς τὸ γεννημένον διακρίνη τοῦ πεποιημένου. Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἐκείνης μέν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ κρηαίνοντος αἰὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀθάνατον, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπὴκοον. Ἀλλάσσεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ δωρεᾷ, καὶ ἀεμνόμενος εὐτὴν ἐκδιηγείται φάσκων· "Καὶ ἐγὼ εἰστήκειν ἀνά μιν κυρίου καὶ ὑμῶν" (Num. xvi. 48), οὐτε ἀγέννητος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ὢν, οὐτε γεννητός ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἄκρων, κ.τ.λ. Quis rerum div. Heres., § 42, Mang., i. 501 f.

3 Dial. 128, see the quotation, p. 572.

of it in 1 Tim. ii. 5: "For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus" (εἰς γὰρ θεός, εἰς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς); and again in Rom. v. 15: " . . . by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ" (τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), as well as other passages.¹ We have already seen in the passage quoted above from "De Confus. Ling." § 28, that Philo mentions, among the many names of the Logos, that of "the Man according to (God's) image" (ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου,² or "the typical man"). If, however, we pass to the application of the Logos doctrine to Jesus, we have the strongest reason for concluding Justin's total independence of the fourth Gospel. We have already pointed out that the title of Logos is given to Jesus in New Testament writings earlier than the fourth Gospel, and we must see that Justin's terminology, as well as his views of the Word become man, is thoroughly different from that Gospel. We have remarked that, although the passages are innumerable in which Justin speaks of the Word having become man through the Virgin, he never once throughout his writings makes use of the peculiar expression of the fourth Gospel: "the Word became flesh" (ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο). On the few occasions on which he speaks of the Word having been *made* flesh, he uses the term *σαρκοποιεῖς*.³ In one instance he has *σάρκα ἔχει*,⁴ and speaking of the Eucharist Justin once explains that it is in memory of Christ's having made himself *body*, *σωματοποιήσασθαι*.⁵ Justin's most common phrase, however, and he repeats it in numberless instances, is that the Logos submitted to be born, and become man (*γεννηθῆναι ἀνθρώπον γενόμενον ὑπέμεινεν*), by a Virgin, or he uses variously the expressions: *ἄνθρωπος γέγονε*, *ἄνθρωπος γένόμενος*, *γενέσθαι ἀνθρώπον*.⁶ In several places he speaks of him as the first production or offspring (*γέννημα*) of God before all created beings, as, for instance: "The Logos . . . who is the first offspring of God" (ὁ ἐστὶ πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ θεοῦ);⁷ and again, "and that this offspring was begotten of the Father absolutely before all creatures the Word was declaring" (καὶ ὅτι γεγενῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλου).⁸ We need not say more of the expressions: "first-born" (*πρωτότοκος*), "first-begotten" (*πρωτόγονος*), so constantly applied to the Logos by Justin, in agreement with

¹ Phil. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 47.

² Elsewhere Philo says that the Word was the archetypal model after which man and the human mind were formed. De Exsecrat., § 8, *Mang.*, i. 436; De Mundi Opificio, § 6, *Mang.*, i. 6.

³ Apol., i. 66 (twice); Dial., 45, 100.

⁴ Dial., 48.

⁵ Apol., i. 5, 23, 63; Apol., ii. 6, 13; Dial., 34, 45, 48, 57, 63, 75, 84, 85, 106, 113, 125, 127, &c., &c.

⁶ Apol., i. 21.

⁷ Dial., 129, cf. 62.

Philo; nor to "only begotten" (μονογενής), directly derived from Ps. xxii. 20 (Ps. xxi. 20, Sept.).

It must be apparent to everyone who seriously examines the subject, that Justin's terminology is thoroughly different from, and in spirit opposed to, that of the fourth Gospel, and in fact that the peculiarities of the Gospel are not found in Justin's writings at all.¹ On the other hand, his doctrine of the Logos is precisely that of Philo,² and of writings long antecedent to the fourth Gospel, and there can be no doubt, we think, that it was derived from them.³

We may now proceed to consider other passages adduced by Tischendorf to support his assertion that Justin made use of the

¹ A passage is sometimes quoted in which Justin reproaches the Jews for spreading injurious and unjust reports "concerning the only blameless and righteous Light sent by God to man" (κατὰ οὖν τοῦ μόνου ἀμώμου καὶ δικαίου φωτός τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πεμφθέντος παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ. Dial. 17), and this is claimed as an echo of the Gospel; cf. John i. 9, viii. 12, xii. 46, &c. Now here again we have in Philo the elaborate representation of the Logos as the sun and Light of the world; as for instance in a long passage in the treatise De Somniis, i. §§ 13 ff., *Mang.*, i. 631 ff., of which we can only give the slightest quotation. Philo argues that Moses only speaks of the sun by symbols, and that it is easy to prove this; "since in the first place God is Light. 'For the Lord is my Light and my Saviour,' it is said in hymns, and not only Light, but archetype of every other light, nay rather more ancient and more perfect than archetype, having the Logos for an exemplar. For indeed the exemplar was his most perfect Logos, Light," &c. (. . . ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ, "Κύριος γὰρ φῶς μου καὶ σωτὴρ μου" ἐν ὑμνοῖς ᾄδεται. Καὶ οὐ μόνον φῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ παντὸς ἑτέρου φωτός ἀρχέτυπον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀρχέτυπον πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἀνώτερον, λόγον ἔχον παραδείγματός· τὸ μὲν γὰρ παραδειγμα ὁ πληρέστατος ἦν αὐτοῦ λόγος, φῶς, κ. τ. λ. De Somniis, i. § 13, *Mang.*, i. 632). And again: "But according to the third meaning, he calls the divine Word the sun" (κατὰ δὲ τρίτην σημαίνόμενον ἥλιον καλεῖ τὸν θεῖον λόγον), and proceeds to show how by this sun all wickedness is brought to light, and the sins done secretly and in darkness are made manifest. De Somniis, i. § 15, *Mang.*, i. 634; cf. *ib.*, § 19.

² If the Cohort. ad Græcos be assigned to Justin, it directly refers to Philo's works, c. ix.

³ *Volkmar*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 300; *Der Ursprung*, p. 92 ff.; *Schotten*, Das Ev. n. Johann., p. 9 f.; *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 24 ff.; *Révillé*, Hist. du Dogme de la Div. D. J. C., 1869, p. 45 ff.; *Vacherot*, Hist. de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, i. p. 230 ff.; *Davidson*, Introd. N.T., ii. p. 380 ff.; *Credner*, P. iträge, i. p. 251 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 298 ff.; *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 351; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 223 ff.; cf. *Dörner*, Die Lehre v. d. Pers. Christi, 1845, i. p. 414 ff.; *Bretschneider*, Probabilia de Ev. et Ep. Joan. Apost., p. 191 f.; *J. T. Tobler* derives the Johannine Logos doctrine from Philo, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1860, p. 180 ff.; *Ewald* holds that the Epistle to the Hebrews transfers the Logos doctrine of Philo to Christianity. The Apostle Paul's mind was filled with it from the same sources. *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, vi. p. 474 f., p. 638 ff.; *Das Sendschr. a. d. Hebräer*, p. 9 ff.; cf. *Kottlin*, Joh. Lehrbegriff, p. 357 ff., p. 392 ff.; cf. *Lücke*, Comment. Ev. Joh., i. p. 284 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 286 ff., pp. 298, 313, 365; *Der Montanismus*, 1841, p. 155; cf. *Holsten*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1861, p. 233 f., ann. 2; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1871, p. 189 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1869, p. 400 ff. That the doctrine of the Logos was enunciated in the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου* we know from the quotations of Clement of Alexandria. *Strom.*, vi. 5, § 39, 7, § 58.

fourth Gospel. He says: "Passages of the Johannine Gospel, however, are also not wanting to which passages in Justin refer back. In the Dialogue, ch. 88, he writes of John the Baptist: 'The people believed that he was the Christ, but he cried to them: I am not the Christ, but the voice of a preacher.' This is connected with John i. 20 and 23; for no other Evangelist has reported the first words in the Baptist's reply." ¹ Now the passage in Justin, with its context, reads as follows: "For John sat by the Jordan (καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) and preached the Baptism of repentance, wearing only a leathern girdle and raiment of camel's hair, and eating nothing but locusts and wild honey; men supposed (ὑπέλαμβανον) him to be the Christ, wherefore he himself cried to them: 'I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying: For he shall come (ἔξει) who is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not meet (ικανός) to bear.'" ² Now the only ground upon which this passage can be compared with the fourth Gospel is the reply: "I am not the Christ" (οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός), which in John i. 20 reads: οὐτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός; and it is perfectly clear that, if the direct negation occurred in any other Gospel, the difference of the whole passage in the Dialogue would prevent even an apologist from advancing any claim to its dependence on that Gospel. In order to appreciate the nature of the two passages, it may be well to collect the nearest parallels in the Gospel, and compare them with Justin's narrative.

JUSTIN, DIAL. 88.

Men (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) supposed him to be the Christ;

wherefore he cried to them: I am not the Christ (οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός),

JOHN I. 19—27.

19. And this is the testimony of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him: Who art thou?

24. And they were sent by the Pharisees.

20. And he confessed, and denied not; and confessed³ that: I am not the Christ (οὐτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός).

21. And they asked again: Who then? Art thou Elias? &c. &c.

¹ Es fehlt aber auch nicht an einzelnen Stellen des Johanneischen Evangeliums, auf welche sich Stellen bei Justin zurückbeziehen. Im Dialog Kap. 88 schreibt er von Johannes dem Täufer: "Die Leute glaubten dass er der Christ sei; aber er rief ihnen zu: Ich bin nicht Christus, sondern Stimme eines Predigers." Dies lehnt sich an Joh. i. 20 und 23 an; denn die ersten Worte in der Antwort des Täufers hat kein anderer Evangelist berichtet. Wann Wurden, u. s. w., p. 33.

² Ἰωάννου γὰρ καθεζομένου ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ πηρύσσοντος βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ ζώην δερματίνην καὶ ἐνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου νόνον φορούντος, καὶ μὴδὲν ἐσθίοντος πλὴν ἀκριδῶν καὶ μέλι ἀγρίον, οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπέλαμβανον αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν· πρὸς οὓς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβόα· Οὐκ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος· ἔξει γὰρ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου· οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανός τα ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι. Dial. 88.

³ The second καὶ ὁμολόγησεν is omitted by the Cod. Sin.

JUSTIN, DIAL. 88.

but the voice, of one crying:

For he shall come (*ἥξει*) who is stronger than I (*ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου*), whose shoes I am not meet (*ἱκανός*) to bear.¹

JOHN I. 19-27.

22. . . . Who art thou? &c. &c.

23. He said: I am the voice of one crying in the desert: Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Isaiah.

25. . . . Why baptizest thou? &c. &c.

26. John answered them, saying: I baptize with water, but in the midst of you standeth one whom ye know not.

27. Who cometh after me (*ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος*) who is become before me (*ὅς ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν*),² the thong of whose shoes I am not worthy (*ἄξιός*) to unloose.

The introductory description of John's dress and habits is quite contrary to the fourth Gospel, but corresponds to some extent with Matt. iii. 4. It is difficult to conceive two accounts more fundamentally different, and the discrepancy becomes more apparent when we consider the scene and actors in the episode. In Justin, it is evident that the hearers of John had received the impression that he was the Christ, and the Baptist becoming aware of it voluntarily disabused their minds of this idea. In the fourth Gospel the words of John are extracted from him ("he confessed and denied not") by emissaries sent by the Pharisees of Jerusalem specially to question him on the subject. The account of Justin betrays no knowledge of any such interrogation. The utter difference is brought to a climax by the concluding statement of the fourth Gospel:—

JUSTIN.

For John sat by the Jordan and preached the Baptism of repentance, wearing, &c.

JOHN I. 28.

These things were done in Bethany beyond the river Jordan, where John was baptizing.

In fact the scene in the two narratives is as little the same as their details. One can scarcely avoid the conclusion, in reading the fourth Gospel, that it quotes some other account and does not pretend to report the scene direct. For instance, i. 15, "John beareth witness of him, and cried, saying: 'This was he of whom I said: He that cometh after me is become before me, because he was before me,'" &c. V. 19: "And this is the testimony of

¹ Matt. iii. 11 reads: "but he that cometh after me is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear." (*ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἔστί, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι*.) The context is quite different. Luke iii. 16, more closely resembles the version of the fourth Gospel in this part with the context of the first Synoptic.

² The Cod. Sinaiticus, as well as most other important MSS., omits this phrase.

John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him: *Who art thou?* and he confessed and denied not, and confessed that I am not the Christ," &c. Now, as usual, the Gospel which Justin uses more nearly approximates to our first Synoptic than the other Gospels, although it differs in very important points from that also—still, taken in connection with the third Synoptic, and Acts xiii. 25, this indicates the great probability of the existence of other writings combining the particulars as they occur in Justin. Luke iii. 15, reads: "And as the people were in expectation, and all mused in their hearts concerning John whether he were the Christ, 16. John answered, saying to them all: I indeed baptize you with water, but he that is stronger than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire," &c.

Whilst, however, with the sole exception of the simple statement of the Baptist that he was not the Christ, which in all the accounts is clearly involved in the rest of the reply, there is no analogy whatever between the parallel in the fourth Gospel and the passage in Justin, many important circumstances render it certain that Justin did not derive his narrative from that source. We have already¹ fully discussed the peculiarities of Justin's account of the Baptist, and in the context to the very passage before us there are details quite foreign to our Gospels which show that Justin made use of another and different work. When Jesus stepped into the water to be baptized a fire was kindled in the Jordan, and the voice from heaven makes use of words not found in our Gospels; but both the incident and the words are known to have been contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other works. Justin likewise states, in immediate continuation of the passage before us, that Jesus was considered the son of Joseph the carpenter, and himself was a carpenter and accustomed to make ploughs and yokes.² The Evangelical work of which Justin made use was obviously different from our Gospels, therefore, and the evident conclusion to which any impartial mind must arrive is, that there is not only not the slightest ground for affirming that Justin quoted the passage before us from the fourth Gospel, from which he so fundamentally differs, but every reason on the contrary to believe that he derived it from a particular Gospel, in all probability the Gospel according to the Hebrews, different from ours.³

¹ P. 269 ff.

² Dial., 88.

³ Credner, Beiträge, ii. p. 218; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 162 ff.; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 33; Davidson, Introd. N.T., ii. p. 377 f.; Bretschneider, Probabilia, p. 192; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 97, p. 156; Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 613 f., 1847, p. 150 ff.; cf. Ebrard, who thinks it a combination of

The next point advanced by Tischendorf is, that on two occasions he speaks of the restoration of sight to persons born blind,¹ the only instance of which in our Gospels is that recorded, John ix. 1. The references in Justin are very vague and general. In the first place he is speaking of the analogies in the life of Jesus with events believed in connection with mythological deities, and he says that he would appear to relate acts very similar to those attributed to Æsculapius when he says that Jesus "healed the lame and paralytic, and the maimed from birth (*ἐκ γενεῆς ποιηροῖς*), and raised the dead."² In the Dialogue, again referring to Æsculapius, he says that Christ "healed those who were from birth and according to the flesh blind (*τοὺς ἐκ γενεῆς καὶ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα πηροῖς*), and deaf, and lame."³ In the fourth Gospel the born-blind is described as (ix. 1) *ἄνθρωπος τυφλὸς ἐκ γενεῆς*. There is a variation it will be observed in the term employed by Justin, and that such a remark should be seized upon as an argument for the use of the fourth Gospel serves to show the poverty of the evidence for the existence of that work. Without seeking any further, we might at once reply that such general references as those of Justin might well be referred to the common tradition of the Church, which certainly ascribed all kinds of marvellous cures and miracles to Jesus. It is moreover unreasonable to suppose that the only Gospel in which the cure of one born blind was narrated was that which is the fourth in our Canon. Such a miracle may have formed part of a dozen similar collections extant at the time of Justin, and in no case could such an allusion be recognized as any evidence of the use of the fourth Gospel. But in the Dialogue, along with this remark, Justin couples the statement that although the people saw such cures: "They asserted them to be magical illusion; for they also ventured to call him a magician and a deceiver of the people."⁴ This is not found in our Gospels, but traces of the same tradition are met with elsewhere, as we have already mentioned,⁵ and it is probable that Justin either found all these particulars in the Gospel of which he made use, or that he refers to traditions familiar amongst the early Christians.

Tischendorf's next point is that Justin quotes the words of Zechariah xii. 10, with the same variation from the text of the

Matt. iii. 11, and John i. 19, but admits that it may be from oral tradition. Die evang. Gesch., p. 843.

¹ Apol., i. 22, Dial., 69. On the second occasion Justin seems to apply the "from their birth" not only to the blind, but to the lame and deaf.

² Apol., i. 22.

³ Dial. 69.

⁴ . . . ; *φαντασίαν μαγικὴν γίνεσθαι ἔλεγον. Καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον.* Dial. 69.

⁵ P. 274 f.

Septuagint as John xix. 37—"They shall look on him whom they pierced" (*ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*¹ instead of *ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲν, ὃν ὡν κατορχήσαντο*), arising out of an emendation of the translation of the Hebrew original. Tischendorf says: "nothing can be more opposed to probability, than the supposition that John and Justin have here, independently of each other, followed a translation of the Hebrew text which elsewhere has remained unknown to us."² The fact is, however, that the translation which has been followed is not elsewhere unknown. We meet with the same variation, much earlier, in the only book of the New Testament which Justin mentions, and with which, therefore, he was beyond any doubt well acquainted, Rev. i. 7: "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him (*ὄψεται αὐτόν*), and they which pierced (*ἐξεκέντησαν*) him and all the tribes of the earth shall bewail him. Yea, Amen." This is a direct reference to the passage in Zech. xii. 10. If Justin derived his variation from either of the Canonical works, there can be no doubt that it must have been from the Apocalypse. It will be remembered that the quotation in the Gospel: "They shall look upon him whom they pierced," is made solely in reference to the thrust of the lance in the side of Jesus, while that of the Apocalypse is a connection of the prophecy with the second coming of Christ, which, except in a spiritual sense, is opposed to the fourth Gospel. Now, Justin upon each occasion quotes the whole passage also in reference to the second coming of Christ as the Apocalypse does, and this alone settles the point so far as these two sources are concerned. The correction of the Septuagint version, which has thus been traced back as far as A.D. 68, when the Apocalypse was composed, was noticed by Jerome in his Commentary on the text;³ and Aquila, a contemporary of Irenæus, and later Symmacus and Theodotion, as well as others, corrected the error and adopted *ἐξεκέντησαν*. Ten important MSS., at least, have the reading of Justin and the Apocalypse, and these MSS. likewise frequently agree with the other peculiar readings of Justin's text. In all probability, as Credner, who long ago pointed out all these circumstances which are lost upon Tischendorf, conjectured, an emendation of the version of the LXX. had

¹ Justin has, Apol. i. 52, *ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*. Dial. 14, *καὶ ὄψεται ὁ λαὸς θυμῶν καὶ γνωρίει εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*, and, Dial. 32, speaking of the two comings of Christ; the first, in which he was pierced (*ἐξεκέντησεν*), "and the second in which ye shall know whom ye have pierced:" *δευτέραν δὲ ὅτε ἐπιγνώσεσθε εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησάτε*.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 34.

³ "Quod ibi (1 Regg. ii. 18) errore interpretationis accidit, etiam hic factum deprehendimus. Si enim legatur *Dacaru*, *ἐξεκέντησαν*, i. e., compunxerunt sive confixerunt accipitur: sin autem contrario ordine, literis commutatis *Racadu*, *ἀρχήσαντο*, i. e., saltaverunt intelligitur et ob similitudinem literarum error est natus."

early been made, partly in Christian interest and partly for the critical improvement of the text, and this amended version was used by Justin and earlier Christian writers.¹

Every consideration is opposed to the dependence of Justin upon the fourth Gospel for this variation. His reading existed long before that Gospel was written in a work with which he declared himself acquainted, whilst not only is his use of the Gospel in any case unproved, but in this instance the quotation is applied by the Gospel in a different connection from Justin's, who in this also agrees with the earlier Apocalypse. The whole argument based on this text falls to the ground.

The next and last point advanced by Tischendorf is a passage in Apol. i. 61, which is compared with John iii. 3—5, and in order to show the exact character of the two passages, we shall at once place them in parallel columns:—

JUSTIN, APOC. I. 61.

For the Christ also said :

Unless ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to go (*ἐμβῆναι*) into the matrices of the parents² (*εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκνουσῶν*) is evident to all.

Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν Ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκνουσῶν τοὺς ἀπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερόν πάντιν ἐστί.

JOHN III. 3—5.

3. Jesus answered and said unto him : Verily, verily, I say unto thee : Except a man be born from above (*γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν*) he cannot see the kingdom of God.

4. Nicodemus saith unto him: How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter (*εἰσελθεῖν*) a second time into his mother's womb (*εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*) and be born?

5. Jesus answered : Verily, verily, I say unto thee: Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter³ into the kingdom of God.⁴

3. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

4. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Νικοδήμους Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέροντων ὧν ; μὴ δύναται εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δευτέρου εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι ;

5. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.⁵

¹ Credner, *Beitrag*, ii. p. 293 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evv. Justin's*, p. 49 ff.; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 37; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 373.

² Τεκνοῦσα, a mother, instead of μήτηρ.

³ The Cod. Sinaiticus reads : " he cannot see."

⁴ The Cod. Sinaiticus has been altered here to " of heaven."

⁵ The Cod. Sinaiticus reads ἰδεῖν for εἰσελθεῖν εἰς here.

⁶ The Cod. Sin. has τῶν οὐρανῶν, but τοῦ θεοῦ is substituted by a later

This is the most important passage by which apologists endeavour to establish the use by Justin of the fourth Gospel, and it is that upon which the whole claim may be said to rest. We shall be able to appreciate the nature of the case by the weakness of its strongest evidence. The first point which must have struck any attentive reader, must have been the singular difference of the language of Justin, and the absence of the characteristic peculiarities of the Johannine Gospel. The double "verily, verily," which occurs twice even in these three verses, and constantly throughout the Gospel,¹ is absent in Justin; and apart from the total difference of the form in which the whole passage is given (the episode of Nicodemus being entirely ignored, and omitting minor differences, the following linguistic variations occur :

Justin has:

ἀν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, instead of	ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν
οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς	οὐ δύναται εἰσεῖν ²
βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀδύνατον	μὴ δύναται
τὰς μητέρας	τὴν κοιλίαν
τῶν τεκοῦσάν	τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
ἐμῶν	εἰσελθῆν
τοὺς ἀπαξ γεννωμένους	ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὧν.

Indeed it is impossible to imagine a more complete difference, both in form and language, and it seems to us that there does not exist a single linguistic trace by which the passage in Justin can be connected with the fourth Gospel. The fact that Justin knows nothing of the expression *γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν* ("born from above"), upon which the whole statement in the fourth Gospel turns, but uses a totally different word, *ἀναγεννηθῆτε* (born again), is of great significance. Tischendorf wishes to translate *ἄνωθεν* "anew" (or again), as the version of Luther and the authorised English translation read, and thus render the *ἀναγεννηθῆναι* of Justin a fair equivalent for it; but even this would not alter the fact that so little does Justin quote the fourth Gospel, that he has not even the test word of the passage. In no case can *ἄνωθεν*, however, here signify anything but "from above," and this is not only its natural meaning, but it is confirmed by the equivalent Syriac expression in the Peshito version, the nearest language to that originally used.³ The

hand. The former reading is only supported by a very few obscure and unimportant codices. The Codices Alex. (A) and Vatic. (B), as well as all the most ancient MSS., read *τοῦ θεοῦ*.

¹ Cf. i. 51; iii. 11; v. 19, 24, 25; vi. 26, 32, 47, 53; viii. 34, 51, 58; x. 1, 7; xii. 24; xiii. 16, 20, 21, 38; xiv. 12; xvi. 20, 23; xxi. 18, &c., &c.

² It is very forced to jump to the end of the fifth verse to get *εἰσελθῆν εἰς*, and even in that case the Cod. Sin. reads again precisely as in the third *εἰσεῖν*.

³ Suicer, Thesaurus s. v. *ἄνωθεν*; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 253; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 214; Lightfoot, Horæ Hebr. et Talm. on John iii. 3; Works, xii. p. 254 ff.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 36; Davidson, Introd. N. T., iii. p. 375;

word is repeatedly used in the fourth Gospel, and always with the same sense, "from above," "from heaven,"¹ and it is repeated in confirmation, and marking how completely the emphasis of the saying rests upon the expression, in the seventh verse: "Marvel not that I said unto thee: ye must be born from above" (*γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*). This signification, moreover, is manifestly confirmed by the context, and intended as the point of the whole lesson. The explanation of the term "born from above" is given in verses 5, 6. "Except a man be born of water and of Spirit² he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. 6. That which hath been born of the flesh is flesh, and that which hath been born of the Spirit is Spirit." The birth "of the Spirit" is the birth "from above," which is essential to entrance into the kingdom of God.³ The sense of the passage in Justin is different and much more simple. He is speaking of regeneration through baptism, and the manner in which converts are consecrated to God when they are made new (*καινοποιούμενοι*) through Christ. After they are taught to fast and pray for the remission of their sins, he says: "They are then taken by us where there is water, that they may be regenerated ("born again," *ἀναγεννώσθαι*), by the same manner of regeneration (being born again, *ἀναγεννήσεως*) by which we also were regenerated (born again, *ἀναγεννήθημεν*). For in the name of the Father of the Universe the Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit they then make the washing with the water. For the Christ also said, 'unless ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' Now that it is impossible for those who have once been born to go into the matrices of the parents is evident to all." And then he quotes Isaiah i. 16—20, "Wash you, make you clean, &c.," and then proceeds: "And regarding this (Baptism) we have been taught this reason. Since at our first birth we were born without our knowledge, and perforce, &c., and brought up in evil habits and wicked ways, therefore in order that we should not continue children of necessity and ignorance, but become children of election and knowledge, and obtain in the water remission of sins, which we had previously committed, the name of the Father of the Universe and Lord God is pronounced over him who desires to be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆναι*), and has repented of his sins, &c."⁴ Now it is clear that whereas Justin speaks simply of regeneration by bap-

Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 193; *Weizsäcker* does not deny this. *Unters. evang. Gesch.*, p. 228; *Lücke*, *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, i. p. 516 ff.; *Zeller*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, p. 140.

¹ Cf. i. 31; xix. 11, 23.

² Cf. *Ezekiel xxxvi.* 25—27.

³ Cf. *Lightfoot*, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm. Works*, xii. p. 256.

⁴ *Apol.* i. 61.

tism, the fourth Gospel indicates a later development of the doctrine by spiritualizing the idea, and requiring not only regeneration through the water ("Except a man be born of water"), but that a man should be born from above ("and of the Spirit"), not merely *ἀναγεννηθῆναι*, but *ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*. The word used by Justin is that which was commonly employed in the Church for regeneration, and other instances of it occur in the New Testament.¹

The idea of regeneration or being born again, as essential to conversion, was quite familiar to the Jews themselves, and Lightfoot gives instances of this from Talmudic writings: "If any one become a proselyte he is like a child 'new born.' The Gentile that is made a proselyte and the servant that is made free he is like a child new born."² This is, of course, based upon the belief in special privileges granted to the Jews, and the Gentile convert admitted to a share in the benefits of the Messiah became a Jew by spiritual new birth. It must be remembered, however, that Justin is addressing the Roman emperors, who would not understand the expression that it was necessary to be "born again" in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. He, therefore, explains that he does not mean a physical new birth by men already born; and we contend that not only may this explanation be regarded as natural, under the circumstances, and independent of any written source, but the absolute and entire difference of his language from that of the fourth Gospel renders it certain that it could not in any case be derived from that Gospel.

Justin in giving the words of Jesus clearly professed to make an exact quotation:³ "For Christ also said: Unless ye be born again, &c.," and as the expressions which he quotes differ in every respect, in language and sense, from the parallel in the fourth Gospel, it seems quite unreasonable to argue that they must be derived from that Gospel. Such an argument assumes the utterly untenable premiss that sayings of Jesus which are maintained to be historical were not recorded in more than four Gospels, and indeed in this instance were limited to one. This is not only in itself preposterous, but historically untrue,⁴ and a moment of consideration must convince every impartial mind that an express quotation of a supposed historical saying cannot legitimately be asserted to be taken from a parallel in one of our Gospels, from which it differs in every particular of language and circumstance, simply because that Gospel happens to be the only one now surviving which contains particulars somewhat similar.⁵

¹ Cf. 1 Peter i. 3, 28.

² Lightfoot, Works, xii. p. 255 ff.

³ Bretschneider, Probabilia, p. 193.

⁵ Cf. Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 253 f.

⁴ Cf. Luke i. 1.

The express quotation fundamentally differs from the fourth Gospel, and the natural explanation of Justin which follows is not a quotation at all, and likewise fundamentally differs from the Johannine parallel. Justin not only ignores here the whole episode in the fourth Gospel in which the passage occurs, but neither here nor anywhere throughout his writings makes any mention of Nicodemus, and all the characteristic points are wanting which could constitute a *prima facie* case for examination. The accident of survival is almost the only justification of the affirmation that the fourth Gospel is the source of Justin's quotation. On the other hand, we have many strong indications of another source. In our first Synoptic (xviii. 3), we find the traces of another version of the saying of Jesus, much more nearly corresponding with the quotation of Justin: "And he said, verily I say unto you: Except ye be turned and become as the little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."¹ The last phrase of this saying is literally the same as the quotation of Justin, and gives his expression, "kingdom of heaven," so characteristic of his Gospel, and so foreign to the Johannine. We meet with a similar quotation in connection with baptism, still more closely agreeing with Justin, in the Clementine Homilies, xi. 26: "Verily I say unto you: Except ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) by living water in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."² Here again we have both the *ἀναγεννηθῆτε*, and the *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, as well as the reference only to water in the baptism, and this is strong confirmation of the existence of a version of the passage, different from the Johannine, from which Justin quotes. As both the Clementines and Justin probably made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the most competent critics have, with reason, adopted the conclusion that the passage we are discussing was derived from that Gospel; at any rate it cannot for a moment be maintained as a quotation from our fourth Gospel,³ and it is of no value as evidence for its existence.

¹ καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀὐτὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παῖδια, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Matt. xviii. 3.

² Ἀὐτὴν ὑμῖν λέγω, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε ὕδατι ζῶντι, εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς, Υἱοῦ, ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Hom. xi. 26. Cf. Recogn. vi. 9: "Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuo renatus fuerit ex aqua, non introibit in regna celorum." (Cf. Clem. Hom. Epitome, § 18. In this much later compilation the passage, altered and manipulated, is of no interest. Uhlhorn, Die Homilien u. Recogn., 1854, p. 43 ff.; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, 1844, p. 334 ff.

³ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 352; Theol. Jahrb., 1857, p. 230 ff.; Bretschneider, Probabilia, p. 179 ff., p. 192 f.; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 252 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 374 f.; Gieseler, Enst. schr. Evv., p. 14, cf. p. 145 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Dis. Evv. Justin's, p. 214 ff., p. 358 ff.; Das Evang. Joh. u. s. w., 1849, p. 151 anm. 1; Lützelberger, Die kirchl. Tradition üb. Ap. Joh., u. s. w., 1840, p. 122 ff.;

If we turn for a moment from this last of the points of evidence adduced by Tischendorf for the use of the fourth Gospel by Justin, to consider how far the circumstances of the history of Jesus narrated by Justin bear upon this quotation, we have a striking confirmation of the results we have otherwise attained. Not only is there a total absence from his writings of the peculiar terminology and characteristic expressions of the fourth Gospel, but there is not an allusion made to any one of the occurrences exclusively narrated by that Gospel, although many of these and many parts of the Johannine discourses of Jesus, would have been peculiarly suitable for his purpose. We have already pointed out the remarkable absence of any use of the expressions by which the Logos doctrine is stated in the prologue. We may now point out that Justin makes no reference whatever to any of the special miracles of the fourth Gospel. He is apparently quite ignorant even of the raising of Lazarus: on the other hand, he gives representations of the birth, life, and death of Jesus, which are ignored by the Johannine Gospel, and are indeed opposed to its whole conception of Jesus as the Logos; and when he refers to circumstances which are also narrated in that Gospel, his account is different from that which it gives. Justin perpetually refers to the birth of Jesus by the Virgin of the race of David and the Patriarchs; his Logos thus becomes man,¹ (not "*flesh*,"—*ἄνθρωπος* not *σὰρξ*); he is born in a cave in Bethlehem;² he grows in stature and intellect by the use of ordinary means like other men; he is accounted the son of Joseph the carpenter and Mary: he himself works as a carpenter, and makes ploughs and yokes.³ When Jesus is baptized by John, a fire is kindled in Jordan; and Justin evidently knows nothing of John's express declaration in the fourth Gospel, that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.⁴ Justin refers to the change of name of Simon in connection with his recognition of the Master as "Christ the Son of God,"⁵ which is narrated quite differently in the fourth Gospel (i. 40—42), where, indeed, such a declaration is put into the mouth of Nathaniel (i. 49), which Justin ignores. Justin does not mention Nicodemus either in connection with the statement regarding the necessity of being "born from above," or with the entombment (xix. 39). He has the prayer and agony in the garden,⁶ which the fourth Gospel excludes, as well as the cries on the cross, which that

Schollen, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 34 ff.; Das Ev. Joh., p. 8 f.; Schweigler, Der Montanismus, p. 184, anm. 86; Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 218 ff.; Volkmar, Justin d. Mart., 1853, p. 18 ff.; Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 614; 1847, p. 152; 1855, p. 138 ff.

¹ Dial., 100, &c., &c.

² Dial., 78.

³ Dial., 88.

⁴ Dial., 88.

⁵ Dial., 100.

⁶ Dial., 99, 103.

Gospel ignores. Then, according to Justin, the last supper takes place on the 14th Nisan,¹ whilst the fourth Gospel, ignoring the Passover and last supper, represents the last meal as eaten on the 13th Nisan (John xiii. 1 f., cf. xviii. 28). He likewise contradicts the fourth Gospel, in limiting the work of Jesus to one year. In fact, it is impossible for writings, so full of quotations of the words of Jesus and of allusions to the events of his life, more completely to ignore or vary from the fourth Gospel throughout; and if it could be shown that Justin was acquainted with such a work, it would follow certainly that he did not consider it an Apostolical or authoritative composition.

We may add that as Justin so distinctly and directly refers to the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse,² there is confirmation of the conclusion, otherwise arrived at, that he did not, and could not, know the Gospel and also ascribe it to John. Finally the description which Justin gives of the manner of teaching of Jesus excludes the idea that he knew the fourth Gospel. "Brief and concise were the sentences uttered by him: for he was no Sophist, but his word was the power of God."³ No one could for a moment assert that this description applies to the long and artificial discourses of the fourth Gospel, whilst, on the other hand, it eminently describes the style of teaching with which we are acquainted in the Synoptics, with which the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in all its forms, was so nearly allied.

The inevitable conclusion at which we must arrive is that, so far from indicating any acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, the writings of Justin not only do not furnish the slightest evidence of its existence, but offer presumptive testimony against its Apostolical origin.

Tischendorf only devotes a short note to Hegesippus, does not pretend to find in the fragments of his writings preserved to us by Eusebius, or the details of his life which he has recorded, any evidence for our Gospels. Apologists generally admit that this source, at least, is dry of all testimony for the fourth Gospel, but Canon Westcott cannot renounce so important a witness without an effort, and he therefore boldly says: "When he (Hegesippus) speaks of 'the door of Jesus' in his account of the death of St. James, there can be little doubt that he alludes to the language of our Lord recorded by St. John."⁴ The passage

¹ "And it is written that on the day of the Passover you seized him and likewise during the Passover you crucified him." Dial., 111; cf. Dial., c. Matt. xxvi. 2, 17 ff., 30, 57.

² Dial., 81.

³ Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγονόσιν. Οὐ γὰρ σοφιστικῆς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν. Apol. i. 14.

⁴ Warr worlen, n. s. w., p. 19, ann. 1.

⁵ On the Canon, p. 182 f.

to which Canon Westcott refers, but which he does not quote, is as follows:—"Certain, therefore, of the seven heretical parties amongst the people, already described by me in the *Memoirs*, inquired of him, what was the door of Jesus; and he declared this (οἶτον—Jesus) to be the Saviour. From which some believed that Jesus is the Christ. But the aforementioned heretics did not believe either a resurrection, or that he shall come to render to every one according to his works. As many as believed, however, did so, through James." The rulers fearing that the people would cause a tumult, from considering Jesus to be the Messiah (Χριστός), entreat James to persuade them concerning Jesus, and prevent their being deceived by him; and in order that he may be heard by the multitude, they place James upon a wing of the temple, and cry to him: "O just man, whom we all are bound to believe, inasmuch as the people are led astray after Jesus, the crucified, declare plainly to us what is the door of Jesus."¹ To find in this a reference to the fourth Gospel, requires a good deal of ignorant ingenuity, or apologetic partiality. It is perfectly clear that, as an allusion to John x. 7, 9: "I am the door," the question: "What is the door of Jesus?" is mere nonsense, and the reply of James totally irrelevant. Such a question in reference to the discourse in the fourth Gospel, moreover, in the mouths of the antagonistic Scribes and Pharisees, is an interpretation which is obviously too preposterous. Various emendations of the text have been proposed to obviate what has been regarded as a difficulty in the passage, but none of these have been adopted, and it has now been generally accepted, that θύρα is used in an idiomatic sense. The word is very frequently employed in such a manner, or symbolically, in the New Testament,² and by the Fathers. The Jews were well acquainted with a similar use of the word in the Old Testament, in some of the Messianic Psalms, as for instance: Ps. cxviii. 19, 20 (cxvii. 19, 20 Sept.). 19, "Open to me the gates (πύλας) of righteousness; entering into them, I will give praise to the Lord;" 20, "This is the gate (ἡ πύλη) of the Lord, the righteous shall enter into it."³ Quoting this passage, Clement

¹ Τινες οὖν τῶν ἐπὶ αἰρέσεων τῶν ἐν τῷ λαῷ, τῶν προγεγραμμένων μοι ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνημασιν, ἐπυνθάνοντο αὐτοῦ, τίς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ ἔλεγε τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν Σωτήρα. Ἐξ ὧν τινὲς ἐπίστευσαν, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός. Αἱ δὲ αἰρέσεις αἱ προειρημέναι οὐκ ἐπίστευον οὔτε ἀνάστασιν, οὔτε ἐρχόμενον ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Ὅσοι δὲ καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, διὰ Ἰάκωβον. . . . Δικαίαι, ὡς πάντες, πείθεσθαι ὀφείλομεν, ἐπεὶ ὁ λαὸς πλανᾶται ὁπίσω Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος, ἀπαγγέλλον ἡμῖν εἰς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. *Eusebius*, H. E., ii. 23.

² Cf. Acts xiv. 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3; James v. 9; Rev. iii. 8, 20; iv. 1.

³ Cf. Ps. xxiv. 7—8 (xxiii. 7—8 Sept.).

of Alexandria remarks: "But explaining the saying of the prophet, Barnabas adds: Many gates (*πυλῶν*) being open, that which is in righteousness is in Christ, in which all those who enter are blessed."¹ Grabe explains the passage of Hegesippus, by reference to the frequent allusions in the Scripture to the two ways; one of light, the other of darkness; the one leading to life, the other to death; as well as the simile of two gates which is coupled with them, as in Matt. vii. 13 ff. He, therefore, explains the question of the rulers: "What is the door of Jesus?" as an inquiry into the judgment of James concerning him: whether he was a teacher of truth or a deceiver of the people; whether belief in him was the way and gate of life and salvation, or of death and perdition.² He refers as an illustration to the Epistle of Barnabas xviii.: "There are two ways of teaching and of power: one of light, the other of darkness. But there is a great difference between the two ways."³ The Epistle, under the symbol of the two ways, classifies the whole of the moral law.⁴ In the Clementine Homilies, xviii. 17, there is a version of the saying, Matt. vii. 13 f., derived from another source, in which "way" is more decidedly even than in our first Synoptic made the equivalent of "gate:" "Enter ye through the narrow and straitened way (*ὁδός*) through which ye shall enter into life." Eusebius himself, who has preserved the fragment, evidently understood it distinctly in the same sense, and he gave its true meaning in another of his works where he paraphrases the question into an inquiry, as to the opinion which James held concerning Jesus (*τίνα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἔχοι δόξαν*).⁵ This view is supported by many learned men, and Routh has pointed out that Ernesti considered he would have been right in making *διδασχῆ*, doctrine, teaching, the equivalent of *θύρα*, although he admits that Eusebius does not once use it in his history in connection with Christian doctrine.⁶ He might, how-

¹ *ἐξηγουμένους δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ προφήτου Βαρναβᾶς ἐπιφέρει: "πολλῶν πυλῶν ἀνεωγνυῶν, ἥ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὐτῇ εἶσιν ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες οἱ εἰσελθόντες."* Strom. vi. 8, § 64. This passage is not to be found in the Epistle of Barnabas.

² Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 254.

³ *Ὅδοι δύο εἰσὶν διδασχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἥ τε τοῦ φωτός, καὶ ἡ τοῦ σκότους. Διαφορὰ δὲ πολλὴ τῶν δυο ὁδῶν.* Barnabæ Ep. xviii.

⁴ In like manner the Clementine Homilies give a peculiar version of Deut. xxx. 15: "Behold I have set before thy face the way of life, and the way of death." *Ἰδοὺ τέθεικα πρὸ προσώπου σου τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θανάτου.* Hom. xviii. 17, cf. vii. 7.

⁵ Demonstrat. Evang. iii. 7. Routh, Rel. Sacr. i. p. 234.

⁶ Si ego in Glossis ponerem: *θύρα, διδασχῆ*, rectum esset. Sed respicerem ad loca Græcorum theologorum v. c. Eusebii in Hist. Eccl. ubi non semel *θύρα Χριστοῦ* (sic) de doctrina Christiana dicitur." Dissert. De Usu Glossariorum. Routh, Reliq. Sacræ. i. p. 236. Donaldson gives as the most probable meaning: "To what is it that Jesus is to lead us? And James' answer is therefore: 'To salvation.'" Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., iii. p. 190, note.

ever, have instanced this passage, in which it is clearly used in this sense, and so explained by Eusebius. In any other sense the question is simple nonsense. There is evidently no intention on the part of the Scribes and Pharisees here to ridicule, in asking: "What is the door of Jesus?" but they desire James to declare plainly to the people, what is the teaching of Jesus, and his personal pretension. To suppose that the rulers of the Jews set James upon a wing of the temple, in order that they might ask him a question, for the benefit of the multitude, based upon a discourse in the fourth Gospel, unknown to the Synoptics, and even in relation to which such an inquiry as: "What is the door of Jesus?" becomes mere ironical nonsense, surpasses all that we could have imagined, even of apologetic zeal.

We have already¹ said all that is necessary with regard to Hegesippus, in connection with the Synoptics, and need not add more here. It is certain that had he mentioned our Gospels, and we may say particularly the fourth, the fact would have been recorded by Eusebius. This first historian of the Christian Church, whose *ἱστορίαι* were composed during the time of the Roman Bishop Eleutherus, "A. D. 177 (182?), 193,"² presents the suggestive phenomenon of a Christian of learning and extensive observation, even at that late date, who had travelled throughout the Christian communities with a view to ascertaining the state of the Church, who probably made exclusive use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews as did certain Christian communities, displayed no knowledge of our Gospels, and whose only Canon was the Law, the Prophets, and the words of the Lord, which he derived from the Hebrew Gospel, and probably from oral tradition.

In Papias of Hierapolis³ we have a similar phenomenon: a Bishop of the Christian Church, flourishing in the second half of the second century, who recognized none of our Gospels, in all probability made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and certainly set oral tradition above all written documents with which he was acquainted. It is perfectly clear that the works of Matthew and Mark, regarding which he records such important particulars, are not the Gospels in our Canon, which pass under their names, and there is no reason to suppose that he referred to the fourth Gospel or made use of it. He is, therefore, at least, a total blank so far as the Johannine Gospel and our third Synoptic are concerned, but he is more than this, and it may, we think, be concluded that Papias was not acquainted with any Gospels which he regarded as Apostolic compositions, or

¹ P. 346 ff.

² *Tschendorf*, Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 19, ann. 1.

³ P. 355 ff.

authoritative documents. It is impossible that, knowing, and recognizing the Apostolic origin and authority of such Gospels, he could have spoken of them in such terms, and held them so cheap in comparison with tradition, or that he should have undertaken, as he undoubtedly did, to supplement and correct them by his work, which Eusebius describes. "For I was not, like the multitude," he says, "taking pleasure in those who speak much, but in those who teach the truth; neither in those who record alien commandments, but in such as recall those delivered by the Lord to the faithful, and which proceed from the truth itself. If it happened that any one came, who had associated with the Presbyters, I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord; what Aristion and the Presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, say. For I held that what was to be derived from books did not so profit me as that from the living and abiding voice (of tradition)."¹ This depreciation of books, and anxiety to know "what John or Matthew, or the other disciples of the Lord said," is incompatible with the supposition that he was acquainted with Gospels² which he attributed to those Apostles. Had he said anything regarding the composition or authorship of the fourth Gospel, Eusebius would certainly have mentioned the fact, and this silence of Papias is strong presumptive evidence against the Johannine Gospel.³

Tischendorf's main argument in regard to the Phrygian Bishop is, that his silence does not make Papias a witness against the fourth Gospel, and he maintains that the omission of any mention by Eusebius of the use of this Gospel in the work of Papias is not singular, and does not involve the conclusion that he did not know it, inasmuch as it was not, he affirms, the purpose of Eusebius to record the mention or use of the books of the New Testament which were not disputed.⁴ This reasoning, however, is opposed to the practice and express declaration of Eusebius himself, who says: "But in the course of the history I shall, with the successions (from the Apostles), carefully intimate what eccle-

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 39.

² It is evident that Papias did not regard the works by "Matthew" and "Mark" which he mentions, as of any authority. Indeed, all that he reports regarding the latter is merely apologetic, and in depreciation of criticism.

³ Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 652 ff.; 1847, p. 148 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 344; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1865, p. 334; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 23 f.; Scholten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 16 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 371; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 61; Renan, Vie de Jésus, xiii^{me} ed., 1867, p. lviii. f.; Strauss, Das Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 62; Lützelberger, Die kirchl. Tradition üb. Ap. Joh., u. s. w., 1840, p. 89 ff.

⁴ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 112 ff.

siastical writers of the various periods made use of the Antilegomena (or disputed writings), and which of them, and what has been stated by these as well regarding the collected (*ἐκδοθέντες*) and Homologumena (or accepted writings), as regarding those which are not of this kind."¹ The presumption, therefore, naturally is that, as Eusebius did not mention the fact, he did not find any reference to the fourth Gospel in the work of Papias. This presumption is confirmed by the circumstance that when Eusebius writes, elsewhere (H. E. iii. 24), of the order of the Gospels, and the composition of John's Gospel, he has no greater authority to give for his account than mere tradition: "they say" (*φασί*). It is scarcely probable that when Papias collected from the Presbyter the facts concerning Matthew and Mark he would not also have inquired about the Gospel by John, had he known it, and recorded what he had heard, or that Eusebius would not have quoted the account.

Proceeding from this merely negative argument, Tischendorf endeavours to show that not only is Papias not a witness against the fourth Gospel, but that he presents testimony in its favour. The first reason he advances is that Eusebius states: "The same (Papias) made use of testimonies out of the first Epistle of John, and likewise out of that of Peter."² On the supposed identity of the authorship of the Epistle and Gospel, Tischendorf, as in the case of Polycarp, claims this as evidence for the fourth Gospel. Eusebius, however, does not quote the passages upon which he bases this statement, and knowing his inaccuracy and the hasty and uncritical manner in which he and the Fathers generally jump at such conclusions, we must reject this as sufficient evidence that Papias really did use the Epistle, and that Eusebius did not adopt his opinion from a mere superficial analogy of passages.³ The fact of his reference to the Epistle at all is therefore doubtful, and, even if really made, the argument remains open as to how far it bears upon the Gospel, which we shall have hereafter to consider.

The next testimony advanced by Tischendorf is indeed of an extraordinary character. There is a Latin MS. (Vat. Alex. 14)

¹ Προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας, προὔργου ποιήσομαι σὺν ταῖς διαδοχαῖς ὑποσημασθαι, τίνες τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων ὁποῖαις κέχρηται τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων, τίνα τε περὶ τῶν ἐκδοθέντων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων γραφῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν μη τοιούτων αὐτοῖς εἰρηται. Eusebius, H. E., iii. 3; cf. iii. 24.

² Κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως. Eusebius, H. E., iii. 39.

³ Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 17; Das Evang. Johan., p. 8; Zeller, Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 652 ff., 1847, p. 148 f.; Lützelberger, Die kirchl. Tradition üb. Ap. Joh., p. 92 ff.; Davidson, Introd. N. T., ii. p. 373.

in the Vatican, which Tischendorf assigns to the ninth century, in which there is a preface by an unknown hand to the Gospel according to John, which commences as follows: "Evangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus discipulus iohannis carus in exotericis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit." "The Gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John whilst he was still in the flesh, as Papias, named of Hierapolis, an esteemed disciple of John, related in his 'Exoterics' that is his last five books." Tischendorf says: "There can, therefore, be no more decided declaration made of the testimony of Papias for the Johannine Gospel."¹ He wishes to end the quotation here, and only refers to the continuation, which he is obliged to admit to be untenable, in a note. The passage proceeds: "Discripsit vero evangelium dictante iohanne recte." "He (Papias) indeed wrote out the Gospel, John duly dictating;" then follows another passage regarding Marcion, representing him also as a contemporary of John, which Tischendorf likewise confesses to be untrue.² Now Tischendorf admits that the writer desires it to be understood that he derived the information that Papias wrote the fourth Gospel at the dictation of John likewise from the work of Papias, and as it is perfectly impossible, by his own admissions, that Papias, who was not a contemporary of the Apostle, could have stated this, the whole passage is clearly fabulous and written by a person who never saw the book at all. This extraordinary piece of evidence is so obviously absurd that it is passed over in silence by other critics, even of the strongest apologetic tendency, and it stands here a pitiable instance of the arguments to which destitute criticism can be reduced.

In order to do full justice to the last of the arguments of Tischendorf, we shall give it in his own words: "Before we separate from Papias, we have still to think of one testimony for the Gospel of John which Irenæus, v. 36, § 2, quotes even out of the mouth of the Presbyters, those high authorities of Papias: 'And therefore, say they, the Lord declared: In my Father's house are many mansions' (John xiv. 2). As the Presbyters set this declaration in connection with the blessedness of the righteous in the City of God, in Paradise, in Heaven, according as they bear thirty, sixty, or one hundred-fold fruit, nothing is more probable than that Irenæus takes this whole declaration of the Presbyters, which he gives, §§ 1-2, like the preceding description of the thousand years' reign, from the work of Papias. But whether they are derived from thence or not, the authority of the Presbyters is in any case

¹ Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 119.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 119, anm. 1.

higher than that of Papias," &c.¹ Now in the quotation from Irenæus given in this passage, Tischendorf renders the oblique construction of the text by inserting "say they," referring to the Presbyters of Papias, and, as he does not give the original, he should at least have indicated that these words are supplementary. We shall endeavour as briefly as possible to state the facts of the case.

Irenæus, with many quotations from Scripture, is arguing that our bodies are preserved, and that the Saints who have suffered so much in the flesh shall in that flesh receive the fruits of their labours. In v. 33, § 2, he refers to the saying given in Matt. xix. 29 (Luke xviii. 29, 30) that whosoever has left lands, &c., because of Christ shall receive a hundred-fold in this world, and in the next, eternal life; and then, enlarging on the abundance of the blessings in the Millennial kingdom, he affirms that Creation will be renovated, and the Earth acquire wonderful fertility, and he adds: § 3, "As the Presbyters who saw John the disciple of the Lord, remember that they heard from him, how the Lord taught concerning those times and said:" &c. ("Quemadmodum presbyteri meminerunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus, et dicebat," &c.), and then he quotes the passage: "The days will come in which vines will grow each having ten thousand Branches," &c.; and "In like manner that a grain of wheat would produce ten thousand ears," &c. With regard to these he says, at the beginning of the next paragraph, v. 33, § 4, "These things are testified in writing by Papias, a hearer of John and associate of Polycarp, an ancient man, in the fourth of his books: for there were five books composed by him.² And he added saying: 'But these things are credible to believers. And Judas the traitor not believing, and asking how shall such growths be effected by the Lord, the Lord said: They who shall come to them shall see.'

¹ Ehe wir aber von Papias scheiden, haben wir noch eines Zeugnisses für das Johannevangelium zu gedenken, das Irenæus, v. 36, 2 sogar aus dem Munde der Presbyter, jener hohen Autoritäten des Papias anführt. "Und deshalb sagen sie habe der Herr den Ausspruch gethan: In meines Vaters Hause sind viele Wohnungen" (Joh. 14, 2). Da die Presbyter diesen Ausspruch in Verbindung setzten mit den Seligkeitsstufen der Gerechten in der Gottesstadt, im Paradiese, im Himmel, je nachdem sie dreissig- oder sechzig- oder hundertfältig Frucht tragen, so ist nichts wahrscheinlicher als dass Irenæus diese ganze Aussage der Presbyter, die er a. a. O. 1—2 gibt, gleich der vorhergegangenen Schilderung des tausendjährigen Reichs, dem Werke des Papias entlehnte. Mag sie aber daher stammen oder nicht, jedenfalls steht die Autorität der Presbyter höher als die des Papias; u. s. w. Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 119 f.

² Eusebius has preserved the Greek of this passage (H. E. iii. 39), and goes on to contradict the statement of Irenæus that Papias was a hearer and contemporary of the Apostles. Eusebius states that Papias in his preface by no means asserts that he was.

Prophesying of these times, therefore, Isaiah says: 'The Wolf also shall feed with the Lamb,' &c., &c. (quoting Isaiah xi. 6—9), and again he says, recapitulating: 'Wolves and lambs shall then feed together,' &c. (quoting Isaiah lxv. 25), and so on, continuing his argument. It is clear that Irenæus introduces the quotation from Papias, and ending his reference at: "They who shall come to them shall see," he continues, with a quotation from Isaiah, his own train of reasoning. We give this passage to show the manner in which Irenæus proceeds. He then continues with the same subject, quoting (v. 34, 35) Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse, and sayings found in the New Testament bearing upon the Millennium. In c. 35 he argues that the prophecies he quotes of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Apocalypse must not be allegorized away, but that they literally describe the blessings to be enjoyed, after the coming of Antichrist and the resurrection, in the New Jerusalem on earth, and he quotes Isaiah vi. 12, lx. 5, 21, and a long passage from Baruch iv. 36, v. 9 (which he ascribes to Jeremiah), Isaiah xlix. 16, Galatians iv. 26, Rev. xxi. 2, xx. 2—15, xxi. 1—6, all descriptive, as he maintains, of the Millennial kingdom prepared for the Saints; and then in v. 36, the last chapter of his work on Heresies, as if resuming his previous argument, he proceeds:¹ § 1. "And that these things shall ever remain without end, Isaiah says: 'For like as the new heaven and the new earth which I make remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name continue,'² and as the Presbyters say, then those who have been deemed worthy of living in heaven shall go thither, and others shall enjoy the delights of Paradise, and others shall possess the glory of the City; for everywhere the Saviour shall be seen as those who see him shall be worthy. § 2. But that there is this distinction of dwelling (*εἶναι δὲ τὴν διαστολὴν ταύτην τῆς οἰκήσεως*) of those bearing fruit the hundred fold, and of the (bearers) of the sixty fold, and of the (bearers of) the thirty fold: of whom some indeed shall be taken up into the heavens, some shall live in Paradise, and some shall inhabit the City, and that for this reason (*διὰ τοῦτο*—propter hoc) the Lord declared: In the (heavens) of my Father are many mansions (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναῖς εἶναι πλείας*).³ For all things are of God, who prepares for all the fitting habitation as his Word says, to be allotted to all by the Father according as each is or shall be worthy. And this

¹ We have the following passage only in the old Latin version, with fragments of the Greek preserved by Andrew of Caesarea in his *Comment. in Apoc.*, xviii., lxiv., and elsewhere.

² Isaiah lxvi. 22 Sept.

³ With this may be compared John xiv. 2, *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἰσιν*. If the passage be maintained to be from the Presbyters, the variations from the text of the Gospel are important.

is the couch upon which they recline who are invited to banquet at the Wedding. The Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles, state this to be the order and arrangement of those who are saved, and that by such steps they advance,"¹ &c., &c.

Now it is impossible for any one who attentively considers the whole of this passage, and who makes himself acquainted with the manner in which Irenæus conducts his argument, and interweaves it with quotations, to assert that the phrase we are considering must have been taken from a book referred to three chapters earlier, and was not introduced by Irenæus from some other source. In the passage from the commencement of the second paragraph Irenæus enlarges upon, and illustrates, what "the Presbyters say" regarding the blessedness of the saints, by quoting the view held as to the distinction between those bearing fruit thirty fold, sixty fold, and one hundred fold,² and the interpretation given of the saying regarding "many mansions," but the source of his quotation is quite indefinite, and may simply be the exegesis of his own day. That this is probably the case is shown by the continuation: "And this is the Couch upon which they recline who are invited to banquet at the Wedding"—an allusion to the marriage supper upon which Irenæus had previously enlarged;³ immediately after which phrase, introduced by Irenæus himself, he says: "The Presbyters, the disciples of the apostles, state this to be the order and arrangement of those who are saved," &c. Now, if the preceding passages had been a mere quotation from the Presbyters of Papias, such a remark would have been out of place and useless, but being the exposition of the prevailing views, Irenæus confirms it and prepares to wind up the whole subject by the general statement that the Presbyter

¹ φησὶν γὰρ Ἰσαΐας "Ὁν τρόπον γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καίνοσ καὶ ἡ γῆ καινῇ, & ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μένει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, λέγει Κύριος, οὕτω δεήσει τὸ σπέρμα ὑμῶν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν . . ." ὡς οἱ πρεσβύτεροι λέγουσι, τότε καὶ οἱ μὲν καταξιώθεντες τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ διατριβῆς ἐκτεῖσε χωρήσουσιν, οἱ δὲ τῆς τοῦ παραδείσου τρυφῆς ἀπολαύσουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πόλεως καθεξέουσιν· πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὁ Σωτὴρ ὁραθήσεται, καθὼς ἄξιοι ἔσονται οἱ ὁρώντες αὐτόν.

² Εἶναι δὲ τὴν διασπολὴν ταύτην τῆς οἰκισέως τῶν τὰ ἐκαστὸν καρποφορούντων, καὶ τῶν τὰ ἐξηκοντα, καὶ τῶν τὰ τριάκοντα· ὧν οἱ μὲν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς ἀναληφθήσονται, οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ διατριψούσιν, οἱ δὲ τὴν πόλιν κατοικήσουσιν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναῖς εἶναι πολλὰς· τὰ πάντα γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅς τοις πᾶσι τὴν ἀρμοζούσαν οἰκίαν παρέχει. Quemadmodum Verbum ejus ait, omnibus divisum esse a Patre secundum quod quis est dignus, aut erit. Et hoc est triclinium, in quo recumbent ii qui epulantur vocati ad nuptias. Hanc esse adordinationem et dispositionem eorum qui salvantur, dicunt presbyteri apostolorum discipuli, et per hujusmodi gradus progredi, &c., &c. Irenæus, Adv. Hær., v. 36, §§ 1, 2.

³ Matt. xiii. 8; Mark iv. 20; cf. Matt. xxv. 14—29; Luke xix. 12—26; xii. 47, 48.

⁴ Adv. Hær., iv. 36, §§ 5, 6.

the disciples of the Apostles, affirm this to be the order and arrangement of those who are saved, and that by such steps they advance and ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, &c., and a few sentences after he closes his work.

In no case, however, can it be affirmed that the citation of "the Presbyters, and the "Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles," is a reference to the work of Papias. When quoting "the Presbyters who saw John the disciple of the Lord," three chapters before, Irenæus distinctly states that Papias testifies what he quotes in writing in the fourth of his books, but there is nothing whatever to indicate that "the Presbyters," and "the Presbyters, disciples of the Apostles," subsequently referred to, after a complete change of context, have anything to do with Papias. The reference to Presbyters in this work of Irenæus are very numerous, and when we remember the importance which the Bishop of Lyons attached to "that tradition which comes from the Apostles, which is preserved in the churches by a succession of Presbyters,"¹ the reference before us assumes a very different complexion. In one place, Irenæus quotes "the divine Presbyter" (ὁ θεοφιλὴς πρεσβύτερος), "the God-loving Presbyter" (ὁ θεοφιλὴς πρεσβύτερος),² who wrote verses against the heretic Marcus. Elsewhere he supports his extraordinary statement that the public career of Jesus, instead of being limited to a single year, extended over a period of twenty years, and that he was nearly fifty when he suffered,³ by the appeal: "As the gospel and all the Presbyters testify, who in Asia had met with John the disciple of the Lord (stating) that these things were transmitted to them by John. For he continued among them till the times of Trajan."⁴ That these Presbyters are not quoted from the work of Papias is evident from the fact that Eusebius, who had his work, quotes the passage from Irenæus without allusion to Papias, and as he adduces two witnesses only, Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, to prove the assertion regarding John, he would certainly have referred to the earlier authority, had the work of Papias contained the statement, as he does for the stories regarding the daughters of the Apostle Philip;

¹ Adv. Hær., iii. 2, § 2; cf. i. 10, § 1; 27, § 1, 2; ii. 22, § 5; iii. pref. 3, § 4; 21, § 3; iv. 27, § 1; 32, § 1; v. 20, § 2; 30, § 1.

² *Ib.*, i. 15, § 6.

³ *Ib.*, ii. 22, §§ 4, 6.

⁴ . . . sicut Evangelium, καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν, ὡς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβηκότες, παραδεδομέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. Παρέμεινε γὰρ αὐτοῖς μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανῶν χρόνων. Adv. Hær., ii. 22, § 5. Cf. Eusebius, H. E., iii. 23. "In Asia" evidently refers chiefly to Ephesus, as is shown by the passage immediately after quoted by Eusebius from Adv. Hær., iii. 3, § 4, "the Church in Ephesus also . . . where John continued until the times of Trajan, is a witness to the truth of the apostolic tradition."

the miracle in favour of Justus, and other matters.¹ We need not refer to Clement, nor to Polycarp, who had been "taught by Apostles," and the latter of whom Irenæus knew in his youth.² Irenæus in one place also gives a long account of the teaching of some one upon the sins of David and other men of old, which he introduces: "As I have heard from a certain Presbyter, who had heard it from those who had seen the Apostles, and from those who learnt from them,"³ &c. Further on, speaking evidently of a different person, he says: "In this manner also a Presbyter-disciple of the Apostles, reasoned regarding the two Testaments:"⁴ and quotes fully. In another place Irenæus, after quoting Gen. ii. 8, "And God planted a Paradise eastward in Eden," &c., states: "Wherefore the Presbyters who are disciples of the Apostles (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί*), say that those who were translated had been translated thither," there to remain till the consummation of all things awaiting immortality, and Irenæus explains that it was into this Paradise that Paul was caught up (2 Cor. xii. 4).⁵ It seems highly probable that these "Presbyters the disciples of the Apostles" who are quoted on Paradise, are the same "Presbyters the disciples of the Apostles" referred to on the same subject (v. 36, §§ 1, 2) whom we are discussing, but there is nothing whatever to connect them with Papias. On the contrary, the Presbyters whose sayings Irenæus quotes from the work of Papias are specially distinguished as "the Presbyters who saw John the disciple of the Lord," a distinction made upon another occasion, quoted above, in connection with the age of Jesus.⁶ He also speaks of the Septuagint translation of the Bible as the version of the "Presbyters,"⁷ and on several occasions he calls Luke "the follower and disciple of the Apostles" (*Sectator et discipulus apostolorum*),⁸ and characterizes Mark as "the interpreter and follower of Peter" (*interpret et sectator Petri*),⁹ and refers to both as having learnt from the words of the Apostles.¹⁰ Here is therefore a wide choice of Presbyters, including even Evangelists, to whom

¹ *Euseb.*, H. E., iii. 39.

² *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, §§ 3, 4. Fragment from his work *De Ogdoad* preserved by Eusebius, H. E., v. 20.

³ *Quemadmodum audivi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant, et ab his qui didicerant, &c.* *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 27, § 1, cf. § 2; 30, § 1. This has been variously conjectured to be a reference to Polycarp, Papias, and Pothinus his predecessor at Lyons, but it is admitted by all to be impossible to decide upon the point.

⁴ *Hujusmodi quoque de duobus testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat, &c.* *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 32, § 1.

⁵ *Adv. Hær.*, v. 5, § 1.

⁶ *Adv. Hær.*, ii. 22, § 5.

⁷ *Ib.*, iii. 21, §§ 3, 4.

⁸ *Ib.*, iii. 10, § 6.

⁹ *Ib.*, i. 23, § 1; iii. 10, § 1; 14, § 1.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, iii. 15, § 3.

the reference of Irenæus may with equal right be ascribed,¹ so that it is unreasonable to claim it as an allusion to the work of Papias.² In fact, Dr. Tischendorf and Canon Westcott³ stand almost alone in advancing this passage as evidence that either Papias or his Presbyters⁴ were acquainted with the fourth Gospel, and this renders the statement which is made by them without any discussion all the more indefensible. Scarcely a single writer, however apologetic, seriously cites it amongst the external testimonies for the early existence of the Gospel, and the few who do refer to the passage merely mention, in order to abandon, it.⁵ So far as the question as to whether the fourth Gospel was mentioned in the work of Papias is concerned the passage has practically never entered into the controversy at all, the great mass of critics having recognized that it is of no evidential value whatever, and, by com-

¹ In the New Testament the term Presbyter is even used in reference to Patriarchs and Prophets. Heb. xi. 2; cf. Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 3, 5.

² With regard to the Presbyters quoted by Irenæus generally. Cf. *Routh, Reliq. Sacre*, i. p. 47 ff.

³ Canon Westcott affirms: "In addition to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, Papias appears to have been acquainted with the Gospel of St. John." (?) He says no more, and offers no evidence whatever for this assertion in the text. There are two notes, however, on the same page, which we shall now quote, the second being that to which (?) above refers. "2 No conclusion can be drawn from Eusebius' silence as to express testimonies of Papias to the Gospel of St. John, as we are ignorant of his special plan, and the title of his book shows that it was not intended to include 'all the oracles of the Lord,' see p. 61, note 2." The second note is: "3 There is also (!?) an allusion to it in the quotation from the 'Elders' found in Irenæus (lib. v. ad. f.) which probably was taken from Papias (fr. v. Routh et Nott.). The Latin passage containing a reference to the Gospel which is published as a fragment of 'Papias' by Grabe and Routh (fr. xi.) is taken from the 'Dictionary' of a mediæval Papias quoted by Grabe upon the passage, and not from the present Papias. The 'Dictionary' exists in MS. both at Oxford and Cambridge. I am indebted to the kindness of a friend for this explanation of what seemed to be a strange forgery." On the Canon, p. 65. The note 2, p. 61, referred to in note 2 quoted above, says on this subject: "The passage quoted by Irenæus from 'the Elders' may probably be taken as a specimen of his style of interpretation" (!) and then follows a quotation: "as the Presbyters say:" down "to many mansions." Dr. Westcott then continues: "Indeed from the similar mode of introducing the story of the vine which is afterwards referred to Papias, it is reasonable to conjecture that this interpretation is one from Papias' 'Exposition.'" We have given the whole of the passages to show how little evidence there is for the statement which is made. The isolated assertion in the text, which is all that most readers would see, is supported by no better testimony than that in the preceding note inserted at the foot of an earlier page.

⁴ *Routh (Reliq. Sacre*, i. p. 10 f., 31) also referred the passage to the work of Papias, and he was followed in this conjecture by *Dorner, Lehre Pers. Christi*, i. p. 217, ann. 56, p. 218, ann. 62.

⁵ *Riggenbach* (*Die Zeugnisse*, f. d. Ev. Johannes, 1866, p. 116) admits that there is no evidence that the passage was derived from Papias, but merely asserts that the "Presbyters" were men of the generation to which Papias and Polycarp belonged, and that the quotation therefore dates from the first half of the second century. Cf. *Auger, Synops. Ev. Proleg.*, p. xxxi.; *Hofstede de Groot, Basilides*, p. 110 f.; *Meyer, Komm. Ev. des Johannes*, p. 6 f.; *Lutharke, Der johann. Urspr. des viert. Evang.* 1874, p. 72; *Zahn, Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, p. 674.

mon consent, tacitly excluded it from the argument.¹ It is admitted that the Bishop of Hierapolis cannot be shown to have known the fourth Gospel, and the majority affirm that he actually was not acquainted with it. Being, therefore, so completely detached from Papias, it is obvious that the passage does not in any way assist the fourth Gospel, but becomes assignable to vague tradition, and subject to the cumulative force of the objections, which prohibit an early date being ascribed to so indefinite a reference.

Before passing on there is one other point to mention: Andrew of Casarea, in the preface to his commentary on the Apocalypse, mentions that Papias maintained the "credibility" (*τὸ ἀξιόπιστον*) of that book, or in other words, its apostolic origin.² His strong millenarian opinions would naturally make such a composition stand high in his esteem, if indeed it did not materially contribute to the formation of his views, which is still more probable. Apologists admit the genuineness of this statement, nay, claim it as undoubted evidence of the acquaintance of Papias with the Apocalypse.³ Canon Westcott, for instance, says: "He maintained, moreover, 'the divine inspiration' of the Apocalypse, and commented, at least, upon part of it."⁴ Now, he must, therefore, have recognized the book as the work of the Apostle John, and we shall, hereafter, show that it is impossible that the author of the Apocalypse is the author of the Gospel; therefore, in this way also, Papias is a witness against the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We must now turn to the Clementine Homilies, although, as we have shown,⁵ the uncertainty as to the date of this spurious work, and the late period which must undoubtedly be assigned to its composition, render its evidence of very little value for the canonical Gospels. The passages pointed out in the Homilies as indicating acquaintance with the fourth Gospel were long advanced with hesitation, and were generally felt to be inconclusive, but on the discovery of the concluding portion of the work and its publication by Dressel in 1853, it was found to contain a passage which apologists now claim as decisive evidence of the use of the Gos-

¹ The following writers directly refer to and reject it: Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1845, p. 593, ann. 2, cf. 1847, p. 160, ann. 1; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 186, ann. 1, 1868, p. 219, ann. 4, cf. 1856, p. 334 ff., *Die Evangelien*, p. 339, ann. 4; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.* ii. pp. 372, 424 f. Distinguished apologetic writers like Bleek, Ebrard, Olshausen, Gericke, Kirchhofer, Thiersch and Tholuck, and eminent critics like Credner, De Wette, Gfrörer, Lücke and others do not even notice it, although they were all acquainted with the article of Zeller in which the passage is discussed.

² Andreas, *Proleg. in Apocalypsin*; Routh, *Fel. Sacrae*, i. p. 15.

³ Lücke, *Einl. Offenb. Joh.* 1852, ii. p. 523; Ewald, *Die Joh. Schriften*, ii. p. 371 f.; Gericke, *Gesamtgesch. N. T.*, p. 535; Tischendorf, *Wann wurden, u. s. w.*, p. 116, &c., &c.

⁴ P. 384 ff.

⁵ On the Canon, p. 65.

pel, and which even succeeded in converting some independent critics.¹ Tischendorf² and Canon Westcott,³ in the few lines devoted to the Clementines, do not refer to the earlier proof passages, but rely entirely upon that last discovered. With a view, however, to making the whole of the evidence clear, we shall give all of the supposed allusions to the fourth Gospel, confronting them with the text. The first is as follows:—

HOM. III. 52.

Wherefore he being the true prophet said:

I am the gate of life; he coming in through me cometh in unto life, as there is no other teaching which is able to save.

*Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἀληθὴς ὢν προφήτης ἔλεγεν·
Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ δὲ ἐμὸν εἰσερχόμενος εἰσερχεται εἰς τὴν ζωὴν· ὡς οὐκ οὐδὲς ἑτέρας τῆς σώζειν δυναμένης διδασκαλίας.*

JOHN I. 9.

I am the door (of the sheepfold), if anyone enter through me he shall be saved, and shall go in and shall go out and shall find pasture.

Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δὲ ἐμὸν εἰσέλθων τις εἰσελεύσεται, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ποιήσεται εἰρήνην.

The first point which is apparent here is that there is a total difference both in the language and real meaning of these two passages. The Homily uses the word *πύλη* instead of the *θύρα* of the Gospel, and speaks of the gate of life, instead of the door of the Sheepfold. We have already⁴ discussed the passage in the Pastor of Hermas in which similar reference is made to the gate (*πύλη*) into the kingdom of God, and need not here repeat our argument. In Matt. vii. 13, 14, we have the direct description of the gate (*πύλη*) which leads to life (*εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*), and we have elsewhere quoted the Messianic Psalm cxviii. 19, 20: "This is the gate of the Lord (*αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ Κυρίου*),⁵ the righteous shall enter into it." In another place, the author of the Homilies, referring to a passage parallel to, but differing from, Matt. xxiii. 2, which we have elsewhere considered,⁶ and which is derived from a Gospel different from ours, says: "Hear *them* (Scribes and Pharisees who sit upon Moses' seat), he said, as entrusted with the key of the kingdom which is knowledge, which alone is able to open the gate of life (*πύλη τῆς ζωῆς*), through which alone is the entrance to Eternal life." Now in the very next chapter to that

¹ Hilgenfeld, who had maintained that the Clementines did not use the fourth Gospel, was induced by the passage to which we refer to admit its use. Cf. Die Ev. Justin's, p. 385 ff.; Die Evangelien, p. 346 f.; Der Kanon, p. 29; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1865, p. 338; Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 534, anm. 1; Volkmar is inclined to the same opinion, although not with the same decision. Theol. Jahrb., 1854, p. 448 ff.

² On the Canon, p. 252.

³ P. 395 ff.

⁴ Cf. Wann wurden, n. s. w., p. 90 f.

⁵ P. 553 f.

⁶ Ps. cxvii. 20, Sept.

⁷ Hom. iii. 18.

in which the saying which we are discussing occurs, a very few lines after it indeed, we have the following passage: "Indeed he said further: 'I am he concerning whom Moses prophesied, saying: a prophet shall the Lord our God raise up to you from among your brethren as also (he raised) me; hear ye him regarding all things, but whosoever will not hear that prophet he shall die.'"¹ There is no such saying in the canonical Gospels or other books of the New Testament attributed to Jesus, but a quotation from Deuteronomy xviii. 15 f., materially different from this, occurs twice in the Acts of the Apostles, once being put into the mouth of Peter applied to Jesus,² and the second time also applied to him, being quoted by Stephen.³ It is quite clear that the writer is quoting from uncanonical sources, and here is another express declaration regarding himself: "I am he," &c., which is quite in the spirit of the preceding passage which we are discussing, and probably derived from the same source. In another place we find the following argument: "But the way is the manner of life, as also Moses says: 'Behold I have set before thy face the way of life, and the way of death'⁴ and in agreement the teacher said: 'Enter ye through the narrow and straitened way through which ye shall enter into life,' and in another place a certain person inquiring: 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' he intimated the Commandments of the Law."⁵ It has to be observed that the Homilies teach the doctrine that the spirit in Jesus Christ had already entered in Adam, and by a species of transmigration passed through Moses and the Patriarchs and prophets: "who from the beginning of the world, changing names and forms, passes through Time, *και μετατρέχει* until, attaining his own seasons, being on account of his labour anointed by the mercy of God, he shall have rest for ever."⁶ Just in the same way, therefore, as the Homilies represent Jesus as fulfilling a prophecy of Moses, and altering it to a personification: "I am the prophet," &c., so here again they make him adopt this

¹ Ἔτι μὴν ἔλεγεν· Ἐγὼ εἰμι περὶ οὗ Μωϋσῆς προφητῆταις εἰπών· Προφήτην ἐγείρει ὑμῖν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς περὶ καὶ ἐγώ, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε κατὰ πάντα· ὅς ἂν διὰ τὴν ἀκούσιν τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου, ἀποθάνῃται. Hom. iii. 53. This drawn from the text of the Sept.

² Acts iii. 22.

³ Acts vii. 37.

⁴ Dent. xxx. 15.

⁵ Ὁδὸς δὲ ἡ πολιτεία ἐστίν, τῷ καὶ τὸν Μωϋσῆν λέγειν· Ἰδοὺ θέλω πρὸ προσώπου σου τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θανάτου. Καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος συμφώνως εἶπεν· Εἰσελθετε διὰ τῆς στενῆς καὶ τεθλιμμένης ὁδοῦ, δι' ἧς εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν ζωὴν. Καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ πον, ἐρωτήσαντός τινος, Τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; τὰς τοῦ νόμου ἐντολὰς ὑπέδειξεν. Hom. xviii. 17.

⁶ . . . ὅς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αἰῶνος ἅμα τοῖς ονόμασι μορφὰς ἀλλάσων τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει, μέχρις ὅτε ἰδῶν χρόνων τυχῶν, διὰ τοὺς καμνούς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλέει χρισθεῖς, εἰς αἰεὶ ἔξει τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν. Hom. iii. 20.

saying of Moses and, "being the true prophet," declare: "I am the gate or the way of life,"—the same commandments of the law which the Gospel of the Homilies represents Jesus as coming to confirm and not to abolish. The whole system of doctrine of the Clementines, as we shall presently see, indicated here even by the definition of "the true prophet," is so fundamentally opposed to that of the fourth Gospel that it is impossible that the author can have derived this brief saying, varying moreover as it does in language and sense, from that work. There is good reason to believe that the author of the fourth Gospel, who most undeniably derived materials from earlier Evangelical works, may have drawn from a source likewise used by the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thence many analogies might well be presented with quotations from that or kindred Gospels.¹ We find, further, this community of source in the fact, that in the fourth Gospel, without actual quotation, there is a reference to Moses, and, no doubt, to the very passage (Dent. xviii. 15), which the Gospel of the Clementines puts into the mouth of Jesus, John v. 46: "For had ye believed Moses ye would believe me, for he wrote of me." Whilst the Ebionite Gospel gave prominence to this view of the case, the dogmatic system of the Logos Gospel did not permit of more than mere reference to it. There are abundant indications in this case that the fourth Gospel was not the source of this saying, and every probability that the Ebionitic author of the Clementines made use of the Ebionite Gospel.

The same remarks fully apply to the next passage pointed out as derived from the Johannine Gospel, which occurs in the same chapter: "My sheep hear my voice."

HOM. III. 52.

Τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.

JOHN x. 27.

Τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει.

There was no more common representation amongst the Jews of the relation between God and his people than that of Shepherd and his Sheep,² and the brief saying was in all probability derived from the same source as the preceding.³

We have already discussed the third passage regarding the new birth in connection with Justin,⁴ and may therefore pass on to the last and most important passage, to which we have referred as contained in the concluding portion of the Homilies first pub-

¹ Neander, K. G., 1843, ii. p. 624 f., ann. 1; Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 326; Scheiten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 59 f.; Das Ev. Johan., p. 12.

² Cf. Isaiah xl. 11; liii. 6; Ezek. xxxiv.; Zech. xi.; Hebrews xiii. 20.

³ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 326; Scheiten, Die ält. Zeugnisse, p. 60; Das Evang. Johan., p. 12.

⁴ P. 589 f.

lished by Dressel in 1853. We subjoin it in contrast with the parallel in the fourth Gospel.

HOM. XIX. 22.

Wherefore also our Teacher when we inquired regarding the man blind from birth and whose sight was restored by him, if this man had sinned or his parents that he should be born blind, answered in explanation: Neither this man sinned at all nor his parents, but that through him the power of God might be made manifest healing the sins of ignorance.

ὅθεν καὶ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς πηροῦ καὶ ἀναβλέσαντος παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζων ἐρωτήσας, εἰ οὗτος ἥμαρτεν ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ, ἀπεκρίνατο· οὔτε οὗτος τι ἥμαρτεν, οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ φανερωθῇ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ταύτης τὰ ἀμαρτήματα.

it is necessary that we should consider the context of this passage in the Homily, which, we must affirm, bears positive characteristics which render it impossible that it can have been taken from the fourth Gospel, and lead to the clear conclusion that, at the most, the Johannine Gospel derived it from the same source as the Gospel of the Clementines, if not from that Gospel itself. We must mention that in the Clementines, the Apostle Peter is represented as maintaining that the Scriptures are not all true, but are mixed up with what is false, and that on this account, and in order to inculcate the necessity of distinguishing between the true and the false, Jesus taught his disciples, "Be ye approved money changers,"¹ an injunction not found in our Gospels.

One of the points which Peter denies is the fall of Adam, a doctrine which, as Neander remarked, "he must combat as blasphemy."² At the part we are considering he is discussing with Simon,—under whose detested personality, as we have elsewhere shown, the Apostle Paul is really attacked,—and refuting the charges he brings forward regarding the origin and continuance

JOHN IX. 1—3.

And as he was passing by he saw a man blind from birth.

2. And his disciples asked him saying: Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents that he should be born blind?

3. Jesus answered, neither this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him.

1. Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς. 2. Καὶ ἡρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· ῥαββί, τίς ἥμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ; 3. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· Οἷτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

¹ Hom. iii. 50, of. 9, 42 ff.; ii. 38. The author denies that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, Hom. iii. 47 ff.

² Hom. iii. 20 ff., 42 ff., viii. 10. "Die Lehre von einem Sündenfalle des ersten Menschen musste der Verfasser der Clementinen als Gotteslästerung bekämpfen." Neander, K. G., ii. p. 612 f. The Jews at that period held a similar belief. Eisenmenger, Entd. Judenthum, i. p. 336. Adam, according to the Homilies not only did not sin, but as a true prophet possessed of the Spirit of God which afterwards was in Jesus, he was incapable of sin. Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 130, p. 176, f., p. 178 f.

of evil. The Apostle Peter in the course of the discussion asserts that evil is the same as pain and death, but evil does not exist eternally, and, indeed, does not really exist at all, for pain and death are only accidents without permanent force—pain is merely the disturbance of harmony, and death nothing but the separation of soul from body.¹ The passions also must be classed amongst the things which are accidental, and are not always to exist; but these, although capable of abuse, are in reality beneficial to the soul when properly restrained, and carry out the will of God. The man who gives them unbridled course ensures his own punishment.² Simon inquires why men die prematurely and periodical diseases come, and also, indeed, visitations of demons and of madness and other afflictions, in reply to which Peter explains that parents by following their own pleasure in all things and neglecting proper sanitary considerations, produce a multitude of evils for their children, and this either through carelessness or ignorance.³ And then follows the passage we are discussing: "Wherefore also our Teacher," &c., and at the end of the quotation he continues: "and truly such afflictions ensue in consequence of ignorance," and giving an instance,⁴ he proceeds: "Now the afflictions which you before mentioned are the consequence of ignorance, and certainly not of an evil act, which has been committed," &c. Now it is quite apparent that the peculiar variation from the parallel in the fourth Gospel in the latter part of the quotation is not accidental, but is the point upon which the whole propriety of the quotation depends. In the Gospel of the Clementines the man is not blind from his birth, "that the works of God might be made manifest in him,"—a doctrine which would be revolting to the author of the Homilies,—but the calamity has befallen him in consequence of some error of ignorance on the part of his parents which brings its punishment; but "the power of God" is made manifest in healing the sins of ignorance. The reply of Jesus is a professed quotation, and it varies very substantially from the

¹ Hom. xix. 20.

² Hom. xix. 21. According to the author of the Clementines, Evil is the consequence of sin, and is on one hand necessary for the punishment of sin, but on the other beneficial as leading men to improvement and upward progress. Suffering is represented as wholesome, and intended for the elevation of man. Cf. Hom., ii. 13; vii. 2; viii. 11. Death was originally designed for man, and was not introduced by Adam's "fall," but is really necessary to nature, the Homilist considers. Cf. Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 177, p. 168 f.

³ Hom. xix. 22.

⁴ Καὶ ἀλλῶς ἀγνοίας αἰτίας, τα τοιαῦτα γίνεται, ἥτοι τῷ μὴ εἰδέναι πότε δεῖ κοινωνεῖν τῇ γαμετῇ, εἰ καθάρᾳ ἐξ ἀφρόδου τυγχάνει. Hom. xix. 22.

⁵ Πλὴν αὖ προεῖρηκας πάθῃ ἀεὶ ἀγνοίας ἐστίν, οὐ μέντοι ἐκ πονηροῦ ἐργασμένου. Hom. xix. 22.

parallel in the Gospel, presenting evidently a distinctly different version of the episode. The substitution of *πηρός* for *τυφλός* in the opening is also significant, more especially as Justin likewise in his general remark, which we have discussed, uses the same word. Assuming the passage in the fourth Gospel to be the account of a historical episode, as apologists, of course, maintain, the case stands thus:—The author of the Homilies introduces a narrative of a historical incident in the life of Jesus, which may have been, and probably was, reported in many early gospels in language which, though analogous to, is at the same time decidedly different, in the part which is a professed quotation, from that of the fourth Gospel, and presents another and natural comment upon the central event. The reference to the historical incident is, of course, no evidence whatever of dependence on the fourth Gospel, which, although it may be the only accidentally surviving work which contains the narrative, had no prescriptive and exclusive property in it, and so far from the partial agreement in the narrative proving the necessary use of the fourth Gospel, the only remarkable point is, that all narratives of the same event and reports of words actually spoken do not more perfectly agree, while, on the other hand, the very decided variation in the reply of Jesus, according to the Homily, from that given in the fourth Gospel leads to the distinct presumption that it is not the source of the quotation. It is perfectly unreasonable to assert that a reference to an actual occurrence, without the slightest indication by the author of the source from which he derived his information, must be dependent on one particular work, more especially when the part which is given as distinct quotation substantially differs from the record in that work. We have already illustrated this on several occasions, and may once more offer an instance. If the first Synoptic had unfortunately perished, like so many other gospels of the early Church, and in the Clementines we met with the quotation: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (*Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*), apologists would certainly assert, upon the very principle upon which they act in the present case, that this quotation was clear evidence of the use of Luke vi. 20: "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (*Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐστέ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*), more especially as a few codices actually insert *τῷ πνεύματι*, the slight variations being merely ascribed to free quotation from memory. In point of fact, however, the third Synoptic might not at the time have been in existence, and the quotation might have been derived, as it is, from Matt. v. 3. Nothing is more certain and undeniable than the fact that the author of the fourth Gospel made use of materials derived

from oral tradition and earlier records for its composition.¹ It is equally undeniable that other gospels, such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews and our Synoptics, had access to the same materials, and made use of them; and a comparison of our first three Gospels renders very evident the community of materials, including the use of the one by the other, as well as the diversity of literary handling to which those materials were subjected. It is impossible with reason to deny that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, for instance, as well as other earlier evangelical works now lost, drew from the same sources as the fourth Gospel, and that narratives derived from the one may, therefore, present analogies with the other whilst still perfectly independent.² Such evidence as that which apologists attempt to deduce from the Clementine Homilies totally fails to prove even the existence of the fourth Gospel, and were it fifty times more powerful, it could do nothing towards establishing its historical character and apostolic origin.

Leaving, however, these few and feeble analogies by which apologists vainly seek to establish the existence of the fourth Gospel and its use by the author of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, and considering the question for a moment from a wider point of view, the results already attained are more than confirmed. The doctrines held and strongly enunciated in the Clementines seem to us to render it impossible that the author can have made use of a work so fundamentally at variance with all his views as the fourth Gospel, and it is absolutely certain that, holding those opinions, he could not in any case have regarded such a Gospel as an apostolic and authoritative document. Space will not permit our entering adequately into this argument, and we must refer our readers to works more immediately devoted to the examination of the Homilies for a close analysis of their dogmatic teaching,³ but we may in the brief manner point out some of their more prominent doctrines in contrast with those of the Johannine Gospel.

One of the leading and most characteristic ideas of the Clemen-

¹ *Ewald*, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, 1849, p. 196 ff., 1851, p. 164, p. 166, anm. 2; *Die Joh. Schriften.*, 1861, i. p. 24 f.; *Bleek*, *Beiträge*, 1846, p. 268 f.; *Einl. N. T.*, p. 308 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 325 ff.; *De Wette*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 209 f.

² *Neander*, *K. G.*, ii. p. 624 f., anm. 1.

³ *Schliemann*, *Die Clementinen*, 1844, p. 130—229; *Uhlhorn*, *Die Homilien und Recogn.*, 1854, p. 153—230; *Credner*, *Winer's Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1829, i. h. 2, p. 237 ff.; *Dorner*, *Entw. Gesch. der Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, i. p. 324 ff.; *Baur*, *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, i. p. 85 ff., p. 218 ff.; *Chr. Gnosis*, p. 300 ff.; *Tub. Zeitschr.*, 1831, iv. p. 114 ff., p. 174 ff., 1836, iii. p. 123 ff., p. 182 ff.; *Neander*, *K. G.*, ii. p. 610 ff., *Genet. Entw. d. Gnost. Systeme*, Beilage, p. 361 ff.; *Schwaegler*, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 363 ff.; *Der Montanismus*, 1841, p. 145 ff. Compare also *Mansel*, *The Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, p. 222 ff., and especially p. 229 ff.

tine Homilies is the essential identity of Judaism and Christianity. Christ revealed nothing new with regard to God, but promulgated the very same truth concerning him as Adam, Moses, and the Patriarchs, and in fact the right belief is that Moses and Jesus were essentially one and the same.¹ Indeed it may be said that the teaching of the Homilies is more Jewish than Christian.² In the preliminary Epistle of the Apostle Peter to the Apostle James, when sending the book, Peter entreats that James will not give it to any of the Gentiles,³ and James says: "Necessarily and rightly our Peter reminded us to take precautions for the security of the truth, that we should not communicate the books of his preachings sent to us, indiscriminately to all, but to him who is good and discreet and desires to teach, and who is *circumcised*,⁴ being faithful,"⁵ &c. Clement also is represented as describing his conversion to Christianity in the following terms: "For this cause I fled for refuge to the Holy God and Law of the Jews, with faith in the certain conclusion that, by the righteous judgment of God, both the Law is prescribed, and the soul beyond doubt everywhere receives the desert of its actions."⁶ Peter recommends the inhabitants of Tyre to follow what are really Jewish rites, and to hear "as the God-fearing Jews have heard."⁷ The Jew has the same truth as the Christian: "For as there is one teaching by both (Moses and Jesus), God accepts him who believes either of these."⁸ The Law was in fact given by Adam as a true prophet knowing all things, and it is called "Eternal" and neither to be abrogated by enemies nor falsified by the impious.⁹ The author,

¹ Hom. xvii. 4; xviii. 14; viii. 6; Schliemann, Die Clem., p. 215 ff.; Dörner, Lehre Pers. Christi, i. p. 325, p. 343 ff.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 365 ff., p. 379 ff.; Baur, K. G., i. p. 85 ff.; Uhlhorn, Die Homilien, p. 212; Neander, K. G., ii. p. 611 ff., p. 621 ff.; Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, p. 230.

² Dörner, Lehre Pers. Christi, i. p. 325; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 365.

³ Ep. Petri ad Jacob. § 1.

⁴ Cf. Galatians, ii. 7.

⁵ Ἀγαθαίως καὶ προπόντως περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀσφαλίζεσθαι ὃ ἡμέτερος ἀπέμνησε Πέτρος, ὅπως τὰς τῶν αὐτοῦ κηρυγμάτων διαπεμφθεὶς ἡμῖν βίβλους μηδενὶ μεταδῶμεν ὡς ἐτυχεν, ἢ ἀγαθῶ τινι καὶ εὐλαβεῖ, τῷ καὶ διδάσκειν αἰρουμένῳ ἐμπεριτόμῳ τε ἔντι πιστῷ, κ.τ.λ. Contestatio, § 1.

⁶ Διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ τῷ ἁγίῳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεῷ καὶ νόμῳ προσέφυγον, ἀποδεχόμενος τὴν πίστιν ἀσφαλεῖ τῇ κρίσει, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δικαίας κρίσεως καὶ νόμος ὀρίσται, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πάντως τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν ὧν ἐπραξεν ὁπουδῆποτε ἀπολαμβάνει. Hom. iv. 22.

⁷ ὡς οἱ θεοὺς σέβοντες ἤκουσαν Ἰουδαῖοι. Hom. vii. 4; cf. ii. 13, 20; xiii. 4; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 221 f.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 368 ff.

⁸ Μίας γὰρ δι' ἀμφοτέρων διδασκαλίας οὐσὺς τὸν αὐτῶν τινὶ πεπιστευκότεν ὁ θεὸς ἀποδέχεται. Hom. viii. 6, cf. 7; Uhlhorn, Die Homilien, p. 212; Schweyler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 366 f.; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 221 f.

⁹ Hom. viii. 10.

therefore, protests against the idea that Christianity is any new thing, and insists that Jesus came to confirm, not abrogate, the Mosaic Law.¹ On the other hand the author of the fourth Gospel represents Christianity in strong contrast and antagonism to Judaism.² In his antithetical system, the religion of Jesus is opposed to Judaism as well as all other belief, as Light to Darkness and Life to Death.³ The Law which Moses gave is treated as merely national, and neither of general application nor intended to be permanent, being only addressed to the Jews. It is perpetually referred to as the "Law of the Jews," "your Law,"—and the Jewish festivals as Feasts of the Jews, and Jesus neither held the one in any consideration nor did he scruple to shew his indifference to the other.⁴ The very name of "the Jews" indeed is used as an equivalent for the enemies of Christ.⁵ The religion of Jesus is not only absolute, but it communicates knowledge of the Father which the Jews did not previously possess.⁶ The inferiority of Mosaism is everywhere represented: "and out of his fullness all we received, and grace for grace. *Because the Law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.*"⁷ "Verily, verily I say unto you: Moses did not give you the bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven."⁸ The fundamental difference of Christianity from Judaism will further appear as we proceed.

The most essential principle of the Clementines, again, is Monotheism,—the absolute oneness of God,—which the author vehemently maintains as well against the ascription of divinity to Christ as against heathen Polytheism and the Gnostic theory of the Demiurge as distinguished from the Supreme God.⁹ Christ

¹ Hom. iii. 51; *Dorner*, Lehre Pers. Christi, i. p. 325; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 366.

² *Köstlin*, Lehrbegriff des Ev. u. Br. Johannes, 1843, p. 40 ff., p. 48 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 330 ff.; Das Evang. u. d. Br. Joh., p. 188 ff.; *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 311 ff., p. 327; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 292 f., p. 359 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 276, note 1.

³ John xii. 46; i. 4, 5, 7 ff.; iii. 19—21; v. 24; viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 35 ff.; xiv. 6; *Köstlin*, Lehrb. Ev. Joh., p. 40 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 330 f.

⁴ John ii. 13; iv. 20 ff.; v. 1, 16, 18; vi. 4; vii. 2, 19, 22; viii. 17; ix. 16, 28, 29; x. 34; xv. 25, &c.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 330 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 364 f.; *Baur*, Theol. Jahrb., 1844, 4, p. 624.

⁵ John vi. 42, 52, &c., &c.; *Fischer*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1840, h. 2, p. 96 f.; *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 163, l. 317 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evang. Joh., p. 193 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 360 f.

⁶ John i. 18; viii. 19, 31 ff., 54, 55; xv. 21 f.; xvii. 25, 26.

⁷ John i. 16, 17; cf. x. 1, 8.

⁸ John vi. 32 ff.

⁹ Hom. xvi. 15 ff.; ii. 12; iii. 57, 59; x. 19; xiii. 4; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, p. 130, p. 134 ..; 144 f., 200; *Dorner*, Lehre Pers. Christi, i. p. 296 ff., p. 325 f., p. 343 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 367, p. 376 f.; cf. ii. p. 270 ff.; Der Montanismus, p. 148 ff.; *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 380 ff.; *Uhlhorn*, Die Hom. u. Recogn., p. 167 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Das Ev. Johan., p. 286 f.; *Mansel*, The Gnostic Heresies, p. 227, p. 230.

not only is not God, but he never asserted himself to be so.¹ He wholly ignores the doctrine of the Logos, and his speculation is confined to the *Σοφία*, the Wisdom of Proverbs viii., &c., and is, as we shall see, at the same time a less developed and very different doctrine from that of the fourth Gospel.² The idea of a hypostatic Trinity seems to be quite unknown to him, and would have been utterly abhorrent to his mind as sheer Polytheism. On the other hand, the fourth Gospel proclaims the doctrine of a hypostatic Trinity in a more advanced form than any other writing of the New Testament. It is, indeed, the fundamental principle of the work,³ as the doctrine of the Logos is its most characteristic feature. In the beginning the Word not only was with God, but "the Word was God" (*θεὸς ᾦν ὁ Λόγος*).⁴ He is the "only begotten God" (*μονογενὴς θεός*),⁵ equivalent to the "Second God" (*δεύτερος θεός*) of Philo, and, throughout, his absolutely divine nature is asserted both by the Evangelist, and in express terms in the discourses of Jesus.⁶ Nothing could be more opposed to the principles of the Clementines.

According to the Homilies, the same Spirit, the *Σοφία*, appeared in Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and finally in Jesus, who are the only "true prophets" and are called the seven Pillars (*ἐπτά στῆλοι*) of the world.⁷ These seven⁸ persons, therefore, are identical, the same true Prophet and Spirit "who from the beginning of the world, changing names and forms, passes through Time,"⁹ and these men were thus essentially the same as Jesus.¹⁰ As Neander rightly observes, the author of the Homilies "saw in

¹ Hom. xvi. 15 f.

² Dörner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i. p. 334; Schweyler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii. p. 294 f.

³ Köstlin, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 56 f., 83 ff.; Reuss, *Hist. de la Théol. Chrétienne au siècle apost.*, 1864, ii. p. 435 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 113 ff.; Schweyler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii. p. 369 ff.

⁴ John i. 1.

⁵ John i. 18. This is the reading of the Cod. Sinaiticus, of the Cod. Vaticanus, and Cod. C., as well as of other ancient MSS., and it must be accepted as the best authenticated.

⁶ John i. 2: v. 17 ff.; x. 30 ff., 38; xvi. 7 f., 23; xvii. 5, 21 f., &c.; Köstlin, *Lehrbegriff* p. 45 f., 55, 89 ff.; Ewald, *Die Joh. Schriften*, i. p. 116 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 84 ff.; Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 312 ff.; Reuss, *Hist. Théol. Chrét.*, ii. p. 435.

⁷ Hom. iii. 20 f.; ii. 15; viii. 10; xvii. 4; xviii. 14.

⁸ Dörner considers that only Adam, Moses, and Christ are recognized as identical (*W. Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1829, I h. 2, p. 247 ff.), and so also Uthhorn (*Die Homilien*, p. 164 ff.); Gfrörer thinks the idea limited to Adam and Christ (*Jahrb. des Heils*, i. p. 337). The other authorities referred to below in note 10 hold to the seven.

⁹ Hom. iii. 20.

¹⁰ Schliemann, *Die Clementinen*, pp. 130, 141 ff., 176, 194 ff., 199 f.; Dörner, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i. pp. 332, 335 ff.; Neander, *K. G.*, ii. pp. 612 ff., 621; Genet, *Entw. Gnost. Syst.*, p. 280; Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies*, p. 229 f.; as also, with the sole difference as to number, the authorities quoted in note 8.

Jesus a new appearance of that Adam whom he had ever venerated as the source of all the true and divine in man."¹ We need scarcely point out how different these views are from the Logos doctrine of the fourth Gospel.² In other points there is an equally wide gulf between the Clementines and the fourth Gospel. According to the author of the Homilies, the chief dogma of true Religion is Monotheism. Belief in Christ, in the specific Johannine sense, is nowhere inculcated, and where belief is spoken of, it is merely belief in God. No dogmatic importance whatever is attached to faith in Christ or to his sufferings, death, and resurrection, and of the doctrines of Atonement and Redemption there is nothing in the Homilies,³—every one must make his own reconciliation with God, and bear the punishment of his own sins.⁴ On the other hand, the representation of Jesus as the Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world,⁵ is the very basis of the fourth Gospel. The passages are innumerable in which belief in Jesus is insisted upon as essential. "He that believeth in the Son hath eternal life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him"⁶ . . . "for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."⁷ In fact, the whole of Christianity according to the author of the fourth Gospel is concentrated in the possession of faith in Christ.⁸ Belief in God alone is never held to be sufficient; belief in Christ is necessary for salvation; he died for the sins of the world, and is the object of faith, by which alone forgiveness and justification before God can be secured.⁹ The same discrepancy is apparent in smaller details. In the Clementines the Apostle Peter is the principal actor, and is represented as the chief amongst the Apostles. In the Epistle of Clement to James, which precedes the Homilies, Peter is de-

¹ K. G., ii. p. 622; cf. Hom. iii. 18 ff.

² It is very uncertain by what means the author of the Homilies considered this periodical reappearance to be effected, whether by a kind of transmigration or otherwise. Critics consider it very doubtful whether he admitted the supernatural birth of Jesus (though some hold it to be probable,) but at any rate he does not explain the matter. *Uhlhorn*, *Die Homilien*, p. 209 f.; *Neander*, K. G., ii. p. 618, ann. 1; *Credner* thought that he did not admit it, l. c. p. 253; *Schliemann*, whilst thinking that he did admit it, considers that in that case he equally attributed a supernatural birth to the other seven prophets. *Die Clementinen*, p. 207 ff.

³ *Schliemann*, *ib.*, p. 217 ff.; *Uhlhorn*, *ib.*, p. 211 f.; *Dorner*, *Lehre Pers. Chr.*, i. p. 338 f.; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, i. p. 367 f.

⁴ Hom. iii. 6 f.; *Uhlhorn*, *ib.*, p. 212.

⁵ John i. 29; cf. iii. 14 ff., iv. 42, &c., &c.

⁶ John iii. 36; cf. 16 f.

⁷ *ib.*, viii. 24.

⁸ *ib.*, iii. 14 ff.; v. 24 ff.; vi. 29, 35 ff., 40, 47, 65; vii. 38; viii. 24, 51; ix. 35 ff.; x. 9, 28; xi. 25 ff.; xii. 47; xiv. 6; xv. 5 f.; xvi. 9; xvii. 2 ff.; xx. 31.

⁹ *Köstlin*, *Lehrbegriff*, pp. 57, 178 ff.; *Reuss*, *Hist. Théol. Chrét.*, ii. pp. 427 f., 491 ff., 508 ff.; *Baur*, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 312; *Hilgenfeld*, *Das Ev. Joh.*, pp. 256 ff., 285 ff.

scribed in the following terms: "Simon, who, on account of his true faith and of the principles of his doctrine, which were most sure, was appointed to be the foundation of the Church, and for this reason his name was by the unerring voice of Jesus himself changed to Peter; the first-fruit of our Lord; the first of the Apostles to whom first the Father revealed the Son; whom the Christ deservedly pronounced blessed; the called and chosen and companion and fellow-traveller (of Jesus); the admirable and approved disciple, who as fittest of all was commanded to enlighten the West, the darker part of the world, and was enabled to guide it aright," &c.¹ He is here represented as the Apostle to the Heathen, the hated Apostle Paul being robbed of that honourable title, and he is, in the spirit of this introduction, made to play, throughout, the first part amongst the Apostles.² In the fourth Gospel, however, he is assigned quite a secondary place to John,³ who is the disciple whom Jesus loved and who leans on his bosom.⁴ We shall only mention one other point. The Homilist, when attacking the Apostle Paul, under the name of Simon the Magician, for his boast that he had not been taught by man, but by a revelation of Jesus Christ,⁵ whom he had only seen in a vision, inquires: "Why, then, did the Teacher remain and discourse a whole year to those who were awake, if you become his Apostle after a single hour of instruction?"⁶ As Neander aptly remarks: "But if the author had known from the Johannine Gospel that the teaching of Christ had continued for several years, he would certainly have had particularly good reason instead of one year to set several."⁷ It is obvious that an author with so vehement an animosity against Paul would assuredly have strengthened his argument, by adopting the more favourable statement of the fourth Gospel as to the duration of the ministry of Jesus, had he been acquainted with that work.

We have only mentioned in the briefest manner a few of the discrepancies between the Clementines and the fourth Gospel,

¹ Σίμων, ὁ διὰ τὴν ἀληθὴ πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀσφαλεστάτην αὐτοῦ τῆς διδασκαλίας ὑποθεσὶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡμεῖς εἶναι ὀρίσθεις καὶ δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀφενδεῖ δόγματι μετονομασθεὶς Πέτρος· ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν· ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων πρῶτος, ὡς πρῶτος ὁ Πατὴρ τὸν Υἱὸν ἀπεκάλυψεν· ὃν ὁ Χριστὸς εὐλόγως ἡμαρτίσεν· ὁ κλητὸς καὶ ἐκλεκτός καὶ συνέδτιος καὶ συνοδοίπορος· ὁ καλὸς καὶ δόκιμος μαθητὴς· ὁ τῆς δύσεως τὸ σκοτεινότερον τοῦ κόσμου μέρος ὡς πάντων ἱκανώτερος φωτίσαι μελενθεῖς καὶ κατορθώσαι δυναθεῖς, κ.τ.λ. Ep. Clem. ad Jacobum, § 1.

² Baur, K. G., i. p. 104 ff.

³ Baur, Theol. Jahrb., 1844, 4, p. 627 ff.; Unters. Kan. Evv., p. 320 ff.; Hilgenfeldt, Die Evangelien, p. 335; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 355 ff.

⁴ Cf. John xiii. 23—25; xix. 26 f.; xx. 2 f.; xxi. 3 ff., 7, 20 ff.

⁵ Gal. i. 12 f.

⁶ Hom., xviii. 19.

⁷ K. G., ii. p. 624, aum. 1.

but those to which we have called attention suffice to show that it is impossible that an author exhibiting such fundamental differences of religious belief can have known the fourth Gospel, or considered it a work of Apostolic origin or authority.

Our attention must now be turned to the anonymous composition, known as the "Epistle to Diognetus," general particulars regarding which we have elsewhere given.¹ This epistle, it is admitted, does not contain any quotation from any evangelical work, but on the strength of some supposed references it is claimed by apologists as evidence for the existence of the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf, who only devotes a dozen lines to this work, states his case as follows: "Although this short apologetic epistle contains no precise quotation from any gospel, yet it contains repeated references to evangelical, and particularly to Johannine, passages. For when the author writes, ch. 6: 'Christians dwell in the world, but they are not of the world;' and in ch. 10: 'For God has loved men, for whose sakes he made the world . . . to whom he sent his only begotten Son,' the reference to John xvii. 11 ('But they are in the world'); 14 ('The world hateth them, for they are not of the world'); 16 ('They are not of the world as I am not of the world'); and to John iii. 16 ('God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'), is hardly to be mistaken."²

Dr. Westcott still more emphatically claims the epistle as evidence for the fourth Gospel, and we shall, in order impartially to consider the question, likewise quote his remarks in full upon the point, but as he introduces his own paraphrase of the context in a manner which does not properly convey to a reader who has not the epistle before him the nature of the context, we shall take the liberty of putting the actual quotations in italics, and the rest must be taken as purely the language of Canon Westcott. We shall hereafter show also the exact separation which exists between phrases which are here, with the mere indication of some omission, brought together to form the supposed references to the fourth Gospel. Canon Westcott says: "In one respect the two parts of the book are united,³ inasmuch as they both exhibit a combination of the teaching of St. Paul and St. John. The love of God, it is said in the letter to Diognetus, is the source of love in the Christian, who must needs '*love God who thus first loved him*' (*προαγαπήσαντα*), and find an expression

¹ P. 408 ff.

² Wasm wurden, u. s. w., p. 40. We may mention that neither Tischendorf nor Dr. Westcott gives the Greek of any of the passages pointed out in the Epistle, nor do they give the original text of the parallels in the Gospel.

³ This is a reference to the admitted fact that the first ten chapters are by a different author from the writer of the last two.

for this love by loving his neighbour, whereby he will be 'an imitator of God.' 'For God loved men, for whose sakes He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that are in the earth . . . unto whom (πρός) He sent His only begotten Son, to whom He promised the kingdom in heaven (τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν), and will give it to those who love Him.' God's will is mercy; 'He sent His Son as wishing to save (ὡς σῶσαι) . . . and not to condemn,' and as witnesses of this, 'Christians dwell in the world, though they are not of the world.'¹ At the close of the paragraph he proceeds: "The presence of the teaching of St. John is here placed beyond all doubt. There are, however, no direct references to the Gospels throughout the letter, nor indeed any allusions to our Lord's discourses."²

It is clear that as there is no direct reference to any Gospel in the Epistle to Diognetus, even if it were ascertained to be a composition dating from the middle of the second century, which it is not, and even if the indirect allusions were ten times more probable than they are, this anonymous work could do nothing towards establishing the apostolic origin and historical character of the fourth Gospel.

We shall, however, for those who may be interested in more minutely discussing the point, at once proceed to examine whether the composition even indicates the existence of the Gospel, and for this purpose we shall take each of the passages in question and place them with their context before the reader; and we only regret that the examination of a document which, neither from its date nor evidence can be of any real weight, should detain us so long. The first passage is "Christians dwell in the world but are not of the world" (χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκοῦσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου). Dr. Westcott, who reverses the order of all the passages indicated, introduces this sentence (which occurs in chapter vi.) as the consequence of a passage following it in chapter vii. by the words "and as witnesses of this, Christians, &c." . . . The first parallel which is pointed out in the Gospel reads, John xvii. 11: "And I am no more in the world, and these are in the world (καὶ οὗτοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσὶν), and I

¹ On the Canon, p. 77. Dr. Westcott continues, referring to the later and more recent part of the Epistle: "So in the conclusion we read that 'the Word who was from the beginning . . . at His appearance speaking boldly manifested the mysteries of the Father to those who were judged faithful by Him.' And these again to whom the Word speaks 'from love of that which is revealed to them,' share their knowledge with others." It is not necessary to discuss this, both because of the late date of the two chapters, and because there is certainly no reference at all to the Gospel in the words. We must, however, add, that as the quotation is given it conveys quite a false impression of the text. We may just mention that the phrase which Dr. Westcott quotes as: "the Word who was from the beginning," is in the text: "This is he who was from the beginning" (οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) although "the Word" is in the context, and no doubt intended.

² *Ib.*, p. 78.

come to thee, Holy Father, keep them," &c. Now it must be evident that in mere direct point of language and sense there is no parallel here at all. In the Gospel the disciples are referred to as being left behind in the world by Jesus who goes to the Father, whilst in the Epistle the object is the antithesis that while Christians *dwell* in the world they are not of the world. In the second parallel, which is supposed to complete the analogy, the Gospel reads: v. 14, "I have given them thy word: and the world hated them because they are not of the world (*καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*) even as I am not of the world." Here, again, the parallel words are merely introduced as a reason why the world hated them, and not antithetically, and from this very connection we shall see that the resemblance between the Epistle and the Gospel is merely superficial and accidental.

In order to form a correct judgment regarding the nature of the passage in the Epistle, we must carefully examine the context. In chapter v. the author is speaking of the manners of Christians, and he says that they are not distinguished from others either by country or language or by their customs, for they have neither cities nor speech of their own, nor do they lead a singular life. They dwell in their native countries, but only as sojourners (*παροικοὶ*), and the writer proceeds by a long sequence of antithetical sentences to depict their habits. "Every foreign land is as their native country, yet the land of their birth is a foreign land" (*πᾶσα ξένη, πατρίς ἐστὶν αὐτῶν καὶ πᾶσα πατρίς, ξένη*), and so on. Now this epistle is in great part a mere plagiarism of the Pauline and other canonical epistles, whilst professing to describe the actual life of Christians, and the fifth and sixth chapters, particularly, are based upon the epistles of Paul and notably the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, from which even the antithetical style is derived. We may give a specimen of this in referring to the context of the passage before us, and it is important that we should do so. After a few sentences like the above the fifth chapter continues: "They are in the flesh, but do not live according to the flesh. They continue on earth, but are citizens of heaven" (*ἐν γῆς διατρίβουσιν ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται*).¹

¹ The whole passage in the Epistle recalls many passages in the works of Philo, with which the writer was evidently well acquainted. One occurs thus. Speaking of Laban and his family, that "they dwelt as in their native country, not as in a foreign land" (*ὡς ἐν πατρίδι, οὐχ ὡς ἐπὶ ξένης παρὰπαρθένου*), he continues after a few reflections: "For this reason all the wise men according to Moses are represented as sojourners (*παροικοῦντες*), for their souls are indeed sent from heaven to earth as to a colony . . . they return thither again whence they first proceeded, regarding indeed as their native land the heavenly country in which they are citizens, but as a foreign land the earthly dwelling in which they sojourn" (*πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χώραν ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται, ξέρον δὲ τὸν περιγείον ἐν ᾧ παρὰπαρθένου νομίζουσιν*). And a little further on: "But Moses saith: 'I am a stranger in a foreign land,' regarding with perfect distinction the abiding in the body not only as a foreign land, as sojourners do, but also as worthy of estrangement, not considering it one's own home." De Confus. Ling., § 17, *Maagey*, i. 416. One more instance: "First that God does not grant to the lover of virtue to dwell in the body as in his own native land, but only permits him to sojourn in it as in a strange country. . . . But the country of the body is kindred to every bad

EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS, v.

They obey the prescribed laws and exceed the laws in their own lives. They love all and are persecuted by all.

They are unknown and are condemned.

They are put to death and are made alive.

They are poor and make many rich; they are in need of all things and in all abound.

They are dishonoured, and in their dishonour honoured; they are profanely reported¹ and are justified.

They are reviled and blessed,² &c., &c.

2ND EP. TO CORINTHIANS.

{ A paraphrase of vi. 3-6 (cf. iv. 2, 8-9).

vi. 9. As unknown and well known; as dying and behold we live; as chastened and not put to death.

10. . . . As poor yet making many rich; as having nothing and possessing all.

8. Through honour and dishonour; through evil report and good report; as deceivers; and true.

1 Cor. iv. 12. Being reviled we bless.³

It is very evident here, and throughout the Epistle, that the Epistles of Paul chiefly, together with the other canonical Epistles, are the sources of the writer's inspiration. The next chapter (vi.) begins and proceeds as follows: "To say all in a word: what the soul is in the body, that Christians are in the world. The soul is dispersed throughout all the members of the body, and Christians throughout all the cities of the world. The soul dwells in the body but is not of the body, and Christians dwell in the world, but are not of the world. (*Οικεί μὲν ἐν τῷ σώματι ψυχὴ, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος· καὶ Χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκοῦσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.*) The invisible soul is kept in the visible body, and Christians are known, indeed, to be in the world, but their worship of God remains invisible. The flesh hates the soul and wages war against it, although in no way wronged by it, because it is restrained from indulgence in sensual pleasures, and the world hates Christians, although in no way wronged by them, because they are opposed to sensual pleasures (*μισεῖ καὶ Χριστιανούς ὁ κόσμος μηδὲν ἀδικοίμενος, ὅτι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ἀντιτάσσονται*). The soul loves the flesh that hates it, and the members, and Christians love those who hate them" (*καὶ Χριστιανοὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ἀγαπῶσιν*). And so on with three or four similar sentences,

man, in which he is careful to dwell, not to sojourn," &c. *Quis Rerum Div. Heres.*, § 54, *Mang.*, i. 512, cf. § 55; *De Confus. Ling.*, § 22, *ib.*, i. 421; *De Migrat. Abrahami*, § 2, *ib.*, i. 438, § 28, *ib.*, i. 460.

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 13.

² *ἄγνωστοί, καὶ κατακρίνονται. Θανατοῦνται, καὶ ζωοποιοῦνται· πτωχοῦσιν, καὶ πλουτίζουσιν πολλούς. Πάντων ὑστεροῦνται, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι περισσεύουσιν. Ἀτιμωῦνται, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀτιμίαις δοξάζονται· βλασφημοῦνται, καὶ δικαιοῦνται· λοιδοροῦνται, καὶ εὐλογοῦσιν.* κ.τ.λ. Ep. ad. Diogn. v.

³ 2 Cor. vi. 9, *ὡς ἄγνωστοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι, ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν, ὡς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ θανατοῦμενοι*, 10 *ὡς πτωχοὶ πολλούς δὲ πλουτίζοντες, ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες*. 8. *διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας, διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας· ὡς πλάνοι καὶ ἀληθεῖς*. 1 Cor. iv. 12 *λοιδοροῦμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν*, κ.τ.λ.

one of which, at least, is taken from the Epistle to the Corinthians,¹ to the end of the chapter.

Now the passages pointed out as references to the fourth Gospel, it will be remembered, distinctly differ from the parallels in the Gospel, and it seems to us clear that they arise naturally out of the antithetical manner which the writer adopts from the Epistles of Paul, and are based upon passages in those Epistles closely allied to them in sense and also in language. The simile in connection with which the words occur is commenced at the beginning of the preceding chapter, where Christians are represented as living as strangers even in their native land, and the very essence of the passage in dispute is given in the two sentences: "They are in the flesh, but do not live according to the flesh" (*ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ σάρκα ζῶσιν*), which is based upon 2 Cor. x. 3, "For we walk in the flesh, but do not war² according to the flesh" (*ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα*), and similar passages abound; as for instance, Rom. viii. 4 . . . "in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit; 9. But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit (*ὁμοῦς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι*): 12 . . . So then, brethren, we are debtors not to the flesh, that we should live after the flesh" (*οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν*) &c., &c., (cf. 4, 14). And the second: "They continue on earth but are citizens of heaven" (*ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται*), which recalls Philip. iii. 20: "For our country (our citizenship) is in heaven" (*ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει*).³ The sense of the passage is everywhere found, and nothing is more natural than the use of the words arising both out of the previous reference to the position of Christians as mere sojourners in the world, and as the antithesis to the preceding part of the sentence: "The soul dwells in the body, but is not of the body," and: "Christians dwell in the world but are not of the world," cf. 1 Cor. ii. 12; vii. 31; 2 Cor. i. 12. Gal. iv. 29, v. 16 ff., 24, 25, vi. 14. Rom. viii. 3 ff. Ephes. ii. 2, 3, 11 ff. Coloss. iii. 2 ff.; Titus ii. 12. James i. 27. There is one point, however, which we think shows that the words were not derived from the fourth Gospel. The parallel with the Epistle can only be made by taking a few words out of xvii. 11 and adding to them a few words in verse 14, where they stand in the following connection: "And the world hated them, because they are not of the world" (*καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*). In the Epistle, in a passage quoted above, we have: "The flesh hates the soul and wages war against it, although unjustly, because it is restrained from indulgence in sensual pleasures, and the world hates Christians, although in no way wronged by them, because they are opposed to sensual pleasures." (*Μισεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ σὰρξ, καὶ πολεμεῖ, μηδὲν ἀδικουμένη, διότι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς κωλύεται χρῆσθαι· μισεῖ καὶ Χριστιανοὺς ὁ κόσμος μηδὲν ἀδικούμενος, ὅτι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ἀντιτίσσονται*.)

¹ "The immortal soul dwells in a mortal tabernacle, and Christians dwell as strangers in corruptible (bodies) awaiting the incorruption in the heavens" (*καὶ Χριστιανοὶ τάρταροῦσιν ἐν φθοροῖς, τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀφθαρσίαν προσδεχόμενοι*). Ep. ad Diogn. vi., cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.

² The preceding verse has "walk," instead of "war."

³ Cf. Ephes. ii. 19; Heb. xii. 22-24.

Now nothing could more clearly show that these analogies are mere accidental coincidence, and not derived from the fourth Gospel, than this passage. If the writer had really had the passage in the Gospel in his mind, it is impossible that he could in this manner have completely broken it up and changed its whole context and language. The phrase: "they are not of the world" would have been introduced here as the reason for the hatred, instead of being used with quite different context elsewhere in the passage. In fact, in the only place in which the words would have presented a true parallel with the Gospel, they are not used. Not the slightest reference is made throughout the Epistle to Diognetus to any of the discourses of Jesus. On the other hand, we have seen that the whole of the passage in the Epistle in which these sentences occur is based both in matter, and in its peculiar antithetical form, upon the Epistles of Paul, and in these and other canonical Epistles, again, we find the source of the sentence just quoted: Gal. vi. 29. "But as then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him (that was born) after the Spirit, even so it is now."¹ v. 16. "Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. 17. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh: for these are contrary the one to the other, that ye may not do the things that ye would."² There are innumerable passages in the Pauline Epistles to the same effect.

We pass on now to the next passage in the order of the Epistle. It is not mentioned at all by Tischendorf: Dr. Westcott introduces it with the words: "God's will is mercy," by which we presume that he means to paraphrase the context. "He sent his Son as wishing to save (ὡς σώζων) . . . and not to condemn."³ This sentence, however, which is given as quotation without any explanation, is purely a composition by Canon Westcott himself out of different materials which he finds in the Epistle, and is not a quotation at all. The actual passage in the Epistle, with its immediate context, is as follows: "This (Messenger—the Truth, the holy Word) he sent to them; now, was it, as one of men might reason, for tyranny and to cause fear and consternation? Not so, but in clemency and gentleness, as a King sending his Son (πέμπων υἱόν) a king, he sent (ἐπεμψεν); as God he sent (him); as towards men he sent; as saving he sent (ὡς σώζων ἐπεμψεν) (him); as persuading (ὡς πείθων), not forcing, for violence has no place with God. He sent as inviting, not vindictively pursuing; he sent as loving, not condemning (ἐπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν, οὐ κρίνων). For he will send him to judge, and who shall abide his presence?"⁴ The supposed parallel in the Gospel is as follows

¹ Ἰαλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν. Gal. iv. 29.

² Gal. v. 16, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσῃτε. Ἦ, ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς· ταῦτα δὲ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ἂν βέλῃτε ταῦτα ποιῆτε. Cf. 18—25; Titus ii. 12.

³ On the Canon, p. 77.

⁴ Ταῦτον πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπέστειλεν, ἄρα γε, ὡς ἀνθρώπων ἂν τις λογιόαιτο, ἐπὶ τυραννίδι καὶ φόβῳ καὶ καταπλήξει; Οὐ μὲνοῦν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ, πραύτητι· ὡς βασιλεὺς πέμπων υἱὸν βασιλεῖα ἐπεμψεν· ὡς υἱὸν ἐπεμψεν, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐπεμψεν, ὡς σώζων ἐπεμψεν.

(John iii. 17): "For God sent not his Son into the world that he might condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved" (οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ). Now, it is obvious at a glance that this passage in the Epistle is completely different from that in the Gospel in every material point of construction and language, and the only similarity consists in the idea that God's intention in sending his Son was to save and not to condemn, and it is important to notice that the latter does not, either here or elsewhere, refer to the condition attached to salvation so clearly enunciated in the preceding verse: "That whosoever believeth in him might not perish." The doctrine enunciated in this passage is the fundamental principle of much of the New Testament, and it is expressed with more especial clearness and force, and close analogy with the language of the letter, in the Epistles of Paul, to which the letter more particularly leads us, as well as in other canonical Epistles, and in these we find analogies with the context quoted above, which confirm our belief that they, and not the Gospel, are the source of the passage—Rom. v. 8: "But God proveth his own love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. 9. Much more then . . . shall we be saved (σωθησόμεθα) through him from the wrath (to come)." Cf. 16, 17. Rom. viii. 1: "There is, therefore, now no condemnation (κατάκριμα) to them which are in Christ Jesus.² 3 . . . God sending his own Son" (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας),³ &c. And coming to the very 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, from which we find the writer borrowing wholesale, we meet with the different members of the passage we have quoted: v. 19 . . . "God was reconciling the world unto himself in Christ, not reckoning unto them their trespasses. . . . 20. On Christ's behalf, then, we are ambassadors, as though God were entreating by us; we pray on Christ's behalf: be reconciled to God. v. 10. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, &c. 11. Knowing, then, the fear of the Lord, we persuade (πείθουμεν) men," &c. Galatians iv. 4. "But when the fulness of time came, God sent out his Son (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ), 5. That he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons,"⁴ &c. Ephes. ii. 4. "But God being rich in

ὡς πείθων, οὐ βιάζόμενος· βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσδετι τῷ θεῷ. Επεμψεν ὡς μελῶν, οὐ διωκῶν· ἐπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν, οὐ κρίνων. Πέμψει γὰρ αὐτὸν κρίνοντα, καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν ὑποστήσεται; C.vii.

¹ The previous verse which we shall more particularly have to consider with the next passage, reads: 16. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have eternal life."

² The Cod. Alex. and some other ancient MSS. add: "who walk not after the flesh," *μη κατὰ σαρκὰ περιπατοῦσιν*. ³ Cf. vv. 32—35, 39.

⁴ The letter to Diognetus may further be connected with the Ep. to the Galatians in the remarks which the writer makes (iv.) on the observance of days, &c., by the Jews: "But regarding their attending to the stars and moon, observing the months and days," &c. (*παρατηρήσιν τῶν μηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν, κ.τ.λ.*). Cf. Gal. iv. 10. "Are ye observing days and months, and times and years?" &c. (*ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς*;))

mercy because of his great love wherewith he loved us, 5. Even when we were dead in our trespasses, quickened us together with Christ—by grace ye have been saved”—cf. verses 7, 8. 1 Thess. : v. 9. “For God appointed us not to wrath, but to the obtaining salvation (σωτηρίας) through our Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Tim. i. 15. “This is a faithful saying . . . that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners” (ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι). 1 Tim. ii. 3. “For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour (τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ). 4. Who willeth all men to be saved” (ὅς πάντας ἀθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι), cf. v. 5, 6. 2 Tim. i. 9. “Who saved us (σώσαντος ἡμῶν), and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose, and the grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before time began; 10. But hath been made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour (σωτῆρος) Jesus Christ.”¹ These passages might be indefinitely multiplied; and they contain the sense of the passage, and in many cases the language, more closely than the fourth Gospel, with which the construction and form of the sentence has no analogy.

Now, with regard to the Logos doctrine of the Epistle to Diognetus, to which we may appropriately here refer, although we must deal with it in the briefest manner possible, so far is it from connecting the Epistle with the fourth Gospel, that it much more proves the writer's ignorance of that Gospel. The peculiar terminology of the prologue to the Gospel is nowhere found in the Epistle, and we have already seen that the term Logos was applied to Jesus in works of the New Testament, acknowledged by all to have been written long before the fourth Gospel. Indeed, it is quite certain, not only historically, but also from the abrupt enunciation of the doctrine in the prologue, that the theory of the Logos was well known and already applied to Jesus before the Gospel was composed. The author knew that his statement would be understood without explanation. Although the writer of the Epistle makes use of the designation “Logos,” he shows his Greek culture by giving the precedence to the term Truth or Reason. It has indeed been remarked² that the name Jesus or Christ does not occur anywhere in the Epistle. By way of showing the manner in which “the Word” is spoken of, we will give the entire passage, part of which is quoted above; the first and only one in the first ten chapters in which the term is used: “For, as I said, this was not an earthly invention which was delivered to them (Christians), neither is it a mortal system which they deem it right to maintain so carefully; nor is an administration of human mysteries entrusted to them, but the Almighty and invisible God

¹ In Ch. xi. which, it will be remembered, is acknowledged to be of later date, and not by the writer of the earlier part, the author, an admitted falsifier therefore, represents himself, as the writer of the letter, as: “having been a disciple of the Apostles, I am become a teacher of the Gentiles.” (ἀποστόλων γερόμερος μαθητὴς, γίνομαι διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν c. xi.) Having observed the imitation in the earlier part of the letter of the Pauline Epistles, the writer of the last two chapters is induced to make this statement after an Epistle ascribed to Paul: 2 Tim. i. 11: “For which I was appointed a herald, and an Apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.” (καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν.)

² Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 127.

himself, the Creator of all things (ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ παντοκτίστης καὶ ἀάρατος θεός) has implanted in men, and established in their hearts from heaven, the Truth and the Word, the holy and incomprehensible (τὴν Ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὸν Λόγον τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἀπερινόητον), not as one might suppose, sending to men some servant or angel or ruler (ἄρχοντα), or one of those ordering earthly affairs, or one of those entrusted with the government of heavenly things, but the artificer and creator of the universe (τὸν τεχνίτην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ὅλων) himself, by whom he created the heavens (ᾧ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἔκτισεν);¹ by whom he confined the sea within its own bounds; whose commands (μυστήρια—mysteries) all the stars (στοιχεῖα—elements) faithfully observe; from whom (the sun) has received the measure of the daily course to observe; whom the moon obeys, being bidden to shine at night; whom the stars obey, following in the course of the moon; by whom all things have been arranged and limited and subjected, the heavens and the things in the heavens, the earth and the things in the earth, the sea and the things in the sea (οὐρανοὶ καὶ τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, θάλασσα καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ), fire, air, abyss, the things in the heights, the things in the depths, the things in the space between. This (Messenger—the truth, the Word) he sent to them. Now, was it, as one of men might reason, for tyranny and to cause fear and consternation? Not so, but in clemency and gentleness, as a King sending his Son, a king, he sent; as God he sent (him); as towards men he sent, as saving he sent (him); as persuading," &c., &c.² The description here given, how God in fact by Reason or Wisdom created the Universe, has much closer analogy with earlier representations of the doctrine than with that in the fourth Gospel, and if the writer does also represent the Reason in a hypostatic form, it is by no means with the concreteness of the Gospel doctrine of the Logos, with which linguistically, moreover, as we have observed, it has no similarity. There can be no doubt that his Christology presents differences from that of the fourth Gospel.³

We have already seen how Jesus is called the Word in works of the New Testament earlier than the fourth Gospel,⁴ and how the doctrine is constantly referred to in the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it is to these, and not to the fourth Gospel, that the account in the Epistle to Diognetus may be more properly traced. Heb. i. 2. "The Son of God by whom also he made the worlds. 10. The heavens are works of thy hands" (ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί). xi. 3. "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed (καταρτίσθαι), by the word of God" (ῥήματι θεοῦ). 1 Cor. viii. 6. "Jesus Christ by whom are all things" (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα). Coloss. i. 13. " . . . The

¹ John i. 3. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made" (πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν). The difference of this language will be remarked.

² Ep. ad Diogn., vii.

³ Cf. *Dorner*, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i. p. 413 ff.; *Donalson*, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 127 ff.

⁴ Rev. xix. 13; vi. 9; xx. 4; Heb. iv. 12, 13; xi. 3.

Son of his love: 15. Who is the image of the invisible God (τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου) the first-born of all creation; 16. Because in him were all things created, the things in the heavens, and the things in the earth, the things visible and the things invisible (ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὀρατὰ, καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα) whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers; All things have been created by him and for him (τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται). 17. And he is before all things, and in him all things subsist. 18. And he is the head of the body, the Church, who is the Beginning¹ (ὃς ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ); the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might be first. 19. Because he was well pleased that in him should all the fulness dwell. 20. And through him to reconcile all things unto himself," &c., &c. These passages might be greatly multiplied, but it is unnecessary, for the matter of the letter is substantially here. As to the titles of King and God they are everywhere to be found. In the Apocalypse, the Lamb whose name is "The Word of God" (ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ), (xix. 13) has also his name written (xix. 16), "King of kings and Lord of lords" (Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ Κύριος κυρίων).² We have already quoted the views of Philo regarding the Logos, which also merit comparison with the passage of the Epistle, but we cannot repeat them here.

The last passage to which we have to refer is the following: "For God loved men, for whose sakes He made the world, to whom He subjected all things that are in the earth . . . Unto whom (πρός) He sent his only-begotten Son, to whom He promised the kingdom in heaven (τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν) and will give it to those who love Him."³ The context is as follows: "For God loved men (ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠγάπησεν) for whose sake he made the world, to whom he subjected all things that are in it, to whom he gave reason and intelligence, to whom alone he granted the right of looking towards him, whom he formed after his own image, to whom he sent his only-begotten son (πρὸς οὗς ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ), to whom he has promised the kingdom in heaven, and will give it to those who have loved him. And when you know this, with what gladness, think you, you will be filled? Or how will you love him, who beforehand so loved you? (προαγαπήσαντά σε) But if you love, you will be an imitator of his kindness," &c. (μιμητὴς εἶναι αὐτοῦ τῆς χρηστότητος).⁴ This is claimed as a reference to John iii. 16 f. "For God so loved the world (οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον) that he gave his only begotten son (ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν) that whosoever believeth in him might not perish," &c. 17. "For God

¹ Rev. iii. 14.

² Cf. Rev. xvii. 14; Coloss. i. 15; Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Heb. i. 8, 2 f.

³ On the Canon, p. 77.

⁴ Ep. ad Diogn. xi., 'Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠγάπησεν, δι' οὓς ἐποίησεν τὸν κόσμον, οὓς ὑπέταξε πάντα τὰ ἐν . . . οὓς λόγιον ἔδωκεν, οὓς νοῦν· οὓς μόνοις πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄραν ἐπέτρεψε· οὓς ἐν τῇς ἰδίας ἐκείνου ἐπλάσεν· πρὸς οὓς ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· οὓς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν ἐπηγγείλατο, καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἀγαπήσασιν αὐτόν. Ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ, τίνος οἶε πληρωθήσεσθαι χαρὰς; ἢ πῶς ἀγαπήσεις τὸν οὕτως προαγαπήσαντά σε; ἀγαπήσας δὲ, μιμητὴς εἶναι αὐτοῦ τῆς χρηστότητος· κ.τ.λ.

sent not his son into the world that he might judge the world. &c. (ὅτι γὰρ ἀπέριττειν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον). Here, again, a sentence is patched together by taking fragments from the beginning and middle of a passage, and finding in them a superficial resemblance to words in the Gospel. We find parallels for the passage, however, in the Epistles from which the unknown writer obviously derives so much of his matter. Rom. v. 8: "But God giveth proof of his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. 10. . . . through the death of his son." Chap. viii. 3, "God sending his son, &c. 29. . . . Them he also foreordained to bear the likeness of the image of his son, &c. 32. He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all," &c. 39. (Nothing can separate us) "from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Gal. ii. 20. . . . "by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me," Chap. iv. 4. "God sent out his son (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ). 5. . . . that he might redeem," &c. Ephes. ii. 4. "But God being rich in mercy because of his great love wherewith he loved us. 5. Even when we were dead in our trespasses hath quickened us together with Christ. . . . that he might show forth the exceeding riches of his grace in kindness (χρηστότης) towards us in Christ Jesus." Chap. iv. 32. "Be ye kind (χρηστοί) one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God also in Christ forgave you." Chap. v. 1. "Be ye therefore imitators (μιμηταί) of God as beloved children. 2. And walk in love (ἐν ἀγάπῃ) even as Christ also loved you (ὁ Χριστὸς ἡγάπησεν ὑμᾶς), and gave himself for us," &c., &c. Titus iii. 4. "But when the kindness (χρηστότης) and love towards men (φιλανθρωπία) of our Saviour God was manifested. 5. . . . according to his mercy he saved us. . . . 6. . . . through Jesus Christ our Saviour. 7. That being justified by his grace, we should become heirs according to the hope of Eternal life."²

The words: "Or how will you love him who so beforehand loved you?" (ἢ πῶς ἀγαπήσεις τὸν οὕτως προαγαπήσαντά σε;), Canon Westcott refers to 1 John iv. 19, "We love God³ because he first loved us" (ἡμεῖς ἀγαπῶμεν τὸν θεόν, ὅτι αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς.) The linguistic differences, however, and specially the substitution of *προαγαπήσαντα* for *πρῶτος ἡγάπησεν*, distinctly oppose the claim. The words are a perfectly natural comment upon the words in Ephesians, from which it is obvious the writer derived other parts of the sentence, as the striking word "kindness" (χρηστότης), which is commonly used in the Pauline Epistles, but nowhere else in the New Testament,⁴ shows.

Dr. Westcott "cannot call to mind a parallel to the phrase 'the kingdom in heaven'⁵ which occurs above in the phrase 'to whom he has

¹ Cf. Coloss. iii. 12—14.

² Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 12, iv. 9.

³ We quote the reading of the Cod. Sinaiticus as most favourable to Dr. Westcott; the Alexandrian and Vatican MSS. have simply: "we love," omitting both "God" and "him."

⁴ Cf. Rom. ii. 4; iii. 12; xi. 22 (thrice); 2 Cor. vi. 6; Gal. v. 22; Ephes. ii. 7; cf. iv. 32; Coloss. iii. 12; Titus, iii. 4; cf. 1 Peter, ii. 3.

⁵ On the Canon, p. 77, note 4.

promised the kingdom in heaven, and will give it to those who have loved him" (*οἷς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν ἐπηγγέλατο, καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἀγαπήσασιν αὐτόν*). This also we find in the Epistles to which the writer exclusively refers in this letter: James ii. 5, "heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him" (*τῆς βασιλείας ἧς ἐπηγγέλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*) i. 12. " . . . he shall receive the crown of life which he promised to them that love him" (*ὃν ἐπηγγέλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*). In 2 Tim. iv. 18, we have: "The Lord . . . shall preserve me safe unto his heavenly kingdom" (*εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ ἐπουράνιον*).¹ It is very possible that all of these passages may refer to words of Jesus not contained in our Gospel, but which the writer of the Epistle may have found in some other evangelical work. The expression "kingdom of heaven" is not found in the fourth Gospel at all, but is characteristic of the first Synoptic, and traces are not wanting in this Epistle of the use of a Gospel akin to, but differing from, the first; we cannot, however, go into this matter.

We have devoted too much time already to this Epistle, the evidence of which could not in any case be of value to the fourth Gospel. The writer of the Epistle to Diognetus is unknown; Diognetus, the friend to whom it is addressed, is equally unknown; the letter is neither mentioned nor quoted by any of the Fathers, nor by any ancient writer, and there is no external evidence as to the date of the composition. It exists only in one codex, the handwriting of which is referred to the thirteenth or fourteenth century, but it is by no means certain that it is even so old. The last two chapters are a falsification by a later writer than the author of the first ten. There is no internal evidence whatever in this brief didactic composition which would render its assignment to the third or fourth centuries incongruous, or which demands an earlier date. Apart from the uncertainty of date, however, there is no allusion in it to any Gospel. Even if there were, the testimony of a letter by an unknown writer at an unknown period could not have much weight, but under the actual circumstances the Epistle to Diognetus furnishes absolutely no testimony at all for the apostolical origin and historical character of the fourth Gospel.

The fulness with which we have discussed the supposed testimony of Basilides² renders it unnecessary for us to re-enter at any length into the argument as to his knowledge of the fourth Gospel. Tischendorf³ and Canon Westcott⁴ assert that two passages, namely: "The true light which lighteth every man came into the world," corresponding with John i. 9, and: "mine hour

¹ Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 5.

² Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 52.

⁴ On the Canon, p. 256, note 3.

is not yet come," agreeing with John ii. 4, which are introduced by Hippolytus in his work against Heresies¹ with a subjectless *φησὶ* "he says," are quotations made in some lost work by Basilides. We have shown that Hippolytus and other writers of his time were in the habit of quoting, indifferently, passages from works by the founders of sects and by their later followers without any distinction, an utterly vague *φησὶ* doing service equally for all. This is the case in the present instance, and there is no legitimate reason for assigning these passages to Basilides himself,² but on the contrary many considerations which forbid our doing so, which we have elsewhere detailed.

These remarks most fully apply to Valentinus, whose supposed quotations we have exhaustively discussed,³ as well as the one passage given by Hippolytus containing a sentence found in John x. 8,⁴ the only one which can be pointed out. We have distinctly proved that the quotations in question are not assignable to Valentinus himself, a fact which even apologists admit. There is no just ground for asserting that his terminology was derived from the fourth Gospel, the whole having been in current use long before that Gospel was composed. There is no evidence whatever that Valentinus was acquainted with such a work.⁵

We must generally remark, however, with regard to Basilides, Valentinus and all such Heresiarchs and writers, that, even if it could be shown, as actually it cannot, that they were acquainted with the fourth Gospel, the fact would only prove the mere existence of the work at a late period in the second century, but would furnish no evidence of the slightest value regarding its apostolic origin, or towards establishing its historical value. On the other hand, if, as apologists assert, these heretics possessed the fourth Gospel, their deliberate and total rejection of the work furnishes evidence positively antagonistic to its claims. It is difficult to decide whether their rejection of the Gospel, or their ignorance of its existence is the more unfavourable alternative.

The dilemma is the very same in the case of Marcion. We have already fully discussed his knowledge of our Gospels,⁶ and

¹ vii. 22, 27.

² Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 345, ann. 5; cf. *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1862, p. 453 ff.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 388 f.; Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 108, p. 125 f.; *Der Ursprung*, p. 71, ann.; Rumpf, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1867, p. 18 ff., p. 366; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 65 f.; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 148 ff.; cf. Guericke, *H'buch. K. G.*, i. p. 184; Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 67 f.; Luthardt, *Der johann. Urspr. d. viert. Ev.*, p. 85 f.

³ P. 421 ff.

⁴ Adv. Hær., vi. 35.

⁵ Baur, *Unters. kan. Ev.*, p. 357 f.; Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 212 ff.; Davidson, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 390; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 345; Scholten, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 67 ff.; Rumpf, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1867, p. 17; Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 65 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 151 f.; Volkmar, *Der Ursprung*, p. 69 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, p. 108, p. 125 f.; Weizsäcker, *Unters. Evang. Gesch.*, p. 234; Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 67.

⁶ P. 436 ff.

need not add anything here. It is not pretended that he made any use of the fourth Gospel, and the only ground upon which it is argued that he supplies evidence even of its existence is the vague general statement of Tertullian, that Marcion rejected the Gospels "which are put forth as genuine, and under the name of Apostles or at least of contemporaries of the Apostles," denying their truth and integrity, and maintaining the sole authority of his own Gospel.¹ We have shown² how unwarrantable it is to affirm from such data that Marcion knew, although he repudiated, the four canonical Gospels. The Fathers, with uncritical haste and zeal, assumed that the Gospels adopted by the Church at the close of the second and beginning of the third centuries must equally have been invested with canonical authority from the first, and Tertullian took it for granted that Marcion, of whom he knew very little, must have deliberately rejected the four Gospels of his own Canon. Even Canon Westcott admits that: "it is uncertain whether Tertullian in the passage quoted speaks from a knowledge of what Marcion may have written on the subject, or simply from his own point of sight."³ There is not the slightest evidence that Marcion knew the fourth Gospel,⁴ and if he did, it is perfectly inexplicable that he did not adopt it as peculiarly favourable to his own views.⁵ If he was acquainted with the work and, nevertheless, rejected it as false and adulterated, his testimony is obviously opposed to the Apostolic origin and historical accuracy of the fourth Gospel, and the critical acumen which he exhibited in his selection of the Pauline Epistles renders his judgment of greater weight than that of most of the Fathers.

We have now reached an epoch when no evidence regarding the fourth Gospel can have much weight, and the remaining witnesses need not detain us long. We have discussed at length the Diatessaron of Tatian,⁶ and shown that whilst there is no evidence that it was based upon our four Gospels, there is reason to believe that it may have been identical with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, by which name, as Epiphanius states,⁷ it was actually called. We have only now briefly to refer to the address to the Greeks (*Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλλήνας*), and to ascertain what testimony it bears regarding our fourth Gospel. It was composed after the

¹ Adv. Marc., iv. 3, 4.

² P. 478 ff.

³ On the Canon, p. 276, note 1.

⁴ Credner, Beiträge, i. p. 45, anm. 1; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. pp. 73 ff., 79, 84; Gieseler, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 25; Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 474; Schleiermacher, Einl. N. T., 1845, p. 214 f.; Rumpf, Rev. de Théol., 1867, p. 21; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 76 ff.; Schweegler, Das nachap. Zeit i. p. 282; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 76.

⁵ Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justin's, p. 474; Scholten, Die alt. Zeugnisse, p. 77; Volkmar, Der Ursprung, p. 76 ff.

⁶ P. 483 ff.

⁷ Her. xlv. § 1.

death of Justin, and scarcely dates earlier than the beginning of the last quarter of the second century. No Gospel and no work of the New Testament is mentioned in this composition, but Tischendorf¹ and others point out one or two supposed references to passages in the fourth Gospel. The first of these in order, is one indicated by Canon Westcott,² but to which Tischendorf does not call attention: "God was in the beginning, but we have learned that the beginning is the power of Reason (Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δυνάμιν παρειλήφαμεν). For the Lord of the Universe (δεσπότης τῶν ὅλων) being himself the substance (ὕψιστος) of all, in that creation had not been accomplished was alone, but inasmuch as he was all power, and himself the substance of things visible and invisible, all things were with him (σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα). With him by means of rational power the Reason (Λόγος) itself also which was in him subsisted. But by the will of his simplicity Reason (Λόγος) springs forth; but the Reason (Λόγος) not proceeding in vain, became the first-born work (ἔργον πρωτότοκου) of the Father. Him we know to be the Beginning of the world (Τούτου ὤσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν). But he came into existence by division, not by cutting off, for that which is cut off is separated from the first; but that which is divided, receiving the choice of administration, did not render him defective from whom it was taken, &c., &c. And as the Logos (Reason), in the beginning begotten, begat again our creation, himself for himself creating the matter (Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Λόγος, ἐν ἀρχῇ γεννηθείς, ἀντεγέννησε τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς τὴν ἡμετέραν, αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ τὴν ἑλὴν δημιουργήσας), so I," &c., &c.³

It is quite evident that this doctrine of the Logos is not that of the fourth Gospel, from which it cannot have been derived. Tatian himself⁴ seems to assert that he derived it from the Old Testament. We have quoted the passage at length that it might

¹ Wann wurden, n. s. w., p. 17.

² On the Canon, p. 278, note 2.

³ Orat. ad Græcos, § 5. As this passage is of some obscurity, we subjoin for the sake of impartiality, an independent translation taken from Dr. Donaldson's able History of Christ. Lit. and Doctrine, iii. p. 42: "God was in the beginning, but we have understood that the beginning was a power of reason. For the Lord of all, Himself being the substance of all, was alone in so far as the creation had not yet taken place, but as far as He was all power and the substance of things seen and unseen, all things were with Him; along with Him also by means of rational power, the reason which was in Him supported them. But by the will of his simplicity, the reason leaps forth; but the reason, not having gone from one who became empty thereby, is the first-born work of the Father. Him we know to be the beginning of the world. But He came into existence by sharing (μετέμυος) not by cutting off; for that which is cut off is separated from the first; but that which is shared, receiving a selection of the work, did not render Him defective from whom it was taken, &c., &c. And as the Word begotten in the beginning begot in his turn our creation, He Himself fashioning the material for himself, so I, &c., &c." Cf. *Dorner, Lehre Pers. Christi*, i. p. 437 ff.

⁴ § 12, cf. § 20; cf. *Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 32; *Reybaud, Hist. der, Probabilia*, p. 193 ff.

be clearly understood; and with the opening words, we presume, for he does not quote at all but merely indicates the chapter, Canon Westcott compares John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (*Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, κ.τ.λ.*). The statement of Tatian is quite different: "God was in the beginning" (*Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ*), and he certainly did not identify the Word with God, so as to transform the statement of the Gospel into this simple affirmation. In all probability his formula was merely based upon Genesis i. 1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (*ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.*).¹ The expressions, "But we have learned that the Beginning (*ἀρχή*) was the power of Reason," &c., "but the Reason (*Λόγος*) not proceeding in vain became the first-born work (*ἔργον πρωτότοκον*) of the Father. Him we know to be the Beginning (*ἀρχή*) of the world," recall many early representations of the *Logos*, to which we have already referred: Prov. viii. 22: "The Lord created me the Beginning (*ἀρχή*) of his ways for his works (*ἔργα*)." 23. Before the ages he established me, in the beginning (*ἐν ἀρχῇ*), before he made the earth," &c., &c. In the Apocalypse also the Word is called "the Beginning (*ἀρχή*) of the creation of God," and it will be remembered that Justin gives testimony from Prov. viii. 21 ff. "that God begat before all the creatures a Beginning (*ἀρχήν*) a certain rational Power (*δύναμιν λογικὴν*), out of himself,"² &c., &c. and elsewhere: "As the *Logos* declared through Solomon, that this same . . . had been begotten of God, before all created beings, both Beginning (*ἀρχή*)," &c.³ We need not, however, refer to the numerous passages in Philo and in Justin, not derived from the fourth Gospel, which point to a different source for Tatian's doctrine. It is sufficient that both his opinions and his terminology differ distinctly from that Gospel.⁴

The next passage we at once subjoin in contrast with the parallel in the fourth Gospel:

ORAT. AD GRÆCOS, § XL.

And this, therefore, is (the meaning of) the saying:

The darkness comprehends not the light

*Καὶ τοῦτο ἵσθαι ἄρα τὴν εἰρη-
νην: ὅτι σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ κατέ-
λαβεν.*

JOHN i. 5.

And the light shineth in the darkness;

and the darkness comprehended it not.

*Καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει,
καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.*

The context to this passage in the Oration is as follows: Ta-

¹ *Prolegomena*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr. iii. p. 43.

² *Ibid.* 61, see p. 572.

³ *Ibid.* 62, see p. 573.

⁴ We have already mentioned that the Gospel according to Peter contained the doctrine of the *Logos*.

tian is arguing about the immortality of the soul, and he states that the soul is not in itself immortal but mortal, but that nevertheless it is possible for it not to die. If it do not know the truth it dies, but rises again at the end of the world, receiving eternal death as a punishment. "Again, however, it does not die, though it be for a time dissolved, if it has acquired knowledge of God; for in itself it is darkness, and there is nothing luminous in it, and this, therefore, is (the meaning of) the saying: The darkness comprehends not the light. For the soul (*ψυχή*) did not itself save the spirit (*πνεῦμα*), but was saved by it, and the light comprehended the darkness. The Logos (Reason) truly is the light of God, but the ignorant soul is darkness (*Ὁ Λόγος μὲν ἔστι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ φῶς, σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχή*). For this reason if it remain alone it tends downward to matter, dying with the flesh," &c., &c.¹ The source of "the saying" is not mentioned, and it is evident that even if it be taken to be a reference to the fourth Gospel, nothing would thereby be proved but the mere existence of the Gospel. "The saying," however, is distinctly different in language from the parallel in the Gospel, and it may be from a different Gospel. We have already remarked that Philo calls the Logos "the Light,"² and quoting in a peculiar form Ps. xxvi. 1: "For the Lord is my light (*φῶς*) and my Saviour," he goes on to say that, as the sun divides day and night, so, Moses says, "God divides light and darkness" (*τὸν θεὸν φῶς καὶ σκότος διατείνει*).³ When we turn away to things of sense we use "another night," which is in no way different from "darkness."⁴ The constant use of the same similitude of Light and darkness, in the Canonical Epistles,⁵ shows how current it was in the Church; and nothing is more certain than the fact that it was neither originated by, nor confined to, the fourth Gospel.

The third and last passage is as follows:

ORAT. AD. GRÆCOS, XIX.

We being such as this, do not pursue us with hatred, but, rejecting the Demons, follow the one God.

All things were by (*ὑπ'*) him, and without him was not anything made.

Πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι οὐδὲ ἔν.

JOHN I. 3.

All things were made by (*δι'*) him, and without him was not anything made that was made.

Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ἃ γέγονεν.

¹ Orat. ad Græcos, § 13.

² De Somniis, i. § 13, *Mangrey*, i. 632; cf. §§ 14 ff., De Mundi op. § 9, *ib.*, v. 7. See p. 580, note 1.

³ De Somniis, i. § 13.

⁴ *Id.*, i. § 14.

⁵ 2 Cor. iv. 6; Ephes. v. 8—14; Coloss. i. 12, 13; 1 Thess. v. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 9; cf. Rev. xxi. 23, 24; xxii. 5.

Tatian here speaks of God, and not of the Logos, and in this respect, as well as language and context, the passage differs from the fourth Gospel. The phrase is not introduced as a quotation, and no reference is made to any Gospel. The purpose for which the words are used, again, rather points to the first chapters of Genesis than to the dogmatic prologue enunciating the doctrine of the Logos.¹ Under all these circumstances, the source from which the expression may have been derived cannot with certainty be ascertained, and, as in the preceding instance, even if it be assumed that the words show acquaintance with the fourth Gospel, nothing could be proved but the mere existence of the work about a century and a half after the events which it records. It is obvious that in no case does Tatian afford the slightest evidence of the Apostolic origin or historical veracity of the fourth Gospel.

We have generally discussed the testimony of Dionysius of Corinth,² Melito of Sardis,³ and Claudius Apollinaris,⁴ and need not say more here. The fragments attributed to them neither mention nor quote the fourth Gospel, but in no case could they furnish evidence to authenticate the work. The same remarks apply to Athenagoras.⁵ Canon Westcott only ventures to say, that he "appears to allude to passages in St. Mark and St. John, but they are all anonymous."⁶ The passages in which he speaks of the Logos, which are those referred to here, are certainly not taken from the fourth Gospel, and his doctrine is expressed in terminology which is different from that of the Gospel, and is deeply tinged with Platonism.⁷ He appeals to Proverbs viii. 22, already so frequently quoted by us, for confirmation by the Prophetic Spirit of his exposition of the Logos doctrine.⁸ He nowhere identifies the Logos with Jesus:⁹ indeed he does not once make use of the name of Christ in his works. He does not show the slightest knowledge of the doctrine of salvation so constantly enunciated in the fourth Gospel. There can be no doubt, as we have already shown,¹⁰ that he considered the Old Testament to be the only inspired Holy Scriptures. Not only does he not mention nor quote any of our Gospels, but the only instance in which he makes any reference to sayings of Jesus, otherwise than by the indefinite *φησὶ*, "he says," is one in which he introduces a saying which is not found in our Gospels by the words:

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 6; Ephes. iii. 9; Heb. i. 2.

² P. 300 ff.

³ P. 497 ff.

⁴ P. 505 ff.

⁵ P. 300 ff.

⁶ On the Canon, p. 103.

⁷ Cf. *Deur.*, *Lehre Pers. Christi*, i. p. 430 ff. *Donabson. Hist. Chr. Lit. and*

Doct., iii. p. 149 ff.

⁸ *Leg. pro Christ.*, § 10.

⁹ *Deur.*, ii. p. 442. *Donabson*, *ib.*, p. 151.

¹⁰ P. 515 f.

"The Logos again saying to us:" (πάλιν ἡμεῖς λέγουσιν τοῦ Λόγου), &c. From the same source, which was obviously not our Canonical Gospels, we have, therefore, reason to conclude that Athénagoras derived all his knowledge of Gospel history and doctrine. We need scarcely add that this writer affords no testimony whatever as to the origin or character of the fourth Gospel.

It is scarcely worth while to refer to the Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, a composition dating at the earliest A.D. 177-178, in which no direct reference is made to any writing of the New Testament.¹ Acquaintance with the fourth Gospel is argued from the following passage:

EPISTLE, § IV

JOHN XVI. 2.

And ~~this~~ was fulfilled the saying
of our Lord

The time shall come in which
every one that killeth you shall think
that he offereth a service unto God

But the hour cometh that every one
that killeth you may think that he
offereth a service unto God.

Ἐλεύσεται καιρὸς ὃν καὶ ὅς οἱ ἄλλοι ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ
ἀποκτείνων ὑμᾶς δοξάζῃ κατακτείνων· δοξάζει λατρίαν
προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ
ἀποκτείνων ὑμᾶς δοξάζῃ κατακτείνων· δοξάζει λατρίαν
προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.

Now such a passage cannot give the use of the fourth Gospel. No source is indicated in the Epistle from which the saying of Jesus, which of course apologists assert to be historical, was derived. It presents decided variations from the parallel in the fourth Gospel; and in the Synoptics we find sufficient indications of similar discourses² to render it very probable that other Gospels may have contained the passage quoted in the Epistle. It is no case could an anonymous reference like this be of any weight as evidence for the Apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We need not further discuss Ptolemy and Heraclon. We have shown that the date at which these heretics flourished places them beyond the limits within which we proposed to confine ourselves. In regard to Ptolemy all that is affirmed is that, in the Epistle to Flora ascribed to him, expressions four in John i. 3 are used. The passage as it is given by Epiphanius is as follows: "Besides, that the world was created by the same, the Apostle states saying all things have been made *per* him by him; and without him nothing was made)." (Ἐτι περὶ τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ὁ αὐτὸς λέγει εἶναι ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γέγονον καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγοναι οὐδέν) ὁ ἀπόστολος.³ Now the supposed quotation is introduced here in a parenthesis interrupting the sense.

¹ P. 516 ff.² Matt. x. 16-22, xxiv. 9 f.; Mark xiii. 9-13; Luke xxi. 12-17.³ P. 519 ff.⁴ Epiphanius, Haer., xxxiii. § 3.

and there is every probability that it was added as an illustration by Epiphanius, and was not in the Epistle to Flora at all. Omitting the parenthesis, the sentence is a very palpable reference to the Apostle Paul, and Coloss. i. 16.¹ In regard to Heraclion, it is asserted from the unsupported references of Origen² that he wrote a commentary on the fourth Gospel. Even if this be a fact, there is not a single word of it preserved by Origen which in the least degree bears upon the Apostolic origin and trustworthiness of the Gospel. Neither of these heresiarchs, therefore, is of any value as a witness for the authenticity of the fourth Gospel.

The heathen Celsus, as we have shown,³ wrote at a period when no evidence which he could well give of his own could have been of much value in supporting our Gospels. He is pressed into service,⁴ however, because after alluding to various circumstances of Gospel history he says: "These things, therefore, being taken out of your own writings, we have no need of other testimony, for you fall upon your own swords,"⁵ and in another place he says that certain Christians "alter the Gospel from its first written form in three-fold, four-fold, and many-fold ways, and re-mould it in order to have the means of contradicting the arguments (of opponents)."⁶ This is supposed to refer to the four Canonical Gospels. Apart from the fact that Origen replies to the first of these passages, that Celsus has brought forward much concerning Jesus which is not in accordance with the narratives of the Gospels, it is unreasonable to limit the accusation of "many-fold" corruption to four Gospels, when it is undeniable that the Gospels and writings long current in the Church were very numerous. In any case, what could such a statement as this do towards establishing the Apostolic origin and credibility of the fourth Gospel?

We might pass over the *Canon of Muratori* entirely, as being beyond the limit of time to which we confine ourselves,⁷ but the unknown writer of the fragment gives a legend with regard to the composition of the fourth Gospel which we may quote here, al-

¹ Scholl n. Die alt. Z. ugnisse, p. 88, ann. 4.

² The passages are quoted by Grabe, Spicil. Patr., ii. p. 85 ff.

³ P. 534 ff.

⁴ Cf. Tischendorf, Wann wurden, n. s. w., p. 71 ff.; Westcott, On the Canon, p. 376.

⁵ ἡμεῖς οὖν οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ περιγραφέντων, ἐφ' οἷς ἡμεῖς ἄλλου μαρτυροῦν χρῆσθαι οὐκ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ περιγράφεται. Origen, Contra Cel., p. 74.

⁶ ὅτι ἐν μέντοι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ περιγράφεται, μετακατασκευάζει ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ γραφῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τριχὺ καὶ τετραχὺ καὶ πολλὰ καὶ μεταπλάττειν, ἵνα ἐχούμεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἀντιτάξαι. Contra Cel., ii. 27.

⁷ P. 545 ff.

though its obviously mythical character renders it of no value as evidence regarding the authorship of the Gospel. The writer says:

Quarti euangeliorum Iohannis ex decipolis
Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis
dixit conieciunare mihi hodie triduo et quid
cuique fuerit reuelatum alterutrum
nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue
latum Andreæ ex apostolis ut recognis
centibus euntis Iohannis suo nomine
cuncta describeret et ideo ⁽¹⁾ licit uaria sin
culis euangeliorum libris principia
doceantur nihil tamen differt creden
tium fidei cum uno ac principali spiritu de
clarata sint in omnibus omnia de natiui
tate de passione de resurrectione
de conuersatione cum decipulis suis

ac de gemino eius aduentu
primo in humilitate dispectus quod fo
rta ⁽²⁾ secundum potestate regali . . . pre
clarum quod futurum est ⁽³⁾ quid ergo
mirum si Iohannes tam constanter
singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat
dicens in semeipsu quæ uidimus oculis
nostris et auribus audiimus et manus
nostre palpaucrunt hæc scripsimus uobis
sic enim non solum uisorem sed et auditorem
sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordi
nem profetetur

"The fourth of the Gospels, of John, one of the disciples. To his fellow disciples and bishops (Episcopis) urging him he said: 'Fast with me to-day for three days, and let us relate to each other that which shall be revealed to each.' On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that, with the supervision of all, John should relate all things in his own name. And, therefore, though various principles (principia) are taught by each book of the Gospels, nevertheless it makes no difference to the faith of believers, since, in all, all things are declared by one ruling Spirit concerning the nativity, concerning the passion, concerning the resurrection, concerning the intercourse with the

¹ It is admitted that the whole passage from this point to "futurum est" is abrupt and without connection with the context, as well as most confused. Cf. *Tregelles*, *Can. Murat.*, p. 36; *Donaldson*, *Hist. Ch. Lit. and Doctr.*, iii. p. 205.

² *Croder* reads here "quod ratum est." *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.*, p. 74. *Dr. Westcott* reads "quod fuit." *On the Canon*, p. 478.

³ *Dr. Tregelles* calls attention to the resemblance of this passage to one of *Tertullian* (*Apol.* § 21). "Daobus enim aduentibus eius significatis, primo, qui iam expunctus est in humilitate conditionis humane; secundo, qui concludendo seculo in nouis in sublimitate diuinitatis exsertæ; primum non intelligendo, secundum, quem manifestius predicatum sperant nunc existimauerunt." *Can. Murat.*, p. 36. This is another reason for dating the fragment in the third century.

disciples, and concerning his double advent; the first in lowliness of estate which has taken place, the second in regal power and splendour, which is still future. What wonder, therefore, if John should so constantly bring forward each thing (singula) also in his Epistles, saying in regard to himself: The things which we have seen with our eyes, and have heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things have we written unto you. For thus he professes himself not only an eye-witness and hearer, but also a writer of all the wonders of the Lord in order."

It is obvious that in this passage we have an apologetic defence of the fourth Gospel,¹ which unmistakably implies antecedent denial of its authority and apostolic origin. The writer not only ascribes it to John, but he clothes it with the united authority of the rest of the apostles, in a manner which very possibly aims at explaining the supplementary chapter xxi., with its testimony to the truth of the preceding narrative. In his zeal the writer goes so far as to falsify a passage of the Epistle, and convert it into a declaration that the author of the letter had written the Gospel. "'The things which we have seen, &c., these things have we written unto you' (hæc scripsimus vobis).² For thus he professes himself not only an eye-witness and hearer, but also a writer of all the wonders of the Lord in order." Credner argues that in speaking of John as "one of the disciples" (ex discipulis), and of Andrew as "one of the Apostles," the writer intends to distinguish between John the disciple, who wrote the Gospel and Epistle, and John the Apostle, who wrote the Apocalypse, and that it was for this reason that he sought to dignify him by a special revelation, through the Apostle Andrew, selecting him to write the Gospel. Credner, therefore, concludes that here we have an ancient ecclesiastical tradition ascribing the Gospel and first Epistle to one of the disciples of Jesus different from the Apostle John.³ Into this, however, we need not enter, nor is it necessary for us to demonstrate the mythical nature of this narrative regarding the origin of the Gospel. We have merely given this extract from the fragment to make our statement regarding it complete. Not only is the evidence of the fragment of no value, from the lateness of its date, and the uncritical character of its author, but a vague and fabulous tradition recorded by an unknown writer could not, in any case, furnish testimony calculated to establish the Apostolic origin and trustworthiness of the fourth Gospel.

¹ Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kanon*, p. 158 f. und Volkmar, *Anhang*, p. 360; *Der Ursprung*, p. 28; *Scholten*, *Die ält. Zeugnisse*, p. 150 f.; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 402; *Hilgenfeld*, *Der Kanon*, pp. 41, 43; *Lomanu*, *Bijdragen*, p. 66 ff.

² 1 John i. 1-3.

³ Credner, *Gesch. N. T. Kan.*, p. 158 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 301.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORSHIP AND CHARACTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE result of our inquiry into the evidence for the fourth Gospel is sufficiently decided to render further examination unnecessary. We have seen that for some century and a half, after the events recorded in the work, there is not only no testimony whatever connecting the fourth Gospel with the Apostle John, but no certain trace even of the existence of the Gospel. There has not been the slightest evidence in any of the writings of the Fathers which we have examined, even of a tradition that the Apostle John had composed any evangelical work at all, and the claim advanced in favour of the Christian miracles to contemporaneous evidence of extraordinary force and veracity by undoubted eye-witnesses so completely falls to the ground, that we might here well bring this part of our inquiry to a close. There are, however, so many peculiar circumstances connected with the fourth Gospel, both in regard to its authorship and to its relationship to the three Synoptics, which invite further attention, that we propose briefly to review some of them. We must, however, carefully restrict ourselves to the limits of our inquiry, and resist any temptation to enter upon an exhaustive discussion of the problem presented by the fourth Gospel from a more general literary point of view.

The endeavour to obtain some positive, or at least negative, information regarding the author of the fourth Gospel is facilitated by the fact that in the New Testament Canon several other works are ascribed to him. These works present such marked and distinct characteristics that, apart from the fact that their number extends the range of evidence, they afford an unusual opportunity of testing the tradition which assigns them all to the Apostle John, by comparing the clear indications which they give of the idiosyncrasies of their author with the independent data which we possess regarding the history and character of the Apostle. It is asserted by the Church that John the son of Zebedee, one of the disciples of Jesus, is the composer of no less than five of our canonical writings, and it would be impossible to select any books of our New Testament presenting more distinct features, or more widely divergent views, than are to be found in the Apocalypse on the one hand, and the Gospel and three Epistles

on the other. Whilst a strong family likeness exists between the Epistles and the Gospel, and they exhibit close analogies both in thought and language, the Apocalypse, on the contrary, is so different from them in language, in style, in religious views and terminology, that it is impossible to believe that the writer of the one could be the author of the other. The translators of our New Testament have laboured, and not in vain, to eliminate as far as possible all individuality of style and language, and to reduce the various books of which it is composed to one uniform smoothness of composition. It is, therefore, impossible for the mere English reader to appreciate the immense difference which exists between the harsh and Hebraistic Greek of the Apocalypse and the polished elegance of the fourth Gospel, and it is to be feared that the rarity of critical study has prevented any general recognition of the almost equally striking contrast of thought between the two works. The very remarkable peculiarities which distinguish the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, however, were very early appreciated, and almost the first application of critical judgment to the Canonical books of the New Testament is the argument of Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, about the middle of the third century, that the author of the fourth Gospel could not be the writer of the Book of Revelation.¹ The dogmatic predilections which at that time had begun to turn against the Apocalypse, the non-fulfilment of the prophecies of which disappointed and puzzled the early Church, led Dionysius to solve the difficulty by deciding in favour of the authenticity of the Gospel, but at least he recognized the dilemma which has since occupied so much of biblical criticism.

It is not necessary to enter upon any exhaustive analysis of the Apocalypse and Gospel to demonstrate anew that both works cannot have emanated from the same mind. This has already been conclusively done by others. Some apologetic writers,—greatly influenced, no doubt, by the express declaration of the Church, and satisfied by the analogies which could scarcely fail to exist between two works dealing with a similar theme,—together with a very few independent critics, have asserted the authenticity of both works.² The great majority of critics, however, have fully admitted the impossibility of recognizing a com-

¹ Eusebius, H. E., vii. 25.

² Alford, Greek Testament, 1868, iv. pp. 198 ff., 229; Bertholdt, Einl. A. u. N. T., iv. p. 1800 ff.; cf. iii. p. 1299 ff.; Ebrard, Die evang. Gesch., p. 858 ff.; Das evang. Johannis, 1845, p. 137 ff.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 375 ff., cf. p. 223 ff.; Feilmoser, Einl. N. T., p. 569 ff., cf. p. 199 ff.; Hase, Die Tüb. Schule, 1855, p. 25 ff.; Hug, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 496 ff., cf. p. 160 ff.; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit. p. 195 ff.; Niemeyer, Verhandl. over de echtheid der Johann. Schr., 1852; Reithmayr, Einl. N. T., p. 774 ff.; Thiersch, Die Kirche im. ap. Zeit., pp. 245 f., 267—274; Tholuck, Glaubw. evang. Gesch., p. 280 ff., &c., &c.

mon source for the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse of John.¹ The critical question regarding the two works has, in fact, reduced itself to the dilemma which may be expressed as follows, in the words of Lücke: "Either the Gospel and the first Epistle are genuine writings of the Apostle John, and in that case the Apocalypse is no genuine work of that Apostle, or the inverse."² After an elaborate comparison of the two writings, the same writer, who certainly will not be suspected of wilfully subversive criticism, resumes: "The difference between the language, way of expression, and mode of thought and doctrine of the Apocalypse and the rest of the Johannine writings, is so comprehensive and intense, so individual and so far radical; the affinity and agreement, on the contrary, partly so general, partly in details so fragmentary and uncertain (*zurückweichend*), that the Apostle John, if he really be the author of the Gospel and of the Epistle—which we here advance—cannot have composed the Apocalypse either *before* or *after* the Gospel and the Epistle. If all critical experience and rules in such literary questions do not deceive, it is certain that the Evangelist and Apocalyptist are two different persons of the name of John,"³ &c.

De Wette, another conservative critic, speaks with equal decision. After an able comparison of the two works, he says: "From all this it follows (and in New Testament criticism no result is more certain than this), that the Apostle John, if he be the author of the fourth Gospel and of the Johannine Epistles, did not write the Apocalypse, or, if the Apocalypse be his work, he is not the author of the other writings."⁴ Ewald is equally positive: "Above all," he says, "should we be in error as to the descent of this work (the Gospel) from the Apostle, if the Apo-

¹ *Dionysius*, in *Euseb*, H. E., vii. 24, 25; *Baur*, *Unters. kan. Ev.*, p. 345 ff.; *K. G.*, drei erst. Jahrh., 1862, p. 146 ff.; *Bleek*, *Beiträge*, p. 190—200; *Bretschneider*, *Probabilia*, p. 156 ff.; *Credner*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. pp. 724 ff., 732 ff.; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, i. p. 313 ff.; ii. p. 441; *Erasmus*, *Annot. in Apoc. Johannis N. Test.*, p. 625; *Ewald*, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, v. 1832—3, p. 179 ff.; x. 1859—60, p. 85 f.; *Die Joh. Schr.*, ii. p. 59 ff.; *Com. in Apoc. Joh.*, 1828, p. 67 ff.; *Evanson*, *Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists*, 1792; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 338 ff.; *Hilsh*, *Ueber Johannes Marcus u. s. Schriften*, 1843; *Kayser*, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1856, xiii. p. 80 ff.; *Köstlin*, *Lehrb. Ev. u. Br. Joh.*, p. 1. ff.; *Lücke*, *Einkl. Offenb. Joh.*, ii. pp. 659 ff., 680 ff., 744 ff.; *Michaelis*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 1598—1650; *Nicholas*, *Et. Cr. sur la Bible N. T.*, p. 183 ff.; *Renan*, *L'Antechrist*, 1873, p. xxv.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 152 f.; *Révillie*, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1854, ix. pp. 332 ff., 354 ff., 1855, x. p. 1 ff.; *Rev. des deux Mondes*, Octr., 1863, p. 633 ff.; cf. *La Vie de Jésus de M. Renan*, 1864, p. 42, note 1; *Scholten*, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 401 ff.; *Schnitzer*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1842, p. 451 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, *Einkl. N. T.*, pp. 317, 449 ff., 466 ff.; *Schweyler*, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii. p. 372 f.; *Taylor*, *The Fourth Gospel*, 1867, p. 14; *De Wette*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 422; *Weizsäcker*, *Unters. evang. Gesch.*, p. 237, p. 295; *Zeller*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1845, p. 654 f., &c., &c.

² *Einkl. Offenb. Johannes*, ii. p. 504.

³ *Ib.*, p. 744 f.

⁴ *Einkl. N. T.*, § 189 e., p. 422.

calypse of the New Testament were by him. That this much earlier writing cannot have been composed by the author of the later is an axiom which I consider I have already, in 1826-28, so convincingly demonstrated, that it would be superfluous now to return to it, especially as, since then, all men capable of forming a judgment are of the same opinion, and what has been brought forward by a few writers against it too clearly depends upon— influences foreign to science.¹ We may, therefore, consider the point generally admitted, and proceed very briefly to discuss the question upon this basis.

The external evidence that the Apostle John wrote the Apocalypse is more ancient than that for the authorship of any book of the New Testament, excepting some of the Epistles of Paul. This is admitted even by critics who ultimately deny the authenticity of the work.² Passing over the very probable statement of Andrew of Cæsarea,³ that Papias recognized the Apocalypse as an inspired work, and the inference drawn from this fact that he referred it to the Apostle, we at once proceed to Justin Martyr, who affirms in the clearest and most positive manner the Apostolic origin of the work. He speaks to Tryphion of "a certain man whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ, who prophesied by a revelation made to him," of the Millennium, and subsequent general resurrection and judgment.⁴ The statement of Justin is all the more important from the fact that he does not name any other writing of the New Testament, and that the Old Testament was still for him the only Holy Scripture. The genuineness of this testimony is not called in question by any one. Eusebius states that Melito of Sardis wrote a work on the Apocalypse of John,⁵ and Jerome mentions the treatise.⁶ There can be no doubt that had Melito thrown the slightest doubt on the Apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, Eusebius, whose dogmatic views led him to depreciate that writing, would have referred to the fact. Eusebius also mentions that Apollonius, a Presbyter of Ephesus, quoted the Apocalypse against the Montanists, and there

¹ Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., v. p. 179.

² Credner, Gesch. N. T. Kan., pp. 97, 180; Baur, Theol. Jahrb., 1844, p. 660; Eberard, Die evang. Gesch., p. 854 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., i. p. 318; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 339 f.; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 197 f.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 249; Feilmoser, Einl. N. T., p. 578; Lücke, Einl. Offenb. Joh., ii. p. 657; Réville, Rev. des deux Mondes, Oct. 1863, p. 632; Kayser, Rev. de Théol., 1856, xiii. p. 80 f., &c., &c.



³ It is generally asserted both by Apologists and others that this testimony is valid in favour of the recognition by Papias of the authenticity of the Apocalypse.

⁴ Dial. 81; cf. Eusebius, H. E., iv. 18; Καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀγῆρ- τις, ὡς ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀπο- καλύψει γενομένην αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσκειν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, κ.τ.λ.




⁵ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 26.

⁶ De Vir. Ill., 24.





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



Photographic Sciences Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

15 28 25
32 22
20
8

10

is reason to suppose that he did so as an Apostolic work.¹ Eusebius further states that Theophilus of Antioch made use of testimony from the Apocalypse of John;² but although, as Eusebius does not mention anything to the contrary, it is probable that Theophilus really recognized the book to be by John the Apostle, the uncritical haste of Eusebius renders his vague statement of little value. We do not think it worth while to quote the evidence of later writers. Although Irenæus, who repeatedly assigns the Apocalypse to John, the disciple of the Lord,³ is cited by Apologists as a very important witness, more especially from his intercourse with Polycarp, we do not attribute any value to his testimony, both from the late date at which he wrote, and from the singularly uncritical and credulous character of his mind. Although he appeals to the testimony of those "who saw John face to face" with regard to the number of the name of the Beast, his own utter ignorance of the interpretation shows how little information he can have derived from Polycarp.⁴ The same remarks apply still more strongly to Tertullian, who, however, most unhesitatingly assigns the Apocalypse to the Apostle John.⁵ It would be useless more particularly to refer to later evidence, however, or quote even the decided testimony in its favour of Clement of Alexandria,⁶ or Origen.⁷

The first doubt cast upon the authenticity of the Apocalypse occurs in the argument of Dionysius of Alexandria, one of the disciples of Origen, in the middle of the third century. He mentions that some had objected to the whole work as without sense or reason, and as displaying such dense ignorance, that it was impossible that an apostle or even one in the Church, could have written it, and they assigned it to Cerinthus, who held the doctrine of the reign of Christ on earth.⁸ These objections, it is obvious, are merely dogmatic, and do not affect to be historical. They are in fact a good illustration of the method by which the Canon was formed. If the doctrine of any writing met with the approval of the early Church it was accepted with unhesitating faith, and its pretension to Apostolic origin was admitted as a natural consequence; but if, on the other hand, the doctrine of the writing was not clearly that of the community, it was rejected without further examination. It is an undeniable fact that not a single trace exists of the application of historical criticism to any book of the New Testament in the early ages of Christianity.

¹ Eusebius, H. E., v. 18.

² *Ib.*, H. E., iv. 24.

³ Adv. Hær., iv. 20, § 11, 21, § 3, 30, § 4, &c., &c.

⁴ *Ib.*, v. 30.

⁵ Adv. Marc., iii. 14, 24, &c., &c.

⁶ Stromata, vi. 13, §§ 106, 141.

⁷ Eusebius, H. E., vi. 25, in Joann. Opp. iv. p. 17.

⁸ Eusebius, H. E., vii. 24.

The case of the Apocalypse is most intelligible:—so long as the expectation and hope of a second advent and of a personal reign of the risen and glorified Christ, of the prevalence of which we have abundant testimony in the Pauline Epistles and other early works, continued to animate the Church, the Apocalypse which excited and fostered them was a popular volume: but as years passed away and the general longing of Christians, eagerly marking the signs of the times, was again and again disappointed, and the hope of a Millennium began either to be abandoned or indefinitely postponed, the Apocalypse proportionately lost favour, or was regarded as an incomprehensible book, misleading the world by illusory promises. Its history is that of a highly dogmatic treatise esteemed or contemned in proportion to the ebb and flow of opinion regarding the doctrines which it expresses.

The objections of Dionysius, arising first from dogmatic grounds and his inability to understand the Apocalyptic utterances of the book, took the shape we have mentioned of a critical dilemma:—The author of the Gospel could not at the same time be the author of the Apocalypse. Dogmatic predilection decided the question in favour of the fourth Gospel, and the reasoning by which that decision is arrived at has, therefore, no critical force or value. The fact still remains that Justin Martyr distinctly refers to the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John, and, as we have seen, no similar testimony exists in support of the claims of the fourth Gospel.

As another most important point, we may mention that there is probably not another work of the New Testament the precise date of the composition of which, within a very few weeks, can so positively be affirmed. No result of criticism rests upon a more secure basis and is now more universally accepted by all competent critics than the fact that the Apocalypse was written in A.D. 68-69.¹ The writer distinctly and repeatedly mentions his name: i. 1, "The revelation of Jesus Christ . . . unto his servant John;" i. 4, "John to the seven churches which are in Asia,"² and he states that the work was written in the island of Patmos where he was "on account of the Word of God and the testimony of

¹ *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 705 ff.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., v. p. 181 ff.; *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vii. p. 227; *Comment. in Apoc. Joh.*, 1828, Die Joh. Schr., ii. p. 62; *Guericke*, Gesammtesch., p. 171, p. 522 f.; *Volkmar*, Comment. zur Offenb. Joh. 1862, p. 7 ff.; *Die Religion Jesu*, p. 143; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 338; *Davidson*, Introd. N. T., i. p. 347 ff.; *Lützelberger*, Die kirchl. Trad. Joh., p. 234; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiii^{me}, ed. p. lxxi. f.; *L'Antechrist*, p. 340 ff.; *Révile*, Rev. des deux Mondes, Oct. 1863, p. 623; *Rev. de Théol.*, 1855, x. p. 4; *Scholten*, Das Ev. Joh., p. 401; *Kayser*, Rev. de Théol., 1856, xiii. p. 80.

² Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ.

³ Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἐπὶ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ. Cf. i. 9; xii. 8.

Jesus."¹ Ewald, who decides in the most arbitrary manner against the authenticity of the Apocalypse and in favour of the Johanneine authorship of the Gospel, objects that the author, although he certainly calls himself John, does not assume to be an Apostle, but merely terms himself the servant (δούλος) of Christ like other true Christians, and distinctly classes himself amongst the Prophets² and not amongst the Apostles.³ We find, however, that Paul, who was not apt to waive his claims to the Apostolate, was content to call himself: "Paul a servant (δούλος) of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle," in writing to the Romans; (i. 1) and the superscription of the Epistle to the Philippians is: "Paul and Timothy servants (δούλοι) of Christ Jesus."⁴ There was, moreover, reason why the author of the Book of Revelation, a work the form of which was decidedly based upon that of Daniel and other Jewish Apocalyptic writings, should rather adopt the character of Prophet than the less suitable designation of Apostle upon such an occasion. It is clear that he counted fully upon being generally known under the simple designation of "John," and when we consider the unmistakable terms of authority with which he addresses the Seven Churches, it is scarcely possible to deny that the writer either was the Apostle, or distinctly desired to assume his personality. It is not necessary for us here to enter into any discussion regarding the "Presbyter John," for it is generally admitted that even he could not have had at that time any position in Asia Minor which could have warranted such a tone. If the name of Apostle, therefore, be not directly assumed—and it was not necessary to assume it—the authority of one is undeniably inferred.

Ewald, however, argues: "On the contrary, indeed, the author could not more clearly express that he was not one of the Twelve, than when he imagines (Apoc. xxi. 14) the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb shining upon the twelve foundation stones of the wall of the future heavenly Jerusalem. He considered that he could not sufficiently elevate the names and the lustre of these Twelve, and he gave them in his own mind the highest external honour which he could confer upon them. No intelligent person ever gives such extreme honour and such sparkling lustre to himself, still less does he determine himself to give them, or himself even anticipates the eternal glorification which God alone can give to him, and boasts of it before men. And could one seriously

¹ i. 9, δια τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ . . .

² Cf. i. 1—3, 9 f.; xix. 9 f.; xii. 6—9, 10, 16 f., 18 f.

³ Ewald, Die Joh. Schr., ii. p. 55 ff.; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., v. p. 179 ff.

⁴ We do not refer to the opening of the Epistle to Titus, nor to that which commences, James a servant (δούλος) of God, &c., nor to the so-called "Epistle of Jude," all being too much disputed or apocryphal.

believe that one of the Twelve, yea, that even he whom we know as the most delicate and refined amongst them, would have written this of himself.¹ Now, in the first place, we must remark that in this discussion it is not permissible to speak of our knowing John the Apostle as distinguished above all the rest of the Twelve for such qualities. Nowhere do we find such a representation of him except in the fourth Gospel, if even there, but as we shall presently see, rather the contrary, and the fourth Gospel cannot here be received as evidence. It is the misfortune of this problem that many critics are so fascinated by the beauty of the fourth Gospel that they sacrifice sense and reason in order to support its claims. Returning to these objections, however, we might by way of retort point out to those who assert the inspiration of the Apocalypse, that the symbolical representation of the heavenly Jerusalem is objective, and not a mere subjective sketch coloured according to the phantasy of the writer. Passing on, however, it must be apparent that the whole account of the heavenly city is typical, and that in basing its walls upon the Twelve, he does not glorify himself personally, but simply gives its place to the idea which was symbolized when Jesus is represented as selecting twelve disciples, the number of the twelve tribes, upon whose preaching the spiritual city was to be built up. The Jewish belief in the special preference of the Jews before all nations led up to this, and it forms part of the strong Hebraistic form of the writer's Christianity. The heavenly city is simply a glorified Jerusalem; the twelve Apostles, representatives of the twelve tribes, set apart for the regeneration of Israel—as the seventy disciples, the number of the nations of the earth, are sent out to regenerate the Gentiles—are the foundation-stones of the New City with its twelve gates, on which are written the names of the twelve tribes of Israel,² for whom the city is more particularly

¹ In making these translations from German writers, and more especially from Ewald, we have preferred to adhere closely to the sense and style of the original, however involved and laboured, rather than secure a more smooth and elegant English version, at the risk of misrepresentation, by a mere paraphrase of the German. "Vielmehr kann ja der Verfasser dass er keiner der Zwölfe war nicht deutlicher ausdrücken als indem er Apoc. 21 14, die namen der 'zwölf Apostel des Lammes,' auf den 12 grundsteinen der mauer des künftigen himmlischen Jerusalems prangend sich denkt. Er meinte also die namen und den glanz dieser Zwölfe nicht genug erheben zu können und gab ihnen im eigenen geiste die höchste äussere ehre welche er ihnen zuweisen konnte. Solche höchste ehre und solchen funkelnden glanz gibt kein irgend verständiger sich selbst, noch weniger beschliesst er sich selbst sie zu geben, oder nimmt gar die ewige verherrlichung welche ihm allein Gott geben kann sich selbst vorweg und rühmt sich ihrer vor den menschen. Und man könnte sich ernstlich einbilden, einer der Zwölfe, ja sogar der welchen wir sonst unter ihnen als den zartesten und feinsten kennen, werde dies von sich selbst geschrieben haben?" Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., v. p. 180 f.; cf. Die Joh. Schr., ii. p. 56 f.

² Apoc. xxi. 12.

provided. For 144,000 of Israel are first sealed, 12,000 of each of the twelve tribes, before the Seer beholds the great multitude of all nations and tribes and peoples.¹ The whole description is a mere allegory of the strongest Jewish dogmatic character, and it is of singular value for the purpose of identifying the author.

Moreover, the apparent glorification of the Twelve is more than justified by the promise which Jesus is represented by the Synoptics² as making to them in person. When Peter, in the name of the Twelve, asks what is reserved for them who have forsaken all and followed him, Jesus replies: "Verily I say unto you that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall be set upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."³ Ewald himself, in his distribution to the supposed original sources of the materials of our existing first Synoptic, assigns this passage to the very oldest Gospel.⁴ What impropriety is there, and what improbability, therefore, that an Apostle in an ecstatic and dogmatic allegory of the spiritual Jerusalem should represent the names of the twelve Apostles as inscribed upon the twelve foundation stones, as the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were inscribed upon the twelve gates of the City? On the contrary, we submit that it is probable under the circumstances that an Apostle should make such a representation, and in view of the facts regarding the Apostle John himself which we have from the Synoptics, it is particularly in harmony with his character, and these characteristics, we shall see, directly tend to establish his identity with the author.

"How much less, therefore, is it credible of the Apostle John," says Ewald, elsewhere, in pursuing the same argument, "who as a writer is so incomparably modest and delicate in feeling, and does not in a single one of his genuine published writings name himself as the author, or at all proclaim his own praise."⁵ This is merely sentimental assumption of facts to which we shall hereafter allude, but if the "incomparable modesty" of which he speaks really existed, nothing could more conclusively separate the author of the fourth Gospel from the son of Zebedee whom we know in the Synoptics, or more support the claims of the Apocalypse. Now, in the first place, we must assert that, in writing a serious history of the life and teaching of Jesus, full of marvellous events and astounding doctrines, the omission of his name by an Apostle can not only not be recognized as genuine modesty, but must be condemned as culpable neglect. It is per-

¹ Apoc., vii. 4-9.

² Matt. xix. 27, 28; Luke xii. 28-30.

⁴ Die drie ersten Evv.

³ Matt. xix. 28.

⁵ Die Joh. Schr., ii. p. 56 f.

fectly incredible that an Apostle could have written such a work without attaching his name as the guarantee of his intimate acquaintance with the events and statements he records. What would be thought of a historian who published a history without a single reference to recognized authorities, and yet who did not declare even his own name as some evidence of his truth? The fact is, that the first two Synoptics bear no author's name because they are not the work of any one man, but the collected materials of many; the third Synoptic only pretends to be a compilation for private use; and the fourth Gospel bears no simple signature because it is neither the work of an Apostle, nor of an eye-witness of the events and hearer of the teaching it records.

If it be considered incredible, however, that an Apostle could, even in an Allegory, represent the names of the Twelve as written on the foundation stones of the New Jerusalem, and the incomparable modesty and delicacy of feeling of the assumed author of the fourth Gospel be contrasted with it so much to the disadvantage of the writer of the Apocalypse, we ask whether this reference to the collective Twelve can be considered at all on a par with the self-glorification of the disguised author of the Gospel, who, not content with the simple indication of himself as John a servant of Jesus Christ, and with sharing distinction equally with the rest of the Twelve, assumes to himself alone a pre-eminence in the favour and affection of his Master, as well as a distinction amongst his fellow disciples, of which we first hear from himself, and which is anything but corroborated by the three Synoptics? The supposed author of the fourth Gospel, it is true, does not plainly mention his name, but he distinguishes himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and represents himself as "leaning on Jesus' breast at supper."¹ This distinction assumed to himself, and this preference over the other disciples in the love of him whom he represents as God, is much greater self-glorification than that of the author of the Apocalypse. We shall presently see how far Ewald is right in saying, moreover, that the author does not clearly indicate the person for whom at least he desires to be mistaken.

We must conclude that these objections have no weight, and that there is no internal evidence whatever against the supposition that the "John" who announces himself as the author of the Apocalypse was the Apostle. On the contrary the tone of authority adopted throughout, and the evident certainty that his identity would everywhere be recognized, denote a position in the Church which no other person of the name of John could possibly have held at the time when the Apocalypse was written.

¹ John xiii. 23; xix. 26, 27; xx. 2 f.; cf. xxi. 20 ff.

The external evidence, therefore, which indicates the Apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse is quite in harmony with the internal testimony of the book itself. We have already pointed out the strong colouring of Judaism in the views of the writer. Its imagery is thoroughly Jewish, and its allegorical representations are entirely based upon Jewish traditions and hopes. The heavenly City is a New Jerusalem; its twelve gates are dedicated to the twelve tribes of Israel; God and the Lamb are the Temple of it; and the sealed of the twelve tribes have the precedence over the nations, and stand with the Lamb on Mount Zion (xiv. 1) having his name and his Father's written on their foreheads. We have already stated that the language in which the book is written is the most Hebraistic Greek of the New Testament, as its contents are the most deeply tinged with Judaism. If, finally, we seek for some traces of the character of the writer, we see in every page the impress of an impetuous fiery spirit, whose symbol is the Eagle, breathing forth vengeance against the enemies of the Messiah, and impatient till it be accomplished, and the whole of the visions of the Apocalypse proceed to the accompaniment of the rolling thunders of God's wrath.

We may now turn to examine such historical data as exist regarding John the son of Zebedee, and to inquire whether they accord better with the character and opinions of the author of the Apocalypse or of the Evangelist. John and his brother James are represented by the Synoptics as being the sons of Zebedee and Salome. They were fishermen on the sea of Galilee, and at the call of Jesus they left their ship and their father and followed him.¹ Their fiery and impetuous character led Jesus to give them the surname of *Βοαρρηγές*: "Sons of thunder,"² an epithet justified by several incidents which are related regarding them. Upon one occasion, John sees one casting out devils in his master's name, and in an intolerant spirit forbids him because he did not follow them, for which he is rebuked by Jesus.³ Another time, when the inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive them, John and James angrily turn to Jesus and say: "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elijah did?"⁴ One remarkable episode will have presented itself already to the mind of every reader, which the second Synoptic Gospel narrates as follows: Mark x. 35, "And James and John the sons of Zebedee come unto him saying unto him: Teacher, we would that thou shouldst do for us whatsoever we shall ask thee. 36. And he said unto them: What would ye

¹ Matt. iv. 21 f.; Mark i. 19 f.; Luke v. 19 ff.

² Mark ix. 38 f.; Luke ix. 49 f.

³ Mark iii. 17.

⁴ Luke ix. 54 ff.

that I should do for you? 37. They said unto him: Grant that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand in thy glory. 38. But Jesus said to them: Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink the cup that I drink? or be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? 39. And they said unto him: We can. And Jesus said unto them: The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: 40. But to sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give, but for whom it is prepared. 41. And when the ten heard it they began to be much displeased with James and John." It is difficult to say whether the egotism and selfishness of the request, or the assurance with which the brethren assert their power to emulate the Master is more striking in this scene. Apparently the grossness of the proceeding already began to be felt when our first Gospel was edited, for it represents the request as made by the mother of James and John; but that is a very slight decrease of the offence, inasmuch as the brethren are obviously consenting, if not inciting parties in the prayer, and utter their "We can," with the same absence of "incomparable modesty."¹ After the death of Jesus, John remained in Jerusalem,² and chiefly confined his ministry to the city and its neighbourhood.³ The account which Hegesippus gives of James the brother of Jesus, who was appointed overseer of the Church in Jerusalem, will not be forgotten,⁴ and we refer to it merely in illustration of primitive Christianity. However mythical elements are worked up into the narrative, one point is undoubted fact, that the Christians of that community were but a sect of Judaism, merely superadding to Mosaic doctrines belief in the actual advent of the Messiah whom Moses and the prophets had foretold; and we find, in the Acts of the Apostles, Peter and John represented as "going up into the Temple at the hour of prayer,"⁵ like other Jews. In the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, we have most valuable evidence with regard to the Apostle John. Paul found him still in Jerusalem on the occasion of the visit referred to in that letter, about A.D. 50—53. We need not quote at length the important passage Gal. ii. 1 ff., but the fact is undeniable, and stands upon stronger evidence than almost any other particular regarding the early Church, being distinctly and directly stated by Paul himself: that the three "pillar" Apostles representing the Church there were James, Peter, and John. Peter is markedly termed the Apostle of the circumcision, and the differences between him and Paul are evidence of the opposition of their views.

¹ Matt. xx. 20 ff.

² Acts viii. 25; xv. 1 ff.

³ Acts iii. 1 f.

⁴ Acts i. 13; iii. 1.

⁵ Eusebius, H. E., ii. 23; cf. p. 347 f.

James and John are clearly represented as sharing the views of Peter, and whilst Paul finally agrees with them that he is to go to the Gentiles, the three *στέλοι* elect to continue their ministry to the circumcision.¹ Here is John, therefore, clearly devoted to the Apostleship of the circumcision as opposed to Paul, whose views, we may gather from the whole of Paul's account, were little more than tolerated by the *στέλοι*. Before leaving New Testament data we may here point out the statement in the Acts of the Apostles that Peter and John were known to be "unlettered and ignorant men"² (*ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται*). Later tradition mentions one or two circumstances regarding John to which we may briefly refer. Irenæus states: "There are those who heard him (Polycarp) say that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed forth from the bath-house without bathing, but crying out: 'Let us fly lest the bath-house fall down: Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, being within it.' . . . So great was the care which the Apostles and their disciples took not to hold even verbal intercourse with any of the corrupters of the truth,"³ &c. Polycrates, who was Bishop of Ephesus about the beginning of the third century, also states that the Apostle John wore the mitre and petalon of the high priest (*ὡς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκώς*),⁴ a tradition which agrees with the Jewish tendencies of the Apostle of the circumcision as Paul describes him.⁵

Now if we compare these data regarding John the son of Zebedee with the character of John the author of the Apocalypse as we trace it in the work itself, it is impossible not to be struck by the singular agreement. The barbarous Hebraistic Greek and abrupt inelegant diction are natural to the unlettered fisherman of Galilee, and the fierce and intolerant spirit which pervades the book is precisely that which formerly forbade the working of miracles even in the name of the Master by any not of the immediate circle of Jesus, and which desired to consume an inhospitable village with fire from heaven.⁶ The Judaistic form of Chris-

¹ Gal. ii. 8-9.

² Acts iv. 13.

³ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 14.

⁴ Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 31.

⁵ We need not refer to any of the other legends regarding John, but it may be well to mention the tradition common amongst the Fathers which assigned to him the cognomen of "the Virgin." One Codex gives as the superscription of the Apocalypse: "*τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδοξοτατοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ πατρὸς ἡμετέρων ἁγιοτάτου ἐπιστολίου Ἰωάννου θεολόγου*," and we know that it is reported in early writings that, of all the Apostles, only John and the Apostle Paul remained unmarried, whence probably, in part, this title. In connection with this we may point to the importance attached to virginity in the Apocalypse, xiv. 4; cf. Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii. p. 254; Lücke, *Comm. ub. d. Br. Joh.*, 1836, p. 32f.; Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 21.

⁶ The very objection of Ewald regarding the glorification of the Twelve, if true,

tianity which is represented throughout the Apocalypse, and the Jewish elements which enter so largely into its whole composition, are precisely those which we might expect from John the Apostle of the circumcision and the associate of James and of Peter in the very centre of Judaism, as we find him described by Paul. Parts of the Apocalypse, indeed, derive a new significance when we remember the opposition which the Apostle of the Gentiles met with from the Apostles of the circumcision, as plainly declared by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians ii. 1 ff., and apparent in other parts of his writings.

We have already seen the scarcely disguised attack which is made on Paul in the Clementine Homilies under the name of Simon the Magician, the Apostle Peter following him from city to city for the purpose of denouncing and refuting his teaching. There can be no doubt that the animosity against Paul which was felt by the Ebionitic party, to which John as well as Peter belonged, was extreme, and when the novelty of the doctrine of justification by faith alone taught by him, is considered, it is very comprehensible. In the Apocalypse, we find undeniable traces of it which accord with what Paul himself says, and with the undoubted tradition of the early Church. Not only is Paul silently excluded from the number of the Apostles, which might be intelligible when the typical nature of the number twelve is considered, but allusion is undoubtedly made to him, in the Epistles to the Churches. It is clear that Paul is referred to in the address to the Church of Ephesus: "And thou didst try them which say that they are Apostles and are not, and didst find them false;"¹ and also in the words to the Church of Smyrna: "But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the sons of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols,"² &c., as well as elsewhere.³ Without dwelling on this point, however, we think it must be apparent to every unprejudiced person that the Apocalypse singularly corresponds in every respect—language, construction, and thought—with what we are told of the character of the Apostle John by the Synoptic Gospels and by tradition, and that the internal evidence, therefore, accords with the external, in attributing the composition of the

would be singularly in keeping with the audacious request of John and his brother, to sit on the right and left hand of the glorified Jesus, for we find none of the "incomparable modesty" which the imaginative critic attributes to the author of the fourth Gospel in the John of the Synoptics.

¹ Apoc. ii. 2.

² *Ib.*, ii. 14, cf. 9, 20 f., iii. 9.

³ Baur, *Geesch. christl. Kirche*, i. p. 80 ff.; Volkmar, *Comm. z. Offenb. Johannis*, 1862, p. 26 ff., p. 80 ff.; Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 160, aum. 2; Hilgenfeld, *Hist. krit. Einl. N. T.*, 1875, p. 413 ff.

Apocalypse to that Apostle.¹ We may without hesitation affirm, at least, that with the exception of one or two of the Epistles of Paul there is no work of the New Testament which is supported by such close evidence.

We need not discuss the tradition as to the residence of the Apostle John in Asia Minor, regarding which much might be said. Those who accept the authenticity of the Apocalypse of

¹ *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., pp. 345 ff., 376 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1844, p. 661 ff.; *Bertholdt*, Einl. A. u. N. T., iv. p. 1800-1875; *A. C. Danemann*, Wer ist der Verfasser der Offenb. Johannis? 1841; *Ehhard*, Das. Ev. Johannis, p. 137 ff.; *Die evang. Gesch.*, p. 847 ff.; *Richhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 375 ff.; *Erasmus*, Dissertatio, &c., 1792; *Feilmoser*, Einl. N. T., p. 569 ff.; *Guericke*, Gesamtgesch., p. 498 ff.; *Beiträge*, p. 181 ff.; *Hase*, Die Tab. Schule, p. 25 ff.; *Haendel*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 220 ff.; *Hartwig*, Apol. d. Apoc., u. s. w., 1780; *Hilgenfeldt*, Lucubr. crit. ad. Apoc. spectantur, 1842; *Heugstenberg*, Die Offenb. d. heil. Johannis, 1849; *Hilgenfeldt*, Die Evangelien, p. 338; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1868, p. 203, ann. 1; *Hist. krit. Einl. N. T.*, 1875, p. 413 ff.; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 426 ff.; *Kleuker*, Urspr. u. Zweck Offenb. Joh., 1799; *M. A. Knittel*, Beitrag z. Krit. Joh. Offenb., 1773; *Kollhof*, Apoc. Joanni apost. vindicata, 1834; *J. P. Lange*, in *Tholuck's Lit. Anzeiger*, 1838, No. 20 ff.; *Vermischt. Schr.*, ii. p. 173 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 197 ff.; *Lüderwald*, Beirh. u. Erkl. Offenb. Johannis, 1788; *Niemeyer*, Verhandel. over Echth. Joh. Schr., 1852; *Olshausen*, Echtheit. d. v. kan. Evv., 1832; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiim^e ed., p. lxxi. f.; *L'Autochrist*, 1873, p. xxii. ff., p. 340 ff.; *Reithmayer*, Einl. N. T., p. 774 ff.; *Reville* (donbtful), Rev. des Deux Mondes, Octr. 1863, p. 633; *Rippenbach*, Die Zengn. Evang. Joh., p. 30 ff.; *Schulten*, Das Evang. Joh., p. 399 ff.; *Schwab*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 249 ff.; *Schnitzer*, Theol. Jahrb., 1842, p. 451 ff.; *Storr*, N. Apol. d. Offenb. Joh., 1783; *Zweck d. evang. Gesch. u. Br. Joh.*, 1786, pp. 70 ff., 83, 163; *C. F. Schmidt*, Unters. Offenb. Joh., 1771; *Thiersch*, Die Kirehe im. ap. Zeit., p. 245 f.; *Tholuck*, Glaubw. evang. Gesch., p. 280 ff.; *Volkmeier*, Comment. Offenb. Joh., 1862, p. 38 ff.; *Zeller*, Theol. Jahrb., 1842, p. 654 ff., &c., &c. Cf. *Weisse*, Die evang. Gesch., i. p. 98, ann. 3.

Although many of those who assign the Apocalypse to the Apostle John are apologists who likewise assert that he wrote the Gospel, very many accept the authenticity of the Apocalypse as opposed to that of the Gospel in the dilemma which we have stated. On the other hand not a few of those who reject the Apocalypse equally reject the Gospel, and consider that neither the one nor the other is apostolic.

We do not of course pretend to give a complete list of those who assert or deny the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, but merely refer to those whom we have noted down. The following deny the apostolic authorship: *Bleek*, Beiträge, p. 190-200; *Bullenstedt*, Philo u. Johannes, u. s. w., 1812; *Greischwider*, Probabilia, p. 150 ff.; *Crelner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 732 ff.; *Corradi*, Versuch Reuecht. d. Gesch. Bibelkanons, 1792, ii. p. 303 ff.; *Cludius*, Uransichten d. Christenth. Alt., 1808, p. 312 ff.; *Diesterdieck*, Hl. sch. Offenb. Joh., 1859; *Eberl*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., v. 1852-53, p. 179 ff.; *Comment. in Apoc. Joh.*, 1829, prolég. § 8; *Die Joh. Schr.*, ii. p. 55 ff.; *Gesch. v. I. r.*, vi. p. 694, vii. p. 227; *Mitziy*, Ueber Johan. Marcus u. s. Scriften; *Kayser* (donbtful), Rev. de Théol., 1856, xiii. p. 85; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 159 f.; *Lücke*, Einl. Offenb. Joh., ii. pp. 491 ff., 802; *Th. Studien u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 654 ff.; *Luther*, Pref. in Apoc., 1552; *Lützberger*, Die kirehl. Trad. ap. Joh., 1840, pp. 198 f., 210 ff.; cf. *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1573 ff.; *Neander*, Gesch. Pflanz. u. s. w. Chr. Kirehe, 1862, p. 481 f.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 757 ff.; *Semler*, Neue Unters. über Apoc., 1776; *Abhandl. Unters. d. Kanons*, i. Anhang; *Stroth*, Freimüthige Unters. Offenb. Joh. betreffend, 1771; *Schott*, Zogoge, §§ 114 ff., p. 473 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 470 f.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. evang. Gesch., pp. 295, 235 ff. Cf. *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 422 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 151 f.

course admit its composition in the neighbourhood of Ephesus,¹ and see in this the confirmation of the wide-spread tradition that the Apostle spent a considerable period of the latter part of his life in that city. We may merely mention, in passing, that a historical basis for the tradition has occasionally been disputed, and has latterly again been denied by some able critics.² The evidence for this as for everything else connected with the early ages of Christianity is extremely unsatisfactory. Nor need we trouble ourselves with the dispute as to the Presbyter John, to whom many ascribe the composition, on the one hand, of the Apocalypse, and, on the other, of the Gospel, according as they finally accept the one or the other alternative of the critical dilemma which we have explained. We have only to do with the Apostle John and his connection with either of the two writings.

If we proceed to compare the character of the Apostle John, as we have it depicted in the Synoptics and other writings to which we have referred, with that of the author of the fourth Gospel, and to contrast the peculiarities of both, we have a very different result. Instead of the Hebraistic Greek and harsh diction which might be expected from the unlettered and ignorant fisherman of Galilee, we find, in the fourth Gospel, the purest and least Hebraistic Greek of any of the Gospels (some parts of the third Synoptic, perhaps, alone excepted), and a refinement and beauty of composition whose charm has captivated the world, and in too many cases overpowered the calm exercise of judgment. Instead of the fierce and intolerant temper of the Son of thunder, we find a spirit breathing forth nothing but gentleness and love. Instead of the Judaistic Christianity of the Apostle of Circumcision, who merely tolerates Paul, we find a mind which has so completely detached itself from Judaism that the writer makes the very appellation of "Jew" equivalent to that of an enemy of the truth. Not only are the customs and feasts of the Jews disregarded and spoken of as observances of a people with whom the writer has no concern, but he anticipates the day when neither on Mount Gerizim nor yet at Jerusalem men shall worship the Father, but when it shall be recognized that the only true worship is that which is offered in spirit and in truth. Faith in Jesus Christ and the merits of his death is the only way by which man can attain to eternal life, and the Mosaic Law is practically abolished. We venture to assert that, taking the portrait of John the son of Zebedee, which is drawn in the Synoptics and the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, supplemented by later tradition, to which we

¹ Apoc. i. 9.

² Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 162 ff.; Scholten, *De Apostel Johannes in Klein-Azië*, 1871.

have referred, and comparing it with that of the writer of the fourth Gospel, no unprejudiced mind can fail to recognize that there are not two features alike.

It is the misfortune of this case, that the beauty of the Gospel under trial has too frequently influenced the decision of the judges, and men who have, in other matters, exhibited sound critical judgment, in this abandon themselves to sheer sentimentality, and indulge in rhapsodies when reasons would be more appropriate. Bearing in mind that we have given the whole of the data regarding John the son of Zebedee, furnished by New Testament writings,—excluding merely the fourth Gospel itself, which, of course, cannot at present be received in evidence,—as well as the only traditional information which, from its date and character, possesses the smallest value, it will become apparent that every argument which proceeds on the assumption that John was the beloved disciple and possessed of characteristics quite different from what we meet with in the writings to which we have referred, is worthless and a mere *petitio principii*. We can, therefore, appreciate the state of the case when, for instance, we find an able man like Credner commencing his inquiry as to who was the author of the fourth Gospel with such words as the following: "Were we entirely without historical data regarding the author of the fourth Gospel, who is not named in the writing itself, we should still from internal grounds lying in the Gospel itself—from the nature of the language, from the freshness and perspicacity of the narrative, from the exactness and precision of the statements, from the peculiar manner of the mention of the Baptist and of the sons of Zebedee, from the love and fervour rising to ecstasy which the writer manifests towards Jesus, from the irresistible charm which is poured out over the whole ideally-composed evangelical history, from the philosophical considerations with which the Gospel begins—be led to the result: that the author of such a Gospel can only be a native of Palestine, can only be a direct eye-witness, can only be an Apostle, can only be a favourite of Jesus, can only be that John whom Jesus held captivated to himself by the whole heavenly spell of his teaching, that John who rested on the bosom of Jesus, stood beneath his cross, and whose later residence in a city like Ephesus proves that philosophical speculation not merely attracted him, but that he also knew how to maintain his place amongst philosophically cultivated Greeks."¹ It is almost impossible to proceed further in building up theory upon baseless assumption; but we shall hereafter see that he is kept in countenance by Ewald, who outstrips

¹ Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 208.

him in the boldness and minuteness of his conjectures. We must now more carefully examine the details of the case.

The language in which the Gospel is written, as we have already mentioned, is much less Hebraic than that of the other Gospels, with the exception, perhaps, of parts of the Gospel according to Luke, and its Hebraisms are not on the whole greater than was almost invariably the case with Hellenistic Greek, but its composition is distinguished by peculiar smoothness, grace, and beauty, and in this respect it is assigned the first rank amongst the Gospels. It may be remarked that the connection which Credner finds between the language and the Apostle John arises out of the supposition, that long residence in Ephesus had enabled him to acquire that facility of composition in the Greek language which is one of its characteristics. Ewald, who exaggerates the Hebraism of the work, resorts nevertheless to the conjecture, which we shall hereafter more fully consider, that the Gospel was written from dictation by young friends of John in Ephesus, who put the aged Apostle's thoughts in many places into purer Greek as they wrote them down.¹ The arbitrary nature of such an explanation, adopted in one shape or another by many apologists, requires no remark, but we shall at every turn meet with similar assumptions advanced to overcome difficulties. Now, although there is no certain information as to the time when, if ever, the Apostle removed into Asia Minor, it is pretty certain that he did not leave Palestine before A.D. 60.² We find him still at Jerusalem about A.D. 50—53, when Paul went thither, and he had not at that time any intention of leaving, but, on the contrary, his dedication of himself to the ministry of the circumcision is distinctly mentioned by the Apostle.³ The "unlettered and ignorant" fisherman of Galilee, therefore, had obviously attained an age when habits of thought and expression have become fixed, and when a new language cannot without great difficulty be acquired. If we consider the Apocalypse to be his work, we find positive evidence of such markedly different thought and language actually existing when the Apostle must have been at least between sixty and seventy years of age, that it is quite impossible to conceive that he could have subsequently acquired the language and mental characteristics of the fourth Gospel.⁴ It would be perfectly absurd, so far as language goes, to find in the fourth Gospel the slightest indication of the Apostle John, of whose lan-

¹ Die Joh. Schr., i. p. 50 f.

² It is certain that John did not remove to Asia Minor during Paul's time. There is no trace of his being there in the Pauline Epistles. Cf. *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 221.

³ Gal. ii. 9.

⁴ *Ewald*, Die Joh. Schr., ii. p. 62 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 340 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 159; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 419, ann. d.

guage indeed we have no information whatever, except from the Apocalypse, a composition which, if accepted as written by the Apostle, would at once exclude all consideration of the Gospel as his work.

There are many circumstances, however, which seem clearly to indicate that the author of the fourth Gospel was neither a native of Palestine nor a Jew, and to some of these we must briefly refer. The philosophical statements with which the Gospel commences, it will be admitted, are anything but characteristic of the Son of thunder, the ignorant and unlearned fisherman of Galilee who, to a comparatively advanced period of life, continued preaching in his native country to his brethren of the circumcision. Attempts have been made to trace the *Logos* doctrine of the fourth Gospel to the purely Hebraic source of the Old Testament, but every impartial mind must perceive that here there is no direct and simple transformation of the theory of Wisdom of the Proverbs and Old Testament Apocrypha, and no mere development of the later *Memra* of the Targums, but a very advanced application to Christianity of Alexandrian philosophy, with which we have become familiar through the writings of Philo, to which reference has so frequently been made. It is quite true that a decided step beyond the doctrine of Philo is made when the *Logos* is represented as *σὰπξ ἐγένετο* in the person of Jesus, but this argument is equally applicable to the Jewish doctrine of Wisdom, and that step had already been taken before the composition of the Gospel. In the Alexandrian philosophy everything was prepared for the final application of the doctrine, and nothing is more clear than the fact that the writer of the fourth Gospel was well acquainted with the teaching of the Alexandrian school, from which he derived his philosophy, and its elaborate and systematic application to Jesus alone indicates a late development of Christian doctrine, which we maintain could not have been attained by the Judaistic son of Zebedee.¹

We have already on several occasions referred to the attitude which the writer of the fourth Gospel assumes towards the Jews. Apart from the fact that he places Christianity generally in strong antagonism to Judaism, as light to darkness, truth to a lie, and presents the doctrine of a hypostatic Trinity in the most developed form to be found in the New Testament, in striking contrast to the three Synoptics, and in contradiction to Hebrew Monotheism, he writes at all times as one who not only is not a Jew himself, but has nothing to do with their laws and customs. He speaks everywhere of the feasts "of the Jews," "the passover

¹ Most critics agree that the characteristics of the fourth Gospel render the supposition that it was the work of an old man untenable.

of the Jews," "the manner of the purifying of the Jews," "the Jews' feast of tabernacles," "as the manner of the Jews is to bury," "the Jews' preparation day," and so on.¹ The Law of Moses is spoken of as "your law," "their law," as of a people with which the writer was not connected.² Moreover, the Jews are represented as continually in virulent opposition to Jesus, and seeking to kill him; and the word "Jew" is the unfailing indication of the enemies of the truth, and the persecutors of the Christ.³ The Jews are not once spoken of as the favoured people of God, but they are denounced as "children of the devil," who is "the father of lies and a murderer from the beginning."⁴ The author shows in a marked way that he was not a Jew, by making Caiaphas, and the chief priests and Pharisees speak of the Jewish nation and the people now as *ὁ λαός*, like the Synoptics and other New Testament writings,⁵ but as *τὸ ἔθνος*, the term always employed by the Jews to designate the Gentiles.⁶ A single instance of the distinctive use of these words may be given. Luke ii. 32: "A light to lighten the Gentiles (*ἔθνος*), and the glory of thy people (*λαός*) Israel."⁷ We need scarcely point out that the Jesus of the fourth Gospel is no longer of the race of David, but the Son of God. The expectation of the Jews that the Messiah should be of the seed of David is entirely set aside, and the genealogies of the first and third Synoptics tracing his descent are not only ignored, but the whole idea absolutely excluded.

Throughout the fourth Gospel a number of mistakes of various kinds occur which clearly point to the fact that the author was neither a Palestinian nor a Jew at all. For instance, the writer calls Annas the high priest, although at the same time Caiaphas is represented as also holding that office.⁸ The expression which

¹ John ii. 6, 13; v. 1; vi. 4; vii. 2; xix. 40, 42, &c., &c.

² *Ib.*, viii. 17; x. 34; xv. 25, &c., &c.

³ *Ib.*, v. 16, 18; vii. 23, 29; viii. 40, 59; ix. 22, 28; xviii. 31 ff.; xix. 12 ff.

⁴ John viii. 44.

⁵ Matt. i. 21; ii. 6; iv. 6; viii. 15; xv. 8; xxi. 23, &c., &c. Mark vii. 6; xi. 32; xiv. 2, &c. Luke i. 10, 17, 21, 68, 77; ii. 10; iii. 15; vi. 17; vii. 16; xviii. 43, &c., &c.

⁶ John xi. 48, 50, 51, 52; cf. xviii. 35. The word *λαός* is only twice used in the fourth Gospel, once in xi. 50, where *ἔθνος* occurs in the same verse, and again in xviii. 14, where the same words of Caiaphas, xi. 50, are quoted. It is found in viii. 2, but that episode does not belong to the fourth Gospel, but is taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

⁷ Cf. Matt. i. 15; vi. 32; x. 5; Mark x. 42; xii. 10; Luke xxi. 10, 24, 25, &c., &c.; Rom. ii. 14; iii. 29; ix. 24; Gal. ii. 2, 8, 9, 12, &c., &c. Ewald himself points out that the saying of Caiaphas is the purest Greek, and this is another proof that it could not proceed from the son of Zebedee. It could still less be, as it stands, an original speech in Greek of the high priest to the Jewish Council, a point which does not require remark. Cf. Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 325, ann. 1.

⁸ John xi. 49, 51; xviii. 13, 16, 19, 22, 24.

he uses is: "Caiaphas being the high priest that year" (*ἀρχιεὺς ὃν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκεῖνου*). This statement, made more than once, would indicate the belief that the office was merely annual, which is erroneous. Josephus states with regard to Caiaphas, that he was high priest for ten years from A.D. 25—36.¹ Ewald and others argue that the expression "that year" refers to the year in which the death of Jesus, so memorable to the writer, took place, and that it does not exclude the possibility of his having been high priest for successive years also.² This explanation, however, is quite arbitrary and insufficient, and this is shown by the additional error in representing Annas as also high priest at the same time. The Synoptics know nothing of the preliminary examination before Annas, and the reason given by the writer of the fourth Gospel why the soldiers first took Jesus to Annas: "for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, who was high priest that same year,"³ is inadmissible. The assertion is a clear mistake, and it probably originated in a stranger, writing of facts and institutions with which he was not well acquainted, being misled by an error equally committed by the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles. In Luke iii. 2, the word of God is said to come to John the Baptist: in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas" (*ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα*), and again, in Acts iv. 6, Annas is spoken of as the high priest when Peter and John healed the lame man at the gate of the Temple which was called "Beautiful," and Caiaphas is mentioned immediately after: "and Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest." Such statements, erroneous in themselves and not understood by the author of the fourth Gospel, may have led to the confusion in the narrative. Annas had previously been high priest, as we know from Josephus,⁴ but nothing is more certain than the fact that the title was not continued after the office was resigned; and Ishmael, Eleazar, and Simon, who succeeded Annas and separated his term of office from that of Caiaphas, did not subsequently bear the title. The narrative is a mistake, and such an error could not have been committed by a native of Palestine,⁵ and much less by an acquaintance of the high priest.⁶

¹ Antiq. xviii. 2, § 2; 4, § 3; cf. Matt. xxvi. 3, 57.

² Die Joh. Schr., i. p. 326, anm. 1; Lücke, Comment. Ev. Joh., ii. p. 484.

³ John xviii. 13.

⁴ Antiq., xviii. 2, § 1.

⁵ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 332 f.; Scholten, Das Ev. 'Johannes, p. 300 ff.; Bretschneider, Probabilia, p. 93 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 429 f.; Nicolas, Et. sur la Bible, N. T., p. 198 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, d. 297, anm. 1; Keim, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. p. 321 ff.; Volkmar, Die Evangelien, p. 586 f.; Schenkel, Das Charakt. Jesu, p. 355.

⁶ John xviii. 15.

The author says, in relating the case of restoration of sight to a blind man, that Jesus desired him: (ix. 7) "Go wash in the pool of Siloam," and adds: "which is by interpretation: Sent." This is a distinct error arising out of ignorance of the real signification of the name of the Pool, which means a spring, a fountain, a flow of water. The writer evidently wishes to give a prophetic character to the name, and thus increase the importance of the miracle. The explanation is a mere conceit in any case, and a foreigner with a slight knowledge of the language is misled by the superficial analogy of sound.¹ Lucke refuses to be persuaded that the parenthesis is by John at all, and evades the difficulty by conjecturing that it is a gloss of some ancient allegorical interpreter.²

There are also several geographical errors committed which denote a foreigner. In i. 28, the writer speaks of a "Bethany beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." The substitution of "Bethabara," mentioned by Origen, which has erroneously crept into the vulgar text, is of course repudiated by all critics, "Bethany" standing in all the older codices. The alteration was evidently proposed to obviate the difficulty that there did not exist any Bethany beyond Jordan in Peræa. The place could not be the Bethany near Jerusalem, and it is scarcely possible that there could have been a second village of the name; no trace of it existed even in Origen's time, and it is utterly unknown now.³ Again, in iii. 23, the writer says that "John was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there." This Ænon near to Salim was in Judæa, as is clearly stated in the previous verse. The place, however, was quite unknown even in the third century, and the nearest locality which could be indicated as possible was in the north of Samaria, and, therefore, differing from the statements in iii. 22, iv. 3. Ænon, however, signifies "Springs," and the question arises whether the writer of the fourth Gospel, not knowing the real meaning of the word, did not simply mistake it for the name of a place.⁴ In any case it is a geographical error into which the author of the fourth Gospel, had he been the Apostle John, could not have fallen.⁵ The account of the miracle of the pool of Bethesda is a remarkable one

¹ Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 93; *Davidson*, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 428.

² *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, ii. p. 381.

³ Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 95 f.; *Baur*, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 331; *Davidson*, *Introd. N. T.*, ii. p. 427; *Schenkel*, *Das Charakt. Jesu*, p. 354; cf. *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, p. 62, *anm. 1*; *Lücke*, *Comm. Ev. Joh.*, i. p. 391 ff.; *Bleek*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 210 f.; *Beiträge*, p. 256 f.

⁴ *Scholten*, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 409 f.

⁵ *Scholten*, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 409 f.; *Bretschneider*, *Probabilia*, p. 96 f.; *Nicolas*, *Et. sur la Bible*, N. T., p. 199 f.; *Schenkel*, *Das Charakt. Jesu*, p. 355; cf. *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 262, *anm. 2*; *Lücke*, *Comm. Ev. Joh.*, i. p. 553 ff.

for many reasons. The words which most pointedly relate the miraculous phenomena characterizing the pool do not appear in the oldest MSS., and are consequently rejected. In the following extract we put them in italics: v. 8.—“*In these (five porches) lay a multitude of the sick, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water.* 4. *For an angel went down at certain seasons into the pool and troubled the water: he, therefore, who first went in after the troubling of the water was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.*” We must believe, however, that this passage did originally belong to the text, and has, from an early period, been omitted from MSS. on account of the difficulty it presents; and one of the reasons which points to this is the fact that verse 7 which is not questioned and has the authority of all codices, absolutely implies the existence of the previous words, without which it has no sense. Now, not only is the pool of Bethesda totally unknown at the present day, but although possessed of such miraculous properties, it was unknown even to Josephus, or any other writer of that time. It is impossible, were the narrative genuine, that the phenomena could have been unknown and unmentioned by the Jewish historian,¹ and there is here evidently neither the narrative of an Apostle nor of an eye-witness.

Another very significant mistake occurs in the account of the conversation with the Samaritan woman, which is said to have taken place (iv. 5) near “a city of Samaria which is called Sychar.” It is evident that there was no such place—and apologetic ingenuity is severely taxed to explain the difficulty. The common conjecture has been that the town of Sichem is intended, but this is rightly rejected by Delitzsch,² and Ewald.³ Credner, not unsupported by others, and borne out in particular by the theory of Ewald, conjectures that Sychar is a corruption of Sichem, introduced into the Gospel by a Greek secretary to whom this part of the Gospel was dictated, and who mistook the Apostle’s pronunciation of the final syllable. We constantly meet with this elastic explanation of difficulties in the Gospel, but its mere enunciation displays at once the reality of the difficulties and the imaginary nature of the explanation. Hengstenberg adopts the view, and presses it with pious earnestness, that the term is a mere nickname for the city of Sichem, and that, by so slight a change in the pronunciation, the Apostle called the place a city of Lies (רָקִיָּה, a lie), a play upon words which he does not consider

¹ Cf. Lücke, Comm. Ev. Joh., ii. p. 16 ff.; Ewald, Die Joh. Schr., i. p. 200 ff.

² Talmudische Stud. Zeitschr. gesamt. luth. Theol. u. Kirche, 1856, p. 240 ff.

³ Die Joh. Schr., i. p. 181, anm. 1; Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 348, anm. 1; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., viii. p. 255 f.

⁴ Einl. N. T., i. p. 264.

unworthy.¹ The only support which this latter theory can secure from internal evidence is to be derived from the fact that the whole discourse with the woman is ideal. Hengstenberg² conjectures that the five husbands of the woman are typical of the Gods of the five nations with which the king of Assyria peopled Samaria, II. Kings, xvii. 24—41, and which they worshipped instead of the God of Israel, and as the actual God of the Samaritans was not recognized as the true God by the Jews, nor their worship of him on Mount Gerizim held to be valid, he, therefore, considers that under the name of the city of Sychar, their whole religion, past and present, was denounced as a lie. There can be little doubt that the episode is allegorical, but such a defence of the geographical error, the reality of which is everywhere felt, whilst it is quite insufficient on the one hand, effectually destroys the historical character of the Gospel on the other.³ The inferences from all of the foregoing examples are strengthened by the fact that, in the quotations from the Old Testament, the fourth Gospel in the main follows the Septuagint version, or shows its influence, and nowhere can be shown directly to translate from the Hebrew.

These instances might be multiplied, but we must proceed to examine more closely the indications given in the Gospel itself as to the identity of its author. We need not point out that the writer nowhere clearly states who he is, nor mentions his name, but expressions are frequently used which evidently show the desire that a particular person should be understood. He generally calls himself "the other disciple," or "the disciple whom Jesus loved."⁴ It is universally admitted that he represents himself as having previously been a disciple of John the Baptist (i. 35 ff.),⁵ and also that he is "the other disciple" who was ac-

¹ Das Ev. des heil. Joh., 1867, i. p. 244.

² *Ib.*, i. p. 262 f.

³ For orthodox theories regarding Sychar, in addition to the works already indicated, readers may be referred to the following:—*Lightfoot*, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm.*, p. 938, Works, ed. Pitman, x. p. 339 f.; *Wieseler*, *Chron. Synops. d. vier Evv.*, p. 256, anm. 1; *Olshausen*, *Bibl. Comm.*, Das Ev. n. Johann., umgearb. Ebrard, ii. 1, p. 122 f.; *De Wette*, *Kurzgef. ex. H'buch N. T.*, i. 3, p. 84; *Hug*, *Einkl. N. T.*, ii. p. 194 f.; *Bunsen*, *Bibelwerk*, iv. p. 219; *Riggenbach*, *Die Zeugnisse*, u. s. w., p. 21; *Godet*, *Com. sur l'Ev. de St. Jean*, p. 475 f.; *Bleek*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 211; *Lange*, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 107; *Meyer*, *Comm. Ev. n. Johan.*, p. 188 f.; *Lücke*, *Comm. Ev. des Joh.*, i. p. 577 f.; *Sandoy*, *Authorship, &c.*, of Fourth Gospel, 1872, p. 92, p. 93, note 1; *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, i. p. 206, note 1; *Neubauer*, *La Géographie du Talmud*, p. 170; *Smith*, *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. p. 1395 f.

⁴ John i. 35 ff.; xiii. 23; xix. 26, 35; xx. 2.

⁵ *Credner*, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 209; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 323; *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 141 f.; *De Wette*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 220; *Thiersch*, *Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 265 f.; *Michaelis*, *Einkl. N. T.*, ii. p. 1127; *Schotten*, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 378; *Lücke*, *Comm. Ev. Joh.*, i. p. 443 f.; *Hengstenberg*, *Das Ev. d. heil. Joh.*, i. p. 106 f.

quainted with the high priest (xviii. 15, 16),¹ if not an actual relative as Ewald and others assert.² The assumption that the disciple thus indicated is John, rests principally on the fact that whilst the author mentions the other Apostles, he seems studiously to avoid directly naming John, and also that he never once distinguishes John the Baptist by the appellation *ὁ βαπτιστής*, whilst he carefully distinguishes the two disciples of the name of Judas, and always speaks of the Apostle Peter as "Simon Peter," or "Peter," but rarely as "Simon" only.³ Without pausing to consider the slightness of this evidence, it is obvious that, supposing the disciple indicated to be John the son of Zebedee, the fourth Gospel gives a representation of him quite different from the Synoptics and other writings. In the fourth Gospel (i. 35 ff.) the calling of the Apostle is described in a peculiar manner. John (the Baptist) is standing with two of his disciples, and points out Jesus to them as "the Lamb of God," whereupon the two disciples follow Jesus, and finding out where he lives, abide with him that day, and subsequently attach themselves to his person. In verse 40 it is stated: "One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother." We are left to imagine who was the other, and the answer of critics is: John. Now, the "calling" of John is related in a totally different manner in the Synoptics—Jesus walking by the Sea of Galilee, sees "two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew, his brother, casting a net into the sea, for they were fishers, and he saith unto them: Follow me and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets and followed him. And when he had gone on from thence, he saw other two brethren, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the ship with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they immediately left their ship and their father and followed him."⁴ These accounts are in complete contradiction to each other, and both cannot be true. We see from the first introduction of "the other disciple" on the scene in the fourth Gospel the evident design to give him the precedence before Peter and the rest of the Apostles. We have above given the account of the first two Synoptics of the calling of Peter. He is the first of the disciples who is selected, and he is directly invited by

¹ Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 400; Lücke, *Comm. Ev. Joh.*, ii. p. 703 f.; Hengstenberg, *Das Ev. heil. Joh.*, iii. p. 196 f.; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 151 f.

² Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 400; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 151; Ewald, considers the relationship to have been on the mother's side. Hengstenberg contradicts that strange assumption, *Das Ev. heil. Joh.*, iii. p. 196.

³ Credner, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 209 f.; De Wette, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 230; Bleek, *Beiträge*, p. 178; *Einl. N. T.*, p. 150 f.; Ebrard, *Die Evang. Gesch.*, p. 835.

⁴ Matt. iv. 18—22; Mark i. 16—20.

Jesus to follow him and become, with his brother Andrew, "fishers of men." James and John are not called till later in the day, and without the record of any special address. In the third Gospel the calling of Peter is introduced with still more important details. Jesus enters the boat of Simon and bids him push out into the Lake and let down his net, and the miraculous draught of fishes is taken: "When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying: Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of fishes which they had taken." The calling of the sons of Zebedee becomes even less important here, for the account simply continues: "And so was also James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon." Jesus then addresses his invitation to Simon, and the account concludes: "And when they had brought their boats to land, they forsook all, and followed him."¹ In the fourth Gospel the calling of the two disciples of John is first narrated, as we have seen, and the first call of Peter is from his brother Andrew, and not from Jesus himself. "He (Andrew) first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him: We have found the Messiah (which is, being interpreted, Christ), and he brought him to Jesus. Jesus looked on him and said: Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas;² thou shalt be called Cephas (which is by interpretation, Peter)."³ This explanation of the manner in which the cognomen Peter is given, we need not point out, is likewise contradictory to the Synoptics, and betrays the same purpose of suppressing the prominence of Peter.

The fourth Gospel states that "the other disciple," who is declared to be John, the author of the Gospel, was known to the high priest, another trait amongst many others elevating him above the son of Zebedee as he is depicted elsewhere in the New Testament. The account which the fourth Gospel gives of the trial of Jesus is in very many important particulars at variance with that of the Synoptics. We need only mention here the point that the latter know nothing of the preliminary examination by Annas. We shall not discuss the question as to where the denial of Peter is represented as taking place in the fourth Gospel, but may merely say that no other disciple but Peter is mentioned in the Synoptics as having followed Jesus; and Peter enters without difficulty into the high priest's palace.⁴ In the

¹ Luke v. 1—11.

² The author apparently considered that Jonas and John were the same name, another indication of a foreigner. Although some of the oldest Codices read John here and in xxi. 15—17, there is great authority for the reading Jona, which is considered by a majority of critics the original.

³ John i. 41—42.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 58, 69; Mark xiv. 54, 56; Luke xxii. 54 ff.

fourth Gospel, Peter is made to wait without at the door until John, who is a friend of the high priest and freely enters, obtains permission for Peter to go in, another instance of the precedence which is systematically given to John. The Synoptics do not in this particular case give any support to the statement in the fourth Gospel, and certainly in nothing that is said of John do they elsewhere render his acquaintance with the high priest in the least degree probable. It is, on the contrary, improbable in the extreme that the young fisherman of Galilee, who shows very little enlightenment in the anecdotes told of him in the Synoptics, and who is described as an "unlettered and ignorant" man in the Acts of the Apostles, could have any acquaintance with the high priest. Ewald who, on the strength of the word *γνωστός*,¹ at once elevates him into a relation of the high priest, sees in the statement of Polycrates that late in life he wore the priestly *πέταλον*, a confirmation of the supposition that he was of the high priest's race and family.² The evident Judaistic tendency, however, which made John wear the priestly mitre may distinguish him as author of the Apocalypse, but it is fatal to the theory which makes him author of the fourth Gospel, in which there is so complete a severance from Judaism.

A much more important point, however, is the designation of the author of the fourth Gospel, who is identified with the Apostle John, as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." It is scarcely too much to say, that this suggestive appellation alone has done more than any arguments to ensure the recognition of the work, and to overcome the doubts as to its authenticity. Religious sentimentality, evoked by the influence of this tender epithet, has been blind to historical incongruities, and has been willing to accept with little question from the "beloved disciple" a portrait of Jesus totally unlike that of the Synoptics, and to elevate the dogmatic mysticism and artificial discourses of the one over the sublime morality and simple eloquence of the other. It is impossible to reflect seriously upon this representation of the relations between one of the disciples and Jesus without the conviction that every record of the life of the great Teacher must have borne distinct traces of the preference, and that the disciple so honoured must have attracted the notice of every early writer acquainted with the facts. If we seek for any evidence, however, that John was distinguished with such special affection—that he lay on the breast of Jesus at supper—that even the Apostle Peter recognized his superior intimacy and influence³—and that he received at the

¹ John xviii. 15.

² Die Joh. Schr., i. p. 400, anm. 1; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 15.

³ John xiii. 23-26.

foot of the cross the care of his mother from the dying Jesus¹—we seek in vain. The Synoptic Gospels, which minutely record the details of the last supper and of the crucifixion, so far from mentioning any such circumstances or such distinction of John, do not even mention his name, and Peter everywhere has precedence before the sons of Zebedee. Almost the only occasions upon which any prominence is given to them are episodes in which they incur the Master's displeasure, and the cognomen of "Sons of thunder" has certainly no suggestion in it of special affection, nor of personal qualities likely to attract the great Teacher. The selfish ambition of the brothers who desire to sit on thrones on his right and on his left, and the intolerant temper which would have called down fire from heaven to consume a Samaritan village, much rather contradict than support the representation of the fourth Gospel. Upon one occasion, indeed, Jesus in rebuking them, adds: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."² It is perfectly undeniable that John nowhere has any such position accorded to him in the Synoptics as this designation in the fourth Gospel implies. In the lists of the disciples he is always put in the fourth place,³ and in the first two Gospels his only distinguishing designation is that of "the brother of James," or one of the sons of Zebedee. The Apostle Peter in all of the Synoptics is the leader of the disciples. He it is who alone is represented as the mouth-piece of the twelve or as holding conversation with Jesus; and the only occasions on which the sons of Zebedee address Jesus are those to which we have referred, upon which his displeasure was incurred. The angel who appears to the women after the resurrection desires them to tell his disciples "and Peter" that Jesus will meet them in Galilee,⁴ but there is no message for any "disciple whom he loved." If Peter, James and John accompany the Master to the mount of transfiguration and are witnesses of his agony in the garden, regarding which, however, the fourth Gospel is totally silent, the two brethren remain in the back ground, and Peter alone acts a prominent part. If we turn to the Epistles of Paul, we do not find a single trace of acquaintance with the fact that Jesus honoured John with any special affection, and the opportunity of referring to such a distinction was not wanting when he writes to the Galatians of his visit to the "Pillar" Apostles in Jerusalem

¹ John xix. 25—27.

² Luke ix. 55. These words are omitted from some of the oldest MSS., but they are in Cod. D (Beze) and many other important texts, as well as in some of the oldest versions, besides being quoted by the Fathers. They were probably omitted after the claim of John to be the "beloved disciple" became admitted.

³ Matt. x. 2—4; Mark iii. 16—19; Luke vi. 14—16.

⁴ Mark xvi. 7.

Here again, however, we find no prominence given to John, but the contrary, his name still being mentioned last and without any special comment. In none of the Pauline or other Epistles, is there any allusion, however distant, to any disciple whom Jesus specially loved. The Apocalypse, which, if any book of the New Testament can be traced to him, must be ascribed to the Apostle John, makes no claim whatever to such a distinction. In none of the Apocryphal Gospels is there the slightest indication of knowledge of the fact, and if we come to the Fathers even, it is a striking circumstance that there is not a trace of it in any early work, and not the most remote indication of any independent tradition that Jesus distinguished John or any other individual disciple with peculiar friendship. The Roman Clement, in referring to the example of the Apostles, only mentions Peter and Paul,¹ Polycarp, who is described as a disciple of the Apostle John, knows nothing of his having been especially loved by Jesus. Pseudo-Ignatius does not refer to him at all in the Syriac epistles, or in either version of the seven Epistles.² Papias, in describing his interest in hearing what the Apostles said, gives John no prominence: "I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters: What Andrew, or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say,"³ &c.

As a fact, it is undenied and undeniable that the representation of John, or of any other disciple, as specially beloved by Jesus, is limited solely and entirely to the fourth Gospel, and that there is not even a trace of independent tradition to support the claim, whilst on the other hand the total silence of the earlier Gospels and of the other New Testament writings on the point, and indeed their data of a positive and contradictory character, oppose rather than support the correctness of the latter and mere personal assertion. Those who abandon sober criticism, and indulge in mere sentimental rhapsodies on the impossibility of the author of the fourth Gospel being any other than the "disciple whom Jesus loved," strangely ignore the fact that we have no reason whatever, except the assurance of the author himself, to believe that Jesus specially loved any disciple, and much less John the son of Zebedee. Indeed, the statements of the fourth Gospel itself on the subject are so indirect and intentionally vague that it is not ab-

¹ Ad Corinth., v.

² Indeed in the universally repudiated Epistles, beyond the fact that two are addressed to John, in which he is not called "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the only mention of him is the statement, "John was banished to Patmos." Ad Tars., iii.

³ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 49.

solutely clear what disciple is indicated as "the beloved," and it has even been maintained that, not John the son of Zebedee, but Andrew the brother of Simon Peter was "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and consequently the supposed author of the fourth Gospel.¹

We have hitherto refrained from referring to one of the most singular features of the fourth Gospel, the chapter xxi., which is by many cited as the most ancient testimony for the authenticity of the work, and which requires particular consideration. It is obvious that the Gospel is brought to a conclusion by verses 30, 31 of chapter xx., and critics are universally agreed at least that, whoever may be its author, chapter xxi. is a supplement only added after an interval. By whom was it written? As may be supposed, critics have given very different replies to this important question. Many affirm, and with much probability, that chapter xxi. was subsequently added to the Gospel by the author himself.² A few, however, exclude the last two verses, which they consider to have been added by another hand.³ A much larger number assert that the whole chapter is an ancient appendix to the Gospel by a writer who was not the author of the Gospel.⁴ A few likewise reject the last two verses of the preceding chapter. In this supplement (v. 20) "the disciple whom Jesus loved, who also leaned on his breast at the supper and said: Lord, which is

¹ *Lutzelberger*, Die kirchl. Tradition über d. Apost. Joh., p. 99 ff.

² *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 213 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 317 ff.; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1868, p. 435 ff.; *Weitzel*, Stud. u. Krit., 1849, p. 596 ff.; *Schliermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 331; *J. P. Lange*, Gesch. chr. Kirche, 1854, ii. p. 421; *Luthardt*, Das Joh. Evang., i. p. 17 f., ii. p. 458 f.; *Wegscheider*, Einl. Ev. Joh., p. 173; *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1170 f.; *Westcott*, Int. to the Study of the Gospels, 1872, p. 254; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiii^{me} éd., p. lxxiii.; *Hengstenberg*, Das Ev. d. heil. Joh., p. 322 ff.; *Olshausen*, Die Leidensgesch. des Herrn, rev. Ebrard, 4te Aufl. ii. 2, p. 235 ff.; *Meyer*, H'buch, Ev. des Johann., p. 604; *Tholuck*, Com. z. Ev. Johann., 1857; Glaubw. ev. Gesch., p. 273 f.; *Guericke*, Beiträge, p. 67 ff.; *Huy*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 250 ff.; *Godet*, Com. sur l'Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 670 ff.; Cf. *Ewald*, references in note 3.

³ *J. P. Lange*, *Tholuck*, *Olshausen*, *Guericke*, *Huy*, *Godet*. *Meyer* only excludes the last verse.

⁴ *Baur*, Unters. Kan. Evv., p. 235 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 219 *; *Bertholdt*, Einl. A. u. N. T., iii. p. 1326; *Clericus*, Ad Hammondii in Ev. Joh. annot.; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 222 f., p. 232 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. pp. 339, 426 f.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss. iil., 1850—51, p. 171 f.; x. 1859—60, p. 87; *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 34 ff.; *Ebrard*, Die Ev. Gesch. 2 Aufl., 1850, p. 838 ff.; *Grotius*, Annot. ad Joh., xx. 30, xxi. 24; *Keim*, Jeau v. Nazara, i. p. 157 f.; *Lücke*, Comm. Ev. Joh., ii. p. 826 ff.; *Neuloecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 334 f., anm. 4; *Paulus*, Repert. ii. p. 327; *Révile*, Rev. de Théol., 1854, ix. p. 345; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 237; *Schott*, Comment. de origine et indole cap. ult. Ev. Joh., 1825; *Isagoge*, § 43, p. 155; *Schenkel*, Das Charakt. Jesu, p. 32; *Scholten*, Das Ev. Johann., pp. 4 ff., 57 ff.; *Schwegler*, Der Montanismus, p. 283 f.; *Späth*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1868, p. 192 ff.; *Semler*, Hist. Einl. Baumgarten's Unters. Theol. Streitigk., p. 62; *Volkmar*, Die Evangelien, p. 641 f.; *Weisse*, Die evang. Gesch., i. p. 99; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. evang. Gesch., p. 301 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 238 f.; *Wieseler*, Chron. Synopse v. Evv., p. 418.

he that betrayeth thee?" is (v. 24) identified with the author of the Gospel.

We may here state the theory of Ewald with regard to the composition of the fourth Gospel, which is largely deduced from considerations connected with the last chapter, and which, although more audaciously minute in its positive and arbitrary statement of details than any other with which we are acquainted, introduces more or less the explanations generally given regarding the composition of chapter xxi. Out of all the indications in the work, Ewald decides:

"1. That the Gospel, completed at the end of chapter xx., was composed by the Apostle about the year 80, with the free help of friends, not to be immediately circulated throughout the world, but to remain limited to the narrower circle of friends until his death, and only then to be published as his legacy to the whole of Christendom. In this position it remained ten years, or even longer.

2. As that preconceived opinion regarding the life or death of the Apostle (xxi. 23) had perniciously spread itself throughout the whole of Christendom, the Apostle himself decided even before his death to counteract it in the right way by giving a correct statement of the circumstances. The same friends, therefore, assisted him to design the very important supplement, chapter xxi., and this could still be very easily added, as the book was not yet published. His friends proceeded, nevertheless, somewhat more freely, in its composition, than previously in writing the book itself, and allowed their own hand more clearly to gleam through, although here, as in the rest of the work, they conformed to the will of the Apostle, and did not, even in the supplement, openly declare his name as the author. As the supplement, however, was to form a closely connected part of the whole work, they gave at its end (verses 24 f.), as it now seemed to them suitable, a new conclusion to the augmented work.

3. As the Apostle himself desired that the preconceived opinion regarding him, which had been spread abroad to the prejudice of Christendom, should be contradicted as soon as possible, and even before his death, he now so far departed from his earlier wish, that he permitted the circulation of his Gospel before his death. We can accept this with all certainty, and have therein a trustworthy testimony regarding the whole original history of our book.

4. First when the Gospel was thus published was it gradually named after our Apostle, even in its external superscription: a nomination which had then become all the more necessary and durable for the purpose of distinction, as it was united in one

whole with the other Gospels. The world, however, has at all times known it only under this wholly right title, and could in no way otherwise know it and otherwise name it."¹

In addressing ourselves to each of these points in detail, we shall be able to discuss the principal questions connected with the fourth Gospel.

The theory of Ewald, that the fourth Gospel was written down with the assistance of friends in Ephesus, has been imagined solely to conciliate certain phenomena presented throughout the Gospel, and notably in the last chapter, with the foregone conclusion that it was written by the Apostle John. It is apparent that there is not a single word in the work itself explaining such a mode of composition, and that the hypothesis proceeds purely from the ingenious imagination of the critic. The nature of the language in which the Gospel is composed, the manner in which the writer is indirectly indicated in the third person, and even in the body of the work (xix. 35) reference is made to the testimony of a third person, combined with the similarity of the style of the supplementary chapter, which is an obvious addition intended, however, to be understood as written by a different hand, have rendered these conjectures necessary to reconcile such obvious incongruities with the ascription of the work to the Apostle. The substantial identity of the style and vocabulary of chapter xxi. with the rest of the Gospel is asserted by a multitude of the most competent critics. Ewald, whilst he recognizes the great similarity, maintains at the same time a real dissimilarity, for which he accounts in the manner just quoted. The language, Ewald admits, agrees fully in many rare nuances with that of the rest of the Gospel, but he does not take the trouble to prove the decided dissimilarities which, he asserts, likewise exist. A less difference than that which he finds might, he thinks, be explained by the interval which had elapsed between the writing of the work and of the supplement, but "the wonderful similarity, in the midst of even greater dissimilarity, of the whole tone and particularly of the style of the composition is not thereby accounted for. This, therefore, leads us," he continues, "to the opinion: The Apostle made use, for writing down his words, of the hand and even of the skill of a trusted friend, who later on his own authority (*für sich allein*) wrote the supplement. The great similarity, as well as dissimilarity, of the style of both parts in this way becomes intelligible: the trusted friend (probably a Presbyterian in Ephesus) adopted much of the language and mode of expression of the youthful old Apostle, without, however, where he wrote more in his own person, being carefully solicitous of imitating them. But

¹ Die Joh. Schr., i. p. 56 f.; cf. Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., iii. p. 171 ff.

even through this contrast, and the definite declaration in v. 24, the Apostolical origin of the book itself becomes all the more clearly apparent; and thus the supplement proves from the most diverse sides how certainly this Gospel was written by the trusted disciple."¹ Elsewhere, Ewald more clearly explains the share in the work which he assigns to the Apostle's disciple: "The proposition that this Apostle composed in a unique way our likewise unique Gospel is to be understood only with that important limitation upon which I always laid so much stress: for John himself did not compose this work quite so directly as Paul did most of his Epistles, but the young friend who wrote it down from his lips, and who, in the later appendix, chapter xxi., comes forward in the most open way without desiring in the slightest to conceal his separate identity, does his work at other times somewhat freely, in that he never introduces the narrator speaking of himself and his participation in the events with 'I' or 'we,' but only indirectly indicates his presence at such events, and, towards the end, in preference refers to him, from his altogether peculiar relation to Christ, as 'the disciple whom the Lord loved,' so that, in one passage, he even speaks of him, in regard to an important historical testimony (xix. 35), as of a third person." Ewald then maintains that the agreement between the Gospel and the Epistles, and more especially the first, which he affirms, without vouchsafing a word of evidence, to have been written down by a different hand, proves that we have substantially only the Apostle's very peculiar composition, and that his friend as much as possible gave his own words.²

It is obvious from this elaborate explanation, which we need scarcely say is full of mere assumptions, that, in order to connect the Apostle John with the Gospel, Ewald is obliged to assign him a very peculiar position in regard to it: he recognizes that some of the characteristics of the work exclude the supposition that the Apostle could himself have written the Gospel, so he represents him as dictating it, and his Secretary as taking considerable liberties with the composition as he writes it down, and even as introducing references of his own; as, for instance, in the passage to which he refers, where, in regard to the statement that at the Crucifixion a soldier pierced the side of the already dead Jesus, and that forthwith there came out blood and water (xix. 35), it is said: "And he that saw it hath borne witness, and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe."³ It is perfectly clear that the writer refers to the testi-

¹ Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., iii. 1850—51, p. 173.

² *Ib.*, x. 1859—60, p. 87 f.

³ We do not go into any discussion on the use of the word *ἐκεῖνος*. We believe that the reference is distinctly to another, but even if taken to be to himself in the third person, the passage is not less extraordinary, and the argument holds.

mony of another person¹—the friend who is writing down the narrative, says Herr Ewald, refers to the Apostle who is actually dictating it. Again, in the last chapter, as elsewhere throughout the work, “the disciple whom Jesus loved,” who is the author, is spoken of in the third person, and also in verse 24: “This is the disciple which testified of these things, and wrote these things” (*καὶ γράψας ταῦτα*). This, according to Ewald, is the same secretary, now writing in his own person. The similarity between this declaration and the appeal to the testimony of another person in xix. 35, is certainly complete, and there can be no doubt that both proceed from the same pen; but beyond the assertion of Herr Ewald there is not the slightest evidence that a secretary wrote the Gospel from the dictation of another, and ventured to interrupt the narrative by such a reference to testimony, which, upon the supposition that the Apostle John was known as the actual author, is singularly out of place. If John wrote the Gospel, why should he appeal in utterly vague terms to his own testimony, and upon such a point, when the mere fact that he himself wrote the statement was the most direct testimony in itself? An author who composed a work which he desired to ascribe to a “disciple whom Jesus loved” might have made such a reference as xix. 35, in his anxiety to support such an affirmation, without supposing that he had really compromised his design, and might have naturally added such a statement as that in the last two verses, but nothing but the foregone conclusion that the Apostle John was the real author could have suggested such an explanation of these passages. It is throughout assumed by Ewald and others, that John wrote in the first instance, at least, specially for a narrow circle of friends, and the proof of this is considered to be the statement of the object with which it was written: “that ye may believe,”² &c., a phrase, we may remark, which is identical with that of the very verse (xix. 35) with which the secretary is supposed to have had so much to do. It is very remarkable, upon this hypothesis, that in xix. 35, it is considered necessary even for this narrow circle, who knew the Apostle so well, to make such an appeal, as well as to attach at its close (xxi. 24), for the benefit of the world in general as Ewald will have it, a certificate of the trustworthiness of the Gospel.

¹ Weisse, *Die Ev. Gesch.*, i. p. 101 ff., ii. p. 327 ff.; Lützelberger, *Die kirchl. Trad. Ap. Joh.*, p. 205 ff.; Köstlin, *Theol. Jahrb.*, l. 71, p. 207; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 341; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1859, p. 414 f., 1861, p. 313 ff.; Weizsäcker, *Unters. ev. Gesch.*, p. 300; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 436 f.; Schenkel, *Das Charakt. Jesu*, 1864, p. 32; Tobler, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 33 ff.; *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1860, p. 177 f.; Scholten, *Das Ev. Joh.*, p. 385.

² John xx. 31; Ewald, *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 56 f.; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii. p. 171; Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 303.

Upon no hypothesis which supposes the Apostle John the author of the fourth Gospel is such an explanation credible. That the Apostle himself could have written of himself the words in xix. 35 is impossible. After having stated so much that is much more surprising and contradictory to all experience without reference to any witness, it would indeed have been strange had he here appealed to himself as to a separate individual, and on the other hand it is quite inadmissible to assume that a friend to whom he is dictating should interrupt the narrative to introduce a passage so inappropriate to the work, and so unnecessary for any circle acquainted with the Apostolic author. If, as Ewald argues, the peculiarities of his style of composition were so well known that it was unnecessary for the writer more clearly to designate himself either for the first readers, or for the Christian world, the passages we are discussing are all the more inappropriate. That any guarantee of the truth of the Gospel should have been thought desirable for readers who knew the work to be composed by the Apostle John, and who believed him to be "the disciple whom Jesus loved," is inconceivable, and that any anonymous and quite indirect testimony to its genuineness should either have been considered necessary, or of any value, is still more incredible. It is impossible that nameless Presbyters of Ephesus could venture to accredit a Gospel written by the Apostle John; and any intended attestation must have taken the simple and direct course of stating that the work had been composed by the Apostle. The peculiarities we are discussing seem to us explicable only upon the supposition that the writer of the Gospel desired that it should be understood to be written by a certain disciple whom Jesus loved, but did not choose distinctly to name him or directly to make such an affirmation.

It is, we assert, impossible that an Apostle who composed a history of the life and teaching of Jesus could have failed to attach his name, naturally and simply, as testimony of the trustworthiness of his statements, and of his fitness as an eye-witness to compose such a record. As the writer of the fourth Gospel does not state his name, Herr Ewald ascribes the omission to the "incomparable modesty and delicacy of feeling" of the Apostle John. We must briefly examine the validity of this explanation. It is universally admitted, and by Ewald himself, that although the writer does not directly name himself, he very clearly indicates that he is "the other disciple" and "the disciple whom Jesus loved." We must affirm that such a mode of indicating himself is incomparably less modest than the simple statement of his name, and it is indeed a glorification of himself beyond anything in the Apocalypse. But not only is the explanation thus

discredited but, in comparing the details of the Gospel with those of the Synoptics, we find still more certainly how little modesty had to do with the suppression of his name. In the Synoptics a very marked precedence of the rest of the disciples is ascribed to the Apostle Peter; and the sons of Zebedee are represented in all of them as holding a subordinate place. This representation is confirmed by the Pauline Epistles and by tradition. In the fourth Gospel, a very different account is given, and the author studiously elevates the Apostle John,—that is to say, according to the theory that he is the writer of the Gospel, himself,—in every way above the Apostle Peter. Apart from the general pre-eminence claimed for himself in the very name of “the disciple whom Jesus loved,” we have seen that he deprives Peter in his own favour of the honour of being the first of the disciples who was called; he suppresses the account of the circumstances under which that Apostle was named Peter, and gives another and trifling version of the incident, reporting elsewhere indeed in a very subdued and modified form, and without the commendation of the Master, the recognition of the divinity of Jesus, which in the first Gospel is the cause of his change of name.¹ He is the intimate friend of the Master, and even Peter has to beg him to ask at the Supper who was the betrayer. He describes himself as the friend of the High Priest, and while Peter is excluded, he not only is able to enter into his palace, but he is the means of introducing Peter. The denial of Peter is given without mitigation, but his bitter repentance is not mentioned. He it is who is singled out by the dying Jesus and entrusted with the charge of his mother. He outruns Peter in their race to the Sepulchre, and in the final appearance of Jesus (xxi. 15) the more important position is assigned to the disciple whom Jesus loved. It is, therefore, absurd to speak of the incomparable modesty of the writer, who, if he does not give his name, not only clearly indicates himself, but throughout assumes a pre-eminence which is not supported by the authority of the Synoptics and other writings, but is heard of alone from his own narrative.

Ewald argues that chapter xxi. must have been written, and the Gospel as we have it, therefore, have been completed, before the death of the Apostle John. He considers the supplement to have been added specially to contradict the report regarding John (xxi. 23). “The supplement must have been written whilst John still lived,” he asserts, “for only before his death was it worth while to contradict such a false hope; and if his death had actually taken place, the result itself would have already refuted so erroneous an interpretation of the words of Christ, and it would

¹ Matt. xvi. 13—19; cf. Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20.

then have been much more appropriate to explain afresh the sense of the words 'till I come.' Moreover, there is no reference here to the death as having already occurred, although a small addition to that effect in ver. 24 would have been so easy. But if we were to suppose that John had long been dead when this was written, the whole rectification as it is given would be utterly without sense."¹ On the contrary, we affirm that the whole history of the first two centuries renders it certain that the Apostle was already dead, and that the explanation was not a rectification of false hopes during his lifetime, but an explanation of the failure of expectations which had already taken place, and probably excited some scandal. We know how the early Church looked for the immediate coming of the glorified Christ, and how such hopes sustained persecuted Christians in their sorrow and suffering. This is very clearly expressed in 1 Thess. iv. 15—18, where the expectation of the second coming within the lifetime of the writer and readers of the Epistle is confidently stated, and elsewhere, and even in 1 John ii. 18, the belief that the "last times" had arrived is expressed. The history of the Apocalypse in relation to the Canon illustrates the case. So long as the belief in the early consummation of all things continued strong the Apocalypse was the favourite writing of the early Church, but when time went on, and the second coming of Christ did not take place, the opinion of Christendom regarding the work changed, and disappointment as well as the desire to explain the non-fulfilment of prophecies upon which so much hope had been based, led many to reject the Apocalypse as an unintelligible and fallacious book. We venture to conjecture that the tradition that John should not die until the second coming of Jesus may have originated with the Apocalypse where that event is announced to John as immediately to take place, xxii. 7, 10, 12, and the words with which the book ends are of this nature, and express the expectation of the writer, 20: "He which testifieth these things saith: Surely I come quickly. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus." It was not in the spirit of the age to hesitate about such anticipations, and so long as the Apostle lived, such a tradition would scarcely have required or received contradiction from any one, the belief being universal that the coming of Jesus might take place any day, and assuredly would not be long delayed. When, however, the Apostle was dead, and the tradition that it had been foretold that he should live until the coming of the Lord exercised men's minds, and doubt and disappointment at the non-fulfilment of what may have been regarded as prophecy produced a prejudicial effect upon Christendom, it seemed to the writer of this

¹ Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., iii. 1850—51, p. 173.

Gospel a desirable thing to point out that too much stress had been laid upon the tradition, and that the words which had been relied upon in the first instance, did not justify the expectations which had been formed from them. This also contradicts the hypothesis that the Apostle John was the author of the Gospel.

Such a passage as xix. 35, received in any natural sense, or interpreted in any way which can be supported by evidence, shows that the writer of the Gospel was not an eye-witness of the events recorded, but appeals to the testimony of others. It is generally admitted that the expressions in ch. i. 14 are of universal application, and capable of being adopted by all Christians, and, consequently, that they do not imply any direct claim on the part of the writer to personal knowledge of Jesus. We must now examine whether the Gospel itself bears special marks of having been written by an eye-witness, and how far in this respect it bears out the assertion that it was written by the Apostle John. It is constantly asserted that the minuteness of the details in the fourth Gospel indicates that it must have been written by one who was present at the scenes he records. With regard to this point we need only generally remark, that in the works of imagination of which the world is full, and the singular realism of many of which is recognized by all, we have the most minute and natural details of scenes which never occurred, and of conversations which never took place, the actors in which never actually existed. Ewald admits that it is undeniable that the fourth Gospel was written with a fixed purpose, and with artistic design, and, indeed, he goes further and recognizes that the Apostle could not possibly so long have recollected the discourses of Jesus and verbally reproduced them, so that, in fact, we have only, at best, a substantial report of the matter of those discourses coloured by the mind of the author himself.¹ Details of scenes at which we were not present may be admirably supplied by imagination, and as we cannot compare what is here described as taking place with what actually took place, the argument that the author must have been an eye-witness because he gives such details is without validity. Moreover, the details of the fourth Gospel in many cases do not agree with those of the three Synoptics, and it is an undoubted fact that the author of the fourth Gospel gives the details of scenes at which the Apostle John was not present, and reports the discourses and conversations on such occasions, with the very same minuteness as those at which he is said to have been present; as, for instance, the interview between Jesus and the woman of Samaria. It is perfectly undeniable that the

¹ Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., x. p. 91 ff.

writer had other Gospels before him when he composed his work, and that he made use of other materials than his own.¹

It is by no means difficult, however, to point out very clear indications that the author was not an eye-witness but constructed his scenes and discourses artistically and for effect. We shall not, at present, dwell upon the almost uniform artifice adopted in most of the dialogues, in which the listeners either misunderstand altogether the words of Jesus, or interpret them in a foolish and material way, and thus afford him an opportunity of enlarging upon the theme. For instance, Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, misunderstands the expression of Jesus, that in order to see the kingdom of God a man must be born from above, and asks: "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?"² Now, as it is well known and as we have already shown, the common expression used in regard to a proselyte to Judaism was that of being born again, with which every Jew, and more especially every "ruler of the Jews," must have been well acquainted. The stupidity which he displays in his conversation with Jesus, and with which the author endowed all who came in contact with him, in order, by the contrast, to mark more strongly the superiority of the Master, even draws from Jesus the remark: "Art thou the teacher of Israel and understandest not these things?"³ There can be no doubt that the scene was ideal, and it is scarcely possible that a Jew could have written it. In the Synoptics, Jesus is reported as quoting against the people of his own city, Nazareth, who rejected him, the proverb: "A prophet has no honour in his own country."⁴ The appropriateness of the remark here is obvious. The author of the fourth Gospel, however, shows clearly that he was neither an eye-witness nor acquainted with the subject or country when he introduces this proverb in a different place. Jesus is represented as staying two days at Sychar after his conversation with the Samaritan woman. "Now after the two days he departed thence into Galilee. For (γὰρ) Jesus himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country. When, therefore (ὅν), he came into Galilee, the Galileans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem, at the feast—for

¹ *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., iii. p. 161; *Die Joh. Schr.*, i. p. 7 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 209 f.; *Bertholdt*, Einl. A. u. N. T., iii. p. 1302; *Lessing*, Neue Hypothese, § 51; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 127 ff.; *Lücke*, Comm. Ev. Joh., i. p. 197; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 118 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 329; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 118 ff.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. evang. Gesch., p. 270; *Huy*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 191 ff.; *Holtzman*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1869, pp. 62 ff., 155 ff.; *Schreyler*, Der Montanismus, p. 205, anm. 137.

² John iii. 4.

³ *Ib.*, iii. 10.

⁴ Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4; Luke iv. 24.

they also went unto the feast."¹ Now it is manifest that the quotation here is quite out of place, and none of the ingenious but untenable explanations of apologists can make it appropriate. He is made to go into Galilee, which was his country, because a prophet has no honour in his country, and the Galileans are represented as receiving him, which is a contradiction of the proverb. The writer evidently misunderstood the facts of the case or deliberately desired to deny the connection of Jesus with Nazareth and Galilee, in accordance with his evident intention of associating the Logos only with the Holy City. We must not pause to shew that the author is generally unjust to the Galileans, and displays an ignorance regarding them very unlike what we should expect from the fisherman of Galilee.² We have already alluded to the artificial character of the conversation with the woman of Samaria, which, although given with so much detail, occurred at a place totally unknown (perhaps allegorically called the "City of Lies"), at which the Apostle John was not present, and the substance of which was typical of Samaria and its five nations and false gods. The continuation in the Gospel is as unreal as the conversation. Another instance displaying personal ignorance is the insertion into a discourse at the Last Supper, and without any appropriate connection with the context, the passage "Verily, verily, I say unto you: he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me."³ In the Synoptics this sentence is naturally represented as part of the address to the disciples who are to be sent forth to preach the Gospel;⁴ but it is clear that its insertion here is a mistake.⁵ Again, a very obvious slip, which betrays that what was intended for realistic detail is nothing but a reminiscence of some earlier Gospel misapplied, occurs in a later part of the discourses very inappropriately introduced as being delivered on the same occasion. At the end of xiv. 31, Jesus is represented, after saying that he would no more talk much with the disciples, as suddenly breaking off with the words: "Arise, let us go hence" (*Ἐγείρεσθε, ἀγομεν ἐνταῦθα*). They do not, however, arise and go thence, but, on the contrary, Jesus at once commences another long discourse: "I am the true vine," &c. The expression is merely introduced artistically to close one discourse, and enable the writer to begin

¹ John iv. 43—45.

² We may merely refer to the remark of the Pharisees: search the Scriptures and see, "for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (vii. 52). The Pharisees could not have been ignorant of the fact that the prophets Jonah and Nahum were Galileans, and the son of Zebedee could not have committed such an error; cf. *Bretschneider*, *Probabilia*, p. 99 f.

³ John xiii. 20.

⁴ Matt. x. 40; cf. xviii. 5; Luke x. 16, cf. ix. 48.

⁵ This is recognized by *De Wette*, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 211 c.

another, and the idea is taken from some earlier work; for in our first Synoptic, at the close of the Agony in the Garden which the fourth Gospel ignores altogether, Jesus says to the awakened disciples: "Rise, let us go" (*Ἐγείσθε ἄγωμεν*).¹ We need not go on with these illustrations, but the fact that the author is not an eye-witness recording scenes which he beheld and discourses which he heard, but a writer composing an ideal Gospel on a fixed plan, will become more palpable as we proceed.

It is not necessary to enter upon any argument to prove the fundamental difference which exists in every respect between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel. This is admitted even by apologists, whose efforts to reconcile the discordant elements are totally unsuccessful. "It is impossible to pass from the Synoptic Gospels to that of St. John," says Canon Westcott, "without feeling that the transition involves the passage from one world of thought to another. No familiarity with the general teaching of the Gospels, no wide conception of the character of the Saviour is sufficient to destroy the contrast which exists in form and spirit between the earlier and later narratives."² The difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, not only as regards the teaching of Jesus but also the facts of the narrative, is so great that it is impossible to harmonize them, and no one who seriously considers the matter can fail to see that both cannot be accepted as correct. If we believe that the Synoptics give a truthful representation of the life and teaching of Jesus, it follows of necessity that, in whatever category we may decide to place the fourth Gospel, it must be rejected as a historical work. The theories which are most in favour as regards it may place the Gospel in a high position as an ideal composition, but sober criticism must infallibly pronounce that they exclude it altogether from the province of history. There is no option but to accept it as the only genuine report of the sayings and doings of Jesus, rejecting the Synoptics, or to remove it at once to another department of literature. The Synoptics certainly contradict each other in many minor details, but they are not in fundamental disagreement with each other, and evidently present the same portrait of Jesus, and the same view of his teaching derived from the same sources.

The vast difference which exists between the representation of Jesus in the fourth Gospel and in the Synoptics is too well recognized to require minute demonstration. We must, however, point out some of the distinctive features. We need not do more here than refer to the fact that whilst the Synoptics relate the

¹ Matt. xxvi. 46; Mark xiv. 42; *De Wette* likewise admits this mistaken reminiscence. Einl. N. T., p. 211 c.

² Introd. to Study of the Gospels, p. 249.

circumstances of the birth of Jesus, two of them at least, and give some history of his family and origin, the fourth Gospel, ignoring all this, introduces the great Teacher at once as the Logos who from the beginning was with God and was himself God. The key-note is struck from the first, and in the philosophical prelude to the Gospel we have the announcement to those who have ears to hear, that here we need expect no simple history, but an artistic demonstration of the philosophical postulate. According to the Synoptics, Jesus is baptized by John, and as he goes out of the water the Holy Ghost descends upon him like a dove. The fourth Gospel knows nothing of the baptism, and makes John the Baptist narrate vaguely that he saw the Holy Ghost descend like a dove and rest upon Jesus, as a sign previously indicated to him by God by which to recognize the Lamb of God.¹ From the very first, John the Baptist, in the fourth Gospel, recognizes and declares Jesus to be "the Christ,"² "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."³ According to the Synoptics, John comes preaching the baptism of repentance, and so far is he from making such declarations, or forming such distinct opinions concerning Jesus, that even after he has been cast into prison and just before his death,—when in fact his preaching was at an end,—he is represented as sending disciples to Jesus, on hearing in prison of his works, to ask him: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"⁴ Jesus carries on his ministry and baptizes simultaneously with John, according to the fourth Gospel, but his public career, according to the Synoptics, does not begin until after the Baptist's has concluded, and John is cast into prison.⁵ The Synoptics clearly represent the ministry of Jesus as having been limited to a single year, and his preaching is confined to Galilee and Jerusalem, where his career culminates at the fatal Passover. The fourth Gospel distributes the teaching of Jesus between Galilee, Samaria, and Jerusalem, makes it extend at least over three years, and refers to three Passovers spent by Jesus at Jerusalem.⁶ The Fathers felt this difficulty and expended a good deal of apologetic ingenuity upon it; but no one is now content with the explanation of Eusebius, that the Synoptics merely intended to write the history of Jesus during the one year after the imprisonment of the Baptist, whilst the fourth Evangelist recounted the events of the time not recorded by the others, a theory which is

¹ John i. 32—33

² *Ib.*, i. 29.

³ *Ib.*, i. 17.

⁴ Matt. xi. 2 ff.; cf. Luke vii. 18 ff.

⁵ John iii. 22; Matt. iv. 12, 17; Mark, i. 14; Luke iii. 20, 23; iv. 1 ff.

⁶ John ii. 13; vi. 40 f.; vii. 2; xiii. 1.

our first
the fourth
disciples:
on with
eye-wit-
which he
plan, will

to prove
between
even by
ments are
the Synop-
"without
the world of
teaching of
Saviour is
and spirit
between
regards the
so great
seriously
accepted
truthful
re- of neces-
the fourth
the theories
Gospel in a
icism must
on the pro-
regards the only
jecting the
ent of liter-
er in many
ement with
Jesus, and
sources.

sensation of
too well re-
st, however,
not do more
es relate the

mistaken rem-

totally contradicted by the four Gospels themselves.¹ The fourth Gospel represents the expulsion of the money-changers by Jesus as taking place at the very outset of his career,² when he could not have been known, and when such a proceeding is incredible; whilst the Synoptics place it at the very close of his ministry after his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, when, if ever, such an act, which might have contributed to the final catastrophe, first became either probable or possible.³ Upon the occasion of this episode, the fourth Gospel represents Jesus as replying to the demand of the Jews for a sign why he did such things: "Destroy this temple, and within three days I will raise it up," which the Jews understand very naturally only in a material sense, and which even the disciples only comprehended and believed "after the resurrection." The Synoptics not only know nothing of this, but represent the saying as the false testimony which the false witnesses bore against Jesus.⁴ No such charge is brought against Jesus at all in the fourth Gospel. So little do the Synoptics know of the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman, and his sojourn for two days at Sychar, that in his instructions to his disciples, in the first Gospel, Jesus positively forbids them either to go to the Gentiles or to enter into any city of the Samaritans.⁵

The fourth Gospel has very few miracles in common with the Synoptics, and those few present notable variations. After the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus, according to the Synoptics, constrains his disciples to enter a ship and to go to the other side of the Lake of Gennesaret, whilst he himself goes up a mountain apart to pray. A storm arises, and Jesus appears walking to them over the sea, whereat the disciples are troubled, but Peter says to him: "Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee over the water," and on his going out of the ship over the water, and beginning to sink, he cries: "Lord, save me;" Jesus stretched out his hand and caught him, and when they had come into the ship, the wind ceased, and they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying: "Of a truth thou art the Son of God."⁶ The fourth Gospel, instead of representing Jesus as retiring to the mountain to pray, which would have been opposed to the author's idea of the Logos, makes the motive for going thither the knowledge of Jesus that the people "would come and take him by force that they might make him a king."⁷ The writer altogether ignores

¹ Eusebius, H. E., iii. 24. We have already referred to the theory of Irenaeus which is at variance with all the Gospels, and extends the career of Jesus to many years of public life.

² John ii. 14 ff.

³ Matt. xxi. 12 ff.; Mark xi. 15 ff.; Luke xix. 45 ff.

⁴ John ii. 18 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 60 ff.; cf. xxvii. 39 f.; Mark xiv. 57 f.; xv. 29.

⁵ Matt. x. 5.

⁶ Matt. xiv. 22, 23; cf. Mark vi. 46 ff.

⁷ John vi. 15.

the episode of Peter walking on the sea, and adds a new miracle by stating that, as soon as Jesus was received on board, "the ship was at the land whither they were going."¹ The Synoptics go on to describe the devout excitement and faith of all the country round, but the fourth Gospel, limiting the effect on the multitude in the first instance to curiosity as to how Jesus had crossed the Lake, represents Jesus as upbraiding them with following him, not because they saw miracles, but because they had eaten of the loaves and been filled,² and makes him deliver one of those long dogmatic discourses, interrupted by, and based upon, the remarks of the crowd, which so peculiarly distinguish the fourth Gospel.

Without dwelling upon such details of miracles, however, we proceed with our slight comparison. Whilst the fourth Gospel from the very commencement asserts the foreknowledge of Jesus as to who should betray him, and makes him inform the Twelve that one of them is a devil, alluding to Judas Iscariot,³ the Synoptics represent Jesus as having so little foreknowledge that Judas should betray him, that, shortly before the end, and, indeed, according to the third Gospel, only at the last supper, Jesus promises that the disciples shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,⁴ and it is only at the last supper, after Judas has actually arranged with the chief priests, and apparently from knowledge of the fact, that Jesus for the first time speaks of his betrayal by him.⁵ On his way to Jerusalem, two days before the Passover,⁶ Jesus comes to Bethany where, according to the Synoptics, being in the house of Simon the leper, a woman with an alabaster box of very precious ointment came, and poured the ointment upon his head, much to the indignation of the disciples, who say: "To what purpose is this waste? For this might have been sold for much, and given to the poor."⁷ In the fourth Gospel the episode takes place six days before the Passover,⁸ in the house of Lazarus, and it is his sister Mary who takes a pound of very costly ointment, but she anoints the feet of Jesus and wipes his feet with her hair. It is Judas Iscariot, and not the disciples, who says: "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?" And Jesus makes a similar reply to that in the Synoptics, showing the identity of the occurrence described so differently.⁹

¹ John vi. 17—21.

² *Ib.*, vi. 26.

³ John vi. 64, 70, 71; cf. ii. 25.

⁴ Matt. xix. 28; cf. xvii. 22 f.; cf. Mark ix. 30 f., x. 32 f.; Luke xxii. 30; cf. ix. 22 f., 44 f.; xviii. 31 f.

⁵ Matt. xxvi. 21 f., cf. 14 ff.; Mark xiv. 18 f., cf. 10 f.; Luke xxii. 21 f., cf. 3 ff.

⁶ Mark xiv. 1.

⁷ Matt. xxvi. 6—13; Mark xiv. 3—9.

⁸ John xii. 1.

⁹ *Ib.*, xii. 1 ff.; cf. xi. 2.

The Synoptics represent most clearly that Jesus on the evening of the 14th Nisan, after the custom of the Jews, ate the Passover with his disciples,¹ and that he was arrested in the first hours of the 15th Nisan, the day on which he was put to death. Nothing can be more distinct than the statement that the last supper was the Paschal feast. "They made ready the Passover (*ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα*), and when the hour was come, he sat down and the Apostles with him, and he said to them: With desire I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" (*Ἐπιθυμία ἐπέβλεψα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν*).² The fourth Gospel, however, in accordance with the principle which is dominant throughout, represents the last repast which Jesus eats with his disciples as a common supper (*δείπνον*), which takes place, not on the 14th, but on the 13th Nisan, the day "before the feast of the Passover" (*πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*),³ and his death takes place on the 14th, the day on which the Paschal lamb was slain. Jesus is delivered by Pilate to the Jews to be crucified about the sixth hour of "the preparation of the Passover" (*ἡν παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*),⁴ and because it was "the preparation," the legs of the two men crucified with Jesus were broken, that the bodies might not remain on the cross on the great day of the feast.⁵ The fourth Gospel knows nothing of the institution of the Christian festival at the last supper, but instead, represents Jesus as washing the feet of the disciples, enjoining them also to wash each other's feet: "For I gave you an example that ye should do according as I did to you."⁶ The Synoptics have no knowledge of this incident. Immediately after the warning to Peter of his future denial, Jesus goes out with the disciples to the Garden of Gethsemane, and, taking Peter and the two sons of Zebedee apart, began to be sorrowful and very depressed, and as he prayed in his agony that if possible the cup might pass from him, an angel comforts him. Instead of this, the fourth Gospel represents Jesus as delivering, after the warning to Peter, the longest discourses in the Gospel: "Let not your heart be troubled," &c.; "I am the true vine,"⁷ &c.; and, although said to be written by one of the sons of Zebedee who were with Jesus on the occasion, the fourth Gospel totally ignores the agony in the garden, and, on the contrary, makes Jesus utter the long prayer xvii. 1—26, in a calm and even exulting spirit very far removed from the sorrow and depression of the more natural scene in Gethsemane. The prayer, like the rest of

¹ Matt. xxvi. 17 f., 19, 36 ff., 47 ff.; Mark xiv. 12 ff., 16 ff.; Luke xxii. 7 ff., 13 ff.

² Luke xxii. 13, 15; cf. Matt. xxvi. 19 ff.; Mark xiv. 16 ff.

³ John xiii. 1.

⁴ John xix. 14.

⁵ *Ib.*, xix. 31 ff.

⁶ *Ib.*, xiii. 12, 15.

⁷ John xiv. 1—31; xv. 1—27; xvi. 1—33; xvii. 1—26.

the prayers in the Gospel, is a mere didactic and dogmatic address for the benefit of the hearers. The arrest of Jesus presents a similar contrast. In the Synoptics, Judas comes with a multitude from the chief priests and elders of the people armed with swords and staves, and, indicating his Master by a kiss, Jesus is simply arrested and, after a slight resistance of one of the disciples, is led away.¹ In the fourth Gospel the case is very different. Judas comes with a band of men from the chief priests and Pharisees, with lanterns and torches and weapons, and Jesus—"knowing all things which were coming to pass"—himself goes towards them and asks: "Whom seek ye?" Judas plays no active part, and no kiss is given. The fourth Evangelist is, as ever, bent on showing that all which happens to the Logos is predetermined by himself and voluntarily encountered. As soon as Jesus replies: "I am he," the whole band of soldiers go backwards and fall to the ground: an incident thoroughly in the spirit of the early apocryphal Gospels still extant, and of an evidently legendary character. He is then led away first to Annas, who sends him to Caiaphas, whilst the Synoptics naturally know nothing of Annas, who was not the high priest and had no authority. We need not follow the trial, which is fundamentally different in the Synoptics and fourth Gospel; and we have already pointed out that in the Synoptics Jesus is crucified on the 15th Nisan, whereas in the fourth Gospel he is put to death—the spiritual Paschal lamb—on the 14th Nisan. According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus bears his own cross to Calvary,² but the Synoptics represent it as being borne by Simon of Cyrene.³ As a very singular illustration of the inaccuracy of all the Gospels, we may point to the circumstance that no two of them agree even about so simple a matter of fact as the inscription on the cross, assuming that there was one at all. They gave it respectively as follows: "This is Jesus the King of the Jews;" "The King of the Jews;" "This (is) the King of the Jews;" and the fourth Gospel: "Jesus the Nazarene the King of the Jews."⁴ The occurrences during the Crucifixion are profoundly different in the fourth Gospel from those narrated in the Synoptics. In the latter, only the women are represented as beholding afar off,⁵ but "the beloved disciple" is added in the fourth Gospel, and instead of being far

¹ Matt. xxvi. 47 ff.; Mark xiv. 43 ff.; Luke xxii. 47 ff.

² John xix. 17.

³ Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxii. 26.

⁴ Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Matt. xxvii. 37; Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Mark xv. 26; Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος. Luke xxiii. 38; Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. John xix. 19.

⁵ Matt. xxvii. 55 f.; Mark xv. 40 f.; Luke xxiii. 49. In this last place all his acquaintance are added.

e evening
Passover
t hours of
Nothing
upper was
ποιμασας τὸ
and the
desired to
ἐπεθύμησα
th Gospel,
dominant
s with his
ce, not on
ast of the
s place on
in. Jesus
to the sixth
τοῦ πύργου,⁴
e two men
ght not re-
The fourth
an festival
ashing the
her's feet:
as I did
s incident.
re denial,
ethsenane,
egan to be
gony that
fforts him.
delivering,
he Gospel:
ine,"⁷ &c.;
f Zebedee
pel totally
ary, makes
ven exulta-
tion of the
the rest of

ke xxii. 7 ff.

off, they are close to the cross; and for the last cries of Jesus reported in the Synoptics we have the episode in which Jesus confides his mother to the disciple's care. We need not compare the other details of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, which are differently reported by each of the Gospels.

We have only pointed out a few of the more salient differences between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, which are rendered much more striking, in the Gospels themselves, by the profound dissimilarity of the sentiments uttered by Jesus. We merely point out, in passing, the omission of important episodes from the fourth Gospel, such as the Temptation in the wilderness, the Transfiguration, at which, according to the Synoptics, the sons of Zebedee were present, the last Supper, the agony in the garden, the mournful cries on the cross, and, we may add, the Ascension; and if we turn to the miracles of Jesus, we find that almost all of those narrated by the Synoptics are ignored, whilst an almost entirely new series is introduced. There is not a single instance of the cure of demoniacal possession in any form recorded in the fourth Gospel. Indeed the number of miracles is reduced in that Gospel to a few typical cases; and although at the close it is generally said that Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, these alone are written with the declared purpose: "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."¹ Without examining the miracles of the fourth Gospel in detail, we may briefly refer to one—the raising of Lazarus. The extraordinary fact that the Synoptics are utterly ignorant of this the greatest of the miracles attributed to Jesus has been too frequently discussed to require much comment here. It will be remembered that, as the case of the daughter of Jairus is, by the express declaration of Jesus, a mere suspension of consciousness,² the only instance in which a dead person is said to have been restored to life by Jesus in any of the Synoptics is that of the son of the widow of Nain.³ It is therefore, quite impossible to suppose that the Synoptists could have known of the raising of Lazarus, and wilfully omitted it. It is equally impossible to believe that the authors of the Synoptic Gospels, from whatever sources they may have drawn their materials, could have been ignorant of such a miracle had it really taken place. This astounding miracle, according to the fourth Gospel, created such general excitement that it was one of the leading events which led to the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus.⁴ If, therefore, the Synoptics had any connection with the writers to whom they

¹ John xx. 30 f.

² Matt. ix. 24; Mark v. 39; Luke viii. 52.

⁴ John xi. 45 ff., 53; xii. 9 ff., 17 ff.

³ Luke vii. 11

are referred, the raising of Lazarus must have been personally known to their reputed authors either directly or through the Apostles who are supposed to have inspired them, or even upon any theory of contemporary origin the tradition of the greatest miracle of Jesus must have been fresh throughout the Church, if such a wonder had ever been performed. The total ignorance of such a miracle displayed by the whole of the works of the New Testament, therefore, forms the strongest presumptive evidence that the narrative in the fourth Gospel is a mere imaginary scene, illustrative of the dogma: "I am the resurrection and the life," upon which it is based. This conclusion is confirmed by the peculiarities of the narrative itself. When Jesus first hears, from the message of the sisters, that Lazarus whom he loved was sick, he declares, xi. 4: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby;" and v. 6: "When, therefore (*ὅτε*), he heard that he was sick, at that time he continued two days in the place where he was." After that time he proposes to go into Judaea, and explains to the disciples, v. 11: "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." The disciples reply, with the stupidity with which the fourth Evangelist endows all those who hold colloquy with Jesus, v. 12: "Lord, if he is fallen asleep, he will recover. Howbeit, Jesus spake of his death; but they thought that he was speaking of the taking of rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly: Lazarus is dead, and I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent that ye may believe." The artificial nature of all this introductory matter will not have escaped the reader, and it is further illustrated by that which follows. Arrived at Bethany, they find that Lazarus has lain in the grave already four days. Martha says to Jesus (v. 21 f.): "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. And I know that even now whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give thee. Jesus saith unto her: Thy brother shall rise again." Martha, of course, as usual, misunderstands this saying as applying to "the resurrection at the last day," in order to introduce the reply: "I am the resurrection and the life," &c. When they come to the house, and Jesus sees Mary and the Jews weeping, "he groaned in spirit and troubled himself," and on reaching the grave itself (v. 35 f.), "Jesus wept: Then said the Jews: Behold how he loved him!" Now this representation, which has ever since been the admiration of Christendom, presents the very strongest marks of unreality. Jesus, who loves Lazarus so much, disregards the urgent message of the sisters and, whilst openly declaring that his sickness is not unto death, intentionally lingers until his friend dies. When he does go to

Bethany, and is on the very point of restoring Lazarus to life and dissipating the grief of his family and friends he actually weeps, and groans in his spirit. There is so total an absence of reason for such grief that these tears, to any sober reader, are seen to be the theatrical adjuncts of a dramatic scene elaborated out of the imagination of the writer. The suggestion of the bystanders (v. 37), that he might have prevented the death, is not more probable than the continuation (v. 38): "Jesus, therefore, again groaning in himself cometh to the grave." Then, having ordered the stone to be removed, he delivers a prayer avowedly intended merely for the bystanders (v. 41 ff.): "And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I knew that thou hearest me always: but for the sake of the multitude which stand around I said this, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." This prayer is as evidently artificial as the rest of the details of the miracle, but like other elaborately arranged scenic representations the charm is altogether dispelled when closer examination shows the character of the dramatic elements. A careful consideration of the narrative and of all the facts of the case must, we think, lead to the conclusion that this miracle is not even a historical tradition of the life of Jesus, but is wholly an ideal composition by the author of the fourth Gospel. This being the case, the other miracles of the Gospel need not detain us.

If the historical part of the fourth Gospel be in irreconcilable contradiction to the Synoptics, the didactic is infinitely more so. The teaching of the one is totally different from that of the others, in spirit, form, and terminology; and in the prolix discourses of the fourth Gospel there is not a single characteristic of the simple eloquence of the Sermon on the Mount. In the diffuse mysticism of the Logos we cannot recognize a trace of the terse practical wisdom of Jesus of Nazareth. It must, of course, be apparent even to the most superficial observer that, in the fourth Gospel, we are introduced to a perfectly new system of instruction and to an order of ideas of which there is not a vestige in the Synoptics. Instead of short and concise lessons full of striking truth and point, we find nothing but long and involved dogmatic discourses of little practical utility. The limpid spontaneity of that earlier teaching, with its fresh illustrations and profound sentences uttered without effort and untinged by art, is exchanged for diffuse addresses and artificial dialogues, in which labour and design are everywhere apparent. From pure and living morality couched in brief incisive sayings, which enter the heart and dwell upon the ear, we turn to elaborate philosophical orations without clearness or order, and to doctrinal announcements unknown to the Synoptics. To the inquiry: "What shall I do to

inherit eternal life?" Jesus replies, in the Synoptics: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself, . . . this do, and thou shalt live."¹ In the fourth Gospel, to the question: "What must we do, that we may work the works of God?" Jesus answers, "This is the work of God, that ye should believe in him whom he sent."² The teaching of Jesus, in the Synoptics, is almost wholly moral, but, in the fourth Gospel, it is almost wholly dogmatic. If Christianity consist of the doctrines preached in the fourth Gospel, it is not too much to say that the Synoptics do not teach Christianity at all. The extraordinary phenomenon is presented of three Gospels, each professing to be complete in itself and to convey the good tidings of salvation to man, which have actually omitted the doctrines which are the condition of that salvation. The fourth Gospel practically expounds a new religion. It is undeniable that morality and precepts of love and charity for the conduct of life are the staple of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics, and that dogma occupies so small a place that it is regarded as a subordinate and secondary consideration. In the fourth Gospel, however, dogma is the one thing needful, and forms the whole substance of the preaching of the Logos. The burden of his teaching is: "He that believeth on the Son, hath eternal life, but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."³ It is scarcely possible to put the contrast between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel in too strong a light. If we possessed the Synoptics without the fourth Gospel, we should have the exposition of the most sublime morality based on perfect love to God and man. If we had the fourth Gospel without the Synoptics, we should have little more than a system of dogmatic mysticism without Christian morality. Not only is the doctrine and the terminology of the Jesus of the fourth Gospel quite different from that of the Jesus of the Synoptics, but so is the teaching of John the Baptist. In the Synoptics, he comes preaching the baptism of repentance,⁴ and, like the Master, inculcating principles of morality;⁵ but in the fourth Gospel he has adopted the peculiar views of the author, proclaims "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world,"⁶ and bears witness that he is "the Son of God."⁷ We hear of the Paraclete for the first time in the fourth Gospel.

In a word, the Synoptics unfold a teaching of sublime morality,

¹ Luke x. 25—28; cf. Mark ix. 17 ff.; Matt. xxii. 36—40.

² John vi. 28, 29.

³ Matt. iii. 1 ff.; Mark i. 4 ff.; Luke iii. 2 ff.

⁴ Luke iii. 8, 10 ff.

⁵ John i. 29, 36.

⁶ John iii. 36.

⁷ *Ib.*, i. 34.

for which the fourth Gospel substitutes a scheme of dogmatic theology of which the others know nothing.

It is so impossible to ignore the distinct individuality of the Jesus of the fourth Gospel, and of his teaching, that even apologists are obliged to admit that the peculiarities of the author have coloured the portrait, and introduced an element of subjectivity into the discourses. It was impossible, they confess, that the Apostle could remember verbally such long orations for half a century, and at best that they can only be accepted as substantially correct reports of the teaching of Jesus.¹ "Above all," says Ewald, "the discourses of Christ and of others in this Gospel, are clothed as by an entirely new colour: on this account also scepticism has desired to conclude that the Apostle cannot have composed the Gospel; and yet no conclusion is more unfounded. When the Apostle at so late a period determined to compose the work, it was certainly impossible for him to reproduce all the words exactly as they were once spoken, if he did not perhaps desire not merely to recall a few memorable sentences, but, in longer discussions of more weighty subjects, to charm back all the animation with which they were once given. So he availed himself of that freedom in their revivification which is both quite intelligible of itself, and sufficiently warranted by the precedent of so many great examples of all antiquity: and where the discourses extend to greater length, there entered involuntarily into the structure much of that fundamental conception and language regarding the manifestation of Christ which had long become deeply rooted in the Apostle's soul. But as certainly as these discourses bear upon them the colouring of the Apostle's mind, so certainly do they agree in their substantial contents with his best recollections—because the *Spruchsammlung* proves that the discourses of Christ in certain moments really could elevate themselves to the full height, which in John only throughout surprises us more than in Matthew. To deny the apostolical authorship of the Gospel for such reasons, therefore, were pure folly, and in the highest degree unjust. Moreover, the circumstance that, in the drawing up of such discourses, we sometimes see him reproduce or further develop sayings which had already been recorded in the older Gospels, can prove nothing against the apostolical origin of the

¹ Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 200 f.; *Beiträge*, p. 242 f.; *Ewald*, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, x. p. 91 f.; *Gfrörer*, *Allg. K. G.*, i. p. 172 f.; *Das Heiligthum u. d. Wahrheit*, 1838, p. 331; *Lücke*, *Comment. Ev. Joh.*, i. p. 242; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 215 f.; *Baur*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1844, p. 452 ff.; *B. Bauer*, *Krit. d. ev. Gesch. d. Johann.*, 1840; *Colani*, *Rev. d. Théol.*, 1851, ii. p. 38 ff.; *Weisse*, *Die evng. Gesch.*, i. p. 105 ff.; *Schotten*, *Das Ev. Johan.*, p. 186 f., p. 223 ff.; *Davidson*, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 439 f.; *Bretschneider*, *Probabilia*, pp. 31 ff., 113 f.; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, xiii^{me} éd., p. lxix. ff.; *De Wette*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 212 ff., p. 232 ff.; *Kayser*, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1856, xiii. p. 74 f., &c., &c., cf. *Weizsäcker*, *Unters. evang. Gesch.*, pp. 238 ff., 253 ff.

Gospel, as he was indeed at perfect liberty, if he pleased, to make use of the contents of such older writings, when he considered it desirable, and when they came to the help of his own memory of those long passed days: for he certainly retained many or all of such expressions also in his own memory."¹ Elsewhere, he describes the work as "glorified Gospel history," composed out of "glorified recollection."²

Another strenuous defender of the authenticity of the fourth Gospel wrote of it as follows: "Nevertheless everything is reconcilable," says Gfrörer, "if one accepts that testimony of the elders as true. For as John must have written the Gospel as an old man, that is to say not before the year 90—95 of our era, there is an interval of more than half a century between the time when the events which he relates really happened, and the time of the composition of his book,—space enough certainly to make a few mistakes conceivable even pre-supposing a good memory and unshaken love of truth. Let us imagine for instance that to-day (in 1841) an old man of eighty to ninety years of age should write down from mere memory the occurrences of the American War (of Independence), in which he himself in his early youth played a part. Certainly in his narrative, even though it might otherwise be true, many traits would be found which would not agree with the original event. Moreover another particular circumstance must be added in connection with the fourth Gospel. Two-thirds of it consist of discourses, which John places in the mouth of Jesus Christ. Now every day's experience proves that oral impressions are much more fleeting than those of sight. The happiest memory scarcely retains long orations after three or four years: how, then, could John with verbal accuracy report the discourses of Jesus after fifty or sixty years! We must be content if he truly render the chief contents and spirit of them, and that, as a rule, he does this, can be proved. It has been shown above that already, before Christ, a very peculiar philosophy of religion had been formed among the Egyptian Jews, which found its way into Palestine through the Essenes, and also numbered numerous adherents amongst the Jews of the adjacent countries of Syria and Asia Minor. The Apostle Paul professed this: not less the Evangelist John. Undoubtedly the latter allowed this Theosophy to exercise a strong influence upon his representation of the life history of Jesus,"³ &c.

Now all such admissions, whilst they are absolutely requisite to explain the undeniable phenomena of the fourth Gospel, have

¹ *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, x. p. 91.

² "Verklärte Evangelische Geschichte,"—"verklärte Erinnerung." *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, iii. p. 163, p. 166.

³ *Gfrörer*, *Allg. K. G.*, 1841, i. p. 172 f.

one obvious consequence: The fourth Gospel, by whomsoever written,—even if it could be traced to the Apostle John himself,—has no real historical value, being at best the “glorified recollections” of an old man written down half a century after the events recorded. The absolute difference between the teaching of this Gospel and of the Synoptics becomes perfectly intelligible, when the long discourses are recognized to be the result of Alexandrian Philosophy artistically interwoven with developed Pauline Christianity, and put into the mouth of Jesus. It will have been remarked that along with the admission of great subjectivity in the report of the discourses, and that nothing beyond the mere substance of the original teaching can reasonably be looked for, there is, in the extracts we have given, an assertion that there actually is a faithful reproduction in this Gospel of the original substance. Now there is not a shadow of proof of this, but on the contrary the strongest reason for denying the fact; for, unless it be admitted that the Synoptics have so completely omitted the whole doctrinal part of the teaching of Jesus, have so carefully avoided the very peculiar terminology of the Logos Gospel, and have conveyed so unhistorical and erroneous an impression of the life and religious system of Jesus that, without the fourth Gospel, we should not actually have had an idea of his fundamental doctrines, we must inevitably recognize that the fourth Gospel cannot possibly be a true reproduction of his teaching. It is impossible that Jesus can have had two such diametrically opposed systems of teaching,—one purely moral, the other wholly dogmatic; one expressed in wonderfully terse, clear, brief sayings and parables, the other in long, involved, and diffuse discourses; one clothed in the great language of humanity, the other concealed in obscure philosophic terminology;—and that these should have been kept so distinct as they are in the Synoptics, on the one hand, and the fourth Gospel, on the other. The tradition of Justin Martyr applies solely to the system of the Synoptics: “Brief and concise were the sentences uttered by him: for he was no Sophist, but his word was the power of God.”¹

We have already pointed out the evident traces of artificial construction in the discourses and dialogues of the fourth Gospel, and the more closely these are examined, the more clear does it become that they are not genuine reports of the teaching of Jesus, but mere ideal compositions by the author of the fourth Gospel. The speeches of John the Baptist, the discourses of Jesus, and the reflections of the Evangelist himself,² are marked by the same peculiarity of style and proceed from the same mind.

¹ Apol., i. 14, see p. 289.

² John i. 1—18, &c., &c.

It is scarcely possible to determine where the one begins and the other ends.¹ It is quite clear, for instance, that the author himself, without a break, continues the words which he puts into the mouth of Jesus, in the colloquy with Nicodemus, but it is not easy to determine where. The whole dialogue is artificial in the extreme, and is certainly not genuine, and this is apparent not only from the replies attributed to the "teacher of Israel," but to the irrelevant manner in which the reflections loosely ramble from the new birth to the dogmatic statements in the thirteenth and following verses, which are the never-failing resource of the Evangelist when other subjects are exhausted. The sentiments and almost the words either attributed to Jesus, or added by the writer, to which we are now referring, iii. 12 ff., we find again in the very same chapter, either put into the mouth of John the Baptist, or as reflections of the author, verses 31—36, for again we add that it is difficult anywhere to discriminate the speaker. Indeed, while the Synoptics are rich in the abundance of practical counsel and profound moral insight, as well as in variety of illustrative parables, it is remarkable how much sameness there is in all the discourses of the fourth Gospel, a very few ideas being constantly reproduced. Whilst the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics is singularly universal and impersonal, in the fourth Gospel it is purely personal, and rarely passes beyond the declaration of his own dignity, and the inculcation of belief in him as the only means of salvation. A very distinct trace of ideal composition is found in xvii. 3: "And this is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." Even apologists admit that it is impossible that Jesus could speak of himself as "Jesus Christ." We need not, however, proceed further with such analysis. We believe that no one can calmly and impartially examine the fourth Gospel without being convinced of its artificial character. If some portions possess real beauty, it is of a purely ideal kind, and their attraction consists chiefly in the presence of a certain vague but suggestive mysticism. The natural longing of humanity for any revelation regarding a future state has not been appealed to in vain. That the diffuse and often monotonous discourses of this Gospel, however, should ever have been preferred to the sublime simplicity of the teaching of the Synoptics, illustrated by such parables as the wise and foolish virgins, the sower, and the Prodigal Son, and culminating in the Sermon on the Mount, each sentence of which is so full of profound truth and beauty, is little to the credit of critical sense and judgment.

¹ Cf. John i. 15 ff., iii. 27 ff., 10—21.

The elaborate explanations, however, by which the phenomena of the fourth Gospel are reconciled with the assumption that it was composed by the Apostle John are in vain, and there is not a single item of evidence within the first century and a half which does not agree with internal testimony in opposing the supposition. To one point, however, we must briefly refer in connection with this statement. It is asserted that the Gospel and Epistles—or at least the first Epistle—of the Canon ascribed to the Apostle John are by one author, although this is not without contradiction,¹ and very many of those who agree as to the identity of authorship by no means admit the author to have been the Apostle John. It is argued, therefore, that the use of the Epistle by Polycarp and Papias is evidence of the apostolic origin of the Gospel. We have, however, seen, that not only is it very uncertain that Polycarp made use of the Epistle at all, but that he does not in any case mention its author's name. There is not a particle of evidence that he ascribed the Epistle, even supposing he knew it, to the Apostle John. With regard to Papias, the only authority for the assertion that he knew the Epistle is the statement of Eusebius, already quoted and discussed, that: "He used testimonies out of John's first Epistle."² There is no evidence, however, even supposing the statement of Eusebius to be correct, that he ascribed it to the Apostle. The earliest undoubted references to the Epistle, in fact, are by Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, so that this evidence is of little avail for the Gospel. There is no name attached to the first Epistle, and the second and third have the superscription of "the Presbyter," which, applying the argument of Ewald regarding the author of the Apocalypse, ought to be conclusive against their being written by an Apostle. As all three are evidently by the same writer, and intended to be understood as by the author of the Gospel, and that writer does not pretend to be an Apostle, but calls himself a simple Presbyter, the Epistles likewise give presumptive evidence against the apostolic authorship of the Gospel.

There is another important testimony against the Johannine origin of the fourth Gospel to which we must briefly refer. We have pointed out that, according to the fourth Gospel, Jesus did not eat the Paschal Supper with his disciples, but that being arrested on the 13th Nisan, he was put to death on the 14th, the actual day upon which the Paschal lamb was sacrificed. The Synoptics, on the contrary, represent that Jesus ate the Passover

¹ Baur, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1844, p. 66 f., 1848, pp. 293—337; *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 350; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 293 ff.; Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1843, p. 558 f., 1847, p. 137. Credner assigns the second and third Epistle not to the Apostle but to the Presbyter John. *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 687 ff.

² H. E., v. 8.

with his disciples on the evening of the 14th, and was crucified on the 15th Nisan. The difference of opinion indicated by these contradictory accounts actually prevailed in various Churches, and in the second half of the second century a violent discussion arose as to the day upon which "the true Passover of the Lord" should be celebrated, the Church in Asia Minor maintaining that it should be observed on the 14th Nisan,—the day on which, according to the Synoptics, Jesus himself celebrated the Passover and instituted the Christian festival,—whilst the Roman Church as well as most other Christians,—following the fourth Gospel, which represents Jesus as not celebrating the last Passover, but being himself slain upon the 14th Nisan, the true Paschal lamb,—had abandoned the day of the Jewish feast altogether, and celebrated the Christian festival on Easter Sunday, upon which the Resurrection was supposed to have taken place. Polycarp, who was sent to Rome to represent the Churches of Asia Minor in the discussions upon the subject, could not be induced to give up the celebration on the 14th Nisan, the day which, according to tradition, had always been observed, and he appealed to the practice of the Apostle John himself in support of that date. Eusebius quotes from Irenæus the statement of the case: "For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it (the 14th Nisan), because he had ever observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the Apostles with whom he consorted."¹ Towards the end of the century, Polycrates, the Bishop of Ephesus, likewise appeals to the practice of "John who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord," as well as of the Apostle Philip and his daughters, and of Polycarp and others in support of the same day. "All these observed the 14th day of the Passover according to the Gospel, deviating from it in no respect, but following according to the rule of the faith."² Now it is evident that, according to this undoubted testimony, the Apostle John by his own practice, ratified the account of the Synoptics, and contradicted the data of the fourth Gospel, and upon the supposition that he so long lived in Asia Minor it is probable that his authority largely contributed to establish the observance of the 14th Nisan there. We must, therefore, either admit that the Apostle John by his practice reversed the statement of his own Gospel, or that he was not its author, which of course is the natural con-

¹ Οὕτε γὰρ ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὸν Πολύκαρπον πείσαι ἐδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἀτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, ἀεὶ τετηρηκότα, κ.τ.λ. Irenæus, Adv. Hæc., iii. 3, § 4; Eusebius, H. E., v. 24.

² Οὗτοι πάντες ἐτηρησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, μηδὲν παρεκβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες. Eusebius, H. E., v. 24.

clusion. Without going further into the discussion, which would detain us too long, it is clear that the Paschal controversy is opposed to the supposition that the Apostle John was the author of the fourth Gospel.¹

We have seen that, whilst there is not one particle of evidence during a century and a half after the events recorded in the fourth Gospel that it was composed by the son of Zebedee, there is, on the contrary, the strongest reason for believing that he did not write it. The first writer who quotes a passage of the Gospel with the mention of his name is Theophilus of Antioch, who gives the few words: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God," as spoken by "John," whom he considers amongst the divinely inspired (*οἱ πνευματοφόροι*);² though even he does not distinguish him as the Apostle. We have seen the legendary nature of the late traditions regarding the composition of the Gospel, of which a specimen was given in the defence of it in the Canon of Muratori, and we must not further quote them. The first writer who distinctly classes the four Gospels together is Irenæus; and the reasons which he gives for the existence of precisely that number in the Canon of the Church illustrate the thoroughly universal character of the Fathers, and the slight dependence which can be placed upon their judgments. "But neither can the Gospels be more in number than they are," says Irenæus, "nor, on the other hand, can they be fewer. For as there are four quarters of the world in which we are, and four general winds (*καθολικὰ πνεύματα*), and the Church is disseminated throughout all the world, and the Gospel is the pillar and prop of the Church and the spirit of life, it is right that she should have four pillars, on all sides breathing out immortality and revivifying men. From which it is manifest that the Word, the maker of all, he who sitteth upon the Cherubim and containeth all things, who was manifested to man, has given to us the Gospel, four-formed but possessed by one spirit; as David also says, supplicating his advent: 'Thou that sittest between the Cherubim, shine forth.' For the Cherubim also are four-faced, and their faces are symbols of the working of the Son of God . . . and the Gospels, therefore, are in harmony with these amongst which Christ is seated. For the Gospel according to John relates his first effectual and glorious generation from the Father, saying:

¹ Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.* p. 334 ff.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 242 ff.; K. G. drei erst. Jahrh., p. 156 ff.; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 403 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 341 ff.; Der Paschastreit, u. s. w., *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 299 f.; Der Paschastreit, 1860; Scholten, *Das Ev. Johan.*, p. 387 ff. De sterfdag van Jezus volgens het vierde Evangelie, 1856; Schwegler, *Der Montanismus*, p. 191 ff.

² Ad Autolyce., ii. 22. Tischendorf dates this work about A.D. 180. Wann wurden, u. s. w., p. 16, ann. 1.

'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,' and 'all things were made by him, and without him nothing was made.' On this account also this Gospel is full of all trustworthiness, for such is his person.¹ But the Gospel according to Luke, being as it were of priestly character, opened with Zacharias the priest sacrificing to God But Matthew narrates his generation as a man, saying: 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham,' and 'the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise.' This Gospel, therefore, is anthropomorphic, and on this account a man, humble and mild in character, is presented throughout the Gospel. But Mark makes his commencement after a prophetic Spirit coming down from on high unto men, saying: 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet,' indicating the winged form of the Gospel; and for this reason he makes a compendious and precursory declaration, for this is the prophetic character. . . . Such, therefore, as was the course of the Son of God, such also is the form of the living creatures; and such as is the form of the living creatures, such also is the character of the Gospel. For quadriform are the living creatures, quadriform is the Gospel, and quadriform the course of the Lord. And on this account four covenants were given to the human race. . . . These things being thus; vain and ignorant, and, moreover, audacious are those who set aside the form of the Gospel, and declare the aspects of the Gospels as either more or less than has been said.² As such principles of criticism presided over the formation of the Canon, it is not singular that so many of the decisions of the Fathers have been reversed. Irenæus himself mentioned the existence of heretics who rejected the fourth Gospel,³ and Epiphanius⁴ refers to the Alogi, who equally denied its authenticity, but it is not needful for us further to discuss this point. Enough has been said to show that the testimony of the fourth Gospel is of no value towards establishing the truth of miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation.

¹ The Greek of this rather unintelligible sentence is not preserved. The Latin version reads as follows: Propter hoc et omni fiducia plenum est Evangelium istud; talis est enim persona ejus.

² Irenæus, Adv. Hær., iii. 11, §§ 8, 9.

³ Adv. Hær. iii. 2, § 9.

⁴ Hær. li. 3, 4, 28.

CHAPTER III.

CONCLUSIONS.

WE may now briefly sum up the conclusions to which we are led by our inquiry into the reality of Divine Revelation, although we shall carefully confine ourselves within certain limits, in order that we may not too far anticipate the fuller observations which we shall have to make at the close of the second portion of this work, when we find the results at which we now arrive confirmed by more comprehensive examination of the subject. It is impossible to refrain from some anticipation of final reflections, nor would it be right to delay a clear statement of what we believe to be the truth and its consequences.

We have seen that a Divine Revelation is such only by virtue of communicating to us something which we could not know without it, and which is in fact undiscoverable by human reason; and that miraculous evidence is absolutely requisite to establish its reality. It is admitted that no other testimony could justify our believing the specific revelation which we are considering, the very substance of which is supernatural and beyond the criterion of reason, and that its astounding announcements, if not demonstrated to be miraculous truths, must inevitably be pronounced "the wildest delusions." On examining the supposed miraculous evidence, however, we find that not only is it upon general grounds antecedently incredible, but that the testimony by which its reality is supported, so far from establishing the inferences drawn from the supposed supernatural phenomena, is totally insufficient even to certify the actual occurrence of the events narrated. The history of miraculous pretension in the world, and the circumstances attending this special exhibition of it, suggest natural explanations of the reported facts which rightly and infallibly remove them from the region of the supernatural.

Even if the reality of miracles could be substantiated, their value as evidence for the Divine Revelation is destroyed by the necessary admission that miracles are not limited to one source, but that there are miracles Satanic which are to be disbelieved, as well as Divine and evidential. As the doctrines supposed to be revealed are beyond Reason, and cannot in any sense, therefore, be intelligently approved by the human intellect, no evidence which is of so double and inconclusive a nature could sufficiently

attest them. This alone would disqualify the Christian miracles for the duty which miracles alone are considered capable of performing.

The supposed miraculous evidence for the Divine Revelation, moreover, is not only without any special divine character, being avowedly common also to Satanic agency, but it is not original either in conception or details. Similar miracles to those which are supposed to attest it are reported long antecedent to the promulgation of Christianity, and continued to be performed for centuries after it. A stream of miraculous pretension, in fact, has flowed through all human history, deep and broad as it has passed through the darker ages, but dwindling down to a thread as it has entered days of enlightenment. The evidence was too hackneyed and commonplace to make any impression upon those before whom the Christian Miracles are said to have been performed, and it altogether failed to convince the people to whom the Revelation was primarily addressed. The selection of such evidence for such a purpose is much more characteristic of human weakness than of divine power.

The true character of miracles is at once betrayed by the fact that their supposed occurrence has been confined to ages of ignorance and superstition, and that they are absolutely unknown in any time or place where science has provided witnesses fitted to appreciate and ascertain the nature of such exhibitions of supernatural power. There is not the slightest evidence that any attempt was made to investigate the supposed miraculous occurrences, or to justify the inferences so freely drawn from them, nor is there any reason to believe that the witnesses possessed in any considerable degree the fulness of knowledge and sobriety of judgment requisite for the purpose. No miracle has yet established its claim to the rank even of apparent reality, and all such phenomena must remain in the dim region of imagination. The test applied to the largest class of miracles, connected with demoniacal possession, discloses the falsity of all miraculous pretension.

There is no uncertainty as to the origin of belief in supernatural interference with nature. The assertion that spurious miracles have sprung up round a few instances of genuine miraculous power has not a single valid argument to support it. History clearly demonstrates that wherever ignorance and superstition have prevailed every obscure occurrence has been attributed to supernatural agency, and it is freely acknowledged that, under their influence, inexplicable and miraculous are convertible terms. On the other hand, in proportion as knowledge of natural laws has increased, the theory of supernatural interference

with the order of nature has been dispelled, and miracles have ceased. The effect of science, however, is not limited to the present and future, but its action is equally retrospective, and phenomena which were once ignorantly isolated from the great sequence of natural cause and effect, are now restored to their place in the unbroken order. Ignorance and superstition created miracles; knowledge has for ever annihilated them..

Miracles, of the reality of which there is no evidence worthy of the name, are not only contradictory to complete induction, but even on the avowal of those who affirm them, they only cease to be incredible upon certain assumptions with regard to the Supreme Being which are equally opposed to Reason. These assumptions, it is not denied, are solely derived from the Revelation which miracles are intended to attest, and the whole argument, therefore, ends in the palpable absurdity of making the Revelation rest upon miracles which have nothing to rest upon themselves but the Revelation. The antecedent assumption of the Divine design of Revelation and of the necessity for it stands upon no firmer foundation, and it is emphatically excluded by the whole constitution of the order of nature, whose imperative principle is progressive development. Upon all grounds of Reason and experience the supposed miraculous evidence, by which alone we could be justified in believing in the reality of the Divine Revelation, must be pronounced mere human delusion, and the result thus attained is confirmed by every external consideration.

When we turn from more general arguments to examine the documentary evidence for the reality of the supposed miraculous occurrences, and of the Divine Revelation which they accredit, we meet with the characteristics which might have been expected. We do not find any real trace even of the existence of our Gospels for a century and a half after the events they record. They are anonymous narratives, and there is no evidence of any value connecting these works with the writers to whom they are popularly attributed. On the contrary, the facts stated by Papias fully justify the conclusion that our first and second Synoptics cannot be the works said to have been composed by Matthew and Mark. The third Synoptic is an avowed compilation by one who was not an eye-witness of the occurrences narrated, and the identity of the writer cannot be established. As little was the supposed writer of the second Synoptic a personal witness of the scenes of his history. The author of the fourth Gospel is unknown, and no impartial critic can assert the historical character of his narrative. Apart from continual minor contradictions throughout all of these narratives, it is impossible to reconcile the markedly different representations of the fourth and of the

Synoptic Gospels. They mutually destroy each other as evidence. These Gospels themselves do not pretend to be inspired histories, and they cannot upon any ground be regarded as more than mere human compositions. As evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation they have no weight, being merely narratives, written long after the events recorded, by unknown persons who were neither eye-witnesses of the supposed miraculous occurrences, nor hearers of the statements they profess to report. Contemporary testimony of such a character would have possessed little force against the opposing weight of complete induction, but still smaller is the evidential value of such narratives as these, which are largely or wholly based upon pious tradition, and which could not, in that superstitious age, have excluded the mythical elements which are so palpably incorporated in our Gospels. The world is full of illustrations of the rapid growth of legendary matter, and it would indeed have been little short of miraculous had these narratives been exceptions to the universal rule, written as they were under the strongest religious excitement at a time "when almost every ordinary incident became a miracle," and in that "mythic period in which reality melted into fable, and invention unconsciously trespassed on the province of history." Tradition, in other forms, to which appeal is sometimes made, is still more worthless, and, opposed to the result of universal experience, it is unworthy of a moment's consideration.

The main evidence upon which alone, it is admitted, we could be justified in believing its astounding doctrines being thus nugatory, the claim of Christianity to be considered a Divine Revelation must necessarily be disallowed, and its supernatural elements, which are, in fact, the very substance of the system, inevitably sharing the same fate as the supposed miraculous evidence, must, therefore, be rejected as incredible and opposed to Reason and complete induction.

It must be remembered that the claim to direct Divine origin, so far from being peculiar to Christianity, has been equally advanced by all the great systems of Religion which have ever been promulgated and taken root in the world. In this, as in all other respects, Christianity can be fitly classified, and assigned its place in natural sequence with other historical creeds, by the rapidly maturing Science of Religion. The character of Divine Revelation, in any supernatural sense, cannot be accorded to any of the Religions which have successively laid claim to it; and whilst in one sense Christianity is the most divine of all human systems, it must be remarked that this is solely due to its noble morality, and not to its supernatural dogmas, which are not more original

than the evidence by which they are supposed to be attested. The so-called Divine Revelation in fact is both in conception and details supremely anthropomorphic. There is not one of its dogmas which does not find parallels in antecedent religions, and although the same may be said of its isolated precepts, it is, notwithstanding, in the completeness and perfection of its elevated morality that its only true and undeniable originality consists.

Christianity takes a higher position when recognized to be the most perfect development of human morality than it could do as an abortive pretendent to divine honours. There is little indeed in its history and actual achievements to support the claim made on its behalf to the character of a scheme Divinely revealed for the salvation of the human race. Primarily communicated to a favoured nation, which almost unanimously rejected it then, and whose descendants still continue almost unanimously to confirm the original judgment, it has not, after upwards of 1800 years, obtained even the nominal adherence of more than a third of the human race.¹ Sâkya Muni, a teacher only second in nobility of character to Jesus, who, like him, proclaimed a system of elevated morality, has even now almost as many followers, although his missionaries have never penetrated the West, and his creed is much less adapted for general acceptance. Such results attained by a Religion specially claiming the character of direct Divine Revelation cannot be called supernatural, although they may not be disproportionate for a human system of pure spiritual morality.

In considering the actual position of Christianity, however, and what it may have done for the world as a religious system, its supernatural dogmas become a mere question of detail. The Divine origin attributed to its founder, the miraculous circumstances represented as attending his birth and subsequent career, as well as the hope of reward in a future life, and the fear of eternal punishment, undoubtedly exercised a certain influence in ages of darkness and superstition, to which the lofty morality of Jesus might have appealed in vain, and, therefore, they may have

¹ The different creeds may be roughly estimated as follows :—

Christians	340 millions,
Other creeds	660 "

The last item is composed as follows :—

Mahomedans	124 millions.
Buddhists	300 "
Brahmins	130 "
Other Pagans	100 "
Jews	6 "

Cf. A. K. Johnston, *Physical Atlas*, 1856, Chart xxxiv., p. 111.

contributed towards the propagation of Christianity. The supernatural dogmas, however, have no virtue in themselves. We shall not here inquire how much or how little of civilization in Europe has been due to the influence of Christianity, but we may assert that whatever beneficial effect has been produced by it has been solely attributable to its morality. It is an undoubted fact that wherever, as in the Eastern Church, dogmatic theology has been dominant, civilization has declined. Theological bigotry rapidly extinguishes Christian virtues. But for the filtration of morality through doctrinal obstructions the dogmas of ecclesiastical Christianity would have produced little or nothing but evil for the world. They have been the fruitful source of "hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness," and their propagation by sword and stake has ensanguined many a page of history. Whatever service the supernatural dogmas may have rendered in securing authority for the sublime Religion of Jesus in ages of barbarism incapable of understanding its elevated purity, their influence and utility can only be regarded as temporary. Their abandonment can have no prejudicial effect upon the power of Religion. No one who pretends to make the moral teaching of Jesus the rule of life merely from dogmatic obligation can have understood that morality at all, or penetrated beyond the mere letter of its precepts. On the other hand, weighted as Christian morality has been by supernatural dogmas, which are felt to be incredible, doubt and hesitation with regard to these more or less paralyzes its practical authority.

Even Bishop Butler acknowledges that the importance of Christianity primarily arises from its being a distinct declaration and institution of natural morality; and he only accords to its supernatural dogmas, ¹ a secondary rank. No one can have attentively studied the subject without being struck by the absence of any such dogmas from the earlier records of the teaching of Jesus. We shall probably never be able to determine now how far the great teacher may, through his own speculations or misunderstood spiritual utterances, have originated the supernatural doctrines subsequently attributed to him, and by which his whole history and system soon became suffused. There can be little doubt that in great part the miraculous elements of Christianity are due to the profound and excited veneration of uninstructed and superstitious ages for the elevated character of Jesus. The history of the world is not without instances of similar phenomena, but as a slight illustration of the tendency we may, in passing, merely point to the case of the excited and superstitious populace of Lystra, who with less reason are described as hailing

¹ Analogy, part ii., ch. 1.

Paul and Barnabas as gods. Whatever explanation may be given, however, it is undeniable that the earliest teaching of Jesus recorded in the Gospel which can be regarded in any degree as historical is pure morality almost, if not quite, free from theological dogmas. Morality was the essence of his system; theology was an after-thought. It is to the followers of Jesus, and not to the Master himself, that we owe the supernatural elements so characteristic of the age and people. We may look in vain in the Synoptic Gospels for the doctrines elaborated in the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of Ephesus. The great transformation of Christianity was thus effected by men who had never seen Jesus, and who were only acquainted with his teaching when already transmuted by tradition. The fervid imagination of the East constructed Christian theology. It is not difficult to follow the gradual development of the creeds of the Church, and it is certainly most instructive to observe the progressive boldness with which its dogmas were expanded by pious enthusiasm. The New Testament alone represents several stages of dogmatic evolution. Before his first followers had passed away, intricate systems of dogma and mysticism began to prevail. The disciples who had so often misunderstood the teaching of Jesus during his life, piously distorted it after his death. His simple lessons of meekness and humility were soon forgotten. With lamentable rapidity the elaborate structure of ecclesiastical Christianity, following stereotyped lines of human superstition, and deeply coloured by Alexandrian philosophy, displaced the simple morality of Jesus. Doctrinal controversy, which commenced amongst the very apostles, has ever since divided the unity of the Christian body. The perverted ingenuity of successive generations of Churchmen has filled the world with theological quibbles which have naturally enough culminated of late in doctrines of Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility.

It must be admitted that Christian ethics were not in their details either new or original. The precepts which distinguish the system may be found separately in early religions, in ancient philosophies, and in the utterances of the great poets and seers of Israel. The teaching of Jesus, however, carried morality to the sublimest point attained, or even attainable, by humanity. The influence of his spiritual religion has been rendered doubly great by the unparalleled purity and elevation of his own character. Surpassing in his sublime simplicity and earnestness the moral grandeur of Sâkya Muni, and putting to the blush the sometimes sullied, though generally admirable, teaching of Socrates and Plato, and the whole round of Greek philosophers, he presented the rare spectacle of a life, so far as we can estimate it, uniformly

noble and consistent with his own lofty principles, so that the "imitation of Christ" has become almost the final word in the preaching of his religion, and must continue to be one of the most powerful elements of its permanence. His system might not be new, but it was in a high sense the perfect development of natural morality, and it was final in this respect amongst others, that, superseding codes of law and elaborate rules of life, it confined itself to two fundamental principles: Love to God and love to man. Whilst all previous systems had merely sought to purify the stream, it demanded the purification of the fountain. It placed the evil thought on a par with the evil action. Such morality, based upon the intelligent and earnest acceptance of Divine Law, and perfect recognition of the brotherhood of man, is the highest conceivable by humanity, and although its power and influence must augment with the increase of enlightenment, it is itself beyond development, consisting as it does of principles unlimited in their range, and inexhaustible in their application. Its perfect realization is that true spiritual Nirvâna which Sâkya Muni less clearly conceived, and obscured with Oriental mysticism: extinction of rebellious personal opposition to Divine order, and the attainment of perfect harmony with the will of God.

Such a system can well afford to abandon claims to a supernatural character which have been raised for it in ages of superstitious ignorance, but which now do it but little honour, and to purge itself of dogmas devised by pious fanaticism against which reason and morality revolt. It is obvious that such morality must be embraced for its own excellence alone. It requires no miraculous evidence, and it is independent of supernatural dogma. We cannot in any high sense receive it at all except for its own sake, with earnest appreciation of its truth, and love of its perfect principles; and any argument that Christian Morality would not possess authority and influence apart from Christian Theology is degrading to the very religion it pretends to uphold. No practice of Christian ethics for any ulterior object whatever can be more than mere formality. Mosaism might be content with observance of Law secured by a promise of length of days in the land, or a threat of death to the offender, but the great Teacher demanded holiness for itself alone. The morality of Jesus lays absolute claim to the whole heart and mind, and they cannot be bribed by hopes of heaven, or coerced by fears of hell. The purity of heart which alone "sees God" is not dependent on views of the Trinity, or belief in a miraculous birth and incarnation. On the contrary, the importance which has been attached to Theology by the Christian Church, almost from its foundation, has been subversive of Christian morality. In surrendering its mir-

aculous element, and its claims to supernatural origin, therefore, the religion of Jesus does not lose its virtue or the qualities which have made it a blessing to humanity. It sacrifices none of that elevated character which has distinguished and raised it above all human systems: it merely relinquishes a claim which it has shared with all antecedent religions, and severs its connection with ignorant superstition. It is too divine in its morality to require the aid of miraculous attributes. No supernatural halo can heighten its spiritual beauty, and no mysticism deepen its holiness. In its perfect simplicity it is sublime, and in its profound wisdom it is eternal.

We gain infinitely more than we lose in abandoning belief in the reality of Divine Revelation. Whilst we retain pure and unimpaired the light of Christian Morality, we relinquish nothing but the debasing elements added to it by human superstition. We are no longer bound to believe a theology which outrages Reason and moral sense. We are freed from base anthropomorphic views of God and his government of the universe; and from Jewish mythology we rise to higher conceptions of an infinitely wise and beneficent Being, hidden from our finite minds it is true in the impenetrable glory of Divinity, but whose Laws of wondrous comprehensiveness and perfection we ever perceive in operation around us. We are no longer disturbed by visions of fitful interference with the order of Nature, but we recognize that the Being who regulates the universe is without variability or shadow of turning. It is singular how little there is in the supposed Revelation of alleged information, however incredible, regarding that which is beyond the limits of human thought, but that little is of a character which reason declares to be the "wildest delusion." Let no man whose belief in the reality of Divine Revelation may be destroyed by such inquiry complain that he has lost a precious possession, and that nothing is left but a blank. The Revelation not being a reality, that which he has lost was but an illusion, and that which is left is the Truth. If he be content with illusions he will speedily be consoled; if he be a lover only of truth, instead of a blank he will recognize that the reality before him is full of great peace.

If we know less than we have supposed of man's destiny, we may at least rejoice that we are no longer compelled to believe that which is unworthy. The limits of thought once attained, we may well be unmoved in the assurance that, all that we do know of the regulation of the universe being so perfect and wise, all that we do not know must be equally so. Here enters the true and noble Faith, which is the child of Reason. If we have believed a system, the details of which must at one time or

another have shocked the mind of every intelligent man, and believed it simply because it was supposed to be revealed, we may equally believe in the wisdom and goodness of what is not revealed. The mere act of communication to us is nothing: Faith in the perfect ordering of all things is independent of revelation.

The argument so often employed by theologians that Divine Revelation is necessary for man, and that certain views contained in that Revelation are required by our moral consciousness, is purely imaginary and derived from the Revelation which it seeks to maintain. The only thing absolutely necessary for man is Truth; and to that, and that alone, must our moral consciousness adapt itself. Reason and experience forbid the expectation that we can acquire any knowledge otherwise than through natural channels. To complain that we do not know all that we desire to know is foolish and unreasonable. It is tantamount to complaining that the mind of man is not differently constituted. All of which the human mind is capable we may, now or hereafter, know. The limits of the Knowable are not yet finally determined, but they alone are the bounds of thought, although even there the eye of Reason may glance into the distance beyond. To attain the full altitude of the Knowable, whatever that may be, should be our earnest aim, and more than this is not for humanity. We might as well expect to be supernaturally nourished as supernaturally informed. It is as irrational to expect or demand knowledge unattainable naturally by man's intellect as it is for a child to cry for the moon. We may be certain that information which is beyond the ultimate reach of Reason is as unnecessary as it is inaccessible. Man knows, or may know, all that man requires to know. To deny this is to deny the perfection of the Laws which regulate the Universe. The necessity of Divine Revelation is a pure theological figment utterly opposed to Reason.

Escaping from it we exchange a Jewish anthropomorphic Divinity made after our image for an omnipresent God under whose beneficent government we know that all that is consistent with wise and omnipotent Law is prospered and brought to perfection, and all that is opposed to Divine order is mercifully frustrated and brought to naught. The man who is truly inspired by the morality of Jesus and penetrated by that love of God and of man which is its living principle, cheerfully ratifies the fiat which thus maintains the order of Nature, and recognizes its ultimate transcendence and good, for by virtue of that noble morality we cease to be mere units seeking only individual or selfish advantage. It is manifestly our first duty, as it should be our supremest pleasure, to apprehend as clearly as we may the laws by which the Supreme Being governs the Universe, and to bring

ourselves and our actions into reverent harmony with them, conforming ourselves to their teaching, and learning wisdom from their decrees. Thus making the Divine Will our will we shall recognize in the highest sense that God is ever with us, that his good providence controls our slightest actions; that we are not the sport of Satanic malice nor the victims of fitful caprice, but are eternally cared for and governed by an omnipresent immutable power for which nothing is too great, nothing too insignificant, and in whose Divine order a fitting place is found for the lowest as well as the highest in the palpitating life of the Universe.

PART IV.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

BEFORE we proceed to examine the evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation which is furnished by the last historical book of the New Testament, entitled the "Acts of the Apostles," it is well that we should briefly recall to mind some characteristics of the document, which most materially affect the value of any testimony emanating from it. Whilst generally asserting the resurrection of Jesus, and his bodily ascension, regarding which indeed it adds fresh details, this work presents to us a new cycle of miracles, and so profusely introduces supernatural agency into the history of the early church that, in comparison with it, the Gospels seem almost sober narratives. The Apostles are instructed and comforted by visions and revelations, and they, and all who believe, are filled with the Holy Spirit and speak with other tongues. The Apostles are delivered from prison and from bonds by angels or by an earthquake. Men fall dead or are smitten with blindness at their rebuke. They heal the sick, raise the dead, and handkerchiefs brought from their bodies cure diseases and expel evil spirits.

As a general rule, any document so full of miraculous episodes and supernatural occurrences would, without hesitation, be characterized as fabulous and incredible, and would not, by any sober-minded reader, be for a moment accepted as historical. There is no other testimony for these miracles. Let the reader endeavour to form some conception of the nature and amount of evidence necessary to establish the truth of statements antecedently so incredible, and compare it with the testimony of this solitary and anonymous document, the character and value of which we shall now proceed more closely to examine.

It is generally admitted, and indeed it is undeniable, that no distinct and unequivocal reference to the Acts of the Apostles, and to Luke as their author, occurs in the writings of Fathers before one by Irenæus¹ about the end of the second century. Passages are, however, pointed out in earlier writings as indicating the use and consequent existence of our document, all of which we shall now examine.

Several of these occur in the "Epistle to the Corinthians," ascribed to Clement of Rome. The first, immediately compared with the passage to which it is supposed to be a reference,² is as follows:—

EPISTLE C. II.

Ye were all humble-minded, not boasting at all, subjecting yourselves rather than subjecting others, more gladly giving than receiving.

Πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε, μηδὲν ἀλαζονευόμενοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι, μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες, ἑαυτοὺς δίδοντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες...

ACTS XX. 35.

... and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said: It is more blessed to give than to receive.

... μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον δίδοναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.

The words of the Epistle are not a quotation, but merely occur in the course of an address. They do not take the form of an axiom, but are a comment on the conduct of the Corinthians, which may have been suggested either by written or oral tradition, or by moral maxims long before current in heathen philosophy.³ It is unnecessary to enter minutely into this, however, or to point out the linguistic differences between the two passages, for one point alone settles the question. In the Acts: the saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," is distinctly introduced as a quotation of "words of the Lord Jesus," and the exhortation "to remember" them, conveys the inference that they

¹ Adv. Hær., iii. 14, §§ 1, 2; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 124; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. 1, p. 273 f.; Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 71 f.; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 279 ff.; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml. N. T. Canons, p. 161, ann. 2; Meyer, Kr. exeg. H'buch. üb. die Apostelgeschichte, 4te Aufl., 1870, p. 1 f.; Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 337, ann. 2; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 118, ann. 2; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 254; Zeller, Die Apostelgeschichte, 1854, p. 71.

² Dressel, Patr. Ap. Opp., 1863, p. 48; Hefele, Patr. Ap. Opp., 1842, p. 29; Jacobson, Patr. Apost., 1863, i. p. 11; Kirchhofer, Quellens. N. T. Canons, p. 162; Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, 1788, ii. p. 34; Lightfoot, The Epistles of S. Clement of Rome, 1869, p. 36. Cf. Meyer, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 453.

³ *Εὐ ποιεῖν ἡδὺν ἔστι τοῦ πάσχειν. Epicur. ap. Plut. Mor. p. 778 c. Errat enim si quis beneficium libentius accipit quam reddit. Seneca, Epist. lxxi. 17. Μᾶλλον ἔστι τοῦ ἐλευθερίου τὸ δίδοναι οἷς δεῖ ἢ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν δεῖ, καὶ μὴ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ. τῆς γὰρ ἀρετῆς μᾶλλον τὸ εὐ ποιεῖν ἢ τὸ εὐ πάσχειν. Aristotle, Eth. Nicom. iv. 1. Δωρεῖσθαι καὶ δίδοναι κρεῖττον ἢ λαμβάνειν. Artemidor. Oneirocr. iv. 3. Cf. Wetstein, N. T. Gr. l. c.*

were well known. They must either have formed part of Gospels now no longer extant, as they are not found in ours, or have been familiar as the unwritten tradition of sayings of the Master. In either case, if the passage in the Epistle be a reference to these words at all, it must be held a reference to an apocryphal gospel, or to tradition, and it cannot reasonably be maintained that they must necessarily have been derived from a work which itself distinctly quotes them from another source. It would be against every principle of evidence, under such circumstances, to conclude the passage to be an allusion to this special work, of whose previous existence we have no independent evidence.¹ The slight coincidence in the expression, without indication that any particular passage is in the mind of the author, and without any mention of the Acts, therefore, is no evidence whatever of the existence of that work.

A few critics point to some parts of the following passage as showing acquaintance with Acts:—"Through jealousy Paul also pointed out the way to the prize of patience, having borne chains seven times, having been put to flight, having been stoned; having become a preacher both in the East and in the West, he gained the noble renown due to his faith; having taught the whole world righteousness, and come to the extremity of the West, and having suffered martyrdom by command of the rulers, he was thus removed from the world and went to the holy place, having become a most eminent example of patience."² The slightest impartial consideration, however, must convince any one that this passage does not indicate the use of the "Acts of the Apostles." The Epistle speaks of seven imprisonments, of some of which the Acts make no mention, and this must, therefore, have been derived from another source.³ The reference to his "coming to the extremity of the West" (τέρμα τῆς δύσεως), whatever interpretation be put upon it, and to his death, obviously carries the history further than the Acts, and cannot have been derived from that document.

¹ Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 269; Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, ii. p. 73; Ekker, *Disq. crit. et hist. de Clem. Rom. priore ad Cor. epist.*, 1854, p. 59; Hilgenfeld, *Die apost. Väter*, 1853, p. 73; N. T. extra Can. recept., 1866, i. p. 78; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 9.

² Διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον [ὑπέδει] ξεν, ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δεσμιὰ φορέσας, φυγαδευθεὶς, λιθασθεὶς, κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δυσεί, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἔλθων· καὶ μαρτυρησάς, ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπὸ ἀλλήλων τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν αἴγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ἐπογραμμός. c. v.

³ Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. 52; Ekker, *Disq.*, p. 64; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 109, anm. 13; N. T. extra Can. recept., i. p. 79; Lightfoot, *Eps. of S. Clement of Rome*, p. 48; Lipsius, *De Clementis Rom. Ep. and Cor. priore Disq.*, 1855, p. 128, Annot. 3; Zeller, *App.*, p. 9.

The last passage, which, it is affirmed,¹ shows acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles is the following: "But what shall we say regarding David who hath obtained a good report (ἐπὶ τῷ μαρτυρημένῳ Δαυίδ)? unto whom (πρὸς ὃν) God said: 'I found a man after mine own heart, David, the son of Jesse: in everlasting mercy I anointed him.'"² This is said to be derived from Acts xiii. 22: "And when he removed him he raised up to them David for king; to whom also he gave testimony (ὃ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας): I found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, who will do all my will."³ The passage, however, is compounded of two quotations loosely made from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, from which all the quotations in the Epistle are taken. Ps. lxxxviii. 20: "I found David my servant; in holy mercy I anointed him."⁴ And 1 Sam. xiii. : "A man after his own heart."⁵ Clement of Alexandria quotes this passage from the Epistle, and for "in everlasting mercy" reads "with holy oil" (ἐν ἑλαίῳ ἁγίῳ) as in the Psalm.⁶ Although, therefore, our Alexandrian MS. of the Epistle has the reading which we have given above, even if we suppose that the Alexandrian Clement may have found a more correct version in his MS., the argument would not be affected. The whole similarity lies in the insertion of "the son of Jesse," but this was a most common addition to any mention of David, and by the completion of the passage from the Psalm, the omission of "who will do all my will," the peculiar phrase of the Acts, as well as the difference of introductory expressions, any connection between the two is severed, and it is apparent that the quotation of the Epistle may legitimately be referred to the Septuagint,⁷ with which it agrees much more closely than with the Acts. In no case could such slight coincidences prove acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles.⁸

¹ Dressel, *Patr. Ap.*, p. 65; Hefele, *Patr. Ap.*, p. 40; Lightfoot, *Eps. of S. Clem.*, p. 79; Tregelles, *Can. Murat.*, p. 82; Wotton, *Clem. Rom.*, p. 90. Cf. *Lardner, Credibility*, &c., Works, 1788, ii. p. 34; Kirchhofer, *Quellenz.*, p. 161.

² Τὶ δὲ εἰπόμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μαρτυρημένῳ Δαυίδ; πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ θεός, Εὐρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυίδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἐν ἑλαίῳ ἁγίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν. c. xviii.

³ Καὶ μεταστῆσας αὐτὸν ἡγείρειν τὸν Δαυίδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα, ὃ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας. Εὐρον Δαυίδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ βελήματά μου. Acts xiii. 22.

⁴ Εὐρον Δαυίδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου, ἐν ἑλαίῳ ἁγίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν. The Alexandrian MS. reads ἐν ἑλαίῳ ἁγίῳ μου. The quotation given is the reading of the Vatican Codex.

⁵ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.

⁶ *Stromata*, iv. 17.

⁷ Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 72 f.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 9. Cf. Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 269; Hilgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 101.

⁸ Eichhorn, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 72 f.; Neudecker, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 337, ann. 2; Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii. Proleg. p. 20; Hilgenfeld, *Ap. Väter*, p. 108; Zeller, *App.*, p. 9; Dr. Westcott does not claim any: On the Canon, 1875, p. 48, note 2.

Only one passage of the "Epistle of Barnabas" is referred to by any one¹ as indicating acquaintance with the Acts. It is as follows, c. 7: "If therefore the son of God, being Lord, and about to judge quick and dead (καὶ μελλῶν κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς) suffered," &c. This is compared with Acts x. 42 . . . "and to testify that it is he who has been appointed by God judge of quick and dead" (οὗτος αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὀρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν). Lardner, who compares the expression of the Epistle with Acts, equally compares it with that in 2 Tim. iv. 1 . . . "and Christ Jesus who is about to judge the quick and dead" (μελλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς), to which it is more commonly referred,² and 1 Pet. iv. 5 . . . "to him who is ready to judge quick and dead" (κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς). He adds, however: "It is not possible to say what text he refers to, though that in Timothy has the same words. But perhaps there is no proof that he refers to any. This was an article known to every common Christian; whereas this writer (whoever he be) was able to teach the Christian religion, and that without respect to any written gospels or epistles."³ It is scarcely necessary to add anything to this. There is of course no trace of the use of Acts in the Epistle.⁴

It is asserted that there is a "clear allusion"⁵ to Acts in the Pastor of Hermas. The passages may be compared as follows:

VIS. IV. 2.

. . . and didst open thy heart to the Lord, believing that by no other couldst thou be saved than by the great and glorious name.

. . . καὶ τὴν καρδίαν σου ἠνοίξας πρὸς τὸν κύριον, πιστεύσας ὅτι δι' οὐδενὸς δύνη σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος.

ACTS IV. 12.

And there is salvation in no other: for neither is there any other name under the heaven that has been given among men whereby we must be saved.

καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομα ἔστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

The slightest comparison of these passages suffices to show that the one is not dependent on the other. The Old Testament is full of passages in which the name of the Lord is magnified as the only source of safety and salvation. In the Pauline Epistles likewise there are numerous passages of a similar tenour. For instance, the passage from Joel ii. 32, is quoted Rom. x. 13: "For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved"

¹ Kirchhofer, Quellens. N.T. Can., p. 161.

² Cf. Westcott, On the Canon, p. 48, n. 2.

³ Credibility, &c., Works, 1788, ii. p. 17.

⁴ Eichhorn, Einl. N.T., ii. p. 72; Neudecker, Einl. N.T., p. 337, an. 2; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 242.

⁵ Westcott, On the Canon, p. 196 f.

(Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται).¹ There was in fact no formula more current either amongst the Jews or in the early Church; and there is no legitimate ground for tracing such an expression to the Acts of the Apostles.²

The only other passage which is quoted³ as indicating acquaintance with Acts is the following, which we at once contrast with the supposed parallel:

SIMIL. IX. 28.

But ye who suffer on account of the name ought to praise God, that God deemed ye worthy to bear his name, and that all your sins may be redeemed.

ὁμοῖς δὲ οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξαζεῖν ὀφείλετε τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀξίους ὑμᾶς ἡγήσατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα τούτου τὸ ὄνομα βαστάζητε, καὶ πᾶσαι ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἰαθῶσιν.

ACTS v. 41.

So they departed rejoicing from the presence of the council that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name.

οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι.

Here again a formula is employed which is common throughout the New Testament, and which, applied as it is here to those who were persecuted, we have reason to believe was in general use in the early Church. It is almost unnecessary to point out any examples. Everywhere "the name" of God or of Jesus is the symbol used to represent the concrete idea, and in the heavenly Jerusalem of the Apocalypse the servants of God and of the Lamb are to have "his name" on their foreheads. The one expression, however, which is peculiar in the passage: "counted worthy,"—in the Acts κατηξιώθησαν, and in the Pastor ἀξίους ἡγήσατο,—is a perfectly natural and simple one, the use of which cannot be exclusively conceded to the Acts of the Apostles. It is found frequently in the Pauline Epistles, as for instance in 2 Thes. i. 5, where, after saying that they give thanks to God for them and glory in the churches of God for the patience and faith with which the Thessalonians endure persecutions, the writer continues: "which is a token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye *may be counted worthy* (καταξιωθῆναι) of the kingdom of God, for which ye also *suffer* (πάσχετε);" and again, in the same chapter, v. 11, 12, "Wherefore we also pray always for you that our God *may count you worthy* (ἀξιώσει) of the calling, and fulfil all good pleasure of good-

¹ The same passage is quoted, Acts ii. 21. Cf. Ephes. i. 20, 21; Philip. ii. 9 ff.; 1 John v. 13 f.

² Zeller, Apostelgesch., p. 10; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 269. Neither Kirchhofer nor Lardner advances the passage at all.

³ Lardner, Works, ii. p. 56. This is not advanced by Kirchhofer, nor does Dr. Westcott refer to it. Even Hefele does not suggest a reference.

ness and work of faith with power; *that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you* (ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν)," &c. The passage we are examining cannot be traced to the "Acts of the Apostles."¹ It must be obvious to all that the Pastor of Hermas does not present any evidence even of the existence of the Acts at the time it was written.²

Only two passages in the Epistles of pseudo-Ignatius are pointed out as indicating acquaintance with the Acts, and even these are not advanced by many critics. We have already so fully discussed these Epistles that no more need now be said. We must pronounce them spurious in all their recensions and incapable of affording evidence upon any point earlier than towards the end of the second century. Those, however, who would still receive as genuine the testimony of the three Syriac Epistles, must declare that they do not present any trace of the existence of the Acts, inasmuch as the two passages adduced to show the use of that work do not occur in those letters. They are found in the shorter recension of the Epistles to the Smyræans and Philadelphians. We might, therefore, altogether refuse to examine the passages, but in order to show the exact nature of the case made out by apologists, we shall briefly refer to them. We at once compare the first with its supposed parallel.³

EP. TO SMYRN. iii.

But after the resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as in the flesh, although spiritually united to the Father.

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρὶ.

ACTS x. 41.

... even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.

... ἡμῖν οἵτινες συνεφαγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

There is nothing in this passage which bears any peculiar analogy to the Acts, for the statement is a simple reference to a tradition which is also embodied both in the third Synoptic⁴ and in the fourth Gospel;⁵ and the mere use of the common words φαγεῖν and πίνεω could not prove anything. The passage occurs in the Epistle immediately after a quotation, said by Jerome to be

¹ Eichhorn, Einl. N.T., ii. p. 73 f.

² Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 306; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 269; Neudecker, Einl. N.T., p. 337, ann. 2; Zeller, Apostelgesch., p. 9 f.

³ Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 73 f.; Kirchhofer, Quellens., 162; Zahn, Ignat. v. Ant., 1873, p. 600.

Dr. Westcott does not claim either this or the second (On the Canon, p. 48, note 2), and Hefele merely suggests comparison with Acts (Patr. Ap., p. 103, p. 98).

⁴ Luke xxiv. 42 ff.

⁵ John xxi. 12 ff.

taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, relating an appearance of Jesus to "those who were with Peter," in which Jesus is represented as making them handle him in order to convince them that he is not an incorporeal spirit.¹ The quotation bears considerable affinity to the narrative in the third Synoptic (xxiv. 39), at the close of which Jesus is represented as eating with the disciples. It is highly probable that the Gospel from which the writer of the Epistle quoted contained the same detail, to which this would naturally be a direct descriptive reference. In any case it affords no evidence of the existence of the Acts of the Apostles.²

The second passage, which is still more rarely advanced,³ is as follows:—

EP. TO PHILAD. ii.

For many wolves (which appear) worthy of belief, make captive by evil pleasure the runners in the course of God.

πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι ἀξιοπίστοι ἡδονῇ κακῇ αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν τοὺς θεοδρόμους.

ACTS xx. 29.

I know that after my departing grievous wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἀφίξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.

The only point of coincidence between these two passages is the use of the word "wolves." In the Epistle the expression is πολλοὶ λύκοι ἀξιοπίστοι, whilst in Acts it is λύκοι βαρεῖς. Now the image is substantially found in the Sermon on the Mount, one form of which is given in the first Synoptic, vii. 15, 16, and which undeniably must have formed part of many of the Gospels which are mentioned by the writer of the third Synoptic. We find Justin Martyr twice quoting another form of the saying: "For many (πολλοί) shall arrive in my name, outwardly indeed clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly being ravening wolves (λύκοι ἀρπαγες)."⁴ The use of the term as applied to men was certainly common in the early Church. The idea expressed in the Epistle is more closely found in 2 Timothy iii. 1 ff., in the description of those who are to come in the last days, and who will (v. 6) "creep into the houses and lead captive (αἰχμαλωτίζοντες) silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." The passage cannot be traced to the Acts,⁵ and the Ignatian Epistles, spurious though

¹ Quoted, p. 240.

² Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 51; Meyer, *Apostelgesch.*, 1870, p. 1; Neudecker, *Einsl. N. T.*, p. 337, ann. 2; Hülgenfeld, *Die ap. Väter*, p. 280 f.

³ Jacobson, *Patr. Ap.*, ii. 418.

⁴ See discussion of the quotation, p. 298, note 2, p. 313 f.

⁵ Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 51.

they be, do not present any evidence of the existence of that work.¹

Only two sentences are pointed out in the "Epistle of Polycarp" as denoting acquaintance with the Acts. The first and only one of these on which much stress is laid is the following:—²

EPISTLE I.

Whom God raised (*ἤγειρε*), having loosed the pains of hell (*ᾗδου*).

ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ θεὸς λύσας τὰς ᾗδου-
ρας τοῦ ᾗδου.

ACTS II. 24.

Whom God raised up (*ἀνέστησε*), having loosed the pains of death (*θανάτου*).

ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς
ᾗδυνας τοῦ θανάτου.³

It will be obvious to all that, along with much similarity, there is likewise divergence between these sentences. In the first phrase the use of *ἤγειρε* in the Epistle separates it from the supposed parallel, in which the word is *ἀνέστησε*. The number of passages in the Pauline Epistles corresponding with it are legion (e.g., 2 Cor. iv. 14, Ephes. i. 20). The second member of the sentence, which is of course the more important, is in reality, we contend, a reference to the very Psalm quoted in Acts immediately after the verse before us, couched in not unusual phraseology. Psalm xvi. 10 (Sept. xv.), reads: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (*ᾗδην*).⁴ In Ps. xviii. 5 (Sept. xvii. 5) we have, "The pains of hell (*ᾗδυνες ᾗδου*) compassed me about."⁵ The difference between the *ᾗδυνας τοῦ ᾗδου* of the Epistle and the *ᾗδυνας τοῦ θανάτου* of the Acts is so distinct that, finding a closer parallel in the Psalms to which reference is obviously made in both works, it is quite impossible to trace the phrase necessarily to the Acts. Such a passage cannot prove the use of that work,⁶ but, if it could, we might inquire what evidence for the authorship and trustworthiness of the Acts could be deduced from the circumstance?⁷

¹ Credner, Einl. N. T., i. 1. p. 274; Zeller, Apog., p. 51 f.; Meyer, Apostelgesch., 4te Aufl., p. 1; Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2. Cf. Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 74.

² Dressel, Patr. Ap., p. 377; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 270; Donaldson, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., 1864, i. p. 197; Hefele, Patr. Ap., p. 117; Jacobson, Patr. Ap., ii. p. 525; Kirchhofer, Quellens., p. 162; Lardner, Works, ii. p. 93; Tregelles, Can. Murat., p. 82; Westcott, Canon, 1874, p. 48, note 2; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 52 f. Cf. Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 74 f.

³ It is right to point out that the Cod. Bezae (D) reads *ᾗδου* here, although all the older, and almost all other, MSS. have *θανάτου*.

⁴ Cod. E reads *ᾗδου*.

⁵ In the Sept. version of Job, xxxix. 2, the expression *ᾗδυνας δὲ αὐτῶν* *ἐλευσάς* occurs.

⁶ Hilgenfeld, Ap. v. 284; Credner, Einl. N. T., i. 1, p. 274.

⁷ For the date and character of the Epistle, see discussion, p. 241 ff.

The second passage, referred to by a few writers,¹ is as follows:—

EPISTLE viii.

Let us therefore become imitators of his patience, and if we suffer for his name, let us praise him.

Μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.

ACTS v. 41.

So they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name.

Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.

It is scarcely necessary to do more than contrast these passages to show how little the "Epistle of Polycarp" can witness for the "Acts of the Apostles." We have already examined another supposed reference to this very passage, and the expressions in the Epistle, whilst scarcely presenting a single point of linguistic analogy to the sentence in the Acts, only tend to show how common and natural such language was in the early Church in connection with persecution. Whilst we constantly meet with the thought expressed by the writer of the Epistle throughout the writings of the New Testament, we may more particularly point to the first Petrine epistle for further instances of this tone of exhortation to those suffering persecution for the cause. For instance, 1 Pet. ii. 19 ff., and again iii. 14.² "But if ye even suffer (πάσχετε) for righteousness' sake, blessed are ye." In the next chapter the tone is still more closely analogous. Speaking of persecutions, the writer says, iv. 13, "... but according as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings rejoice," &c., &c. 14. "If ye are reproached in Christ's name (ἐν ὀνόματι Χ.) blessed are ye, for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." 15. "For let none of you suffer (πάσχω) as a murderer," &c., &c. 16. "But if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him praise God in this name (δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ)," &c., &c. Nothing but evidential destitution could rely upon the expression in the "Epistle of Polycarp" to show acquaintance with Acts.

Few apologists point out with confidence any passages from the voluminous writings of Justin Martyr, as indicating the use of the Acts of the Apostles. We may, however, quote such expressions as the more undaunted amongst them venture to advance. The first of these is the following:³ "For the Jews having the

¹ Jacobson, Patr. Ap., ii. p. 541. Cf. Dressel, Patr. Ap., p. 386; Hefele, Patr. Ap., p. 120.

² Ver. 13, according to some MSS., reads: "And who is he that will harm you, if ye become imitators (μιμηταὶ) of the good?"

³ Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 122; Kirchhofer, Quellens. N. T. Can., p. 163.

prophecies and ever expecting the Christ to come knew him not (*ἠγνόησαν*), and not only so, but they also maltreated him. But the Gentiles, who had never heard anything regarding the Christ until his Apostles, having gone forth from Jerusalem, declared the things concerning him, and delivered the prophecies, having been filled with joy and faith, renounced their idols and dedicated themselves to the unbegotten God through the Christ."¹ This is compared with Acts xiii. 27, "For they that dwell at Jerusalem and their rulers not knowing this (man) (*τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες*) nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, fulfilled them by their judgment of him," &c. 48. "But the Gentiles, hearing, rejoiced and glorified the word of the Lord," &c.² We may at once proceed to give the next passage. In the Dialogue with Trypho, Justin has by quotations from the prophets endeavoured to show that the sufferings of Christ, and also the glory of his second advent, had been foretold, and Trypho replies: "Supposing these things to be even as thou sayest, and that it was foretold that Christ was to suffer (*ὅτι παθὴρὸς Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη μέλλειν εἶναι*), and has been called a Stone, and after his first coming in which it had been announced that he was to suffer, should come in glory, and become judge of all, and eternal king and priest;" &c.³ and in another place, "For if it had been obscurely declared by the prophets that the Christ should suffer (*παθὴρὸς γενησόμενος ὁ Χριστὸς*) and after these things be lord of all," &c.⁴ This is compared with Acts xxvi. 22, ".... saying nothing except those things which the prophets and Moses said were to come to pass, (23) whether the Christ should suffer (*εἰ παθὴρὸς ὁ Χριστός*), whether, the first out of the resurrection from the dead, he is about to proclaim light

¹ Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ ἔχοντες τὰς προφητείας καὶ αἰεὶ προσδοκῆσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν παραγεννησόμενον ἠγνόησαν, οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρεχρήσαντο· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθνῶν μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μέχρις οὗ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξεληόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμύνησαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς προφητείας παρέδωκαν, πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοῖς εἰδωλοῖς ἀπετάξαντο καὶ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέθηκαν. *Apol. i. 49.*

² Acts xiii. 27: Οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγιγωσκόμενας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν· κ.τ.λ. 48. ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, κ.τ.λ.

³ Ἐδὼ καὶ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα ὡς λέγεις, καὶ ὅτι παθὴρὸς Χριστὸς προεφητεύῃ μέλλειν εἶναι, καὶ λίθος κέκληται, καὶ ἐνδοξὸς μετὰ τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν, ἐν ᾗ παθὴρὸς φαίνεσθαι κεκήρυκτο, ἐλυσόμενος καὶ κριτὴς πάντων λοιπῶν, καὶ αἰώνιος βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς γενησόμενος· κ.τ.λ. *Dial. 76.*

⁴ Εἰ γὰρ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν παρακεκαλυμμένως κεκήρυκτο παθὴρὸς γενησόμενος ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντων κυριεύσων· κ.τ.λ. *Dial. 76.*

unto the people and to the Gentiles."¹ It is only necessary to quote these passages to show how impossible it is to maintain that they show the use of the Acts by Justin. He simply sets forth from the prophets, direct, the doctrines which formed the great text of the early Church. Some of the warmest supporters of the canon admit the "uncertainty" of such coincidences, and do not think it worth while to advance them. There are one or two still more distant analogies sometimes pointed out which do not require more particular notice.² There is no evidence whatever that Justin was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles.³

Some apologists⁴ claim Hegesippus as evidence for the existence of the Acts, on the strength of the following passages in the fragment of his book preserved by Eusebius. He puts into the mouth of James the Just, whilst being martyred, the expression: "I beseech (thee) Lord God, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." This is compared with the words said to have been uttered by the martyr Stephen, Acts vii. 60, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." The passage is more commonly advanced as showing acquaintance with Luke xxiii. 34, and we have already discussed it.⁵ Lardner apparently desires it to do double duty, but it is scarcely worth while seriously to refer to the claim here. The passage more generally relied upon, though that also is only advanced by a few,⁶ is the following: "This man was a faithful witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ," (*Μάρτυς οὗτος ἀληθὴς Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήσι γεγένηται ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν*). This is compared with Acts xx. 21, where Paul is represented as saying of himself, " . . . testifying fully both to Jews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Διαμαρτυρούμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλήσιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν, καὶ*

¹ Acts xxvi. 22. . . . οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφηταὶ ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς, 23. εἰ παθητός ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

² Apol. i. 50, cf. Acts i. 8 f.; Apol. i. 40, cf. Acts iv. 27; Apol. ii. 10, cf. Acts xvii. 23; Dial. 8, cf. Acts xxvi. 29; Dial. 20, cf. Acts x. 14; Dial. 68, cf. Acts ii. 30.

³ Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 49 f.; Eichhorn, *Einel. N.T.*, ii. p. 75; Credner, *Einel. N.T.*, i. 1, p. 274; Meyer, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 1 f. Dean Alford says: "Nor are there any references in Justin Martyr which, fairly considered, belong to this book." Greek Test., 1871, Proleg. ii. p. 20. Dr. Westcott says: "The references to the Acts are uncertain;" and he merely illustrates this by referring to the first of the passages discussed in the text. On the Canon, 1875, p. 163, note 3. Donaldson, *Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr.*, ii. p. 329.

⁴ Lardner, *Credibility*, Works, ii. p. 142.

⁵ P. 352 f.

⁶ Lardner, *Credibility*, Works, ii. p. 142; Westcott, *On the Canon*, 4th ed., p. 205. Dr. Westcott, however, merely says: "There are forms of expression corresponding to passages in . . . and in the Acts which can scarcely be attributed to chance."

⁷ Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii. 23.

πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.). The two passages are totally different both in sense and language, and that the use of Acts is deduced from so distant an analogy only serves to show the slightness of the evidence with which apologists have to be content.

Papias need not long detain us, for it is freely admitted by most divines that he does not afford evidence of any value that he was acquainted with the Acts. For the sake of completeness we may however refer to the points which are sometimes mentioned. A fragment of the work of Papias is preserved giving an account of the death of Judas, which differs materially both from the account in the first Synoptic and in Acts i. 18 f.¹ Judas is represented as having gone about the world a great example of impiety, for his body having swollen so much that he could not pass where a chariot easily passed, he was crushed by the chariot so that his entrails emptied out (ὥστε τὰ ἔγκαια αὐτοῦ ἐκκενωθῆναι). Apollinaris of Laodicea quotes this passage to show that Judas did not die when he hung himself, but subsequently met with another fate, in this way reconciling the statements in the Gospel and Acts.² He does not say that Papias used the story for this purpose, and it is fundamentally contradictory to the account in Acts i. 18, 19. "Now this man purchased a field with the reward of the unrighteousness, and falling headlong burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out" (καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ). It is scarcely necessary to argue that the passage does not indicate any acquaintance with Acts³ as some few critics are inclined to assert.⁴ The next analogy pointed out is derived from the statement of Eusebius that Papias mentions a wonderful story which he had heard from the daughters of Philip (whom Eusebius calls "the Apostle,") regarding a dead man raised to life.⁵ In Acts xxi. 8, 9, it is stated that Philip the evangelist had four daughters. It is scarcely conceivable that this should be advanced as an indication that Papias knew the Acts. The last

¹ P. 381.

² Routh, Reliq. Sacr., i. p. 25 f.

³ Overbeck, Zeitsch. wiss. Theol., 1867, p. 39 ff. Cf. Steitz, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1868, p. 87 ff.; Meyer, Die Apostelgesch., p. 2, anm. * * Dr. Westcott says: "In his account of the fate of Judas Iscariot there is a remarkable divergence from the narrative in Matth. xxvii. 5, and Acts i. 18." On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 77, n. 1.

⁴ Zahn, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 680 ff. Dr. Lightfoot says: "But there are indications, however indecisive, that Papias did use the writings of St. Luke." And further on, after quoting the passage about Judas, and mentioning the view of Apollinaris that it reconciles the accounts in the first Gospel and in the Acts, he continues: "It is too much to assume that Papias himself repeated the tradition with this aim, but the resemblance to the account in the Acts is worthy of notice." Contemporary Rev., vol. v., 1867, p. 415.

⁵ H. E., iii. 39.

point is that Eusebius says: "And again (he narrates) another marvel regarding Justus who was surnamed Barsabas; how he drank a baneful poison and by the grace of the Lord sustained no harm. But that this Justus, after the Ascension of the Saviour, the holy apostles appointed with Matthias, and that they prayed (on the occasion) of the filling up of their number by lot instead of the traitor Judas, the Scripture of the Acts thus relates: 'And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed and said,' &c."¹ Whatever argument can be deduced from this, obviously rests entirely upon the fact that Papias is said to have referred to Justus who was named Barsabas, for of course the last sentence is added by Eusebius himself, and has nothing to do with Papias. This is fairly admitted by Lardner and others. Lardner says: "Papias does undoubtedly give some confirmation to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, in what he says of Philip; and especially in what he says of Justus, called Barsabas. But I think it cannot be affirmed, that he did particularly mention, or refer to, the book of the Acts. For I reckon, it is Eusebius himself who adds that quotation out of the Acts, upon occasion of what Papias had written of the before-mentioned Barsabas."² There is no evidence worthy of serious attention that Papias was acquainted with the Acts.³

No one seriously pretends that the Clementine Homilies afford any evidence of the use or existence of the Acts; and few, if any, claim the Epistle to Diognetus as testimony for it.⁴ We may, however, quote the only passage which is pointed out. "... these who hold the view that they present them (offerings) to God as needing them might more rightly esteem it foolishness and not worship of God. For he who made the heaven and the earth, and all things in them, and who supplies to us all whatever we need, can himself be in need of none of those things which he

¹ H. E., iii. 39.

² Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 113. *Kirchhofer* makes a similar statement, *Quellens.*, p. 163, ann. 1. Dr. Lightfoot says: "Other points of affinity to the Acts are his mention of Justus Barsabas, and his relations with the daughters of Philip." *Contemp. Rev.*, vol. v., 1867, p. 415. Such "indications" he may indeed well characterise as "indecisive." Dr. Westcott says: "Dr. Lightfoot notices some slight indications of Papias' use of the writings of St. Luke (in the article quoted above), but I do not think that much stress can be laid on them." On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 77, note 1.

³ *Zeller*, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 11; *Eichhorn*, *Einl. N. T.*, ii. p. 75; *Neudecker*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 337, ann. 2; *Alford*, *Greek Test.*, 6th ed., ii. Proleg., p. 20; *Overbeck*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1867, p. 39 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 77.

⁴ Dr. Westcott merely speaks of "coincidences of language more or less evident with the Acts," &c., &c., referring to c. iii. (Acts xvii. 24, 25), as "worthy of remark" (Canon, p. 91), but he does not include it in the "Synopsis of Historical Evidence," p. 584.

himself presents to those who imagine that they give to him." ¹ This is compared with Acts xvii. 24: "The God that made the world and all things in it, he being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; (25) neither is served by men's hand as though he needed anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life and breath and all things."² There is nothing here but a coincidence of sense, though with much variation between the two passages, but the Epistle arises from a different context, and this illustration is obvious enough to be common to any moralist. There is not a single reason which points to the Acts as the source of the writer's argument.

Basilides and Valentinus are not claimed at all by apologists as witnesses for the existence of the Acts of the Apostles, nor is Marcion, whose Canon, however, of which it formed no part, is rather adverse to the work than merely negative. Tertullian taunts Marcion for receiving Paul as an apostle, although his name is not mentioned in the Gospel, and yet not receiving the Acts of the Apostles in which alone his history is narrated;³ but it does not in the least degree follow from this that Marcion knew the work and deliberately rejected it.

A passage of Tatian's oration to the Greeks is pointed out by some as showing his acquaintance with the Acts. It is as follows: "I am not willing to worship the creation made by him for us. Sun and moon are made for us; how, therefore, shall I worship my own servants? How can I declare stocks and stones to be gods? . . . But neither should the unnameable (*ἀνώνμαστον*) God be presented with bribes; for he who is without need of anything (*πάντων ἀνεδεής*) must not be calumniated by us as needy (*ἐδεής*)."⁴ This is compared with Acts xvii. 24, 25, quoted above, and it only serves to show how common such language was. Lardner himself says of the passage, "This is much the same

¹ . . . ταῦθ' οὗτοι καθάπερ προσδεόμενα τῷ θεῷ λογίζόμενοι παρέχειν, μωρίαν εἰκὸς μᾶλλον ἡγοῦντ' ἂν, οὐ θεοσέβειαν. Ὅγάρ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν χορηγῶν ὧν προσδεόμεθα, οὐδενὸς ἂν αὐτὸς προσδέοιτο τούτων ὧν τοῖς ὀλομένοις διδόναι παρέχει αὐτός. Ep. ad Diognetum, c. iii.

² Acts xvii. 24. Ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχων κύριος οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, 25. οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς διδούς πᾶσιν ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν καὶ τὰ πάντα.

³ Adv. Marc., v. 1 ff.

⁴ Kirchhofer, Quellens., p. 166; Lardner mentions, merely to disclaim, it. Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 139 f. Dr. Westcott does not advance it at all.

⁵ Δημιουργίαν τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένην χάριν ἡμῶν προσκυνεῖν οὐ θέλω. Γέγονεν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη δι' ἡμᾶς· εἴτα πῶς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ὑπηρετὰς προσκυνήσω; Πῶς δὲ ξύλα καὶ λίθους θεοὺς ἀποφανοῦμαι; . . . Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν ἀνώνμαστον θεὸν δωροδοκῆτέον· ὁ γὰρ πάντων ἀνεδεής οὐ διαβλητέος ὑφ' ἡμῶν ὡς ἐνδεής. Orat. ad Græcos, c. iv.

thought, and applied to the same purpose, with Paul's, Acts xvii. 25, *as though he needeth anything*. But it is a character of the Deity so obvious, that I think it cannot determine us to suppose he had an eye to those words of the Apostle.¹ The language, indeed, is quite different and shows no acquaintance with the Acts,² Eusebius states that the Severians who more fully established Tatian's heresy rejected both the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles.³

Dionysius of Corinth is scarcely adduced by any one as testimony for the Acts. The only ground upon which he is at all referred to is a statement of Eusebius in mentioning his Epistles. Speaking of his Epistle to the Athenians, Eusebius says: "He relates, moreover, that Dionysius the Areopagite who was converted to the faith by Paul the Apostle, according to the account given in the Acts, was appointed the first bishop of the church of the Athenians."⁴ Even apologists admit that it is doubtful how far Dionysius referred to the Acts,⁵ the mention of the book here being most obviously made by Eusebius himself.

Melito of Sardis is not appealed to by any writer in connection with our work, nor can Claudius Apollinaris be pressed into this service. Athenagoras is supposed by some to refer to the very same passage in Acts xvii. 24, 25, which we have discussed when dealing with the work of Tatian. Athenagoras says: "The Creator and Father of the universe is not in need of blood, nor of the steam of burnt sacrifices, nor of the fragrance of flowers and of incense, he himself being the perfect fragrance, inwardly and outwardly without need."⁶ And further on: "And you kings indeed build palaces for yourselves; but the world is not made as being needed by God."⁷ These passages occur in the course of a defence of Christians for not offering sacrifices, and both in language and context they are quite independent of the Acts of the Apostles.

¹ Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 139 f.

² Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 76; Neudecker, Einl. N. T., p. 337, ann. 2; Meyer, Apostelgesch., p. 1 f.

³ Eusebius, H. E., iv. 29.

⁴ *Δηλοὶ δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὡς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου προτραπείς ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν κατὰ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι δεδολωμένα, πρῶτος τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις παροικίας τὴν ἐπίσκοπὸν ἐγκειρίσθη.* H. E., iv. 23.

⁵ Lardner, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 134; Kirchhofer, Quellens., p. 163. Dr. Westcott naturally does not refer to the passage at all.

⁶ *Ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντός δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ οὐ δεῖται αἵματος, οὔδ' ἐκτίσεως, οὔδ' ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θυμαμάτων εὐωδίας, αὐτὸς ὢν ἡ τελεία εὐωδία, ἀνεκδοξὴ καὶ ἀπροσδοξή.* Leg. pro. Christ., xiii.

⁷ *Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὲν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἑαυτοὺς ἀσκεῖτε τὰς καταγωγὰς βασιλικὰς· ὁ δὲ κόσμος, οὐχ' ὡς δεομένου τοῦ θεοῦ, γέγονεν.* Leg. pro. Christ., xvi.

In the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, giving an account of the persecution against them, it is said that the victims were praying for those from whom they suffered cruelties: "like Stephen the perfect martyr: 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' But if he was supplicating for those who stoned him, how much more for the brethren?"¹ The prayer here quoted agrees with that ascribed to Stephen in Acts vii. 60. There is no mention of the Acts of the Apostles in the Epistle, and the source from which the writers obtained their information about Stephen is of course not stated. If there really was a martyr of the name of Stephen, and if these words were actually spoken by him, the tradition of the fact, and the memory of his noble saying, may well have remained in the Church, or have been recorded in writings then current, from one of which, indeed, eminent critics conjecture that the author of Acts derived his materials,² and in this case the passage obviously does not prove the use of the Acts. If, on the other hand, there never was such a martyr by whom these words were spoken, and the whole story must be considered an original invention by the author of Acts, then, in that case, and in that case only, the passage does show the use of the Acts.³ Supposing that the use of Acts be held to be thus indicated, what does this prove? Merely that the Acts of the Apostles were in existence in the year 177-178, when the Epistle of Vienne and Lyons was written. No light whatever would thus be thrown upon the question of its authorship; and neither its credibility nor its sufficiency to prove the reality of a cycle of miracles would be in the slightest degree established.

Ptolemæus and Heracleon need not detain us, as it is not alleged that they show acquaintance with the Acts, nor is Celsus claimed as testimony for the book.

The Canon of Muratori contains a very corrupt paragraph regarding the Acts of the Apostles. We have already discussed the date and character of this fragment,⁴ and need not further speak

1. . . καθάπερ Στέφανος ὁ τέλειος μάρτυς· Κύριε, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην. εἰ δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν λυθάζοντων ἐδέετο, πόσω μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν; Eusebius, H. E., v. 2.

² Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 341 f., p. 347 f.; Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi., 1858, p. 37, p. 191 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, 1838, i. p. 404, p. 409 f.; Meyer, Apostelgesch., p. 12; Neander, Pflanzung. u. s. w. chr. Kirche, 5te Aufl., p. 65, ann. 2; Schwanbeck, Quellen. d. Schr. des Lukas, 1847, i. p. 250 ff.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 249 f., &c., &c.

³ Dr. Lightfoot, speaking of the passage we are discussing, says: "Will he (author of S. R.) boldly maintain that the writers had before them another Acts containing words identical with our Acts, just as he supposes, &c., &c. . . . Or will he allow this account to have been taken from Acts vii. 60, with which it coincides?" Contemp. Review, August, 1876, p. 410. The question is here answered.

⁴ P. 540 ff.

of it here. The sentence in which we are now interested reads in the original as follows :

"Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt lucas obtine theophile conprindit quia sub presentia eius singula gerebantur sicut et semote passionem petri euidenter declarat sed et profectionem pauli ab urbes ad spania proficescentis."

It is probable that in addition to its corruption some words may have been lost from the concluding phrase of this passage, but the following may perhaps sufficiently represent its general sense: "But the Acts of all the Apostles were written in one book. Luke included (in his work) to the excellent Theophilus only the things which occurred in his own presence, as he evidently shows by omitting the martyrdom of Peter and also the setting forth of Paul from the city to Spain."

Whilst this passage may prove the existence of the Acts about the end of the second century, and that the authorship of the work was ascribed to Luke, it has no further value. No weight can be attached to the statement of the unknown writer beyond that of merely testifying to the currency of such a tradition, and even the few words quoted show how uncritical he was. Nothing could be less appropriate to the work before us than the assertion that it contains the Acts of *all* the Apostles, for it must be apparent to all, and we shall hereafter have to refer to the point, that it very singularly omits all record of the acts of most of the apostles, occupies itself chiefly with those of Peter and Paul, and devotes considerable attention to Stephen and to others who were not apostles at all. We shall further have occasion to show that the writer does anything but confine himself to the events of which he was an eye-witness, and we may merely remark, in passing, as a matter which scarcely concerns us here, that the instances given by the unknown writer of the fragment to support his assertion are not only irrelevant, but singularly devoid themselves of historical attestation.

Irenæus¹ assigns the Acts of the Apostles to Luke, as do Clement of Alexandria,² Tertullian,³ and Origen,⁴ although without any statements giving special weight to their mention of him as the author in any way counterbalancing the late date of their testimony. Beyond showing that tradition, at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, associated the name of Luke with this writing and the third Gospel, the evidence of these Fathers is of no value to us. We have already incidentally mentioned that some heretics either ignored or rejected the book, and

¹ Adv. Hæc., iii. 14, § 1, 2; 15, § i., &c.

² Strom., v. 12; Adamb., in 1 Petr. Ep.

³ De Jejunio, x.

⁴ Contra Cel., vi. 12.

to the Marcionites and Severians we may now add the Ebionites¹ and Manichæans.² Chrysostom complains that in his day the Acts of the Apostles were so neglected that many were ignorant of the existence of the book and of its authors.³ Doubts as to its authorship were expressed in the ninth century, for Photius states that some ascribed the work to Clement of Rome, others to Barnabas, and others to Luke the evangelist.⁴

If we turn to the document itself, we find that it professes to be the second portion of a work written for the information of an unknown person named Theophilus, the first part being the Gospel, which, in our canonical New Testament, bears the name of "Gospel according to Luke." The narrative is a continuation of the third Synoptic, but the actual title of "Acts of the Apostles," or "Acts of Apostles" (*πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, πράξεις ἀποστόλων*),⁵ attached to this *δευτερος λόγος* is a later addition, and formed *his* part of the original document. The author's name is not given in any of the earlier MSS., and the work is entirely anonymous. That in the prologue to the Acts the writer clearly assumes to be the author of the Gospel does not in any way identify him, inasmuch as the third Synoptic itself is equally anonymous. The tradition assigning both works to Luke the follower of Paul, as we have seen, is first met with towards the end of the second century, and very little weight can be attached to it. There are too many instances of early writings, several of which indeed have secured a place in our canon, to which distinguished names have been erroneously ascribed. Such tradition is notoriously liable to error.

We shall presently return to the question of the authorship of the third Synoptic and Acts of the Apostles, but at present we may so far anticipate as to say that there are good reasons for affirming that they could not have been written by Luke.

Confining ourselves here to the actual evidence before us, we arrive at a clear and unavoidable conclusion regarding the Acts of the Apostles. After examining all the early Christian literature, and taking every passage which is referred to as indicating the use of the book, we see that there is no certain trace even of its existence till towards the end of the second century; and, whilst the writing itself is anonymous, we find no authority but

¹ *Epiphanius*, *Haer.*, xxx. 16.

² *August*, *Epist.* 237; ed. Bened., ii. p. 644; *De Util. Cred.*, ii. 7, T. viii. p. 36; cf. *Beausobre*, *Hist. de Manichéisme*, i. p. 293 f.

³ Πολλοὶ τοῦτ' ὁ βιβλίον οὐδ' ὅτι ἐνὶ γνώριμον ἔστιν, οὔτε αὐτὸ, οὔτε ὁ γράψας αὐτό καὶ συνήεις. *Hom.* i. in *Act. Apost.*

⁴ Τὴν δὲ συγγραφεὰ τῶν πράξεων οἱ μὲν Κλήμεντα λέγουσι τὸν Ρώμης, ἄλλοι δὲ Βαρνάβαν, καὶ ἄλλοι Λουκᾶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν. *Photius*, *Amphiloch. Quest.* 145.

⁵ The *Cod. Sin.* reads simply *πράξεις*. *Cod. D.* (Beza) has *πράξεις ἀποστόλων*, "Acts of Apostles."

late tradition assigning it to Luke or to any other author. We are absolutely without evidence of any value as to its accuracy or trustworthiness, and, as we shall presently see, the epistles of Paul, so far from accrediting it, tend to cast the most serious doubt upon its whole character. This evidence we have yet to examine, when considering the contents of the Acts, and we base our present remarks solely on the external testimony for the date and authorship of the book. Our position, therefore, is simply this: We are asked to believe in the reality of a great number of miraculous and supernatural occurrences which, obviously, are antecedently incredible, upon the assurance of an anonymous work of whose existence there is no distinct evidence till more than a century after the events narrated, and to which an author's name—against which there are strong objections—is first ascribed by tradition towards the end of the second century. Of the writer to whom the work is thus attributed we know nothing beyond the casual mention of his name in some Pauline Epistles. If it were admitted that this Luke did actually write the book, we should not be justified in believing the reality of such stupendous miracles upon his bare statement. As the case stands, however, even taking it in its most favourable aspect, the question scarcely demands serious attention, and our discussion might at once be ended by the unhesitating rejection of the Acts of the Apostles as sufficient, or even plausible evidence for the miracles which it narrates.

CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE REGARDING THE AUTHORSHIP.

If we proceed further to discuss the document before us, it is from no doubt as to the certainty of the conclusion at which we have now arrived, but from the belief that closer examination of the contents of the Acts may enable us to test this result, and more fully to understand the nature of the work and the character of its evidence. Not only will it be instructive to consider a little closely the contents of the Acts, and to endeavour from the details of the narrative itself to form a judgment regarding its historical value, but we have in addition external testimony of very material importance which we may bring to bear upon it. We happily possess some undoubted Epistles which afford us no little information concerning the history, character, and teaching of the Apostle Paul, and we are thus enabled to compare the statements in the work before us with contemporary evidence of great value. It is scarcely necessary to say that, wherever the statements of the unknown author of the Acts are at variance with these Epistles, we must prefer the statements of the Apostle. The importance to our inquiry of such further examination as we now propose to undertake consists chiefly in the light which it may throw on the credibility of the work. If it be found that such portions as we are able to investigate are inaccurate and untrustworthy, it will become still more apparent that the evidence of such a document for miracles, which are antecedently incredible, cannot even be entertained. It may be well also to discuss more fully the authorship of the Acts, and to this we shall first address ourselves.

It must, however, be borne in mind that it is quite foreign to our purpose to enter into any exhaustive discussion of the literary problem presented by the Acts of the Apostles. We shall confine ourselves to such points as seem sufficient or best fitted to test the character of the composition, and we shall not hesitate to pass without attention questions of mere literary interest, and strictly limit our examination to such prominent features as present themselves for our purpose.

It is generally admitted, although not altogether without exception,¹ that the author of our third Synoptic Gospel likewise

¹ *Schelling*. Is de derde Evangelist de Schrijver van het Boek der Handelingen? 1871. *Wittenburger Zeitschr. f. d. Theologie*, 1873, p. 508 ff.

composed the Acts of the Apostles. The linguistic and other peculiarities which distinguish the Gospel are equally prominent in the Acts. This fact, whilst apparently offering greatly increased facilities for identifying the author, and actually affording valuable material for estimating his work, does not, as we have already remarked, really do much towards solving the problem of the authorship, inasmuch as the Gospel, like its continuation, is anonymous, and we possess no more precise or direct evidence in connection with the one than in the case of the other. We have already so fully examined the testimony for the third Gospel that it is unnecessary for us to recur to it. From about the end of the second century we find the Gospel and Acts of the Apostles ascribed by ecclesiastical writers to Luke, the companion of the Apostle Paul. The fallibility of tradition, and the singular phase of literary morality exhibited during the early ages of Christianity, render such testimony of little or no value, and in the almost total absence of the critical faculty a rank crop of pseudonymic writings sprang up and flourished during that period. Some of the earlier chapters of this work have given abundant illustrations of this fact. It is absolutely certain, with regard to the works we are considering, that Irenæus is the earliest writer known who ascribes them to Luke, and that even tradition therefore, cannot be traced beyond the last quarter of the second century. The question is—does internal evidence confirm or contradict this tradition?

Luke, the traditional author, is not mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles.² In the Epistle to Philemon his name occurs, with those of others, who send greeting, verse 23, "There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus; 24. Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow-labourers." In the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 14, mention is also made of him—"Luke, the beloved physician,³ salutes you, and Demas." And again, in the 2 Epistle to Timothy iv. 10—"For Demas forsook me, having loved this present world, and departed into Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia. 11. Only Luke is with me."

¹ Cf. *Kritik. Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1851, p. 149 ff.

² It is unnecessary to discuss the ingeniously far-fetched theory which has been advanced by a few critics to show the identity of Luke with the Silas (or Silvanus) of the Acts, based upon the analogy presented by their names: *lucos* & *prove*, *silva* & *wood*. Nor need we amuse the reader with Lange's suggestion that Luke may be the Aristion mentioned by Papias, from *ἀπὸ τρεῖν*=*lucere*.

³ Calvin, Basnage, Heumann and others have doubted whether this Luke is the same as the Luke elsewhere mentioned without this distinguishing expression, and whether he was the Evangelist. The point need not detain us. Cf. Lardner, *Credibility*, Works, vi. p. 116 f., 118.

He is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament;¹ and his name is not again met with till Irenæus ascribes to him the authorship of the Gospel and Acts. There is nothing in these Pauline Epistles confirming the statement of the Fathers, but it is highly probable that these references to him largely contributed to suggest his name as the author of the Acts, the very omission of his name from the work protecting him from objections connected with the passages in the first person to which other followers of Paul were exposed, upon the traditional view of the composition. Irenæus evidently knew nothing about him, except what he learnt from these Epistles, and derives from his theory that Luke wrote the Acts, and speaks as an eye-witness in the passages where the first person is used. From these he argues that Luke was inseparable from Paul, and was his fellow-worker in the Gospel, and he refers, in proof of this, to Acts xvi. 8 ff.,² 13 ff., xx. 5 ff., and the later chapters, all the details of which he supposes Luke to have carefully written down. He then continues: "But that he was not only a follower, but likewise a fellow-worker of the Apostles, but particularly of Paul, Paul himself has also clearly shown in the Epistles, saying; . . ." and he quotes 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11, ending: "Only Luke is with me," and then adds, "whence he shows that he was always with him and inseparable from him, *see, &c.*"³ The reasoning of the zealous Father deduces a great deal from very little, it will be observed, and in this elastic *any* tradition enlarged its borders" and assumed unsubstantial dimensions. Later writers have no more intimate knowledge of Luke, although Eusebius states that he was born at Antioch;⁴ a tradition likewise reproduced by Jerome.⁵ Jerome further identifies Luke with "the brother, whose praise in the Gospel is throughout all the churches" mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 18, as accompanying Titus to Corinth.⁶

¹ It is now universally admitted that the "Lucius" referred to in Acts xiii. 1 and Rom. xvi. 21, is a different person; although their identity was suggested by Origen and the Alexandrian Clement.

² The words "they came down to Troas" (*κατέβησαν εἰς Τρωάδα*) are here translated "we came to Troas" (*nos venimus in Troadem*).

³ Quoniam non solum persecutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli, et ipse autem Paulus manifestavit in epistolis, dicens: "Demas me dereliquit, et abiit Thessalonicam, Crescens in Galatiam, Titus in Dalmatiam. Lucas est mecum solus." Unde ostendit, quod semper junctus ei et inseparabilis fuerit ab eo. Adv. Har., iii. 14 § 1.

⁴ H. E., iii. 4.

⁵ De vir. ill. 7.

⁶ I. c. This view was held by Origen, Ambrose, and others of the Fathers; who, moreover, suppose Paul to refer to the work of Luke when he speaks of "his Gospel" (also cf. Eusebius, H. E., iii. 4), an opinion exploded by Grotius. Grotius and Olshausen both identify "the brother" with Luke. Many of the Fathers and later writers have variously conjectured him to have been Barnabas, Silas, Mark, Trophimus, Gaius, and others. This is mere guess-work; but Luke is scarcely seriously advanced in later times. The Bishop of Lincoln, however, not only does

At a later period, when the Church required an early artist for its service, Luke the physician was honoured with the additional title of painter.¹ Epiphanius,² followed later by some other writers, represented him to have been one of the seventy-two disciples, whose mission he alone of all New Testament writers mentions. The view of the Fathers, arising out of the application of their tradition to the features presented by the Gospel and Acts, was that Luke composed his Gospel, of the events of which he was not an eye-witness, from information derived from others, and his Acts of the Apostles from what he himself, at least in the parts in which the first person is employed, had witnessed.³ It is generally supposed that Luke was not born a Jew, but was a Gentile Christian.

Some writers endeavour to find a confirmation of the tradition, that the Gospel and Acts were written by Luke "the beloved physician," by the supposed use of peculiarly technical medical terms,⁴ but very little weight is attached by any one to this feeble evidence which is repudiated by most serious critics, and it need not detain us.

As there is no indication, either in the Gospel or the Acts, of the author's identity proceeding from himself, and tradition does not offer any alternative security, what testimony can be produced in support of the ascription of these writings to "Luke?" To this question Ewald shall reply: "In fact," he says, "we possess only one ground for it, but this is fully sufficient. It lies in the designation of the third Gospel as that 'according to Luke' which is found in all MSS. of the four Gospels. For the quotations of this particular Gospel under the distinct name of Luke,

so, but maintains that Paul quotes Luke's Gospel in his Epistles, in one place (1 Tim. v. 18) designating it as *Scripture*. Greek Test., Four Gospels, p. 163, p. 170.

¹ Nicephorus, H. E., ii. 43. The Bishop of Lincoln, who speaks of "this divine book," the Acts of the Apostles, with great enthusiasm, says in one place: "The Acts of the Apostles is a portraiture of the church; it is an Historical Picture delineated by the Holy Ghost guiding the hand of the Evangelical Painter St. Luke." Greek Test., Int. to Acts, 1874, p. 4.

² Hier., li. 11; Theophylact (ad Luc. xxiv. 18) suggests the view—considered probable by Lange, *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 252—that Luke was one of the two disciples of the journey to Emmaus. This is the way in which tradition works.

³ Cf. Eusebius, H. E., iii. 4; Hieron., de vir. ill. 7. We need not discuss the view which attributes to Luke the translation or authorship of the Ep. to the Hebrews.

⁴ Cf. Luke iv. 38, viii. 43, 44, xxii. 44; Acts iii. 7, xii. 23, xiii. 11, xxviii. 8, &c., &c.; Ebrard, *Wiss. Kr. d. evang. Gesch.*, 1853, p. 683; Hackett, *On Acts*, 1852, p. 5, p. 385; Humphrey, *On Acts*, 1854, p. xiv.; Meyer, *Kr. ex. H'buch üh. d. Ev. des Markus u. Lukas*, 5te Aufl., p. 327; *Apostelgesch.*, p. 562; Alford, *Greek Test.*, 1871, ii. proleg. p. 3, § 10; J. Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 3 ed., 1866, p. 2 f.; Wordsworth, *Greek Test.*, Four Gospels, p. 160. Cf. Hug, *Einl. N. T.*, 4te Aufl., p. 126, anm. 1.

in the extant writings of the Fathers, begin so late that they cannot be compared in antiquity with that superscription; and those known to us may probably themselves only go back to this superscription. We thus depend almost alone on this superscription."¹ Ewald generally does consider his own arbitrary conjectures "fully sufficient," but it is doubtful whether, in this case, any one who examines this evidence will agree with him. He himself goes on to admit, with all other critics, that the superscriptions to our Gospels do not proceed from the authors themselves, but were added by those who collected them, or by later readers to distinguish them.² There was no author's name attached to Marcion's Gospel, as we learn from Tertullian.³ Chrysostom very distinctly asserts that the Evangelists did not inscribe their names at the head of their works,⁴ and he recognizes that, but for the authority of the primitive Church which added those names, the superscriptions could not have proved the authorship of the Gospels. He conjectures that the sole superscription which may have been placed by the author of the first Synoptic was simply *εὐαγγέλιον*.⁵ It might be argued, and indeed has been, that the inscription *κατὰ Λουκᾶν*, "according to Luke," instead of *εὐαγγέλιον Λουκᾶ* "Gospel of Luke," does not actually indicate that "Luke" wrote the work any more than the superscription to the Gospels "according to the Hebrews" (*καθ' Ἑβραίων*) "according to the Egyptians" (*κατ' Αἰγυπτίους*) has reference to authorship. The Epistles, on the contrary, are directly connected with their writers, in the genitive, Παύλου, Πέτρου, and so on. This point, however, we merely mention *en passant*. By his own admission, therefore, the superscription is merely tradition in another form, but instead of carrying us further back, the superscription on the most ancient extant MSS., as for instance the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices of the Gospels, does not on the most sanguine estimate of their age, date earlier than the fourth century.⁶ As for the Acts of the Apostles, the book is not ascribed to Luke in a single

¹ Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1857, 1858, ix. p. 55.

² Ewald, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 56 f.; Bertholdt, Einl. A. u. N. Test., 1813, iii. p. 1095; Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 89; Guericke, Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 107 f., ann. 2; Hilgenfeld, Einl. N. T., 1875, p. 779; Hug, Einl. N. T., i. p. 222 f.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., 4te Aufl., p. 391 f.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 47 f., &c., &c.

³ Adv. Marc. iv. 2.

⁴ Hom. i. in Epist. ad Rom.

⁵ Hom. i. in Matth. præp. Grotius considers that the ancient heading was *εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, as in some MSS. of our second Synoptic. Annot. in N. T., i. p. 7. So also Bertholdt, Einl. iii. p. 1095, and others.

⁶ Tischendorf, N. T. Gr. ed. oct. Crit. Maior, 1869, i. p. ix. ff.; De Wette, Einl. N. T., p. 76 ff.; Hug, Einl. N. T., i. p. 234 ff.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 394 ff.; Reithmayr, Einl. N. B., 1852, p. 227 ff.; Alford, Greek Test., i. Proleg., p. 107 ff.; ii. Proleg., p. 62 ff.; Scrivener, Int. to Criticism of N. T., 1874, p. 83 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Einl. N. T., p. 790 ff.

uncial MS., and it only begins to appear in various forms in later codices. The variation in the titles of the Gospels and Acts in different MSS. alone shows the uncertainty of the superscription. It is clear that the "one ground" upon which Ewald admits that the evidence for Luke's authorship is based, is nothing but sand, and cannot support his tower. He is on the slightest consideration thrown back upon the quotations of the Fathers, which begin too late for the purpose, and it must be acknowledged that the ascription of the third Gospel and Acts to Luke rests solely upon late and unsupported tradition.

Let it be remembered that with the exception of the three passages in the Pauline Epistles quoted above, we know absolutely nothing about Luke. As we have mentioned, it has even been doubted whether the designation "the beloved physician" in the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 14, does not distinguish a different Luke from the person of that name in the Epistles to Philemon and Timothy. If this were the case, our information would be further reduced; but supposing that the same Luke is referred to, what does our information amount to? Absolutely nothing but the fact that a person named Luke was represented by the writer of these letters,¹ whoever he was, to have been with Paul in Rome, and that he was known to the church of Colossæ. There is no evidence whatever that this Luke had been a travelling companion of Paul, or that he ever wrote a line concerning him or had composed a Gospel. He is not mentioned in Epistles written during this journey, and indeed, the rarity and meagreness of the references to him would much rather indicate that he had not taken any distinguished part in the proclamation of the Gospel. If Luke be *ὁ ἰατρός ὁ ἀγαπητός*, and be numbered amongst the Apostle's *συνεργοί*, Tychicus is equally "the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord."² Onesimus the "faithful and beloved brother,"³ and Aristarchus, Mark the cousin of Barnabas, Justus and others are likewise his *συνεργοί*.⁴ There is no evidence, in fact, that Paul was acquainted with Luke earlier than during his imprisonment in Rome, and he seems markedly excluded from the Apostle's work and company by such passages as 2 Cor. i. 19.⁵ The simple theory that Luke wrote the Acts supplies all the rest of the tradition of the Fathers, as we have seen in the case of Irenæus, and to this mere tradition we are confined in the total absence of more ancient testimony.

¹ We cannot discuss the authenticity of these Epistles in this place, nor is it very important that we should do so. Nor can we pause to consider whether they were written in Rome, as a majority of critics think, or elsewhere.

² *ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀδελφός καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ.* Coloss. iv. 7.

³ Coloss. iv. 9.

⁴ Coloss. iv. 10, 11; Philem. 23, 24.

⁵ *Keim, Jesu v. Naz., i. 81, an. 2.*

The traditional view, which long continued to prevail undisturbed, and has been widely held up to our own day,¹ represents Luke as the author of the Acts, and, in the passages where the first person is employed, considers that he indicates himself as an actor and eye-witness. These passages, where *ἡμεῖς* is introduced, present a curious problem which has largely occupied the attention of critics, and it has been the point most firmly disputed in the long controversy regarding the authorship of the Acts. Into this literary labyrinth we must not be tempted to enter beyond a very short way; for, however interesting the question may be in itself, we are left so completely to conjecture that no result is possible which can materially affect our inquiry, and we shall only refer to it sufficiently to illustrate the uncertainty which prevails regarding the authorship. We shall, however, supply abundant references for those who care more minutely to pursue the subject.

After the narrative of the Acts has, through fifteen chapters, proceeded uninterruptedly in the third person, an abrupt change to the first person plural occurs in the sixteenth chapter.² Paul, and at least Timothy, are represented as going through Phrygia and Galatia, and at length "they came down to Troas," where a vision appears to Paul beseeching him to come over into Macedonia. Then, xvi. 10, proceeds: "And after he saw the vision, immediately we endeavoured (*ἐζητήσαμεν*) to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us (*ἡμᾶς*) to preach the

¹ *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 1 f.; *Baumgarten*, Die Apostelgeschichte, 2te Aufl., i. p. 495 ff.; *Beelen*, Acta Apost., ed. alt., p. 4, p. 401 ann. I; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 130, p. 280 ff.; *Das N. T.*, 1847, ii. p. 355; *von Döllinger*, Christenthum u. Kirche, 2te Aufl., p. 134 f.; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. evang. Gesch., p. 732 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 10 ff., p. 30 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., vi. p. 33 ff.; *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, ix. p. 59 ff.; *Feilmoser*, Einl. N. B., p. 296 ff.; *Gran*, Entw. N. T., Schriftthums, 1871, i. p. 316 f.; *Guericke*, Beiträge N. T., 1823, p. 74 ff.; *Gesamtgesch. N. T.*, p. 279 f.; *Huckett*, On the Acts, 1852, p. 5 f.; *Heinrichs*, N. T. gr., iii. p. 29 f.; *Humphrey*, On Acts, p. xiii. f.; *Huy*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 127 f., p. 257 ff.; *Kaiuol*, Comm. in N. T., iv. p. xv.; *Klostermann*, Vindiciae Lucanæ, 1866, p. 68 ff.; *Lange*, Apost. Zeit., 1853, i. p. 90 f.; *Lekebusch*, Die Comp. u. Entst. der Apostelgesch., 1854, p. 7 ff., p. 131 ff., p. 387 ff.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 4 ff.; *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1175 ff.; *Oertel*, Paulus in der Apostelgesch., 1868, p. 7 ff., p. 27 ff.; *Obshausen*, Bibl. Comm., ii. 3 Apostelgesch., 1862, p. 8, p. 225 f.; *de Pressensé*, Hist. des trois prem. siècles de l'Eglise, 2me éd., i. p. 485; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xiv. ff.; *St. Paul*, 1869, p. 130 f., n. 3; *Riehm*, De fontibus Act. Apost., 1821, p. 62 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apostelgesch., 1841, p. 17 ff.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 137; Versuch Herstell. Kr. N. T., p. 209 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus nach d. Apostelgesch., 1866, p. 30 ff., p. 272 f.; *Tholuck*, Glaubwürdigk. ev. Gesch. 2te Aufl., p. 375 ff.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., The Four Gospels, p. 168 f., Acts, p. 118; *Wieseler*, Chron. d. Apost. Zeit., p. 36 ff., et passim; Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. a. w., 5te Aufl., p. 1 ff., p. 229.

² It is unnecessary to discuss whether xiv. 22 belongs to the *ἡμεῖς* sections or not.

Gospel unto them." After verse 17, the direct form of narrative is as suddenly dropped as it was taken up, and does not reappear until xx. 5, when, without explanation, it is resumed and continued for ten verses. It is then again abandoned, and recommenced in xxi. 1-18, and xxvii. 1, xxviii. 16.

It is argued by those who adopt the traditional view,¹ that it would be an instance of unparalleled negligence, in so careful a writer as the author of the third Synoptic and Acts, to have composed these sections from documents lying before him, written by others, leaving them in the form of a narrative in the first person, whilst the rest of his work was written in the third, and that, without doubt, he would have assimilated such portions to the form of the rest. On the other hand, that he himself makes distinct use of the first person in Luke i. 1-3 and Acts i. 1, and consequently prepares the reader to expect that, where it is desirable, he will resume the direct mode of communication; and in support of this supposition, it is asserted that the very same peculiarities of style and language exist in the *ἡμεῖς* passages as in the rest of the work. The adoption of the direct form of narrative in short merely indicates that the author himself was present and an eye-witness of what he relates,² and that writing as he did for the information of Theophilus, who was well aware of his personal participation in the journeys he records it was not necessary for him to give any explanation of his occasional use of the first person.

Is the abrupt and singular introduction of the first person in these particular sections of his work, without a word of explanation, more intelligible and reasonable upon the traditional theory of their being by the author himself as an eye-witness? On the contrary, it is maintained, the phenomenon on that hypothesis becomes much more inexplicable. On examining the *ἡμεῖς* sections it will be observed that they consist almost entirely of an itinerary of journeys, and that while the chronology of the rest of the Acts is notably uncertain and indefinite, these passages enter into the minutest details of daily movements (xvi. 11, 12; xx. 6, 7, 11, 15; xxi. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 18; xxvii. 2; xxviii. 7, 12, 14) of the route pursued, and places through which often they merely pass (xvi. 11, 12; xx. 5, 6, 13, 15; xxi. 1-3, 7; xxvii. 2 ff.; xxviii. 11-15), and record the most trifling circumstances (xvi. 12; xx. 13; xxi. 2, 3, 15; xxviii. 2, 11). The distinguishing feature of these sections in fact is generally asserted to be the stamp which

¹ See references in note 1, p. 735.

² Some writers also consider as one of the reasons why Luke, the supposed author, uses the first person, that where he begins to do so he himself becomes associated with Paul in his work, and first begins to preach the Gospel. *Thersich*, *Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 137; *Baumgarten*, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, i. p. 496.

they bear, above all other parts of the Acts, of intimate personal knowledge of the circumstances related.

Is it not, however, exceedingly remarkable that the author of the Acts should intrude his own personality merely to record these minute details of voyages and journeys? That his appearance as an eye-witness should be almost wholly limited to the itinerary of Paul's journeys and to portions of his history which are of very subordinate interest? The voyage and shipwreck are thus narrated with singular minuteness of detail, but if any one who reads it only considers the matter for a moment, it will become apparent that this elaboration of the narrative is altogether disproportionate to the importance of the voyage in the history of the early Church. The traditional view indeed is fatal to the claims of the Acts as testimony for the great mass of miracles it contains, for the author is only an eye-witness of what is comparatively unimportant and commonplace. The writer's intimate acquaintance with the history of Paul, and his claim to participation in his work, begin and end with his actual journeys. With very few exceptions, as soon as the Apostle stops anywhere, he ceases to speak as an eye-witness and relapses into vagueness and the third person. At the very time when minuteness of detail would have been most interesting, he ceases to be minute. A very long and important period of Paul's life is covered by the narrative between xvi. 10, where the *hμeis* sections begin, and xxviii. 16, where they end; but, although the author goes with such extraordinary detail into the journeys to which they are confined, how bare and unsatisfactory is the account of the rest of Paul's career during that time!¹ How eventful that career must have been we learn from 2 Cor. xi. 23-26. In any case, the author who could be so minute in his record of an itinerary, apparently could not, or would not, be minute in his account of more important matters in his history. In the few verses, ix. 1-30, chiefly occupied by an account of Paul's conversion, is comprised all that the author has to tell of three years of the Apostle's life, and into xi. 19-xiv. are compressed the events of fourteen years of his history (cf. Gal. ii. 1).² If the author of those portions be the same writer who is so minute in his daily itinerary in the *hμeis* sections, his sins of omission and commission are of a very startling character. To say nothing more severe here, upon the traditional theory he is an elaborate trifter.

Does the use of the first person in Luke i. 1-3 and Acts i. 1 in any way justify or prepare the way for the sudden and unex-

¹ Cf. Ewald, *Gesch. v. Isr.*, vi. p. 35 f.

² Cf. Overbeck, zu de Wette's *Kurze Erkl. Apostelgesch.*, 1870, Einl., p. lxi. f.

³ Cf. Ewald, *Jahrb. bibl. Wiss.*, ix. p. 51 ff.; Meyer, *Apostelgesch.*, 1870, p. 6;










IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4502

44 28 25
32 22
30 20
18

01

plained introduction of the first person in the sixteenth chapter? Certainly not. The *ἐγώ* in these passages is used solely in the personal address to Theophilus, is limited to the brief explanation contained in what may be called the dedication or preface, and is at once dropped when the history begins. If the prologue of the Gospel be applied to the Acts, moreover, the use of earlier documents is at once implied, which would rather justify the supposition that these passages are part of some diary, from which the general editor made extracts.¹ Besides, there is no explanation in the Acts which in the slightest degree connects the *ἐγώ* with the *ἡμεῖς*.² To argue that explanation was unnecessary, as Theophilus and early readers were well acquainted with the fact that the author was a fellow-traveller with the Apostle, and therefore at once understood the meaning of "We,"³ would destroy the utility of the direct form of communication altogether; for if Theophilus knew this, there was obviously no need to introduce the first person at all, in so abrupt and singular a way, more especially to chronicle minute details of journeys which possess comparatively little interest. Moreover, writing for Theophilus, we might reasonably expect that he should have stated where and when he became associated with Paul, and explained the reasons why he again left and rejoined him.⁴ Ewald suggests that possibly the author intended to have indicated his name more distinctly at the end of his work;⁵ but this merely shows that, argue as he will, he feels the necessity for such an explanation. The conjecture is negatived, however, by the fact that no name is subsequently added. As in the case of the fourth Gospel, of course the "incomparable modesty" theory is suggested as the reason why the author does not mention his own name, and explain the adoption of the first person in the *ἡμεῖς* passages;⁶ but to base theories such as this upon the modesty or elevated views of a perfectly unknown writer is obviously too arbitrary a proceeding to be permissible.⁷ There is, besides, exceedingly little modesty in a writer forcing

Grau, Entwicklungsgesch. des N. T. Schriftthums, 1871, i. p. 318; *Klostmann*, Vind. Lucanæ, 1866, p. 68 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 2.

¹ Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 4.

² *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette, Apostelgesch., p. xlii.

³ *Lange*, Das apost. Zeitalter, 1853, i. p. 91; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 33 f.; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 51 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Ueb. d. Zweck d. Apostelgesch., 1841, p. 39; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 357.

⁴ *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 331 f.

⁵ Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 34, an. 1; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 52.

⁶ Cf. *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær. iii. 14. § 1; *Lange*, Das apost. Zeit., i. p. 91; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 33 ff.; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 52; *Olshausen*, Die Apostelgesch., 1862, p. 225; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test. Acts, p. 118.

⁷ Cf. *Schwanbeck*, Ueber die Quellen d. Schr. d. Lukas, 1847, i. p. 128 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., p. xliii.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. j. 81, an. 2; *Meyer*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 357.

himself so unnecessarily into notice, for he does not represent himself as taking any active part in the events narrated; and, as the mere chronicler of days of sailing and arriving, he might well have remained impersonal to the end.

On the other hand, supposing the general editor of the Acts to have made use of written sources of information, and amongst others of the diary of a companion of the Apostle Paul, it is not equally strange that, for one reason or another, he should have allowed the original direct form of communication to stand whilst incorporating parts of it with his work. Instances have been pointed out in which a similar retention of the first or third person, in a narrative generally written otherwise, is accepted as the indication of a different written source, as for instance in Ezra vii. 27—ix; Nehemiah viii.—x.; in the Book of Tobit i. 1—3, iii. 7 ff., and other places;¹ and Schwanbeck has pointed out many instances of a similar kind amongst the chroniclers of the middle ages.² There are various ways in which the retention of the first person in these sections, supposing them to have been derived from some other written source, might be explained. The simple supposition that the author, either through carelessness or oversight, allowed the *ἡμεῖς* to stand³ is not excluded, and indeed some critics, although we think without reason, maintain both the third Gospel and the Acts to be composed of materials derived from various sources and put together with little care or adjustment.⁴ The author might also have inserted these fragments of the diary of a fellow-traveller of Paul, and retained the original form of the document to strengthen the apparent credibility of his own narrative; or, as many critics believe, he may have allowed the first person of the original document to remain, in order himself to assume the character of eye-witness, and of companion of the Apostle.⁵ As we shall see in the course of our examination of the Acts, the general procedure of the author is by no means of a character to discredit such an explanation.

We shall not enter into any discussion of the sources from which critics maintain that the author compiled his work. It is

¹ Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, 1864, i. p. 278; Hilgenfeld, *Einkl. N.T.*, p. 607.

² Quellen d. Schr. des Lukas, i. p. 183 ff. Cf. De Wette, *Einkl. N.T.*, p. 247, an. e; Bleek, *Einkl. N.T.*, p. 332 ann.

³ Cf. Bleek, *Einkl. N.T.*, p. 331, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1047; Scholten, *Het paulin. Evangelie*, p. 451 f.

⁴ Schleiermacher, *Versuch üb. die Schr. des Lukas Sammtl. Werke*, 1836, ii. p. 14 ff., p. 219 ff.; Einkl. N.T., 1845 (iii.), p. 349 ff.; Konigsmann, *Prolusio de tontibus Act. Apost.*, in Pott's *Sylloge*, 1802, iii. p. 215 ff.; Schwanbeck, *Quellen Schr. d. Lukas*, 1847, i. p. 41 ff., p. 253 ff.; Scholten, *Het paulin. Evangelie*, 1870, p. 451 f.

⁵ Baur, *Paulus*, 2te Aufl., i. p. 16 f.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 456 f., p. 510, ann. 1; Schrader, *Der Ap. Paulus*, 1836, v. p. 549; Stap, *Origines du Christianisme*, 2me éd., p. 205 f.; Overbeck, *Zu de Wette's Apostelgesch.*, 4te Aufl., p. xlv. f.; Hausrath, *N.T., Zeitgesch.*, 1874, iii. p. 442, ann. 7.

chapter?
the per-
planation
ce, and is
gue of the
lier docu-
he suppo-
which the
nation in
with the
heophilus
that the
erefore at
he utility
heophilus
the first
pecially to
paratively
we might
l when he
as why he
ssibly the
tly at the
s he will,
jecture is
sequently
the "in-
why the
adoption
ories such
unknown
nissible. 7
er forcing

lost. remain,

Isr., vi. p.
d. Apostel.

91; Ewald,
Die Apost.

28 f.; Over-
81, an. 2;

sufficient to say that, whilst some profess to find definite traces of many documents, few if any writers deny that the writer made more or less use of earlier materials. It is quite true that the characteristics of the general author's style are found throughout the whole work.¹ The Acts are no mere aggregate of scraps collected and rudely joined together, but the work of one author in the sense that whatever materials he may have used for its composition were carefully assimilated, and subjected to thorough and systematic revision to adapt them to his purpose.² But however completely this process was carried out, and his materials interpenetrated by his own peculiarities of style and language, he did not succeed in entirely obliterating the traces of independent written sources. Some writers maintain that there is a very apparent difference between the first twelve chapters and the remainder of the work, and profess to detect a much more Hebraistic character in the language of the earlier portion,¹ although this is not received without demur.² As regards the *ἡμεῖς* sections, whilst it is admitted that these fragments have in any case been much manipulated by the general editor, and largely contain his general characteristics of language, it is at the same time affirmed that they present distinct foreign peculiarities, which betray a

¹ *Credner*, Einl. N.T., i. l. p. 132 ff., p. 282 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 357 ff., 457, 490 ff.; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 35 ff., 130 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus im Apostelg., p. 27 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N.T., ii. p. 260 ff.; *Gersdorf*, Beiträge, p. 160 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N.T., ii. p. 30 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 20 ff., 218 ff.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N.T., p. 341 ff., anm. 6; *De Wette*, Einl. N.T., p. 246 f.; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., p. lvi. f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N.T., p. 199 f.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 3 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 2 f.; *Trip*, Paulus nach d. Apostelg., p. 26 ff.; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 236, anm. 1.

² *Bleek*, Einl. N.T., p. 340 f.; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1034 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 9 f.; *Credner*, Einl. N.T., i. p. 280 ff., 132 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N.T., ii. p. 260 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N.T., ii. p. 35 ff.; *Gersdorf*, Beiträge, p. 160 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N.T., p. 574 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelwerk, viii., p. 349; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 35 ff., 130 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 1 ff., 218 ff.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 3 f., 12 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch., p. 24 ff.; *Olshausen*, Apostelgesch., p. 7 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., p. lvi. ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, 1873, p. 497 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xi. ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N.T., p. 199 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apostelgesch., p. 20 ff., 64 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 38 ff., 73 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus n. Apostelgesch., 1866, p. 26 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N.T., p. 246; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 387 ff. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 37 f.

³ *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 37 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 12; *Riehm*, De fontibus Act. Ap., p. 106 ff., 189 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apostelgesch., p. 153 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen d. Sehr. Lukas, i. p. 36 ff., 114 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 99; *Tholuck*, Glaubw. ev. Geschichte, p. 376 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N.T., p. 249 f. Cf. *Credner*, Einl. N.T., i. p. 282 f.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 12; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 404 f.

⁴ *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 490 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's Apostelg., p. lvi. f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N.T., ii. p. 31 ff. Cf. *Credner*, Einl., p. 282 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 35 ff., 404 f.

borrowed document.¹ Even critics who maintain the *ἡμεῖς* sections to be by the same writer who composed the rest of the book point out the peculiarly natural character and minute knowledge displayed in these passages, as distinguishing them from the rest of the Acts.² This of course they attribute to the fact that the author there relates his personal experiences; but even with this explanation it is apparent that all who maintain the traditional view do recognize peculiarities in these sections, by which they justify the ascription of them to an eye-witness. For the reasons which have been very briefly indicated, therefore, and upon other strong grounds, some of which will be presently stated, a very large mass of the ablest critics have concluded that the *ἡμεῖς* sections were not composed by the author of the rest of the Acts, but that they are part of the diary of some companion of the Apostle Paul, of which the Author of Acts made use for his work,³ and that the general writer of the work, and consequently of the third Synoptic, was not Luke at all.⁴

¹ Zeller, *App.*, p. 457 f., 513 ff., 516, anm. 1; Overbeck, *Zu de W. App.*, p. xxxix. f., xlv. f., 1 anm.; Straatman, *Paulus, de Apost. van Jezus Christus*, 1874, p. 307 ff.; *Stap, Origines du Christ.*, p. 205 f.; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, iii. p. 423 anm.; De Wette, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 246 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 607 f.; Köstlin, *Urspr. Synopt. Evv.*, p. 291 f.

² Lekebusch, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 382 ff., et passim; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 39, anm. 1; &c., &c.

³ Baur, *Paulus*, 2te Aufl., i. p. 16 f., p. 243; Beyschlag, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1864, p. 214 f.; Bertholdt, *Einkl. N. T.*, iii. p. 1332; Bleek, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 332 ff.; *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 1030 ff.; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 273 ff.; Gfrörer, *Die heil. Sage*, ii. 245 f., i. p. 383 ff., 422 ff.; Allg. K. G., i. p. 165 f., 237; Hauber, *Betracht. fib. einig. Gläubigen*, u. s. w., chr. Kirche, p. 61 f.; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, iii. p. 422 f., anm. 7; Hilgenfeld, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 606 ff., *Die Evangelien*, p. 225; Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 85 ff.; Horst, *Essai sur les Sources de la deuxième partie des Actes des Apôtres*, 1848; Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 81, anm. 1; Kohlfrey, *Chronologia Sacra*, p. 99 f.; Köstlin, *Urspr. synopt. Evv.*, p. 291 f.; Konigsmann, *De fontibus*, &c., in Pott's *Sylloge*, iii. p. 231 f.; Krenkel, *Paulus*, 1869, p. 213 ff.; Overbeck, *Zu de W. App.*, p. 1 ff.; Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 207 f.; Schleiermacher, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1845, p. 239 f., p. 348 ff.; Scholten, *Het paulin. Evangelie*, p. 413 ff.; Schwanbeck, *Quellen*, u. s. w., p. 168 ff., 140 ff.; *Stap, Origines*, &c., p. 205 f.; Straatman, *Paulus*, p. 6; Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 127; Ulrich, *Th. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1837, p. 369 ff.; 1840, p. 1003 ff.; Volkmar, *Die Religion Jesu*, p. 291; De Wette, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 247; *Apostelgesch.*, p. xxxviii.; Wittichen, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, p. 509 f.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 515 f. Cf. Neander, *Pflanzung*, u. s. w., p. 229; cf. p. 1 f.

⁴ Baur, *Paulus*, p. 16 ff.; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 24 f., 54, 269 ff.; Gfrörer, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 34, anm. 1, 383 f., 432 ff.; ii. p. 245 f.; Allg. K. G., i. p. 165 ff.; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, iii. p. 421 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Einkl. N. T.*, p. 608 ff.; *Die Evangelien*, p. 225; Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1873, p. 85 ff.; Köstlin, *Ursprung*, u. s. w., p. 286 ff.; Mayerhoff, *Einkl. petr. Schr.*, p. 6 ff.; Overbeck, *Zu de W. App.*, p. 1 ff., lxiii. f.; Schleiermacher, *Einkl. N. T.*, 1845, p. 239 ff., 305 f., 347 ff.; Scholten, *Het paulin. Ev.-ag.*, p. 412 ff.; *Is de derde Evangelist de Schrijver van het Boek der Handelingen?* 1873, p. 98 f.; Schwanbeck, *Quell. Schr. Lukas*, p. 253 ff.; Schweigler, *Das nachap. Zeit.*, ii. p. 38 ff., 73 ff.; Straatman, *Paulus*, p. 14 ff.; *Stap, Origines*, &c., p. 203 ff.; Strauss, *Das Leben*

A careful study of the contents of the Acts cannot, we think, leave any doubt upon an unprejudiced mind that the work could not have been written by any companion or intimate friend of the Apostle Paul.¹ In here briefly indicating some of the reasons for this statement, we shall be under the necessity of anticipating, without much explanation or argument, points which will be more fully discussed further on, and which now, stated without preparation, may not be sufficiently clear to some readers. They may hereafter seem more conclusive. It is impossible to believe that a friend or companion could have written so unhistorical and defective a history of the Apostle's life and teaching. The Pauline Epistles are nowhere directly referred to, but where we can compare the narrative and representations of Acts with the statements of the Apostle, they are strikingly contradictory.² His teaching in the one scarcely presents a trace of the strong and clearly defined doctrines of the other, and the character and conduct of the Paul of Acts are altogether different from those of Paul of the Epistles. According to Paul himself (Gal. i. 16—18), after his conversion, he communicated not with flesh and blood, neither went up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before him, but immediately went away into Arabia, and returned to Damascus, and only after three years he went up to Jerusalem to visit Kephas, and abode with him fifteen days, during which visit none other of the Apostles did he see "save James, the brother

Jesu, p. 126 f.; *Tjernk-Willink*, Just. Martyr in zijne verh. tot Paulus, 1868, p. 64; *Volkmar*, Die Religion Jesu, p. 291; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 206 f., 244 f.; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii. f.; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1873, p. 508 ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 460 ff.; Vorträge, u. s. w., 1865, p. 206 ff. Cf. *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 194-208; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 508, 556.

¹ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 16 ff. passim; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 271 f.; *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1873, p. 87 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 239 f., 360 ff., 367 ff.; *Schotten*, Het paulin. Ev., p. 414; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 262 f.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 203 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 245; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii. f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 462 ff.; Vorträge, u. s. w., p. 206 ff. Cf. *Reuss*, Hist. de la Théologie Chrét., 3me éd., ii. p. 343; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xiii.

² *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 8 f., 123 ff., 149 f., et passim; K. G. 3te Aufl., i. p. 126 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 212 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., p. 40 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 27, 412 f., et passim; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitgesch., iii. p. 422 ff., anm. 7; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 224 ff., 1593 ff.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 111 ff., 118 ff., 135 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 32 ff., 62 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bibel Lex. (s. v. Apostelconvent), i. p. 194 ff.; *Nicolas*, Etudes crit. sur la Bible, N. Test., 1864, p. 267 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. App., p. lix., anm. **; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, xxix. ff.; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théologie, 1851. iii. p. 336; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 368 ff.; *Schotten*, Het paulin. Evang., p. 447 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 536 f., 543 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 30 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 116 ff., ii. p. 82 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 135 ff.; *Stratman*, Paulus, p. 47 ff., 82 ff., 97 ff., et passim; *Tjernk-Willink*, Just. Martyr, 1868, p. 27 f., p. 31, noot 3; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 245; Apostelgesch., p. xxxv. ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 216 ff., et passim; Vorträge, u. s. w., p. 206 ff. Cf. *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., 2te Aufl., p. 11 ff.

of the Lord." If assurance of the correctness of these details were required, Paul gives it by adding (v. 20): "Now the things which I am writing to you, behold before God I lie not." According to Acts (ix. 19—30), however, the facts are quite different. Paul immediately begins to preach in Damascus, does not visit Arabia at all, but, on the contrary, goes to Jerusalem, where, under the protection of Barnabas (v. 26, 27), he is introduced to the Apostles, and "was with them going in and out." According to Paul (Gal. i. 22), his face was after that unknown unto the churches of Judea, whereas, according to Acts, not only was he "going in and out" at Jerusalem with the Apostles, but (ix. 29) preached boldly in the name of the Lord, and (Acts xxvi. 20) "in Jerusalem and throughout all the region of Judaea," he urged to repentance. According to Paul (Gal. ii. 1 ff.), after fourteen years he went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus, "according to a revelation," and "privately" communicated his Gospel "to those who seemed to be something," as, with some irony, he calls the Apostles. In words still breathing irritation and determined independence, Paul relates to the Galatians the particulars of that visit—how great pressure had been exerted to compel Titus, though a Greek, to be circumcised, "that they might bring us into bondage," to whom, "not even for an hour did we yield the required subjection." He protests, with proud independence, that the Gospel which he preaches was not received from man nor taught to him (Gal. i. 11, 12), but revealed to him by God (verses 15, 16); and during this visit (ii. 6, 7), "from those seeming to be something (*τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι*), whatsoever they were it makes no matter to me—God accepts not man's person—for to me those who seemed (*οἱ δοκῶντες*) communicated nothing additional." According to Acts, after his conversion, Paul is taught by a man named Ananias what he must do (ix. 6, xxii. 10); he makes visits to Jerusalem (xi. 30, xii. 25, &c.), which are excluded by Paul's own explicit statements; and a widely different report is given (xv. 1 ff.) of the second visit. Paul does not go, "according to a revelation," but is deputed by the Church of Antioch, with Barnabas, in consequence of disputes regarding the circumcision of Gentiles, to lay the case before the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem. It is almost impossible in the account here given of proceedings characterised throughout by perfect harmony, forbearance, and unanimity of views, to recognize the visit described by Paul. Instead of being private, the scene is a general council of the Church. The fiery independence of Paul is transformed into meekness and submission. There is not a word of the endeavour to compel him to have Titus circumcised—all is peace and undisturbed good-will. Peter pleads the cause of Paul, and is more

re think,
rik could
friend of
e reasons
icipating,
a will be
without
rs. They
to believe
orical and
The Pau-
re we can
n the state-
ory.² His
strong and
er and con-
in those of
i. 16—18),
and blood,
stles before
returned to
erusalem to
which visit
the brother

anus, 1866, p.
206 f., 244 f.;
73, p. 508 ff.;
ff. Cf. Reuss,
6.
271 f.; Holtz-
T., p. 239 f.,
ellen, u. s. w.,
245; Apostel-
u. s. w., p. 206
n, Les Apôtres,

Auf., i. p. 126
T., p. 40 f.;
T. Zeitgesch.,
Zeitschr. wiss.,
62 ff.; Lipsius,
as, Etudes crit.
lix. anm. * *;
51. iii. p. 336;
ang., p. 447 ff.;
len, u. s. w., p.
p. Origines, &c.,
Tjeenk-Willink,
245; Apostelg.,
äge, u. s. w., p.

Pauline in his sentiments than Paul himself, and, in the very presence of Paul, claims to have been selected by God to be Apostle of the Gentiles (xv. 7—11). Not a syllable is said of the scene at Antioch shortly after (Gal. ii. 11 ff.), so singularly at variance with the proceedings of the council, when Paul withstood Cephas to the face. Then, who would recognize the Paul of the Epistles in the Paul of Acts, who makes such repeated journeys to Jerusalem, to attend Jewish feasts (xviii. 21,¹ xix. 21, xx. 16, xxiv. 11, 17, 18); who, in his journeys, halts on the days when a Jew may not travel (xx. 5, 6); who shaves his head at Cenchrea because of a vow (xviii. 18); who, at the recommendation of the Apostles, performs that astonishing act of Nazariteship in the Temple (xxi. 23), and afterwards follows it up by a defence of such "excellent dissembling" (xxiii. 6, xxiv. 11 ff.); who circumcises Timothy, the son of a Greek and of a Jewess, with his own hands (xvi. 1—3, cf. Gal. v. 2); and who is so little the apostle of the uncircumcision that he only tardily goes to the Gentiles when rejected by the Jews (cf. xviii. 6). Paul is not only robbed of the honour of being the first Apostle of the Gentiles, which is conferred upon Peter, but the writer seems to avoid even calling him an apostle at all,² the only occasions upon which he does so being indirect (xiv. 4, 14); and the title equally applied to Barnabas, whose claim to it is more than doubted. The passages in which this occurs, moreover, are not above suspicion, "the Apostles" being omitted in Cod. D. (Bezae) from xiv. 14. The former verse in that codex has important variations from other MSS.

If we cannot believe that the representation actually given of Paul in the Acts could proceed from a friend or companion of the Apostle, it is equally impossible that such a person could have written his history with so many extraordinary imperfections and omissions. We have already pointed out that between chs. ix.—xiv. are compressed the events of seventeen of the most active years of the Apostle's life, and also that a long period is comprised within the *ἡμεῖς* sections, during which such minute details of the daily itinerary are given. The incidents reported, however, are quite disproportionate to those which are omitted. We have no record, for instance, of his visit to Arabia at so interesting a portion of his career (Gal. i. 17), although the particulars of his conversion are repeated with singular variations no less than three times (ix. xxii. xxvi.); nor of his preaching in Illyria (Rom. xv. 19); nor of the incident referred to in Rom. xvi. 3, 4. The mo-

¹ The Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian, with other ancient codices, omit: "I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem."

² Hilgenfeld, Einl. N. T., p. 585; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. iii. note, p. xiii. f.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p., 206; Wuttichen, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 73, p. 513 f.

mentous adventures in the cause of the Gospel spoken of in 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. receive scarcely any illustration in Acts, nor is any notice taken of his fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus (1 Cor. xv. 32), which would have formed an episode full of serious interest. What, again, was "the affliction which happened in Asia," which so overburdened even so energetic a nature as that of the Apostle that "he despaired even of life?" (2 Cor. ii. 8f.) Some light upon these points might reasonably have been expected from a companion of Paul. Then, xvii. 14—16, xviii. 5, contradict 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, in a way scarcely possible in such a companion, present with the Apostle at Athens; and in like manner the representation in xxviii. 17—22, is inconsistent with such a person, ignoring as it does the fact that there already was a Christian Church in Rome (Ep. to Romans). We do not refer to the miraculous elements so thickly spread over the narrative of the Acts, and especially in the episode xvi. 25 ff., which is inserted in the first *ἡμεῖς* section, as irreconcilable with the character of an eye-witness, because it is precisely the miraculous portion of the book which is on its trial; but we may ask whether it would have been possible for such a friend, acquainted with the Apostle's representations in 1 Cor. xiv. 2 ff., cf. xii.—xiv., and the phenomena there described, to speak of the gift of "tongues" at Pentecost, as the power of speaking different languages (ii. 4—11, cf. x. 46, xix. 6)?

It will readily be understood that we have here merely rapidly and by way of illustration, referred to a few of the points which seem to preclude the admission that the general Author of the Acts could be an eye-witness,¹ or companion of the Apostle Paul, and this will become more apparent as we proceed, and more closely examine the contents of the book. Who that author was, there are now no means of ascertaining. The majority of critics who have most profoundly examined the problem presented by the Acts, however, and who do not admit Luke to be the general author, are agreed that the author compiled the *ἡμεῖς* sections from a diary kept by some companion of the Apostle Paul during the journeys and voyages to which they relate, but opinion is very divided as to the person to whom that diary must be ascribed. It is of course admitted that the various theories regarding his identity are merely based upon conjecture, but they have long severely exercised critical ingenuity. A considerable party adopt the conclusion that the diary was probably written by Luke.²

¹ Bleek does not consider it probable that he narrates anything as eye-witness. Einl. N.T., p. 340.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 16 f., 243; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, ii. p. 245 f.; cf. i. p. 383 ff., 422 ff.; Allg. K. G., i. p. 165 f., 237; Hausrath, N. T. Zeit., iii. p. 422

This theory has certainly the advantage of whatever support may be derived from tradition; and it has been conjectured, not without probability, that this diary, being either written by, or originally attributed to, Luke, may possibly have been the source from which, in course of time, the whole of the Acts, and consequently the Gospel, came to be ascribed to Luke.¹ The selection of a comparatively less known name than that of Timothy, Titus or Silas,² for instance, may thus be explained; but, besides, it has the great advantage that, the name of Luke never being mentioned in the Acts, he is not exposed to criticism, which has found serious objections to the claims of other better known followers of Paul.

There are, however, many critics who find difficulties in the way of accepting Luke as the author of the "we" sections, and who adopt the theory that they were probably composed by Timothy.³ It is argued that, if Luke had been the writer of this diary, he must have been in very close relations to Paul, having been his companion during the Apostle's second mission journey, as well as during the later European journey, and finally during the eventful journey of Paul as a prisoner from Caesarea to Rome. Under these circumstances, it is natural to expect that Paul should mention him in his earlier epistles, written before the Roman imprisonment, but this he nowhere does. For instance, no mention whatever is made of Luke in either of the letters to the Corinthians nor in those to the Thessalonians; but on the other hand, Timothy's name, together with that of Silvanus (or Silas), is joined to Paul's in the two letters to the Thessalonians, besides being mentioned in the body of the first Epistle (iii. 2, 6); and he is repeatedly and affectionately spoken of in the earlier letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10), and his name is likewise combined with the Apostle's in the sec-

f., ann. 7; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 606 ff., Die Evangelien, p. 225; *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 85 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 291 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. App., p. 1. ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 205; *Volkmar*, Die Religion Jesu, p. 291; *Wuttchen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 509 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 515 f. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 229; cf. p. 1 f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 207. We only refer here, of course, to writers who do not consider Luke the author of the rest of Acts.

¹ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 16 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's App., p. 1. ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 608; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 291; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, ii. p. 245 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelg., p. 515 f.

² *Schotten*, Het paulin. Evangelie, p. 416.

³ *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 332 ff.; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1030 ff.; *Beyschlag*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1864, p. 214 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 273 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 376, cf. 354, ann. 1; *Vorlesungen ap. De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 247, § 115 b, ann. a; *Ulrich*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1837, p. 369 ff.; 1840, p. 1003 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 247; *Apostelgesch.*, p. xxxviii. f. Cf. *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 81, ann. 1, 2; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 229, cf. 1 f.

ond Epistle (2 Cor. i. 1), as well as mentioned in the body of the letter, along with that of Silvanus, as a fellow-preacher with Paul. In the Epistle to the Philippians, later, the name of Luke does not appear, although, had he been the companion of the Apostle from Troas, he must have been known to the Philippians, but on the other hand, Timothy is again associated in the opening greeting of that Epistle. Timothy is known to have been a fellow-worker with the Apostle, and to have accompanied him in his missionary journeys, and he is repeatedly mentioned in the Acts as the companion of Paul, and the first occasion is precisely where the *ἡμεῖς* sections commence.¹ In connection with Acts xv. 40, xvi. 3, 10, it is considered that Luke is quite excluded from the possibility of being the companion who wrote the diary we are discussing, by the Apostle's own words in 2 Cor. i. 19:² "For the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who was preached among you by us, by me and Silvanus and Timothy," &c.; &c. The eye-witness who wrote the journal from which the *ἡμεῖς* portions are taken, must have been with the Apostle in Corinth, and, it is of course always asserted, must have been one of his *συνεργοί*, and preached the Gospel.³ Is it possible, on the supposition that this fellow-labourer was Luke, that the Apostle could in so marked a manner have excluded his name by clearly defining that "us" only meant himself and Silvanus and Timothy? Mayerhoff⁴ has gone even further than the critics we have referred to, and maintains Timothy to be the author of the third Synoptic and of Acts.

We may briefly add that some writers have conjectured Silas to be the author of the *ἡμεῖς* sections,⁵ and others have referred them to Titus.⁶ It is evident that whether the *ἡμεῖς* sections be by the unknown author of the rest of the Acts, or be part of a diary by some unknown companion of Paul, introduced into the work by the general editor, they do not solve the problem as to the identity of the author who remains absolutely unknown.

¹ xvi. 1 ff.; cf. xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5; xix. 22; xx. 4.

² Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 81, anm. 2.

³ Cf. Wordsworth, *Greek Test.*, The Four Gospels, 1875, p. 168; Acts of the Apost., 1874, p. 118. The Bishop of Lincoln considers that the vision which appeared to Paul (Acts xvi. 9), praying him to come over into Macedonia, was regarded by Luke as a message also designed for himself: "and the Holy Spirit, in the Acts of the Apostles, authorizes that opinion. Therefore, St. Luke also, as well as the Apostle, was called by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel in Greece." Four Gospels, p. 168.

⁴ Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 6 ff.

⁵ Hauber, *Betracht. üb. einig. d. erst. Glaubigen*, u. s. w., christl. Kirche, p. 61 f.; Kohlreiff, *Chron. Sacra*, p. 99; Schwanbeck, *Quellen*, u. s. w., p. 168 ff. Cf. Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, p. 81, anm. 1, 2.

⁶ Horst, *Essai sur les sources de la deuxième partie des Actes des Apôtres*, 1848; Krenkel, *Paulus*, p. 214 ff.; Straatman, *Paulus*, p. 6. We do not think it necessary to consider the theory that the sections we have been discussing are altogether a fiction. Br. Bauer, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 132 f.; cf. Schrader, *Der Apostel Paulus*, v. p. 549.

We have said enough to enable the reader to understand the nature of the problem regarding the author of the third Synoptic and of the Acts of the Apostles, and whilst for our purpose much less would have sufficed, it is evident that the materials do not exist for identifying him. The stupendous miracles related in these two works, therefore, rest upon the evidence of an unknown writer, who from internal evidence must have composed them very long after the events recorded. Externally there is no proof even of the existence of the Acts until towards the end of the second century, when also for the first time we hear of a vague theory as to the name and identity of the supposed author, a theory which declares Luke not to have himself been an eye-witness of the occurrences related in the Gospel, and which reduces his participation even in the events narrated in the Acts to a very small and modest compass, leaving the great mass of the miracles described in the work without even his personal attestation. The theory, however, we have seen to be not only unsupported by evidence, but to be contradicted by many potent circumstances. We propose now, without exhaustively examining the contents of the Acts, which would itself require a separate treatise, at least to consider some of its main points sufficiently to form a fair judgment of the historical value of the work, although the facts which we have already ascertained are clearly fatal to the document as adequate testimony for miracles, and the reality of Divine Revelation.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK. DESIGN AND COMPOSITION.

THE historical value of the Acts of the Apostles has very long been the subject of vehement discussion, and the course of the controversy has certainly not been favourable to the position of the work. For a considerable time of course the traditional view continued to prevail, and little or no doubt of the absolute credibility of the narrative was ever expressed. When the spirit of independent and enlightened criticism was finally aroused, it had to contend with opinions which habit had rendered stereotype, and prejudices which took the form of hereditary belief. As might naturally be expected, many writers in more recent times have defended the authenticity of the Acts, and asserted that the work is substantially historical and trustworthy; and, at the present day, apologists still express unshaken confidence in its character and enthusiastic faith in its truth and inspiration. On the other hand, a large body of eminent critics, after an exhaustive investigation of the Acts, have concluded that the work is not historically accurate, and cannot be accepted as a true account of the Acts and teaching of the Apostles.¹

The Author of the Acts has been charged with having written the work with a distinct design to which he subordinated historical truth, and in this view many critics have joined, who ultimately do not accuse him absolutely of falsifying history, but merely of making a deliberate selection of his materials and of

¹ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 8 ff., 19 ff., 96 ff., 119 ff., 134 ff., 143, anm. 1, 166, 189, et passim; *K. G.*, i. p. 125 f.; *Br. Bauer*, Apostelgesch., 1850, p. 114 ff.; *Christianus*, Das Ev. des Reichs, p. 767 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 207 ff., 275 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 27 f., p. 383 ff., 421 f. (second part historical, cf. 422 ff.); *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 420 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 101 ff.; Einl. N. T., p. 225 ff., 574 ff., 593 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 350 f.; in Schenkel's Bibel Lex., i. p. 213 f.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 86 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 6 ff., 212 ff.; *Nicolas*, Etudes N. T., p. 267 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. App., p. lii. ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Des Paulinismus, p. 277 ff., 495 ff.; *Revan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxiv. ff. (except last pages, p. xxvii.); *Scherer*, Rev. de Théologie, 1851, iii. p. 335 f.; *Scholten*, Het paul. Evang., p. 410, 414, 447 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 508 ff. passim; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 31 ff.; *Schweyler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 90, ii. p. 73 ff., 112 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 117 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 17 ff., et passim; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 28 f., 31, noot 3; *Volkmar*, Die Religion, p. 336 ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelg., p. 76 ff., 316 ff.; Vorträge, p. 206 ff. Cf. *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 344 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 203 f., 205 f.; Hist. Théol. Chrét., ii. p. 7, 327 ff.; *Révillé*, Essais de Critique Religieuse, 1860, p. 27 f.; *Schneckenburger*, p. 151 ff., et passim; *De Wette*, Apostelg., p. lix. f.; Einl. N. T., p. 252 f.; *Wuttichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1873, p. 512 ff.

placing them in the point of view most suitable for his purpose. Most of those, however, who make this charge maintain that, in carrying out the original purpose of the Acts, the writer so freely manipulated whatever materials he had before him, and so dealt with facts, whether by omission, transformation or invention, that the historical value of his narrative has been destroyed or at least seriously affected by it.¹ On the other hand, many apologetic writers altogether deny the existence of any design on the part of the author such as is here indicated, which could have led him to suppress or distort facts,² and whilst some of them advance very varied and fanciful theories as to the historical plan upon which the writer proceeds, and in accordance with which the peculiarities of his narrative are explained, they generally accept the work as the genuine history of the Acts of the Apostles so far as the author possessed certain information. The design most generally ascribed to the writer of the Acts may, with many minor variations, be said to be apologetic and conciliatory: an attempt to reconcile the two parties in the early church by representing the difference between the views of Peter and Paul as slight and unimportant, Pauline sentiments being freely placed in the mouth of Peter, and the Apostle of the Gentiles being represented as an orthodox adherent of the church of Jerusalem, with scarcely such advanced views of Christian universality as Peter; or else an effort of Gentile Christianity to bring itself into closer union with the primitive church, surrendering, in so doing, all its distinctive features and its Pauline origin, and representing the universalism by which it exists, as a principle adopted and promulgated from the very first by Peter and the Twelve. It is not necessary, however, for us to enter upon any minute discussion of this point, nor is it requisite, for the purposes of our inquiry, to determine whether the peculiar character of the writing which we are examining

¹ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 8 ff., 19 ff.; *Christianus*, Ev. des Reichs, p. 761 ff.; *Davidson*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 275; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 420 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 225 ff., 575 ff., 593 ff.; *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1860, p. 101 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 350 ff.; *Krenke*, Paulus, p. 6 ff., 212 ff.; *Nicolas*, Etudes N. T., p. 267 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Zeitg., p. xxv. ff., lix. ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxiv. ff. (except last few pages, p. xxvii.); *Révillé*, Essais de Crit. Rel., p. 27 ff.; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théol., 1851, iii. p. 336; *Schwiegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 73 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 1 ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelg., p. 76 ff., 316 ff.; *Vorträge*, p. 206 ff. Cf. *Reuss*, Hist. Théol. Chr., ii. p. 7, 327 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apostelg., p. 44 ff., 57 f., 92 f., 127 f., 140 f., 152 ff., 217 f.

² *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 17; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 328 ff., 345 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 23 ff.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 62 ff.; *Gray*, Entw. N. T., Schrifth., i. p. 320 ff.; *Guericke*, Gesammtg. N. T., p. 270 ff.; *Lange*, Das ap. Zeit., i. p. 87 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 7 ff., 159; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 189 ff., 374; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 8 ff.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 344 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 165 ff., 182 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 496 ff.; *de Pressensac*, Hist. trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 434 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 261 ff.

is the result of a perfectly definite purpose controlling the whole narrative and modifying every detail, or naturally arises from the fact that it is the work of a pious member of the Church writing long after the events related, and imbuing his materials, whether of legend or ecclesiastical tradition, with his own thoroughly orthodox views: history freely composed for Christian edification. We shall not endeavour to construct any theory to account for the phenomena before us, but taking them as they are, without seeking to discover the secret motives or intentions of the writer, we shall simply examine some of the more important portions of the narrative, with a view to determine whether the work can in any serious sense be regarded as credible history.

No one can examine the contents of the Acts without perceiving that some secret motive or influence did certainly govern the writer's mind, and guide him in the selection of topics, and this is betrayed by many peculiarities in his narrative. Quite apart from any attempt to discover precisely what that motive was, it is desirable that we should briefly point out some of these peculiarities. It is evident that every man who writes a history must commence with a distinct plan, and that the choice of subjects to be introduced or omitted must proceed upon a certain principle. This is of course an invariable rule wherever there is order and arrangement. No one has ever questioned that in the Acts of the Apostles both order and arrangement have been deliberately adopted, and the question naturally arises: What was the plan of the author? and upon what principle did he select, from the mass of facts which might have been related regarding the Church in the Apostolic ages, precisely those which he has inserted, to the exclusion of the rest? ¹ What title will adequately represent the contents of the book? for it is admitted by almost all critics that the actual name which the book bears neither was given to it by its author nor properly describes its intention and subject.² The extreme difficulty which has been felt in answering these questions, and in constructing any hypothesis which may fairly correspond with the actual contents of the Acts, constitutes one of the most striking commentaries on the work, and although we cannot here detail the extremely varied views of critics upon the subject, they are well worthy of study.³ No one now advances the theory which

¹ *Lekebusch*, Die Comp. u. Entst. d. Apostelgesch., 1854, p. 190 f.

² Perhaps the perfectly vague designation of the book "Acts," Ἱστορίαι, in the Col. Sinaiticus, may be taken as the closest—if most vague—description of its contents.

³ The reader may be referred, amongst many others, to the following works: *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 125 ff.; *Bertholdt*, Einl., iii. p. 1333 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 325 ff.; *Credner*, Einl. i. p. 268 ff., 283 f.; *Erard*, Zu Olshausen's Apg., p. 318 ann.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 16 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 28 ff.; *Feil-*

was anciently current that the author simply narrated that of which he was an eye-witness.¹ Its present title *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων* would lead us to expect an account of the doings of the Apostles in general, but we have nothing like this in the book. Peter and Paul occupy the principal parts of the narrative, and the other Apostles are scarcely mentioned. James is introduced as an actor in the famous Council, and represented as head of the church in Jerusalem, but it is much disputed that he was an Apostle, or one of the Twelve. The death of James the brother of John is just mentioned. John is represented on several occasions during the earlier part of the narrative as the companion of Peter, without, however, being prominently brought forward; and the rest of the Twelve are left in complete obscurity. It is not a history of the labours of Peter and Paul, for not only is considerable importance given to the episodes of Stephen and Philip the Evangelist, but the account of the two great Apostles is singularly fragmentary. After a brief chronicle of the labours of Peter, he suddenly disappears from the scene, and we hear of him no more. Paul then becomes the prominent figure in the drama; but we have already pointed out how defective is the information given regarding him, and he is also abandoned as soon as he is brought to Rome: of his subsequent career and martyrdom nothing whatever is said. The work is not, as Luther suggested, a gloss on the Epistles of Paul and the inculcation of his doctrine of righteousness through faith, for the narrative of the Acts, so far as we can compare it with the Epistles, which are nowhere named in it, is generally in contradiction with them, and the doctrine of justification by faith is conspicuous by its absence. It is not a history of the first Christian missions, for it ignores entirely the labours of most of the Apostles, omits all mention of some of the most interesting missionary journeys, and does not even give a report of the introduction of Christianity into Rome. It is not in any sense a Paulinian history of the Church, for if, on the one side, it describes the Apostles of the circumcision as promulgating the universalism which Paul preached, it robs him of his originality, dwarfs his influence upon the development of Christianity, and is, on the other hand, too defective to represent church his-

moser, Einl., p. 295 ff.; Guericke, Gesammtg. N. T., p. 269 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Einl., p. 593 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 329 ff.; Lekebusch, App., p. 189 ff.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 5 f.; Meyer, App., p. 8 ff.; Oertel, Paulus, p. 165 ff.; Overbeck, Zu de W. App., p. xxv. ff.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 205 ff.; Hist. Théol. Chr., ii. p. 327 ff.; Schneckenburger, Zweck App., p. 45 ff.; Trip, Paulus, p. 33 f., 63 ff.; De Wette, Einl., p. 241 ff.; Wordsworth, Greek Test., Acts, p. 1 ff.; Zeller, App., p. 316 ff.

¹ Cf. Hieron, De vir. ill. 7; Eusebius, H. E., iii. 4; Can. Murat., ed. Tregelles, p. 18 f.

tory, whether from a Paulinian or any other standpoint. The favourite theory: that the writer designed to relate the story of the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, can scarcely be maintained, although it certainly has the advantage of a vagueness of proportions equally suitable to the largest and most limited treatment of history. But, in such a case, we have a drama with the main incident omitted; for the introduction of the Gospel into Rome is not described at all, and whilst the author could not consider the personal arrival at Rome of the Apostle Paul the climax of his history, he at once closes his account where the final episode ought to have commenced.

From all points of view, and upon any hypothesis, the Acts of the Apostles is so obviously incomplete as a history, so fragmentary and defective as biography, that critics have to the present day failed in framing any theory which could satisfactorily account for its anomalies, and have almost been forced to explain them by supposing a partial, apologetic or conciliatory design, which removes the work from the region of veritable history. The whole interest of the narrative, of course, centres in the two representative Apostles, Peter and Paul, who alternately fill the scene. It is difficult to say, however, whether the account of the Apostle of the Circumcision or of Paul is the more capriciously partial and incomplete. After his miraculous liberation from the prison into which he had been cast by Herod, the doings of Peter are left unchronicled, and although he is reintroduced for a moment to plead the cause of the Gentiles at the Council in Jerusalem, he then finally retires from the scene, to give place to Paul. The omissions from the history of Paul are very remarkable, and all the more so from the extreme and unnecessary detail of the itinerary of some of his journeys, and neither the blanks, on the one hand, nor the excessive minuteness, on the other, are to be explained by any theory connected with personal knowledge on the part of Theophilus. Of the general history of the primitive Church and the life and labours of the Twelve, we are told little or nothing. According to the author the propagation of the Gospel was carried on more by angelic agency than apostolic enthusiasm. There is a liberal infusion of miraculous episodes in his history, but a surprising scarcity of facts. Even where the author is best informed, as in the second part of the Acts, the narrative of Paul's labours and missionary journeys, while presenting striking omissions, is really minute and detailed only in regard to points of no practical interest, leaving both the distinctive teaching of the Apostle, and the internal economy of the Church almost entirely unrepresented. Does this defective narrative of the Acts of the Apostles proceed from poverty of information,

Weyherfeld, Einl.,
sch. Apg., p.
Oertel, Pau-
N. T., p. 205
g., p. 45 ff.;
worth, Greek

ed. Tregelles,

or from the arbitrary selection of materials for a special purpose? As we proceed, it will become increasingly evident that, limited although the writer's materials are, the form into which they have been moulded has undoubtedly been determined either by a dominant theory, or a deliberate design, neither of which is consistent with the composition of sober history.

This is particularly apparent in the representation which is given of the two principal personages of the narrative. Critics have long clearly recognized that the Author of the Acts has carefully arranged his materials so as to present as close a parallelism as possible between the Apostles Peter and Paul.¹ We shall presently see how closely he assimilates their teaching, ascribing the views of Paul to Peter, and putting Petrine sentiments in the mouth of Paul, but here we shall merely refer to points of general history. If Peter has a certain pre-eminence as a distinguished member of the original Apostolic body, the equal claim of Paul to the honours of the Apostolate, whilst never directly advanced, is prominently suggested by the narration, no less than three times, of the circumstances of his conversion and direct call to the office by the glorified Jesus. The first miracle ascribed to Peter is the healing of "a certain man lame from his mother's womb" (*τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*) at the beautiful gate of the Temple,² and the first wonder performed by Paul is also the healing of "a certain man lame from his mother's womb" (*τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*) at Lystra;³ Ananias and Sapphira are punished through the instrumentality of Peter,⁴ and Elymas is smitten with blindness at the word of Paul;⁵ the sick are laid in the streets that the shadow of Peter may fall upon them, and they are healed, as are also those vexed with unclean spirits;⁶ handkerchiefs or aprons are taken to the sick from the body of Paul, and they are healed, and the evil spirits go out of them;⁷ Peter withstands Simon the sorcerer,⁸ as Paul does the sorcerer Elymas and the exorcists at Ephesus;⁹ if Peter heals the

¹ Baur, *Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1838, H. iii. p. 142 f.; Paulus, i. p. 8 f.; K. G., i. p. 127 f.; *Christianus*, Ev. des Reichs, p. 767 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 275 ff.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 420 ff., 427 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii., p. 350 f.; in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 213 f.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 201 f.; *Noack*, Urspr. des Christenthums, 1857, p. 283, 288; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 495 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii.; *Révillie*, Essais, p. 27 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck Apg., p. 52 ff., 212 f.; *Schotten*, Het paulin. Evang., p. 463 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 76 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 123 ff.; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 341 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 320 ff. Cf. *Lightfoot*, Epistles of St. Paul, Galatians, 4th ed., p. 342; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 79, 121 f.

² iii. 2 ff.

³ xiv. 8. ff.

⁴ v. 1 ff.

⁵ xiii. 11 f.

⁶ v. 12, 15 f.

⁷ xix. 11, 12.

⁸ viii. 20 ff.

⁹ xiii. 11 f., xix. 13 ff.

paralytic Æneas at Lydda,¹ Paul restores to health the fever-stricken father of Publius at Melita;² Peter raises from the dead Tabitha, a disciple at Joppa,³ and Paul restores to life the disciple Eutychus at Troas;⁴ Cornelius falls at the feet of Peter, and worships him, Peter preventing him, and saying: "Rise up! I myself also am a man,"⁵ and in like manner the people of Lystra would have done sacrifice to Paul, and he prevents them, crying out: "We also are men of like passions with you;"⁶ Peter lays his hands on the people of Samaria, and they receive the Holy Ghost and the gift of tongues,⁷ and Paul does the same for believers at Ephesus;⁸ Peter is brought before the council,⁹ and so is Paul;¹⁰ the one is imprisoned and twice released by an angel,¹¹ and the other is delivered from his bonds by a great earthquake;¹² if Peter be scourged by order of the council,¹³ Paul is beaten with many stripes at the command of the magistrates of Philippi.¹⁴ It is maintained that the desire to equalise the sufferings of the two Apostles in the cause of the Gospel, as he has equalised their miraculous displays, probably led the Author to omit all mention of those perils and persecutions to which the Apostle Paul refers in support of his protest, that he had laboured and suffered more than all the rest.¹⁵ If Paul was called by a vision to the ministry of the Gentiles,¹⁶ so Peter is represented as having been equally directed by a vision to baptize the Gentile Cornelius;¹⁷ the double vision of Peter and Cornelius has its parallel in the double vision of Paul and Ananias. It is impossible to deny the measured equality thus preserved between the two Apostles, or to ignore the fact that parallelism like this is the result of premeditation, and cannot claim the character of impartial history.

The speeches form an important element in the Acts of the Apostles, and we shall now briefly examine them, reserving, however, for future consideration their dogmatic aspect. Few, if any writers, however apologetic, maintain that these discourses can possibly have been spoken exactly as they are recorded in the Acts. The utmost that is asserted is that they are substantially historical, and fairly represent the original speeches.¹⁸ They were

¹ ix. 33 f.² xxviii. 8.³ ix. 36 ff.⁴ xx. 9 ff.⁵ x. 25, 26.⁶ xiv. 13 ff., cf. xxviii. 6.⁷ viii. 14 ff., x. 44 ff., &c., &c.⁸ 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff., 1 Cor. xv. 10; *Stap.* *Etudes sur les Origines*, &c., p. 124 f.⁹ ix. 6, 15 f.¹⁰ ix. 6, 15 f. ¹¹ x. 9 ff., xi. 1 ff., xv. 7.¹² *Alford*, *Greek Test.*, ii. proleg., p. 13 ff.; *Bleek*, *Einl.*, p. 346 f.; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch.*, p. 683 ff.; *Güericke*, *Gesammtg. N. T.*, p. 275 ff.; *Kähler*, *Th. Stud. u. Kr.*, 1873, p. 492 ff.; *Lechler*, *Das. ap. u. nachap. Zeit.*, p. 30, 146 ff.⁸ xix. 1 ff.⁹ v. 21 ff.¹⁰ xxii. 30, xxiii. 1 ff.¹¹ v. 19, xii. 6 ff.¹² xvi. 26.¹³ v. 40.¹⁴ xvi. 22 f.

derived, it is alleged, either from written sources, or oral tradition, and many, especially in the second part, are supposed to have been delivered in the presence of the Author of the work. This view is held, of course, with a greater or less degree of assurance as to the closeness of the relation which our record bears to the original addresses; but, without here very closely scrutinizing hesitation or reticence, our statement fairly renders the apologetic position. A large body of able critics, however, deny the historical character of these speeches,¹ and consider them mere compositions from the Author of the Acts, at the best being on a par with the speeches which many ancient writers place in the mouths of their historical personages, and giving only what the writer supposed that the speaker would say under the circumstances. That the writer may have made use of such materials as were within his reach, or endeavoured to embody the ideas which tradition may broadly have preserved, may possibly be admitted, but that these discourses can seriously be accepted as conveying a correct report of anything actually spoken by the persons in whose mouths they are put is, of course, denied. It is, obviously, extremely improbable that any of these speeches could have been written down at the time.² Taking even the supposed case that

Meyer, App., 13; *Michaelis*, Einl., ii. p. 1180 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. a. w., p. 1 ff., 57 ann. 2, 65 ann. 1, 150 ann. 2, et passim; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 69 ff.; *Olshausen*, App., p. 9 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Hist., i. p. 485; *Riehlm*, De fontibus, &c., p. 75 ff., 127 ff., 148 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl., p. 373 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, App., p. 129 ff., 156 f.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 70 ff., 84 ff.; *Tholuck*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 307 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 187 ff.; *Weiss*, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, 1855, p. 5 ff., 147 ff. Cf. *Mayerhoff*, as regards the latter half of the Acts only, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 19 ff., 219 ff.

¹ *Baur*, Paulus, i. 3 ff., 19 ff., passim; *Br. Bauer*, App., p. 76 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 36 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum. Ev. des Paulus u. Petrus, 1868, p. 147; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 354 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's App., p. liii. f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 505 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii. f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 38 f., 52, 199, 206; Hist. Théol. chr., ii. p. 7 f., p. 335 ff.; *Scherer* (first part), Rev. de Théol., 1851, iii. p. 336; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 510, 513, 522, 524, 540 f., et passim; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 73 ff., 97, 102 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 127 ff.; 137 ff., et passim; *Stratman*, Paulus, p. 62 f., 70 f., 160 ff., 258 f., 286 ff., 341 ff.; *Zeller*, App., p. 496 ff., 519 ff. Cf. *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 283; Das N. Test., ii. p. 45 ann.; *Lekebusch*, App., p. 331 f.; *Mayerhoff*, (first part), Einl. petr. Schr., p. 218 ff., 230; *Weiss*, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, p. 5 f., 200 ann. 1; *De Wette*, Einl., p. 250 f., App., p. liii. In regard to some speeches, compare *Bleek*, Einl., p. 349 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 383 ff., passim.

² *Olshausen* says: "One cannot, naturally, suppose that these speeches are recorded exactly as they were delivered. We have only to represent to ourselves exciting moments (as for instance the farewell of Paul to the Ephesian Presbyters at Miletus, xx, 17 ff.) to feel the inadequacy of this view. The Paulinian speech in the touching scene so moved their hearts that all present burst into tears; who thinks on such occasions of a mechanical record of the spoken living discourse? One of course fears that if no instantaneous record was made, all guarantee for the credibility of the speech is lost. Only, this fear obviously proceeds from unbelief in the power of the Spirit of Truth, as has already been observed in the

the Author of the Acts was Luke, and was present when some of the speeches of Paul were delivered, it is difficult to imagine that he should have immediately recorded his recollection of them, and more than this he could not have done. He must continually have been in the habit of hearing the preaching of Paul, and therefore could not have had the inducement of novelty to make him write down what he heard. The idea of recording them for posterity could not have occurred to such a person, with the belief in the approaching end of all things then prevalent. The Author of Acts was not the companion of Paul, however, and the contents of the speeches, as we shall presently see, are not of a character to make it in the least degree likely that they could have been written down for separate circulation. Many of the speeches in the Acts, moreover, were delivered under circumstances which render it specially unlikely that they could have been reported with any accuracy. At no time an easy task correctly to record a discourse of any length, it is doubly difficult when those speeches, like many in Acts, were spoken under circumstances of great danger or excitement. The experience of modern times, before the application of systems of short-hand, may show how imperfectly speeches were taken down, even where there was deliberate preparation and set purpose to do so, and if it be suggested that some celebrated orations of the last century have so been preserved, it is undeniable that what has been handed down to us not only does not represent the original, but is really almost a subsequent composition, preserving little more than some faint echoes of the true utterance. The probability that a correct record of speeches made, under such circumstances, in the middle of the first century could have been kept, seems exceedingly small. Even if it could be shown that the Author of the Acts took these speeches substantially from earlier documents, it would not materially tend to establish their authenticity; for the question would still remain perfectly open as to the closeness of those documents to the original discourses; but in the absence of all evidence, whether as to the existence or origin of any such sources, the conjecture of their possible existence can have no weight. We have nothing but internal testimony to examine, and that, we shall see, is totally opposed to the claim to historical value made for those discourses.

Apologists scarcely maintain that we have in the Acts a record

introduction to the Gospels; if we do not suppose this working in the mind of the writer of the Acts, and of the Apostles, under whose eyes he wrote, then we have nowhere any warrant for the contents; if this, however, be recognized, then the free conception of the speeches indicated cannot disturb us or prejudice them." *Olshausen, Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 9. Here the apologist takes refuge in a theory of inspiration which is but a sorry shelter from the simplest critical attack.

of the original discourses in their completeness, but in claiming substantial accuracy most of them include the supposition at least of condensation.¹ The longest discourse in the Acts would not have taken more than six or seven minutes to deliver,² and it is impossible to suppose that what is given in the Acts can have been the whole speech delivered on many of the occasions described. For instance, is it probable that King Agrippa, who desires to hear Paul, and who comes "with great pomp" with Bernice to do so, should only have heard a speech lasting some five minutes? The Author himself tells us that Paul was not always so brief in his addresses as any one might suppose from the specimens here presented.³ It is remarkable, however, that not the slightest intimation is given that the speeches are either merely substantially reported or are abridged, and their form and character are evidently designed to convey the impression of complete discourses. If the reader examine any of these discourses, it will be clear that they are concise compositions, betraying no marks of abridgement, and having no fragmentary looseness, but, on the contrary, are highly artificial and finished productions, with a continuous argument. They certainly are singularly inadequate, many of them, to produce the impressions described; but at least it is not possible to discover that material omissions have been made, or that their periods were originally broken by large, or even any, amplification. If these speeches be regarded as complete, and with little or no condensation, another strong element is added to the suspicion as to their authenticity, for such extreme baldness and brevity in the declaration of a new religion, requiring both explanation and argument, cannot be conceived, and in the case of Paul, with whose system of teaching and doctrine we are well acquainted through his Epistles, it is impossible to accept such meagre and one-sided addresses, as representations of his manner. The statement that the discourses are abridged, and a mere *résumé* of those originally delivered, however, rests upon no authority, is a mere conjecture to account for an existing difficulty, and is in contradiction to the actual form of the speeches in Acts, which evidently are designed to be complete in themselves. Regarding them as complete, it will be found that their incongruity is intensified, but considered as abridged, they have lost in the process all representative character and historical fitness.

It has been argued, indeed, that the different speeches bear evidence to their genuineness from their suitability to the speakers, and

¹ Lechler (Das ap. und nachap. Zeit., p. 148, an. 1) quotes from Dr. Stanley (Sermons and Essays, p. 168) the opinion that these speeches are "invaluable models of missionary preaching." In one respect at least—brevity—they certainly are models even for other preaching than that of the missionary.

² Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 199.

³ xx. 7-9.

to the circumstances under which they are said to have been spoken but the existence of anything but the most superficial semblance of idiosyncratic character must be denied. The similarity of form, manner, and matter in all the speeches is most remarkable, as will presently be made more apparent, and the whole of the doctrine enunciated amounts to little more than the repetition, in slightly varying words, of the brief exhortation to repentance and belief in Jesus, the Christ, that salvation may be obtained,¹ with references to the ancient history of the Jews, singularly alike in all discourses. Very little artistic skill is necessary to secure a certain suitability of the word to the action, and the action to the word; and certainly evidence is reduced to a very low ebb when such agreement as is presented in the Acts is made an argument for authenticity. Not only is the consistency of the sentiments uttered by the principal speakers, as compared with what is known of their opinions and character, utterly disputed, but it must be evident that the literary skill of the Author of the Acts was quite equal to so simple a task as preserving at least so much superficial fitness as he displays, and a very much greater amount of verisimilitude might have been attained, as in many works of fiction, without necessarily involving the inference of genuineness.

It has been freely admitted by critics of all schools that the author's peculiarities of style and language are apparent in all the speeches of the Acts,² and this has been so often elaborately demonstrated that it is unnecessary minutely to enter upon it again. It may not be out of place to quote a few lines from the work of one of the ablest and most eminent advocates of the general authority of the Acts. Speaking of the speeches of Paul, Lekebusch says: "The speeches of our Book, in fact, are calculated, perhaps more than anything, to excite doubt regarding its purely historical character. But here everything depends upon an unbiassed judgment. We are sufficiently free from prejudice to make the admission to recent criticism that the speeches are not verbally given as they were originally delivered, but are composed by the Author of the Acts of the Apostles. Schleiermacher, certainly, has confidently asserted their originality. He thinks: 'If the

¹ Reuss, *Hist. de la Théol. Chrét.*, ii. p. 335.

² Alford, *Greek Test.*, ii. proleg., p. 13 ff.; Credner, *Einkl. N. T.*, i. p. 283; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 226 ff.; Eichhorn, *Einkl.*, ii. p. 36 ff.; Kähler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1873, p. 492 ff.; Lekebusch, *App.*, p. 37 ff., 331 f., 335 f.; Mayerhoff, *Einkl. petr. Schr.*, p. 19 ff., 218 ff.; Meyer, *App.*, p. 12 f.; Oertel, *Paulus*, p. 69 ff.; Overbeck, *Zu de Wette's App.*, p. liii. ff.; Pfeiderer, *Paulinismus*, p. 505 f.; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. xxviii. f.; Reuss, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 199 f.; *Hist. Théol. Chrét.*, ii. p. 7 f.; Schneckenburger, *App.*, p. 129 ff., 135 f., 156; Tholuck, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1839, p. 366 f.; Trip, *Paulus*, p. 191 ff.; De Wette, *Einkl.*, p. 250 f.; Zeller, *App.*, p. 496 ff.; Cf. Bleek, *Einkl.*, p. 346 f.; Guericke, *Gesammtg. N. T.*, p. 275, anm. 6.

speeches were separately reported they could not but appear just as we find them in the Acts of the Apostles.' But his remarks, however ingenious and acute they may be, do not stand the test of a thorough examination of the individual speeches. No one who impartially compares these, one with another, and particularly their style with the mode of expression of the author in the other sections, can help agreeing with Eichhorn, when, in consonance with his view regarding the uniform character of the Acts, on the grounds quoted, page 14, he ascribes the composition of the speeches to the writer from whom the whole book in all its parts proceeds."¹ To this impartial expression of opinion Lekebusch adds a note: "In saying this, it is naturally not suggested that our author simply *invented* the speeches, independently, without any historical intimation whatever as to the substance of the original: the *form* only, which certainly is here very closely connected with the substance, is hereby ascribed to him."² Lekebusch then merely goes on to discuss the nature of the author's design in composing these speeches. The reasons given by Eichhorn, which Lekebusch quotes at "page 14," referred to above, had better be added to complete this testimony. After referring to the result of Eichhorn's "very careful examination" of the internal character of Acts, Lekebusch says: "He finds, however, that, 'throughout the whole Acts of the Apostles there prevails the same style, the same manner, the same method and mode of expression' (ii. 35). Not even the speeches, which one at first might take for inserted documents, seem to him 'from a strange hand, but elaborated by the same from which the whole book, with its three parts, proceeds.' 'Various peculiarities existing in the speeches' prove this to him, independent of the similarity of the style, and that, 'although they are put into the mouths of different persons, they nevertheless follow one and the same type, make use of one and the same mode of argument, and have so much that is common to them that they thereby prove themselves to be speeches of one and the same writer' (ii. 38). From these circumstances, therefore, it seems to Eichhorn 'in the highest degree probable, that Luke, throughout the whole Acts of the Apostles, writes as an independent author, and apart from all extraneous works.' And in this view he is 'strengthened by the resemblance of the style which runs through the whole Acts of the Apostles, through speeches, letters, and historical sections,' as well as by the fact that, 'through the whole book, in the quotations from the Old Testament, a similar relation prevails between the Greek text of the Septuagint and that of Luke' (ii. 43)."³ We

¹ Comp. u. Entst. der Apostelgesch., 1854, p. 331 f.

² *Ib.*, p. 332, ann. l.

³ Lekebusch, Comp. u. Entst. der Apostelgesch., p. 14 f.

have thought it well to quote these independent opinions from writers who range themselves amongst the defenders of the historical character of the Acts, rather than to burden our pages with a mass of dry detail in proof of the assertion that the peculiarities of the author pervade all the speeches indifferently, to a degree which renders it obvious that they proceed from his pen.

Without entering into mere linguistic evidence of this, which will be found in the works to which we have referred,¹ we may point out a few general peculiarities which are worthy of attention. The author introduces the speeches of different persons with the same expression "he opened his mouth," or something similar. Philip "opened his mouth" (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ*)² and addressed the Ethiopian (viii. 35). Peter "opened his mouth (and) said" (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα, εἶπεν*), when he delivered his discourse before the baptism of Cornelius (x. 34). Again, he uses it of Paul: "And when Paul was about to open his mouth (*μύλλοντος ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα*), Gallio said," &c. (xviii. 14). The formula with which the speech of Peter at Pentecost is introduced deserves more attention: "Peter lifted up his voice and said unto them" (*ἐπὶ ἤρην τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπεφθέγγετο αὐτοῖς*) (ii. 14). The verb *ἀποφθέγγεσθαι* occurs again (ii. 4) in the account of the descent of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues, and it is put into the mouth of Paul (xxvi. 25) in his reply to Festus, but it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The favourite formula with which all speeches open is, "Men (and) Brethren (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*), or *ἄνδρες* coupled with some other term, as "Men (and) Israelites" (*ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῆται*), or simply *ἄνδρες* without addition. "*Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*" occurs no less than thirteen times. It is used thrice by Peter,³ six times by Paul,⁴ as well as by Stephen,⁵ James,⁶ the believers at Pentecost,⁷ and the rulers of the Synagogue.⁸ The angels at the Ascension address the disciples as "Men (and) Galileans" (*ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*).⁹ Peter makes use of *ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῆται* twice,¹⁰ and it is likewise employed by Paul,¹¹ by Gamaliel,¹² and by the Jews of Asia.¹³ Peter addresses those assembled at Pentecost as *ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι*.¹⁴ Paul opens his Athenian

¹ See references, p. 759, note 2, and especially the works of Eichhorn, Credner, Zeller, Mayerhoff, Lekebusch, and Davidson.

² It is to be remarked, however, that the same expression occurs in the first Synoptic (Matth. v. 2, xiii. 35, xvii. 27), and only once in Luke i. 64. It is also quoted Acts viii. 32 from the lxx. version of Isaiah liii. 7.

³ i. 16; ii. 29; xv. 7.

⁴ xiii. 26, 38; xxii. 1; xxiii. 1, 6; xxviii. 17.

⁵ vii. 2.

⁶ xv. 13.

⁷ ii. 37.

⁸ xiii. 15.

⁹ i. 11.

¹⁰ ii. 22; iii. 12.

¹¹ xiii. 16.

¹² v. 35.

¹³ xxi. 28.

¹⁴ ii. 14.

speech with ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι,¹ and the town-clerk begins his short appeal to the craftsmen of Ephesus: ἄνδρες Ἐφεσίοι.² The simple ἄνδρες is used indifferently by various speakers.³ There can be no doubt that the common use of these expressions by all speakers in the Acts betrays the hand of the same composer throughout.

In the speech which Peter is represented as making at Pentecost, he makes an altogether peculiar use (ii. 25—27) of Psalm xvi., which he quotes, in order to prove that the Resurrection of Jesus the Messiah was a necessary occurrence, which had been foretold by David. This is principally based upon the tenth verse of the Psalm: "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thine Holy One (τὸν ἁγίόν σου) to see corruption (διαφθοράν)?"⁴ Peter argues that David both died and was buried, and that his sepulchre is with them to that day, but that, being a prophet, he foresaw and spake here of the Resurrection of Christ, "that neither was he left in Hades nor did his flesh see corruption (διαφθοράν)."⁵ Is it not an extremely singular circumstance that Peter, addressing an audience of Jews in Jerusalem, where he might naturally be expected to make use of the vernacular language, actually quotes the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and bases his argument upon a mistranslation of the Psalm, which, we may add, was in all probability not composed by David at all?⁶ The word translated "Holy One," should be in the plural: "holy ones,"⁷ that is to say: "thy saints," and the word rendered διαφθορά, corruption, really signifies "grave" or "pit."⁸ The poet, in fact, merely

¹ xvii. 22.

² xix. 35.

³ vii. 26; xiv. 15; xix. 25; xxvii. 10, 21, 25.

⁴ Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 224 ff.; Eichhorn, Einl., ii. p. 42.

⁵ ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκατελείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾗδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὁσίόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. Acts ii. 27.

⁶ . . . ὅτι οὔτε ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ᾗδην οὔτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν. Acts ii. 31.

⁷ Ewald, Die Psalmen, u. s. w., 1866, p. 237 ff., 246 ff.; Fürst, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, 1870, ii. p. 187, anm. 2, p. 392; Kuenen, Hist. Krit. Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan des Ouden Verbonds, 1865, iii. p. 281, 294, 295 f., n. 12; J. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, 1853, p. 83. Cf. Bleek, Einl. A. T., 1865, p. 615 f.; Hupfeld, Die Psalmen, 1867, i. p. 396 ff.

⁸ R. Anger, Gesch. mess. Idee., p. 73; Ch. Bruston, Les Psaumes, 1865, p. 23; Mallet de Chilly, Les Prophètes, 1862, p. 21; Davidson, Int. O. Test., 1862, ii. p. 279; Ewald, Die Psalmen, p. 246, 249 f.; Fischer, Prolusiones de vitis Lex. N. T., 1791, p. 184 ff.; Four Friends, The Psalms chron. arranged, 1867, p. 202; Fürst, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, ii. p. 392; Hengstenberg, Die Psalmen, 2te Aufl., i. p. 337 ff.; Hupfeld, Die Psalmen, i. p. 369 ff.; Komphausen, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iii. p. 30; Kuenen, De Profeten, ii. p. 241 f.; Meyer, Arg., p. 75; J. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, p. 83, 89; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Vet. Test., Psalmi, i. 1821, p. 394 ff.; De Wette, Die Psalmen, p. 197; Die heil. Schr. A. u. N. T. übera, 1856; Apostelg., p. 41. Cf. Tholuck, Die Psalmen, 2te Aufl., p. 170, anm.*.

⁹ Ch. Bruston, Les Psaumes, 1865, p. 23; Mallet de Chilly, Les Prophètes, &c., 1862, p. 21; Davidson, Int. O. T., ii. 279; Delitzsch, Die Psalmen, 3te Aufl., i. p.

expresses his confidence that he will be preserved alive. The best critics recognize that Ps. xvi. is not properly a Messianic Psalm at all,¹ and many of those who, from the use which is made of it in Acts, are led to assert that it is so, recognize in the main that it can only be applied to the Messiah indirectly, by arguing that the prophecy was not fulfilled in the case of the poet who speaks of himself, but was fulfilled in the Resurrection of Jesus. This reasoning, however, totally ignores the sense of the original, and is opposed to all legitimate historical interpretation of the psalm. Not dwelling upon this point at present, we must go on to point out that, a little further on (xiii. 35—37), the Apostle Paul is represented as making use of the very same argument which Peter here employs, and quoting the same passage from Ps. xvi. to support it. This repetition of very peculiar reasoning, coupled with other similarities which we shall presently point out, leads to the inference that it is merely the author himself who puts this argument into their mouths,² and this conclusion is strengthened by the circumstance that, throughout both Gospel and Acts, he always quotes from the Septuagint,³ and even when that version departs from the sense of the original. It may be well to give both passages in juxtaposition, in order that the closeness of the analogy may be more easily realized. For this purpose we somewhat alter the order of the verses:—

156, 164; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 246, 249 f.; *Fischer*, Prolog. de vitis Lex. N. T., p. 181 ff.; *Gesenius*, Lex. Hebr. et Chald. in Vet. Test. sub. voce; *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 337 ff.; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, 1863, i. p. 86; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 396 ff.; *Kamphausen*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iii. p. 30; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 241 f.; *Kuinool*, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 84; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 75 f.; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 89; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in Vet. Test., Psalms, i. 1821, p. 393 ff.; *De Wette*, Die Psalmen, p. 197; Apg., p. 41. Cf. *Anger*, Gesch. mess. Idee, p. 73; *Grotius*, Annot. N. T., v. p. 17 f.; *Tholuck*, Die Psalmen, p. 170, anm. *

¹ *Anger*, Gesch. mess. Idee, p. 73 f.; *G. Baur*, Gesch. alttest. Weissagung, i. p. 407 ff., 417; *Bleek*, Einl. A. T., p. 624 f.; *Brethschneider*, Lehrb. d. Religion u. d. Gesch. chr. Kirche, 1827, p. 139; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. p. 279 f.; Int. N. T., ii. p. 228; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 238 f., 245 ff.; *Fürst*, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, ii. p. 187, anm. 2, 392; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 396 ff.; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 249 ff.; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 83 ff.; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in V. T., Psalms, i. 1821, p. 363 ff.; *De Wette*, Die Psalmen, p. 192 ff. Cf. *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 338 ff., 342.

² *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 38 f.; *De Wette*, Apostelgesch., p. liii., p. 204; Einl. N. T., p. 250 f.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 222; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 240; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apg., p. 130. Cf. *Weiss*, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, p. 205, anm. 2.

³ *Bleek*, Einl., p. 277 f.; *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 273; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 240, 267; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 43; *Guericke*, Gesamtgt., p. 275 f., anm. 6; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. xxiii.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 78 f., 404 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 12; *Schleiermacher*, Einl., p. 378 f.; *De Wette*, Einl., p. 247; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 398. Cf. *Rennan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii. f., note 6.

PETER IN ACTS ii.

25. For David saith concerning him.
 . . . 27. Because thou wilt not
 leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt
 thou give thine holy one to see corrup-
 tion.

30. Being therefore a prophet and
 knowing that God swore with an oath
 to him that of the fruit of his loins¹
 he would set one upon his throne,

31. He foresaw and spoke of the
 resurrection of the Christ, that he
 was neither left in Hades, nor did his
 flesh see corruption (*διαφθοράν*).

29. Men (and) brethren, I may
 speak with freedom unto you of the
 patriarch David, that he both died
 and was buried, and his sepulchre is
 amongst us unto this day.

32. This Jesus God raised up.

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.

35. Wherefore he (David) saith also,
 in another (Psalm): Thou wilt not
 give thine holy one to see corrup-
 tion.

22. . . . he raised up unto
 them David for king

23. Of this man's seed God, accord-
 ing to promise, brought unto Israel a
 Saviour Jesus.

34. But that he raised him up from
 the dead no more to return to cor-
 ruption (*διαφθοράν*) he has said on
 this wise.

36. For David, after he served in
 his own generation, the counsel of
 God, fell asleep, and was added to
 his fathers and saw corruption (*δια-
 φθοράν*);

37. But he whom God raised saw
 not corruption (*διαφθοράν*).

Not only is this argument the same in both discourses, but the whole of Paul's speech, xiii. 16 ff., is a mere reproduction of the two speeches of Peter, ii. 14 ff. and iii. 12 ff., with such alterations as the writer could introduce to vary the fundamental sameness of ideas and expressions. It is worth while to show this in a similar way:—

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.

16. And Paul having risen . . .
 (*ἀναστὰς δὲ Π.*) . . . said . . .
 Men (and) Israelites (*ἄνδρες Ἰσραη-
 λῆται*) and ye that fear God . . .

22 and 23. See above.

24. When John first preached² be-
 fore his coming the baptism of re-
 pentance to all the people of Israel.

26. Men (and) Brethren (*ἄνδρες
 ἀδελφοί*), sons (*υἱοί*) of the race of
 Abraham and those among you who

PETER IN ACTS ii. and iii.

14. And Peter stood up (*στῆθεὶς
 δὲ Π.*) . . . and spoke plainly to
 them . . . Men (and) Jews (*ἄνδρες
 Ἰουδαῖοι*) and all ye that dwell at
 Jerusalem . . . (verse 22 and iii.
 12) Men (and) Israelites (*ἄνδρες
 Ἰσραηλῆται*).

30. See above.

iii. 19. Repent, therefore, and turn
 20. . . . that he may
 send Christ Jesus who before was
 appointed² for you.

ii. 29. Men (and) Brethren (*ἄνδρες
 ἀδελφοί*).

¹ The authorised version, with Cod. D, and some other MSS., inserts here:
 "according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit," &c.

² The authorised version of iii. 20 reads "preached," adopting the same verb
προκηρύττειν as in xiii. 24, which is nowhere else used in the N. T. It is fair
 to say, however, that the evidence is greatly in favour of the reading "*προκηρυ-
 ρισμένον*" in iii. 20.

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.

fear God, to you was the word of this salvation sent (*ἀπεστάλη*).²

27. For they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers (*οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν*), not knowing (*ἀγνοήσαντες*) this (man) nor yet the voices of the prophets (*τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν*), which are read every (*πᾶν*) sabbath day, fulfilled (*ἐπλήρωσαν*) them by their judgment of him.

28. And though having found no cause of death, they desired (*ἤθελον*) Pilate that he should be slain (*ἀνακτείναι*).⁵

29. But when they finished all the things written regarding him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a sepulchre.

30. But God raised him from the dead, (*ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

31. . . . who are now his witnesses (*μαρτυρες*). . . .

32. And we declare unto you the promise made unto the fathers (*πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας*),

33. That God has perfectly fulfilled the same unto our children, having raised up (*ἀναστήσας*) Jesus, as it is written, . . .

34, 35, 36, 37. See above.

PETER IN ACTS ii. and iii.

iii. 25.¹ Ye are the sons (*υἱοὶ*) of the prophets and of the covenant which God made unto your fathers, saying unto Abraham . . . 26 . . . unto you first God, having raised up his servant (*τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ*),³ sent (*ἀπέστειλεν*) him to bless you.

iii. 17.⁴ And now Brethren (*ἀδελφοί*) I know that ye did (it) in ignorance (*ἄγνοιαν*), as did also your rulers (*οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν*); 18. but the things which God before announced by the mouth of all the prophets (*διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν*) he thus fulfilled (*ἐπλήρωσεν*);

iii. 13. . . . whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate when he decided to release him;

(ii. 23. This (man) delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, by the hand of lawyers (men) crucifying (him) ye slew (*ἀνείλατε*).)⁵

iii. 14. But ye denied the holy and just one, and desired (*ἤθελασθε*) a murderer to be granted to you,

15. And killed the Prince of life whom God raised from the dead (*ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν*), whose witnesses (*μαρτυρες*) we are.

iii. 25. Ye are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant made unto your fathers (*πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν*) saying . . .

26. Unto you first God, having raised up (*ἀναστήσας*) his servant. (*παῖδα*) Jesus, sent him to bless you, &c.

ii. 31, 27, 29, 32. See above.

¹ Cf. ii. 39: For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, whomsoever the Lord God shall have called unto him.

² *ἐξαπεστάλη* is the reading of A, B, C, D, &c.; the reading given is that of E, G, H, &c.

³ Rendered "son" in the authorised vers.

⁴ Cf. Acts xvii. 30.

⁵ This verb *ἀνακτείνω* is used twice in Luke, only thrice in the rest of the N. T., but nineteen times in Acts, and it is freely put into the mouths of Peter, Paul, Stephen, and Gamaliel, as well as used in the narrative portions.

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.

38. Be it known unto you, therefore, men (and) brethren (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*), that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins (*ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*).

39. And from all things from which ye could not be justified in the law of Moses, every one who believes in this man is justified;

40. Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets:

41. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish.

PETER IN ACTS ii. and iii.

ii. 37. Men (and) Brethren (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*).

38. . . . Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of your sins (*ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν*), &c.

iii. 22. Moses indeed said: A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.

23. And it shall be that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.

24. And all the prophets also from Samuel and from those that follow after, as many as spake, also foretold these days.

Paul's address likewise bears close analogy with the speech of Stephen, vii. 2 ff., commencing with a historical survey of the earlier traditions of the people of Israel, and leading up to the same accusation that, as their fathers disregarded the prophets, so they had persecuted and slain the Christ. The whole treatment of the subject betrays the work of the same mind in both discourses. Bleek, who admits the similarity between these and other speeches in Acts, argues that: "it does not absolutely follow from this that these speeches are composed by one and the same person, and are altogether unhistorical;" for it is natural, he thinks, that in the apostolical circle, and in the first Christian Church, there should have existed a certain uniform type in the application of Messianic passages of the Old Testament, and in quotations generally, to which different teachers might conform without being dependent on each other.² He thinks also that, along with the close analogy, there is also much which is characteristic in the different speeches. Not only is this typical system of quotation, however, a mere conjecture to explain an actual difficulty, but it is totally inadequate to account for the phenomena. If we suppose, for instance, that Paul had adopted the totally unhistorical application of the sixteenth Psalm to the Messiah, is it not a very extraordinary thing that in all the arguments in his Epistles, he does not once refer to it? Even if this be waived, and it be assumed that he had adopted this interpretation of the Psalm, it will scarcely be asserted that Paul, whose independence

¹ This reference is also put into the mouth of Stephen, Acts vii. 37.

² Bleek, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 346; *Paulus*, p. 195.

and originality of mind are so undeniable, and whose intercourse with the apostolical circle at any time, and most certainly up to the period when this speech was delivered, was very limited,¹ could so completely have caught the style and copied the manner of Peter that, on an important occasion like this, his address should be a mere reproduction of Peter's two speeches delivered so long before, and when Paul certainly was not present. The similarity of these discourses does not consist in the mere application of the same Psalm, but the whole argument, on each occasion, is repeated with merely sufficient transposition of its various parts to give a superficial appearance of variety. Words and expressions, rare or unknown elsewhere, are found in both, and the characteristic differences which Bleek finds exist only in his own apologetic imagination. Let it be remembered that the form of the speeches and the language are generally ascribed to the Author of the Acts. Can any unprejudiced critic deny that the ideas in the speeches we are considering are also substantially the same? Is there any appreciable trace of the originality of Paul in his discourses? There is no ground whatever, apart from the antecedent belief that the various speeches were actually delivered by the men to whom they are ascribed, for asserting that we have here the independent utterances of Peter and Paul. It is internal evidence alone, and no avowal on the part of the author, which leads to the conclusion that the form of the speeches is the author's, and there is no internal evidence which requires us to stop at the mere form, and not equally ascribe the substance to the same source. The speeches in the Acts, generally, have altogether the character of being the composition of one mind endeavouring to impart variety of thought and expression to various speakers, but failing signally from poverty of invention on the one hand, and from the purpose of instituting a close parallel in views, as well as actions, between the two representative Apostles.

Further to illustrate this, let us take another speech of Peter which he delivers on the occasion of the conversion of Cornelius, and it will be apparent that it also contains all the elements, so far as it goes, of Paul's discourse.

PETER IN ACTS x.

35. But in every nation he that fears him (*ὁ φοβούμενος*). . . is acceptable to him—

36. The word (*τὸν λόγον*) which he (God) sent (*ἀπέστειλεν*) unto the sons (*υἱοὺς*) of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ ;³ he is Lord of all.

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.

26. Sons (*υἱοὶ*) of the race of Abraham, and those among you who fear God (*οἱ φοβούμενοι*), to you was the word (*ὁ λόγος*) of this salvation sent (*ἀπεστάλη*).²

¹ Cf. Gal. i. 11 ff., ii. 6.

² See p. 765, note 2.

³ Cf. xiii. 23.

PETER IN ACTS x.

37. Ye know the word spoken throughout all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism (*βάπτισμα*) which John preached,

38. Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.

39. And we are witnesses (*μάρτυρες*) of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem; whom also they slew (*ἀνέβλαν*), hanging him upon a tree (*ξύλου*).

40. Him God raised (*ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν*) the third day, and gave him to become manifest;

41. Not to all the people, but to witnesses (*μάρτυσιν*) chosen before by God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*).

42. And he commanded *παρήγγειλεν* us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is he who has been appointed (*ὁ ὀρισμένος*)¹ by God judge (*κριτῆς*) of quick and dead.

43. To him bear all the prophets witness that through his name all who believe in him shall receive remission of sins (*ἀφεσὶν ἁμαρτιῶν*).

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.

24. When John first proclaimed before his coming the baptism (*βάπτισμα*) of repentance to all the people of Israel.

25. And as John was fulfilling his course he said: Whom think ye that I am? I am not he; but behold there comes one after me the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to loose.

27. For they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers . . . 28. Though having found no cause of death, desired Pilate that he should be slain (*ἀναπεθῇναι*); 29. But when they had finished all the things written regarding him they took him down from the tree (*ξύλου*).

30. But God raised (*ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν*) him from the dead (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*);

31. And he appeared for many days to those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses (*μάρτυρες*) unto the people.

xvii. 30. . . but now commands (*παράγγελλει*) all men everywhere to repent; 31. Because he fixed a day in the which he is about to judge (*κρίνειν*) the world in righteousness by the man whom he appointed (*ὥρισεν*),¹ having given assurance to all by having raised him up from the dead.

xiii. 27. . . not knowing the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day. . . 38. Be it known to you, therefore, . . . that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins (*ἀφεσὶς ἁμαρτιῶν*).

Again, to take an example from another speaker, we find James represented as using an expression which had just before been put into the mouth of Paul, and it is not one in the least degree likely to occur independently to each. The two passages are as follows:—

¹ Except by the author of Luke (xxii. 22) and Acts, the verb *ὀρίζειν* is only twice used in the N.T. In Acts it is twice put into the mouth of Peter (ii. 23 x. 42), and twice into that of Paul (xvii. 26, 31), as well as used in narrative (xi. 29).

JAMES IN ACTS XV. 21.

Moses . . . being read in the
synagogues every Sabbath day.

(κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινώσκόμενος.)

PAUL IN xiii. 27.

. . . the prophets being read every
Sabbath day.

(κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινώσκόμενος.)

The fundamental similarity between these different speeches cannot possibly be denied;¹ and it cannot be reasonably explained in any other way than by the fact that they were composed by the author himself, who had the earlier speeches of Peter still in his memory when he wrote those of Paul,² and who, in short, had not sufficient dramatic power to create altogether distinct characters, but simply made his different personages use his own vocabulary to express his own somewhat limited range of ideas. Setting his special design aside, his inventive faculty only permitted him to represent Peter speaking like Paul, and Paul like Peter.

It is argued by some, however, that in the speeches of Peter, for instance, there are peculiarities of language and expression which show analogy with the first Epistle bearing his name in the New Testament Canon,³ and, on the other hand, traces of translation in some of them which indicate that these speeches were delivered originally in Aramaic, and that we have only a version of them by the Author of the Acts, or by some one from whom he derived them.⁴ As regards the first of these suppositions, a few phrases only have been pointed out, but they are of no force under any circumstances, and the whole theory is quite groundless.⁵ We do not consider it worth while to enter upon the discussion, and those who desire to do so are referred to the works just indicated. There are two potent reasons which render such an argument of no force, even if the supposed analogies were in themselves both numerous and striking, which actually they are not. The authenticity of the Epistles bearing the name of Peter is not only not established, but is by very many eminent critics

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 115 ff.; K. G., i. p. 127; Br. Bauer, App., p. 78 f.; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 230 ff.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 ff.; Schneckenburger, App., p. 130 f.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 540; De Wette, App., p. 112; Einl. N.T., p. 250; Zeller, App., p. 301 ff., 497 f.

² Zeller, App., p. 405 f.

³ Alford, Greek Test., ii. Proleg., p. 10; Ebrard, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 683 f.; Lange, Das apost. Zeit., i. p. 108; Riehm, De Fontibus Act. Apost., 1821, p. 126 ff., 143 f.; Seyler, Stud. u. Krit., 1832, p. 53 ff.; Tholuck, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 306; Weiss, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, 1855, p. 5 f., p. 144 ff. Cf. Kähler, Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 492 ff., 535 f.

⁴ Bleek, Einl., p. 348 f.; Meyer, App., p. 73.

⁵ Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 237 f.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 220 ff.; Overbeck, Zu de Wette's App., p. liv. f.; De Wette, Einl. N.T., p. 251; Zeller, App., p. 496 f. Cf. Kähler, Stud. u. Krit., p. 1873, p. 535 f.

absolutely denied; and there is no certainty whatever that any of the speeches of Peter were delivered in Greek, and the probability is that most, if not all, of that Apostle's genuine discourses must have been spoken in Aramaic. It is in fact asserted by apologists that part or all of the speeches ascribed to him in the Acts must have been originally Aramaic, although opinion may differ as to the language in which some of them were spoken. Whether they were delivered in Aramaic, or whether there be uncertainty on the point, any conclusion from linguistic analogies with the Epistles is obviously excluded. One thing is quite undeniable: the supposed analogies are few, and the peculiarities distinguishing the Author of Acts in these speeches are extremely numerous and general. Even so thorough an apologist as Tholuck candidly acknowledges that the attempt to prove the authenticity of the speeches from linguistic analogies is hopeless. He says: "Nevertheless, a comparison of the language of the Apostles in their Epistles and in these speeches must in many respects be less admissible than that of the *character and historical circumstances*, for indeed if the language and their peculiarities be compared, it must first be established that all the reported speeches were delivered in the Greek language, which is improbable, and of one of which (xxii. 1, 2), the contrary is expressly stated. Willingly admitting that upon this point difference of opinion is allowable, we express as the view which we have hitherto held that, from ch. xx. onwards, the speeches delivered by Paul are reported more in the language of Luke than in that of Paul."¹ This applies with double force to Peter,² whose speeches there is still greater reason to believe were delivered in Aramaic, and there is difference of opinion amongst the critics we have referred to even as to whether these speeches were translated by the Author of the Acts, or were already before him in a translated form, and were subsequently re-edited by him. We have already shown cause for believing that the whole discussion is groundless, from the fact that the speeches in Acts were simply composed by the author himself, and are not in any sense historical, and this we shall hereafter further illustrate.

¹ Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 306.

² Kähler, after a very exhaustive analysis of the speeches of Peter in Acts, says: "Finally, a possible misunderstanding must be removed. The analogy of the speeches with 1 Peter, and even 2 Peter, is repeatedly referred to; this is not done in the sense that the proof of a Petrine Greek in these speeches could be attempted. If these be regarded at all as true reproductions of historical originals, they were at all events delivered in Aramaic; only in the case of the speech at Cæsarea an exception would perhaps have to be made. Thus, in any case, our text is based upon a translation, which one could not well trace back to the Apostle himself. But only in that case could the proof referred to have any weight." Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 535.

It may be worth while to consider briefly the arguments advanced for the theory that some of the speeches show marks of translation. It is asserted that the speech of Peter at Pentecost, ii. 14 ff., was delivered in Aramaic.¹ Of course it will be understood that we might be quite prepared to agree to this statement as applied to a speech actually delivered by Peter; but the assertion, so far as the speeches in Acts are concerned, is based upon what we believe to be the erroneous supposition that they are genuine reports of discourses. On the contrary, we maintain that these speeches are mere compositions by the author of the work. The contention is, however, that the speech attributed to Peter is a translation of a speech originally delivered in Aramaic. In ii. 24, Peter is represented as saying: "Whom God raised up having loosed the pains of death (*λύσας τὰς ὀδύνας τοῦ θανάτου*), because it is not possible that he should be held (*κρατεῖσθαι*) by it." It is argued by Bleek and others² that, as the context proves, the image intended here was evidently the "snares" or "cords" of death, a meaning which is not rendered by the Greek word *ὀδύνας*. The confusion is explained, they contend, when it is supposed that, in his Aramaic speech, Peter made use of a Hebrew expression, equally found in Aramaic, which means as well "snares" or "cords" as "pains" of death. The Greek translator, probably misled by the Septuagint,³ adopted the latter signification of the Hebrew word in question, and rendered it *ὀδύνας* "pains," which is absolutely inappropriate, for, they argue, it is very unnatural to say of one who had already suffered death, like Christ, that he had been held prisoner by the "pains" of death, and loosed from them by the resurrection. There is, however, very little unanimity amongst apologists about this passage. Ebrard⁴ asserts that *ὀδύνας* "pains" is the correct translation of the Hebrew expression, as in Ps. xviii. 5, and that the Hebrew word used always expresses pains of birth, the plural of the similar word for "cord" or "snare" being different. Ebrard, therefore, contends that the Psalm (xviii. 5) does not mean bonds or snares of death but literally "birth-pains of death," by which the soul is freed from the natural earthly existence as by a second birth to a glorified spiritual life. We need not enter further into the discussion of the passage, but it is obvious that it is mere

¹ Bleek, Einl. N. T., p. 348; Ebrard, Zu Olshausen, Apostelgesch., p. 59 f., cf. Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 684; Meyer, Die Apostelgesch., p. 73; Weiss, Die petr. Lehrs., p. 205, anm. 3. Ebrard, in his note to Olshausen, considers that the author had the speech already in a translated form, or an account of it, before him, but in his own work he declares for its having been delivered in Greek.

² Bleek, Einl., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1038 f. Cf. Meyer, Apg., p. 72 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 22, anm. 1; Humphrey, Acts, p. 20.

³ Ps. xvii. 5 (A. V. xviii. 5).

⁴ Ebrard, Zu Olshausen, Apg., p. 63.

assumption to assert, on the one hand, that Peter made use of any specific expression, and, on the other, that there was any error of translation on the part of the Author of Acts. But, agreeing that the Hebrew is erroneously rendered,¹ the only pertinent question is: by whom was the error in question committed? and the reply beyond any doubt is: by the LXX. who translate the Hebrew expression in this very way. It is therefore inadmissible to assert from this phrase the existence of an Aramaic original of the speech, for the phrase itself is nothing but a quotation from the Septuagint.²

The expression *ὁδίνες θανάτου* occurs no less than three times in that version: Ps. xvii. 5 (A. V. xviii.), cxiv. 3 (A. V. cxvi.) and 2 Sam. xxii. 6; and in Job xxxix. 2, we have *λύειν* used with *ὁδίνες*: *ὁδίνας δὲ αὐτῶν λύσας*. When it is remembered that the author of Acts always quotes the Septuagint version, even when it departs from the sense of the Hebrew original, and in all probability was only acquainted with the Old Testament through it, nothing is more natural than the use of this expression taken from that version, but with the error already existing there, to ascribe it afresh and independently to the Author of Acts, upon no other grounds than the assumption that Peter may have spoken in Aramaic, and used an expression which the author misunderstood or wrongly rendered, is not permissible. Indeed, we have already pointed out that, in this very speech, there are quotations of the Old Testament according to the LXX. put into the mouth of Peter, in which that version does not accurately render the original.³

The next trace of translation advanced by Bleek⁴ is found in ii. 33,⁵ where Peter speaks of Christ as exalted: "*τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ*." There can be no doubt, Bleek argues, that there is here a reference to Psalm cx. 1, and that the Apostle intends to speak of Christ's elevation "to the right (hand) of God;" whereas the Greek expression rather conveys the interpretation "by the right (hand) of God." This expression certainly comes, he asserts, from a not altogether suitable translation of the Hebrew. To this on the other hand, much may be objected. Winer,⁶ followed by others, defends the construction, and affirms that the passage may with-

¹ Bleek, Einl., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1038 f.; *Lekebusch*, App., p. 404 f.; *Meyer*, App., p. 72 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 22, anm. 1; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette, App., p. 40; *De Wette*, App., p. 39 f.; *Zeller*, App., p. 502 f. Cf. *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 182; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 56 f.; *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 394 f.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 455; *Gesenius*, Lexicon, s. v.

² *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 502 f.; *Lekebusch*, Die Comp. u. Entst. d. Apostelgesch., p. 404 f. Cf. *Kähler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 571.

³ Acts ii. 16 ff., 26, 27.

⁴ Einl. N. T., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1038; *De Wette*, App., p. 42; *Weiss*, Petr. Lehrs., p. 205.

⁵ Cf. Acts v. 31.

⁶ Grammat. N. T. Sprachid., 1867, § 31, 5, p. 201.

out hesitation, be translated "to the right (hand) of God."¹ In which case there is no error at all, and the argument falls to the ground. If it be taken, however, either that the rendering should be or was intended to be "by the right (hand) of God,"² i.e., by the power of God, that would not involve the necessity of admitting an Aramaic original,³ because there is no error at all, and the argument simply is, that being exalted by the right hand of God, Jesus had poured forth the Holy Spirit; and in the next verse the passage in Ps. cx. 1 (Sept. cix.) is accurately quoted from the Septuagint version: "Sit thou on my right (hand)" (*ἐκ δεξιῶν μου*). In fact, after giving an account of the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the speaker ascribes his subsequent exaltation to the power of God.⁴

We have seen that at least the form of the speeches in Acts is undoubtedly due to the author of the book, and that he has not been able to make the speeches of the different personages in his drama differ materially from each other. We shall hereafter have occasion to examine further the contents of some of these speeches, and the circumstances under which it is alleged that they were spoken, and to inquire whether these do not confirm the conclusion hitherto arrived at, that they are not historical, but merely the free composition of the Author of Acts, and never delivered at all. Before passing on, however, it may be well to glance for a moment at one of these speeches, to which we may not have another opportunity of referring, in order that we may see whether it presents any traces of inauthenticity and of merely ideal composition.

In the first chapter an account is given of a meeting of the brethren in order to elect a successor to the traitor Judas. Peter addresses the assembly, i. 16 ff., and it may be well to quote the opening portion of his speech: 16. "Men (and) brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, who became guide to them that took Jesus, 17. because he was numbered

¹ Winer, l. c.; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 405; *Kähler*, Stud. u. Kr., 1873, p. 511 f.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Acts, p. 49; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 51; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 66; *Fritzsche*, Conject., i. p. 42.

² *Meyer*, Apg., p. 77 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 42; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 21, anm. 1; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 502, anm. 2; *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., p. 511; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 26. "By" is adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and English (authorized) versions.

³ *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 405; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 77 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 42; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 502 f., anm. 2; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 26. Cf. *Kähler*, Stud. u. Kr., 1873, p. 511 f.

⁴ The expression *ἐκ δεξιῶν* is used in this sense in the Sept. version of Isaiah lxiii. 12; cf. Acts v. 31. The "right hand of God," as symbolising his power, is constantly employed in the Old Testament.

with us and obtained the lot of this ministry. 18. Now (*μὲν οὖν*) this man purchased a field with the wages of the iniquity (*ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας*), and falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out; 19. and (*καὶ*) it became known¹ unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem, so that that field was called in their own tongue (*τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ*) Acheldamach, that is: field of blood. 20. For (*γὰρ*) it is written in the book of Psalms: 'Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein,' and 'his office let another take,' &c., &c. Now let it be remembered that Peter is supposed to be addressing an audience of Jews in Jerusalem, in the Hebrew or Aramaic language, a few weeks after the crucifixion. Is it possible, therefore, that he should give such an account as that in vs. 18, 19, of the end of Judas, which he himself, indeed, says was known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem? Is it possible that, speaking in Aramaic to Jews, probably in most part living at and near Jerusalem, he could have spoken of the field being so called by the people of Jerusalem "in their own tongue?" Is it possible that he should, to such an audience, have translated the word Acheldamach? The answer of most unprejudiced critics is that Peter could not have done so.² As de Wette remarks: "In the composition of this speech the author has not considered historical decorum."³ This is felt by most apologists, and many ingenious theories are advanced to explain away the difficulty. Some affirm that verses 18 and 19 are inserted as a parenthesis by the Author of the Acts,⁴ whilst a larger number contend that only v. 19 is parenthetical.⁵ A very cursory examination of the passage, however, is sufficient to show that the verses cannot be separated. Verse 18 is connected with the preceding by the *μὲν οὖν*, 19 with 18 by *καὶ*, and verse 20 refers to 16, as indeed it also does to 17 and 18, without which the passage from the Psalm, as applied to Judas, would be unintelligible. Most critics, therefore, are agreed that none of the verses can be considered parenthetical.⁶ Some apologists,

¹ The peculiar and favourite expression, *γνωστὸν ἐγένετο* (or *ἔδω*) *ὅτι*, which only occurs in Acts, is placed in the mouth of Peter, Paul, and others, and itself betrays the hand of the author. Cf. ii. 14, iv. 10, ix. 42, xiii. 38, xix. 17, xxviii. 22, 28.

² Credner, Einl., i. p. 283; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 384 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 335 f.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 f.; Overbeck, Zu de Wette's Apg., p. 12 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 510; Schweegler, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 97, anm. 1; De Wette, Einl., p. 250; Apg., p. 12; Zeller, Apg., p. 79 ff.

³ Apostelg., p. 12.

⁴ Beelen, Comm. Act. Apost., p. 35 f.; Hackett, Acts, p. 9 f.; Humphrey, Acts, p. 9 f.; Schleiermacher, Einl., p. 372. Cf. Robinson, Acts, p. 5.

⁵ Ebrard, Zu Olshausen, Apg., p. 39; Kuiper, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 18.

⁶ Alford, Greek Test., ii. p. 8 f.; Baumgarten, Apg., i. p. 31 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 384 ff.; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr.

however, who feel that neither of the obnoxious verses can be thus explained, endeavour to overcome the difficulty by asserting that the words: "in their own tongue" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ) and: "that is: the field of blood" (τοῦτ' ἐστὶν χωρίον αἵματος) in verse 19, are merely explanatory and inserted by the Author of Acts.¹ It is unnecessary to say that this explanation is purely arbitrary, and that there is no ground, except the difficulty itself, upon which their exclusion from the speech can be based. In the cases to which we have hitherto referred, the impossibility of supposing that Peter could have spoken in this way has led writers to lay the responsibility of unacknowledged interpolations in the speech of the Apostle upon the Author of Acts, thus at once relieving Peter. There are some apologists, however, who do not resort to this expedient, but attempt to meet the difficulty in other ways, while accepting the whole as a speech of Peter. According to one theory, those who object that Peter could not have thus related the death of Judas to people who must already have been well acquainted with the circumstances have totally overlooked the fact, that a peculiar view of what has occurred is taken in the narrative, and that this peculiar view is the principal point of it. According to the statement made, Judas met his miserable end in the very field which he had bought with the price of blood. It is this circumstance, it appears, which Peter brings prominently forward and represents as a manifest and tangible dispensation of Divine justice.² Unfortunately, however, this is clearly an imaginary moral attached to the narrative by the apologist, and is not the object of the supposed speaker, who rather desires to justify the forced application to Judas of the quotations in verse 20, which are directly connected with the preceding by γὰρ. Moreover, no explanation is here offered of the extraordinary expressions in verse 19 addressed to citizens of Jerusalem by a Jew in their own tongue. Another explanation, which includes these points, is still more striking. With regard to the improbability of Peter's relating, in such a way, the death of Judas, it is argued that, according to the Evangelists, the disciples, some eight days after the resurrection, went from Jerusalem back to Galilee, and only returned, earlier than usual, before Pentecost to await the fulfilment of the promise of Jesus. Peter and his companions, therefore, it is argued, only after their return became acquainted with the fate of Judas, which had taken place

Sehr., p. 225 f.; Meyer, Apg., p. 38 f.; Overbeck, Zu de W. Apg., p. 12 f.; Stier, Die Reden der Apostel, 2te Aufl., i. p. 8; De Wette, Apg., p. 12 f.; Zeller, Apg., p. 79 ff.

¹ Alford, Greek Test., ii. p. 9 f.; Bengel, Gaom. N. T., p. 503; Meyer, Apg., p. 39; Stier, Die Reden der Apostel, p. 8.

² Baumgarten, Die Apostelgesch., 1859, p. 31 f.

during their absence, and the matter was, therefore, quite new to them; besides, it is added, a speaker is often obliged on account of some connection with his subject to relate facts already known.¹ It is true that some of the Evangelists represent this return to Galilee² as having taken place, but the author of the third Gospel and the Acts not only does not do so but excludes it.³ In the third Gospel (xxiv. 49), Jesus commands the disciples to remain in Jerusalem until they are endued with power from on high, and then, after blessing them, he is parted from them, and they return from Bethany to Jerusalem.⁴ In Acts, the author again takes up the theme, and whilst evidently giving later traditions regarding the appearances after the resurrection, he adheres to his version of the story regarding the command to stay in Jerusalem. In i. 4, he says: "And being assembled together with them he commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father," etc.; and here again, verse 12, the disciples are represented, just before Peter's speech is supposed to have been delivered, as returning from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem. The Author of Acts and of the third Synoptic, therefore, gives no countenance to this theory. Besides, setting all this aside, the apologetic hypothesis we are discussing is quite excluded upon other grounds. If we suppose that the disciples did go into Galilee for a time, we find them again in Jerusalem at the election of the successor to Judas, and there is no ground for believing that they had only just returned. The Acts not only allow of no interval at all for the journey to Galilee between i. 12-14 and 15 ff., but by the simple statement with which our episode commences, v. 15: "And in these days" (*καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις*), Peter conveys anything but the impression of any very recent return to Jerusalem. If the Apostles had been even a few days there, the incongruity of the speech would remain undiminished; for the 120 brethren who are said to have been present must chiefly have been residents in Jerusalem, and

¹ Lange, *Das Apost. Zeitalter*, i. 85, ii. p. 16.

² Mt. xxviii. 10, 16; Mk. xvi. 7; John xxi. 1. Dr. Farrar, somewhat pertinently asks: "Why did they (the disciples) not go to Galilee immediately on receiving our Lord's message? The circumstance is unexplained. . . . Perhaps the entire message of Jesus to them is not recorded; perhaps they awaited the end of the feast." *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 441, note 1.

³ In Luke xxiv. 49 the Cod. Alex. reads ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλὴμ, with Cod. C*, F, H, K, M, and a number of others of less note. The other older Codices omit Ἱερουσαλὴμ, but there is no difference of opinion that the "city" is Jerusalem.

⁴ We shall hereafter have to go more fully into this, and shall not discuss it here. The third Gospel really represents the Ascension as taking place on the day of the Resurrection; and Acts, whilst giving later tradition, and making the Ascension occur forty days after, does not amend, but confirms the previously enunciated view that the disciples had been ordered to stay in Jerusalem.

cannot be supposed also to have been absent, and, in any case, events which are stated to have been so well known to all the dwellers in Jerusalem, must have been well known to the whole of the small Christian community, whose interest in the matter was so specially great. Moreover, according to the first Synoptic, as soon as Judas sees that Jesus is condemned, he brings the money back to the chief priests, casts it down and goes and hangs himself, xxvii. 3 ff. This is related even before the final condemnation of Jesus to death and before his crucifixion, and the reader is led to believe that Judas at once put an end to himself, so that the disciples who are represented as being still in Jerusalem for at least eight days after the resurrection must have been there at the time. With regard to the singular expressions in verse 19, this theory goes on to suppose that out of consideration for Greek fellow-believers Peter had probably already begun to speak in the Greek tongue, and when he designates the language of the dwellers in Jerusalem as "their own dialect," he does not thereby mean Hebrew in itself, but their own expression, the peculiar confession of the opposite party which admitted the cruel treachery towards Jesus, in that they named the piece of ground Hakei Damah.¹ Here, again, what assumptions! Most critics recognize that Peter must have spoken in Aramaic, and even if he did not, *τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ*² cannot mean anything but the language of "all the dwellers at Jerusalem." In a speech at Jerusalem delivered in any language, to an audience consisting at least in considerable part of inhabitants of the place, and certainly almost entirely of persons whose native tongue was Aramaic, to tell them that the inhabitants called a certain field "in their own tongue" Acheldamach, giving them at the same time a translation of the word, is inconceivable to most critics, even including apologists, as we have already pointed out.

There is another point which indicates not only that this theory is inadequate to solve the difficulty, but that the speech could not have been delivered by Peter a few weeks after the occurrences related. It is stated that the circumstances narrated were so well known to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that the field was called in their own tongue Acheldamach. The origin of this name is not ascribed to the priests or rulers, but to the people, and it is not to be supposed that a popular name could have become attached to this field, and so generally adopted as the text represents, within the very short time which could have elapsed be-

¹ Lange, Das apost. Zeit., i. p. 85 f., ii. 16.

² *διάλεκτος* is used six times in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament; *τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ* occurs thrice, i. 19, ii. 6, 8; and *τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ* thrice, xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14.

tween the death of Judas and the delivery of this speech. Be it remembered that from the time of the crucifixion to Pentecost the interval was in all only about seven weeks, and that this speech was made some time before Pentecost, how long we cannot tell, but in any case, the interval was much too brief to permit of the popular adoption of the name.¹ The whole passage has much more the character of a narrative of events which had occurred at a time long past than of circumstances which had taken place a few days before.

The obvious conclusion is that this speech was never spoken by Peter, but is a much later composition put into his mouth,² and written for Greek readers, who required to be told about Judas, and for whose benefit the Hebrew name of the field, inserted for local colouring, had to be translated. This is confirmed by several circumstances, to which we may refer. We shall not dwell much upon the fact that Peter is represented as applying to Judas two passages quoted from the Septuagint version of Ps. lxxix. 25 (Sept. lxxviii.) and Ps. cix. (Sept. cviii.), which, historically, cannot for a moment be sustained as referring to him.³ The first of these Psalms is quoted freely, and moreover the denunciations in the original being against a plurality of enemies, it can only be made applicable to Judas by altering the plural "their" (αὐτῶν) to "his habitation" (ἐπαυλὶς αὐτοῦ), a considerable liberty to take with prophecy. The Holy Ghost is said to have spoken this prophecy "concerning Judas" "by the mouth of David," but modern research has led critics to hold it as most probable that neither Ps. lxxix.⁴ nor Ps. cix.⁵ was composed by David at all. As

¹ Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 36 f.

² Eichhorn, Einl., ii. p. 36 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 384 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 336; Mayerhoff, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 97, anm. 1; Zeller, Apog., p. 79 ff.

³ Davidson, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; Int. N. T., ii. p. 227; Ewald, Die Psalmen, p. 292 ff.; Hitzig, Die Psalmen, 1864, ii. 1, p. 93 ff.; ii. 2, 1865, p. 314; Hupfeld, Die Psalmen, ed. Riehm, 1870, iii. p. 260 f.; iv., 1871, p. 172 ff.; Kamphausen in Bunsen's Bibelw. iii. p. 138 f. 217 f.; Kuenen, Hist. krit. Onderzoek, O. V., 1865, iii. p. 299; De Profeten, p. 237 ff., 252 f.; J. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, 1853, p. 297 ff., 417 ff.; Rosenmüller, Scholia in V. T., Psalmi, 1823, iii. p. 1295, 1646 ff.; De Wette, Apog., p. 12; Comm. üb. die Psalmen, p. 386 f., 466 ff.; Four Friends, The Psalms, p. 227, 232. Cf. G. Baur, Gesch. alttest. Weissagung, p. 416; Bueh, Einl. A. Test., p. 625; Delitzsch, Die Psalmen, i. p. 487; Hengstenberg, Die Psalmen, iii. p. 240, iv. p. 209 ff.; Meyer, Apog., p. 40; Olshausen, Apog., p. 39 f.; Stier, Die Reden der Apost., i. p. 4. It is scarcely maintained by any reasonable critic that the supposed prophecies had immediate or direct bearing upon Judas. They can only be applied to him secondarily, and by forcing the historical sense.

⁴ Davidson, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; Delitzsch, Die Psalmen, i. p. 485 f.; Ewald, Die Psalmen, p. 292; Fürst, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, ii. 1870, p. 130, anm. 4; Four Friends, The Psalms, p. 227; Hitzig, Die Psalmen, 1864, ii. p. 33 f.; Hupfeld, Die Psalmen, iii. p. 259 f.; Kamphausen, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iii. p. 138; Kuenen, Hist. krit. Onderzoek, iii. p. 294, 299; J. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, p. 298; Rosenmüller, Scholia in V. T., Psalmi, iii. p. 1295 f.; De Wette, Einl. A. T., p. 362.

⁵ Davidson, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; Ewald, Die Psalmen, p. 298 f.; Fürst, Gesch.

we know nothing of Peter's usual system of exegesis, however, very little weight as evidence can be attached to this. On the other hand, it is clear that a considerable time must have elapsed before these two passages from the Psalms could have become applied to the death of Judas.¹

The account which is given of the fate of Judas is contradictory to that given in the first Synoptic and cannot be reconciled with it, but follows a different tradition.² According to the first Synoptic (xxvii. 3 ff.), Judas brings back the thirty pieces of silver, casts them down in the Temple, and then goes and hangs himself. The chief priests take the money and buy with it the Potter's field, which is not said to have had any other connection with Judas, as a place for the burial of strangers. In the Acts, Judas himself buys a field as a private possession, and instead of committing suicide by hanging, he is represented as dying from a fall in his field, which is evidently regarded as a special judgment upon him for his crime. The apologetic attempts to reconcile these two narratives,³ are truly lamentable. Beyond calling attention to this amongst other phenomena presented in this speech, however, we have not further to do with the point at present. We have already devoted too much space to Peter's first address, and we now pass on to more important topics.

bibl. Lit., ii. p. 130, anm. 4; *Four Friends*, The Psalms, p. 232; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, ii. p. 312 f.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, iv. p. 175; *Kuenen*, Hist. 'kr. Onderzoek, iii. p. 285; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 417; *De Wette*, Einl. A. T., p. 362; Die Psalmen, p. 466. Cf. *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, ii. p. 194.

¹ *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 385.

² *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 8 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 385 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 287; viii. p. 335; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 13; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 510; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 13; *Winer*, Realwörterb. s. v. "Blutacker," i. p. 88; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 80 f. Cf. *Meyer*, Apg., p. 38 f.

³ *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 31 f.; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 543 f.; *Guericke*, Beiträge, p. 88 f.; *Hackett*, On Acts, p. 32; *Humphrey*, On Acts, p. 10; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., i. p. 85 f.; ii. p. 16 f.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Acts, p. 40 f. The usual apologetic mode of reconciling the contradictions regarding the manner of death is by supposing that the rope by which Judas hung himself, according to the Gospel, broke, and, in his fall, the occurrence ensued which is related in the Acts.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

WE now enter upon a portion of our examination of the Acts which is so full of interest in itself that peculiar care will be requisite to restrain ourselves within necessary limits. Hitherto our attention has been mainly confined to the internal phenomena presented by the document before us, with comparatively little aid from external testimony, and although the results of such criticism have been of no equivocal character, the historical veracity of the Acts has not yet been tested by direct comparison with other sources of information. We now propose to examine, as briefly as may be, some of the historical statements in themselves, and by the light of information derived from contemporary witnesses of unimpeachable authority, and to confront them with well-established facts in the annals of the first two centuries. This leads us to the borders not only of one of the greatest controversies which has for half a century occupied theological criticism, but also of still more important questions regarding the original character and systematic development of Christianity itself. The latter we must here resolutely pass almost unnoticed, and into the former we shall only enter so far as is absolutely necessary to the special object of our inquiry. The document before us professes to give a narrative of the progress of the primitive Church from its first formation in the midst of Judaism, with strong Judaistic rules and prejudices, up to that liberal universalism which freely admitted the Christian Gentile, upon equal terms, into communion with the Christian Jew. The question with which we are concerned is strictly this: Is the account in the Acts of the Apostles of the successive steps by which Christianity emerged from Judaism, and, shaking off the restrictions and obligations of the Mosaic law, admitted the Gentiles to a full participation of its privileges historically true? Is the representation which is made of the conduct and teaching of the older Apostles on the one hand, and of Paul on the other, and of their mutual relations an accurate one? Can the Acts of the Apostles, in short, be considered a sober and veracious history of so important and interesting an epoch of the Christian Church? This has been vehemently disputed or denied, and the discussion, extend-

ing on every side into important collateral issues, forms in itself a literature of voluminous extent and profound interest. Our path now lies through this debatable land; but although the controversy as to the connection of Paul with the development of Christianity and his relation to the Apostles of the Circumcision cannot be altogether avoided, it only partially concerns us. We are freed from the necessity of advancing any particular theory, and have here no further interest in it than to inquire whether the narrative of the Acts is historical or not. If, therefore, avoiding many important but unnecessary questions, and restricting ourselves to a straight course across the great controversy, we seem to deal insufficiently with the general subject, it must be remembered that the argument is merely incidental to our inquiry, and that we not only do not pretend to exhaust it, but distinctly endeavour to reduce our share in it to the smallest limits compatible with our immediate object.

According to the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, the apostolic age presents a most edifying example of concord and moderation. The emancipation of the Church from Mosaic restrictions was effected without strife or heart-burning, and the freedom of the Gospel, if not attained without hesitation, was finally proclaimed with singular largeness of mind and philosophic liberality. The teaching of Paul differed in nothing from that of the elder Apostles. The Christian universalism, which so many suppose to have specially characterized the great Apostle of the Gentiles, was not only shared, but even anticipated, by the elder Apostles. So far from opposing the free admission of the Gentiles to the Christian community, Peter declares himself to have been chosen of God, that by his voice they should hear the gospel,¹ proclaims that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile,² and advocates the abrogation, in their case at least, of the Mosaic law.³ James, whatever his private predilections may be, exhibits almost equal forbearance and desire of conciliation. In fact, whatever anomalies and contradictions may be discoverable, upon close examination, beneath this smooth and brilliant surface, the picture superficially presented is one of singular harmony and peace. On the other hand, instead of that sensitive independence and self-reliance of character which has been ascribed to the Apostle Paul, we find him represented in the Acts as submissive to the authority of the "Pillars" of the Church, ready to conform to their counsels and bow to their decrees, and as seizing every opportunity of visiting Jerusalem, and coming in contact with that stronghold of Judaism. Instead of the Apostle of the Gentiles, preaching the

¹ Acts xv. 7.

² xv. 9.

³ xv. 10.

abrogation of the law, and more than suspected of leading the Jews to apostatize from Moses,¹ we find a man even scrupulous in his observance of Mosaic customs, taking vows upon him, circumcising Timothy with his own hand, and declaring at the close of his career, when a prisoner at Rome, that he "did nothing against the people or the customs of the fathers."² There is no trace of angry controversy, of jealous susceptibility, of dogmatic difference in the circle of the Apostles. The intercourse of Paul with the leaders of the Judaistic party is of the most unbroken pleasantness and amity. Of opposition to his ministry, or doubt of his apostleship, whether on the part of the Three, or of those who identified themselves with their teaching, we have no hint. We must endeavour to ascertain whether this is a true representation of the early development of the Church, and of the momentous history of the apostolic age.

In the epistles of Paul we have, at least to some extent, the means of testing the accuracy of the statements of the Acts with regard to him and the early history of the Church. The Epistles to the Galatians, to the Corinthians (2), and to the Romans are generally admitted to be genuine,³ and can be freely used for this purpose. To these we shall limit our attention, excluding other epistles, whose authenticity is either questioned or denied, but in doing so no material capable of really affecting the result is set aside. For the same reason, we must reject any evidence to be derived from the so-called Epistles of Peter and James, at least so far as they are supposed to represent the opinions of Peter and James, but here again it will be found that they do not materially affect the points immediately before us. The veracity of the Acts of the Apostles being the very point which is in question, it is unnecessary to say that we have to subject the narrative to examination, and by no means to assume the correctness of any statements we find in it. At the same time it must be our endeavour to collect from this document such indications—and they will frequently be valuable—of the true history of the occurrences related, as may be presented between the lines of the text.

In the absence of fuller information, it must not be forgotten that human nature in the first century of our era was very much what it is in the nineteenth, and certain facts being clearly established, it will not be difficult to infer many details which cannot now be positively demonstrated. The Epistle to the Galatians, however, will be our most invaluable guide. Dealing, as it does, with some of the principal episodes of the Acts, we are enabled

¹ Acts xxi. 21.

Acts xxviii. 17.

In great part, at least.

by the words of the Apostle Paul himself, which have all the accent of truth and vehement earnestness, to control the narrative of the unknown writer of that work. And where this source fails, we have the unsuspected testimony of his other epistles, and of later ecclesiastical history to assist our inquiry.

The problem then which we have to consider is the manner in which the primitive Church emerged from its earliest form, as a Jewish institution with Mosaic restrictions and Israelitish exclusiveness, and finally opened wide its doors to the uncircumcised Gentile, and assumed the character of a universal religion. In order to understand the nature of the case, and be able to estimate aright the solution which is presented by the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles, it is necessary that we should obtain a clear view of the actual characteristics of Christianity at the period when that history begins. We must endeavour to understand precisely what view the Apostles had formed of their position in regard to Judaism, and of the duty which devolved upon them of propagating the Gospel. It is obvious that we cannot rightly appreciate the amount of persuasion requisite to transform the primitive Church from Jewish exclusiveness to Christian universality, without ascertaining the probable amount of long rooted conviction and religious prejudice or principle which had to be overcome before that great change could be effected.

We shall not here enter upon any argument as to the precise views which the Founder of Christianity may have held as to his own person and work, nor shall we attempt to sift the traditions of his life and teaching which have been handed down to us, and to separate the genuine spiritual nucleus from the grosser matter by which it has been enveloped and obscured. We have much more to do with the view which others took of the matter, and, looking at the Gospels as representations of that which was accepted as the orthodox view regarding the teaching of Jesus, they are almost as useful for our present purpose as if they had been more spiritual and less popular expositions of his views. What the Master was understood to teach is more important for the history of the first century than what he actually taught without being understood. Nothing is more certain than the fact that Christianity, originally, was developed out of Judaism, and that its advent was historically prepared by the course of the Mosaic system, to which it was so closely related.¹ In its first stages during the Apostolic age, it had no higher ambition than to be, and to be considered, the continuation and the fulfilment of Judaism, its final and triumphant phase. The substantial identity of primitive Christianity with true Judaism was at first.

¹ *Rothe, Anfänge d. chr. Kirche*, 1837, i. p. 326.

never called in question; it was considered a mere internal movement of Judaism, its development and completion, but by no means its mutilation. The idea of Christianity as a new religion never entered the minds of the Twelve or of the first believers, nor, as we shall presently see, was it so regarded by the Jews themselves. It was in fact, originally, nothing more than a sect of Judaism, holding a particular view of one point in the creed, and, for a very long period, it was considered so by others, and was in no way distinguished from the rest of Mosaism.¹ Even in the Acts there are traces of this, Paul being called "a ring-leader of the sect (*αἵρεσις*) of the Nazarenes,"² and the Jews of Rome being represented as referring to Christianity by this term.³ Paul before the Council not only does not scruple to call himself "a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee," but the Pharisees take part with him against the more unorthodox and hated sect of the Sadducees.⁴ For eighteen centuries disputes have fiercely raged over the creed of Christendom, and the ingenuity of countless divines has been exhausted in deducing mystic dogmas from the primitive teaching, but if there be one thing more remarkable than another in that teaching, according to the Synoptics, it is its perfect simplicity. Jesus did not appear with a ready-made theology, and imposed no elaborate system of doctrine upon his disciples. Throughout the prophetic period of Mosaism, one hope had sustained the people of Israel in all their sufferings and reverses: that the fortunes of the nation should finally be retrieved by a scion of the race of David, under whose rule it should be restored to a future of unexampled splendour and prosperity. The expectation of the Messiah, under frequently modified aspects, had formed a living part in the religion of Israel. Primitive Christianity, reviving and recasting this ancient hope, was only distinguished from Judaism, with whose worship it continued in all points united, by a single doctrine, which did not in itself pass beyond the limits of the national religion: the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, the promised Messiah. This was substantially the whole of its creed.⁵

¹ Bleek, *Hebräerbr.*, i. 1, p. 56 ff., 60 f.; *Credner*, *Das N. T.*, 1847, ii. p. 20 ff.; *Gfrörer*, *K. G.*, i. p. 222 f., 238; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 365 ff., 369; *Mitman*, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 377 f., 380; *Nicolas*, *Etudes N. T.*, p. 237 f.; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, xiii^{me} éd., p. 47 f.; *Les Apôtres*, p. 91 ff.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. N. T.*, p. 19 ff., 40 f.; *Hist. Théol. Chr.*, i. p. 283 f.; *Réville*, *Essais de critique religieuse*, 1860, p. 18; *Rothe*, *Aufänge chr. Kirche*, i. p. 142 ff.; *Schlemann*, *Die Clementinen*, p. 371 ff.; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Z.*, i. p. 21, 91 ff., 99 ff., 113 f.; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 52 f., 56 f.; *Zeller*, *Gesch. chr. Kirche*, 1848, p. 51. Cf. *Lechler*, *Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit.*, p. 287 ff., 330 ff.; *Lightfoot*, *The Epistles of St. Paul*, *Galatians*, 4th ed., p. 302; *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, p. 33 ff., 46 f.

² Acts xxiv. 5.

³ Acts xxviii. 22.

⁴ Acts xxiii. 6 ff.

⁵ *Baur*, *Paulus*, i. p. 49 f.; *Bleek*, *Hebräerbr.*, i. 1, p. 56 f.; *Credner*, *Das N. T.*, i. p. 2, 14 f., ii. p. 20 ff.; *von Döllinger*, *Christ: u. Kirche*, p. 59; *Gfrörer*, *K. G.*,

The synoptic Gospels, and more especially the first,¹ are clearly a history of Jesus as the Messiah of the house of David, so long announced and expected, and whose life and even his death and resurrection are shown to be the fulfilment of a series of Old Testament prophecies.² When his birth is announced to Mary, he is described as the great one, who is to sit on the throne of David his father, and reign over the house of Jacob for ever,³ and the good tidings of great joy to all the people (*κατὰ τὸ λαόν*), that the Messiah is born that day in the city of David, are proclaimed by the angel to the shepherds of the plain.⁴ Symeon takes the child in his arms and blesses God that the words of the Holy Spirit are accomplished, that he should not die before he had seen the Lord's anointed, the Messiah, the consolation of Israel.⁵ The Magi come to his cradle in Bethlehem, the birth-place of the Messiah indicated by the prophet,⁶ to do homage to him who is born King of the Jews,⁷ and there Herod seeks to destroy him,⁸ fulfilling another prophecy.⁹ His flight into Egypt and return to Nazareth are equally in fulfilment of prophecies.¹⁰ John the Baptist, whose own birth as the forerunner of the Messiah had been foretold,¹¹ goes before him preparing the way of the Lord, and announcing that the Messianic kingdom is at hand. According to the fourth Gospel, some of the twelve had been disciples of the Baptist, and follow Jesus on their Master's assurance that he is the Messiah. One of these, Andrew, induces his brother Simon Peter also to go after him by the announcement: "We have

i. p. 222; *Hase*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 153 f.; *Hensen*, Der Apost. Paulus, 1830, p. 26, 35 f.; *Hilgenfeldt*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 108; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paul. u. des Petrus, 1868, p. 40 ff., 98, 236 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 364 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 16 f., 245; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 140 ff., 377 f., et passim; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 24 ff.; K. G., 1843, i. 2, p. 590; *Nicolas*, Et. N. T., p. 237; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 91; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 19 f.; Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 283 f.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 42; *Rothe*, Anfänge chr. Kirche, 1837, i. p. 142 ff.; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, p. 371 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 21, 91 ff., 113 f., 139 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 516 f.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5; Vorträge, p. 202 f., 216 f. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 265 ff., 278 ff., vi. 135 f., 401, 422 f.

¹ The Gospel commences with the announcement, i. 1, 17, 18. Cf. Mk. i. 1 ff.

² *Baur*, N. T. Theologie, 1864, p. 298 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 77 f.; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 60; Das N. T., ii. p. 150 ff.; *Delitzsch*, Ursprung d. Matth. Ev., 1853, p. 58 ff.; *D'Eichthal*, Les Evangiles, i. p. 51; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 319 f.; *Käim*, Jesu v. Naz., i. p. 52 f.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 6 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91, 101 ff.; Cf. *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., p. 381 ff.

³ Luke i. 32, 33.

⁴ Luke ii. 10 ff.

⁵ Luke ii. 25-28. So also Elizabeth, ii. 38.

⁶ Matth. ii. 5, 6. Cf. Micah. v. 2.

⁷ Mt. ii. 2.

⁸ Mt. ii. 16 f.

⁹ Mt. ii. 17 f.

¹⁰ Mt. ii. 23.

¹¹ Luke i. 17 (cf. Mt. xi. 14, xvii. 12 f.; Mk. ix. 11 ff.), ii. 67 ff.; Mt. iii. 3; Mk. i. 1 ff.

found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ" (i. 35 ff., 41). And Philip tells Nathaniel: "We have found him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write: Jesus, the son of Joseph, who is from Nazareth" (i. 45). When he has commenced his own public ministry, Jesus is represented as asking his disciples: "Who do men say that I am?" and setting aside the popular conjectures that he is John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets, by the still more direct question: "And whom do ye say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And in consequence of this recognition of his Messiahship, Jesus rejoins: "And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."¹

It is quite apart from our present object to show by what singular feats of exegesis and perversions of historical sense passages of the Old Testament are forced to show that every event in the history, and even the startling novelty of a suffering and crucified Messiah, which to Jews was a stumbling-block and to Gentiles folly,² had been foretold by the prophets. From first to last the Gospels strive to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, and connect him indissolubly with the Old Testament. The Messianic key-note, which is struck at the outset, regulates the strain to the close. The disciples on the way to Emmaus, appalled by the ignominious death of their Master, sadly confide to the stranger their vanished hope that Jesus of Nazareth, whom they now merely call "a prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people," was he "who was about to redeem Israel," and Jesus himself replies: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spake! Was it not needful that the Christ (Messiah) should suffer these things and enter into his glory? And, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."³ Then, again, when he appears to the eleven, immediately after, at Jerusalem, he says: "'These are the words that I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms concerning me.' Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them:—'Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise from the dead the third day.'"⁴

¹ Mt. xvi. 13—18; cf. Mk. viii. 29; Luke ix. 20. Neander says: "And because this conviction, rooted in the depth of the soul, that Jesus is the Messiah, is the foundation upon which the kingdom of God rests, Christ therefore names him in reference to this the Rock-man (*Felsen-mann*) and the Rock upon which he should build the everlasting Church." Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 449.

² 1 Cor. i. 23.

³ Luke xxiv. 15—17.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 44—46.

The crucifixion and death of Jesus introduced the first elements of rupture with Judaism, to which they formed the great stumbling-block.¹ The conception of a suffering and despised Messiah could naturally never have occurred to a Jewish mind.² The first effort of Christianity, therefore, was to repair the apparent breach by proving that the suffering Messiah had actually been foretold by the prophets; and to re-establish the Messianic character of Jesus, by the evidence of his resurrection.³ But, above all, the momentary deviation from orthodox Jewish ideas regarding the Messiah was retraced by the representation of a speedy second advent, in glory, of the once rejected Messiah to restore the kingdom of Israel, in which the ancient hopes of the people became reconciled with the new expectation of Christians. Even before the Ascension, the disciples are represented in the Acts as asking the risen Jesus:—"Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"⁴ There can be no doubt of the reality and universality of the belief, in the Apostolic Church, in the immediate return of the glorified Messiah and speedy "end of all things."⁵

The substance of the preaching of the Apostles in Acts, simply is that Jesus is the Christ,⁶ the expected Messiah.⁷ Their chief aim

¹ Baur, K. G., i. p. 39 ff.; N. T. Theol., p. 129 ff., 305 ff.; Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 340; Hausrath, N. T. Zeitg., ii. 2te Aufl., p. 333 f.; Der Ap. Paulus, 2te Aufl., p. 132; Holsten, Zum Ev. Paul., u. s. w., p. 40 ff., 98 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 366 f.; Milman, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 338 ff., 352 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91 f.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 518 f.; Weissdicker, Unters. ev. Gesch., p. 476 f.

² In the Gospels, the disciples are represented as not understanding such a representation, and Peter, immediately after the famous declaration, "Thou art the Christ," rebukes Jesus for such an idea. Mt. xvi. 21 ff.; cf. Mk. ix. 32; Luke ix. 45, xviii. 34, &c., &c.

³ Baur, N. T. Theol., p. 305 ff.; Credner, Das N. T., i. p. 141 f.; Hausrath, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 334 ff., 341; Holsten, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 98 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 367 f.; Milman, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 355 ff.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 305 f.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 518 f.

⁴ Acts i. 6. Haase pertinently observes: "The Apostolic Church, both before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, devoutly expected from day to day the return of Christ. If an interval of thousands of years (Jahrtausenden) occur between both events, then there is either an error in the prophecy or in the tradition." Das Leben Jesu, 5te Aufl., p. 226.

⁵ Credner, Einl., i. p. 198; Das N. T., ii. p. 20 f.; Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., vii. p. 34 ff.; Haase, Das Leben Jesu, p. 226 f.; Jowett, The Epistles of St. Paul, 1855, i. p. 96 ff.; Milman, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 378, 418 f.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. 92; St. Paul, p. 248 f.; L'Antechrist, p. 338 f.; Reuss, Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 423 ff.; Réville, Essais, p. 21; Zeller, Vorträge, p. 221 ff.

⁶ Cf. Acts ix. 22, ii. 36, v. 42, viii. 4 f., 35, x. 36 ff., xiii. 23 ff., xvii. 3, xviii. 5, 28, xxvi. 22 f. Hegesippus says of James that he was a witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ. Euseb., A. E., ii. 25.

⁷ Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 16 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 24 ff.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. 103; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 20; Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 283 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91.

is to prove that his sufferings and death had been foretold by the prophets,¹ and that his resurrection establishes his claim to the title.² The simplicity of the creed is illustrated by the rapidity with which converts are made. After a few words, on one occasion, three thousand³ and, on another, five thousand⁴ are at once converted. No lengthened instruction or preparation was requisite for admission into the Church.⁵ As soon as a Jew acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah he thereby became a Christian.⁶ As soon as the three thousand converts at Pentecost made this confession of faith they were baptized.⁷ The Ethiopian is converted whilst passing in his chariot, and is immediately baptized,⁸ as are likewise Cornelius and his household, after a short address from Peter.⁹ The new faith involved no abandonment of the old. On the contrary, the advent of the Messiah was so essential a part of Judaic belief, and the Messianic claim of Jesus was so completely based by the Apostles on the fulfilment of prophecy—"showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ,"—that recognition of the fact rather constituted firmer adhesion to Mosaism, and deeper faith in the inviolable truth of the Covenant with Israel. If there had been no Mosaism, so to say, there could have been no Messiah. So far from being opposed either to the form or spirit of the religion of Israel, the proclamation of the Messiah was its necessary complement, and could only be intelligible by confirmation of its truth and maintenance of its validity. Christianity—belief in the Messiah—in its earlier phases, drew its whole nourishment from roots that sank deeply into Mosaism. It was indeed nothing more than Mosaism in a developed form. The only difference between the Jew and the Christian was that the latter believed the Messiah to have already appeared in Jesus, whilst the former still expected him in the future,¹⁰ though even this difference was singularly diminished, in appearance at least, by the Christian expectation of the second advent.

¹ Acts ii. 23 ff., iii. 13 ff., xxvi. 22 f.

² Acts ii. 31, iii. 26, iv. 33, v. 30 f., x. 40 ff. See references in note 3, p. 787.

³ Acts ii. 41.

⁴ Acts iv. 4. There may be doubt as to the number on this occasion.

⁵ Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 25; de Pressensé, Hist. trois. prom. Siècles, i. p. 377; Zeller, Vorträge, p. 202 f.

⁶ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 49, ii. p. 134 f.; Bleek, Hebräerbr., i. 1, p. 56 f.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 25; Reuss, Hist. Théol. Chr., p. 283 f.; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 371 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 21; Zeller, Vorträge, p. 202 f., 216 f.

⁷ Acts ii. 41.

⁸ Acts viii. 35 f.

⁹ Acts x. 47 f.

¹⁰ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 49; K. G., i. p. 36 ff.; Credner, Das N. T., i. p. 2 f., p. 14 f., ii. p. 20 ff.; Gfrörer, K. G., i. p. 222; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 24 ff., 33 ff.; Nicolas, Etudes. N. T., p. 237; Schliemann, Die Clementinen, p. 371 ff.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 516 f.; Zeller, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.; Vorträge, p. 202 f., 216 f.

It is exceedingly important to ascertain, under these circumstances, what was the impression of the Apostles as to the relation of believers to Judaism and to Mosaic observances, although it must be clear to any one who impartially considers the origin and historical antecedents of the Christian faith, that very little doubt can have existed in their minds on the subject. The teaching of Jesus, as recorded in the synoptic Gospels, is by no means of a doubtful character, more especially when the sanctity of the Mosaic system in the eyes of a Jew is borne in mind. It must be apparent that, in order to remove the obligation of a Law and form of worship believed to have been, in the most direct sense, instituted by God himself, the most clear, strong, and reiterated order would have been requisite. No one can reasonably maintain that a few spiritual expressions directed against the bare letter and abuse of the law, which were scarcely understood by the hearers, could have been intended to abolish a system so firmly planted, or to overthrow Jewish institutions of such antiquity and national importance, much less that they could be taken in this sense by the disciples. A few passages in the Gospels, therefore, which may bear the interpretation of having foreseen the eventual supersession of Mosaism by his own more spiritual principles, must not be strained to support the idea that Jesus taught disregard of the Law. The very distinct and positive lessons, conveyed both by precept and practice, show, on the contrary, that not only he did not intend to attack Mosaism, but that he was understood both directly and by inference to recognize and confirm it. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus states to the disciples in the most positive manner: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law, till all be accomplished."¹ Whether the last phrase be interpreted: till all the law be accomplished, or till all things appointed to occur be accomplished, the effect is the same. One clear explicit declaration like this, under the circumstances, would outweigh a host of doubtful expressions. Not only does Jesus in this passage directly repudiate any idea of attacking the law and the prophets, but, in representing his mission as their fulfilment, he affirms them, and associates his own work in the closest way with theirs. If there were any uncertainty, however, as to the meaning of his words it would be removed by the continuation: "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these commandments, even the least, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven;

¹ Mt. v. 17, 18; cf. xxiii. 2 ff.; cf. Luke xvi. 17.

but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."¹ It would be difficult for teaching to be more decisive in favour of the maintenance of the law, and this instruction, according to the first Synoptic, was specially directed to the disciples.² When Jesus goes on to show that their righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, and to add to the letter of the law, as interpreted by those of old, his own profound interpretation of its spirit, he only intensifies, without limiting, the operation of the law; he merely spiritualises it. He does no more than this in his lessons regarding the observance of the Sabbath. He did not in point of fact attack the genuine Mosaic institution of the day of rest at all, but merely the intolerable literalism by which its observance had been made a burden instead of "a delight." He justified his variation from the traditional teaching and practice of his time, however, by appeals to Scriptural precedent.³ As a recent writer has said: ". . . the observance of the Sabbath, which had been intended to secure for every man a rest full of love and peace and mercy, had become a mere rational Fetish—a barren custom fenced in with the most frivolous and senseless restrictions."⁴ Jesus restored its original significance. In restricting some of the permissive clauses of the Law, on the other hand, he acted precisely in the same spirit. He dealt with the Law not with the temper of a revolutionist, but of a reformer, and his reforms, so far from affecting its permanence, are a virtual confirmation of the rest of the code.⁵ Ritschl, whose views on this point will have some weight with apologists, combats the idea that Jesus merely confirmed the Mosaic moral law, and abolished the ceremonial law. Referring to one particular point of importance, he says: "He certainly contests the duty of the Sabbath rest, the value of purifications and sacrifices, and the validity of divorce; on the other hand, he leaves unattacked the value of circumcision, whose regulation is generally reckoned as part of the ceremonial law; and nothing justifies the conclusion that Jesus estimated it in the same way as Justin Martyr, and the other Gentile Christian Church teachers, who place it on the same line as the ceremonies. The only passage in which Jesus touches upon circum-

¹ Mt. v. 19; *Hilgenfeld* (Einl. N. T., p. 469 f.) and some others consider this, as well as other parts of the Sermon on the Mount, to be inserted as a direct attack upon Pauline teaching.

² Mt. v. 1. 2. *Ritschl*, *Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 35; *Hilgenfeld*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 469.

³ Mt. xii. 3 ff.; Mk. ii. 25 ff.; Luke vi. 3 ff.

⁴ *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, i. p. 375, cf. p. 431 f., ii. 115 ff.

⁵ *Ritschl* limits the application of much of the modification of the law ascribed to Jesus to the disciples, as members of the "Kingdom of God." *Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 29 ff.

cision (John vii. 22) rather proves that, as an institution of the patriarchs, he attributes to it peculiar sanctity. Moreover, when Jesus, with unmistakable intention, confines his own personal ministry to the Israelitish people (Mk. vii. 27, Mt. x. 5, 6), he thereby recognizes their prior right of participation in the Kingdom of God, and also, indirectly, circumcision as the sign of the preference of this people. The distinction of circumcision from ceremonies, besides, is perfectly intelligible from the Old Testament. Through circumcision, to wit, is the Israelite, sprung from the people of the Covenant, indicated as sanctified by God; through purification, sacrifice, Sabbath-rest must he continually sanctify himself for God. So long, therefore, as the conception of the people of the Covenant is maintained, circumcision cannot be abandoned, whilst even the prophets have pointed to the merely relative importance of the Mosaic worship."¹

Jesus everywhere in the Gospels recognizes the divine origin of the law² and he quotes the predictions of the prophets as absolute evidence of his own pretensions. To those who ask him the way to eternal life he indicates its commandments,³ and he even enjoins the observance of its ceremonial rites.⁴ Jesus did not abrogate the Mosaic law; but, on the contrary, by his example as well as his precepts, he practically confirmed it.⁵

It is evident from the statement of the Gospels that Jesus himself observed the prescriptions of the Mosaic law.⁶ From his birth he had been brought up in its worship.⁷ He was circumcised on the eighth day.⁸ "And when the days of their purification were accomplished, according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, even as it is written in the law of the Lord: Every male, &c., &c., and to

¹ *Ritschl*, *Entst. altk. Kirche*, p. 34, cf. 46 f.

² Mt. xv. 4, &c., &c. Paley says: "Undoubtedly our Saviour assumes the divine origin of the Mosaic institution." *A View of the Evidences*, &c., &c., ed. Potts, 1850, p. 262.

³ Mt. xix. 17; Mk. x. 17; Luke xviii. 18; x. 25 f., xv. 29, 31, 32.

⁴ Mt. viii. 4; Luke v. 14; John vii. 8.

⁵ *D'Eichthal*, *Les Evangiles*, i. p. 43 ff.; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 430 f.; *Hase*, *Das Leb. Jesu*, 5te Aufl., p. 149 ff.; *Hausrath*, *N. T. Zeitg.*, ii. 2te Aufl., p. 406 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Einl.*, p. 469 f.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 365 f.; *Keim*, *Der gesch. Christus*, 1866, p. 47 ff.; *Jesu v. Nazara*, ii., 1871, p. 242 ff., 263 ff.; *Kostlin*, *Urspr. synopt. Evv.*, p. 11 ff.; *Lightfoot*, *Galatians*, p. 285 f.; *Lipsius*, in *Schenkel's Bib. Lex.*, i. p. 200; *Neander*, *K. G.*, 1843, ii. p. 590 f.; *Reuss*, *Hist. Théol. Chr.*, i. p. 165 f., 263; *Ritschl*, *Entst. d. altk. Kirche*, 2te Aufl., p. 28 ff., p. 45 ff., 140; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 46 ff. Cf. *Baur*, *N. T. Theol.*, p. 46 ff.; *Strauss*, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 209 ff., 217 ff.

⁶ *Bleek*, *Hebräerbr.*, i. p. 56; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 430 f.; *Lechler*, *Das ap. n. nachap. Zeit.*, p. 288 f.; *Lightfoot*, *Eps. of St. Paul, Colossians*, &c., 1875, p. 174 f.; *Neander*, *K. G.*, ii. p. 590 f.; *Pfanzung*, p. 47; *Reuss*, *Théol. Chr.*, i. p. 167 f., 263; *Révillé*, *Essais*, p. 15; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 47 f., 53.

⁷ Cf. *Gal. iv. 4.*

⁸ *Luke ii. 21.*

give a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord," &c., &c.¹ Every year his parents went to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover,² and this practice he continued till the close of his life. "As his custom was, he went into the Synagogue (at Nazareth) and stood up to read."³ According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the various festivals of the Jews,⁴ and the feast of the Passover, according to the Synoptics, was the last memorable supper eaten with his disciples,⁵ the third Synoptic representing him as saying: "With desire I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you that I will not any more eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."⁶ However exceptional the character of Jesus, and however elevated his views, it is undeniable that he lived and died a Jew, conforming to the ordinances of the Mosaic law in all essential points, and not holding himself aloof from the worship of the Temple which he purified. The influence which his adherence to the forms of Judaism must have exerted over his followers⁷ can scarcely be exaggerated, and the fact must ever be carefully borne in mind in estimating the conduct of the Apostles and of the primitive Christian community after his death.

As befitted the character of the Jewish Messiah, the sphere of the ministry of Jesus and the arrangements for the proclamation of the Gospel were strictly and even intensely Judaic. Jesus attached to his person twelve disciples, a number clearly typical of the twelve tribes of the people of Israel;⁸ and this reference is distinctly adopted when Jesus is represented, in the Synoptics, as promising that, in the Messianic kingdom, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," the Twelve also "shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel;"⁹ a promise which, according to the third Synoptist, is

¹ Luke ii. 22 ff.

² Luke ii. 41.

³ Luke iv. 16.

⁴ John v. 1, vii. 8, 10, x. 22 f., xi. 55, 56, xii. 1, 12, xiii. 1 f.

⁵ Mt. xxvi. 17 ff.; Mk. xiv. 12 ff.; Luke xxii. 7 ff.

⁶ Luke xxii. 15 f.

⁷ Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 430 f.; *Lechler*, *Das ap. u. nachap. Z.*, p. 285 f.; *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, p. 47; *K. G.*, ii. p. 590.

⁸ *Delitzsch*, *Urspr. Matth. Ev.*, p. 89 f.; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 388; *Gfrörer*, *Das Jahrb. des Heils*, ii. p. 369 f.; *Gieseler*, *Entst. schr. Evv.*, p. 127 f.; *Hase*, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 139 ff.; *Hausrath*, in *Schenkel's Bib. Lex.*, i. p. 186; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Nazara*, ii. p. 303 f.; *Mosheim*, *Inst. Hist. Eccles. sac.*, i. pars. i. c. iii. § 6; *Neander*, *Das Leben Jesu*, 7te Aufl., p. 144 ff.; *de Pressensé*, *Hist. trois prem. Siècles*, i. p. 776; *Reuss*, *Théol. Chr.*, ii. p. 347; *Rüschl*, *Das Ev. Marcion's*, p. 185; *Scherer*, *Rev. Théol.*, iv. 1859, p. 340 f.; *Schotten*, *Het paulin. Ev.*, p. 100; *Schwegler*, *Das nachap. Z.*, ii. p. 46; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 47 f.; *Strauss*, *Das L. v. Jesu*, p. 270; *Weisse*, *Die evang. Geschichte*, ii. p. 394; *De Wette*, *Enl. N. T.*, p. 179.

⁹ Mt. xix. 28.

the law of the
Jerusalem at
inued till the
to the Syna-
ording to the
rious festivals
ording to the
with his dis-
ying: "With
e I suffer; for
until it be ful-
nal the charac-
is undeniable
inances of the
y himself aloof
The influence
t have exerted
d the fact must
conduct of the
unity after his

a, the sphere of
the proclama-
ensely Judaic.
number clearly
l,³ and this re-
esented, in the
don, when the
ne Twelve also
velve tribes of
l Synoptist, is

41.

chap. Z., p. 288 f.;

V. Ier., v. p. 388;
r. Evv., p. 127 f.;
b. Lex., i. p. 180;
lea. sac., i. pars. i.
de Pressensac, Hist.
7; Ritschl, Das Ev.
hollen, Het paulin.
s, p. 47 f.; Strauss,
94; De Wette, Einl.

actually made during the last supper.¹ In the Apocalypse, which, "of all the writings of the New Testament is most thoroughly Jewish in its language and imagery,"² the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb are written upon the twelve foundations of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem, upon the twelve gates of which, through which alone access to the city can be obtained, are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel.³ Jesus himself limited his teaching to the Jews, and was strictly "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."⁴ To the prayer of the Canaan- itish woman: "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David," unlike his gracious demeanour to her of the bloody issue,⁵ Jesus, at first, it is said, "answered her not a word;" and even when besought by the disciples—not to heal her daughter, but—to "send her away," he makes the emphatic declaration: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."⁶ To her continued appeals he lays down the principle: "It is not lawful to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." If after these exclusive sentences the boon is finally granted, it is as of the crumbs⁷ which fall from the master's table.⁸ The modified expression⁹ in the second Gospel: "Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," does not affect the case, for it equally represents exclusion from the privi- leges of Israel, and the Messianic idea fully contemplated a cer-

¹ Luke xxii. 30.

² Lightfoot, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 4th ed., p. 343.

³ Rev. xxi. 12, 14.

⁴ Rom. xv. 8. Alford, Greek Test., i. p. 164 f.; D'Eichthal, Les Evangiles, i. p. 47 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bausen's Bibelw. iv., 1864, p. 57; Hausvath, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 407 f.; Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 86 f.; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., ii. p. 405 ff.; Klostermann, Das Marcusevang., 1867, p. 156 f.; Meyer, Ev. Matth., 3te Aufl., p. 251, p. 340 f.; Mosheim, Inst. Hist. Eccles., i. pars. i. c. iii. §§ 6, 7; Neander, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 369; Renan, Vie de Jésus, xiii. ed., p. 458 f.; Reuss, Theol. Chr., iii. p. 346 f.; Ritschl, Entst. d. K. Kirche, p. 34, 141; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 217 ff.; Weiss, Die ev. Gesch., 1858, ii. p. 61. Cf. Ewald, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 247 f., 266.

⁵ Matth. ix. 22.

⁶ This expression does not occur in the parallel in Mark.

⁷ These ψίχια, it is supposed, may mean the morsels of bread on which the hands were wiped after they had, in Eastern fashion, been thrust into the dishes before them.

⁸ Mt. xv. 22 ff.; cf. Mk. vii. 25 ff. Some commentators, as Kuinoel, Lange, Ebrard, Wordsworth, Farrar, Baur, and others, read the words of Jesus, through- out, either as a trial of the woman's faith, or not seriously to be understood in their obvious sense.

⁹ Meyer (Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 99 f.) considers the ἀφ' ὧν πρῶτον χορράσ- σιναι τὰ τέκνα of the second Synoptic a modification of later tradition. He holds that the episode in Mt. has the impress of greater originality. So also Weiss, Das Marcusev. erklärt, 1872, p. 254 ff.; Scholten, Das ält. Evang., p. 157 f.; Ewald, Drei erst. Evv., p. 266; De Wette, K. Erkl. Evv. der Luk. u. Mark., 1846, p. 203; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., ii. p. 407, anm.

tain grace to the heathen when the children were filled. The expression regarding casting the children's bread "to the dogs" is clearly in reference to the Gentiles, who were so called by the Jews.¹ A similar, though still stronger use of such expressions, might be pointed out in the Sermon on the Mount in the first Gospel (vii. 6): "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine." It is certain that the Jews were in the habit of speaking of the heathen both as dogs and swine—unclean animals,—and Hilgenfeld,² and some other critics, see in this verse a reference to the Gentiles. We do not, however, press this application, which is, and may be, disputed, but merely mention it and pass on. There can be no doubt, however, of the exclusive references to the Gentiles in the same sermon, and other passages, where the disciples are enjoined to practise a higher righteousness than the Gentiles. "Do not even the publicans . . . do not even the Gentiles or sinners the same things."³ "Take no thought, &c., for after all these things do the Gentiles seek; but seek ye, &c., &c."⁴ The contrast is precisely that put with some irony by Paul, making use of the common Jewish expression "sinner" as almost equivalent for "Gentile."⁵ In another place the first Synoptic represents Jesus as teaching his disciples how to deal with a brother who sins against them, and as the final resource, when every effort at reconciliation and justice has failed, he says: "Let him be unto thee as the Gentile (*ἔθνικὸς*) and the publican." (Mt. xviii. 17.) He could not express in a stronger way to a Jewish mind the idea of social and religious excommunication.

The instructions which Jesus gives in sending out the Twelve, however, express the exclusiveness of the Messianic mission, in the first instance at least, to the Jews, in a very marked manner. Jesus commands his disciples: "Go not into a way of the Gen-

¹ Baumgarten-Crusius, *Comm. Ev. Matth.*, 1844, p. 272; Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i. p. 713 ff., ii. p. 630, 635 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 86 f.; Einl., p. 479; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's *Bibelw.*, iv. p. 57; Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, ii. p. 407, ann. 4; Klostermann, *Das Marcusev.*, p. 157; Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr.*, Works, xi. p. 220; Meyer, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 340 f.; De Wette, *K. Erkl. Ev. Matth.*, 4te Aufl., p. 901; Wordsworth, *Greek Test.*, The Four Gospels, p. 55. Dr. Wordsworth says: "*κυνάρτιος* curs. Not that our Lord regarded them as such, but because they were so called by the Jews, whose language he adopts. *κυνάρτιος* is a contemptuous diminutive." *Greek Test.*, The Four Gospels, On Mt. xv. 26, p. 55. Many critics argue that the diminutive *κυνάρτιος* for *κύων* removes the offensive term from the heathen.

² Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, p. 64; Einl., p. 470; Reuss, *Théol. Chr.*, ii. p. 348. Cf. Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebr.*, p. 87; Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, ii. p. 406, ann. 3; Köstlin, *Urspr. synopt. Evv.*, p. 178.

³ Mt. v. 46 f., vi. 7 f.; cf. Luke vi. 32 ff., where "sinners" is substituted for "Gentiles."

⁴ Mt. vi. 31 f.; cf. xx. 25 f.; Luke xii. 30.

⁵ Gal. ii. 15; cf. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Ep. to Gal.*, 4th ed., p. 114.

tiles (*ἰθὺν*) and into a city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand."¹ As if more emphatically to mark the limitation of the mission the assurance is seriously added: "For verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man come."² It will be observed that Jesus here charges the Twelve to go rather "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" in the same words that he employs to the Canaanitish woman to describe the exclusive destination of his own ministry.³ In coupling the Samaritans with the Gentiles there is merely an expression of the intense antipathy of the Jews against them, as a mixed and, we may say, renegade race, excluded from the Jewish worship although circumcised, intercourse with whom is to this day almost regarded as pollution.⁴ The third Gospel, which omits the restrictive instructions of Jesus to the Twelve given by the first Synoptist, introduces another episode of the same description, the appointment and mission of seventy disciples,⁵ to which we must very briefly refer. No mention whatever is made of this incident in the other Gospels, and these disciples are not referred to in any other part of the New Testament.⁶ Even Eusebius remarks that no catalogue of them is anywhere given,⁷ and, after naming a few persons, who were said by tradition to have been of their number, he points out that more than seventy disciples appear, for instance, according to the testimony of Paul.⁸ It will be observed that the instructions at least in considerable part, supposed to be given to the seventy in the third Synoptic are, in the first, the very instructions given to the Twelve. There has been much discussion regarding the whole episode, which need not here be minutely referred to. For various reasons the majority of critics impugn its historical character.⁹ A large number

¹ Mt. x. 5-7; cf. Mk. iii. 13 f., vi. 7 ff.; Luke ix. 1 ff.

² Mt. x. 23.

³ Mt. xv.; cf. Acts iii. 25, 26, xiii. 46.

⁴ Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i. 208 f.

⁵ Luke x. 1 ff. We need not discuss the precise number, whether 70 or 72. The very same uncertainty exists regarding the number of the elders and of the nations.

⁶ Even Thiersch is struck by this singular fact. "It is remarkable," he says, "that no further mention of the seventy disciples of Christ (Luke x. 1) occurs in the N. T., and that no credible tradition regarding them is preserved." *Die Kirche im ap. Zeit.*, p. 79, anm. 2.

⁷ τῶν δ' ἐβδουμήκοντα κατὰλογος μὲν οὐδεὶς οὐδαμῇ φέρεται. Euseb. H. E., i. 12.

⁸ καὶ τῶν ἐβδουμήκοντα δὲ πλείους τοῦ σωτῆρος πεφηνέναι μαθητὰς εἶροισ ἂν ἐπιτηρῆσας, μάρτυρι χρώμενος τῷ Παύλῳ, κ. τ. λ. lb.; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.

⁹ Baur, *Unters. kan. Evv.*, p. 434 f., 498 ff.; Davidson, *Int. N.T.*, ii. p. 44 f.; Ewald, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 234 f.; Geach, *V. Isr*, v. p. 392 f.; Ahrföhrer, *Das*

Eisenmenger, *Ent-
die Evangelien*, p.
Keim, *Jesu. v.*
Lightfoot, *Horæ*
tte, K. Erkl. *Ev.*
r Gospels, p. 55.
regarded them as
guage he adopts.
four Gospels, *On*
ἀπὸ τῶν κρυφῶν
Théol. Chr., ii. p.
i. p. 406, anm. 3;
is substituted for

of these, as well as other writers, consider that the narrative of this appointment of seventy disciples, the number of the nations of the earth according to Jewish ideas, was introduced in Pauline universalistic interest,¹ or, at least, that the number is typical of Gentile conversion, in contrast with that of the Twelve who represented the more strictly Judaic limitation of the Messianic mission; and they seem to hold that the preaching of the seventy is represented as not confined to Judæa, but as extending to Samaria, and that it thus denoted the destination of the Gospel also to the Gentiles. On the other hand, other critics, many, though by no means all, of whom do not question the authenticity of the passage, are disposed to deny the Pauline tendency, and any special connection with a mission to the Gentiles, and rather to see in the number seventy a reference to well-known Judaistic institutions.² It is true that the number of the nations was set down at seventy by Jewish tradition,³ but, on the other hand, it was the number of the elders chosen by Moses from amongst the children of Israel by God's command to help him, and to whom God gave of his spirit;⁴ and also of the national Sanhedrin, which, according to the *Mischna*,⁵ still represented the

Jahrh. des Heils, ii. p. 371 f.; Die heil. Sage, i. p. 231 ff.; Hase, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 200 f.; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv., 1863, p. 392 f.; Keim, Jesu v. Nazara, ii. p. 332 ff., 329 f., iii. p. 8 ff.; Köstlin, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 267 ff.; Krüger-Velthusen, Das Leben Jesu, 1872, p. 173, anm.*; Ritschl, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 185 ff.; Scherer, Rev. de Théol., iv. 1859, p. 340 f.; Schleiermacher, Einl. N.T., 1845, p. 274; Scholten, Het paul. Ev., p. 99 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 45 ff.; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 274 ff.; Weiss, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 405 f.; Weizsäcker, Unters. ev. Gesch., p. 409 f.; De Wette, Ev. Lucas u. Marc., 3te Aufl., p. 78 ff.; Zeller, Apg., p. 41, 448. Cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evangelien, p. 183 ff.; Die Evv. Justins, p. 356 f.

¹ Baur, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 435 f., 498 f.; K. G. i. p. 76, anm. 1; N.T. Theol., p. 329 f.; Bleek, Einl., p. 283 f.; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 44 f.; Gieseler, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 127 f.; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., ii. v. 329; iii. p. 10 ff.; Köstlin, Urspr. syn. Evv., p. 267; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 157; Olshausen, Bibl. Comm., i. 2. 4te Aufl., p. 591; Reuss, Théol. Chr., ii. p. 347 f.; Ritschl, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 185 f.; Scherer, Rev. de Théol., iv. 1859, p. 340 f.; Scholten, Het. paul. Ev., p. 100 f.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 45 f.; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 274 ff.; Volkmar, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 308, 325; De Wette, Ev. Luc. u. Marc., p. 79; Einl. N.T., p. 179; Zeller, Apg., p. 41, 448. Cf. Oosterzee, Das Ev. n. Lukas, 3te Aufl., p. 162 f.

² Baumgarten-Crusius, Ev. des Mark. u. Lukas, 1845, p. 72; Bengel, Gnom. N. T., p. 295; Ebrard, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 418 f.; Ewald, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 284 f.; cf. Die Alterth. d. V. Isr., 3te Aufl., p. 328 ff.; Farrar, Life of Christ, ii. p. 99; Gfrörer, Das Jahrh. d. Heils, ii. p. 371 f.; Die heil. Sage, i. p. 235; Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evv., p. 392 f.; Kuinoel, Comm. in N. T., ii. p. 450 f.; Meyer, Ev. des Mark. u. Lukas, p. 393 ff.; Weiss, Stud. u. Krit., 1861, p. 710 f. Cf. Alford, Greek Test., i. p. 536 f.; Hase, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 200 f.; Schleiermacher, Einl. N.T., p. 274; Wordsworth, Greek Test., Four Gospels, p. 207.

³ See ante p. 133 f.; Clem. Recog., ii. 42; Epiphanius, Hær., i. 5; Eisenmenger, Entd. Judenthum, ii. p. 3 ff., p. 736 f.

⁴ Numbers xi. 16 ff., 25 ff. Also the number of the sons of Jacob who went into Egypt, Gen. xlv. 27.

⁵ Sanhedr. i. 6.

Mosaic council. This view receives confirmation from the Clementine Recognitions in the following passage: "He therefore chose us twelve who first believed in him, whom he named Apostles; afterwards seventy-two other disciples of most approved goodness, that even in this way recognising the similitude of Moses the multitude might believe that this is the prophet to come whom Moses foretold."¹ The passage here referred to is twice quoted in the Acts: "Moses indeed said: A prophet will the Lord our God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me," &c.² On examination, we do not find that there is any ground for the assertion that the seventy disciples were sent to the Samaritans or Gentiles, or were in any way connected with universalistic ideas. Jesus had "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," and sent messengers before him who "went and entered into a village of the Samaritans to make ready for him," but they repulsed him, "because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem."³ There is a decided break, however, before the appointment of the seventy. "After these things (*μετὰ ταῦτα*) the Lord appointed seventy others also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to come."⁴ There is not a single word in the instructions given to them which justifies the conclusion that they were sent to Samaria, and only the inference from the number seventy, taken as typical of the nations, suggests it. That inference is not sufficiently attested, and the slightness of the use made of the seventy disciples in the third Gospel—this occasion being the only one on which they are mentioned, and no specific intimation of any mission to all people being here given—does not favour the theory of Pauline tendency. So far as we are concerned, however, the point is unimportant. Those who assert the universalistic character of the episode generally deny its authenticity; most of those who accept it as historical deny its universalism.

The order to go and teach all nations, however, by no means carries us beyond strictly Messianic limits. Whilst the Jews expected the Messiah to restore the people of Israel to their own Holy Land, and crown them with unexampled prosperity and peace, revenging their past sorrows upon their enemies, and granting them supremacy over all the earth, they likewise held that

¹ Nos ergo primos elegit duodecim sibi credentes, quos Apostolos nominavit, postmodum alios septuaginta duos probatissimos discipulos, ut vel hoc modo recognita imagine Moysis crederet multitudo, quia hic est, quem prædixit Moysis venturum prophetam. Recog. i. 40. Cf. Hilgenfeld, Die Evv. Justini, p. 356 f. Hilgenfeld suggests the possibility of an earlier tradition out of which both the third Synoptist and the Clementines may have drawn their materials.

² Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; cf. Deuteronomy xviii. 18.

³ Luke ix. 51 ff.

⁴ Luke x. 1.

one of the Messianic glories was to be the conversion of the Gentiles to the worship of Jahveh. This is the burden of the prophets, and it requires no proof. The Jews, as the people with whom God had entered into Covenant, were first to be received into the kingdom. "Let the children first be filled,"¹ and then the heathen might partake of the bread. Regarding the ultimate conversion of the Gentiles, therefore, there was no doubt; the only questions were as to the time and the conditions of admission into the national fellowship. As to the time, there never had been any expectation that the heathen could be turned to Jahveh in numbers before the appearance of the Messiah, but converts to Judaism had been made in all ages, and after the dispersion, especially, the influence of the Jews upon the professors of the effete and expiring religions of Rome, of Greece, and of Egypt was very great, and numerous proselytes adopted the faith of Israel,² and were eagerly sought for³ in spite of the abusive terms in which the Talmudists spoke of them.⁴ The conditions on the other hand were perfectly definite. The case of converts had been early foreseen and provided for in the Mosaic code. Without referring to minor points, we may at once say that circumcision was indispensable to admission into the number of the children of Israel.⁵ Participation in the privileges of the Covenant could only be secured by accepting the mark of that Covenant. Very many, however had adopted Judaism to a great extent, who were not willing to undergo the rite requisite to full admission into the nation, and a certain modification had gradually been introduced by which, without it, strangers might be admitted into partial communion with Israel. There were, therefore, two classes of proselytes,⁶ the first called Proselytes of the Covenant or of Righteousness who were circumcised, obeyed the whole Mosaic law, and were fully incorporated with Israel, and the other called Proselytes of the Gate,⁷ or worshippers of Jahveh, who in the New Testament are commonly called οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν, or οἱ εὐσεβεῖς. These had not undergone the rite of circum-

¹ Mk. viii. 27.

² Credner, *Das N. T.*, i. p. 72 f., 192 f., anm. 4; von Döllinger, *Heidenthum u. Judenthum*, 1857, p. 628 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 368 ff.; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitg.*, ii. p. 111 ff.; Lechler, *Das ap. u. nachap. Z.*, p. 239; Schneckenburger, *Vorles. N. T. Zeitgesch.*, 1862, p. 67 ff.

³ Mt. xxiii. 15.
⁴ They were said to be "as a scab to Israel." Bab. Middah. fol. xiii. 2; Lightfoot, *Horæ. Hebr.*, Works, xi. p. 282.

⁵ Exod. xii. 48; Numb. ix. 14; cf. Ex. xii. 19, &c., &c.

⁶ Credner, *Das N. T.*, ii. p. 27 f.; von Döllinger, *Heidenth. u. Judenth.*, p. 806; Christenthum u. Kirche, p. 49; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 379 f.; Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitg.*, ii. p. 115 ff.; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 286; Milman, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 382, note 5; Neander, *K. G. 2te Aufl.*, i. p. 113 ff.; Schneckenburger, *N. T. Zeitg.*, p. 68 ff.; Steiner, *Schenkel's Bib. Lex. s. v. Proselyten*; *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. s. v. Proselyte, &c.

⁷ We need not discuss the chronology of this class.

cision, and therefore were not participators in the Covenant, but merely worshipped the God of Israel,¹ and were only compelled to observe the seven Noachian prescriptions. These Proselytes of the Gate, however, were little more than on sufferance. They were excluded from the Temple, and even the Acts of the Apostles represent it to be pollution for a Jew to have intercourse with them: it requires direct Divine intervention to induce Peter to go to Cornelius, and to excuse his doing so in the eyes of the primitive Church.² Nothing short of circumcision and full observance of the Mosaic Law could secure the privileges of the Covenant with Israel to a stranger, and in illustration of this we may again point to the Acts, where certain who came from Judea, members of the primitive Church, teach the Christians of Antioch: "Except ye have been circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved."³ This will be more fully shown as we proceed. The conversion of the Gentiles was not, therefore, in the least degree, an idea foreign to Judaism, but, on the contrary, formed an intimate part of the Messianic expectation of the later prophets. The condition, however, was the full acceptance of the Mosaic law, and admission to the privileges and promises of the Covenant through the initiatory rite.⁴ That small and comparatively insignificant people, with an arrogance that would have been ridiculous if, in the influence which they have actually exerted over the world, it had not been almost sublime, not only supposed themselves the sole and privileged recipients of the oracles of God, as his chosen and peculiar people, but they contemplated nothing short of universal submission to the Mosaic code, and the supremacy of Israel over all the earth.

We are now better able to estimate the position of the Twelve when the death of their master threw them on their own re-

¹ It is scarcely necessary to speak of the well-known case of Izates, King of Adiabene, related by Josephus. The Jewish merchant Ananias, who teaches him to worship God according to the religion of the Jews, is willing, evidently from the special emergency of the case and the danger of forcing Izates fully to embrace Judaism in the face of his people, to let him remain a mere Jahveh worshipper, only partially conforming to the Law, and remaining uncircumcised; but another Jew from Galilee, Eleazer, versed in Jewish learning, points out to him that, in neglecting circumcision, he breaks the principal point of the Law. Izates then has himself circumcised. *Josephus*, *Antiq.* x. 2, § 3 f.

² Acts x. 2 ff., xi. 2 ff. Dr. Lightfoot says: "The Apostles of the circumcision, even St. Peter himself, had failed hitherto to comprehend the wide purpose of God. With their fellow-countrymen they still 'held it unlawful for a Jew to keep company with an alien' (Acts x. 28)." *Galatians*, p. 290.

³ Acts xv. 1.

⁴ *Ayford*, *Greek Test.*, ii. p. 109; *Credner*, *Das N. T.*, ii. p. 20 f., 56 ff.; *von Döllinger*, *Carist. u. Kirche*, p. 49; *Ehrhard*, *zu Olshausen*, *Apog.*, p. 159 f.; *Lechler*, *Das ap. u. nachap. Z.*, p. 238 ff.; *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, p. 24; *Olshausen*, *Apog.*, p. 158 ff.; *de Pressense*, *Trois prem. Siècles*, i. 372 f.; *Pfeiderer*, *Der Paulinismus*, p. 284 ff.; *Ritschl*, *Entst. altk. K.*, p. 141 f.; *Schliemann*, *Die Clementinen*, p. 378 ff.; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 43 ff.

f the Gen-
f the pro-
people with
ve received
nd then the
e ultimate
loubt; the
s of admis-
e never had
to Jahveh
converts to
dispersion,
sors of the
l of Egypt
he faith of
usive terms
ions on the
nverts had
de. With-
at circumci-
ber of the
the Coven-
t Covenant.
reat extent,
full admis-
l gradually
t be admit-
e, therefore,
the Coven-
d the whole
el, and the
s of Jahveh,
ρεβόμενοι τὸν
of circum-

heidenthum u.
ff.; *Hausrath*,
Schneckenbur-
xxiii. 15.
u. fol. xiii. 2;

lenth., p. 806;
f.; *Hauerath*,
Hist. of Chr.,
mburger, N. T.
Smith's Diction-

sources, and left them to propagate his Gospel as they themselves understood it. Born a Jew of the race of David, accepting during his life the character of the promised Messiah, and dying with the mocking title "King of the Jews" written upon his cross, Jesus had left his disciples in close communion with the Mosaic law which he had spiritualized and ennobled, but had not abolished. He himself had taught them that "it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness," and, from his youth upwards, had set them the example of enlightened observance of the Mosaic law. His precept had not belied his example, and whilst in strong terms we find him inculcating the permanence of the Law, it is certain that he left no order to disregard it. He confined his own preaching to the Jews; the first ministers of the Messiah represented the twelve tribes of the people of Israel; and the first Christians were of that nation, with no distinctive worship, but practising as before the whole Mosaic ritual. What Neander says of "many," may, we think, be referred to all: "That Jesus faithfully observed the form of the Jewish law served to them as evidence that this form should ever preserve its value."¹ As a fact, the Apostles and the early Christians continued as before assiduously to practise all the observances of the Mosaic law, to frequent the Temple² and adhere to the usual strict forms of Judaism.³ In addition to the influence of the example of Jesus and the powerful effect of national habit, there were many strong reasons which obviously must to Jews have rendered abandonment of the law as difficult as submission to its full requirements must have been to Gentiles. Holding as they did the Divine origin of the Old Testament, in which the observance of the Law was inculcated on almost every page, it would have been impossible, without counter-teaching of the most peremptory and convincing character, to have shaken its pre-eminence; but beyond this, in that theocratic community Mosaic law was not only the condition of the Covenant, and the key of the Temple, but it was also the diploma of citizenship, and the bond of social and political life. To abandon the observance of the law was not only to resign the privilege and the distinctive characteristic of Israel, to

¹ Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 47.

² Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 20, 42, xxi. 20—27, xxii. 17, &c., &c.

³ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 49; Bleek, Hebräerbr., i. l. p. 56 f.; Credner, Das N. T., ii. p. 20 ff.; Hausrath, N. T. Zeitg., i. p. 360; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 281 f., 287 ff.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 285 f., 287, 360 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 202 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 33 f.; Nicolas, Etudes N. T., p. 237 f.; de Pressensé, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 372 f., 377 f., 410; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 22 f.; Théol. Chr., i. p. 290 ff.; Réville, Essais, p. 15, 19 f.; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 124 f., 140 ff.; Rothe, Anfänge chr. Kirche, i. p. 142 f., 316 ff.; Schliemann, Cleven-tinen, p. 371 ff.; Stapf, Origines, p. 52 ff.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 567 f.; Zeller, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.; Vorträge, p. 21.

relinquish the faith of the Patriarchs who were the glory of the nation, and to forsake a divinely appointed form of worship, without any recognized or even indicated substitute, but it severed the only link between the individual and the people of Israel, and left him in despised isolation, an outcast from the community. They had no idea, however, that any such sacrifice was required of them. They were simply Jews believing in the Jewish Messiah, and they held that all things else were to proceed as before, until the glorious second coming of the Christ.¹

The Apostles and primitive Christians continued to hold the national belief that the way to Christianity lay through Judaism, and that the observance of the law was obligatory and circumcision necessary to complete communion.² Paul describes with unappeased irritation the efforts made by the community of Jerusalem, whose "pillars" were Peter, James, and John, to force Titus, a Gentile Christian to be circumcised,³ and even the Acts represent James and all the elders of the Church of Jerusalem as requesting Paul, long after, to take part with four Jewish Christians, who had a vow and were about to purify themselves and shave their heads, and, after the accomplishment of the days of purification, make the usual offering in the Temple, in order to convince the "many thousands there of those who have believed and are all zealous for the law," that it is untrue that he teaches: "all the Jews who are among the Gentiles apostasy (*ἀποστασίαν*) from Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs," and to show, on the contrary, that he himself walks orderly and keeps the Law.⁴ As true Israelites, with opinions fundamentally unchanged by belief that Jesus was the Messiah, they held that the Gospel was specially intended for the people of the Covenant, and they confined their teaching to the Jews.⁵ A Gentile whilst still uncircumcised, even

¹ Neander, Pflanzung, p. 33 f.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 137 f.; Credner, Das N. T., ii. p. 20 f., 26 ff.; von Döllinger, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 48 f., 58, 62; Hausrath, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 406 ff.; in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 190 f.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 285 f., 290; Lipsius, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 200, 202 f.; Milman, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 377 f., 382 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 24, 668 f.; K. G., ii. p. 590 f.; Nicolas, Etudes N. T., p. 237 f.; Pfeiderer, Der Paulinismus, p. 284 f.; de Pressensé, Trois prem. Siècles, p. 372 f.; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 22; Théol. Chr., i. p. 291 ff., 294, 307; ii. p. 343; Ritschl, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 147; Schliemann, Clementinen, p. 378 ff.; Stap, Origines, p. 56 f.; Zeller, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.; Vorträge, p. 204 ff. Cf. Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 242 ff.; Rothe, Anfänge chr. K., p. 142 ff., 315 ff.

³ Gal. ii. 3 ff. As we shall more fully discuss this episode hereafter, it is not necessary to do so here.

⁴ Acts xxi. 18—26; cf. xv. i. Paul is also represented as saying to the Jews of Rome that he has done nothing "against the customs of their fathers."

⁵ Dr. Lightfoot says: "Meanwhile at Jerusalem some years past away before the barrier of Judaism was assailed. The Apostles still observed the Mosaic ritual; they still confined their preaching to Jews by birth, or Jews by adoption, the

although converted, could not, they thought, be received on an equality with the Jew, but defiled him by contact.¹ The attitude of the Christian Jew to the merely Christian Gentile, who had not entered the community by the portal of Judaism, was, as before, simply that of the Jew to the proselyte of the Gate. The Apostles could not upon any other terms have then even contemplated the conversion of the Gentiles. Jesus had limited his own teaching to the Jews, and, according to the first Gospel, had positively prohibited, at one time at least, their going to the Gentiles, or even to the Samaritans, and if there had been an order given to preach to all nations it certainly was not accompanied by any removal of the conditions specified in the Law.² It has been remarked that neither party, in the great discussion in the Church regarding the terms upon which Gentiles might be admitted to the privileges of Christianity, ever appealed in support of their views to specific instructions of Jesus on the subject.³ The reason is intelligible enough. The Petrine party, supported as they were by the whole weight of the Law and of Holy Scripture, as well as by the example and tacit approval of the Master, could not have felt even that degree of doubt which precedes an appeal to authority. The party of Paul, on the other hand, had nothing in their favour to which a specific appeal could have been made; but in his constant protest that he had not received his doctrine from man, but had been taught it by direct revelation, the Apostle of the Gentiles, who was the first to proclaim a substantial difference between Christianity and Judaism,⁴ in reality endeavoured to set aside the authority of the Judaistic party by an appeal from the

proselytes of the Covenant," &c. Paul's Ep. to Gal., p. 287. *Paley* says: "It was not yet known to the Apostles, that they were at liberty to propose the religion to mankind at large. That 'mystery,' as St. Paul calls it (Eph. iii. 3-6), and as it then was, was revealed to Peter by an especial miracle." A view of the Evidence, &c., ed. Potts, 1850, p. 228. ¹ Acts x. 1 ff., 14, 28; xi. 1 ff.

² Dr. Lightfoot says: "The Master himself had left no express instructions. He had charged them, it is true, to preach the Gospel to all nations, but how this injunction was to be carried out, by what changes a national Church must expand into an universal Church, they had not been told. He had indeed asserted the sovereignty of the spirit over the letter; he had enunciated the great principle—as wide in its application as the law itself—that 'man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man.' He had pointed to the fulfilment of the law in the Gospel. So far he had discredited the law, but he had not deposed it or abolished it. It was left to the Apostles themselves under the guidance of the Spirit, moulded by circumstances and moulding them in turn, to work out the great change." St. Paul's Ep. to Gal. 286.

³ *Gfrörer*, Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit, 1838, p. 386; Allg. K. G., i. p. 227 f.

⁴ *Baur*, N.T. Theologie, 1864, p. 128 ff.; K. G., i. p. 44 f.; *Credner*, Das N.T., i. p. 156 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 232 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl., p. 222 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr., p. 236 f. et passim; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 369 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 200 ff.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.

earthly to the spiritualized Messiah. Even after the visit of Paul to Jerusalem about the year 50, the elder Apostles still retained the views which we have shown to have been inevitable under the circumstances, and, as we learn from Paul himself, they still continued mere "Apostles of the Circumcision," limiting their mission to the Jews.¹

The Apostles and the primitive Christians, therefore, after the death of their Master, whom they believed to be the Messiah of the Jews, having received his last instructions, and formed their final impressions of his views, remained Jews, believing in the continued obligation to observe the Law, and, consequently, holding the initiatory rite essential to participation in the privileges of the Covenant. They held this not only as Jews believing in the Divine origin of the Old Testament and of the Law, but as Christians confirmed by the example and the teaching of their Christ, whose very coming was a substantial ratification of the ancient faith of Israel. In this position they stood when the Gospel, without their intervention, and mainly by the exertions of the Apostle Paul, began to spread amongst the Gentiles, and the terms of their admission came into question. It is impossible to deny that the total removal of conditions, advocated by the Apostle Paul with all the vehemence and warmth of his energetic character, and involving nothing short of the abrogation of the Law and surrender of all the privileges of Israel, must have been shocking not only to the prejudices, but also to the deepest religious convictions of men who, although Christians, had not ceased to be Jews, and, unlike the Apostle of the Gentiles, had been directly and daily in contact with Jesus, without having been taught such revolutionary principles. From this point we have to proceed with our examination of the account in the Acts of the relation of the elder Apostles to Paul, and the solution of the difficult problem before them.

¹ Gal. ii. 9.

ya: "It was the religion to (6), and as it the Evidence, 28; xi. 1 ff. ructions. He but how this must expand asserted the at principle— e for the Sab- the law in the t or abolished spirit, moulded change." St.

g. K. G., i. p.

er, Das N.T., 22 ff.; Holsten, sen's Bibelw., tesch. chr. K.,

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. STEPHEN THE MARTYR.

BEFORE the Apostle of the Gentiles himself comes on the scene, and is directly brought in contact with the Twelve, we have to study the earlier incidents narrated in the Acts, wherein, it is said, the emancipation of the Church from Jewish exclusiveness had already either commenced or been clearly anticipated. The first of these which demands our attention is the narrative of the martyrdom of Stephen. This episode, although highly interesting and important in itself, might, we consider, have been left unnoticed in connection with the special point now engaging our attention, but such significance has been imparted to it by the views which critics have discovered in the speech of Stephen, that we cannot pass it without attention. If this detention be, on the one hand, to be regretted, it will on the other be compensated by the light which may be thrown on the composition of the Acts.

We read¹ that, in consequence of murmurs amongst the Hellenists against the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily distribution of alms, seven deacons were appointed specially to attend to such ministrations. Amongst these it is said, was Stephen,² "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit." Stephen, it appears, by no means limited his attention to the material interests of the members of the Church, but being "full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα) amongst the people." "But there arose certain of those of the synagogue which is called (the synagogue) of the Libertines³ and Cyrenians and Alexandrians and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen; and they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. Then they suborned men who said: We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God. And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes, and came upon him, and seized

¹ Acts vi. 1 ff.

² It is unnecessary to discuss whether Stephen was a Jew of Palestinian or Hellenist extraction. The historic elements in the episode are too slight to render such a point either important or capable of determination.

³ The Libertines were probably Jewish freedmen, or the descendants of freedmen, who had returned to Jerusalem from Rome.

him, and brought him to the Council, and set up false witnesses who said: This man ceaseth not to speak words against the holy place and the law; for we have heard him say, that Jesus, this Nazarene, shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered to us." The high-priest asks him: Are these things so? And Stephen delivers an address, which has since been the subject of much discussion amongst critics and divines. The contents of the speech taken by themselves do not present any difficulty, so far as the sense is concerned, but regarded as a reply to the accusations brought against him by the false witnesses, the defence of Stephen has perhaps been interpreted in a greater variety of ways than any other part of the New Testament. Its shadowy outlines have been used as a setting for the pious thoughts of subsequent generations, and every imaginable intention has been ascribed to the proto-martyr, every possible or impossible reference detected in the phrases of his oration. This has mainly arisen from the imperfect nature of the account in the Acts, and the absence of many important details which has left criticism to adopt that "divinatorisch-combinatorische" procedure which is so apt to evolve any favourite theory from the inner consciousness. The prevailing view, however, amongst the great majority of critics of all schools is, that Stephen is represented in the Acts as the forerunner of the Apostle Paul, anticipating his universalistic principles, and proclaiming with more or less of directness the abrogation of Mosaic ordinances and the freedom of the Christian Church.¹ This view was certainly advanced by Augustine, and lies at the base of his famous saying: "Si sanctus Stephanus sic non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non haberet,"² but it was first clearly enunciated by Baur, who subjected the speech of Stephen to detailed analysis,³ and his interpretation has to a large extent been adopted even by apologists. It must be clearly understood that adherence to this reading of the aim and meaning of the speech, as it is given in the Acts, by no means involves an admission of its authenticity, which, on the contrary, is impugned by Baur himself, and by a large number of independent critics. We have the misfortune of differing most materially from the prevalent view regarding the contents of the speech, and we maintain that, as it stands in the Acts, there is not a word in it which can be legitimately construed into an attack upon the Mosaic law, or which anticipates the Christian universalism of Paul. Space, however, forbids our

¹ Holsten, we think rightly, denies that Stephen can be considered in any way the forerunner of Paul. *Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr.* p. 52, anm. * *, p. 253, anm. *.

² Sermo. i. in fest. St. Stephani.

³ *De orationis habitæ a Stephano consilio*, 1829; *Paulus*, u. s. w., i. 49 ff.

entering here upon a discussion of this subject, but the course which we must adopt with regard to it renders it unnecessary to deal with the interpretation of the speech. We consider that there is no reason for believing that the discourse put into the mouth of Stephen was ever actually delivered, but on the contrary that there is every ground for holding that it is nothing more than a composition by the Author of the Acts. We shall endeavour clearly to state the reasons for this conclusion.

With the exception of the narrative in the Acts, there is no evidence whatever that such a person as Stephen ever existed. The statements of the Apostle Paul leave no doubt that persecution against the Christians of Jerusalem must have broken out previous to his conversion, but no details are given, and it can scarcely be considered otherwise than extraordinary, that Paul should not in any of his own writings have referred to the proto-martyr of the Christian Church, if the account which is given of him be historical. It may be argued that his own share in the martyrdom of Stephen made the episode an unpleasant memory, which the Apostle would not readily recall. Considering the generosity of Paul's character on the one hand, however, and the important position assigned to Stephen on the other, this cannot be admitted as an explanation, and it is perfectly unaccountable that, if Stephen really be a historical personage, no mention of him occurs elsewhere in the New Testament.

Moreover, if Stephen was, as asserted, the direct forerunner of Paul, and in his hearing enunciated sentiments like those ascribed to him, already expressing much more than the germ—indeed the full spirit—of Pauline universality, it would be passing strange that Paul not only tacitly ignores all that he owes to the proto-martyr, but vehemently protests: "But I make known unto you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ."¹ There is no evidence whatever that such a person exercised any such influence on Paul.² One thing only is certain, that the speech and martyrdom of Stephen made so little impression on Paul that, according to Acts, he continued a bitter persecutor of Christianity, "making havoc of the Church."

The statement, vi. 8, that "Stephen, full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs among the people" is not calculated

¹ Gal. i. 11, 12.

² It is further very remarkable, if it be assumed that the vision, Acts vii. 55, actually was seen, that, in giving a list of those who have seen the risen Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5—8), which he evidently intends to be complete, he does not include Stephen.

to increase confidence in the narrative as sober history; and as little is the assertion, vi. 15, that "all who sat in the Council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." This, we think, is evidently an instance of Christian subjective opinion made objective.¹ How, we might ask, could it be known to the writer that all who sat at the Council saw this? Neander replies that probably it is the evidence of members of the Sanhedrin of the impression made on them by the aspect of Stephen.² The intention of the writer, however, obviously is to describe a supernatural phenomenon,³ and this is in his usual manner in this book, where miraculous agency is more freely employed than in any other in the Canon. The session of the Council commences in a regular manner,⁴ but the previous arrest of Stephen,⁵ and the subsequent interruption of his defence, are described as a tumultuous proceeding, his death being unsanctioned by any sentence of the Council.⁶ The Sanhedrin, indeed, could not execute any sentence of death without the ratification of the Roman authorities,⁷ and nothing is said in the narrative which implies that any regular verdict was pronounced; but, on the contrary, the tumult described in v. 57 f. excludes such a supposition. Olshausen⁸ considers that, in order to avoid any collision with the Roman power, the Sanhedrin did not pronounce any formal judgment, but connived at the execution which some fanatics carried out. This explanation, however, is inadmissible, because it is clear that the members of the Council themselves, if also the audience, attacked and stoned Stephen.⁹ The act is

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 65, amn.; De Wette, Apg., p. 90; Zeller, Apg., p. 152. Cf. Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 191.

² Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 68.

³ Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 66; Baumgarten, Apg., i. p. 130; Baur, Paulus, i. p. 64 f.; Hackett, Acts, p. 96; Humphrey, Acts, p. 52; Lightfoot, Works, viii. p. 416; Meyer, Apg., p. 158; Robinson, Acts, p. 33; Weissäcker, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., v. p. 387; Zeller, Apg., p. 152.

⁴ vi. 13 ff., vii. 1.

⁵ vi. 11, 12.

⁶ Humphrey (On the Acts, p. 668 f.), with a few others, thinks there was a regular sentence. De Wette (K. Erkl. Apostelgesch., p. 114) thinks it more probable that there was a kind of sentence pronounced, and that the reporter, not having been an eye-witness, does not quite correctly state the case.

⁷ John xviii. 31. Cf. Origen, Ad. African. § 14; Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 82 f.; Baur, Paulus, i. p. 62; von Döllinger, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 456 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bausen's Bibelw., viii. p. 338; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 72 f.; Olshausen, Apg., p. 125; Weissäcker, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex. v. p. 387; Zeller, Apg., p. 150. It is argued, however, that the trial of Stephen probably took place just after the recall of Pontius Pilate, either in an interval when the Roman Procurator was absent, or when one favourable to the Jews had replaced Pilate. A most arbitrary explanation, for which no ground, but the narrative which requires defence, can be given.

⁸ Die Apostelgesch., 125.

⁹ Meyer, Apg., p. 193; Overbeck, Zu de Wette's Apg., p. 114 f.

stoning¹ is carried out with all regard to legal forms;² the victim being taken out of the city,³ and the witnesses casting the first stone,⁴ and for this purpose taking off their outer garments. The whole account, with its singular mixture of utter lawlessness and formality, is extremely improbable,⁵ and more especially when the speech itself is considered. The proceedings commence in an orderly manner, and the high priest calls upon Stephen for his defence. The council and audience listen patiently and quietly to his speech, and no interruption takes place until he has said all that he had to say, for it must be apparent that when the speaker abandons narrative and argument and breaks into direct invective, there could not have been any intention to prolong the address, as no expectation of calm attention after such denunciations could have been natural. The tumult cuts short the oration precisely where the author had exhausted his subject, and by temporary lawlessness overcomes the legal difficulty of a sentence which the Sanhedrin, without the ratification of the Roman authority, could not have carried out. As soon as the tumult has effected these objects, all becomes orderly and legal again; and, consequently, the witnesses can lay their garments "at a young man's feet whose name was Saul." The principal actor in the work is thus dramatically introduced. As the trial commences with a supernatural illumination of the face of Stephen, it ends with a supernatural vision, in which Stephen sees heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God. Such a trial and such an execution present features which are undoubtedly not historical.

This impression is certainly not lessened when we find how many details of the trial and death of Stephen are based on the accounts in the Gospels of the trial and death of Jesus.⁶ The irri-

¹ It is said both in v. 58 and 59 that "they stoned" him. The double use of the term *ἐλθοβολουν* has called forth many curious explanations. *Heinrichs* (ad vii. 57, p. 205), and after him *Kuinoel* (iv. p. 288), explain the first as meaning only that they prepared to stone him, or that they wantonly threw stones at him on the way to the place of execution. *Olshausen* (on vii. 57—60, p. 125) considers the first to be a mere anticipation of the second more definitely described stoning. So also *Meyer* (on vii. 57, p. 193). *Bleek*, (Einl. N. T., p. 341 f.) conjectures that the author only found it stated generally in the written source which he uses, as in v. 58, that they cast Stephen out of the city and stoned him, and that, from mere oral tradition, he inserted the second *ἐλθοβολουν*, v. 59, for the sake of what is there related about Saul.

² *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 83; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 195; *Humphrey*, *Acts*, p. 69; *Meyer*, *App.*, p. 193; *Milman*, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 365 f.; *Overbeck*, *Zu de W. Apg.*, p. 114 f.; *Weizsäcker*, in *Schenkel's Bib. Lex.*, v. p. 387.

³ *Levit. xxiv. 14.*

⁴ *Dent. xvii. 7.*

⁵ *Baur*, *Paulus*, i. p. 62 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 338; *Overbeck*, *Zu de W. Apg.*, p. 114 f.; *Schneckenburger*, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, p. 526 f.; *Weizsäcker*, in *Schenkel's Bib. Lex.*, v. p. 387; *Zeller*, *App.*, p. 149 ff.

⁶ *Baur*, *Paulus*, i. p. 64 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 338; *Overbeck*, *Zu de W. Apg.*, p. 115 f.; *Schneckenburger*, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, p. 526 f.; *Strauss*, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 584; *Weizsäcker*, in *Schenk. Bib. Lex.*, v. p. 388.

the victim
ing the first
The
lessness and
ly when the
ence in an
phen for his
d quietly to
has said all
the speaker
et invective,
the address,
iations could
on precisely
y temporary
ce which the
hority, could
fected these
equently, the
s feet whose
thus drama-
supernatural
supernatural
e Son of Man
and such an
ot historical.
we find how
based on the
us.⁶ The irri-

double use of the
Heinrichs (ad vii.
as meaning only
tones at him on
25) considers the
bed stoning. So
jectures that the
he uses, as in v.
that, from mere
e sake of what is

195; *Hampshery*,
5 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu
387.

iii, p. 338; *Over-*
1855, p. 526 f.;
49 ff.

p. 338; *Overbeck*,
p. 526 f.; *Strauss*,
88.

tated adversaries of Stephen stir up the people and the elders and scribes, and come upon him and lead him to the Council.¹ They seek false witnesses against him;² and these false witnesses accuse him of speaking against the temple and the law.³ The false witnesses who are set up against Jesus with similar testimony, according to the first two Synoptics, are strangely omitted by the third. The reproduction of this trait here has much that is suggestive. The high priest asks: "Are these things so?"⁴ Stephen, at the close of his speech, exclaims: "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Jesus says: "Henceforth shall the Son of Man be seated on the right hand of the power of God."⁵ Whilst he is being stoned, Stephen prays, saying: "Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit;" and, similarly Jesus on the cross cries, with a loud voice: "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit;" and, having said this, he expired.⁶ Stephen, as he is about to die, cries, with a loud voice: "Lord lay not this sin to their charge; and when he said this he fell asleep;" and Jesus says: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."⁷ These two sayings of Jesus are not given anywhere but in the third Synoptic,⁸ and their imitation by Stephen, in another work of the same Evangelist, is a peculiarity which deserves attention. It is argued by apologists⁹ that nothing is more natural than that the first martyrs should have the example of the suffering Jesus in their minds, and die with his expressions of love and resignation on their lips. On the other hand, taken along with other most suspicious circumstances which we have already pointed out, and with the fact, which we shall presently demonstrate, that the speech of Stephen is nothing more than a composition by the Author of Acts, the singular analogies presented by this narrative with the trial and last words of Jesus in the Gospels seem to

¹ Acts vi. 12; cf. Luke xxii. 60, Mt. xxvi. 57.

² Acts vi. 11; cf. Mt. xxvi. 59, Mk. xiv. 55.

³ Acts vi. 13 f.; cf. Mt. xxvi. 60 f., Mk. xiv. 57 f.

⁴ The words in Acts vii. 1 are: *εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς. Εἰ (ἀρα) ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει;* In Matth. xxvi. 63, — *ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Ἐξομολογῶ σε . . . ἵνα ἡμῖν εἰπῇς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός . . .* In Luke xxii. 66 . . . *λέγοντες. Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὼν ἡμῖν.* Cf. *Zeller*, *Die Apostelg.*, p. 153, ann. 2.

⁵ Acts vii. 56, Luke xxii. 69.

⁶ . . . *λέγοντα Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.* Acts vii. 59.
καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν. Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεται τὸ πνεῦμα μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xiii. 46.

⁷ . . . *ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.* Acts vii. 60.

⁸ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν. Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς; οὐ γὰρ οἶδαςιν τί ποιοῦσιν. Luke xiii. 34.

⁹ *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, u. s. w., p. 73, ann. 2; *Meyer*, *Apostelgesch.*, 195, &c., &c.

us an additional indication of its inauthenticity. As Baur¹ and Zeller² have well argued, the use of two expressions of Jesus only found in the third Synoptic is a phenomenon which is much more naturally explained by attributing them to the Author, who of course knew that Gospel well, than to Stephen who did not know it at all.³ The prominence which is given to this episode of the first Christian martyrdom is intelligible in itself, and it acquires fresh significance when it is considered as the introduction of the Apostle Paul, whose perfect silence regarding the proto-martyr, however, confirms the belief which we otherwise acquire, that the whole narrative and speech, whatever unknown tradition may have suggested them, are, as we have them, to be ascribed to the Author of the Acts.

On closer examination, one of the first questions which arises is: how could such a speech have been reported? Although Neander⁴ contends that we are not justified in asserting that all that is narrated regarding Stephen in the Acts occurred in a single day, we think it cannot be doubted that the intention is to describe the arrest, trial, and execution as rapidly following each other on the same day. "They came upon him, and seized him, and brought him to the Council, and set up false witnesses, who said," &c.⁵ There is no ground here for interpolating any imprisonment, and if not, then it follows clearly that Stephen, being immediately called upon to answer for himself, is, at the end of his discourse, violently carried away without the city to be stoned. No preparations could have been made even to take notes of his speech, if upon any ground it were reasonable to assume the possibility of an intention to do so; and indeed it could not, under the circumstances, have been foreseen that he should either have been placed in such a position, or have been able to make a speech at all. The rapid progress of all the events described, and the excitement consequent on such tumultuous proceedings, render an ordinary explanation of the manner in which such a speech could have been preserved improbable, and it is difficult to suppose that it could have been accurately remembered, with all its curious details, by one who was present. Improbable as it is, however, this is the only suggestion which can possibly be advanced. The majority of apologists suppose that

¹ Paulus, i. p. 64, ann. 1.

² Apostelgesch., 152.

³ Neander, admits that the narrative in Acts is wanting in clearness and intuitive evidence of details, although he does not think that this at all militates against the trustworthiness of the whole. (Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 68, ann.) Bleek, points out that viii. 1-3, which is so closely connected with this episode, shows a certain confusion and want of clearness, and supposes the passage interpolated by the author into the original narrative of which he made use. (Einl. N.T., p. 342.)

⁴ Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 68, ann.

⁵ Acts vi. 12 f.

the speech was heard and reported by the Apostle Paul himself,¹ or at least that it was communicated or written down either by a member of the Sanhedrin, or by some one who was present.² As there is no information on the point, there is ample scope for imagination, but when we come to consider its linguistic and other peculiarities, it must be borne in mind that the extreme difficulty of explaining the preservation of such a speech must be an element in judging whether it is not rather a composition by the Author of Acts. The language in which it was delivered, again, is the subject of much difference of opinion, many maintaining that it must have originally been spoken in Aramaic,³ whilst others hold that it was delivered in Greek.⁴ Still, a large number of critics and divines of course assert that the speech attributed to Stephen is at least substantially authentic. As might naturally be expected in a case where negative criticism is arrayed against a canonical work upheld by the time-honoured authority of the Church, those who dispute its authenticity are in the minority.⁵ It is maintained by the latter that the language is more or less that of the writer of the rest of the work, and that the speech in fact as it lies before us is a later composition by the Author of the Acts of the Apostles.

Before examining the linguistic peculiarities of the speech, we may very briefly point out that, in the course of the historical survey, many glaring contradictions of the statements of the Old Testament occur.⁶ Stephen says (vs. 2, 3) that the order to Abra-

¹ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. proleg., p. 11; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 131; *Ebrard*, Ev. Gesch., p. 690; *Zu Olsh. Apg.*, p. 112; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 56; *Lüger*, Zweek, u. s. w., der Rede des Stephanus, 1838, p. 31 f.; *Rehm*, De font. Act. Apost., p. 195 f.; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 73 f.

² *Bleek*, Einl., p. 348; *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 1036; *Heinrichs*, Act. Apost., i. p. 24, ii. p. 387 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 162; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 112.

³ *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 191; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 168; *Michaelis*, Einl., ii. p. 1181 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 114. Cf. *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 66.

⁴ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 67; *Heinrichs*, Act. Apost., i. p. 177; *Stier*, Die Reden d. Ap., i. p. 172, ann. *; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 93; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 93; *Weizsäcker*, in *Schenkel's Bib. Lex.*, v. p. 390.

⁵ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 61 ff.; *N. T. Theol.*, p. 338; *B. Bauer*, Apg., p. 87 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 524; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 102 f., ann. 3; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 63 ff., 70 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 92 ff.; *Weizsäcker*, in *Schenk. B. Lex.*, v. p. 390 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 149 ff., 510 ff. Cf. *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 235 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. ii. p. 36 ff., 39 f.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 338.

⁶ The Bishop of Lincoln says of those who venture to observe these: "The allegations in question, when reduced to their plain meaning, involve the assumption, that the Holy Ghost, speaking by St. Stephen (who was 'full of the Holy Spirit'), forgot what He Himself had written in the Book of Genesis; and that His Memory is to be refreshed by biblical commentators of the nineteenth century! This kind of criticism is animated by a spirit very alien from that Christian temper of reverential modesty, gentleness, and humility, which are primary requisites for the discovery and reception of truth. *Mysteria are revealed to the meek* (Eccles. iii. 19). *Them that are meek shall He guide in judgment; and such*

ham to leave his country was given to him in Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Haran; but, according to Genesis (xii. i. ff.) the call is given whilst he was living in Haran. The speech (v. 4) represents Abraham leaving Haran after the death of his father, but this is in contradiction to Genesis, according to which¹ Abraham was 75 when he left Haran. Now, as he was born when his father Terah was 70,² and Terah lived 205 years,³ his father was only 145 at the time indicated, and afterwards lived 60 years. In v. 5 it is stated that Abraham had no possession in the promised land, not even so much as to set his foot on; but, according to Genesis,⁴ he bought the field of Ephron in Machpelah. It is said (v. 14) that Jacob went down into Egypt with 75 souls, whereas, in the Old Testament, it is repeatedly said that the number was 70.⁵ In v. 16, it is stated that Jacob was buried in Schechem in a sepulchre bought by Abraham of the sons of Emmor in Schechem, whereas in Genesis⁶ Jacob is said to have been buried in Machpelah; the sepulchre in Schechem, in which the bones of Joseph were buried, was not bought by Abraham, but by Jacob.⁷ Moses is described (v. 22) as mighty in words, but in Exodus⁸ he is said to be the very reverse, and Aaron in fact is sent with him to speak words for him. These are some of the principal variations. It used to be argued that such mistakes were mere errors of memory, natural in a speech delivered under such circumstances and without preparation,⁹ and that they are additional evidence of its authenticity, inasmuch as it is very improbable that a writer deliberately composing such a speech could have committed them. It is very clear, however, that the majority of these are not errors of memory at all, but either the exegesis prevailing at the time amongst learned Jews, or traditions deliberately adopted, of which many traces are elsewhere found.¹⁰

as are gentle, then shall He learn His way (Ps. xxv. 8). But such a spirit of criticism seems willing to accept any supposition, however fanciful, except that of its own fallibility! It is ready to allege that St. Luke is in error in saying that St. Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost. It is ready to affirm that St. Stephen was forgetful of the elements of Jewish history. . . . No wonder that it is given over by God to a reprobate mind." Greek Test., Acts of the Apostles, p. 66 f.

¹ Gen. xii. 4.

² xi. 26.

³ xi. 32.

⁴ xxiii. 4 ff., 17 ff.

⁵ Gen. xvi. 27, Exod. i. 5, Deut. x. 22. It must be added that in the last two passages the version of the lxx. also gives 75 including the sons of Joseph.

⁶ xlix. 29, l. 13.

⁷ Joshua xxiv. 32.

⁸ iv. 10 ff.

⁹ Even *De Wette* says: "The numerous historical errors are remarkable; they may most probably be ascribed to an unprepared speech." *K. Erkl. Apostelgesch.*, p. 93.

¹⁰ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 67 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 235 f.; *Ebrard*, *Zu Olsh. Apg.*, p. 115 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 39 f.; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi.

The form of the speech is closely similar to other speeches found in the same work. We have already in passing pointed out the analogy of parts of it to the address of Peter in Solomon's porch, but the speech of Paul at Antioch bears a still closer resemblance to it, and has been called "a mere echo of the speeches of Peter and Stephen."¹ We must refer the reader to our general comparison of the two speeches of Peter and Paul in question,² which sufficiently showed, we think, that they were not delivered by independent speakers, but on the contrary that they are nothing more than compositions by the Author of the Acts. These addresses which are such close copies of each other, are so markedly cast in the same mould as the speech of Stephen, that they not only confirm our conclusions as to their own origin, but intensify suspicions of its authenticity. It is impossible, without reference to the speeches themselves, to shew how closely that of Paul at Antioch is traced on the lines of the speech of Stephen, and this resemblance is much greater than can be shown by mere linguistic examination. The thoughts correspond where the words differ. There is a constant recurrence of words, however, even where the sense of the passages is not the same, and the ideas in both bear the stamp of a single mind. We shall not attempt fully to contrast these discourses here, for it would occupy too much space, and we therefore content ourselves with giving a few illustrations, begging the reader to examine the speeches themselves.

STEPHEN.

vii. 2. Men, brethren, fathers, hear.

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε.

The God of glory (ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης)³ appeared to our father (τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν) Abraham when he was in (ὄντι ἐν τῇ Μ.) Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in (κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν) Haran, &c.

6. . . . that his seed should be a sojourner in a strange land (παροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ) . . .

PAUL AND PETER.

xiii. 15. Men, brethren

16. Men, Israelites, and ye that fear God, hear.

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ . . . ἀκούσατε.

xxii. 1. Men, brethren, and fathers, hear . . .

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε.

xiii. 17. The God of this people (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου) Israel chose our fathers (τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν) and exalted the people in their sojourn in the land of Egypt (ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ) . . .

p. 193, ann. 2; *Feilmoser*, Einl., p. 314 f.; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 57 ff.; *Meyer*, App., p. 170 f.; *Olshausen*, App., p. 117 f.

¹ *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apostelgesch., p. 130.

² See back, p. 764 ff.

³ Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8, κίριος τῆς δόξης; cf. lxx. Ps. xxviii. 3.

STEPHEN.

5. . . . and to his seed (καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ)¹

8. And he gave him (Abraham) a covenant (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην) of circumcision.²

22. (Moses) was mighty in his words and deeds (ἦν διὰ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ).

32. I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. (Εγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ.)

36. This (Moses) brought them (the people τὸν λαόν) out (ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς) having worked wonders and signs³ in the land of Egypt (ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ) and in the Red Sea and in the wilderness forty years (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα). v. 42. . . . forty years in the wilderness. . . . (ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ)

37. This is the Moses who said unto the children of Israel: A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me. . . .

42. . . . God delivered them up to serve the host of heaven (ὁ θεὸς παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεῖν, κ.τ.λ.).

45. Which also our fathers brought in with Joshua when they took possession of the Gentiles (τῶν ἐθνῶν) whom God drove out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David.

46. Who found (εὑρε) favour with God. . . .

PAUL AND PETER.

iii. 25. Ye are the children of the covenant (τῆς διαθήκης) which God made with your fathers, saying unto Abraham: And in thy seed (καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου), &c., &c.

(Luke xxiv. 19. Jesus . . . mighty in deed and word (δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ))

iii. 13. The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers. (ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν)

xiii. 17. . . . and exalted the people (τὸν λαόν) in their sojourn in the land of Egypt (ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ), and with a high arm brought them out of it (ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς), 18. and for about the time of forty years⁴ (τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη) nourished them in the wilderness. (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ).

iii. 22. Moses indeed said:⁵ A prophet shall the Lord our God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me, &c., &c.

(Rom i. 24. . . . God delivered them up . . . to uncleanness (παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, κ.τ.λ. cf. 26. . . . παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάλη ἀτιμίας 28. . . . παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν. . . .)).

xiii. 19. And he destroyed seven nations (ἔθνη) in the land of Canaan,⁶ and divided their land to them by lot.

22. . . . he raised up unto them David as king, to whom also he bare

¹ Compare with this verse Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 16, 29.

² Cf. Rom. iv. 11, καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς.

³ . . . ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα . . . ii. 22. . . . τέρασιν καὶ σημείοις οἷς ἐποίησεν. . . .

⁴ vii. 23 reads . . . τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη χρόνος . . . and xiii. 18 . . . τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη χρόνον . . . and again vii. 23, ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ . . . 1 Cor. ii. 9, ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη . . .

⁵ The authorized version, on the authority of several important MSS. adds "unto the fathers" "πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας," but the balance of evidence is decidedly against the words.

⁶ vii. 11. Then came a famine upon all Egypt and Canaan.

STEPHEN.

48. Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in what is made with hands (οὐκ ὁ ὑψίστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ) even as the prophet saith :

49. The heaven (ὁ οὐρανός) is my throne, and the earth (ἡ γῆ) is my footstool. 50. Did not my hand make all these things? (Οὐχὶ ἡ χεὶρ μου ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα;)

51. Ye uncircumcised in hearts . . . (ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις. . .)

52. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed (ἀπέκτειναν) them which announced before of the coming of the righteous One (τοῦ δικαίου), of whom ye have become betrayers and murderers (φονεῖς).

53. Ye received the law at the arrangements of angels . . . (ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων . . .)

54 And hearing these things they were cut to their hearts (ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα διεπρίοντο), and gnashed their teeth upon him.

It is argued that the speech of Stephen bears upon it the stamp of an address which was actually delivered.¹ We are not able to discover any special indication of this. Such an argument, at the best, is merely the assertion of personal opinion, and cannot have any weight. It is quite conceivable that an oration actually spoken might lose its spontaneous character in a report, and on the other hand that a written composition might acquire oratorical reality from the skill of the writer. It would indeed exhibit great want of literary ability if a writer, composing a speech which he desires to represent as having actually been spoken altogether failed to convey some impression of this. To have any application to the present case, however, it must not only be affirmed that the speech of Stephen has the stamp of an address really spoken, but that it has the character of one delivered

PAUL AND PETER.

witness and said: I found (εὑρον) David, a man after mine own heart, &c., &c.

xvii. 24f. The God that made the world and all things therein (ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ), he being Lord of heaven and earth (οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς) dwelleth not in temples made with hands (οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ) neither is served by men's hands (χειρῶν), &c., &c., &c.

(Rom. ii. 29. Circumcision is of the heart, in spirit (περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, κ. τ. λ. . .))

xxii. 14. . . the righteous One (τὸν δίκαιον). . .

iii. 14. But ye denied the holy and righteous One (τὸν δίκαιον) and desired a murderer (ἄνδρα φονεά) to be granted unto you, 15. and killed (ἀπέκτεινατε) the Prince of Life, &c., &c.

(Gal. iii. 19. What then is the law? It was added . . . ; being arranged by means of angels . . . (τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; προσετέθη . . . διαταγὰς δι' ἀγγέλων . . .))

v. 33. When they heard they were cut (to their hearts) (οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπρίοντο) and took counsel to slay them.

¹ Baumgarten, *Apq.*, i. p. 131; *Gfrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 409; *Meyer*, *Apq.*, p. 161 f.; *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, p. 65 f., *anm.* 1.

under such extraordinary circumstances, without premeditation and in the midst of tumultuous proceedings. It cannot, we think, be reasonably asserted that a speech like this is peculiarly characteristic of a man suddenly arrested by angry and excited opponents, and hurried before a council which, at its close, rushes upon him and joins in stoning him. Unless the defence attributed to Stephen be particularly characteristic of this the argument in question falls to the ground. On the contrary, if the speech has one feature more strongly marked than another, it is the deliberate care with which the points referred to in the historical survey are selected and bear upon each other, and the art with which the climax is attained. In showing, as we have already done, that the speech betrays the handwork of the Author of the Acts, we have to a large extent disposed of any claim, to peculiar individuality in the defence, and the linguistic analysis which we shall now make will conclusively settle the source of the composition. We must point out here in continuation that, in the rest of the work, all the quotations in the speech are from the Septuagint, and that the author follows that version even when it does not fairly represent the original.¹

We may now proceed to analyse the language of the whole episode from vi. 9 to the end of the seventh chapter, in order to discover what linguistic analogy it bears to the rest of the Acts and to the third Synoptic, which for the sake of brevity we shall simply designate "Luke." With the exception of a very few words in general use, every word employed in the section will be found in the following analysis, based upon Bruder's "Concordance,"² which is arranged in the order of the verses, although for greater clearness the whole is divided into categories.

We shall commence with a list of the words in this section which are not elsewhere used in the New Testament. They are as follows:—*ὑποβάλλειν*, vi. 11; *συγκινεῖν*, vi. 12; *ὠνεῖσθαι*, vii. 16;³ *ἐκθερος*, vii. 19, but *ἐκτιθέναι*, occurs several times in Acts, see below, vii. 21; *ἀμύνεσθαι*, vii. 24; *συναλλίσσειν*, vii. 26; *διαδέχεσθαι*, vii. 45, this word, which is common amongst Greek writers,⁴ is used in lxx. 2 Chron. xxxi. 12; *ἔλεσις*, vii. 52. These nine words

¹ vii. 42, 43; cf. ii. 25, 28, xiii. 41, xv. 16, 17.

² We have already referred to works in which a very complete analysis of the language of the Acts and Gospels has been made, and we may here again point out: *Zeller*, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 388 ff.; *Lekbusch*, *Apostelgesch.*, p. 35 ff.; *Holtzmann*, *Die synopt. Evv.*, p. 302 ff. The last-named has chiefly reference to the Gospel. We have made our analysis of the speech of Stephen, as compared with the rest of Acts and Gospel, independently, but we are likewise indebted to the works above named, to the first two especially.

³ *καθώς*, of time, vii. 17, is rare; but the cod. A. reads *ὡς*, which occurs 30 times in Acts, 19 times in Luke, and some 20 times elsewhere in N. T.

⁴ Cf. *Kuinoel*, l. c.

are all that can strictly be admitted as *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, but there are others, which, although not found in any other part of the Acts or of the Gospel, occur in other writings of the New Testament, and which must here be noted. *βλασφημος*, vi. 11, occurring 1 Tim. i. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 2, 2 Pet. ii. 11, Rev. xiii. 5; *βλασφημεῖν*, however, is used four times in Acts, thrice in Luke, and frequently elsewhere, and *βλασφημία* in Luke v. 21. *ἑνδής*, vi. 13, used Rev. ii. 2, xxi. 8; *ἀλλάρτειν*, vi. 14, Rom. i. 23, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, Gal. iv. 20, Heb. i. 12, almost purely a Pauline word: *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι*, vii. 5, elsewhere fourteen times; *μετατιθέναι*, vii. 16, also Gal. i. 6, Heb. vii. 12, xi. 5 twice (1xx. Gen. v. 24), Jude 4; *καταπονεῖν* (*καταπονοῦμενος*), vii. 24, also 2 Pet. ii. 7; *μάχεσθαι*, vii. 26, also John vi. 52, 2 Tim. ii. 24, James iv. 2; *λόγιον*, vii. 38, also Rom. iii. 2, Heb. v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 11; *ὑπὸ ἡκού*, vii. 39, also 2 Cor. ii. 9, Phil. ii. 8; *διαταγή*, vii. 53, also Rom. xiii. 2, cf. Gal. iii. 19, but the writer makes use of *διατάσσειν*, see vii. 44, below; *ἀποτιθέναι*, vii. 58, also Rom. xiii. 12, Eph. iv. 22, 25, Col. iii. 8, Heb. xii. 1, James i. 21, 1 Pet. ii. 1. If we add these ten words to the preceding, the proportion of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* is by no means excessive for the 67 verses, especially when the peculiarity of the subject is considered, and it is remembered that the number of words employed in the third Gospel, for instance, which are not elsewhere found, greatly exceeds that of the other Gospels, and that this linguistic richness is characteristic of the author.

There is another class of words which may now be dealt with: those which, although not elsewhere found either in the Acts or Gospel, are derived from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. The author makes exclusive use of that version, and in the historical survey, of which so large a portion of the speech is composed, his mind very naturally recalls its expressions even where he does not make direct quotations, but merely gives a brief summary of its narratives. In the following list, where words are not clearly taken from the Septuagint version¹ of the various episodes referred to, the reasons shall be stated:—

μεροικίζειν, vii. 4, and 43, where it is quoted from Amos v. 27. *κατασχεῖς*, vii. 5, and 45; Gen. xvii. 8, and Numb. xxxii. 5, &c., &c. *παροιῖος*, vii. 6 from Gen. xv. 13; again, vii. 29 from Exod. ii. 22; it also occurs Eph. ii. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 11. *ἀλλοτριός*, vii. 6 (*παροιῖος ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*); cf. Gen. xv. 13 f., from which verses 6, 7 are taken; Gen. xv. 13 reads *οὐκ ἰδίᾳ* for *ἀλλοτρίᾳ*, but Ex. ii. 22, and xviii. 3, which are equally to the point, have *παροιῖος ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*, cf. Ps. cxxvi. 4.

¹ vii. 6, 7, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 40, 42, 43, 47, 49, 50, are almost wholly direct quotations from the 1xx. We have referred to any words in these verses requiring notice.

χορτάσθαι, vii. 11, used Gen. xlii. 27 in narrating the visit of Joseph's brethren to Egypt for provender; also Gen. xxiv. 25, 32, &c., &c.; χορτάζειν occurs in Luke vi. 21, ix. 17, xv. 16, xvi. 21.

στειρόν, vii. 12; in Gen. xlii. 1, 2, which is quoted, στειρός is used, and it recurs Acts xxvii. 38, thrice in Luke, and nine times in other parts of the N. T. The plural στειρά, which is the reading of the best MSS. in this place, however, does not elsewhere occur in the N. T. στειρά is the reading of some other Codices, and likewise στειρός, so the word must be considered doubtful.

ἀναγνωρίζεσθαι, vii. 13, Gen. xlv. 1.

κατασοφίζεσθαι, vii. 19, Exod. i. 10.

ἀστέλιος, vii. 20, Exod. ii. 2, also used Heb. xi. 23.

στεναγμός, vii. 34, Exod. ii. 24, cf. iii. 7; also used Rom. viii. 26.

λυτρωτής, vii. 35, Ps. lxxvii. 35, speaking of the delivery of Israel from Egypt; rest of passage from Ex. iii. 2, xiv. 19.

μοσχοποιεῖν, vii. 41, Ex. xxxii. 4 . . . ποιεῖν μόσχον—also ver. 8 and Ps. cv. 19—from which this word is coined.

σκηνώμα, vii. 46 (. . . εὐρεῖν σκην. τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ) Ps. cxxxii. 5 (εὐρω σκην. τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ); also 2 Rev. i. 13, 14.

σκληροτράχηλος, vii. 51, Exod. xxxiii. 3, 5, Deut. ix. 6, 13.

ἀπερίτμητος, vii. 51 (ἀπ. καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν),¹ Ezek. xlv. 9 (ἀπ. καρδία ἀπ. σαρκί) also v. 7, Jerem. ix. 26 (ἀπ. καρδία . . . ἀπ. σαρκί) Jerem. vi. 10 (ἀπερίτμητα τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν); Rom. ii. 29.

ἀντιπίπτειν, vii. 51, used Numb. xxvii. 14 in regard to the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness.

βρύχειν, vii. 54 (ἐβρύχον τοὺς ὁδόντας ἐπ' αὐτόν); Ps. xxxiv. 16 (ἐβρύξαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τοὺς ὁδόντας), Ps. xxxvi. 12 (βρύξει ἐπ' αὐτόν τοὺς ὁδ.); cf. Matth. viii. 12, &c., &c.

We shall now, by way of disposing of them, take the words which require little special remark, but are used as well in the rest of the Acts and in the Gospel as in other writings of the New Testament:—

ἰσχύειν, vi. 10, xv. 10, xix. 16, 20, xxv. 7, xxvii. 16; Luke eight times, rest of N. T. 15 times.

ἀνθιστάναι, vi. 10, xiii. 8; Luke xxi. 15; rest 11 times.

σοφία, vi. 10, 3, vii. 10, 22; six times in Luke, 19 times by Paul,² 22 times elsewhere.

πρεσβύτερος (Jewish), vi. 12 and other 6 times; 4 times in Luke, frequently elsewhere.

τόπος, vi. 13 and 18 times; Luke 20 times, rest frequently.

μαρτυς, vi. 13 and 12 times; Luke xxiv. 48; rest 20 times.

παραδιδόναι, vi. 14, vii. 42 and 12 times; Luke 17 times, rest frequently.

προσῶπον, vi. 15 twice, vii. 45, and 9 times; Luke 15, rest frequently.

ὠσεῖ, vi. 15 and 8 times; Luke 10, rest 17 times.

δόξα, vii. 2, 55, xii. 23, xxii. 11; Luke 13, rest frequently. (ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης, Ps. xxviii. 3; cf. xxiii. 7, 8, 9, 10; cf. Cor. ii. 8, κύριος τῆς δόξης.)

σπέρμα, vii. 5, 6, iii. 25, xiii. 23; Luke i. 55, xx. 28, Paul 17, rest 21 times.

τέκνον, vii. 5, ii. 39, xiii. 33, xxi. 5, 21; Luke 14 times, rest frequently.

¹ Codices E H P read τῇ καρδίᾳ.

² We shall use this expression to indicate the use of words in the Epistles to the Romans, 1 and 2 to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians.

- δουλεύειν, vii. 7, *Gen.*¹ xv. 14, *Acts* xx. 19; *Luke* xv. 29, xvi. 13 twice, *Paul* 11, rest 9 times.
- διαθήκη, vii. 8, *Gen.* xvii. 9, 10, 11, *Acts* iii. 25; *Luke* i. 72, xxii. 20, *Paul* 6, rest 20 times.
- γεννᾶν, vii. 8, 20, 29, ii. 8, xiii. 33, xxii. 3, 28; *Luke* 4 times, rest frequently.
- ἀποδιδόναι, vii. 9, *Gen.* xxxvii. 28, 29, *Acts* v. 8; *Heb.* xii. 16; in other senses *Acts* 2, *Luke* 8, rest 35 times.
- ὀλιγίς, vii. 10, 11, xi. 19, xiv. 22, xx. 23; *Paul* 15, rest 25 times.
- χάρις, vii. 10 and 16 times; *Luke* 8, *Paul* 61, and rest 72 times.
- καθίστημι, vii. 10, *Gen.* xxxix. 4, 5, xli. 41, 43; *Acts* vi. 3, vii. 27, 35, *Exod.* ii. 14; xvii. 15; *Luke* xii. 14, 42, 44, rest 16 times.
- λιμός, vii. 11, *Gen.* xli. 54, *Acts* xi. 28; *Luke* 4, rest 6 times.
- πρωτόν, adv. vii. 12, iii. 26, xi. 26, xiii. 46, xv. 14, xxvi. 20; *Luke* 10 times, rest frequently.
- φανερός, vii. 13, iv. 16; *Luke* viii. 17 twice; *Paul* 7, rest 10 times.
- δεύτερος, vii. 13 and 4 times; *Luke* 3, rest 36 times: ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ, not elsewhere, but cf. *Luke* xii. 38 ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ.
- τελευτᾶν, vii. 15, ii. 29; *Luke* vii. 2; elsewhere 10 times.
- χρόνος, vii. 17, 23, and 15 times; *Luke* 7 times, rest often.
- ἐπαγγελία, vii. 17, i. 4, ii. 33, 39, xiii. 23, 32, xxiii. 21, xxvi. 6; *Luke* xxiv. 49, *Paul* 20; rest 24 times.
- ὁμολογεῖν, vii. 17, xxiii. 8, xxiv. 14; *Luke* xii. 8 twice, rest 21 times.
- καιρός, vii. 20, and 8 times; *Luke* 13 times, rest frequently.
- ἀδικεῖν, vii. 24, *Ex.* ii. 13; *Acts* vii. 26, 27, xxv. 10, 11; *Luke* x. 19; rest 13.
- ὥσθηρία, vii. 25, iv. 12, xiii. 26, 47, xvi. 17, xxvii. 34; *Luke* i. 69, 71, 77, xix. 9, *Paul* 10, rest 26 times.
- συνιέναι, vii. 25 twice, xxviii. 26, 27; *Luke* ii. 50, viii. 10, xviii. 34, xxiv. 45, rest 16 times.
- ἐτήρη, vii. 26, ix. 31, x. 36, xii. 20, xv. 33, xvi. 36, xxiv. 3; *Luke* 14 times, rest frequently.
- πληθίον, vii. 27, *Ex.* ii. 13; *Luke* x. 27, 29, 36, rest 13 times.
- φενγειν, vii. 29, xxvii. 30; *Luke* iii. 7, viii. 34, xxi. 21, rest 27 times.
- έρμος, ἡ, vii. 30, 36, 38, 42, 44, *Ex.* iii. 1, xvi. 1, &c., &c., *Acts* xiii. 18, xxi. 38; *Luke* 8 times, rest 20 times.
- ἔτος, vii. 30, 6, 36, 42, *Gen.* xv. 13, *Ex.* xvi. 35, *Amos* v. 25, &c., and 7 times; *Luke* 15, rest 23.
- θανυμάζειν, vii. 31, ii. 7, iii. 12, iv. 13, xiii. 41; *Luke* 13 times, rest frequently.
- τολυᾶν, vii. 32, v. 13; *Luke* xx. 40, *Paul* 7, rest 6 times.
- λύειν, vii. 33, *Ex.* iii. 5, *Acts* ii. 24, xiii. 25, 43, xxii. 30, xxiv. 26, xxvii. 41; *Luke* 7 times, rest often.
- ἀρνεῖσθαι, vii. 35, iii. 13, 14, iv. 16; *Luke* viii. 45, ix. 23, xii. 9, xxii. 57, rest 24 times.
- ἐκκλησία, vii. 38, *Deut.* xxxii. 1, and *Acts* 23 times; *Paul* 39, rest 49 times.
- θυσία, vii. 41, 42, *Amos* v. 25; *Luke* ii. 24, xiii. 1, rest 25 times.
- εἰδωλον, vii. 41 (*Ex.* xx. 4, *Numb.* xxv. 2 . . . εἰς τὰς θυσίας τῶν εἰδωλῶν αὐτ.), *Acts* xv. 20; *Paul* 6, rest 3.
- λατρεῦειν, vii. 42, *Deut.* iv. 19, *Ex.* xx. 5, &c., &c., *Acts* xxiv. 14, xxvi. 7, xxvii. 23; *Luke* 3, rest 13 times.

¹ When a passage of Old Testament is referred to it will be understood that the Lxx. version is intended, and that the word is derived from it. When this is not clear, and the word is only used in the passage indicated, it will be placed within brackets.

προσφέρειν, vii. 42, *Amos* v. 25; *Acts* viii. 18, xxi. 26; *Luke* 5 times, rest frequently.
τύπος, vii. 43, *Amos* v. 26, *Acts* vii. 44, *Ex.* xxv. 9, 40, *Acts* xxiii. 25; *Paul* 4 times, rest 9.
προσκυνεῖν, vii. 43; *Deut.* iv. 19, xvii. 3; *Acts* viii. 27, x. 25, xxiv. 11; *Luke* iv. 7, 8, xxiv. 52, rest frequently.
σκηνή, vii. 43, *Amos* v. 26; *Acts* vii. 44, xv. 16, *Amos* ix. 11; *Luke* ix. 33, xvi. 9, rest 16 times.
μαρτύριον, vii. 44, *Ex.* xxvii. 21; *Acts* iv. 33; *Luke* v. 14, ix. 5, xxi. 13, rest 15.
αἰτεῖν, vii. 46, iii. 2, 14, ix. 2, xii. 20, xiii. 21, 28, xvi. 29, xxv. 3, 15; *Luke* 11 times, rest frequently.
οἰκοδομεῖν, vii. 47, 3 *Kings* vi. 2, viii. 20, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 6; *Acts* vii. 49, *Isaiah*, lxi. 1; *Acts* iv. 11, ix. 31, xxii. 32; *Luke* 11, rest frequently.
ναός,¹ vii. 48, xvii. 24, xix. 24; *Luke* 4, rest 39 times.
ποιός, vii. 49, *Isaiah*, lxi. 1; *Acts* iv. 7, xxiii. 34; *Luke* 8, rest 22 times.
οὐς, vii. 51, *Jerem.* vi. 10; *Acts* vii. 57, xi. 2, xxviii. 27 twice; *Luke* 7, rest 25 times.
διώκειν, vii. 52, and 8 times; *Luke* xvii. 23, xxi. 12, *Paul* 14, rest 19 times.
φυλάσσειν, vii. 53, xii. 4, xvi. 4, xxi. 24, 25, xxii. 20, xxiii. 35, xxviii. 16; *Luke* 6, rest 17 times.
θεωρεῖν, vii. 56, and 13 times; *Luke* 7, rest 36 times.
ἐκβάλλειν, vii. 58, ix. 40, xiii. 50, xvi. 37, xxviii. 38; *Luke* 21 times, rest frequently.
ἐξω, vii. 58, and 10 times; *Luke* 11 times, rest frequently.
ιμάτιον, vii. 58, and 7 times; *Luke* 10 times, rest frequently.

We shall now give the words which may either be regarded as characteristic of the author of the Acts and Gospel, or the use of which is peculiar or limited to him:—

συζητεῖν, vi. 9, ix. 29; *Luke* xxii. 23, xxiv. 15, *Mark* 6 times.
ῥήμα with *λαλεῖν*, vi. 11, 13, x. 44, xi. 14, xiii. 42; *Luke* ii. 17, 59, rest 6 times; without *λαλ.* *Acts* 9, *Luke* 17, rest 32 times.
ἐφιστάναι, vi. 12, iv. 1, x. 17, xi. 11, xii. 7, xvii. 5, xxii. 13, 20, xxiii. 11, 27, xxviii. 2; *Luke* 7 times, 1 *Thess.* v. 3, 2 *Tim.* iv. 26 only.
συναπαύειν, vi. 12, xix. 29, xxvii. 15; *Luke* viii. 29, only.
συνέδριον, vi. 12, and 13 times; *Luke* xxii. 66; *Mt.* 3 times, *Mk.* 3, *John* 1, only.
πανεσθαι (followed by particip.), vi. 13, v. 42, xiii. 19, xx. 31, xxi. 32; *Luke* v. 4, rest 3 times; otherwise *Acts* xx. 1; *Luke* viii. 24, xi. 1, rest 3 times.
καταλύνειν, vi. 14, v. 38, 39; *Luke* xxi. 6, cf. ix. 12, xix. 7, *Paul* 3, *Mt.* 5, *Mk.* 3 times.
ῥθός, vi. 14, xv. 1, xxv. 16; *Luke* i. 9, ii. 42, xxii. 39, rest 9; *τὸ ῥθόν*, vi. 14, xvi. 21, xxi. 21, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 17, only.
καθεξέσθαι, vi. 15, xx. 9; *Luke* ii. 46, *Mt.* xxvii. 55, *John* iv. 6, xi. 20, xx. 12, only.
κατοικεῖν, vii. 2, 4 twice, 48, i. 19, 20, ii. 5, 9, 14, iv. 16, ix. 22, 32, 35, xi. 29, xiii. 27, xvii. 24, 26, xix. 10, 17, xxii. 12; *Luke* twice, rest 25 times.
συγγένεια, vii. 3, *Gen.* xii. 1, cf. *Ex.* xii. 21; *Acts* vii. 14; *Luke* i. 61, only.

¹ The oldest codices omit *ναός* from vii. 48.

κάκειθεν, v. xxviii. 1
κληρονομία times.
δοῦναι, vii. 5
βῆμα, vii. 5
 12, 16, 1
περιτομή, vi
περιτέμνειν i. 59, ii.
πατριάρχης,
ζηλοῦν, vii. 1
ἐξαίρειν, vii. 1
 rest 2 times
ἐναντίον, vii. 1
 xxiv. 19,
ἡγούμενος, vii. 17, 24.
ἐξαποστείλλειν *Luke* 3 times
γένος, vii. 13 times.
μετακλιθεῖσθαι
ἐνυχή (man), v. xiii. 1, 2
μνησθαι, vii. 16
τιμή (price), v. 6, 9, only.
ἀργύριον, vii. xxii. 5, rest
ἐγγίζειν, vii. times.
ἀνέγειν, vii. ii. 27, xii.
πληθύνειν, vii. 1
βρέφος, vii. 16
 2, only.
κακοῦν, vii. 19
 xvii. 10, 1
ζωογονεῖν, vii. 1
ἀνατρέφειν, v. 1
ἡγῆναι, vii. 20, x.
ἐκτιθέναι, vii. 1
ἀναιρεῖσθαι (d twice, ii. 22
 20, xiii. 11 times.
παίδευσιν, vii. 1
καὶ (casti
ἀνταρτί, vii. 2
 49, xiv. 31,
ἐπιμαρτυροῦμαι,
Acts xv. 14,
ἀληθοῦς (of tin
John vii. 8;
 iii. 5, rest 2
 53

- times, rest
i. 25; Paul
5, xxiv. 11;
Luke ix. 33,
5, xxi. 13,
3, 15; Luke
Acts vii. 49,
frequently.
t 22 times.
ce; Luke 7,
14, rest 19
6, xxviii. 16;
21 times, rest
regarded as
the use of
i. 17, 50, rest
20, xxiii. 11,
only.
Mk. 3, John
31, xxi. 32;
24, xi. 1, rest
Paul 3, Mt. 5,
et *θη*, vi. 14,
6, xi. 20, x
x. 22, 32, 30,
twice, rest 25
4; Luke i. 61,
κακείθεν, vii. 4, xiii. 21, xiv. 26, xvi. 12, xx. 15, xxi. 1, xxvii. 4, 12 (1),
xxviii. 15, Mk. x. 1 (1) only.
κληρονομία, vii. 5, xx. 32, both with *δοῦναι*; Luke xii. 13, xx. 14, rest 10
times.
δοῦναι, vii. 5, 38, v. 31, xix. 31, xx. 32; Luke 8, rest 9 times.
βῆμα, vii. 5 (οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός) Deut. ii. 5 (οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός), xii. 21, xviii.
12, 16, 17, xxv. 6, 10, 17; Paul twice, rest twice.
περιτομή, vii. 8, x. 45, xi. 2; Paul 23, rest 11 times.
περιτέμνειν, vii. 8, Gen. xxi. 4; Acts xv. 1, 5, 24, xvi. 3, xxi. 21; Luke
i. 59, ii. 21, Paul 8, rest 2 times.
πατριάρχης, vii. 8, 9, ii. 29, Heb. vii. 4, only.
ἡλθόν, vii. 9, Gen. xxxviii. 11; Acts xvii. 5; Paul 9, rest 2 times.
ἐξαίρειν, i. 10, 34, Exod. iii. 8; Acts xii. 11, xxi. 27, xxv. 17; Paul 3,
rest 2 times.
ἐναντίον, vii. 10, Gen. xli. 37; viii. 32, Isaiah liii. 7 Luke i. 8, xx. 26,
xxiv. 19, Mk. ii. 12 (1) only.
ἡγούμενος, vii. 10, xiv. 12, xv. 22, cf. xxvi. 2; Luke xxii. 26, Heb. xiii. 7,
17, 24.
ἐκαστρέλλειν, vii. 12, ix. 30, xi. 22, xii. 11, xiii. 26, xvii. 14, xxv. 21;
Luke 3 times, Gal. iv. 4, 6, only.
γένος, vii. 13, 19, iv. 6, 36, xiii. 26, xvii. 28, 29, xviii. 2, 24; Paul 5, rest 7
times.
μεταναεῖσθαι, vii. 14, x. 32, xx. 17, xxiv. 25, only.
φυγή (man), vii. 14, Deut. x. 22; Acts ii. 41, 43, iii. 23, xxvii. 37; Rom.
xiii. 1, 2 Pet. ii. 14, Rev. xvi. 3. Constr. cf. Luke xiv. 31.
μνημα, vii. 16, ii. 29; Luke viii. 27, xxiii. 23, xxiv. 1, rest 3 times.
τιμή (price), vii. 16, iv. 34, v. 2, 3, xix. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, Mt. xxvii.
6, 9, only.
ἀργύριον, vii. 16, iii. 6, viii. 20, xix. 19, xx. 33; Luke ix. 3, xix. 15, 23,
xxii. 5, rest 11 times.
ἐγγίζειν, vii. 17, ix. 3, x. 9, xxi. 32, xxii. 6, xxiii. 15; Luke 18, rest 19
times.
αὐξάνειν, vii. 17, Exod. i. 7; Acts vi. 7, xii. 24, xix. 20; Luke i. 80, ii. 40,
ii. 27, xiii. 19, rest 4 and in other senses 10 times.
πληθύνειν, vii. 17, Exod. i. 7; Acts vi. 7, ix. 31, xii. 24, rest 6 times.
βρέφος, vii. 19; Luke i. 41, 44, ii. 12, 16, xviii. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 1 Pet. ii.
2, only.
κακοῦν, vii. 19, Exod. i. 11; Acts vii. 6, Gen. xv. 13; Acts xii. 1, xiv. 2,
xviii. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 13, only.
ῥωγοποιεῖν, vii. 19, Exod. i. 17, 18, 22; Luke xvii. 33, 1 Tim. vi. 13, only.
ἀνατρέφειν, vii. 20, 21, xxii. 3, only.
μῆν, vii. 20, xviii. 11, xix. 8, xx. 3, xxviii. 11; Luke 5, rest 8 times.
ἐκθέναι, vii. 21, xi. 4, xviii. 26, xxviii. 23, only.
ἀναεῖσθαι (de tollere liberos), vii. 21, Exod. ii. 5; ἀναεῖν, vii. 28
twice, ii. 23, v. 33, 36, ix. 23, 24, 29, x. 39, xii. 2, xiii. 28, xvi. 27, xxii.
20, xxiii. 15, 21, 27, xxv. 3, xxvi. 10; Luke xxii. 2, xxiii. 32, rest 3
times.
παίδευσιν, vii. 22, xxii. 3; 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 25, Tit. ii. 12, only;
παῖδ. (castigare), Luke xxiii. 16, 22, rest 6 times.
δυνατός, vii. 22, ii. 24, xi. 17, xviii. 24, xx. 16, xxv. 5; Luke xxiv. 19, i.
49, xiv. 31, xviii. 27; Paul 12, rest 13 times.
ἐπιθεπεσθαι, vii. 23, vi. 3, xv. 36, Mt. xxv. 36, 43, James i. 27; of God,
Acts xv. 14, Luke i. 68, 78, vii. 16; Heb. ii. 6, only.
πληροῦν (of time), vii. 23, 30, ix. 23, xxiv. 27; Luke xxi. 24; Mk. i. 15,
John vii. 8; (of fulness), Acts, ii. 2, 28, v. 3, 28, xiii. 52, Luke ii. 40,
iii. 5, rest 24 times.

- ἐκδίκῃς, vii. 24 ; Luke xviii. 7, 8, xxi. 22, all with ποιεῖν except the last; rest 5 times.
- πατάσσειν, vii. 24, *Exod.* ii. 12 ; Acts xii. 7, 23 ; Luke xxii. 49, 50 ; rest 5 times.
- νομίζειν, vii. 25, viii. 20, xiv. 19, xvi. 13, 27, xvii. 29, xxi. 29 ; Luke ii. 44, iii. 23, rest 6 times.
- ἐπιέναι, vii. 26, xxiii. 11, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18, only. See again below.
- ἀπωθεῖν, vii. 27, 39, xiii. 46 ; Rom. xi. 1, 2 ; 1 Tim. i. 19, only.
- ἄρχων, vii. 27, 35 twice, *Ex.* ii. 14 ; Acts iii. 17, iv. 5, 8, 26, xiii. 27, xiv. 5, xvi. 19, xxiii. 5 ; Luke 8, rest 18 times.
- δικαστῆς, vii. 27, 35, *Exod.* ii. 14 ; Luke xii. 14, only.
- δραμα, vii. 31, *Exod.* iii. 3 ; Acts ix. 10, 12, x. 3, 17, 19, xi. 5, xii. 9, xvi. 9, 10, xviii. 9 ; Mt. xvii. 9, only.
- κατανοεῖν, vii. 31, 32, xi. 6, xxvii. 39 ; Luke vi. 41, xii. 24, 27, xx. 23 ; Rom. iv. 19 ; Mt. vii. 3 ; rest 4 times.
- ἐντρομος, vii. 32, xvi. 29, both with γερόμενος ; Heb. xii. 21, only.
- σύν, vii. 35, and 50 times ; Luke 26, Paul 22, rest 31 times.
- ἐξάγειν, vii. 36, 40, v. 19, xii. 17, xiii. 17, xvi. 37, 39, xxi. 38 ; Luke xxiv. 50 ; rest 4 times.
- δέχεσθαι, vii. 38, 59, iii. 21, viii. 14, xi. 1, xvii. 11, xxi. 17, xxii. 5, xxviii. 21 ; Luke 15, rest 30 times.
- στρέφειν, vii. 39, 42, xiii. 46 ; Luke 8, rest 9 times.
- ἀνάγειν, vii. 41, ix. 39, xii. 4, xvi. 34 ; Luke ii. 22, iv. 5, xxii. 66 (3 Kings iii. 16, 2 Chron. xxix. 21), Rom. x. 7, Heb. xiii. 20, Mt. iv. 1, only. In sense of putting off to sea, Acts 13 times ; Luke once, only.
- εὐφραίνειν, vii. 41, ii. 26 ; Luke xii. 19, xv. 23, 24, 29, 32, xvi. 19 ; Rom. xv. 10, 2 Cor. ii. 2, Gal. iv. 27, Rev. thrice, only.
- στρατιά, vii. 42 ; Luke ii. 13, only, (3 Kings xxii. 19).
- ἀναλαμβάνειν, vii. 43, *Amos* v. 26 ; Acts i. 2, 11, 22, x. 16, xx. 13, 14, xxiii. 31, rest 5 times.
- διατασσειν, vii. 44, xxiv. 23 ; xviii. 2, xx. 13, xxiii. 31 ; Luke iii. 13, viii. 55, xvii. 9, 10 ; Paul 5 times ; Tit. i. 5, only.
- εισάγειν, vii. 45, ix. 8, xxi. 28, 29, 37, xxii. 24 ; Luke ii. 27, xiv. 21, xxii. 54 ; rest twice, only.
- ἐξωθεῖν, vii. 45, xxvii. 39 only ; (*Jerem.* xxiv. 9, &c., &c.).
- προπορεύεσθαι, vii. 47, *Ex.* xxxii. 1 ; Luke i. 76, only.
- ὑψιστος, absolute, vii. 48 (cf. xvi. 17, ii. 33, v. 31, xxiv. 49) ; Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35 (cf. ii. 14, viii. 28, xix. 38), only. Cf. Mk. v. 7, Heb. vii. 1.
- χειροποιήτος, vii. 48, xvii. 24 ; Mk. xiv. 58, Eph. ii. 11, Heb. ix. 11, 24 only. Other compounds of *χεῖρ*, used by the author only : *χειραγωγῆν*, ix. 8, xxii. 11 ; *χειραγωγός*, xiii. 11. *χειροτονεῖν*, xiv. 23 and 2 Cor. viii. 9 only.
- προκαταγγέλλειν, vii. 52, iii. 18, 24, only (2 Cor. ix. 5 much too doubtful to quote).
- δικαιός, absolute, vii. 52, iii. 14, xxii. 14 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18 (cf. James v. 6), only.
- προδοτής, vii. 52 ; Luke vi. 16, 2 Tim. iii. 4, only.
- φανεύς, vii. 52, iii. 14, xxviii. 4 ; Mt. xxii. 7, 1 Pet. iv. 15, Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15, only.
- διαπρίειν, vii. 54, v. 33, only ; (1 Chron. xx. 3).
- ὑπάρχειν, vii. 55, and 25 times ; Luke 7, Paul 9, rest 6 times.
- ἀτενίζειν εἰς, vii. 55, vi. 15, i. 10, iii. 4, xi. 6, xiii. 9 ; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13 only ; *ἀτ. τινί*, iii. 12, x. 4, xiv. 9, xxiii. 1 ; Luke iv. 20, xxii. 56, only.
- πλήρης, vii. 55, vi. 3, 5, 8, ix. 36, xi. 24, xiii. 10, xix. 28 ; Luke iv. 1, v. 12 ; rest 7 times.

διανοίγειν, vii. 56, xvi. 14, xvii. 3; Luke ii. 23, xxiv. 31, 32, 45, Mk. ii. 34, 35, only.
δυνέχειν, vii. 57, xviii. 5, xxviii. 8; Luke iv. 38, viii. 37, 45, xii. 50, xix. 43, xxii. 63, rest thrice only.
ὀρμαίν, vii. 57, xix. 29; Luke viii. 33, Mt. viii. 32, Mk. v. 13, only.
δοκίμασθόν, vii. 57, i. 14, ii. 1, 46, iv. 24, v. 12, viii. 6, xii. 20, xv. 25, xviii. 12, xix. 29; Rom. xv. 6, only.
λιθοβολεῖν, vii. 58, 59, xiv. 5; Luke xiii. 34, rest 5 times (*Ex.* xix. 13).
νεανίας, vii. 58, xx. 9, xxiii. 17, 18, 22, only.
ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, vii. 59 and 19 times; Luke xxii. 3; Paul 5, rest 5 times.
κοιμᾶσθαι (of dying), vii. 60, xiii. 36; Paul 6, rest 7 times. Otherwise, Acts xii. 6; Luke xxii. 45; Matth. xxviii. 13.

To this very remarkable list of words we have still to add a number of expressions which further betray the Author of the Acts and Gospel:—

vi. 10. *καὶ οὐκ ἰσχυρὸν ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει.* Luke xxi. 15. *ἐγὼ χάριθ' ὁμολοῶ ἡμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν ἣ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι . . . πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν.*

vi. 12. The participle *ἐπιστάς* added to a finite verb: xvii. 5, xxii. 13, xxiii. 11, 27; Luke ii. 38, iv. 39, x. 40.

vi. 13. *ῥήματα λαλῶν κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ νόμου.* xxi. 28 κατὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου (τοῦ ἁγίου) ¹ τοῦτου διδάσκων, . . . καὶ κεκοινῶκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον. Cf. Mt. xxiv. 15.

vi. 14. *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος*, ii. 22, iii. 6, iv. 10, xxii. 8, xxvi. 9; Luke xviii. 37, xxiv. 19; Mt. 2, Mk. 1, John 3 times.

vii. 2. *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε*, xxii. 1 the same; *ἀνδ. ἀδελφοί*, i. 16, ii. 29, 37, vii. 2, 26, xiii. 15, 26, 38, xv. 7, 13, xxiii. 1, 6, xxviii. 17, and with *ἀκούσατε* added in ii. 22, xiii. 16; *ἄνδρες* alone with name of place or people, i. 11, ii. 14, 22, iii. 12, v. 35, xiii. 16, xvii. 22, xix. 35, xxi. 28; *ἀνὴρ* with name, v. 1, viii. 9, 27, ix. 12, x. 28, xi. 20, xxii. 3.

vii. 2. *πρὶν ἢ*, with infinitive and accusative ii. 20; Luke xxii. 61; Mt. i. 18, Mk. xiv. 30; with conjunct. and optat. xxv. 16, Luke ii. 20, xxii. 34.

vii. 3. *πρὸς*, with accusative after *εἰπεῖν*, i. 7, ii. 29, 37, iii. 22, iv. 8, 19, 23, v. 9, 35, viii. 20, ix. 10, 15, x. 21, xii. 8, 15, xv. 7, 36, xviii. 6, 14, xix. 2 twice, 3, xxi. 37, xxii. 8, 10, 21, 25, xxiii. 3; = 30 times; Luke upwards of 70 times, cf. Mt. iii. 15 (?), Mk. 2, John 11 times, only.

vii. 4. *γῆ*, with name of country without article (cf. 11), vii. 29, 36, 40, xiii. 17, 19; Mt. 9, rest 2 times.

" *μετὰ τὸ*, followed by infinitive, i. 3, x. 41, xv. 13, xix. 21, xx. 1; Luke xii. 5, xxii. 20.

vii. 6. *μετ' αὐτόν*, xix. 4; xiii. 25, *μετ' ἐμέ*.

vii. 9. *καὶ ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ*, Gen. xxxix. 2, cf. 21, 23; x. 38, . . . *οὗτος ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Cf. John iii. 2.

vii. 10. *οἶκος*, family, vii. 42, ii. 36, x. 2, xi. 14, xvi. 15, 31, xviii. 8; Luke 7 times, rest 16; *ὁσος ὁ οἶκος*, Acts vii. 10, ii. 2, xviii. 8.

vii. 17. *ἀνέβαινεν καὶ πληθύενεν*, vi. 7, xii. 24.

¹ The words between brackets are found in the Codices A, C, and others, but are omitted by other ancient authorities.

- vii. 18, ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ., xxvii. 33; cf. Luke xxi. 24 (11). Paul 4, rest 3 times.
- vii. 19, τοῦ κοιεῖν. The use of the genitive τοῦ before a verb in the infinitive, iii. 2, 12, viii. 40, ix. 15, x. 25, 47, xiii. 47, xiv. 9, 18, xv. 20, xviii. 10, xx. 3, 20, 27, 30, xxi. 12, xxiii. 15, 20, xxvi. 18 twice, xxvii. 1, 20, = 23 times; Luke 25 times, rest 36.
- vii. 22, ἦν δυνατός ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις. xviii. 24, δυνατός ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. Luke xxiv. 19, δυνατός ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ.
- vii. 23 . . . τεσσερακονταετής χρόνος . . . xiii. 18 . . . τεσσερακονταετή χρόνον.
- vii. 23 . . . ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ . . . 1 Cor. ii. 9
 "ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη"
 cf. Luke xxiv. 38; cf. Acts x. 9; ἀναβαίνειν, Acts 20 times,
 Luke 9 times, rest frequently. καρδιά occurs in Acts 21, Luke
 24 times, rest frequently.
 "οἱ Ἰσραὴλ, 37, v. 21, ix. 15, x. 36; Luke i. 16, Paul 3, rest 4
 times.
- vii. 24, ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν . . . Luke xviii. 7 and 8 . . . ποιήσει
 τὴν ἐκδίκησιν.
- vii. 26, νομίζειν, πᾶσι accusative and infinitive, xiv. 19, xvi. 13, 27, xvii. 29;
 only once used otherwise xxi. 29; so Luke ii. 44; rare elsewhere.
- vii. 26, θυμὸν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὄρε . . . Mt. xvii. 13; τότε συνῆλθεν
 ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.
- vii. 26, ἡ χεὶρ, h. 23, v. 12 xi. 30, xiv. 3, xv. 23, xix. 11, 26; ἐν χειρὶ,
 v. 26.
- vii. 26, τῇ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ . . . xxiii. 11, τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ. τῇ
 ἐπιούσῃ κείνῃ a substantive, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18, ἐπιέναι does
 not occur in any other writing of the N. T. The τε in this passage may
 not be sufficiently certain, but it occurs some 140 times in Acts, 8 in
 Luke, and only 46 times in the rest of the N. T.
- vii. 28, ὃν τρόπον h. 14, Acts i. 11, xv. 11, xxvii. 25; Luke xiii. 34,
 Mt. xxiii. 37, 2 Tim. iii. 6, otherwise τρόπος 6 times.
- vii. 29, ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, viii. 1, ix. 37, xiv. 1, xxi. 1, xxii. 17; Luke 32 times,
 rest 9.
- vii. 30, ἐν φλογὶ . . . Luke xvi. 24, ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ, only.
- vii. 30, λήψιν τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου, Ex. iii. 5; Acts xiii. 25, τὸ
 ὑπόδημα τὸν ποδῶν λῶσαι.—ὑπόδημα, Luke iii. 16, x. 4, xv. 22 xx
 36, rest 4 times.
- vii. 34, καὶ ἐν, h. 17, x. 5, xiii. 11, xvi. 37, xx. 22, 25, xxii. 16, xxi. 6;
 elsewhere 12 times.
- vii. 36, ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς, absol. v. 19, Mk. xv. 20.
- vii. 36, ἡμέρας ἡμῶν, vii. 11, 12, 15, 19, 39, 44, 4 twice, 51, 52, iii. 13,
 25, v. 41, xiii. 17, 32, 36, xv. 16, xxi. 14, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 25.
- vii. 36, ἐδέξατο λόγια ζωῆς . . . Rom. iii. 2 . . . τὰ λόγια
 τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. John vi. 51, Heb. iv. 12, v. 12, x. 20; Acts viii. 14
 ἐδέξατο τὴν λέγον τοῦ θεοῦ . . . xi. 1 . . . ἐδέξαντο τὸν
 λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ . . . xvii. 11 . . . ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον
 Rev. ix. 20
- vii. 41, ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν . . . Rev. ix. 20
 ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, cf. Heb. i. 10 (Is. ci. 25, cxxxv
 15).
- vii. 42, στρατιὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Luke ii. 13, . . . στρατιὰ οὐρανίου,
 nowhere else in N. T. 3 Kings xxii. 19 . . . στρατιὰ τοῦ
 οὐρανοῦ
 "καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν . . . 1. 20
 γέγραπται καὶ ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν.
- vii. 45, ἀπὸ προσώπου, iii. 19, v. 41; Rev. vi. 16, xii. 14, xx. 11, only.

- vii. 46, *ὅς εὗρεν χάριν ἐν ὧπιον τοῦ θεοῦ* . . . Luke i. 30, *εἶρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*; cf. 2 Tim. i. 18 (*Gen.* xxxiii. 10).
 " *ἐν ὧπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, iv. 19, x. 31, 33, cf. viii. 21, x. 4; Luke i. 6, 19, xii. 6, xvi. 15.
 vii. 55, *ἐστὼς* for *ἐστηκώς*, vii. 56, iv. 14, v. 23, 25, xvi. 9, xxi. 40, xxii. 25, xxiv. 21, xxv. 10; Luke 4 times.
 " *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου*; vi. 5, *πλήρης . . . πνεύματος ἁγίου* . . . xi. 24, *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου* . . . vi. 3 . . . *πλήρεις πνεύματος* . . . cf. 8, ix. 36, *πλήρης ἔργων ἀγαθῶν* . . . cf. xiii. 10, xix. 28; Luke iv. 1, *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου*, cf. v. 12. Not elsewhere in N. T.
 vii. 56, *θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανούς διηνοιγμένους*;¹ x. 11, *θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγμένον*.
 vii. 57, *φωνὴ μεγάλη*, 60, viii. 7, xiv. 10, xvi. 28, xxvi. 24; Luke 7 times, Rev. 19, rest 5 times. *κράζαντες φωνὴ μεγάλη*, Acts vii. 57, 60, Mt. xxvii. 50; *κράζας φωνὴ μεγάλη*, Rev. vi. 10; *ἐκαραζαν φωνὴ μεγάλη*, cf. Mk. i. 26, v. 7, Acts xxiv. 21, Rev. vii. 2, 10, x. 3, xiv. 15, xviii. 2, xix. 17.
 vii. 58, *παρὰ τοῦς πόδας*, iv. 35, 37 (l), v. 2; Mt. xv. 30 only. Everywhere else *πρός*.
 vii. 58, *καλούμενος*, with name, i. 12, 23, iii. 11, viii. 10, ix. 11, x. 1, xiii. 1, xv. 22, 27, xxvii. 8, 14, 16; Luke 9 times, Rev. 4 times.
 vii. 60, *θεῖς τὰ γόνατα*, ix. 40, xx. 36, xxi. 5; Luke xxii. 41, cf. v. 8, Mk. xv. 19.

It is impossible, we think to examine this analysis in which we might fairly have included other points which we have passed over, without feeling the certain conviction that the speech of Stephen was composed by the author of the rest of the Acts of the Apostles. It may not be out of place to quote some remarks of Lekebusch at the close of an examination of the language of the Acts in general, undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the literary characteristics of the book, which, although originally having no direct reference to this episode in particular, may well serve to illustrate our own results:—"An unprejudiced critic must have acquired the conviction from the foregoing linguistic examination that, throughout the whole of the Acts of the Apostles, and partly also the Gospel, the same style of language and expression generally prevails, and therefore that our book is an original work, independent of written sources on the whole, and proceeding from a single pen. For when the same expressions are everywhere found, when a long row of words which only recur in the Gospel and Acts, or comparatively only very seldom in other works of the New Testament, appear equally in all parts, when certain forms of words, peculiarities of word-order, construction and phraseology, indeed even whole sentences, recur in the different sections, a compilation out of documents by different earlier writers can no longer be thought

¹ D^{ss} E, H, and other codices read *ἀνεωγμένους*.

of, and it is 'beyond doubt, that we have to consider our writing as the work of a single author, who has impressed upon it the stamp of a distinct literary style' (Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851. p. 107). The use of written sources is certainly not directly excluded by this, and probably the linguistic peculiarities, of which some of course exist in isolated sections of our work, may be referred to this. But as these peculiarities consist chiefly of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, which may rather be ascribed to the richness of the author's vocabulary than to his talent for compilation, and generally in comparison with the great majority of points of agreement almost disappear, we must from the first be prepossessed against the theory that our author made use of written sources, and only allow ourselves to be moved to such a conclusion by further distinct phenomena in the various parts of our book, especially as the prologue of the Gospel, so often quoted for the purpose, does not at all support it. But in any case, as has already been remarked, the opinion that, in the Acts of the Apostles, the several parts are strung together almost without alteration, is quite irreconcilable with the result of our linguistic examination. Zeller rightly says:—'Were the author so dependent a compiler, the traces of such a proceeding must necessarily become apparent in a thorough dissimilarity of language and expression. And this dissimilarity would be all the greater if his sources, as in that case we could scarcely help admitting, belonged to widely separated spheres as regards language and mode of thought. On the other hand, it would be altogether inexplicable that, in all parts of the work, the same favourite expressions, the same turns, the same peculiarities of vocabulary and syntax should meet us. This phenomenon only becomes conceivable when we suppose that the contents of our work were brought into their present form by one and the same person, and that the work as it lies before us was not merely *compiled* by some one, but was also *composed* by him.'"¹

Should an attempt be made to argue that, even if it be conceded that the language is that of the Author of Acts, the sentiments may be those actually expressed by Stephen, it would at once be obvious that such an explanation is not only purely arbitrary and incapable of proof, but opposed to the facts of the case. It is not the language only which can be traced to the Author of the rest of the Acts but, as we have shown, the whole plan of the speech is the same as that of others in different parts of the work. Stephen speaks exactly as Peter does before him and Paul at a later period. There is just that amount of variety which a writer of not unlimited resources can introduce to express the views of

Lekebusch, *Die Com. und Entsch. der Apostelgesch.*, p. 79 f.

different men under different circumstances, but there is so much which is nevertheless common to them all, that community of authorship cannot be denied. On the other hand, the improbabilities of the narrative, the singular fact that Stephen is not mentioned by the Apostle Paul, and the peculiarities which may be detected in the speech itself receive their very simple explanation when linguistic analysis so clearly demonstrates that, whatever small nucleus of fact may lie at the basis of the episode, the speech actually ascribed to the martyr Stephen is nothing more than a later composition put into his mouth by the Author of the Acts.

our writing
upon it the
rb. 1851. p.
directly ex-
es, of which
rk, may be
chiefly of
ness of the
, and gener-
es of agree-
prepossessed
ten sources,
nclusion by
of our book,
noted for the
case, as has
Acts of the
most without
our linguistic
nor so depen-
st necessarily
anguage and
he greater if
lp admitting,
anguage and
be altogether
ame favourite
of vocabulary
only becomes
our work were
he person, and
compiled by

if it be con-
cts, the senti-
n. it would at
y purely arbi-
ts of the case.
the Author of
le plan of the
ts of the work.
nd Paul at a
which a writer
s the views of

CHAPTER VI.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PHILIP AND THE EUNUCH. PETER AND CORNELIUS.

WE have been forced to enter at such length into the discussion of the speech and martyrdom of Stephen, that we cannot afford space to do more than merely glance at the proceedings of his colleague Philip, as we pass on to more important points in the work before us. The author states that a great persecution broke out at the time of Stephen's death, and that all (πάντες) the community of Jerusalem were scattered abroad "except the Apostles," (πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων). That the heads of the Church, who were well known, should remain unmolested in Jerusalem, whilst the whole of the less known members of the community were persecuted and driven to flight, is certainly an extraordinary and suspicious statement.¹ Even apologists are obliged to admit that the account of the dispersion of the whole church is hyperbolic;² but exaggeration and myth enter so largely and persistently into the composition of the Acts of the Apostles, that it is difficult, after any attentive scrutiny, seriously to treat the work as in any strict sense historical at all. It has been conjectured by some critics, as well in explanation of this statement as in connection with theories regarding the views of Stephen, that the persecution in question was limited to the Hellenistic community to which Stephen belonged, whilst the Apostles and others, who were known as faithful observers of the law and of the temple worship,³ were not regarded as heretics by the orthodox Jews.⁴ The narrative in the Acts does not seem to support the view that the persecution was limited to the Hellenists;⁵ but beyond the fact vouched for by Paul that about this time there was a persecution, we have no data whatever regarding that event. Philip, it is said, went down to the city of Samaria, and "was preaching the

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 46; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246; Schleiermacher, Einl. N. T., p. 359; Schneckenburger, App., p. 182 f.; Zeller, App., p. 153 f. Cf. Lekebusch, App., p. 98 f.

² Alford, Creek Test., ii. p. 84; Baumgarten, App., i. p. 161; Hackett, Acts, p. 119; Meyer, App., p. 197.

³ iii. 1, 11, iv. 1, v. 25.

⁴ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 46; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246; Schneckenburger, App., p. 183; Tjeenk-Willink, Just. Mart., p. 25 f.; Zeller, App., p. 154.

⁵ Baumgarten, Acts, i. p. 160 f.; Hackett, Acts, p. 119; Humphrey, Acts, p. 71; Lekebusch, App., p. 355 f., anm.; Meyer, App., p. 197; Stier, Reden d. Ap., i. p. 184 f.

Christ" to them. As the statement that "the multitudes with one accord gave heed to the things spoken" to them by Philip is ascribed to the miracles which he performed there, we are unable to regard the narrative as historical, and still less so when we consider the supernatural agency by which his further proceedings are directed and aided. We need only remark that the Samaritans, although only partly of Jewish origin, and rejecting the Jewish Scriptures with the exception of the Pentateuch, worshipped the same God as the Jews, were circumcised, and were equally prepared as a nation to accept the Messiah. The statement that the Apostles Peter and John went to Samaria, in order, by the imposition of hands, to bestow the gift of the Holy Spirit to the converts baptized by Philip, does not add to the general credibility of the history.² As Bleek³ has well remarked, nothing is known or said as to whether the conversion of the Samaritans effected any change in their relations towards the Jewish people and the temple in Jerusalem; and the mission of Philip to the Samaritans, as related in the Acts, cannot in any case be considered as having any important bearing on the question before us. We shall not discuss the episode of Simon at all, although, in the opinion of eminent critics, it contains much that is suggestive of the true character of the Acts of the Apostles. An "Angel of the Lord" (*ἄγγελος κυρίου*) speaks to Philip, and desires him to go to the desert way from Jerusalem to Gaza,⁴ where the Spirit tells him⁵ to draw near and join himself to the chariot of a man of Ethiopia who had come to worship at Jerusalem, and was then returning home. Philip runs thither, and hearing him read Isaiah, expounds the passage to him, and at his own request the eunuch is at once baptized. "And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away (*πνεῦμα κυρίου ἔρπασεν*) Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more; for he went on his way rejoicing; but Philip was found at Azotus."⁶ Attempts have of course been made to explain naturally the supernatural features of this narrative.⁷ Ewald, who is master of the art of rationalistic explanation, says, with regard to the order given by the angel: "He felt impelled as by the power and the clear voice of an angel" to go in that direction; and the final miracle is disposed of by a contrast of the disinterestedness of

¹ viii. 5 . . . ἐκήρυσσαν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 47; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246; Overbeck, Zu de Wette App., p. 123; Zeller, App., p. 156 f.

³ Hebraerbr., i. p. 57, ann. 72.

⁴ viii. 26.

⁵ v. 29.

⁶ v. 39 f. Azotus was upwards of 30 miles off.

⁷ Ewald, Gesch. des V. Isr., vi. p. 219 f.; Olshausen, Apostelgesch., p. 138. Meyer has abandoned his earlier views of this kind.

Philip with the conduct of Gehazi, the servant of Elisha; it was the desire to avoid reward, "which led him all the more hurriedly to leave his new convert;" "and it was as though the Spirit of the Lord himself snatched him from him another way," &c., &c. "From Gaza Philip repaired rapidly northward to Ashdod, &c."¹ The great mass of critics reject such evasions, and recognize that the Author relates miraculous occurrences. The introduction of supernatural agency in this way, however, removes the story from the region of history. Such statements are antecedently, and, indeed, coming from an unknown writer and without corroboration, are absolutely incredible, and no means exist of ascertaining what original tradition may have assumed this mythical character. Zeller supposes that only the personality and nationality of the Eunuch are really historical.² All that need here be added is, that the great majority of critics agree that the Ethiopian was probably at least a Proselyte of the Gate,³ as his going to Jerusalem to worship seems clearly to indicate.⁴ In any case, the mythical elements of this story, as well as the insufficiency of the details, deprive the narrative of historical value.⁵

The episodes of Stephen's speech and martyrdom and the mission of Philip are, in one respect especially, unimportant for the inquiry on which we are now more immediately engaged. They are almost completely isolated from the rest of the Acts: that is to say, no reference whatever is subsequently made to them as forming an precedent for the guidance of the church in the burning question which soon arose within it. Peter, as we shall see, when called upon to visit and baptize Cornelius, exhibits no recollection of his own mission to the Samaritans, and no knowledge of the conversion of the Ethiopian. Moreover, as Stephen plays so small a part in the history, and Philip does not reappear upon the scene after this short episode, no opportunity is afforded

¹ Gesch. V. Isr., vi. 219, 220.

² Die Apostelgesch., p. 176. Cf. Holtzmann, Bunsen's Bibelwerk, viii. 339.

³ Baumgarten, App., i. p. 183; von Dollinger, Chr. u. Kirche, p. 48; Ehrard, Zu Olsh. App., p. 135; Hackett, Acts, p. 126; Humphrey, Acts, p. 76; Lange, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 109; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 336; Leckebusch, App., p. 354; de Pressensé, Hist., i. p. 402; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. 158; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 126; Schliemann, Clementinen, p. 383; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 527; Thiersch, Die K. im ap. Z., p. 91; Wordsworth, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 80. Cf. Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 93; Stier, Red. d. Ap., i. 201; De Wette, App., p. 127 f.; Zeller, App., p. 176, ann. 1. Lange and some others are inclined to think that he was even a Proselyte of Righteousness.

⁴ Some critics doubt whether the term *εὐνοῦχος* does not indicate merely an official position. Zeller, App., p. 176, ann. 1; Milman, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 367 note. Humphrey maintains that it does so here, Acts, p. 76.

⁵ viii. 37 of the authorized version, which is omitted by Codices A, B, C, H, &c., and many others, and of course omitted as spurious by most editors, is an example of the way in which dogmas become antedated.

of comparing one part of their history with the rest. In passing on to the account of the baptism of Cornelius, we have at least the advantage of contrasting the action attributed to Peter with his conduct on earlier and later occasions, and a test is thus supplied which is of no small value for ascertaining the truth of the whole representation. To this narrative we must now address ourselves.

As an introduction to the important events at Cesarea, the Author of the Acts relates the particulars of a visit which Peter pays to Lydda and Joppa, during the course of which he performs two very remarkable miracles. At the former town he finds a certain man named *Aeneas*, paralysed, who had lain on a bed for eight years. Peter said to him "*Aeneas, Jesus the Christ healeth thee; arise and make thy bed.*" And he arose immediately.¹ As the consequence of this miracle, the writer states that: "*All who dwelt at Lydda and the Sharon saw him, who turned to the Lord.*"² The exaggeration of such a statement³ is too palpable to require argument. The effect produced by the supposed miracle is almost as incredible as the miracle itself, and the account altogether has little claim to the character of sober history.

This mighty work, however, is altogether eclipsed by a miracle which Peter performs about the same time at Joppa. A certain woman, a disciple, named *Tabitha*, who was "*full of good works,*" fell sick in those days and died, and when they washed her, they laid her in an upper chamber, and sent to Peter at Lydda, beseeching him to come to them without delay. When Peter arrived they took him into the upper chamber, where all the widows stood weeping, and showed coats and garments which *Dorcas* used to make while she was with them. "*But Peter put them all out, and kneeled down and prayed; and, turning to the body, said: Tabitha, arise.*" And she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter she sat up. And he gave her his hand, and raised her up, and when he called the saints and the widows, he presented her alive." Apparently, the raising of the dead did not produce as much effect as the cure of the paralytic, for the writer only adds here: "*And it was known throughout all Joppa; and many believed in the Lord.*"⁴ We shall hereafter have to speak of the perfect calmness and absence of surprise with which these early writers relate the most astonishing miracles. It is evident from the manner in which this story is narrated that the miracle was anticipated.⁵ The

¹ ix. 33, 34.

² ix. 35.

³ *Zeller, Apostelgesch.*, p. 177 f.

⁴ ix. 36—42.

⁵ *Zeller, Apg.*, p. 178; *Overbeck, Zu de Wette, Apg.*, p. 150. Cf. *Davidson, Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 249 f.; *Meyer, Apg.*, p. 234.










IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

1.8 2.0 2.2 2.5 2.8 3.2 3.6 4.0 4.5 5.0 5.6 6.3 7.1 8.0 9.0 10.0 11.2 12.5 14.0 16.0 18.0 20.0 22.4 25.0 28.0 31.5 36.0 40.0 45.0 50.0 56.0 63.0 71.0 80.0 90.0 100.0

10 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 4.0 5.0 6.0 8.0 10.0 12.5 16.0 20.0 25.0 31.5 40.0 50.0 63.0 80.0 100.0

ὑπερφῶν in which the body is laid cannot have been the room generally used for that purpose, but is probably the single upper chamber of such a house which the Author represents as specially adopted in anticipation of Peter's arrival.¹ The widows who stand by weeping and showing the garments made by the deceased complete the preparation. As Peter is sent for after Dorcas had died, it would seem as though the writer intimated that her friends expected him to raise her from the dead. The explanation of this singular phenomenon, however, becomes clear when it is remarked that the account of this great miracle is closely traced from that of the raising of Jairus' daughter in the Synoptics,² and more especially in the second Gospel.³ In that instance Jesus is sent for; and, on coming to the house, he finds people "weeping and wailing greatly." He puts them all forth, like Peter; and, taking the child by the hand, says to her: "Talitha koum," which is being interpreted: Maiden, I say unto thee, arise. And immediately the maiden arose and walked.⁴ Baur and others⁵ conjecture that even the name "Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas," was suggested by the words Ταλιθά κοῦμ, above quoted. The Hebrew original of Ταβιθά signifies "Gazelle," and they contend that it was used, like Ταλιθά, in the sense generally of: Maiden.⁶ These two astonishing miracles, re-

¹ Meyer, Apg., p. 234; Zeller, Apg., p. 178, ann. 1.

² Mt. ix. 18, 19, 23—25; Mk. v. 22, 23, 35—42; Luke viii. 41, 42, 49—56.

³ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 219, ann. 1; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 249 f., Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 414; Overbeck, Zu de W. Apg., p. 150; Schwanbeck, Quellen d. Schr. d. Lukas, i. p. 48; Zeller, Apg., p. 177.

⁴ Mk. v. 38—42.

⁵ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 219, ann. 1; Schwanbeck, Quellen, p. 48. In Mk. v. 41, Ταλιθά κοῦμ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον τὸ κοράσιον . . . In Acts ix. 36, Ταβιθά ἢ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς.

⁶ The leading peculiarities of the two accounts may be contrasted thus—

Acts ix. 36 . . . τις ἦν μαθήτρια ἰνομᾷ Ταβιθά, ἢ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς. 38. . . ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Π. ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ (λύδδ.), ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἀνδράς πρὸς αὐτὸν παρακαλοῦντες. Μὴ ἀκνήσθης διελθεῖν ἕως ἡμῶν. 39. . . πᾶσαι αἱ χήραι κλαίουσιν καὶ . . . 40. ἐμβαλὼν δὲ ἐξω πάντας ὁ Π. . . καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα εἶπεν. Ταβιθά ἀνάστηθι. ἢ δὲ . . . ἀνεκάθισεν. 41. δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν.

Luke viii. 41. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 52. ἐκλαίον δὲ πάντες καὶ . . . 54. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβαλὼν πάντας ἔξω*, καὶ κρατῆσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, ἐφώνησεν λέγων. Ὁ παῖς, ἔγειρον. 55. καὶ ἐπὶ τρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα.

Mark x. 40. . . αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβαλὼν πάντας . . . εἰσπορεύεται . . . 41. καὶ κρατῆσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ, Ταλιθά κοῦμ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον. Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. 42. καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τὸ κορ. κ.τ.λ.

* Although this is the reading of the Cod. A (and C, except the ἐξω) and others, it is omitted by other ancient MSS.

ported by an unknown writer, and without any corroboration, are absolutely incredible, and cannot prepossess any reasonable mind with confidence in the narrative to which they form an introduction, and the natural distrust which they awaken is fully confirmed when we find supernatural agency employed at every stage of the following history.

We are told¹ that a certain devout centurion, named Cornelius, "saw in a vision plainly" (εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι φανερώς) an angel of God, who said to him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, who is surnamed Peter, whose house is by the sea side." After giving these minute directions, the angel departed, and Cornelius sent three messengers to Joppa. Just as they approached the end of their journey on the morrow, Peter went up to the housetop to pray about the sixth hour, the usual time of prayer among the Jews.² He became very hungry, and while his meal was being prepared he fell into a trance and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending as it had been a great sheet let down by four corners, in which were all four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth and birds of the air. "And there came a voice to him: Rise, Peter; kill and eat. But Peter said: Not so Lord; for I never ate anything common or unclean. And the voice came unto him again a second time: What God cleansed call not thou common. This was done thrice; and straightway the vessel was taken up into heaven." While Peter "was doubting in himself" what the vision which he had seen meant, the men sent by Cornelius arrived, and "the Spirit said unto him: Behold men are seeking thee; but arise and get thee down and go with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them." Peter went with them on the morrow, accompanied by some of the brethren, and Cornelius was waiting for them with his kinsmen and near friends whom he had called together for the purpose. "And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell at his feet and worshipped. But Peter took him up, saying: Arise; I myself also am a man."³ Going in, he finds many persons assembled, to whom he said: "Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with, or come unto one of another nation; and yet God showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean. Therefore also I came without gainsaying when sent for. I ask, therefore, for what reason ye sent for me?" Cornelius narrates the particulars of his

¹ x. 1 ff.

² *Beald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. pp. 152, 222; *Lange*, *Das ap. Zeit.*, ii. 131; *Lightfoot*, *Works*, viii. 215 f.

³ x. 26; cf. xiv. 14, 15.

vision and continues: "Now, therefore, we are all present before God to hear all the things that have been commanded thee of the Lord. Then Peter opened his mouth and said: Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him," and so on. While Peter is speaking, "the Holy Spirit fell on all those who heard the word. And they of the circumcision who believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also has been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit; for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter: Can any one forbid the water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

We shall not waste time discussing the endeavours of Kuinoel, Neander, Lange, Ewald, and others, to explain away as much as possible the supernatural elements of this narrative, for their attempts are repudiated by most apologists, and the miraculous phenomena are too clearly described and too closely connected with the course of the story to be either ignored or eliminated. Can such a narrative, heralded by such miracles as the instantaneous cure of the paralytic Æneas, and the raising from the dead the maiden Dorcas be regarded as sober history? Of course many maintain that it can, and comparatively few have declared themselves against this.¹ We have, however, merely the narrative of an unknown author to set against unvarying experience, and that cannot much avail. We must now endeavour to discover how far this episode is consistent with the rest of the facts narrated in this book itself, and with such trustworthy evidence as we can elsewhere bring to bear upon it. We have already in an earlier part of our inquiry pointed out that in the process of exhibiting a general parallelism between the Apostles Peter and Paul, a very close *pendant* to this narrative has been introduced by the author into the history of Paul. In the story of the conversion of Paul, the Apostle has his vision on the way to Damascus,² and about the same time the Lord in a vision desires Ananias ("a devout man, according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews that dwell" in Damascus),³ "arise, and go to the street

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 90 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 249 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 414 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 340; Overbeck, Zu de W. Apg., p. 151 ff.; Stap, Origines, p. 52, note 1; Zeller, Apg., p. 179 ff.

² ix. 3 ff.

³ xxii. 12, Ἀνανίας δὲ τις, ἀνὴρ εὐλαβὴς (E and others, εὐσεβὴς) κατὰ τὸν νομὸν, μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικοῦντων Ἰερουσαλὴν. Cf. x. 1 f., Ἀνὴρ δὲ τις . . . Κορνήλιος . . . εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν . . . 22 . . . μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one named Saul of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth, and saw in a vision a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand on him that he might receive sight." On this occasion also the gift of the Holy Spirit is conferred and Saul is baptized.¹ Whilst such miraculous agency is so rare elsewhere, it is so common in the Acts of the Apostles that the employment of visions and of angels, under every circumstance, is one of the characteristics of the author, and may therefore be set down to his own imagination.

No one who examines this episode attentively, we think, can doubt that the narrative before us is composed in apologetic interest,² and is designed to have a special bearing upon the problem as to the relation of the Pauline Gospel to the preaching of the Twelve. Baur³ has acutely pointed out the significance of the very place assigned to it in the general history, and its insertion immediately after the conversion of Paul, and before the commencement of his ministry, as a legitimization of his apostleship of the Gentiles. One point stands clearly out of the strange medley of Jewish prejudice, Christian liberalism, and supernatural interference which constitute the elements of the story: the actual conviction of Peter regarding the relation of the Jew to the Gentile, that the Gospel is addressed to the former and that the Gentile is excluded,⁴ which has to be removed by a direct supernatural revelation from heaven. The author recognises that this was the general view of the primitive Church, and this is the only particular in which we can perceive historical truth in the narrative. The complicated machinery of visions and angelic messengers is used to justify the abandonment of Jewish restrictions, which was preached by Paul amidst so much virulent opposition. Peter anticipates and justifies Paul in his ministry of the uncircumcision, and the overthrow of Mosaic barriers has the sanction and seal of a divine command. We have to see whether the history itself does not betray its mythical character, not only in its supernatural elements, but in its inconsistency with other known or narrated incidents in the apostolical narrative.

There has been much difference of opinion as to whether the centurion Cornelius had joined himself in any recognised degree to the Jewish religion before this incident, and a majority of

¹ ix. 10-18.

² Baur, *Paulus*, i. p. 90 ff., 96 f., 143 ann. 1; Overbeck, *Zu de W. App.*, p. 151; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. 205; Zeller, *App.*, p. 189 f., 332.

³ Baur, *Paulus*, i. p. 90; Schneckenburger, *Zweck d. Apostelgesch.*, p. 170 ff.

⁴ Baur, *Paulus*, i. p. 91 ff.; Ehrhard, *Zu Olsh. App.*, p. 159 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 223 f.; Lechler, *Das ap. u. nachap. Z.*, p. 339; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 290; Olshausen, *App.*, p. 158 ff.; de Pressensé, *Hist.*, i. p. 408 f.; Thiersch, *Die K im ap. Z.*, p. 92 f.; Zeller, *App.*, p. 179 ff.

critics maintain that he is represented as a Proselyte of the Gate.¹ The terms in which he is described, x. 2, as *εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν*, certainly seem to indicate this, and probably the point would not have been questioned but for the fact that the writer evidently intends to deal with the subject of Gentile conversion, with which the representation that Cornelius was already a proselyte would somewhat clash.² Whether a proselyte or not, the Roman centurion is said to be "devout and fearing God with all his house, giving much alms to the people, and praying to God always;"³ and probably the ambiguity as to whether he had actually become affiliated in any way to Mosaism is intentional. When Peter, however, with his scruples removed by the supernatural communication with which he had just been favoured, indicates their previous strength by the statement: "Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with or come unto one of another nation,"⁴ the author evidently oversteps the mark, and betrays the unhistorical nature of the narrative; for such an affirmation not only could not have been made by Peter, but could only have been advanced by a writer who was himself a Gentile, and writing at a distance from the events described. There is no injunction of the Mosaic law declaring such intercourse unlawful,⁵ nor indeed is such a rule elsewhere heard of, and even apologists who refer to the point have no show of authority by which to support such a statement.⁶ Not only was there no legal prohibition, but it is impossible to conceive that there was any such exclusiveness practised by traditional injunction.⁷ As de Wette appropriately remarks, moreover, even if such

¹ Bleek, Einl., p. 370; Credner, Das N. T., ii. p. 28; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 250; von Döllinger, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 49; Ehrard, Zu Olsh. App., p. 161; Jovett, The Eps. of St. Paul, ii. p. 19; Kuinoel, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 358; Lange, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 131 f.; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 338 f.; Lekebusch, App., p. 215 f.; Milman, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 382 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 92; Olshausen, App., p. 161; de Pressensé, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 407 f.; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., pp. 126, 139; Stier, Red. d. Apos., i. p. 204; Thiersch, K. im. ap. Z., p. 91; Weiseler, Chron. d. ap. Z., p. 145. Cf. Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 110; Zeller, App., p. 190.

² Zeller, App., p. 190; Overbeck, Zu de Wette, App., p. 153; Meyer, App., p. 238 f. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 290 f.

³ Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 242; Overbeck, Zu de Wette App., p. 159; De Wette, App., p. 158; Zeller, App., p. 187.

⁴ Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 116; Beelen, Act. Apost., p. 284 f.; Ehrard, Zu Olsh. App., p. 168; Grotius, Annot. in N. T., v. p. 83; Hackett, Acts, p. 150 f.; Kuinoel, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 377 f.; Lightfoot, Works, viii. p. 217 f.; Meyer, App., p. 247 f.; Oertel, Paulus, p. 210 f.; Schoettgen, Horæ Hebr., p. 448. The passages in Juvenal, Sat., xvi. 103, and Tacitus, Hist., v. 5, sometimes quoted, have no real bearing on the subject. The habits of Jews living amongst strange and idolatrous nations, by whom they were too often oppressed and persecuted, have nothing to do with such an episode as the present.

⁷ De Wette quotes against it Schemoth Rabba, sect. 19 f., 118. 3. ad. Exod. xii. 2: "Hoc idem est, quod scriptum dicit Jes. lvi. 3: Et non dicit filius advenæ, qui adhæsit Domino, dicendo: separando separavit me Dominus a populo suo." Apostelgesch., p. 158.

a prohibition existed as regards idolators, it would still be inconceivable how it could apply to Cornelius: "a righteous man and fearing God, and of good report among all the nation of the Jews."¹ It is also inconsistent with the zeal for proselytism displayed by the Pharisees,² the strictest sect of the Jews; and the account given by Josephus of the conversion of Izates of Adiabene is totally against it.³ There is a slight trait which, added to others, tends to complete the demonstration of the unhistorical character of this representation. Peter is said to have lived many days in Joppa with one Simon, a tanner, and it is in his house that the messengers of Cornelius find him.⁴ Now the tanner's trade was considered impure amongst the Jews,⁵ and it was almost pollution to live in Simon's house. It is argued by some commentators that the fact that Peter lodged there is mentioned to show that he had already emancipated himself from Jewish prejudices.⁶ However this may be, it is strangely inconsistent that a Jew who has no objection to live with a tanner should, at the same time, consider it unlawful to hold intercourse of any kind with a pious Gentile, who, if not actually a Proselyte of the Gate, had every qualification for becoming one. This indifference to the unclean and polluting trade of the tanner, moreover, is inconsistent with the reply which Peter gives to the voice which bids him slay and eat: "Not so, Lord, for I never ate anything common or unclean." No doubt the intercourse to which Peter refers indicates, or at least includes, eating and drinking with one of another country, and this alone could present any intelligible difficulty, for the mere transaction of business or conversation with strangers must have been daily necessary to the Jews. It must be remarked, however, that, when Peter makes the statement which we are discussing, nothing whatever is said of eating with the Centurion or sitting with him at table. This leads to a striking train of reflection upon the whole episode. It is a curious thing that the supernatural vision, which is designed to inform Peter and the Apostles that the Gentiles might be received into the Church, should take the form of a mere declaration that the distinction of clean and unclean animals was no longer binding, and that he might indifferently kill and eat. One might have thought that, on the supposition that Heaven desired to give Peter and the Church a command to

¹ x. 22; *De Wette*, *Apg.*, p. 158.

² Mt. xxiii. 15.

³ *Antiq.* xx. 2, 3.

⁴ ix. 43, x. 6.

⁵ *Schoettgen*, *Horæ Hebr.*, p. 447; *Alford*, *Greek Test.*, ii. p. 109; *Hackett*, *Acts*, p. 144; *Meyer*, *Apg.*, p. 235; *Renan*, *Les Apôtres*, p. 199; *De Wette*, *Apg.*, p. 150; *Wordsworth*, *Greek Test.*, *Acts*, p. 88.

⁶ *De Wette*, *Apg.*, p. 150; *Overbeck*, *ib.*, p. 150.

admit the Gentiles unconditionally to the benefits of the Gospel, this would be simply and clearly stated. This was not done at all, and the intimation by which Peter supposes himself justified in considering it lawful to go to Cornelius is, in the first place, merely on the subject of animals defined as clean and unclean. Doubtless the prohibition as to certain meats might tend to continue the separation between Jew and Gentile, and the disregard of such distinctions of course promoted general intercourse with strangers; but this by no means explains why the abrogation of this distinction is made the intimation to receive Gentiles into the Church. When Peter returns to Jerusalem we are told that "they of the circumcision"—that is to say, the whole Church there, since at that period all were "of the circumcision," and this phrase further indicates that the writer has no historical stand-point—contended with him. The subject of the contention we might suppose was the baptism of Gentiles; but not so: the charge brought against him was: "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."¹ The subject of Paul's dispute with Peter at Antioch simply was that, "before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they came he withdrew, fearing them of the circumcision."² That the whole of these passages should turn merely on the fact of eating with men who were uncircumcised, is very suggestive, and as the Church at Jerusalem make no allusion to the baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles, it would lead to the inference that nothing was known of such an event, and that the circumstance was simply added to some other narrative; and this is rendered all the more probable by the fact that, in the affair at Antioch as well as throughout the Epistle to the Galatians, Peter is very far from acting as one who had been the first to receive uncircumcised Gentiles freely into the Church.

It is usually admitted that the vision of Peter abrogated the distinction of clean and unclean animals so long existing in the Mosaic law,³ but there is no evidence that any subsequent gradual abandonment of the rule was ascribed to such a command; and it is remarkable that Peter himself not only does not, as we shall presently see, refer to this vision as authority for disregarding the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and for otherwise considering nothing common or unclean, but acts as if such a vision had never taken place. The famous decree of the Council

¹ xi. 3.

² Gal. ii. 12.

³ *Atford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 113 f.; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 240 ff.; *von Döllinger*, Chr. u. K., p. 50; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 165 f.; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 147; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 133; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 244 f.; *Milman*, Hist of Chr., i. p. 381 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 157; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 408 f.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 156.

of Jerusalem, moreover, makes no allusion to any modification of the Mosaic law in the case of Jewish Christians, whatever relaxation it may seem to grant to Gentile converts, and there is no external evidence of any kind whatever that so important an abolition of ancient legal prescriptions was thus introduced into Christendom.

We have, however, fortunately one test of the historical value of this whole episode, to which we have already briefly referred, but which we must now more closely apply. Paul himself, in his Epistle to the Galatians, narrates the particulars of a scene between himself and Peter at Antioch, of which no mention is made in the Acts of the Apostles, and we think that no one can fairly consider that episode without being convinced that it is utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that the vision which we are now examining can ever have appeared to Peter, or that he can have played the part attributed to him in the conversion and baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles. Paul writes: "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles, but when they came he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision, and the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy."¹ It will be remembered that "they of the circumcision" in Jerusalem, at the head of whom was James, from whom came those "of the circumcision" of whom Peter was afraid at Antioch, contended with Peter for going in "to men uncircumcised and eating with them,"² the very thing which was in question at Antioch. In the Acts, Peter is represented as defending his conduct by relating the divine vision under the guidance of which he acted, and the author states as the result that, "When they heard these things they held their peace and glorified God, saying: Then to the Gentiles also God gave repentance unto life."³ This is the representation of the author of the vision and of the conversion of Cornelius, but very different is his conduct as described by the Apostle Paul, very dissimilar the phenomena presented by a narrative upon which we can rely. The "certain who came from James" can never have heard of the direct communication from Heaven which justified Peter's conduct, and can never have glorified God in the manner described, or Peter could not have had any reason to fear them; for a mere reference to his vision, and to the sanction of the Church of Jerusalem, must have been sufficient to reconcile them to his freedom. Then, is it conceivable that after such a vision, and after being taught by God himself not to call any man or thing common or unclean, Peter could have acted as

¹ Gal. ii. 11—13.

² Acts xi. 2, 3.

³ Acts xi. 18.

he did for fear of them of the circumcision? His conduct is convincing evidence that he knew as little of any such vision as those who came from James. On the other hand, if we require further proof it is furnished by the Apostle Paul himself. Is it conceivable, we again ask, that if such an episode had ever really occurred the Apostle Paul would not have referred to it upon this occasion? What more appropriate argument could he have used, what more legitimate rebuke could he have administered, than merely to have reminded Peter of his own vision? He both rebukes him and argues, but his rebuke and his argument have quite a different complexion; and we confidently affirm that no one can read that portion of the Epistle to the Galatians without feeling certain that, had the writer been aware of such a divine communication—and we think it must be conceded without question that, if it had taken place, he must have been aware of it¹—he would have referred to so direct and important an authority. Neither here nor in the numerous places where such an argument would have been so useful to the Apostle does Paul betray the slightest knowledge of the episode of Cornelius. The historic occurrence at Antioch, so completely ignored by the Author of the Acts, totally excludes the mythical story of Cornelius.²

There are merely one or two other points in connection with the episode to which we must call attention. In his address to Cornelius, Peter says, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons" (*οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήπτης ὁ θεός*). Now this is not only a thoroughly Pauline sentiment, but Paul has more than once made use of precisely the same expression. Rom. ii. 11. "For there is no respect of persons with God" (*οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*), and, again, Gal. ii. 6, "God respecteth no man's person" (*πρόσωπον ὁ θεός ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει*).³ The Author of the Acts was certainly acquainted with the epistles of Paul, and the very manner in which he represents Peter as employing this expression betrays the application of a sentiment previously in his mind, "Of a truth I perceive," &c. The circumstance confirms what Paul had already said.⁴ Then, in the defence of his conduct at Jerusalem, Peter is represented as saying: "And I remember the word of the Lord, how he said,

¹ Indeed the reference to this case, supposed to be made by Peter himself, in Paul's presence, excludes the idea of ignorance, if the Acts be treated as historical.

² *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 415; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 151; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 119 f., 127 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 185 ff.

³ Cf. Ephes. vi. 9, Col. iii. 25.

⁴ Compare further x. 35 ff. with Rom. ii. iii. &c. The sentiments and even the words are Pauline.

John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.¹ Now these words are by all the Gospels put into the mouth of John the Baptist, and not of Jesus,² but the Author of the Acts seems to put them into the mouth of Jesus at the beginning of the work,³ and their repetition here is only an additional proof of the fact that the episode of Cornelius, as it stands before us, is not historical, but is merely his own composition.

The whole of this narrative, with its complicated series of miracles, is evidently composed to legitimate the free reception into the Christian Church of Gentile converts and, to emphasise the importance of the divine ratification of their admission, Peter is made to repeat to the Church of Jerusalem the main incidents which had just been fully narrated. On the one hand, the previous Jewish exclusiveness of both Peter and of the Church is displayed, first, in the resistance of the Apostle, which can only be overcome by the vision and the direct order of the Holy Spirit, and by the manifest outpouring of the Spirit upon the Centurion and his household; and second, in the contention of them of the circumcision, which is only overcome by an account of the repeated signs of divine purpose and approval. The universality of the Gospel could not be more broadly proclaimed than in the address of Peter to Cornelius. Not the Jews alone, "but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him." Pauline principles are thus anticipated and, as we have pointed out, are expressed almost in the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles.⁴ The Jews who go with Peter were astonished because that on the Gentiles also had been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit,⁵ and the Church of Jerusalem, on hearing of these things, glorified God that repentance unto life had been given to the Gentiles. It is impossible that the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Church could be more prominently signified than by this episode, introduced by prodigious miracles and effected by supernatural machinery. Where, however, are the consequences of this marvellous recognition of the Gentiles? It does not in the slightest degree preclude the necessity for the Council, which we shall presently consider; it does not apparently exercise any influence on James and the Church of Jerusalem; Peter, indeed, refers vaguely to it, but as a matter out of date and almost forgotten; Paul, in all his disputes with the emissaries of the Church of Jerusalem, in all his pleas for the freedom of his Gentile converts, never makes

¹ xi. 16.

³ i. 5.

⁵ x. 45 f.

² Mt. iii. 11, Mk. i. 8, Luke iii. 16, John i. 26, 33.

⁴ Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 184 f.

the slightest allusion to it ; it remains elsewhere unknown, and so far as any evidence goes, utterly without influence upon the primitive Church.¹ This will presently become more apparent ; but already it is clear enough to those who will exercise calm reason that it is impossible to consider this narrative with its tissue of fruitless miracles as a historical account of the development of the Church.

¹ *Baur*, *Paulus*, i. p. 91 ff. ; *Zeller*, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 183 ff.

known, and
e upon the
apparent;
ercise calm
e with its
ne develop-

CHAPTER VII.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES.

We have now arrived at the point in our examination of the Acts in which we have the inestimable advantage of being able to compare the narrative of the unknown Author with the distinct statements of the Apostle Paul. In doing so, we must remember that the Author must have been acquainted with the Epistles which are now before us, and supposing it to be his purpose to present a certain view of the transactions in question, whether for apologetic or conciliatory reasons or any other cause, it is obvious that it would not be reasonable to expect divergences of so palpable a nature that any reader of the letters must at once too clearly perceive such contradictions. When the Acts were written, it is true, the Author could not have known that the Epistles of Paul were to attain the high canonical position which they now occupy, and might, therefore, use his materials more freely; still a certain superficial consistency it would be natural to expect. Unfortunately, our means of testing the statements of the Author are not so minute as is desirable, although they are often of much value, and seeing the great facility with which, by apparently slight alterations and omissions, a different complexion can be given to circumstances regarding which no very full details exist elsewhere, we must be prepared to seize every indication which may enable us to form a just estimate of the nature of the writing which we are examining.

In the first two chapters of his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle Paul relates particulars regarding some important epochs of his life, which likewise enter into the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles. The Apostle gives an account of his own proceedings immediately after his conversion, and of the visit which about that time he paid to Jerusalem; and, further, of a second visit to Jerusalem fourteen years later, and to these we must now direct our attention. We defer consideration of the narrative of the actual conversion of Paul for the present, and merely intend here to discuss the movements and conduct of the Apostle immediately subsequent to that event. The Acts of the Apostles represent Paul as making five journeys to Jerusalem subsequent to his joining the Christian body. The first, ix. 26 ff., takes place imme-

diately after his conversion; the second, xi. 30, xii. 25, is upon an occasion when the Church at Antioch are represented as sending relief to the brethren of Judæa by the hands of Barnabas and Saul, during a time of famine; the third visit to Jerusalem, xv. 1 ff., Paul likewise pays in company with Barnabas, both being sent by the Church of Antioch to confer with the Apostles and Elders as to the necessity of circumcision, and the obligation to observe the Mosaic law in the case of Gentile converts; the fourth, xviii. 21 ff., when he goes to Ephesus with Priscilla and Aquila, "having shaved his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow;" and the fifth and last, xxi. 15 ff. when the disturbance took place in the temple which led to his arrest and journey to Rome. The circumstances and general character of these visits to Jerusalem, and more especially of that on which the momentous conference is described as having taken place, are stated with so much precision, and they present features of such marked difference, that it might have been supposed there could not have been any difficulty in identifying, with certainty, at least the visits to which the Apostle refers in his letter, more especially as upon both occasions he mentions important particulars which characterised those visits. It is a remarkable fact, however, that, such are the divergences between the statements of the unknown Author and of the Apostle, upon no point has there been more discussion amongst critics and divines from the very earliest times, or more decided difference of opinion. Upon general grounds, it has been seen, there has been good reason to doubt the historical character of the Acts. Is it not a singular suggestive circumstance, that, when it is possible to compare the authentic representations of Paul with the narrative of the Acts, even apologists perceive so much opening for doubt and controversy?

The visit described in the ninth chapter of the Acts is generally¹ identified with that which is mentioned in the first chapter of the Epistle. This unanimity, however, arises mainly from the circumstance that both writers clearly represent that visit as the first which Paul paid to Jerusalem after his conversion, for the details of the two narratives are anything but in agreement with each other. Although, therefore, critics are forced to agree as to the bare identity of the visit, this harmony is immediately disturbed on examining the two accounts, and whilst the one party find the statements in the Acts reconcileable with those of Paul, a large body more or less distinctly declare them to be contradictory and unhistorical.² In order that the question at issue may

¹ There have, however, been differences of opinion also regarding this.

² Baur, *Paulus*, i. p. 121 ff.; *Erasmus*, *Des Ap. Paul. Sendschr. an die Gal.*, 1869, p. 77 ff.; *Davidson*, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 213; *Eichhorn*, *Einl.*, iii. p. 23 ff.;

be fairly laid before the reader, we shall give the two accounts in parallel columns.

ACTS ix. 19 ff.

19. And he was certain days (*ἡμέρας τινάς*) with the disciples in Damascus,

20. And immediately (*εὐθέως*) was reaching Jesus in the synagogues, &c., &c.

21. And all that heard him were amazed, saying, &c.

22. But Saul was increasing in strength more and more, and confounding the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ.

23. And after many days (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*) were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him; 24. But their plot was known to Saul. And they were even watching the gates day and night to kill him.

25. But the disciples took him by night, and let him down through the wall in a basket.

26. And when he came to Jerusalem he was assaying to join himself to the disciples; but all were afraid of him, not believing that he is a disciple.

27. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he saw the Lord in the way, and that he spake to him; and how he preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.

28. And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord.

29. And he was speaking and disputing against the Grecian Jews; but they took counsel to slay him.

30. But when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus.

EP. TO GAL. i. 15 ff.

15. But when it pleased God . . .

16. To reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles;

immediately (*εὐθέως*) I conferred not with flesh and blood;

17. Neither went I up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia, and returned again into Damascus.

18. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days.

19. But other of the apostles saw I not save James the Lord's brother.

20. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God I lie not.

21. Thereafter I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;

22. But I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ; but they were only hearing that he who formerly persecuted us is now preaching the faith which once he was destroying; and they glorified God in me.

Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 412 f.; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., iv. p. 419; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbrief, 1852, p. 121 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 32 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 230; Galaterbr. 5te. Aufl., p. 39 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., i. 140 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxx. ff., 208 note 1; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 368 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 167; *Schwanbeck*, Quellan, u. s. w., p. 31 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 33 ff., 47 f., 98; *Stap*, Origines, p. 159 ff.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 142 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 201 ff. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi., p. 398 f., 401 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv., p. 503; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm. iv., 1844, p. 31 f.

¹ To become acquainted with.

Now, it is obvious that the representation in the Acts of what Paul did after his conversion differs very widely from the account which the Apostle himself gives of the matter. In the first place, not a word is said in the former of the journey into Arabia; but, on the contrary, it is excluded, and the statement which replaces it directly contradicts that of Paul. The Apostle says that after his conversion: "Immediately¹ (εὐθέως) I conferred not with flesh and blood," but "went away into Arabia." The Author of the Acts says that he spent "some days" (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the disciples in Damascus, and "immediately" (εὐθέως) began to preach in the synagogues. Paul's feelings are so completely misrepresented that, instead of that desire for retirement and solitude which his words express,² he is described as straightway plunging into the vortex of public life in Damascus. The general apologetic explanation is, that the Author of the Acts either was not aware of the journey into Arabia, or that, his absence there having been short, he did not consider it necessary to mention it. There are no data for estimating the length of time which Paul spent in Arabia, but the fact that the Apostle mentions it with so much emphasis proves not only that he attached much weight to the episode, but that the duration of his visit could not have been unimportant. In any case the Author of the Acts, whether ignorantly or not, boldly describes the Apostle as doing precisely what he did not. To any ordinary reader, moreover, his whole account of Paul's preaching at Damascus certainly excludes altogether the idea of such a journey, and the argument that it can be inserted anywhere is purely arbitrary. There are many theories amongst apologists, however, as to the part of the narrative in Acts, in which the Arabian journey can be placed. By some it is assigned to a period before he commenced his active labours, and therefore before ix. 20,³ from which the words of the author repulse it with singular clearness; others intercalate it with even less reason between ix. 20 and 21;⁴ a few discover some indication of it in the μάλλον ἐνεδυναμοῦτο of ver. 22,⁵ an expression, however, which refuses to be forced into such service; a greater number place it in the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί of ver. 23,⁶ making that clas-

¹ Dr. Ellicott remarks, "*straightway*; the word standing prominently forward, and implying that he not only avoided conference with men, but did so from the very first." St. Paul Ep. to the Gal., 4th ed., p. 16.

² Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 90.

³ Lightfoot, Ib., p. 99, n. 1; Robinson, Acts, p. 50.

⁴ Beelen, Act. Apost., p. 260.

⁵ Alford, Greek Test., ii. p. 103.

⁶ Bisping, Ex. H'buch N. T., vi. 1, 1862, p. 187; Hackett, Acts, p. 138; Heinrichs, N. T. Gr., Act. Apost., i. p. 230; Humphrey, Acts, p. 83 f.; Lange, Das ap. Z., i. p. 97; Meyer, Apg., p. 228; Galaterbr., p. 39; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 122, ann. 1; Oertel, Paulus, p. 58, ann. 2. Cf. Ellicott, St. Paul Ep. to the Galatians, 4th ed., p. 18; Schneckenburger, Apg., p. 180.

tie phrase embrace this as well as other difficulties till it snaps under the strain. It seems evident to an unprejudiced reader that the *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* are represented as passed in Damascus.¹ And lastly, some critics place it after ix. 25, regardless of Paul's statement that from Arabia he returned again to Damascus, which, under the circumstances mentioned in Acts, he was not likely to do, and indeed it is obvious that he is there supposed to have at once gone from Damascus to Jerusalem. These attempts at reconciliation are useless. It is of no avail to find time into which a journey to Arabia and the stay there might be forcibly thrust. There still remains the fact that so far from the Arabian visit being indicated in the Acts, the *εἰθέως* of ix. 20, compared with the *εἰθέως* of Gal. i. 16, positively excludes it, and proves that the narrative of the former is not historical.²

There is another point in the account in Acts which further demands attention. The impression conveyed by the narrative is that Paul went up to Jerusalem not very long after his conversion. The omission of the visit to Arabia shortens the interval before he did so, by removing causes of delay, and whilst no expressions are used which imply a protracted stay in Damascus, incidents are introduced which indicate that the purpose of the writer was to represent the Apostle as losing no time after his conversion before associating himself with the elder Apostles and obtaining their recognition of his ministry; and this view, we shall see, is confirmed by the peculiar account which is given of what took place at Jerusalem. The Apostle distinctly states, i. 18, that three years after his conversion he went up to visit Peter.³ In the Acts he is represented as spending "some days" (*ἡμέρας τινάς*) with the disciples, and the only other chronological indication given is that after "many days" (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*) the plot occurred which forced him to leave Damascus. It is argued that *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* is an indefinite period, which may, according to the usage of the author⁴ indicate a considerable space of time, and certainly rather express a long than a short period.⁵ The fact is, however, that the instances cited are evidence, in themselves,

¹ *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 103; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 213; *Stap*, Origines, p. 163; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 203.

² We shall not discuss the indication given in 2 Cor. xi. 32 of the cause of his leaving Damascus, although several contradictory statements seem to be contained in it.

³ "The 'straightway' of ver. 16 leads to this conclusion: 'At first I conferred not with flesh and blood, it was only after the lapse of three years that I went to Jerusalem.'" *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 83.

⁴ Acts ix. 43, xviii. 18, xvii. 7; *Lightfoot*, Ib., p. 59, note 3.

⁵ "The difference between the vague 'many days' of the Acts and the definite 'three years' of the Epistle is such as might be expected from the circumstances of the two writers." *Lightfoot*, Ib., p. 89, note 3.

against the supposition that the author can have had any intention of expressing a period of three years by the words *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*. We suppose that no one has ever suggested that Peter staid three years in the house of Simon the tanner at Joppa (ix. 43); or, that when it is said that Paul remained "many days" at Corinth after the insurrection of Jews, the author intends to speak of some years, when in fact the *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* contrasted with the expression (xviii. 11): "he continued there a year and six months," used regarding his stay previous to that disturbance, evidently reduces the "yet many days" subsequently spent there to a very small compass. Again, has any one ever suggested that in the account of Paul's voyage to Rome, where it is said (xxvii. 7) that, after leaving Myrra "and sailing slowly many days" (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*), they had scarcely got so far as Cnidus, an interval of months, not to say years, is indicated? It is impossible to suppose that, by such an expression, the writer intended to indicate a period of three years.¹ That the narrative of the Acts actually represents Paul as going up to Jerusalem soon after his conversion, and certainly not merely at the end of three years, is obvious from the statement in ver. 26, that when Paul arrived at Jerusalem, and was assaying to join himself to the disciples, all were afraid of him, and would not believe in his conversion. It is impossible to suppose that the author could have stated this, if he had desired to imply that Paul had already been a Christian, and publicly preached with so much success at Damascus, for three years.² Indeed, the statements in ix. 26 are irreconcilable with the declaration of the Apostle, whatever view be taken of the previous narrative of the Acts. If it be supposed that the author wishes to describe the visit to Jerusalem as taking place three years after his conversion, then the ignorance of that event amongst the brethren there and their distrust of Paul are utterly inconsistent and incredible; whilst if, on the other hand, he represents the Apostle as going to Jerusalem with but little delay in Damascus, as we contend he does, then there is no escape from the conclusion that the Acts, whilst thus giving a narrative consistent with itself, certainly distinctly contradicts the deliberate assertions of the Apostle. It is absolutely incredible that the conversion of a well-known persecutor of the Church (viii. 3 ff.), effected in a way which is represented as so sudden and supernatural, and accompanied by a supposed vision of the Lord, could

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 121 f.; Brandes, Sendschr. an d. Gal., p. 77; Lekebusch, Apg., p. 283; Meyer, Apg., p. 230; Overbeck, Zu d. W. Apg., p. 142; Zeller, Apg., p. 203 ff.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 122; Lekebusch, Apg., p. 283; Meyer, Apg., p. 230; Oertel, Paulus, p. 58 f.; Overbeck, Zu d. W. Apg., p. 142; Trip, Paulus, p. 66 ff.; De Wette, Apg., p. 142.

for three years have remained unknown to the community of Jerusalem. So striking a triumph for Christianity must have been rapidly made known throughout the Church, and the fact that he who formerly persecuted was now zealously preaching the faith which once he destroyed must long have been declared in Jerusalem, which was in such constant communication with Damascus.

The Author of the Acts continues in the same strain, stating that Barnabas, under the circumstances just described, took Paul and brought him to the Apostles (*πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους*), and declared to them the particulars of his vision and conversion, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus.¹ No doubt is left that this is the first intimation the Apostles had received of such extraordinary events. After this, we are told that Paul was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord. Here again the declaration of Paul is explicit, and distinctly contradicts this story both in the letter and the spirit. He makes no mention of Barnabas. He states that he went to Jerusalem specially with the view of making the acquaintance of Peter, with whom he remained fifteen days; but he emphatically says: "But other of the Apostles saw I not, save (*ἄλλῃ*) James, the Lord's brother;" and then he adds the solemn declaration regarding his account of this visit: "Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." It is difficult to avoid the impression that some other version of this story was current which the Apostle desired to correct; and, considering his character and position, probably a narrative such as that before us in the Acts would have been supremely displeasing to him. Instead of being presented "to the Apostles," and going in and out with them at Jerusalem, we have here the emphatic assurance that, in addition to Peter, Paul saw no one except "James, the Lord's brother." There has been much discussion as to the identity of this James, and whether he was an apostle or not, but into this it is unnecessary for us to enter. Most writers agree at least that he is the same James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, whom we again frequently meet with in the Pauline Epistles and in the Acts, and notably in the account of the Apostolic Council. The exact interpretation to be put upon the expression *ἄλλῃ Ἰάκωβον* has also been the subject of great controversy, the question being whether James is here really called an apostle or not; whether *ἄλλῃ* is to be understood as applying solely to the verb, in which case the statement would mean that he saw no other of the Apostles, but only James;² or to the whole phrase

¹ ix. 27.

² Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, p. 1059; Credner, *Das N. T.*, i. p. 44; Jowett,

which would express that he had seen no other of the Apostles save James.¹ It is admitted by many of those who think that in this case the latter signification must be adopted that grammatically either interpretation is permissible. Even supposing that rightly or wrongly James is here referred to as an Apostle, the statement of the Acts is, in spirit, quite opposed to that of the Epistle; for when we are told that Paul is brought "to the Apostles" (πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους), the linguistic usage of the writer implies that he means much more than merely Peter and James. It seems impossible to reconcile the statement, ix. 27, with the solemn assurance of Paul,² and if we accept what the Apostle says as truth, and we cannot doubt it, it must be admitted that the account in the Acts is unhistorical.

We arrive at the very same conclusion on examining the rest of the narrative. In the Acts, Paul is represented as being with the Apostles going in and out, preaching openly in Jerusalem, and disputing with the Grecian Jews.³ No limit is here put to his visit, and it is difficult to conceive that what is narrated is intended to describe a visit of merely fifteen days. A subsequent statement in the Acts, however, explains and settles the point. Paul is represented as declaring to King Agrippa, xxvi. 19 f.: "Wherefore, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision, but first unto those in Damascus, and throughout all the region of Judæa, and to the Gentiles, I was declaring that they should repent and turn to God," &c. However this may be, the statement of Paul does not admit the interpretation of such public ministry. His express purpose in going to Jerusalem was, not to preach, but to make the acquaintance of Peter; and it was a marked characteristic of Paul to avoid preaching in ground already occupied by the other Apostles before him.⁴ Not only is the account in Acts apparently excluded by such considerations and by the general tenor of the epistle, but it is equally so by the

Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 219; Winer, P. ad Gal. Ep., 1859, p. 52; cf. Gramm. N. T., Sprachid., 1867, iii. § 67 e. Cf. Neander, Pflanzung, p. 127.

¹ Ellicott, Galatians, p. 19; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 84; Meyer, Galaterbr., p. 42; Olshausen, Bibl. Comm., iv., 1844, p. 31 f.; Usteri, Br. an die Galater, 1833, p. 31; Wieseler, Comm. Br. an die Gal., 1859, p. 73.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 125 f.; Bleek, Einl. p. 364; Brandes, Senoschr. an d. Gal., p. 77 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 213; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 413; Hausrath, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 141; in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., iv. p. 419; Hilgenfeld, Galaterbr., p. 122 f., 124 f.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 308; Krenkel, Paulus, p. 44 f.; Lekebusch, App., p. 283; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 127 f.; Overbeck, Zu de Wette, App., p. 145; Schneckenburger, App., p. 167 f., 180 f.; Schrader, Der Ap. P., v. p. 530; Scholten, Het Paulin. Ev., p. 448; Schwanebeck, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 31 f.; Stap, Origines, p. 165 ff.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 47 f.; Trip, Paulus, p. 70; Zeller, App., p. 205 f. Cf. Olshausen, Bibl. Comm., 1844, iv. p. 31 f.

³ ix. 28 f.

⁴ 2 Cor. x. 14 ff. Cf. Rom. xv. 20.

direct words of the Apostle (i. 22): "I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa." It is argued that the term: "churches of Judæa" excludes Jerusalem.¹ It might possibly be asserted with reason that such an expression as "the churches of Jerusalem" might exclude the churches of Judæa, but to say that the Apostle, writing elsewhere to the Galatians of a visit to Jerusalem, and of his conduct at that time, intends, when speaking of the "churches of Judæa," to exclude the principal city, seems to us arbitrary and unwarrantable. The whole object of the Apostle is to show the privacy of his visit and his independence of the elder Apostles. He does not use the expression as a contrast to Jerusalem. Nothing in his account leads one to think of any energetic preaching during the visit, and the necessity of finding some way of excluding Jerusalem from the Apostle's expression is simply thrust upon apologists by the account in Acts. Two passages are referred to as supporting the exclusion of Jerusalem from "the churches of Judæa." In John iii. 22, we read: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa." In the preceding chapter he is described as being at Jerusalem. We have already said enough about the geographical notices of the author of the Fourth Gospel.² Even those who do not admit that he was not a native of Palestine are agreed that he wrote in another country and for foreigners. "The land of Judæa," was therefore a natural expression superseding the necessity of giving a more minute local indication which would have been of little use. The second instance appealed to, though more doubtfully,³ is Heb. xiii. 24: "They from Italy salute you." We are at a loss to understand how this is supposed to support the interpretation adopted. It is impossible that if Paul went in and out with the Apostles, preached boldly in Jerusalem, and disputed with the Hellenistic Jews, not to speak of what is added, Acts xxvi. 19 f., he could say that he was unknown by face to the churches of Judæa. There is nothing, we may remark, which limits his preaching to the Grecian Jews. Whilst apologists maintain that the two accounts are reconcilable, many of them frankly admit that the account in Acts requires correction from that in the Epistle;⁴ but, on the other hand, a still greater number of critics pronounce the narrative in the Acts contradictory to the statements of Paul.⁵

¹ *Alford*, Greek Test., iii. p. 10; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 85; *Meyer*, Gal., p. 46; *Moeller*, *Za de Wette*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 21; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 71; *De Wette*, Br. an die Gal., p. 21; *Wieseler*, Br. an die Gal., p. 86 f. *Winer*, F. ad Gal. Ep., p. 53.

² S. R., p. 661 f.

³ Compare n. 1, above.

⁴ *Bleek*, Einl., p. 364 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 403, anm. 1; *Sendschr.* d. Ap. Paulus, 1857, p. 68 f.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 92; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 127 ff.

⁵ *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 126 f.; *Brandes*, Gal., p. 77 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p.

There remains another point upon which a few remarks must be made. In Acts ix. 29 f. the cause of Paul's hurriedly leaving Jerusalem is a plot of the Grecian Jews to kill him. Paul does not in the Epistle refer to any such matter, but, in another part of the Acts, Paul is represented as relating, xxii. 17 f.: "And it came to pass, that, when I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the temple, I was in a trance and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for they will not receive thy witness concerning me," &c., &c. This account differs, therefore, even from the previous narrative in the same book, yet critics are agreed that the visit during which the Apostle is said to have seen this vision was that which we are discussing.¹ The writer is so little a historian working from substantial facts that he forgets the details of his own previous statements; and in the account of the conversion of Paul, for instance, he thrice repeats the story with emphatic and irreconcilable contradictions. We have already observed his partiality for visions, and such supernatural agency is so ordinary a matter with him that, in the first account of this visit, he altogether omits the vision, although he must have known of it then quite as much as on the second occasion. The Apostle, in his authentic and solemn account of this visit, gives no hint of any vision, and leaves no suggestion even of that public preaching which is described in the earlier, and referred to in the later, narrative in the Acts.² If we had no other grounds for rejecting the account as unhistorical this miraculous vision, added as an after-thought, would have warranted our doing so.

Passing on now to the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, we find that Paul writes: "Then, after fourteen years, again I went up to Jerusalem..." (*ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα...*). He states the particulars of what took place upon the occasion of this second visit with a degree of

213 f.; *Gfrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 419; *Hausrath*, in *Schenkel's B. L.*, iv. p. 419; *Hilgenfeld*, *Galaterbr.*, p. 123 ff.; *Krenkel*, *Paulus*, p. 44 f.; *Overbeck*, *Zu de W. App.*, p. 146; *Renan*, *Les Apôtres*, p. xxx. ff., 209 n. 2; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 165 f.; *Straatman*, *Paulus*, p. 33 ff.; *Zeller*, *App.*, p. 207 f. Cf. *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, p. 127 ff.

¹ *Alford*, *Greek Test.*, iii. p. 9; *Bleek*, *Einl.*, p. 364; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch.*, p. 719; *Hilgenfeld*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1860, p. 112; *Lightfoot*, *Galatians*, p. 92, n. 2; *Meyer*, *App.*, p. 231; *Olshausen*, *App.*, p. 156; *Paley*, *Evidences*, and *Horæ Paul.*, ed. Potts, ch. v., No. viii., p. 379; *Schrader*, *Der Ap. P.*, i. p. 56; *Wieseler*, *Chron. ap. Zeit.*, p. 165; *Zeller*, *App.*, p. 208.

² *Paley* (*Horæ Paul.* v., No. viii.) actually endeavours to show the genuineness of the Ep. to the Galatians by the "undesigned coincidence" of the shortness of Paul's visit as stated by himself and the miraculous order reported Acts xxii. 17 f., "Get thee quickly out of Jerusalem." The fallacy, not to say unfairness, of this partial argument needs no demonstration, and indeed it has been well pointed out by *Dr. Jowett*. The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 350 f.

minuteness which ought, one might have supposed, to have left no doubt of its identity, when compared with the same visit historically described elsewhere; but such are the discrepancies between the two accounts that, as we have already mentioned, the controversy upon the point has been long and active.¹ The Acts, it will be remembered, relate a second visit of Paul to Jerusalem, after that which we have discussed, upon which occasion it is stated (xi. 30) that he was sent with Barnabas to convey to the community, during a time of famine, the contributions of the Church of Antioch. The third visit of the Acts is that (xv.) when Paul and Barnabas are said to have been deputed to confer with the Apostles regarding the conditions upon which Gentile converts should be admitted into the Christian brotherhood. The circumstances of this visit, more nearly than any other, correspond with those described by the Apostle himself in the Epistle (ii. 1 ff.), but there are grave difficulties in the way of identifying them. If this visit be identical with that described Acts xv., and if Paul, as he states, paid no intermediate visit to Jerusalem, what becomes of the visit interpolated in Acts xi. 30? The first point which we must endeavour to ascertain is exactly what the Apostle intends to say regarding the second visit which he mentions. The purpose of Paul is to declare his complete independence from those who were Apostles before him, and to maintain that his Gospel was not of man, but directly revealed to him by Jesus Christ. In order to prove his independence, therefore, he categorically states exactly what had been the extent of his intercourse with the elder Apostles. He protests that, after his conversion, he had neither conferred with flesh and blood nor sought those who had been Apostles before him, but, on the contrary, that he had immediately gone away to Arabia. It was not until three years had elapsed that he had gone up to Jerusalem, and then only to make the acquaintance of Peter, with whom he had remained only fifteen days, during which he had not seen other of the Apostles save James, the Lord's brother. Only after the lapse of fourteen years did he again go up to Jerusalem. It is argued² that when Paul says, "he went up again" (*πάλιν ἀνέβη*), the word *πάλιν* has not the force of *δευτερον*, and that, so far from

¹ There was anything but unanimity on the point among the Fathers. *Irenæus* identified the second Galatian visit with the third of Acts (xv.). It is not certain whether *Tertullian* agreed in this (*Adv. M.*, v. 2, 3) or placed it later (*Adv. M.*, i. 20); *Eusebius* thought it the same as the second of Acts; *Epiphanius* identified it with the fifth of Acts (xxi. 15); *Chrysostom* places it after the third of Acts; and the *Chronicon Paschale* interpolates it between Acts xiii. and xv. It is not now necessary to enter minutely into this.

² By *Wieseler*, for instance, *Chron. des ap. Zeit.*, p. 182; *Br. Pauli an die Galater.*, 1859, p. 94 f.

excluding any intermediate journey, it merely signifies a repetition of what had been done before, and might have been used of any subsequent journey. Even if this were so, it is impossible to deny that, read with its context, *πάλιν ἀνέβη* is used in immediate connection with the former visit which we have just discussed. The sequence is distinctly marked by the *ἔπειτα* "then," and the adoption of the preposition *διὰ*—which may properly be read "after the lapse of,"¹—instead of *μετά* seems clearly to indicate that no other journey to Jerusalem had been made in the interval. This can be maintained linguistically; but the point is still more decidedly settled when the Apostle's intention is considered. It is obvious that his purpose would have been totally defeated had he passed over in silence an intermediate visit. Even if, as is argued, the visit referred to in Acts xi. 30 had been of very brief duration, or if he had not upon that occasion had any intercourse with the Apostles, it is impossible that he could have ignored it under the circumstances, for by so doing he would have left the retort in the power of his enemies that he had, on other occasions than those which he had enumerated, been in Jerusalem and in contact with the Apostles. The mere fact that a visit had been unmentioned would have exposed him to the charge of having suppressed it, and suspicion is always ready to assign unworthy motives. If Paul had paid such a hasty visit as is suggested, he would naturally have mentioned the fact and stated the circumstances, whatever they were. These and other reasons convince the majority of critics that the Apostle here enumerates all the visits which he had paid to Jerusalem since his conversion.² The visit referred to in Gal. ii. 1 ff. must be considered the second occasion on which the Apostle Paul went to Jerusalem.

This being the case, can the visit be identified as the second visit described in Acts xi. 30? The object of that journey to Jerusalem, it is expressly stated, was to carry to the brethren in Jerusalem the contributions of the Church of Antioch during a time of famine; whereas Paul explicitly says that he went up to Jerusalem, on the occasion we are discussing, in consequence of a revelation, to communicate the Gospel which he was preaching among the Gentiles. There is not a word about contributions. On the other hand, chronologically it is impossible that the second visit of the Epistle can be the second of the Acts. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the fourteen years are to be calculated from the date of his conversion,³ or from the previous

¹ Winer, *Grammatik des N. T. Sprachidioms*, 7th Aufl., § 47, i. p. 356.

² See references, p. 856, note 1.

³ *Alford*, *Greek Test.*, iii. p. 11; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, *Br. an die Galater*, 1845, p. 33; *Baur*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 478; *K. G.*, i. p. 49; *Bisping*, *H'buch N. T.*,

journey.¹ The latter seems to be the more reasonable supposition, but in either case it is obvious that the identity is excluded. From various data,—the famine under Claudius, and the time of Herod Agrippa's death,—the date of the journey referred to in Acts xi. 30 is assigned to about A.D. 45. If, therefore, we count back fourteen or seventeen years, we have as the date of the conversion, on the first hypothesis, A.D. 31, and on the second, A.D. 28, neither of which of course is tenable. In order to overcome this difficulty, critics² at one time proposed, against the unanimous evidence of MSS., to read instead of *διὰ δεκατεσσ. ἐτῶν* in Gal. ii. 1, *διὰ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν*, "after four years;" but this violent remedy is not only generally rejected, but, even if admitted for the sake of argument, it could not establish the identity, inasmuch as the statements in Gal. ii. 1 ff. imply a much longer period of missionary activity among the Gentiles than Paul could possibly have had at that time, about which epoch, indeed, Barnabas is said to have sought him in Tarsus, apparently for the purpose of first commencing such a career;³ certainly the account of his active ministry begins in the Acts only in Ch. xiii. Then, it is not possible to suppose that, if such a dispute regarding circumcision and the Gospel of the uncircumcision as is sketched in Gal. ii. had taken place on a previous occasion, it could so soon be repeated, Acts xv., and without any reference to the former transaction. Comparatively few critics, therefore, have ventured to maintain that the second visit recorded in the Epistle is the same as the second mentioned in the Acts (xi. 30), and in modern times the theory is almost entirely abandoned. If, therefore, it be admitted that Paul mentions all the journeys which he had made to Jerusalem up to the time at which he wrote, and that his second visit was not the second visit of the Acts, but must be placed later, it follows clearly upon the Apostle's own assurance that the visit mentioned in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, cannot have taken place, and is

1863, vi. 1. p. 191; *Ebrard*, *Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch.*, p. 718; *Zu Olsh. App.*, p. 154, anm.; *Eichhorn*, *Einl.*, iii. p. 31; *Ellicott*, *Galatians*, p. 23; *Hausrath*, *Der Ap. Paulus*, p. 246; *Hilgenfeld*, *Galaterbr.*, p. 129 f.; *Lange*, *Das ap. Z.*, ii. p. 4 f.; *Olshausen*, *Bibl. Comm.*, iv. p. 36; *Renan*, *St. Paul*, p. 75, n. 1; *Stap*, *Origines*, p. 177, n. 2; *Wieseler*, *Chron. ap. Z.*, p. 176 f.; *Br. an d. Gal.*, p. 90 ff.

¹ *Bengel*, *Gnom. N. T.*, ad Gal., ii. 1; *Bleek*, *Einl.*, p. 366, 369; *Conybeare and Howson*, *Life and Eps. of St. Paul*, 1856, i. p. 539 ff.; *Credner*, *Einl.*, i. p. 314; *Hofmann*, *Die heil. Schr. N. T.*, 2te Aufl., i. p. 81 ff.; *Holsten*, *Zam ev. Paul. u. a. w.*, p. 272, 275, anm.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, iv. p. 472; *Lightfoot*, *Galatians*, p. 102; *Lipsius*, in *Schenkel's B. L.*, i. p. 195; *Meyer*, *Gal.*, p. 51; *Schliefmacher*, *Einl. N. T.*, p. 369; *Schrader*, *Der Ap. P.*, i. p. 48 f., 74; v. p. 264; *Straatman*, *Paulus*, p. 84 ff., 104, 107; *Usteri*, *Br. an d. Gal.*, p. 39; *Winer*, *P. ad Gal. Ep.*, p. 148 ff.; *Zeller*, *App.*, p. 217.

² So *Grotius*, *Semler*, *Bertholdt*, *Kuinöl*, *Heinrichs*, *Ulrich*, *Böttger*, and others.

³ Acts xi. 25 f.

unhistorical, and this is the conclusion of the majority of critics,¹ including many apologists, who, whilst suggesting that, for some reason, Barnabas may alone have gone to Jerusalem without Paul, or otherwise deprecating any imputation of conscious inaccuracy to the Author, still substantially confirm the result that Paul did not on that occasion go to Jerusalem, and consequently that the statement is not historical. On the other hand, it is suggested that the additional visit to Jerusalem is inserted by the Author with a view to conciliation, by representing that Paul was in constant communication with the Apostles and community of Jerusalem, and that he acted with their approval and sympathy. It is scarcely possible to observe the peculiar variations between the narratives of the Acts and of Paul without feeling that the author of the former deliberately sacrifices the independence and individuality of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

The great mass of critics agree in declaring that the second visit described in the Epistle is identical with the third recorded in the Acts (xv.), although a wide difference of opinion exists amongst them as to the historical value of the account contained in the latter. This general agreement renders it unnecessary for us to enter at any length into the arguments which establish the identity, and we shall content ourselves with very concisely stating some of the chief reasons for this conclusion. The date in both cases corresponds, whilst there are insuperable chronological objections to identifying the second journey of the Epistle with any earlier or later visit mentioned in the Acts. We have referred to other reasons against its being placed earlier than the third visit of Acts, and there are still stronger objections to its being dated after the third. It is impossible, considering the object of the Apostle, that he could have passed over in silence such a visit as that described Acts xv., and the only alternative would be to date it later than the composition of the Epistle, to which the narrative of the Acts as well as all other known facts would be irreconcilably opposed. On the other hand, the date,

¹ *Anger*, De tempore in Act. Ap. ratione, p. 141, ff.; *Baur*, Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 479 f.; *Paulus*, i. p. 129 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 366; Beiträge, p. 55 f.; *Brandes*, Br. Gal., p. 92 ff.; *Oredner*, Einl., i. p. 314 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N.T., iii. p. 222; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 717; *Zu Olsh. App.*, p. 178; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, p. 418 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 125 f., 149 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 472, 474 f., viii. p. 340; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 195; *Meyer*, App., p. 267, anm.; *Galaterbr.*, p. 51 f., 58 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 146; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 34 ff.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. App., p. 178; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxii. ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl., N.T., p. 368 f.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., v. p. 264 f., 537; *Stap*, Origines, p. 174 ff.; *Stratman*, Paulus, p. 98 ff.; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Justin. Mart., p. 32 n.; *Usteri*, Br. an die Gal., p. 35 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 547; *Zeller*, App., p. 213 ff. Cf. *Ellcott*, Galatians, p. 23; *Lekebusch*, App., p. 289 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 71—74.

the actors, the cause of dispute, and probably the place (Antioch) in which that dispute originated, so closely correspond, that it is incredible that such a coincidence of circumstances should again have occurred.

Without anticipating our comparison of the two accounts of this visit, we must here at least remark that the discrepancies are so great that not only have apologetic critics, as we have indicated, adopted the theory that the second visit of the Epistle is not the same as the third of the Acts, but is identical with the second (xi. 30), of which so few particulars are given; but others, and notably Wieseler,¹ have maintained it to have been the same as that described in Acts xviii. 21 ff., whilst Paley and others² have been led to the hypothesis that the visit in question does not correspond with any of the visits actually recorded in the Acts, but is one which is not referred to at all in that work. These theories have found very little favour, however, and we mention them solely to complete our statement of the general controversy. Considering the fulness of the report of the visit in Acts xv. and the peculiar nature of the facts stated by the Apostle him-

¹ Chron. ap. Zeit., p. 179 ff., p. 201 ff.; Br. Pauli an d. Galater, p. 39 ff.

² Paley, Evidences, and Horne Paul., ch. v. Nos. 2, 10, p. 367 f., 382 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, i. p. 75 ff., 122 ff. It may be well to quote the following passage from Paley, a witness whose testimony will scarcely be suspected of unorthodox partiality: "It must not be dissembled that the comparison of our epistle with the history presents some difficulties, or to say the least, some questions of considerable magnitude. It may be doubted, in the first place, to what journey the words which open the second chapter of the Epistle—'then fourteen years afterwards I went unto Jerusalem'—relate. That which best corresponds with the date, and that to which most interpreters apply the passage, is the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, when they went thither from Antioch, upon the business of the Gentile converts, and which journey produced the famous council and decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. To me this opinion appears to be encumbered with strong objections. In the Epistle, Paul tells us that 'he went up by revelation' (ii. 2). In the Acts we read that he was sent by the Church of Antioch. 'After no small dissension and disputation, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question' (xv. 2). This is not very reconcilable. In the Epistle, St. Paul writes that, when he came to Jerusalem, 'he communicated that Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation' (ii. 2). If by 'that Gospel' he meant the immunity of the Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message. But a yet greater difficulty remains—viz., that in the account which the Epistle gives of what passed upon this visit at Jerusalem, no notice is taken of the deliberation and decree which are recorded in the Acts, and which, according to that history, formed the business for the sake of which the journey was undertaken. The mention of the council and of its determination, whilst the Apostle was relating his proceedings at Jerusalem, could hardly have been avoided if in truth the narrative belonged to the same journey. To me it appears more probable that Paul and Barnabas had taken some journey to Jerusalem, the mention of which is omitted in the Acts. . . ." Evid. ces, and Horne Paulinæ, ch. v. No. 10, p. 382.

self in his letter to the Galatians, the difficulty of identifying the particular visit referred to is a phenomenon which cannot be too much considered. Is it possible, if the narrative in the Acts were really historically accurate, that any reasonable doubt could ever have existed as to its correspondence with the Apostle's statements? We may here at once say that, although many of the critics who finally decide that the visit described in Acts xv. is the same as that referred to in the second chapter of the Epistle argue that the obvious discrepancies and contradictions between the two accounts may be sufficiently explained and reconciled, this is for very strong reasons disputed,¹ and the narrative in the Acts, when tested by the authentic statements of the Apostle, pronounced inaccurate and unhistorical.

It is only necessary to read the two accounts in order to understand the grounds upon which even apologists like Paley and Wieseler feel themselves compelled to suppose that the Apostle is describing transactions which occurred during some visit either unmentioned or not fully related in the Acts, rather than identify it with the visit reported in the fifteenth chapter, from which it so essentially differs. The material difference is scarcely denied by any one, and explanations with a view to reconciliation have never been dispensed with. Thiersch, who has nothing better than the usual apologetic explanations to offer, does not hesitate to avow the apparent incongruities of the two narratives. "The journey," he says, "is the same, but no human ingenuity can make out that also the conference and the decree resulting from it are the same."² Of course he supposes that the problem is to be solved by asserting that the Apostle speaks of the private, the historian of the public, circumstances of the visit. All who maintain the historical character of the Acts must of course more or less thoroughly adopt this argument, but it is obvious that, in doing so, they admit on the one hand the general discrepancy, and on the other, if successful in establishing their position, they could do no more than show that the

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. 129 ff., 132 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 457 ff.; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 214 ff., 251 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 77 ff., 317 ff.; 1860, p. 118 ff.; Galaterbr., p. 53 ff., 149 ff.; Einl., p. 227 ff.; Holtmann, in Bunsen's Bist. w., viii. p. 340 f.; Krenkel, Paulus, p. 62 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 195 ff.; Nicolas, Etudes N. T., p. 254, notes 1, 3; Overbeck, Zu de Wette, App., p. 216 ff.; Pfeiderer, Der Paulinismus, p. 277 ff., 500 ff.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxiv. ff.; St. Paul, p. 81, note 2; Scholten, Het paul. Ev., p. 448 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 544 ff.; Schwanbeck, Quellen, u. s. w., i. p. 32; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 116 ff.; Stap, Origines, p. 69, note 2, p. 182 ff.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 187 ff.; Tjrenk-Willink, Just. Mart., p. 31, n. 3; Volkmar, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 345 ff.; Zeller, App., p. 216 ff., 357 f. Cf. Jewett, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 330 ff., 351 f.; Schneckenburger, App., p. 71 ff.; Stud. u. Krit., 1855, p. 551 ff.

² Thiersch, Die Kirche im ap. Zeitalter, p. 129.

Epistle does not absolutely exclude the account in the Acts. Both writers profess to describe events which occurred during the same visit; both record matters of the highest interest closely bearing on the same subject; yet the two accounts are so different from each other that they can only be rescued from complete antagonism by complete separation. Supposing the Author of the Acts to be really acquainted with the occurrences of this visit, and to have intended to give a plain unvarnished account of them, the unconscious ingenuity with which he has omitted the important facts mentioned by Paul and eliminated the whole of the Apostle's individuality would indeed be as remarkable as it is unfortunate. But supposing the Apostle Paul to have been aware of the formal proceedings narrated in the Acts, characterized by such unanimity and liberal Christian feeling, it would be still more astonishing and unfortunate that he has not only silently passed them over, but has conveyed so singularly different an impression of his visit.¹ As the Apostle certainly could not have been acquainted with the Acts, his silence regarding the council and its momentous decree, as well as his ignorance of the unbroken harmony which prevailed, are perfectly intelligible. He of course only knew and described what actually occurred. The Author of the Acts, however, might and must have known the Epistle to the Galatians, and the ingenuity with which the tone and details of the authentic report are avoided or transfigured cannot be ascribed to mere accident, but must largely be attributed to design, although also partly, it may be, to the ignorance and the pious imagination of a later age. Is it possible, for instance, that the controversy regarding the circumcision of Titus, and the dispute with Peter at Antioch, which are so prominently related in the Epistle, but present a view so different from the narrative of Acts, can have been undesignedly omitted? The violent apologetic reconciliation which is effected between the two accounts is based upon the foregone conclusion that the Author of the canonical Acts, however he may seem to deviate from the Apostle, cannot possibly contradict him or be in error; but the preceding examination has rendered such a position untenable, and here we have not to do with a canonized "St. Luke," but with an unknown writer whose work must be judged by the ordinary rules of criticism.

According to the Acts, a most serious question is raised at Antioch. Certain men from Judaea came thither teaching: "Ex-

¹ "Our difficulty in reading this page of history arises not so much from the absence of light as from the perplexity of cross lights. The narratives of St. Luke and St. Paul only then cease to conflict, when we take into account the different positions of the writers and the different objects they had in view." *Light-foot, St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 294.

atisfying the
cannot be too
in the Acts
doubt could
the Apostle's
gh many of
in Acts xv.
pter of the
ntradictions
plained and
d,¹ and the
statements
eal.

in order to
s like Paley
ose that the
during some
Acts, rather
enth chapter,
difference is
a view to re-
sch, who has
ons to offer,
s of the two
ut no human
nd the decree
oses that the
tle speaks of
ances of the
of the Acts
rgument, but
one hand the
in establish-
now that the

7 ff.; Davidson,
1858, p. 77 ff.,
7 ff.; Holtmann,
Lipsius, in Sehen-
3; Overbeck, Za-
500 ff.; Renan,
Het paul. Ev., p.
ellen, u. s. w., i.
p. 69, note 2, p.
art., p. 31, u. 3;
f. Cf. Jewett,
p. 71 ff.; Stud.

cept ye have been circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." After much dissension and disputation the Church of Antioch appoint that Paul and Barnabas, "and certain others of them" shall go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question. The motive of the journey is here most distinctly and definitely described. Paul is solemnly deputed by the church to lay before the mother church of Jerusalem a difficult question, upon the answer to which turns the whole future of Christianity. Paul's account, however, gives a very different complexion to the visit: "Then, after fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. But I went up according to revelation (*κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*) and communicated to them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," &c. Paley might well say: "This is not very reconcilable."¹ It is argued,² that the two statements may supplement each other; that the revelation may have been made to the Church of Antioch and have led to the mission; or that, being made to Paul, it may have decided him to undertake it. If, however, we admit that the essence of truth consists not in the mere letter but in the spirit of what is stated, it seems impossible to reconcile these accounts. It might be granted that a historian, giving a report of events which had occurred, might omit some secret motive actuating the conduct even of one of the principal persons with whom he has to do; but that the Apostle, under the actual circumstances, and while protesting: "Now the things which I am writing unto you, behold, before God, I lie not!" should altogether suppress the important official character of his journey to Jerusalem, and give it the distinct colour of a visit voluntarily and independently made *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*, is inconceivable. As we proceed it will become apparent that the divergence between the two accounts is systematic and fundamental; but we may here so far anticipate as to point out that the Apostle explicitly excludes an official visit not only by stating an "inward motive," and omitting all mention of a public object, but by the expression: "And communicated to them the Gospel

¹ Horæ Paul., ch. v. No. x. See back, p. 857, note 2.

² "Here, however, there is no contradiction. The historian naturally records the external impulse which led to the mission; the Apostle himself states his inward motive. 'What I did,' he says, 'I did not owing to circumstances, not as yielding to pressure, not in deference to others, but because the Spirit of God told me it was right.' The very stress which he lays on this revelation seems to show that other influences were at work" (!). *Lightfoot*, St. P. Ep. to the Gal., p. 124. *Lightfoot* quotes as parallel cases, suggesting how the one motive might supplement the other, Acts ix. 29, 30; cf. xxii. 17, xiii. 2-4, and xv. 28. It is unfortunate that all these "parallel cases" are taken from the work whose accuracy is in question, and that the first is actually discredited by the Apostle's own account, whilst the others are open to equally strong objections. See also *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg. p. 27, iii. p. 12; *Meyer*, *loc. cit.* an die Gal., p. 61 f.

which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who," &c. To quote Paley's words: "If by 'that Gospel' he meant the immunity of the Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message;"¹ and, we may add, how he should so absolutely alter the whole character of his visit. In the Acts he is an ambassador charged with a most important mission; in the Epistle he is Paul the Apostle, moved solely by his own reasons again to visit Jerusalem. The Author of the Acts, however, who is supposed to record only the external circumstances, when tested is found to do so very imperfectly, for he omits all mention of Titus, who is conjectured to be tacitly included in the "certain others of them," who were appointed by the Church to accompany Paul, and he is altogether silent regarding the strenuous effort to enforce the rite of circumcision in his case, upon which the Apostle lays so much stress. The Apostle, who throughout maintains his simply independent attitude, mentions his taking Titus with him as a purely voluntary act, and certainly conveys no impression that he also was delegated by the Church. We shall presently see how significant the suppression of Titus is in connection with the Author's transformation of the circumstances of the visit. In affirming that he went up "according to revelation," Paul proceeds in the very spirit in which he began to write this epistle. He continues simply to assert his independence and equality with the elder Apostles. In speaking of his first journey he has this object in view, and he states precisely the duration of his visit and whom he saw. If he had suppressed the official character of this second visit and the fact that he submitted for the decision of the Apostles and elders the question of the immunity of the Gentile converts from circumcision, and thus curtly ascribed his going to a revelation, he would have compromised himself in a very serious manner, and exposed himself to a charge of disingenuousness of which his enemies would not have failed to take advantage. But, whether we consider the evidence of the Apostle himself in speaking of this visit, the absence of all external allusion to the supposed proceedings when reference to them would have been not only most appropriate but was almost necessary, the practical contradiction of the whole narrative implied in the subsequent conduct of Peter at Antioch, or the inconsistency of the conduct attributed in it to Paul himself, we are forced back to the natural conclusion that the Apostle does not suppress anything, and does not give so absurdly partial an account of his visit as would be the case if the narrative in the

¹ Horæ Paul., ch. v., No. x.

Acts be historical, but that, in a few rapid powerful lines, he completes a suggestive sketch of its chief characteristics. This becomes more apparent at every step we take in our comparison of the two narratives.

If we pass on to the next stage of the proceedings, we find an equally striking divergence between the two writers, and it must not escape attention that the variations are not merely incidental but are thorough and consecutive. According to the Acts, there was a solemn congress held in Jerusalem, on which occasion the Apostles and elders and the Church being assembled, the question whether it was necessary that the Gentiles should be circumcised and bound to keep the law of Moses was fully discussed, and a formal resolution finally adopted by the meeting. The proceedings in fact constitute what has always been regarded as the first Council of the Christian Church. The account in the Epistle does not seem to betray any knowledge of such a congress.¹ The Apostle himself says merely: "But I went according to revelation and communicated to them (*αὐτοῖς*) the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which seemed (to be something) (*κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*)."² The usual apologetic explanation, as we have already mentioned, is that whilst more or less distinctly the Author of Acts indicates private conferences, and Paul a public assembly, the former chiefly confines his attention to the general congress and the latter to the more private incidents of his visit.³ The opinion that the Author of Acts "alludes in a general way to conferences and discussions preceding the congress,"⁴ is based upon the statement xv. 4, 5: "And when they came to Jerusalem they were received by the Church and by the Apostles and the elders, and declared all that God did with them. But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees, who believed, saying: That it is necessary to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the Apostles and the elders came together to see regarding this matter. And when

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 152 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1846, p. 474 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 f., 253; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196; Overbeck, Zu de Wette, App., p. 218 f.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 188 ff.; Stap, Origines, p. 184 ff.; Zeller, App., p. 226 f.

² Gal. ii. 2.

³ Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 162 f.; iii. p. 12 f.; Baumgarten, App., i. p. 461 ff.; Bleek, Einl., p. 371; Ebrard, ev. Gesch., p. 699 f.; Ellicott, Galatians, p. 24; Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 434 f., anm. 2; Hofmann, Die heil. Schr. N. T., i. p. 128 ff.; Lange, Das ap. Z., i. p. 100 f., ii. p. 178 ff.; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 397 f.; Lekebusch, App., p. 294 ff.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 103, 124 f.; Meyer, App., p. 329 f., Gal. p. 64 f.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 160 ff.; Oertel, Paulus, p. 226 ff., 232 ff.; de Pressensé, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 458 f.; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 150; Schliemann, Clementinen, p. 388 f.; Thiersch, K. im ap. Z., p. 129 f.; Trip, Paulus, p. 84 ff.

⁴ Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 125.

there had been much disputation, Peter rose up and said," &c. It is clear that the words cannot be legitimately strained into a reference to more than two conferences. The first of these is a general meeting of the Apostles and elders and of the Church to receive the delegates from Antioch, and the second is an equally general and public conference (verse 6): not only are the Apostles and elders present but also the general body of Christians, as clearly appears from the statement (ver. 12) that, after the speech of Peter, "all the multitude (*πάν τὸ πλῆθος*) kept silence."¹ The "much disputation" evidently takes place on the occasion when the Apostles and elders are gathered together to consider the matter. If, therefore, two meetings can be maintained from the narrative in Acts, both are emphatically public and general, and neither, therefore, the private conference of the Epistle. The main fact that the Author of the Acts describes a general congress of the Church as taking place is never called in question.

On the other hand, few who appreciate the nature of the discrepancy which we are discussing will feel that the difficulty is solved by suggesting that there is space for the insertion of other incidents in the Apostle's narrative. It is rather late now to interpolate a general Council of the Church into the pauses of the Galatian letter. To suppose that the communications of Paul to the "Pillar" Apostles, and the distressing debate regarding the circumcision of Titus, may be inferred between the lines of the account in the Acts, is a bold effort of imagination; but it is far from being as hopeless as an attempt to reconcile the discrepancy by thrusting the important public congress into some corner of the Apostle's statement. In so far as any argument is advanced in support of the assertion that Paul's expression implies something more than the private conference, it is based upon the reference intended in the words *ἀνέβην αὐτοῖς*. When Paul says he went up to Jerusalem and communicated "to them" his Gospel, but privately *τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*, whom does he mean to indicate by the *αὐτοῖς*? Does he refer to the Christian community of Jerusalem, or to the Apostles themselves? It is pretty generally admitted that either application is permissible; but whilst a majority of apologists, together with some independent critics adopt the former,² not a few consider, as Chrysostom, Ecumenius, and Calvin

¹ It has been pertinently asked how it is possible that such a meeting could have taken place? What room could have been found to contain the assembly? Cf. Reuss, N. Rev. de Théol., 1858, ii. p. 36.

² Alford, Gk. Test., iii. p. 12 f.; Baumgarten-Crusius, Br. an d. Gal., p. 36; Ellicott, Galatians, p. 24; Hilgenfeld, Galaterbr., p. 55 f., 130; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 472; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 397 f.; Lekebusch, Apg., p. 294 f.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 103, 125; Lipsius, in Schenkel's

did before them, that Paul more probably referred to the Apostles.¹ In favour of the former there is the fact, it is argued, that the *αὐτοῖς* is used immediately after the statement that the Apostle went up "to Jerusalem," and that it may be more natural to conclude that he speaks of the Christians there, more especially as he seems to distinguish between the communication made *αὐτοῖς* and *κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*;² and, in support of this, "they" in Gal. i. 23, 24, is, though we think without propriety, referred to. It is, on the other hand, urged that it is very unlikely that the Apostle would in such a way communicate his Gospel to the whole community, and that in the expressions used he indicates no special transaction, but that the *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς* is merely an indefinite statement for which he immediately substitutes the more precise *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*.³ It is quite certain that there is no mention of the Christian community of Jerusalem to which the *αὐτοῖς* can with any real grammatical necessity be referred; but when the whole purport of the first part of the Apostle's letter is considered the reference to the Apostles in the *αὐτοῖς* becomes clearer. Paul is protesting the independence of his Gospel, and that he did not receive it from man but from Jesus Christ. He wishes to show that he was not taught by the Apostles nor dependent upon them. He states that after his conversion he did not go to those who were Apostles before him, but, on the contrary, went away to Arabia, and only three years after he went up to Jerusalem, and then only for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Peter, and on that occasion other of the Apostles saw he none save James the Lord's brother. After fourteen years, he continues to recount, he again went up to Jerusalem, but according to revelation, and communicated to them, *i. e.*, to the Apostles, the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles. The Apostles have been in the writer's mind throughout,

B. L., i. p. 196; Meyer, *Ap. g.*, p. 329; Gal. br., p. 62; Oertel, *Paulus*, p. 232; Pfeiderer, *Der Paulinismus*, p. 502; Usteri, *Br. an die Gal.*, p. 44; De Wette, *Br. an die Gal.*, p. 22; Wieseler, *Br. an die Gal.*, p. 98 f., 100, 106; Winer, *P. ad Gal. Ep.*, p. 54; Graun, *N. T. Sprach.*, p. 587. Cf. Stap, *Origines*, p. 185 f.

¹ Baur, *Paulus*, i. p. 133 f.; Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 216 f.; Jewett, *Eps. of St. P.*, i. p. 236; Olshausen, *Bibl. Comm.*, iv. p. 38; Reuss, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1858, ii. p. 340 f. Cf. Zeller, *Ap. g.*, p. 226, ann. 2.

² Meyer argues, not without force, that if Paul had not by *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ* intended to distinguish a different communication, he must have said; *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς, κ. τ. λ., ἀνεθέμην δὲ τοῖς δοκ.* omitting the distinguishing *κατ' ἰδίαν*. *Br. an die Gal.*, p. 62, ann.

³ An able and impartial critic, Reuss, attempts to reconcile the two accounts by arguing that such a question could not possibly have been laid before and decided by the whole community. He therefore supposes that private conferences only took place. This "reconciliation," however, is excluded by the account in Acts, which so distinctly represents a large public congress, and it by no means lessens the fundamental discrepancy of the narratives. Cf. Reuss, *N. Rev. d. Théol.*, 1858, ii. 334 ff., 1859, iii. p. 62 ff.

bat in the impetuous flow of his ideas, which in the first two chapters of this epistle outrun the pen, the sentences become involved. It must be admitted, finally, that the reference intended is a matter of opinion and cannot be authoritatively settled. If we suppose it to refer to the community of Jerusalem, taking thus the more favourable construction, how would this affect the question? Can it be maintained that in this casual and indefinite "to them" we have any confirmation of the general congress of the Acts, with its debates, its solemn settlement of that momentous proposition regarding the Gentile Christians, and its important decree? It is impossible to credit that, in saying that he "communicated to them" the Gospel which he preached amongst the Gentiles, the Apostle referred to a Council like that described in the Acts, to which, as a delegate from the Church of Antioch, he submitted the question of the conditions upon which the Gentiles were to be admitted into the Church, and tacitly accepted their decision.¹ Even if it be assumed that the Apostle makes this slight passing allusion to some meeting different from his conference with the pillar Apostles, it could not have been a general congress assembled for the purpose stated in the Acts and characterized by such proceedings. The discrepancy between the two narratives is not lessened by any supposed indication either in the Epistle or in the Acts of other incidents than those actually described. The suggestion that the dispute about Titus involved some publicity does not avail, for the greater the publicity and importance of the episode the greater the difficulty of explaining the total silence regarding it of the Author of Acts. The more closely the two statements are compared the more apparent does it become that the Author describes proceedings which are totally different in general character, in details, and in spirit, from those so vividly sketched by the Apostle Paul.

We shall have more to say presently regarding the irreconcilable contradiction in spirit between the whole account which is given in the Acts of this Council and the writings of Paul; but it may be more convenient, if less effective, if we for the present take the chief points in the narrative as they arise and consider how far they are supported or discredited by other data. We shall refer later to the manner in which the question which leads to the Council is represented as arising and at once proceed to the speech of Peter. After there had been much disputation as to whether the Gentile Christians must necessarily be circumcised

¹ It is unnecessary that we should here discuss the meaning of the Apostle's words: "Lest by any means I might be running or have run in vain." Critics are generally agreed that they express no doubt in the Apostle's mind, and that they cannot be taken as a submission, in any dependent sense, of his views to the elder Apostles.

to the Apos-
argued, that
at the Apos-
e natural to
re especially
made *αὐτοῖς*
ney" in Gal.
ferred to. It
ely that the
ospel to the
he indicates
s merely an
stitutes the
in that there
em to which
be referred;
Apostle's let-
the *αὐτοῖς* be-
of his Gos-
e from Jesus
by the Apos-
r his conver-
ore him, but,
ee years after
ose of mak-
other of the
After four-
ap to Jerusa-
to them, *i. e.*,
ng the Gen-
throughout,

Paulus, p. 232;
44; De Wette,
6; Winter, P. ad
es, p. 185 f.
Jowett, Eps. of
le Théol., 1858,

ἵδιον δὲ ἰν-
ιδ; ἀρεθύν
inguishing *κατ'*

the two accounts
l before and de-
vate conferences
y the account in
l it by no means
use, N. Rev. d.

and required to observe the Mosaic law, it is stated that Peter rose up and said: xv. 7. "Men (and) brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among you that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe. 8. And God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit even as unto us; 9. and put no distinction between us and them, having purified their hearts by the faith. 10. Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? 11. But by the grace of our Lord Jesus we believe we are saved even as also they."¹ The liberality of the sentiments thus put into the mouth of Peter requires no demonstration, and there is here an explicit expression of convictions, which we must, from his own words, consider to be the permanent and mature views of the Apostle, dating as they do "from ancient days" (*ἀπ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*) and originating in so striking and supernatural a manner. We may, therefore, expect that whenever we meet with an authentic record of Peter's opinions and conduct elsewhere, they should exhibit the impress of such advanced and divinely imparted views. The statement which Peter makes: that God had a good while before selected him that the Gentiles by his voice should hear the Gospel, is of course a reference to the case of Cornelius, and this unites the fortunes of the speech and proceedings of the Council with that episode. We have seen how little ground there is for considering that narrative, with its elaborate tissue of miracles, historical. The speech which adopts it is thus discredited, and all other circumstances confirm the conclusion that the speech is not authentic.² If the name of Peter were erased and that of Paul substituted, the sentiments expressed would be singularly appropriate. We should have the divinely appointed Apostle of the Gentiles advocating complete immunity from the Mosaic law, and enunciating Pauline principles in peculiarly Pauline terms. When Peter declares that "God put no distinction between us (Jews) and them (Gentiles), purifying their

¹ Acts xv. 7. Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀπ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι. 8. καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν, 9. καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρῶς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. 10. νῦν οὖν τί πειράξετε τὸν θεόν, ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν ἑσθλάσαι; 11. ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστευομένους σωθῆναι καθ' ὃν τρόπον κακεῖνοι.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 132 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 ff., 253; Lipsius, in Scheukel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 197 f.; Overbeck, Zu de W. App., p. 225; Pfeiderer, Der Paulinismus, p. 505 f.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvii.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 544 f.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., ii. p. 106 f.; Stapf, Origines, p. 128 f.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 189 ff., 196 f.; Zeller, App., p. 230 ff.

that Peter
now that a
Gentiles by
believe. 8.
less, giving
distinction
y the faith.
e upon the
e were able
believe we
sentiments
tration, and
ch we must,
and mature
cient days"
upernatural
e meet with
t elsewhere,
nd divinely
s: that God
ntiles by his
e to the case
ch and pro-
ve seen how
with its elac-
ch adopts it
rm the con-
ne of Peter
ts expressed
the divinely
te immunity
ples in pecu-
l pat no dis-
rifying their

ερῶν ἀρχαίων
δοῦναι τὰ ἔθνη
πρὸς ἡμᾶς
θῶς καὶ ἡμῖν,
τῇ πίστει κα-
τε τὸν θεόν,
τε οἱ πατέρες
ἡ χάρις τοῦ
εἶναι.

253; Lipsius, in
Pfleiderer, Der
Der Ap. Paulus,
ap, Origines, p.
c.

hearts by faith,¹ but by the grace (χάρις) of our Lord Jesus Christ we believe we are saved even as also they," do we not hear Paul's sentiments, so elaborately expressed in the Epistle to the Romans and elsewhere? "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord of all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"² . . . "justified freely by his grace (χάρις) through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus"³ And when Peter exclaims: "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke (ζυγός) upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" have we not rather a paraphrase of the words in the Epistle to the Galatians? "With liberty Christ made us free; stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke (ζυγός) of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised Christ will profit you nothing. But I testify again to every man who is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law."⁴ . . . For as many as are of works of law are under a curse," &c.⁵ These are only a few sentences of which the speech in Acts is an echo, but no attentive reader can fail to perceive that it contains in germ the whole of Pauline universalism.

From the Pauline Author of the Acts this might fairly be expected, and if we linguistically examine the speech we have additional evidence that it is simply, like others which we have considered, a composition from his own pen. We shall, as briefly as possible, refer to every word which is not of too common occurrence to require notice, and point out where they are elsewhere used. The opening *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* occurs elsewhere in the Acts 13 times, as we have already pointed out, being the favourite phrase placed in the mouth of all speakers; *ἐπίστασθαι*, x. 28, xviii. 25, xix. 15, 25, xx. 18, xxii. 19, xxiv. 16, xxvi. 3, 26, and elsewhere only 5 times. The phrase *ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε* at the beginning of a sentence has been pointed out, in connection with a similar way of expressing the personal pronoun in x. 21 *ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε*, and x. 37, *ὑμεῖς οἴδατε*, as consequently characteristic of Peter, and considered "important as shewing that these reports are not only according to the sense of what was said, but the words spoken, *verbatim*."⁶ This is to overlook the fact that the very same words are put into the mouth of Paul. Peter commences his speech, xv. 7: *ἄνδρες ἀδ., ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*, κ. τ. λ. Paul begins his speech at Miletus, xx. 18: *ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας*

¹ Cf. Rom. iv. 13.

² Rom. x. 12, 13; cf. Gal. iii. 26 ff.: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus; . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek; . . . for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."

³ Rom. iii. 24.

⁴ Gal. iii. 10.

⁵ Gal. v. 1-3.

⁶ Alford, Gk. Test., ii. 163.

ἀφ' ἧς, κ. τ. λ.; and at Ephesus, Demetrius the silversmith commences his address, xix. 25: *ἄνδρες, ἐπίστασθε ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.*, cf. xxiii. 15. *ἀρχαῖος*, xv. 21, xxi. 16; Luke ix. 8, 19; elsewhere 6 times; the expression ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament, but ἡμ. ἀρχ. is common in the Septuagint, cf. Ps. xliii. 1, lxxvi. 5, cxlii. 5, Isaiah xxxvii. 26, Lament. i. 7, ii. 17, &c., &c. ἐκλέγεσθαι, i. 2, 24, vi. 5, xiii. 17, xv. 22, 25; Luke 4 times, elsewhere 11 times, and of these the following with inf., Acts i. 24 f., xv. 22, 25, Ephes. i. 4. With the phrase ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο¹ may be compared that of Paul, xiii. 17, ὁ θεὸς . . . ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, and 1 Cor. i. 27, in which ὁ θεὸς ἐξ. occurs twice, as well as again in the next verse, 28. διὰ τοῦ στόματος, i. 16, iii. 18, 21; iv. 25; Luke i. 70; and the whole phrase διὰ τ. στόματος μου ἀκοῦσαι may be compared with the words put into Paul's mouth, xxii. 14; καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. ἐναγγέλιον, xx. 24, in Paul's Epistles (4) 33 times, and elsewhere 42 times. Verse 8. ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεός,—in the N. T. καρδ. only occurs here and in i. 24, Σὺ κύριε καρδιογνώστη πάντων, where it forms part of the prayer at the election of the successor to Judas. We have fully examined the speech of Peter, i. 16 ff., and shewn its unhistorical character, and that it is a free composition by the Author of the Acts; the prayer of the assembly is not ascribed to Peter in the work itself, though apologists, grasping at the καρδιογνώστης, assert that it must have been delivered by that Apostle; but, with the preceding speech, the prayer also must be attributed to the pen of the Author; and if it be maintained that Peter spoke in the Aramaic tongue² it is useless to discuss the word at all, which of course in that case must be allowed to belong to the Author. μαρτυρεῖν, Acts 12 times, Luke 2, rest frequently; with the phrase ὁ θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς may be compared Paul's words in xiii. 22, ὡς καὶ (ὁ θεὸς) εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας. Verse 9, διακρίνειν, x. 20, xi. 2, 12, Paul 7 times, &c., μεταξύ, xii. 6, xiii. 42; Luke xi. 51, xvi. 26; rest 4 times. τε καί, Acts 27 times, Luke 3, Paul 9, rest 15 times; τε . . . καί Acts 33 times, Luke 5, Paul 4, rest 10 times—τε καί is clearly characteristic of the Author. πίστις, Acts 15, Luke 11 times, rest very frequently. καθαρίζειν, x. 15, xi. 9; Luke 7, and elsewhere 20 times. νῦν οὖν, x. 33, xvi. 36, xxiii. 15; an expression not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and which is also indicative of the Author's composition. Verse 10, περάζειν, v. 9, xvi. 7, xxiv. 6; Luke iv. 2, xi. 16, xx. 23, rest frequently; the question of Jesus in Luke and the parallel passages, τί με περάζετε; will occur to

¹ We need not discuss ἐξ. ἐν ὑμῖν (or ἡμῖν) which de Wette, Ewald, and others take for a Hebraism, but Winer (§ 32, 3), Meyer and others defend.

² . . . den selbstverständlich ist's (gegen Lange u. Aeltere) dass Petrus nicht Griechisch, sondern Aramäisch geredet hat. Meyer, Apg., p. 39.

every one. *ἐπιτιθέσθαι*, Acts 12, Luke 6 times, the rest frequently. *ζυγός* does not occur elsewhere, either in the Acts or third Gospel, but it is used precisely in the same sense by Paul, Gal. v. 1, in a passage to which we have called attention a few pages back¹ in connection with this speech. *τράχηλος*, xx. 37, Luke xv. 20, xvii. 2; Romans xvi. 4, Matth. xviii. 6, Mark ix. 42; *ἐπὶ τὸν τραχ-* occurs 4 times. *ισχύειν*, vi. 10, xix. 16, 20, xxv. 7, xxvii. 16; Luke 8 times and elsewhere 15 times. *βαστάζειν*, iii. 2, ix. 15, xxi. 35; Luke, 5, Paul 6, rest 12 times. Verse 11, *χάρις*, Acts 17 times, Luke 8, Paul 61 times, rest frequently. *πιστεύειν*, Acts 38, Luke 9 times, rest frequently. *σώζειν*, Acts 12, Luke 18 times, rest frequently. *καθ' ὃν τρόπον*, is also put into the mouth of Paul, xxvii. 25, and is not elsewhere found in the New Testament; *ὃν τρόπον*, i. 11, vii. 28; Luke xiii. 34; Matth. xxiii. 37, 2 Tim. iii. 8. *κάκεινος*, v. 37, xviii. 19; Luke xi. 7, 42, xx. 11, xxii. 12, and elsewhere in the New Testament 17 times. It cannot be doubted that the language of this speech is that of the Author of the Acts, and no serious attempt has ever been made to show that it is the language of Peter. If it be asserted that, in the form before us, it is a translation, there is not the slightest evidence to support the assertion; and it has to contend with the unfortunate circumstance that, in the supposed process, the words of Peter have not only become the words of the Author, but his thoughts the thoughts of Paul.

We may now inquire whether we find in authentic records of the Apostle Peter's conduct and views any confirmation of the liberality which is attributed to him in the Acts. He is here represented as proposing the emancipation of Gentile converts from the Mosaic Law: does this accord with the statements of the Apostle Paul and with such information as we can elsewhere gather regarding Peter? Very much the contrary.

Peter in this speech claims that, long before, God had selected him to make known the Gospel to the Gentiles, but Paul emphatically distinguishes him as the Apostle of the Circumcision; and although, accepting facts which had actually taken place and could not be prevented, Peter with James and John gave Paul right hands of fellowship, he remained as he had been before, Apostle of the Circumcision,² and, as we shall see, did not practise the liberality which he is said to have preached. Very shortly after the Council described in the Acts, there occurred the celebrated dispute between him and Paul which the latter proceeds to describe immediately after the visit to Jerusalem: "But when Cephas came to Antioch," he writes, "I withstood him to the face, for he was condemned. For before certain

¹ p. 867.² Gal. ii. 7 ff.

came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those of the Circumcision. And the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Cephas before all: If thou being a Jew livest ($\xi\eta\varsigma$) after the manner of Gentiles and not after the manner of Jews, how compellest ($\alpha\nuαγκάζεις$) thou the Gentiles to adopt the customs of the Jews? ($\iotaουδαίζεις$)"¹ Before commenting upon this, it is necessary to say a few words as to the significance of Peter's conduct and of Paul's rebuke, regarding which there is some difference of opinion.² Are we to understand from this that Peter, as a general rule, at Antioch and elsewhere, with enlightened emancipation from Jewish prejudices, lived as a Gentile and in full communion with Gentile Christians?³ Meyer⁴ and others argue that by the use of the present $\xi\eta\varsigma$, the Apostle indicates a continuous practice based upon principle, and that the $\xi\eta\varsigma$ is not the mere moral life, but includes the external social observances of Christian community: the object, in fact, being to show that upon principle Peter held the advanced liberal views of Paul, and that the fault which he committed in withdrawing from free intercourse with the Gentile Christians was momentary, and merely the result of "occasional timidity and weakness." This theory cannot bear the test of examination. The account of Paul is clearly this: *when Cephas came to Antioch, the stronghold of Gentile Christianity, before certain men came from James, he ate with the Gentiles, but as soon as these emissaries arrived he withdrew, "fearing those of the circumcision."* Had his normal custom been to live like the Gentiles, how is it possible that he could have, on this occasion only, feared those of the circumcision? His practice must have been notorious; and had he, moreover, actually expressed such opinions in the congress of Jerusalem, his confession of faith having been so publicly made, and so unanimously approved by the Church, there could not have been any conceivable cause for such timidity. The fact evidently is, on the contrary, that Peter, under the influence of Paul, was induced for the time to hold free communion with the Gentile Christians; but as soon as the emissaries of James appeared on the scene, he became alarmed at this departure from

¹ Gal. ii. 11—14.

² Cf. *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal., 338.

³ *Hilgenfeld* argues that in speaking of "eating with them," Paul refers to the Agape, the meals of the Christians which had a religious significance. Although this is well worthy of consideration, it is not necessary for us here to go into the question. Cf. *Galaterbrief*, p. 59 ff. *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1858, p. 87 ff.

⁴ *Br. an die Gal.*, 98 f.

his principles and fell back again into his normal practice. If the present $\xi\eta\varsigma$ be taken to indicate continuous habit of life, the present $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ very much more than neutralizes it. Paul with his usual uncompromising frankness rebukes the vacillation of Peter: by adopting even for a time fellowship with the Gentiles, Peter has practically recognised its validity, has been guilty of hypocrisy in withdrawing from his concession on the arrival of the followers of James, and is condemned; but after such a concession he cannot legitimately demand that Gentile converts should "judaize." It is obvious that whilst Peter lived as a Gentile, he could not have been compelling the Gentiles to adopt Judaism. Paul, therefore, in saying: "Why compellest thou ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) the Gentiles to adopt the customs of the Jews? ($\iota\omega\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\upsilon$)" very distinctly intimates that the normal practice of Peter was to compel Gentile Christians to adopt Judaism. There is no escaping this conclusion, for after all specious reasoning to the contrary is exhausted, there remains the simple fact that Peter, when placed in a dilemma on the arrival of the emissaries of James, and forced to decide whether he will continue to live as a Gentile or as a Jew, adopts the latter alternative, and as Paul tells us "compels" (in the present) the Gentiles to judaize. A stronger indication of his views could scarcely have been given. Not a word is said which in the remotest degree implies that Peter yielded to the vehement protests of Paul, but on the contrary we must undoubtedly conclude that he did not; for it is impossible to suppose that Paul would not have stated a fact so pertinent to his argument, had the elder Apostle been induced by his remonstrance to walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel which Paul preached, and both to teach and practise Christian universalism. We shall have abundant reason, apart from this, to conclude that Peter did not yield, and it is no false indication of this, that, a century after, we find the Clementine Homilies expressing the bitterness of the Petrine party against the Apostle of the Gentiles for this very rebuke, and representing Peter as following his course from city to city for the purpose of refuting Paul's unorthodox teaching. It is contended that Peter's conduct at Antioch is quite consistent with his denial of his master related in the Gospels, and, therefore, that it might well have taken place even after his adoption of liberal principles, such momentary weakness being in fact characteristic. Those who argue in this way, however, forget that the denial of Jesus, as described in the Gospels, proceeded from the fear of death, and that such a reply to a merely compromising question which did not directly involve principles, is a very different thing from conduct like that at Antioch where,

under one influence, a line of action was temporarily adopted which ratified views upon which the opinion of the Church was divided, and then abandoned merely from fear of the disapproval of those of the circumcision. The Author of the Acts passes over this altercation in complete silence. No one has ever called in question the authenticity of the account which Paul gives of it. If Peter had the courage to make such a speech at the Council in the very capital of Judaic Christianity, and in the presence of James and the whole Church, how could he possibly, from fear of a few men from Jerusalem, have shown such pusillanimity in Antioch, where Paul and the mass of Christians supported him? If the unanimous decision of the Council had really been a fact, how easily he might have silenced any objections by an appeal to that which had "seemed good to the Holy Spirit" and to the Church! But there is not the slightest knowledge of the Council and its decree betrayed either by those who came from James, or by Peter, or Paul. The episode at Antioch is inconsistent with the conduct and words ascribed to Peter in the Acts, and contradicts the narrative in the fifteenth chapter which we are examining.¹

The Author of the Acts states that after Peter had spoken, "all the multitude kept silent and were hearing Barnabas and Paul declaring what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."² We shall not at present pause to consider this statement, nor the rôle which Paul is made to play in the whole transaction, beyond pointing out that, on an occasion when such a subject as the circumcision of the Gentiles and their subjection to the Mosaic law was being discussed, nothing could be more opposed to nature than to suppose that a man like the Author of the Epistle to the Galatians could have assumed so passive and subordinate an attitude.³ After Barnabas and Paul had spoken, James is represented as saying: "Men (and) brethren, hear me. Simeon declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And with this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written: 'After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which has fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and

¹ Baur, K. G., i. p. 52 f.; Paulus, i. p. 146 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 f., 222; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 415 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 87 ff.; 1860, p. 140 ff.; Der Kanon, p. 204; Einl., p. 232 f.; Holsten, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. c. w., p. 359 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 197; Overbeck, Zu de W. Apg., p. 221 f.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxv.; Schweegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., 127 ff.; ii. p. 106 ff.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 196; Usteri, Br. and Gal., p. 37 f.; Zeller, Apg., p. 233 ff. Cf. Schneckenburger, Apg., p. 106 ff.; Wieseler, Br. and Gal., p. 153 ff., 157 ff.

² xv. 12.

³ Overbeck, Zu de Wette's K. Erkl. Apostelgesch., p. 227.

ily adopted
Church was
disapproval
s passes over
er called in
al gives of it.
e Council in
presence of
from fear of
llanimity in
ported him?
been a fact,
oy an appeal
and to the
f the Council
om James, or
sistent with
ets, and con-
h we are ex-

had spoken,
Barnabas and
ought among
pause to con-
ide to play in
n an occasion
iles and their
nothing could
man like the
e assumed so
bas and Paul
(and) breth-
did visit the
. And with
n: 'After this
David which
thereof, and

N. T., ii. p. 220
wiss. 'th., 1858,
Holsten, Zum Ev.
p. 197; Overbeck,
egler, Das nachap.
Usteri, Br. and
App., p. 106 ff.;

will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name has been called, saith the Lord who doeth these things, known from the beginning.' Wherefore, I judge that we trouble not those from among the Gentiles who are turning to God; but that we write unto them that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses from generations of old hath in every city those who preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath."¹ There are many reasons for which this speech also must be pronounced inauthentic.² It may be observed, in passing, that James completely disregards the statement which Barnabas and Paul are supposed to make as to what God had wrought by them among the Gentiles; and, ignoring their intervention, he directly refers to the preceding speech of Peter claiming to have first been selected to convert the Gentiles. We shall reserve discussion of the conditions which James proposes to impose upon Gentile Christians till we come to the apostolic decree which embodies them. The precise signification of the sentence with which (ver. 21) he concludes has been much debated, but need not detain us long. Whatever may be said of the liberal part of the speech, it is obvious that the Author has been more true to the spirit of the time in conceiving this and other portions of it, than in composing the speech of Peter. The continued observance of the Mosaic ritual, and the identity of the synagogue with the Christian Church are correctly indicated; and when James is again represented (xxi. 20 ff.) as advising Paul to join those who had a vow, in order to prove that he himself walked orderly and was an observer of the law, and did not teach the Jews to apostatize from Moses and abandon the rite of circumcision, he is consistent in his portrait. It is nevertheless clear that, however we may read the restrictions which James proposes to impose upon Gentile Christians, the Author of Acts intends them to be considered as a most liberal and almost complete con-

¹ Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατέ μου. Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπέδεψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἑθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦτω συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται, κ.τ.λ. (Greek below.) διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλογνημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος. Μωϋσῆς γάρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν δάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος. Acts xv. 13-20.

² Baur, Paulus, i. p. 135 ff., 150 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 221, 252 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 198 f.; Overbeck, Zu de W. App., 216, 222, 227 ff.; Pfeiderer, Paulinismus, p. 505 f.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxv., note 1; xxxvii.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., ii. p. 106 f.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 189 ff., 196 f.; Zeller, App., p. 232 ff.

cession of immunity. "I judge," he makes James say, "that we trouble not those from among the Gentiles who are turning to God;" and again on the second occasion of which we have just been speaking, in referring to the decree, a contrast is drawn between the Christian Jews, from whom observance of the law is demanded, and the Gentiles, who are only expected to follow the prescriptions of the decree. James is represented as supporting the statement of Peter, how God visited the Gentiles by "the words of the Prophets," quoting a passage from Amos ix. 11, 12. It is difficult to see how the words, even as quoted, apply to the case at all, but this is immaterial. Loose reasoning can certainly not be taken as a mark of inauthenticity. It is much more to the point that James, addressing an assembly of Apostles and elders in Jerusalem, quotes the prophet Amos freely from the Septuagint version,¹ which differs widely in the latter and more important part from the Hebrew text.² The passage in the Hebrew reads: ix. 11. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, 12. that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord that doeth this." The authors of the Septuagint version altered the twelfth verse into: "That the residue of men may seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called, saith the Lord who doeth these things."³ It is perfectly clear that the prophet does not, in

¹ "St. James and St. Luke adopt that Version as not contrary to the mind of Spirit, and indeed as expressing that mind," &c., &c. Wordsworth, Gk. Test., The Acts, p. 113.

² Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 165; Baumgarten, Apg., i. p. 436 ff.; Beelen, Act. Apost., p. 382 ff.; Davidson, Int. O. T., iii. p. 259; Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 436, ann. 2; Hengstenberg, Christol. d. A. T. 2 Aufl., i. p. 454 f.; Kuenen, De Profeten, ii. p. 211 f.; Kuinoel, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 506; Lightfoot, Works, viii. p. 475 f.; Meyer, Apg., p. 333 f.; Olshausen, Apg., p. 211 ff.; Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 84 f.; Stier, Reden d. Ap., ii. p. 25, cf. 28; De Wette, Apg., p. 228; Wordsworth, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 113.

³ The whole passage in the Lxx. reads: 'Εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος. 12. Ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ καταλοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον (Cod. Alex.) καὶ πάντα τὸ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, λέγει κύριος ὁ ποίων ταῦτα (Cod. Alex. cm. πάντα). The passage in the speech of James reads: 16. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτὴν, 17. ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ καταλοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, λέγει κύριος ὁ ποίων ταῦτα 18. γινώσκει ἅπ' αἰῶνος. The rest of the verse, ἐστὶ τῷ θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, which stands in the A.V. is omitted by B, C, and other important codices, but Cod. A and D have τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, the latter having also ἐστίν.

the original, say what James is here represented as stating, and that his own words refer to the national triumph of Israel, and not to the conversion of the Gentiles. Amos in fact prophesies that the Lord will restore the former power and glory of Israel, and that the remnant of Edom and the other nations of the theocracy shall be re-united, as they were under David. No one questions the fact that the original prophecy is altered, and those who desire to see the singular explanations of apologists may refer to some of the works indicated.¹ The question as to whether James or the Author of the Acts is responsible for the adoption of the Septuagint version is felt to be a serious problem. Some critics affirm that in all probability James must have spoken in Aramaic;² whilst others maintain that he delivered this address in Greek.³ In the one case, it is supposed that he quoted the original Hebrew and that the Author of the Acts or the document from which he derived his report may have used the Septuagint; and in the other, it is suggested that the LXX. may have had another and more correct reading before them, for it is supposed impossible that James himself could have quoted a version which was actually different from the original Hebrew. These and many other similar explanations, into which we need not go, do little to remove the difficulty presented by the fact itself. To suppose that our Hebrew texts are erroneous in order to justify the speech is a proceeding which does not require remark. It will be remembered that, in the Acts, the Septuagint is always employed in quotations from the Old Testament, and that this is by no means the only place in which that version is used when it departs from the original. It is difficult to conceive that any intelligent Jew could have quoted the Hebrew of this passage to support a proposal to free Gentile Christians from the necessity of circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic Law. It is equally difficult to suppose that James, a bigoted leader of the Judaistic party and the head of the Church of Jerusalem, could have quoted the Septuagint version of the Holy Scriptures, differing from the Hebrew, to such an assembly. It is useless to examine here the attempts to make the passage quoted a correct interpretation of the prophet's meaning, or seriously to consider the proposition that this alteration of a prophetic utterance is adopted as better expressing "the mind of the Spirit." If the original prophecy did not express that mind, it is rather late to amend the utterances of the prophets in the Acts of the Apostles.

¹ See p. 874, note 2.

² Bengel, Gnom. N.T., p. 576; Lightfoot, Works, viii. p. 474 f.; Meyer, Apg., p. 334; Stier, Die Reden d. Ap., p. 25, anm. Cf. Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 84.

³ Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 165; Hengstenberg, Christol. d. A. T. 2te Aufl., i. p. 455 f.; Olshausen, Apg., p. 212.

We may now briefly examine the speech linguistically. *Verse 13*: The opening as usual is *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*, which occurs elsewhere in the Acts 13 times as we have already mentioned; but the whole phrase *ἄνδρ. ἀδ. ἀκούσατέ μου* is put into the mouth of Paul in xxii. 1, *ἔνδρ. ἀδ. καὶ πατέρες ἀκούσατέ μου*, and with but little variation again in xiii. 16, cf. ii. 22. The use of the Hebrew form *Συμεών*, in speaking of Peter, has been pointed out by Bleek¹ and others, after Lightfoot,² as a characteristic peculiarity showing the authenticity of the speech. The same form occurs in 2 Pet. i. 1, but its use in that spurious epistle is scarcely calculated to give weight to its use here. If it be characteristic of anyone, however, it is characteristic of the author of the third Gospel and the Acts, and in no case is it peculiarly associated with James. In addition to the instance referred to above, and Apoc. vii. 7, where the tribe of Simeon is thus named, the Jewish form *Συμεών* of the name Simon occurs four times only in the New Testament, and they are confined to our Author: Acts xiii. 1; Luke ii. 25, 34, iii. 30. Being acquainted with the Jewish form of the name, he made use of it in this speech probably for the effect of local colouring. *ἐξηγείσθαι*, x. 8, xv. 12, xxi. 19; Luke xxiv. 35, and nowhere else except John i. 18—it is peculiar to the Author. *καθώς*, Acts 11, Luke 16 times, and elsewhere frequently. *πρῶτον*, iii. 26, vii. 12, xi. 26, xiii. 46, xxvi. 20; Luke 10 times; Jam. iii. 17; Paul 10 times, rest frequently. *ἐπισκέπτεσθαι*, vi. 3, vii. 23, xv. 36; Luke i. 68, 78, vii. 16; Matth. xxv. 36, 43; Hebr. ii. 6; Jam. i. 27, that is to say 7 times used by the Author and only 4 times in the rest of the New Testament; compare especially Luke i. 68, and vii. 16. *λαός* opposed to *ἔθνη*, xxvi. 17, 23. The expression *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* occurs ii. 38, iv. 17, 18, v. 28, 40; Luke ix. 48, 49, xxi. 8, xxiv. 47, and only 5 times in the rest of the New Testament. *Verse 15*: *συμφωνεῖν*, v. 9; Luke v. 36, and Matth. xviii. 19, xx. 2, 13 only. *Verse 16*: In this quotation from Amos, for the *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ* of the Septuagint, the Author substitutes *μετὰ ταῦτα*, which phrase occurs elsewhere in Acts vii. 7, xiii. 20, xviii. 1; Luke v. 27, x. 1, xii. 4, xvii. 8, xviii. 4. *ἀναστρέφειν*, v. 22 and 9 times elsewhere. *Verse 18*: *γνωστός*, i. 19, ii. 14, iv. 10, 16, ix. 42, xiii. 38, xix. 17, xxviii. 22, 28=10 times in Acts; Luke ii. 44, xxiii. 49; elsewhere only in Rom. i. 19, John xviii. 15, 16.—a characteristic word. So likewise is the expression *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, iii. 21, Luke i. 70; *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων* occurs in Ephes. iii. 9, Col. i. 26. These words are added to the passage quoted from the Septuagint. *Verse 19*: *δός* is used 11 times in Acts; Luke i. 35, vii. 7; by Paul 18 times, Ep. Jam. twice, and

¹ Einl. N. T., p. 348; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1036 f.

² Works, viii. p. 474 f.

elsewhere 25 times. κρίνειν, 22 times in Acts; Luke 6 times, Paul 37 times, Ep. Jam. 6, and elsewhere 44 times. παρενοχλεῖν is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. ἐπιστρέφειν, Acts 11, Luke 7, Jam. v. 19, 20, rest 19 times; the phrase ἐπιστρ. ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν is a favourite and characteristic expression of the Author, who uses it ix. 35, xi. 21, xiv. 15, xxvi. 20, and Luke i. 16, and it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament except in 1 Pet. ii. 25. *Verse* 20: ἐπιστέλλειν, xxi. 25, and Hebr. xiii. 22 only. ἀπέχειν, xv. 29, Luke vi. 24, vii. 6, xv. 20, xxiv. 13, 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 22, 1 Tim. iv. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 11, and elsewhere 7 times; in both passages of the Ep. to the Thess. it is used with ἀπό as here. ἀλόγημα is not elsewhere found. εἶδωλον, vii. 41; 6 times by Paul, and elsewhere 3: it occurs very frequently in the Septuagint. πορνεία, xv. 29, xxi. 25; Paul 8, elsewhere 15 times. πικτόν, xv. 29, xxi. 25, a technical word. αἷμα, Acts 12, Luke 11 times, rest frequently. γενεά, ii. 40, viii. 33, xiii. 36, xiv. 16; Luke 13 times, Matth. 13, Mk. 5, rest 5 times. ἀρχαῖος, xv. 7, xxi. 16; Luke ix. 8, 19, elsewhere 7 times. κατὰ πόλιν, xv. 36, xx. 23, xxiv. 12; Luke viii. 1, 4, xiii. 22, and elsewhere only in Tit. i. 5. κηρύσσειν, viii. 5, ix. 20, x. 37, 42, xix. 13, xx. 25, xxviii. 31; Luke 9, Paul 14, elsewhere 30 times. σάββατον, Acts 9, Luke 20, rest 35 times, the whole phrase ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος occurs again in the Acts, being put into the mouth of Paul xiii. 27, and ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πᾶν σάβ. being used by the writer in xviii. 4. συναγωγή, Acts 20, Luke 15, rest 22 times. ἀναγινώσκειν, viii. 28, 30 twice, 32, xiii. 27, xv. 31, xxiii. 34; Luke 3, and elsewhere 22 times. This analysis confirms the conclusion that the speech of James at the Council proceeds likewise from the pen of the general Author, and the incomprehensible liberality of the sentiments expressed, as well as the peculiarity of the quotation from Amos according to the Septuagint, thus receive at once their simple explanation. If we now compare the account of James' share in granting liberal conditions to Gentile Christians with the statements of Paul we arrive at the same result. It is in consequence of the arrival of "certain men from James" (τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) that Peter through fear of them withdrew from communion with the Gentiles. It will be remembered that the whole discussion is said to have arisen in Antioch originally from the judaistic teaching of certain men who came "from Judæa," who are disowned in the apostolic letter.¹ It is unfortunate, however, to say the least of it, that so many of those who systematically opposed the work of the Apostle Paul claimed to represent the views of James and the mother church.² The contradiction of

¹ Acts xv. 24.

² "Of the Judaizers who are denounced in St. Paul's Epistles this much is cer-

the Author of the Acts, with his object of conciliation before him, has but small weight before the statements of Paul and the whole voice of tradition. At any rate, almost immediately after the so-called Apostolic Council, with its decree adopted mainly at the instigation of James, his emissaries caused the defection of Peter in Antioch and the rupture with Paul. It is generally admitted, in the face of the clear affirmation of Paul, that the men in question must probably or certainly have been actually sent by James.¹ It is obvious that, to justify the fear of so leading an apostle as Peter, not only must they have been thus deputed, but must have been influential men, representing authoritative and prevalent judaistic opinions. We shall not attempt to divine the object of their mission, but we may say that it is impossible to separate them from the judaistic teachers who urged circumcision upon the Galatian Christians and opposed the authority of the Apostle Paul. Not pursuing this further at present, however, it is obvious that the effect produced by these emissaries is quite incompatible with the narrative that, so short a time before, James and the Church of Jerusalem had unanimously promulgated conditions, under which the Gentile Christians were freely admitted into communion, and which fully justified Peter in eating with them. The incident at Antioch, as connected with James as well as with Peter, excludes the supposition that the account of the Council contained in the Acts can be considered historical.

The Apostolic letter embodying the decree of the Council now demands our attention. It seemed good to the Apostles and the elders with the whole Church to choose two leading men among the brethren, and to send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, and they wrote by them (xv. 23): "The Apostles and brethren which are elders unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting. 24. Forasmuch as we heard that certain which went out from us troubled you with

tain, that they exalted the authority of the Apostles of the Circumcision; and that, in some instances at least, as members of the mother Church, they had direct relations with James, the Lord's brother. But when we attempt to define those relations, we are lost in a maze of conjecture." *Lightfoot*, Ep. to the Gal., p. 353.

¹ *Aiford*, Greek Test., iii. p. 18; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 374, anm.; *Davidson*, Int. N.T., ii. p. 220 f.; *Hensen*, Der Ap. Paulus, 1830, p. 98; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 139 f.; *Galaterbr.*, p. 153; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 357, 362; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 244 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 382; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 111; cf. 353; *Meyer*, Gal., p. 93 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de W. Apg., p. 222; *de Pressense*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 473; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 284 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvii.; St. Paul, p. 291 ff.; *Révillat*, Essais, p. 16; *Ritschl*, Entst. eltk. K., p. 145; *Rückert*, Br. an die Gal., p. 87 f.; *Schweyler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 118 f., 159, ii. p. 107; *Stap*, Origines, p. 77; *De Wette*, Br. an die Gal., p. 38; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 232 ff.

words, subverting your souls, to whom we gave no commandment, 25. it seemed good unto us, having become of one mind, to choose out and send men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. 27. We have, therefore, sent Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by word of mouth. 28. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: 29. that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well."¹ It is argued that the simplicity of this composition, its brevity, and the absence of hierarchical tendency, prove the authenticity and originality of the epistle. Nothing, however, could be more arbitrary than to assert that the Author of the Acts, composing a letter supposed to be written under the circumstances, would have written one different from this. We shall, on the contrary, see good reason for affirming that he actually did compose it, and that it bears the obvious impress of his style. Besides, Zeller² has pointed out that, in a document affirmed to be so removed from all calculation or object, verse 26 could hardly have found a place. The reference to "our beloved" Barnabas and Paul, as "men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," is scarcely consistent with the primitive brevity and simplicity which are made the basis of such an argument. In the absence of better evidence, apologists grasp at extremely slight indications of authenticity, and of this nature seems to us the mark of genuineness which Bleek and others³ consider that they find in the fact, that the name of Barnabas is placed before that of Paul in this document. It is maintained that, from the 13th chapter, the author commences to give the precedence to Paul, but that, in reverting to the former order, the synodal letter gives evidence both of its antiquity and genuineness. If any weight could be

¹ 23. Οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν χαίρειν. 24. ἐπειδὴ ᾤκοντο ὅτι τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγους ἀναθεματίζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, οἷς οὐ διεστείλαμεθα. 25. ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενόμενοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν, ἐκλεκμένους ἀνδράς πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβαν καὶ Παύλῳ, 26. ἀνθρώποις παραδεδωκόσιν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 27. ἀπεστάλκαμεν οὖν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σίλαν, καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά. 28. ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τούτων τῶν ἐπ' ἀνάγκης. 29. ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλωθῶν καὶ αἵματος καὶ πνικτῶν καὶ πορνείας, ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε, ἐρρώσθε.

² Apostelgesch., 246 f.

³ Bleek, Einl., p. 349; Baumgarten, Apg., p. 470 f.; Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 440, anm.; Lange, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 189; Meyer, Apg., p. 345 f.

attached to such an indication, it is unfortunate for this argument that the facts are not as stated, for the order "Barnabas and Paul" occurs at xiv. 12 and 14, and even in the very account of the Council at xv. 12. The two names are mentioned together in the Acts sixteen times, Barnabas being named first eight times (xi. 30, xii. 25, xiii. 1, 2, 7, xiv. 12, 14, xv. 12), and Paul as frequently (xiii. 43, 46, 50, xv. 2 twice, 22, 25, 35). Apologists like Lekebusch¹ and Oertel² reject Bleek's argument. In the greeting *χαίρειν*, with which the letter opens, and which, amongst the Epistles of the New Testament, is only found in that bearing the name of James (i. 1), an indication is found that the letter of the Council was written by James himself.³ Before such an argument could avail, it would be necessary, though difficult, to prove the authenticity of the Epistle of James, but we need not enter upon such a question. *χαίρειν* is the ordinary Greek form of greeting in all epistles,⁴ and the Author of Acts, who writes purer Greek than any other writer in our Canon, naturally adopts it. Not only does he do so here, however, but he makes use of the same *χαίρειν* in the letter of the chief captain Lysias (xxiii. 26),⁵ which also evidently proceeds from his hand. Moreover, the word is used as a greeting in Luke i. 28, and not unfrequently elsewhere in the New Testament, as Matth. xxvi. 49, xxvii. 29, xxviii. 9, Mark xv. 18, John xix. 3, 2 John 10, 11. Lekebusch,⁶ Meyer,⁷ and Oertel⁸ reject the argument, and we may add that if *χαίρειν* prove anything, it proves that the Author of Acts, who uses the word in the letter of Lysias, also wrote the synodal letter. In what language must we suppose that the Epistle was originally written? Oertel maintains an Aramaic original,⁹ but the greater number of writers consider that the original language was Greek.¹⁰ It cannot be denied that the composition, as it stands, contains many of the peculiarities of style of the Author of Acts;¹¹ and these are,

¹ Die Apostelgesch., p. 316.

² Paulus in d. Apostelgesch., 1868, p. 227.

³ Baumgarten, Apg., i. p. 470 f.; Bengel, Gnom. N. T., p. 577; Bleek, Einl., p. 349; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1037; Fielmoser, Einl., p. 487; Kern, Br. Jacobi, 1838, p. 106; Schaff, Gesch. d. ap. Kirche, 2te Aufl., p. 260, anm. 1; Stier, Die Red. d. Ap., ii. p. 41. Cf. Neander, Pflanzung, p. 173, anm. 1.

⁴ Wetstein quotes Artemidorus (Oneir. iii. 44): ἰδίον πάσης πιστολῆς τὸ χαίρειν καὶ ἐρῶσο λέγειν. Ad Act. Apost. xv. 23.

⁵ This letter terminates, v. 30, with the usual ἐρῶσο, according to the Cod. Sinaiticus, E, G, and others; A and B omit it.

⁶ Apostelg. p. 316.

⁷ Apostelg., p. 345.

⁸ Paul ii. Apg., p. 227; comp. Reiche, Comm. in Ep. Jac., 1833, p. 1.

⁹ *Ib.*, p. 227 f. Cf. Grotius, Annot. in N. T. ad Act. Ap., xv. 23, who takes *χαίρειν* to be the rendering of the Hebrew salutation of Peace.

¹⁰ Alford, Gk. Test., ii. p. 169; Bleek, Einl., p. 349; Meyer, Apg., p. 345; Olshausen, Apg., p. 217 f. Cf. Baumgarten, Apg., p. 470 ff.

¹¹ Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 253 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 444; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 340 f.; Lekebusch, Apg., p. 116, 315; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 199; Oertel, Paulus, p. 227; Overbeck, Zu d. W. Apg., p. 236 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 127, anm. 1; Zeller, Apg., p. 246 ff.

indeed, so marked that even apologists like Lekebusch and Oertel, whilst maintaining the substantial authenticity of the Epistle, admit that at least its actual form must be ascribed to the general Author. The originality of the form being abandoned, it is difficult to perceive any ground for asserting the originality and genuineness of the substance. That assertion rests solely upon a vague traditional confidence in the Author of Acts, which is shown to be without any solid foundation. The form of this Epistle clearly professes to be as genuine as the substance, and if the original language was Greek, there is absolutely no reason why the original letter should have been altered. The similarity of the construction to that of the prologue to the third Gospel, in which the personal style of the writer may be supposed to have been most unreservedly shown, has long been admitted:—

LUKE I.

1. ἐπειδὴ περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀναγείνασθαι . . .
3. ἔδοξε καὶ μοι, παρηκολουθήκоти πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, καθ' ἑξῆς σοι γράψαι.

ACTS XV.

24. ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐτάραισαν . . .
25. ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἀνδρας πέμψαι.

A more detailed linguistic examination of the Epistle, however, confirms the conclusion already stated. Verse 23: διὰ χειρός, ii. 23, v. 12, vii. 25, xi. 30, xiv. 3, xix. 11, 26, and the expression is only met with elsewhere in Mark vi. 2; the phrase γράψαντες δ. χ. αὐτῶν finds a parallel in xi. 30, ἀποστέλλαντες δ. χ. βαρνάβη, κ. τ. λ. The characteristic expression, κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, κ. τ. λ., is repeated, xi. 1, xvi. 7, xxvii. 2, 5, 7. Verse 24: ἐπειδὴ, xiii. 46, xiv. 12, Luke vii. 1, xi. 6, cf. i. 1; Paul 5, rest only 2 times. τὰράσσειν, xvii. 8, 13, Luke i. 12, xxiv. 38, elsewhere thirteen times. ἀνασκευάζειν is not found elsewhere, but the preference of our writer for compounds of ἀνά, διά, and ἐπί is marked, and of these consists a large proportion of his ἀπαξ λεγόμενα. Ψυχή, Acts 15, Luke 14 times, and frequently elsewhere; the phrase ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχάς, κ. τ. λ., may be compared with xiv. 22, ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχάς, κ. τ. λ., cf. xiv. 2. διαστέλλεσθαι not elsewhere found in Acts, but it occurs Matth. xvi. 20, Mark v. 43, vii. 36 twice, viii. 15, ix. 9, and Heb. xii. 20. Verse 25: δοκεῖν, Acts 8, Luke 11, Paul 17 times, elsewhere frequently. ὁμοθυμαδόν, i. 14, ii. 1, 46, iv. 24, v. 12, vii. 57, viii. 6, xii. 20, xviii. 12, xix. 29; so that this word, not in very common use even in general Greek literature, occurs 10 times elsewhere in the Acts, but except in Rom. xv. 6, is not employed by any other New Testament writer. ἐκλέγεσθαι, i. 2, 24, vi. 5, xiii. 17, xv. 7, 22, Luke vi. 13, x. 42, xiv. 7, and elsewhere 11 times. πέμπειν, Acts 11, Luke 10 times, elsewhere common. ἀγαπητός is not elsewhere used in Acts, but is found in

Luke iii. 22, ix. 35, xx. 13, Paul 13 times, and is common elsewhere. *Verse 26*: παραδίδοναι, Acts 13, Luke 17 times, and common elsewhere. ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου, xxi. 13, v. 41, ix. 16, Rom. i. 5, 3 John 7. *Verse 27*: ἀποστελλειν, Acts 25, Luke 26 times, elsewhere very frequently. διὰ λόγου, xv. 32. ἀπαγγέλλειν, Acts 14, Luke 11, rest 21 times. τὰ αὐτά, Luke vi. 23, 26; τὸ αὐτό, Acts i. 15, ii. 1, 44, iii. 1, iv. 26, xiv. 1; Luke vi. 33, xvii. 35. *Verse 28*: μηδέν, Acts 12, Luke 4, Paul 6, elsewhere 13 times; the same expression, μηδὲν πλέον . . . is also found in Luke iii. 13. ἐπιτίθεναι, Acts 13, Luke 6, elsewhere 21 times. βάρος is not elsewhere met with in Acts, but occurs Matt. xx. 12, 2 Cor. iv. 17, Gal. vi. 2, 1 Thess. ii. 6, Apoc. ii. 24. πλὴν, viii. 1, xx. 23, xxvii. 22, Luke 15, elsewhere 13 times. ἐπάναγκες is not elsewhere found in the New Testament. *Verse 29*: ἀπέχων, xv. 20, Luke vi. 24, vii. 6, xv. 20, xxiv. 13, elsewhere 12 times. εἰδωλόθυτον, xxi. 25, 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, 7, 10, x. 19, 28, Apoc. ii. 14, 20. διατηρεῖν occurs only in Luke ii. 51. πράσσειν, Acts 12, Luke 6, Paul 15, elsewhere 5 only. ῥώνυσθαι, this usual Greek formula for the ending of a letter, ἔρῳσθαι, is nowhere else used in the New Testament, except at the close of the letter of Lysias, xxiii. 30.

Turning now from the letter to the spirit of this decree, we must endeavour to form some idea of its purport and bearing. The first point which should be made clear is, that the question raised before the Council solely affected the Gentile converts, and that the conditions contained in the decree were imposed upon that branch of the Church alone. No change whatever in the position of Jewish Christians was contemplated; they were left, as before, subject to the Mosaic law.¹ This is very apparent in the reference which is made long after to the decree, Ch. xxi. 20 ff. 25, when the desire is expressed to Paul by James, who proposed the decree, and the elders of Jerusalem, that he should prove to the many thousands of believing Jews all zealous of the law, that he did not teach the Jews who were among the Gentiles apostasy from Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. Paul, who, in the Acts, is likewise represented as circumcising with his own hand, after the decision of the Council had been adopted,

¹ Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 95; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 408 ff.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 167 f.; Niedner, Gesch. chr. Kirche, p. 103; Overbeck, Zu d. W. Apg., p. 227 f., 236 f.; Pfeiderer, Der Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.; de Pressensé, Trois Prem. Siècles, I. p. 472 f.; Renan, St. Paul, p. 87; Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 65 ff., 83 f.; Gesch. N. T., p. 56; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 129 ff.; Schliemann, Clementinen, p. 373 ff., anm.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 124; Straatman, Paulus, p. 192 f.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 571; Weiseler, Br. an die Gal., p. 144, anm. I; Zeller, Apg., p. 235 f., 238 f. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 125 f., 294 f.; Oertel, Paulus, p. 250 f.

Timothy, the son of a Greek, whose mother was a Jewess, consents to give the Jews of Jerusalem the required proof. We have already shown at the commencement of this section, that nothing was further from the minds of the Jewish Christians than the supposition that the obligation to observe the Mosaic law was weakened by the adoption of Christianity; and the representation in the Acts is certainly so far correct, that it does not pretend that Jewish Christians either desired or sanctioned any relaxation of Mosaic observances on the part of believing Jews. This cannot be too distinctly remembered in considering the history of primitive Christianity. The initiatory rite was essential to full participation in the Covenant. It was left for Paul to preach the abrogation of the law and the abandonment of circumcision. If the speech of Peter seems to suggest the abrogation of the law even for Jews, it is only in a way which shows that the author had no clear historical fact to relate, and merely desired to ascribe vaguely and indefinitely Pauline sentiments to the Apostle of the circumcision. No remark whatever is made upon these strangely liberal expressions of Peter, and neither the proposition of James nor the speech in which he makes it takes the slightest notice of them. The conduct of Peter at Antioch and the influence exercised by James through his emissaries restore us to historical ground. Whether the author intended to represent that the object of the conditions of the decree was to admit the Gentile Christians to full communion with the Jewish, or merely to the subordinate position of Proselytes of the Gate, is uncertain, but it is not necessary to discuss the point. There is not the slightest external evidence that such a decree ever existed, and the more closely the details are examined the more evident does it become that it has no historical consistency. How, and upon what principle, were these singular conditions selected? Their heterogeneous character is at once apparent, but not so the reason for a combination which is neither limited to Jewish customs nor sufficiently representative of moral duties. It has been argued, on the one hand, that the prohibitions of the apostolic decree are simply those, reduced to a necessary minimum, which were enforced in the case of heathen converts to Judaism who did not join themselves fully to the people of the Covenant by submitting to circumcision, but were admitted to imperfect communion as Proselytes of the Gate.¹ The condi-

¹ Ebrard, Zu Olsh. Apg., p. 215 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 204 f.; Niedner, K. G., p. 103; Overbeck, Zu de W. Apg., p. 230; Reuss, Rev de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 85 f.; Gesch. N. T., p. 56; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 129 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 109 f.; Stapf, Origines, p. 188 ff.; Wieseler, Br. an d. Gal., p. 147 ff. Cf. Bleek, Einl., p. 372; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 167, anm. 3, p. 171, anm. 1; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 570 f.

tions named, however, do not fully represent the rules framed for such cases, and many critics consider that the conditions imposed, although they may have been influenced by the Noachian prescriptions, were rather moral duties which it was, from special circumstances, thought expedient to specify.¹ We shall presently refer to some of these conditions, but bearing in mind the views which were dominant amongst primitive Christians, and more especially, as is obvious, amongst the Christians of Jerusalem where this decree is supposed to have been unanimously adopted, bearing in mind the teaching which is said to have led to the Council, the episode at Antioch, and the systematic judaistic opposition which retarded the work of Paul and subsequently affected his reputation, it may be instructive to point out not only the vagueness which exists as to the position which it was intended that the Gentiles should acquire, as the effect of this decree, but also its singular and total inefficiency. An apologetic writer, having of course in his mind the fact that there is no trace of the operation of the decree, speaks of its conditions as follows: "The miscellaneous character of these conditions showed that, taken as a whole, they had no binding force independently of the circumstances which dictated them. They were a temporary expedient framed to meet a temporary emergency. Their object was the avoidance of offence in mixed communities of Jew and Gentile converts. Beyond this recognised aim and general understanding implied therein, the limits of their application were not defined."² In fact the immunity granted to the Gentiles was thus practically almost unconditional. It is obvious, however, that every consideration which represents the decree as more completely emancipating Gentile Christians from Mosaic obligations, and admitting them into free communion with believers amongst the Jews, places it in more emphatic contradiction to historical facts and the statements of the Apostle Paul. The unanimous adoption of such a measure in Jerusalem, on the one hand, and, on the other, the episode at Antioch, the fear of Peter, the silence of Paul, and the attitude of James, become perfectly inconceivable. If on the contrary the conditions were seriously imposed and really meant anything, a number of difficulties spring up of which we shall presently speak. That the prohibitions, in the opinion of the Author of the Acts, constituted a positive and binding obligation can scarcely be doubted by any-

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.*, 1858, p. 75 f.; 1860, p. 128 ff., 164 f.; Hofmann, *Die heil. Schr. N. T.*, i. p. 133 f.; Lekebusch, *Apog.*, p. 311 ff.; Lightfoot, *Works*, iii. p. 220 ff., viii. p. 477 ff.; J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 295; Meyer, *Apog.*, p. 338 ff.; Schliemann, *Clementinen*, p. 388, *ann.* 23; Schneckenburger, *Apog.*, p. 73 f., *ann.*; Schoettgen, *Horn Hebr.*, p. 461 ff.

² Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Gal.*, p. 296.

one who considers the terms in which they are laid down. If they are represented as a concession they are nevertheless recognised as a "burden," and they are distinctly stated to be the obligations which "it seemed good to the Holy Spirit" as well as to the Council to impose. The qualification, that the restrictive clauses had no binding force "independently of the circumstances which dictated them," in so far as it has any meaning beyond the unnecessary declaration that the decree was only applicable to the class for whom it was framed, seems to be inadmissible. The circumstance which dictated the decree was the counter-teaching of Jewish Christians, that it was necessary that the Gentile converts should be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. The restrictive clauses are simply represented as those which it was deemed right to impose; and, as they are stated without qualification, it is holding the decision of the "Holy Spirit" and of the Church somewhat cheap to treat them as mere local and temporary expedients. This is evidently not the view of the Author of the Acts. Would it have been the view of anyone else if it were not that, so far as any external trace of the decree is concerned, it is an absolute myth? The prevalence of practices to which the four prohibitions point is quite sufficiently attested to show that, little as there is any ground for considering that such a decree was framed in such a manner, the restrictive clauses are put forth as necessary and permanently binding. The very doubt which exists as to whether the prohibitions were not intended to represent the conditions imposed on Proselytes of the Gate shows their close analogy to them, and it cannot be reasonably asserted that the early Christians regarded those conditions either as obsolete or indifferent. The decree is clearly intended to set forth the terms upon which Gentile Christians were to be admitted into communion, and undoubtedly is to be taken as applicable not merely to a few districts, but to the Gentiles in general.

The account which Paul gives of his visit not only ignores any such decree, but excludes it. In the first place, taking into account the Apostle's character and the spirit of his Epistle, it is impossible to suppose that Paul had any intention of submitting, as to higher authority, the Gospel which he preached, for the judgment of the elder Apostles and of the Church of Jerusalem.¹ Nothing short of this is involved in the account in the Acts, and in the form of the decree which promulgates, in an authoritative manner, restrictive clauses which "seemed good to the Holy

¹ Davidson, *Int. N. T.*, ii. p. 217 f.; Ewald, *Sendschr. des Ap. Paulus*, 1857, p. 71; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1858, p. 77 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's *B. L.*, i. p. 196, 199 f.; Reuss, *Rev. de Théol.*, 1858, ii. p. 334; *Théol. Chr.*, i. p. 311 f.; Stap, *Origines*, p. 183 ff.; Straatman, *Paulus*, p. 189 f., 196.

Spirit" and to the Council. The temper of the man is well shown in Paul's indignant letter to the Galatians. He receives his Gospel, not from men, but by direct revelation from Jesus Christ, and, so far is he from submission of the kind implied, that he says: "But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any Gospel other than that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so say I now again: If any man preach any Gospel to you other than that ye received, let him be accursed."¹ That the Apostle here refers to his own peculiar teaching, and does so in contradistinction to the Gospel preached by the Judaizers, is evident from the preceding words: "I marvel that ye are so soon removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different Gospel; which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and desire to pervert the Gospel of Christ."² Passing from this, however, to the restrictive clauses in general, how is it possible that Paul could state, as the result of his visit, that the "pillar" Apostles "communicated nothing" after hearing his Gospel, if the four conditions of this decree had thus been authoritatively "communicated"? On the contrary, Paul distinctly adds that, in acknowledging his mission, but one condition had been attached: "Only that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do."³ As one condition is here mentioned, why not the others, had any been actually imposed? It is argued that the remembrance of the poor of Jerusalem which is thus inculcated was a recommendation personally made to Paul and Barnabas, but it is clear that the Apostle's words refer to the result of his communication of his Gospel, and to the understanding under which his mission to the Gentiles was tolerated. We have already pointed out how extraordinary it is that such a decision of the Council should not have been referred to in describing his visit, and the more we go into details the more striking and inexplicable, except in one way, is such silence. In relating the struggle regarding the circumcision of Titus, for instance, and stating that he did not yield, no, not for an hour, to the demands made on the subject, is it conceivable that, if the exemption of all Gentile Christians from the initiatory rite had been unanimously conceded, Paul would not have added to his statement about Titus, that not only he himself had not been compelled to give

¹ Gal. i. 8, 9.

² Gal. i. 7.

³ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 151 ff.; K. G., i. p. 51; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858. p. 81 f., 1860, p. 131 f.; Krenkel, Paulus, p. 66; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. Lex., i. p. 199 f.; Pfeleiderer, Paulinismus, p. 503; Schrader, Der Ap. P., ii. p. 305 v. p. 271 f., 546; Stapf, Origines, p. 191 f.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 192 f.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Geach. V. Ier., ii. p. 570 ff.; Zeller, Apg., p. 235 ff.

way in this instance, but that his representations had even convinced those who had been Apostles before him, and secured the unanimous adoption of his own views on the point? The whole of this Epistle is a vehement and intensely earnest denunciation of those Judaizers who were pressing the necessity of the initiatory rite upon the Galatian converts.¹ Is it possible that the Apostle could have left totally unmentioned the fact that the Apostles and the very Church of Jerusalem had actually declared circumcision to be unnecessary? It would not have accorded with Paul's character, it is said, to have appealed to the authority of the elder Apostles or of the Church in a matter in which his own apostolic authority and teaching were in question. In that case, how can it be supposed that he ever went at all up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and elders about this question? If he was not too proud to lay aside his apostolic dignity, and, representing the Christians of Antioch, to submit the case to the Council at Jerusalem, and subsequently to deliver its decree to various communities, is it consistent with reason or common sense to assert that he was too proud to recall the decision of that Council to the Christians of Galatia? It must, we think, be obvious that, if such an explanation of Paul's total silence as to the decree be at all valid, it is absolutely fatal to the account of Paul's visit in the Acts. This reasoning is not confined to the Epistle to the Galatians, but, as Paley points out, applies to the other Epistles of Paul, in all of which the same silence is preserved. Moreover, the apologetic explanation altogether fails upon other grounds. Without appealing to the decree as an authority, we must feel sure that the Apostle would at least have made use of it as a logical refutation of his adversaries. The man who did not hesitate to attack Peter openly for inconsistency, and charge him with hypocrisy, would not have hesitated to cite the decree as evidence, and still less to fling it in the faces of those Judaizers who, so short a time after that decree is supposed to have been promulgated, preached the necessity of circumcision and Mosaic observances in direct opposition to its terms, whilst claiming to represent the views of the very Apostles and Church which had framed it. Paul, who never denies the validity of their claim, would most certainly have taunted them with gross inconsistency and reverted that the Church of Jerusalem, the Apostles, and the Judaizers who now troubled him and preached circumcision and the Mosaic law had, four or five years previously, declared as the

¹ "Turning from Antioch to Galatia, we meet with Judaic teachers who urged circumcision on the Gentile converts, and, as the best means of weakening the authority of St. Paul, asserted for the Apostles of the Circumcision the exclusive right of dictating to the Church." *Lightfoot*, Ep. to the Gal., p. 353.

an is well
le receives
om Jesus
plied, that
en, should
e preached
say I now
an that ye
e refers to
tion to the
e preceding
n him that
pel; which
and desire
however, to
e that Paul
" Apostles
if the four
y "commu-
that, in ac-
n attached:
very thing I
mentioned,
? It is ar-
m which is
made to Paul
refer to the
understand-
erated. We
at such a de-
o in describ-
ore striking
In relating
instance, and
the demands
mption of all
unanimously
ment about
lled to give

T., ii. p. 217;
renkel, Paulus,
nismus, p. 503;
vies, p. 191 f.;
., ii. p. 570 ff.

deliberate decision of the Holy Spirit and the Council, that they were no longer binding on the Gentile converts. By such a reference "the discussion would have been foreclosed." None of the reasons which are suggested to explain the undeniable fact that there is no mention of the decree can really bear examination, and that fact remains supported by a great many powerful considerations, leading to the very simple explanation which reconciles all difficulties, that the narrative of the Acts is not authentic.

We arrive at the very same results when we examine the Apostle's references to the practices which the conditions of the decree were intended to control. Instead of recognizing the authority of the decree, or enforcing its prescriptions, he does not even allow us to infer its existence, and he teaches disregard at least of some of its restrictions. The decree enjoins the Gentile Christians to abstain from meats offered to idols. Paul tells the Corinthians to eat whatever meat is sold in the shambles without asking questions for conscience sake, for an idol is nothing in the world, "neither if we eat are we the better, nor if we eat not are we the worse."¹ It is not conceivable that the Apostle could so completely have ignored the prohibition of the decree if he had actually submitted the question to the Apostles, and himself so distinctly acquiesced in their decision as to distribute the document amongst the various communities whom he subsequently visited. To argue that the decree was only intended to have force in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, to which, as the locality in which the difficulty had arisen which had originally led to the Council, the decree was, in the first instance, addressed, is highly arbitrary; but, when proceeding further, apologists² draw a distinction between those churches "which had already been founded, and which had felt the pressure of Jewish prejudice (Acts xvi. 4)," and "brotherhoods afterwards formed and lying beyond the reach of such influences," as a reason why no notice of the decree is taken in the case of the Corinthians and Romans, the special pleading ignores very palpable facts. "Jewish prejudices" are represented in the Acts of the Apostles themselves as being more than usually strong in Corinth. There was a Jewish synagogue there, augmented probably by the Jews expelled from Rome under Claudius,³ and their violence against Paul finally obliged him to leave the place.⁴ Living in the midst of an idolatrous city, and much exposed to the temptations of sacrificial feasts, we might naturally expect excessive rigour against participation, on the

¹ Cor. viii. 4 ff., x. 25 ff.

² *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal., p. 126 f.

³ Acts xviii. 2.

⁴ xviii. 6, 12 ff.

one hand, and perhaps too great indifference, on the other; and this we actually find to have been the case. It is in consequence of questions respecting meats offered to idols that Paul writes to the Corinthians, and, whilst treating the matter in itself as one of perfect indifference, merely inculcates consideration for weak consciences.¹ It is clear that there was a prejudice against the practice; it is clear that strong Jewish prejudices existed in the Jewish colony at Corinth, and wherever there were Jews the eating of meats offered to idols was an abomination. The sin of Israel at Baalpeor² lived in the memory of the people, and abstinence from such pollution³ was considered a duty. If the existence of such "Jewish prejudices" was a reason for publishing the decree, we have, in fact, more definite evidence of them in Corinth than we have in Antioch, for, apart from this specific mention of the subject of eating sacrificial meats, the two apostolic letters abundantly show the existence and activity of Judaistic parties there, which opposed the work of Paul, and desired to force Mosaic observances upon his converts. It is impossible to admit that, supposing such a decree to have been promulgated as the mind of the Holy Spirit, there could be any reason why it should have been unknown at Corinth so short a time after it was adopted. When, therefore, we find the Apostle not only ignoring it, but actually declaring that to be a matter of indifference, abstinence from which it had just seemed good "the Holy Spirit to enjoin, the only reasonable conclusion is that Paul himself was totally ignorant of the existence of any decree containing such a prohibition. There is much difference of opinion as to the nature of the *prophecy* referred to in the decree, and we need not discuss it; but in all the Apostle's homilies upon the subject there is the same total absence of all allusion to the decision of the Council. Nowhere can any practical result from the operation of the decree be pointed out, nor any trace even of its existence.⁴ The objections and conjectures, by which those who maintain the authenticity of the narrative in the Acts seek to explain the extraordinary absence of all external evidence of the decree, labour under the disadvantage of all attempts to account for the total failure of effects from a supposed cause, the existence of which is in reality only assumed. It is customary to reply to the objec-

¹ 1 Cor. viii. 1—13, x. 23 ff.

² Numb. xxv. 2 f.; Ps. cvi. 28.

³ Dan. i. 8 f.

⁴ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 150 ff.; Bleek, Einl., p. 372 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 ff., 222; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 82 ff.; Krenkel, Paulus, p. 69 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 199 f.; Nicolas, Etudes N. T., p. 254 f.; Overbeck, Zu de W. App., p. 239 f.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvii. f.; Scholten, Het paul. Ev., p. 450 f.; Stap, Origines, p. 192 ff.; Zeller, App., p. 234 ff. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 296 f.

tion that there is no mention of the decree in the Epistles of Paul or in any other contemporary writing, that this is a mere argument *a silentio*. Is it not, however, difficult to imagine any other argument, from contemporary sources, regarding what is affirmed to have had no existence, than that from silence? Do apologists absolutely demand that, with prophetic anticipation of future controversies, the Apostle Paul should obligingly have left on record that there actually was no Council such as a writer would subsequently describe, and that the decree which he would put forward as the result of that Council must not be accepted as genuine? It is natural to expect that, when writing of the very visit in question, and dealing with subjects and discussions in which, whether in the shape of historical allusion, appeal to authority, taunt for inconsistency, or assertion of his own influence, some allusion to the decree would have been highly appropriate, if not necessary, the Apostle Paul should at least have given some hint of its existence. His not doing so constitutes strong presumptive evidence against the authenticity of the decree, and all the more so as no more positive evidence than silence could possibly be forthcoming of the non-existence of that which never existed. The supposed decree of the Council of Jerusalem cannot on any ground be accepted as a historical fact.¹

We may now return to such further consideration of the statements of the Epistle as may seem necessary for the object of our inquiry. No mention is made by the Apostle of any official mission on the subject of circumcision, and the discussion of that question arises in a merely incidental manner from the presence of Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile Christian. There has been much discussion as to whether Titus actually was circumcised or not, and there can be little doubt that the omission of the negative *οὐδὲ* from Gal. ii. 5, has been in some cases influenced by the desire to bring the Apostle's conduct upon this occasion into harmony with the account, in Acts xvi. 3, of his circumcising Timothy.² We shall not require to enter into any controversy on the point, for the great majority of critics are agreed that the

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 150 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 474 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217 ff., 252 f.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 81 ff., 600; 1860, p. 128 ff.; Galaterbr., p. 58 f., 151 f.; Der Kanon, p. 205 ff.; Krenkel, Paulus, p. 70 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 199 ff., 204 f.; Overbeck, Zu de W. Apg., p. 216 ff., 221, 229 f., 236 ff.; Pfeiderer, Der Paulinismus, p. 503; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvi. ff.; St. Paul, p. 92, note 2; Schotten, Het paul. Ev., p. 450 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, ii. p. 305; v. p. 545 f.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff.; ii. p. 87 ff.; Stap, Origines, p. 191 ff.; Strautman, Paulus, p. 192 ff.; Zeller, Apg., p. 234 ff. Cf. Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 340 f.

² Alford, Greek Test., iii. p. 14; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 165, anm. 1; Thiersch, Die K. im ap. Z., p. 137; Usteri, Br. an die Gal., p. 46.

Epistles of
is is a mere
imagine any
ng what is
lence? Do
icipation of
have left on
riter would
ould put for-
as genuine?
isit in ques-
ich, whether
y, taunt for
e allusion to
ot necessary,
nt of its ex-
umptive evi-
the more so
bly be forth-
xisted. The
a any ground

of the state-
object of our
y official mis-
sion of that
the presence
ere has been
rcumcised or
of the nega-
nfluenced by
occasion into
circumcising
controversy
eed that the

Davidson, *Int. N.*
p. 81 ff., 600;
Krenkel, *Paul.*
Overbeck, *Zu de*
nismus, p. 503;
ollen, *Het paul.*
Schwegler, *Das*
Strautmann, *Paul.*
s Bibelw., viii.

im. I; Thierack,

Apostle intended to say that Titus was not circumcised, although the contrary is affirmed by a few writers.¹ It is obvious from the whole of the Apostle's narrative that great pressure was exerted to induce Titus to submit, and that Paul, if he did not yield even for an hour the required subjection, had a long and severe struggle to maintain his position. Even when relating the circumstances in his letter to the Galatians, the recollection of his contest profoundly stirs the Apostle's indignation; his utterance becomes vehement, but cannot keep pace with his impetuous thoughts, and the result is a narrative in broken and abrupt sentences whose very incompleteness is eloquent, and betrays the irritation which has not even yet entirely subsided. How does this accord with the whole tone of the account in the Acts? It is customary with apologists to insert so much between the lines of that narrative, partly from imagination and partly from the statements of the Epistle, that they almost convince themselves and others that such additions are actually suggested by the Author of the Acts himself. If we take the account of the Acts, however, without such transmutations, it is certain that not only is there not the slightest indication of any struggle regarding the circumcision of Titus, "in which St. Paul maintained at one time almost single-handed the cause of Gentile freedom,"² but no suggestion that there had ever been any hesitation on the part of the leading Apostles and the mass of the Church regarding the point at issue. The impression given by the Author of the Acts is undeniably one of unbroken and undisturbed harmony: of a council in which the elder Apostles were of one mind with Paul, and warmly agreed with him that the Gentiles should be delivered from the yoke of the Mosaic law and from the necessity of undergoing the initiatory rite. What is there in such an account to justify in any degree the irritation displayed by Paul at the mere recollection of this visit, or to merit the ironical terms with which he speaks of the "pillar" Apostles? We may, however, now consider the part which the Apostles must have taken in the dispute regarding the circumcision of Titus. Is it possible to suppose that if the circumcision of Paul's follower had only been demanded by certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, unsupported by the rest, there could ever have been any considerable struggle on the point? Is it possible, further, to suppose that if Paul had received the cordial support of James and the leading Apostles in his refusal to concede the circumcision of Titus, such a contest could have been more than momentary and trifling? Is it pos-

¹ *Reiche*, *Comm. crit. in N. T.*, 1859, ii. p. 14 ff.; *Renan*, *Les Apôtres*, p. xxxv. f.; *St. Paul*, p. 87 ff.; *Rückert*, *Br. an d. Gal.*, p. 73 ff.

² *Lightfoot*, *Ib.*, p. 106.

sible that the Apostle Paul could have spoken of "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed" in such terms as: "to whom we yielded by the submission (*ὑποταγή*) no not for an hour?"¹ or that he could have used this expression if those who pressed the demand upon him had not been in a position of authority, which naturally suggested a subjection which Paul upon this occasion persistently refused? It is not possible. Of course many writers who seek to reconcile the two narratives, and some of whom substitute for the plain statements of the Acts and of the Apostle, an account which is not consistent with either, suppose that the demand for the circumcision of Titus proceeded solely from the "false brethren,"² although some of them suppose that at least these false brethren may have thought they had reason to hope for the support of the elder Apostles.³ It is almost too clear for dispute, however, that the desire that Titus should be circumcised was shared or pressed by the elder Apostles.⁴ According to the showing of the Acts, nothing could be more natural than the fact that James and the elders of Jerusalem who, so long after (xxi. 20 ff.), advised Paul to prove his continued observance of the law and that he did not teach the Jews to abandon circumcision, should on this occasion have pressed him to circumcise Titus. The conduct of Peter at Antioch, and the constant opposition which Paul met with from emissaries of James and of the Apostles of the Circumcision upon the very point of Gentile circumcision, all support the inevitable conclusion, that the pressure upon Paul in the matter of Titus was not only not resisted by the Apostles, but proceeded in no small degree from them.

This is further shown by the remainder of Paul's account of his visit and by the tone of his remarks regarding the principal Apostles, as well as by the historical data which we possess of his subsequent career. We need not repeat that the representation in the Acts both of the Council and of the whole intercourse

¹ Gal. ii. 5.

² Bleek, Einl., p. 372; Ewald, Sendschr. Ap. Paulus, 1857, p. 71; Lechler, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 403 ff.; Meyer, Gal., p. 56, 69 ff.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 164, ann. 2; de Pressensé, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 460 f.; Reuss, Théol. Chr., i. p. 315 f.; Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 68 f.; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 128, ann. 1; Wieseler, Chron. ap. Z., p. 192 f.; Br. an d. Gal., p. 106 ff. Cf. Elliott, Galatians, p. 25 f.; Alford, Gk. Test., iii. p. 13.

³ Wieseler (Chron. ap. Zeit., p. 194) conjectures the meaning of Paul to be that, but for the false brethren, he would actually have circumcised Titus, and thus have been consistent with the principles which he maintained by the circumcision of Timothy, xvi. 3.

⁴ Baur, K. G., i. p. 49 f.; Paulus, i. p. 137 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Galaterbr., p. 56 f.; Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 78 ff., 317 ff.; Einl., p. 228 f., 420 f.; Holsten, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 272 ff.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 105 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196 f., 202; Pfeiderer, Der Paulinismus, p. 279 f.; Stapf, Origines, p. 72 f. Cf. Jowett, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 241, 331.

between Paul and the Apostles is one of "unbroken unity."¹ The struggle about Titus and the quarrel with Peter at Antioch are altogether omitted, and the Apostolic letter speaks merely of "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."² The language of Paul is not so pacific and complimentary. Immediately after his statement that he had "yielded by the submission, no, not for an hour," Paul continues: "But from those who seemed to be something (*ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι*)—whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person;—for to me those who seemed (*οἱ δοκούντες*) (to be something) communicated nothing, but, on the contrary, &c., &c., and when they knew the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars (*οἱ δοκούντες στῦλοι εἶναι*), gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship that we (should go) unto the Gentiles," &c., &c.³ The tone and language of this passage are certainly depreciatory of the elder Apostles,⁴ and, indeed, it is difficult to understand how any one could fail to perceive and admit the fact. It is argued by some who recognise the irony of the term *οἱ δοκούντες* applied to the Apostles, that the disparagement which is so transparent in the form *οἱ δοκούντες εἶναι τι*, "those who seemed to be something," is softened again in the new turn which is given to it in ver. 9, *οἱ δοκούντες στῦλοι εἶναι*, "those who seemed to be pillars," in which, it is said, "the Apostle expresses the real greatness and high authority of the twelve in their separate field of labour."⁵ It seems to us that this interpretation cannot be sustained. Paul is ringing the changes on *οἱ δοκούντες*, and contrasting with the position they assumed and the estimation in which they were held, his own experience of them, and their inability to add anything to him. "Those who seemed to be something," he commences, but immediately interrupts himself, after having thus indicated the persons whom he meant, with the more direct protest of irritated independence:—"whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person." These *δοκούντες* communicated nothing to him, but, on the contrary, when they knew the grace given to him, "those who seemed to be pillars" gave him hands of fellowship, but nothing

¹ Jowett, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 330.

² Acts xv. 25 f.

³ Gal. ii. 6, 9.

⁴ Blom, Theol. Tijdschrift, 1870, p. 466; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 218, 220; Hausrath, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 192; Der Ap. Paulus, p. 257; H. Lang, Rel. Charaktere, i. 1862, p. 69 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 197; Overbeck, Zu de W. App., p. 217; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvi; Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 90 f.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 120 f., 157 f.; ii. p. 109; Stap, Origines, p. 94; Strauss, Das Leben Jesu, p. 76. Cf. Jowett, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 330 f.; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 107, 335.

⁵ Jowett, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 331.

more, and they went their different ways, he to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision. If the expression: *οἱ δοκ. στῦλοι εἶναι* be true, as well as ironically used, it cannot be construed into a declaration of respect, but forms part of a passage whose tone throughout is proudly depreciatory. This is followed by such words as "hypocrisy" (*ὑπόκρισις*) and "condemned" (*κατεγνωσμένος*) applied to the conduct of Peter at Antioch, as well as the mention of the emissaries of James as the cause of that dispute, which add meaning to the irony. This is not, however, the only occasion on which Paul betrays a certain bitterness against the elder Apostles. In his second letter to the Corinthians, xi. 5, he says, "For I reckon that I am not a whit behind the over much Apostles" (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*), and again, xii. 11, "For in nothing was I behind the over much Apostles" (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*); and the whole of the vehement passage in which these references are set shows the intensity of the feeling which called them forth. To say that the expression, in the Galatian Epistle and here are "depreciatory, not indeed of the twelve themselves, but of the extravagant and exclusive claims set up for them by the Judaizers,"¹ is an extremely arbitrary distinction. They are directly applied to the Apostles, and *οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι* cannot be taken as irony against those who over estimated them, but against the *δοκοῦντες* themselves. Paul's blows generally go straight to their mark. Meyer argues that the designation of the Apostles as *οἱ δοκοῦντες* is purely historical, and cannot be taken as ironical, inasmuch as it would be inconsistent to suppose that Paul could adopt a depreciatory tone when he is relating his recognition as a colleague by the elder Apostles;² and others consider that ver. 8, 9, 10 contain evidence of mutual respect and recognition between Paul and the twelve. Even if this were so, it could not do away with the actual irony of the expressions; but do the facts support such a statement? We have seen that, in spite of the picture of unbroken unity drawn by the Author of the Acts, and the liberal sentiments regarding the Gentiles which he puts into the mouth of Peter and of James, Paul had a severe and protracted struggle to undergo in order to avoid circumcising Titus. We have already stated the grounds upon which it seems certain that the pressure upon that occasion came as well from the elder Apostles as the "false brethren," and critics who do not go so far as to make this positive affirmation, at least recognise the negative, and therefore to a large extent compliant, attitude which the Apostles must have held. It is after narrating some of the particulars of this struggle that Paul uses the terms of de-

¹ Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 107.

² Kr. Ex. H'buch üb. d. Br. an die Ga¹, 63 f.

preciation which we have been discussing; and having added, "for to me those who seemed (to be something) communicated nothing," he says, "*but, on the contrary*, when they saw that I have been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with that of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the Apostleship of the circumcision, wrought also for me unto the Gentiles); and when they knew the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship, that we (should go) unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision: only that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do." It will be observed that, after saying they "communicated nothing" to him, the Apostle adds, in opposition, "*but, on the contrary*" (ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον). In what does this opposition consist? Apparently in this, that, instead of strengthening the hands of Paul, they left him to labour alone. They said: "Take your own course; preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision to Gentiles, and we will preach the Gospel of the circumcision to Jews."¹ In fact, when Paul returned to Jerusalem for the second time after fourteen years, he found the elder Apostles not one whit advanced towards his own universalism; they retained their former Jewish prejudices, and remained as before Apostles of the circumcision.² Notwithstanding the strong Pauline sentiments put into his mouth by the Author of the Acts, and his claim to have been so long before selected by God that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, Paul singles out Peter as specially entrusted with the Gospel of the circumcision; and, in the end, after Paul has exerted all his influence, Peter and the rest remain unmoved, and allow Paul to go to the Gentiles, while they confine their ministry as before to the Jews. The success of Paul's work amongst the heathen was too palpable a fact to be ignored, but there is no reason to believe that the conversion of the Gentiles, upon his terms, was more than tolerated at that time, or the Gentile Christians admitted to more than such imperfect communion with the Jewish Christians as that of Proselytes of the Gate in relation to Judaism. This is shown by the conduct of Peter at Antioch after the supposed Council, and of the Jews with him, and even of Barnabas, through fear of the emissaries of James, whose arrival certainly could not have produced a separation between Jewish and Gentile Christians had the latter been recognised as in full com-

¹ Jowett, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. 240 f.

² Baur, K. G., i. p. 51 f., Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 468 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 142 ff.; Blom, Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 471 f.; Hilgenfeld, Einl., p. 230 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 198 f., 202 f.; Pfleiderer, Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.

munion. The "hands of fellowship" clearly was a mere passive permission of Paul's mission to the Gentiles, but no positive and hearty approval of it testified by active support.¹ It must, we think, be evident to any one who attentively considers the passage we are examining, that there is no question whatever in it of a recognition of the Apostolate of Paul.¹ The elder Apostles consent to his mission to the Gentiles; whilst they themselves go to the circumcision; but there is not a syllable which indicates that Paul's claim to the title of Apostle was ever either acknowledged or discussed. It is not probable that Paul would have submitted such a point to their consideration. It is difficult to see how the elder Apostles could well have done less than they did, and the extent of their fellowship seems to have simply amounted to toleration of what they could not prevent. The pressure for the circumcision of the Gentile converts was an attempt to coerce, and to suppress the peculiar principle of the Gospel of uncircumcision; and though that effort failed through the determined resistance of Paul, it is clear, from the final resolve to limit their preaching to the circumcision, that the elder Apostles in no way abandoned their view of the necessity of the initiatory rite. The episode at Antioch is a practical illustration of this statement. Hilgenfeld ably remarks: "When we consider that Peter was afraid of the circumcised Christians, there can be no doubt that James, at the head of the primitive community, made the attempt to force heathen Christians to adopt the substance of Jewish legitimacy, by breaking off ecclesiastical community with them."² The Gentile Christians were virtually excommunicated on the arrival of the emissaries of James, or at least treated as mere Proselytes of the Gate; and the pressure upon the Galatian converts of the necessity of circumcision by similar Judaizing emissaries, which called forth the vehement and invaluable Epistle before us, is quite in accordance with the circumstances of this visit. The separation agreed upon between Paul and the elder Apostles was not in any sense geographical,

¹ Baur, K. G., i. p. 51 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 468 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 142 ff.; Blom, Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 471 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 ff.; Hase, K. G. 9te Aufl., p. 33 f.; Hausrath, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 191 f.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 86 f.; 1860, p. 119 ff.; Einl., p. 230 f.; Jowett, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 236, 240 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 198, 202 f.; Pfeiderer, Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 121 f.; Stap, Origines, p. 73 f.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 192 f.; Tjeenk-Willink, Just. Mart., p. 32 f.; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 569 f. Cf. Alford, Gk. Test., iii. p. 15.

² Holsten, Zum Ev. des Paulus, u. s. w., p. 273, anm.*; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 203.

³ Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 90.

but purely ethnological.¹ It was no mere division of labour,² no suitable apportionment of work. The elder Apostles determined, like their Master before them, to confine their ministry to Jews, whilst Paul, if he pleased, might go to the Gentiles; and the mere fact that Peter subsequently goes to Antioch, as well as many other circumstances, shows that no mere separation of localities, but a selection of race was intended. If there had not been this absolute difference of purpose, any separation would have been unnecessary, and all the Apostles would have preached one Gospel indifferently to all who had ears to hear it; such strange inequality in the partition of the work could never have existed: that Paul should go unaided to the gigantic task of converting the heathen, while the Twelve doggedly reserved themselves for the small but privileged people. All that we have said at the beginning of this section of the nature of primitive Christianity, and of the views prevalent amongst the disciples at the death of their Master, is verified by this attitude of the Three during the famous visit of the Apostle of the Gentiles to Jerusalem, and Paul's account is precisely in accordance with all that historical probability and reason, unwarping by the ideal representations of the Acts, prepare us to expect. The more deeply we go into the statements of Paul the more is this apparent, and the more palpable does the inauthenticity of the narrative of the Council appear.

The words of Paul in describing the final understanding are very remarkable and require further consideration. The decision that they should go to the circumcision and Paul to the Gentiles is based upon the recognition of a different Gospel entrusted to him, the Gospel of the circumcision is entrusted to Peter. It will be remembered that Paul states that, on going up to Jerusalem upon this occasion, he communicated to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and it is probable that he made the journey more especially for this purpose. It appears from the account that this Gospel was not only new to them, but was distinctly different from that of the elder Apostles. If Paul preached the same Gospel as the rest, what necessity could there have been for communicating it at all? What doubt that by any means he might be running, or had run, in vain? He knew perfectly well that he preached a different Gospel from the Apostles of the cir-

¹ Baur, K. G., i. p. 51 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 468 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 142 ff.; Blom, Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 471 f.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 ff.; Hausath, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 191 f.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 86 f.; 1860, p. 119 ff.; Einl., p. 230 f.; Jowett, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 240 ff.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 198 f., 202 f.; Overbeck, Zu de W. Ap., p. 220 f.; Pfeiderer, Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.; Reuss, Rev. de Theol., 1859, iii. p. 80; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 130 f.; Stap, Origines, p. 73 f.

² "They would sanction but not share his mission to the Gentiles." Jowett, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. 236.

cumcision, and his anxiety probably was to secure an amicable recognition of the Gentile converts whom he had taught to consider circumcision unnecessary and the obligation of the law removed. Of course there was much that was fundamentally the same in the two Gospels, starting, as they both did, with the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah; but their points of divergence were very marked and striking, and more especially in directions where the prejudices of the Apostles of the circumcision were the strongest. Avoiding all debatable ground, it is clear that the Gospel of the uncircumcision, which proclaimed the abrogation of the law and the inutility of the initiatory rite, must have been profoundly repugnant to Jews, who still preached the obligation of circumcision and the observance of the law. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law"¹ said the Gospel of the uncircumcision. "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. . . . For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love."² "For neither circumcision is anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."³ The teaching which was specially designated the Gospel of the circumcision, in contradistinction to this Gospel of the uncircumcision, held very different language. There is no gainsaying the main fact—and that fact, certified by Paul himself and substantiated by a host of collateral circumstances, is more conclusive than all conciliatory apologetic reasoning—that, at the date of this visit to Jerusalem (c. A.D. 50-52), the Three, after hearing all that Paul had to say, allowed him to go alone to the Gentiles, but themselves would have no part in the mission, and turned as before to the circumcision.

There is another point to which we must very briefly refer. The statements of Paul show that, antecedent to this visit to Jerusalem, Paul had been the active Apostle of the Gentiles, preaching his Gospel of the uncircumcision, and that subsequently he returned to the same field of labour. If we examine the narrative of the Acts, we do not find him represented in any special manner as the Apostle of the Gentiles, but, on the contrary, whilst Peter claims the honour of having been selected that by his voice the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, Paul is everywhere described as going to the Jews, and only when his teaching is rejected by them does he turn to the Gentiles. It is true that Ananias is represented as being told by the Lord that Paul is a chosen vessel "to bear my name both before Gentiles and kings, and the sons of Israel."⁴ And Paul subsequently recounts how the Lord had said to himself, "Go, for I will send thee

¹ Gal. iii. 13.

³ Gal. vi. 15.

² Gal. v. 2, 6.

⁴ ix. 15 f.

far hence unto Gentiles."¹ The Author of the Acts, however, everywhere conveys the impression that Paul very reluctantly fulfils this mission, and that if he had but been successful amongst the Jews he never would have gone to the Gentiles at all. Immediately after his conversion, he preaches in the synagogues at Damascus and confounds the Jews,² as he again does during his visit to Jerusalem.³ When the Holy Spirit desires the Church at Antioch to separate Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto he has called them, they continue to announce the word of God "in the synagogues of the Jews,"⁴ and in narrating the conversion of the Roman proconsul at Paphos, it is said that it is Sergius Paulus himself who calls for Barnabas and Saul, and seeks to hear the word of God.⁵ When they came to Antioch in Pisidia, they go into the synagogue of the Jews⁶ as usual, and it is only after the Jews reject them that Paul and Barnabas are described as saying: "It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you: seeing that ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."⁷ In Iconium, to which they next proceed, however, they go into the synagogue of the Jews,⁸ and later, it is stated that Paul, on arriving at Thessalonica, "as his custom was," went into the synagogue of the Jews, and for three Sabbaths discoursed to them.⁹ At Corinth it was only when the Jews opposed him and blasphemed, that Paul is represented as saying: "Your blood be upon your own head; I will henceforth, with a pure conscience, go unto the Gentiles." It is impossible to distinguish from this narrative any difference between the ministry of Paul and that of the other Apostles. They all address themselves mainly and primarily to the Jews, although if Gentiles desire to eat of "the crumbs which fall from the children's bread" they are not rejected. Even the Pharisees stirred heaven and earth to make proselytes. In no sense can the Paul of the Acts be considered specially an Apostle of the Gentiles, and the statement of the Epistle to the Galatians¹⁰ has no significance, if interpreted by the historical work. Apologists usually reply to this objection, that the practice of Paul in the Acts is in accordance with his own words in the Epistle to the Romans, i. 16, in which, it is asserted, he recognizes the right of the Jews to precedence. In the authorised version this passage is rendered as follows:—"For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that

¹ xxii. 21; cf. xxvi. 17 ff.³ ix. 28 f.⁴ xiii. 5.² ix. 20, 22.⁶ xiii. 14 ff., 42 ff.⁷ xiii. 46.⁵ xiii. 7.⁹ xvii. 1 ff.; cf. 10 ff., 17 ff.; xviii. 4 ff., 19, 28; xix. 8.⁸ xiv. 1 f.¹⁰ Gal. ii. 9.

believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek."¹ (*δὲναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτῳ καὶ Ἕλληνι*). As a matter of fact we may here at once state that the word *πρῶτον* "first," is not found in Codices B and G, and that it is omitted from the Latin rendering of the verse quoted by Tertullian.² That the word upon which the controversy turns should not be found in so important a MS. as the Vatican Codex is very significant, but proceeding at once to the sense of the sentence, we must briefly state the reasons which seem to us conclusively to show that the usual rendering is erroneous. The passage is an emphatic statement of the principles of Paul. He declares that he is not ashamed of the Gospel, and he immediately states the reason: "for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."³ He is not ashamed of the Gospel because he recognizes its universality; for, in opposition to the exclusiveness of Judaism, he maintains that all are "sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek . . . for ye are all one man in Jesus Christ. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise."⁴ "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love."⁵ The reason which he gives is that which lies at the basis of the whole of his special teaching; but we are asked to believe that, after so clear and comprehensive a declaration, he at once adds the extraordinary qualification: *Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτῳ καὶ Ἕλληνι*, rendered "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." What is the meaning of such a limitation? If the Gospel be a power of God unto salvation "to every one that believeth" (*παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι*), in what manner can it possibly be so "to the Jew first"? Can it be maintained that there are comparative degrees in salvation? "Salvation" is obviously an absolute term. If saved at all, the Jew cannot be more saved than the Greek. If, on the other hand, the expression be interpreted as an assertion that the Jew has a right of precedence either in the offer or the attainment of salvation before the Greek, the manner of its realization is almost equally inconceivable, and a host of difficulties, especially in view of the specific Pauline teaching, immediately present themselves. There can be no doubt that the judaistic view distinctly was that Israel must first be saved, before the heathen could obtain any part in the Messianic kingdom, and we have shown that this idea dominated primitive Christianity; but inseparable from this was the belief that the only way to a participation in its benefits lay through Judaism. The heathen could only obtain

¹ Cf. Rom. ii. 9, 10.² Adv. Marc. v. 13.³ Rom. i. 16.⁴ Gal. iii. 26 f.⁵ Gal. v. 6.

admission into the family of Israel, and become partakers in the covenant, by submitting to the initiatory rite. It was palpably under the influence of this view, and with a conviction that the Messianic kingdom was primarily destined for the children of Israel, that the elder Apostles, even after the date of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, continued to confine their ministry "to the circumcision." Paul's view was very different. He recognised and maintained the universality of the Gospel and, in resolving to go to the heathen, he practically repudiated the very theory of Jewish preference which he is here supposed to advance. If the Gospel, instead of being a power of God to salvation to every man who believed, was for the Jew first, the Apostolate of the Gentiles was a mere delusion and a snare. What could be the advantage of so urgently offering salvation to the Greek, if the gift, instead of being "for every one that believeth," was a mere prospective benefit, inoperative until the Jew had first been saved? "Salvation to the Jew first and also to the Greek," if it have any significance whatever of the kind argued,—involving either a prior claim to the offer of salvation, or precedence in its distribution,—so completely destroys all the present interest in it of the Gentile, that the Gospel must to him have lost all power. To suppose that such an expression simply means, that the Gospel must first be preached to the Jews in any town to which the Apostle might come before it could legitimately be proclaimed to the Gentiles of that town, is childish. We have no reason to suppose that Paul held the deputy Sergius Paulus, who desired to hear the word of God and believed, in suspense until the Jews of Paphos had rejected it. The cases of the Ethiopian eunuch and Cornelius throw no light upon any claim of the Jew to priority in salvation. Indeed, not to waste time in showing the utter incongruity of the ordinary interpretation, we venture to affirm that there is not a single explanation, which maintains a priority assigned to the Jew in any way justifying the reference to this text, which is capable of supporting the slightest investigation. If we linguistically examine the expression *Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι*, we must maintain that the usual rendering is inaccurate, and disregards the fact that *πρῶτον* with *τε* and *καὶ* is applied equally both to "Jew" and "Greek" and cannot rightly be appropriated to the Jew only, as implying a preference over the Greek.¹ The sense can only be intelligibly given by disregarding *πρῶτον* and simply translating the words: "both to the

¹ Baur, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 93 ff.; Beelen, *Comm. in Ep. S. Pauli ad Rom.*, 1854, p. 22 f., cf. 59 f.; Schrader, *Der Ap. Paulus*, iv. p. 373; Stap, *Origines*, p. 142 ff.; Volkmar, *Pömerbr.*, 1875, p. 4, p. 74 f.]

Jew and the Greek."¹ This was the rendering of the ancient Latin version quoted by Tertullian in his work against Marcion: "Itaque et hic, cum dicit: Non enim me pudet evangelii, virtus enim dei est in salutem omni credenti, Judæo et Græco, quia justitia dei in eo revelatur ex fide in fidem."² We are not left without further examples of the very same expression, and an examination of the context will amply demonstrate that Paul used it in no other sense. In the very next chapter the Apostle twice uses the same words. After condemning the hasty and unrighteous judgment of man, he says, "For we know that the judgment of God is according to truth . . . who will render to every one according to his works; to them who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that act out of factious spirit and do not obey the truth but obey unrighteousness, anger, and wrath: affliction and distress upon every soul of man that worketh evil, both of the Jew and of the Greek (Ἰουδαίου τε πρώτον καὶ Ἕλληνας, A. V. "of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile"); but glory and honour and peace to every one that worketh good, both to the Jew and to the Greek (Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, A. V. "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile"). For there is no respect of persons with God."³ How is it possible that, if the Apostle had intended to assert a priority of any kind accorded to the Jew before the Gentile, he could at the same time have added: "For there is no respect of persons with God"? If salvation be "to the Jew first," there is very distinctly respect of persons with God. The very opposite, however, is repeatedly and emphatically asserted by Paul in this very epistle. "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek" (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος), he says, "for the same Lord of all is rich unto all them that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."⁴ Nothing could be more clear and explicit. The precedence of the Jew is directly excluded. At the end of the second chapter, moreover, he explains his idea of a Jew: "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outwardly in flesh, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit not letter."⁵ If anything further were required to prove that the Apostle does not by the expression: Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον

¹ Beelen rightly interprets this passage in his Commentary on the Romans: "Sensus ergo est: Evangelii doctrinam non erubesco; est hæc enim (γὰρ) Dei salifica quædam vis cuicumque qui credit (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Dativus commodi), sive Judæus sit sive Gentilis." Comment. in Epist. S. Pauli ad Romanos, 1854, p. 23. Lachmann puts the word πρώτον between brackets.

² Adv. Marc., v. 13.

⁴ Rom. x. 12, 13.

³ Rom. ii. 2, 6—11.

⁵ Rom. ii. 28.

καὶ Ἕλλησι, intend to indicate any priority accorded to the Jew, it is supplied by the commencement of the third chapter. "What then is the advantage of the Jew? or what the profit of circumcision?" It is obvious that if the Apostle had just said that the Gospel was the power of God unto salvation, "to the Jew first and also to the Greek," he had stated a very marked advantage to the Jew, and that such an inquiry as the above would have been wholly unnecessary. The answer which he gives to his own question, however, completes our certainty. "Much every way," he replies; but in explaining what the "much" advantage was, we hear no more of "to the Jew first:" "Much every way: for first indeed they were entrusted with the oracles of God."¹ And, after a few words, he proceeds: "What then? are we better? Not at all; for we before brought the charge that both Jews and Greeks (Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας) are all under sin."² There can be no doubt in the mind of any one who understands what Paul's teaching was, and what he means by claiming the special title of "Apostle to the Gentiles," that in going "to the Heathen" after his visit to Jerusalem, as before it, there was no purpose in his mind to preach to the Jews first and only on being rejected by them to turn to the Gentiles, as the Acts would have us suppose; but that the principle which regulated his proclamation of the Gospel was that which we have already quoted: "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord of all is rich unto all them that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."³

Still more incongruous is the statement of the Acts that Paul took Timothy and circumcised him because of the Jews. According to this narrative, shortly after the supposed Council of Jerusalem, at which it was decided that circumcision of Gentile converts was unnecessary; immediately after Paul had in spite of great pressure refused to allow Titus to be circumcised; and after it had been agreed between the Apostle of the Gentiles and James and Cephas and John that while they should go to the circumcision, he, on the contrary, should go to the heathen, Paul actually took and circumcised Timothy. Apologists, whilst generally admitting the apparent contradiction, do not consider that this act involves any real inconsistency, and find reasons which, they affirm, sufficiently justify it. Some of these we shall presently examine, but we may at once say that no apologetic arguments seem to us capable of resisting the conclusion arrived at by many independent critics, that the statement of the Acts with regard to Timothy is opposed to all that we know of Paul's views, and that

¹ Rom. iii. 1.² Rom. iii. 9.³ Rom. x. 12, 13.

for unassailable reasons it must be pronounced unhistorical.¹ The Author of the Acts says: "And he (Paul) came to Derbe and Lystra. And behold a certain disciple was there, named Timothy, son of a believing Jewish woman, but of a Greek father; who was well reported of by the brethren in Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those places (καὶ λαβὼν περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκεῖνοις); for they all knew that his father was a Greek (ἤδεισαν γὰρ ἅπαντες ὅτι Ἕλλην ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπῆρχεν)."² The principal arguments of those who maintain the truth and consistency of this narrative briefly are: Paul resisted the circumcision of Titus because he was a Greek, and because the subject then actually under consideration was the immunity from the Jewish rite of Gentile Christians, which would have been prejudiced had he yielded the point. On the other hand, Timothy was the son of a Jewish mother, and whilst there was no principle here in question, Paul circumcised the companion whom he had chosen to accompany him in his missionary journey, both as a recognition of his Jewish origin, and to avoid offence to the Jews whom they should encounter in the course of their ministry, as well as to secure for him access to the synagogues which they must visit: Paul in this instance, according to all apologists putting in practice his own declaration (1 Cor. ix. 19-20): "For being free from all men, I made myself servant unto all that I might gain the more; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews."

It must be borne in mind that the Author who chronicles the supposed circumcision of Timothy makes no allusion to the refusal of Paul to permit Titus to be circumcised; an omission which is not only singular in itself, but significant when we find him, immediately after, narrating so singular a concession of which the Apostle makes no mention. Of course it is clear that Paul could not have consented to the circumcision of Titus, and we have only to consider in what manner the case of Timothy differed so as to support the views of those who hold that Paul, who would not yield to the pressure brought to bear upon him in the case of Titus, might, quite consistently, so short a time after circumcise Timothy with his own hand. It is true that the necessity of circumcision for Gentile Christians came prominently into question, during Paul's visit to Jerusalem, from the presence of his uncircumcised follower Titus, and no doubt the abrogation of

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 147 f., *anm.* 1; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. p. 223; Hilgenfeld, Einl., p. 600; Overbeck, Zu de W. Ap., p. 248 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. P., v. p. 548; Schweyler, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 82 f.; Stapf, Origines, p. 136 f., 144 ff.; Straßmann, Paulus, p. 217 f.; Zeller, Ap., p. 238 f. Vorrede, p. 209.

² Acts xvi. 1-3.

the rite must have formed a striking part of the exposition of his Gospel, which Paul tells us he made upon this occasion; but it is equally certain that the necessity of circumcision long continued to be pressed by the judaistic party in the Church. It cannot fairly be argued that, at any time, Paul could afford to relax his determined and consistent attitude as the advocate for the universality of Christianity and the abrogation of a rite, insistence upon which, he had been the first to recognise, would have been fatal to the spread of Christianity. To maintain that he could safely make such a concession of his principles and himself circumcise Timothy, simply because at that precise moment there was no active debate upon the point, is inadmissible; for his Epistles abundantly prove that the topic, if it ever momentarily subsided into stubborn silence, was continually being revived with renewed bitterness. Pauline views could never have prevailed if he had been willing to sacrifice them for the sake of conciliation, whenever they were not actively attacked.

The difference of the occasion cannot be admitted as a valid reason; let us, therefore, see whether any difference in the persons and circumstances removes the contradiction. It is argued that such a difference exists in the fact that, whilst Titus was altogether a Gentile, Timothy, on the side of his mother at least, was a Jew; and Thiersch, following a passage quoted by Wetstein, states that, according to Talmudic prescriptions, the validity of mixed marriages between a Jewess and a Gentile was only recognized upon the condition that the children should be brought up in the religion of the mother. In this case, he argues that Paul merely carried out the requirement of the Jewish law by circumcising Timothy, which others had omitted to do, and thus secured his admission to the Jewish synagogues to which much of his ministry was directed, but from which he would have been excluded had the rite not been performed.¹ Even Meyer, however, in reference to this point, replies that Paul could scarcely be influenced by the Talmudic canon, because Timothy was already a Christian and beyond Judaism.² Besides, in point of fact, by such a marriage the Jewess had forfeited Jewish privileges. Timothy, in the eyes of the Mosaic law, was not a Jew, and held, in reality, no better position than the Greek Titus. He had evidently been brought up as a heathen, and the only question which could arise in regard to him was whether he must first become a Jew before he could be fully recognised as a

¹ Die Kirche im ap. Z., p. 138. Ewald similarly argues that Paul circumcised Timothy to remove the stigma attaching to him as the child of such a mixed marriage. Gesch. V. Isr., vi. 445; Jahrb. Bibl. Wiss., 1857-58, ix. p. 64.

² A postelg., p. 354.

Christian. The supposition that the circumcision of Timothy, the son of a Greek, after he had actually become a Christian, without having passed through Judaism, could secure for him free access to the synagogues of the Jews, may show how exceedingly slight at that time was the difference between the Jew and the Christian, but it also suggests the serious doubt whether the object of the concession, in the mind of the Author of the Acts, was not rather to conciliate the Judaic Christians, than to represent the act as one of policy towards the unbelieving Jews. The statement of the Acts is that Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews which were in those places; for they knew all that his father was a Greek." If the reason which we are discussing were correct, the expression would more probably have been: "for they knew that his mother was a Jewess." The Greek father might, and probably did, object to the circumcision of his son, but that was no special reason why Paul should circumcise him. On the other hand, the fact that the Jews knew that his father was a Greek made the action attributed to Paul a concession which the Author of the Acts thus represented in its most conciliatory light. The circumcision of Timothy was clearly declared unnecessary by the apostolic decree, for the attempt to show that he was legitimately regarded as a Jew utterly fails. It is obvious that, according to Pauline doctrine, there could be no obligation for any one who adopted Christianity to undergo this initiatory rite. It is impossible reasonably to maintain that any case has been made out to explain why Timothy, who had grown into manhood without being circumcised, and had become a Christian whilst uncircumcised, should at that late period be circumcised. Beyond the reference to a Talmudic prescription, in fact, with which there is not the slightest evidence that Paul was acquainted, and which, even if he did know of it, could not possibly have been recognised by him as authoritative, there has not been a serious attempt made to show that the case of Timothy presents exceptional features which reconcile the contradiction otherwise admitted as apparent.

The whole apologetic argument in fact sinks into one of mere expediency: Timothy, the son of a Jewess and of a Greek, and thus having a certain affinity both to Jews and Gentiles, would become a much more efficient assistant to Paul if he were circumcised and thus had access to the Jewish synagogues; therefore Paul, who himself became as a Jew that he might win the Jews, demanded the same sacrifice from his follower. But can this argument bear any scrutiny by the light of Paul's own writings? It cannot. Paul openly claims to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, and just before the period at which he is supposed to

circumcise Timothy, he parts from the elder Apostles with the understanding that he is to go to the Gentiles who are freed from circumcision. It is a singular commencement of his mission, to circumcise the son of a Greek father after he had become a Christian. Such supposed considerations about access to synagogues and conciliation of the Jews would seem more suitable to a missionary to the circumcision, than to the Apostle of the Gentiles. It must be apparent to all that in going more specially to the Gentiles, as he avowedly was, the alleged expediency of circumcising Timothy falls to the ground, and on the contrary that such an act would have compromised his whole Gospel. Paul's characteristic teaching was the inutility of circumcision, and upon this point he sustained the incessant attacks of the emissaries of James and the Judaistic party without yielding or compromise. What could have been more ill-advised under such circumstances than the circumcision with his own hands of a convert who, if the son of a Jewess, was likewise the son of a Greek, and had remained uncircumcised until he had actually embraced that faith which Paul taught superseded circumcision? The Apostle who declared: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing,"¹ could not have circumcised the Christian Timothy; and if any utterance of Paul more distinctly and explicitly applicable to the present case be required, it is aptly supplied by the following: "Was any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Hath any man been called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. . . . Let each abide in the same calling wherein he was called."² Apologists quote very glibly the saying of Paul: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews," as sufficiently justifying the act which we are considering; but it is neither applicable to the case, nor is the passage susceptible of such interpretation. The special object of Paul at that time, according to his own showing,³ was not to gain Jews but to gain Gentiles; and the circumcision of Timothy would certainly not have tended to gain Gentiles. If we quote the whole passage from which the above is extracted, the sense at once becomes clear and different from that assigned to it: "For being free from all men, I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain Jews; to them under law, as under law, not being myself under law, that I might gain them under law; to them without law, as without law,—not being without law to God, but under law to Christ,—that I might gain them without law; to the weak I became weak that I might gain the weak; I am become all things to all men, that I may by

¹ Gal. v. 2.² 1 Cor. vii. 18, 20.³ Gal. ii. 9.

all means save some. And all things I do for the Gospel's sake, that I may become a partaker thereof with them."¹ It is clear that a man who could become "all things to all men," in the sense of yielding any point of principle, must be considered without principle at all, and no one could maintain that Paul was apt to concede principles. Judged by his own statements, indeed, his character was the very reverse of this. There is no shade of conciliation when he declares: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach any Gospel unto you other than that we preached unto you, let him be accursed. . . . For am I now making men my friends, or God? or am I seeking to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ."² The Gospel of which he speaks, and which he protests "is not after men," but received "through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"³ is that Gospel which Paul preached among the Gentiles, and which proclaimed the abrogation of the law and of circumcision. Paul might in one sense say that "circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of God;"⁴ but such a statement, simply intended to express that there was neither merit in the one nor in the other, clearly does not apply to the case before us, and no way lessens the force of the words we have quoted above: "If ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing." In Paul such a concession would have been in the highest degree a sacrifice of principle, and one which he not only refused to make in the case of Titus, "that the truth of the Gospel might abide," but equally maintained in the face of the pillar Apostles, when he left them and returned to the Gentiles whilst they went back to the circumcision. Paul's idea of being "all things to all men" is illustrated by his rebuke to Peter,—once more to refer to the scene at Antioch. Peter apparently practised a little of that conciliation, which apologists, defending the unknown Author of the Acts at the expense of Paul, consider to be the sense of the Apostle's words. Paul repudiated such an inference, by withstanding Peter to the face as condemned, and guilty of hypocrisy. Paul became all things to all men by considering their feelings, and exhibiting charity and forbearance, in matters indifferent. He was careful not to make his liberty a stumbling block to the weak. "If food maketh my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh for ever lest I make my brother to offend."⁵ Self-abnegation in the use of enlightened liberty, however, is a very different thing from the concession of a rite, which it was the purpose of his whole Gospel to discredit, and the labour of his life to resist. Once more we repeat that the narrative of the Acts regarding the

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 19—23.² Gal. i. 8, 10.³ Gal. i. 11, 12.⁴ 1 Cor. vii. 19.⁵ 1 Cor. viii. 13.

circumcision of Timothy is contradictory to the character and teaching of Paul as ascertained from his Epistles, and like so many other portions of that work which we have already examined, must, as it stands, be rejected as unhistorical.

We have already tested the narrative of the Author of the Acts by the statements of Paul in the first two chapters of the Galatians at such length that, although the subject is far from exhausted, we must not proceed further. We think that there can be no doubt that the rôle assigned to the Apostle Paul in Acts xv. is unhistorical,¹ and it is unnecessary for us to point out the reasons which led the writer to present him in such a subdued light. We must, however, before finally leaving the subject, very briefly point out a few circumstances which throw a singular light upon the relations which actually existed between Paul and the elder Apostles, and tend to show their real, if covert, antagonism to the Gospel of the uncircumcision. We may at the outset remark, in reference to an objection frequently made, that Paul does not distinctly refer to the Apostles as opposing his teaching and does not personally attack them, that such a course would have been suicidal in the Apostle of the Gentiles, whilst on the other hand it could not but have hindered the acceptance of his Gospel, for which he was ever ready to endure so much. The man who wrote: "If it be possible, as much as dependeth on you, be at peace with all men,"² could well be silent in such a cause. Paul, in venturing to preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision, laboured under the singular disadvantage of not having, like the Twelve, been an immediate disciple of the Master. He had been "as the one born out of due time,"³ and although he claimed that his Gospel had not been taught to him by man but had been received by direct revelation from Jesus, there can be no doubt that his apostolic position was constantly assailed. The countenance of the elder Apostles, even if merely tacit, was of great importance to the success of his work; and he felt this so much that, as he himself states, he went up to Jerusalem to communicate to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles: "lest by any means I might be running or did run in vain."⁴ Any open breach between them would have frustrated his labours. Had Paul been in recognised enmity with the Twelve who had been selected as

¹ Baur, K. G., i. p. 126 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 138 ff.; Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217 ff.; 251 f.; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 77 ff.; 1860, p. 121 ff.; Galatibr., p. 151 f.; Einl., p. 231 f.; Lipsius, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196 ff.; Overbeck, Zu de W. App., p. 217 ff.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvi.; St. Paul, p. 81, note 2; Scholten, Het paulin. Ev., p. 448 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. P., v. p. 544 ff.; Schweyler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., ii. p. 86 ff.; Stap, Origines, p. 69, n. 2, p. 182 ff.; Straatman, Paulus, p. 187 ff.; Tjeenk-Willink, Just. Mart., p. 31 f., n. 3; Volkmar, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 345 ff.; Zeller, Apg., p. 224 ff.

² Rom. xiii. 18.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 8.

⁴ Gal. ii. 2.

his special disciples by the Master, and been repudiated and denounced by them, it is obvious that his position would have been a precarious one. He had no desire for schism. His Gospel, besides, was merely a development of that of the elder Apostles; and, however much they might resent his doctrine of the abrogation of the law and of the inutility of circumcision, they could still regard his Gentile converts as at least in some sort Proselytes of the Gate. With every inducement to preserve peace if by any means possible, and to suppress every expression of disagreement with the Twelve, it is not surprising that we find so little direct reference to the elder Apostles in his epistles. During his visit to Jerusalem he did not succeed in converting them to his views. They still limited their ministry to the circumcision, and he had to be content with a tacit consent to his work amongst the heathen. But although we have no open utterance of his irritation, the suppressed impatience of his spirit, even at the recollection of the incidents of his visit, betrays itself in abrupt sentences, unfinished expressions, and groans which break down in the struggle of repressed emotion. We have already said enough regarding his ironical references to those "who seemed to be something," to the "overmuch Apostles," and we need not again point to the altercation between Paul and Cephas at Antioch, and the strong language used by the former. Nothing is more certain than the fact that, during his whole career, the Apostle Paul had to contend with systematic opposition from the Judaic Christian party;¹ and the only point regarding which there is any difference of opinion is the share in this taken by the Twelve. As we cannot reasonably expect to find any plain statement of this in the writings of the Apostle, we are forced to take advantage of such indications as can be discovered. Upon one point we are not left in doubt. The withdrawal of Peter and the others at Antioch from communion with the Gentile Christians, and consequently from the side of Paul, was owing to the arrival of certain men from James, for the Apostle expressly states so. No surprise is expressed, however, at the effect produced by these *ἄνδρες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, and the clear inference is that they represented the views of a naturally antagonistic party, an inference which is in accordance with all that we elsewhere read of James. It is diffi-

¹ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 161; *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 53 f.; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 165 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 369 f.; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 332 ff.; *Kurtz*, Lehrb. K. G., i. p. 45 f.; *Lang*, Rel. Charaktere, p. 69 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 379 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 299 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 414 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 273 ff.; *Nicolas*, Etudes, N. T., p. 256 ff.; *Renan*, St. Paul, p. 299; *Révillé*, Essais, p. 29 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 156 ff., ii. p. 107 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 84 ff., 113 f.; *Zeller*, Vorträge, p. 211 f.

cult to separate the *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* from the *τινὲς* of the preceding chapter (i. 7) who "trouble" the Galatians, and "desire to pervert the Gospel of Christ," asserting the necessity of circumcision, against whom the epistle is directed. Again we meet with the same vague and cautious designation of judaistic opponents in the second epistle to the Corinthians (iii. 1), where "some" (*τινὲς*) bearers of "letters of commendation" (*συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν*) from persons unnamed, were attacking the Apostle and endeavouring to discredit his teaching. By whom were these letters written? We cannot of course give an authoritative reply, but we may ask: by whom could letters of commendation possessing an authority which could have weight against that of Paul be written, except by the elder Apostles? We have certain evidence in the first Epistle to the Corinthians that parties had arisen in the Church of Corinth in opposition to Paul. These parties were distinguished, as the Apostle himself states, by the cries: "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ."² (*ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παῦλον, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ*.) Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to the precise nature of these parties, there can be no doubt that both the party "of Cephas" and the party "of Christ" held strong Judaistic views and assailed the teaching of Paul, and his apostolic authority. It is very evident that the persons to whom the apostle refers in connection with "letters of commendation" were of these parties. Apologists argue that: "in claiming Cephas as the head of their party they had probably neither more nor less ground than their rivals, who sheltered themselves under the names of Apollos and of Paul."³ It is obvious, however, that, in a Church founded by Paul, there could have been no party created with the necessity to take his name as their watchword, except as a reply to another party which, having intruded itself, attacked him, and forced those who maintained the views of their own Apostle to raise such a counter-cry. The parties "of Cephas" and "of Christ" were manifestly

¹ A curious corroboration of this conclusion was found in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions:—

διὸ πρὸ πάντων μέμνησθε ἀπόστολον ἢ διδάσκαλον ἢ προφήτην φεῖγειν μὴ πρότερον ἀκριβῶς ἀντιβαλλόντα αὐτοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰακώβω τῷ λεγόντι ἀδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου καὶ πεπιστευμένῳ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν Ἑβραίων διέπειν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ μετὰ μαρτύρων προσεληλυθότα πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Hom. xi. 35.

Propter quod observate cautius, ut nulli doctorum credatis, nisi qui Jacobi fratris Domini ex Hierusalem detulerit testimonium, vel ejus, quicumque post ipsum fuerit. Nisi enim quis illuc ascenderit, et ibi fuerit probatus, quod sit doctor idoneus et fidelis ad prædicandum Christi verbum, nisi, inquam, inde detulerit testimonium, recipiendus omnino non est. Recog. iv. 35.

² 1 Cor. i. 12.

³ Lightfoot, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 1874, p. 355.

nd de-
e been
el, be-
ostles;
abroga-
y could
oselytes
by any
ecement
e direct
his visit
s views.
he had
agst the
is irrita-
recollée-
entences,
n in the
ough re-
be some-
ain point
and the
e certain
Paul had
Christian
difference
we cannot
the writ-
such in-
e are not
at Antioch
sequently
ertain men
surprise is
se *τινὲς ἀπὸ*
sented the
which is in
It is diffi-

Jahrb., 1850,
Eps. of St.
raktere, p. 69
299 f.; Mil-
colas, Etudes,
f.; Schwegler,
113 f.; Zeller,

aggressive, intruding themselves, as the Apostle complains, into "other men's labours,"¹ and this in some manner seems to point to that convention between the Apostle and the Three, that he should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision which, barely more than passive neutrality at the beginning, soon became covertly antagonistic. The fact that the party "of Paul" was not an organized body, so to say, directed by the Apostle as a party leader, in no way renders it probable that the party of Cephas, which carried on active and offensive measures, had not much more ground in claiming Cephas as their head. One point is indisputable, that no party ever claims any man as its leader who is not clearly associated with the views it maintains. The party "of Cephas," representing judaistic views, opposing the teaching of Paul, and joining in denying his apostolic claims, certainly would not have taken Peter's name as their watch-cry if he had been known to hold and express such Pauline sentiments as are put into his mouth in the Acts, or had not, on the contrary, been intimately identified with judaistic principles. To illustrate the case by a modern instance: Is it possible to suppose that, in any considerable city in this country, a party holding ritualistic opinions could possibly claim the present Archbishop of Canterbury as its leader, or one professing "broad-church" views could think of sheltering itself under the name of the Archbishop of York? Religious parties may very probably mistake the delicate details of a leader's teaching, but they can scarcely be wrong in regard to his general principles. If Peter had been so unfortunate as to be flagrantly misunderstood by his followers and, whilst this party preached in his name judaistic doctrines and anti-Pauline opinions, the Apostle himself advocated the abrogation of the law, as a burden which the Jews themselves were not able to bear, and actively shared Pauline convictions, is it possible to suppose that Paul would not have pointed out the absurdity of such a party claiming such a leader?

The fact is, however, that Paul never denies the claim of those who shelter themselves under the names of Peter and James, never questions their veracity, and never adopts the simple and natural course of stating that, in advancing these names, they are imposters or mistaken. On the contrary, upon all occasions he evidently admits, by his silence, the validity of the claim.² We are not left to mere inference that the adopted head of the party actually shared the views of the party. Paul himself distinguishes Peter as the head of the party of the circumcision in a passage in his letter to the Galatians already frequently referred

¹ 2 Cor. x. 13 ff.

² *Réville, Essais de Critique religieuse*, 1860, p. 16 f.

to,¹ and the episode at Antioch confirms the description. Upon that occasion, Peter retracts a momentary concession made under the influence of Paul and of a Gentile community, and no doubt is left that his permanent practice was to force the Gentiles to judaize. For reasons which we have already stated, Paul could not but have desired to preserve peace, or even the semblance of it, with the elder Apostles, for the Gospel's sake; and he, therefore, wisely leaves them as much as possible out of the question and deals with their disciples. It is obvious that mere policy must have dictated such a course. By ignoring the leaders and attacking their followers, he suppressed the chief strength of his opponents and kept out of sight the most formidable argument against himself: the concurrence with them of the elder Apostles. On the one hand, the epistles of Paul bear no evidence to any active sympathy and co-operation with his views and work on the part of the elder Apostles. Had any real unanimity existed between them, any positive support been given to him by the Twelve, it is impossible to suppose that, under the circumstances, Paul would not have allowed the fact to be plainly perceptible in his writings, in which so many opportunities occur. On the other hand, Paul is everywhere assailed by judaistic adversaries who oppose his Gospel and deny his apostleship, and who claim as their leaders the elder Apostles. Paul does not deny the truth of their pretensions, and combats them alone and unaided, but with an under-current of suppressed bitterness against their leaders which cannot be ignored. We shall not again refer to the expressions in the Epistle to the Galatians, but no one can read these letters to the Corinthians, which bear on their very front, as the reason which has called them forth, the existence of such parties, without recognising that the apostle not only does not, and cannot, contradict the claim of the party "of Cephas," for instance, but feels its substantial truth.

If, even without pressing expressions to their extreme and probable point, we take the contrast drawn between his own Gospel and that of the circumcision, the reality of the antagonism must be apparent. "For we are not as the many (*οἱ πολλοί*)² which adulterate the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, before God, speak we in Christ."³ Later on in the letter, after

¹ Gal. ii. 7 f.

² Although this reading is supported by the oldest MSS. such as A, B, C, K, Σ , and others, the reading of *λοιποί*, "the rest," stands in D, E, F, G, I, and a large number of other codices, and is defended by many critics as the original, which they argue was altered to *οἱ πολλοί*, to soften the apparent hardness of such an expression, which would seem to imply that Paul declared himself the sole true exponent of the Gospel.

³ 2 Cor. ii. 17.

referring to the intrusion of the opposite party into the circle of his labours, Paul declares that his impatience and anxiety proceed from godly jealousy at the possible effect of the judaistic intruders upon the Corinthians. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, your thoughts should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we did not preach, or if ye receive another spirit which ye received not, or another Gospel which ye did not accept, ye bear well with him. For I think I am not a whit behind the overmuch Apostles (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*)."¹ This reference to the elder Apostles gives point to much of the epistle which is ambiguous, and more especially when the judaistic nature of the opposition is so clearly indicated a few verses further on: "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they Abraham's seed? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool), I am more; in labours more abundantly, in prisons exceedingly, in deaths often," &c., &c.²

It is argued that the Twelve had not sufficient authority over their followers to prevent such interference with Paul, and that the relation of the Apostle to the Twelve was: "separation, not opposition, antagonism of the followers rather than of the leaders, personal antipathy of the Judaizers to St. Paul, rather than of St. Paul to the Twelve."³ It is not difficult to believe that the antipathy of Paul to the Judaizers was less than that felt by them towards him. The superiority of the man must have rendered him somewhat callous to such dislike.⁴ But the mitigated form of difference between Paul and the Twelve here assumed, although still very different from the representations of the Acts, cannot be established, but on the contrary must be much widened before it can justly be taken as that existing between Paul and the elder Apostles. We do not go so far as to say that there was open enmity between them, or active antagonism of any distinct character on the part of the Twelve to the Apostle of the Gentiles, but there is every reason to believe that they not only disliked his teaching, but endeavoured to counteract it by their own ministry of the circumcision. They not only did not restrain the opposition of their followers, but they abetted them in their counter-assertion of judaistic views. Had the Twelve felt any cordial friendship for

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 2-5; cf. Gal. i. 6 ff.

² 2 Cor. xi. 22 ff.

³ *Jewett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, 1855, i. p. 326, 339.

⁴ We do not think it worth while to refer to the argument that the collections made by Paul for the poor of Jerusalem, &c., in times of distress proves the unanimity which prevailed between them. Charity is not a matter of doctrine, and the Good Samaritan does not put the suffering man through his catechism before he relieves his wants.

Paul, and exhibited any active desire for the success of his ministry of the uncircumcision, it is quite impossible that his work could have been so continuously and vexatiously impeded by the persecution of the Jewish Christian party. The Apostles may not have possessed sufficient influence or authority entirely to control the action of adherents, but it would be folly to suppose that, if unanimity of views had prevailed between them and Paul, and a firm and consistent support had been extended to him, such systematic resistance as he everywhere encountered from a party professing to be led by the "pillar" Apostles could have been seriously maintained, or that he could have been left alone and unaided to struggle against it. If the relations between Paul and the Twelve had been such as are intimated in the Acts of the Apostles, his epistles must have presented undoubted evidence of the fact. Both negatively and positively they testify the absence of all support, and the existence of antagonistic influence on the part of the elder Apostles, and external evidence fully confirms the impression which the epistles produce.¹

From any point of view which may be taken, the Apocalypse is an important document in connection with this point. If it be accepted as a work of the Apostle John—the preponderance of evidence and critical opinion assigns it to him—this book, of course, possesses the greatest value as an indication of his views. If it be merely regarded as a contemporary writing, it still is most interesting as an illustration of the religious feeling of the

¹ "Everywhere in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles, we find traces of an opposition between the Jew and the Gentile, the circumcision and the uncircumcision. It is found, not only in the Epistle to the Galatians, but in a scarcely less aggravated form in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, softened, indeed, in the Epistle to the Romans, and yet distinctly traceable in the Epistle to the Philippians; the party of the circumcision appearing to triumph in Asia, at the very close of the Apostle's life, in the second Epistle to Timothy. In all these Epistles we have proofs of a reaction to Judaism, but though they are addressed to Churches chiefly of Gentile origin, never of a reaction to heathenism. Could this have been the case, unless within the Church itself there had been a Jewish party urging upon the members of the Church the performance of a rite repulsive in itself, if not as necessary to salvation, at any rate as a counsel of perfection, seeking to make them in Jewish language, not merely proselytes of the gate, but proselytes of righteousness? What, if not this, is the reverse side of the Epistles of St. Paul? that is to say, the motives, object, or basis of teaching of his opponents, who came with 'epistles of commendation' to the Church of Corinth, 2 Cor. iii. 1; who profess themselves 'to be Christ's' in a special sense, 2 Cor. x. 7; who say they are of Apollos, or Cephas, or Christ, 1 Cor. i. 12; or James, Gal. ii. 12; who preach Christ of contention, Phil. i. 15, 17; who deny St. Paul's authority, 1 Cor. ix. 1, Gal. iv. 16; who slander his life, 1 Cor. ix. 3, 7. We meet these persons at every turn. Are they the same or different? Are they more chance opponents? or do they represent to us one spirit, one mission, one determination to root out the Apostle and his doctrine from the Christian Church? Nothing but the fragmentary character of St. Paul's writings would conceal from us the fact, that here was a concerted and continuous opposition." *Jowett, The Ep. of St. Paul, i. p. 332 f.*

period. The question is: Does the Apocalypse contain any reference to the Apostle Paul, or throw light upon the relations between him and the elder Apostles? If it does so, and be the work of one of the *στῦλοι*, nothing obviously could be more instructive. In the messages to the seven churches, there are references and denunciations which, in the opinion of many able critics, are directed against the Apostle of the Gentiles and his characteristic teaching.¹ Who but Paul and his followers can be referred to in the Epistle to the Church of Ephesus: "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and that thou canst not bear wicked persons: and didst try them which say they are Apostles and are not, and didst find them liars?"² Paul himself informs us not only of his sojourn in Ephesus, where he believed that "a great and effectual door" was opened to him, but adds, "there are many adversaries" (*ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί*).³ The foremost charge brought against the churches is that they have those that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the sons of Israel, "to eat things offered unto idols."⁴ The teaching of Paul upon this point is well known, 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff., x. 25 ff., Rom. xiv. 2 ff., and the reference here cannot be mistaken; and when in the Epistle to the Church of Thyatira, after denouncing the teaching "to eat things offered unto idols," the Apocalypticist goes on to encourage those who have not this teaching, "who knew not the depths of Satan, (*τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ*),⁵ as they say" the expression of Paul himself is taken to denounce his doctrine; for the Apostle, defending himself against the attacks of those parties "of Cephas" and "of Christ" in Corinth, writes: "But God revealed (them) to us through his

¹ Baur, K. G., i. p. 30 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Einl., p. 413 ff.; Keim, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 160, ann. 2; Renan, St. Paul, p. 303 ff., 367 f.; Rovers, Heeft Paulus zich ter verdedig. van zijn Apost. op. Wond. beroepen? 1870, p. 32 f.; Schwegler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 172 f., ii. p. 116; Tjeenk-Willink, Just. Mart., p. 45; Volkmar, Comm. Offenb. Johannis, 1862, p. 25 ff., 80 ff.; Zeller, Vortrage, p. 215 f. cf. Kostlin, Lehrb. d. Ev. u. Br. Johannis, 1843, p. 486 f.; Ritschl, Entst. altk. K., p. 134 f.

² ii. 2.

³ 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

⁴ Apoc. ii. 14, 20. We do not enter upon the discussion as to the exact interpretation of *πορνεύσαι*, which is always associated with the *φάγεσθαι εἰδωλόθυρα*, regarding which opinions differ very materially. It is probable that the apocalypticist connected the eating of things offered to idols with actual idolatrous worship. It is not improbable that the maxim of Paul: "all things are lawful unto me" (*πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν*), 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23, may have been abused by his followers, and, in any case, such a sentiment, coupled with Paul's teaching and his abandonment of the Law, must have appeared absolute license to the judaistic party. We must also pass over the discussion regarding the significance of "Balaam." This and other points are fully dealt with by several of the writers indicated in note 1, above. The Nicolaitans are not only classed as followers of the teaching of Balaam, but as adherents of Paul.

⁵ Apoc. ii. 24. This is the reading of \aleph , P, and some other codices; A, B, C, read *τὰ βάθη*.

Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the depths of God" (*τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ*)—"the depths of Satan" rather, records the judaistic author of the Apocalypse. *τὰ βάθη* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Again, in the address to the churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, when the writer denounces those "who say that they are Jews, and are not, but a synagogue of Satan,"¹ whom has he in view but those Christians whom Paul had taught to consider circumcision unnecessary and the law abrogated? We find Paul in the Epistle to the Corinthians, so often quoted, obliged to defend himself against these judaizing parties upon this very point: "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they Abraham's seed? so am I."² It is manifest that his adversaries had vaunted their own Jewish origin as a title of superiority over the Apostles of the Gentiles. We have, however, further evidence of the same attack upon Paul regarding this point. Epiphanius points out that the Elionites denied that Paul was a Jew, and asserted that he was born of a Gentile father and mother, but, having gone up to Jerusalem, that he became a proselyte and submitted to circumcision in the hope of marrying a daughter of the high priest. But afterwards, according to them, enraged at not securing the maiden for his wife, Paul wrote against circumcision and the Sabbath and the law.³ The Apostle Paul, whose constant labour it was to destroy the particularism of the Jew, and raise the Gentile to full, free, and equal participation with him in the benefits of the New Covenant, could not but incur the bitter displeasure of the Apocalypticist, for whom the Gentiles were, as such, the type of all that was common and unclean. In the utterances of the seer of Patmos we seem to hear the expression of all that judaistic hatred and opposition which pursued the Apostle who laid the axe to the root of Mosaism and, in his efforts to free Christianity from trammels which, more than any other, retarded its triumphant development, aroused against himself all the virulence of Jewish illiberality and prejudice.

The results at which we have arrived might be singularly con-

¹ Apoc. ii. 9, iii. 9.

² 2 Cor. xi. 22; cf. Philip. iii. 4 ff.

³ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ νενοφωρίας ἔμπλεα, ὡς καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐνταῦθα κατηγοροῦντες οὐκ ἀδύνατον ἐπιπλάσσειν τισὶ τῆς τῶν προαποστόλων αὐτῶν κακοουργίας καὶ πλάνης λόγους πεποιημένοις. Τί ποτε μὲν αὐτόν, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀρνέζεται, λέγοντες ἑ: Ἑλλήνων δὲ αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίζεται, λαβόντες τὴν πρόφασιν ἐκ τοῦ τοποῦ διὰ τὸ φιλάλῃες ὅτι αὐτοῦ ῥήθεν, ὅτι, Τροάσει εἰμι, οὐκ ἁσίου πόλεως πολίτης. Κτεν ἀποκρούει αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἕλληνα, καὶ Ἑλληνίδος μη-ρὸς καὶ Ἑλληνοῦ πατρὸς παῖδα, ἀναβιβασμένοι δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσόλῃμα, καὶ χρόνον ἐκεῖ μεμενημένοι, ἐπιτεθυγαμένοι δὲ βορατέρα τοῦ ἱερέως πρὸς γάμον ἀγαγέσθαι, καὶ τοῦτον ἔκτισαι, προδόντων γενέσθαι καὶ περιεμνησθῆναι, εἰς αὐτὸν λαβόντες τὴν παρὰ τὸν ἱερέα, καὶ κατὰ ἐπιτομὴν γεγραμέναι, καὶ κατὰ συμβατέον καὶ νομιθεσίαις. Her. xxx. 16.

firmed by an examination of the writings of the first two centuries, and by observing the attitude assumed towards the Apostles of the Gentiles by such men as Justin Martyr, Papias, Hegesippus, and the Author of the Clementines; but we have already devoted too much space to this subject, and here we must reluctantly leave it.

The steps by which Christianity was gradually freed from the trammels of Judaism and became a religion of unlimited range and universal fitness were clearly not those stated in the Acts of the Apostles. Its emancipation from Mosaism was not effected by any liberal action or enlightened guidance on the part of the elder Apostles. At the death of their Master, the Twelve remained closely united to Judaism, and evidently were left without any understanding that Christianity was a new religion which must displace Mosaic institutions, and replace the unbearable yoke of the law by the divine liberty of the Gospel. To the last moment regarding which we have any trustworthy information, the Twelve as might have been expected, retained all their early religious customs and all their Jewish prejudices. They were simply Jews believing that Jesus was the Messiah; and if the influence of Paul enlarged their views upon some minor points, we have no reason to believe that they ever abandoned their belief in the continued obligation of the law, and the necessity of circumcision for full participation in the benefits of the Covenant. The Author of the *Acts* would have us believe that they required no persuasion, but anticipated Paul in the Gospel of uncircumcision. It is not within the scope of this work to inquire how Paul originally formed his views of Christian universalism. Once formed, it is easy to understand how rapidly they must have been developed and confirmed by experience amongst the Gentiles. Whilst the Twelve still remained in the narrow circle of Judaism and could not be moved beyond the ministry of the circumcision, Paul, in the larger and freer field of the world, must daily have felt more convinced that the abrogation of the Law and the abandonment of circumcision were essential to the extension of Christianity amongst the Gentiles. He had no easy task, however to convince others of this, and he never succeeded in bringing his elder colleagues over to his views. To the end of his life Paul had to contend with bigoted and narrow-minded opposition within the Christian body, and if his views ultimately triumphed, and the seed which he sowed virtually yielded a rich harvest, he himself did not live to see the day, and the end was attained only by slow and natural changes. The new religion gradually extended beyond the limits of Judaism. Gentile Christians soon outnumbered Jewish believers.

The Twelve whose names were the strength of the Judaistic opposition one by one passed away; but, above all, the fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Christian community secured the success of Pauline principles and the universalism of Christianity. The Church of Jerusalem could not bear transplanting. In the uncongenial soil of Pella it gradually dwindled away, losing first its influence and soon after its nationality. The divided members of the Jewish party, scattered amongst the Gentiles and deprived of their influential leaders, could not long retard the progress of the liberalism which they still continued to oppose and to misrepresent. In a word, the emancipation of Christianity was not effected by the Twelve, was no work of councils, and no result of dreams; but, receiving its first great impulse from the genius and the energy of Paul, its ultimate achievement was the result of time and natural development.

We have now patiently considered the "Acts of the Apostles," and although it has in no way been our design exhaustively to examine its contents, we have more than sufficiently done so to enable the reader to understand the true character of the document. The author is unknown, and it is no longer possible to identify him. If he were actually the Luke whom the Church indicates, our results would not be materially affected; but the mere fact that the writer is unknown is obviously fatal to the Acts as a guarantee of miracles. A cycle of supernatural occurrences could scarcely, in the estimation of any rational mind, be established by the statement of an anonymous author, and more especially one who not only does not pretend to have been an eyewitness of most of the miracles, but whose narrative is either uncorroborated by other testimony or inconsistent with itself, and contradicted on many points by contemporary documents. The phenomena presented by the Acts of the Apostles become perfectly intelligible when we recognise that it is the work of a writer living long after the occurrences related, whose pious imagination furnished the apostolic age with an elaborate system of supernatural agency, far beyond the conception of any other New Testament writer by which, according to his view the proceedings of the Apostles were farthered and directed, and the infant Church miraculously fostered. On examining other portions of his narrative, we find that they present the features which the miraculous elements rendered antecedently probable. The speeches attributed to different speakers are all cast in the same

mould, and betray the composition of one and the same writer. The sentiments expressed are inconsistent with what we know of the various speakers. And when we test the circumstances related, by previous or subsequent incidents and by trustworthy documents, it becomes apparent that the narrative is not an impartial statement of facts, but a reproduction of legends or a development of tradition, shaped and coloured according to the purpose or the pious views of the writer. The Acts of the Apostles, therefore, is not only an anonymous work, but upon due examination its claims to be considered sober and veracious history must be emphatically rejected. It cannot strengthen the foundations of Supernatural Religion, but, on the contrary, by its profuse and indiscriminate use of the miraculous it discredits miracles, and affords a clearer insight into their origin and fictitious character.

the writer,
know of
ances re-
stworthy
ot an im-
s or a de-
g to the
the Apos-
n due ex-
us history
ne founda-
y its pro-
redits mir-
fictitious

PART V.

THE DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES.

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLES AND THE APOCALYPSE.

TURNING from the Acts of the Apostles to the other works of the New Testament, we shall be able very briefly to dispose of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. The so-called Epistles of James, Jude, and John, do not contain any evidence which, even supposing them to be authentic, really bears upon our inquiry into the reality of Miracles and Divine Revelation; and the testimony of the Apocalypse affects it quite as little. We have already, in examining the fourth Gospel, had occasion to say a good deal regarding both the so-called Epistles of John and the Apocalypse. It is unnecessary to enter upon a more minute discussion of them here. "Seven books of the New Testament," writes Dr. Westcott, "as is well known, have been received into the Canon on evidence less complete than that by which the others are supported."¹ These are "the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse." We have already furnished the means of judging of the nature of the evidence upon which some of the other books have been received into the Canon, and the evidence for most of these being avowedly "less complete," its nature may be conceived. Works which for a long period were classed amongst the Antilegomena, or disputed books, and which only slowly acquired authority as, in the lapse of time, it became more difficult to examine their claims, could scarcely do much to establish the reality of miracles. With regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may remark that we are freed from any need to deal at length with it, not only by the absence of any specific evidence in its contents, but by the following consideration. If the Epistle be not by Paul,—and it not only is not his, but does not even pretend to be so,—the author is un-

¹ On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 347.

known, and therefore the document has no weight as testimony. On the other hand, if assigned to Paul, we shall have sufficient ground in his genuine epistles for considering the evidence of the Apostle, and it could not add anything even if the Epistle to the Hebrews were included in the number.

The first Epistle of Peter might have required more detailed treatment, but we think that little could be gained by demonstrating that the document is not authentic, or showing that, in any case, the evidence which it could furnish is not of any value. On the other hand, we are averse to protract the argument by any elaboration of mere details which can be avoided. If it could be absolutely proved that the Apostle Peter wrote the epistle circulating under his name, the evidence for miracles would only be strengthened by the fact that incidentally the doctrine of the Resurrection of Jesus is maintained. No historical details are given, and no explanation of the reasons for which the writer believed in it. Nothing more would be proved than the point that Peter himself believed in the Resurrection. It would certainly be a matter of very deep interest if we possessed a narrative written by the Apostle himself, giving minute and accurate details of the phenomena in consequence of which he believed in so miraculous an event; but since this epistle does nothing more than allow us to infer the personal belief of the writer, unaccompanied by corroborative evidence, we should not gain anything by accepting it as genuine. We are quite willing to assume, without further examination, that the Apostle Peter in some way believed in the Resurrection of his Master. For the argument regarding the reality of that stupendous miracle, upon which we are about to enter, this is tantamount to assuming the authenticity of the epistle.

Coming to the Epistles of Paul, it will not be necessary to go into the evidence for the various letters in our New Testament which are ascribed to him, nor shall we require to state the grounds upon which the authenticity of many of them is denied. Accepting the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians and Romans in the main as genuine compositions of the Apostle, the question as to the origin of the rest, so far as our inquiry is concerned, has little or no interest. From these four letters we obtain the whole evidence of Paul regarding miracles, and this we now propose carefully to examine. One point in particular demands our fullest attention. It is undeniable that Paul preached the doctrine of the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus, and believed in those events. Whilst, therefore, we shall not pass over his supposed testimony for the possession of miraculous powers, we shall chiefly devote our attention to his evidence for the central

dogmas of Supernatural Religion, the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus. We shall not, however, limit our examination to the testimony of Paul, but, as the climax of the historical argument for miracles, endeavour to ascertain the exact nature of the evidence upon which belief is claimed for the actual occurrence of those stupendous events. For this, our inquiry into the authorship and credibility of the historical books of the New Testament has at length prepared us, and it will be admitted that, in subjecting these asserted miracles to calm and fearless scrutiny—untinged by irreverence or disrespect, if personal earnestness and sincere sympathy with those who believe are any safeguards, the whole theory of Christian miracles will be put to its final test.

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL.

It is better, before proceeding to examine the testimony of Paul for the Resurrection, to clear the way by considering his evidence for miracles in general, apart from that specific instance. In an earlier portion of this work¹ the following remark was made: "Throughout the New Testament, patristic literature, and the records of ecclesiastical miracles, although we have narratives of countless wonderful works performed by others than the writer, and abundant assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church, there is no instance whatever, that we can remember, in which a writer claims to have himself performed a miracle."² It is asserted that this statement is erroneous, and that Paul does advance this claim.³ It may be well to quote the moderate words in which a recent able writer states the case, although not with immediate reference to the particular passage which we have quoted. "... In these undoubted writings St. Paul certainly shows by incidental allusions, the good faith of which cannot be questioned, that he believed himself to be endowed with

¹ p. 192 f.

² Dr. Kuennen has made a very similar remark regarding the Old Testament. He says: "When Ezra and Nehemiah relate to us what they themselves did or experienced, there does not appear in their narratives a single departure from the common order of things. On the other hand, these departures are very numerous in the accounts which are separated by a greater or lesser interval from the time to which they refer." *De Godesdienst van Israël*, 1869, i. p. 22.

³ Dr. Westcott, speaking of the author of S. R., says: "He is far more familiar, unless I am mistaken, with some modern German and Dutch speculations on the Gospels and early Church history, than with the new Testament itself . . ." (and in a note to this) "One or two examples of grave inaccuracy as to the letter of the New Testament may be given to justify my statement, . . . and after quoting from the above passage: 'There is no instance . . . to 'claims to have himself performed a miracle,' Dr. Westcott adds: 'Can the writer have forgotten Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12?' On the Canon, 4th ed., 1874, p. xxx. Dr. Lightfoot says: 'Thus again, he can remember 'no instance whatever,' where a New Testament writer 'claims to have himself performed a miracle,' though St. Paul twice speaks of his exercising this power as a recognised and patent fact (note, Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12). The point to be observed is, that St. Paul treats the fact of his working miracles as a matter of course, to which a passing reference is sufficient.' The Contemporary Review, May, 1875, p. 854. May I suggest that the defence of Christianity from an 'attack' made in a very serious and inquiring spirit has, on the part of these two writers, perhaps rather too much taken the shape of picking out a few supposed errors of detail, and triumphantly slaking them with a persistence not characteristic of strength. To twit an advancing foe with having lost a button of his tunic will scarcely repel his charge.

the power of working miracles, and that miracles, or what were thought to be such, were actually wrought both by him and by his contemporaries. He reminds the Corinthians that 'the signs of an Apostle were wrought among them . . . in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds' (*ἐν σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμει*—the usual words for the higher forms of miracle—2 Cor. xii. 12). He tells the Romans that 'he will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by¹ him to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God' (*ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος Θεοῦ*, Rom. xv. 18, 19). He asks the Galatians whether 'he that ministereth to them the Spirit, and worketh miracles (*ὁ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις*) among them, doeth it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' (Gal. iii. 5.) In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, he goes somewhat elaborately into the exact place in the Christian economy that is to be assigned to the working of miracles and gifts of healing (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29).²

We shall presently examine these passages, but we must first briefly deal with the question whether, taken in any sense, they furnish an instance "in which a writer claims to have himself performed a miracle." It must be obvious to any impartial reader, that the remark made in the course of our earlier argument precisely distinguished the general "assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church," from the explicit claim to have personally performed "a miracle" in the singular. If, therefore, it were even admitted "that St. Paul treats the fact of his working miracles as a matter of course, to which a passing reference is sufficient," such "incidental allusions" would not in the least degree contradict the statement made, but being the only instances producible, would in fact completely justify it. General and vague references of this kind have by no means the force of a definite claim to have performed some particular miracle. They partake too much of that indiscriminate impression of the possession and common exercise of miraculous powers which characterized the "age of miracles" to have any force. The desired instance, which is not forthcoming and to which alone reference was made, was a case in which, instead of vague expressions, a writer, stating with precision the particulars, related that he himself had, for instance, actually raised some person from the dead. As we then added, even if Apostles had chronicled their miracles, the argument for

¹ These words are printed "in him," but we venture to correct what seems evidently to be a mere misprint, substituting "by," (*διὰ*) as in the authorized version, to which Mr. Sanday adheres throughout the whole of these passages, even when it does not represent the actual sense of the original.

² Sanday, *the Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876, p. 11.










IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic
Sciences
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

28 25
22
20
18

10

their reality would not have been much advanced; but it is a curious phenomenon not undeserving of a moment's attention that apologists can only refer to such general passages, and cannot quote an instance in which a specific miracle is related in detail by the person who is supposed to have performed it. Passing references on a large scale to the exercise of miraculous power, whilst betraying a suspicious familiarity with phenomena of an exceptional nature, offer too much latitude for inaccuracy and imagination to have the weight of an affirmation in which the mind has been sobered by concentration to details. "Signs and wonders," indefinitely alluded to, may seem much more imposing and astonishing than they really are, and it may probably be admitted by everyone that, if we knew the particulars of the occurrences, which are thus vaguely indicated and which may have been considered miraculous in a superstitious age, they might to us possibly appear no miracles at all. General expressions are liable to an exaggeration from which specific allegations are more frequently free. If it be conceded that the Apostle Paul fully believed in the possession by himself and the Church of divine Charismata, the indefinite expression of that belief, in any form, must not be made equivalent to an explicit claim to have performed a certain miracle, the particulars of which are categorically stated.

Passing from this, however, to the more general question, the force of some of these objections will be better understood when we consider the passages in the Epistles which are quoted as expressing Paul's belief in miracles, and endeavour to ascertain his real views: what it is he actually says regarding miracles; and what are the phenomena which are by him considered to be miraculous. We shall not waste time in considering how, largely through the influence of the Septuagint, the words *σημεῖον*, *τέρας*, and *δύναμις* came to be used in a peculiar manner by New Testament writers to indicate miracles. It may, however, be worth while to pause for a moment to ascertain the sense in which Paul, who wrote before there was a "New Testament" at all, usually employed these words. In the four Epistles of Paul the word *σημεῖον* occurs six times. In Rom. iv. 11 Abraham is said to have received the "sign (*σημεῖον*) of circumcision," in which there is nothing miraculous. In 1 Cor. i. 22 it is said: "Since both Jews require signs (*σημεῖα*)¹ and Greeks seek after wisdom;" and again, 1 Cor. xiv. 22: "Wherefore the tongues are for a sign (*σημεῖον*) not to the believing but to the unbelieving," &c. We shall have more to say regarding these passages presently, but just now we merely

¹ The singular *σημεῖον* of the authorized version must be abandoned before the almost unanimous testimony of all the older MSS.

but it is a
ention that
and cannot
in detail
t. Passing
ous power,
mena of an
accuracy and
n which the
"Signs and
ore imposing
probably be
ulars of the
which may
e, they might
pressions are
ons are more
le Paul fully
ch of divine
in any form,
to have per-
are categori-

question, the
erstood when
quoted as ex-
ascertain his
miracles; and
ed to be mirac-
how, largely
s σημεῖον, τέρας,
y New Testa-
er, be worth
n which Paul,
at all, usually
Paul the word
is said to have
which there is
nce both Jews
;" and again,
gn (σημεῖον) not
hall have more
now we merely

andoned before the

quote them to show the use of the word. The only other places in which it occurs¹ are those pointed out, and which are the subject of our discussion. In Rom. xv. 19 the word is used in the plural and combined with *τέρας*: "in the power of signs and wonders" (σημεῖων καὶ τεράτων); and in the second passage, 2 Cor. xii. 12, it is employed twice, "the signs (τὰ σημεῖα) of the apostle" and the second time again in combination with *τέρας* and *δύναμις*, "both in signs" (σημεῖοις), &c. The word *τέρας* is only twice met with in Paul's writings; that is to say, in Rom. xv. 19 and 2 Cor. xii. 12; and on both occasions, as we have just mentioned, it is combined with *σημεῖον*.² On the other hand, Paul uses *δύναμις* no less than 34 times,³ and, leaving for the present out of the question the passages cited, upon every occasion, except one, perhaps, the word has the simple signification of "power." The one exception is Rom. viii. 38, where it occurs in the plural: *δυνάμεις* "powers," the Apostle expressing his persuasion that nothing will be able to separate us from the love of God, "nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers (*δυνάμεις*), nor height, nor depth," &c., &c. In 1 Cor. xiv. 11, where the authorized version renders the original: "Therefore, if I know not the meaning (*δύναμις*) of the voice," it has still the same sense.

Before discussing the passages before us we must point out that there is so much doubt, at least, regarding the authenticity of the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans that the passage, Rom. xv. 18, 19, can scarcely be presented as evidence on such a point as the reality of miracles. We do not intend to debate the matter closely, but shall merely state a few of the facts of the case and pass on, for it would not materially affect our argument if the passage were altogether beyond suspicion. The Epistle, in our authorized text, ends with a long and somewhat involved doxology, xvi. 25-27; and we may point out here that it had already seemed to be brought to a close not only at the end of chapter xv. (33) but also at xvi. 20. The doxology, xvi. 25-27, which more particularly demands our attention, is stated by Origen⁴ to

¹ In the Epistles which bear the name of Paul it is only to be found in 2 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 17.

² *τέρας* is only met with elsewhere in the New Testament five times: Mt. xxiv. 24, Mk. xiii. 22, John iv. 48, 2 Thess. ii. 9, Heb. ii. 4.

³ Rom. i. 4, 16, 20, viii. 38, ix. 17, xv. 13, xv. 19 (twice), 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 4, 5, iv. 19, 20, v. 4, vi. 14, xii. 10, 28, 29, xiv. 11, xv. 24, 43, 56, 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 7, vi. 7, viii. 3 (twice), xii. 9 (twice), 12, xiii. 4 (twice), and Gal. iii. 5.

⁴ "In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput (xvi. 25-27) diversè positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum, quem supra diximus, hoc est 'cumne quod non est ex fide peccatum est' (xiv. 23) satim coherens habetur: 'ei autem, qui potens est vos confirmare' (xvi. 25-27). Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum continent." Comment. ad Rom. xvi. 25. This passage is only extant in the Latin version of Rufinus.

be placed in some MSS. at the end of ch. xiv; and a similar statement is made by Cyril, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact and others. We find these verses actually so placed in L, and in upwards of 220 out of 250 cursive MSS. of Byzantine origin, in an account of ancient MSS. in Cod. 66, in most of the Greek Lectionaries, in the Slavonic and later Syriac versions, as also in the Gothic, Arabic (in the polyglot and triglot text), and some MSS. of the Armenian. They are inserted both at the end of xiv. and at the end of the Epistle by the Alexandrian Codex,¹ one of the most ancient manuscripts extant, and by some other MSS.² Now, how came this doxology to be placed at all at the end of chapter xiv.? The natural inference is that it was so placed because that was the end of the Epistle. Subsequently, chapters xv. and xvi. being added, it is supposed that the closing doxology was removed from the former position and placed at the end of the appended matter. This inference is supported by the important fact that, as we learn from Origen,³ the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, including the doxology (xvi. 25-27), did not exist in Marcion's text, the most ancient form of it of which we have any knowledge. Tertullian, who makes no reference to these two chapters, speaks of the passage, Rom. xiv. 10, as at the close (in clausula) of the Epistle,⁴ and he does not call any attention to their absence from Marcion's Epistle. Is it not reasonable to suppose that they did not form part of his copy? In like manner Irenæus, who very frequently quotes from the rest of the Epistle, nowhere shows acquaintance with these chapters. The first writer who distinctly makes use of any part of them is Clement of Alexandria. It has been argued both that Marcion omitted the two chapters because they contain what was opposed to his views, and because they had no dogmatic matter to induce him to retain them; but, whilst the two explanations destroy each other, neither of them

¹ xvi. 24 is wholly omitted by the Alexandrian, Vatican, and Sinaitic codices, and also by C and some other MSS.

² It is unnecessary for us to state that other codices, as B, C, D, E, ∞ , and some cursive MSS., have the verses only at the end of xvi.; nor that they are omitted altogether by F, G, D^{***}, and by MSS. referred to by Jerome.

³ "Caput hoc (xvi. 25-27) Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit. Et non solum hoc, sed et ubi eo loco, ubi scriptum est: Omne autem quod non ex fide, peccatum est (xiv. 23), usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit." Comment. ad Rom. xvi. 25. We shall not discuss the difference between "abstulit" and "dissecuit," nor the interpretation given by Nitzsch (*Zeitschr. hist. Theol.*, 1860, p. 285 ff.) to the latter word. Most critics agree that Marcion altogether omitted the chapters.

⁴ Adv. Marc. v. 14; Rönisch, *Das N. T. Tertullian's*, 1871, p. 349. The passages from Tertullian's writings in which reference is supposed to be made to these chapters which are quoted by Rönisch (p. 350) do not show any acquaintance with them.

is more than a supposition to account for the absence of what, it may with equal propriety be conjectured, never formed part of his text.

The external testimony, however, does not stand alone, but is supported by very strong internal evidence. We shall only indicate one or two points, leaving those who desire to go more deeply into the discussion to refer to works more particularly concerned with it, which we shall sufficiently indicate. It is a very singular thing that Paul, who, when he wrote this epistle had never been in Rome, should be intimately acquainted with so many persons there. The fact that there was much intercourse between Rome and other countries by no means accounts for the simultaneous presence there of so many of the Apostle's personal friends. Aquilla and Priscilla, who are saluted (xvi. 3), were a short time before (1 Cor. xvi. 19) in Ephesus.¹ It may, moreover, be remarked as a suggestive fact that when, according to the Acts (xxviii. 14 ff.), Paul very soon afterwards arrived in Rome, most of these friends seem to have disappeared,² and the chief men of the Jews called together by Paul do not seem to be aware of the existence of a Christian body at Rome.³ Another point is connected with the very passage which has led to this discussion. xv. 18, 19 read: 18. "For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, in order to (eis) the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, 19. in the power of signs and wonders (ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων) in the power of the Spirit (ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος); so that from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ;" &c. The statement that "from Jerusalem" he had "fully preached" the Gospel is scarcely in agreement with the statement in the Epistle to the Galatians i. 17-23, ii. 1 ff. Moreover, there is no confirmation anywhere of the Apostle's having preached as far as Illyricum, which was then almost beyond the limits of civilization. Baur suggests that in making his ministry commence at Jerusalem, there is too evident a concession made to the Jewish Christians, according to whom every preacher of the Gospel must naturally commence his career at the holy city. It would detain us much too long to enter upon an analysis of these two chapters, and to show the repetition in them of what has already been said in the earlier part of the Epistle; the singular analogies presented with the Epistles to the Corinthians, not of the nature of uniformity of style, but of imitation; the peculiarity of the mention of a journey to Spain as the justification of a passing visit to Rome,

¹ The writer of 2 Tim. iv. 19 represents them as in Ephesus.

² Credner, Einl. N. T., i. p. 387; Schwegler, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 124, anm. 2.

³ Acts xxviii. 21, 22.

and perhaps a further apology for even writing a letter to the Church there which another had founded; the suspicious character of the names which are mentioned in the various clauses of salutation; and to state many other still more important objections which various critics have advanced, but which would require more elaborate explanation than can possibly be given here. It will suffice for us to mention that the phenomena presented by the two chapters are so marked and curious that for a century they have largely occupied the attention of writers of all shades of opinion, and called forth very elaborate theories to account for them; the apparent necessity for which in itself shows the insecure position of the passage. Semler,¹ without denying the Pauline authorship of the two chapters, considered they did not properly belong to the Epistle to the Romans. He supposed xvi. 3-16 to have been intended merely for the messenger who carried the Epistle, as a list of the persons to whom salutations were to be given, and to these ch. xv. was to be specially delivered. Paulus² considered ch. xv. to be a separate letter, addressed specially to the leaders of the Roman Church, ch. i.-xiv. being the Epistle to the community in general. The Epistle then being sealed up and ready for any opportunity of transmission, but none presenting itself before his arrival in Corinth, the apostle there, upon an additional sheet, wrote xvi. and entrusted it with the letter to Phœbe. Eichhorn³ supposed that the parchment upon which the Epistle was written was finished at xiv. 23: and, as Paul and his scribe had only a small sheet at hand, the doxology only, xvi. 25-27, was written upon the one side of it, and on the other the greetings and the apostolic benediction, xvi. 21-24, and thus the letter was completed; but, as it could not immediately be forwarded, the apostle added a fly-leaf with ch. xv. Bertholdt,⁴ Guericke⁵ and others adopted similar views more or less modified, representing the close of the Epistle to have been formed by successive postscripts. More recently, Renan⁶ has affirmed the epistle to be a circular letter addressed to churches in Rome, Ephesus, and other places, to each of which only certain portions were transmitted with appropriate salutations and endings, which have all been collected into the one Epistle in the form in which we have it. David Schulz conjectured that xvi. 1-20 was an epistle written from Rome to the church at Ephesus; and this theory was substantially adopted by Ewald,—who held that xvi. 3-20 was part of a

¹ Diss. de duplici apend. ep. P. ad Rom. 1767; Paraphr. epist. ad Rom., 1769, p. 290 ff.

² Uebers. u. Erkl. des Römer. u. Galaterbr., 1831, Einl.

³ Einl. iii. 232 ff.

⁵ Gesamtgesch. N. T., p. 327 f.

⁴ Einl. viii. p. 3303 ff.

⁶ St. Paul, 1869, p. lxiii. ff.

lost epistle to Ephesus,—and by many other critics.¹ Of course the virtual authenticity of the xv.-xvi. chapters, nearly or exactly as they are, is affirmed by many writers. Baur, however, after careful investigation, pronounced the two chapters inauthentic, and in this he is followed by able critics.² Under all these circumstances it is obvious that we need not occupy ourselves much with the passage in Rom. xv. 18, 19, but our argument will equally apply to it. In order to complete this view of the materials we may simply mention, as we pass on, that the authenticity of 2 Cor. xii. 12 has likewise been impugned by a few critics, and the verse, or at least the words *σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν*, as well as Rom. xv. 19, declared an interpolation.³ This cannot, however, so far as existing evidence goes, be demonstrated; and, beyond the mere record of the fact, this conjecture does not here require further notice.

It may be well, before proceeding to the Epistles to the Corinthians, which furnish the real matter for discussion, first to deal with the passage cited from Gal. iii. 5, which is as follows: "He then that supplieth to you the Spirit and worketh powers (*δυνάμεις*) within you (*ἐν ὑμῖν*), (doeth he it) from works of law or from hearing of faith?"⁴ The authorized version reads: "And worketh miracles among you;" but this cannot be maintained, and *ἐν ὑμῖν* must be rendered "within you," the *ἐν* certainly retaining its natural signification when used with *ἐνεργεῖν*, the primary meaning of which is itself to in-work. The vast majority of critics of all schools agree in this view.⁵ There is an evident reference to iii. 2, and to the reception of the Spirit, here further characterised as producing such effects within the minds of those who receive it,⁶

¹ Schulz, Stud. u. Krit., 1829, p. 609 ff.; Ewald, Sendschr. d. Paulus, p. 345, anm., p. 428 f.; Laurent, N. T. Stud., 1866, p. 32 f.; Mangold, Römerbr., 1866, p. 38, 62; Ritschl, Jahrb. deutsche Th., 1866, p. 352; Reuss, Gesch. N. T., p. 98; Schott, Isagoge, p. 249 ff.; Weiss, Philos. Dogmatik, 1855, i. p. 146.

² Baur, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1836, iii. p. 97 f.; Paulus, i. p. 393 ff.; Lucht, Ueb. die heid. letzt. Cap. des Römerbr., 1871; Schotten, Theol. Tijdschr., 1876, p. 3 ff.; Schweigler, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 296; ii. 123 ff.; Volkmar, Römerbr., 1875, p. xv. ff., 129 ff. Cf. Holtzmann, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1874, p. 511 ff.; Lipsius, Protestanten-Bibel, 1872, p. 488, §12, 629; Rovers, Heeft Paulus zich. op. wond. hereop., 1870, p. 15 ff.; Zeller, Apg., p. 488. Some consider ch. xvi. alone inauthentic, as: Davidson, Int. N. T., ii. p. 137; Weiss, Das Marcusevng., 1872, p. 495, anm. 1.

³ Matthies, De nieuwe Richting, 2de uitg., p. 203; Rovers, Heeft Paulus, &c., 1870, p. 6 ff.; Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 606 ff.; Schotten, Theol. Tijdschr., 1876, p. 25 f.; Het paul. Ev., p. 464, n. 1.

⁴ ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; Gal. iii. 5.

⁵ So Alford, Bisping, Ellicott, Ewald, Grotius, Hofmann, Holtzmann, Lightfoot, Matthies, Meyer, Olshausen, Schott, Schrader, Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler, Wordsworth, &c., &c., in 1.

⁶ Olshausen, for instance, says: "Das ἐν ὑμῖν ist nicht zu fassen: unter euch, sondern ἐν καρδίαις ὑμῶν, in dem die Geisteswirkung als eine innerliche gedacht ist." Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 58.

the worker who gives the Spirit being God. The opinion most commonly held is that reference is here made to the "gifts" (*χαρίσματα*), regarding which the Apostle elsewhere speaks,¹ and which we shall presently discuss, but this is by no means certain and cannot be determined. It is equally probable that he may refer to the spiritual effect produced upon the souls of the Galatians by the Gospel which he so frequently represents as a "power" of God. In any case, it is clear that there is no external miracle referred to here, and even if allusion to Charismata be understood we have yet to ascertain precisely what these were. We shall endeavour to discover whether there was anything in the least degree miraculous in these "gifts," but there is no affirmation in this passage which demands special attention, and whatever general significance it may have will be met when considering the others which are indicated.

The first passage in the Epistles to the Corinthians, which is pointed out as containing the testimony of Paul both to the reality of miracles in general and to the fact that he himself performed them, is the following, 2 Cor. xii. 12: "Truly the signs (*σημεία*) of the Apostle were wrought in you (*κατεργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν*) in all patience, both in signs and wonders and powers (*σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν*)."² We have to justify two departures in this rendering from that generally received. The first of these is the adoption of "wrought in you," instead of "wrought among you;" and the second the simple use of "powers" for *δυνάμεις*, instead of "mighty works." We shall take the second first. We have referred to every passage except 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, in which Paul makes use of the word *δυνάμεις*, and fortunately they are sufficiently numerous to afford us a good insight into his practice. It need not be said that the natural sense of *δυνάμεις* is in no case "mighty works" or miracles, and that such an application of the Greek word is peculiar to the New

¹ Dr. Lightfoot says on the words "*ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν*" Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10, *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* (with vv. 28, 29), Matth. xiv. 2, *αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ* (comp. Mark vi. 14). These passages favour the sense 'worketh miraculous powers in you,' rather than 'worketh miracles among you,' and this meaning also accords better with the context; comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6, *ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν ὑμῖν*. What was the exact nature of these 'powers,' whether they were exerted over the physical or the moral world, it is impossible to determine. The limitations implied in 1 Cor. xii. 10, and the general use of *δυνάμεις* point rather to the former. It is important to notice how here, as in the Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul assumes the possession of these extraordinary powers by his converts as an acknowledged fact." Ep. to the Gal., p. 135. Cf. Wordsworth, Gk. Test., St. Paul's, p. 57, and especially p. 128, where, on 1 Cor. xii. 11, Dr. Wordsworth notes: "*ἐνεργεῖ* in-worketh," and quotes Cyril, ". . . and the Holy Spirit works in every member of Christ's body," &c. ² *τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατεργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ, σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν*. 2 Cor. xii. 12.

nion most
e "gifts"
eaks,¹ and
ns certain
at he may
of the Gala-
a "power"
al miracle
understood
We shall
n the least
irmation in
tever gen-
sidering the

us, which is
both to the
he himself
"Truly the
(κατεργάσθη
and powers
justify two
ly received,
you," instead
mple use of
e shall take
except 1 Cor.
δυνάμεις, and
is a good in-
natural sense
les, and that
to the New

[Comp. 1 Cor.
2, αἱ δυνάμεις
avour the sense
les among you;
Cor. xii. 6, ὁ δὲ
exact nature of
moral world, it
10, and the gen-
nt to notice how
ession of these
Ep. to the Gal.,
y p. 128, where,
th," and quotes
rist's body," &c.
ἐμὴν ἐν πάσῃ
Cor. xii. 12.

Testament and, subsequently, to Patristic literature. There is, however, no ground for attributing this use of the word to Paul. It is not so used in the Septuagint, and it is quite evident that the Apostle does not employ it to express external effects or works, but spiritual phenomena or potentiality. In the passage, Gal. iii. 5 which we have just discussed, where the word occurs in the plural, as here, it is understood to express "powers." We may quote the rendering of that passage by the Bishop of Gloucester: "He then, *I say*, that ministereth to you the Spirit and worketh *mighty* powers within you, *doeth he it* by the works of the law or by the report of faith?"¹ Why "mighty" should be inserted it is difficult to understand, but the word is rightly printed in italics to show that it is not actually expressed in the Greek. "What was the exact nature of these 'powers' . . . it is impossible to determine," observes another scholar quoted above,² on the same passage.³ In 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, where the plural δυνάμεις again occurs, the intention to express "powers"⁴ and not external results—miracles—is perfectly clear, the word being in the last two verses used alone to represent the "gifts." In all of these passages the word is the representative of the "powers" and not of the "effects."⁵ This interpretation is rendered more clear by, and at the same time confirms, the preceding phrase, "were wrought in you" (κατεργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν). "Powers" (δυνάμεις), as in Gal. iii. 5, are worked "within you," and the rendering of that passage being so settled, it becomes authoritative for this. If, however, direct confirmation of Paul's meaning be required, we have it in Rom. vii. 8, where we find the same verb used with ἐν in this sense: "But sin . . . wrought in me (κατεργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ) all manner of coveting," &c.; and with this may also be compared 2 Cor. vii. 11 . . . "what earnestness it wrought in you" (κατεργάσατο ἐν ὑμῖν). It was thus Paul's habit to speak of spiritual effects wrought "within," and as he referred to the "powers" (δυνάμεις) worked "within" the souls of the Galatians, so he speaks of them here as "wrought in" the Corinthians. It will become clear as we proceed that the addition to δυνάμεις of "signs and wonders" does not in the least affect this interpretation. In 1 Cor. xiv. 22, the Apostle speaks of the gift of "tongues" as "a sign" (σημεῖον).

Upon the supposition that Paul was affirming the actual per-

¹ Ellicott, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 4th ed., 1867, p. 154 f.

² Dr. Lightfoot, see note 2, p. 337.

³ It is rendered "vertues" in Wyclif's version.

⁴ "δυνάμεις] powers. From persons he passes to things," &c. Wordsworth, on 1 Cor. xii. 28, Gk. Test., St. Paul's Epistles, p. 129.

⁵ Grotius renders δυνάμειν=virtutibus ad 2 Cor. xii. 12. Annot. in N. T., vi. 539.

⁶ ἐν is found in C, F, G, and other MSS., although it is omitted in the other great codices. This, however, does not affect the argument.

formance of miracles by himself, how extraordinary becomes the statement that they "were wrought in all patience," for it is manifest that "in all patience" (*ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ*) does not form part of the signs, as some have argued, but must be joined to the verb (*κατεργάσθη*).¹ It may be instructive to quote a few words of Olshausen upon the point: "The *ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ* is not altogether easy. It certainly cannot be doubtful that it is to be joined to *κατεργάσθη* and not to what follows; but for what reason does Paul here make it directly prominent that he wrought his signs in all patience? It seems to me probable that in this there may be a reproof to the Corinthians, who, in spite of such signs, still showed themselves wavering regarding the authority of the Apostle. In such a position, Paul would say, he had, patiently waiting, allowed his light to shine amongst them, certain of ultimate triumph."² This will scarcely be accepted by any one as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, which is a real one if it be assumed that Paul, claiming to have performed miracles, wrought them "in all patience." Besides the matter is complicated, and the claim to have himself performed a miracle still more completely vanishes, when we consider the fact that the passive construction of the sentence does not actually represent Paul as the active agent by whom the signs were wrought. "Truly the signs of the Apostle were wrought," but how wrought? Clearly he means by the Spirit, as he distinctly states to the Galatians. To them "Jesus Christ (the Messiah) was fully set forth crucified," and he asks them: Was it from works of the Law or from hearing in faith the Gospel thus preached to them that they "received the Spirit"? and that he who supplies the Spirit "and worketh powers" in them does so? From faith, of course.³ The meaning of Paul, therefore, was this: His Gospel was preached among them "in all patience," which being received by the hearing of faith, the Spirit was given to them, and the signs of the Apostle were thus wrought among them. The representation is made throughout the Acts that the Apostles lay their hands on those who believe, and they receive the Holy Spirit and speak with tongues. If any special "sign of the apostle" can be indicated at all, it is this; and in illustration we may point to one statement made in the Acts. Philip, the evangelist, who was not an apostle, is represented as going into Samaria and preaching the Messiah to the Samaritans, who give heed to the things spoken by him, and multitudes are baptized (viii. 5, 6, 12), but there was not the outpouring of the Holy Spirit which usually accompanied the apos-

¹ So Alford, Billroth, Ewald, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Olshausen, Oslander, De Wette, &c., &c., l. c.

² Olshausen, *Bibl. Com.*, iii. p. 879 f.

³ Gal. iii. 1 ff.

tolie baptism. "And the Apostles in Jerusalem, having heard that Samaria had received the word of God, sent unto them Peter and John; who when they came down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit—for as yet he had fallen upon none of them, but they had only been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they (the Apostles) their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit."¹ We may further refer to the episode at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1 ff.) where Paul finds certain disciples who, having only been baptized into John's baptism, had not received the Holy Spirit, nor even heard whether there was a Holy Spirit. (xix. 6.) "And Paul having laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they were speaking with tongues and prophesying."

When we examine Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians we find ample assurance that the interpretation here given of this passage is correct, and that he does not refer, as apologists have maintained, to miracles wrought by himself, but to the Charismata, which were supposed to have been bestowed upon the Corinthians who believed, and which were thus the signs of his apostleship. The very next verse to that which is before us shows this: "Truly the signs of the Apostle were wrought in you in all patience . . . 13. For (γὰρ) what is there wherein ye were inferior to the other Churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you?" The mere performance of signs and wonders did not constitute their equality; but in the possession of the Charismata,—regarding which so much is said in the first epistle, and which were the result of his preaching,—they were not inferior to the other Churches, and only inferior, Paul says with his fine irony, in not having, like the other Churches with their Apostles, been called upon to acquire the merit of bearing his charges. What could be more distinct than the Apostle's opening address in the first Epistle: "I thank my God always, on your behalf, for the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus; that in everything ye were enriched by him (at the time of their conversion),² in all utterance and in all knowledge: even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: so that ye come behind in no gift (χαρίσματι)," &c. For this reason they were not inferior to the other Churches, and those were the signs of the Apostle which were wrought in them. Paul very distinctly declares the nature of his ministry amongst the Corinthians and the absence of other "signs:" 1 Cor. i. 22 f. "Since both Jews demand signs (σημεῖα) and Greeks seek after wisdom, but we (ἡμεῖς δὲ) preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-

¹ Acts viii. 14—17.

² Stanley, Eps. to the Cor., p. 23.

block and unto Gentiles foolishness, but unto those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power (*δύναμις*) of God and the wisdom of God." The contrast is here clearly drawn between the requirement of Jews (signs) and of Greeks (wisdom) and Paul's actual ministry: no signs, but a scandal (*σκάνδαλον*) to the Jew, and no wisdom, but foolishness to the Greek, but this word of the cross (*λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*) "to us who are being saved is the power (*δύναμις*) of God" (i. 18).¹ The Apostle tells us what he considers the "sign of the Apostle" when, more directly defending himself against the opponents who evidently denied his apostolic claims, he says vehemently: 1 Cor. ix. 1 ff. "Am I not free? Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord? are ye not my work in the Lord? If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: *for the seal (σφραγίς) of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord.*"² It cannot, we think, be doubted, when the passage, 2 Cor. xii. 12, is attentively considered, that Paul does not refer to external miracles performed by him, but to the Charismata which he supposed to be conferred upon the Corinthian Christians on their acceptance of the Gospel which the Apostle preached. These Charismata, however, are advanced as miraculous, and the passages 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29 are quoted in support of the statement we are discussing, and these now demand our attention.

It may be well at once to give the verses which are referred to, and in which it is said that Paul "goes somewhat elaborately into the exact place in the Christian economy that is to be assigned to the working of miracles and gifts of healing" (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29). It is necessary for the full comprehension of the case that we should quote the context: xii. 4. "Now there are diversities of gifts (*χαρισμάτων*), but the same Spirit; 5, and there are diversities of ministries (*διακονιών*), and the same Lord; 6, and there are diversities of workings (*ἐνεργημάτων*), but it is the same God who worketh the all in all (*ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν ᾧ ὅν*); 7. But to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit (*φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος*) for profit; 8. For to one is given by the Spirit a word of wisdom (*λόγος σοφίας*); to another a word of knowledge (*λόγος γνώσεως*) according to the same Spirit; 9. to another faith (*πίστις*) in the same Spirit, to another gifts of healings (*χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*) in the one Spirit; 10. to another (inward) workings of powers (*ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*); to another prophecy (*προφητεία*); to another discerning of spirits (*διάκρισις πνευμάτων*); to another kinds of tongues (*γῆνη γλωσσῶν*); to another interpretation of tongues (*ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*);

¹ And again Rom. i. 16, &c., &c.

² Comp. Rom. iv. 11, "and he (Abraham) received a sign (*σημεῖον*) of circumcision, a seal (*σφραγίδα*) of the righteousness of the faith," &c., &c.

11. but all these worketh (*ἐνεργεῖ*) the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally as he wills." After illustrating this by showing the mutual dependence of the different members and senses of the body, the Apostle proceeds: v. 28. "And God set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that powers (*δυνάμεις*), after that gifts of healings (*χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*), helpings (*ἀντιλήψεις*), governings (*κυβερνήσεις*), kinds of tongues (*γένη γλωσσῶν*). 29. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all powers (*δυνάμεις*)? 30. have all gifts of healings (*χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*)? do all speak with tongues (*γλωσσῶσι λαλοῦσίν*)? do all interpret (*διερμηνεύουσιν*)?"

Before we commence an examination of this interesting and important passage, it is essential that we should endeavour to disabuse our minds of preconceived ideas. Commentators are too prone to apply to the Apostle's remarks a system of interpretation based upon statements made by later and less informed writers, and warped by belief in the reality of a miraculous element pervading all apostolic times, which have been derived mainly from post-apostolic narratives. What do we really know of the phenomena supposed to have characterized the Apostolic age, and which were later, and are now, described as miraculous? With the exception of what we glean from the writings of Paul, we know absolutely nothing from any contemporary writer and eye-witness. In the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles, we have detailed accounts of many miracles said to have been performed by the Apostles and others; but these narratives were all written at a much later period, and by persons who are unknown and most of whom are not even affirmed to have been eye-witnesses.¹ In the Acts of the Apostles we have an account of some of the very Charismata referred to by Paul in the passage above quoted, and we shall thus have the advantage of presently comparing the two accounts. We must, however, altogether resist any attempt to insert between the lines of the Apostle's writing ideas and explanations derived from the Author of the Acts and from patristic literature, and endeavour to understand what it is he himself says and intends to say. It must not be supposed that we in the slightest degree question the fact that the Apostle Paul believed in the reality of supernatural intervention in mundane affairs, or that he asserted the actual occurrence of certain miracles. Our desire is as far as possible to ascertain what Paul himself has to say upon specific phenomena, now generally explained as miraculous, and thus, descending from vague generalities to more distinct statements, to ascertain the value of his opinion re-

¹ It is suggestive that the curious passage Mk. xvi. 17-18 is not even by the author of the second Gospel, but a later addition.

garding the character of such phenomena. It cannot fail to be instructive to determine something of the nature of Charismata from an eye-witness who believed them to have been supernatural. His account, as we have seen, is the most precious evidence of the Church to the reality of the miraculous.

The first point which must be observed in connection with the Charismata referred to by Paul in the passage before us is that, whilst there are diversities amongst them, all the phenomena described are ascribed to "one and the same Spirit dividing to each severally as he wills;" and, consequently, that, although there may be differences in their form and value, a supernatural origin is equally assigned to all the "gifts" enumerated. What then are these Charismata? "A word of wisdom," "a word of knowledge," and "faith" are the first three mentioned. What the precise difference was, in Paul's meaning, between the utterance of wisdom (*σοφία*) and of knowledge (*γνώσις*) it is impossible now with certainty to say, nor is it very essential for us to inquire. The two words are combined in Rom. xi. 33: "O the depths of the riches and wisdom (*σοφίας*) and knowledge (*γνώσεως*) of God!" and in this very epistle some varying use is made of both words. Paul tells the Corinthians (1, i. 17) that Christ did not send him "in wisdom of word" (*οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου*) or utterance: and (ii. 1) "not with excellency of word or wisdom" (*λόγου ἢ σοφίας*, cf. ii. 4); and further on he says (i. 30) that Christ Jesus "was made unto us wisdom (*σοφία*) from God." The most suggestive expressions,¹ however, are the following, we think: 1 Cor. ii. 6. "But we speak wisdom (*σοφίαν*) among the perfect, yet not the wisdom (*σοφίαν*) of this age, nor of the rulers of this age, that come to nought, 7. but we speak God's wisdom (*θεοῦ σοφίαν*) in mystery, the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the ages unto our glory, 8. which none of the rulers of this age has known, for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. 9. But as it is written, 'What eye saw not,' &c., &c. 10. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit. . . . 11. . . . even so also the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God. 12. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might know the things that are freely given us by God; 13. which things also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to the spiritual"² (*πνευματικαῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες*). It is quite clear from all the antecedent

¹ The word is used in the following passages of Paul's four Epistles: Rom. xi. 33; 1 Cor. i. 17, 19, 20, 21 twice, 22, 24, 30, ii. 1, 4, 5, 6 twice, 7, 13, iii. 19, xii. 8; 2 Cor. i. 12.

² There is considerable room for doubt as to the real sense of this last phrase.

context that Paul's preaching was specially the Messiah crucified, "Christ the power of God and the wisdom (σοφίαν) of God," and we may conclude reasonably that the λόγος σοφίας of our passage was simply the eloquent utterance of this doctrine. In like manner, we may get some insight into the meaning which Paul attached to the word "knowledge" (γνώσις). It will be remembered that at the very opening of the first Epistle to the Corinthians Paul expresses his thankfulness that in everything they were enriched in Christ Jesus: i. 5. "in all utterance (λόγῳ) and in all knowledge (γνώσει), &c. even as the testimony of the Christ was confirmed in you;" that is to say, according to commentators, by these very Charismata. Later, speaking of "tongues," he says (1 Cor. xiv. 6): ". . . What shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either in revelation or in knowledge (ἐν γνώσει), or in prophecy, or in teaching?" We obtain a clearer insight into his meaning in the second Epistle, in the passage 2 Cor. ii. 14-16, and still more in iv. 3-6 and x. 5, where he describes metaphorically his weapons as not carnal, but strong through God, "casting down reasonings and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of the Christ;" and if we ventured to offer an opinion, it would be that Paul means by λόγος γνώσεως simply Christian theology. We merely offer this as a passing suggestion. Little need be said with regard to the gift of "faith" (πίστις), which is perfectly intelligible. Apologists argue that by these three "gifts" some supernatural form of wisdom, knowledge, and faith is expressed, and we shall have something more to say on the point presently; but here we merely point out that there is no ground whatever for such an assertion except the fact that the Apostle ascribes to them a supernatural origin, or, in fact, believes in the inspiration of such qualities. All that can be maintained is that Paul accounts for the possession of characteristics, which we now know to be natural, by asserting that they are the direct gift of the Holy Spirit. There is not the faintest evidence to show that these natural capabilities did not antecedently exist in the Corinthians, and were not merely stimulated into action in Christian channels by the religious enthusiasm and zeal accompanying their conversion; but, on the contrary, every reason to believe this to be the case, as we shall further see.¹ In fact, according to the Apostolic Church, every quality was a supernatural gift, and all ability or excellence in practical life directly emanated from the action of the Holy Spirit.

¹ We may here say that attempts have been made to show that the Apostle classifies the charismata in groups of threes, and even sets forth the three persons of the Trinity as the several donors. It would be useless for us to touch upon the point.

Epistles: Rom. xi. 9, 7, 13, iii. 19, xii. 10. this last phrase.

We may now proceed to "gifts of healings" (*χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*)¹ which it will be noted are doubly in the plural, indicating, as is supposed, a variety of special gifts, each having reference probably to special diseases. What is there to show that there was anything more miraculous in "gifts of healings" than in the possession of an utterance of wisdom, an utterance of knowledge, or faith? Nothing whatever. On the contrary, everything, from the unvarying experience of the world, to the inferences which we shall be able to draw from the whole of this information regarding the Charismata, shows that there was no miraculous power of healing either possessed or exercised. Reference is frequently made to the passage in the so-called Epistle of James as an illustration of this, v. 14: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name of the Lord: 15. And the prayer of faith shall save the afflicted, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." The context, however, not only shows that in this there is no allusion to any gift of healing or miraculous power, but seems to ignore the existence of any such gift. The Epistle continues: v. 16. "Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray for one another that ye may be healed. The supplication of a righteous man availeth much when it is working." And then the successful instance of the prayer of Elijah that it might not rain and again that it might rain is given. The passage is merely an assertion of the efficacy of prayer, and if, as is not unfrequently done, it be argued that the gifts of healings were probably applied by means of earnest prayer for the sick, it may be said that this is the only "gift" which is supposed to have descended to our times. It does not require much argument, however, to show that the reality of a miraculous gift can scarcely be demonstrated by appealing to the objective efficacy of prayer. We may, in passing, refer apologists who hold the authenticity of the Epistles to the Philippians and to Timothy, to indications which do not quite confirm the supposition that a power of miraculous healing actually existed in the Apostolic Church. In the Epistle to the Philippians, ii. 25 ff., Paul is represented as sending Epaphroditus to them (v. 26) "Since he was longing after you all, and was distressed because ye heard that he was sick. 27 For, indeed, he was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, that I might not have sorrow upon sorrow. I sent him, therefore, the more anxiously, that, when ye see him, ye may rejoice again, and that

¹ The word *ἰάμα* only occurs in the N. T. in 1 Cor. xii 10, 28, 29. It might better be rendered "means of healing," or "remedies."

I may be the less sorrowful." The anxiety felt by the Philip-
pians, and the whole language of the writer, in this passage, are
rather inconsistent with the knowledge that miraculous power
of healing was possessed by the Church, and of course by Paul,
which would naturally have been exerted for one in whom so
many were keenly interested. Then, in 2 Tim. iv. 20, the writer
says: "Trophimus I left at Miletus sick." If miraculous powers
of healing existed, why were they not exerted in this case? If
they were exerted and failed for special reasons, why are these
not mentioned? It is unfortunate that there is so little evidence
of the application of these gifts. On the other hand, we may
suggest that medical art scarcely existed at that period in such
communities, and that the remedies practised admirably lent
themselves to the theory of "gifts" of healings, rather than to
any recognition of the fact that the accurate diagnosis of disease
and successful treatment of it can only be the result of special
study and experience.

The next gift mentioned is (v. 10) "workings of powers"
(ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων) very unwarrantably rendered in our "author-
ized" version "the working of miracles." We have already said
enough regarding Paul's use of δυνάμις. The phrase before us
would be even better rendered in- or inward-workings of powers,
and the use made of ἐνεργεῖν by Paul throughout his epistles would
confirm this. It may be pointed out that as the gifts just referred
to are for "healings" it is difficult to imagine any class of
"miracles" which could well be classed under a separate head as
the special "working of miracles" contemplated by apologists. In-
finitely the greater number of miracles related in the Gospels and
Acts are "healings" of disease. Is it possible to suppose that Paul
really indicated by this expression a distinct order of "miracles"
properly so called? Certainly not. Neither the words themselves
used by Paul, properly understood, nor the context permit us to
suppose that he referred to the working of miracles at all. We
have no intention of conjecturing what these "powers" were sup-
posed to be; it is sufficient that we show they cannot rightly be
exaggerated into an assertion of the power of working miracles.
It is much more probable that, in the expression, no external
working by the gifted person is implied at all, and that the gift
referred to "in-workings of powers" within his own mind pro-
ducing the ecstatic state with its usual manifestations or those
visions and supposed revelations to which Paul himself was

¹ The Bishop of Lincoln has on 1 Cor. xii. 6, "ἐνεργημάτων] in-wrought
works. 'Ενεργημα is more than ἔργον. For ἐνεργημα is not every work,
it is an in-wrought work," &c. On v. 11: "ἐνεργεῖ] in-worketh;" and on v. 28:
"δυνάμεις] powers." Greek Test. St. Paul's Eps., p. 127 ff.

subject. Demoniacs, or persons supposed to be possessed of evil spirits, were called *ἐνεργούμενοι*, and it is easy to conceive how anyone under strong religious impressions, at that epoch of most intense religious emotion, might, when convulsed by nervous or mental excitement, be supposed the subject of inward workings of powers supernaturally imparted. Every period of religious zeal has been marked by such phenomena.¹ These conclusions are further corroborated by the next gifts enumerated. The first of these is "prophecy" (*προφητεία*), by which is not intended the mere foretelling of events, but speaking "unto men edification and exhortation and comfort," as the Apostle himself says (xiv. 3); and an illustration of this may be pointed out in Acts iv. 36, where the name Barnabas = "Son of prophecy," being interpreted is said to be "Son of Exhortation" (*υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*). To this follows the "discerning (or judging) of spirits" (*διάκρισις πνευμάτων*), a gift which, if we are to judge by Paul's expressions elsewhere, was simply the exercise of natural intelligence and discernment. In an earlier part of the first Epistle, rebuking the Corinthians for carrying their disputes before legal tribunals, he says, vi. 5: "Is it so that there is not even one wise man among you who shall be able to discern (*διακρίναι*) between his brethren?" Again, in xi. 31, "But if we discerned (*διακρίνομεν*) we should not be judged (*ἐκρινόμεθα*)" (cf. vv. 28, 29), and in xiv. 29, "Let Prophets speak two or three, and let the others discern (*διακρινέτωσαν*).

We reserve the "kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues" for separate treatment, and proceed to vv. 28 ff., in which, after illustrating his meaning by the analogy of the body, the Apostle resumes his observations upon the Charismata, and it is instructive to consider the rank he ascribes to the various gifts. He classes them: "First, apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that powers, after that gifts of healings, helpings, governings, kinds of tongues." These so-called miraculous gifts are here placed in a lower class than those of exhortation and teaching, which is suggestive; for it is difficult to suppose that even a man like Paul could have regarded the possession of such palpable and stupendous power as the instantaneous and miraculous healing of disease, or the performance of other miracles, below the gift of teaching or exhortation. It is perfectly intelligible that the practice of medicine as it was then understood, and the skill which might have been attained in particular branches of disease by individuals, not to speak of those who may have been supposed to be performing miracles when they dealt with cases

¹ We may point out further instances of the use of *ἐνεργεῖν* in the New Testament, in addition to those already referred to, and which should be examined: Ephes. i. 20, ii. 2, iii. 20; Phil. ii. 13; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7.

of hysteria or mental excitement, might appear to the Apostle much inferior to a gift for imparting spiritual instruction and admonition; but the actual possession of supernatural power, the actual exercise of what was believed to be the personal attribute of God, must have been considered a distinction more awful and elevated than any gift of teaching. It will be noticed also that other Charismata are here introduced, whilst "discerning of spirits" is omitted. The new gifts, "helpings" and "governings," have as little a miraculous character about them as any that have preceded them. Is it not obvious that all special ability, all official capacity, is simply represented as a divine gift, and regarded as a "manifestation of the Spirit?"

It is important in the highest degree to remember that the supposed miraculous Charismata are not merely conferred upon a few persons, but are bestowed upon all the members of the Apostolic Church.¹ "The extraordinary Charismata which the Apostles conferred through their imposition of hands," writes Dr. von Döllinger, "were so diffused and distributed, that nearly every one, or at any rate many, temporarily at least, had a share in one gift or another. This was a solitary case in history, which has never since repeated itself, and which, in default of experience, we can only approximately picture to ourselves. One might say: the metal of the Church was still glowing, molten, formless, and presented altogether another aspect than, since then, in the condition of the cold and hardened casting."² The apologetic representation of the case is certainly unique in history, and in its departure from all experience might, one might have thought, have excited suspicion. Difficult as it is to picture such a state, it is worth while to endeavour to do so to a small extent. Let us imagine communities of Christians, often of considerable importance, in all the larger cities as well as in smaller towns, all or most of the members of which were endowed with supernatural

¹ Cf. Eph. iv. 7, 11; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. Dean Stanley says: "It is important to observe, that these multiplied allusions imply a state of things in the Apostolic age, which has certainly not been seen since. On particular occasions, indeed, both in the first four centuries, and afterwards in the middle ages, miracles are ascribed by contemporary writers to the influence of the relics of particular individuals; but there has been no occasion when they have been so emphatically ascribed to whole societies, so closely mixed up with the ordinary course of life. It is not maintained that every member of the Corinthian Church had all or the greater part of these gifts, but it certainly appears that every one had some gift; and this being the case, we are enabled to realize the total difference of the organization of the Apostolic Church from any through which it has passed in its later stages. It was still in a state of fusion. Every part of the new Society was instinct with a life of its own. The whole atmosphere which it breathed must have confirmed the belief in the importance and novelty of the crisis." The Epistles of St. P. to the Corinthians, 4th ed., p. 224.

² Christenthum und Kirche, 2te Aufl., 1868, p. 298.

gifts, and, amongst others, with power to heal diseases and to perform miracles; all the intellectual and religious qualities requisite for the guidance, edification, and government of the communities supplied abundantly and specially by the Holy Spirit; the ordinary dependence of society on the natural capacity and power of its leaders dispensed with, and every possible branch of moral culture and physical comfort provided with inspired and miraculously-gifted ministries; the utterance of wisdom and knowledge, exhortation and teaching, workings of healings, discernment of spirits, helpings, governings, kinds of tongues supernaturally diffused throughout the community by God himself. As a general rule, communities have to do as well as they can without such help, and eloquent instructors and able administrators do not generally fail them. The question, therefore, intrudes itself: Why were ordinary and natural means so completely set aside, and the qualifications which are generally found adequate for the conduct and regulation of life supplanted by divine Charismata? At least, we may suppose that communities endowed with such supernatural advantages, and guided by the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, must have been distinguished in every way from the rest of humanity, and must have presented a spectacle of the noblest life, free from the weakness and inconsistency of the world, and betraying none of the moral and intellectual frailties of ordinary society. At the very least, and without exaggeration, communities in every member of which there existed some supernatural manifestation of the Holy Spirit might be expected to show very marked superiority and nobility of character.

When we examine the Epistles of Paul and other ancient documents, we find anything but supernatural qualities in the Churches supposed to be endowed with such miraculous gifts. On the contrary, it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the intensely human character of the conduct of such communities, their fickleness, the weakness of their fidelity to the Gospel of Paul, their wavering faith, and the ease and rapidity with which they are led astray, their petty strifes and discords, their party spirit, their almost indecent abuse of some of their supposed gifts, such as "tongues," for which Paul rebukes them so severely. The very Epistles, in fact, in which we read of the supernatural endowments and organization of the Church, are full of evidence that there was nothing supernatural in them. The primary cause apparently for which the first letter was written to the Corinthians was the occurrence of divisions and contentions amongst them (i. 10 ff.), parties of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, of Christ, which make the Apostle give thanks (i. 14) that he had baptized but few of them, that no one might say that they were

baptized into his name. Paul had not been able to speak to them as spiritual but as carnal, mere babes in Christ (iii. 1 f.); he fed them with milk, not meat, for they were not yet able, "nor even now are ye able," he says, "for ye are yet carnal. For whereas there is among you envying and strife; are ye not carnal?" He continues in the same strain throughout the letter, admonishing them in no flattering terms. Speaking of his sending Timothy to them, he says (iv. 18 f.): "But some of you were puffed up, as though I were not coming to you; but I will come to you shortly, if it be the Lord's will, and will know, not the speech of them who are puffed up, but the power." There is serious sin amongst them, which they show no readiness to purge away. Moreover these Corinthians have lawsuits with each other (vi. 1 ff.), and, instead of taking advantage of those supernatural Charismata, they actually take their causes for decision before the uninspired tribunals of the heathen rather than submit them to the judgment of the saints. Their own members, who have gifts of wisdom and of knowledge, discerning of spirits and governings, have apparently so little light to throw upon the regulation of social life, that the Apostle has to enter into minute details for their admonition and guidance. He has even to lay down rules regarding the head-dresses of women in the Churches (xi. 3 ff.). Even in their very Church assemblies there are divisions of a serious character amongst them (xi. 18 ff.). They misconduct themselves in the celebration of the Lord's supper, for they make it, as it were, their own supper, "and one is hungry and another is drunken." "What!" he indignantly exclaims, "have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God?" To the Galatians Paul writes, marveling that they are so soon removing from him that called them in the grace of Christ unto a different Gospel (i. 6). "O foolish Galatians," he says (iii. 1), "who bewitched you?" In that community also, opposition to Paul and denial of his authority had become powerful. If we turn to other ancient documents, the Epistles to the seven Churches do not present us with a picture of supernatural perfection in those communities, though doubtless, like the rest, they had received these gifts. The other Epistles of the New Testament depict a state of things which by no means denotes any extraordinary or abnormal condition of the members. We may quote a short passage to show that we do not strain this representation unduly. "But certainly," says Dr. von Döllinger, "in spite of a rich outpouring of spiritual gifts vouchsafed to it, a community could fall into wanton error. Paul had in Corinth, contemporaneously with his description of the charismatic state of the Church there, to denounce sad abuses. In

the Galatian community, Judaistic seduction, and the darkening of Christian doctrine through the delusion as to the necessity of the observance of the law, had so much increased that the Apostle called them fools and senseless, but at the same time he appealed to the proof which was presented by the spiritual gifts and miraculous powers, in which they had participated not through the observance of the law, but through faith in Christ (Gal. iii. 2, 5). Now at that time the Charismata of teaching and knowledge must already have been weakened or extinguished in these communities, otherwise so strong an aberration would not be explicable. Nowhere, however, in this Epistle is there any trace of an established ministry; on the contrary, at the close, the 'spiritual' among them are instructed to administer the office of communion. But, generally, from that time forward, the charismatic state in the Church more and more disappeared, though single Charisma, and individuals endowed with the same, remained. In the first Epistle to the believers in Thessalonica, Paul had made it specially prominent that his Gospel had worked there, not as mere word, but with demonstration of the power of the Holy Spirit (i. 5). In the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, there is no longer the slightest intimation of, or reference to, the Charismata, although in both communities the occasion for such an allusion was very appropriate—in Philippi through the Jewish opponents, and in Colossæ on account of the heretical dangers and the threatening Gnostic asceticism. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Philippians, bishops and deacons are already mentioned as ministers of the community. Then, in the Pastoral Epistles, not only is there no mention of the Charismata, but a state of the community is set forth which is wholly different from the charismatic. The communities in Asia Minor, the Ephesian first of all, are partly threatened, partly unsettled by Gnostic heresies, strifes of words, foolish controversies, empty babbling about matters of faith, of doctrines of demons, of an advancing godlessness corroding like a gangrene (1 Tim. iv. 1-3, vi. 3 ff., 20, 2 Tim. ii. 14 ff.) All the counsels which are here given to Timothy, the conduct in regard to these evils which is recommended to him, all is of a nature as though Charismata no longer existed to any extent, as though, in lieu of the first spiritual soaring and of the fulness of extraordinary powers manifesting itself in the community, the bare prose of the life of the Church had already set in.¹ Regarding this it is not necessary for us to say more than that the representation which is everywhere made, in the Acts and elsewhere, and which seems to be confirmed by Paul, is that all the members of these Christian communities received the Holy Spirit, and the divine

¹ Christenthum u. Kirche, 1868, p. 300 f.

Charismata, but that nowhere have we evidence of any supernatural results produced by them. If, however, the view above expressed be accepted, the difficulty is increased; for, except in the allusions of the Apostle to Charismata, it is impossible to discover any difference between communities which had received miraculous spiritual "gifts" and those which had not done so. On the contrary, it might possibly be shown that a church which had not been so endowed, perhaps on the whole exhibited higher spiritual qualities than a *other* which was supposed to possess the Charisma. In none are we able to perceive any supernatural characteristics, or more than the very ordinary marks of a new religious life. It seems scarcely necessary to depart from the natural order of nature, and introduce the supernatural working of a Holy Spirit to produce such common-place results. We venture to say that there is nothing whatever to justify the assertion of supernatural agency here, and that the special divine Charismata existed only in the pious imagination of the Apostle, who referred every good quality in man to divine grace.

We have reserved the gift of "Tongues" for special discussion because Paul enters into it with a fulness with which he does not treat any of the other Charismata, and a valuable opportunity is thus afforded us of ascertaining something definite with regard to the nature of the gift; and also because we have a narrative in the Acts of the Apostles of the first descent of the Holy Spirit, manifesting itself in "Tongues," with which it may be instructive to compare the Apostle's remarks. We may mention that, in the opinion of many, the cause which induced the Apostle to say so much regarding Charismata in his first letter to the Corinthians was the circumstance, that many maintained the gift of tongues to be the only form of "the manifestation of the Spirit." This view is certainly favoured by the narrative in the Acts, in which not only at the first famous day of Pentecost, but on almost every occasion of the imposition of the Apostle's hands, this is the only gift mentioned as accompanying the reception of the Holy Spirit. In any case, it is apparent from the whole of the Apostle's homily on the subject, that the gift of tongues was especially valued in the Church of Corinth.¹ It is difficult to conceive, on

¹ Dean Stanley says: "It may easily be conceived that this new life was liable to much confusion and excitement, especially in a society where the principle of moral stability was not developed commensurably with it. Such was, we know, the state of Corinth. They had, on the one hand, been 'in everything enriched by Christ, in all utterance, and in all knowledge,' 'coming behind in no gift' (i. 5, 6, 7); but, on the other hand, the same contentious spirit which had turned the most sacred names into party watchwords, and profaned the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, was ready to avail itself of the openings for vanity and ambition afforded by the distinctions of the different gifts. Accordingly various disorders arose; every one thought of himself, and no one of his neighbour's

the supposition that amongst the Charismata there were comprised miraculous gifts of healings, and further power of working miracles, that these could have been held so cheap in comparison with the gift of tongues; but in any case a better comprehension of what this "gift" really was cannot fail to assist us in understanding the true nature of the whole of the Charismata. It is evident that the Apostle Paul himself does not rank the gift of tongues very highly, and indeed, that he seems to value prophecy more than all the other Charismata (xiv. 1 ff.); but the simple yet truly noble eloquence with which (xiii. 1 ff.) he elevates above all these gifts the possession of spiritual love is a subtle indication of their real character. Probably Paul would have termed Christian Charity a gift of the Spirit as much as he does "gifts of healings" or "workings of powers;" but however rare may be the virtue, it will scarcely now be recognised as miraculous, although it is here shown to be more desirable and precious than all the miraculous gifts. Even Apostolic conceptions of the Supernatural cannot soar above the range of natural morality.

The real nature of the "gift of tongues" has given rise to an almost interminable controversy, and innumerable treatises have been written upon the subject. It would have been impossible for us to have exhaustively entered upon such a discussion in this work, for which it only possesses an incidental and passing interest; but fortunately such a course is rendered unnecessary by the fact that, so far as we are concerned, the miraculous nature of the "gift" alone comes into question, and may be disposed of without any elaborate analysis of past controversy or minute reference to disputed points. Those who desire to follow the course of the voluminous discussion will find ample materials in the treatises which we shall at least indicate in the course of our remarks, and we shall adhere as closely as possible to our own point of view.

In 1 Cor. xii. 10, the Apostle mentions amongst the other Charismata "kinds of tongues" (γένη γλωσσῶν) and "interpretation of tongues" (ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν), as two distinct gifts. In v. 28 he again uses the expression γένη γλωσσῶν, and in a following verse he inquires: "do all speak with tongues" (γλώσσοις λαλοῦσι)¹

good; and, as a natural consequence, those gifts were most highly honoured, not which were most useful, but which were most astonishing. Amongst these the gift of tongues rose pre-eminent, as being in itself the most expressive of the new spiritual life; the very words 'spiritual gifts,' 'spiritual man' (πνευματικά, xiv. 1; πνευματικός, xiv. 37), seem, in common parlance, to have been exclusively appropriated to it; and the other gifts, especially that of prophecy, were despised as hardly proceeding from the same Divine source." The Eps. of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 1876, p. 210 f. Imagine this state of things in a community endowed with so many supernatural gifts!

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 6, 18, 23, 39; Acts x. 46, xix. 6.

"do all interpret" (διερμηνεύουσι)? He says shortly after, xiii. 1: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels (ἐν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων) and have not love," &c. In the following chapter the expressions used in discussing the gift vary. In xiv. 2 he says: "he that speaketh with a tongue" (λαλῶν γλώσση),² using the singular; and again (v. 22), of "the tongues" (αἱ γλώσσαι), being a sign; and in v. 26, each "hath a tongue" (γλώσσαν ἔχει). The word γλώσσα or γλῶττα has several significations in Greek. The first and primary meaning "the tongue": as a mere member of the body, the organ of speech; next, a tongue, or language; and further, an obsolete or foreign word not in ordinary use. If we inquire into the use of γλώσσα in the New Testament, we find that, setting aside the passages in Acts, Mark, and 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., in which the phenomenon we are discussing is referred to, the word is invariably used in the first sense, "the tongue,"³ except in the Apocalypse, where the word as "language" typifies different nations.⁴ Any one who attentively considers all the passages in which the Charisma is discussed will observe that no uniform application of any one signification throughout is possible. We may briefly say that all the attempts which have been made philologically to determine the true nature of the phenomenon which the Apostle discusses have failed to produce any really satisfactory result, or to secure the general adhesion of critics. It is we think obvious that Paul does not apply the word, either in the plural or in the singular, in its ordinary senses, but makes use of γλώσσα to describe phenomena connected with speech, without intending strictly to apply it either to the tongue or to a definite language. We merely refer to this in passing, for it is certain that no philological discussion of the word can materially affect the case; and the argument is of no interest for our inquiry. Each meaning has been adopted by critics, and been made the basis for a different explanation of the phenomenon. Philology is incapable of finally solving such a problem.

From the time of Irenæus,⁵ or at least Origen, the favourite

¹ The rendering of the Authorized Version "an unknown tongue," is wholly imaginary. The "with" which we adopt is more frequently rendered "in;" it is a mere matter of opinion of course, but we maintain "with."

² Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 4, 13, 14, 19, 27.

³ Mark vii. 33, 35; Luke i. 64, xvi. 24; Acts ii. 3, 26; Rom. iii. 13, xiv. 11; Philip. ii. 11; James i. 26, iii. 5, 6 twice, 9; 1 Pet. iii. 10; 1 John iii. 18; cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 1; Apoc. xvi. 10.

⁴ Apoc. v. 9, vii. 9, x. 11, xi. 9, xiii. 7, xiv. 6, xvii. 15.

⁵ Propter quod et Apostolos ait: "Sapientiam loquimur inter perfectos;" perfectos dicens eos qui perceperunt Spiritum Dei, et omnibus linguis loquuntur per Spiritum Dei, quemadmodum et ipse loquebatur. Καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ακούομεν ἀδελφὲν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, προφητικά χαρίσματα ἔχοντων, καὶ

theory of the Fathers, based chiefly upon the narrative in Acts of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, was that the disciples suddenly became supernaturally endowed with power to speak other languages which they had not previously learned, and that this gift was more especially conferred to facilitate the promulgation of the Gospel throughout the world. Augustine went so far as to believe that each of the Apostles was thus enabled to speak all languages.¹ The opinion that the "gift of tongues" consisted in the power, miraculously conferred by the Holy Ghost, to speak in a language or languages previously unknown to the speaker long continued to prevail, and it is still the popular, as well as the orthodox, view of the subject.² As soon as the attention of critics was seriously directed to the question, however, this interpretation became rapidly modified, or was altogether abandoned. It is unnecessary for us to refer in detail to the numerous explanations which have been given of the phenomenon, or to enumerate the extraordinary views which have been expressed regarding it; it will be sufficient if, without reference to minor differences of opinion respecting the exact form in which it exhibited itself, we broadly state that a great majority of critics, rejecting the theory that *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* means to speak languages previously unknown to the speakers, pronounce it to be the speech of persons in a state of ecstatic excitement, chiefly of the nature of prayer or praise, and unintelligible to ordinary hearers.³ Whe-

παντοδαπαῖς λαλοῦντων διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος γλώσσαις, καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερόν ἀγόντων, κ.τ.λ. *Irenaeus*, Adv. Hær. v. 6, § 1; *Eusebius*, H. E., v. 7.

¹ De Verb. Apost. clxxv. 3; Serm. 9: "Loquebatur enim tunc unus homo omnibus linguis, quia locutura erat unitas ecclesie in omnibus linguis."

² *Aford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 15 f.; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 336 f.; *Ebrard*, Zu Olsb. Apg., p. 56; *Englmann*, Von den Charismen, 1849, p. 261 ff.; *Kling*, Stud. u. Kr., 1839, p. 487 ff.; *Maier*, Die Glossolalie d. apost. Zeitalter, 1855; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 56 f.; Bibl. Comm., iii. p. 711 f.; *Oxlander*, Comm. erst. Br. P. an die Korinther, 1847, p. 546 ff.; *Rossteuscher*, Die Gabe d. Sprachen im apost. Zeit., 1850, p. 80 ff.; *Rückert*, Der erste Br. an die Kor., 1836, p. 448 ff.; *Schaff*, K. G. 2te Aufl., p. 203 ff.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Z., p. 67 f.; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., St. Paul's Eps., p. 128, 131 f.

³ *Baur*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1830, ii. p. 75 ff.; Stud. u. Krit., 1838, p. 618 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 182 ff.; *Bleek*, Stud. u. Krit., 1829, p. 17 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N.T., ii. p. 223; *Delitzsch*, Syst. bibl. Psychologi., 2te Aufl., p. 362 f.; *Eichhorn*, Allg. Biblioth. bibl. Lit., i. p. 91 ff., 775 ff.; ii. p. 795 ff.; iii. p. 225 ff.; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 53, 387 f.; in *Schenkel's B. L.*, iv. p. 431 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Glosstalie d. alt. Kirche, 1850, p. 23 ff.; Einl., p. 275 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in *Bunsen's Bibelw.*, viii. p. 440; *Keim*, in *Herzog's R. E.*, xviii. p. 688 ff.; *Meyer*, 1 Br. an die Korinther, 5te Aufl., p. 345 f.; Apg., p. 57 ff.; *Ev. Mark. u. Luk.*, p. 217 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 11 ff.; *Ausl. beid. Br. an die Cor.*, 1869, p. 204; *Noack*, Ursprung d. Christenth., ii. p. 282 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu d. W. Apg., p. 26 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 234 f.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 355 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 61 ff.; *Reuss*, Rev. d. Théol., 1851, iii. p. 65 ff.; *Riehm*, Stud. u. Krit., 1865, p. 21 f.; *Schulz*, Die Geistesgaben d. erst. Christ., 1836, p. 57 ff., 140 f.; Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 752 ff.; *Stanley*, St. Paul's Eps. to the Cor., 4th ed., p. 245 ff.;

ther this speech consisted of mere inarticulate tones, of excited ejaculations, of obsolete or uncommon expressions and provincialisms, of highly poetical rhapsodies, of prayer in slow scarcely audible accents, or of chaunted mysterious phrases, fragmentary and full of rapturous intensity, as these critics variously suppose, we shall not pause to inquire. It is clear that, whatever may have been the form of the speech, if instead of being speech in unlearned languages supernaturally communicated, *γλώσσας λαλεῖν* was only the expression of religious excitement, however that may be supposed to have originated, the pretensions of the gift to a miraculous character shrink at once into exceedingly small proportions.

Every unprejudiced mind must admit that the representation that the gift of "tongues," of which the Apostle speaks in his Epistle to the Corinthians, conferred upon the recipient the power to speak foreign languages before unknown to him, may in great part be traced to the narrative in Acts of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Although a few apologists advance the plea that there may have been differences in the manifestation, it is generally recognised on both sides that, however differently described by the two writers, the *γλώσσας λαλεῖν* of Paul and of the Acts is one and the same phenomenon. The impression conveyed by the narrative has been applied to the didactic remarks of Paul, and a meaning forced upon them which they cannot possibly bear. It is not too much to say that, but for the mythical account in the Acts, no one would ever have supposed that the *γλώσσας λαλεῖν* of Paul was the gift of speaking foreign languages without previous study or practice. In the interminable controversy regarding the phenomenon, moreover, it seems to us to have been a fundamental error, on both sides too often, to have considered it necessary to the acceptance of any explanation that it should equally suit both the remarks of Paul and the account in Acts.¹ The only right course is to test the narrative by the distinct and authoritative statements of the Apostle; but to adopt the contrary course is much the same procedure as altering the natural interpretation of an original historical document in order to make it agree with the romance of some unknown writer of a later day. The Apostle Paul writes as a contemporary and eye-witness of phenomena which affected

Steuert, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1830, ii. p. 133 ff.; 1831, ii. p. 128 ff.; *Wieseler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1838, p. 703 ff.; 1860, p. 111 ff.; *Zeller*, Apog., p. 85 ff. Cf. *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. K., p. 337 ff.; *Ewald*, Sendschr. des Ap. P., p. 201 ff.; *Geschn. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 110 ff.; *v. Hengel*, De Gave der tales, p. 90 ff.; *Kling*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 493 f.; *Olshausen*, Stud. u. Krit. 1831, p. 568 ff.; *Bibl. Comment.*, iii. p. 709 ff.; *Apog.*, p. 47 ff.; *Schaff*, K. G., p. 203 ff.

¹ Cf. *Baur*, Stud. u. Krit., 1838, p. 620 f.

himself, and regarding which he gives the most valuable direct and indirect information. The unknown Author of the Acts was not an eye-witness of the scene which he describes, and his narrative bears upon its very surface the clearest marks of traditional and legendary treatment. The ablest apologists freely declare that the evidence of Paul is of infinitely greater value than that of the unknown and later writer, and must be preferred before it. The majority of those who profess to regard the narrative as historical explain away its clearest statements with startling ingenuity, or conceal them beneath a cloud of words. The references to the phenomenon in later portions of the Acts are in themselves quite inconsistent with the earlier narrative in ch. ii. The detailed criticism of Paul is the only contemporary, and it is certainly the only trustworthy, account we possess regarding the gift of "tongues."¹ We must, therefore, dismiss from our minds, if possible, the bias which the narrative in the Acts has unfortunately created, and attend solely to the words of the Apostle. If his report of the phenomenon discredit that of the unknown and later writer, so much the worse for the latter. In any case it is the testimony of Paul which is referred to and which we are called upon to consider, and later writers must not be allowed to invest it with impossible meanings. Even if we had not such undeniable reasons for preferring the statements of Paul to the later and untrustworthy narrative of an unknown writer, the very contents of the latter, contrasted with the more sober remarks of the Apostle, would consign it to a very subordinate place. Discussing the miracle of Pentecost in Acts, which he, of course, regards as the instantaneous communication of ability to speak in foreign languages, Zeller makes the following remarks: "The supposition of such a miracle is opposed to a right view of divine agency, and of the relation of God to the world, and, in this case in particular, to a right view of the constitution of the human mind. The composition and the properties of a body may be altered through external influence, but mental acquirements are attained only through personal activity, through practice; and it is just in this that spirit distinguishes itself from matter: that it is free, that there is nothing in it which it has not itself spontaneously introduced. The external and instantaneous in-pouring of a mental acquirement is a representation which refutes itself." In reply to those who object to this reasoning he retorts: "The assertion that such a miracle actually occurred contradicts the analogy of all attested experience, that it is invented by an individual or by tradition corresponds with it; when, therefore, the

¹ We need not here say anything of the reference in Mark xvi. 17, which is undoubtedly a later and spurious addition to the Gospel.

historical writer has only the choice between these two alternatives, he must, according to the laws of historical probability, under all the circumstances, unconditionally decide for the second. He must do this even if an eye-witness of the pretended miracle stood before him; he must all the more do so if he has to do with a statement which, beyond doubt not proceeding from an eye-witness, is more possibly separated by some generations from the event in question."¹

These objections are not confined to rationalistic critics and do not merely represent the arguments of scepticism. Neander expresses similar sentiments,² and after careful examination pronounces the narrative in Acts untrustworthy, and, adhering to the representations of Paul, rejects the theory that *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* was speech in foreign languages supernaturally imparted. Meyer, who arrives at much the same result as Neander, speaks still more emphatically. He says: "*This supposed gift of tongues (all languages), however, was in the apostolic age, partly unnecessary for the preaching of the Gospel, as the preachers thereof only required to be able to speak Hebrew and Greek; partly too general, as amongst the assembly there were certainly many who were not called to be teachers. And, on the other hand, again, it would also have been premature, as, before all, Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles would have required it, in whom nevertheless there is as little trace of any subsequent reception of it as that he preached otherwise than in Hebrew and Greek. But now, how is the event to be historically judged? Regarding this the following is to be observed: As the instantaneous bestowal of facility in a foreign language is neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable, and as not the slightest intimation of such a thing in the Apostles is perceptible in their Epistles and elsewhere (on the contrary, comp. xiv. 11); as, further, if it was only momentary, the impossibility increases, and as Peter himself in his speech does not once make the slightest reference to the foreign languages: therefore,—whether, without any intimation in the text, one consider that Pentecost assembly as a representation of all future Christianity, or not—the occurrence, as Luke relates it, cannot be transmitted in its actual historical circumstance.*"³

Let us a little examine the particulars of the narrative in Acts ii. All the brethren were assembled in one place, a house (*oikos*), on the morning of the day of Pentecost. In the preceding chapter (i. 15) we learn that the number of disciples was then about

¹ Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch.*, p. 85 f.

² Pfanzung, u. s. w., p. 16.

³ Meyer, *Kr. ex. H'buch üb. die Apostelgesch.*, 4te Aufl., 1870, p. 54 f.

120, and the crowd which came together when the miraculous occurrence took place must have been great, seeing that it is stated that 3,000 souls were baptized and added to the Church upon the occasion (ii. 41). Passing over the statement as to the numbers of the disciples, which might well surprise us after the information given by the Gospels,¹ we may ask in what house in Jerusalem could such a multitude have assembled? Apologists have exhausted their ingenuity in replying to the question, but whether placing the scene in one of the halls or courts of the Temple, or in an imaginary house in one of the streets leading to the Temple, the explanation is equally vague and unsatisfactory. How did the multitude so rapidly know of what was passing in a private house? We shall say nothing at present of the sound of the "rushing mighty wind" which filled all the house, nor of the descent of the "tongues of fire," nor of the various interpretations of these phenomena by apologetic writers. These incidents scarcely add to the historical character of the narrative, nor can it be pronounced either clear or consistent. The brethren assembled were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues (λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις), as the Spirit gave them utterance."² Apologists, in order somewhat to save the historical credit of the account and reconcile it with the statements of Paul, have variously argued that there is no affirmation made in the narrative that speech in foreign languages previously unknown was imparted. The members of the fifteen nations who hear the Galileans speaking "in our own language wherein we were born" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν) are disposed of with painful ingenuity; but, passing over all this, it is recognised by unprejudiced critics on both sides that at least the Author of Acts, in writing this account, intended to represent the brethren as instantaneously speaking those previously unknown foreign languages. A few writers, represent the miracle to have been one of hearing rather than of speaking, the brethren merely praising God in their own tongue, the Aramaic, but the spectators understanding in their various languages.³ This merely shifts the difficulty from the speakers to the hearers, and the explanation is generally repudiated. It is, however, freely granted by all that history does not exhibit a single instance of such a gift of tongues having ever been made useful for the purpose of preaching the gospel.⁴ Paul, who claimed the possession of the

¹ John xvi. 31; Mt. xxviii. 7.

² Acts ii. 4.

³ *Schneckenburger*, Beiträge, p. 84; *Svensen*, Zeitschr. luth. Thu. u. Kirche, 1859, p. 1 ff. This view was anciently held by Gregory Naz. (Orat. 44), and some of the Fathers, and in more recent times it was adopted by Erasmus and others.

⁴ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 15; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 120, ann. 2; *Kling*,

miraculous that it is the Church as to the after the house in Apologists tion, but parts of the leading to satisfactory. passing in the sound use, nor of s interpre- these inci- narrative, the brethren an to speak gave them the historical tements of on made in ously un- nations who wherein we disposed of recognised Author of the brethren own foreign have been ren merely the specta- this merely and the ex- ly granted ce of such a purpose of ssion of the

hu. u. Kirche, Orat. 44), and Erasmus and ma. 2; Kling,

gift of tongues in a superlative degree (1 Cor. xiv. 18), does not appear to have spoken more languages than Aramaic and Greek. He writes to the Romans in the latter tongue and not in Latin, and to the Galatians in the same language instead of their own. Peter, who appears to have addressed the assembled nations in Greek on this very occasion, does not in his speech either refer to foreign languages or claim the gift himself, for in v. 15 he speaks only of others. "For these (οἱ τοι) are not drunken." Every one remembers the ancient tradition recorded by Papias, and generally believed by the Fathers, that Mark accompanied Peter as his "interpreter" (ἐρμηνεύς).¹ The first Epistle bearing the name of Peter, and addressed to some of the very nations mentioned in Acts, to sojourners "in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," is written in Greek; and so is the "Epistle to the Hebrews" and the other works of the New Testament. Few will be inclined to deny that, to take only one language for instance, the Greek of the writings of the New Testament leaves something to be desired, and that, if the writers possessed such a supernatural gift, they evidently did not speak even so important and current a language with absolute purity. "Le style des écrivains sacrés," writes a modern apologist, "montre clairement qu'ils ont appris la langue grecque et qu'ils ne la possèdent pas de droit divin et par inspiration, car ils l'écrivent sans correction, en la surchargeant de locutions hébraïques."² In fact, as most critics point out, there never was a period at which a gift of foreign tongues was less necessary for intercourse with the civilized world, Greek or Hellenistic Greek being almost everywhere current. As regards the fifteen nations who are supposed to have been represented on this great occasion, Neander says: "It is certain that amongst the inhabitants of towns in Cappadocia, in Pontus, in Asia Minor, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Cyrene, and in the parts of Libya and Egypt peopled by Greek and Jewish colonies, the Greek language was in great part more current than the old national tongue. There remain, out of the whole catalogue of languages, at most the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. The more

Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 494 f.; Meyer, *Apog.*, p. 54 f.; Milman, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 354, note; Neander, *Pflanzung*, p. 12 ff.; Br. an die Cor., p. 294 f.; Olshausen, *Apog.*, p. 52 f.; de Pressensé, *Trois prem. Siècles*, i. p. 356; Reuss, *Rev. d. Théol.*, 1851, iii. p. 83 ff.; Schaff, *K. G.*, p. 204 f.; Stanley, *Eps. to the Cor.*, p. 249 f.; Thiersch, *Die K. im ap. Z.* p. 69; Zeller, *Apog.*, p. 87 f.

¹ Cf. Eusebius, *H. L.* iii. 39, v. 8; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, § 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5. Of course there is doubt as to the sense in which ἐρμηνεύς is to be understood, although that of interpreter of language is certainly the most natural.

² de Pressensé, *Hist. des Trois prem. Siècles*, i. p. 356. Neander (*Pflanzung*, u. s. w., p. 14 f.), Reuss (*Rev. d. Théol.*, 1851, iii. p. 84 f.), and many other able writers, still more strongly enforce these arguments.

rhetorical than historical stamp of the narrative is evident.¹ This rhetorical character as contradistinguished from sober history is indeed painfully apparent throughout. The presence in Jerusalem of Jews, devout men "from every nation under heaven" is dramatically opportune, and thus representatives of the fifteen nations are prepared to appear in the house and hear their own languages in which they were born spoken in so supernatural, though useless, a manner by the brethren. They are all said to have been "confounded" at the phenomenon, and the writer adds, v. 7 f.: "And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own language wherein we were born?" &c. Did all the multitude say this? Or is not this the writer ascribing, according to his view, probable sentiments to them? How again did they know that the hundred and twenty or more brethren were Galilean? Further on, the writer adds more of the same kind, v. 12, 13: "And they were all amazed and were in doubt, saying one to another: What may this mean? But others mocking said, They are full of sweet wine." Is it not a strange manner of accounting for such a phenomenon as (v. 11) hearing people speaking in their own tongues the great works of God to suppose that they are drunken? People speaking with tongues, in Paul's sense (1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24, 33), and creating an unintelligible tumult, might well lead strangers to say that they were either mad or drunken, but the praise of God in foreign languages, understood by so many, could not convey such an impression. Peter does not, in explanation, simply state that they are speaking foreign languages which have just been supernaturally imparted to them, but argues (v. 15) that "these are not drunken, as we suppose, for it is the third hour of the day,"—too early to be "full of sweet wine," and proceeds to assert that the phenomenon is, on the contrary, a fulfilment of a prophecy of Joel in which, although the pouring out of God's Spirit upon all flesh is promised "in the last days," and as a result that: "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams," not a single word is said of any gift of "tongues," foreign or otherwise. The miraculous phenomenon in question is not mentioned in the prophecy of which it is supposed to be the accomplishment. It does not much help matters to argue that the miracle, although not for future use, was intended as a sign. We shall see what Paul says regarding *γλώσσας λαλεῖν* as a sign, but we may here merely point out that the effect produced in the Corinthian Church is rather an impression of madness, whilst

¹ Neander, *Pfhai sung*, u. s. w., p. 18.

here it leads to a mocking accusation of drunkenness. The conversion of the 3,000 is by no means referred to the speaking with tongues, but simply to the speech of Peter (ii. 37 f. 41). From every point of view, there is no cohesion between the different parts of the narrative; it is devoid of verisimilitude. It is not surprising that so many critics of all shades of opinion recognise unhistorical elements in the narrative in Acts,¹ not to use a stronger term. To allow such an account to influence our interpretation of Paul's statements regarding the gift of tongues is quite out of the question; and no one who appreciates the nature of the case and who carefully examines the narrative of the unknown writer can, we think, hesitate to reject his theory of a supernatural bestowal of power to speak foreign languages, before unknown.

It is not difficult to trace the origin of the account in Acts, and, although we cannot here pause to do so with any minuteness, we may at least indicate the lines upon which the narrative is based. There is no doubt that then, as now, the Jews commemorated at the feast of Pentecost the giving of the law on Sinai.² It seemed good to the Author of Acts that the prophet like unto Moses,³ who was to abrogate that law and replace it by a dispensation of grace, should inaugurate the new law of love and liberty⁴ with signs equally significant and miraculous. It is related in Exodus xix. 18 that the Lord descended upon Sinai "in fire," and that the whole mount quaked greatly. The voice of God pronounced the decalogue and, as the Septuagint version renders our Ex. xx. 18: "All the people saw the voice, and the lightnings and the voice of the trumpet and the mountain smoking."⁵ According to Rabbinical tradition, however, when God came down to give the law to the Israelites, he appeared not to Israel alone, but to all the other nations, and the voice in which the law was given went to the ends of the earth and was heard of all peoples.⁶ It will be remembered that the number of the nations was supposed to be

¹ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 96; Davidson, Int. N.T., ii. 222 f.; Gfrörer, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 387 ff.; Holtzmann, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 336, 437 ff., iv. 287 f.; Keim, in Herzog's R. E., xviii. p. 689 ff.; Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 596, ann. 2; Noack, Urspr. d. Christ., 1857, ii. p. 280 f.; Renan, Les Apôtres, p. xxvii. f.; Reuss, Rev. de Théol., 1851, iii. p. 90 ff.; Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 512; Zeller, Apg., p. 82 ff. Cf. Bleek, Stud. u. Krit., 1830, p. 53; Hausrath, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 99 ff.; Meyer, Apg., p. 54 ff.; 1 Br. an die Cor., p. 341; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 17 ff.; Schulz, Geistesg. d. erst. Christen., p. 58 f., 80 f.; Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 76.

² Schneckenburger, Beiträge zur Einl. N. T., 1832, p. 79; Lightfoot, Works, ed. Pitman, 1825, viii. p. 42 f.; Schoettgen, Horæ Hebr., p. 408; Gfrörer, Das Jahrh. des Heils, 1838, ii. 390 f.

³ Acts iii. 22, vii. 37.

⁴ Cf. Gal. iv. 21 ff.

⁵ Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ τὰς λαμπάδας, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος, καὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ καπνίζον κ.τ.λ.

⁶ Bab. Sevachim, 116 a.; Gfrörer, Das. Jahrh. des Heils, ii. 392 f.

seventy, each speaking a different language, and the law was given in the one sacred Hebrew tongue. The Rabbins explained, however: "The voice from Sinai was divided into 70 voices and 70 languages, so that all nations of the earth heard (the law), and each heard it actually in its own language."¹ And again: "Although the ten commandments were promulgated with one single tone, yet it is said (Exod. xx. 15), 'All people heard the voices' (in the plural and not the voice in the singular); the reason is: As the voice went forth it was divided into seven voices, and then into seventy tongues, and every people heard the Law in its own mother-tongue."² The same explanation is given of Ps. lxxviii. 11, and the separation of the voice into seven voices and seventy tongues is likened to the sparks beaten by a hammer from molten metal on the anvil.³ Philo expresses the same ideas in several places. We can only extract one passage in which, speaking of the giving of the law on Sinai, and discussing the manner in which God proclaimed the decalogue, he says: "For God is not like a man in need of a voice and of a tongue . . . but it seems to me that at that time he performed a most holy and befitting wonder, commanding an invisible voice to be created in air, more wonderful than all instruments, . . . not lifeless, but neither a form of living creature composed of body and soul, but a reasonable soul full of clearness and distinctness, which formed and excited the air and transformed it into flaming fire, and sounded forth such an articulated voice, like breath through a trumpet, that it seemed to be equally heard by those who were near and those furthest off."⁴ A little further on he says: "But from the midst of the fire streaming from heaven, a most awful voice sounded forth, the flame being articulated to language familiar to the hearers, which made that which was said so vividly clear, as to seem rather seeing than hearing it."⁵ It requires no elaborate explanation to show how

¹ Schemoth Rabba, 70 d.; *Gfrörer*, *Ib.*, ii. 393.

² Midrash Tanchumah, 26 c.; *Gfrörer*, *Ib.*, ii. 393.

³ Midrash Tillin; Bab. Schabbath, 85 b.; *Gfrörer*, *Ib.*, ii. 393 f.

⁴ Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεός, στόματος καὶ γλώττης καὶ ἀρτηρίας δεόμενος, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ἱεροπρεπέστατον τι θαυματουργῆσαι, κελεύσας ἤχην ἀόρατον ἐν αἱρὶ δημιουργῆσθαι, πάντων ὀργάνων θαυμασιωτέρων . . . οὐκ ἄψυχον ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς τροπὸν ζωῶν συνθεσθηναι, ἀλλὰ ψυχὴν λογικὴν ἀνάπλεων σαφηνείας καὶ τρανότητος, ἥ τὸν αἶρα σχηματίζουσα καὶ ἐπιτείνουσα καὶ πρὸς πῦρ φλογοειδὲς μεταβαλοῦσα, καθάπερ πνεῦμα διὰ σάλπιγγος φωνὴν τοσαύτην ἐναρθρον ἐξήχησεν, ὡς τοῖς ἔγγιστα τοὺς πορρωτάτω κατ' ἴσον ἀκροᾶσθαι δοκεῖν. De decem Oraculis, § 9, ed. Mangey, ii. 185 f.

⁵ Φωνὴ δὲ ἐκ μέσου τοῦ ρυέντος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ πυρὸς ἐξήκει καταπληκτικωτάτη, τῆς φλογὸς εἰς διάλεκτον ἀρθρουμένην τὴν συνήθη τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις, ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα οὕτως ἐναργῶς ἐτρανοῦτο,

this grew into the miracle at Pentecost at the inauguration of the Christian dispensation, when suddenly there came a sound as of a rushing mighty wind which filled all the house where the disciples were, and there appeared to them tongues as of fire parting asunder which sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, even as the Spirit gave them utterance, so that devout men from every nation under heaven heard them speaking, everyone in his own language wherein he was born, the great works of God.¹

When we turn to the other passages in the Acts where gifts of tongues is mentioned, we find that the interpretation of foreign languages supernaturally imparted is quite out of place. When Peter is sent to Cornelius, as he is addressing the centurion and his household, and even before they are baptized (x. 44), "the Holy Spirit fell on all them who hear the word;" and the sign of it is (v. 46) that they are heard "speaking with tongues and magnifying God" (λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν), precisely like the disciples at Pentecost (cf. ii. 11, xi. 15 f.). Now as this gift fell on all who heard the word (x. 44), it could not be a sign to unbelievers; and the idea that Cornelius and his house immediately began to speak in foreign languages, which, as in the case of the Corinthians, probably no one understood, instead of simply "magnifying God" in their own tongue, which everyone understood, is almost ludicrous, if without offence we may venture to say so. The same remarks apply to xix. 6. We must again allow an eminent apologist, who will not be accused of irreverence, to characterise such a representation. "Now in such positions and such company, speech in foreign tongues would be something altogether without object and without meaning. Where the consciousness of the grace of salvation, and of a heavenly life springing from it, is first aroused in man, his own mother tongue verily, not a foreign language, will be the natural expression of his feelings. Or we must imagine a magical power which, taking possession of men, like instruments without volition, forces them to utter strange tones—a thing contradicting all analogy in the operations of Christianity."² The good sense of the critic revolts against the natural submission of the apologist.

We have diverged so far in order prominently to bring before the reader the nature and source of the hypothesis that the gift

ὡς ὁρᾶν αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀκούειν δοκεῖν. De de sem Oracula, § 11, ed. Mangey, ii. 188; cf. De Septenario et festis, § 22, ed. Mangey, ii. 295 f.

¹ Schneckenburger, Beiträge zur Einl. N. T., p. 80 ff.; Zweck der Apostelgesch., p. 203 ff.; Gfrörer, Das Jahrhr. des Heils, ii. 392 ff.; Die apst. Sage, i. p. 387 ff.; Zeller, Die Apostelgesch., p. 110 ff.; Overbeck, Zu de Wette's Apg., p. 34 f.; Hauerath, Der Apostel Paulus, p. 100 f.

² Neander, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 19.

the law was
explained,
voices and
the law), and
again: "Al-
h one single
the voices'
the reason is:
ces, and then
w in its own
Ps. lxxviii. 11,
and seventy
er from mol-
me ideas in
which, speak-
g the manner
"For God is
but
most holy and
to be created
not lifeless,
ody and soul,
ctness, which
flaming fire,
eath through
y those who
r on he says:
rom heaven,
g articulated
e that which
seeing than
to show how

f.
της καὶ ἀρτη-
ρόνον ιεροπρε-
ατον ἐν αἰρί
οὐκ ἀφυχον
τηκνίαν, ἀλλὰ
ς, ἢ τὸν αἶρα
μεταβαλοῦσα,
ὄθρον ἐξήχησεν,
αὐτὸν δοκεῖν. De

πυρὸς ἐξήκει
θρουμένης τῇ
ὡς ἐτρανοῦτο,

of "tongues" signifies instantaneous power to speak unlearned foreign languages. Such an interpretation is derived almost entirely from the mythical narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. We shall now proceed to consider the statements of the Apostle Paul, and endeavour to ascertain what the supposed miraculous Charisma really is. That it is something very different from what the unknown writer represents it in the episode of Pentecost cannot be doubted. "Whoever has, even once, read with attention what Paul writes of the speaking with tongues in the Corinthian community," writes Thiersch, "knows that the difference between that gift of tongues and this (of Acts ii.) could scarcely be greater. There, a speech which no mortal can understand without interpretation, and also no philologist, but the Holy Spirit alone can interpret; here, a speech which requires no interpretation. That gift serves only for the edification of the speaker, this clearly also for that of the hearer. The one is of no avail for the instruction of the ignorant; the other, clearly, is imparted wholly for that purpose."¹

It may be well that we should state a few reasons which show that Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians does not intend, in speaking of *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, to represent speech in foreign languages. In the very outset of his dissertation on the subject (xiv. 2), Paul very distinctly declares as the principal reason for preferring prophecy to the gift of tongues: "For he that speaketh with a tongue (*λαλῶν γλώσση*) speaketh not unto men but unto God: for no one understandeth² (*οὐδεὶς ἀκούει*)."³ How could this be said if *γλώσση λαλεῖν* meant merely speaking a foreign language? The presence of a single person versed in the language spoken would in such a case vitiate the whole of Paul's argument. The statement made is general, it will be observed, and not limited to one community, but applied to a place like Corinth, one of the greatest commercial cities, in which merchants, seamen, and visitors of all countries were to be found, it would have been unreasonable to have characterized a foreign tongue as absolutely unintelligible. In xiv. 9, Paul says: "So likewise ye, unless ye utter by the tongue (*διὰ τῆς γλώσσης*) words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye will be speaking into air." How could Paul use the expression "by the tongue" if he meant a foreign language in v. 2 and elsewhere? He is comparing *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* in the preceding verses with the sounds of musical instruments, and the point reached in v. 9 clearly

¹ Thiersch, *Die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter*, 2te Aufl., 1858, p. 68 f.

² The literal meaning of course is, "no one heareth," but the sense is "heareth with the understanding." Cf. Mk. iv. 33 and the lxx. version of Gen. xi. 7, Isaiah xxxvi. 11, &c., &c., where *ἀκούειν* has this meaning. The word is rightly rendered in the A. V.

brings home the application of his argument: the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* is unintelligible like the pipe or harp, and unless the tongue utter words which have an understood meaning, it is mere speaking into air. Is it possible that Paul would call speech in a language, foreign to him perhaps, but which nevertheless was the mother tongue of some nation, "speaking into air?" In such a case he must have qualified his statement by obvious explanations, of which not a word appears throughout his remarks. That he does not speak of foreign languages is made still more clear by the next two verses, v. 10: in which, continuing his argument from analogy, he actually compares *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* with speech in foreign languages, and ends, v. 11: "If, therefore, I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian (foreigner) and he that speaketh a barbarian (foreigner) in my judgment."¹ Paul's logic is certainly not always beyond reproach, but he cannot be accused of perpetrating such an antithesis as contrasting a thing with itself. He, therefore, explicitly distinguishes (v. 10) *γένη φωνῶν* "kinds of languages"² from (xii. 10, 28, &c.) *γένη γλωσσῶν* "kinds of tongues." In xiv. 6, Paul says: "If I come unto you speaking with tongues (*γλώσσαις λαλῶν*) what shall I profit you, unless I shall speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in teaching?" (*ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν διδαχῇ*); and then he goes on to compare such unintelligible speech with musical instruments. Now it is obvious that revelation, knowledge, prophecy and teaching might equally be expressed in foreign languages, and, therefore, in "speaking with tongues" it is no mere difficulty of expression which makes it unprofitable, but that general unintelligibility which is the ground of the whole of Paul's objections. Paul claims: v. 18 "I thank God I speak with a tongue (*γλώσση λαλῶ*)³ more than ye all, 19. but in a church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue (*ἐν γλώσσῃ*)."⁴ We have already pointed out that there is no evidence whatever that Paul could speak many languages. So far as we have any information, he only made use of Greek and Aramaic, and never even preached where those languages were not current. He always employed the former in his Epistles,

¹ *ἐὰν οὖν μὴ εἰδῶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς, ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος καὶ ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ βάρβαρος.* 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

² It is unnecessary to show that *φωνή* is used to express language.

³ This is the reading of A, D, E, F, G, H, and other ancient codices, and is adopted by most critics in preference to *γλώσσαις* the reading of B, K, L.

⁴ *18. εἰ χαριστὸν τῷ θεῷ, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσῃ λαλῶ, 19. ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοῦ μου λαλεῖν, ἢ καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, ἢ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ.* 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

68 f.
the sense is "heareth
of Gen. xi. 7, Isaiah
word is rightly ren-

whether addressed to Corinth, Galatia, or Rome, and his knowledge even of that language was certainly not perfect. Speaking "with a tongue" cannot, for reasons previously given, mean a foreign language; and this is still more obvious from what he says in v. 19, just quoted, in which he distinguishes speaking with a tongue from speaking with his understanding. Five words so spoken are better than ten thousand in a tongue, because he speaks with the understanding in the one case and without it in the second. It is clear that a man speaks with his understanding as much in one language as another, but it is the main characteristic of the speech we are discussing that it is throughout opposed to understanding: cf. vv. 14, 15. It would be inconceivable that, if this gift really signified power to speak foreign languages, Paul could on the one hand use the expressions in this letter with regard to it, and on the other that he could have failed to add remarks consistent with such an interpretation. For instance is it possible that the Apostle in representing the exercise of the Charisma, as he does, could have neglected to point out some other use for it than mere personal edification? Could he have omitted to tell some of these speakers with tongues that, instead of wasting their languages in a church where no one understood them, it would be well for them to employ them in the instruction of the nations whose tongues had been supernaturally imparted to them? As it is, Paul checks the use of a gift bestowed by the Holy Spirit, and reduces its operation to the smallest limits, without once indicating so obvious a sphere of usefulness for the miraculous power. We need not, however, proceed to further arguments upon this branch of the subject; although, in treating other points, additional evidence will constantly present itself. For the reasons we have stated, and many others, the great majority of critics are agreed that the gift of tongues, according to Paul, was not the power of speaking foreign languages previously unknown.¹ But for the narrative in Acts ii. no one would ever have thought of such an interpretation.

Coming now to consider the two Charismata, "kinds of tongues" and the "interpretation of tongues," more immediately in connection with our inquiry, as so-called miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, we shall first endeavour to ascertain some of their principal characteristics. The theory of foreign languages supernaturally imparted without previous study may be definitely laid aside.

¹ So Bardili, Baur, Bleek, Davidson, Eichhorn, Ewald, Fritzche, Gröner, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Keim, Meyer, Neander, Noack, Olshausen, Overbeck, Paulus, Pfeiderer, de Pressensé, Renan, Reuss, Schaff, Schrader, Schulz, Schwegler, Stapf, Steudel, de Wette, Wieseler, Weiss, Zeller, and others.

The interpretation of tongues may go with it, but requires a few observations. It is clear from Paul's words throughout this dissertation that the interpretation of tongues not only was not invariably attached to the gift of tongues¹ (1 Cor. xiv. 13, 27, 28), but was at least often a separate gift possessed without the kinds of tongues (cf. xii. 10, 28, xiv. 26, 28). Nothing can be more specific than xii. 10 " . . . to another kinds of tongues; and to another interpretation of tongues;" and again, v. 30: "do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" This is indeed presaged by the "diversities of gifts," &c., of xii. 4 ff. Upon the hypothesis of foreign languages, this would presuppose that some spoke languages which they could not interpret, and consequently could not understand, and that others understood languages which they could not speak. The latter point is common enough in ordinary life; but, in this instance, the miracle of supernaturally receiving a perfect knowledge of languages, instantaneously and without previous study, is as great as to receive the power to speak them. The anomaly in the miracle, merely to point out a suggestive discrepancy where all is anomalous, is that the gift of tongues should ever have been separated from the gift of interpretation. If a man understand the foreign language he speaks he can interpret it; if he cannot interpret it, he cannot understand it; and if he cannot understand it, can he possibly speak it? Certainly not, without his having been made a perfectly mechanical instrument through which, apart from the understanding and the will, sounds are involuntarily produced, which is not to be entertained. Still pursuing the same hypothesis,—the one gift is to speak languages which no one understands, the other to understand languages which no one speaks. Paul never even assumes the probability that the "tongue" spoken is understood by any one except the interpreter. The interpretation of such obscure tongues must have been a gift very little used,—never, indeed, except as the complement to the gift of tongues. The natural and useful facility in languages is apparently divided into two supernatural and useless halves. The idea is irresistibly suggested, as apparently it was to the Apostle himself, whether it would not have been more for the good of mankind and for the honour of Christianity, if, instead of these two miraculously incomplete gifts, a little natural good sense, five words even, to be spoken in the vernacular tongue and requiring no interpretation had been imparted. If, instead of foreign languages, we substitute the utterance of ecstatic reli-

¹ *Ewald* maintains that "interpretation" was always separate from "tongues." *Die Sendschr. des Ap. Paul.*, p. 205, anm. *Wieseler* at one time (*St. u. Krit.*, 1838, p. 720 f.) asserted that the speaker with tongues was always his own interpreter. He subsequently (*St. u. Krit.*, 1860, p. 117 ff.) withdrew this extraordinary theory.

Fritzsche, Gfrörer, Noack, Olshausen, Schaff, Schrader, Zeller, and others.

gious excitement, the anomaly of speaking a language without understanding it or being understood becomes intelligible; and equally so the interpretation, unaccompanied by the powers of speaking. It is obvious in both cases that, as no one understands the tongue, no one can determine whether the interpretation of it be accurate or not. But it is easily conceivable that a sympathetic nervous listener might suppose that he understood the broken and incoherent speech of ecstasy and might interpret it according to his own stimulated imagination. The mysterious and unknown are suggestive texts, and there is nothing more infectious than religious excitement. In all this, however, is there anything miraculous?

We need not further demonstrate that the chief and general characteristic of "kinds of tongues," was that they were unintelligible (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 6-11, 13-19). Speaking with the spirit (*πνεῦμα*) is opposed to speaking with the understanding (*νοῦς*) (cf. vv. 14-16, &c.). They were not only unintelligible to others, but the speaker himself did not understand what he uttered: v. 14. "For if I pray with a tongue (*γλῶσση*) my spirit (*πνεῦμα*) prayeth, but my understanding (*νοῦς*) is unfruitful" (cf. 15f. 19). We have already pointed out that Paul speaks of these Charismata in general, and not as affecting the Corinthians only; and we must now add that he obviously does not even insinuate that the "kinds of tongues" possessed by that community was a spurious Charisma, or that any attempt had been made to simulate the gift; for nothing could have been more simple than for the Apostle to denounce such phenomena as false, and to distinguish the genuine from the imitated speech with tongues. The most convincing proof that his remarks refer to the genuine Charisma is that the Apostle applies to himself the very same restrictions in the use of "tongues" as he enforces upon the Corinthians (vv. 18-19, 6, &c), and characterises his own gift precisely as he does theirs (vv. 6, 11, 14, 15, 19).

Now what was the actual operation of this singular miraculous gift, and its utility whether as regards the community or the gifted individual? Paul restricts the speaking of "tongues" in church because, being unintelligible, it is not for edification (xiv. 2 ff. 18 f. 23, 27, 28). He himself does not make use of his gift for the assemblies of believers (vv. 6, 18). Another ground upon which he objects to the use of "kinds of tongues" in public is that all the gifted apparently speak at once (vv. 23, 27 f. 33). It will be remembered that all the Charismata and their operations are described as due to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit (xii. 4ff.); and immediately following their enumeration, ending with "kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues," the Apostle

resumes: v. 11. "but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally as he wills;" and in Acts ii. 4 the brethren are represented as speaking with tongues "as the Spirit gave them utterance." Now the first thought which presents itself is: How can a gift which is due to the direct working of the Holy Spirit possibly be abused? We must remember clearly that the speech is not expressive of the understanding of the speaker. The *πνευματικοί* spoke under the inspiration of the Supernatural Agent, what neither they nor others understood. Is it permissible to suppose that the Holy Spirit could inspire speech with tongues at an unfitting time? Can we imagine that this Spirit can actually have prompted many people to speak at one and the same time to the utter disturbance of order? Is not such a gift of tongues more like the confusion of tongues in Babel than a Christian Charisma? "And the Lord said: . . . Go to, let us go down and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech."² In spite of his abstract belief in the divine origin of the Charisma, Paul's language unconsciously betrays practical doubt as to its character. Does not such sarcasm as the following seem extremely indecorous when criticising a result produced directly by the Holy Spirit? (xiv. 23) "If, therefore, the whole church be come into one place and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned and unbelieving persons will they not say that ye are mad?" At Pentecost such an assembly was supposed to be drunken.³ The whole of the counsel of the Apostle upon this occasion really amounts to an injunction to quench the Spirit. It is quite what might be expected in the case of the excitement of ecstatic religion, that the strong emotion should principally find vent in the form of prayer and praise (vv. 25 ff.), equally so that it should be unintelligible and that no one should know when to say "Amen" (v. 16), and that all should speak at once, and still more so that the practical result should be tumult (vv. 23, 33). All this, it might appear, could be produced without the intervention of the Holy Spirit. So far, is there any utility in the miracle?

But we are told that it is "for a sign." Paul argues upon this point in a highly eccentric manner. He quotes (v. 21) Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, in a form neither agreeing with the Septuagint nor with the Hebrew, a passage which has merely a superficial and verbal analogy with the gift of tongues, but whose real historical meaning has no reference to it whatever: "In the Law it is written, that with men of other tongues and with the lips of others will I

¹ Cf. Schrader, *Der Ap. Paulus*, ii. p. 72 f.

² Gen. xi. 6, 7.

³ The same gift, it is generally understood, is referred to in Ephes. v. 18 ff.

speak unto this people; and yet for all that they will not hear me, saith the Lord." The Apostle continues with singular logic: "So that (*ὥστε*) the tongues are for a sign (*εἰς σημεῖον*) not to those who believe but to the unbelieving; but prophecy is not for the unbelieving but for those who believe. If, therefore, the whole church be come into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned or unbelieving persons, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophecy and there come in an unbeliever he is convicted by all and so falling on his face he will worship God, reporting that God is indeed in you." The Apostle himself shows that the tongues can scarcely be considered a sign by unbelievers, upon whom, apparently, they produce no other impression than that the speakers are mad or drunken. Under any circumstances, the "kinds of tongues" described by the Apostle are a very sorry specimen of the "signs and wonders and powers" of which we have heard so much. It is not surprising that the Apostle prefers exhortation in a familiar tongue. In an ecstatic state, men are incapable of edifying others: we shall presently see how far they can edify themselves. Paul utters the pith of the whole matter at the very outset of his homily, when he prefers exhortation to kinds of tongues: v. 2. "For he that speaketh with a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God: for no one understandeth, but in Spirit he speaketh mysteries" (*λαλεῖ μυστήρια*). It is scarcely possible to avoid feeling an impression of the suppressed impatience with which the Apostle deals with the whole subject. His mind was too prone to believe in spiritual mysteries, and his nervous nature too susceptible to religious emotion and enthusiasm to permit him clearly to recognise the true character of the gift of "tongues;" but his good sense asserted itself and, after protesting that he would rather speak five words with his understanding than ten thousand words in a tongue, he breaks off with a characteristic exclamation (v. 20): "Brethren, become not children in your minds" (*μὴ παῖδια γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν*). The advice is not yet out of place in the Epistle.

What was the private utility or advantage of the supernatural gift? How did he who spoke with a tongue edify himself? (v. 4). Paul clearly states that he does not edify the church (vv. 2ff.). In the passage just quoted the Apostle, however, says that the speaker "with a tongue" "speaketh to God;" and further on (vv. 18, 19) he implies that, although he himself does not use the gift in public, he does so in private. He admonishes (v. 18) any one gifted with tongues, if there be no interpreter present, to "keep silence in a church, but let him speak to himself and to God." But in what does the personal edification of the individual

consist? In employing language, which he does not comprehend, in private prayer and praise? In addressing God in some unintelligible jargon, in the utterance of which his understanding has no part? Many strange purposes and proceedings have been attributed to the Supreme Being, but probably none has been imagined more incongruous than a gift of tongues unsuitable for the edification of others, and not intelligible to the recipient, but considered an edifying substitute in private devotion for his own language. This was certainly not the form of prayer which Jesus taught his disciples.¹ And this gift was valued more highly in the Corinthian Church than all the rest! Do we not get an instructive insight into the nature of the other Charismata from this suggestive fact? The reality of miracles does not seem to be demonstrated by these chapters.²

We have already stated that the vast majority of critics explain *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* as speech in an ecstatic condition;³ and all the phenomena described by Paul closely correspond with the utterance of persons in a state of extreme religious enthusiasm and excitement, of which many illustrations might be given from other religions before and since the commencement of our era, as well as in the history of Christianity in early and recent times. Every one knows of the proceedings of the heathen oracles, the wild writhings and cries of the Pythoness and the mystic utterances of the Sibyl. In the Old Testament there is allusion to the ecstatic emotion of the prophets in the account of Saul 1 Sam. xix. 24; cf. Isaiah viii. 19, xxix. 4. The Montanists exhibited similar phenomena, and Tertullian has recorded several instances of such religious excitement, to which we have elsewhere referred. Chrysostom had to repress paroxysms of pious excitement closely resembling these in the fourth century;⁴ and even down to our own times instances have never been wanting of this form of hysterical religion. Into none of this can we enter here. Enough, we trust, has been said to show the true character of the supposed supernatural Charismata of Paul from his own account of them, and the information contained in his epistles.

Although we have been forced to examine in considerable detail the passages in the writings of Paul cited by apologists in support of miracles, the study is one of great value to our inquiry. These are the only passages which we possess in which a con-

¹ Mt. vi. 5 ff.; Luke xi. 1 ff.

² It is impossible to refer to every writer by whom the arguments adopted throughout this section may have been used or suggested, but we very gladly express our obligation, especially to the writings of Baur, Zeller, Meyer, Reuss, Overbeck, Holtzmann, and Neander, referred to higher up (note 3, p. 950).

³ Note 3, p. 950.

⁴ Hom. in Is., vi. 2.

temporary and eye-witness describes what he considers supernatural phenomena, and conveys to us his impression of miraculous agency. Instead of traditional reports of miracles narrated by writers who are unknown, and who did not witness the occurrences in question, we have here a trustworthy witness dealing with matters in which he was personally interested, and writing a didactic homily upon the nature and operation of Charismata, which he believed to be miraculous and conferred upon the Church by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit. The nineteenth century here comes into direct contact with the age of miracles, but at the touch the miracles vanish, and that which, seen through the golden mist of pious tradition, seems to possess unearthly power and beauty, on closer examination dwindles into the prose of every day life. The more minutely reported miracles are scanned, the more unreal they are recognised to be. The point to which we now desire to call attention, however, is the belief and the mental constitution of Paul. We have seen something of the nature and operation of the gift of tongues. That the phenomena described proceeded from an ecstatic state, into which persons of highly excitable nervous organization are very liable to fall under the operation of strong religious impressions, can scarcely be doubted. Eminent apologists¹ have gravely illustrated the phenomena by the analogy of mesmerism, somnambulism and the effects of magnetism. Paul asserts that he was subject to the influence, whatever it was, more than any one, and there is nothing which is more credible than the statement, or more characteristic of the Apostle. We desire to speak of him with the profoundest respect and admiration. We know more, from his epistles, of the intimate life and feelings of the great Apostle of the Gentiles than of any other man of the apostolic age, and it is impossible not to feel warm sympathy with his noble and generous character. The history of Christianity, after the death of its Founder, would sink almost into common place if the grand figure of Paul were blotted from its pages. But it is no detraction to recognise that his nervous temperament rendered him peculiarly susceptible of those religious impressions which result in conditions of ecstatic trance, to which, as we actually learn from himself, he was exceptionally subject. The effects of this temperament probably first made him a Christian; and to his enthusiastic imagination we owe most of the supernatural dogmas of the religion which he adopted and transformed. One of these trances the Apostle himself recounts,² & says with the cautious reserve: "whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knoweth," how he was caught up to the third heaven,

¹ Bleek, Olshausen, and others.

² 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.

and in Paradise heard unutterable words which it is not lawful for a man to speak; in immediate connection with which he continues: "And lest I should be exalted above measure by the excess of the revelations, there was given to me a stake (*σκόλοψ*) in the flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me."¹ This was one of the "visions (*ὀπτασίαις*) and revelations (*ἀποκαλύψεις*) of the Lord" of which he speaks, and of which he had such an excess to boast. Can any one doubt that this was nearly akin to the state of ecstatic trance in which he spoke with tongues more than all the Corinthians? Does any one suppose that Paul, "whether in the body or out of the body," was ever actually caught up into "the third heaven," wherever that may be? or doubt that this was simply one of the pious hallucinations which visit those who are in such a state? If we are seriously to discuss the point,—it is clear that evidence of such a thing is out of the question; that Paul himself admits that he cannot definitely describe what happened; that we have no other ground for considering the matter than the Apostle's own mysterious utterance; that it is impossible for a person subject to such visions and hallucinations to distinguish between reality and seeming; that this narrative has not only all the character of hallucination, but no feature of sober fact; and finally that, whilst it accords with all experiences of visionary hallucination, it contradicts all experience of practical life. We have seen that Paul believes in the genuineness and supernatural origin of the divine Charismata, and he in like manner believes in the reality of his visions and revelations. He has equal reason, or want of reason, in both cases. What, however, was the nature of the "stake in the flesh" which, upon the theory of the diabolical origin of disease, he calls "an angel of Satan to buffet me"? There have been many conjectures offered, but one explanation which has been advanced by able critics has special force and probability. It is suggested that this "stake in the flesh," which almost all now at least recognise to have been some physical malady, and very many suppose to have been headache or some other similar periodical and painful affection, was in reality a form of epilepsy.² It has been ably argued that the representation of the malady as "an angel of Satan" to buffet him, directly connects it with nervous disorders like epilepsy, which the Jews especially ascribed to diabolical influence; and the mention of this *σκόλοψ* in immediate continuation of his

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 7. We need not discuss the connection of *καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ*. We have adopted that which is also the reading of the A. V.

² *Ewald*, Sendschr. des Ap. Paulus, p. 307 f.; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 52 ff.; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., 1866, ii. 3, p. 309; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus, u. s. w., p. 85 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 186 ff.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 302; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 542 f.

remarks on "visions" and "revelations," which a tendency to this very malady would so materially assist in producing, further confirms the conjecture.¹ No one can deny, and medical and psychological annals prove, that many men have been subject to visions and hallucinations which have never been seriously attributed to supernatural causes. There is not one single valid reason removing the ecstatic visions and trances of the Apostle Paul from this class. We do not yet discuss the supposed vision in which he saw the risen Jesus, though it is no exception to the rest, but reserve it for the next chapter. At present, it suffices that we point out the bearing of our examination of Paul's general testimony to miracles upon our future consideration of his evidence for the Resurrection. If it be admitted that his judgment as to the miraculous character of the Charismata is fallacious, and that what he considered miraculous were simply natural phenomena, the theory of the reality of miracles becomes less tenable than ever. And if, further, it be recognised, as we think it necessarily must be, that Paul was subject to natural ecstatic trances, with all their accompanying forms of nervous excitement: "kinds of tongues," visions, and religious hallucinations, a strong and clear light will fall upon his further testimony for miraculous occurrences which we shall shortly have before us.

¹ *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. des Paulus u. des Petrus*, 1868, p. 85 f.

PART VI.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF EVIDENCE TO SUBJECT.

WHEN the evidence of the Gospels regarding the great central dogmas of ecclesiastical Christianity is shown to be untrustworthy and insufficient, apologists appeal with confidence to the testimony of the Apostle Paul. We presume that it is scarcely necessary to show that, in fact, the main weight of the case rests upon his epistles, as undoubted documents of the apostolic age, written some thirty or forty years after the death of the Master. The retort has frequently been made to the earlier portion of this work that, so long as the evidence of Paul remains unshaken, the apologetic position is secure. We may quote a few lines from an able work, part of a passage discussed in the preceding chapter, as a statement of the case: "In the first place, merely as a matter of historical attestation, the Gospels are not the strongest evidence for the Christian miracles. Only one of the four, in its present shape, is claimed as the work of an Apostle, and of that the genuineness is disputed. The Acts of the Apostles stand upon very much the same footing with the Synoptic Gospels, and of this book, we are promised a further examination. But we possess at least some undoubted writings of one who was himself a chief actor in the events which followed immediately upon those recorded in the Gospels; and in these undoubted writings, St. Paul certainly shows by incidental allusions, the good faith of which cannot be questioned, that he believed himself to be endowed with the power of working miracles, and that miracles, or what were thought to be such, were actually wrought by him and by his contemporaries. . . . Besides these allusions, St. Paul repeatedly refers to the cardinal miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension; he refers to them as notorious and unquestionable facts at a time when such an assertion might have been easily

refuted. On one occasion he gives a very circumstantial account of the testimony on which the belief in the Resurrection rested (1 Cor. xv. 4-8). And not only does he assert the Resurrection as a fact, but he builds upon it a whole scheme of doctrine: 'If Christ be not risen,' he says, 'then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.' We do not stay now to consider the exact philosophical weight of this evidence. It will be time enough to do this when it has received the critical discussion that may be presumed to be in store for it. But as external evidence, in the legal sense, it is probably the best that can be produced, and it has been entirely untouched so far."¹ We have already disposed of the "allusions" above referred to. We shall in due time deal with the rest of the statements in this passage, but at present it is sufficient to agree at least with the remark that, "as external evidence," the testimony of Paul "is probably the best that can be produced." We know at least who the witness really is, which is an advantage denied us in the case of the Gospels. It would be premature to express surprise, however, that we find the case of miracles and more especially of such stupendous miracles as the Resurrection and Ascension, practically resting upon the testimony of a single witness. The thought will intrude itself, but cannot at present be pursued.

The allegation which we have to examine is that the Founder of Christianity, after being dead and buried, rose from the dead and did not again die, but after remaining sometime with his disciples ascended with his body into heaven.² It is unnecessary to complicate the question by adding the other doctrines regarding the miraculous birth and divine origin and personality of Jesus. In the problem before us, certain objective facts are asserted which admit of being judicially tested. We have nothing to do here with the vague modern representation of these events, by means of which the objective facts vanish, and are replaced by subjective impressions and tricks of consciousness or symbols of spiritual life. Those who adopt such views have of course abandoned all that is real and supernatural in the supposed events. The Resurrection and Ascension which we have to deal with are events precisely as objective and real as the death and burial,—no ideal process figured by the imagination or embodiments of Chris-

¹ *Sanday, The Gospels in the Second Century, 1876, p. 10 f.*

² In the Articles of the Church of England this is expressed as follows: Art. ii. " . . . who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, &c., &c." Art. iii. "As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell." Art. iv. "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."

tian hope, but tangible realities, historical occurrences in the sense of ordinary life. If Jesus, after being crucified, dead and buried, did not physically rise again from the dead, and in the flesh,¹ without again dying, "ascend into Heaven," the whole case falls to the ground. These incidents, although stupendous miracles, must also have been actual occurrences. They must have been simply historical in order to be miraculous. If they did not really take place, our task is at an end. If it be asserted that they really did take place their occurrence must be attested by adequate evidence. Apologists, whilst protesting that the occurrences in question are believed upon ordinary historical evidence, and that Christianity requires no indulgence, but submits itself to the same tests as any other affirmation, do not practically act upon this principle, we think; but, as soon as it is enunciated, introduce a variety of special pleas which remove the case from the domain of history into that of theology, and proceed upon one assumption after another until the fundamental facts become enveloped and, so to say, protected from judicial criticism by a cloud of religious dogmas and hypotheses.² By confining our attention to the simple facts, which form the basis of the whole superstructure of ecclesiastical Christianity we may avoid much confusion of ideas, and restrict the field of inquiry to reasonable limits. We propose, therefore, to limit our investigation to the evidence for the reality of the Resurrection and Ascension.

What evidence could be regarded as sufficient to establish the reality of such supposed occurrences? The question is one which demands the serious attention and consideration of every thoughtful man. It is not too much to say that, as a general rule, the Resurrection and Ascension are mere doctrines transmitted from one generation to another, believed as a matter of course, and rarely or never analysed and adopted by the understanding of those who profess to believe them. It is obvious that the amount of evidence requisite to satisfy our minds as to the truth of any statement should be measured by the nature of the statement made and, we may as well add, by its practical importance to ourselves. The news that a man was married or a child born last week is received without doubt, because men are married, and children are born every day: and although such pieces of

¹ The disappearance of the body from the sepulchre, a point much insisted upon, could have had no significance or reality if the body did not rise and afterwards ascend.

² A work of this kind may be mentioned in illustration: Dr. Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection." The argument of this work is of unquestionable ability, but it is chiefly remarkable, we think, for the manner in which the direct evidence is hurried over, and a mass of assertions and assumptions, the greater part of which is utterly untenable and inadmissible, is woven into specious and eloquent pleading, and does duty for substantial testimony.

gossip are frequently untrue, nothing appears more natural or in accordance with our experience. If we take more distant and less familiar events we have no doubt that a certain monarch was crowned, and that he subsequently died some centuries ago. If we ask for the evidence for the statement, nothing may be forthcoming of a very minute or indubitable nature. No absolute eye-witness of the coronation may have left a clear and detailed narrative of the ceremony; and possibly there may no longer be extant a sufficiently attested document proving with certainty the death of the monarch. There are several considerations, however, which make us perfectly satisfied with the evidence, incomplete as it may be. Monarchs are generally crowned and invariably die; and the statement that any one particular monarch was crowned and died is so completely in conformity with experience, that we have no hesitation in believing it in the specific case. We are satisfied to believe such ordinary statements upon very slight evidence, both because our experience prepares us to believe that they are true, and because we do not much care whether they are true or not. If succession to an estate, or even life, depended upon either event, the demand for evidence, even in such simple matters, would be immensely intensified. The converse of the statement, however, would not meet with the same reception. Would any one believe the affirmation that Alfred the Great, for instance, did not die at all? What amount of evidence would be required before such a statement could be pronounced sufficiently attested? Universal experience would be so uniformly opposed to the assertion that such a phenomenon had taken place, that probably no evidence which could readily be conceived possible could ensure the belief of more than a credulous few. The assertion that a man actually died and was buried, and yet afterwards rose from the dead, is still more at variance with human experience. The prolongation of life to long periods is comparatively consistent with experience; and if a life extending to several centuries be incredible it is only so in degree, and is not absolutely contrary to the order of nature, which certainly under present conditions does not favour the supposition of such lengthened existence, but still does not fix hard and fast limits to the life of man. The resurrection of a man who has once been absolutely dead, however, is not only contrary to all human experience, but is a direct breach of firmly established laws of nature. If to this we add the assertion that the person so raised from the dead never again died, but after continuing some time longer on earth, ascended bodily to some invisible and inconceivable place called Heaven, there to "sit at the right hand of God," the shock to reason and common sense becomes so extreme, that it is difficult even to realize the nature of the affirmation.

It would be hopeless to endeavour to define the evidence which could establish the reality of the alleged occurrences. As the central doctrines of a religion upon which the salvation of the human race is said to depend, we are too deeply interested to be satisfied with slight evidence or no evidence at all. It has not unfrequently been made a reproach that forensic evidence is required of the reality of Divine Revelation. Such a course is regarded as perfectly preposterous, whether the test be applied to the primary assertion that a revelation has been made at all, or to its contents. What kind of evidence then are we permitted decorously to require upon so momentous a subject? Apparently just so much as apologists can conveniently set before us, and no more. The evidence deemed necessary for the settlement of a Scotch Peerage case, or a disputed will, is, we do not hesitate to say, infinitely more complete than that which it is thought either pious or right to expect in the case of Religion. The actual occurrence of the Resurrection and Ascension, however, is certainly a matter of evidence and, to retort, it is scarcely decent that any man should be required to believe what is so opposed to human experience, upon more imperfect evidence than is required for the transfer of land or the right of a title, simply because ecclesiastical dogmas are founded upon them, and it is represented that unless they be true "our hope is vain." The testimony requisite to establish the reality of such a stupendous miracle can scarcely be realized. Proportionately it should be as unparalleled in its force as those events are in fact. One point, moreover, must never be forgotten. Human testimony is exceedingly fallible at its best. It is liable to error from innumerable causes, and most of all, probably, when religious excitement is present, and disturbing elements of sorrow, fear, doubt, or enthusiasm interfere with the calmness of judgment. When any assertion is made which contradicts unvarying experience, upon evidence which experience knows to be universally liable to error, there cannot be much hesitation in disbelieving the assertion and preferring belief in the order of nature. And when evidence proceeds from an age not only highly exposed to error, from ignorance of natural laws, superstition, and religious excitement, but prolific in fabulous reports and untenable theories, it cannot be received without the gravest suspicion. We make these brief remarks, in anticipation, as nothing is more essential in the discussion upon which we are about to enter than a proper appreciation of the allegations which are to be tested, and of the nature of the testimony required for their belief.

We shall not limit our inquiry to the testimony of Paul, but shall review the whole of the evidence adduced for the Resurrec-

tion and Ascension. Hitherto our examination of the historical books of the New Testament has been mainly for the purpose of ascertaining their character, and the value of their evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation. It is unnecessary for us here minutely to recapitulate the results. The Acts of the Apostles, we have shown, cannot be received as testimony of the slightest weight upon any of the points before us. Written by an unknown author, who was not an eye-witness of the miracles related; who describes events not as they occurred, but as his pious imagination supposed they ought to have occurred; who seldom touches history without transforming it by legend until the original elements can scarcely be distinguished; who puts his own words and sentiments into the mouths of the Apostles and other persons of his narrative; and who represents almost every phase of the Church in the Apostolic age as influenced, or directly produced, by means of supernatural agency; such a work is of no value as evidence for occurrences which are in contradiction to all human experience. Briefly to state the case of the Gospels in other words than our own, we repeat the honest statement of the able writer quoted at the beginning of this chapter: "In the first place, merely as a matter of historical attestation, the Gospels are not the strongest evidence for the Christian miracles. Only one of the four, in its present shape, is claimed as the work of an Apostle, and of that the genuineness is disputed."¹ We may add that the third Synoptic does not, in the estimation of any one who has examined the Acts of the Apostles, gain additional credibility by being composed by the same author as the latter work. The writers of the four Gospels are absolutely unknown to us, and in the case of three of them, it is not even affirmed that they were eye-witnesses of the Resurrection and Ascension and other miracles narrated. The undeniably doubtful authorship of the fourth Gospel, not to make a more positive statement here, renders this work, which was not written until upwards of half a century, at the very least, after the death of Jesus, incapable of proving anything in regard to the Resurrection and Ascension. A much stronger statement might be made, but we refer readers to our earlier chapters, and we shall learn something more of the character of the Gospel narratives as we proceed. Although we cannot attach any value as evidence to the Gospels, we propose, before taking the testimony of Paul, to survey the various statements made by them regarding the astounding miracles we are discussing. Enough has been said to show that we cannot accept any statement as true simply because it is made by a Gospel or Gospels. When it is related in the first Synoptic, for instance,

¹ *Sanday, The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 10.

that Pilate took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of this man's blood: see ye to it."¹—an incident to which no reference, be it said in passing, is made by the other evangelists, although it is sufficiently remarkable to have deserved notice,—we cannot of course assume that Pilate actually said or did anything of the kind. A comparison of the various accounts of the Resurrection and Ascension, however, and careful examination of their details, will be of very great use, by enabling us to appreciate the position of the case apart from the evidence of Paul. The indefinite impression fostered by apologists, that the evidence of the Gospels supplements and completes the evidence of the Apostle, and forms an aggregate body of testimony of remarkable force and volume, must be examined, and a clear conception formed of the whole case.

One point may at once be mentioned before we enter upon our examination of the Gospels. The Evangelists narrate such astonishing occurrences as the Resurrection and Ascension with perfect composure and absence of surprise. This characteristic is even made an argument for the truth of their narrative. The impression made upon our minds, however, is the very reverse of that which apologists desire us to receive. The writers do not in the least degree seem to have realized the exceptional character of the occurrences they relate, and betray the assurance of persons writing in an ignorant and superstitious age, whose minds have become too familiar with the supernatural to be at all surprised either by a resurrection from the dead or a bodily ascension. Miracles in their eyes have lost their strangeness and seem quite common-place. It will be seen as we examine the narratives that a stupendous miracle, or a convulsion of nature, is thrown in by one or omitted by another as a mere matter of detail. An earthquake or the resurrection of many bodies of saints are mere trifles which can be inserted without wonder or omitted without regret. The casual and momentary expression of hesitation to believe, which is introduced, is evidently nothing more than a rhetorical device or artistic touch to heighten the reality of the scene. It would have been infinitely more satisfactory had we been able to perceive that these witnesses, instead of being genuine denizens of the age of miracles, had really understood the astounding nature of the occurrences they report, and did not consider a miracle the most natural thing in the world.

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS.

IN order more fully to appreciate the nature of the narratives which the four evangelists give of the last hours of the life of Jesus, we may take them up at the point where, mocked and buffeted by the Roman soldiers, he is finally led away to be crucified. Let no one suppose that, in freely criticising the Gospels, we regard without deep emotion the actual incidents which lie at the bottom of these narratives. No one can form to himself any adequate conception of the terrible sufferings of the Master, maltreated and insulted by a base and brutal multitude, too degraded to understand his noble character, and too ignorant to appreciate his elevated teaching, without keen pain; and to follow his course from the tribunal which sacrificed him to Jewish popular clamour to the spot where he ended a brief but self-sacrificing life by the horrible and shameful death of a slave upon the cross may well make indignant sympathy take the place of criticism. Profound veneration for the great Teacher, however, and earnest interest in all that concerns his history rather command serious and unhesitating examination of the statements made with regard to him, than discourage an attempt to ascertain the truth; and it would be anything but respect for his memory to accept without question the Gospel accounts of his life simply because they were composed with the desire to glorify him.

According to the Synoptics, when Jesus is led away to be crucified, the Roman guard entrusted with the duty of executing the cruel sentence find a man of Cyrene, Simon by name, and compel him to carry the cross.¹ It was customary for those condemned to crucifixion to carry the cross, or at least the main portion of it, themselves to the place of execution, and no explanation is given by the Synoptists for the deviation from this practice which they relate. The fourth Gospel, however, does not appear to know anything of this incident or of Simon of Cyrene, but distinctly states that Jesus bore his own cross.² On the

¹ Mt. xxvii. 32; Mk. xv. 21; Luke. xxiii. 26.

² βαρυνων ταυτω τ'ν σταυρον, John xix. 17. If instead of this reading, which is that of the Sinaitic and Alexandrian codices and other authorities, adopted by Tischendorf and others, the ρον σταυρον αυτου of the received text and Lachmann, or αυτω ρ. στ., of B, X, &c., be preferred, the result is the same. We may mention, in passing, that the fourth Gospel has no reference to a saying ascribed by the Synoptics to Jesus, in which bearing his cross is used typically: Mt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Mk. viii. 34, x. 21; Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27.

way to Golgotha, according to the third Gospel, Jesus is followed by a great multitude of the people, and of women who were bewailing and lamenting him, and he addresses to them a few prophetic sentences.¹ We might be surprised at the singular fact that there is no reference to this incident in any other Gospel, and that words of Jesus, so weighty in themselves and spoken at so supreme a moment, should not elsewhere have been recorded, but for the fact that, from internal evidence, the address must be assigned to a period subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. The other evangelists may, therefore, well ignore it. It was the custom to give those about to be crucified a draught of wine containing some strong opiate, which in some degree alleviated the intense suffering of that mode of death. Mark² probably refers to this (xv. 23) when he states that, on reaching the place of execution, "they gave him wine (*οἶνον*) mingled with myrrh." The fourth Gospel has nothing of this. Matthew says (xxvii. 34): "They gave him vinegar (*ὄξος*) to drink mingled with gall" (*μετὰ χολῆς*). If, instead of *ὄξος* with the Alexandrian and a majority of MSS., we read *οἶνος*, "wine," with the Sinaitic, Vatican, and some other ancient codices, this is a curious statement, and is well worthy of a moment's notice as suggestive of the way in which these narratives were written. The conception of a suffering Messiah, it is well known, was more particularly supported, by New Testament writers, by attributing a Messianic character to Ps. xxii., lxix., and Isaiah: liii., and throughout the narrative of the Passion we are perpetually referred to these and other Scriptures as finding their fulfilment in the sufferings of Jesus. The first Synoptist found in Ps. lxix. 21 (Sept. lxviii. 21): "They gave me also gall (*χολήν*) for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar (*ὄξος*) to drink;" and apparently in order to make the supposed fulfilment correspond as closely as possible, he combined the "gall" of the food with the vinegar or wine in strangely literal fashion,⁴ very characteristic, however, of the whole of the evangelists. Luke, who seems not to have understood the custom known perhaps to Mark, represents (xxiii. 36)

¹ Luke xxiii. 27 ff.; cf. xxi. 23; Mt. xxiv. 19.

² We shall, for the sake of brevity, call the Gospels by the names assigned to them in the Canon.

³ There have been many attempts to explain away *χολή*, and to make it mean either a species of Vermuth or any bitter substance (*Olshausen*, *Leidenges.*, 168); but the great mass of critics rightly retain its meaning, "Gall." So *Ewald*, *Meyer*, *Bleek*, *Strauss*, *Weisse*, *Schenkel*, *Volkmar*, *Alford*, *Wordworth*, &c., &c.

⁴ "St. Matthew mentally refers it to Ps. lxix. 21 *ὄξος* (or possibly *οἶνον*, which *Tischendorf* admits from *ℵ*, *B*, *D*, *K*, *L*, &c.) *μετὰ χολῆς*." *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 400, note 1.

the soldiers as mocking Jesus by "offering him vinegar" ¹ (ὄξος); he omits the gall, but probably refers to the same Psalm without being so falsely literal as Matthew.

We need not enter into the discussion as to the chronology of the Passion week, regarding which there is so much discrepancy in the accounts of the fourth Gospel and of the Synoptics, nor shall we pause minutely to deal with the irreconcilable difference which, it is admitted,² exists in their statement of the hours at which the events of the last fatal day occurred. The fourth Gospel (xix. 4) represents Pilate as bringing Jesus forth to the Jews "about the sixth hour" (noon). Mark (xv. 25), in obvious agreement with the other Synoptics as further statements prove, distinctly says: "And it was the third hour (9 o'clock a.m.), and they crucified him." At the sixth hour (noon), according to the three Synoptists, there was darkness over the earth till about the ninth hour (3 o'clock p.m.), shortly after which time Jesus expired.³ As, according to the fourth Gospel, the sentence was not even passed before midday, and some time must be allowed for preparation and going to the place of execution, it is clear that there is a very wide discrepancy between the hours at which Jesus was crucified and died, unless, as regards the latter point, we take agreement in all as to the hour of death. In this case, commencing at the hour of the fourth Gospel and ending with that of the Synoptics, Jesus must have expired after being less than three hours on the cross. According to the Synoptics, and also, if we assign a later hour for the death, according to the fourth Gospel, he cannot have been more than six hours on the cross. We shall presently see that this remarkably rapid death has an important bearing upon the history and the views formed regarding it. It is known that crucifixion, besides being the most shameful mode of death, and indeed chiefly reserved for slaves and the lowest criminals, was one of the most lingering and atrociously cruel punishments ever invented by the malignity of man. Per-

¹ Luke omits the subsequent offer of "vinegar" (probably the *Posca* of the Roman soldiers) mentioned by the other Evangelists. We presume the reference in xxiii. 36 to be the same as the act described in Mt. xxvii. 34, and Mk. xv. 23.

² *Alford*, *Ck. Test.*, ii. p. 426 f., 897 f.; *Brückner*, *Zu de Wette's Ev. u. Br. Johannes*, 5te Aufl., 1862, p. 305; *Hase*, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 253; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, 1872, iii. p. 295 f., anm. 4; *Lücke*, *Comm. Ev. des Johannes*, ii. 1843, p. 754 ff.; *Luthardt*, *Das johann. Evang.*, 2te Aufl., ii. p. 463 ff.; *Meyer*, *Ev. des Johannes*, 5te Aufl., p. 622 ff.; *Ev. des Matth.*, p. 596; *Neander*, *Das Leb. Jesu*, 7te Aufl., p. 580, anm. 3; *Schollen*, *Het Ev. naar Johann.*, 1864, p. 331 f.; *Weizsäcker*, *Unters. ev. Gesch.*, p. i. 7, anm. 1; *De Wette*, *Ev. u. Br. Johannes*, p. 304 f. Cf. *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 385.1, 414.1. The common explanation of the discrepancy by supposing the author of the fourth Gospel to use "the Roman mode of reckoning time" no longer needs refutation.

³ Mt. xxvii. 45 f.; Mk. xv. 33 f.; Luke xx.ii. 44 f.

sons crucified, it is stated and admitted,¹ generally lived for at least twelve hours, and sometimes even survived the excruciating tortures of the cross for three days. We shall not further anticipate remarks which must hereafter be made regarding this.

We need not do more than point out that no two of the Gospels agree upon so simple, yet important, a point as the inscription on the cross.² It is argued that "a close examination of the narratives furnishes no sufficient reason for supposing that all proposed to give the same or the entire inscription," and, after some curious reasoning, it is concluded that "there is at least no possibility of showing any inconsistency on the strictly literal interpretation of the words of the evangelist."³ On the contrary, we had ventured to suppose that, in giving a form of words said to have been affixed to the cross, the evangelists intended to give the form actually used, and consequently "the same" and "entire inscription," which must have been short; and we consider it quite inconceivable that such was not their deliberate intention, however imperfectly fulfilled.

We pass on merely to notice a curious point in connection with an incident related by all the Gospels. It is stated that the Roman soldiers who crucified Jesus divided his garments amongst them, casting lots to determine what part each should take. The clothing of criminals executed was the perquisite of the soldiers who performed the duty, and there is nothing improbable in the story that the four soldiers decided by lot the partition of the garments—indeed there is every reason to suppose that such was the practice. The incident is mentioned as the direct fulfilment of the Ps. xxii. 18, which is quoted literally from the Septuagint version (Ps. xxi. 18) by the Author of the fourth Gospel. He did not, however, understand the passage, or disregarded its true meaning,⁴ and in order to make the incident accord better, as he supposed, with the prophetic Psalm, he represents that the soldiers amicably parted the rest of his garments amongst them without lot, but cast lots for the coat, which was without seam: xix. 24. "They said, therefore, among themselves: Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be; that the Scripture might be fulfilled: They parted my garments among them, and for my

¹ Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 585; *Farrar, Life of Christ*, ii. p. 423, 427, n. 2; *Godet, Comm. sur l'Ev. de St. Jean*, 1865, ii. p. 610; *Luthardt, Das Joh. Evang.*, ii. p. 470; *Renan, Vie de Jésus*, xiième éd., p. 438; *Winer, Realwörterb.*, i. p. 679.

² Cf. Mt. xxvii. 37; Mk. xv. 26; Luke xxiii. 38; John xix. 19.

³ *Westcott, Int. to Study of the Gospels*, 4th ed., p. 328, note 10.

⁴ *Strauss, Das Leben Jesu*, 2te Aufl., 1864, p. 679 f.; *Keim, Jesu v. Nazara*, iii. p. 421, ann. 1; *Scholten, Evang. naar Johannes*, 1864, p. 334; *Renan, Vie de Jésus*, xiième éd., p. 524 f.; *Lücke, Ev. des Johannes*, ii. p. 761. Cf. *Hengstenberg, Das Ev. des heil. Johannes*, 2te Aufl., iii. p. 261 f.

vesture they cast lots. These things, therefore, the soldiers did." The evangelist does not perceive that the two parts of the sentence in the Psalm really refer to the same action, but exhibits the partition of the garments and the lots for the vesture as separately fulfilled. The Synoptists apparently divide the whole by lot.¹ They do not expressly refer to the Psalm, however, except in the received text of Matth. xxvii. 35, into which and some other MSS. the quotation has been interpolated.² That the narrative of the Gospels, instead of being independent and genuine history, is constructed upon the lines of supposed Messianic Psalms and passages of the Old Testament, will become increasingly evident as we proceed.

It is stated by all the Gospels that two malefactors—the first and second calling them "robbers"—were crucified with Jesus, the one on the right hand and the other on the left. The statement in Mark xv. 28, that this fulfilled Isaiah liii. 12, which is found in our received text, is omitted by all the oldest codices, and is an interpolation,³ but we shall hereafter have to speak of this point in connection with another matter, and we now merely point out that, though the verse was thus inserted here, it is placed in the mouth of Jesus himself by the third Synoptist (xxii. 37), and the whole passage from which it was taken has evidently largely influenced the composition of the narrative before us. According to the first and second Gospels,⁴ the robbers joined with the chief priest and the scribes and elders and those who passed by in mocking and reviling Jesus. This is directly contradicted by the third Synoptist, who states that only one of the malefactors did so (xxiii. 39 ff.): "But the other answering rebuked him and said: Dost not thou even fear God seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds; but this man did nothing amiss. And he said: Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And he said unto him: Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." It requires very little examination to detect that this story is legendary,⁵

¹ Mt. xxvii. 35; Mk. xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34.

² "Certainly an interpolation." *Westcott, Int. to Study of Gospels*, p. 325, n. 2.

³ "Certainly an interpolation." *Westcott, Ib.*, p. 326, n. 5.

⁴ Mt. xxvii. 44; Mk. xv. 32.

⁵ *D'Eichthal, Les Evangiles*, 1863, ii. p. 311 f.; *Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 578 f.; *Ofrörer, Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 348 f.; *Keim, Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 425 f.; *Krüger-Velthusen, Das Leb. Jesu*, 1872, p. 251, anm.; *Schenkel, Das Charakterb. Jesu*, 1864, p. 308 f.; *Scholten, Het paulin. Ev.*, p. 284 f.; *Schwegler, Das nachap. Z.*, ii. p. 50 f.; *Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, Krit. bearb. 4te Aufl.*, 1840, ii. p. 518 ff.; *Leb. Jesu, für d. deutsche Volk bearb. 2te Aufl.*, p. 582; *Weisse, Die ev. Gesch.*, ii. p. 180; *Zeller, Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 78 f. Cf. *Weizsäcker, Unters. ev. Gesch.*, p. 568.

and cannot for a moment be maintained as historical. Those who dwell upon its symbolical character¹ do nothing to establish its veracity. This exemplary robber speaks like an Apostle, and in praying Jesus as the Messiah to remember him when he came into his kingdom, he shows much more than apostolic appreciation of the claims and character of Jesus. The reply of Jesus, moreover, contains a statement not only wholly contradictory of Jewish belief as to the place of departed spirits, but of all Christian doctrine at the time as to the descent of Jesus into Hades. Into this, however, it is needless for us to go.² Not only do the other Gospels show no knowledge of so interesting an episode, but, as we have pointed out, the first and second Synoptics positively exclude it. We shall see, moreover, that there is a serious difficulty in understanding how this conversation on the cross, which is so exclusively the property of the third Synoptist, could have been reported to him.

The Synoptics represent the passers by and the chief priests, scribes, and elders, as mocking Jesus as he hung on the cross. The fourth Gospel preserves total silence as to all this. It is curious, moreover, that the mocking is based upon that described in the Psalm xxii., to which we have already several times had to refer. In v. 7 f. we have: "All they that see me laughed me to scorn: they shot out the lip; they shook the head (saying), 8. He trusted on the Lord, let him deliver him, let him save him (seeing) that he doth both in him."³ Compare with this Mt. xxvii. 39 ff., Mk. xv. and Luke xlii. 35. Is it possible to suppose that the chief priests and elders and scribes could actually have quoted the words of the Psalm there put into the mouth of the Psalmist's enemies, as the first Synoptist represents (xxvii. 43)?⁴ It is obvious that the speeches ascribed to the chief priests and elders can be nothing more than mere expressions which the writers considered suitable to quote, and the fact that they seek their inspiration in a Psalm which they suppose to be Messianic is suggestive.

We have already mentioned that the fourth Gospel says nothing of any mocking speeches. The *Agapē*, however, narrates an episode (xix. 25-27) in which the dying Jesus is represented as confiding his mother to the care of "the disciple whom he loved," of which in their turn the Synoptists seem to be per-

¹ *Obhansen*, *Bibl. Com.*, ii. 2, p. 172.

² It is unnecessary for us to discuss the various ideas of which this episode is supposed to be symbolical.

³ Ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, ἐλάλησαν ἐν χειλέσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν, 8. Ἠλπιδεν ἐπὶ Κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν, σωσάτω αὐτόν, ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν. Ps. xxi. Sept., cf. vv. 4, 5.

⁴ *Strauss*, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 580 f.

ers did."
the sen-
exhibits
resture as
the whole
however,
which and
1.² That
ndent and
sed Messi-
become in-

—the first
with Jesus,
The state-
2, which is
est codices,
to speak of
now merely
here, it is
d Synoptist
taken has
e narrative
the robbers
rs and those
is directly
only one of
r answering
seeing thou
stly; for we
his man did
e when thou
erily, I say
It requires
legendary,⁵

Gospels, p. 325,

7. Isr., v. p. 578
425 f.; *Kruger*-
araktorb. Jesu,
s nachap. Z., ii.
p. 518 ff.; *Leb*.
v. Gesch., ii. p.
a. ev. Gesch., p.

fectly ignorant. We have already elsewhere remarked that there is no evidence whatever that there was any disciple whom Jesus specially loved, except the repeated statement in this Gospel. No other work of the New Testament contains a hint of such an individual, and much less that he was the Apostle John. The Synoptic Gospels do not confirm the claim to this distinction, and the Apostle Paul in no way allows us to suppose that he was aware of the existence of any particular preference on the part of Jesus to one of the disciples. Nor is there any evidence that any one of the disciples took the mother of Jesus to his own home. There is, therefore, no external confirmation of this episode; but there is, on the contrary, much which leads to the conclusion that it is not historical.¹ There has been much discussion as to whether four women are mentioned (xix. 25), or whether "his mother's sister" is represented as "Mary, the wife of Clopas," or was a different person. There are, we think, reasons for concluding that there were four, but in the doubt we shall not base any argument on the point. The Synoptics² distinctly state that "the women that followed him from Galilee," among which were "Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joseph and the mother of Zebedee's sons,"³ and, as the third Synoptic says, "all his acquaintance"⁴ were standing "afar off" (*μακρόθεν*). They were unanimous in saying this, and there is every reason for supposing that they are correct.⁵ This is consequently a contradiction of the account in the fourth Gospel that John and the women were standing "by the cross of Jesus." Olshausen, Lücke, and others, suggest that they subsequently came from a distance up to the cross, but the statement of the Synoptists is made at the close, and after this scene is supposed to have taken place. The opposite conjecture, that from standing close to the cross they removed to a distance has little to recommend it. Both explanations are equally arbitrary and unsupported by evidence.

It may be well, in connection with this, to refer to the various sayings and cries ascribed by the different evangelists to Jesus on the cross. We have already mentioned the conversation with the "penitent thief," which is peculiar to the third Gospel, and now that with the "beloved disciple," which is only in the fourth. The third Synoptic⁶ states that, on being crucified, Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," a say-

¹ Keim, *Jesus v. Naz.*, iii. p. 423, ann. 1, 426; Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 525 ff. Schenkel, *Charakterb. Jesu*, p. 311; Strauss, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 585. Cf. Weizsäcker, *Unters. ev. Gesch.*, p. 568.

² Mt. xxvii. 55 f.; Mk. xv. 40; Luke xxiii. 49.

³ Mt. xxvii. 56; Mk. xv. 40.

⁵ Cf. Mt. xxvi. 31, 56; Mk. xiv. 27.

⁴ Luke xxiii. 49.

⁶ xxiii. 34.

ing which is in the spirit of Jesus and worthy of him, but of which the other Gospels do not take any notice.¹ The fourth Gospel again has a cry (xix. 28): "After this, Jesus knowing that all things are now fulfilled, that the Scripture might be accomplished, saith: I thirst."² The majority of critics³ understand by this that "I thirst" is said in order "that the Scripture might be fulfilled" by the offer of the vinegar, related in the following verse. The Scripture referred to is of course Ps. lxix. 21: "They gave me also gall for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar (ὄζος) to drink;" which we have already quoted in connection with Matth. xxvii. 34. The third Synoptic (xxiii. 36) represents the vinegar as being offered in mockery at a much earlier period, and Matthew and Mark⁴ connect the offer of the vinegar with quite a different cry from that in the fourth Gospel, as we shall presently see. Nothing could be more natural than that, after protracted agony, the patient sufferer should cry: "I thirst," but the dogmatic purpose, which dictates the whole narrative in the fourth Gospel, is rendered obvious by the reference of such a cry to a supposed Messianic prophecy. This is further displayed by the statement (v. 29) that the sponge with vinegar was put "upon hyssop" (ὑσσώπῳ),—the two Synoptics have "on a reed" (καλάμῳ),—which the author probably uses in association with the paschal lamb,⁵ an idea present to his mind throughout the passion. The first and second Synoptics⁶ represent the last cry of Jesus to have been a quotation from Ps. xxii. 1: "Eli (or Mk., Eloi), Eli, lema sabachthani? that is to say: My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?" This, according to them, evidently, was the last articulate utterance of the expiring Master, for they merely add that "when he cried again with a loud voice," Jesus yielded up his spirit.⁷ Neither of the other Gospels has any mention of

¹ Strauss calls attention to Isaiah liii. 12, where, of the servant of Jehovah, it is said that he "made intercession for the transgressors." Das Leben Jesu, p. 584.

² Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, ἵνα τελεσθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει διψῶ.

³ Alford, Gk. Test., i. p. 900 f.; Brückner, Zu de Wette Ev. u. Br. Joh., p. 308; Ewald, Dio Johann. Schr., 1861, i. p. 412; Godet, Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 617; Hengstenberg, Ev. Johann., iii. p. 271; Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 314; Lucke, Ev. Johann., ii. p. 764 f.; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 585; De Wette, Ev. u. Br. Johann., p. 307. Others connect "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled" with the preceding phrase; so Luthardt, Das Joh. Ev., ii. p. 478; Lange, Ev. u. Johann., 2te Aufl., p. 405; Meyer, Ev. Johann., p. 631; Scholten, Ev. Johann., p. 338, n. 1.

⁴ Mt. xxvii. 48 f.; Mk. xv. 36.

⁵ Ex. xii. 22; cf. Levit. xiv. 4, 6, 49; Hengstenberg, Das Ev. Joh., iii. p. 273; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 430, anm. 2; Scholten, Het Ev. Joh., p. 337. Cf. Renan, Vie de Jésus, p. 528.

⁶ Mt. xxvii. 46; Mk. xv. 34.

⁷ Mt. xxvii. 50; Mk. xv. 37.

this cry. The third Gospel substitutes: "And when Jesus cried with a loud voice, he said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said this he expired."¹ This is an almost literal quotation from the Septuagint version of Ps. xxxi. 5. The fourth Gospel has a totally different cry (xix. 30), for, on receiving the vinegar, which accomplished the Scripture, he represents Jesus as saying: "It is finished" (*Τετέλεισται*), and immediately expiring. It will be observed that seven sayings are attributed to Jesus on the cross, of which the first two Gospels have only one, the third Synoptic three, and the fourth Gospel three. We do not intend to express any opinion here in favour of any of these, but we merely point out the remarkable fact that, with the exception of the one cry in the first two Synoptics, each Gospel has ascribed different sayings to the dying Master, and not only no two of them agree, but in some important instances the statement of the one evangelist seems absolutely to exclude the accounts of the others. Every one knows the hackneyed explanation of apologists, but in works which repeat each other so much elsewhere, it certainly is a curious phenomenon that there is so little agreement here. If all the Master's disciples "forsook him and fled,"² and his few friends and acquaintances stood "afar off" regarding his sufferings, it is readily conceivable that pious tradition had unlimited play. We must, however, return to the cry recorded in Matthew and Mark,³ the only one about which two witnesses agree. Both of them give this quotation from Ps. xxii. 1 in Aramaic: *Eli* (Mark: *Eloi*), *Eli*,⁴ *lema sabacthani*. The purpose is clearly to enable the reader to understand what follows, which we quote from the first Gospel: "And some of them that stood there, when they heard it said: This man calleth for Elijah.

The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elijah is coming to save him."⁵ It is impossible to confuse "*Eli*" or "*Eloi*" with "*Elijahu*,"⁶ and the explanations suggested by apologists are not sufficient to remove a difficulty which seems to betray the legendary character of the statement. The mistake of supposing that Jesus called for Elijah could not possibly have been made by those who spoke Aramaic; that strangers not perfectly understanding Aramaic should be here intended cannot be main-

¹ καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xxiii. 46.

² Mt. xxvi. 56.

³ Mt. xxvii. 46; Mk. xv. 34.

⁴ The Sinaitic cod., Mt. xxvii. 46 reads: *ἐλωι, ἐλωι, λεμα σαβαχθανει*; the cod. Alex., *ήλι, ήλι, κ.τ.λ.*; cod. Vat., *ἐλωει, ἐλωει, κ.τ.λ.* D has *ήλει, ήλει, κ.τ.λ.* We only note the variations in the first two words, which are those upon which the question turns.

⁵ Mt. xxvii. 47, 49; cf. Mk. xv. 35, 36.

⁶ *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 351 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 428, anm. 1.

tained, for the suggestion is represented as adopted by "the rest." The Roman soldiers had probably never heard of Elijah; and there is nothing whatever to support the allegation of mockery¹ as accounting for the singular episode. The verse of the Psalm was too well known to the Jews to admit of any suggested play upon words.

The three Synoptics state that, from the sixth hour (mid-day) to the ninth (3 o'clock), "there was darkness over all the earth" (σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν).² The third Gospel adds: "the sun having failed" (τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος).³ By the term "all the earth" some critics⁴ maintain that the evangelist merely meant the Holy Land,⁵ whilst others hold that he uses the expression in its literal sense.⁶ The fourth Gospel takes no notice of this darkness. Such a phenomenon is scarcely a trifle to be ignored in any account of the crucifixion, if it actually occurred. The omission of all mention of it either amounts to a denial of its occurrence or betrays most suspicious familiarity with supernatural interference. There have been many efforts made to explain this darkness naturally, or at least to find some allusion to it in contemporary history, all of which have signally failed. As the moon was at the full, it is admitted that the darkness could not have been an eclipse.⁷ The Fathers appealed to Phlegon the Chronicler, who mentions⁸ an eclipse of the sun about this period accompanied by an earthquake, and also to a similar occurrence referred to by Eusebius,⁹ probably quoted from the historian Thallus, but of course, modern knowledge has dispelled the illusion that these phenomena have any connection with the darkness we are discussing, and the theory that the evangelists are confirmed in their account by this

¹ Meyer says: "Frevelhafter Judenhitz mit lappisch bösslicher Verdrehung des ἡλί, ἡλί nicht Missverständniss, weder der Römischen Soldaten, noch gemeiner Juden, noch der Hellenisten, da der ganze Context Scenen des giftigen Spottes vorführt." Ev. des Matthäus, p. 599.

² Mt. xviii. 45; Mk. xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44.

³ Luke xxiii. 45. This is the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican (ἐκλείπ.) codices. A reads καὶ ἐκκρίσθη ὁ ἥλιος.

⁴ Ebrard, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 560; Kuinoel, Comm. in N. T., i. p. 795; Lange, Das Ev. Matth., p. 435; Mälan, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 335; Wordsworth, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 105.

⁵ Dr. Farrar says: "It is quite possible that the darkness was a local gloom which hung densely over the guilty city and its immediate neighbourhood." Life of Christ, 5th ed., ii. p. 414.

⁶ Alford, Gk. Test., i. p. 294, 427 f.; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 438; Meyer, Ev. Matth., p. 359; De Wette, Ev. Matth., p. 359; Weiss, Marcusev., p. 499.

⁷ Alford, Gk. Test., i. p. 294; Ewald, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 581, ann. 4; Farrar, Life of Christ, ii. p. 413 f.; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 439; Meyer, Ev. Matth., p. 596; Neander, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 574, ann. 1; Olshausen, Leidensgesch. des Herrn, 1862, p. 176; Wordsworth, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 105.

⁸ xiii. Olympiadum.

⁹ Chron. ad Olymp., 202.

evidence is now generally abandoned.¹ It is apart from our object to show how common it was amongst classical and other writers to represent nature as sympathising with national or social disasters;² and as a poetical touch this remarkable darkness of the Synoptists, of which no one else knows anything, is quite intelligible. The statement, however, is as seriously and deliberately made as any other in their narrative, and does not add to its credibility. It is palpable that the account is mythical,³ and it bears a strange likeness to passages in the Old Testament, from the imagery of which the representation in all probability was derived.⁴

The first and second Gospels state that when Jesus cried with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit, "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom."⁵ The third Synoptic associates this occurrence with the eclipse of the sun, and narrates it before the final cry and death of the Master.⁶ The fourth Gospel takes no notice of so extraordinary a phenomenon. The question might be asked: How could the chief priests, who do not appear to have been at all convinced by such a miracle, but still continued their invincible animosity against the Christian sect, reveal the occurrence of such a wonder, of which there is no mention elsewhere? Here again the account is legendary and symbolical,⁷ and in the spirit of the age of miracles.⁸ The first Synoptist, however, has further marvels to relate. He states in continuation of the passage quoted above: "and the earth was shaken (*ἐσείσθη*) and the rocks were rent and the sepulchres were opened, and many bodies of the saints who slept were raised; and they came out of the sepulchres after his resurrection, and entered

¹ Ewald, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 581, anm. 4; Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 438 f.; Meyer, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 596; Milman, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 335, note n.; De Wette, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 359; Wieseler, *Chron. synops. Evv.*, 387 f., &c., &c. Cf. Farrar, *Life of Chr.*, ii. p. 414; Neander, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 574, anm. 1.

² Cf. Virgil, *Georg.*, i. 463-468; Dio Cass., 40.17, 56.29; Plin. H. N., 2.30; Plutarch, *V. Rom.* § 27, p. 34; Cæs. § 69, p. 740 f.; Welstein, *Grotius*, ad h. l.

³ Gfrörer, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 349, 352 f.; Hase, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 278 f.; Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 437 ff.; Krüger-Velthusen, *Das Leb. Jesu*, 1872, p. 252 f.; Schleiermacher, *Schr. des Lukas*, *Sämmtl. Werke*, 1836, ii. p. 214; Stricker, *Jesus van Nazareth*, 1868, ii. p. 265. Cf. Ewald, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 360; *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 581 f.; De Wette, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 362.

⁴ Cf. Joel ii. 10, 31, iii. 15; Amos viii. 9; Isaiah xlii. 10, 1. 3, &c.

⁵ Mt. xxvii. 51; Mk. xv. 38.

⁶ Luke xxiii. 45.

⁷ Gfrörer, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 349, 352 f.; Hase, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 279; Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 437 ff.; Krüger-Velthusen, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 252 f.; Schleiermacher, *Schr. des Lukas*, p. 213 f.; Strauss, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 588; Stricker, *Jesus v. Naz.*, ii. p. 265. Cf. Ewald, *Die drei Evv.*, p. 360; *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 582; Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 574 f.

⁸ We have elsewhere referred to the wonderful occurrences related by Josephus at the Temple about the time of the siege. *Bell. Jud.*, vi. 5, § 3. Cf. S. R., pp. 140, 152; cf. Apoc. xi. 19.

into the holy city and appeared unto many."¹ How great must be the amazement of anyone who may have been inclined to suppose the Gospels soberly historical works, on finding that the other three evangelists do not even mention these astounding occurrences related by the first Synoptist! An earthquake (*σασμός*)² and the still more astounding resurrection of many saints who appeared unto "many," and, therefore, an event by no means secret and unknown to all but the writer, and yet three other writers, who give accounts of the crucifixion and death of Jesus, and who enter throughout into very minute details, do not even condescend to mention them! Nor does any other New Testament writer chronicle them. It is scarcely necessary to say that the passage has been a very serious difficulty for apologists; and one of the latest writers of this school, reproducing the theories of earlier critics, deals with it in a *Life of Christ*, which "is avowedly and unconditionally the work of a believer,"³ as follows:—"An earthquake shook the earth and split the rocks, and as it rolled away from their places the great stones which closed and covered the cavern sepulchres of the Jews, so it seemed to the imaginations of many to have disimprisoned the spirits of the dead, and to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen appeared to linger in the Holy City." In a note he adds, "Only in some such way as this can I account for the singular and wholly isolated allusion of Matt. xxvii. 52, 53."⁴ It is worthy of note, and we may hereafter refer to the point, that learned divines thus do not scruple to adopt the "vision hypothesis" of the resurrection. Even if the resurrection of the saints so seriously related by the evangelist be thus disposed of, and it be assumed that the other Gospels, likewise adopting the "vision"

¹ καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθή, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν, καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεώχθησαν καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν· καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ ἐσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ νεφανίσθησαν πολλοίς. Matt. xxvii. 51-53.

² So the phenomenon is distinctly called in xxvii. 54.

³ Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i. Pref., p. viii.

⁴ Farrar, *Ib.*, ii. p. 419. Dean Milman, following the explanation of Michaelis, says: "Even the dreadful earthquake which followed, seemed to pass away without appalling the enemies of Jesus. The rending of the veil of the Temple from the top to the bottom, so strikingly significant of the approaching abolition of the local worship, would either be concealed by the priesthood, or attributed as a natural effect to the convulsion of the earth. The same convulsion would displace the stones which covered the ancient tombs and lay open many of the innumerable rock-hewn sepulchres which perforated the hills on every side of the city, and expose the dead to public view. To the awe-struck and depressed minds of the followers of Jesus, no doubt, were confined those visionary appearances of the spirits of their deceased brethren, which are obscurely intimated in the rapid narratives of the Evangelists." *Hist. of Christianity*, i. p. 336. It will be observed that inadvertently Dr. Milman has put "Evangelists" in the plural.

explanation, consequently declined to give an objective place in their narrative to what they believed to be a purely subjective and unreal phenomenon, there still remains the earthquake, to which supernatural incident of the crucifixion none of the other evangelists think it worth while to refer. Need we argue that the earthquake¹ is as mythical as the resurrection of the saints?² In some apocryphal writings, even the names of some of these risen saints are given.³ As the case actually stands, with these marvellous incidents related solely by the first Synoptist and ignored by the other evangelists, it would seem superfluous to enter upon more detailed criticism of the passage; and to point out the incongruity of the statement that these saints are said to be raised from the dead, just as the Messiah expires, or the strange fact that, although the sepulchres are said to have been opened at that moment and the resurrection to have then taken place, it is stated that they only came out of their graves after the resurrection of Jesus. The allegation, moreover, that they were raised from the dead at that time, and before the resurrection of Jesus, virtually contradicts the saying of the Apocalypse (i. 5) that Jesus was the "first begotten of the dead," and of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 20) that he was "the first fruits of them who have fallen asleep."⁴ Paul's whole argument is opposed to such a story; for he does not base the resurrection of the dead upon the death of Jesus, but, in contradistinction, upon his resurrection only. The Synoptist evidently desires to associate the resurrection of the saints with the death of Jesus to render that event more impressive, but delays the completion of it in order to give a kind of precedence to the resurrection of the Master. The attempt leads to nothing but confusion. What could be the object of such a resurrection? It could not be represented as any effect produced by the death of Jesus, nor even by his alleged resurrection, for what dogmatic connection could there be between that event and the fact that a

¹ *Gfrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 349; *Hase*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 278 f.; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 437 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 252 f.; *Stricker*, *Jezus v. Naz.*, ii. p. 265. Cf. *Ewald*, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 360; *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 581 f.; *Meyer*, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 601 f.; *De Wette*, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 362.

² *Eichhorn*, *Einl. N. T.*, i. p. 487 ff.; *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 419; *Gfrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 352 f.; *Hase*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 279; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 444 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 252; *Meijboom*, *Het Geloof aan Jezus' Opstanding*, 1865, p. 141 f.; *Milman*, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 336 f.; *Schleiermacher*, *Schr. d. Lukas*, p. 214; *Strauss*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 589 f.; *Stricker*, *Jezus v. Naz.*, ii. p. 265; *Volkmar*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 601; *De Wette*, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 361 f.; *Wilcke*, *Der Urevangelist*, p. 639 f. Cf. *Ewald*, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 360; *Gesch. V. Isr.*, v. p. 582 f.; *Krabbe*, *Lehre d. Sünde*, p. 297; *Meyer*, *Ev. Mt.*, p. 601 f.

³ *Anaphora Pilati*, *Thilo*, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, p. 810 f.; *Tischendorf*, *Evang. Apocr.*, p. 424.

⁴ Can the author of the Apocalypse, or Paul, ever have heard of the raising of Lazarus?

few saints only were raised from their graves, whilst it was not pretended that the dead "saints" generally participated in this resurrection? No intimation is given that their appearance to many was for any special purpose, and certainly no practical result has ever been traced to it. Finally we might ask: What became of these saints raised from the dead? Did they die again? Or did they also "ascend into Heaven?"¹ A little reflection will show that these questions are pertinent. It is almost inconceivable that any serious mind could maintain the actual truth of such a story, upon such evidence. Its actual objective truth not being maintainable, however, the character of the work which advances such an unhesitating statement is determined, and at least the value of its testimony can without difficulty be settled.

The continuation of this episode in the first Synoptic is quite in keeping with its commencement. It is stated: "But when the centurion and they that were with him watching Jesus saw the earthquake (*σεισμὸν*) and the things that were done (*τὰ γεγόμενα*) they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was a son of God" (*Ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν οὗτος*).² In Mark the statement is very curiously varied: "And when the centurion who stood over against him saw that he so expired, he said: Truly this man was a son of God."³ It is argued on the one hand that the centurion's wonder here was caused by Jesus dying with so loud a cry, and the reading of many MSS. would clearly support this;⁴ and on the other that the cause of his exclamation was the unexpectedly rapid death of Jesus. Whichever view be taken the centurion's deduction, it must be admitted, rests upon singularly inconclusive reasoning. We venture to think that it is impossible that a Roman soldier could either have been led to form such an opinion upon such grounds, or to express it in such terms. In Luke, we have a third reading: "But when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying: Certainly this man was righteous"⁵ (*Ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν*). There is nothing here about the "Son of God;" but when the writer repre-

¹ Eichhorn, Einl. N. T., i. p. 487 ff.

² Mt. xxvii. 54. This is the reading of the Vatican Cod. and D, with some others. Cod. A, C, E, F, and many others read *θεοῦ υἱός*. The Sinaitic MS. has *Ἀλ. υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ οὗτος*. The rendering of the A. V., "the Son of God," cannot be sustained linguistically, whatever may have been the writer's intention.

³ Mk. xv. 39. The A. V. has: "saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost:" *κραῖας* has certainly high authority (A, C, E, G, H, &c.; D has *κραῖαντα*), but the Sin., Vat., and some other codices and versions, omit it, and it is rejected by Tischendorf. We, therefore, take the reading for the moment which leaves the question most open.

⁴ Meyer, who takes the view, considers that, hearing Jesus expire with so loud a cry, the centurion concluded him to be a "Hero." Ev. des Mark. u. Lukas, 5te Aufl., 203 f.

⁵ xliii. 47.

place in
subjective
quake, to
the other
rgue that
saints? 2
e of these
with these
ptist and
rfluous to
l to point
are said to
he strange
en opened
n place, it
the resur-
ere raised
a of Jesus,
that Jesus
or. xv. 20)
n asleep." 4
or he does
Jesus, but,
e Synoptist
saints with
ressive, but
precedence
to nothing
urrection?
y the death
t dogmatic
fact that a

Keim, Jesu v.
Jesus v. Naz.
v. p. 581 f.

419; Gfr. er,
v. Naz., iii. p.
oof aan Jezus
rmacher, Schr.
az., ii. p. 265;
ilcke, Der Ure-
V. Isr., v. p.

ndorf, Evang.

the raising of

sents the Roman soldier as glorifying God, the narrative does not seem much more probable than that of the other Synoptists.

The fourth Evangelist of course does not refer to any such episode, but, as usual, he introduces a very remarkable incident of his own, of which the Synoptists, who record such peculiar details of what passed, seem very strangely to know nothing. The fourth evangelist states: "The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies might not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath (for that Sabbath-day was a high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken and they might be taken away. So the soldiers came and brake the legs of the first, and of the other who was crucified with him, but when they came to Jesus, as they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs; but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and that man knoweth that he saith what is true, that ye also may believe. For these things came to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled: A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture saith: They shall look on him whom they pierced."¹ It is inconceivable that, if this actually occurred, and occurred more especially that the "Scripture might be fulfilled," the other three Evangelists could thus totally ignore it all.² The second Synoptist does more: he not only ignores but excludes it, for (xv. 43 f.) he represents Joseph as begging the body of Jesus from Pilate "when evening was now come." "And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead; and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been long dead. And when he knew it of the centurion he gave the corpse to Joseph."³ Now, although there could be no doubt on the point, the fourth Gospel clearly states (xix. 38, *μετὰ ταῦτα*) that Joseph made his request for the body after the order had been given by Pilate to break the legs of the crucified, and after it had been executed as above described. If Pilate had already given the order to break the legs, how is it possible he could have marvelled, or acted as he is described in Mark to have done? It is well known that the *Crurifragium*, which is here applied, was not usually an accompaniment of crucifixion, though it may have been sometimes employed along with it,⁴ but that it was a distinct punishment. It consisted in breaking, with ham-

¹ John xix. 31-37.

² The Sin., Vat., and other codices insert in Mt. xxvii. 49, the phrase from John xix 34, *ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην, ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα*. Notwithstanding this high authority, it is almost universally acknowledged that the phrase is an interpolation here.

³ Mk. xv. 44-45.

⁴ Ebrard admits that it was not common. *Evang. Gesch.*, p. 565, anm. 31.

mers or clubs, the bones of the condemned from the hips to the feet. We shall not discuss whether in the present case this measure really was adopted or not. The representation is that the Jews requested Pilate to break the legs of the crucified that the bodies might be removed before the Sabbath, and that the order was given and executed. The first point to be noted is the very singular manner in which the leg-breaking was performed. The soldiers are said to have broken the legs of the first and then of the other who was crucified with Jesus, thus passing over Jesus in the first instance; and then the Evangelist says: "*but when they came to Jesus, as they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side.*" This order of procedure is singular; but the whole conduct of the guard is so extraordinary that such details become comparatively insignificant. An order having been given to the Roman soldiers, in accordance with the request of the Jews, to break the legs of the crucified, we are asked to believe that they did not execute it in the case of Jesus! It is not reasonable to suppose, however, that Roman soldiers either were in the habit of disregarding their orders, or could have any motive for doing so in this case, and subjecting themselves to the severe punishment for disobedience inflicted by Roman military law. It is argued that they saw that Jesus was already dead, and therefore that it was not necessary to break his legs; but soldiers are not in the habit of thinking in this way: they are disciplined to obey. The fact, is, however, that the certainty that Jesus was dead already did not actually exist in their minds, and could scarcely have existed seeing that the death was so singularly rapid, for in that case why should the soldier have pierced his side with a spear? The only conceivable motive for doing so was to make sure that Jesus really was dead;¹ but is it possible to suppose that a Roman soldier, being in the slightest doubt, actually chose to assure himself in this way when he might still more effectually have done so by simply obeying the order of his superior and breaking the legs? The whole episode is manifestly unhistorical.² It is clear that to fulfil in a marked way the prophecies which the writer had in his mind, and wished specially to apply to Jesus, it was necessary that, in the first place, there should have been a distinct danger of the bones being broken, and at the same time of the side not being pierced. The order to break the legs of the crucified is

¹ Cf. *Luthardt*, *Das johann. Ev.*, 2te Aufl., 1876, ii. p. 483 f.

² For the whole argument as to the leg-breaking and the lance-thrust, compare *Gfrörer*, *Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*, p. 231 ff., 241 ff.; *Keim*, *Jesus v. Naz.*, iii. p. 508 ff.; *Schollen*, *Ev. n. Johannes*, p. 338 ff.; *Strauss*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 591 ff.; *Weisse*, *Die ev. Gesch.*, ii. p. 325 ff.

therefore given, but an extraordinary exception is made in favour of Jesus, and a thrust with the lance substituted, so that both passages of the Scripture are supposed to be fulfilled.¹ What Scriptures, however, are fulfilled? The first: "A bone of him shall not be broken," is merely the prescription with regard to the Paschal lamb, Ex. xii. 46;² and the dogmatic view of the fourth Evangelist leads him throughout to represent Jesus as the true Paschal lamb. The second is Zech. xii. 10,³ and any one who reads the passage, even without the assistance of learned exegesis, may perceive that it has no such application as our Evangelist gives it. We shall pass over, as not absolutely necessary for our immediate purpose, very many important details of the episode; but regarding this part of the subject we may say that we consider it evident that, if an order was given to break the legs of the crucified upon this occasion, that order must have been executed upon Jesus equally with any others who may have been crucified with him. There has been much discussion as to the intention of the author in stating that, from the wound made by the lance, there forthwith came out "blood and water" (αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ); and likewise as to whether the special testimony here referred to in the third person is to attest more immediately the flow of blood and water, or the whole episode.⁴ In regard to the latter point, we need not pause to discuss the question.⁵ As to the "blood and water," some see in the statement made an intention to show the reality of the death of Jesus,⁶ whilst others more rightly regard the phenomenon described as a representation of a supernatural and symbolical incident,⁷ closely connected with the whole dogmatic view of the Gospel. It is impossible not to see in this the same idea as that expressed in 1 John v. 6: "This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and the blood."⁸ As a natural incident

¹ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 593.

² Cf. Numbers ix. 12; Ps. xxxiv. 23.

³ Cf. Ps. xxii. 16. We need not discuss here the variation in the quotation from Zech. xii. 10.

⁴ Of course we do not here even touch upon the wider question raised by this passage.

⁵ We refer readers to the works quoted in the following two notes.

⁶ *Mitman*, *Hist. of Chr.*, i. p. 337; *Neander*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 583, ann. 3; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 443 f.; *De Wette*, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 312. Cf. *Brückner*, *Zu de W. Ev. Joh.*, i. p. 312; *Ebrard*, *Zu Olsh. Leidensgesch.*, p. 187; *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 424.

⁷ *Alford*, *Gk. Test.*, i. p. 902; *Baur*, *Unters. Kan. Evv.*, p. 216 ff.; *Gfrörer*, *Das Heilthum*, p. 235 f.; *Hengstenberg*, *Ev. Joh.*, iii. p. 278; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 442 f.; *Kruger-Felthusen*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 254; *Luthardt*, *Das joh. Ev.*, ii. p. 485 f.; *Meyer*, *Ev. Joh.*, p. 636; *Strauss*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 594; *Weisse*, *Die ev. Gesch.*, i. p. 100 ff.; ii. p. 326 ff.; *Wordsworth*, *Gk. Test.*, *Four Gospels*, p. 357. Cf. *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 424; *Hilgenfeld*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 316, ann. 3.

⁸ Cf. John vii. 37-39, iii. 5, &c., &c.

it cannot be entertained, for in no sense but mere quibbling could it be said that "blood and water" could flow from such a wound, and as a supernatural phenomenon it must be rejected. As a proof of the reality of the death of Jesus, it could only have been thought of at a time when gross ignorance prevailed upon all medical subjects. We shall not here discuss the reality of the death of Jesus, but we may merely point out that the almost unprecedentedly rapid decease of Jesus was explained by Origen¹ and some of the Fathers as miraculous. It has been argued that the thrust of the lance may have been intended to silence those objectors who might have denied the actual death on the ground that the legs of Jesus were not broken like those of the two malefactors,² and it certainly is generally quoted as having assured the fact of death. The statement that blood flowed from the wound, however, by no means supports the allegation, and, although we may make little use of the argument, it is right to say that there is no evidence of any serious kind advanced of the reality of the death of Jesus, here or in the other Gospels.³

The author of the fourth Gospel himself seems to betray that this episode is a mere interpolation of his own into a narrative to which it does not properly belong.⁴ According to his own account (xix. 31), the Jews besought Pilate that the legs might be broken and that the bodies "might be taken away" (*ἀρθῶσιν*). The order to do this was obviously given, for the legs are forthwith broken and of course, immediately after, the bodies in pursuance of the same order would have been taken away. As soon as the Evangelist has secured his purpose of showing how the Scriptures were fulfilled by means of this episode, he takes up the story as though it had not been interrupted, and proceeds v. 38: "After these things" (*μετὰ ταῦτα*), that is to say after the legs of the malefactors had been broken and the side of Jesus pierced, Joseph besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus, and Pilate gave leave. But, if v. 31 f. be historical, the body must already have been taken away. All the Synoptics agree with the fourth Gospel in stating that Joseph of Arimathæa begged for and obtained the body of Jesus from Pilate.⁵ The

¹ "Oravit Patrem, et exanditus est, et statim ut clamavit ad Patrem, receptus est aut sicut qui potestatem habebat ponendi animam suam, posuit eam quando voluit ipse Miraculum enim erat quoniam post tres horas receptus est," &c., &c. Orig. in Matth. ed. Delarue, 1740, iii. § 140, p. 923.

² The use of the verb *ῥυτίσσω* does not favour the view that the writer intended to express a deep wound.

³ It has likewise been thought that the representation in Mark xv. 44, that Pilate marvelled at the rapid death of Jesus, and sent for the centurion to ascertain the fact, was made to meet similar doubts, or at least to give assurance of the reality of the death.

⁴ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 596.

⁵ According to Luke xxiii. 53, Joseph actually "took down" the body.

the quotation
raised by this

es.
um. 3; *Renan*,
Zu de W. Ev.
Life of Christ,

Gröner, Das
Jesu v. Naz.,
Joh. Ev., ii. p.
Weisse, Die ev.
Gospels, p. 357.
p. 316, ann. 3.

second and third Synoptics describe him as belonging to the Council, but the first Gospel merely calls him "a rich man," whilst the fourth omits both of these descriptions. They all call him a disciple of Jesus—secretly for fear of the Jews, the fourth Gospel characteristically adds—although the term that he was "waiting for the Kingdom of God," used by the second and third Gospels, is somewhat vague. The fourth Gospel, however, introduces a second personage in the shape of Nicodemus, "who at the first came to him by night,"¹ and who, it will be remembered, had previously been described as "a ruler of the Jews."² The Synoptics do not once mention such a person, either in the narrative of the Passion or in the earlier chapters, and there are more than doubts as to his historical character.³

The accounts of the Entombment given by the three Synoptists, or at least by the second and third, distinctly exclude the narrative of the fourth Gospel, both as regards Nicodemus and the part he is represented as taking. The contradictions which commence here between the account of the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, in fact, are of the most glaring and important nature, and demand marked attention. The fourth Gospel states that, having obtained permission from Pilate, Joseph came and took the body of Jesus away. "And there came also Nicodemus, . . . bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight. They took, therefore, the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein was never man yet laid. There, therefore, on account of the preparation of the Jews (*ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), they laid Jesus, for the sepulchre was at hand" (*ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον*).⁴ According to the first Synoptic, when Joseph took the body, he simply wrapped it "in clean linen" (*ἐν σινδόνι καθαρᾷ*) and "laid it in his own new sepulchre, which he hewed in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed."⁵ There is no mention of spices or any anointing of the body,⁶ and the statement that the women provide for this is not made in this Gospel. According to the writer, the burial is complete and the sepulchre finally closed. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary come merely "to behold the sepulchre" at the end of the Sabbath.⁷ The fourth Evangelist apparently does not know anything of the sepulchre

¹ John iii. 1.

³ Cf. *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 517 ff.

⁴ John xix. 39—42.

⁶ *Strauss* suggests that, for the first Synoptist, his anointing had already been accomplished. Cf. xxvi. 12; *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 598

⁷ Mt. xxviii. 1.

² John iii. 1, vii. 50.

⁵ Mt. xxvii. 59 ff.

being Joseph's own tomb, and the body is, according to him, although fully embalmed, only laid in the sepulchre in the garden on account of the Sabbath, and because it was at hand. We shall refer to this point, which must be noted, further on. There are very striking differences between these two accounts, but the narratives of the second and third Synoptists are still more emphatically contradictory of both. In Mark,¹ we are told that Joseph "bought linen, and took him down and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which had been hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone against the door of the sepulchre." There is no mention here of any embalming performed by Joseph or Nicodemus, nor are any particulars given as to the ownership of the sepulchre, or the reasons for its selection. We are, however, told:² "And when the Sabbath was passed, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, brought spices that they might come and anoint him." It is distinctly stated in connection with the entombment, moreover, in agreement with the first Synoptic:³ "And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joseph beheld where he was laid."⁴ According to this account and that of the first Gospel, the women, having remained to the last and seen the body deposited in the sepulchre, knew so little of its having been embalmed by Joseph and Nicodemus, that they actually purchase the spices and come to perform that office themselves. In Luke, the statement is still more specific, in agreement with Mark, and in contradiction to the fourth Gospel. Joseph took down the body "and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never before man was laid. . . . And women who had come with him out of Galilee followed after, and beheld the sepulchre *and how his body was laid*. And they returned and prepared spices and ointments." Upon the first day of the week, the author adds: "they came unto the sepulchre bringing the spices which they had prepared."⁵ Which of these accounts are we to believe? According to the first Gospel, there is no embalment at all; according to the second and third Gospels, the embalment is undertaken by the women, and not by Joseph and Nicodemus, but is never carried out; according to the fourth Gospel, the embalment is completed on Friday evening by Joseph and Nicodemus, and not by the women. According to the first Gospel, the burial is completed on Friday evening; according to the second and third, it is only provisional; and according to the fourth, the embalment is final, but it is doubtful whether

¹ Mk. xv. 46.³ Mt. xxvii. 61.⁵ Luke xxiii. 53 ff., xxiv. 1.² Mk. xvi. 1.⁴ Mk. xv. 47.

the entombment is final or temporary; several critics consider it to have been only provisional.¹ In Mark, the women buy the spices "when the Sabbath was past" (*διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου*);² in Luke before it has begun;³ and in Matthew and John they do not buy them at all. In the first and fourth Gospels, the women come after the Sabbath merely to behold the sepulchre,⁴ and in the second and third, they bring the spices to complete the burial. Amid these conflicting statements we may suggest one consideration. It is scarcely probable, in a hot climate, that a wounded body, hastily laid in a sepulchre on Friday evening before six o'clock, would be disturbed again on Sunday morning for the purpose of being anointed and embalmed. Corruption would, under the circumstances, already have commenced. Besides, as Keim⁵ has pointed out, the last duties to the dead were not forbidden amongst the Jews on the Sabbath, and there is really no reason why any care for the body of the Master which reverence or affection might have dictated should not at once have been bestowed.

The enormous amount of myrrh and aloes—"about a hundred pound weight" (*ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν*)—brought by Nicodemus, has excited much discussion, and adds to the extreme improbability of the story related by the fourth Evangelist.⁶ To whatever weight the litra may be reduced, the quantity specified is very great; and it is a question whether the body thus enveloped "as the manner of the Jews is to bury" could have entered the sepulchre. The practice of embalming the dead, although well known amongst the Jews, and invariable in the case of Kings and noble or very wealthy persons, was by no means generally prevalent. In the burial of Gamaliel the elder, chief of the party of the Pharisees, it is stated that over 80 pounds of balsam were burnt in his honour by the proselyte Onkelos;⁷ but this quantity, which was considered very remarkable, is totally eclipsed by the provision of Nicodemus.

The key to the whole of this history of the burial of Jesus, however, is to be found in the celebrated chapt. liii. of "Isaiah." We have already, in passing, pointed out that, in the third Gospel (xxii. 37), Jesus is represented as saying: "For I say unto you, that this which is written must be accomplished in me: And he was reckoned among transgressors." The same quotation

¹ Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 447.

² Luke xliii. 35.

³ Schabbath 151.1; Keim, *Jesu von Nazara*, iii. 522, ann. 1.

⁴ Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 521 f.; Weiss, *Die ev. Gesch.*, ii. p. 342 f. Cf. Farrer, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 429, note 1; Luthardt, *Das joh. Ev.*, ii. p. 492; Olshausen, *Leidensgesch.*, p. 189.

⁵ Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, iii. 524.

⁶ Mk. xvi. 1.

⁷ Mt. xxviii. 1; John xx. 1.

from Is. liii. 12 is likewise interpolated in Mk. xv. 28. Now the whole representation of the burial and embalment of Jesus is evidently based upon the same chapter, and more especially upon v. 9, which is wrongly rendered both in the authorized version and in the Septuagint, in the latter of which the passage reads: "I will give the wicked for his grave and the rich for his death."¹ The Evangelists, taking this to be the sense of the passage, which they suppose to be a Messianic prophecy, have represented the death of Jesus as being with the wicked, crucified as he is between two robbers; and through Joseph of Arimathea, significantly called "a rich man" (*ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος*) by the first Synop- tist, especially according to the fourth Evangelist by his addition of the counsellor Nicodemus and his hundred pounds weight of mingled myrrh and aloes, as being "with the rich in his death." Unfortunately, the passage in the "prophecy" does not mean what the Evangelists have been led to understand, and the ablest Hebrew scholars and critics are now agreed that both phrases quoted refer, in true Hebrew manner, to one representation, and that the word above translated "rich" is not used in a favourable sense, but that the passage must be rendered: "And they made his grave with the wicked and his sepulchre with the evil-doers," or words to that effect.² Without going minutely into the details of opinion on the subject of the "servant of Jehovah" in this writing of the Old Testament, we may add that upon one point at least the great majority of critics are of one accord: that Is. liii. and other passages of "Isaiah" describing the sufferings of the "Servant of Jehovah" have no reference to the Messiah.³

¹ Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. Is. liii. 9.

² Anger, Vorles. Gesch. d. Moss. Idee, herausg. Krenkel, 1873, p. 65; Beck, Die cyrojesajan. Weissag., 1844, p. 138 ff.; Bunsen, Bibelw., 1860, ii. p. 440 f.; Gott. in d. Gesch., 1857, i. p. 251; Cheyne, The Book of Isaiah chron. arranged, 1870, p. 190; Mallet de Chilly, Les Prophètes, 1862, p. 317; Davidson, Int. O. T., iii. p. 62; Ewald, Die Propheten d. Alt. B. 2te Aufl., iii. p. 92; Gesenius, Der Prophet Jesaja, 2te Aufl., i. 1829, p. 129; iii. 1821, p. 163, 167 f., 184 f.; Hendewerk, Des Prophet. Jesaja Weissag., 1843, ii. p. 132; Hitzig, Der Proph. Jesaja, 1833, p. 572 ff.; Die prophet. Büch. des A. T. übers., 1854, p. 80; Keim, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 527, anm. 1; Knobel, Der Proph. Jesaja, 1861, p. 389 f.; Meijboom, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 150; Reuss, La Bible: Les Prophètes, ii. p. 1875, p. 278; Schegg, Der Proph. Jesajas, i. p. 152 f.; Sam. Sharpe, The Heb. Scriptures, 1866, iii. p. 140; Strauss, Leb. Jesu, p. 597; Volkmar, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 78; Die Evangelien, p. 603 f.; De Wette, Die heil. Schr. des A. u. N. T. 4te Aufl., p. 738; Rowland Williams, The Hebrew Prophets, ii. 1871, p. 440 f. Cf. Birks, Comm. on Book of Isaiah, 1871, p. 271; Rosenmüller, Scholia in V. T. Jesajae, iii. p. 360 ff.; Seucke, Der Ev. d. A. T., 1870, p. 206 f.

³ Anger, Vorles. üb. Gesch. d. Moss. Idee, 1873, p. 64 ff.; Beck, De cap. quinquagesimo tertio Lib. Jesajani, 1840, p. 80 ff.; Die cyrojes. Weissag., p. 23 ff., 128 ff., 139 ff.; Bunsen, Bibelw., ii., 1860, p. 439 f.; cf. Gott in d. Gesch., i. p. 249 ff.; Cheyne, Isaiah chron. arranged, 1870, p. 190 ff.; Colani, Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Moss., 1864, p. 132 f.; Davidson, Int. O. T., iii. p. 62 ff.; Ewald,

As we have touched upon this subject, it may not be out of place to add that Psalms xxii.¹ and lxix.,² which are so frequently quoted in connection with the Passion, and represented by New Testament and other early writers as Messianic, are determined by sounder principles of criticism applied to them in modern times not to refer to the Messiah at all. We have elsewhere spoken of other supposed Messianic Psalms quoted in the New Testament.³

We now come to a remarkable episode which is peculiar to the first Synoptic and strangely ignored by all the other Gospels. It is stated that the next day—that is to say, on the Sabbath—the chief priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate, saying: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive: After three days I am raised (*Metà treís hēmeras éγείρωμαι*). Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come and steal him away and say unto the people: He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them: Ye have a guard (*Έχετε κουστωδιάς*): go, make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, with the guard."⁴ Not only do the other Evangelists pass over this strange proceeding in total silence, but their narratives exclude it, at least those of the second and

Die Propheten des A. B., iii. p. 89 ff.; Gesenius, Der Prophet Jesaja, iii., 1821, p. 160 ff.; Hendewerk, Des Proph. Jesaja Weissag., ii. p. 122 ff.; Hitzig, Der Prophet Jesaja, 1833, p. 564 ff.; Kleinart, Stud. u. Krit., 1862, p. 699 ff.; Knobel, Der Proph. Jesaja, 1861, p. 389 ff.; Kuenen, De Profeten en de Prof. ond. Israel, 1875, i. p. 257 ff., ii. p. 287 ff.; Meijboom, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 153 f.; G. R. Noyes, New Trans. of Hebrew Prophets, 1866, Intr., p. xl. ff.; Reuss, La Bible: Les Prophètes, 1876, ii. p. 279 f.; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Jesaie vaticinia, 1820, iii. p. 323 ff.; Schenkel, Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 982 ff.; Seinecke, Der Evang. d. A. T., p. 21 ff., 206 f.; Stähelin, Die mess. Weissagungen, 1847, p. 101 ff.; Strauss, Leb. Jesu, p. 231 ff., 575 f.; De Wette, Comm. de morte J. C. expiatoria, p. 13 ff., 26 ff.; Einl. A. T., p. 281; Weisse, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 425 ff. Cf. Riehm, Stud. u. Krit., 1865, p. 457 f., 487 ff.; 1869, p. 258 ff.

¹ R. Anger, Vorles. üb. Gesch. Mess. Idee, 1873, p. 73 f.; Bleek, Einl. A. T. 2te Aufl., p. 624 f.; Davidson, Int. O. T., 1862, ii. p. 280 f.; Kamphausen, in Bunsen's Bibelw., 1868, iii. p. 41 f.; Kuenen, De Profeten, ii. p. 242, 248 ff.; Reuss, La Bible: Le Psautier, 1875, p. 117 ff.; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Vet. Test., Psalmi. ii. p. 576 ff.; Ruperti, in Pott's Sylloge Comm. Theol., 1801, ii. p. 280; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 578; De Wette, Die Psalmen, p. 234; Ev. Johannes, p. 306. Cf. Hengstenberg, Die Psalmen, 2te Aufl., ii. p. 7 ff.; Lücke, Ev. Johan., 1843, ii. p. 760 f.

² R. Anger, Vorles. Gesch. Mess. Idee, p. 74; G. Baur, Gesch. A. T. Weissag., p. 416; Bleek, Einl. A. T., p. 625; Davidson, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; Ewald, Die Psalmen, 3te Aufl., 1866, p. 292 f.; Four Friends, The Psalms chron. arranged, p. 227; Hitzig, Die Psalmen, ii. 1 p. 93 ff.; Hupfeld, Die Psalmen, ed. Riehm., 1870, iii. p. 259; Kamphausen, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iii. p. 138; Kuenen, De Profeten, ii. p. 243 ff., 248 ff., 252 ff.; Lücke, Ev. Joh., ii. p. 764; J. Olshausen, Die Psalmen, p. 298; Reuss, La Bible: Le Psautier, p. 240 ff.; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Vet. Test., 1823, iii. p. 1295 f.; Strauss, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 578; Cf. Hengstenberg, Die Psalmen, iii. p. 240 ff.

³ See p. 762 ff., 778 f.

⁴ Mt. xxvii. 62—66.

third Synoptists do so. The women came with their spices to embalm the body, in total ignorance of there being any guard to interfere with their performance of that last sad office for the Master. We are asked to believe that the chief priests and the Pharisees actually desecrated the Sabbath and visited the house of the heathen Pilate on so holy a day, for the purpose of asking for the guard.¹ These priests are said to have remembered and understood a prophecy of Jesus regarding his resurrection, of which his disciples are represented to be in ignorance.² The remark about "the last error," moreover, is very suspicious. The ready acquiescence of Pilate is quite incredible.³ That he should employ Roman soldiers to watch the sepulchre of a man who had been crucified cannot be entertained; and his friendly: "Go, make it as sure as ye can," is not in the spirit of Pilate. It is conceivable that to satisfy their clamour he may, without much difficulty, have consented to crucify a Jew, more especially as his crime was of a political character represented as in some degree affecting the Roman power; but, once crucified, it is not in the slightest degree likely that Pilate would care what became of his body, and still less that he would employ Roman soldiers to mount guard over it. It may be as well to dispose finally of this episode, so we at once proceed to its conclusion. When the resurrection takes place, it is stated that some of the guard went into the city, and, instead of making their report to Pilate, as might have been expected, told the chief priests all that had occurred. A council is held, and the soldiers are largely bribed, and instructed: "Say that his disciples came by night and stole him while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears we will persuade him and make you free from care. So they took the money and did as they were taught."⁴ Nothing could be more simple than the construction of the story, which follows the usual broad lines of legend. The idea of Roman soldiers confessing that they slept whilst on watch, and allowed that to occur which they were there to prevent! and this to oblige the chief priests and elders, at the risk of their lives! Then are we to suppose that the chief priest and council believed this story of the earthquake and angel, and yet acted in this way? and if they did not believe it, would not the very story itself have led to the punishment of the men, and to the confirmation of the report they desired to spread, that the

¹ *Keim*, *Jesu v. Nazara*, iii. p. 524.

² Cf. *John* xx. 9.

³ It has been argued that Pilate does not give a Roman guard, but merely permits the chief priests to make use of their own guard. This, however, is opposed to the whole tenor of the story, and the suggestion is generally rejected. *Tertulian* says: "Tunc Judei detractum et sepulchro conditum magna etiam militaris custodiæ diligentia circumsederunt." *Apol.* § 21.

⁴ *Mt.* xxviii. 11—15.

at of place
tly quoted
ew Testa-
rmined by
lern times
re spoken
ew Testa-

iliar to the
ospels. It
bath—the
te, saying:
s yet alive:
Command,
third day,
the people:
worse than
κονστωδιαν):
e the sepul-
only do the
otal silence,
second and

a, iii., 1821, p.
itzig, *Der Pro-*
99 ff.; *Knobel*,
of. ond. Israel,
153 f.; *G. R.*
uss, *La Bible* :
vaticinia, 1820,
Der Evang. d.
47, p. 101 ff.;
C. expiatoria,
p. 425 ff. Cf.

Einl. A. T. 2te
en, in Bunsen's
euss, *La Bible* :
Psalmi. ii. p.
y; *Strauss*, *Das*
es, p. 306. Cf.
an., 1843, ii. p.

A. T. Weissag.,
02; *Ewald*, *Die*
on. arranged, p.
Riehm., 1870,
t, *De Profeten*,
n, *Die Psalmen*,
ip in *Vet. Test.*,
nberg, *Die Psal-*

disciples had stolen the body? The large bribe seems to have been very ineffectual, however, since the Christian historian is able to report precisely what the chief priests and elders instruct them to say.¹ Is it not palpable that the whole story is legendary? If it be so, and we think it cannot be doubted, a conclusion which the total silence of the other Gospels seems to confirm, very suggestive consequences may be deduced from it. The first Synoptist, referring to the false report which the Sanhedrin instruct the soldiers to make, says: "And this saying was spread among the Jews unto this day."² The probable origin of the legend, therefore, may have been an objection to the Christian affirmation of the resurrection to the above effect; but it is instructive to find that Christian tradition was equal to the occasion, and invented a story to refute it. It is the tendency to this very system of defence and confirmation, everywhere apparent, which renders early Christian tradition so mythical and untrustworthy.

We now enter upon the narrative of the Resurrection itself. The first Synoptist relates that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to behold the sepulchre "at the close of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn into the first day of the week" (*Ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*),³ that is to say, shortly after six o'clock on the evening of Saturday, the end of the Sabbath, the dawn of the next day being marked by the glimmer of more than one star in the heavens.⁴ The second Synoptic represents that, "when the Sabbath was past," Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices, and that they came to the sepulchre "very early on the first day of the week after the rising of the sun" (*καὶ λίαν πρὸς τῆς μῆς σαββάτων . . . ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*).⁵ The third Synoptist states that the women who came with Jesus from Galilee came to the sepulchre, but he subsequently more definitely names them: "Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them,"⁶—a larger number of women,—and they came "upon the first day of the week at early dawn" (*τῇ δὲ μετὰ τῶν σαββάτων*

¹ Olshausen, to obviate the difficulty of supposing that the Sanhedrin did all this, supposes that Caiaphas the high priest may have been the principal agent. *Bibl. Comm.*, ii. 2, p. 190 f.

² *Eichhorn*, *Einl.*, i. p. 490 f.; *Ewald*, *Die drei erst. Evv.*, p. 365; *Gfrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 354 f.; *Kern*, *Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1834, ii. p. 100 f.; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 523 ff., 556 ff.; *Meijboom*, *Jezus' Opstanding*, p. 139 ff.; *Meyer*, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 607 f.; *Renan*, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 445, n. 1; *Scholten*, *Het Ev. n. Joh.*, p. 358 f.; *Strauss*, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 599 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, ii. p. 523; *Weisse*, *Die ev. Gesch.* ii. p. 343 f.; *Wilcke*, *Der Urevangelist*, 1838, p. 640 f. Cf. *De Wette*, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 370 f.

³ Mt. xxviii. 15.

⁴ *Keim*, *Jesu v. Nazara*, iii. 552 f.

⁵ Mk. xvi. 2.

⁶ Mt. xxviii. 1.

⁷ Luke xxiii. 55, xxiv. 1, 10.

have been
n is able to
truct them
endary ?² If
sion which
very sug-
rst Synop-
nstruct the
among the
end, there-
firmation of
tive to find
ad invented
y system of
ich renders
hy.

etion itself.
d the other
ne Sabbath,
"Οὐκ δὲ σαβ-
hortly after
ne Sabbath,
ner of more
represents
e, and Mary
d that they
f the week
άτων . . .
t the women
chre, but he
Magdalene,
ther women
came "upon
ων σαββάτων

hedrin did all
principal agent.

; Gfrörer, Die
Keim, Jesu v.
ff.; Meyer, Ev.
t Ev. n. Joh.,
Gesch. V. Isr.,
gelist, 1836, p.

xxiv. 1, 10.

ἄθρου βαθείας). The fourth Evangelist represents that Mary Magdalene only¹ came to the sepulchre, on the first day of the week, "early, while it was yet dark" (πρὸ σκοτίας ἔτι οὐρανός).²

The first Evangelist indubitably makes the hour at which the women came to the sepulchre different and much earlier than the others, and at the same time he represents them as witnessing the actual removal of the stone, which, in the other three Gospels, the women already find rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre.³ It will, therefore, be interesting to follow the first Synoptic. It is here stated: 2. "And behold there was a great earthquake (σεισμός): for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it. 3. His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. 4. And for fear of him the keepers did shake and became as dead men. 5. And the angel answered and said unto the women: Fear ye not, for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. 6. He is not here: for he was raised (ἡγέρθη γάρ) as he said: Come, see the place where he lay. 7. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he was raised (ἡγέρθη) from the dead, and behold he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him: behold, I have told you. 8. And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and ran to tell his disciples."⁴ We have here in the first place another earthquake and apparently, on the theory of the course of cosmical phenomena held during the "Age of Miracles," produced by the angel who descended to roll away the stone from the sepulchre. This earthquake, like the others recorded in the first Synoptic, appears to be quite unknown to the other Evangelists, and no trace of it has been pointed out in other writings. With the appearance of the angel we obviously arrive upon thoroughly unhistorical ground. Can we believe, because this unknown writer tells us so, that "an angel,"⁵ causing an earthquake, actually descended and

¹ It is argued from the οὐρανός of xx. 2, that there were others with her, although they are not named.

² John xx. 1.

³ Mk. xvi. 4; Luke xxiv. 2; John xx. 1.

⁴ Mt. xxviii. 2. καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμός ἐγένετο μέγας· ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ. 3. ἦν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή, καὶ τὸ ἐνδύμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιὼν. 4. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐδείσθησαν οἱ τηροῦντες, καὶ ἐγενήθησαν ὡς νεκροί. 5. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν ταῖς γυναῖκιν· Μὴ φοβεῖσθε υμεῖς· οἶδα γὰρ, ὅτι ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε. 6. οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἡγέρθη γὰρ, καθὼς εἶπεν· δεῦτε ἴδετε τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο. 7. καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ προάγει υμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. ἰδοὺ εἶπον υμῖν. 8. καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

⁵ Compare his description with Dan. x. 6. It is worthy of consideration also that when Daniel is cast into the den of lions a stone is rolled upon the mouth of the den, and sealed with the signet of the king and his lords, vi. 17.

took such a part in this transaction? Upon the very commonest principles of evidence, the reply must be an emphatic negative. Every fact of science, every lesson of experience excludes such an assumption, and we may add that the character of the author, with which we are now better acquainted, as well as the course of the narrative itself, confirms the justice of such a conclusion.¹ If the introduction of the angel be legendary, must not also his words be so? Proceeding, however, to examine the narrative as it stands, we must point out a circumstance which, it seems to us, may appropriately be mentioned here, and which is well worthy of attention. The women and the guard are present when the stone is rolled away from the sepulchre, but they do not witness the actual Resurrection. It is natural to suppose that, when the stone was removed, Jesus, who, it is asserted, rises with his body from the dead, would have come forth from the sepulchre: but not so; the angel only says, v. 6: "He is not here: for he was raised (*ἡγέρθη γάρ*);" and he merely invites the women to see the place where he lay. The actual resurrection is spoken of as a thing which had taken place before, and in any case it was not witnessed by any one. In the other Gospels, the resurrection has already occurred before any one arrives at the sepulchre; and the remarkable fact is, therefore, absolutely undeniable, that there was not, and that it is not even pretended that there was, a single eye-witness of the actual Resurrection. The empty grave, coupled with the supposed subsequent appearances of Jesus, is the only evidence of the Resurrection. We shall not, however, pursue this further at present. The removal of the stone is not followed by any visible result. The inmate of the sepulchre is not observed to issue from it, and yet he is not there. May we not ask what was the use, in this narrative, of the removal of the stone at all? As no one apparently came forth, the only purpose seems to have been to permit those from without to enter and see that the sepulchre was empty. Another remarkable point is that the angel desires the women to go quickly and inform the disciples: "he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him." One is tempted to inquire why, as he rose from the dead in Jerusalem and, in spite of previous statements, the disciples are represented as being there also,² Jesus did not appear to them in the Holy City, instead of sending them some three days' journey off to Galilee. At the same time, Jesus is represented by the first two Synoptics as saying at the last Supper, when warning the disciples that they will all be offended at him that night and be

¹ Hase, *Das Leb. Jesu*, p. 279; Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 547 f.; Lücke, *Das Ev. Joh.*, ii. p. 780 f.

² Luke xxiv. 33; John xx. 18 ff.

scattered: "But after I shall have been raised, I will go before you into Galilee." At present we have only to call attention to the fact that the angel gives the order. With how much surprise, therefore, do we not immediately after read that, as the women departed quickly to tell the disciples in obedience to the angel's message, v. 9: "Behold Jesus met them, saying, Hail. And they came up to him and laid hold of his feet, and worshipped him. 10. Then saith Jesus unto them: Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there they shall see me." What was the use of the angel's message since Jesus himself immediately after appears and delivers the very same instructions in person? This sudden and apparently unnecessary appearance has all the character of an afterthought. One point, however, is very clear: that the order to go into Galilee and the statement that there first Jesus is to appear to the disciples are unmistakable, repeated and peremptory.

We must now turn to the second Gospel. The women going to the sepulchre with spices that they might anoint the body of Jesus—which, according to the fourth Gospel, had already been fully embalmed and, in any case, had been already since the Friday evening in the sepulchre—are represented as saying amongst themselves: "Who will roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" This is a curious dramatic speculation, but very suspicious. These women are apparently not sufficiently acquainted with Joseph of Arimathea to be aware that, as the fourth Gospel asserts, the body had already been embalmed, and yet they actually contemplate rolling the stone away from the mouth of a sepulchre which was his property.⁴ Keim has pointed out that it was a general rule⁵ that after a sepulchre had been closed in the way described it should not again be opened. Generally, the stone was not placed against the opening of the sepulchre till the third day, when corruption had already commenced; but here the sepulchre is stated by all the Gospels to have been closed on the first day, and the unhesitating intention of the women to remove the stone is not a happy touch on the part of the second Synoptist. They find the stone already rolled away.⁶ Ver. 5: "And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted. 6. And he saith unto them: Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified: he was raised (*ἡγέρθη*); he is not here;

¹ Mt. xxvi. 32; Mk. xiv. 28.

² Mt. xxviii. 9, 10.

⁴ Keim, *Jesu v. Nazara*, iii. p. 522.

⁶ Mk. xvi. 4. The continuation: "for it was very great" (*ὅτι γὰρ μέγας ἐφ' ὅσον*), is peculiar, but of course intended to represent the difficulty of its removal.

³ Mk. xvi. 3.

⁵ *Ib.*, iii. 522, anm. 1.

behold the place where they laid him. 7. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. 8. And they went out and fled from the sepulchre: for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid.¹ In Matthew, the angel rolls away the stone from the sepulchre and sits upon it, and the women only enter to see where Jesus lay, upon his invitation. Here, they go in at once, and see the angel ("a young man") sitting at the right side, and are affrighted. He re-assures them and, as in the other narrative, says: "he was raised." He gives them the same message to his disciples and to Peter, who is specially named, and the second Synoptic thus fully confirms the first in representing Galilee as the place where Jesus is to be seen by them. It is curious that the women should say nothing to anyone about this wonderful event, and in this the statements of the other Gospels are certainly not borne out. There is one remarkable point to be noticed, however, that, according to the second Synoptist also, not only is there no eye-witness of the Resurrection, but the only evidence of that marvellous occurrence which it contains is the information of the "young man," which is clearly no evidence at all. There is no appearance of Jesus to any one narrated, and it would seem as though the appearance described in Matt. xxviii. 9 f. is excluded. It is well known that Mark xvi. 9-20 did not form part of the original Gospel and is inauthentic. It is unnecessary to argue a point so generally admitted. The verses now appended to the Gospel are by a different author and are of no value as evidence. We, therefore, exclude them from consideration.

In Luke, as in the second Synoptic, the women find the stone removed, and here it is distinctly stated that "on entering in they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. 4. And it came to pass as they were perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments; 5. And as they were afraid, and bowed their faces to the earth, they said unto them: Why seek ye the living among the dead? 6. He is not here, but was raised (*ἡγέρθη*); remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, 7. saying, that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified and the third

¹ Mk. xvi. 5: καὶ εἰσελθούσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιotois, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν, καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. 6. ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς· Μὴ ἐκθαμβείσθε· Ἰησοῦς ζητεῖτε τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἡγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἴδε ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν. 7. ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτόν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. 8. καὶ ἐξελθούσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου· εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον· ἐφοβούντο γάρ.

day rise again. 8. And they remembered his words, 9. and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven and to all the rest. . . . 11. And these words appeared to them as an idle tale, and they believed them not.¹ The author of the third Gospel is not content with one angel, like the first two Synoptists, but introduces "two men in shining garments," who seem suddenly to stand beside the women, and instead of re-assuring them, as in the former narratives, rather adopt a tone of reproof (v. 5). They inform the women that "Jesus was raised;" and here again not only has no one been an eye-witness of the resurrection, but the women only hear of it from the angels. There is one striking peculiarity in the above account. There is no mention whatever of Jesus going before his disciples into Galilee to be seen of them, nor indeed of his being seen at all; but "Galilee" is introduced by way of a reminiscence. Instead of the future, the third Synoptist substitutes the past and, as might be expected, he gives no hint of any appearances of Jesus to the disciples beyond the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. When the women tell the disciples what they have seen and heard, they do not believe them. The thief on the cross, according to the writer, was more advanced in his faith and knowledge than the Apostles. Setting aside Mat. xxviii. 9, 10, we have hitherto no other affirmation of the Resurrection than the statement that the sepulchre was found empty, and the angels announced that Jesus was raised from the dead.

The account of the fourth Evangelist, however, differs completely from the narratives of all the Synoptists. According to him Mary Magdalene alone comes to the sepulchre and sees the stone taken away. She therefore runs and comes to Simon Peter and to "the other disciple whom Jesus loved," saying: "They took (ἔραν) the Lord out of the sepulchre and we know not (οὐκ οἶδαμεν)² where they laid (έθηκαν) him. 3. Peter, therefore, went forth and the other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. 4. And the two ran together; and the other disciple outran Peter and came first to the sepulchre; 5. and stooping down, looking in, he seeth the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. 6. Then cometh Simon Peter following him and went into the sepulchre and beholdeth the linen clothes lying, 7. and the napkin that was on his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped in one place by itself. 8. Then went in, therefore, the other disciple also, who came first to the sepulchre and he saw and be-

¹ Luke xxiv. 3—9, 11. It is unnecessary to say that v. 12 is a later interpolation.

² From the use of this plural, as we have already pointed out, it is argued that there were others with Mary who are not named. This by no means follows, but if it were the case the peculiarity of the narrative becomes all the more apparent.

ell his dis-
there shall
ut and fled
eized them,
raid." In
ulchre and
e Jesus lay,
e the angel
righted. He
s: "he was
iples and to
ic thus fully
where Jesus
a should say
in this the
borne out.
that, accord-
eye-witness
t marvellous
the "young
o appearance
s though the
1. It is well
the original
ne a point so
he Gospel are
e. We, there-

nd the stone
n entering in
nd it came to
ro men stood
e afraid, and
; Why seek
ere, but was
when he was
t be delivered
and the third

τον νεανίσκον
ευκλιν, και εξ-
ησθουν ζητετε
σπος ουκ εθη-
αυτου και τω
αυτον οφειθε,
του μνημειου.
ουδεν ειπον

believed. 9. For as yet they knew not the scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead. 10. So the disciples went away to their own homes."¹ Critics have long ago pointed out the careful way in which the actions of "the beloved disciple" and Peter are balanced in this narrative. If the "other disciple" outstrips Peter, and first looks into the sepulchre, Peter first actually enters; and if Peter first sees the careful arrangement of the linen clothes, the other sees and believes. The evident care with which the writer metes out a share to each disciple in this visit to the sepulchre, of which the Synoptics seem totally ignorant, is very suggestive of artistic arrangement, and the careful details regarding the folding and position of the linen clothes, which has furnished so much matter for apologetic reasoning, seems to us to savour more of studied composition than natural observation. So very much is passed over in complete silence which is of the very highest importance, that minute details like these, which might well be composed in the study, do not produce so much effect as some critics think they should do. There is some ambiguity as to what the disciple "believed," according to v. 8, when he went into the sepulchre; and some understand that he simply believed what Mary Magdalene had told them (v. 2), whilst others hold that he believed in the resurrection, which, taken in connection with the following verse, seems undoubtedly to be the author's meaning. If the former were the reading it would be too trifling a point to be so prominently mentioned, and it would not accord with the contented return home of the disciples. Accepting the latter sense, it is instructive to observe the very small amount of evidence with which "the beloved disciple" is content. He simply finds the sepulchre empty and the linen clothes lying and although no one even speaks of the resurrection, no one professes to have been an eye-witness of it, and "as yet they know not the scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead," he is nevertheless said to see and believe.

It will have been observed that as yet, although the two disciples have both entered the sepulchre, there has been no mention whatever of angels: they certainly did *not* see any. In immediate continuation of the narrative, however, we learn that when they have gone home, Mary Magdalene, who was standing without at the tomb weeping, stooped down and, looking into the sepulchre,—where just before the disciples had seen no one, she beheld "two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus lay. 13. They say unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them: Because they took away (*ἔραβ*) my Lord, and I know not where

¹ John xx. 2—10.

they laid him."¹ This again is a very different representation and conversation from that reported in the other Gospels. Do we acquire any additional assurance as to the reality of the angels and the historical truth of their intervention from this narrative? We think not. Mary Magdalene repeats to the angels almost the very words she had said to the disciples, v. 2. Are we to suppose that "the beloved disciple," who saw and believed, did not communicate his conviction to the others, and that Mary was left precisely in the same doubt and perplexity as before, without an idea that anything had happened *except* that the body had been taken away and she knew not where it had been laid? She appears to have seen and spoken to the angels with singular composure. Their sudden appearance does not *even* seem to have surprised her. We must, however, continue the narrative, and it is well to remark the artificial maintenance, at first, of the tone of affected ignorance, as well as the dramatic construction of the whole scene: v. 14. "Having said this, she turned herself back and beholdeth Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. 15. Jesus saith unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing that it was the gardener, saith unto him: Sir, if thou didst bear him hence, tell me where thou didst lay him, and I will take him away. 16. Jesus saith unto her: Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him in Hebrew: ² Rabboni, which is to say, Master. 17. Jesus saith unto her: Touch me not (*Μή μου ἅπρῳς*); for I have not yet ascended to the Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them: I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God. 18. Mary Magdalene cometh announcing to the disciples that she has seen the Lord, and he spake these things unto her."³ To those who attach weight to these narratives and consider them historical, it must appear astonishing that Mary, who up to the very last had been closely associated with Jesus, does not recognise him when he thus appears to her, but supposes him at first to be the gardener. As part of the evidence of the Gospel, however, such a trait is of much importance, and must hereafter be alluded to. After a couple of days not know Jesus whom she had daily seen for so long! The interpretation of the reply of Jesus, v. 17: "Touch me not," &c., has long been a bone of contention with critics, but it does not sufficiently affect the inquiry upon which we are engaged to require discussion here.⁴ Only one point may be mentioned in

¹ John ix. 12, 13.

² This is the reading of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, besides D and many other important MSS.

³ John xx. 14-18.

⁴ Those who desire to see some of the very conflicting opinions expressed may refer to *Axford*, *Gk. Test.*, i. p. 908; *Baur*, *Unters. Kan. Evv.*, p. 221 ff.; *Ewald*,

passing, that if, as has been supposed in connection with Mt. xxviii. 9, Jesus be understood to repel, as premature, the worship of Mary, that very passage of the first Gospel, in which there is certainly no discouragement of worship, refutes the theory. We shall not say more about the construction of this dialogue, but we may point out that, as so many unimportant details are given throughout the narrative, it is somewhat remarkable that the scene terminates so abruptly, and leaves so much untold that it would have been of the utmost consequence for us to know. What became of Jesus, for instance? Did he vanish suddenly? or did he bid Mary farewell, and leave her like one in the flesh? Did she not inquire why he did not join the brethren? whither he was going? It is scarcely possible to tell us less than the writer has done; and as it cannot be denied that such minor points as where the linen clothes lay, or whether Mary "turned herself back" (v. 14) or "turned herself" (v. 16) merely, cannot be compared in interest and importance to the supposed movements and conduct of Jesus under such circumstances, the omission to relate the end of the interview, or more particular details of it, whilst those graphic touches are inserted, is singularly instructive. It is much more important to notice that here again there is no mention of Galilee, nor, indeed, of any intention to show himself to his disciples anywhere, but simply the intimation sent to them: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father," &c., a declaration which seems emphatically to exclude further "appearances," and to limit the vision of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene. Certainly this message implies in the clearest way that the ascension was then to take place, and the only explanation of the abrupt termination of the scene immediately after this is said is, that, as he spoke, Jesus then ascended. The subsequent appearances related in this Gospel must, consequently, either be regarded as an afterthought, or as visions of Jesus after he had ascended. This demands serious attention. We shall see that after sending this message to his disciples he is represented as appearing to them on the evening of the very same day.

According to the third Synoptic, the first appearance of Jesus to any one after the Resurrection was not to the women, and not

Die johann. Schr., i. p. 417; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 435, n. 1; *Gebhardt*, Die Auferstehung Christi, 1864, p. 59 f.; *Gfrörer*, Das Heiligthum, p. 108 f.; *Goltz*, L'Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 646 ff.; *Hengstenberg*, Ev. Johann. iii. p. 302 ff.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 560, anm. 1; *Lange*, Das Ev. Joh., p. 418 f.; *Lücke*, Ev. Joh., ii. p. 783 ff.; *Luthardt*, Das joh. Ev., ii. p. 504 ff.; *Meyer*, Ev. Joh., p. 648 ff.; *Olshausen*, Leidensgesch., p. 207 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Vorles., ap. Strauss, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1863 p. 397; *Steinmeyer*, Auferstehungsgesch. des Herrn, 1871, p. 79, anm.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 606; *De Wette*, Ev. Johann., p. 315 ff.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 394 ff.

to Mary Magdalene, but to two brethren,¹ who were not apostles at all, the name of one of whom, we are told, was Cleopas.² The story of the walk to Emmaus is very dramatic and interesting, but it is clearly legendary.³ None of the other Evangelists seems to know anything of it. It is difficult to suppose that Jesus should after his resurrection appear first of all to two unknown Christians in such a manner, and accompany them in such a journey. The particulars of the story are to the last degree improbable, and in its main features incredible, and it is indeed impossible to consider them carefully without perceiving the transparent inauthenticity of the narrative. The two disciples were going to a village called Emmaus threescore furlongs distant from Jerusalem, and while they are conversing Jesus joins them, "but their eyes were holden that they should not know him." He asks the subject of their discourse, and pretends ignorance, which surprises them. Hearing the expression of their perplexity and depression, he says to them: 25. "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spoke. 26. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things, and enter into his glory? 27. And beginning at Moses and at all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." When they reach the village, he pretends to be going further (v. 28), but they constrain him to stay. 30. "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them he took the bread and blessed and brake and gave to them; 31. and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." Now why all this comedy? why were their eyes holden that they should not know him? why pretend ignorance? why make "as though he would go further?" Considering the nature and number of the alleged appearances of Jesus, this episode seems most disproportionate and inexplicable. The final incident completes our conviction of the unreality of the whole episode: after the sacramental blessing and breaking of bread, Jesus vanishes in a manner which removes the story from the domain of history. On their return to Jerusalem, the Synoptist adds that they find the Eleven, and are informed that "the Lord was raised and was seen by Simon." Of this appearance we are not told anything more.

Whilst the two disciples from Emmaus were relating these things to the eleven, the third Synoptist states that Jesus himself stood in the midst of them: v. 37. "But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they saw a spirit." The appa-

¹ Luke xlv. 13-34.

² *Ib.*, verse 18.

³ *Keim*, *Jean v. Naz.* iii. p. 546; *Schulten*, *Het paulin. Ev.*, p. 344 ff.; *d'Eichthof*, *Les Evangiles*, ii. p. 313 ff.; *Hofmann*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 365 ff.

1 Mt. xxviii.
worship of
here is cer-
y. We shall
but we may
en through-
ne scene ter-
at it would
What be-
? or did he
? Did she
either he was
e writer has
nts as where
erself back"
compared in
and conduct
elate the end
whilst those
e. It is much
no mention of
elf to his dis-
to them: "I
aration which
nces," and to
ne. Certainly
scension was
abrupt termi-
is, that, as he
rances related
d as an after-
ed. This de-
sending this
ng to them on
ance of Jesus
men, and not

1: *Gebhardt*, *Die*
p. 108 ff.; *Gabel*,
p. 202 ff.; *Keim*,
Litcke, *Ev. Joh.*
Joh., p. 648 ff.;
Strauss, *Zeitschr.*
ern, 1871, p. 79,
15 ff.; *Weisse*, *Die*

rent intention is to represent a *miraculous* sudden entry of Jesus into the midst of them, just as he had *vanished* at Emmaus; but, in order to re-assure them, Jesus is represented as saying: v. 39. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and behold, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me having. 41. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them: Have ye here any food? 42. And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish.¹ 43. And he took it and did eat before them." The care with which the writer demonstrates that Jesus rose again with his own body is remarkable, for not only does he show his hands and feet, we may suppose for the purpose of exhibiting the wounds made by the nails by which he was affixed to the cross, but he eats, and thereby proves himself to be still possessed of his human organism. It is apparent, however, that there is direct contradiction between this and the representation of his vanishing at Emmaus, and standing in the midst of them now. The Synoptist who is so lavish in his use of *miraculous agency* naturally sees no incongruity here. One or other alternative must be adopted:—If Jesus possessed his own body after his resurrection and could eat and be handled, he *could not vanish*, if he vanished, he *could not* have been thus corporeal. The aid of a miracle has to be invoked in order to reconcile the representations. We need not here criticise the address which he is supposed to make to the disciples.² But we must call attention to the one point that Jesus (v. 49) commands the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem until they be "clothed with power from on high." This completes the exclusion of all appearances in Galilee, for the narrative proceeds to say, that Jesus led them out towards Bethany and lifted up his hands and blessed them: v. 51 "And it came to pass, while blessing them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven" whilst they returned to Jerusalem, where they "were continually in the temple" praising God. We shall return to the Ascension presently, but, in the meantime, it is well that we should refer to the accounts of the other two Gospels.

According to the fourth Gospel, on the first day of the week, after sending to his disciples the message regarding his Ascension, which we have discussed, when it was evening xx. 19. And the doors having been shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst and saith unto them: Peace be unto you 20 And having said this, he showed unto

¹ We omit *καὶ αὐτὸ μετέσθιον ἔσθιον*, which is not found in the most ancient codices.

² The statement in xxiv. 44, however, is suggestive as showing how the fulfilment of the Prophets and Psalms is in the mind of the writer. We have seen how much this idea influenced the account of the Passion in the Gospels.

them both his hands and his side. The disciples, therefore, rejoiced when they saw the Lord. 21. So then he said to them again: Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, I also send you. 22. And when he said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: 23. Whosoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whosoever ye retain they are retained." This appearance of Jesus to the eleven bears so far analogy to that in the third Gospel, which we have just examined, that it occurs upon the same day and to the same persons. Is it probable that Jesus appeared twice upon the same evening to the eleven disciples? The account in the fourth Gospel itself confirms the only reasonable reply: that he did not do so; but the narrative in the third Synoptic renders the matter certain. That appearance was the first to the eleven (xxiv. 36 f.), and he then conducted them towards Bethany, and ascended into heaven (v. 50 f.) How then, we may inquire, could two accounts of the same event differ so fundamentally? It is absolutely certain that both cannot be true. Is it possible to suppose that the third Synoptist could forget to record the extraordinary power supposed to have been on this occasion bestowed upon the ten Apostles to forgive sins and to retain them? Is it conceivable that he would not relate the circumstance that Jesus breathed upon them, and endowed them with the Holy Ghost? Indeed, as regards the latter point, he seems to exclude it, v. 49, and in the *Acts* (ii.) certainly represents the descent of the Holy Spirit as taking place at Pentecost. On the other hand, can we suppose that the fourth Evangelist would have ignored the walk to Bethany and the solemn parting there? or the injunction to remain in Jerusalem? not to mention other topics. The two episodes cannot be reconciled. In the fourth Gospel, instead of showing his hands and feet, Jesus is represented as exhibiting "his hands and his side," and that this is not accidental is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that Thomas, who is not present, refuses to believe (v. 25) unless he see and put his finger into the print of the nails in his hands and put his hand into his side; and Jesus, when he appears again, allows him (v. 27) to put his fingers into his hands and his hand into his side. In the Synoptic, the wound made by that mythical lance is ignored and, in the fourth Gospel, the wounds in the feet. The omission of the whole episode of the leg-breaking and lance-thrust by the three Synoptics thus gains fresh significance. On the other hand, it may be a question whether, in the opinion of the fourth Evangelist, the feet of Jesus were nailed to the cross at all, or whether, indeed, they were so in fact. It was at least as common, not to say more, that the hands alone of those who were crucified were nailed to the cross,

the legs being simply bound to it by cords. Opinion is divided as to whether Jesus was so bound or whether the feet were likewise nailed, but the point is not important to our examination and need not be discussed, although it has considerable interest in connection with the theory that death did not actually ensue on the cross, but that, having fainted through weakness, Jesus, being taken down after so unusually short a time on the cross, subsequently recovered. There is no final evidence upon the point. None of the explanations offered by apologists remove the contradiction between the statement that Jesus bestowed the Holy Spirit upon this occasion and that of the third Synoptic and Acts. There is, however, a curious point to notice in connection with this: Thomas is said to have been absent upon this occasion, and the representation, therefore, is that the Holy Spirit was only bestowed upon ten of the Apostles. Was Thomas excluded? Was he thus punished for his unbelief? Are we to suppose that an opportunity to bestow the Holy Spirit was selected when one of the Apostles was not present? We have, however, somewhat anticipated the narrative (xx. 24 ff.), which relates that upon the occasion above discussed Thomas, one of the Twelve, was not present, and hearing from the rest that they had seen the Lord, he declares that he will not believe without palpable proof by touching his wounds. The Evangelist continues: v. 26. "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas was with them. Jesus cometh, the doors having been shut (*τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*), and stood in the midst and said: Peace be unto you. 27. Then saith he to Thomas: Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not unbelieving but believing. 28. Thomas answered and said unto him: My Lord and my God. 29. Jesus saith unto him: Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." The third Synoptic gives evidence that the risen Jesus is not incorporeal by stating that he not only permitted himself to be handled, but actually ate food in their presence. The fourth Evangelist attains the same result in a more artistic manner through the doubts of Thomas, but in allowing him actually to put his finger into the prints of the nails in his hands, and his hand into the wound in his side, he asserts that Jesus rose with the same body as that which had hung on the cross. He, too, however, whilst doing this, actually endows him with the attribute of incorporeality; for, upon both of the occasions which we are discussing, the statement is markedly made that, when Jesus came and stood in the midst, the doors were shut where the disciples were. It can

scarcely be doubted that the intention of the writer is to represent a miraculous entry.¹ We are asked, however, to believe that when Thomas had convinced himself that it was indeed Jesus in the flesh who stood before him, he went to the opposite extreme of belief and said to Jesus: (*καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ*) "My Lord and my God!" In representing that Jesus, even before the Ascension, was addressed as "God" by one of the Twelve, the Evangelist commits one of those anachronisms with which we are familiar, in another shape, in the works of great painters, who depict pious bishops of their own time as actors in the scenes of the Passion. These touches, however, betray the hand of the artist, and remove the account from the domain of sober history. In the message sent by Jesus to his disciples he spoke of ascending "to your God and my God," but the Evangelist at the close of his Gospel strikes the same note as that upon which he commenced his philosophical prelude. We shall only add one further remark regarding this episode, and it is the repetition of one already made. It is much to be regretted that the writer does not inform us how these interviews of Jesus with his disciples terminated. We are told of his entry, but not of his mode of departure. Did he vanish suddenly? Did he depart like other men? Then, it would be important to know where Jesus abode during the interval of eight days. Did he ascend to heaven after each appearance? or did he remain on earth? Why did he not consort as before with his disciples? These are not jeering questions, but serious indications of the scantiness of the information given by the Evangelists, which is not compensated by some trifling detail of no value occasionally inserted to heighten the reality of a narrative. This is the last appearance of Jesus related in the fourth Gospel; for the character of ch. xxi. is too doubtful² to permit it to rank with the Gospel. The appearance of Jesus therein related is in fact more palpably legendary than the others. It will be observed that in this Gospel, as in the third Synoptic, the appearances of Jesus are confined to Jerusalem and exclude Galilee. These two Gospels are, therefore, clearly in contradiction with the statement of the first two Synoptics.³

It only remains for us to refer to one more appearance of Jesus: that related in the first Synoptic, xxviii. 16 ff. In obedience to the command of Jesus, the disciples are represented as having gone away into Galilee, "unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." We have not previously heard anything of this

¹ Alford, Gk. Test., i. p. 909; Ebrard, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 587; Godet, L'Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 309 f.; Hengstenberg, Ev. Joh., iii. p. 309 f.; Luthardt, Das Joh. Ev., ii. p. 509; Meyer, Ev. Joh., p. 653 f.; Wordsworth, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 360.

² Cf. S. R., p. 669 ff.

³ Mt. xxviii. 7; Mk. xvi. 7.

specific appointment. The Synoptist continues: v. 17. "And when they saw him they worshipped him, but some doubted. 18. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying: All authority was given to me (*ἐδόθη μοι*) in heaven and on earth. 19. Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; 20, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you all the days, unto the end of the world." This appearance not only is not mentioned in the other Gospels, but it excludes the appearances in Judæa, of which the writer seems to be altogether ignorant. If he knew of them, he practically denies them. There has been some discussion as to what the doubt mentioned in v. 17 refers, some critics maintaining that "some doubted" as to the propriety of worshipping Jesus, whilst others more correctly consider that they doubted as to his identity,¹ but we need not mention the curious apologetic explanations offered.² Are we to regard the mention of these doubts as an "inestimable proof of the candour of the Evangelists?" If so, then we may find fault with the omission to tell us whether, and how, those doubts were set at rest. As the narrative stands the doubts were not resolved. Was it possible to doubt without good reason of the identity of one with whom, until a few days previously, the disciples had been in daily and hourly contact at least for a year, if not longer? Doubt in such a case is infinitely more decisive than belief. We can regard the expression, however, in no other light than as a mere rhetorical device in a legendary narrative. The rest of the account need have little further discussion here. The extraordinary statement in v. 18³ seems as clearly the expression of later theology as the baptismal formula in v. 19, where the doctrine of the Trinity is so definitely expressed. Some critics suppose that the Eleven were not alone upon this occasion, but that either all the disciples of Jesus were present, or at least the 500 brethren⁴ to whom Paul refers, 1 Cor. xv. 6. This mainly rests on the state-

¹ *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 305; *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 445, n. 1; *Meyer*, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 616; *Schollen*, *Het Ev. n. Joh.*, p. 353.

² Dr. *Farrar* makes the following remarks on this point: "The *οἱ δὲ ἐδιδόσαντες* of Matt. xxviii. 17, can only mean 'but some doubted,'—not as *Wetstein* and others take it, whether they should worship or not, but respecting the whole scene. All may not have stood near to Him, and even if they did, we have seen in four previous instances (Mt. xxviii. 17, Luke xxiv. 16, 37; John xxi. 4), that there was something unusual and not instantly recognizable in His resurrection body. At any rate, here we have another inestimable proof of the candour of the Evangelists, for there is nothing to be said in favour of the conjectural emendation *οὐδὲ*." *Life of Christ*, ii. 445, note 1.

³ This is supposed to be a reference to Daniel vii. 14.

⁴ Dr. *Farrar*, without explanation or argument, boldly asserts the presence of the 500. *Life of Christ*, ii. 445.

17. "And
e doubted.
authority
19. Go ye
n into the
Spirit; 20.
ommanded
end of the
n the other
which the
of them, he
ssion as to
s maintain-
worshipping
doubted as
s apologetic
ion of these
he Evangel-
ission to tell
est. As the
Was it pos-
of one with
had been in
nger? Doubt
ef. We can
an as a mere
st of the ac-
extraordinary
of later the-
octrine of the
pose that the
either all the
brethren¹ to
on the state-

ment that "some doubted," for it is argued that, after the two previous appearances to the disciples in Jerusalem mentioned by the other Evangelists, it is impossible that the Eleven could have felt doubt, and consequently that others must have been present who had not previously been convinced. It is scarcely necessary to point out the utter weakness of such an argument. It is not permissible, however, to patch on to this Gospel scraps cut out of the others. It must be clear to every unprejudiced student that the appearances of Jesus narrated by the four Gospels in Galilee and Judea cannot be harmonized,¹ and we have shown that they exclude each other.² The first Synoptist records (v. 10) the order for the disciples to go into Galilee, and with no further interruption than the mention of the return of the discomfited guard from the sepulchre to the chief priest, he (v. 16) states that they went into Galilee, where they saw Jesus in the manner just described. No amount of ingenuity can insert the appearances in Jerusalem here without the grossest violation of all common sense. This is the only appearance to the Eleven recorded in Matthew. We must here again point out the singular omission to relate the manner in which this interview was ended. The episode and the Gospel, indeed, are brought to a very artistic close by the expression, "lo, I am with you all the days unto the end of the world," but we must insist that it is a very suggestive fact that it does not occur to these writers to state what became of Jesus. Surely no point could have been more full of interest than the manner in which Jesus here finally leaves the disciples, and is dismissed from the history. That such an important part of the narrative is omitted is in the highest degree remarkable and significant. Had a formal termination to the interview been recounted, it would have been subject to criticism, and by no means any evidence of truth; but it seems to us that the circumstance that it never occurred to these writers to relate the departure of Jesus is a very strong indication of the unreality and shadowy nature of the whole tradition.

5, n. 1; Meyer,
ne oi δὲ ἐρί-
not as Wetstein
ecting the whole
id, we have seen
ohn xxi. 4), that
his resurrection
ne candour of the
jectural emenda-

¹ Alford, *Gk. Test.*, i. p. 432, 904 f.; Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 432, n. 1; Holtzmann, *Die synopt. Evv.*, p. 500 ff.; Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 533 ff.; Krüger-Velthusen, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 262 f.; Meijboom, *Jezus' Opstand*, p. 37 ff.; Meyer, *Ev. Matth.*, p. 612 ff.; *Ev. Joh.*, p. 643, ann.; Olshausen, *Leidensgesch.*, p. 200 ff.; Schenkel, *Bib. Lex.*, i. p. 292 f.; Steinmeyer, *Auferstehungsgesch. d. Herrn*, p. 59 ff.; Strauss, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 202; Westcott, *Int. to Study of the Gospels*, 4th ed., p. 329 ff.

² Dean Alford, whilst admitting that it is fruitless to attempt a harmony of the different accounts, curiously adds: ". . . Hence the great diversity in this portion of the narrative:—and hence I believe much that is now dark might be explained, were the facts themselves, in their order of occurrence, before us. Till that is the case (and I am willing to believe that it will be one of our delightful employments hereafter, to trace the true harmony of the Holy Gospels, under His teaching of whom they are the record), we must be content to walk by faith, and not by sight." *Gk. Test.*, on John xx. 1—29, i. p. 905.

a the presence of

We are thus brought to consider the account of the Ascension, which is at least given by one Evangelist. In the appendix to the second Gospel, as if the later writer felt the omission and desired to complete the narrative, it is vaguely stated: xvi. 19. "So then after the Lord spake unto them he was taken up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God."¹ The writer, however, omits to state how he was taken up into heaven; and sitting "at the right hand of God" is an act and position which those who assert the "Personality of God" may possibly understand, but which we venture to think betrays that the account is a mere theological figment. The third Synoptist, however, as we have incidentally shown, gives an account of the Ascension. Jesus having, according to the narrative in xxiv. 50 ff., led the disciples out to Bethany, lifted up his hands and blessed them: v. 51. "And it came to pass while blessing them he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven."² The whole of the appearances narrated in the third Synoptic, therefore, and the Ascension are thus said to occur on the same day as the Resurrection.³ In Matthew there is a different representation made, for the time consumed in the journey of the disciples to Galilee obviously throws back the Ascension to a later date. In Mark, there is no appearance at all recorded, but the command to the disciples to go into Galilee confirms the first Synoptic. In the fourth Gospel, Jesus revisits the eleven a second time after eight days; and, therefore, the Ascension is here necessarily later still. In neither of these Gospels, however, is there any account of an Ascension at all. We may here point out that there is no mention of the Ascension in any of the genuine writings of Paul, and it would appear that the theory of a bodily ascension, in any shape, did not form part of the oldest Christian tradition.⁴ The growth of the legend of the Ascension is apparent in the circumstance that the Author of the third Gospel follows a second tradition regarding that event when composing

¹ Cf. Ps. cx. 1.

² The last phrase: "and was carried up into heaven," καὶ ἀνέβητο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, is suggested by *Oriensbach*, and omitted by *Tischendorf*, and pronounced inauthentic by some critics. The words are not found in the Sinaitic Codex and D, but are in the great majority of the oldest MSS., including the Alexandrian, and Vatican, C, F, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, &c., &c. The preponderance of authority is greatly in their favour. Compare also Acts i. 2.

³ *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 93; *Afrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 373; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 539; *Meyer*, *Ev. Mark u. Luk.* 5te Aufl., p. 609, ann., p. 611 ff.; *Révillat*, *La Résurrection de Jésus-Christ*, 1869, p. 9 f.; *Scholten*, *Het Ev. n. Joh.*, p. 357 f.; *Strauss*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 292, 614; *Falkmar*, *Die Rel. Jesu*, p. 95; *Weisse*, *Die Ev. Gesch.*, ii. p. 415. Cf. *de Wette*, *Ev. Luc. u. Marc.*, p. 167.

⁴ *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 97 ff.; *Afrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 373 ff.; *Hase*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 281 f.; *Keim*, *Der geschichtl. Christus*, 1866, p. 131; *Meyer*, *Ev. Mark. u. Luk.*, p. 614; *Scholten*, *Het Ev. Joh.*, p. 361 f.

the Ascension, appendix to sion and ded: xvi. 19. was taken God."¹ The into heaven; and position may possibly ys that the l Synoptist, ecount of the ive in xxiv. s hands and essing them ven."² The optie, there- same day as e presentation e disciples to ter date. In he command Synoptic. In d time after e necessarily is there any int out that genuine writ- y of a bodily est Christian sion is appa- third Gospel en composing

ἀνεφέρετο ἐς
endorf, and pro-
l in the Sinaitic
y, including the
The preponder-
i. 2.
i. p. 373; Keim,
09, ann., p. 611
p. 101, Het Ev. n.
Rel. Jeau, p. 95;
are., p. 167.
e, i. p. 373 ff.;
s, p. 131; Meyer,

Acts.¹ Whether he thought a fuller and more detailed account desirable, or it seemed necessary to prolong the period during which Jesus remained on earth after his Resurrection, and to multiply his appearances, it is impossible to say, but the fact is that he does so. He states in his second work: that to the Apostles Jesus "presented himself alive after he suffered by many proofs, appearing (*ὁπτανόμενος*) to them during forty days, and speaking of the things concerning the Kingdom of God." It is scarcely possible to doubt that the period of forty days is suggested by the Old Testament² and the Hebrew use of that number, of which indeed we already find examples in the New Testament in the forty days' temptation of Jesus in the wilderness,³ and his fasting forty days and forty nights.⁴ Why Jesus remained on earth this typical period we are not told,⁵ but the representation evidently is of much more prolonged and continuous intercourse with his disciples than any statements in the Gospels have led us to suppose, or than the declaration of Paul renders in the least degree probable. If indeed the account in Acts were true, the numbered appearances recited by Paul show singular ignorance of the phenomena of the Resurrection. We need not discuss the particulars of the last interview with the Apostles, (i. 4 ff.) although they are singular enough, and are indeed elsewhere referred to, but at once proceed to the final occurrences: v. 9. "And when he had spoken these things, while they are looking he was lifted up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. 10. And as they were gazing steadfastly into the heaven as he went, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; 11. which also said: Men of Galilee (*ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*), why stand ye looking into the heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into the heaven, shall come in like manner as ye saw him going into the heaven. 12. Then returned they into Jerusalem," &c. A definite statement is here made of the mode in which Jesus finally ascended into heaven, and it presents some of the incongruities which might have been expected. The bodily Ascension up the sky in a cloud, apart from the miraculous nature of such an occurrence, seems singularly to localize "Heaven," and to present views of cosmical and celestial phenomena, suitable certainly to the age of the writer, but scarcely endorsed by modern science. The sudden appearance of the

¹ Keim, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 539, 613, ann. 3; Meyer, Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 612 ff.; Strauss, Leb. Jesu, p. 615.

² Keim, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 539 f.; Overbeck, Zu de Wette App., p. 8 f. Schneckenburger, App., p. 12 f.; Strauss, Leb. Jesu Krit. bearb. 4te Aufl., ii. p. 659; cf. i. p. 450.

³ Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2.

⁴ Mt. iv. 2.

⁵ The testimony of the Epistle of Barnabas (c. xv.) does not agree with this.



1.8
2.0
2.2
2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.6
6.3
7.1
8.0
9.0
10.0
11.2
12.5
14.0
16.0
18.0
20.0
22.4
25.0
28.0
31.5
36.0
40.0
45.0
50.0
56.0
63.0
71.0
80.0
90.0
100.0

10

"two men in white apparel," the usual description of angels, is altogether in the style of the Author of Acts, but does it increase the credibility of the story? It is curious that the angels open their address to the Apostles in the same form as almost every other speaker in this book. They adopt a style of thought and expression very suspiciously like that of the Author. One might ask, indeed, why such an angelic interposition should have taken place? for its utility is not apparent, and in the short sentence recorded nothing which is new is embodied. No surprise is expressed at the appearance of the angels, and nothing is said of their disappearance. They are introduced like the chorus of a Greek play, and are left unceremoniously, with an indifference which betrays complete familiarity with supernatural agency. Can there be any doubt that the whole episode is legendary?¹

It may not seem inappropriate to mention here that the idea of a bodily ascension does not originate with the Author of the third Synoptic and Acts, nor is it peculiar to Christianity. The translation of Enoch² had long been chronicled in the sacred books; and the ascent of Elijah³ in his whirlwind and chariot of fire before the eyes of Elisha was another well-known instance. The vision of Daniel (vii. 13), of one like the "Son of man" coming with the clouds of heaven, might well have suggested the manner of his departure, but another mode has been suggested.⁴ The Author of Acts was, we maintain, well acquainted with the works of Josephus. We know that the prophet like unto Moses was a favourite representation in Acts of the Christ. Now in the account which Josephus gives of the end of Moses, he states that, although he wrote in the holy books that he died lest they should say that he went to God, this was not really his end. After reaching the mountain Abarim he dismissed the senate; and as he was about to embrace Eleazar, the high priest, and Joshua, "a cloud suddenly having stood over him he disappeared in a certain valley."⁵ This, however, we merely mention in passing.

Our earlier examination of the evidence for the origin and authorship of the historical books of the New Testament very

¹ Keim, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 539 f.; Meyer, *Ev. Mark. u. Luk.*, p. 614; App. p. 32 f.; Overbeck, *Zu de Wette App.*, 7 ff.; Strauss, *Leh. Jesu Kr. bearb.*, ii. p. 658 ff.; Zeller, *App.*, p. 76 ff.

² Gen. v. 24; Ecclesiasticus xlv. 16, xlix. 14; Heb. xi. 5.

³ 2 Kings ii. 11; Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 9, 11.

⁴ Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 618.

⁵ *νέφους ἀπνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν σάντος ἀφανίζε. τι κατὰ τινος φάραγγος.* Antiq. Jud. iv. 8, § 48.

clear
cles
migh
hav
ally
can
been
rati
who
mira
place
has
ances
inser
impr
write
the n
recti
gene
Luke
impos
them
comp
of the
moni
the s
which
be ob
that
ments
we ha
sistem
is it p
extra
to con
and b
tigati
are of
mutu
of the
differ

¹ Keim
² Enoch
³ Elijah
differen
dwells

clearly demonstrated that the testimony of these works for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation, whatever that testimony might seem to be, could not be considered of any real value. We have now examined the accounts which the four Evangelists actually give of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and there can be no hesitation in stating as the result that, as might have been expected from works of such uncertain character, these narratives must be pronounced mere legends, embodying vague and wholly unattested tradition. As evidence for such stupendous miracles, they are absolutely of no value. No reliance can be placed on a single detail of their story. The aim of the writers has obviously been to make their narrative of the various appearances of Jesus as convincing as possible,¹ and they have freely inserted any details which seemed to them calculated to give them impressiveness, force, and verisimilitude. A recent apologetic writer has said: "Any one who will attentively read side by side the narratives of these appearances on the first day of the resurrection, will see that they have only been preserved for us in general, interblended and scattered notices (see Matt. xxviii. 16; Luke xxiv. 34; Acts i. 3), which, in strict exactness render it impossible, without many arbitrary suppositions, to produce from them a *certain* narrative of the order of events. The *lacunæ*, the compressions, the variations, the actual differences, *the subjectivity of the narrators as affected by spiritual revelations*, render all harmonies at the best uncertain."² Passing over without comment, the strange phrase in this passage which we have italicised, and which seems to claim divine inspiration for the writers, it must be obvious to any one who has carefully read the preceding pages that this is an exceedingly moderate description of the wild statements and irreconcilable contradictions of the different narratives we have examined. But such as it is, with all the glaring inconsistencies and impossibilities of the accounts even thus subdued, is it possible for any one who has formed even a faint idea of the extraordinary nature of the allegations which have to be attested, to consider such documents really evidence for the Resurrection and bodily Ascension? The usual pleas which are advanced in mitigation of judgment against the Gospels for these characteristics are of no avail. It may be easy to excuse the writers for their mutual contradictions, but the pleas themselves are an admission of the shortcomings which render their evidence valueless. "The differences of purpose in the narrative of the four Evangelists,"³

¹ *Keim, Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. 542.

² *Farrar, Life of Christ*, ii. 432, n. 1.

³ "Professor Westcott, with his usual profundity and insight, points out the differences of purpose in the narrative of the four Evangelists. St. Matthew dwells chiefly on the majesty and glory of the Resurrection; St. Mark, both in

may be fancifully set forth, or ingeniously imagined, but no "purpose" can transform discordant and untrustworthy narratives into evidence for miracles. Unless the prologue to the third Gospel be considered a condemnation of any of the other Synoptics which may have existed before it, none of the Evangelists makes the smallest reference to any of his brethren or their works. Each Gospel tacitly professes to be a perfectly independent work, giving the history of Jesus, or at least of the active part of his life, and of his death and Resurrection. The apologetic theory, derived from the Fathers, that the Evangelists designed to complete and supplement each other, is totally untenable. Each work was evidently intended to be complete in itself; but when we consider that much the greater part of the contents of each of the Synoptics is common to the three, frequently with almost literal agreement, and generally without sufficient alteration to conceal community of source or use of each other, the poverty of Christian tradition becomes painfully evident. We have already pointed out the fundamental difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. In no part of the history does greater contradiction and disagreement between the three Synoptics themselves, and likewise between them and the fourth Gospel exist, than in the account of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. It is impossible to examine the four narratives carefully without feeling that here tradition, for natural reasons, has been more than usually wavering and insecure. Each writer differs essentially from the rest, and the various narratives not only disagree but exclude each other. The third Synoptist, in the course of some years, even contradicts himself. The phenomena which are related, in fact, were too subjective and unsubstantial for sober and consistent narrative, and free play was allowed for pious imagination to frame details by the aid of supposed Messianic utterances of the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel. Such a miracle as the Resurrection, startling as it is in our estimation, was

the original part and in the addition (Mark xvi. 9-20) insists upon it as a fact; St. Luke, as a *spiritual necessity*; St. John, as a touchstone of character. (*Introd.* 310-315.) *Farrar, Ib.*, ii. 432, n. 1. Dr. Westcott says: "The various narratives of the Resurrection place the fragmentariness of the Gospel in the clearest light. They contain difficulties which it is impossible to explain with certainty, but there is no less an intelligible fitness and purpose in the details peculiar to each account. . . . It is necessary to repeat these obvious remarks, because the records of the Resurrection have given occasion to some of the worst examples of that kind of criticism from which the other parts of the Gospels have suffered, though not in an equal degree. It is tacitly assumed that we are in possession of all the circumstances of the event, and thus, on the one hand differences are urged as fatal, and on the other elaborate attempts are made to show that the details given can be forced into the semblance of a complete and connected narrative. The true critic will pause before he admits either extreme." *Int. to the Study of the Gospels*, 4th ed., p. 329, 331.

co
no
lif
ing
the
the
it
da
dea
La
ari
ho
ser
Jes
tha
he
him
add
is a
thin
the
bec
and
old
who
him
the
the
vari
wri
thes
ings
case
form
surr
11
3 L
5 K
a' rō
yocō
6 α
τη5,
7. 7
διηπε
ρων,
τις τ
κερα
εζητε

common-place enough in the view of these writers. We need not go back to discuss the story of the widow's son restored to life by Elijah,¹ nor that of the dead man who revived on touching the bones of Elisha.² The raising from the dead of the son of the widow of Nain³ did not apparently produce much effect at the time, and only one of the Evangelists seems to have thought it worth while to preserve the narrative. The case of Jairus' daughter,⁴ whatever it was, is regarded as a resurrection of the dead and is related by two of the Synoptists; but the raising of Lazarus is only recorded by the fourth Evangelist. The familiarity of the age with the idea of the resurrection of the dead, however, according to the Synoptists, is illustrated by the representation which they give of the effect produced by the fame of Jesus upon Herod and others. We are told by the first Synoptist that Herod said unto his servants: "This is John the Baptist; he was raised from the dead; and therefore the powers work in him."⁵ The second Synoptist repeats the same statement, but adds: "But others said that it is Elijah; and others said that it is a prophet like one of the prophets."⁶ The statement of the third Synoptist is somewhat different. He says: "Now Herod the tetrarch heard all that was occurring: and he was perplexed because it was said by some that John was raised from the dead, and by some that Elijah appeared, and by others that one of the old prophets rose up. And Herod said: John I beheaded, but who is this of whom I hear such things, and he sought to see him."⁷ The three Synoptists substantially report the same thing; the close verbal agreement of the first two being an example of the community of matter of which we have just spoken. The variations are instructive as showing the process by which each writer made the original form his own. Are we to assume that these things were really said? Or must we conclude that the sayings are simply the creation of later tradition? In the latter case, we see how unreal and legendary are the Gospels. In the former case, we learn how common was the belief in a bodily resurrection. How could it seem so strange to the Apostles that

¹ 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.

² 2 Kings xiii. 21.

³ Luke vii. 11 ff.

⁴ Mk. v. 35 ff.; Luke viii. 49 ff.

⁵ καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ, Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· αὐτός ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ. Mk. xiv. 2; cf. Mk. vi. 1.

⁶ ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης, ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. Mk. vi. 15.

⁷ Ἦκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα, καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, 8. ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐφάνη, ἄλλα· δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέσθῃ. 9. εἶπεν δὲ Ἡρώδης· Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα· τίς δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἔσθῃ ἰδεῖν αὐτόν. Luke ix. 7-9.

Jesus should rise again, when the idea that John the Baptist or one of the old prophets had risen from the dead was so readily accepted by Herod and others? How could they so totally misunderstand all that the chief priests, according to the first Synoptic, so well understood of the teaching of Jesus on the subject of his resurrection, since the world had already become so familiar with the idea and the fact? Then that episode of the Transfiguration must have occurred to every one, when Jesus took with him Peter and James and John into a high mountain apart, "and he was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment became white as the light. And behold, there was seen (*ὁφθῆν*) by them Moses and Elijah talking with him;" and then "a bright cloud overshadowed them" and "a voice came out of the cloud: This is my beloved son," &c. "And when the disciples heard they fell on their face and were sore afraid."¹ The third Synoptist even knows the subject of their conversation: "They were speaking of his decease which he was about to fulfil in Jerusalem."² This is related by all as an objective occurrence.³ Are we to accept it as such? Then how is it possible that the disciples could be so obtuse and incredulous as they subsequently showed themselves to be regarding the person of Jesus, and his resurrection? How could the announcement to the women by the angels of that event seem to them as an idle tale, which they did not believe?⁴ Here were Moses and Elijah before them, and in Jesus, we are told, they recognised one greater than Moses and Elijah. The miracle of the Resurrection was here again anticipated and made palpable to them. Are we to regard the Transfiguration as a subjective vision? Then why not equally so the appearances of Jesus after his passion? We can regard the Transfiguration, however, as nothing more than an allegory without either objective or subjective reality. Into this at present we cannot further go. It is sufficient to repeat that our examination has shown the Gospels to possess no value as evidence for the Resurrection and Ascension. The account of these events cannot be regarded as history.

¹ Mt. xvii. 1 ff.; cf. Mk. ix. 2 ff.; Luke ix. 28 ff. Nothing could be more instructive than a careful comparison of the three narratives of this occurrence and of the curious divergences and amplifications of a common original introduced by successive editors.

² Luke ix. 31.

³ We need not here speak of the use of the verb *ὁράω*.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 11.

W
occ
ver
lie;
is a
tha
ing
bee
5.
tha
of
fall
the
one
cun
we
tes
pris
tha
we
cun
T
had
does
que
For
trin
tinu
1 S
2 L
ὄτι
4. κα
γρα
ἐπὶ
ἔως
τοῖς
ματι

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL.

WE may now proceed to examine the evidence of Paul. "On one occasion," it is affirmed in a passage already quoted, "he gives a very circumstantial account of the testimony upon which the belief in the Resurrection rested (1 Cor. xv. 4—8)."¹ This account is as follows: 1 Cor. xv. 3. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, 4. and that he was buried, and that he has been raised (*ἐγήγερται*) the third day according to the Scriptures, 5. and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve. 6. After that, he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once, (*ἐφάπαξ*), of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. 7. After that, he was seen by James; then by all the Apostles. 8. And last of all he was seen by me also as the one born out of due time."² Can this be considered a "very circumstantial account"? It may be exceedingly unreasonable, but we must at once acknowledge that we are not satisfied. The testimony upon which the belief in the Resurrection rests comprised in a dozen lines! for we may so far anticipate as to say that this can scarcely be regarded as a *resumé* of evidence which we can find elsewhere. We shall presently point out a few circumstances which it might be useful to know.

The Apostle states in this passage that the doctrines which he had delivered to the Corinthians he had himself "received." He does not pretend to teach them from his own knowledge, and the question naturally arises: From whom did he "receive" them? Formerly, divines generally taught that Paul received these doctrines by revelation, and up to recent times apologists have continued to hold this view, even when admitting the subsidiary use

¹ *Sanday, The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 12.

² 1 Cor. xv. 3. *παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, 4. καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, 5. καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, εἰτα τοῖς δώδεκα. 6. ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπὶ πάντων πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν. 7. ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, ἔπειτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάνσιν. 8. ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡς περὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη καί μοι.*

of tradition.¹ If this claim were seriously made, the statements of the Apostle, so far as our inquiry is concerned, would certainly not gain in value, for it is obvious that Revelation could not be admitted to prove Revelation. It is quite true that Paul himself professed to have received his Gospel not from men, but from God by direct revelation, and we shall hereafter have to consider this point and the inferences to be drawn from such pretensions. At present the argument need not be complicated by any such supposition, for certainly Paul does not here advance any such claim himself, and apologetic and other critics agree in declaring the source of his statements to be natural historical tradition.² The points which he delivered and which he had also received are three in number: (1) that Christ died for our sins; (2) that he was buried; and (3) that he has been raised the third day. In strictness the *καὶ ὅτι* might oblige us to include, "and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve," after which the construction of the sentence is changed. It is not necessary to press this, however, and it is better for the present to separate the dogmatic statements from those which are more properly evidential. It will be observed that, although the death, burial, and resurrection are here taught as "received," evidence only of one point is offered: that Jesus "was seen by" certain persons. We have already pointed out that the Gospels do not pretend that any one was an eye-witness of the Resurrection itself, and it is important to notice that Paul, the earliest and most reliable witness produced, entirely passes over the event itself, and relies solely on the fact that Jesus was supposed to have been seen by certain persons to prove that he died, was buried, and had actually risen the third day. The only inference which we here wish to draw from this is, that the alleged appearances are thus obviously separated from the death and burial by a distinct gulf. A dead body, it is stated, or one believed to be dead, is laid in a sepulchre: after a certain time, it is alleged that the dead person has been seen alive. Supposing the first statement to be correct, the second, being in itself, according to all our experience, utterly incredible, leaves further a serious gap in the continuity of evidence. What occurred in the interval between the burial and the supposed apparition? If it be asserted—as in the Gospels it is—that, before the apparition, the sepulchre was found empty and

¹ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 302; *Bisping*, Erkl. 1 Br. an die Kor. 2te Aufl., p. 264; *Maier*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 1857, p. 336; *Neander*, Br. an die Kor., 1859, p. 239; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iii. 2te Aufl., p. 733 f.; *Osiander*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 1847, p. 676 f.; *Rückert*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 1836, p. 389.

² *Ewald*, Sendschr. d. Ap. Paulus, p. 207 f.; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., ii. 2, p. 348; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 546; *Meyer*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 5te Aufl., p. 414; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, iv. p. 201. Cf. *Rückert*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 389.

the body gone, not only may it be replied that this very circumstance may have assisted in producing a subjective vision, but that, in so far as the disappearance of the body is connected with the appearance of the person apparently alive, the fact has no evidential value. The person supposed to be dead, for instance, may actually not have been so, but have revived; for, although we have no intention ourselves of adopting this explanation of the Resurrection, it is, as an alternative, certainly preferable to belief in the miracle. Or, in the interval, the body may have been removed from a temporary to a permanent resting place unknown to those who are surprised to find the body gone;—and in the Gospels the conflicting accounts of the embalming and hasty burial, as we have seen, would fully permit of such an argument if we relied at all on those narratives. Many other means of accounting for the absence of the body might be advanced, any one of which, in the actual default of testimony to the contrary, would be irrefutable. The mere surprise of finding a grave empty which was supposed to contain a body betrays a blank in the knowledge of the persons, which can only be naturally filled up. This gap, at least, would not have existed had the supposed resurrection occurred in the presence of those by whom it is asserted Jesus "was seen." As it is, no evidence whatever is offered that Jesus really died; no evidence that the sepulchre was even found empty; no evidence that the dead body actually arose and became alive again; but skipping over the intermediate steps, the only evidence produced is the statement that, being supposed to be dead, he is said to have been seen by certain persons.¹

There is a peculiarity in the statement to which we must now refer. The words, "according to the Scriptures" (*κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*) are twice introduced into the brief recapitulation of the teaching which Paul had received and delivered: (1) "That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and (3) "that he has been raised the third day according to the Scriptures." It is evident that mere historical tradition has only to do with the fact "that Christ died," and that the object: "for our sins," is a dogmatic addition. The Scriptures certainly supply the dogma. In the second point, the appeal to Scripture is curious, and so far important as indicating that the resurrection on the third day was supposed to be a fulfilment of prophecy; and we have thus an indication, regarding which we must hereafter speak, of the manner in which the belief probably originated. The double re-

¹ The curious account in Matthew xxviii. 1 ff., of the earthquake and rolling away of the stone by an angel in the presence of the women, who nevertheless saw no resurrection, will not be forgotten.

ference to the Scriptures is peculiarly marked, and we have already more than once had occasion to point out that the narratives of the Gospels betray the very strong and constant influence of parts of the Old Testament supposed to relate to the Messiah. It cannot, we think, be doubted by any independent critic, that the details of these narratives were to a large extent traced from those prophecies. It is in the highest degree natural to suppose that the early Christians, once accepting the idea of a suffering Messiah, should, in the absence of positive or minute knowledge, assume that prophecies which they believed to have reference to him should actually have been fulfilled, and that in fact the occurrences corresponded minutely with the prophecies. Too little is known of what really took place, and it is probable that Christian tradition generally was moulded from foregone conclusions. Now, what were the "Scriptures," according to which "Christ died for our sins," and "has been raised the third day?" The passages which are generally referred to, and which Paul most probably had in view, are well known: as regards the death for our sins,—Isaiah liii., Ps. xxii. and lxix., and for the resurrection,—Ps. xvi. 10, and Hosea vi. 2. Now we have already pointed out that historical criticism has shown that the first four passages just indicated are not Messianic prophecies at all,¹ and we may repeat that the idea of a suffering Messiah was wholly foreign to the Jewish prophets and people. The Messiah "crucified," as Paul himself bears witness, was "to Jews a stumbling block,"² and modern criticism has clearly established that the parts of Scripture by which the early Christians endeavoured to show that such a Messiah had been foretold can only be applied by a perversion of the original signification. In the case of the passages supposed to foretell the Resurrection, the misapplication is particularly flagrant. We have already discussed the use of Ps. xvi. 10, which in Acts³ is put into the mouth of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and shown that the proof passage rests upon a mistranslation of the original in the Septuagint.⁴ Any reader who will refer to Hosea vi. 2 will see that the passage in no way applies to the Messiah,⁵ although undoubtedly it has influenced the formation of the doctrine of the Resurrection. The "sign of the prophet Jonah," which in Mt. xii. 40 is put into the mouth of Jesus is another passage used with equal incorrectness, and a glimpse of the manner in which Christian tradition took shape,

¹ See references p. 999, notes 1, 2, p. 1000, notes 1, 2, and p. 778 f., and p. 763, note 1.

² 1 Cor. i. 23.

³ ii. 25 ff., xiii. 35 ff.

⁴ p. 82.

⁵ Kuenen, *De Profeten en de Profetie onder Israël*, 1875, ii. 293. Compare, generally, the excellent chapters on the N. T. and Old Test. prophecy, pp. 199–318.

and the Gospels were composed, may be obtained by comparing with the passage in the first Synoptic the parallel in the third (xi. 29—31).¹ We shall have more to say presently regarding the resurrection "on the third day."

We may now proceed to examine the so-called "very circumstantial account of the testimony on which the belief in the Resurrection rested." "And that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve. After that he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles, and last of all he was seen by me also."² There can be no doubt, we think, from the terms in which this statement is made, that Paul intended to give the appearances in chronological order.³ It would likewise be a fair inference that he intended to mention all the appearances of which he was aware. So far, the account may possibly merit the epithet "circumstantial," but in all other respects it is scarcely possible to conceive any statement less circumstantial. As to where the risen Jesus was seen by these persons, in what manner, and under what circumstances, and at what time, we are not vouchsafed a single particular. Moreover, the Apostle was not present on any of these occasions, excepting of course his own vision, and consequently merely reports appearances of which he has been informed by others, but he omits to mention the authority upon which he makes these statements, or what steps he took to ascertain their accuracy and reality. For instance, when Jesus is said to have been seen by five hundred brethren at once, it would have been of the highest importance for us to know the exact details of the scene, the proportion of inference to fact, the character of the Apostle's informant, the extent of the investigation into the various impressions made upon the individuals composing the five hundred, as opposed to the collective affirmation. We confess that we do not attach much value to such appeals to the experience of 500 persons at once. It is difficult to find out what the actual experience of the individuals was, and each individual is so apt to catch the infection of his neighbour, and join in excitement, believing that, though he does not himself see or feel anything, his neighbour does, that it is probable, when inquiry is pressed home, the aggregate affirmation of a large number may resolve itself into the actual experience of very few. The fact is, however, that in this "very circumstantial account" we have

¹ Cf. Mt. xvi. 4; Mk. viii. 11.

² 1 Cor. xv. 5—8.

³ *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 603; *Keim*, *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 543; *Maier*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 337; *Meyer*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 416; *Rückert*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 390; *Stanley*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Cor., 4th ed., p. 288; *de Wette*, Br. an die Kor., 1855, p. 141; *Weisse*, *Die ev. Gesch.*, ii. p. 364.

nothing whatever except a mere catalogue by Paul of certain appearances which he did not himself see—always excepting his own vision, which we reserve—but merely had “received” from others, without a detail or information of any kind.

If we compare these appearances with the instances recorded in the Gospels, the result is by no means satisfactory. The first appearance is said to be to Cephas. It is argued that Paul passes in silence over the appearances to women, both because the testimony of women was not received in Jewish courts and because his own opinions regarding the active participation of women in matters connected with the Church were of a somewhat exclusive character.¹ The appearance to Cephas is generally identified with that mentioned in Luke xxiv. 34.² Nothing could be more cursory than the manner in which this appearance is related in the Synoptic. The disciples from Emmaus, returning at once to Jerusalem, found the Eleven and those who were with them saying: “The Lord was raised indeed, and was seen by Simon.” Not another syllable is said regarding an appearance which, according to Paul, was the first which had occurred. The other Gospels say still less, for they ignore the incident altogether. It is difficult to find room for such an appearance in the Gospel narratives. If we take the report of Paul to be true, that Jesus was first seen by Cephas, the silence of three Evangelists and their contradictory representations, on the one hand, and the remarkable way in which the third Gospel avoids all but the mere indirect reference to the occurrence, on the other, are phenomena which we leave apologists to explain.³ He is next seen “by the Twelve.” This vision is identified with that narrated in John xx. 19 ff. and Luke xxiv. 36 ff.,⁴ to which, as Thomas was absent on the first occasion, some critics understand the episode in John xx. 26 ff. to be added. On reference to our discussion of these accounts, it will be seen that they have few or no elements of credibility. If the appearance to the Twelve mentioned by Paul be identified with these episodes, and their details be declared authentic, the second item in Paul’s list becomes discredited. The appearance to 500 brethren at once is not mentioned in any of the Gospels, but critics, and especially apologetic critics, assert with more or less of certainty the identity of the occasion with the scene described in Matth. xxviii. 16 ff.⁵ We re-

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 ff.

² So Bisping, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Osiander, Rückert, Stanley, de Wette, &c., &c., in l.

³ *Gfrörer* thinks the germ of Paul’s incident to lie in the statement John xx. 4, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 376 f. *Dr. Farrar* thinks the details “may have been of a nature too personal to have been revealed.” *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 67.

⁴ So Bisping, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Osiander, Stanley, de Wette, &c., &c., in l.

⁵ So Grotius, Maier, Osiander, Wordsworth, &c., ad l. *Ebrard*, *Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch.*, p. 591 f., 599; *Zu Olsh. Leidensgesch.*, p. 210; *Farrar*, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 445. Cf. *Olshausen*, *Leidensgesch.*, p. 227. *Stanley*, *Corinthians*, p. 288.

marked whilst discussing the passage that this is based chiefly on the statement that "some doubted," which would have been inconsistent, it is thought, had Jesus already appeared to the Eleven. The identity is, however, denied by others.² The narrative in the first Synoptic would scarcely add force to the report in the Epistle. Is it possible to suppose, however, that, had there been so large a number of persons collected upon that occasion, the Evangelist would not have mentioned the fact? On the other hand, does it not somewhat discredit the statement that Jesus was seen by so large a number at once, that no record of such a remarkable occurrence exists elsewhere?³ How could the tradition of such an event, witnessed by so many, have so completely perished that neither in the Gospels nor Acts, nor in any other writing, is there any reference to it, and our only knowledge of it is this bare statement, without a single detail? There is only one explanation: that the assembly could not have recognised in the phenomenon, whatever it was, the risen Jesus, or that subsequently an explanation was given which dispelled some temporary illusion. In any case, we must insist that the total absence of all confirmation of an appearance to 500 persons at once alone renders such an occurrence more than suspicious. The statement that the greater number were still living when Paul wrote does not materially affect the question. Paul doubtless believed the report that such an appearance had taken place, and that the majority of witnesses still survived, but does it necessarily follow that the report was true? The survivors were certainly not within reach of the Corinthians, and could not easily be questioned. The whole of the argument of Paul which we are considering, as well as that which follows, was drawn from him by the fact that, in Corinth, Christians actually denied a resurrection, and it is far from clear that this denial did not extend to denying the Resurrection of Jesus himself.⁴ That they did deny this we think certain, from the care with which Paul gives what he considers evidence for the fact. Another point may be mentioned. Where could so many as 500 disciples have been collected at one time? The Author of Acts states (i. 15) the number of the Christian community gathered together to elect a successor to Judas as "about 120."

¹ *Beyschlag* considers that, in these doubts, we have clearly an erroneous mixing up of the story of Thomas, John xx. 24 ff., and he thinks that probably in the incident of Jesus eating fish, described by the third Synoptic (xxiv. 42), we have a reminiscence of John xxi. 13. *Stud. u. Kr.* 1870, p. 218, ann.

² *Alford*, *Bisping*, *Hofmann*, *Meyer*, *de Wette*, &c., &c., in l.

³ *Hausrath*, (*Der Ap. Paulus*, p. 101 f.) and some others are disposed to identify the supposed appearance to 500 with the occurrence at Pentecost, Acts ii.

⁴ *Weisse*, *Die evang. Gesh.*, ii. p. 416.

⁵ *Alford*, *Gk. Test.*, ii. 601; *Maier*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 333 f.; *Neander*, Br. Kor., p. 237 f., 240; *Olshausen*, *Bibl. Comm.*, iii. p. 732 f.; *de Wette*, Br. Kor., p. 138.

Apologists, therefore, either suppose the appearance to 500 to have taken place in Jerusalem, when numbers of pilgrims from Galilee and other parts were in the Holy City, or that it occurred in Galilee itself, where they suppose believers to have been more numerous.¹ This is the merest conjecture; and there is not even ground for asserting that there were so many as 500 brethren in any one place, by whom Jesus could have been seen. The appearance to James is not mentioned in any of our Gospels. Jerome preserves a legend from the Gospel of the Hebrews, which states that James, after having drunk the cup of the Lord, swore that he would not eat bread until he should see him risen from the dead. When Jesus rose, therefore, he appeared to James; and, ordering a table and bread to be brought, blessed and broke the bread, and gave it to James.² Beyond this legendary story there is no other record of the report given by Paul. The occasion on which he was seen by "all the Apostles" is indefinite, and cannot be identified with any account in the Gospels.

It is asserted, however, that although Paul does not state from whom he "received" the report of these appearances of the risen Jesus, he must have heard them from the Apostles themselves. At any rate, it is added, Paul professes that his preaching on the death, burial, and resurrection is the same as that of the other Apostles.³ That the other Apostles preached the resurrection of Jesus may be a fact, but we have no information as to the precise statements they made. We shall presently discuss the doctrine from this point of view, but here we must confine ourselves to Paul. It is undeniable that Paul neither enters into details nor cites authority for the particular appearances which he mentions. As for the inference that, associating with the Apostles, he must have been informed by them of the appearances of Jesus, we may say that this by no means follows so clearly as is supposed. Paul was singularly independent, and at every turn we perceive in his writings that he disclaims all indebtedness to the elder Apostles. He claims that his Gospel is not after man, nor was it taught to him by man, but through the revelation of Jesus Christ.⁴ Now Paul himself informs us of his action after it pleased God to reveal his Son in him that he might preach him among the Gentiles. It might then, indeed, have been reasonably expected that Paul should have sought out those who could have informed him of all the extraordinary occurrences supposed to have taken place after the death of Jesus. Paul does nothing of the kind. He is

¹ Probably in Jerusalem: *Bisping*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 265; *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 603; *Neander*, Br. Kor., p. 240 f. Probably in Galilee: *Maier*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 337. Uncertain: *Meyer*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 416; *Stanley*, Eps. to Cor., p. 288.

² *Hieron*, De vir. ill. ii.

⁴ Gal. i. 11, 12.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 11. 12.

apparently quite satisfied with his own convictions. "Immediately," he says, in his wondrously human and characteristic letter to the Galatians, "I communicated not with flesh and blood; neither went I away to Jerusalem to them who were Apostles before me, but I went away to Arabia, and returned again into Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days; but other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the brother of the Lord. Now the things which I write, behold before God I lie not."

Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem,"¹—upon which occasion, we know, his business was not of a nature to allow us to suppose he obtained much information regarding the Resurrection. Now we may ask: Is there that thirst for information regarding the facts and doctrines of Christianity displayed here, which entitles us to suppose that Paul eagerly and minutely investigated the evidence for them? We think not. Paul made up his own mind in his own way, and having waited three years without asking a question, it is not probable that the questions which he then asked were of any searching nature. The protest that he saw none of the other Apostles may prove his independence, but it certainly does not prove his anxiety for information. When Paul went up to make the acquaintance of Cephas, his object was clearly not to be taught by him, but to place himself in communication with the man whom he believed to be the chief of the Apostles, and we may assume, largely with a view to establish a friendly feeling, and secure his recognition of his future ministry. We should not, of course, be justified in affirming that the conversation between the two great Apostles never turned upon the subject of the Resurrection, but we think that it is obvious that Paul's visit was not in the least one of investigation. He believed; he believed that certain events had occurred "according to the Scriptures;" and the legitimate inference from Paul's own statements must be that, in this visit after three years, his purpose was in no way connected with a search for evidential information. The Author of Acts, it will be remembered, represents him as, before any visit to Jerusalem, publicly and boldly preaching in Damascus that Jesus is the Son of God, and "confounding the Jews . . . proving that this is the Christ."² This representation, it will be admitted, shows an advanced condition of belief little supporting the idea of subsequent investigation. When all conjectures are exhausted, however, we have the one distinct fact remaining, that Paul gives no authority for his report that Jesus was seen by the various persons mentioned, nor does he furnish any means by which we can judge of the nature and reality

¹ Gal. i. 16, 18, ii. 1.

² Acts ix. 20, 22, 27.

of the alleged phenomena. We continue here to speak of the appearances to others, reserving the appearance to himself, as standing upon a different basis, for separate examination.

Now what is the value of this evidence? The fact to be proved is that, after a man had been crucified, dead and buried, he actually rose from the dead, and appeared alive to many persons. The evidence is that Paul, writing some twenty years after the supposed miraculous occurrences, states, without detailed information of any kind, and without pretending to have himself been an eye-witness of the phenomena, that he has been told that Jesus was, after his death and burial, seen alive on the occasions mentioned! Now, as to the Apostle Paul himself, let it be said in the strongest and most emphatic manner possible that we do not suggest the most distant suspicion of the sincerity of any historical statement he makes. We implicitly accept the historical statements, as distinguished from inferences, which proceed from his pen. It cannot be doubted that Paul was told that such appearances had taken place. We do not question the fact that he believed them to have taken place; and we shall hereafter discuss the weight to be attached to this circumstance. Does this, however, guarantee the truth of the reports or inferences of those who informed the Apostles? Does the mere passage of any story or tradition through Paul necessarily transmute error into truth—self-deception or hallucination into objective fact? Are we—without any information as to what was really stated to Paul, as to the personality and character of his informants, as to the details of what was believed to have occurred, as to the means taken or which it might have been possible to take to test the reality of the alleged phenomena, without an opportunity of judging for ourselves on a single point—to believe in the reality of these appearances simply because Paul states that he has been informed that they occurred, and himself believes the report? So far as the belief of Paul is concerned, we may here remark that his views as to the miraculous Charismata in the Church do not prepare us to feel any confidence in the sobriety of his judgment in connection with alleged supernatural occurrences. We have no reliance upon his instinctive mistrust of such statements, or his imperative requirement of evidence, but every reason to doubt them. On the other hand, without in any way imputing wilful incorrectness or untruth to the reporters of such phenomena, let it be remembered how important a part inference has to play in the narrative of every incident, and how easy it is to draw erroneous inferences from bare facts.¹ In proportion as persons are ignorant, on the one hand,

¹ We may merely in passing refer to the case of Mary Magdalene in the fourth Gospel. She sees a figure standing beside her, and infers that it is the gardener:

and have their minds disturbed, on the other, by religious depression or excitement, hope, fear, or any other powerful emotion, they are liable to confound facts and inferences, and both to see and analyse wrongly. In the case of a supposed appearance alive of a person believed to be dead, it will scarcely be disputed, there are many disturbing elements, especially when that person has just died by a cruel and shameful death, and is believed to be the Messiah. The occurrence which we at any time see is, strictly speaking, merely a series of appearances, and the actual nature of the things seen is determined in our minds by inferences. How often are these inferences correct? We venture to say that the greater part of the proverbial incorrectness and inaccuracy which prevails arises from the circumstance that inferences are not distinguished from facts, and are constantly erroneous. Now in that age, under such circumstances, and with Oriental temperaments, it is absolutely certain that there was exceptional liability to error, and because Paul repeats the statements of unknown persons, dependent so materially upon inference, that cannot possibly warrant us in believing them when they contradict known laws which express the results of universal experience. It is infinitely more probable that these persons were mistaken, than that a dead man returned to life again, and appeared to them. We shall presently consider how much importance is to be attached to the mere belief in the occurrence of such phenomena, but with regard to the appearances referred to by Paul, except in so far as they attest the fact that certain persons may have believed that Jesus appeared to them, such evidence has not the slightest value, and is indeed almost ludicrously insufficient to establish the reality of so stupendous a miracle as the Resurrection. It will have been observed that of the Ascension there is not a word—obviously for Paul the Resurrection and Ascension were one act.

Having so far discussed Paul's report that Jesus rose from the dead and was seen by others, we turn to his statement that, last of all, he was seen also by himself. In the former cases, we have had to complain of the total absence of detailed information as to the circumstances under which he was supposed to have been seen; but it may be expected that at least in his own case we shall have full and minute particulars of so interesting and extraordinary a phenomenon. Here again we are disappointed. Paul

—presently something else occurs which leads her to infer that she was mistaken in her first inference, and to infer next, that it is Jesus. It is a mere narrative upon which no serious argument can be based, but had she at first turned away, her first inference would have remained, and, according to the narrative, have been erroneous. We might also argue that, if further examination had taken place, her second inference might have proved as erroneous as the first is declared to have been.

does not give us a single detail. He neither tells us when, where, nor how he saw Jesus. It was all the more important that he should have entered into the particulars of this apparition, because there is one peculiarity in his case which requires notice. Whereas it may be supposed that in the other instances Jesus is represented as being seen immediately after the Resurrection and before his Ascension, the appearance to Paul must be placed years after that occurrence is alleged to have taken place. The question, therefore, arises: Was the appearance to Paul of the same character as the former? Paul very evidently considers that it was. He uses the very same word when he says "he was seen (*ὤφθη*) by me," that he employs in stating that "he was seen (*ὤφθη*) by Cephas" and the rest, and he classes all the appearances together in precisely the same way. If, therefore, Paul knew anything of the nature of the appearances to the others, and yet considers them to have been of the same nature as his own, an accurate account of his own vision might have enabled us in some degree to estimate that of the others. Even without this account, it is something to know that Paul believed that there was no difference between the earlier and later appearances. And yet, if we reflect that in the appearances immediately after the Resurrection the representation is that Jesus possessed the very same body that had hung on the cross and been laid in the sepulchre, and that, according to the Gospels, he exhibited his wounds, allowed them to be touched, assured the disciples of his corporeality by permitting himself to be handled, and even by eating food in their presence, and that in the case of Paul the appearance took place years after Jesus is said to have ascended into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God, the identity of the apparition becomes a suggestive feature. The testimony of Paul must at least override that of the Gospels, and whatever may have been the vision of Paul, we may fairly assume that the vision of Peter and the rest was like it. Beyond this inference, however, Paul gives us no light with regard to the appearance of Jesus to himself. He merely affirms that Jesus did appear to him. "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he says in one place.¹ Elsewhere he relates: "But when he was pleased, who set me apart from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; immediately, I communicated not with flesh and blood . . . but I went away into Arabia and returned again unto Damascus."²

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 1.

² Gal. i. 15. ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ 16. ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεβέβην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι, 17. . . ἀλλὰ ἀπ' ἰθὺς εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν.

Various opinions have been expressed regarding the rendering of ἀποκαλύψει τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. The great majority of critics agree that the direct and natural sense must be adopted: "to reveal his son in me," that is to say, "within me," "in my spirit."¹ Others maintain that ἐν ἐμοί must be rendered "through me,"² giving ἐν the sense of διὰ; but in that case the following context would be quite unnecessary. Hilgenfeld³ thinks that the meaning is "in his person;" and Rückert⁴ and a few others read "to me." The liberties taken by interpreters of the New Testament with the preposition ἐν, too frequent, from preconceived dogmatic reasons, are remarkable. The importance of this passage chiefly lies in the question whether the revelation here referred to is the same as the appearance to him of Jesus of the Corinthian letter. Some critics incline to the view that it is so,⁵ whilst others consider that Paul does not thus speak of his vision, but rather of the doctrine concerning Jesus which formed his Gospel, and which Paul claimed to have received, not from man, but by revelation from God.⁶ Upon this point we have only a few remarks to make. If it be understood that Paul refers to the appearance to him of Jesus, it is clear that he represents it in these words as a subjective vision, within his own consciousness. If, on the other hand, he do not refer to the appearance, then the passage loses all distinct reference to that occurrence. We do not intend to lay any further stress upon the expression than this, and it is fair to add that we do not think there is any special reference to the apparition of Jesus in the passage, but simply an allusion to his conversion to Christianity, which the Apostle considered a revelation in his mind of the true character and work of the Christ which had previously been so completely misunderstood by him. We may as well say at once that we desire to take the argument in its broadest form, without wasting time by showing that Paul himself uses language which seems to indicate that he recognised the appearance of Jesus to have been merely subjective. The only other passage which we need now mention is the account which Paul gives, 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff., of his being caught up to the third heaven. A few critics consider that

¹ So Alford, Bisping, Ellicott, Ewald, Holtzmann, Jowett, Meyer, Olshausen, Schrader, Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler, Winer, Wordsworth, ad l.; Baur, Paulus, i. p. 75 ff.; Holsten, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 42 f., ann.; Meijboom, Jezus' Opstand., p. 105; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 117.

² Grotius, Annot. in N. T., vi. p. 553; Baumgarten-Crusius, Br. an die Gal., p. 26; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 82.

³ Der Galaterbr., p. 121.

⁴ Ad. l.

⁵ Baur, Paulus, i. p. 75 ff.; Meijboom, Jezus' Opstand. i., p. 105 f.; Jowett, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 216 f., 230 f.; Ewald, Holtzmann, Schrader, Usteri, Wieseler, &c., in l.

⁶ Holsten, Zum Ev. Paul. u. s. w., p. 42, ann.; Neander, Pflanzung, p. 117; Alford, Bisping, Hilgenfeld, Lightfoot, Meyer, de Wette, Wordsworth, &c., in l.

this may be the occasion on which Jesus appeared to him, to which he refers in the passage of the former letter which we are considering,¹ but the great majority are opposed to the supposition. In any case there is no evidence that the occasions are identical, and we therefore are not entitled to assume that they are so.

It will have been observed that we have hitherto confined our attention wholly to the undoubted writings of Paul. Were there no other reason than the simple fact that we are examining the evidence of Paul himself, and have, therefore, to do with that evidence alone, we should be thoroughly justified in this course. It is difficult to clear the mind of statements regarding Paul and his conversion which are made in the Acts of the Apostles, but it is absolutely essential that we should understand clearly what Paul himself tells us and what he does not, for the present totally excluding Acts. What then does Paul himself tell us of the circumstances under which he saw Jesus? Absolutely nothing. The whole of his evidence for the Resurrection consists in the bare statement that he did see Jesus. Now can the fact that any man merely affirms, without even stating the circumstances, that a person once dead and buried has risen from the dead and been seen by him, be seriously considered satisfactory evidence for so astounding a miracle? Is it possible for any one of sober mind, acquainted with the nature of the proposition, on the one hand, and with the innumerable possibilities of error, on the other, to regard such an affirmation even as evidence of much importance in such a matter? We venture to say that, in such a case, an affirmation of this nature, even made by a man of high character and ability, would possess little weight. If the person making it, although of the highest honour, were known to suppose himself the subject of constant revelations and visions, and if, perhaps he had a constitutional tendency to nervous excitement and ecstatic trance, his evidence would have no weight at all. We shall presently have to speak of this more in detail in connection with Paul. Such an allegation even supported by the fullest information and most circumstantial statement could not establish the reality of the miracle; without them, it has no claim to belief. What is the value of a person's testimony who simply makes an affirmation of some important matter, unaccompanied by particulars, and the truth of which cannot be subjected to the test of even the slightest cross-examination? It is worth nothing. It would not be received at all in a Court of Justice. If we knew the whole of the circumstances of the apparition to Paul, from which he inferred that he had seen the

¹ Dr. Jowett thinks this not improbable. The Epistles of St. Paul, i. p. 229.

risen Jesus, the natural explanation of the supposed miracle might be easy. There were no other witnesses of it. This is clear; for, had there been, Paul must have mentioned them as he mentioned the five hundred. We have only the report of a man who states that he had seen Jesus, unconfirmed by any witnesses. Under no circumstances could isolated evidence like this be of much value. Facts and inferences are alike uncorroborated, but on the other hand are contradicted by universal experience. When we analyse the evidence, it is reduced to this: Paul believed that he had seen Jesus. This belief constitutes the whole evidence of Paul himself for the Resurrection. It is usual to argue that the powerful effect which this belief produced upon Paul's life and teaching renders this belief of extraordinary force as evidence. This we are not prepared to admit. If the assertion that Jesus appeared to him had not been believed by Paul, it would not have secured a moment's attention. That this belief affected his life was the inevitable consequence of such belief. Paul eminently combined works with faith in his own life. When he believed Jesus to be an imposter, he did not content himself with sneering at human credulity, but vigorously persecuted his followers. When he came to believe Jesus to be the Messiah, he was not more inactive, but became the irrepressible Apostle of the Gentiles. He acted upon his convictions in both cases; but his mere persecution of Christianity no more proved Jesus to be an imposter than his mere preaching of Christianity proved Jesus to be the Messiah. It only proved that he believed so. He was as earnest in the one case as in the other. We repeat, therefore, that the evidence of Paul for the Resurrection amounts to nothing more than the unfeigned belief that Jesus had been seen by him. We shall presently further examine the value of this belief as evidence for so astounding a miracle.

We must not form exaggerated conceptions of the effect upon Paul of the appearance to him of Jesus. That his convictions and views of Christianity were based upon the reality of the Resurrection is undeniable, and that they received powerful confirmation and impulse through his vision of Jesus is also not to be doubted, but let us clear our minds of representations derived from other sources and clearly understand what Paul himself does and does not say of this vision, and for this purpose we must confine ourselves to the undoubted writings of the Apostle. Does Paul himself ascribe his conversion to Christianity to the fact of his having seen Jesus? Most certainly not. That is a notion derived solely from the statements in Acts. The sudden and miraculous conversion of Paul is a product of the same pen which produced the story of the sudden conversion of the thief on the

cross, an episode equally unknown to other writers. Paul neither says when nor where he saw Jesus. The revelation of God's Son in him not being an allusion to this vision of Jesus, but merely a reference to the light which dawned upon Paul's mind as to the character and mission of Jesus, there is no ground whatever, from the writings of the Apostle himself, to connect the appearance of Jesus with the conversion of Paul. The statement in the Epistle to the Galatians simply amounts to this: When it pleased him who elected him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace to reveal to his mind the truth concerning his Son, that he might preach him among the Gentiles, he communicated not with flesh and blood, neither did he go up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before him, but immediately went away to Arabia, and after that returned again to Damascus. It can scarcely be doubted that Paul here refers to his change of views—to his conversion—but as little can it be doubted that he does not ascribe that conversion to the appearance to him of Jesus spoken of in the Corinthian letter. Let any reader who honestly desires to ascertain the exact position of the case ask himself the simple question whether, supposing the Acts of the Apostles never to have existed, it is possible to deduce from this, or any other statement of Paul, that he actually ascribes his conversion to the fact that Jesus appeared to him in a supernatural manner. He may possibly in some degree base his apostolic claims upon that appearance, although it may be doubted how far he does even this; if he did so, it would only prove the reality of his belief, but not the reality of the vision; but there is no evidence whatever in the writings of Paul that he connected his conversion with the appearance of Jesus. All that we can legitimately infer seems to be that, before his adoption of Christianity, he had persecuted the Church;¹ and further it may be gathered from the passage in the Galatian letter, that at the time when this change occurred he was at Damascus. At least he says that from Arabia he "returned again to Damascus," which seems to imply that he first went from that city to Arabia. When we consider the expressions in the two letters, it becomes apparent that Paul does not set forth any instantaneous conversion of the character related elsewhere. To the Galatians he describes his election from his mother's womb and call by the grace of God as antecedent to the revelation of his Son in him: "When he who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace was pleased to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles," &c. And if the reading "through me" be adopted, the sense we are pointing out becomes

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 9.

still
sion
me t
of t
beca
God
me v
all, y
fore,
sees
most
Corin
of h
diate
Apos
excla
here
callin
on th
He is
he p
There
he sa
sider
rectio
sured
We si
for th
the a
32, up
fact w
Twel
from
fortui
apost
ye no
yet I
in th
There

11 C
καὶ
10. κα
νευή
τῶ δ
21 C

still more apparent. In the Corinthian letter again, the expressions should be remarked : v. 8. "And last of all he was seen by me also, as the one born out of due time. 9. For I am the least of the Apostles, that am not fit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God : 10. but by the grace of God I am what I am : and his grace which was (bestowed) upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God with me. 11. Whether, therefore, it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."¹ Peter sees Jesus first, Paul sees him last ; and as the thought uppermost in his mind in writing this epistle was the parties in the Corinthian Church, and the opposition to himself and denial even of his apostleship, the mention of his having seen Jesus immediately leads him to speak of his apostolic claims. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he had just before exclaimed, and proceeded to defend himself against his opponents : here again he reverts to the same subject, with proud humility calling himself, on the one hand, "the least of the Apostles," but, on the other, asserting that he had "laboured more than they all." He is led to contrast his past life with his present ; the time when he persecuted the Church with that in which he built it up. There is, however, no allusion to any miraculous conversion when he says : "by the grace of God I am what I am." He may consider his having seen the Lord and become a witness of his resurrection one part of his qualification for the Apostolate, but assuredly he does not represent this as the means of his conversion. We shall not pause to discuss at length how far being a witness for the resurrection really was made a necessary qualification for the apostolic office. The passages, Luke xxiv. 48, Acts i. 22, ii. 32, upon which the theory mainly rests, are not evidence of the fact which can for a moment be accepted. It is obvious that the Twelve were Apostles from having been disciples of the Master from the commencement of his active career, and not from any fortuitous circumstance at its close. If Paul says : "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he continues : "Are ye not my work in the Lord? If I am not an apostle unto others, yet I am at least to you : for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord. My defence to them that examine me is this."² There can be no doubt that the claims of Paul to the Apostolate

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 8. ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡς περὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὡφθῆ καί μοι. 9. ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλαχίστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὅς οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 10. χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὃ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη, ἀλλὰ περισσώτερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοιτάσα, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί. κ.τ.λ.

² 1 Cor. ix. 1—3.

were, during his life, constantly denied, and his authority rejected. As we have elsewhere pointed out, there is no evidence that his apostleship was ever recognised by the elder Apostles, nor that his claim was ever submitted to them. Even in the second century, the Clementine Homilies deny him the honour, and make light of his visions and revelations. All the evidence we possess shows that Paul's vision of Jesus did not secure for him much consideration in his own time, a circumstance which certainly does not tend to establish its reality.

What weight can we, then, attach to the representation in the Acts of the Apostles of the conversion of Paul? Our examination of that work has sufficiently shown that none of its statements can be received as historical. Where we have been able to compare them with the epistles of Paul, they have not been in agreement. Nothing could be more obvious than the contradiction between the narrative of Paul's conduct after his conversion, according to Acts, and the account which Paul gives in the Galatian letter. We need not repeat the demonstration here. Where we possess the means of comparison, we discover the inaccuracy of Acts. Why should we suppose that which we cannot compare more accurate? So far as our argument is concerned, it matters very little whether we exclude the narrative of the conversion of Acts or not. We point out, however, that there is no confirmation whatever in the writings of Paul of the representation of his conversion by means of a vision of Jesus, which, upon all considerations, may much more reasonably be assigned to a somewhat later period. If we ventured to conjecture, we should say that the Author of Acts has expanded the scattered sayings of Paul into this narrative, making the miraculous conversion by a personal interposition of Jesus, which he therefore relates no less than three times, counterbalance the disadvantage of his not having followed Jesus in the flesh.¹ It is curious that he has introduced the bare statement into the third Synoptic, that Jesus "was seen by Simon" (*ὡφθη Σίμωνι*),² which none of the other evangelists mentions, but which he may have found, without further particulars, *ὡφθη Κηφᾶ*, in the Epistle whence he derived, perhaps, materials for the other story. In no case can the narrative in Acts be received as evidence of the slightest value; but in order not to pass over even such statements in silence, we shall very briefly examine it.

The narrative is repeated thrice: in the first instance (ix. 1 ff.) as a historical account of the transaction; next (xxii. 4 ff.) introduced into a speech supposed to be delivered by Paul to the Jews

¹ Cf. *Schneckenburger*, *Zweck der Apostelgesch.*, p. 61 f.

² Luke xxiv. 34.

when taken prisoner in consequence of their uproar on finding him in the Temple purifying himself with the four men who had a vow, a position which cannot historically be reconciled with the character and views of Paul; and, thirdly, again put into the mouth of the Apostle (xxvi. 9 ff.) when he pleads his cause before King Agrippa. Paul is represented in the headlong career of persecuting the Church, and going with letters from the high priest empowering him to bring Christian men and women bound unto Jerusalem. "And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh to Damascus, and suddenly there shone round about him a light out of the heaven, and he fell upon the earth and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."¹ In the second account, there is so far no very wide discrepancy, but there, as in the third, the time is said to be about noon. There is a very considerable difference in the third account, however, more especially in the report of what is said by the voice: xxvi. 13. "At midday, O King, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and those journeying with me; 14. And when we all fell to the earth, I heard a voice saying unto me in the Hebrew tongue: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against pricks. 15. And I said: Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. 16. But rise and stand upon thy feet; for I was seen by thee for this purpose, to choose thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou sawest, and of the things in which I will appear unto thee; 17. delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee: 18. to open their eyes, that they may turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and a lot among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."² It will be admitted that this address is widely differ-

¹ Acts ix. 3. ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ, ἐξαίφνης τε αὐτὸν περιήστραψεν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 4. καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ. Σαούλ Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; 5. εἶπεν δέ. Τίς εἰ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν. Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 6. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λαληθήσεται σοι ὅτι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. Cf. xxii. 6-8, 10.

² Acts xxvi. 13. ἡμέρας μέσης κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶδον, βασιλεῦ, οὐρανόθεν ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου περιλάμψαν με φῶς καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἐμοὶ πορευομένους. 14. πάντων τε καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσαν πρὸς με τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; σαλὴρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λαλῆσειν. 15. ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα. Τίς εἰ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ κυριὸς εἶπεν. Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 16. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στήθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὥφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπὲρ τῆν καὶ

ority re-
nce that
tles, nor
e second
our, and
lence we
for him
ich cer-

n in the
examina-
its state-
en able to
been in
contradic-
nversion,
the Gala-
. Where
naccuracy
t compare
it matters
version of
confirmation
of his
all consi-
somewhat
I say that
s of Paul
by a per-
es no less
is not hav-
has intro-
that Jesus
the other

without fur-
rived, per-
e narrative
ut in order
shall very

e (ix. 1 ff.)
4 ff.) intro-
to the Jews

ent from that reported in the two earlier accounts. Apologists argue that, in this third narrative, Paul has simply transferred from Ananias to Jesus the message delivered to him by the former, according to the second account. Let us first see what Ananias is there represented as saying. Acts xxii. 14: "And he said: The God of our fathers chose thee, to know his will and to see the Righteous One; 15. for thou shalt be a witness to him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."² Now Paul clearly professes in the speech which he is represented as delivering before Agrippa to state what the voice said to him: "And he said," "and I said," "and he said," distinctly convey the meaning that the report is to be what actually was said. If the sense of what Ananias said to him is embodied in part of the address ascribed to the voice, it is strangely altered and put into the first person; but, beyond this, there is much added which neither appears in the speech of Ananias nor anywhere else in any of the narratives. If we further compare the instructions given to Ananias in the vision of the first narrative with his words in the second and those ascribed to the voice in the third, we shall see that these again differ very materially. Acts ix. 15. "But the Lord said unto him: Go; for this man is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before Gentiles and kings, and the sons of Israel: 16. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake."³ What must we think of a writer who deals so freely with his materials, and takes such liberties even with so serious a matter as this heavenly vision and the words of the glorified Jesus? In the third account, Jesus is represented as saying: "It is hard for thee to kick against pricks."⁴ This is a well-known proverbial saying, frequently used by classical Greek and Latin authors,⁵ and not altogether strange to Hebrew. It is a

μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες ὧν τε ὁμῶμαι σοι, 17. ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἔθνων, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε, 18. ἀνοιξάναι ὀφθαλμούς σου αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτῶν εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σάταν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀφεσὶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἁγιασμένοις πιστεῖ τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.

¹ It will be remembered that this epithet occurs in Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, and nowhere else in the New Testament.

² Acts xxii. 14. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσασθαι σε γινώσκων τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἀκούσαι φωνῆν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, 15. ὅτι ἔσθ' μαρτυρὸς αὐτῶν πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἐώρακας καὶ ἡκουσας.

³ Acts ix. 15. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος· Πορεύου, ὅτι σκευὸς ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐνώπιον ἔθνων τε καὶ βασιλέων νῦν τε Ἰσραὴλ· 16. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπερ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου παθεῖν.

⁴ xxvi. 14. This phrase was introduced into Acts ix. 5 of the authorised version by Erasmus from the Vulgate, but it is not found there in any Greek MS. of the slightest authority.

⁵ Cf. *Æsch.*, *Prom.*, 323; *Agamem.*, 1633; *Eurip.*, *Bacch.*, 791; *Pindar*, *Pyth.*, ii. 173 *Terent.*, *Phorm.*, i. 2.27; *Plaut.*, *Truc.*, iv. 2. 59. *Baumgarten*, *Beelen*,

singularly anthropomorphic representation to put such a saying into the mouth of the divine apparition, and it assists in betraying the mundane origin of the whole scene. Another point deserving consideration is, that Paul is not told what he is to do by the voice of Jesus, but is desired to go into the city to be there instructed by Ananias. This is clearly opposed to Paul's own repeated asseverations. "For neither did I receive it from man nor was taught it, but through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"¹ is his statement. The details of the incident itself, moreover, are differently stated in the various accounts and cannot be reconciled. According to the first account, the companions of Paul "stood speechless" (ix. 7); in the third, they "all fell to the earth" (xxvi. 14). The explanation, that they first fell to the ground and then rose up, fails satisfactorily to harmonise the two statements; as does likewise the suggestion that the first expression is simply an idiomatic mode of saying that they were speechless, independent of position. Then again, in the first account, it is said that the men stood speechless, "hearing the voice (*ἀκούοντες τῆς φωνῆς*) but seeing no one."² In the second we are told: "And they that were with me saw indeed the light; but they heard not the voice (*τὴν φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν*) of him speaking to me."³ No two statements could be more contradictory. The attempt to reconcile them by explaining the verb *ἀκούω* in the one place "to hear" and in the other "to understand" is inadmissible, because wholly arbitrary. It is quite obvious that the word is used in the same sense in both passages, the difference being effected by the negative. In the third account, the voice is described as speaking "in the Hebrew tongue,"⁴ which was probably the native tongue of the companions of Paul from Jerusalem. If they heard the voice speaking Hebrew, they must have understood it. The effort to make the vision clearly objective, and at the same time, to confine it to Paul, leads to these complications. The voice is heard, though the speaker is not seen, by the men, in the one story, whilst the light is seen, and the voice not heard, in the other, and yet it speaks in Hebrew according to the third, and even makes use of classical proverbs, and uses language wondrously similar to that of the Author of Acts. We may remark here that Paul's Gospel was certainly not revealed to him upon this occasion; and, therefore, the expressions in his epistles upon this subject must be referred to other revelations. There is, however, another curious point to be observed. Paul is not

Grotius, Hackett, Humphrey, Kuinoel, Meyer, Olshausen, Overbeck, Wetstein, de Wette, Wordsworth, &c., in l. Zeller, *Ap. g.* p. 193, ann. l.

¹ Gal. i. 11 ff.

² Acts ix. 7.

³ Acts xxii. 9.

⁴ Acts xxvi. 14.

described as having actually seen Jesus in the vision. According to the first two accounts, a light shines round about him and he falls to the ground and hears a voice; when he rises he is blind.¹ If in the third account he sees the light from heaven above the brightness of the sun shining round about him and his companions,² they equally see it, according to the second account.³ The blindness, therefore, is miraculous and symbolic, for the men are not blinded by the light.⁴ It is singular that Paul nowhere refers to this blindness in his letters. It cannot be doubted that the writer's purpose is to symbolise the very change from darkness to light, in the case of Paul, which, after Old Testament prophecies, is referred to in the words ascribed, in the third account,⁵ to the voice. Paul, thus, only sees the light which surrounds the glorified Jesus, but not his own person, and the identification proceeds only from the statement: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." It is true that the expression is strangely put into the mouth of Jesus, in the third account: "for I was seen by thee (*ὡφθην σοι*) for this purpose," &c.,⁶ but the narrative excludes the actual sight of the speaker, and it is scarcely possible to read the words just quoted, and their context, without being struck by their incongruity. We need not point out the sources of this representation of light shrouding the heavenly vision, so common in the Old Testament. Before proceeding to the rest of the account, we may point out in passing the similarity of the details of this scene to the vision of Daniel, x. 7-9. Returning, however, to the first narrative, we are told that, about the same time as this miracle was occurring to Paul, a supernatural communication was being made to Ananias in Damascus: ix. 10. "And to him said the Lord in a vision: Ananias. And he said, Behold I am here, Lord. 11. And the Lord said unto him: Rise and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for, behold he prayeth; 12, and he saw a man named Ananias who came in and put his hand on him that he might receive sight. 13. But Ananias answered, Lord I heard from many concerning this man, how much evil he did to thy saints in Jerusalem: 14. And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name. 15. But the Lord said, Go, &c. (quoted above). 17. And Ananias went away, and entered into the house; and having put his hands on him said: Brother Saul, the Lord hath sent me, even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way by which thou camest, that thou mightest receive sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. 18. And immediately there fell from

¹ Acts ix. 3, 4, 8. xxii. 6, 7, 11.

² xxvi. 13.

³ xxii. 9.

⁴ xxii. 11, does not refute this.

⁵ xxvi. 18.

⁶ xxvi. 16.

his eyes as it were scales; and he received sight, rose up, and was baptized, and having taken food was strengthened." We have already had occasion to point out, in connection with the parallelism kept up in Acts between the Apostle of the Gentiles and the Apostle of the Circumcision, that a similar double vision is narrated by the Author as occurring to Peter and Cornelius. Some further vision is referred to in v. 12; for in no form of the narrative of Paul's vision on the way to Damascus is he represented as seeing a man named Ananias coming to him for the purpose described. Many questions are suggested by the story just quoted. How did Ananias know that Paul had authority from the chief priests to arrest any one? How could he argue in such a way with the Lord? Did he not then know that Jesus had appeared to Paul on the way? How did he get that information? Is it not an extraordinary thing that Paul never mentions Ananias in any of his letters, nor in any way refers to these miracles? We have already referred to the symbolic nature of the blindness, and recovery of sight on receiving the Holy Spirit and being baptized, and this is rendered still more apparent by the statement: v. 9. "And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." We may further point out that in immediate connection with this episode Paul is represented, in the second account, as stating that, on going to Jerusalem, he has another vision of Jesus: xxii. 17. "And it came to pass that, when I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the Temple, I was in a trance, 18, and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy witness concerning me. 19. And I said: Lord, they themselves know that I was wont to imprison and beat in every synagogue them that believe on thee. 20. And when the blood of Stephen, thy witness, was shed, I also was standing by and consenting, and keeping the garments of them that slew him. 21. And he said unto me: Go, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." It seems impossible, considering the utter silence of Paul, that the apparition to which he refers, can have spoken to him at length as described upon these occasions.¹ We have elsewhere remarked that there is not the slightest evidence in his own or other writings connecting any Stephen with Paul, and it may be appropriate to add here that, supposing him to have been present when the martyr exclaimed: "Lo, I behold the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God,"² it is singular that he does not name him as one of those by whom Jesus "was seen." To resume this discussion, however: we have already shown that the statements of the Acts regarding Paul's conduct after this alleged vision are

¹ Keim, *Jesus v. Nazara*, iii. 542 f.

² vii. 56.

distinctly in contradiction with the statements of Paul. The explanation here given of the cause of Paul's leaving Jerusalem, moreover, is not in agreement with the Acts ix. 29 f., and much less with Gal. i. 20 ff. The three narratives themselves are full of irreconcilable differences and incongruities, which destroy all reasonable confidence in any substantial basis for the story. It is evident that the three narratives are from the same pen, and betray the composition of the Author of Acts.¹ They cannot be regarded as true history.² The hand of the composer is very apparent in the lavish use of the miraculous, so characteristic of the whole work. It is worth while to catalogue the supernatural incidents of this episode. 1, The vision; 2, Companions hearing the voice but seeing no man, or not hearing the voice but seeing the light; 3, Paul's blindness; 4, Vision of Ananias; 5, Restoration of sight to Paul; 6, Trance of Paul in Jerusalem. Such a narrative cannot be received in evidence.

The testimony before us simply amounts to this: Paul believed that he had seen Jesus some years after his death: there is no evidence that he ever saw him during his life.³ He states that he had "received" that he was seen by various other persons, but he does not give the slightest information as to who told him, or what reasons he had for believing the statements to be correct. And still less does he narrate the particulars of the alleged appearances or even of his own vision. Although we have no detailed statements of these extraordinary phenomena, we may assume that, as Paul himself believed that he had seen Jesus, certain other people of the circle of his disciples likewise believed that they had seen the risen Master. The whole of the evidence for the Resurrection reduces itself to an undefined belief on the part of a few persons, in a notoriously superstitious age, that after Jesus had died and been buried they had seen him alive. These visions, it is admitted, occurred at a time of the most intense religious excitement, and under circumstances of wholly exceptional mental agitation and distress. The wildest

¹ Zeller, *App.*, p. 399 ff.; *Lekebusch*, *App.*, p. 125 f., 129 f.; *Overbeck*, *Zu de Wette*, *App.*, p. 139; *Davidson*, *Int. N.T.*, ii. p. 235.

² *Baur*, *Paulus*, i. p. 70 ff.; *Gfrörer*, *Die heil. Sage*, i. p. 412 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Theol.* 1864, p. 155 ff.; *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. Paul.*, u. s. w., p. 34 ff.; *Meijboom*, *Jezus' Opstanding*, p. 99 ff.; *Overbeck*, *Zu de W. App.*, p. 132 ff.; *Renan*, *Les Apôtres*, p. 175 ff.; *Schrader*, *Der Ap. Paulus*, v. p. 529 f.; *Straatman*, *Paulus*, p. 17 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, ii. p. 540 ff.; *Zeller*, *App.*, p. 191 ff. Cf. *Davidson*, *Int. N.T.*, ii. p. 246 ff.; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 345 ff.; *Hausrath*, *De Ap. Paulus*, p. 125 ff.; in *Schenkel's B. L.*, iv. p. 416 ff.; *Meyer*, *App.*, p. 132 f.; *Schneckenburger*, *A. g.*, p. 167 ff., 180 ff.

³ *Ebrard*, *Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch.*, p. 719, anm. 13; *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 70 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1864, p. 184 f.; *Einl.*, p. 219; *Pfleiderer*, *Paulinismus*, p. 394 anm.; *Renan*, *Les Apôtres*, p. 73, 210 ff.; *Strauss*, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 276.

alternations of fear, doubt, hope and indefinite expectation, added their effects to oriental imaginations already excited by indignation at the fate of their Master, and sorrow or despair at such a dissipation of their Messianic dreams. There was present every element of intellectual and moral disturbance. Now must we seriously ask again whether this bare and wholly unjustified belief can be accepted as satisfactory evidence for so astounding a miracle as the Resurrection? Can the belief of such men, in such an age, establish the reality of a phenomenon which is contradicted by universal experience? We have no evidence as to what actually occurred. We do not even know the facts upon which they based their inferences. We only know that they thought they had seen Jesus and that they therefore concluded that he had risen from the dead. It comes to us as bare belief from the Age of Miracles, unsupported by facts, uncorroborated by evidence, unaccompanied by proof of investigation, and unprovided with material for examination. What is such belief worth? We have no hesitation in saying that it is absolutely worth nothing.

We might here well bring our inquiry to a close, for we have no further evidence to deal with. The problem, however, is so full of interest that we cannot yet lay it down, and although we must restrain our argument within certain rigid limits, and wholly refrain from entering into regions of mere speculation, we may further discuss the origin and nature of the belief in the Resurrection. Recognising the fact that, although its nature and extent are very indefinite, there existed an undoubted belief that, after his death, Jesus was seen alive; the argument is advanced that there must have been a real basis for this belief. "The existence of a Christian society," says an apologetic writer, "is the first and (if rightly viewed) the final proof of the historic truth of the miracle on which it was founded. It may indeed be said that the Church was founded upon the belief in the Resurrection, and not upon the Resurrection itself: and that the testimony must therefore be limited to the attestation of the belief, and cannot reach to the attestation of the fact. But belief expressed in action is for the most part the strongest evidence which we can have of any historic event. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that the origin of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection, with due regard to the fulness of its characteristic form, and the breadth and rapidity of its propagation can be satisfac-

l. The
usalem,
uch less
of irre-
reason-
It is
en, and
cannot be
very ap-
e of the
natural
ring the
ing the
ration of
arrative

Paul be-
there
He states
her per-
to who
ments to
s of the
ough we
phenomena,
had seen
likewise
le of the
ined be-
ious age,
seen him
ne of the
tances of
e wildest

erk, Zu de

Hilgenfeld,
p. 34 ff.;
ff.; Renan,
ta, Paulus,
p. 191 ff.
Hausath,
p. App. p.

Isr., vi. p.
Pfeiderer,
auss, Leb.

torily explained on other grounds, the belief itself is a sufficient proof of the fact."¹ This is obviously Paley's argument of the Twelve men² in a condensed form. Belief in action may be the strongest evidence which we can have of any historic event; but when the historic event happens to be an event in religious history, and an astounding miracle like the Resurrection, such bare evidence, emanating from such an age, is not very strong evidence, after all. The breadth and rapidity of its propagation absolutely prove nothing but belief in the report of those who believed; although it is very far from evident that people embraced Christianity from a rational belief in the Resurrection. No one pretends that the Gentiles who believed made a preliminary examination of the truth of the Resurrection. If breadth and rapidity of propagation be taken as sufficient proof of the truth of facts, we might consider Buddhism and Mahomedanism as satisfactorily attested creeds. There could not be a greater fallacy than the supposition that the origin of a belief must be explained upon other grounds, or that belief itself accepted as a sufficient proof of the fact asserted. The truth or falsehood of any allegation is determined by a balance of evidence, and the critic is no more bound to account for the formation of erroneous belief than he is bound to believe, because he may not, after a great lapse of time, be able so clearly to demonstrate the particular manner in which that erroneous belief originated, that any other mode is definitely excluded. The belief that a dead man rose from the dead and appeared to several persons alive is at once disposed of upon abstract grounds. The alleged occurrence is contrary to universal experience; but on the other hand the prevalence of defective observation, mistaken inference, self-deception and credulity, any of which might lead to such belief, are only too well-known to it. Is it necessary to define which peculiar form of error is present in every false belief, before, with this immense preponderance of evidence against it, we finally reject it? We think not. Any explanation consistent with universal experience must be adopted, rather than a belief which is contradictory to it.

There are two theories which have been advanced to explain the origin of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection, to which we may now briefly refer; but it must be clearly understood that the suggestion of an explanation is quite apart from our examination of the actual evidence for the Resurrection. Fifty explanations might be offered and be considered unsatisfactory without in the least degree altering the fact, that the testimony

¹ *Westcott, The Gospel of the Resurrection*, 3rd ed., p. 106 f.

² *Evidences and Horæ Pauline*, ed. Potts, 1850, p. 6.

for the final miracle of Christianity is totally insufficient, and that the allegation that it actually occurred cannot be maintained. The first explanation, adopted by some able critics, is that Jesus did not really die on the cross, but being taken down alive, and his body being delivered to friends, he subsequently revived. In support of this theory, it is argued that Jesus is represented by the Gospels as expiring after having been but three to six hours upon the cross, which would have been an unprecedentedly rapid death. It is affirmed that only the hands and not the feet were nailed to the cross. The *crurifragium*, not usually accompanying crucifixion, is dismissed as unknown to the three Synoptists, and only inserted by the fourth Evangelist for dogmatic reasons, and of course the lance-thrust disappears with the leg-breaking. Thus the apparent death was that profound faintness which might well fall upon such an organization after some hours of physical and mental agony on the cross, following the continued strain and fatigue of the previous night. As soon as he had sufficiently recovered, it is supposed that Jesus visited his disciples a few times to re-assure them, but with precaution on account of the Jews, and was by them believed to have risen from the dead, as indeed he himself may likewise have supposed, reviving as he had done from the faintness of death.¹ Seeing, however, that his death had set the crown upon his work, the Master withdrew into impenetrable obscurity and was heard of no more. We have given but the baldest outline of this theory; for it would occupy too much space to represent it adequately and show the ingenuity with which it is worked out, and the very considerable support which it receives from statements in the Gospels, and from inferences deducible from them. We do not ourselves adopt this explanation, although it must be clearly repeated that, were the only alternative to do so, or to fall back upon the hypothesis of a miracle, we should consider it preferable. A serious objection brought against the

¹ *Gfrörer*, who maintains the theory of a Scheintod with great ability, thinks that Jesus had believers amongst the rulers of the Jews, who, although they could not shield him from the opposition against him, still hoped to save him from death. Joseph, a rich man, found the means of doing so. He prepared the new sepulchre close to the place of execution to be at hand—bought the body from Pilate—the immense quantity of spices bought by Nicodemus being merely to distract the attention of the Jews—and Jesus being quickly carried to the sepulchre, was restored to life by their efforts. He interprets the famous verse John xx. 17 curiously. The expression: "I have not yet ascended to my Father and your Father," &c., he takes as meaning simply the act of dying: "going to heaven," and the reply of Jesus is equivalent to: "Touch me not, for I am still flesh and blood—I am not yet dead." Jesus sees his disciples only a few times mysteriously, and believing that he had set the final seal to the truth of his work by his death, he then retires into impenetrable gloom. *Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*, p. 107 ff., p. 231 ff.

theory seems to be, that it is not natural to suppose that, after such intense and protracted fatigue and anxiety followed by the most cruel agony on the cross, agony both of soul and body,¹ ending in unconsciousness only short of death, Jesus could within a short period have presented himself to his disciples with such an aspect as could have conveyed to them the impression of victory over death by the Prince of Life. He must still, it is urged, have presented the fresh traces of suffering and weakness little calculated to inspire them with the idea of divine power and glory. This is partly, but not altogether, true. There is no evidence, as we shall presently show, that the appearances of Jesus occurred so soon as is generally represented; and, in their astonishment at again seeing the Master whom they supposed to be dead, the disciples could not have been in a state minutely to remark the signs of suffering;² then probably, with the power of a mind like that of Jesus over physical weakness, little apparent. Time and imagination would doubtless soon have effaced from their minds any such impressions, and left only the belief that he had risen from the dead to develop and form the Christian doctrine. A more powerful objection seems to us the disappearance of Jesus. We cannot easily persuade ourselves that such a teacher could have renounced his work and left no subsequent trace of his existence. Still, it must be admitted that many explanations might be offered on this head, the most obvious being that death, whether as the result of the terrible crisis through which he had passed, or from some other cause, may soon after have ensued. We repeat, however, that we neither advance this explanation nor think it worth while to discuss it seriously, not because we think it untenable, although we do not adopt it, but because we consider that there is another explanation of the origin of belief in the Resurrection which is better, and which is in our opinion the true one. We mean that which is usually called the "vision-hypothesis."

The phenomenon which has to be accounted for is the apostolic belief that, after he had been dead and buried, Jesus "was seen" (*ὤφθη*) by certain persons. The explanation which we offer, and which has long been adopted in various forms by able critics,³ is, that doubtless Jesus was seen, but the vision was not

¹ *Holsten* remarks that the cry put into the mouth of Jesus on the Cross, in the first and second Synoptics: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" if genuine, can scarcely be otherwise historically conceived than as a last surrender of his last hope that God's will would not continue his sufferings even unto death. *Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr.*, p. 227.

² The reported statement in the Gospels that the women and his disciples did not at first recognise the risen Jesus, are quoted in connection with this point.

³ *Ewald*, *Gesch. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 68 ff.; *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. Paulus*, u. s. w., p. 117 ff., *et passim*; *Meijboom*, *Jezus' Opstanding*, p. 99 ff., 162 ff.; *Noack*, *Die*

real and objective, but illusory and subjective; that is to say: Jesus was not himself seen, but only a representation of Jesus within the minds of the beholders. This explanation not only does not impeach the veracity of those who affirmed that they had seen Jesus, but, accepting to a certain extent a subjective truth at the basis of the belief, explains upon well-known and natural principles the erroneous inference deduced from the subjective vision. It seems to us that the points to be determined are simple and obvious: Is it possible for a man to mistake subjective impressions for objective occurrences? Is it possible that any considerable number of persons can at the same time receive similar subjective impressions and mistake them for objective facts? If these questions can be answered affirmatively, and it can be shown that the circumstances, the characters, the constitution of those who believed in the first instance, favoured the reception of such subjective impressions, and equally the deduction of erroneous inferences; it may be admitted that a satisfactory explanation can thus be given of the apostolic belief, on other grounds than the reality of a miracle opposed to universal experience, little as we feel bound to give any such explanation at all. No sooner is the first question formulated than it becomes obvious to every one who is acquainted with psychological and physiological researches, or who has even the most elementary knowledge of the influence of the mind upon the body, that it must at once be answered in the affirmative. Indeed the affirmation that subjective impressions, in connection with every sense, can be mistaken for, and believed to be, actual objective effects, is so trite that it seems almost superfluous to make it. Every reader must be well acquainted with illustrations of the fact, or can readily make himself acquainted with them. The only difficulty is to deal authoritatively with such a point within moderate compass. We must limit ourselves to the sense of sight. "There are abundant proofs," says Sir Benjamin Brodie, "that impressions may be made in the brain by other causes simulating those which are made on it by external objects through the medium of the organs of sense, thus producing false perceptions, which may, in the first instance, and before we have had time to reflect on the subject, be mistaken for realities."¹ The limitation here in-

Aufersteh. d. Gekreuzigten im Lichte heut. Wiss., 1861, p. 133 ff.; Urspr. d. Christ., ii. p. 274 f.; Renan, Vie de Jésus, p. 448 ff.; Les Apôtres, p. 10 ff.; Réville, La Résurrection de J. C., p. 11 ff.; Strauss, Leb. Jesu, p. 295 ff.; Zeller, Apg., p. 196 ff. Cf. Krüger-Velthusen, Leb. Jesu, p. 263 ff.; Scholten, Het Ev. n. Joh., p. 346 ff.; Volkmar, Die Evangelien, p. 612 ff.; Die Rel. Jesu, p. 86 ff., 108; Weber u. Holtzmann, Gesch. V. Isr., p. 254 ff.; Weiss, Die Ev. Gesch., p. 438.

¹ Psychological Inquiries, 1854, p. 78; cf. 79 ff.

troduced: "before we have had time to reflect on the subject," is of course valid in the case of those whose reason is capable of rejecting the false perceptions, whether on the ground of natural law or of probability; but, in anyone ignorant of natural law, familiar with the idea of supernatural agency and the occurrence of miraculous events, it is obvious, reflection, if reflection of a sceptical kind can even be assumed, would have little chance of arriving at any true discrimination of phenomena. Speaking of the nervous system and its functions, and more immediately of the relation of the Cerebrum to the Sensorium and the production of spectral illusions, Dr. Carpenter says, in his work on the "Principles of Mental Physiology," which is well worth the study of those interested in the question we are discussing: "Still stronger evidence of the same associated action of the Cerebrum and Sensorium is furnished by the study of the phenomena designated as *Spectral Illusions*. These are clearly *sensorial states* not excited by external objects; and it is also clear that they frequently originate in cerebral changes, since they represent *creations* of the mind, and are not mere reproductions of past sensations." Dr. Carpenter refers in illustration to a curious illusion to which Sir John Herschel was subject, "in the shape of the involuntary occurrence of Visual impressions, into which Geometrical regularity of form enters as the leading character. These were not of the nature of those ocular Spectra which may be attributed with probability to retinal changes."¹ Dr. Carpenter then continues: "We have here *not* a reproduction of sensorial impressions formerly received; but a *construction* of new forms, by a process which, if it had been carried on *consciously*, we should have called imagination. And it is difficult to see how it is to be accounted for in any other way, than by an unconscious action of the cerebrum; the products of which impress themselves on the sensorial consciousness, just as, in other cases, they express themselves through the motor apparatus."² The illusions described by Sir John Herschel who, as he himself says, was "as little visionary as most people" should be referred to. Of the production of sensations by ideas there can be no possible doubt³ and, consequently, as little of the realisation by the person in whom they are produced of subjective impressions exactly as though they were objective. With regard to false perceptions, Dr. Carpenter says: "It has been shown that the action of *ideational* states upon the Sensorium can modify or even produce *sensations*. But the action of pre-existing states of Mind is still more frequently

¹ Sir John Herschel gives a full account of them in his "Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects," (Daldy, Isbister, & Co., 1876) p. 402 ff.

² Principles of Mental Physiology, 4th ed., 1875, p. 113 f.

³ *Ib.*, p. 155 ff.

shown in modifying the *interpretation* which we put upon our sense-impressions. For since almost every such interpretation is an act of *judgment* based upon experience, that judgment will vary according to our mental condition at the time it is delivered; and will be greatly affected by any dominant idea or feeling, so as even to occasion a complete mis-interpretation of the objective source of the sense-impression, as often occurs in what is termed 'absence of mind.' The following case, mentioned by Dr. Tuke¹ as occurring within his own knowledge, affords a good example of this fallacy:—'A lady was walking one day from Penryn to Falmouth, and her mind being at that time, or recently, occupied by the subject of drinking-fountains, thought she saw in the road a newly-erected fountain, and even distinguished an inscription upon it, namely—"If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink." Some time afterwards, she mentioned the fact with pleasure to the daughters of a gentleman who was supposed to have erected it. They expressed their surprise at her statement, and assured her that she must be quite mistaken. Perplexed with the contradiction between the testimony of her senses and of those who would have been aware of the fact had it been true, and feeling that she could not have been deceived ("for seeing is believing"), she repaired to the spot, and found to her astonishment that no drinking-fountain was in existence—only a few scattered stones, which had formed the foundation upon which the suggestion of an expectant imagination had built the superstructure. The subject having previously occupied her attention, those sufficed to form, not only a definite erection, but one inscribed by an appropriate motto corresponding to the leading idea.'² We may give as another illustration an illusion which presented itself to Sir Walter Scott.³ He had been reading, shortly after the death of Lord Byron, an account in a publication professing to detail the habits and opinions of the poet. As Scott had been intimate with Lord Byron he was deeply interested in the publication, which contained some particulars relative to himself and other friends. "Their sitting-room opened into an entrance hall, rather fantastically fitted up with articles of armour, skins of wild animals, and the like. It was when laying down his book, and passing into this hall, through which the moon was beginning to shine, that the individual of whom I speak saw, right before him, and in a standing posture, the exact representation of his departed friend whose recollection had been so strongly brought to his imagination. He stopped for a single moment, so as to notice the wonderful accu-

¹ Influence of the Mind on the Body, p. 44.

³ It is likewise quoted by Dr. Carpenter, p. 207 f.

² Carpenter, *Ib.*, 206 f.

racy with which fancy had impressed upon the bodily eye the peculiarities of dress and posture of the illustrious poet. Sensible, however, of the delusion, he felt no sentiment save that of wonder at the extraordinary accuracy of the resemblance, and stepped onward towards the figure, which resolved itself, as he approached, into the various materials of which it was composed. These were merely a screen, occupied by great-coats, shawls, plaids and such other articles as usually are found in a country entrance-hall. The spectator returned to the spot from which he had seen the illusion, and endeavoured, with all his power, to recall the image which had been so singularly vivid. But this was beyond his capacity," &c.¹ Although Sir Walter Scott might be sensible of the delusion, it may be more than doubted whether, in the first century of our era, such an apparition proceeding from or connected with religious agitation of mind would have been considered so. Dr. Abercrombie² mentions many instances of spectral illusions, "some of the most authentic facts" relating to which he classes under the head of "intense mental conceptions so strongly impressed upon the mind as, for the moment, to be believed to have a real existence." We cannot, however, venture to quote illustrations.³ Dr. Hibbert, in whose work on Apparitions many interesting instances are to be found, thus concludes his consideration of the conditions which lead to such illusions: "I have at length concluded my observations on what may be considered as the leading mental laws which are connected with the origin of spectral impressions. The general inference to be drawn from them is,—that *Apparitions are nothing more than morbid symptoms, which are indicative of an intense excitement of the renovated feelings of the mind.*"⁴ Subjective visions, believed to have had objective reality, abound in the history of the world. They are familiar to all who have read the lives of the Saints, and they have accompanied the progress of Christianity in various forms from the trances of Montanism to the vision of the "Immaculate Conception" in the Grotto of Lourdes.

If we turn to the inquiry whether a similar subjective impression can be received by many persons at one time and be mistaken by them for an objective reality, an equally certain reply in the affirmative must unhesitatingly be given. The contagiousness of emotion is well known,⁵ and the rapidity with which panic, for in-

¹ Demonology and Witchcraft, 1868, Letter i, p. 37 f.

² Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers, 19th ed., p. 274 ff.

³ Every one remembers the case of Luther and his visions of the Devil.

⁴ Sketches of the Philosophy of Apparitions, by Samuel Hibbert, M.D., F.R.S.E., 2nd ed., 1825, p. 375.

⁵ We might point in illustration to the use of "Tongues" in the Corinthian Church, where the contagiousness of the ecstatic state is exemplified. 1 Cor. xiv. 23, 26 ff.

stance, spreads from a single individual to the mass is remarked every day. The most trifling incident, unseen by more than a few and, therefore, more pliant in the imagination of the many, has instantaneously convinced multitudes of the most erroneous inferences. We need scarcely refer, moreover, to the numerous religious and other mental epidemics which have swept over the face of the world, infecting society with the wildest delusions. From Montanism to camp meetings and revivals in our own day, it has been demonstrated that religious excitement and dominant ideas have spread with astonishing rapidity and power amongst the circles in which they have arisen. In certain states of nervous expectation, false impressions are instantaneously transmitted from one to another in a religious assembly. Dr. Carpenter says: "Moreover, if not only a single individual, but several persons should be 'possessed' by one and the same idea or feeling, the same misinterpretation may be made by all of them; and in such a case the concurrence of their testimony does not add the least strength to it. Of this we have a good example in the following occurrence cited by Dr. Tuke, as showing the influence of a 'dominant idea' in falsifying the perceptions of a number of persons at once: 'During the conflagration at the Crystal Palace in the winter of 1866-67, when the animals were destroyed by the fire, it was supposed that the Chimpanzee had succeeded in escaping from his cage. Attracted to the roof, with this expectation in full force, men saw the unhappy animal holding on to it, and writhing in agony to get astride one of the iron ribs. It need not be said that its struggles were watched by those below with breathless suspense, and as the newspapers informed us "with sickening dread." But there was no animal whatever there; and all this feeling was thrown away upon a tattered piece of blind, so torn as to resemble to the eye of fancy, the body, arms, and legs of an ape!' (Op. cit., p. 44.) Another example of a like influence affecting several individuals simultaneously in a similar manner is mentioned by Dr. Hibbert in his well-known Treatise on Apparitions: 'A whole ship's company was thrown into the utmost consternation by the apparition of a cook who had died a few days before. He was distinctly seen walking a-head of the ship, with a peculiar gait by which he was distinguished when alive, through having one of his legs shorter than the other. On steering the ship towards the object, it was found to be a piece of floating wreck. Many similar cases might be referred to, in which the imagination has worked up into 'apparitions' some common-place objects, which it has invested with attributes derived from the previous Mental state of the observer; and the belief in such an apparition as a reality, which usually exists in

such cases, unless antagonized by an effort of the reason, constitutes a *delusion*."¹ We must maintain indeed that a number of persons assembled under the influence of strong similar ideas, and excited by the same active religious emotion are more likely to be affected by similar subjective impressions to the extent of believing them to be objective than one or two would be. The excitement of each acts upon the whole body, and is itself increased by reaction from the aggregate emotion. Each receives impressions from the other, which are vividly felt even without being verified by personal experience. The most nervous temperament in the assembly gives the final impetus to the excited imagination of the rest. In moments of supreme expectation and doubt, enthusiasm overcomes reason. If one man see, if one man hear, the mental impression is credited with an objective cause, even when unfelt by others, and then a similar impression is soon carried from the brain to the sensorium of all. There is no supposition of a diseased mind in this in ordinary cases, and in the instances which we have in view the false perceptions were determined and encouraged by foregone conclusions of a nature rarely possible and, when existing, rarely resisted. "There are many persons," adds Dr. Carpenter, "quite sane upon ordinary matters, and even (it may be) distinguished by some special form of ability, who are yet affected with what the writer once heard Mr. Carlyle term a 'diluted insanity'; allowing their minds to become so completely 'possessed' by 'dominant ideas,' that their testimony as to what they declare themselves to have witnessed—even when several individuals concur in giving exactly the same account of it—must be regarded as utterly untrustworthy."²

That subjective impressions can, in the opinion of eminent apologists, be recorded by an Evangelist as objective reality, we have already pointed out in connection with the statement of the first Synoptist, that "Many bodies of the saints were raised; and they came out of the sepulchres after his resurrection and appeared unto many." (xxvii. 52 f.) Dean Milman and Canon Farrar explain this by the supposition that the earthquake "seemed to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen appeared to linger in the Holy City."³ It follows as a logical consequence that as this subjective impression felt by many at once is described in the Gospel as objective; these writers not only admit the possibility of such a mistake on the part

¹ Principles of Mental Physiology, 1876, p. 208 f.

² Principles of Mental Physiology, 1876, p. 209.

³ Farrar, Life of Christ, ii. p. 419; Milman, Hist. of Christianity, i. 336 f. Passages quoted p. 989.

of the observers, but that the Gospel, in adopting that mistake, may be suspected of a similar course in recording the appearances of Jesus.

We have thus replied to the question whether the "vision-hypothesis" could explain the belief of five hundred, or even of eleven persons who supposed they had seen Jesus at once, and we do not think that any one who seriously considers the Age, and the circumstances under which the phenomenon is alleged to have occurred, can doubt that such belief could very easily have resulted from merely subjective impressions. Before going further into the discussion of the matter, however, we must again, with a little more minuteness, call attention to the date of the actual statements upon which the whole argument turns. The Apostle Paul writes about a quarter of a century after the time when it is said that Jesus "was seen" by those whom he names. Whatever opinion may be formed as to the amount of information obtained by Paul during the visit he paid to Jerusalem for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Peter, it is undeniable that some years had elapsed between the time when Jesus is supposed to have been seen and the time when Paul could have received information regarding these appearances from any of the Apostles. If we date the death of Jesus in the year 33, almost the latest date assigned to it by any eminent critic, and the conversion of Paul about A.D. 38-40,¹ it will be remembered that the Apostle himself states that he did not go to Jerusalem till three years after, which brings us to A.D. 41-43 as the earliest time when Paul first came in personal contact with Peter and James. He did not go up to Jerusalem again for fourteen years after that, and we have no reason for believing that he met any of the Apostles in the interval, but the contrary, from his own account of that second visit, Gal. ii. 2. He could not, therefore, have heard anything of the appearances of Jesus even from Peter and James till some eight to ten years after they had taken place. From the other Apostles, in all probability, he cannot have heard anything till nearly twenty years had elapsed since they supposed they had seen Jesus. Where did he get his information regarding the 500 brethren at once? From whom did he get it? If the supposed appearance took place, as so many suppose, in Galilee, the date of his information is still more uncertain. If, on the other hand, it occurred in Jerusalem, whilst so many of

¹ The Chronicon Paschale dates it 42; and the following critics date it as noted: *Michaelis*, about 37? *Kuinoel*, 40; *Heinrichs*, 37? *Eichhorn*, 37 or 38; *Hug*, 35; *Schmidt*, 41; *Bertholdt*, 40; *Feilmoser*, 35; *Winer*, 38? *De Wette*, 37 or 38; *Schott*, 37; *Schrader*, 39; *Anger*, 38? *Wieseler*, 40; *Ewald*, 38; *Meyer*, 35. *Wieseler*, *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters*, 1848, *Chronologische Tabelle*; *Meyer*, *Ap. g.*, p. 24.

the numbers were visitors only, it is obvious that the greater part must subsequently have left the Holy City and become scattered to their respective homes. The difficulty of obtaining information from more than a few of the 500 becomes obvious. In any case, from no authority which we are entitled to assume could Paul have been minutely informed of these appearances less than eight to ten years after they occurred, and then of the vision of the Eleven, only from one of the number to whom the first vision occurred. Now, no one who considers the operation of memory, even in persons of more than usual sobriety of imagination, dealing with circumstances not likely to be exaggerated or distorted by feeling in the course of time, can doubt that, in ten years, all the circumstances of such occasions, amidst which much excitement certainly prevailed, must have assumed a very different aspect from what they originally bore. We may be permitted to quote a few words on this subject: "Though we are accustomed to speak of memory as if it consisted in an *exact* reproduction of past states of Consciousness, yet experience is continually showing us that this reproduction is very often *inexact*, through the modification which the 'trace' has undergone in the interval. Sometimes the trace has been partially obliterated; and what remains may serve to give a very erroneous (because imperfect) view of the occurrence. . . . And where it is one in which our own Feelings are interested, we are extremely apt to lose sight of what goes against them, so that the representation given by Memory is altogether one-sided. This is continually demonstrated by the entire dissimilarity of the accounts of the same occurrence or conversation, which shall be given by two or more parties concerned in it, even when the matter is fresh in their minds, and they are honestly desirous of telling the truth. And this diversity will usually become still more pronounced with the lapse of time: the trace becoming gradually but unconsciously modified by the habitual course of thought and feeling; so that when it is so acted on after a lengthened interval as to bring up a reminiscence of the original occurrence, that reminiscence really represents, *not* the actual occurrence, but the modified trace of it."¹ This is specially likely to occur where, as in our case, there were Old Testament prophecies supposed to describe minutely the sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, to furnish lines upon which the transformation of memory must insensibly shape itself. Unconsciously, we may be certain, the misty outlines of the original transaction would acquire consistency and take form according to the tenor of so infallible an index. It would require a memory of iron and of more than stubborn dog-

¹ *Carpenter, Principles of Mental Psychology, 1876, p. 456.*

gedness to resist the unobtrusive influence of supposed prophecies. Be it clearly understood that we speak of an unconscious process, which is perfectly consistent with complete belief that the transformed trace is exactly what originally took place. But adhering more closely to the point before us, can we suppose that the account which Paul received of these appearances, after that lapse of time, was a perfectly sober and unwarped description of what actually took place? We think not. Is it possible that the vision of the 500, for instance, had escaped the maturing influence of time? or that of the Eleven? We believe that it is not possible. However, Paul does not give a single detail, and consequently this argument mainly affects the abstract value of all such evidence whether at first or second hand, but it likewise makes more vague the original transaction, so indefinitely sketched for us, which we have to explain. What was it the 500 really saw? "Jesus," says the report matured by time; and modern divines taking the statement in its most objective sense, demand an explanation of the unknown phenomenon which led 500 to believe that they actually saw the riser Master. Did the 500 originally think anything of the kind? What impression did the individuals receive? Did any two receive precisely the same impression? There is not the slightest evidence that they did. Although Paul gives the most meagre report of these appearances that could well be conceived, it must be remembered that the impression made upon his own mind was not by the events themselves but by the narrative of the events recounted at least eight or ten years afterwards. There can be no doubt that, earlier, Paul the persecutor must also frequently have heard of the Resurrection, and of alleged occasions when Jesus had been seen after his death and burial, from persecuted members of the Christian community, but beyond the undefined certainty of this we are not entitled to go. That what he heard must have received warmth of colouring from the fire of persecution is most probable. Of this, however, we shall speak presently.

It is not necessary further to enlarge upon the superstition of the age of which we write. We have elsewhere quoted the opinion of an orthodox divine and Hebrew scholar on the character of the Jewish people about that period. "Not to be more tedious, therefore, in this matter," he says, "let two things only be observed: i. That the nation under the second Temple was given to magical arts beyond measure; and ii. That it was given to an easiness of believing all manner of delusions beyond measure."¹ And again: "It is a disputable case whether the Jewish nation

¹ *Lightfoot, Hæcæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ; Works, ed. Pitman, 1823, xi. p. 81.*

were more mad with superstition in matters of religion, or with superstition in curious arts."¹ Even supposing the Twelve to have been men of superior intelligence to most of their fellow-countrymen of the period, it cannot reasonably be questioned that they were "men of like passions" and failings with the rest, and that, as were the most eminent men of all countries for centuries after, they were ignorant of the true order of nature, full of superstitious ideas regarding cosmical phenomena, and ready at all times to believe in miracles and supernatural interference with the affairs of life. As Jews, moreover, they had inherited belief in angelic agency and divine apparitions. The old Testament is full of narratives in which Jehovah appears to the Patriarchs and Law-givers of Israel. Celestial visions had been familiar to every Jew from his infancy, and the constant personal communications of the Almighty with his peculiar people were still the most sacred traditions of the nation. Nursed in the prevalent superstition of the time, educated by the Law and the Prophets to familiarity with the supernatural, and prepared by the fervid imagination of their race to recognise wonders in heaven and earth,² the disciples were naturally prepared for the great Christian Miracle. The special circumstances in which they were placed at the death of Jesus conduced in the highest degree to excite that expectant attention which, in their state of profound agitation, rendered them readily susceptible of extraordinary impressions. The disciples had for a long period followed Jesus and felt the influence of his elevated character. It may be doubted how far they had entered into the spirit of his sublime teaching, or understood the spiritual wisdom which lay beneath the noble simplicity of his language, but it cannot be doubted that his personal greatness must have produced a profound effect upon their minds. When they came at last to understand, if in a material and imperfect way, his views as to his Messianic character, they can have had little difficulty in believing, in spite of the mysterious lowliness and humility of his aspect, although probably in a sense widely different from his own, that the hope of Israel had at last come, and that the hour of her redemption was at hand. It is probable that, as the enmity of the priests and rulers increased, and the danger of his position became more apparent, whilst he disdained unworthily to shrink from his public work, he must have felt all the peril before him, and observed the anxiety of his followers. It may be conceived that, under such circumstances, his teachings may have assumed even a higher spirituality than before and, rising above the clouds of the pre-

¹ *Ib.*, xi. p. 299 f.

² Cf. *Exeal*, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, vi. p. 345.

sent, soared out into that calmer future when the religion he founded would be accepted by men, and become a light to the Gentiles and the glory of his people Israel. It is probable that he may have spoken of his death in spiritual terms as a sacrifice for them and for the world, which would secure the triumph of his work and regenerate mankind. Comforting those who had left all and followed him, but from whom he might so soon be parted, and knowing their doubts and fears, he must have re-assured their minds by inspiring views of the inseparable nature of his union with those who loved him and did his commandments; his spirit dwelling within them and leading them safely through the world, in the peace and security of souls raised by the truth beyond the reach of its corruption and its wrong. That they must have felt the strongest conviction of his Messianic character, we think cannot be doubted, however confused may have been their ideas of the exact nature of his office and of the manner in which his coming was to secure the triumph of Israel. The shock to their expectations and the utter dissipation of their hopes which must have been felt in the first moment of his arrest, hurried trial, and cruel condemnation can well be imagined. It is probable that in that first moment of terror and bewilderment the disciples indeed all forsook him and fled. No one who had consorted with the Great Teacher, however, and felt the influence of his mind, could long have resisted the reaction to nobler thoughts of him. In all the bitterness of sorrow for the loss of their master and friend, in horror at his agonizing and shameful death, and in doubt, consternation, and almost despair, they must have gathered together again and spoken of these strange events. Believing Jesus to have been the Messiah, how could they interpret his death on the cross? If he was the Messiah could he thus die? ¹ If Enoch and Elijah, if Moses, precursors of the Messiah, had not seen death, how could that prophet like unto Moses whom Jehovah had raised up end his career by a shameful death on the cross? Throughout that time of fiery trial and supreme mental agitation, they must have perpetually sought in their own minds some explanation of the terrible events then occurring and seeming to blast all their hopes, and doubtless mystic utterances of Jesus must have assumed new meanings, meanings probably different from his own. In the accounts of the coming Messiah in the Prophets, they must have searched for some light by which to solve the inexplicable problem. Is it not conceivable that, in that last time of danger and darkness, when he saw the persecution against him become more vehement, and felt that the path which he had chosen led him

¹ Cf. *Ewald*, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vi. p. 72 a. ff.; *Holsten*, *Zum Evang. des Paul. u. Petr.*, p. 193 f., p. 229 ff.

through danger and distress perhaps to death, Jesus may, in the bitter contemplation of that fanatical opposition of bigotry and superstition have applied to himself the description of the suffering servant of Jehovah, suffering—as all noble souls have done who are in advance of their age, and preach great truths which condemn either directly or by implication the vices and follies of their time—"the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," and, worse still, the ignoble insults of popular ignorance and fickleness? Here might seem to them the solution of the enigma; and returning from that first flight of terror and bewilderment, feeling all the intense reaction of affection and grief and faith in the Master quickened by shame at their abandonment of him in his moment of supreme danger and affliction, still believing that he must be the Messiah, and in mute longing and expectation of the next events which were to confirm or confound their hopes, the disciples must have been in the climax of nervous agitation and excitement, and ready to receive any impression which might be suggested in their embarrassment.¹

According to Paul it was Peter who first saw the risen Jesus. According to the first and fourth Gospels, the first appearance was to the women, and notably, in the latter, to Mary Magdalene, out of whom had been cast "seven devils," and whose temperament probably rendered her unusually susceptible of all such impressions. Did Paul intentionally omit all mention of the appearances to the women, or did he not know of them? In the latter case, we have an instructive light thrown on the Gospel tradition; in the former, the first suggestion of the Resurrection becomes even more clearly intelligible. It will be observed that in all this explanation we are left chiefly to conjecture, for the statements in the Gospels cannot, upon any point, be used with the slightest confidence. On the other hand, all that is demanded is that a probable or possible explanation of the origin of the belief in the Resurrection should be given; and in the total absence of historical data we are entitled to draw inferences as to the course of events at the time. It may well be that a mistake as to the sepulchre, rendered not improbable if any hint of the truth be conveyed in the conflicting traditions of the Gospel, or one of many other suggestions which might be advanced, might lead the women or Peter to believe that the sepulchre was empty. Or some other even trifling circumstance, which we no longer can indicate with precision, might convey to the women or to Peter,

¹ Ewald points out that, according to the belief of the period, the souls of the dead hovered for a time between heaven and earth, and he considers that the belief undeniably played an important part in this sphere of visions of the Christ. *Gesch. d. V. Isr.*, vi. p. 72 a.

in their state of nervous excitement, the last impulse wanting to cause that rapid revulsion from extreme depression, which is so suitable to the state which we may perhaps be allowed to call creative subjectivity. If we are to accept the indications scattered about the New Testament, the impetuous ardent temperament of Peter was eminently one to bound into sudden ecstatic enthusiasm, and in all probability some commonplace or trifling incident may have been the spark which kindled into flame the materials already at glowing heat. The strong subjective impression that Jesus had risen would create a vision of him which, at once confirming previous conclusions, resolving perplexing doubts and satisfying feverish expectations, would be accepted by each mind with little or no question as an objective reality. If Peter, or even the women, brought to the disciples the assurance that they had seen the Lord, we cannot doubt that, in the unparalleled position in which they were then placed, under all the circumstances of intense feeling and religious excitement at the moment, such emotions would be suddenly called into action as would give to these men the impression that they had seen the Master whom they had lost. These subjective impressions would be strengthened daily and unconsciously into ever more objective consistency, and being confirmed by supposed prophecy would be affirmed with a confidence insensibly inspired by dogmatic considerations.¹ That the news would fly from believer to believer, meeting everywhere excited attention and satisfying eager expectancy, is certain; and that these devout souls, swayed by every emotion of glad and exultant enthusiasm, would constantly mistake the suggestions of their own thoughts for objective realities is certain. Jesus died, was buried, and rose again "according to the Scriptures." This would harden every timid supposition into assurance; and as time went on, what was doubtful would become certain, what was mysterious, clear; and those who had seen nothing would take up and strengthen the tradition of those who had seen the Lord.

It is argued that there was not time for the preparation of the disciples to believe in the Resurrection of Jesus between his crucifixion and "the third day," when that event is alleged to have occurred, and, consequently, no probability of subjective impressions of so unexpected a nature being received. To those apologists who adopt this argument we might point to many passages in the Gospels, which affirm that the resurrection on the third day was predicted. These, however, we assign of course to a later date. The argument assumes that there was no preparation

¹ Cf. *Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vi. p. 72 a. ff.; *Holsten, Zum Ev. Paul. u. Petr.*, p. 229 ff.; *Keim, Jesu v. Nazara*, iii. p. 590 ff.

in the teaching of Jesus, which, as we have endeavoured to suggest, is not the case. If there had been no other, the mere assurance that he was the Messiah must have led to reflections, which demanded some other sequel to his career than the death of a slave. The mere suggestion of such a problem as must have proposed itself to the minds of the disciples: If all is to end here, Jesus was not the Messiah: if he was the Messiah, what will now happen?—must have led to expectant attention. But there was much more than this. In such moments as those of the Passion, thought works feverishly and fast. It is not to be supposed that Peter and the rest did not foresee the end, when Jesus was led away prisoner in the hands of his enemies. It is still less to be imagined that their minds were not ceaselessly revolving that problem, on the solution of which depended their fondest hopes and highest aspirations.¹ It is most probable, indeed, that no time could have found the disciples in a state so ripe for strong impressions as that immediately succeeding the death of their Master. There are, however, other aspects in which this point may be placed. What evidence is there that Jesus was seen, or supposed to have been seen, on the third day? Absolutely none worthy of the name. Paul does not say that he was, and as for the Gospels their statement is of no value, and the tradition which they record may be set down as a foregone dogmatic conclusion. Paul very distinctly shows this. He says: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he has been raised the third day, according to the Scriptures."² The repetition of the phrase "according to the Scriptures" is very marked, and points to the fact that the purpose for which Jesus died—"for our sins"—and the date of his resurrection—"the third day"—are statements directly based upon Scripture. We have mentioned that the Scriptures supposed to indicate the third day, do not really apply to the Messiah at all, but this does not affect the question before us. Now believing this epoch to be defined in prophecy, this is precisely one of those points upon which memory would, in the lapse of time, be most likely to adjust itself to the prophecy. We will assume that Jesus was not "seen" before the third day. It is obvious that if he was seen forty days after, it might be affirmed that he had been actually raised long before, on the third day. The vision occurring on the third day itself even could not prove that he had not "risen" before. There is, in fact, no way that we can see of fixing the third day except the statement of "Scripture," and, the moment

¹ Cf. *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. des Paul. u. Petr.*, p. 233 f.

² 1 Cor. xv. 3 f.

we accept that, we must recognise the force of dogmatic influence.¹ The fact that the third day has from early times been set apart as the Christian Sabbath, does not prove anything. If the third day was believed to be the day indicated by "Scripture" for the Resurrection, of course that day would be selected as the time at which it must have occurred, and on which it should be commemorated. So far as the vision hypothesis is concerned, the day is of no consequence whatever, and the objection upon this point has no force.

There is another consideration which we must mention, which is not only important in connection with an estimate of the evidence for the Resurrection, but the inferences from which clearly support the explanation we are proposing. Before stating it we may, in passing, again refer to the fact that it is nowhere affirmed that anyone was an eye-witness of the actual Resurrection. It is supposed to be proved by the circumstance that Jesus was subsequently "seen." Observe, however, that the part of this miracle which could not well have been ascribed to subjective impressions—the actual resurrection—is, naturally enough, not seen by anyone, but that which comes precisely within the scope of such subjective action is said to have been seen by many. To come at once to our point, however, neither Paul, nor the Gospels, nor Christian tradition in any form, pretends that Jesus was seen by any one but his disciples and those who believed in him. In fact, Jesus only appeared to those who were prepared by faith and expectant attention to see him in the manner we assert. We are at present merely speaking of the earlier appearances, and reserving Paul for separate discussion. Why, we may inquire, did Jesus not appear to his enemies as well as to his friends?² Nothing of course could have been more intelligible than his desire to comfort and reassure those who believed in and mourned for him, but to do this by no means excluded a wider manifestation of himself, supposing him to have actually risen from the dead. On the hypothesis that he only rose again and was seen through the yearning and enthusiastic faith of his followers, the reason why he was not seen by others is not hard to find. Yet it might be thought that the object of at once establishing beyond doubt his supernatural mission, and convincing his enemies of their crime, and the Jews of their blindness and folly, was important enough. Had he shown himself to the Chief Priests and elders,

¹ We do not go into any argument based on the order given in the first two Synoptics to go into Galilee—a three days' journey at least—where the disciples were to see Jesus. Nor need we touch upon other similar points which arise out of the narratives of the Gospels.

² Cf. *Schenkel*, *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, 2te Aufl., 1864, p. 324; *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr.*, p. 124.

and confounded the Pharisees with the vision of him whom they had so cruelly nailed to the accursed tree, how might not the future of his followers have been smoothed, and the faith of many made strong! Or if he had stood again in the Courts of the Roman Procurator, no longer a prisoner buffeted and spat upon, but the glorious Messiah, beyond the reach of Jewish malignity or Roman injustice. But no, he was seen by none but those devoted to him. We shall of course be told by apologists that this also was "for the trial of our faith;" though to anyone who earnestly reflects, it must seem childish to ask men to believe what is beyond their reason, yet conceal the evidence by which reason is supposed to be guided. The reply, however, is clear: for the trial of our faith or for any other reason, it is nevertheless certain that this evidence does not exist. When the argument which we are now discussing was first advanced long ago by Celsus, Origen had no better refutation than, after admitting the fact that Jesus was not after his resurrection seen as before publicly and by all men, to take refuge in the belief that the passage of Paul regarding his appearances contains wonderful mysteries which, if understood, would explain why Jesus did not show himself after that event as he had done before it.¹

We must now proceed to show that the vision of Paul is satisfactorily explained by the same hypothesis.² We have already proved that there is no evidence of any value that Paul's conversion was due to his having seen Jesus in a manner which he believed to be objective and supernatural. To represent the arch persecutor Paul transformed in a moment, by a miraculous vision of Jesus, into the Apostle of the Gentiles was highly characteristic of the Author of Acts, who further represents Paul as imme-

¹ *Contra Cels.*, ii. 63. It is curious that, in an earlier chapter, Origen discussing the question of Celsus, whether any one who had been actually dead had ever risen with a real body, says that if Celsus had been a Jew who believed that Elijah and Elisha had raised little children he could not have advanced this objection. Origen adds that he thinks the reason why Jesus appeared to no other nation but the Jews was, that they had become accustomed to miracles, and could, by comparing the works of Jesus and what was told of him with what had been done before, recognise that he was greater than all who had preceded him. ii. 57.

² *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 75 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 247 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Allg. Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit., vi. p. 1 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 95 f., 345 ff.; *Haus-rath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 134 ff.; in *Schenkel's B. L.*, iv. p. 418; *Hilgenfeld*, *Lehr. wiss. Th.*, 1864, p. 155 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 1 ff., 65 ff.; *Keim*, Der Gesch. Christus, 1866, p. 134, 137; cf. *Jesu v. Naz.*, iii. p. 540 ff.; *Lany*, Religiöse Charaktere, i. 1862, p. 15 ff.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 99 ff.; *Noack*, Der Urspr. d. Christenthums, ii. p. 274 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 14 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 178 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 529; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 21 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 541 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 195 ff. Cf. *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 230 ff.; *Usteri*, Br. Gal., p. 26; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 412 f.

diately preaching publicly in Damascus and confounding the Jews. Widely different is the statement of Paul. He distinctly affirms that he did not communicate with flesh and blood, nor went he up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before him, but that he immediately went away into Arabia. The Fathers delighted in representing this journey to Arabia as an instance of Paul's fervour and eagerness to preach the Gospel in lands over which its sound had not yet gone forth. There can be no doubt, however, we think, that Paul's journey to Arabia and his sojourn there were for the purpose of reflection.¹ It is only in legends that instantaneous spiritual revolutions take place. In sober history the process is more slow and progressive. We repeat that there is no evidence which can at all be accepted that Paul's conversion was effected by a vision, and that it is infinitely more probable that it was, so to say, merely completed and crowned by seeing Jesus; but, at the same time, even if the representation be adopted that this vision was the decisive circumstance which induced Paul at once to resign his course of persecution and embrace Christianity, our argument is not materially affected. In any case, much silent, deep, and almost unconscious preparation for the change must long before have commenced in the mind of Paul, which was finally matured in the Arabian waste. Upon no view that is taken can this be excluded; upon every ground of common sense, experience, and necessary inference, it must be admitted. Indifference is the only great gulf which separates opinions. There was no stolid barrier of apathy between Saul of Tarsus and belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. In persecuting Christianity, Paul proved two things: the earnestness and energy of his convictions, and the fact that his attention was keenly directed to the new sect. Both points contributed to the result we are discussing. Paul's Judaism was no mere formalism. It was the adoption, heart and soul, of the religion of his people; which was to him no dead principle, but a living faith stimulating that eager impetuous character to defend its integrity with "fire and sword." He did not, like so many of his countrymen, turn away with scorn from the followers of the despised Nazarene and leave them to their delusion; but turned to them, on the contrary, with the fierce attraction of the zealot whose own belief is outraged by the misbelief of others. The earnest Jew came into sharp collision with the earnest Christian. The earnestness of each was an element of mutual respect. The

¹ *Bisping*, Ex. H'buch N. T., vi. 1, p. 187; *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. Paulus*, p. 269, *anm.*; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 90; *Schrader*, *Der Ap. P.*, v. p. 263. Cf. *Alford*, *Gk. Test.*, iii. p. 9; *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 17 f.; *Neander*, *Pflanzung*, p. 123; *de Wette*, *Br. an d. Gal.*, p. 19.

endurance and firmness of the one might not melt the bigoted resolution of the other, but it arrested his attention and commanded his unconscious sympathy. Just so would the persecutor have endured and resisted persecution; so, subsequently, he actually did meet it. And what was the main difference between the persecutor and the persecuted? It consisted in that which constituted the burden of the apostolic preaching: the belief that "this was the Christ." The creed of the new sect at least was not complicated. It was little more at that time than a question of identity, until Paul himself developed it into an elaborate system of theology. In this question of identity, however, there was comprised a vast change of national ideas. To the devout Jew,—looking for the hope of Israel, yearning and praying for the advent of that Son of David who was to sit upon the throne of his fathers, restore the fortunes of the people, drive out the heathen and subdue the nations again to the yoke of Israel, establishing the worship of Jehovah in its purity and turning the Gentiles to the service of the God of Gods,—it was an abhorrent thought that the lowly peasant who had died a shameful death on Golgotha should be represented as the Messiah, the promised King of the Jews. Still there was something sufficiently startling in the idea to excite reflection. A political aspirant, who pretended to play the part, and after some feeble attempt at armed insurrection had been crushed by the heel of the Roman, could not have attracted attention. In that, there would have been no originality to astonish, and no singularity to require explanation. This man, on the contrary, who was said to be the Messiah, assumed no earthly dignity; claimed no kingdom in this world; had not even a place to lay his head; but ended a short and unambitious career as the teacher of a simple but profound system of morality by death on a cross. There was no vulgar imitation here. This was the reverse of the Messiah of the Jews. In spite of so much dissimilarity, however, there was in the two parties a fundamental agreement of belief. The Jew expected the Messiah; the Christian believed he had now come. The Messiah expected by the Jew was certainly a very different Saviour from the despised and rejected Jesus of Nazareth, but at the root of the Christian faith lay belief in a Messiah. It was a thoroughly Jewish belief, springing out of the covenant with the fathers and based upon the Law and the Prophets. The difference was not one of principle but one of details. Their interpretation of the promises was strangely dissimilar, but the trust of both was in the God of Israel. To pass from one to the other did not involve the adoption of a new religion, but merely a modification

of the views of the old. Once convinced that the Messiah was not a political ruler but a spiritual guide, not a victorious leader, but a suffering servant of Jehovah, the transition from judaic hopes to recognition of Jesus was almost accomplished. It is clear that Paul in his capacity of Persecutor must have become well acquainted with the views of the Christians, and probably must have heard them repeatedly expounded by his captives before the Jewish Sanhedrin.¹ He must have heard the victims of his blind religious zeal affirming their faith with all that ecstatic assurance which springs out of persecution. The vision of Peter contributed to the vision of Paul. There can be no doubt that Paul must have become aware of the application to Jesus of Old Testament prophecies, and of the new conception thence derived of a suffering Messiah. The political horizon was certainly not suggestive of the coming of the Lord's Anointed. Never had the fortunes of Israel been at a lower ebb. The hope of a Prince of the house of David to restore dominion to the fallen race was hard to entertain. The suggestion of an alternative theory based upon a new interpretation of the prophets, if startling, was not untimely, when the old confidence was becoming faint in many minds, and the hope of his coming seemed so distant and unsure. If we do not misjudge the character of Paul, however shocked he may have been at first by the substitution of a crucified Nazarene for the triumphant Messiah of his earlier visions, there must have been something profoundly pleasing to his mind in the conception of a spiritual Messiah. As he became familiar with the idea, it is probable that flashes of doubt must have crossed his mind as to the correctness of his more material views. If the belief were true, which Christians professed, that this Jesus, despised and rejected of men, was actually the suffering servant of Jehovah, and this servant of Jehovah the Messiah! If the claim of this Jesus who had been esteemed smitten of God and afflicted, had been verified by his rising again from the dead and ascending to the right hand of God! This aspect of the Messianic idea had a mystery and significance congenial to the soul of Paul. The supernatural elements could have presented no difficulties to him. Belief in the Resurrection was part of his creed as a Pharisee. That the risen Messiah should have been seen by many, the fundamental idea once admitted, could not surprise the visionary Jew. We can well imagine the conflict which went on in the ardent mind of Paul when doubts first entered it; his resistance and struggle for the faith of his youth; the pursuance as duty of the course he had begun, whilst the former conviction no longer

¹ Hausrath, *Der Ap. Paulus*, 2 Aufl., 1872, p. 130 f.

strengthened the feverish energy; the excitement of religious zeal in the mad course of persecution, not to be arrested in a moment, but become, by growing doubt, bitterness and pain to him; the suffering inflicted sending its pang into his own flesh. There was ample preparation in such a situation for the vision of Paul.

The constitution and temperament of the Apostle were eminently calculated to receive impressions of the strongest description.¹ We have mentioned the conjecture of many able men that his "stake in the flesh" was a form of epilepsy. It is, of course, but a conjecture, though one which has great probability,² and we must not treat it otherwise; but, if it could be proved correct, much light would be thrown upon Paul's visions. We have discussed the Apostle's statements regarding the supernatural Charismata in the Church, and have seen his extreme readiness to believe in the lavish bestowal of miraculous gifts where others could recognise but ordinary qualities. That Paul should be able to claim the power of speaking with tongues more than all the Corinthians, whose exercise of that spiritual gift he so unceremoniously restrains, is in perfect keeping with all that we elsewhere learn about him. Everywhere we find the keenly impressionable nature so apt to fall into the ecstatic state when brought under the influence of active religious emotion. "I must glory," he exclaims with irresistible impulse on coming to a theme so congenial to him, "I must glory; it is not indeed expedient, but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord."³ Even when he speaks of the stake in his flesh, which he does in such suggestive connection with his visions, he describes it as sent lest he should "be exalted above measure by the excess of the revelations."⁴ We have so repeatedly had to refer to Paul's claim to have received his Gospel by special revelation that we need not again speak of it here. If we could quote Acts as a genuine representation of Christian tradition regarding Paul, we might point out the visions and revelations therein so freely ascribed to him, but his own writings are amply sufficient for our purpose. Even his second journey to Jerusalem is attributed to the direction of revelation.⁵ The only vision regarding which the Apostle gives any particulars is that referred to, 2 Cor. xii. 2: "I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I know not, whether out of the body I know not, God knoweth),

¹ Cf. *Holsten*, *Zum Ev. des Paulus*, u. s. w., p. 84 ff.

² Cf. Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3.

³ Καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μὲν, ἐλεῖσθαι δὲ εἰς ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου. 2 Cor. xii. 1.

⁴ 2 Cor. xii. 7.

⁵ Gal. ii. 2.

such an one caught up even unto the third heaven. 3. And I know such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knoweth), 4. that he was caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. 5. For such an one will I boast," etc.¹ It has been argued from this passage and the repetition of the expression "whether in the body or out of the body I know not," that Paul himself could clearly distinguish objective facts from subjective impressions.² No interpretation could well be more erroneous. It is evident that Paul has no doubt whatever of his having been in the third heaven and in Paradise, and as little of his having heard the unspeakable words. That is quite objectively real to him. His only doubt is whether the body was caught up with his soul upon this occasion.³ No one who has carefully considered such phenomena and examined the statements here made can have any doubt as to the nature of this vision. The conception of being caught up into "the third heaven," "into Paradise," and there hearing these "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter," betrays in no doubtful manner the source of the subjective impressions. Of course, divines who are prepared to see in this passage the account of an actual objective event will not consider it evidence that Paul had subjective visions which he believed to have been objective facts; but to those who, more rightly and reasonably, we think, recognise the subjective character of the vision, it must at once definitely settle the point that Paul could mistake subjective impressions for objective realities, and consequently the argument for the similar subjectivity of the vision of Jesus becomes complete. The possibility of such a mistake is precisely what apologists question. Here is an instance in which the mistake has clearly been made by Paul. The Apostle's own statements show him to have been superlatively visionary and impressionable, with restless nervous energy it is true, but, at the same time, with keen physical and mental susceptibility. Liable to be uplifted by "the excess of revelations," glorying in "visions and revelations of the Lord," possessing ecsta-

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 2. Οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἔκτος τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ἀρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰς τρίτον οὐρανόν. 3. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, εἴτε ἐν σώματι εἴτε ἔκτος τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν. 4. ὅτι ἠρπάγη εἰς τὸν παραδεισὸν καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξόν ἄνθρωπῳ λαλῆσαι. 5. ὑπὲρ τοιοῦτον καυχῶμαι, κ.τ.λ.

² Cf. Neander, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 154; Paul, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1863, p. 201; Westcott, Gospel of the Resurrection, p. 112, note 1.

³ Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1864, p. 174 f.; Holsten, Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr., p. 21 ff., p. 122 f. Hilgenfeld points out that the representation of such a separation from the body as Paul here contemplates is to be found in Philo (De Somniis, i. § 6).

tic powers more than all others, subjecting his very movements, his visits to Jerusalem, to the direction of impulses which he supposed to be revelations: there has never been a case in which both temperament and religious belief more thoroughly combined to ascribe, with perfect conviction, objective reality to subjective impressions, connected with divine things then occupying his mind. Paul moreover lived in a time when the Messianic longing of the Jews made them profoundly interested students of the later apocalyptic writings, which certainly made a deep impression upon the Apostle, and in which he must have been struck by the image of the promised Messiah, like the Son of Man, coming on the clouds of heaven (Dan. xii. 13, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 47).¹ At no time was such a vision more likely to present itself to him, than when his mind was fixed upon the Messianic idea with all the intensity of one who had been persecuting those who asserted that the Messiah had already come. Here was reason for all that concentration of thought upon the subject which produces such visions, and when doubt and hesitation entered into that eager intense spirit, the conflict must have been sharp and the nerves highly strung. The Jesus whom he saw with his mind's eye was the climax of conviction in such a nature; and the vision vividly brought to him his own self-reproachful thoughts for cruelly mistaken zeal, and the remorse of noble souls which bounds to reparation. He devoted himself as eagerly to Christianity, as he had previously done to Judaism. He changed the contents but not the form of his mind.² Paul the Christian was the same man as Paul the Jew; and in abandoning the conception of a Messiah "according to the flesh," and placing his whole faith in one "according to the spirit," he displayed the same characteristics as before. The revolution in his mind, of which so much is said, was merely one affecting the Messianic idea. He did not at a bound become the complete Apostle of the Gentiles, but accepting at first nothing more than belief in a Messiah according to the spirit, his comprehensive and peculiar system of theology was, of course, only the result of subsequent reflection. That his conviction should have been completed by a subjective vision is no more strange than that he should believe in supernatural Charismata, miraculous speaking with tongues, and being actually caught up into the third heaven, into Paradise, and hearing there unutterable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Paul evidently never questioned the source of his visions. They were simply accepted as divine revelations, and they excited all the less of mis-

¹ Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1864, p. 183.

² Holsten, *Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr.*, p. 84 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. wiss. Th.*, 1864, p. 188 ff.

giving in his soul from the fact that, without doubt, they expressed the expected solution of problems which intensely occupied his mind, and reflected conclusions already practically formed by his own thoughts.¹

There remain two points to be briefly considered. The first of these is the assertion, constantly made in various shapes, that the cardinal miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension were proclaimed as unquestionable facts, without contradiction, at a time when such an assertion might have been easily refuted. The production of the body, the still occupied sepulchre, it is said, would have set such pretensions at rest. It is unnecessary to say that the proclamation of the Resurrection and Ascension as facts proved nothing beyond the belief, perhaps, of those who asserted them. So far as Paul is concerned, we may seek in vain for any assertion of a bodily Ascension. But there is not the slightest evidence to show when the Resurrection and Ascension were first publicly proclaimed as unquestionable facts. Even the Gospels do not state that they were mentioned beyond the circle of disciples. The second Synoptist, who does not state that Jesus himself was seen by any one, makes the curious affirmation at the close of his Gospel as we have it, that the women, on receiving the announcement of the Resurrection from the angels, and the command for the disciples and Peter to go into Galilee, "went out and fled from the sepulchre; for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid."² In the fourth Gospel, although the "beloved disciple" went into the sepulchre, "and he saw and believed," it is related of him and Peter: "So the disciples went away again unto their own home."³ The Eleven, in fact, who all forsook their Master and fled; who are represented as meeting with closed doors "for fear of the Jews;" with closed doors after eight days, it is again said, although, a week before, ten of them are said to have seen Jesus, were not likely to expose themselves to the fate of Jesus by rushing into the highways and asserting the Resurrection. Beyond the statement of the Gospels, the value of which we have seen, and a statement accom-

¹ "If those appearances (to his disciples) were purely *subjective*," objects a recent writer, "how can we account for their sudden, rapid, and total cessation?" (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ii. p. 432, note 1.) We might reply that, if objective, such a cessation would be still more unaccountable. Being subjective, the appearances of course ceased when the conditions of excitement and expectancy which produced them passed away. But in point of fact they did not suddenly and totally cease. The appearance to Paul occurred after a considerable interval, and there is the tradition of more than one appearance to him; but throughout the history of the Church we hear of similar subjective visions whenever a fitting individual has been found in the state to receive them.

² Mk. xvi. 8.

³ John xx. 10.

panied by so many confused circumstances, there is no evidence whatever that the sepulchre was found empty. There is no evidence that the sepulchre was really known to the disciples, none of whom, probably, was present at the crucifixion; and it might well be inferred that the women, who are represented as ignorant that the body had already been embalmed, yet who are the chief supposed witnesses for the empty sepulchre and the informants of the disciples, were equally ignorant of the sepulchre in which the body was laid. We might ask whether the 500 brethren who are said to have seen Jesus at the same time came from Galilee, or wherever they were, and examined the state of the sepulchre? We have already said, however, that if the sepulchre had been shown to be empty, the very last thing which could be proved by that circumstance would be the correctness of the assertion that it had become so in consequence of a stupendous miracle. On the other hand, if it had been shown that it was occupied by a body, it is exceedingly doubtful whether the fact would have convinced any one not previously sure that Jesus could not have risen from the dead, and he would not have required such evidence. When the Resurrection was publicly proclaimed as a fact, the body could no longer have been recognisable, and the idea that any of those in authority could have thought such demonstration necessary to refute a story whispered about amongst an obscure sect in Jerusalem, or even more courageously asserted, is a product of later times. When Jesus of Nazareth, the head of the nascent sect, was suppressed by a shameful death, his humble and timid followers were obviously for a time despised; and there is little reason to suppose that the chief priests and rulers of the Jews would have condescended to any public contradiction of their affirmations, if they had even felt indifference to the defilement of exposing a decaying body to the gaze of Jerusalem. This kind of refutation is possible only in the imagination of divines. Besides, what evidence is there that even a single indifferent person found the sepulchre empty? There is not an iota of proof.

On the contrary, there is the very strongest evidence that when the assertion of the Resurrection and Ascension as "unquestionable facts" was made, it was contradicted in the only practical and practicable way conceivable. 1, by all but universal disbelief in Jerusalem; 2, by actual persecution of those who asserted it. It is a perfectly undeniable fact that the great mass of the Jews totally denied the truth of the statement by disbelieving it, and that the converts to Christianity who soon swelled the numbers of the Church and spread its influence amongst the nations were not citizens of Jerusalem, who were capable of refuting such assertions, but strangers and Gentiles. The number of the community

of Jerusalem after the forty days seems to be stated by the Author of Acts as "about 120," and although the numbers added to the Church, according to this document, are evidently fabulous, the converts at Pentecost are apparently chiefly from amongst the devout men of every nation upon earth congregated at Jerusalem. To this hour the Jews have retained as their inheritance the denial by their forefathers of the asserted facts. The assertion, moreover, was emphatically denied by persecution as soon as it became worth any one's while to persecute those who made it. It was in this way denied by Paul himself, at a time when verification was infinitely more possible than when he came to join in the assertion. Are we to suppose that the Apostle took no trouble to convince himself of the facts before he began to persecute? He was in the confidence of the high priests it seems; can he ever have heard the slightest doubt from them on the subject? Is it not palpable that Paul and his party, by their very pursuit of those who maintained such allegations, stigmatized them as falsehoods, and perhaps as imposture? If it be said that Paul became convinced of his mistake, it is perfectly obvious that his conversion was not due to local and circumstantial evidence, but to dogmatic considerations and his supposed vision of Jesus. He disbelieved when the alleged occurrences were recent and, as it is said, capable of refutation; he believed when the time for such refutation had passed.

The second point to which I have referred is the vague and final objection of apologists that, if the vision of Jesus was merely subjective, the fabric of the Church and of Christianity is based upon unreality and self-deception. Is this possible? they ask. Is it possible that for eighteen centuries the Resurrection and Ascension have been proclaimed and believed by millions, with no other original foundation than self-delusion? The vagueness and apparent vastness of this objection, perhaps, make it a formidable *argumentum ad hominem*, but it vanishes into very small proportions as we approach it. Must we then understand that the dogmas of all religions which have been established must have been objective truths? and that this is a necessary inference from their wide adoption? If so, then all historical religions before Christianity, and after it, must take rank as substantially true. In that case the religion of the Veda, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, of Mahomet, for instance, can as little be based on unreality and self-deception as Christianity. They have secured wide acceptance from mankind. Millions have for centuries held their tenets as sacredly as those of Christianity, and to this day the followers of Sākya Muni are as numerous as the believers in the religion of Paul. If not, the objection at once falls to the ground as an argu-

ment, and the problem becomes a simple matter of evidence, which has been fully discussed and disposed of. When we analyse the fact, it becomes apparent that, ultimately, belief in the Resurrection and Ascension resolves itself into the belief of a few or of one. It requires very little reflection to perceive that the Christian Church is founded much more upon belief in the Resurrection than on the fact itself.¹ Nothing is more undeniable than the circumstance that not more than a very small number of men are even alleged to have seen the risen Jesus. The mass of those who have believed in the Resurrection have done so because of the assurance of these few men, and perhaps because they may have been led to think that the event was predicted in Scripture. Up to this day, converts to the dogma are made, if made at all, upon the assurance of Paul and the Gospels. The vast question at last dwindles down to the inquiry: Can a few men, can one man, draw erroneous inferences and be honestly deceived by something which he supposes he has seen? We presume that there can be no hesitation in giving an affirmative reply. The rest follows as a matter of course. Others simply believe the report of those who have believed before them. In course of time, so many believed that it is considered almost outrageous to disbelieve or demand evidence. The number of those who have believed is viewed at last as an overwhelming proof of the truth of the creed.

It is a most striking and extraordinary fact that the life and teaching of Jesus have scarcely a place in the system of Paul. Had we been dependent upon him we should have had no idea of the Great Master who preached the Sermon on the Mount, and embodied pure truths in parables of such luminous simplicity. His noble morality would have remained unknown, and his lessons of incomparable spiritual excellence have been lost to the world. Paul sees no significance in that life, but concentrates all interest in the death and resurrection of his Messiah. In the sepulchre hewn out of the rock are deposited the teaching and example of Jesus, and from it there rises a mystic Christ lost in a halo of theology. The ecclesiastical Christianity which was mainly Paul's work has almost effaced the true work of Jesus. Too little can now be traced of that teaching, and few are the genuine records of his work which have survived the pious enthusiasm evoked by his character. Theology has done its worst

¹ Baur, *Gesch. d. Christ. Kirche*, 1863, i. p. 40.

with the life; and that death, which will ever be the darkest blot upon history, has been represented as the climax of divine beneficence. The Resurrection and Ascension have deified Jesus of Nazareth; but they have done so at the expense of all that was most truly sublime in his work. The world will gain when it recognises the real character and source of such dogmas, and resigns this inheritance from the Age of Miracles. For, although we lose a faith which has long been our guide in the past, we need not now fear to walk boldly with Truth in the future, and turning away from fancied benefits to be derived from the virtue of his death, we may find real help and guidance from more earnest contemplation of the life and teaching of Jesus.

which
se the
surrec-
w or of
ristian
rection
the cir-
men are
se who
e of the
ay have
re. Up
ll, upon
n at last
ne man,
nothing
e can be
ows as a
ose who
believed
demand
iewed at

e life and
of Paul.
o idea of
unt, and
mplicity.
d his les-
st to the
centrates
In the
hing and
st lost in
hich was
of Jesus.
w are the
pious en-
its worst

INDEX.

N.B.—The figures refer to the pages. Those in parentheses refer to the notes.

INDEX TO THE PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION.

Searching Criticism of Reviewers, p. 1; Historical and Philosophical Arguments both necessary, 1; Mill, on Adequate Evidence to establish a Divine Revelation, 2; Four Canonical Gospels, not written until the end of second century, 2; Reality of Miracles and sufficiency of proof, 3; Statements of Fathers respecting Gospels only personal opinion, 4; Examination of Dr. Lightfoot's criticisms, 4; on "Silence of Eusebius," 5; nature of the arguments based on Silence of Eusebius, 6; on nature of quotations by Eusebius, 7; Dr. Lightfoot's arguments examined, 7 to 9; unanimity of Asiatic Elders who knew John examined, 9; on Eusebius and Hegeippus, &c., 9, 10; on numerous references by Eusebius to Hegeippus, 10; on Martyrdom of James, 10; Fourth Gospel not quoted by Eusebius, 10; Eusebius on Apostle John and his writings, 10; on authenticity of Apocalypse and 2nd and 3rd Epistles of John, 11; on John's return from exile, 11; Eusebius on Fourth Gospel, why it was written, 11; Papias on Matt. and Mark, 11; presumptive evidence that Papias did not know of Fourth Gospel, 12; Presbyter John, 12; two men named John in Asia, two tombs at Ephesus bearing the name of John, 12; Dr. Lightfoot on "Silence of Eusebius," evidence in its favour, 13; attack respecting

Ignatian Epistles, 13; admitted perplexity to students of Ignatian Literature, 13; danger of illiberal criticism when inaccurate, 13; on Syriac version of Ignatian Letters, 14; on error of summary of Ignatian controversy, 14; on priority of Syriac version of Ig. Eps., 15; on change of opinions by eminent critics, 15; Analysis of Dr. Lightfoot's general statement, 16; result of analysis of statement, 17; Long Recension Controversy, 18; on doubts regarding Ig. Eps., 19; purpose for which Ig. Epistles are quoted, 19; Vossian Eps. and version of Abp. Usher, 20; on borrowing unsorted references, 21; unfair criticisms, 21; examination of opinions expressed by eminent critics, 22; Lardner, Beausobre, Schroeckh, their opinions examined, 22; Greisbach, Kestner, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, 23; Dr. Lightfoot misrepresents the purpose, 24; opinions of Bleek, Gfrörer, Harless and Schliemann examined, 25; Hase and Lechler, 26; Dr. L. inaccurate in matters of fact, 27; on rank of Armenian version, 28; critics who refute, ignore, or support Armenian version, 28; Eusebius mentions seven Eps. only, 28; Theoderet ignorant of the doubtful, 8 Eps., 29; Alleged characteristics of spurious Eps., 29; order of Ig. Eps. in MSS., 32; Dr. Westcott's objections examined, 33; Argument

and Evidence much ignored, 33; Dr. Westcott on date and place of Martyrdom of Ignatius, 34; Martyrdom variously dated, 35; Baur on date, 35; Bretschneider, Bleek, Guericke, and Hagenbach on date, 36; comparative statements of Dr. Westcott and Author of S. R., on date and place of Martyrdom of Ignatius, 35 to 41; propriety of accuracy in References, 42; on Roman procedure towards Christian prisoners, 43; on romantic story of Peregrinus Protens, 44; a parody of the history of Jesus, 44; Sketch of the case of Ignatius, 45; on treatment of Christians under Trajan, 46; no general persecution, 46; Neander and Milman on Trajan, 46; Marcus Aurelius, 46; the Ignatian story examined, 47;

the transport to Rome incredible, 47; Dean Milman on the earthquake, 48; John Malalas on Trajan, Ignatius, and the earthquake, 48; Dr. Lightfoot abuses Malalas for telling foolish stories, 49; the Fathers full of foolish stories 49; Ignatian Epistles the only source of information, 50; Jerome and Chrysostom on Ignatius, 50; on Translation of Remains, 50; Zahn on feast of translation, 51; two dates for Martyrology and two places of Martyrdom, 50, 51; Critics on genuineness of versions of Eps. 52; Criticism of Matt. Arnold, 52; on defacing the Bible, 53; on the governing idea of Criticism, 53; rejection of the miraculous necessary to the attainment of the beauty and goodness of the Bible, 54.

GENERAL INDEX.

ABERCROMBIE, Dr., p. 1056.
Acta Pilati, see Nicodemus, Gospel of.
Acts of Apostles: Miracles in, 709; first distinct mention of, 710; alleged Evidence of Clement of Rome, 710; of Ep. of Barnabas, 713; of Hermas, 713; of Ignatian Epistles, 715, 716; of Polycarp, 717; of Justin Martyr, 718, 720; of Hegippus, 720; of Papias, 721; of Ep. to Diognetus, 722; of Marcion, 723; of Tatian, 723; of Dionysius of Corinth, 724; of Athenagoras, 724; of Ep. of Vienne and Lyons, 725; of Canon of Muratori, 542, 724; of Irenæus, 726; of Clement of Alexandria, 726; of Tertullian, 726; of Origen, 726; Rejected by Heretical Sects, 727; Doubts of authorship, 727; Ascribed to Clement of Rome and Barnabas, 727; Title, 727; Continuation of third Gospel, 727; Conclusion from external evidence, 727, 728; Evidence regarding authorship, 729, 730; regarding Luke, the traditional author, 730, 731; Superscription of, 732, 733; *ἡμεῖς* sections, 735 to 741; sources, 739; author's peculiarities throughout,

740; author not Luke, 741, nor companion of Paul, 742, contradictions and omissions of Paul's history, 742, 743; Timothy, supposed author of, 746; Silas, 747; Titus, 747; author unknown, 747; inadequate as evidence for miracles, 748; historical value, 748; design, 749; title, 751; limited scope, 751, 752; incompleteness as history, 753; parallelism between Peter and Paul, 754; the speeches, 755, 756; not historical, 756; brevity of speeches, 758; author's peculiarities, throughout speeches, 759; all quotations from Septuagint, 760, 761, 763; speeches composed by author, 760; speech of Peter at Pentecost, 761, 771; Peter's speeches compared with Paul's, 761; apologetic argument, 761, 766; fundamental similarity of speeches, 764, 765, 766, 769; alleged analogy between Peter's language in Acts and in Epistles, 770; alleged traces of translation, 771, 772; speech of Peter, 771 to 779; death of Judas, 774; historical value of, 780; representation of the apostolic age in, 781; Stephen

- credible, the earthquake, Malalas 49; the oracles 49; y source come and 50; on 50; Zahn 51; two and two 51; Crisostom of Eps. bold, 52; 3; on the cism, 53; ous neces- the beau- able, 54.
- 741, nor 2, contra- of Paul's othy, sup- silas, 747; own, 747; for mira- blue, 748; ; limited leteness as n between speeches, 756; bre- author's speeches, m Septua- eches com- speech of 761, 771; are with argument, similarity 766, 769; en Peter's n Epistles, translation, ter, 771 to 74; histori- entation of ; Stephen
- the Martyr, 804, 805; his speech, how reported 1, 810; contradictions of O. T., 811, 812; similarity to speeches of Paul and Peter, 813 to 815; linguistic analysis of speech of Stephen, 816 to 825; result of analysis, 825; first persecution, 828; Philip in Samaria, 828, 829; Philip and Eunuch, 829; Peter at Lydda, 831; at Joppa, 832, 833; conversion of Cornelius, 833; vision, abrogated distinction of clean and unclean animals, 833; inconsistent with Peter's conduct at Antioch, 839; episode of Cornelius unhistorical, 840; Paul's conduct after conversion, 845; his first visit to Jerusalem, 848; Paul's vision in Temple, 852; Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, 852; not second visit of Acts, 853, 854; third visit of Acts, 853, 856; discrepancy of the two narratives, 857; motive of the visit, 860; the public congress, 862; speech of Peter, 863, 866; compared with conduct at Antioch, 871, 872; speech of James at Council, 872, 873; the Apostolic letter, 878; spirit of the decree, 882; Paul's mission according to Acts, 882, 883; circumcision of Timothy, 833; rôle of Paul in, not historical, 872, 885, 886, 887, 888, 909; conclusions arrived at, 888, 918, 919; gift of Tongues at Pentecost, 946, 951, 953, 954; origin of the account, 957; Acts as evidence, 976; account of ascension in Acts, 1019; conversion of Paul, 1039, 1040, 1077.
- Ælianus, 524.
- Æneas the paralytic, 831.
- Ænon near Salem, 521, 525.
- Æsculapius, 584.
- Agrippa Castor, 411.
- Agbarus, letter of Jesus to, 234.
- Alexandrians, Epistle to the, 542.
- Alexandrinus, Codex, 201, 202, 352-401, note 2, 928.
- Alford, Dean, 720, note 3; 934, note 1; 1017, note 2.
- Alogi, 697.
- Alpiel, Angel, over fruit-bearing trees, 132.
- Ambrose, St., miracles of, 172, 540; on Luke, 731, note 6.
- Ambrosius, 537; Ambrosian Library, 540.
- Amos ix, 11 f. 574.
- Amulets, Jewish, roots, written charms, &c., 137.
- Ammonius of Alexandria, 489, 490.
- Anabaptists, 377.
- Anacletus, Bishop of Rome, 203, 205, 346-348.
- Ananias, 1044 to 1047.
- Andrew of Caesarea, Apocalypse considered by Papias to be inspired, 605, 643.
- Anicetus, 563.
- Anpiel, Angel, over birds, 132.
- Anthony, St., miracles of, 170, 171, 172; date of, 170.
- Antichrist, 562, 600.
- Antilegomena, 7, 493.
- Antipodes, 150, 151, note 1.
- Antithesis, Marcion's work, 449, 453, 455.
- Archon, the, 414.
- Apocalypse, the only book of the New Testament mentioned by Justin, 564; of John, 256, 257, 542, 564, 601, 605; writer of, could not be the author of Gospel, 605; external evidence that Apostle John wrote, 643; Dionysius of Alex. the first who doubted it, 644; his reasons purely dogmatic, 645; date of, 645; writer calls himself John, 645; was he the Apostle?, 646; Ewald's argument that he was not, 646, 647; glorification of the Twelve, 647; an allegory, 647; justified by the words of Jesus, 648; no modesty for historian to withhold his name, 648; compared with author of Gospel, 649; no internal evidence opposes ascription to Apostle, 649, 650; character of the s. of Zebedee, 650; agrees with indication in Apocalypse, 650; Judaistic Christianity and opposition to Paul, 652; external and internal evidence agrees in ascribing it to Apostles, 653.
- Apocalypse and Paul, 653, 917; ascribed to Presbyter John, 655.
- Apocalypse of Peter, 255, 542.
- Apocryphal Works quoted as Holy Scripture, 202, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 255, 256, read in churches, 202, 212, 216, 228, 255, 256.

- Apocryphal Gospels, 201, 203, 253, 255, 260, 273, 275.
- Apollinarius Claudius, date of, 505, 506; his works, 506; fragment on Paschal controversy ascribed to him, 509, on thundering legion, 506, note 1; reasons for considering fragment spurious, 507, 508, 509.
- Apollinaris of Laodicea, on death of Judas, 721.
- Apollonius of Ephesus, 643, 644.
- Apollo, 409; probable author of Ep. to the Hebrews, 570, note 1.
- Apostles, Gospel according to the, 253.
- Aquila's version of O. T., 523, 585.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, disease and tempest, direct work of the Devil, 147.
- Arabic Gospel of infancy, 266.
- Ariston, 12, 356, 357, 358, 596, 720.
- Aristarchus, 734.
- Arneith, 439.
- Arnold, Matt., 52, 53, 54.
- Arnold, Dr., Miracles objects of faith, 74; we must judge a Revelation by its substance, not by its evidence, 74; Miracles common to God and the Devil, 74.
- Articles of Church of England, 972, note 2.
- Asa, Demon, taught Solomon magic, 138.
- Asael, Demon, taught Solomon wisdom and arts, 138.
- Asaph, 390, note 7.
- Ascensio Isaie, on Angel of the Sun and Moon, 131, note 4.
- Ascensio Isaie, 280, note 2, 354.
- Ascension, same day as Resurrection, 228, 776, note 4; allegation regarding the, 971, 972; evidence required, 973; account in Mark and Luke, 1005, 1006; account in Acts, 1019; value of evidence of Gospels and Acts, 1019 to 1024; idea of Ascension not original in Christianity, 1020.
- Asmodeus, Demon, strangled seven husbands from love of Sara, 128; visits Solomon's wives in slippers to conceal his Cock's feet, 135; King of Devils, 145.
- Athanasius, St., accused of sorcery, 157; miracles of St. Anthony, 170; vouches for the truth of miracles of St. Anthony, 171; Epistle of Ignatius, 232.
- Athenagoras, alleged evidence for Acts, 542, 724; angelic agency in natural phenomena, 141, 142; on Demons, 142; account of him, 109; works and date, 509; alleged quotations from our Gospels, 511, 512; quotation of Apocryphal work, 514; does not mention the name of Christ, 510; does not mention any Canonical Gospel, 510; the Logos 510; on inspiration of O. T. 515; total absence of allusion to N. T. Scriptures, 515; alleged reference to Fourth Gospel, 635; his Logos doctrine, 515, 635; uncanonical quotation in mouth of Logos, 514; does not use the name of Christ, 635; no evidence as to origin or character of Fourth Gospel, 636.
- Augustine, St., on Demons, 149; Angels and Demons assume bodies, 150; Incubi and Succubi, 150, note 1; Dusii, 150; argument against antipodes, 150; on miracles, 172; saw miracle performed on blind man with his own eyes, 172; also an incurable cancer cured, 172; a torn out eye restored to its socket, 173; names and addresses given of persons miraculously cured, 177; preface of work on miracles, 178; avowed object of publication of his list of miracles, 178; several cases of dead restored to life, 174, 175; arguments regarding and guarantee of miracles reported, 178, 179; statement of reasons for giving his list of miracles, 180, 181; a miracle performed in his own church in sight of his own congregation, 181; on Luke iii. 22, 274; on Mark, 364, note 1; on Matthew, 374; on Stephen, 805; on "Tongues," 950.
- Arabic Gospel of the infancy, Jesus born in a cave, 266.
- Ashbeel, angel, corrupted holy angels, 129.
- Atterbury, Bp., necessity of miraculous evidence, 55, 56; the truths requiring such attestation beyond reason, 77.
- Aubertin, 18, 19.

- miracles of
 of Ignatius
 of agency in
 142; on
 aim, 109;
 aged quo-
 511, 512;
 work, 514;
 name of
 tion any
 the Logos
 T. 515;
 to N. T.
 reference
 his Logos
 canonical
 gos, 514;
 of Christ,
 origin or
 el, 636.
 ons, 149;
 ne bodies,
 150, note
 against an-
 172; saw
 blind man
 ; also an
 72; a torn
 cket, 173;
 en of per-
 177; pre-
 les, 178;
 tion of his
 veral cases
 174, 175;
 guarantee
 178, 179;
 giving his
 ; a miracle
 church in
 ation, 181;
 on Mark,
 y, 374; on
 Tongues,"
 ncy, Jesus
 oly angels,
 of miracu-
 the truths
 on beyond
- Autolyceus, 505.
 Aurelius, Bp., sends a cured paraly-
 tic to St. Augustine, 173.
 Aurelius, Marcus, 49, 243, 244, 247.
 Axionicus, 430, 530.
 Azael or Azazel, fallen angel, taught
 men vicious arts, 129.
 Azotus, 829, note 5.
 BACON, Lord: Proof should precede
 belief, 60; unbelief preferable to
 contumely, 111.
 Barcabbas, 413.
 Barcaph, 413.
 Bardesanes, 430, 530.
 Barnabas, Epistle of: clean and un-
 clean beasts, 151; superstition re-
 garding the hare, 151; the hyena,
 152; author of, 212; early refer-
 ences to 212, 213; date of, 214;
 found in Cod. Sinaiticus, 214;
 quotes Book of Enoch, 216, note 1;
 quotes Apocryphal Book of Wisdom,
 216; supposed quotation of Matt.
 xxii. 14; as H. S., 215; Orelle's ex-
 planation, 217, 218; quotations com-
 pared with Synoptic Gospels and
 Book of Ezra, 221 to 223; evidence
 for Fourth Gospel—type of brazen
 serpent, 226, 549, 550; on the two
 ways, 594; alleged evidence for
 Acts, 713—1019, note 5.
 Barnabas, Gospel according to, 213,
 250, 255.
 Baronius, 522.
 Bartholomew, Apostle, 373.
 Basil, St., 170.
 Basilides, date and writings of, 411;
 made use of Apocryphal Gospel,
 412; claimed to have received his
 knowledge from Glancias, "Inter-
 preter of Peter," 413; quoted Apo-
 cryphal works, 414; nature of his
 "Gospel," 412; alleged references
 to our Gospels, 416; alleged refer-
 ence to fourth Gospel, 629, 630.
 Baynage, 18, 730.
 Baur, J. C., 28, 35, 40, 42, 44, 378,
 note 1, 386, 805, 810, 835, 929; on
 Clementines, 386; on Marcion's
 Gospel, 440, 441, 451, 463, 465,
 note 1, 468, 474.
 Baumgarten-Crusius, 22, 23.
 Beausabre, 22.
 Beeler, 902, note 1.
 Böhringer, 16, 28.
 Bertholdt, 438, 930.
 Bethabara, 661.
 Bethany, 661, 1012, 1013, 1018.
 Bethesda, Pool of, 135, 130, 661.
 Beyschlag, 1031, note 1.
 Beze, Codex (D.), 209, note 3, 274,
 352, 727 (5), 744.
 Bleek, 16, 26, 28, 36, 38, 39; 365,
 435, note 3, 474, 605, note 1, 745,
 note 1, 766, 771, 772, 808, 810, 876,
 879.
 Bochart, 18.
 Bochartus, 18.
 Bollandist, Collection of lives of Saints
 contain more than 25,000 miracles,
 183.
 Blondel, 18.
 Bolten, 438, 474.
 Boronius, 516, note 4.
 Bretschneider, 36, 38, 218, 679, note
 2.
 Brodie, 1053.
 Bruder, 816.
 Brown, Sir Thomas, on witches, 158;
 disbelief in, infidelity and atheism,
 158.
 Buckle, Relation between ignorance
 and superstition, 159, 162, note 3;
 194, note 1.
 Bunsen, 16, 28, 502, 544.
 Burton, Anatomy of Melancholy, on
 Incubi and Succubi, 150, note 2.
 Butler, B.p., Miracles proof of Divine
 Revelation, 64, 65; Christianity be-
 yond reason, 77, note 2; Christian-
 ity primarily important as declara-
 tion of natural morality, 703.
 CAESAREA PHILIPPI, Miracles at,
 169.
 Caiaphas, High Priest, 660.
 Cajetan, 377.
 Cains, 544.
 Calviu, on Eps. of Ignatius, 16, 17,
 18, 231; our Gospel of Matt. shows
 no trace of Hebrew original, 277;
 Calvin on Luke, 730, note 3; on
 Acts, 863.
 Canon of Muratori, on Pastor of
 Hermas, 228, 494, 500, note 2; evi-
 dence for Acts, 542; distinction be-
 tween John disciple and John apos-
 tle, 639; evidence for Acts, 542;
 canon of Scripture, how formed, 644.
 Carpenter, Dr., on Spectral Illusions,
 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1060.

- Carpocrates, 340.
 Carlyle, 1058.
 Celsus, on demons, 145; on phoenix, 151; on the character of the Apostles, 224; Jesus accused of magic, 275; his work, two of the name, early one generally set aside, 537; against Christians, 434; date of Celsus, 434; was he the Epicurean, 535, 536; he was a neo-Platonist, 538, 539; mentions only Book of Enoch and Sibylline books, 540; accusation against Christians of altering Gospel, 540; no evidence for Fourth Gospel, 637, 1068, note 1.
 Centuriators, Magdeburg (16, 18), on Eps. of Ignatius, 231.
 Cerdo, 525, 526.
 Cerinthus, 9, 340, 644.
 Charismata, referred to, Gal. iii. 5, 926; in Corinthian Church, 935; bestowed on whole Church, 943; not supernatural, 943, 944; no practical trace of them, 946, 967; Tongues, 947; interpretation of Tongues, 959; non miraculous, 960 to 962, 967; 2 Charismata, 962.
 Charms, Jewish, 135, 137, 138, 139.
 Christianity, supernatural or untenable, 64; claim to be a Divine Revelation not original, 64; character of earlier and later ages, 161; affirmed to be believed upon miraculous evidence by the thinking and educated, 194, 195; fallacy of the argument, 195, 196; shared national superstition of the Jews, 156; inherited demonology and witch-craft, and transmitted it intact, 157; Spiritual Charismata by Christians, 167; comparative position of, 701, 702; takes a higher place as a perfect development of morality, than as pretendant to be a supernatural religion, 702; the influence of supernatural dogmas in extending Christianity temporarily, 702, 703; shared the national superstition, 156; its primary importance as declaration of morality, 703; supernatural elements introduced by followers and not by Jesus, 703, 704; Christian Ethics not new or original, 704; but teaching of Jesus carried morality to the highest point attainable by man, 704, 705; his religion is independent of supernatural dogmas, 705; the effect of Christianity on civilization almost solely due to its morality, 703; Christian Theology where dominant, has led to debasement of morals, 703; in surrendering miraculous elements the religion of Jesus does not lose any of its virtue, 706; we gain more than we lose by abandoning theory of Divine Revelation, 706, 708; Primitive, 780; developed out of Judaism, 781 to 783; only distinguished from Judaism by belief in Jesus as Messiah, 784; Jew believing in Jesus as Messiah became a Christian, 786, 788; involved no breach with Judaism, 788; obligation of law continued, 789 to 791; Jesus confined ministry to Jews, 791, 793; instructions to the Twelve, 794, 795; appointment of seventy disciples, 795; their alleged mission, 797; position of disciples on death of Jesus, 799, 800; way to, still through Judaism, 801; Apostles and primitive Christians continued Jews, 802; development of, 802, 883, 918, 919.
 Chrysostom, 50; on angels, 145; place where Mark was written, 361; note 1, on Matthew, 374.
 Chrysostom St., 540; on Acts of Ap., 727, 853, 863, 928, 967.
 Claudius, Apollinaris, see Apollinaris.
 Clement of Alexandria, 10, 11; quotes Xenophanes, 111, note 7, 112; on angels, 141; angelic agency in nature, 141; Greeks plagiarize miracles from the Bible, 141; the Son gave philosophy to the Greeks by inferior angels, 141; tempests, &c.; produced by evil angels, 147; calls Roman Clement "Apostle," 212; Epistle of Barnabas, 212; calls author "Apostle Barnabas," 212; variation from Matt. v. 16, 295, note 3; variation from Matt. v. 37, 295, note 4; variation from Luke xii. 48, 298, note 6; variation from Matt xi, 27, 331; quotes Gospel of Hebrews, 340, 341; on composition of Mark, 359, 360; used *Κηρυγμα Πέτρου*, 365; reference to Basilides and followers, 416; quotations from Valentinus, 420, 421; variations from Matt. xix,

- logias, unity on its theology debase-render religion of its than we of Divine primitive, 781 ed from as Mes- in Jesus-ian, 780, th Juda-aw con- confined 703; in- 94, 795; disciples, on, 797; death of through and primi-ews, 802; 918, 919. 45; place 361; note as of Ap., pollinaris. 1; quotes 7, 112; agency in plagiarize 141; the e Greeks tempests, gels, 147; Apostle," as, 212; arnabas," tt. v. 16, om Matt. variation note 6; 27, 331; ews, 340, ark, 359, ov, 365; followers, alentinus, Matt. xix, 17, 427; Valentinus professed to have traditions from Apostles, 433; alleged quotation of Tatian, 483; does not mention Tatian's Diatesaron, 485; quotes Sibylline books and Book of Hystaspes, as inspired, 494; quotation from Apocryphal book regarding Paul, 494, note 5; does not mention work on Passover by Apollinaris, 508; mentions Heracleon, 533; date of Stromata, 533; Logos, doctrine in *Κηρυγμα Περου*, 580, note 3; on a passage from Barnabas, 594; on Ps. cxviii, 19, 594; Apocalypse, 644, 928; Clementine Homilies quote Apocryphal work, 212; combination similar to a passage in Justin, 292, note 5, 295, note 4; varied quotations agreeing with Justin, 294, 295, note 4, 295, 297, note 4; supposed to use Gospel of Hebrews, 335; variation from Luke xxiii, 34, 281, note 4; analogy of, with work of Mark, described in Papias, 365; date and character, 384, 385; Ebionitic, 384, 385; their nature, 385; only internal evidence as to date and origin, 385, 386; quotations generally put in the mouth of Peter, 387; number of evangelical quotations, 387; theories as to the source of quotation, 388; comparison of quotations with Synoptics, 388; quotation from Apocryphal Gospel, 389; Codex Ottobonianus, 400; quotations with persistent variations, on 402; true and false Scriptures, 403, 404; result of examination of quotations in, 405; no trace of N. T. Canon, 406; animosity against Apostle Paul, 406, 407; Paul attacked under the disguise of Simon the Magician, 406, 407, 617; variation from Matt. xix. 17, 427; variation from Matt. vii. 13, 14, 606; variation from Deut. xxx. 15, 607; alleged references to Fourth Gospel, 608; uncanonical quotations, 607, 608; alleged references to John ix. 1-3, 609; the fall denied in, 609, 610; deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, 609, note 1; on evil, 609, 610; alleged reference not to Fourth Gospel, 610, 611; dogmatic teaching totally different from Fourth Gospel, 612, 613; identity of Judaism and Christianity maintained, 613, 614; denied in Gospel, 614; Monotheism maintained as opposed to the divinity of Christ, 614; does not know Logos, doctrine, 615; *Σοφία*, appeared in Adam and others before Jesus, 615; total absence of Johannine dogmas, 615, 616; Peter, the chief of the Apostles, 616; the career of Jesus limited to one year, 652, 617; express bitterness against Paul, 871. Clementine Recognitions, on the Giants, 142, note 3; on angels and demons, 147; Jesus accused of Magic, 275; variation from Matt. xi. 27, 333; passage compared with Justin, 335, 336; date and character, 384; Ebionitic, 384, 385; only known through a Latin version, 384, 385, 386; assigns "Acts" to Luke, 726-731; on the Twelve and on the Seventy-two, 797. Clement of Rome, on Phoenix, 151; antipodes, 151, note 1; Epistle to Corinthians, 201; 2nd Epistle spurious, 201; identity of author, 202; called "Apostle," 202; Epistle to Hebrews ascribed to him, 202; Acts of "Apostle" ascribed to him, 202; Epistle to Corinthians read in churches, 202; amongst Apocrypha in Stichometry of Nicephorus, 203; date, 203; Epistle mentioned by Dionysius of Corinth, 203; by Hegesippus, 203; order of succession to Bishopric of Rome, 203; mentions Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, 204, 205; supposed references to Gospels, 208; quotes Apocryphal Gospels, 212; no use of our Gospels, 212; passage in Epistles similar to one in Ep. of Polycarp, 203; epistle read in churches, 212, 216; quotation 2nd Epistle to Corinthians, compared with Justin, 312; passage of Epistle of Clement, compared with Justin, 335; spurious works ascribed to, 408; Epistle to Diognetus erroneously ascribed to him, 409; no evidence for Fourth Gospel, 549; alleged evidence for Acts, 710, 727. Columban, 540. Colarbasus, 527, 528.

- Cocus, 18.
 Constations, the Apostolic, 151, 295, 335, note 3, 495.
 Coponius, 263.
 Corinthians, 3rd Epistle to the, 495.
 Corinth, parties in Church, 452.
 Campianus, 18.
 Casubon, 18 to 20.
 Chemnitz, 16; on Ignatian Epistles, 231.
 Cleophas, 10.
 Curetonian Epistle, 17, 18.
 Crucifixion, 978 to 996.
 Corinthians, Ep. to, xii. 12, 925 to 931; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 936; 2nd, xii. 12 ff. 924.
 Corrodi, 438.
 Cotelerius, 400, note 5.
 Credner, on Stichometry of Nicophorus, 203, notes 1 and 2; Justin's Memoirs, 258, note 1, 260, note 1; birth of Jesus in a cave, 266, note 6; use of lights at Baptism, 273; on a supposed quotation by Justin of Matt. xvii. 13, 323, 324; on statements of Fathers regarding Matt. xvii. 13, 324, 325, 326; on statements of Fathers regarding Matt. xiii. 35, 390, note 7; on quotations in Clementines, 394; Marcion's Gospel, 439; on Tatian's Diatessaron, 488; against use of Fourth Gospel, by Justin, 563, note 2; on emendation Sept. version, 585; silence on passage from Papias, 605, note 1; on descent of same spirit from Adam to Jesus, in Clementines, 615, note 8; on supernatural birth in Clementines, 616, note 2; on passage in Canon of Muratori; 639, note 1; distinction in Canon of Muratori between John the disciple and John the apostle, 639; on Fourth Gospel and its authorship, 656; on Sychar, John iv. 5, 662.
 Cornelius, baptism of, 755; conversion of, 767, 833-901, 959, 1047.
 Crescens, cynic, 247.
 Cross, sign of, deliver men from demons, 171; Cross typified, 226.
 Cross, inscription on, in Gospels, 981.
 Cureton, Dr., 20, 28, 31; Syriac Epistles of Ignatius, 230, 235, note 3; Syriac fragments ascribed to Meito of Sardis, 502, 503, 504.
 Cyprian, of Carthage, on demons, 142; demoniacal origin of disease, 142; accused of magic, 167; miracles in his day, 168.
 Cyrenius, 248, 262, 263.
 Cyril, of Jerusalem, quotes story of Phoenix, 151; on gospel of Matthew, 374, 928.
 Codex, Bezae, 209, note 3, 274, 297, note 3, 352, 667, note 2, 712, 727 (5), 744, 717.
 Codex, Vatican, 260 (2), 209 (2), 210 (1), 215, 217 (3), 278.
 Codex, Sinaiticus, 209 (2), 210 (1), 215, 217 (3), 147, 223, 224, 228, 239 (1), 586, 727 (5), 712 (4).
 Codex, Alexandrianus, 201, 202.
 Codex, Claramontanus, 255, note 9.
 Codex, Ottobonianus, 400.
 Codex, Charamontanus, 225 (9).
 DALLÆUS, 16; on Ignatian Epistles, 231; on Polycarp, 243.
 Davidson, 37-40, 605.
 Death, Angels of, 132.
 Decree, the Apostolic, 872 to 878.
 Deity, argument of miracles begins and ends with assumption of a personal, 102, note 1; assumption of personal, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110.
 Deliel, Angel, over fish, 132.
 Delitzsch, on quotations by Justin from the Memoirs, 309, note 2; finds traces of Gospel of Hebrews in Talmud, 340; on Sychar, 662.
 Demoniacs of Gadarenes, 154.
 De Pressense, 15.
 Demonology, of Book of Tobit, 128; of Book of Enoch, 129, 130; of Jews at time of Jesus, 134; of Fathers, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145.
 Demons, heathen gods considered by Jews to be, 127; and by N. T. writers, 128; Book of Tobit on, 128; Book of Enoch on, 129, 130; belief in, at time of Jesus, 134; number of, 134; work and habits, 135; how to see them, 135; have cock's feet, 135, note 1; possession by, 136; Josephus on, 139; Justin Martyr on, 141; Theophilus of Antioch on, 141; Athenagoras on, 141; Tatian on, 142; Cyprian of Carthage on, 142; Tertullian on, 143; Origen on, 144, 145; Celsus

- demons, disease, 7; mir-
- story of of Mat-
- 74, 297, 712, 727
- (2), 210
- 210 (1), 24, 228, (4), 02, note 9.
- (9).
- ian Epis- 3.
- o 878.
- cs begins of a per- nption of 106, 197,
- y Justin note 2; Hebrews har, 662.
- 4.
- bit, 128; 130; of 134; of 4, 145.
- dered by y N. T. obit on, 129, 130; us, 134; d habits, 35; have ossession 9; Justin hilus of goras on, yprian of llian on, 5; Celaus
- on, 145; Jerome on, 145; St. Thomas Aquinas on, 147; Clemen- tine Recognitions on, 147; Lactan- tius on, 148; univ- reality of belief in, 157; Eusebius on, 149; belief in dispelled, 159.
- Devil, history and gradual develop- ment of, full of instruction, 92, note 4.
- Diatessaron, *see* Tatian.
- Diognetus, Epistle to, 408; author- ship and date, 409; integrity, 409, 410; does not quote Synoptics, 410; alleged references to Fourth Gospel, 618, 619; recalls passages in Philo, 620, note 1; this Epistle a plagiarism of Pauline Epistles, 621; comparison with 2nd Epistles to Corinthians, 621 to 625: Logos doctrine of Epistle different from that of the Gospel, 625 to 626; of no value as evidence for Fourth Gospel, 629; Epistle to alleged evidence for Acts, 723.
- Dionysius, of Alexandria, 11; on tomb of two Johns at Ephesus, 358; on Gospel and Apocalypse of John, *see* first doubt, 644.
- Dionysius, Bar-Salibi, 489, 490.
- Dionysius, of Corinth, 12; mentions Clement of Rome, 203; Epistle of Clement read in churches, 255; Epistle of Soter read in churches, 255; account of him, 490; Epistle to Soter, 491; date, 491; expres- sions claimed as evidence for gos- pels, 491, 492; what were the "Scriptures of the Lord?" 492, 493; alleged references to Matthew and the Apocalypse, 495; uncanonical works read in churches, 496; al- leged evidence for Acts, 724.
- Dionysius, Bp. of Alex., on Apostol John's works, 641, 645.
- Divine design of Revelation, 93.
- Docete, 419, 561.
- Dodwell, 509.
- Dollinger, von, 943, 945.
- Donaldson, Dr., on date of Epistle of Barnabas, 215; on Justin Martyr, 250, note 1; on Epistle to Diog- netus, 409; on Tatian's Diatessa- ron, 486, 487; Diatessaron may have been confounded with Gospel of Hebrews, by Theodoret, 487; we could not identify it by our actual information concerning it, 489; on "Scriptures of the Lord," referred to by Dionysius of Corinth, 492; on his "rule of truth," 496; fragment ascribed to Miletus spuri- ous, 509, note 2; on Athenagoras, 514; on expression of Hegesippus, "The door of Jesus," 594, note 6; passage by Tatian, 632, note 3.
- Dorcus. *See* Tabitha, 755, 831.
- Dorner, 604.
- δύναμις*, 926, 927, 941.
- Dreams, Rules in Talmud regarding, 137; fasts to obtain good, 137; in- terpretation of, a public profession, 137.
- Dressel, 28; Clementines, 384, 605, 606, 609.
- Duncker, 431.
- Dusii, St. Augustine, 150.
- EBED-JESU, 490.
- Ebionites, Gospel of the, 272, 339, 341; Ebionites, 727, 917.
- Ehrard, 474, 583, note 3, 605, note 1, 771, note 1.
- Egyptians, Gospel according to the, 312, 339, 412.
- Eichhorn, 438, 760, 930.
- Eldad and Modat, Prophecy of, 229.
- Elijah prays that it may not rain, 940; called for at crucifixion, 986; bodily ascension of, 1020, 1023-1063.
- Elias, Revelation of, 217.
- Elisha restores a dead child to life, 185; other miracles of, 185, 1023.
- Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, 10, 346, 516, 522, 523, 524, 595.
- Eleusinus' child restored to life, 175.
- Ellicott, Dr., Bishop of Gloucester, 846, note 1, 933.
- Enkratites, 481, 490.
- Enoch, Book of, quoted by Epistle of Jude, 129; considered inspired by Fathers, 129; Tertullian on, 129; Angelology and Demonology of, 129; quoted by Epistle of Barna- bas, 216, 221; referred to by Cel- sus, 224, 1020, 1063.
- Epaphroditus, 940.
- Ephesians, Epistle to the, 558, 565.
- Ephrem, Syrus, 490.
- ἡμεῖς* sections, 735 to 741.
- εὐεργετῶν*, 931, 941.
- St. Epiphanius, miracles of, 170 (2).

- Epiphanius, epistle of Clement, 255 ; fire and voice at baptism of Jesus, from Gospel according to Hebrews, 272 ; combination of passages similar to quotation in Justin, 293, note 5, 292 ; variation from Matt. xi. 27, 328, 329, 232 ; on Gospel to Hebrews, 312, note 5 ; variation from Matt. v. 37, 295, 296, note 4 ; on James as High Priest, 348, note 1 ; on language of Gospel of Matthew, 374 ; travels of Peter, 386 ; alleged references of Basilides and his school to our Gospels, 416 ; variation from Matt. xix. 17, from Gospel of Marcionites, 427 ; bitterness against Marcion, 439, 442 ; charge of mutilating Luke, 443 ; his plan in attacking Marcion, 444 ; had not Marcion's Gospel before him while writing, 446 ; reproaches Marcion with erasing passages from Luke not in Gospel, 444-445, 449 ; undertakes to refute Marcion out of his own Gospel, 456 ; on Tatian's Diatessaron, 484, 485, 486, 631 ; fragment of Athenagoras, 510.
- Epistle to Flora of Ptolemæus, 519, 531 ; Theodotian's version, O. T., 523 ; on Cerdo, 525, 526 ; refers to Alogi, who reject Fourth Gospel, 697 ; on Luke, one of the seventy-two disciples, 732 ; on Acts, 853, 917.
- Epistles, the Catholic, 213, 215, 404, 490, 921.
- Epistle to the Alexandrians, 542.
- Evidence, miraculous, necessary to establish reality of Divine Revelation, 63, 64, 65 ; error of supposing that nothing supported by credible testimony should be disbelieved, 120, 121, 1059 ; evidence for the miraculous required, 973, 974, 975.
- Epistle to Laodiceans, 542.
- Eucherius, 540.
- Erasmus, 277, 1044, note 4.
- Ernesti, 594.
- Essenes, 691.
- Eucharistus, presbyter, miracles performed on, 175, 176.
- Eunuch, 829, 901.
- Eusebius, silence of, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 29, 30, 50, 62, 234, 235 ; on demons, 149 ; Greek gods demons, 149 ; demons introduced magic, 149 ; miracle of Natalius, 149 ; on statement of Irenæus regarding continuance of miraculous gifts, 166 ; miracles related by, 169 ; on succession to Bishopric, Clement of Rome, 203 ; Epistle to Barnabas, 212, 213 ; classes it among spurious books, 233 ; Epistles of Ignatius, 232-4-5 ; letter of Jesus to Agbarus, 234 ; Justin's apologies, 248 ; Apocryphal works read in churches, 255 ; birth of Jesus in a cave, 266 ; classes Gospel of Hebrews amongst Antilegomena, 341 ; on Gospel of Hebrews, 339, 341 ; on Hegesippus, 346-7 ; on Proverbs, 349 ; on Papias, 349 ; on connection of Peter with Gospel of Mark, 359, 361 ; his depreciation of Papias, 349, 357, 372 ; on Pantenus, 373 ; on composition and language of Gospel of Matthew, 373, 374 ; use of Epistles of John and Peter by Papias, 382 ; Papias uses Gospel of Hebrews, 382 ; on Basilides, 411 ; on Tatian's Diatessaron, 485 ; on Dionysius of Corinth, 490-1 ; on Melito of Sardis, 497 ; list of Melito's works, 503 ; on Claudius Apollinaris, 505 ; does not mention a work on Passover, by Apollinaris, 507 ; passage from Hegesippus, 594 ; plan of Eusebius regarding references to books of N. T., 596-7 ; reference to tradition regarding John not connected with Papias, 597 ; contradicts statement of Irenæus regarding Papias, 599, note 2 ; his explanation of difference between Fourth and Synoptic Gospels, 681-2 ; on Luke, 731 ; on authorship of Apocalypse, 643, 644 ; on the darkness, 987.
- Ewald, 16, 28, 51 ; his views on miracles, 81, note 1 ; *Spruchsammlung*, 220, 225, 239, 472, 482 ; on Justin's Memoirs, birth in cave, 265, 266 ; on Matt. xvii. 13, 324, 325 ; source of Synoptic Gospels, 472 ; Mythical character of first chapters of Luke, 473, 517 ; Apollon author of Epistle to Hebrews, 570, note 1 ; it transferred Philo's doctrine of Logos to Christianity, 579, note 1, 580, note 3 ; Apollon impregnated Paul with Logos doctrine, 570, note 1 ; Papias not a hearer of the Apostles as

- on state-
g contin-
s, 166;
on suc-
ment of
Barnabas,
spurious
Ignatius,
Agbarus,
38; Apo-
churches,
ve, 266;
amongst
Gospel of
gesippus,
n Papias,
eter with
; his de-
357, 372;
position
Matthew,
of John
; Papias
ws, 382;
Tatian's
onysius of
of Sardis,
a, 503; on
; does not
sover, by
from Heg-
Eusebius
oks of N.
tradition
ected with
statement
pias, 599,
difference
optic Gos-
; on auth-
s, 644; on
ys on mir-
ammlung,
n Justin's
5, 266; on
source of
Mythical
of Luke,
of Epistle
it trans-
Logos to
580, note
Paul with
1; Papias
postles as
stated by Irenaeus, 599, note 2;
Apocalypse and Gospel cannot have
been written by the same author,
642, 643; against apostolic origin of
Apocalypse, 646; on modesty of
Apostle John, 646; the Fourth Gos-
pel written by Presbyter, of Ephes-
us, at dictation of Apostle John,
657; speech of Caiaphas in purest
Greek, 659, note 7; on Sychar,
662; asserts John to have been re-
lative of the High Priest, 664;
theories as to the composition of
Fourth Gospel to explain its peculi-
arities, 670; no catalogue of the
Seventy, 795; on chapter xxi.,
670; the Apostle's share in the
composition of the Gospel, 670, 671;
on xix. 35, 671; assumed that John
wrote first in narrow circle of
friends, 673; explanation of anony-
mity on ground of "incomparable
modesty" examined, 674; asser-
tion that ch. xxi. must have been
written before Apostle's death dis-
cussed, 675; on discourses in Fourth
Gospel, 675; his argument regard-
ing John of Apocalypse applied to
Epistles, 676; on superscription to
Luke's Gospel, 732, 733; on "Acts,"
829, 834, 853, 868, 905, 930, 963,
note 1; 1064, note 1.
- Exorcism of Demons**, 136, 137; forms
of, by Solomon, 139; account of, by
Josephus, 139; Rabbins powerful
in, 139; Justin Martyr on, 139,
165; potent root for, 140; Tatian
on, 142; Origen on, 144, 145, 168;
Lactantius on, 149, 168; asserted
by Jesus, 155; continuance of
power of, in Church, 156.
- Experience**, the argument from, 98,
99, 1050; Hume's argument, 113
to 123.
- Ezra**, Book of, 212, 218, 220, 221.
- FABIANUS**, of Rome, miracle at his
election, 169; a dove alights on
his head, 169.
- Faunel**, angel, over the penitence,
&c., 130.
- Farrer**, Dr., Hulsean lecturer, mira-
cles inseparable from Christianity,
69; on Hume's argument from
experience, 112; misconception of
Mill's criticism on Hume, 114,
116; credibility of miracles a ques-
tion of evidence, mainly depending
on character of gospels, 197, note
1. 776, note 2; 987, note 5; 989,
note 4; 1016, note 2 and 5; 1021,
note 2, 1058.
- Fathers**, 4, 7, 8, 50; cosmical theo-
ries of, 143, 144; uncritical and
credulous character of, 157, 366,
444; absence of critical discrimi-
nation by, 213, 366, 444; testimony
of, regarding original language of
Gospel of Matthew, 373, 374, 375;
on Paul's journey to Arabia, 1069.
- Faber Stapulensis**, 31.
- Fian**, Dr., burnt for sorcery, 158.
- Felix**, 43.
- Flavia Neapolis**, 247.
- Franke**, 40.
- Fronto**, cured of leprosy by a sight
of Egypt, 171.
- Francis**, St., of Assisi, miracles of,
183.
- Francis**, St. Xavier, miracles of, 183.
- Flora**, Epistle to, 519, 520, 532, 636,
637.
- GABRIEL**, Angel, over serpents,
Paradise and the Cherubim, 130;
over thunder, fire and ripening of
fruit, 132; taught Joseph the
seventy languages of the earth,
133; over wars, 146.
- Gadreel**, a fallen angel, seduced Eve,
129; taught use of weapons of war,
129.
- Galatians**, Epistle to the, 925, 927,
929, 931, 1032, 1033.
- Galilee**, did the disciples go into, after
crucifixion, 1015 to 1017; a three
days' journey, 1067.
- Galasius**, decretal of, condemns gos-
pel according to Barnabas, 213.
- Ganaliel**, 761, 998.
- Gerizem**, Mount, 655, 663.
- Gervasius**, St., miracles by relics;
172, 173.
- Gesta Pilati**, see Nicodemus, Gospel
according to.
- Gfrörer**, 25; descent of spirit of
Adam, to Jesus, in Clementines,
615, note 8; on Fourth Gospel, 691;
on appearance of Jesus after death,
1030, note 3; 1061, note 1.
- Giants**, the offspring of fallen angels,
129.

- Gieseler, 439.
 Glaucias, "interpreter of Peter," 413.
 Gnosticism, 411.
 Gnostics, variation of, from Matt. xi. 27, 327, 328.
 God, assumption of personal, 103 ; conception of personal obtained from Revelation, 104 ; the physical universe does not display the peculiar doctrinal conception of, 104 ; a personal an exercise of faith, 105 ; cannot be proved as he is, 106 ; absolute and infinite personality a contradiction, 107, note 3 ; not represented as he is, but as it is our duty to regard him, 108, note 1 ; God understood would be no God at all, 109, note 2.
 Gospels, Apocryphal, number, of in early Church, 200, 203, 253, 255, 260, 268, 273, 275, 338, 339, 412, 413, 542.
 Gospel of Thomas, 253, 268.
 Gospel, the fourth, viii. 1-11, 382 ; viii. 1-11 derived from Gospel of Hebrews, 382 ; alleged quotation by Valentinus, 421, 425 ; the external evidence for, Clement of Rome, 549 ; Epistle of Barnabas, 550 ; Pastor of Hermes, 551 ; Ignatian Epistles, 557 ; alleged evidence in the Epistle of Polycarp, 241, 560, 563 ; the Logos doctrine in Justin, 271 ; alleged references in Justin, 563, 580, 581, 582, note 1 ; alleged reference of Hegesippus, to x. 7, 593 ; Papias presumptive evidence against, 596, note 2 ; alleged quotation by Presbyters in work of Papias, 603, 604 ; alleged reference in Clementines to, 606, 607, 608, 609 ; fundamental difference of doctrines of Clementines, 610, 611, 616 ; alleged reference to, in Epistle to Diognetus, of no value as evidence, 629 ; alleged references by Basilides, 629, 630 ; alleged reference by Valentinus, 630 ; dilemma of the argument from Heresiarchs, 630 ; alleged reference by Tatian, 632, 633 ; by Athenagoras, 510 ; by Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, 636 ; by Ptolemaeus, 636, 637 ; alleged testimony by Celsus, 637 ; legendary account of its composition in Canon of Muratori, 542, 637, 638 ; no testimony for a century and a half after the events, of the existence of a fourth gospel, 640 ; Christian miracles related by, of no force, 640 ; evidence as eye witness falls to the ground, 640 ; distinct characteristics of works ascribed to, 640 ; authorship and character of, 640 ; the five Canonical works attributed to John, 640 ; writer of Apocalypse cannot be writer of the gospel, 641 ; characteristics of, 641 ; language of, 641, 650 ; theories to account for it, 650, 656 ; author not a Jew, 655, 658 ; Logos doctrine, 658 ; attitude towards Jews, 655, 658, 659 ; mistakes denoting foreigner, 659, 660 ; Annas and Caiaphas, 659, 660 ; Pool of Siloam, 661 ; Bethany beyond Jordan, 661 ; Aenon, 661 ; Pool of Bethesda, 661, 662 ; Sychar, a city of Samaria, 662 ; chiefly follows Septuagint version, 663 ; John, of fourth gospel, and of Synoptics, 664, ff ; John, the beloved disciple limited to fourth gospel, 666 ; theories regarding chap. xxi., 669 ; theory of Ewald regarding composition of Gospel, 670 ff ; on xix. 35 f., 670, 672, 681 ; extraordinary phenomena of gospel only explained by unsubstantiated assumption, 672 ; peculiarities of gospel render hypothesis that it was written by the Apostle John incredible, 674 ; modesty of the supposed author examined, 674 ; Ewald's argument that chap. xxi. was written before death of Apostle John, 676 ; refuted, 676 ; author was not an eye-witness, 677 ; fundamental difference between Jesus of Synoptics, and of, 677 to 680 ; historical differences, 680 to 686 ; raising of Lazarus, 686, 687, 688 ; difference of teaching between Synoptics and, 688 to 690 ; theories to account for subjectivity in discourses, 690 ; impossibility of remembering long discourses so long, 690 ; explanations destroy historical character of, 692 ; discourses in, ideal, 692, 693 ; argument from Epistles, 694 ; Paschal controversy, 694 to 696 ; summary, 698 to 708.

- Gospels, the Synoptic, 199; [supposed use of by Clement of Rome, 206, 208, 209; passages resembling parallels in, not necessarily from, 245, 246; actual agreement of quotation from unnamed source no proof of use of, 305; theories as to order of, 473, 474; results of examination regarding date and origin of, 547; Justin's description of system of Jesus applicable to, 592; contrast between Fourth Gospel and Synoptics, 680, 681, 686, 688, 689; superiority of teaching of, over Fourth Gospel, 680, 690; result of examination of, 547, 548, 698 to 708; Gospels, evidence of the, bearing cross, 978, 979; vinegar and gall, 979; hours of the passion, 978, 979; inscription on cross, 981; parting garments, 981; the two malefactors, 982; the penitent thief, 982; mockery of the crucified, 982, 983; the beloved disciple and women by the cross, 984; the words on the cross, 985, 986; Eli, Eli, 985; the great darkness, 987; the veil of the temple, 988; resurrection of the saints, 988; the earthquake, 989; the centurion, 991; the Crucifragium, 992, 993, 1051; the wound in the side, 993, 994; Joseph and Nicodemus, 996; the entombment, 996; the spices, 996; Isaiah, chap. liii., 998, 999; watch by the sepulchre, 1000; the resurrection, 1001, 1002; according to Matthew, 1002, 1003; according to Mark, 1002, 1005; according to Luke, 1002, 1006; according to Fourth Gospel, 1003, 1007; vision of Mary Magdalene, 1010; journey to Emmaus, 1011; appearance to the eleven, 1011; according to Luke, 1011, 1012; according to Fourth Gospel, 1012, 1013; incredulity of Thomas, 1013, 1014; appearance related in Matthew, 1015; conclusion from evidence of gospels, 253, 1021 to 1024.
- Grabe, 337, 594.
 Gratz, 439.
 Gregory, Bar-Hebræus, Bishop of Tagrit, 490.
 Gregory of Nazianzum on Mark, 365; 954, note 3.
 Gregory, of Neo-Cæsarea, Thaumaturgus, miracles of, 169, 170.
 Gregory, of Nyssa, account of miracles, 169.
 Gregory the Great on Volcanoes being entrances into Hell, 152, note 4.
 Griebach, 20, 23, 438.
 Grotius, 474, 731, note 6; 880 (9), 933 (5).
 Guericke, 36-38; 605, note 1; 930.
 HASE, 26, 787.
 Hagenbach, 36, 38.
 Hausath, 1031.
 Hahn, 439, 440, 446, 448, 450, 456, 457, 463, note 1; 468, 469, 463, notes 1, 3, 4.
 Hale, Sir Thomas, Scriptures affirmed witchcraft, and the wisdom of all nations had provided laws against, 158, note 3.
 Ham, discovered the art of magic, 147.
 Hamilton, Sir William, on Unknowable God, p. 109, note 2; class of phenomena requiring that cause called Deity confined to phenomena of mind, p. 111.
 Hare, superstition regarding the, 151.
 Hariel, Angel, over cattle, 132.
 Harless, 25.
 Hawkins, Dr., complains of those who judge Revelation by substance and not by evidence, p. 74.
 Hebrew, the original language of Matthew's Gospel, 367; Paul represents the Jesus of his vision speaking, 376, note 2.
 Hebrews, Gospel according to, mentioned earlier than our Gospels, 200; quotation from, in Epistles of Ignatius, 238, 240; Justin's Memoirs, 250, 251, 252; public reading, 255; birth of Jesus, 267; fire and voice at baptism, 272; Gospel of Egyptians, a version of, 312; nearly related to Matthew, 325; used by Hegesippus, 340; Justin supposed to refer to, 338; relation between it and Gospel of Peter, 339; various forms of, 339; identity of, with Memoirs of the Apostles discussed, 339, 340; quoted by Papias, 340; used by Clementines, 340; used by Cerinthus and Carpocrates, 340; Diatessaron of Ta-

- tian called, 340; quoted by Clement of Alexandria, 340, 341; used by Origen, 341; found in circulation by Theodoret, 339, 341; classed by Eusebius in second class, 341; also by Nicephorus, 341; value attached to it by Ebionites, 341; believed to be original of Matthew, 341; translated by Jerome, 341; relation between it and Matthew, 341, 342; its antiquity, 340, 342; called Gospel according to the Apostles, 339; the two opening chapters, 350, 351; used by Hegesippus, 348; Jesus spoke to Paul in Hebrew, 376, note 2; Epiphanius on, 342; supposed use by author of Clementines, 388; supposed to be Gospel of Basilides, 412; alleged to have formed part of Tatian's Diatessaron, 483, 484, 488, 489.
- Hebrews, Epistle to the, ascribed to Clement of Rome, 202; Origen on, 202, 212; in Muratorian Canon, 542; Logos, doctrine of, 554; Work of a Christian Philo, 570; transferred Philo's doctrine of Logos to Christianity, 570, note 1; ascribed to Apollos, 573, note 1.
- Hefele, 28; date of epistle of Clement of Rome, 204, 714, (3) 715, (3).
- Hegesippus, 7, 8, 10, 11; refers to the epistle of Clement, of Rome, 203; quotation from Gospel of Hebrews, 212; passage from, 340; account of him and date, 346; considered James chief of apostles, 347; his account of James, 347; his rule of faith, 348; his reference to Apocrypha discussed, 349, 350; surviving members of family of Jesus, 350; supposed reference to Matthew, 350; supposed reference to Luke, 352; fragment in Stephen Gobarus, 354; on heresies in early church, 349, 354; opposition to Paul, 354; did not know any N. T. Canon, 348, 355; Canon of Muratori ascribed to him, 544; alleged reference to Fourth Gospel, 592; expression "door of Jesus" used by, 593; did not know our gospels, 592 to 595; alleged evidence for Acts, 713, 714, 720.
- Hegrin, Angel, has rule over beasts, 147.
- Heinrichs, 808, note 1.
- Hengstenberg, on Marcion, 474; on Sychar, John iv. 5, 662; the husbands of Samaritan woman typical of gods of Samaria, 663; contradicts assertion that John was related to high priest, 664, note 2.
- Heresiarch, 436, 439, 444, 451.
- Heracleon, used *Κήρυγμα Περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 430, 533; views regarding Jesus, 430, 431; date, 420; alleged commentary on Luke, 533; inference that he wrote commentary on the Fourth Gospel considered, 533.
- Hermas, Pastor of, quoted as Holy Scripture, 228; on Hegrin, angel of beasts, 147; author, 256—date, 256, note 2. No quotations from synoptics, 229; read in churches 228, note 2, 493; alleged allusion to Fourth Gospel, 552, 553; alleged evidence for Acts, 713, 714, 715.
- Herschel, Sir John; 1054, note 1.
- Hesperius, miraculous power of a piece of sacred earth from Jerusalem, 173.
- Heurtlery, Dr., miracles necessary to prove Revelation, p. 66, 68.
- Heumann, 730, note 3.
- Hibbard, Dr., 1056, 1057.
- Hilarion, St., miracles of, 171.
- Hilgenfeld, 28, 41, 42; on quotation in Epistle of Barnabas, 227; on Epistle of Polycarp, 243; on Protevangelium of James, 260, and note 7; quotation on baptism of Jesus from Gospel according to Hebrews, 271, note 2; Petrine tendency in Justin's memoirs, 280; Justin quotes from Gospel of Hebrews or Peter, 280; on Justin's quotations from Sermon on the Mount, 299, 300; on use of Luke by Hegesippus, 352; on Clementines, 386, note 2; author of Clementines used same gospel as Justin, 389, note; on Epistle of Peter attached to Clem. Homilies, 397; on Basilides in Hippolytus, 419; on Marcion's gospel, 440; on procedure of Tertullian, and on Tertullian's manner in dealing with Marcion, 446; Epiphanius against

beasts,

474; on the bus- a typical contra- was rela- note 2.

51.
Hippov, rding Je- ; alleged 3; infer- entary on red, 533. as Holy in, angel 56—date, ions from churches l allusion 553; al- 713, 714,

note 1.
ower of a om Jerusa- necessary to 68.

171.
a quotation s, 227; on 3; on Pro- 260, and baptism of cording to Petrine ten- hoirs, 280; pel of He- on Justin's on on the ase of Luke on Clemen- hor of Cle- pel as Jus- le of Peter ilies, 397; lytus, 419; 40; on pro- nd on Ter- ealing with nius against

Marcion, 444, 445; insufficiency of date for the reconstruction of text of Marcion's gospel, 450; on pas- sages in Marcion's gospel, 461, 463, 464, 465, note 1, 468; reference to Zacharias in epistle of Vienne and Lyons, 517; on Protevang. Jacobi, 517; date of Bardesanes, 530; ad- mits use by Clementines of Fourth Gospel, 606, note 1.

Hilgenfeld, 870, note 3, 896; 1037, 1073, note 3; 605, note 1; 790 note 1.

Hippolytus, supposed quotations from Synoptics by Basilides in work of, 412, 630; his mode of quoting, 414; derived views of Basilides from works of followers, 419, 420; on Valentinus, 415; alleged quota- tions from Valentinus, 428; his system of quotation, 428, 429; on views of Valentinus, 429, 430; on Heracleon and Ptolemæus, 430, 519, 420, 421; on Axionicus and Bardesanes, 431, 530; his writing of school and not of founder, 432; source of system of Valentinus, 433, 434; Ptolemæus and Heracleon, 519, 525, 526, 527, 528; de- pendence on Irenæus, 529; on Col- orbasus, 527, 528.

Hitzig, date of Book of Judith, 205.

Holstien, 805, note 1; 1052, note 1.

Hug, 439, 474.

Hume, Canon Mozley's attack on, 112; definition of miracle, 117; his argument from experience, 113, 117; attacked by Dr. Farrar, 413; Mill's criticism on, 114, 115; Pa- ley's argument against, 119 to 123.

Humphrey, 18, 19, 807, note 6.

Hyena, superstition regarding, 152.

Hyginus, 525.

Hystapes, book of, quoted as Holy Scripture, 494.

Heresiarchs, 528.

IGNATIUS, Epistles of, 17, 18, 29, 31, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 230; Greek versions, 230, 231; Syriac version, 230; authenticity of, 231; critical examination of the Greek Latin and Syriac versions, 235; Medi- cean MSS., 235; journey to martyr- dom, 236; date and place of mar- tyrdom of Ignatius, 237; note 2.

Martyrologies spurious, 237, 560; supposed references to Matt., 237; use of Gospel according to Hebrews, 240; alleged references to the Fourth Gospel, 555, 556; generally follow Synoptics and not Fourth Gospel narrative, 559, note 6; alleged re- ferences do not occur in Syriac epistles, 560; all spurious or with- out evidential value, 560; alleged evidence for Acts, 715, 716, 717; tes- timony afforded to date, &c., of gos- pels 230; number of, 230; addressed to Virgin Mary and Apostle John, 230; texts of Dr. Cureton's Syriac version, 130; Dr. Tattam's MSS., Calvin on, 231; Polycarp on, 232; Irenæus on, 232; Origen on, 232; Athanasius on, 233; Syriac version, 233; Arch. Usher on, 233; critical examination of, 233-4; Eusebius, 15 eps. of, 234; silence of Eusebius regarding eight eps. of, 234; martyr journey to Rome, 234; letter of Jesus to Agbarus, 234; no evidence that Irenæus or Origen quoted Greek versions of, 234; mixed up character of Medicean and corres- ponding Latin MSS., 235; value of testimonies of Eusebius and Origen, 235; critical analysis of value of ex- tant versions, 235, 236; falsifica- tion, interpolation and fraud of, 236; incredible character of both journey and epistles, 236; whole story incredible, 237; Ignatius not sent to Rome, 237; three martyro- logies, 237; passages in bearing on gospels, 237; quotation from Matt. xvi. 26, 237; date of martyrdom doubtful, 237, note 2; quotation not found in Syriac or Latin versions, 238; Tischendorf silent on, 238; re- miniscence of Matt. iii. 15 to epistle to Smyrneans, 238; Jerome re- ferred it to gospel to the Hebrews, 238; passages in parallel columns from epistles of Ignatius and Matt. x. 16, 239; Eusebius on epistle to Smyrneans c. iii.; Origen quotes passage from "The Doctrine of Peter," 240; three mysteries in epistle to the Ephesians, c. xix, 240; epistle to Polycarp, 240; Dean Milman on Dr. Cureton's Syriac reprint of, 241, note 1; Ignatius

- literature a tissue of fraud and imposture, 241; afford no evidence of the existence of our Synoptic Gospels, 241.
- Incubi, 150, note 1.
- Infancy, Arabic Gospel of, 266.
- Irenæus, 9, 11, 50; on Septuagint version, O. T. 128; continuance of miraculous power in church, 165; on miracles of Simon and Carpo- crates, 165; dead raised in his day, 165, 166; succession of Clement of Rome, 204; reference to passage in Ignatian epistles, 232; on Polycarp, 241; memoirs of Presbyter, 252; quotations of Justin against Mar- cion, 256; Davidic descent through Mary, 260, note 8; variations from Matt. xi. 27, 328, 329; on Gospel of Marcosians, 330, 331; on Gospel of Ebionites, 341; on Proverbs, 349, 350; on Papias, 356, 357; on con- nection of Peter with Gospel of Mark, 359; date and place where Mark was written, 360, 361, note 1; his quotation of Papias, 373; on original language of Gospel of Matthew, 373; on Valentinus, 421, 422; does not quote Valentinus, but later followers, 423; quotation vary- ing from Matt. xix. 17, from Gos- pel of Marcosians, 426; on Valen- tinians, 433; their Gospel, 434; charge against Marcion, 443; child- ish reasoning, 434; on Marcion's Gospel, 443, 478, 479; does not mention Tatian's diatesaron, 485; Syriac fragment ascribed to him and Melito of Sardis, 505; does not mention work on passover by Apol- linaris, 508; on Ptolemæus and Heracleon, 519, 520, 521, 522, 526; birth and death of, 522; date of his work adv. Hær., 522; bearer of epistle of Vienne and Lyons, 522; on the absence of knowledge of four prominent fathers of second century, 526; mistake regarding his passage on Tetrads of Valentinian Gnosis, 527; Ptolemæus and Heracleon his contemporaries, 529, 530; regarding Polycarp, 529, 562; on Gospel of Valentinians, 532; quotation from Fourth Gospel, 598; alleged to be made by Presbyters and taken from work of Papias, 598; not a reference to work of Papias, 598, 599, 602; on public career of Jesus in extent twenty years; was near fifty when he suffered, 602; on teaching of presbyters, 603; refers to many presbyters, 600, 601, 603; on Apo- calypse, 600; traditions regarding Polycarp and Apostle John, 694; Polycarp and Paschal controversy, 695; reasons why gospels cannot be more or less than four, 696; men- tions heretics who reject Fourth Gospel, 697; Acts of the Apostles, 710; on Acts of the Apostles, 726; the first who assigned Luke's gospel and Acts to Luke, 730, 853, 928.
- Irons, Dr., on miracles and evidence Revelation x. 124, note 1.
- Isaiah, prophet, 600.
- Isidorus, 413, note 6, 419.
- Itala version, 274.
- Izates, King of Adiabene, 799, note 1, 837.
- JAMES, Apostle, high priest, 348; his rule of faith, 348.
- James the Just, 720.
- James, Apostle, 347, 348, 349, 353, 593, 595, 870; analysis of speeches, 876, 877.
- James, Epistle of, 295, note 4, 311, 404, 542.
- James, Gospel according to, 260, note 7, 261, 262, 264, 266, 267, 517.
- James, head of Church of Jerusalem, 752.
- Jerome, 240, 354, 360, 731, 928, 1032.
- Jesus, warns disciples against false miracles, 70; mental condition of Jews incapable to judge of miracles of, 125; on guardian angels of children, 134; argues with the Pharisees on casting out devils by Satanic power, 138; belief of, in demoniacal possession, 155; dilem- ma, Dean Milman and Archbishop Trench in defence of, 155; miracles performed in the name of, 166, 168; the touch of him or even the hem of his garment work miracles, 185, notes 3 and 4; few Jews who wit- nessed miracles of, converted, 186; Letter of, to Agbarus, 234; Davidic descent of, through Mary, held in early church, 260; events preced- ing birth of, 262 to 264; birth and

- 602; on extent fifty when reaching of to many on Apo- regarding John, 694; controversy, cannot be 696; men- Fourth Apostles, 726; ke's gospel 53, 928. evidence
- 799, note
- orist, 348 ;
- 349, 353, of speeches,
- note 4, 311,
- to, 260, note 67, 517. Jerusalem,
- , 928, 1032. against false condition of of miracles angels of with the but devils by belief of, in 155; dilem- Archbishop 55; miracles of, 166, 168; ven the hem miracles, 185, ws who wit- inverted, 186; 234; Davidic Mary, held in rents preced- 4; birth and
- infancy of, 265 ; born in a cave, 265 ; reference to particulars of cave, 266, note 6; fire in the Jordan at baptism of, 269 ; accused of magic, 274, 275, 584 ; apocryphal official reports of trial of, 276 ; agony of, 277 ; at arrest of, forsaken by all, 278 ; all denied him, 279 ; treatment at crucifixion, 281 ; chal- lenge to establish his divinity, 281 ; different versions of cry on the cross, 283 ; charged with atheism and im- posture, 288 ; surviving members of family of, brought before Domitian, 350 ; not the Jewish Messiah to the Marcionites, 452 ; Messianic prophecies not applicable to, 454 ; works as a carpenter, makes ploughs and yokes, 583 ; public career of for twenty years, near fifty when he suffered, 602 ; public career limited to a single year, 617 ; preference for John detrimental to character of, 666 ; John xvii. 3, Jesus repre- sented as speaking of Jesus Christ, 693 ; Sakya Muni compared with, 702 ; perfect morality of, 702 to 705 ; perversions of historical sense to prove Messiahship of, 786 ; second advent of, 787 ; subject of "Acts" Jesus the Christ, 787 ; resurrection and ascension of, same day, 776, note 4 ; date of death of, 1059 ; not seen after death but by believers, 1067 ; no eye-witness of resurrec- tion of, 1067 ; probable effect of appearance of, in open court before his enemies, 1068 ; deified by death, 1079.
- Jews, credulous fickleness of, 127 ; monotheism of the, 127, notes 1, 2, 3 ; superstitions of the, 128, 153.
- Jechiel, Angel, over wild beasts, 132.
- Jehuel, Angel, over fire, 132.
- quin, a fallen angel, seduced the holy angels, 129.
- Jerome, 50 ; on demons, 145 ; angel Hegrin, 147 ; miracles of St. Hilarion, 171 ; Epistle of Barnabas, 213 ; Rev. of Elias, quoted by, 1 Cor. ii. 9, 217 ; Gospel according to He- brews, quoted by Epistle of Igna- tius, 240 ; Epistle of Clement read in churches, 202, 255 ; Gospel of Hebrews, on voice, &c., at baptism of Jesus, 272 ; considered Gospel of Hebrews original of Matt., 340, 342 ; translated it, 341, 342 ; lan- guage of Gospel of Hebrews, 342, 349 ; on connection of Peter with Gospel of Mark, 339, 340 ; on origi- nal language of Gospel of Matthew, 342, 373 ; who translated Hebrew original, 342 ; on Matt. xiii. 35, 390 ; does not mention Tatian's Diates- saron, 485 ; does not mention work on Passover, by Claudius Apollinaria, 508 ; date of Irenæus, 424, note 4 ; variation of, Sept. of Zach. xiii. 10, as quoted Apoc. i. 7, 585, and by Justin, 585.
- John, Apostle, 550, 551, 554, 561, 602 ; 508 kept 14 ; Nisan, 508, 562 ; writings ascribed to, 640 ; if he wrote Apocalypse could not have written Gospel, 641 ; external evi- dence that he wrote Apocalypse, 643 ; internal, 650 ff ; character author of Apocalypse, 650 ; charac- ter, son of Zebedee, 650 ff ; called the virgin, 652, note 4 ; author of Apocalypse, 652 ; residence in Ephesus, 654, 655 ; character, son of Zebedee, compared with author of Gospel, 655 ; John of Fourth Gospel different from John of Sy- noptics, 656.
- John, Epistle of, first, said to have been referred to by Papias, 382 ; in Canon of Muratori, 639 ; alleged quotation of first, in Epistle of Polycarp, 560 ; Credner assigns second and third to Presbyter John, 639 ; earliest references to, by Ire- næus and Clement of Alexandria, 644 ; writer of last two calls him- self Presbyter, 639.
- John, Presbyter, 596, 646, 655.
- Josephus, on exorcism, 139 ; on de- mons, 140 ; portents of fall of Jeru- salem, 140, 141 ; regarding Capi- phas, high priest, 660 ; Annas, high priest, 660 ; Pool of Bethesda and its miraculous properties unknown to, 662.
- Josephus, on the last end of Moses, 1020.
- Jowett, Dr., 852, note 2 ; 1038, note 1.
- Judas Iscariot, account of his death by Papias, 381.
- Judas, death of, 381 ; Irenæus on, 599 ; Judas, gospel according to, 253.

Jude, Epistle of, quotes Book of Enoch, 129; disputed, 494-542.
 Judith, Book of, date, 205; mentioned by Clement of Rome, 205.
 Justa, the Syrophenician, 399, note 3.
 Justin Martyr, on exorcism, 139-140; cosmical theories of, 141; on demons, 141; on demoniacs, 141; continuance of miracles, 164; quotation apocryphal works, 211, 212; Ascension day, 228; date and history of, 246; his two apologies, 246, 248; Dial. with Trypho, 246, 249; reference to Marcion, 248; number of Scriptural quotations, 249; Memoirs of Apostles, 249, 251; theories with regard to them, 249, 250, 251; memoirs how quoted, 252, 253; read in Churches, 255, 256; memoirs not inspired, 256; quotation from lost work against Marcion, 256; quotations with name and without form, O. T., 257, 258, 259; contents of Memoirs, 258; genealogy of Jesus, 258, 259; names of O. T. writers constantly occur in his writings, 257; Apocalypse of John only work quoted from New Test., 257; always quotes from a written source, 258; evidence he did not quote our Gospels, 258; quotes expressions of Jesus not found in Gospels, inexplicable omissions, 258; discrepancy between genealogies of Justin and New Test. Genealogies, 259; events preceding the birth of Jesus, 261, 262; removal to Bethlehem, 262, 263; dwelling place of Joseph and Mary, 262, 264; birth of Jesus in a cave, 265, 266, 591; references to particulars of cave, 266; angelic appearance to shepherds, ignorant of, 267; guiding star, 267; Herod questions the elders, not chief priests, 268; magi from Arabia, 267 to 271; Jesus works as a carpenter, 268, 591; baptism by John, 269; miracles of Jesus attributed to magic, 274, 584; prediction of Elias, 269; fire in the Jordan at baptism of Jesus, 269, 591; trial, &c., of Jesus, 275; omissions and discrepancies in the agony scene, 277, 278; the denial of Peter extends to the twelve, 279;

Jesus forsaken by all, 278; crucifixion, 279; on treatment of Jesus during crucifixion, 281; challenge to deliver himself, 281; mocking speeches, 282; the cry on the cross (of Jesus), 283; mission of the Jews after resurrection, 288; difference of the Memoirs from the Gospels, 289 to 299; style of teaching of Jesus, 289; quotations of Memoirs of Sermon on the Mount compared with Synoptics, 289; difference of professed, 289 to 299; difference in the Greek and in Translations, 289, note 2; result of examination of quotations from Sermon on the Mount, 300 to 308; express quotations from Memoirs compared with Synoptics, 309, 310; quotations of sayings of Jesus foreign to our Gospels, 281, 325, 334, 335; apparent ascription of Memoirs to Peter, 338; identity of the Memoirs of the Apostles with Gospel of the Hebrews or of Peter discussed, 343, 344; no evidence he used our Gospels, 344, 345; similarity of quotations with Clementines, 388; Epistle to Diognetus, once ascribed to him erroneously, 408; variation from Matt. xix. 17, 427; does not accuse Marcion of mutilating Gospel, 478; complains of adulteration of O. T. Scriptures, used Gospel of Hebrews, 488; quotes Sybilline books as the word of God, 494; type of brazen serpent, 551, note 4; as witness for fourth Gospel, 563, note 2; Apocalypse only book in New Testament mentioned by him, 564; the Logos doctrine of Justin, 564; same representation in Epistle and Philo, 565; knew Logos doctrine of Plato, 567; held Plato and Socrates to be Christians, 567; his doctrine less developed than that of Fourth Gospel, 568, 569; real source of his terminology, 568; his terminology different from that of Fourth Gospel, 568, 571, 576; Psalm xxii. 20, 568; origin of Logos doctrine, 570, note 1; Justin follows Philo, and traces Logos doctrine to O. T., 571, 580, note 1; Logos as "wisdom," 569, 572;

- 8; cruci-
of Jesus
challenge
mocking
the cross
of the
88; differ-
the Gos-
teaching
s of Me-
e Mount
ics, 289;
99 to 299;
k and in
2; result
tions from
00 to 308;
Memoirs
s, 309, 310;
of Jesus
281, 325,
ription of
identity of
ostles with
or of Peter
o evidence
344, 345;
with Clem-
Diognetus,
rroneously,
tt. xix. 17,
Marcion of
complains
Scriptures,
ews, 488;
s the word
brazen ser-
witness for
te 2; Apo-
New Testa-
n, 564; the
stin, 564;
Epistle and
s doctrine
ato and So-
s, 567; his
l than that
3, 569; real-
y, 568; his
rom that of
571, 576;
; origin of
ote 1; Jus-
traces Logos
580, note 1;
569, 572;
- quotes Proverbs viii, 22, 570, 572;
evidence of his indebtedness to
Philo, 570, note 1, 572, note; his
representations of Logos also found
in Epistle to Hebrews, 570; and in
early N. T. Epistles, 570; Justin
and Philo place Logos in secondary
position, 575, 576; alleged refer-
ence to Fourth Gospel, 580, note 1;
peculiarities of account of baptism,
583; variation from Zechariah xii.
10 with Fourth Gospel, 584, 585;
likewise found in Apocalypse, 585;
Justin derived his reading from
Apocalypse or its source, 585; al-
leged quotation from John iii. 3-5,
586, 587; derived from different
source, 589-590; displays no knowl-
edge of Fourth Gospel, 591; events
in the life of Jesus different to Gos-
pels, 591; no reference to special
miracles of Fourth Gospel, 591; his
description of teaching of Jesus
does not apply to Fourth Gospel,
591, 592; affirms Apostolic origin
of Apocalypse, 633; alleged evi-
dence for Acts, 716, 718, 719; no
evidence for Acts, 720.
Justus, 722, 734.
- KANT, we should avoid forming
views of God, 109, note 1.
Kainites, 525.
Kähler, 770, note 2.
Knodaja, a fallen angel, taught magic
and exorcism, 129.
Keim, 537, 998, 1005.
Kestner, 23.
Kirchhofer, 537, note 4; on Celsus,
on passage from Papias, 605, note
1, 714, 722, note 2.
Kostlin, 440.
Kuenen, 924, note 2.
Kuinoel, 808, note 1, 834.
- LACTANTIUS, on angels and de-
mons, 148; fall of angels, 148; ex-
orcism, 149; antipodes, 150; Jesus
accused of magic, 275; quotes Si-
bylline books and Hystaspes as in-
spired, 494.
Lachmann, 902, note 1.
Lange, 730, note 2, 834.
Laodiceans, Epistle to the, 436.
Lardner, Dr., 22; on Epistles of Poly-
carp, 232, note 1; on passage in
Eusebius regarding Gospel of He-
brews, 349; on "Scriptures of the
Lord," referred to by Dionysius of
Corinth, 492; on Melito of Sardis,
498, note 1; alleged quotation by
Athenagoras from Luke, 513, note
3; date of Celsus, 538.
Lardner, 524, 713, 714, 722.
Law, miracles ascribed to unknown,
84; to unknown connection with
known, 84; higher, 85; will of man
subject to, 80, 87; sense in which
term used, 87, note 1; progressive
succession of, 89, 90; invariability
of, 91.
Law, Mosaic, Jesus did not abrogate,
791 ff; he and his disciples observed
it, 793 ff; phenomena at the giving
of the Law, 957, 958.
Law of progress, 95, 96.
Lazarus, raising of, 163, 177.
Leckey, History of Rationalism, 158.
Lechler, 26.
Legion, an unclean company, 136,
note 3.
Lekebusch, on Paul's speeches, 759,
760, 816, note 2, 825, 880.
Liddon, Canon, on evidential purpose
of miracles and their nature, 84,
note 1.
Lightfoot, Prof., 4 to 9, 12 to 19, 24
to 31, 42 to 45, 48, 60, 62; on Jew-
ish superstition, 126; idea of re-
generation attached by Jews to
conversion, 589; on Papias' use of
Luke, 721, note 4; 722, note 2;
725, note 3; 799, note 2, 801, 803;
on Paul's conduct after conversion,
847, notes 3, 4, 5; 860, note 2; 876,
877, note 2; 887, note 1; 924, note
3.
Loflier, 438.
Lilith, She-Devil, 135.
Lincoln, Bp. of, see Wordsworth.
Lipsius, 15, 16, 28.
Lucian, 44, 45, 538, 539.
Lücke, on Pastor of Hermas, 551,
note 1; Ignatian Epistles, 555, note
6; Apocalypse and Fourth Gospel
cannot have been written by the
same author, 642; considers inter-
pretation of Siloam John ix. 7; a
gloss, 661-984.
Logos, doctrine of, in Septuagint
version, 552, 569; in Proverbs,
252, 569, 570; in Psalms, 568, 573,

- 574; in O. T. Apocrypha, 552, 371; in Apocalypse, 552, 555; in Epistle to Hebrews, 552, 554, 565; in Philo, 552, 553, note 2, 555, 558, 559, 565, 566, 568, 570, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, note 7; 580, note 1; 620, note 1; in *Κηρυγμα Πέρπου*, 580, note 3; in Pauline Epistles, 552, 556, 557, 558, 564, 565, 566, 570, 574, 575; in Plato, 567, 570, note 3; in Justin Martyr, 564, 567, 569, 571, 572, 574; transferred from Philo to Christianity by the Author of Epistle to the Hebrews, 570, note 1; in Clementines, 615, 616; in Epistle to Diognetus, 618, 619; in Tatian's work, 632, 633; in work of Athenagoras, 635.
- Luke, Gospel according to, private document written for Theophilus, 160, note 1; 199, note 1; many Gospels previously written, 199; genealogy of Jesus, 259, 264; events preceding his birth, 261; removal to Bethlehem, 262, 263; dwelling place, 264; birth, 265; Magi, 267; ch. iii. 22, 274; agony in the garden, 277, 278, 321; the Crucifixion, 281, note 4; passages compared with Justin, 281, note 5; "Sermon on the Mount" compared with Justin's quotations, 289 to 299, 303; danger of inferences from similarity of quotations, 300, 301, 302, 303; alleged quotation by Justin from i. 318, note 1; admitted express quotations by Justin compared with, 322 to 327; Gnostic and other variations from Luke x. 22, 327, 328; alleged references by Hegesippus to, 352, 353; on xxiii. 34, 352; alleged reference by Papias to it unfounded, 361, note 6, 362; alleged quotations in Clementines, 365; alleged references of Basilides to, 412, 413, 414, 415; alleged references by Valentinus, 425, 428; relation of Marcion's Gospel to, 440, 442; dependent on Mark and Matthew, 440; comparison of Marcion's Gospel with, 460, 467; comparison of opening chapters with Matthew and Marcion, 470; alleged reference by Tatian to, 482; alleged quotations by Athenagoras, 513; reference to Zacharias in Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, 516, 517; alleged commentary on, and references by Heraclion, 533, note 6; Canon of Muratori on the, 542, 543; result of examination of evidence regarding, 543; ch. iii., 582, note 1, 583; Irenæus on, 603; result of examination of evidence for, 583, 728; conjectured to be Barnabas, Silas, Mark, Trophimus, Gaius, 731, note 6; Luke, first mentioned as author of Acts and Gospel by Irenæus, 730; evidence regarding him, 730, 731, notes 2 and 3; as painter, 732; the beloved physician, 730, 732; one of disciples at Emmaus, 732, note 2; Ewald on superscription in, 732, 733; no evidence that he travelled with Paul, 734; connection with *ημετε* sections, 735 and note 2; not author of Gospel and Acts, 741; not author of diary, 741; called to preach, Luther, 587, 752, 1056, note 3. Lysias, 880.
- MACRINA, St., 170; Marcellina, 538 and note 8.
- Marcosians, 330, 331, 339, note 3, 426.
- Millennium, 599, 600, 645.
- Marcarius, St. miracles of, 171.
- Magia Jesu Christi, 275.
- Magic, fallen angels, taught, 130; Jews, addicted to, 137, 138, 139; discovered by Ham, 147; invented and sustained by demons, 143, 144, 147; universality of belief in, 137, 157, 158; belief dispelled, 159, 160.
- Magistris, Simon de, 544.
- Mahomet claims Divine inspiration, 64; his religion pronounced irrational as without miraculous evidence, 64.
- Makturiel, Angel, over rocks, 132.
- Malalas, John, 48, 49, 50.
- Manicheans, 377, 727.
- Mansel, Dean: Miracles necessary to Christianity, 66, 68; Christianity must stand or fall with a belief in the fact of the Resurrection of Christ, 68; but cannot compel belief, 70, 74; demands scientific accuracy of evidence, 86; argument for miracles from efficient cause as represented by will of man, 86, 87,

- ne and
 commen-
 y Hera-
 of Mura-
 ult of ex-
 garding,
 1, 583;
 f exami-
 83, 728;
 as, Silas,
 731, note
 as author
 Irenæus,
 him, 730,
 painter,
 an, 730,
 Emmaus,
 perscrip-
 ence that
 734; con-
 sions, 735
 of Gospel
 of diary,
 e 3.
- Marcellina,
 te 3, 426.
- 171.
- ght, 130;
 138, 139;
 e invented
 143, 144,
 ef in, 137,
 , 159, 160.
- spiration,
 nced irra-
 ous evi-
 s, 132.
- necessary
 hristianity
 a belief in
 rection of
 compel be-
 ientific ac-
 argument
 t cause as-
 an, 86, 87,
- 88, 89; assumption of personal
 deity, 100, 107; Paley's criticism,
 true one, 106.
- Marcion, 25; the first born of Satan,
 243; referred to by Justin, 248; Jus-
 tin against, 256, 400, 419; account
 of him, 436; date, 436; his collection
 of Christian writings, 437; his Gos-
 pel, 437, 438; theories regarding
 it, 438, 439; insecure data, 439,
 440, 441; sources of information,
 442; dependent on statements of
 dogmatic enemies, 442, 443; ob-
 ject of Fathers in refuting Marcion
 entirely dogmatic, 442, 450; his
 alleged aim in mutilating Luke,
 443, 444; value of materials sup-
 plied by Fathers estimated, 445;
 Tertullian and Epiphanius on, 445,
 446; imperfect data of Fathers,
 445; had they his Gospel or only
 the antithesis before them? 446,
 457; accused of erasing passages
 not in Luke at all, 445, 448, 449;
 data for reconstruction of text in-
 sufficient, 441, 450, 451; his system
 and character, 451, 452, 453; his
 work "Antithesis" on the Law,
 the fall, the devil, fraud on the
 Egyptians, Messianic prophecies,
 &c., 453, 454; his work anti-
 thesis, 442, 453; hypothesis
 that his Gospel was a mutilated
 Luke rests upon Tertullian's accu-
 sation, 455; anomalies unfavour-
 able to hypothesis, 456, 457, 458,
 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 465;
 the hypothesis tested, 455,
 456, 457; result, 465, 466;
 the "Lord's Prayer," 467; open-
 ing chapters of Luke, 467; his
 Gospel probably an earlier Gospel
 than our Luke, 474, 475; Evange-
 lium Ponticum, 475; had no au-
 thor's name, 476; argument from
 state of his Epistles of Paul, 477;
 Justin does not accuse him of mu-
 tilating Gospel, 478; did he know
 other Gospels? 479; statement of
 Latin MS. quoted by Tischendorf,
 598; on his knowledge of Fourth
 Gospel, 630, 631.
- Marcion, 25, 210, 436 to 480, 928.
- Marcionites, 727.
- Mark, Gospel according to, 253; au-
 thorship doubtful, 188; not an eye-
 witness, 188; Jesus the carpenter,
 268; quotations of Justin from
 Sermon on the Mount compared
 with, 280, 296, note 1; danger of
 inferences from similarity of quo-
 tations, 303, 305, 316; supposed
 quotations by Justin from, 316, 317;
 connection of Mark with apostle
 Peter, 358, 359, 603; Papias, on,
 355, 357, 360, 365, 955; are there
 traces of Petrine influence in?, 361,
 362; when and where written, 361,
 note 1; growth of tradition re-
 garding, 366, 367; was our Gospel
 the work of Mark described by Pa-
 pias? 366-367; supposed quota-
 tions in Clementines, 399; inter-
 preter of Peter, 413; alleged quota-
 tions by Athenagoras, 510 to 514;
 result of examination of evidence
 regarding date and origin, 548;
 Irenæus on, 603; result of exami-
 nation of evidence, 604 ff, and note
 3.
- Martin, St. Miracles of, 171-172.
- Martyrdom, value of, as evidence,
 189.
- Mary, Gospel of Nativity of, 260.
- Mary Magdalene, false inferences of,
 1034, note 1.
- Massuet, 524.
- Matthew, Gospel according to: sup-
 posed references to it by Clement
 of Rome, 210, 211, 212; supposed
 quotation as H. S., by Epistle of
 Barnabas, 216, 217; xx. 16, 219;
 supposed references to, in Epistle
 of Barnabas, 220, 222; relation to
 Gospel according to the Hebrews,
 342, 343; supposed references to
 in Epistle of Polycarp, 244; Gene-
 alogy of Jesus, 259; events pre-
 ceding his birth, 261; dwelling-
 place, 264; quotes Apocryphal work,
 264, note 4; magi, 268; baptism by
 John, 269, ch. iii. 15, 274; agony
 in the Garden, 277, 278; Cruci-
 fixation, 280, 281, 282; quotations
 affirmed to be made by Justin, 287,
 288; quotations of Justin from
 Sermon on the Mount compared,
 280 to 297; danger of inferences
 from similarity of quotations, 300,
 301, 302, 303, ch. ii. 16, x. 350;
 admitted express quotations by
 Justin compared with, 322 to 327;

- Gnostic and other variations from xi. 27, xxv. 41, 327-328, 336; Gospel of Hebrews, supposed to be original of, 341-342; relation to Gospel of Hebrews, 343; supposed reference of Hegesippus to, 349, 350; Papias on, 349; interpretation of and application of the account to, 368, 369, 370; original language of our, 371, 373, 374; critical dilemma involved from account of Papias, 371; testimony of the Fathers that work of Matthew was written in Hebrew, 373, 374; who translated it 376, 377; no evidence except of a Hebrew work, 378, 379; Matthew cannot be the author of the Greek, 378; Apostolical authority of Greek, gone, 379, 380; canonical, an original Greek work, 378; result of evidence of Papias, 380, 381; facts confirming conclusion that work of Matthew known to Papias was not our, 378 to 382; different account of death of Judas by Papias, 381; and in Acts, 381, note 1; supposed quotations in Clementines, 399; regarding xii. 35; alleged references in Basilides, 412; alleged references by Valentinus, 422, 425, 426; comparison with opening chapters of Luke, 470; alleged reference by Tatian to, 482; alleged reference to, by Dionysius of Corinth, 495; alleged quotations by Athenagoras, 510, 511, 512; alleged quotations by Ptolemæus, 519, 532; result of examination of date and origin, 548, ch. iii. 4, 582; iii 11, 582, note 1; Irenæus on, 697; result of examination of evidence for 697 E.; Matthew, Gospel of pseudo, 260.
- Matthias, Gospel according to, 253.
- Maury, on connection between ignorance and miracles, 194, note 1.
- Maximinus, colleague of St. Augustine, and a witness of miracles at Hippo, 173.
- Mayerhoff, 37, 38, 747.
- Mechitarist Library, 505.
- Melchisedec, Logos in, 574.
- Melito of Sardis, date, 497; fragment in Eusebius, 497; alleged reference to New Testament, 497; list of books of O. T. and difficulty of obtaining it, 497; alleged evidence for a N. T. Canon, 498; could not even state Canonical Books of O. T. without research, 498; Syriac, fragments ascribed to him, 502; list of his works, 503; fragment on faith, 503; alleged quotations from New Testament, 504; fragment is spurious, 504; also ascribed to Irenæus, 505; other works ascribed to Melito, 505; on Apocalypse, 643.
- Memoirs of the Apostles, Justin's, 249, 251, 252, 253, 254.
- Memra, 658.
- Messannahel, angel, over reptiles, 132.
- Messiah, Jesus the, 784, 785; the distinguishing belief of primitive Christianity, 784, 788; representation of, in Gospels, 785; the suffering Messiah, 934, 979, 1028, 1064, 1071.
- Messianic prophecies, alleged, 979, 981, 983, 985, 986.
- Methodius, 509.
- Meyer, 808, note 1, 868, note 1, 870, 880, 894, 905, 934, note 1, 953, 987, note 1, 991.
- Michael, Archangel, presents prayers of saints to God, 129, note 1, 146; angel of Israel, 133; over water, 132; high priest of heaven, 133.
- Michaelis, if our Gospel of Matthew a translation, its authority gone, 377; on Celana, 537, 538; on earthquake at Crucifixion, 989, note 4.
- Mill, John Stuart, I, 2; criticism on Hume's argument regarding miracles, 113, 114, 115; observation on Mill's criticism, 116, 117; on credible testimony, 122.
- Milman, Dean, 15, 16, 48; on spirit of early Christian times, 126; on demoniacal possession, 154; explanation of apparent belief of Jesus in demoniacal possession, 155; character of early ages of Christianity, 191; Ignatian Epistles, 237, note 2, 241; on Marcion, 454, note 11—989, note 4, 1058.
- Minucius, Felix, exorcism in his day, 168.
- Miracle of multiplication of loaves and fishes, 81, note 1, 83, note 5, 187; of country of Gadarenes, 154; of Thundering Legion, 168; raising of Lazarus, 163, 177.

Miracles, invisible, 65.

Miracles, as evidence, 1, 3, 53, 65, 66, 67; if not supernatural truths, are the wildest delusions, 67; as objects of faith, 69, 73, 79; false attributed to God, 70; of no intrinsic evidential value, 75; Satanic as well as Divine, 70, 72, 75, 78, 699; credited because of Gospel, 78, 196; true and false, 78; in relation to the order of nature, 80; German critics generally reject, 80; analysis of, 85, 86; referred to unknown Law, 84, 86, 91; argument of begins and ends with an assumption, 102, 103; religious excitement a cause of belief in, 122; no account of from trustworthy witnesses, 122; the age of, 124, 125, 153; character of original witnesses of, 125; Gospel miracles not original in their character, 153; permanent stream of, 153, 154; miracles arising out of demoniacal possession shown to be imaginary, 159; Christian and Pagan, 161, 162; Satanic recognised by Old and New Testament, 161; when did they cease? 160, 161; Gospel not original, 153, 161; claim of special distinction of Gospel, 163; ecclesiastical, 164 to 167; miracles of Simon and Carpoerates attributed to magic, 165; reported by Papias, 164; by Justin, 164; reported by Irenaeus, 165, 166; reported by Tertullian, 166, 167; reported by Cyprian, 168; reported by Origen, 168; reported by Eusebius, 169; of Gregory Thaumaturgus, 169; St. Athanasius, 170; of St. Anthony, 170, 171; of Hilariem, 171; of St. Marcarius, 171; of St. Martin, 171, 172; by relics of Protarins and Gervasius, 172; of St. Ambrose, 172; reported by St. Augustine, 172; facts not verified, 178; argument of St. Augustine, and affirmation regarding, 179; comparative evidence of, recorded by St. Augustine and Gospels, 180; miracles of saints, 183; classification of, 184; Christian miracles not original, 183; absence of distinctive character, 184, 185; comparison of evidence for Gospel and ecclesiastical, 186, 187, 188; Pascal

and Port Royal miracles, 188; of Gospel sink in the stream, 188, 189; none recorded by actual workers, 192; confined to periods of ignorance, 192, 700; ceased on diffusion of knowledge, 193, 700; at present day argument refers to narrative and not to actual, 196; the literary evidence for, 223; miracles are incredible antecedently, and are unsupported by evidence, 228; they are mere human delusion, 700.

Miracles: in Acts, 219; evidence of Paul for, generally, 925, 926; no writer claims to have himself performed one, 192, 925; Paul's alleged claims, 924; supposed reference (Gal. iii. 5), 925, 931; 2 Cor. xii. 12, 9.5, 932; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 936; gift of tongue, 947, 948, 949.

Monianism, 1056, 1057.

Modat, Prophecies of Eldad and, 229.

Moses, made use of the worm schainir 139, note 1; 1063.

Mosheim, 539.

Mozley, Canon: necessity of miraculous evidence, 64; miracles inseparable from Christianity, 67, 68; cannot compel belief, 73, 74; yet internal evidence insufficient, 77; miraculous evidence checked by conditions, 77; miracles subject to moral approval of doctrine attested, 73; this only limitation not disproof of miracles as evidence, 78; referribleness of miracles to unknown law, or unknown connection with known law, 84, 91; with "higher law," 85; is suspension of physical laws by a spiritual being inconceivable? 87; progressive successions of law, 88; antecedent incredibility, 90; Divine design of Revelation, 92, 93; belief in "Order of Nature," irrational, 99; argument of, begins and ends with assumption of acceptance of Christian evidence an act of faith, 106; personal Deity, 103; constant stream of miraculous pretention, 162; Jewish supernaturalism contemporary with Gospel miracles, 162; claim of speciality in Christian miracles, 162, 163; either clearly distinguished or not of evidential value, 163; on

- statement of Irenæus regarding continuance of miraculous power in Church, 165; on miracles reported by St. Augustine, 175; his objections unfounded, 176; absence of verification of miracles, 176, 178; character of later ages of Christianity, 194, 195; is Christianity believed upon miraculous evidence by the educated, 195, 196.
- Muratori, Canon of, 540; on Pastor of Hermas, 228, 494; Apoc. of Peter, 542; account of, 540; age of MS., 540; conflicting views regarding it, 540, 541; original language, 541; on Luke, 542; contents, 541, 542, 543; on Pastor of Hermas, 543, 544; theories regarding unknown author of, 544; date of the fragment, 544, 545; its testimony, 547; account of Fourth Gospel, 638; apology for Fourth Gospel, 639; author falsifies 1st Epistle of John, 639; does he refer to Apostle John? 639; distinguishes between John the Apostle and John the disciple, 639; no evidence for Fourth Gospel, 639.
- Muratori, Canon of, *See* Canon.
- Müller, Max, 63 and 64, note 1.
- NAASENI, 419.
- Naaman, 460.
- Narcissus, miracles of, 169.
- Natalius, scourged by angels, 149, 170.
- Nature, phenomena of, controlled and produced by angels, 126, 130, 141, 143, 145, 148.
- Nazarene, 1069, 1071.
- Nazarenes, Gospel of the, 339, 342.
- Neander, on Gospel of Basilides, 412; on Marcion, 439; on Clementines, 609, 615, 616, 617; Neander, 786, note 1; on Jesus and Jewish Law, 800; on Stephen 810, note 3; 834, 934, note 1; 953, 955, 959.
- Newman, Dr., miracles necessary to prove Revelation, 66; on ambiguous miracles, 71; miracles wrought by spirits opposed to God, 71 f.; doubtful origin destroys cogency of argument for miracles, 714; supports ecclesiastical at the expense of Gospel miracles, 74, note 4; a miracle at most token of a super-human being, 75, note 1; on mutual dependence of doctrine and miracle, 75; on the "Rationalistic" and "Catholic" tempers, 76, note 1; he really makes reason the criterion of miracles, 76; no miracle great in comparison with Divine Incarnation, 80, note 1; miracles reverse laws of nature, 83, note 5; religious excitement and imagination a cause of miracles, 122, 125; no definite age of miracles 161; absence of distinctive character in Christian miracles, 162, 186; honesty and competency traits necessary to attest miracles, 53; enthusiasm, ignorance, and credulity defects which no number of witnesses can remove, 153.
- Nicephorus, Stichometry of, 203, 229, 341, 343; on Luke, 732, note 1.
- Nicodemus, Gospel of, 253, 274, 275, 283.
- Nicolaitans, 9, 916, note 4.
- Nitzsch, 928, note 3.
- Nuriel, Angel, over hail, 132.
- Nyssa, *See* Gregory.
- Nyssen, a staff takes root and becomes a tree, still living in his time, 170.
- Nisan 14th, 562.
- ECOLAMPADIUS, 377.
- Ecumenius, 381, 363.
- Olshausen, 439, 440, 463, 605, 731, 756, note 2—807, 808, note 1—934, 984, 1002, note 1.
- Onesimus, 497, 498, 501, 734.
- Ophites, 419, 525, 547.
- Oertel, 880.
- Orelli, 379. Note 2.
- Origen, on Angel Michael, 129, Note 1; on demons, 144-145; exorcism, 145; analogy between demons and animals recognised by Moses, 144; angels employed in natural phenomena, 145; eating with demons, 145; sun, moon and stars endowed with souls, 145-146; demons produce famines and other evils, 147; on Phoenix, 151; exorcism in his day, 168; ascribes Epistle to Hebrews, to Clem. Rom., 202; Epistle of Barnabas, 224, 225; revelation of Elias quoted by 1st Cor. ii. 9, 217; reference to Epistle of Barnabas, 224, 225; on Pastor of Her-

- line and
national-
emperors,
a reason
76; no
on with
note 1;
ture, 83,
ent and
miracles,
of mira-
distinctive
miracles,
petency
miracles,
ce, and
no num-
e, 153.
203, 229,
note 1.
274, 275,
2.
and be-
in his
05, 731,
el—934,
29, Note
exorcism,
ions and
es, 144;
phenom-
demonia,
endowed
us pro-
ils, 147;
m in his
to He-
2; Epis-
revela-
Cor. ii.
e of Bar-
of Her-
mas, 228; reference to passage in
Epistles of Ignatius, 232; Doctrine
of Peter, 240; Epistle to Hebrews,
252; birth of Jesus in a cave, 266;
omission from Mark that Jesus was
called a carpenter, 269; combina-
tion of passages similar to quota-
tion in Justin, 292, note 5; varia-
tion of quotation similar to Justin's,
293, note 5, 292, 297, note 5; va-
riation from Matt. xi. 27, 328, 329;
agreement of Gospel of Peter with
that of Hebrews, 339, 341; quota-
tion in 1 Cor. ii. 9, 354; on Peter's
connection with Gospel of Mark,
359, 360; denounced *Κήρυγμα*
Πέτρου, 365; on composition and
language of Gospel of Matthew,
374; mentions "Travels of Peter,"
386; on Gospel of Basilides 412,
note 2; on Matt. xix. 17, 427, on
Valentinus, 433; Dial. de recta in
deum fide, not his, 442; on Hera-
cleon, 524, 525, 526; supposed com-
mentary on Fourth Gospel by He-
racleon, 533; Origen against Cel-
sus, 534, 535; on date and identity
of Celsus, 535; his uncertainty con-
cerning Celsus, 535, 536, note 4;
expectation of further treatise by
Celsus, 536; Celsus the Epicurean,
537, 538; quotations from Hera-
cleon, 525, 533; reply to Celsus on
alteration of the Gospel, on Apo-
calypse, 644, 927, 1068; on Luke,
726, 731, note 6.
Overbeck, 409, note 4.
PALEY, miracles proof of Revela-
tions, 65, 66, note 7; argument
against Hume, 119, 120; refuted,
120; his analogy a failure 121;
twelve witnesses refuted, 120, 121,
1050; on discrepancy regarding
Paul's visits to Jerusalem, 857, note
2, 858.
Pamphilus, martyr, of Caesarea, 342.
Pantenus, 373, 509.
Papias of Hierapolis, 78, 10, 11, 12;
on raising of a dead man, 164; re-
garding Mark, 251; on value of
tradition, 253, 282, 283; quotes
Gospel according to Hebrews, 282;
date and history, 356; prefers tra-
dition to written works, 256, 296;
the first mentioned traditions of
Matt. and Mark, 355; fragments of
works preserved by Eusebius, 356;
on Mark's Gospel, 355, 356, 359;
statement in preface of his work,
357; identity of Presbyter John,
357; Mark as the interpreter of
Peter, 358, 369; the description of
Presbyter John does not apply to
our Mark, 357, 358, 364; how
Mark's work disappeared, 366; ac-
count of work ascribed to Matthew,
367; was it derived from Presbyter
John? 367, 368; interpretation and
application of the account of our
Gospel according to Matthew, 367;
were *λόγια* merely discourses, or,
did they include historical narra-
tive? 368, 369; not applicable to
our Gospel, 370, 371; explanation
of his remark regarding interpreta-
tion of Logia, 371, 376; did not
know a Greek Matthew, 376, 377;
fragment of his work preserved,
381, 382; account of death of Ju-
das Iscariot, 381; said to have used
Epistles of John and Peter, 382;
knew no Canonical Gospels, 383,
595, 596; does not call Matthew
who wrote Logia an Apostle, 383,
note 2; first who mentions Mat-
thew and Mark as writers, 383;
Canon of Muratori ascribed to him,
544; does not know Fourth Gospel,
382, 595; knew no authoritative Gos-
pels, 383, 595; offers presumptive
evidence against Fourth Gospel,
596; no proof he knew 1st Epistle
of St. John or assigned it to Apos-
tle, 597; statements in Latin MS.
preface to Fourth Gospel, 598; al-
leged quotation by Presbyters in
Irenaeus referred to his work, 598;
no evidence that the Presbyters are
connected with Papias, 599; Pa-
pias asserted Apostolic origin of
Apocalypse, 605; alleged evidence
for Acts, 721, 722; on death of
Judas, 721.
Paraclete, first mentioned in Fourth
Gospel, 689.
Parchor, 413 and note 6.
Parrach, a magician, built a chamber
of the Second Temple by magic,
132.
Paschal Chronicle, 506, 507, 508, 524.
Paschal Controversy, 243, 506 to 508,
562, 563.

Pastor of Hermas, quoted by the Fathers as inspired Scriptures, 147, 193; publicly read in churches, 228; attributed to Hermines mentioned Rom. xiv. 14, 228.

Paul, Apostle, never saw Jesus, 188; Epistles rejected, 341; Jesus spoke to in Hebrew, 376, note 3; Clementines directed against him, 386, 406; Clementine attack him under the name of Simon the Magician, 406, 407; Theodas his disciple, 433; Marcion, Epistles of, 437; delivered from prison by an Angel, 134; party in the Church, 452; his Gospel, 455; accusations against Apostles, 454; rejected by Eusebius, 490; alleged recommendation of apocryphal works, 494, note 5; falsification of his Epistles, 495; Epistles of Paul and Seneca, 495; *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, 495; Epistles in *Concordia* of Muratori, 494, 492, 493; Paul a servant of Jesus *Christus*, 494; evidence regarding John, 495, 496; tradition regarding him and John, 497, note 5; attached in *Apocalypse*, 498, 917; date of conversion of, 1069, note 1; connection with Luke, 730, 731; his statements *congruent* with Acts, 742, 743; imperfect account of, 744, 745; parallelism with Peter, 750 to 755; speech, chap. xiii. compared with *Paul's* speeches, 764 to 767; analogy of speech at Pentecost and address of Theophylact, 766; conversation of Paul, 764; his genuine Epistles, 764; shows no knowledge of Stephen, 810; his rebuke of Peter at Antioch, 844, 840, 869, 870; his visits to Jerusalem, 844; conduct after conversion, 845, 846, 846, 847; his first visit to Jerusalem, 846; his vision in the Temple, 852; his second visit to Jerusalem, 853, 864; not second visit of Acts, 855; third visit of Acts, 856; discrepancies of two accounts, 857, 858; motive of visit, 860; the public congress, 862; speech, 866 to 869; ignores and excludes Apostolic decree, 874, 878, 885; circumcision of Titus, 886, 897; neither eating nor abstaining, a virtue, 888, 889; ironical expressions regarding Apostles, 891, 893, 894; understanding with the three,

895 to 897, 898; Gospel of the uncircumcision, 897, 898; his mission according to the Acts, 898, 899; priority of Jew examined, 899, 900; circumcision of Timothy, 903; Paul in Acts not historical, 904; Paul and the twelve, 909, 910; systematic opposition to, 910; Corinthian opponents, 914; denunciation of, in Apocalypse, 916, 917; said not to be a Jew, 917; genuine Epistles of, 922; evidence for miracles generally, 924; reference to signs and wonders, 925; Gal. iii. 5, 925, 931; 2nd Cor. xii. 12, 925, 931; signs of the Apostles, 925, 935; charismata, 926, 932, 935, 936; no practical trace of their operation, 936, 946; what are these charismata? 938, 939; gifts of healing, 940; leaves Trophimus at Miletus sick, 941; Tongues, 933, 934, 939, 947 to 949; does not mean power of speaking foreign languages, 950, 951, 962; interpretation of tongues, 959, 960; nervous temperament of, 966, 964, 966, 968; stake in the Acts, 969, 1072; value of his opinion of supernatural, 968; importance attached to his testimony, 974; evidence for resurrection, 975, 976; sources of his information, 1002; appearances compared with Gospels, 1030 to 1032; value of the evidence, 1034, 1035; his own vision of Jesus, 1035, 1037; effect upon Paul, 1039; was he converted by his vision? 1039; on appearance of Jesus to five hundred, 1029, 1030, 1030, 1061; as Christian or persecutor his convictions did not prove Christianity true or Jesus an imposter, 1039; narrative in Acts, 1039, 1041; date of conversion, 1059; result of examination of his evidence for resurrection, 1048, 1049; vision hypothesis applied to vision of, 1068; theological development by, 1070; his constitution and temperament, 1069, 1072; a Pharisee, 1071; his visions and revelations, 1072, 1073; process of conversion, 1072 to 1074; practical denial of resurrection by, 1077; life and teaching of Jesus neglected by, 1078, 1079.

- Pauline Epistles, Logos doctrine in, 565.
 "Pauli Prædicatio," 273.
 Paulus, his treatment of miracles, 80; on Marcion, 439, — 930; on the last two chapters of Romans, 930.
 Pênemné, a fallen angel, taught wisdom writing, &c., 129.
 Peratici, 419, 547.
 Persecution, the first, 828.
 Peter, Apostle, 249, 252, note 3, 337, 356, 359, 385, 387, 388, 406, 407, 413, 452, 610, 613.
 Peter, Apostle, in Acts, 750 956, 957, 959; parallelism with Paul, 750 to 755; speech at Pentecost, 761 to 771; Peter's speeches compared with Paul's, 761, 813, 814, 815; alleged analogy between language of speeches in Acts and Epistles, 770, note 2; speech, Acts i. 773, 774; sent to Samaria, 829; at Lydda, 831; at Joppa, 831; conversion of Cornelius, 830, 833; living with Simon a tanner, 837; inconsistent with his conduct at Antioch, 839, 869, 870, 871, speech at Council, 866; relation to Paul, 840, 866, 867, 868; temperament of, 1065.
 Peter, first Epistle of, 922.
 Peter, Apocalypse of, 255, 494, 542.
 Peter, Apostle, discussion with Simon the magician, 391.
 Peter, doctrine of, 240, 280, 340.
 Peter, Epistle of, first said to have been used by Papias, 382.
 Peter, Gospel according to, 250, 251, 253, 255, note 9, 337, 339, 388, 489, 493, 517.
 Peter, preaching of (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*), 280, 367, 369, 385, 404, 580.
 Peregrinus Proteus, Story of, Parody on Jesus, 14, 45.
 Peter, travels of (*Περίοδοι Πέτρου*) 385, 386.
 Pharaoh, his heart hardened, 70, note 3.
 Philastrius, 519, 520, 527, 528.
 Philadelphians, Eps. to, 230, 556, 558.
 Philip, Apostle, story related by daughter of, 164, 644, 643; appealed to by Polycrates in support of 14th Nisan, 508.
 Philip in Samaria, 828; and the eunuch, 829.
 Philip Sidetes, 509, 510.
 Philo Judæus, the stars spiritual beings, 130.
 Philo — date of, 558, note 5; type of brazen serpent, 551, note 4; Logos as rock, 553, note 2; Logos over universe, 555; first begotten Son of God, 555, note 2; Eternal Logos, 558; Logos, the bread from heaven, 558, 559; Logos, the fountain of wisdom, 559; Logos guides man to the Father, 559, all representations of Logos in Fourth Gospel, close parallel in Philo, 559; Logos as substitute of God, 565; Logos as the image of God, 565; Logos as Priest, 565, 575; Logos by whom the world was made, 565, 574; Logos the second God, 566; Logos the interpreter of God, 566; Logos the ambassador of God to men, 566; Logos the power of God, 575, note 7; Logos as king; Logos as angel, 571, note 8, 572; Logos as the beginning, 571; Logos as the east, 578, note; Logos the name of God, 572; Logos as man, 571, note 8, 772, 579; Logos as mediator, 569, 571; Logos as light, 580, note 1, 534; on Ep. to Diognetus, 620, note 1; Philo, 658, 958.
 Phlegon, 987.
 Phoenix, 151, notes 2, 4, 5, 6.
 Photius, Clemens Rom. reputed author of Acts of the Apostles, 207, 202, 727; fragment of Hegesippus, 350; does not mention work on Passover, by Apollinarius, 508; on history of Philip Sidetes, 509, 510; fragment of Athenagoras, 510.
 Pierius of Alexandria, 509.
 Pilate, Joseph begs the body of Jesus from, 992, 1000, 1001.
 Pindar, 419.
 Pins of Rome, 243, 544, 545.
 Plato, 431, 433, 525, 576, note 3, 704.
 Pleroma, The, 431.
 Polycarp, Epistle of, 230, 232, 241; account of him, 241; date 241; authenticity discussed, 241, 242; supposed references to Synoptics, 244, 245, 246; on Passover, 508; alleged quotation from 1st Epistle of John, 560, independent of Epistle, 561.
 Polycarp, Ep. of, alleged evidence for Acts, 717, 718.

- Polycrates, 508, 666.
 Pontus, 475, 476, 491.
 Porphyry on Matt. xiii. 35, 390.
 Possession, demoniacal, 134, note 6;
 possessed, dwell among tombs, 135;
 in man and animals, 134, 136;
 cause of disease, 136, 137; univer-
 sality of belief in, 137, 138; reality
 of, asserted by Jesus, 138, 155; re-
 ality asserted in Old Testament,
 139, 140, 156, 157; belief in, dis-
 sipated, 159; continuance of, assert-
 ed, 164.
 Possidius, Bp., by relics, works mira-
 cles, 176.
 Pothinus, 515, 522.
 Powell, Professor Baden: no evi-
 dence of a Deity working miracles,
 110; at present day not a miracle
 but a narrative of miracles discus-
 sed, 196.
 Prayer, "The Lord's," 392, 467.
 Presbyters, quoted by Papias and
 Irenæus, 598, 599.
 Prepon, the Marcionite, 530.
 Primus, Bishop of Corinth, 348.
 Proclus, 433.
 Proselytes, 798, 799, 802, 836, 885,
 895, 896, 910, 915, note 1.
 Protavius, St., miracles by relics of,
 172, 173.
 Protevangelium, *see* Gospel of James.
 Proverbs of Solomon, 551, note 4;
 doctrine of Logos, 569, 570, 571.
 Psalms, Messianic, xvi., 762; xviii.,
 771, 772; xxii. 568, 979; lxix., 773,
 979; cix., 773; cx., 459, 772.
 Pseudographs, number of in early
 Church, 202, 476, 494, 501.
 Ptolemæus, Irenæus on, 423, 424;
 Hippolytus on, 430, 432; date of,
 520; on the animal body of Jesus,
 430; Epistle to Flora, 519; alleged
 quotation from Matthew, 532; du-
 ration of ministry of Jesus, 533,
 note 8; alleged reference to fourth
 Gospel, 533, 636.
 Pythagoras, 431, 433, 525.
 QUATERNION, 431.
 RAGUEL, Angel, 128; executes ven-
 geance on the world and stars, 130.
 Raphael, angel; charm for exorcising
 demons, 128; angel of healing, 128,
 notes 4, 5, 6, 7; 130; presents
 prayers of saints to God, 129; an-
 gel of spirits of men, 130; over
 earth, 132.
 Renan, 930, 994, note 6.
 Resurrection: Paul's evidence for,
 972; allegation to be proved, 973;
 amount of evidence required, 973,
 974, 975; Acts and Gospels as evi-
 dence for, 976; account in Gospels
 of, 976; according to Matthew,
 976, 977, 979, 991, 1002, 1003; ac-
 cording to Mark, 979, 991, 1002 to
 1005; according to Luke, 979, 991,
 1002, 1006; according to Fourth
 Gospel, 980, 1003, 1007; vision of
 Mary Magdalene, 1010; journey to
 Emmaus, 1011; appearance to
 Eleven according to Luke, 1011,
 1012; according to Fourth Gospel,
 1012, 1013; incredulity of Thomas,
 1013, 1014; appearance related in
 Matthew, 1015; conclusions from
 evidence of Gospels and Acts, 1021;
 idea of anticipated, 1022, 1023;
 evidence of Paul for, 1025, 1026 to
 1032; appearances mentioned by
 Paul compared with Gospels, 1029,
 1030; appearance to 500 at one
 time examined, 1030, 1031, 1032;
 appearance to James not mentioned
 in Gospels, 1032; value of the evi-
 dence, 1029; the vision of Paul,
 1046, 1047; narrative in Acts, 1047;
 existence of Christian Society as
 evidence for, 1049; explanation of
 origin of belief in, 1060 to 1065;
 hypothesis that Jesus did not die as
 explanation of, 1051, 1052; vision
 hypothesis, 1052 to 1065; on the
 third day, 1065 to 1067; asserted
 proclamation at time without con-
 tradiction, 1075.
 Reuss on passage Epistle of Barnabas,
 227; on Clementines, 386; char-
 acter of Tertullian, 443, 863, note
 1; 864, note 3.
 Rettig, 461.
 Revelation, Divine, only such by
 telling something undiscoverable
 by reason, and requires miraculous
 evidence, 63, 693; should be clear-
 ly distinctive of Divine power and
 associated with Divine Truth, 78;
 Veda claims to be, 63; religion of
 Zoroaster claims to be, 64; Ma-
 homet proclaims, 64; design and

- details of the, 92, 93; design of, contradicted by experience, 99, 700; result of inquiry into the reality of, 698; we gain more than we lose by abandoning theory of, 706; if we know less than we supposed we are not compelled to believe what is unworthy, 706; the argument that it is necessary for man is purely imaginary, 707.
- Riggenbach on Passage from Papias, 604, note 5.
- Ritschl on Marcion's Gospel (386), 440, 450, 451, 468, 469, 790, note 8.
- Romans, Epistle to the, 228, 425, 427, note 11; 430, note 5.
- Romans, Ep. to the, last two chapters of, 927 to 931.
- Ronsch, 928, note 4.
- Routh, 594, 604, notes 3 and 4.
- Ruchiel, Angel, over the winds, 132.
- Rückert, 1037.
- Rufinus, 370, 384, 385.
- SAINTS, Bollandist collection of, 183.
- Sakya Muni, 702, 704, 705, 1077.
- Samael, Angel of death over Gentiles, 132.
- Samaria, five nations and gods of, typified by husbands of Samaritan woman, John iv. 5 ff.
- Samaritans, 829.
- Samniel, Angel, over things in the waters and on the face of the earth, 132.
- Sanday, 925, notes 1 and 2; 972, 976.
- Sandalfon, Angel, over the human race, 132.
- Sanhedrin, could not execute sentence of death without confirmation by Roman authorities, 807.
- Saragael, Angel, over the souls of the children of men, 130.
- Saroel, Angel, 132.
- Satan, Angel of death, an all powerful and persistent enemy of God, 92; a personal being, 103.
- Schafiriri, Angel of blindness, 135.
- Schamir, a worm, aided Solomon in building the Temple, 138, 139.
- Schenkel, Epistle of Barnabas, 213.
- Schleiermacher, explained away miracles, 80; explanation of Papias' remark regarding interpretation of the Logia, 375; on Luke's Gospel not identical with Marcion's Gospel, 439; Marcion's Gospel, 438; Paul's speeches, 759.
- Schliemann, on Clementines, 609, note 2.
- Schmidt, 438.
- Schneckenburger, on Gospel of Basilides, 412.
- Schneidewin, 431.
- Schoettgen, Academia Celestis, 136, note 5; Jewish practice of magic, 137.
- Scholten, on Justin's reference to Acta Pilati, 276, 277; type of brazen serpent in Epistles of Barnabas, 550, note 4; on alleged quotation from 1 Epistle of John in Epistle of Polycarp, 561.
- Schultz, 438, 950.
- Scott, Sir W., 1055.
- σημεῖον, 926, 927.
- Schwegler, on origin of Gospel of Hebrews and Matthew, 343; on Justin's use of Gospel of Hebrews, 344, note 3; on Marcion's Gospel, 430; namelessness of Marcion's Gospel evidence of originality, 476.
- Secundus, 527.
- Semisich, on Justin's Memoirs, 257, 265, 282.
- Semler, 435, 930.
- Septimus Severus, 539.
- Science repudiates miracles, 159; that which is opposed to science and experience demands irrefragable proof before belief, 160.
- "Scriptures," according to, 1025, 1027, 1033, 1066.
- Septuagint version of Bible, Superstition regarding the Translation, 127, 128, 133, 283, 354, 390, 499, note 2; 552, 560, 572, 580, 603, 1028.
- Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, on Gospel according to Peter, 489, 493, 505.
- Sergius, Paulus, 899, 901.
- Shibta, angel spirit who sits on men's hands at night, on food, &c., 136, 137, note 9.
- Servant of Jehovah, Isaiah liii., 999.
- Sethiani, 525.
- Severians, 727.
- Silas, 730, note 2, 746, 747.
- Sibylline Books, 273, 494, and note 5, 540.
- Sibyllists, Christians called, 494, 540.
- Sichem, 247, 662.

- Signs, asked for of the Lord, 69, 70.
 Siloam, 661.
 Simon of Cyrene, 478.
 Simon the Magician, his part in the Clementines, 385; on Deity, 391.
 Sinaiticus, Codex, 209, note 2, 210, 213, 215, 217, 219, 223, 225, 227, note 3; 228, 239, note 1; 293, notes 3 and 4; 293, 294, note 1; 295, note 2; 352, 395, 401.
 Socrates, Historian, 509.
 Socrates, Philosopher, 704.
 Solomon a Great Magician, 138, 139; taught wisdom by demons, 138; composed powerful charms and forms of exorcism, 138, 139.
 Sopater executed for Sorcery, 158.
 Sophia, 430.
 Sorcery, 156; universality of belief in, 157; St. Athanasius and St. Cyprian accused of, 157.
 Sorcel Angel, over trees which do not bear fruit, 132.
 Soter, Bishop of Rome, 255, 348, 491, 496.
 Speeches in Acts, 755 to 779; speech of Stephen, 805, 813 to 815; speech of Peter at the Council, 865 to 872; speech of James, 874 to 878.
 Spencer, Mr. Herbert, on the evanescence of evil, 94, 95, note 1.
 Spinoza; even existence of God cannot be inferred from miracles, 111.
 Spruchsammlung, 220, 225, 239, 472, 482.
 Stanley, Dean, 758, note 1; 935, note 2; 943, note 1; 947, note 1.
 Stag, 152.
 Stephen, The Martyr, 174, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809.
 Stars believed to be living entities, 130, 145, 146.
 Stephanus, H., 409, note 4.
 Stichometry of Nicephorus, derived from Syrian Catalogue, 203; Epistle of Clement of Rome, 203; Eldad and Modat, 229; Gospel of Hebrews, 341, 343.
 Storr, 439.
 Stoughton, Dr., on Assumptions, 102(1).
 Strauss, 985, note 1.
 Statistics of different creeds estimated, 702, note 1.
 Succubi, 150, note 1.
 Survival of the fittest, the stern decree of nature, 95, 96.
 Sychar, orthodox theories regarding, 663, note 2.
 Symmachus, 585.
 Sulpicius, knew a man raised from the dead by St. Martin, 172.
 Syrian Ephrem, 489.
 TABITHA, raising of, 755, 831.
 Talmud on, phoenix, 151, note 2.
 Tatian, on demons, 142; on demoniacal origin of disease, 142; ascribes spirituality to stars, plants, and waters, 146, note 3; disciple of Justin, 481; Diatessaron called Gospel of Hebrews, 340; account of him, 481; oration to the Greeks, 481; no quotations from Synoptics, 481; alleged reference to parable in Matthew, 481; to Luke, 482; theories regarding his Diatessaron, 483, 484; called Diapente, 484, 485; called Gospel of Hebrews, 484; Theodoret's account of Diatessaron, 484, 486; difficulty of distinguishing it, 487; its peculiarities shared by other uncanonical Gospels, 488, 489; later history, 489; sect of Encratites rejected Paul, and used Apocryphal Gospels, 490; alleged use of Fourth Gospel, 632; his Logos doctrine, 632, 633, 634, 635; alleged evidence for Acts, 724.
 Tepas, 926, 927.
 Tattam, Dr., Syriac MS., purchased from the monks of the Desert of Nitria, 230.
 Tertullian, 4, 11; miracles without prophecy cannot prove Revelation, 71, note 1; credo quia impossibile, 94; on Book of Enoch, 120; on demons, 143; demoniacal origin of disease, 143; Cosmical theories, 144; on phoenix, 150; change of sex of hyena, 152; superstition regarding stag, 152, note 2; on volcanoes, 152; continuance of miraculous gifts, 166, 167, 168; a dead body moves to make room for another body, 168; on the miracle of the Thundering Legion, 168; account of miracles, 167, 168; passage in Marcion's Gospel, 210; Epistle to Hebrews ascribed to Barnabas, 213; descent through Mary, 260, note 8; on Gospel of Nicodemus 276; variation of Marcion's from

garding,

ed from
2.

31.

2.

emonia-
ascribes
its, and
e of Jus-
d Gospel
of him,
ks, 481 ;
ics, 481 ;
in Mat-
theories
483, 484 ;
5 ; called
Theodo-
con, 484,
ishing it,
ared by
483, 489 ;
of Encra-
sed Apo-
leged use
is Logos
5 ; alleged

urchased
Desert of

A without
velation,
possibile,
120 ; on
origin of
theories,
change of
stitution re-
; on vol-
of miracu-
; a dead
n for an-
miracle of
168 ; ac-
8 ; passage
; Epistle
Barnabas,
ary, 260,
icodemus
on's from



Luke x. 22, 332 ; on connection of
Peter with Mark's Gospel, 359 ;
wrote vehemently against the Gno-
ses, 386 ; on Valentinus, 433 ; source
of his work on Valentinians, 433 ;
views regarding Marcion not trust-
worthy, 433 ; his style of contro-
versy and character, 442, 444 ;
charge against Marcion of mutilat-
ing Luke, 443 ; Marcion's alleged
aim, 443, 444 ; the course which
Tertullian intends to pursue in re-
futing him, 444 ; had he Marcion's
Gospel before him ? 446, 449 ; he
had not Luke, 446 ; reproaches
Marcion for erasing from Luke pas-
sages not in Gospel, 446, 447, 449 ;
on Marcion's antithesis, 453 ; com-
pares Marcionites to the cuttle-fish,
453, 454, note 7 ; his account of
Marcion's object, 455 ; undertakes
to refute Marcion out of his own
Gospel, 456 ; calls Marcion's Gospel
"Evangelium Ponticum," 475 ; no
author's name affixed, 476 ; on Mar-
cion's deductions from Epistle to
Galatians, 479 ; on martyrdom of
Zacharias, 516 ; gave the name
Nevum Testamentum to the col-
lected writings, 501 ; on Axionicus,
530 ; on Logos, 632, 633, 634, 635 ;
on Apocalypse of John, 644 ; on
priority of Jew, 902.
Testament, Old and New, origin of
name, 498, vide note 4 ; earlier de-
signation of, 499, 500, 853, 928,
1001, note 3.
Thallus, the historian, 987.
Theodas, 433, 532.
Theodoret, quotes Xenophanes, 112,
note* ; found Gospel of Hebrews
circulating, 339, 341 ; on Tatian's
Diatessaron, 484, 485, 486, 487,
488 ; does not mention any work
on the Passover by Apollinaris,
508 ; suppressed Gospel according
to the Hebrews, 489.
Theodotian's version O.T., 523, 524,
585.
Theophilus, Luke's Gospel a private
document for use of, 160, note 1.
Theophilus of Antioch : Greek Poets
inspired by demons, 141 ; serpent
and pains of childbirth proof of
truth of Fall in Genesis, 141, note
13 ; exorcism, 165 ; Canon Westcott

on, 510 ; on Apocalypse, 644 ; date
of Ep. ad Autol. 696, note 2 ; first
who mentions John in connection
with passage from Gospel, 696.
Theophylact, 381.
Thiersch, 544, 605, 795, 858, 905, 960.
Tholuck, 605, 770.
Thomas, Gospel of, 253, 268.
Timothius of Alexandria, 238.
Timothy, supposed author of diary,
746 ; circumcision of, 744, 903 ; of
Acts, 747.
Tischendorf, on date of Epistle of
Clement at Rome, 204 ; Clement
does not refer to our Gospels, 206 ;
probably oral tradition source of
words of Jesus, 211, note 2 ; on
Epistle of Barnabas, 222, 224, note
1, 226 ; on Pastor of Hermas,
228, 229 ; Epistles of Ignatius,
237, 238 ; Protevangelium of James,
260, notes 6 and 7 ; quotation of
Protevangelium by Justin, 261,
266 ; on Gospel of Nicodemus, 276,
283 ; quotations of Justin asserted
to be from Matthew, 286 ; on sup-
posed quotations by Justin of Mark
and Luke, 316, 317 ; on Hegesippus,
355 ; on books referred to by
Papias, 356, note 7 ; argument for
identity of works described by
Papias with our Gospels, 366 ; on
interpretation of word *λογια*, 368,
note i, 370, note 1 ; on original
language of our Gospel according
to Matthew, 371 ; on applicability
of account of Papias to it, 371 ;
on disparagement of Papias, 372 ;
uncritical spirit of Fathers, 374,
375 on Clementines, 389, note 1 ;
on work of Basilides on the Gospel,
411, 413 ; alleged quotations by
Basilides from Gospel, 414, 416 ;
not by Basilides, 416, 417 ; on al-
leged quotations of Gospels by Val-
entinus, 421 ; falsification of Hip-
polytus, 421 ; falsification of Irenaeus
422 ; his argument, 423 ; alleged
quotation by Valentinus in work of
Hippolytus, 428 ; admits uncer-
tainty of source of quotations, 429 ;
Tatian does not quote Synoptics,
481 ; date of Tatian's Diatessaron,
484 ; asserts it harmony of our Gos-
pels, 487, 488 ; expressions of
Dionysius claimed as references to




- our Gospels, 491; does not cite Miletus, 497; on date of Apollinaris, 506; claims fragment of Apollinaris, as evidence for our Gospels, 507; on Athenagoras, 510; on martyrdom of Zacharias in Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, 517; alleged quotations of Gospels by Ptolemæus, 519; date of Ptolemæus, 520; date of Heraclion, 524; meaning of *γνώριμος*, 526; Epiphanius on Cerdo, 525, 526; date of Celsus, 534, note 2; on Epistle of Barnabas as evidence for Fourth Gospel, 550; on use of Fourth Gospel in Ignatian Epistles, 555; alleged reference in Epistle of Polycarp to 1st Epistle of John, 560, 561; on Justin as evidence for the Fourth Gospel, 563; does not claim Hegesippus as witness for Fourth Gospel, 592; Logos doctrine of the Fathers' evidence for Fourth Gospel, 551, 555, 556, 557, 560, 563, 564, 565, 567, 580, 586; his argument that Papias is not a witness against Fourth Gospel, 563, 596; argument regarding silence of Eusebius, 596; attempt to make Papias witness for it, 597; extraordinary argument from reference to Papias in Latin MSS. 597, 598; alleged connection of Papias with Presbyters referred to by Irenæus, 598; alleged quotation, not by Presbyters, of Papias, 598, 599; alleged references to Fourth Gospel in Clementines, 606; in Epistle to Diognetus, 618; alleged reference to Basilides, 629, 630; alleged references by Tatian, 632; date of Theophilus and Autolyc., 696, note 2.
- Titus, supposed author of Acts, 747 and note 3; circumcision of, 743.
- Tobit, Book of, Jewish superstitions in the, 123.
- Tongues, the gift of, 933 to 949; interpretation of tongues, 959, 960; unintelligible speech, 961, 962; what its utility for Church, 963, 964; as a sign? 965, 966; for private edification, 966; ecstatic speech, 967, 968; in no way miraculous, 970, 1056, note 5.
- Tregelles, Dr., 15, 30, 231, note 1; or Canon of Muratori, 638 (1) (3).
- Transfiguration, the, 1024.
- Trench, Archbishop, on the sin of credulity, 61; miracles cannot command obedience absolutely, 72, 73; office of miracles, 73; Satanic miracles, 73 f., 82; theory of reminiscence, 735, note 1; analysis of miracles, definition of, 81, 82; ingenious way of overcoming difficulty of miracles, 82-96, 97; exemption from physical law a lost prerogative of our race, p. 97, note 1, 101; demoniacal possession, 155; on belief of Jesus in reality of demoniacal possession, 155; are there demons now? 156; on withdrawal of miraculous power, 164.
- Trophemus left at Melitus sick, 941.
- Tuke, Dr., 1055, 1057.
- Twelve, Gospel according to the, 253, 255.
- Twelve, the conduct of, at death of Jesus, 918, 919.
- Tryphon, 492, 633.
- Trypho, 719.
- Tychius, 734.
- UHLHORN, 28, 386, 615.
- Uriel, Angel, of thunder and earthquakes, 130.
- Usher, Archbishop, 20, 22, 32; on Ignatian Epistles, 233.
- VALENTINUS, date and history of, 420, 421; alleged references to Gospels, 421; Irenæus does not refer to him but to later followers, 423; letter of, quoted by Clement of Alexandria, 416; alleged quotations in work of Hippolytus, 417, 419; Eastern and Italian Schools, quotations not made by Valentinus, 430; results regarding alleged quotations, 432; derived his system from Pythagoras and Plato, 433; Tertullian on, 433; his alleged use of N. T., 425; professed to have traditions from Apostles, 433; rejects Gospels, 436; the Gospel of Truth, 434; his followers, Ptolemæus and Heraclion, 519, 520; Oriental and Italian Valentinians, 530; alleged reference to fourth Gospel, 630; date of, 528.

- Valentinus, 518, 519, 523, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529.
- Vaticanus, Codex, 991, note 1 and 3.
- Veda considered divinely inspired, 63, 64.
- Vettius Epagathus, 516, 518.
- Victor of Capua, 484, 524.
- Vienne and Lyons, Epistle of, date and circumstances, 515, 516, 636; references to Zacharias, 516, 517; Irenaeus bearer of, 522; alleged reference to Fourth Gospel, 636.
- Vienne and Lyons, Epistle of, alleged evidence for Acts, 725.
- Vision hypothesis, applied to resurrection of Saints, 989; applied to resurrection of Jesus, 1010; applied to transfiguration, 1024, 1052, 1053; applied to visions of Jesus generally, 1024, 1052 to 1059; applied to vision of Paul, 970, 1030, 1047.
- Volcanoes, openings into Hell, 152; account of Gregory the Great, 152, note 4.
- Volkmar, 15, 28, 34, 37, 41, 42, 48; date of Book of Judith, 205; author of Clementines used same Gospel as Justin, 388, note 3; on quotations of Hippolytus, 419; on Marcion's Gospel, 440, 441, 442; author of *Dial. de recte in deum fide* on Marcion, 442; on procedure of Tertullian against Marcion, 445, 446; arguments *a silentio*, 445, 446; incompleteness and doubtful trustworthiness of Epi-phanus and Tertullian against Marcion, 447, 448; their contradictions, 450; on insufficiency of data for reconstruction of text of Marcion's Gospel, and settlement of the discussion, 450, 451; on passages in Marcion's Gospel, 461, 464, note 1, 468, 469, 472; on Ax-ionius and Bardesanes, 530, note 2; date of Ptolemæus and Heracleon, 522, 526, 529, 530; on date of Celsus, 535, 537; on language of Canon of Muratori, 541, note 1, 545, 546; on alleged quotation from 1st Epistle of John in Epistle of Polycarp, 561; admits probable use of fourth Gospel by Clementines, 606, note 1.
- Vulgate, 390, note 2.
- Vossian, 25, 30, 51, 52.
- WEASELS, 144, 152, note 1.
- Weizsäcker, on Epistle of Barnabas, 219, 220; on quotation in work of Hippolytus ascribed to Valentinus, 429.
- Westcott, Canon, 4, 33 to 35, 37 to 42, 52; Miracles inseparable from Christianity, 68; resumption of Personal God, cannot be proved, 104, note 1; to speak of God as Infinite and Personal a contradiction, 107, note 3; on a quotation of Justin's, 281; apologetic criticism, by, 281, note 4; 300, note 2; on coincidence between quotation of Justin and Clementines, 311, note 2; on Justin's quotation from the "Memoirs," 318, 319, 320 to 329; on Apocrypha of Hegesippus, 350, note 1; supposed reference of Hegesippus to Luke, 352; on the uncritical character of the first two centuries, 367, note 1; his silence regarding original language of work attributed to Matthew, 372, note 2; on Clementines, 389, note 1; on supposed quotation from Mark in Clementines, 400, 401; Paul attacked as "the enemy" in Clementines, 406, note 5; on Basilides, 411, 412; statement regarding Glaucius to whom Basilides appealed, 413; his explanation of use of uncanonical works by Basilides, 413, note 4; assertion that Basilides admitted historic truth of Gospels, 415; no reference to N. T. in fragments of Isidorus, 414, 415; alleged quotations of our Gospels by Basilides, 417, 418; uncertainty regarding writings used by Hippolytus, 419; silence regarding doubt whether Hippolytus quotes Basilides, 420; on the formula employed in the supposed quotations, 420; does not refer to quotations of Valentinus alleged by Tischendorf, 425; extraordinary statement regarding Valentinus, 425; alleged references of Valentinus to Matthew, 425, 426; alleged quotation by Valentinus from Gospels in work of Hippolytus, 427, note 11, 428; silence regarding uncertain system of quotation of Hippolytus, 429; does not state facts, 430, 431;





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



Photographic Sciences Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

43
42
38
36
32
28
25
22
20
18

10

- assertion regarding Valentinus and New Testament Canon, 432, 433; not clear that Marcion himself altered his Gospel, 474; some supposed alterations, various readings, 477; on text of Marcion's Epistles of Paul, 477; on passage in Tertullian on Marcion's treatment of Gospels, 478, 479, 631; alleged references of Tatian to Matthew, 481, 482; on Tatian's Diatessaron, 486; the incorrectness of his assertions, 487; Tatian's Diatessaron said to be the first recognition of a four-fold Gospel, 488, 489; later history of Diatessaron involved in confusion, 489; on "Scriptures of the Lord" referred to by Dionysius of Corinth, 492, 495; incorrectness of his deductions from words of Dionysius, 494; alleged reference of Dionysius to Matthew and the Apocalypse, 495; and to a New Testament Canon, 495, 496; on works read in churches, 496; asserts that Melito of Sardis speaks of a collected New Testament, 497; extraordinary nature of this assertion, 497, 498; he follows and exaggerates Lardner, 498, note 1; value of Melito's evidence for a New Testament Canon, 498, 500, 501; on Syriac fragment of Oration, 502, 503; fragment on Faith, 503; silence as to doubtful character, 503; claims fragment ascribed to Apollinaris as evidence for our Gospels, 507; on alleged quotations of Athenagoras, 510, 511, 512, 513; on Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, 519, 524, note 5; Ptolemaeus on duration of ministry of Jesus, 533, note 8; date of Celsus, 537, note 4; on Canon of Muratori, 541, note 5, 546, note 2; Clement of Rome as evidence for Fourth Gospel, 549, note 1; alleged allusions in Pastor of Hermas to Fourth Gospel, 551, 552, note 3, 555, note 5; alleged Johannine influence traceable in Ignatian epistles, 557; on evidence of Justin for Fourth Gospel, 563; claims Hegesippus as witness for Fourth Gospel, 592; on "door of Jesus," 595; alleged quotation by presbyters, in Irenaeus, from work of Papias, 604, note 3; assertion that numerous references intending to show that Papias was acquainted with Matt., Mark and John, 604; note 3; no evidence of fact, *ib.*; Papias knew Fourth Gospel, 604, note 3; Papias maintained divine inspiration of Apocalypse, 605; alleged references in Clementines to Fourth Gospel, 606; alleged references to Fourth Gospel in Epistle to Diognetus, 618, 619-623; alleged reference to Fourth Gospel by Basilides, 629, 630; alleged reference by Tatian, 632, 633; alleged reference to Fourth Gospel by Athenagoras, 635; passage in Canon of Muratori, 638, note 2; contrast in form and spirit between Fourth Gospel and Synoptics, 629; on Papias, reference to Acts, 722, n. 2, 3, 4. Wescott, Canon, 921, 924, note 3, 973, 1021, note 3, 1050, note 1.
- Wette, De, on quotations of Justin, compared with our synoptics, 288, 289, 299; on Evangelical quotations of Clementines, 387, 395, 397, 398, 400; on Marcion's gospel, 433, 469, 474; on Athenagoras, 514, note 1; date of Irenaeus, 524, notes 3 and 4; Apocalypse and Fourth Gospel cannot have been written by same author, 642; mistaken reminiscences in Fourth Gospel, 680, note 1; on speech of Peter, regarding death of Judas, 774; on Acts, 868.
- Wetstein, 474, 905.
- Weiss, 16, 28.
- Wette, De, on Justin's quotations, 288, 395; on passage from Ignatius, 605, note 1; on Acts, 836, 934.
- Wiesler, 857, 858, 892, note 3, 963, note 1.
- Wetsmann, 20.
- Winer, 772, 868.
- Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), 569, 571, 572.
- Wisdom of Solomon, Brazen Serpent, 571, note 3; Logos doctrine in, 569 to 572.
- Witchcraft, universality of belief in, 157; belief in dispelled, 159, 160; of Old Testament laws against Exod. xxii. 18, Levit. xix. 31, xx. 6 and 27, Deut. xviii. 10, 11, 12, 156, 157.

- Wordsworth, Dr., Bishop of Lincoln, 731, note 6, 732, note 1, 747, note 3, 794, note 1, 811, note 6, 941, note 1.
- XENOPHANES, of Colophon, on Anthropomorphic Divinity, 111.
- ZAHN, 2, 8, 30, 43, 45, 48, 51, 721, note 4.
- Zaccheus, 465.
- Zacharias, 516, 517.
- Zephyrinus, Bishop of Rome, Natalus implores to be received into the Church by, 149.
- Zaller, 388, 409, note 2, 605, note 1, 810, 816, note 2, 826, 830, 879; on evidence and proof, 952.
- Zoroaster, religion of, claims to have been Divine Revelation, 64.

