

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 00599483 5

HANDBOUND  
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF  
TORONTO PRESS









A

CRITICAL ESSAY

ON THE

GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

BY

DR. FREDERICK SCHLEIERMACHER.

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION BY THE TRANSLATOR,

CONTAINING

AN ACCOUNT OF THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING THE  
ORIGIN OF THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS SINCE  
BISHOP MARSH'S DISSERTATION.

CONNOP THIRLWALL  
(1797-1875) BISHOP  
of ST-DAN

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN TAYLOR,

WATERLOO-PLACE, FALL-MALL.

1825.

CRITICAL ESSAY  
ON THE  
INTRODUCTION  
OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE

BY  
DR. FREDERICK SCHLEIERMACHER.

8728

24/11/90

LONDON:

PRINTED BY THOMAS DAVISON, WHITEFRIARS.

## INTRODUCTION

BY

THE TRANSLATOR.

---

THE work of which a translation is now laid before the public is one of the latest productions of biblical criticism in Germany, relating to the origin of our three first Gospels. The author himself has prefixed an introduction, in which, supposing his readers acquainted with the works of his predecessors, he has contented himself with pointing out the principal imperfections of the two hypotheses which in various forms and combinations have almost exclusively divided the possession of public opinion, and with explaining the nature and object of his own investigation. But as the English reader cannot be presumed to be equally conversant with the present state of the controversy, which, since Bishop Marsh's Dissertation on this subject annexed to his translation of Michaelis and the discussion occasioned by it, has been almost entirely confined to Germany, it be-

comes necessary, in order even to render the author fully intelligible, to give some account of the works to which he alludes ; and this seems an appropriate occasion for noticing some of the principal contributions which have been made within the last twenty years to the solution of this important and intricate problem. This review will neither comprehend every work which has been produced within that period on the subject, nor will it enter into the details of those which are selected. Its object is to present the reader with the principal variations of opinion, to draw his attention to the most important points of the controversy, and to enable him to prosecute the inquiry for himself. The earlier history of this long-disputed question he is supposed to possess in Bishop Marsh's Dissertation. This it was the less necessary to repeat here, as every class of opinions to which the subject had given rise has been attacked and defended within the period to which we shall confine ourselves, and therefore an account of this part of the controversy must contain every thing requisite to form a general view of the whole. It may however be proper briefly to remind the reader, that when a more critical study of the original text had discovered in our three first evangelists variations and coincidences in matter, language and arrangement, such as could no longer be satisfactorily explained by referring to the common supernatural source from which

alone the sacred historians were generally supposed to have drawn, two modes of explanation presented themselves, between which the voices of the learned were long divided. The first was the hypothesis that the later evangelists borrowed from the writings of the earlier. This theory of course admitted of a great variety of modifications. Any one of the three might be supposed the original, and either of the other two might be supposed to have drawn from him, and the third from either or both of the two former. The precedence was accordingly assigned in a different order by different critics, and almost every possible shape of the hypothesis found an advocate. The second mode of explanation which suggested itself was the hypothesis that all the three evangelists, or at least two of them, drew from some common source or sources. This hypothesis is likewise susceptible of many forms. For not only might there be several sources or one, but, if only one, this one might be either oral tradition or a written document; and if the latter, that might either be imagined so copious as to occasion different selections, or so scanty as to occasion different enlargements. All these views—that of several documents prior to our Gospels, that of a common oral tradition, that of a single, large and multifarious original, from which our evangelists made extracts, and that of a concise outline, which in its passage through various hands grew to the

size of a little book—were successively adopted. It was in the last form, that of a short, Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic original document, supposed to have constituted the basis of our three first Gospels, that the second hypothesis was introduced into this country by Bishop Marsh, with the modifications which appeared to him necessary to explain all the phenomena of the Gospels.

Before however we enter upon the proposed inquiry, it may appear to some readers necessary to apologise for the controversy itself, by shewing, what has never been universally or even generally admitted in this country, that it is neither dangerous nor useless. Indeed with few exceptions one half of our theological public seems to have viewed this discussion with jealousy, and the other with indifference. And as those who are aware of its continued existence may perhaps think it a fortunate circumstance that it has here been almost entirely dropped, and that no service is done to religion in thus attempting to revive it, it seems worth while to pause a little at the outset, and examine from this point of view the nature and tendency of the theories, which we shall afterwards consider in a merely historical or critical light. This digression seems the more unavoidable, as it cannot be concealed that German theology in general, and German biblical criticism in particular, labours at present under an ill name among our divines ; so that no one is more sure of

an attentive and believing audience than he who undertakes to point out its mischiefs and dangers, and no one of course has need of greater caution than he who thinks of importing any novelties from that suspected quarter\*.

\* The last warning voice against the infection of German divinity was raised by Mr. Conybeare, in the Bampton Lectures for 1824. The candour and earnestness displayed by the author increase our regret that his studies had not led him to feel the necessity of acquiring the German language before he undertook that work, and that he was snatched away before he had an opportunity of enlarging and correcting his views. He might otherwise perhaps have discovered that Semler and the Rosenmüllers do not completely represent the modern German school of divinity, and that the state of Christianity in Germany is not quite so low as he apprehends, p. 74. But it would almost seem as if at Oxford the knowledge of German subjected a divine to the same suspicion of heterodoxy which we know was attached some centuries back to the knowledge of Greek; as if it was thought there that a German theologian is dangerous enough when he writes in Latin, but that when he argues in his own language there can be no escaping his venom. Unfortunately for those who wish to become acquainted with the modern German divinity, without burdening themselves with this obnoxious accomplishment, the German divines continue more and more to prefer their own language to the Latin. Very few works of value have for many years past been written in the latter; and, at all events, whoever attempts to form a judgement on the merits of the modern school, without a knowledge of the former, will be either greatly disappointed or grossly deceived. To this it is owing that, although so much of Mr. Conybeare's book is directed against that school, it does not contain one of the modern names which every one at all acquainted with the literature of Germany has been accustomed to respect as the chief ornaments of its theology.

It has been frequently asserted, that the hypotheses which have been invented to explain the relation of our three first Gospels to each other tend to destroy the reverence with which Christians are accustomed to regard these works as Holy Writ and containing the word of God. The principal ground of this complaint is the alleged inconsistency of these hypotheses with the inspiration of the Gospels. Bishop Marsh indeed in his "Illustration \* has already vindicated his own particular hypothesis from the charges which, in a very narrow and feeble spirit of criticism, had been brought against it on this head. Schleiermacher himself in his preface has anticipated and endeavoured to obviate a similar objection to his own view of the composition of St. Luke's Gospel. But the objection has not yet lost much of its currency. In a work which enjoys a considerable circulation among learned and unlearned readers, all the hypotheses known to the author are involved in one sweeping sentence of condemnation, as "not only detrimental to the character of the sacred writers, but also as diminishing the value and importance of their testimony, and further as tending to *sap the inspiration* of the New Testament †." Such an as-

\* Marsh's Illustration of the Hypothesis proposed in the Dissertation on the origin and composition of our three first canonical Gospels.

† Horne's Introduction, Vol. iv. Part ii. chap. ii. sect. 5.

sersion would not in itself be entitled to much attention; but as it seems to be not a solitary voice, but the echo of a very general opinion, and as this prejudice opposes a fatal obstacle to the cultivation of biblical criticism, it will be worth while to examine generally, without reference to any particular hypothesis, how the inspiration of the Gospels is affected by the theories in question. For until these theories can be shewn to be harmless, it will be in vain to prove that they are necessary. The obvious argument, that the correctness of a process of reasoning cannot be affected by the consequences to which it leads, and that the first duty of a critical inquirer is absolute resignation to the result of his researches, however incontrovertible in the abstract, is of little weight in the present instance, when it is applied to a series of probabilities which neither separately nor in the aggregate can ever be expected to counteract the impression of a fixed idea.

In the first place then it must be admitted, that all the hypotheses we have mentioned are equally and decidedly irreconcilable with that doctrine of inspiration once universally prevalent in the Christian church, according to which the sacred writers were merely passive organs or instruments of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine however has been so long abandoned that it would now be a waste of time to attack it. When I say it has been abandoned, I mean of course

only by the learned ; for undoubtedly it is still a generally received notion ; and when those expressions which long usage has consecrated are used in public respecting the scriptures, they will most frequently, unless particular care be taken to qualify and restrict them, be understood in this strictest sense. Among theologians however this doctrine of literal inspiration has been long softened into a milder and more flexible theory. Instead of an uniform, unremitting, indiscriminate operation, the agency of the Spirit was represented as accommodating itself to circumstances, and assuming, as occasion required, two different forms. One of these was designated as the inspiration of suggestion, the other as the inspiration of superintendency ; the object of the former was to reveal to the penmen of the Scriptures what was necessary to be revealed, that of the latter to secure them from any material error or mistake. This convenient division, which has been adopted by our most orthodox divines, enables the church of England to comprehend within her bosom (as it is her wish to do on points of minor importance) very different and even opposite opinions on this subject. The inspiration of Scripture is a necessary and fundamental tenet on which she absolutely insists ; but as to the nature and mode of that inspiration she allows her members full liberty of private judgment. Those whose notion of revelation requires that

every part of Scripture should have proceeded from a positive supernatural impulse, will see in every passage the operation of the Holy Spirit. Those who consider such an agency of the Spirit as a continual miracle, for which they can find no adequate occasion, may still believe the sacred writers to have composed their works under his superintending control, which does not of necessity imply an active interposition. This seems a sufficient latitude of opinion; and it is difficult to conceive how any hypotheses respecting the origin of the Gospels can have required a larger license, or have overstepped these very ample bounds. Nor in fact has this ever been the case; no mode of explanation has yet been proposed which has not left room at least for the second kind of inspiration. It must however be admitted, that the two opposite views just stated are not very general among those who reflect on this subject, and that it may even be difficult to find an instance of either, except where it is the result of a particular hypothesis respecting the Gospels; the ordinary opinion seems to be one compounded, perhaps in varying proportions, of both. The rational and orthodox medium (so far as it is possible to ascertain what has never been precisely defined) appears to be thought to consist in this: it recedes on the one hand from the ancient doctrine of verbal, or, as it has been called, organic inspiration, by rejecting all unnecessary

exertions of supernatural influence ; so that the evangelists may be believed to have written whatever fell within their own experience, or was communicated to them by inspired witnesses, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, and only under his guardianship and protection ; on the other hand it shrinks from the boldness of the modern theories, by maintaining that whatever was not known to the sacred historians by one or other of those ways was directly revealed to them from above. Those who insist upon this middle line seem to think, that although their view of the subject may leave some difficulties in our Gospels unexplained, it has at all events the advantage, in point of piety and orthodoxy, over the theories which suppose every part of our Gospels to have been derived by different processes from human sources. This superiority however, if we examine the foundation on which it rests, appears very questionable. For those who hold this opinion do not pretend to possess any peculiar information respecting the situation of the sacred writers and the opportunities and means of knowledge they enjoyed, so as to be able to determine where their ordinary sources failed them and the need of a divine interposition arose ; still less do they profess to recognize by any marks the operation of the Spirit, and so to distinguish passages suggested and revealed from those derived from personal experience or testimony. The existence therefore

of any passages of the former description is a merely arbitrary conjecture, which rests entirely on a dogmatical ground. And even as opposed to the view of those who believe that the evangelists do not every where report either their own experience or the immediate testimony of eye-witnesses, but that they sometimes received their relations from second or third hand, the opinion we are examining possesses even in a dogmatical point of view no substantial advantage. For as the more rigid theory of inspiration was abandoned by the learned on account of the insuperable difficulties opposed to it by the discrepancies found in the Gospels, so these same discrepancies compel us to admit, that the superintending control of the Spirit was not exerted to exempt the sacred writers altogether from errors and inadvertencies. And why need it be supposed, that the variations which a narrative might undergo in passing through one or two hands must be more material than those produced by the difference in situation, character, memory, or other circumstances of the first witnesses? Yet unless we make this totally unfounded supposition, there appears to be no dogmatical necessity for denying that the evangelists drew from secondary sources, or for maintaining that the use of these was superseded by the extraordinary suggestions of the Spirit. It would appear then, that if there be any real difference between those who hold this,

which passes for the more orthodox opinion, and the advocates of the modern hypotheses which they reprobate, it is one which does not affect the dogma of inspiration, which is or may be common to both, but only the mode of applying it; a wholly extraneous point, which can only be decided on historical or critical grounds.

But should we rest here, it might be imagined that the design of what has been hitherto said was not merely to defend from the charge of innovation the theories which have been proposed to explain the origin of the Gospels, but to attack the doctrine of inspiration itself; for the result of the argument seems to be, that we can find no reason for believing the inspiration of suggestion was in any instance necessary to the composition of the Gospels, and consequently that we cannot believe it was ever exerted. Now if this first kind of inspiration is totally excluded, it is evident that the second kind, that of superintendence, ceases to be any thing positive and real, and exists only in possibility, or, at the utmost, it can only have operated in directing the evangelists to the best sources; and it then becomes an ordinary dispensation of divine providence, which might have been equally granted to a heathen historian of Christianity; so that we lose every idea of inspiration, in the proper sense of the word. Perhaps however this consequence, which is seemingly inevitable, does not flow from the nature of the

doctrine itself, but from something erroneous or partial in the mode of considering it. And indeed when we examine once more the common division of the subject, it seems in itself liable to considerable objections. In the first place, it implies an inequality in each Gospel, some passages being supposed to have been written under a more immediate influence of the Holy Spirit than others; of which nevertheless, as we have already observed, no one has hitherto professed to have discovered the slightest trace. In the next place, it assumes that the inspiration under which the historical parts of the New Testament were written was something essentially different from that experienced by the writers of the didactic parts; for in the latter no one certainly will contend that the positive agency of the Spirit could have been for a moment suspended or interrupted. The suspicion of any such break in the unity of those writings would, if well-founded, deprive them of all their value and authority; and there is no internal mark which in any degree justifies it. But perhaps it may be said, that this difference naturally arises out of the different nature of the works; that in the composition of the historical parts the active influence of the Spirit was only occasionally needed, to supply the defects of the writers or to prevent the consequences of their human infirmity. But surely this view of the subject exaggerates the importance of historical accuracy, which never-

theless it does not suppose to have been completely attained, while it underrates the magnitude and difficulties of the task which the evangelists have executed, and overlooks in their works what is most excellent and truly divine. For whoever considers the variety of delusions, prejudices and errors which were rife in the pregnant age in which our Gospels were written, and, dismissing for a time all critical analysis, contemplates each in the light in which it was intended to appear, as a whole, and observes how pure and bright an image (though occasionally broken and obscured, from the very absence of such an inspiration as is commonly ascribed to them) it presents of the life and character which it describes,—whoever takes all this into consideration, will readily believe that the writers were filled with that Spirit which was to lead into all truth. And we shall feel this still more strongly, and shall subscribe still more willingly to the decision of the church, which consecrated these as the sole authentic Christian records, when we compare them with the fragments preserved to us, even of the earlier apocryphal Gospels. Perhaps then it may be desirable that the modern division (which seems indeed rather to have been devised as an expedient for getting rid of an apparent difficulty, than to have resulted from any independent view of the subject) should be discarded, and that we should return to the old opinion, that the whole of Scripture proceeded

from the constant and uniform operation of the Spirit; only we must clear that opinion of the exaggerations with which it has been loaded, and which were not implied in the judgment of the primitive church when it fixed the canon; and must seek the operation of the Spirit, not in any temporary, physical or even intellectual changes wrought in its subjects, but in the continual presence and action of what is most vital and essential in Christianity itself. With this view of our Gospels, we certainly need not be alarmed at the course which may be taken by any investigations instituted to explain their mutual relation, or even scruple to prosecute them ourselves.

The other objections which have been brought against these explanatory hypotheses on account of their tendency either may be reduced to that which we have been considering, or are too trifling to deserve serious notice. Indeed this question has been and still is sometimes treated as the personal cause of the evangelists themselves; for not only does Bishop Marsh's anonymous antagonist complain of the injury they sustain in being degraded to the office of copiers and compilers, but in the quotation above made the condemned hypotheses are denounced as *detrimental to the character of the sacred writers*, apparently on the supposition that the names of these pious men would become less dear and venerable to Christian ears if they were to lose a part of their literary reputation. It

seems hardly necessary to observe, that these discussions ought to be confined to those who are disciplined in the studies requisite for forming an opinion on the subject. If they pass beyond the circle for which they are designed, and produce any mischievous effects in unprepared and uninstructed minds, this must either be merely casual, and therefore extremely rare, or it must be attributed to popular introductory treatises, adapted to the taste and comprehension of a mixed circle of readers, and containing a superficial account of the controversy. By these indeed it may occasionally happen that old prejudices are undermined, while no new truth is substituted in their stead. From works where the question is examined with the proper depth of research and severity of argument no such evil can be reasonably apprehended. The respect of the learned for these books will certainly not be abated by any change of opinion respecting them which, as has been shewn of the modern hypotheses, does not affect their credibility, or, in the highest and largest sense of the word, their inspiration.

The utility and importance of an inquiry into the mutual relation of the three first evangelists has never been directly disputed, even in this country; yet it does not seem to have been generally admitted, or the danger of the investigation has been thought to counterbalance the prospect of advantage it affords. For though it has been contended that the phenomena of the Gospels

need no hypothesis to explain them, still this opinion, which passes so lightly over so many difficulties, can hardly be supposed to have been universally received. The silence therefore which has so long prevailed here on a question which elsewhere has been so actively discussed would be inexplicable, unless it be that the inquiry has been deemed unimportant, or its consequences have appeared so alarming as to produce a tacit compromise of opposite opinions. In either case it does little honour to the state of theological learning in this country. The alarm which has been expressed is, we have seen, as unfounded as the acknowledgment of it is injudicious. A general insensibility to the importance of the inquiry seems to imply a growing remissness in the study of the Gospels themselves ; for a critical examination and comparison of them, which is the foundation of all knowledge in this branch of learning, can never fail to excite the desire of discovering the cause of the many singular phenomena they present, and to suggest to different minds various means of arriving at that end. The problem however is not merely interesting on account of its difficulty and perplexity, or because it is accidentally connected with subjects of the highest moment. Upon its solution depends the determination of several points very material to the right understanding of the Gospel history. From its solution alone can we expect to see full light

thrown on all the strokes of heavenly wisdom contained in these books, which are so often obscured by the uncertainty of their reference and connexion. This at least will, I hope, be sufficiently evident to every one who shall read the following Essay. There may however be many who would admit the importance of the inquiry, if they were convinced that it could ever lead to a satisfactory result. But when they reflect on the length of time that the controversy has lasted, the number of conflicting opinions it has produced, and the perseverance with which each has been maintained to the present day, they conclude that the difficulties are insurmountable, and that it is time patiently to resign ourselves to a state of doubt from which we can no longer hope to be ever freed. In that case we might perhaps lament the labours which so many successive generations of critics have bestowed on an impracticable undertaking. But it is yet too soon to pronounce that ultimate success is absolutely hopeless. That a problem so complicated may not yet have been viewed from every possible side, and therefore that the right clew may still be discovered, is not in itself improbable. At all events the essays and researches of the learned men who have already examined the subject ought not to discourage us whose investigations are abridged by as many steps as they have already taken. It may even be admitted

that the point to which the inquiry tends is in fact infinitely remote, that absolute certainty cannot reasonably be expected, and that we must content ourselves with an increasing degree of probability. Still this gradual approximation, to which we may fairly look forward, on such a subject is worth some pains. In the meanwhile they who are impatient of the slow advance and fluctuating state of the controversy may console themselves by observing, that even where the inquiry has been pursued in a wrong direction, it has been and cannot fail to be attended by a variety of beneficial effects. It may indeed safely be affirmed, that no question was ever discussed in this branch of literature which has been more fertile in valuable observations and discoveries, which has occasioned so deep and accurate a study of the Gospels and of the early Christian literature, and been the means of presenting them in so many new and interesting points of view. If the illustration of this assertion is to be found so much more frequently in German than in English literature, this inferiority of the latter must be in great part ascribed to the prevalence of the erroneous impressions which it has been the object of these remarks to remove ; and when the mingled jealousy and apathy with which the subject has been hitherto treated here shall have been exchanged for a more comprehensive view and a more lively feeling of critical interest, we may

hope that the investigation will produce in this country also its natural fruits.

We may now proceed to trace the progress of the controversy ; in doing which however we shall not strictly confine ourselves to a chronological order, but shall follow that which the subject itself may naturally appear to suggest. But before the reader's attention is drawn to what is new and foreign, it seems necessary to inquire whether the problem has been already solved by Bishop Marsh in so satisfactory a manner as to render all other attempts superfluous. A short examination of the hypothesis proposed in his *Dissertation* will besides be the most natural introduction to the works of his successors.

The difficulties under which that hypothesis labours are partly such as it has in common with the general one of Eichhorn on which it is founded, and partly such as are peculiar to itself. In the first place, the adoption of Eichhorn's original Aramaic \* document, as the common source of our three first Gospels, is not guarded with the same degree of critical caution which in more minute

\* As this term, though it comprehends several dialects, is most generally used by the German critics and always in the ensuing work to designate the language spoken in Palestine in the time of our Saviour as distinguished from Greek, I have adopted it in preference to the terms Hebrew and Syro-chaldaic, with which, in the sense which Bishop Marsh gives to them, it is for this purpose exactly synonymous.

particulars we have such frequent occasion to admire. The German critic's ingenious and specious investigation of this supposed document, and the tempting facilities it offered for the solution of the problem, seem to have dazzled the judgement of his follower, and to have prevented him from scrutinizing this groundwork of his whole fabric with his usual vigilance. In fact in the *Dissertation* itself the probability of such a document having ever existed is not thought deserving of any discussion; it is first barely asserted (Vol. III. part ii. p. 196, 2d edition); and the description afterwards given (p. 362.) of the document **N** does not even enable the reader to ascertain the author's own opinion of its origin and design. All that is said on this subject is, that it was *a short narrative containing the principal transactions of Jesus Christ from his baptism to his death; that it must not be considered as a finished history, but as a document containing only materials for a history, probably not all communicated at the same time, and therefore not all placed in exact chronological order; that it was drawn up from communications made by the apostles, and therefore that it was not only a work of good authority, but a work which was worthy of furnishing materials to any one of the apostles who had formed a resolution of writing a more complete history.* The last remark was probably intended to obviate an objection which has not failed to be made,

against the supposition of St. Matthew having consulted an outline, to the production of which he was at least a contributor, the contents of which must have been perfectly familiar to him, and which no other person, not an apostle, was better qualified than himself to fill up. But it is not to be inferred either from this or the preceding expressions of the author, that he supposed the document to have been drawn up with the view of furnishing materials of a future history, either for any one of the apostles or even for the compiler himself, without any other immediate object. Both of these suppositions are too unnatural to be attributed, unless they were clearly expressed, to so able a critic. For one of the apostles such a collection of memoranda, which had not even the merit of being connected with chronological accuracy, would have been wholly superfluous and useless. Any other person who had a complete history in view would certainly have taken advantage of his intimacy with the apostles, to obtain from them more ample and detailed accounts. In either case it would be inconceivable, how a document designed for private use and for a particular and temporary purpose should pass so rapidly into the circulation implied by the labours supposed to have been bestowed on it. In the *Dissertation* therefore the object of this work is left entirely undefined. And yet when it is closely examined, its nature proves to be so pe-

cular and extraordinary, that, unless it be accounted for by shewing its adaptation to a particular purpose, although after passing through a certain number of stages it may afford an explanation of the phenomena, still nothing more is gained than to transfer the reader's curiosity from one enigma to another, and to substitute for the problem to be solved another equally perplexing.

The original Gospel is supposed to be contained in the forty-two sections which are common to the three evangelists. To extract it out of these sections, it is of course necessary to retrench all the circumstances in which the three writers vary from each other. To determine in this way the original text is certainly by no means an easy task. It is however an experiment which any person conversant with these subjects may make for himself, and though he should not possess the ingenuity and dexterity of an Eichhorn, he will still be able to define with some degree of exactness the extent of the original Gospel. Now it may safely be affirmed, that the more minutely and accurately any unprejudiced person conducts this investigation, the more he will be at a loss to conceive with what design and according to what method the common matter which he will deduce by this process could have been taken down and combined into an independent whole. For no one has yet undertaken to analyse the supposed original Gospel itself, and to distinguish in it the

hands of different writers. And if it is the work of one person, although *the communications made by the apostles* be supposed to have been taken down at different times, yet we must do this unknown writer the common justice to believe, that he retained the same object and plan throughout. But the inequality of the narrative is so great, that it seems scarcely possible to assign a motive which will account for the nature of any part of it, and which is not inconsistent with the character of the rest. For it will be found that the form of the narrative is scarcely ever that in which the original communications could have been made by the apostles; and at all events in the main it bears marks of a most studied and elaborate conciseness. It remains therefore to be explained why the same person, who in some passages suppressed all the circumstances of the incidents communicated to him and reduced his account to a naked memorandum absolutely useless and even unintelligible to any one not otherwise informed, should in other passages have admitted a variety of superfluous details, and have given a colouring to his descriptions. This inequality cannot be ascribed to any supposed defect in ability or skill in the writer. Bishop Marsh himself seems to have felt, without being distinctly conscious of, the difficulty arising from this circumstance, when he speaks of the original document, in one place, as a *short but well connected representation of the principal trans-*

*actions of Christ from his baptism to his death, and in another, as not a finished history, but containing only materials for a history.* In fact neither of these descriptions corresponds to its real character. For not only was chronological order neglected in it, but one of the first results from the process of comparison by which it is to be extracted will be to eliminate almost all the references of time and place which connect the parts of each Gospel together, and to reduce it to a mass of fragments. Yet these fragments cannot in ordinary language be described as materials for a history. They might indeed by enlargement and interpolation acquire the bulk and shape of one. But when we speak of the materials of a work, we usually mean, not merely something which may be used in forming it, but something from or out of which it may be formed, generally by selection, by the omission of what is redundant and the arrangement of what is requisite, but at all events without the necessity of any addition. Lessing might in this sense say of the original Gospel as he conceived it, that is, as a collection of narratives more or less exact and faithful, but all recorded as nearly as possible in the language in which they were delivered, that it contained materials for a history; and accordingly it was by a process of selection that he supposed the canonical as well as other Gospels to have been de-

rived from it \*. But such an expression may convey a very erroneous notion of a work, which is not only select in its contents, but notwithstanding the glaring disproportion of its parts, is every where confined within the limits of a studied and artificial brevity. Its peculiarity is, that it is neither a full body nor a dry anatomy ; it rather presents the appearance of a disjointed skeleton, in which some of the bones are missing, others out of their place, and the interstices are here and there covered with a fragment of skin or flesh.

\* The English reader will hardly collect, from Bishop Marsh's account of Lessing's hypothesis, what his conception of the original Gospel really was, and that it not only differed from Eichhorn's, but was the very reverse of it. According to Lessing the original Gospel was a collection of written documents, in which the oral narratives of the apostles and other eye-witnesses were preserved. The pieces which composed it were not all of the same value and importance. Hence arose different editions and selections from it. It contained the whole of Matthew, and some things beside. St. Mark drew his Gospel from a less complete copy of the original collection. As to St. Luke, Lessing leaves it uncertain whether he supposed that evangelist to have made any additions of his own to the original Gospel or not. He says after stating, with a misgiving excited by the absence of the article, the conjecture mentioned by Bishop Marsh, (p. 363.) *So much is certain, that Luke himself had before him the original Hebrew document, the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and transferred, if not all, at least the greatest part of it into his Gospel, only in rather a different order, and in rather better language.*

The silence with which Bishop Marsh passed over the origin and object of the supposed original document in his *Dissertation* certainly enabled him to give a satisfactory answer to an objection on which considerable stress was laid by his opponents in this country, and which still continues to be repeated as unanswerable, though to *his* statement of Eichhorn's hypothesis it never could apply. This is the objection arising from the improbability of the original document having been lost or forgotten. Now as long as nothing more is said of this piece than that it contained materials for a history, (that is, when the word *materials* is taken in the sense which the nature of the thing requires, for heads or memoranda,) there is certainly no difficulty in conceiving that it might be lost and forgotten, as soon as a history was composed in which the whole of it was contained. But then this same circumstance leaves in full force another objection to the hypothesis, namely the improbability, first that a translation should have been made of this document in its imperfect and unfinished state, and then that it should have passed into circulation, and that copies of it should have been multiplied even in sufficient number to deduce from it our canonical Gospels. If indeed it was drawn up with no other view than to serve as a collection of heads or memoranda for a history, such a circulation and multiplication of copies would, as I have before ob-

served, be quite incredible. Until some other purpose be assigned it remains at least improbable; and consequently the hypothesis itself is unsatisfactory\*.

Another objection which has been made both at home and abroad to Bishop Marsh's hypothesis is, that it is complex. This objection, as it only affects the particular mode in which the author deduces the canonical Gospels from the given original document, is of no great importance in a general view of the subject, unless, as he seems to have firmly believed, there be no other simpler form in which the general hypothesis can be stated and determined. For in that case this objection, so far as it is well founded, would apply to the fundamental position, the existence of the original Gospel itself. But if any such improvement can be discovered, the objection ceases to be of any moment in our inquiry, and can interest

\* The force of this argument is not at all weakened by diminishing the number of *intermediate transcripts between the original document and the copies supposed to have been used by the evangelists*. (Dissert. p. 368.) Even the translating of such a document is a fact so improbable as to require an explanation. But of course, though we happen to be acquainted with the history of only two copies, the motive which operated on the original transcribers of those two must have operated on others also. We see at all events that the owner of the original document did not wish to reserve it, unfinished as it was, for his own use, and that the circulation actually began at least in two directions.

only the author of the more complex hypothesis. It is however worth while to examine on what ground the objection really rests; for some of Bishop Marsh's English critics seem to have mistaken the confusion produced in their memories by his algebraical notation for a complexity and intricacy in the hypothesis itself. The want of simplicity does not consist in the multiplicity of the steps requisite to the process. This, if they were all natural and easy, would not form an objection to the hypothesis, unless another series less numerous and equally easy were proposed; as the latter might then perhaps be entitled to the preference. But in the first place the additions supposed to be made to the original Gospel in the copies afterwards used by the evangelists wear an appearance of symmetry which the effects of accident rarely assume. The genealogy by which Bishop Marsh (p. 367) traces our Gospels to the original document is perhaps the simplest mode of deducing them according to his hypothesis; and yet even this supposes a somewhat singular combination of circumstances. The copies afterwards used by St. Matthew and St. Luke are previously consulted by St. Mark. Before he sees them they had received additions, both of supplemental circumstances and new facts. But until then all the additions made to each of them were peculiar to it; no fact and no circumstance had come to the knowledge of the person who owned one of

these copies, which was also known to the owner of the other. For otherwise there would be narratives in our Gospels common to all three evangelists, which nevertheless would not contain a word of the original Gospel; and in some of the common sections the part belonging to the original Gospel must now appear larger than it really is. But after the contents of these two copies had been extracted to form that used by St. Mark, the whole of the matter which our first and third Gospel have exclusively in common to them is added to those copies; and it is even doubtful whether they receive any other kind of addition but these parallel passages till they come into the hands of the evangelists.

In the process by which these documents are supposed to have been afterwards converted into our present canonical Gospels, the use of the Greek translation ascribed both to St. Mark and St. Luke is a coincidence the less natural, as the habits of the age and persons (St. Mark too as the ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου enjoys a traditional celebrity for skill in both languages) would not lead us to expect this sort of minute diligence in either evangelist. And if in the translator of St. Matthew's Gospel such an operation should be considered as less extraordinary, still that he should have had the means and the inclination to perform it in the way supposed (p. 361) on both the other Gospels, is another combination of motives

and circumstances, which has in it more the appearance of art than of nature. The conduct of this translator indeed is throughout a little mysterious. Though he looked for nothing more in the two evangelists than some Greek words to assist him in his task, still instead of profiting equally by both he confines himself constantly to one as long as the common matter lasts; and though St Luke's Greek is evidently the better of the two, by some unaccountable caprice he gives the preference to St. Mark.

Finally, Mr. Veysie, in his *Examination of Mr. Marsh's hypothesis*\*, has observed, that the phenomena in the verbal harmony and discrepancy of the three first Gospels are not fully and correctly stated in the *Dissertation*, though they were the object of its author's more particular attention, and that even those which are correctly stated are not all satisfactorily explained by the hypothesis there proposed. One phenomenon which struck Mr. Veysie, if not before, at least independently of any one else, and which is left

\* *An examination of Mr. Marsh's hypothesis respecting the origin of our three first canonical Gospels; including an attempt to explain the phenomena observable in those Gospels by a new hypothesis. By Daniel Veysie, B. D. 1808.* Mr. Veysie's very able and original essay seems to be almost wholly unknown to the continental critics. It has become extremely scarce in this country; and after many unavailing inquiries I could only procure the use of a copy through the kindness of a friend.

unnoticed and unexplained by the *Dissertation*, is of the very highest importance. Bishop Marsh's algebraical notation may perhaps have led him to overlook it; but it is one which cannot safely be neglected in any hypothesis, and which seems more likely than any other to lend a clew in the most difficult parts of the subject. It is that the verbal agreement of the evangelists is found chiefly in the words of our Lord or of others, and comparatively seldom in the narratives of facts. This is the case more especially in the additions common to St. Luke and either of the other two evangelists; and it sometimes happens that in passages where the introductory facts are very differently expressed the language of the speeches is exactly, or very nearly, identical. Now only two causes are assigned by Bishop Marsh for the verbal harmony in our three first Gospels. One is the Greek translation which was consulted by St. Mark and St. Luke in rendering the original Aramaic document; the other is the use made by St. Matthew's translator of the other two Gospels. But it is manifest that St. Mark and St. Luke could have no particular reason for consulting the Greek translation, nor St. Matthew's translator for consulting St. Mark or St. Luke, in rendering a speech more than in rendering a narrative of a fact.

Mr. Veysie has also remarked, that in the sections common to all three evangelists or to St.

Matthew and St. Mark alone, Bishop Marsh's hypothesis will account for those passages in which the expressions are synonymous, though different, but it will not account for those passages in which, though the substance is the same, the words are so different that they cannot be rendered literally into another language, so as to produce an exact verbal coincidence. To this objection, which will apply to almost every one of those sections, the only answer seems to be that by which Eichhorn has endeavoured to obviate it: that the several translators treated their text freely, sometimes transposing, sometimes compressing, at other times paraphrasing it. St. Mark's in particular, he thinks (and in this Bishop Marsh agrees with him), was a paraphractical translation. But, not to observe that such an assumption is merely arbitrary and amounts to little more than a confession of the difficulty, whatever liberty we may be willing to allow the translators in the narrative parts, it is difficult to believe that in those which contained the words of Christ they should not have endeavoured to make their translations as literal and exact as possible. Yet the reader has only to cast his eye over a synopsis to perceive that the speeches of Christ form no exception to Mr. Veysie's remark, and that they exhibit several instances of verbal disagreement, which it is impossible, without supposing a singular license in

some of the translators, to refer to the same original.

Mr. Veysie asks, how it happens that there are so few instances of verbal agreement in  $\aleph$  (the common part of the common sections) between St. Mark and St. Luke, who used the same Greek translation of that portion of their Gospels. Perhaps Bishop Marsh is not bound to answer this question. But since he has stated, as one of the phenomena which he has discovered, *that the instances of verbal agreement in  $\aleph$  between St. Mark and St. Luke are neither so numerous nor so long as those between St. Matthew and St. Mark*, we may expect his hypothesis to afford an explanation of that circumstance. Yet the facts which he supposes are so far from accounting for it, that they would lead any one to anticipate a relation directly opposite between St. Mark and the two other evangelists. For though it does not follow from the above mentioned genealogy, that in the copies used by St. Mark and St. Luke the original document  $\aleph$  was still kept separate and distinct from the subsequent additions, still this is in itself much the more probable supposition. Though the author of that document might only consider it as an unfinished performance, *containing only materials for a history*, and therefore might not scruple in a fresh copy of it to introduce into the text supplemental

circumstances and additional facts which he had noted in the margin, the persons who took the copies of it from which our first and third Gospels are derived most probably considered it in the other point of view, as *a well connected representation of the principal transactions of Christ, drawn up from communications made by the apostles, and therefore a work of good authority.* In this case the marginal supplements would not so soon creep into the text, and it is very likely that St. Mark and St. Luke would have found them still distinct. They would therefore have had before them a continuous Aramaic text, and a continuous Greek translation of it; and as the only object they could have proposed to themselves must have been a plain and literal version, we might expect to find an almost uninterrupted verbal harmony between them. But even if their Aramaic text had been already broken by insertions, still, as their Greek translation was continuous, the case would be but little altered; and their discrepancies, not their coincidences, would be exceptions to the general rule. On the other hand, St. Matthew's translator had before him a broken Aramaic text, and he had to consult in St. Mark's Gospel a broken, sometimes transposed, and *frequently paraphractical* version. Under these circumstances it would not have been surprising if he should less frequently have taken the pains of hunting out the parallel passages, or in-

deed should never have done so except in cases of peculiar difficulty and doubt, which in such a narrative could not very often occur.

But as this translator in general consulted St. Mark's Gospel very regularly, and yet according to Bishop Marsh (for other critics deny the fact) there are no instances of verbal coincidence in the sections common to the 1st and 2d Gospels which are placed in a different order, he is forced to conclude that the variations in these sections must have been owing to the difference in their relative positions, and that St. Matthew's translator was not aware of their existence in St. Mark's Gospel. But as he is not supposed to have been at all deficient in memory (for in translating the eleventh chapter of St. Matthew he could remember the contents of the chapter in St. Luke which he had consulted for a few verses in translating the eighth chapter of St. Matthew \*), we can only account for his ignorance of that fact and his consequent neglect of the assistance he might have gained from St. Mark in that part of his version, by imagining that when he began to translate he had not yet read through St. Mark's Gospel, and that he only became acquainted with its contents as he proceeded in his task. Perhaps this supposition might also account for his uniformly preferring, of two translations, that which was at once less

\* See Dissertation, p. 394.

faithful and less elegant ; but still it is one which few would be willing to adopt.

Lastly, I would observe that the supplemental additions  $\gamma$  (those common to St. Matthew and St. Luke) afford, in the account of John the Baptist, Matthew III. 1—12, Luke III. 1—18, an instance of verbal agreement continued through several verses. Now Bishop Marsh's hypothesis accounts for the verbal agreement in this passage, but for the verbal agreement only. It does not explain how it happened that the Aramaic texts used by the two evangelists were so similar, if not identical, as to admit of the same translation being given of each. And this cannot be accounted for by the circumstance that the coincidence occurs in a discourse, and not in the narrative of a fact. For though this will explain a very exact harmony between two independent relators in a short passage even at a great distance of time, it is not sufficient to explain a coincidence extending uninterruptedly through so many verses. And moreover it is quite evident from the manner in which the words here ascribed to John are introduced, that they are not meant to be taken as part of a discourse actually delivered by him, but only to convey the substance of his doctrine. If this be so, they can have been inserted in the copies of the original Gospel used by St. Matthew and St. Luke only from two different documents, or two copies of the same document. But of these we find no mention in

Bishop Marsh, who supposes only two Aramaic documents to have been used by each of those evangelists. This remark I have been led to make here by the consideration of Bishop Marsh's hypothesis; but of course I do not intend it as a direct objection to that hypothesis; I have only suggested it as confirming a different view of the subject which we shall afterwards have occasion to mention.

On the whole, whether we consider the foundation on which Bishop Marsh's hypothesis rests, its peculiar construction, or its application to the phenomena to be explained by it, it cannot be admitted to be so completely satisfactory as to supersede the necessity of all farther inquiry\*.

At the time when Bishop Marsh's Dissertation appeared, Eichhorn was preparing for the press his *Introduction to the New Testament* †, of which the first volume was published in 1804. It contains the result of his critical researches into the origin and composition of the three first Gospels, before communicated to the public in the 5th volume of his *Universal Library of Biblical Literature*, with the additions and modifications subsequently suggested to him by his own reflexions and the observations of others. A very

\* The reader must not suppose that I have here stated all Mr. Veysie's objections. I have only mentioned those which suggested to me some additional remark.

† *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.*

able review of this volume appeared the next year, and has since been republished by the writer, Dr. Paulus, in a Collection, the first number of which is appropriated to the reception of his reviews and occasional pieces relating to this controversy \*; a highly interesting miscellany, which I have consulted with great advantage, and to which I shall have frequent occasion to refer in the course of this discussion, both on account of the critical remarks and the original views contained in it. Two other volumes of Eichhorn's Introduction have since appeared; and a second edition of the first volume, published in 1820, has afforded the author an opportunity of noticing the investigations which the subject had undergone in the interval.

The examination of the canonical Gospels is preceded by an inquiry into the origin and character of the most ancient Gospels, in the relics of which the author discovers traces of the same original document from which he believes our three first Gospels to have been derived. He considers separately the historical evidence extant respecting the nature and contents of the Gospel of the Hebrews, that of Marcion, Justin's Ἀπομνημονεύματα, the Gospel of Cerinthus, Tatian's Harmony, and the Gospels used by the apostolical fathers Barnabas,

\* *Theologisch-Exegetisches Conservatorium. Heidelberg, 1822.*

Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and Polycarp. The direct object of this investigation is to prove that our three first Gospels did not come into use\* before the end of the second century, or, which is the same thing, that all the Gospels which were in use before that time were different from our canonical Gospels, and independent of them in their origin. And since from external or internal evidence it seems that an affinity subsisted between the apocryphal and canonical Gospels, the inference drawn from the whole is, that the relation which the former bore to the latter can only be explained by their derivation from a common original document, or at least strongly favours that hypothesis. The proof of the main proposition is of course only an approximation; it would however, if successfully established in each of the instances discussed, afford as much satisfaction as can be reasonably expected on such a subject. But Eichhorn's argument labours under the disadvantage that, from the scantiness and imperfection of the data which we have left respecting most of these lost works, it is scarcely possible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion respecting them; while a single positive proof of the early

\* The use however which this proposition denies is not the private use, which may have been pretty extensive, but the public use of the Gospels as text books, which were read or discoursed on in the churches, or cited by ecclesiastical writers.

use of one of the three canonical Gospels would be sufficient to overthrow his main proposition altogether. And indeed as there is nothing in the hypothesis of an original Gospel irreconcilable with the generally-received opinion that our three first Gospels came much earlier into public use, it is not obvious at first sight what should have induced Eichhorn to make so paradoxical an assertion. For as he himself supposes our three first Gospels to have assumed very nearly their present form before the end of the first century, it is equally difficult, upon this supposition, to account for their long obscurity and their sudden elevation to canonical rank. But the fact seems to be that, as in the very references which have been supposed most distinctly and unequivocally to prove the use of our Gospels in the second century he discovered the strongest traces of his supposed original Gospel, this part of his argument in favour of the latter tended to overthrow every direct proof remaining of the early use of the former, and naturally led him to his general conclusion, the principal grounds of which we will briefly examine.

I. The Gospel of the Hebrews \* is much more

\* Eichhorn considers it as a point which cannot admit of a doubt, that the inscription of this Gospel, *καθ' Ἑβραίων*, *secundum, juxta Hebræos*, denoted its authors. The analogy to the inscriptions of our Gospels does indeed at first sight seem to favour this construction, yet not so decidedly but that

celebrated than known. Eichhorn indeed asserts that it is the *most ancient Gospel* of which any traces are to be found in ecclesiastical history, and thinks that what we know of its contents is sufficient to authorize the conclusion that it bore an affinity to our Gospel of Matthew, though it was no more derived from it than the other canonical Gospels are. But the proof of the latter point at least is extremely imperfect. Though Eichhorn represents the traces of this Gospel as beginning with Papias, and running down through Ignatius, Hegesippus and Justin Martyr, to Origen, Eusebius and Jerom, yet when we examine this supposed series of evidence we find that it neither establishes the antiquity nor determines the character of the Gospel in question. The first author who names this Gospel is Clemens Alex. That it was used by any of the preceding writers mentioned by Eichhorn is far from certain. With respect to Papias, Eusebius only says that he has recorded an incident which is contained in the

Eichhorn himself in the next page but one (p. 10.) proposes to interpret *Evangelium secundum XII. apostolos*, a *Gospel approved, confirmed, and sanctioned by the twelve apostles*. What is there then to prevent us from construing *Evangelium secundum Hebræos* to mean a Gospel approved and adopted by the Judaizing Christians, for whom Ἑβραῖοι was the generic name which seems to have included the particular sects, such as the Nazarenes, the Ebionites, the Cerinthians, &c. ? As these were all Ἑβραῖοι, though with different shades of opinion, so each of their Gospels was an Ἐυαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίουσ, only differently modified.



horn seems to do, that the words ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν ἔφη αὐτοῖς formed a part of Ignatius's quotation in the passage above mentioned; and as he must have had some particular motive for designating the apostles by this uncommon circumlocution, it would not be a very improbable conjecture, that he meant by this introduction to indicate the κήρυγμα Πέτρον as the source from which he drew. That Justin used the Gospel of the Hebrews is a mere conjecture of Eichhorn, which rests on a similar, but if possible a still slighter foundation. If then the antiquity of the work is so questionable, or if at all events nothing certain can be affirmed of its nature and character as it existed in the two first centuries, it is evident that any conclusion respecting its original relation to one of our canonical Gospels, drawn from fragments preserved by later writers, were they even much longer and more numerous than they are, must be extremely precarious. These fragments however in general discover so little affinity with St. Matthew's Gospel, that they would probably of themselves never have given rise to the suspicion of any connexion between the two works. But the language in which Jerom speaks of the Gospel of the Hebrews \* scarcely admits of explanation,

\* *Catalog. vir. illustr. s. v. Matthæus. Matthæus—evangelium Hebraicis litteris verbisque composuit, quod quis postea transtulerit non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca quam*

unless we suppose that he saw such a resemblance between the two as led him to believe the apocryphal to have been an enlarged and corrupted edition of the canonical Gospel, and therefore that the common rumour which represented them as identical was only incorrect, and not absolutely unfounded. And otherwise it seems strange, not only that Jerom should not have expressed himself more decidedly on this point, but that the opinion he mentions should have been so prevalent\*; for this can scarcely have arisen out of the mere circumstance of the language in which the Gospel of the Nazarenes was written, but must have originated in the reports of those who had seen it. On the whole then it appears that we have no means of ascertaining with any degree of precision the date of the composition of this Gospel, and therefore that it might have been derived from our Gospel of Matthew, according to any hypothesis respecting the original language of the latter, either as an enlarged and corrupted edition or translation of it. If we were to form our opinion

Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaræis qui in Berœa urbe Syriæ hoc volumine utuntur describendi facultas fuit.

\* Advers. Pelag. III. c. 1. In Evangelio juxta Hebræos—sive *ut plerique autumant* juxta Matthæum. And Comment. in Matth. ad XII. 13. In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaræi et Ebionitæ et quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus, et *quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum.*

## I INTRODUCTION BY THE TRANSLATOR.

respecting the contents of the Gospel of the Hebrews from the general character of the fragments which are left of it, we should pronounce it equally unallied to any of our canonical Gospels, and the work of a later age and a different spirit; if we consider these passages as spurious additions, and in the absence of any fair specimen of the genuine text appeal to the language of the father who was best acquainted with the work, we must conclude that notwithstanding the freedom with which it had been treated, and even the mutilations which it had undergone, it still preserved unequivocal marks of its derivation from our first Gospel\*.

\* This result is sufficient for our present purpose. Paulus, in the *Conserv.* p. 143, 144, goes farther, and endeavours to show, in a fragment preserved by Jerom, and another in Epiphanius, traces of the use of Matthew's Gospel, and even of his Greek text. It does indeed seem from Jerom *ad Matth.* 27. 16, as if the writer of the Gospel of the Hebrews had converted the accusative termination in the word *Βαραββᾶν* into the Hebrew suffix of the first person plural; and in the beginning of the Ebionite Gospel, quoted by Epiphanius, 30, 13, a mistake is committed in the date of the Baptist's appearance, which might have been occasioned by the seemingly definite reference *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις*, *Matt.* 3. 1. But as in the passage in Jerom it is not quite clear from his *filius magistri eorum* what the Hebrew text really was, and as the date in the fragment in Epiph. is supposed by Eichhorn himself to be an addition of an ignorant transcriber, it is perhaps safer to confine ourselves to the general argument. I have even scrupled to avail myself of Epiphanius's authority as to the character of the Gospel of the Hebrews. For he seems never to have seen the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and to speak of it only from general report, 29. 9. That which he de-

II. The nature and origin of Marcion's Gospel is a point of greater importance; and it is one for the determination of which we have much more ample data; though in the application of them there is need of great industry and caution. The generally received opinion, founded on the unanimous evidence of ecclesiastical writers, that Marcion mutilated and corrupted St. Luke's Gospel in order to adapt it to his theological system, was first called in question by Semler, whose distrust of the fathers sometimes passed the just limits of critical scepticism. His doubt was adopted by several succeeding critics \*; and Eichhorn, who saw

scribes in the 30th heresy seems to have differed from it so much, that it is doubtful whether the same arguments would apply to both.

The same subject has since been very ably discussed by Prof. Olshausen of Königsberg, in his elaborate and instructive work, *Die Echtheit der vier Canonischen Evangelien aus der Geschichte der zwei ersten Jahrhunderte erwiesen*. Königsberg, 1823. The result at which the author arrives is, that the Gospel of the Hebrews was derived from an Aramaic original of St. Matthew's Gospel, and differed from the latter almost exclusively in additions and enlargements. He explains in a very satisfactory manner the distinction between the Ebionites and the Nazarenes. The industry, accuracy, and soundness of judgement displayed in this work render it a most valuable companion in all researches connected with the early history of the Gospels and the Canon.

\* Bishop Marsh has dismissed the subject in a short note to Michaelis (vol. iii. part 2. p. 159, second ed.) far too hastily; for the assertion with which he cuts short all farther inquiry is not warranted by the argument he produces, which we shall afterwards have occasion to consider.

in his own hypothesis of an original Gospel a sufficient explanation of the phenomena which seemed to favour the common opinion, naturally took the same side. His conclusion is, that the fathers mistook the shorter and simpler, but more genuine and unadulterated Gospel, for a mutilated one. He does not indeed say what some critics have not scrupled to conjecture, that the supposed additions were introduced to suit the views of Judaizing Christians; but as he supposes them to have been made in order to round and polish the original rude and abrupt narrative, we should certainly in this case have reason to doubt their authority, and to regret that Marcion's Gospel was not preserved to us instead of St. Luke's. Paulus, in the review above-mentioned, has corrected some hasty conclusions of Eichhorn, and in another part of his collection has given his own view of that work of Marcion which formed the subject of Tertullian's five books (*adversus Marcionem*); a point which the vagueness of Tertullian's allusions renders very obscure. The question has been since discussed in a masterly manner by Professor Hahn of Königsberg, whose work \* must, I think, satisfy every impartial inquirer, that the ancient opinion has been abandoned without sufficient ground. He there states and clears from misrepresentation the evidence of the fathers on this

\* Entitled *Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner Ursprünglicher Gestalt*.

head, gives a full and distinct view of the peculiarities of Marcion's theological system, exhibits the real character of his work, shews by an elaborate comparison of Tertullian, Epiphanius and other writers who have quoted or mentioned this Gospel, that it coincided exactly in contents and arrangement with St. Luke's, except where doctrinal motives naturally led to omission and alteration; and finally he removes the objections which had induced modern critics to reject the old opinion. According to Eichhorn's own statement, which renders Marcion's Gospel the main prop of his hypothesis, it agreed with St. Luke's in contents, order and even in words, with the exception of some passages omitted at the beginning and end and throughout the course of the work, and of occasional various readings and a text in general more concise and abrupt. On the latter point however he has frequently been led into mistakes, as Paulus and Hahn have observed, from inattention to the desultory manner in which Epiphanius quotes from Marcion; as he was deceived on the former points by a misapprehension of the plan and design of Epiphanius, who did not intend to point out all Marcion's variations, but only to give such extracts from his Gospel as appeared to afford the best opportunity of refuting his opinions. Since however this statement is by no means at variance with the assertion of the ancient ecclesiastical writers, Eichhorn proceeds to examine the nature

and grounds of their declarations. He attempts to get rid of the testimony of Tertullian by shewing that his opinion was a mere conjecture, on which he himself placed no great reliance. Tertullian says (A. M. iv. 2.) “ *Ex his commentatoribus quos habemus Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse quem cæderet.* On this *videtur* Eichhorn lays great stress; as if Tertullian did not venture to speak of the fact as certain, though Ireneus had unequivocally asserted it before him. Not only however is the use of the word from which this inference is deduced perfectly compatible (as Hahn has proved by parallel passages in the same author) with a full conviction in the writer, but the context itself plainly shews how this form of speech occurred to Tertullian, though not a shadow of doubt existed in his mind. After stating (IV. 1.) a general objection to Marcion’s argument, he enters upon the consideration of the Gospel which is its chief foundation; and before he begins to examine its contents he alleges against the whole his favourite *præscriptio*. He lays it down that the credit of the canonical Gospels (*evangelicum instrumentum*) depends entirely on the character of their authors, who were either Apostles or apostolical men. But Marcion’s is an anonymous work. *Contra Marcion evangelio scilicet suo nullum adscribit autorem*, which he considers as a wanton insult to the understanding of the readers; *quasi non licuerit illi titulum quoque affingere cui*

*nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evertere.* “On this ground,” he says, “I might rely, and reject a production destitute of apostolical sanction, without farther inquiry. *Sed per omnia congregari malimus, nec dissimulamus, quod ex nostro intelligi potest. Nam ex his commentatoribus quos habemus Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse quem cæderet.*” The *videtur*, as well as the *intelligi potest*, is one of those qualifying phrases by which we admit what, though certain in itself, we should be justified by our opponent’s proceeding in treating as doubtful. In fact so far is Tertullian from really entertaining a doubt, that he cannot help noticing the fact (*cui nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evertere*) before he formally admits it.

Eichhorn however not only infers from the ambiguity of Tertullian’s expression that he was uncertain of the fact, but considers the circumstance which gave rise to that ambiguity, the want of an inscription, as a proof that he had no means of ascertaining the fact. It is upon this argument that Bishop Marsh also relies in his note above alluded to. It would almost seem from Eichhorn’s language as if he supposed that Marcion might consistently have inscribed his Gospel, if he had extracted it from that of St. Luke, with the author’s name, and that his omission of it affords ground for presuming him to have been unacquainted with the work of the evangelist. But unless we suppose,

with Semler \* and Eichhorn, that Tertullian never saw the book which he pretends to refute, and that he fabricated not only the system which he attributes to Marcion but also Marcion's defence of it, it is evident that Marcion vindicated his own Gospel from the charge of mutilation, just as some of his modern advocates have done, by alleging that the Gospel to which his own bore so striking a resemblance was corrupted and loaded with Judaical interpolations †. And these he would naturally ascribe to St. Luke, who was generally supposed to have derived his Gospel from the preaching of St. Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, and the only one of the apostles whose authority Marcion acknowledged. And as this circumstance led him to select St. Luke's Gospel while he rejected all others, so it rendered it impossible for him to affix to his extract the name of the supposed corrupter and interpolater. That he did not inscribe it with the name of St. Paul himself was probably owing not so much to the silence of tradition respecting any writings of St. Paul beside his Epistles, as to the light in which he and his followers viewed his

\* Semler, Præfat. ad vol. vi. Op. Tertull. p. xii. Librorum aut scriptionum nihil quicquam oculis suis usurpavit auctor; fingit igitur ipse argumentum doctrinæ quod Marcioni impune tribuit, atque facillime, licet et petulantissime atque ineptissime, refellit.

† A. M. iv. 4. Interpolatum a protectoribus Judaismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum.

Gospel—not simply as an historical record, but as the revelation of the *good God*, applying to it the language of their apostle, Gal. I. 11, 12.

The opposition in which Marcion, arguing from the celebrated passage in the same epistle, c. 2. (Tertull. A. M. I. 20) conceived St. Paul to stand to the other apostles, would be in itself a sufficient explanation of the circumstance which Eichhorn considers as a strong objection to the common opinion, namely, that Marcion in forming his canon did not select St. John's Gospel instead of St. Luke's. But Hahn has also shewn that Eichhorn had not a sufficiently distinct conception of Marcion's theology, when he supposed that no omission of entire passages would have been necessary to adapt St. John's Gospel to that system. According to Marcion's doctrines, the God who revealed himself in the person of Christ was a being of totally distinct nature and attributes from the Creator of the world, who spoke in the Old Testament by the prophets. Christianity was not, as the Catholics held, the consummation and perfection of Judaism, but its abolition and destruction. The Christ who descended from heaven in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius into the synagogue of Capernaum, in human shape but without fleshly substance, was not the same who was promised to the Jews, but came to destroy their privileges, and to rescue the rest of mankind

from the partial and unmerciful government of the Creator. His ascetic maxims corresponded with his speculative tenets. As the latter broke the unity of history by separating God from the world, so the former broke the harmony of life by converting it into a perpetual struggle between two tendencies supposed to be absolutely inconsistent. He prescribed rigid abstinence from sensual enjoyment, forbade the use of wine and meat, and even of marriage. Without entering into a farther description of Marcion's system, the reader who examines the two first chapters of St. John will see that Marcion would have been driven by these principles to make numerous omissions and alterations there. He could not for instance have retained in the first chapter verses 3. 10. 14—36 (the Baptist was a prophet of the Creator, and did not and could not predict the coming of the true Christ. Tert. iv. 11); and he must have altered almost the whole dialogue between Christ, Philip and Nathaniel. In the 2d chapter he must have omitted the whole scene of the marriage at Cana, which would have appeared to him unworthy of the character of Christ. A more intimate acquaintance with Marcion's doctrines, and an attentive comparison of them with the rest of St. John's Gospel, as well as with those of St. Matthew and St. Mark, will probably induce an impartial inquirer to embrace Hahn's conclusion, that St.

Luke's Gospel was on the whole that which best suited Marcion's system, and required the fewest omissions and alterations.

An accurate knowledge of this branch of ecclesiastical history is also necessary to enable the reader to form an independent judgement on the main question, on which Eichhorn allows the whole controversy must depend: whether an adequate motive can be found in Marcion's principles for the omission of those passages in St. Luke which were wanting in his Gospel. To establish the affirmative is the great object of Hahn's work. It would of course lead us far beyond the limits of our present inquiry to follow him through the details of this investigation; and it is one which every reader who wishes to ascertain the state of the case may, and indeed must, institute for himself. But we may observe that all the instances mentioned by Eichhorn of passages in Marcion's Gospel which seem inconsistent with the design ascribed to him admit of an easy explanation, and could never have been produced if the critic had paid more attention to Tertullian, whose evidence he rejects in favour of the later Epiphanius, whom however he likewise misapprehends. He specifies Luke X. 25—28, XVI. 17. 29, XVII. 11—19, XXII. 15, as passages containing a direct or indirect sanction of the Jewish law, and XXIV. 39, as a direct contradiction of the docetic doctrine; and he asks how Marcion could have in-

serted at Luke XVII. 14. an allusion to the Old Testament which does not occur in that part of St. Luke's Gospel but in IV. 27? As to Luke X. 25—28, Tertullian (IV. 25) shews that, by the omission of the word *αἰώνιον*, Marcion was enabled to adapt these verses to his system by an interpretation not more harsh than that which he applied to many other refractory passages; and this is, I think, one of the numerous instances of minute observation which ought to satisfy the most incredulous, that Tertullian really had before him Marcion's Gospel accompanied with a commentary. Luke XVI. 17 is also quoted by Tertullian (IV. 33) with an alteration, (*apex verborum domini* instead of *apex legis*), which converts it into a confirmation of Marcion's system, even without ascribing to him, with Hahn, the addition *sicut et lex et prophetæ*, which I am rather inclined to consider as Tertullian's own allusion to verse 16. Nor is it necessary to decide, what I think doubtful, whether Tertullian was aware that the passage ran differently in St. Luke, the two readings being according to his view perfectly synonymous. The parable of Lazarus, XVI. 19—31, seems according to Tertullian, IV. 34 (who himself coincides with Schleiermacher in the application of the parable to Herod), to have been wrested by Marcion into a corroboration of his doctrine respecting the subterraneous and fleshly paradise and place of torment, by which the Creator God

invited and enforced obedience to his laws, and which he contrasted with the heavenly and spiritual rewards of Christ's kingdom. In Christ's mode of proceeding with the ten lepers whom he cleansed, as well as in the miracle itself (Luke XVII. 11—19), Marcion only discovered an *antithesis* between the severity and comparative weakness of the God of the Old Testament, who had ordained so rigorous a treatment of persons afflicted with this scourge, and whose prophet Elisha had healed but one out of so great a number, and the clemency and infinite power of Christ, who, in directing the lepers to shew themselves to the priests and causing the cure to take place as they went, intended to convince them of the inefficacy and inutility of the legal ordinances (Levit. XIII. XIV.), and to lead them to give glory to the only true God (Tertull. IV. 35). The allusion to the passover in Luke XXII. 15. might well be retained by Marcion, who even carried to an excess the doctrine of accommodation, particularly when he added an explanation of the whole transaction which so completely distinguished it from the Jewish rite, as he appears to have done from Tertull. IV. 40; where however I do not refer the *suum*, as Hahn seems to do, to Marcion's text or commentary, but to Tertullian's own argument. The passage XXIV. 39, which seems so directly to contradict Marcion's notion of Christ's incorporeal nature that Ter-

tullian himself (IV. 43) is surprized at his boldness in admitting it, he explains away, by a construction certainly of the most forced and unnatural kind, but which for that very reason is the less likely to have been invented by Tertullian, and affords another indication of the nature of Marcion's work.

This specimen will perhaps satisfy the reader; and I shall now dismiss the subject with two observations, which may be of use to any one who is disposed to investigate it farther, and for which we are indebted to Hahn. According to Paulus \* Marcion's work was not and did not profess to be a complete and independent Gospel, but contained a selection of texts from that of St. Luke in the order of the evangelist, each accompanied by a comment either drawing a dogmatical inference from the text or shewing grounds for rejecting it as a Judaical interpolation; and these comments were in Paulus's opinion the *antitheses* of which Tertullian speaks as the outworks \* of what he treats either in assumed or real ignorance as Marcion's Gospel. But it seems much more probable, from the order of Tertullian's refutation and the nature of his allusions, that the work which he had before him consisted, as Hahn conceives, of a system of theology which formed an introduction to his canon, and of the canon itself,

\* Paulus, Conserv. i. p. 116, and Commentar. i. p. 11.

† Tert. iv. 6. Etiam Antitheses præstruendo.

which was composed of the Gospel and the select epistles of St. Paul, and was accompanied with a dogmatical, exegetical and critical commentary, to which he gave the name of Ἀντιθέσεις. In this, his system, before laid down in the preliminary part, was corroborated by a dogmatical application of the passages of the Gospel which seemed to favour it, and seems in its turn to have been employed as a test of the genuineness of the commonly-received reading, and a ground for rejecting it wherever it could not be reconciled with the system.—Tertullian occasionally speaks of Marcion having withdrawn or erased passages from the *Gospel*, which we do not find in St. Luke, but in St. Matthew. As, III. 13, he says, *Redde Evangelio veritatis quæ posterior detraxisti*, and then proceeds to shew the accomplishment of prophecies of the Old Testament in the history of the Magi. So, IV. 7, after quoting Matt. V. 17, he adds, *Hoc Marcion ut additum erasit*; and again, alluding to the same passage, IV. 9, *Quid ergo tibi fuit de evangelio erasisse quod salvum est?* Hahn confesses that these and similar passages, which seem at first sight inconsistent with the view of Marcion's Gospel we have been here maintaining, had for some time a great deal embarrassed him. But he reminds us that the word *evangelium*, in the language of the fathers of the second and third centuries, signifies not only each separate Gospel, but what Tertullian calls *evan-*

*gelicum instrumentum*, the Four Gospels collectively. And this removes one part of the difficulty very satisfactorily. But it will also appear upon an attentive examination of these quotations, that Tertullian in making them was not wandering from his subject, but had the double view of vindicating the purity of the rejected Gospels, and illustrating his own argument\*.

III. As to Justin's *Ἀπομνημονεύματα*, Eichhorn rejects as well the opinion of those who consider them identical with the Gospel of the Hebrews, as that of those who believe them to have been no other than our canonical Gospels, whether all of them in their present shape, or as Paulus (Conserv. p. 70, and foll.) conjectures, a species of harmony or compilation, principally from Matthew and Luke, enlarged by some traditional anecdotes. Eichhorn conceives them to have been one distinct and independent Gospel, a branch of the same stock from which our Gospel of Matthew also sprang. We need not here examine the grounds of difference between Eichhorn and those who likewise deny the *Ἀπομνημονεύματα* to have been the same as our canonical Gospels, nor between the more commonly received opinion, that Justin quoted the latter, and the hypothesis of Paulus, which seems to have scarcely any

\* The question of Marcion's Gospel is also very fully discussed by Olshausen, pp. 106-215, and 355-377.

other foundation than the circumstance (one admitting certainly of a very easy explanation from other causes) that scarcely any quotation is found in Justin from the Gospels of St. Mark and St. John. But as our only object is to inquire whether there be any sufficient ground for considering these Ἀπομνημονεύματα as entirely distinct from our Gospels, we need only observe, 1st, That the description given by Justin of that work corresponds precisely to our four Gospels. The words in Apol. I. 66, ἐν τοῖς . . . ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ καλεῖται ἐυαγγέλια, evidently refer to more works than one \*. In another passage, (Dialog. cum Tryph.

\* To elude this natural inference from the passage, Eichhorn is forced to assert that it is a custom of the fathers to call a single evangelical narrative ἐυαγγέλιον, in proof of which he cites from Ireneus the passage III. 15, *Operatus est Deus plurima evangelia ostendi per Lucam*; where indeed *evangelium* seems to be used much as we use the word *scripture*, when we say a *scripture* in speaking of a single text. But he has not produced an instance in which a *single* history of the life of Christ, or a *single* epistle of an apostle, is called ἐυαγγέλια. And a great number of instances would have been necessary to persuade us that Justin, in mentioning the common appellation used among Christians themselves of a book which he chose to recommend to profane and philosophical ears by the more intelligible and familiar title of ἀπομνημονεύματα, would naturally have been led to prefer the plural to the singular. Possibly a desperate advocate of Eichhorn's opinion might still say that the relative ἃ is not to be taken so strictly, that it is only equivalent to οἷα, and that Justin means *remiscences, such as are called Gospels*. But does he seem to have been so well acquainted with other works on the same subject? or if he was, would he so lightly have placed ther

c. 103.) our evangelists are accurately described as *οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἐκείνοις παρακολουθήσαντες*. In the same work (c. 106.) the Gospel of Mark seems to be described according to the ecclesiastical tradition as the *ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου* \*. To the strong presumption created by these circumstances we shall not see any objection in Eichhorn's remark, that the same work is elsewhere spoken of in Justin as *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* in the singular, when we recollect the observation above noticed respecting the use of the word *εὐαγγέλιον* in the second and third centuries; and still less in his question, how it happens that Justin never names one of the four evangelists, though he cites the Hebrew prophets by name, and even in quoting from the Revelations always mentions the name of the supposed author? That he names the prophets whom he quotes is in the common course of things; and moreover these prophecies were not wholly unknown and unheard of in the heathen world; and the names of those ancient sages and

on a level with that which in every orthodox Christian community known to him, and his travels were very extensive, was regularly used in public worship? *Apol. I. c. 67.*

\* This however is an argument on which much reliance cannot be placed. The reading *αὐτοῦ* is uncertain. Gratz, *Kritische Untersuchungen über Justin's apostolische Deukwürdigkeiten*, p. 51, prefers *αὐτῶν*. The construction of *αὐτοῦ* itself is doubtful. Olshausen, p. 290 of the above-mentioned work, refers it not, as is commonly done, to *Πέτρον*, but to the preceding *αὐτὸν (χριστὸν)*.

ministers of Jehovah probably carried with them something venerable and impressive even to pagan ears. On the other hand the names of the obscure individuals who had recorded the actions and sayings of Jesus added no degree of weight or authority to their works either with Jew or Gentile; and there was therefore no inducement, in quoting these works, to mention any thing more than the relation in which the writers stood to Jesus. That notwithstanding St. John is named as the author of the Revelations, *as often as Justin quotes that work*, will not appear very inconsistent with the truth of this remark, when we consider that Justin quotes, or rather alludes to, the Revelations *only once*, and then thinks it necessary to preface the allusion thus, (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 81.)

καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀνὴρ τις ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν Ἀποστόλων τοῦ  
 χριστοῦ ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ. To have referred to a book containing a revelation, without mentioning the name of the person to whom the revelation was made, would have been unnatural; but the mode of introducing the author shews of how little importance the mention of his name (a name too so distinguished and celebrated throughout the Christian world) appeared to Justin when addressing himself to unbelievers. Not only however was there no inducement in the case of the evangelists for adding the names of the individuals to the description of their office and character, but a sufficient reason may be assigned

why their names should not have been mentioned. The reader's attention has been already drawn to some mistakes which have arisen from inattention to the circumstance, that in the second and third centuries *εὐαγγέλιον* is used to signify the four gospels, and in fact all the canonical scriptures collectively; and we must again make use of this remark to remove what remains of the present difficulty. Those scriptures were viewed as one whole exhibiting in various forms the life and doctrines of Christ. That this mode of considering the four gospels, which is distinctly expressed by Ireneus, who speaks (III. 11.) of *quadriforme evangelium quod uno spiritu continetur*, was familiar to Justin, is in itself highly probable, and will fully explain why he quotes indiscriminately the two evangelists of whom he principally makes use without naming them\*.

\* Dr. Theile, in a very able review of Olshausen's above mentioned work, in the *Neues Kritisches Journal der Theologischen Literatur*, Vol. I. p. 222, questions that the word *εὐαγγέλιον*, or *evangelium*, was used in the second century to signify the four Gospels collectively. He denies that the canon of the Gospels was then finally fixed, and therefore that a collection of them can be said to have been then made, though they may often have been found together in the same volume; and he thinks it probable that no collection of them (that is, no final and exclusive recognition of their authority) was ever made distinct from those of the other apostolical writings which compose our present canon. It is evident, that whether our four Gospels were transcribed into one book seldom or often, and whether they were so transcribed to-

Secondly, The contents of the Ἀπομνημονεύματα, so far as we are acquainted with them, may all have been taken, with a greater or less degree of

gether with other works more frequently than alone, that these are points quite foreign to this question, to decide which we have only to consider the view of the four Gospels taken by the church in the second century, and the language used in expressing it. Now the testimony of Ireneus (in the celebrated passage, III. 11.) is quite conclusive as to the fact, that when he wrote the number of the Gospels was unalterably fixed, and had been so for a considerable time before. The same passage proves no less clearly that the four Gospels were then considered as intimately connected together, as different forms of the same subject, and therefore as composing one whole. The consequence probably was that they were more often found together than apart. But at all events as soon as the number was limited, and the notion by which all were considered as a whole had become prevalent, the canon, so far as the Gospels were concerned, was fixed, and a collection, in the sense in which alone Dr. Theile seems to deny its existence, was made. This evangelical canon was probably fixed before the other parts of our present canon; at least we have no evidence equally early respecting the latter parts. Then as to the language by which this collection so defined and considered was described, Dr. Theile is probably correct in observing, that the εὐαγγέλιον to which Ireneus applies the epithet τετράμορφον cannot be the collection of Gospels, but the Christian doctrine or the aggregate of truths contained in the Gospels. At the same time it is obvious that no transition could be more natural than that by which the name εὐαγγέλιον was transferred from this aggregate of truths contained in the four books to the books themselves. It is precisely the same process by which the word came to signify a written history of the life of Christ. We need therefore feel no scruple in applying the latter sense to the word, even in works of the second century, wherever the context requires it. And this seems to be the case in all those

exactness in quotation, from our Gospels. Eichhorn indeed (p. 99.) has produced a series of passages contained, as he assures us, in the

passages where a quotation is made from one of the Gospels without any other reference than by the word *euangelium*, or τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, especially when, as in the passages above cited from Tertullian (c. Marc. III. 13, and IV. 9), the Gospel from which the quotation is thus made has not been the subject of discussion. But at least it seems difficult to give any other sense to the word where passages are quoted or referred to which occur in more Gospels than one. This is the case, Clem. Alex. Strom. V. c. 12. φησὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὡς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἔλεγε τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις τὸν λόγον ἐν μυστηρίῳ where, by the quotation which follows from the Psalms, it is evident that reference is made to the words Χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, Matth. XIII. 34, Mark IV. 34. So Strom. VI. c. 14, ταύτας ἐκλέκτας οὐσας τὰς τρεῖς μονὰς οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἐυαγγελίῳ ἀριθμοὶ αἰνίσσονται, ὁ τριάκοντα, καὶ ὁ ἕξ, καὶ ὁ ἑκατόν, where either St. Mark, who mentions the numbers in the same order, IV. 8, or St. Matthew, XIII. 8, might appear to be quoted. So Origen, Homil. in Jerem. XIV. c. 6, κείται ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὅτι ἰδὼν τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱερουσαλήμ, and then follows the apostrophe, Luke XIII. 34, Matth. XXIII. 37. That Origen adopts St. Matthew's more common form ἐπισυναγαγεῖν, and not St. Luke's rarer ἐπισυνάξει, will hardly be considered as a proof that he quoted from the former rather than from the latter. The indiscriminate use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and τὰ εὐαγγέλια, as equivalent expressions in the first half of the third century, is clearly proved by the following passage in Origen, c. Celsus II. 27, though it may not, as Olshausen, p. 342, seems to think, prove the same use of the word εὐαγγέλιον to have been made by Celsus. Μετὰ ταῦτά τινες τῶν πιστευόντων φησιν ὡς ἐκ μέθης ἦγοντας εἰς τὸ ἐφροσάναί αὐτοῖς μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τριχῆ καὶ τετραχῆ καὶ πολλαχῆ, καὶ μεταπλάττειν, ἵν' ἔχοιεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἀρνεῖσθαι μεταχαράξαντας δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἄλλους

'Απομν., and asserts that no trace of them is to be found in our four Gospels. But on examination we discover that only one of the six passages he has quoted is referred by Justin himself to the 'Απομν., and that of the rest three are distant allusions to, or compendious statements of, narratives contained in our Gospels; and of the remaining two one at least, if not both, contains only the thoughts of Justin himself. But of the passages really contained in the 'Απομν., some are to be found word for word in our Gospels, others with a slight variation of reading, and others again with a very considerable difference of expression, and even a slight alteration of the matter. The first impression produced by the inspection of all these fragments,

οὐκ οἶδα, ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ Μαρκίου καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ 'Ουαλεντίνου, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Λουκάνου. τοῦτο δὲ λεγόμενον οὐ τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶν ἔγκλημα, ἀλλὰ τῶν τολμησάντων βραδυσργῆσαι τὰ εὐαγγέλια. Before I conclude this note, I will call the reader's attention to a somewhat singular use of the word in Clem. Rom. I. ad Cor. c. 47. (vol. i. p. 175, ed. Coteler.) Αναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ 'Αποστόλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; see the notes of Coteler and Junius. In Constit. Apost. I. 5. it signifies the whole New Testament. But this latter signification was not given to the word till a much later period. In the time of Origen it was new and singular. When he uses the word in this larger sense (Præf. ad Comment. in Joh. c. 4.), he thinks it necessary to guard against misapprehension, and to defend this use of it by a long and very instructive argument, c. 5, which seems to prove most decisively the position maintained in this note.

collected and compared with the corresponding passages in our Gospels, will assuredly be in favour of the opinion that the whole was taken from the latter. That Justin's manner of quotation should have been both loose and free, is in itself a thing which we might expect. We cannot be surprized that he should frequently quote from memory; for his manuscripts might not be always at hand, nor if they were would he always think it worth his while, when the substance was fresh in his recollection, to open them for the sake of preserving verbal exactness, when the persons whom he addressed would be unable to ascertain, and could not derive the slightest benefit from his accuracy. For the same reason nothing can in itself be more natural than that, even when he had the original text before him, he should feel no scruple in occasionally adapting its language to the more fastidious taste of the learned Greeks and Jews, who were accustomed to see the most sublime truths of philosophy clothed in the most exquisite diction. The only question therefore is, what is there to force us to turn from our Gospels and seek the source of Justin's quotations in an imaginary work? Eichhorn maintains that, whatever may in the abstract be possible or probable respecting a writer in Justin's circumstances, the fact is that Justin was in the habit of quoting exactly from the works to which we know him to have had recourse, namely,

the books of the Old Testament, and that consequently we should not be warranted in supposing he would have been less accurate in his quotations from our Gospels. Every body sees that this conclusion is a lame one. Justin's acquaintance with the Old Testament was probably of a much longer standing than his acquaintance with the New. He had moreover inducements to exactness in quoting from the former which did not apply to the latter. He viewed the former in a different light. The Old Testament he considered, in common (as we shall hereafter have occasion to observe) with all the Christian writers of his and the preceding age, as the text on which the New was the commentary. Independently of this, in arguments drawn principally from the fulfilment of prophecy it was to be expected that even a man habitually careless in quoting should take some pains to be exact in the citations on which his whole reasoning was founded. But in quoting from the New Testament: where he related a fact, even if it were the fulfilment of a prophecy, the words were of no consequence, the substance was sufficient; where he recited sayings of Christ, (though in them he is generally accurate) the letter was of little importance if he did but convey the spirit. Thus then Justin's accuracy in the one case may be explained without ascribing to him habitual attention, and his inaccuracy in the other without charging him with

habitual negligence; both may have been the effect of different views and feelings in different circumstances. Should however Eichhorn's inference be admitted, and should we be required to meet facts with facts, we have two to oppose to his premises. Hug \* has produced a list of passages which are twice quoted by Justin, some too in the same book, with very considerable variations of expression. Another list of passages, in which Justin allows himself similar deviations from the text of the Septuagint, has been produced by another critic †. These two specimens certainly leave Eichhorn's argument every way doubtful.

Though Justin, as seems far the most probable, quoted from our Gospels, yet his age and birth-place render it by no means unlikely that he may have derived some particulars respecting the life and speeches of Christ from oral tradition. But though there would in this be nothing either surprizing in itself or inconsistent with our position, still I am not at all satisfied that it was actually the case. At all events I am not aware of any passage in which he has drawn from any other source than our Gospels. The passage commonly

\* In the work hereafter mentioned, vol. ii. p. 95.

† Winer. In *Oratione Muneris adeundi causâ recitandâ quâ Just. M. Evangeliiis Canonicis usum fuisse ostenditur*, 1819, where Justin's quotations are pretty fully exhibited by the side of the corresponding passages in our Gospels, and perspicuously classed.

cited as a relic of oral tradition, (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 88.) ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα ἐργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὡν ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά: διὰ τούτων καὶ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον, does not appear to me in that light. This, it must be observed, is one of the six passages above mentioned as quoted by Eichhorn, who asserts them to have been contained in the Ἀπομνημον, though except in one instance there is not in Justin any hint of a quotation. But is there in these words any thing which he might not or ought not to have written without a farther knowledge of the fact than he derived from the notoriety of Joseph's calling? Was it so bold a supposition, that Jesus, before he entered upon his public ministry, assisted his reputed father in making implements of husbandry? Is Justin's application of the fact so very unlikely to have occurred to himself? Or rather is it not evident that it was merely for the sake of this application that he thus parenthetically introduced what has been sometimes considered as a quotation, at other times as a traditional anecdote\*?

And here we may conclude for the present our examination of Eichhorn's preliminary chapter; for it would be a waste of the reader's time

\* The reader who wishes to verify the preceding general assertions respecting Justin will find the evidence, for which there was not room here, collected in Winer's pamphlet. For an able statement of the question, I would refer him to *The Letters of an Oxford Layman to the Editor of the Trial*

to discuss the critic's conjectures, respecting the Gospel of Cerinthus and Tatian's Diatessaron, which, taking advantage of their utter inability to speak for themselves, notwithstanding the remonstrances of some of the fathers, whom he thinks himself at liberty to disregard because they did not live much more than 1300 years before himself, he has pressed into the service of his hypothesis. The quotations of the apostolical fathers we shall have occasion to notice in another part of this introduction. But we may here remark, that whatever confirmation the hypothesis of an original Gospel may seem to derive from the shew of historical evidence produced in this part of Eichhorn's work, this advantage is at least counterbalanced by the uncertainty which is hereby thrown over the contents of the original document; for, as Schleiermacher has observed, so long as we remain ignorant of the variations which existed in the series of Gospels thus supposed to have been derived from the same source, the result of Eichhorn's analysis of our three first must be extremely precarious.

Eichhorn, as we have seen, has not been satisfied like Bishop Marsh, who seems to wish rather to force than to invite our acquiescence, with leaving his hypothesis to depend entirely on the

*of the Witnesses*, lately published, p. 64—72, where he will meet with several interesting observations on the early Christian literature.

phenomena which it is to explain. He felt that something more was wanting to render it plausible, and has accordingly attempted to shew an historical foundation for it. He endeavours also to recommend it by an argument a priori drawn from the character of the age and persons to which it relates, and to obviate some of the objections to which it was exposed, by defining more precisely some points which Bishop Marsh has left undetermined. It may however be doubted whether our countryman has not taken the more prudent course; though it would certainly be a circumstance rather unfavourable to his hypothesis, if every attempt to convey a vivid conception of the origin and character of the supposed original document should be found to throw additional difficulties in its way. Eichhorn conceives that the qualities which belong to the outline of the life and actions of Jesus extracted by him from our three first Gospels are precisely such as might be expected in the first Christian essay at historical writing. The production of an unpractised, unlettered man, it would, he thinks, naturally be short, rude and imperfect. It would embrace those transactions of Christ on which the apostles chiefly dwelt in their ministry, but would omit the particular circumstances which give life and grace to a narrative\*. But this view of the

\* This description, it must be observed, is faithfully extracted from Eichhorn. If any one who has read the original

subject is surely a very partial one. For the date as well as the extent ascribed to this composition necessarily imply that the author was intimately acquainted with the facts which he relates; and this indeed Eichhorn himself supposes. Now a dry brevity is not the characteristic which we should expect to find in the narrative of a plain illiterate man, whose mind is full of a subject which deeply interests him. On the contrary we should be prepared to discover the want of art and experience rather in repetitions and the accumulation of superfluous details. If such a person is himself an eye-witness of the events which he records, we can generally distinguish this circumstance by the liveliness and circumstantial fulness of his descriptions. If he has received his information from others, we should not perhaps be surprized to find in his narrative some misrepresentation and confusion; but the stronger his feelings and the weaker his judgment, the less probable would it be that he should forget much, or drop any circumstance as immaterial. Upon general grounds then the

should object to me that in p. 177 the author of the original Gospel is on the contrary described as a scholar of the apostles *who had practice in writing, der Uebung im Schreiben hatte*, I can only say that in two preceding passages (p. 6 and 155,) the same work is attributed to men unpractised in writing, *im Schreiben ungeübten Männern*, and that it seems to be difficult in explaining this theory to escape occasional contradictions.

narratives in our Gospels which are peculiar to some of them, and which Eichhorn therefore supposes to have been preserved in their original shape, seem much fairer specimens of the style of composition to be expected under such circumstances than those of the original Gospel. And most readers who compare the view of the subject presented in our author's introduction with this of Eichhorn, will, I think, scarcely hesitate to prefer the former.

Some however who agree with me in thinking the conciseness of the original document, according to Eichhorn's view of it, strange and unnatural, may be of opinion that this difficulty admits of being removed by a supposition which Eichhorn indeed makes for a different purpose, but which might also be applied to this. He seems to have been aware that some explanation was necessary to account for the remarkable circumstance, that a piece which had so little to recommend it, and to which any hearer of the apostles who possessed the mechanical art of writing might have produced something equal, if not superior, should have been so extensively circulated as is implied at least in the great number of works which he imagines to have been derived from it. He supposes then that when Christianity began to extend itself beyond the limits of Palestine, the apostolical missionaries, who were not themselves eye-witnesses of the events which they related,

required some written document sanctioned by the apostles, and comprising the principal facts which were to form the basis of their public preaching. This supposition, which implies a want of mutual confidence in the apostles, the missionaries and their hearers, quite inconsistent with their respective relations, and which nevertheless does not supply it by an adequate security, seems to me in itself much more incredible than any thing for which it can be meant to account. And when it is added that the outline abstracted by Eichhorn from our three Gospels was the very document used for this purpose, objections crowd on with overwhelming rapidity. It is of no consequence whether we suppose the original Gospel to have been drawn up with this view, or to have been composed for private use and adopted by the apostles as a convenient instrument for their purpose. The former supposition may, as I have before said, be thought to account for some of the peculiarities of the composition; and the latter, which is Eichhorn's, certainly leaves all the objections arising from the selection and arrangement of this compendious voucher in full force, and only excites a little surprize at the fortunate chance that the apostles found a piece which had been drawn up without any such object so completely to their mind. Besides the general argument with which Schleiermacher combats this view of

the original Gospel in his introduction, the reader will find in the course of the work itself a number of specific objections, which it will require great ingenuity to elude. Others are suggested by Paulus in his review; but I think it needless to particularize them, as many such will occur to every reader.

We have already observed that Bishop Marsh was enabled by the generality of his statement to reserve for himself an answer to one of the objections brought against his hypothesis, namely, the improbability that the original document should have been so soon lost and forgotten. But according to Eichhorn's view this difficulty becomes a very serious one, and is accompanied by another which is also mentioned by Schleiermacher, and is almost insurmountable. It is inconceivable how any of the persons intrusted with a document of this venerable character, or those to whom they transmitted it, should have grown so utterly heedless of its nature and design, as to suffer it in a short time to be overwhelmed, as Eichhorn says, (p. 156) *with such a multiplicity of additions that its original words only swam like detached fragments among them*; and even if this could have happened to some copies which fell into private hands, it is at least incredible that some of the religious communities founded by these missionaries should not have preserved in its purity this credential of their

founders and basis of their faith, if not as a precious relic, yet as a useful criterion. Is it possible that the feeling which Eichhorn expresses, (p. 158) in regretting that the church, when at the end of the second century she established our four Gospels in their canonical dignity, had it no longer in her power to invest with that distinction this original sketch only accompanied by St. John's Gospel: is it possible that this, which is surely not the feeling of the critic and antiquary only, should have been unknown to the Christians of the two first centuries? Paulus's objection, that if the original Gospel had been framed or adopted as a voucher for the missionaries on their journies out of Palestine, the language would not have been Aramaic but Greek, requires perhaps some qualification. But even admitting that a few copies in Aramaic may have been wanted for those missionaries who bent their course eastward, it is certain that Greek must have been the language of the great majority of copies, and that the Greek version (if Greek was not the language of the original) as it not only entered into, but was the principal instrument of the original design, must have been equally authentic with the Aramaic text. And this renders it at least very difficult to explain how St. Luke, who, if not one of the first persons that would have been furnished with a Greek copy, had at least numerous opportunities of procuring one, should have had before him

none but Aramaic materials. The reader who keeps in mind the difference between the views of Eichhorn and Bishop Marsh with respect to the nature and origin of the original Gospel will not find any inconsistency in objecting to the one statement the want of this original Greek translation, and considering its existence as an obstacle to the reception of the other. This however is a subordinate objection, grounded only on Eichhorn's peculiar view of his general hypothesis combined with his mode of developing it.

The process by which in his last work he deduces our three first Gospels from the Aramaic original, does not very materially differ from that of Bishop Marsh. According to this improved form, four copies of the Aramaic original formed the basis of our three Gospels. These were

A, which was enriched with some of the greater additions in St. Matthew ;

B, which was enriched with some of the greater additions in St. Luke ;

C, which was enriched with all the additions contained in A and B ; and

D, which was enriched with some other of the greater additions in St. Luke.

Of A and D there were early Greek translations. St. Matthew's Aramaic text E was composed of A and D, augmented with some additions peculiar to the evangelist. From his more accurate knowledge of the scene and date of some

of the events, he transposed in the first part the sections of the original Gospel, together with the additions with which it was enlarged in A and D, and in the last part some of the additions derived from D. The translator of St. Matthew made use of the former translations of A and D.

The copy C formed the substance of a Gospel which was translated either by St. Mark, or by another person whose work the evangelist afterwards revised and augmented with a few additions of his own. The translator made use of the former translation of A. From B and D was composed an Aramaic text F, which St. Luke translated with the assistance of the former translation of D. He inserted a translation of some detached pieces which he found, and some little additions of his own.

According to this statement, a verbal agreement ought to pervade all the sections common to St. Matthew and St. Mark. This however Bishop Marsh denies to be the case in those sections of the original Gospel of which the order is different in the two evangelists, and explains the variation by the oversight of the translator of St. Matthew. Eichhorn however contends that a verbal agreement may be discovered even in these sections sufficient to indicate that the same translation had been consulted, though not so obvious as in the others, because in these sections the original text happened to have undergone more alteration in the

copies E and C, and therefore the earlier translation of A did not everywhere exactly correspond to the Aramaic text of the two evangelists. Supposing even the phenomenon to be correctly stated, he rejects the explanation given by Bishop Marsh, which indeed is not the simplest part of his hypothesis, on two grounds. He thinks the oversight thus ascribed to the translator inconsistent with the minute diligence which enabled him to discover in Luke XI. 17 the passage corresponding to Matthew XII. 25, where he evidently quits the Greek text of the parallel passage in Mark III. 23. Nor can he admit the probability of the supposition that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke should so soon have fallen into the hands of one individual, which would of course be hardly consistent with his opinion above mentioned respecting the circulation of the canonical Gospels; and indeed even those who do not concur in that view may still think that this supposition adds considerably to the difficulties of Bishop Marsh's hypothesis. One phenomenon however Eichhorn himself admits is not explained by his statement, namely, the instance of verbal agreement between Mark I. 24 and Luke IV. 34. Other instances have been pointed out by succeeding critics, which Eichhorn thinks unworthy of notice, though upon grounds which I cannot reconcile with his objection to the existence of the phenomenon stated by Bishop Marsh. The difference however between these

two forms of the hypothesis is not sufficiently important to repay a discussion of these details.

Another attempt to recommend the hypothesis of an original Gospel, by a more simple mode of deducing from it our three first Gospels, was made by Alois Gratz, now Catholic Professor of Divinity at Bonn, in an essay published in 1812 \*. Every original attempt of this sort deserves the attention even of those who find it impossible to admit the fundamental position itself, not only because it shews, if successful, that the verbal harmony of the evangelists does not, as Bishop Marsh believes (p. 208.), afford so severe a test that only one assignable cause can be expected to account for them, but also, and chiefly, because such an attempt must be founded on a new view of the phenomena, which may either confirm or correct others taken from different points. The inquirer will at least find in the work of Professor Gratz some useful materials and instructive discussions. His conception of the original Gospel so far agrees with Eichhorn's, that he considers it as the work of a private person of which the apostles availed themselves. But in describing the use to which it was applied he differs considerably from Eichhorn. He imagines it to have been used by the apostles themselves, as well as by their scholars. Its object however was not in either case to limit the

\* *Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drey ersten Evangelien zu erklären.*

subjects on which the preachers were to enlarge, or in the case of the missionaries to serve them as a voucher and a guide. It was not in fact designed for the use of the preachers themselves, but for that of their converts, for whom it was to supply not only the absence of their instructors, but also the historical facts which they omitted in their public discourses.

The supposition that the first propagators of Christianity provided themselves with copies of a written document for such a purpose appears to me to be not only unwarranted, but directly contradicted by every memorial we have remaining of the earliest transactions in Christian history. But at all events we may pronounce with certainty that such a composition as the supposed original Gospel could never have been exclusively used for this purpose. For as the preachers must be supposed to have impressed their hearers with every fact essential to the reception of Christianity, we should be obliged actually to believe what Gratz suggests (p. 113.) as natural and probable, that the apostles were willing to gratify the propensity to the marvellous already excited by their preaching in their hearers, by leaving with them some more miraculous stories concerning Jesus. It is indeed difficult to say what other impression, beside that of his supernatural power, could be made on the readers by many of these narratives, which are only reduced to the shape in which

they are supposed to have appeared in the original Gospel, by stripping them of every characteristic circumstance. Not to mention that some of them, as Schleiermacher observes of the narrative of the Temptation, must have been wholly unintelligible to the new converts, and could only have given rise to wild, fantastical and most unprofitable speculations. This variance then of Gratz, if it enables him to avoid some of the difficulties which press upon Eichhorn's statement of the hypothesis, makes an opening for other objections, and does not on the whole render it more plausible.

The process by which he deduces our three Gospels from their common source has certainly some considerable advantages over those adopted by his predecessors. He begins with an analysis of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, the comparison of which leads him to infer the existence of a common Greek document which comprised the principal incidents in the public life of Christ. He rejects, on what every unbiassed reader must admit to be very strong external and internal evidence, the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel; these he considers as an apocryphal addition made by a later hand to supply the place of the genuine conclusion, which may have been accidentally torn off from the original manuscript. The passage, Mark VI. 46—VIII. 26, which opposes the principal obstacle to the supposition that St. Luke had before him St. Mark's Gospel, he

thinks may have formed a detached fragment, which fell into St. Mark's hands. St. Luke he conceives to have used, besides the work which formed the basis of his and St. Mark's Gospel, three detached pieces : an *Evangelium Infantiae Jesu*, which comprised the contents of his two first chapters, an *Ἀπομνημόνευμα* including the transactions of a particular period contained in VI. 17—VIII. 3, and what is called the Gnomology, IX. 51—XVIII. 14. And to such detached narratives he applies the language of St. Luke's introduction. To explain the relation of St. Matthew's Gospel to the other two, he supposes the above mentioned Greek document to have been a translation of the Aramaic original used by St. Matthew, enlarged by six additional sections. He conceives that this translation may have been made for the use of the converts at Antioch, mentioned Acts XI. 21, and conjectures that St. Mark himself was the author of it, and thus gave rise to the ancient tradition of a twofold publication of his Gospel (a tradition however which, if it have any foundation, seems too closely connected with the presence of St. Mark at Rome and at Alexandria to be referred to any other occasion). The verbal harmony of the three evangelists in the common sections he accounts for by supposing that the translator of St. Matthew made use of St. Mark's Gospel; but, with Eichhorn, he rejects as unfounded Bishop Marsh's observation (p. 316.) as

to the want of verbal agreement in the sections which occur in a different order in St. Matthew. To explain the agreement in the passages which are common to two evangelists only, he resorts to the hypothesis of a subsequent interpolation, which is the chief peculiarity of his essay. He first supposes that the translator of St. Matthew's Gospel transferred into his translation the sections which St. Matthew has in common with St. Mark; an hypothesis which he considers not only as more natural and easy than that of another copy of the original Gospel enriched by these additions, but as confirmed by their internal character. To prove this he institutes a minute comparison between the two Gospels in these sections, and points out in the variations in St. Matthew what he conceives to be traces of a correcting and improving hand. The sections common to St. Matthew and St. Luke (among which he enumerates, I cannot see why, the two genealogies and the parting scenes in Matth. XXVIII. 16—20, Luke XXIV. 36—49.) he divides into two classes. The passages in the one class are distinguished by a close verbal agreement, but are placed in a different order. Those of the other class occupy corresponding places, but agree only in matter, not in expression. The passages of the first class he considers as interpolations, some of which were introduced by a later hand from St. Luke into St. Matthew, and others, among which are most of those in the Gnomology,

from St. Matthew into St. Luke. The passages of the second class he supposes may have been derived by the evangelists themselves from similar but distinct sources. St. Matthew for instance may have used a Gnomology, perhaps compiled by himself, different from St. Luke's, and different reports of the Sermon on the Mount and the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum. He then proceeds to shew that his hypothesis explains all the phenomena stated by Bishop Marsh (except the one which he denies), and concludes with a critical investigation of all the sections common to the three evangelists, in which he examines more minutely the relation of the Aramaic and Greek original Gospels, and points out the circumstances which appear to him to confirm the other parts of his hypothesis.

The author has endeavoured to obviate some of the objections which he anticipated to the supposition of interpolations so considerable, of which no traces appear in any of our manuscripts, by some general remarks on the early history of the sacred books, which however, even when admitted in their full extent, do not remove all the difficulties under which this branch of his hypothesis labours. He observes that our Gospels were occasional works, originally designed not for general circulation, but for the use either of individuals or of particular societies; that even in the latter case in early times copies were not freely

multiplied, but confined to the presbyters, to prevent them from falling into profane hands ; and hence that even after they had found their way into other provinces an interpolation admitted into the copies used in one church might, in the frequent circuits of the presbyters, from their pious wish to render the copies which they found or carried with them as complete as possible, be introduced into those of other churches, and that thus the process of conformation, of which Origen and Jerom complain, may have taken place on a larger scale in the second century. He is also of opinion that the *Lectionaria* may have given occasion to many interpolations, particularly in the larger sections. But even should this view of the subject reconcile us to the supposition in general, we shall still feel the same difficulty in applying it to St. Matthew and St. Luke. For in both cases the interpolaters, as Eichhorn observes, would have effected very imperfectly the purpose ascribed to them ; and if it is difficult to conceive why they should have confined themselves to a few passages, and omitted so many other remarkable peculiarities in the Gospel from which they made their extracts, we are at least equally at a loss to account for the place which these heterogeneous additions occupy, and for the variations from the original text which notwithstanding their general harmony they exhibit. The reader who accompanies Schleiermacher

through his discussion of that part of St. Luke's Gospel which is commonly called the Gnomology will certainly be very little inclined to admit the sections which Gratz considers as interpolations to have been borrowed from St. Matthew ; but still he will probably see in the arguments adduced by the author in support of this supposition sufficient reason for rejecting the other alternative.

As my object is only to describe the progress of the controversy, not to give an account of every work relating to it, I might here close that part of this review which concerns the hypothesis of an original Gospel. I shall however mention one other work in which it has been adopted, not on account of any additional light that the author has thrown on the subject, but in order to give the reader a specimen of the language held by the followers of Eichhorn, and to justify the attention which has been paid in this inquiry to the general question as to the existence of an original Gospel. The writer I am speaking of, Professor Bertholdt of Erlangen, is one of the latest advocates of this hypothesis. In his very learned and useful Introduction \* he thinks the existence of an original Gospel so firmly established that it stands in no need of historical evidence to confirm it. The critic in his opinion is no less compelled to admit

\* *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des alten und neuen Testaments.*

that fact by the mutual relation of our three first Gospels, than the geographer is forced to infer from the petrifications excavated in some southern countries, that those countries were once subject to a colder climate. He contends indeed that, if not express evidence, still sufficiently distinct and unequivocal traces of the lost original document are to be found in history. He conceives that it is impossible to explain how any Gospel should have received a title importing that it was composed by the twelve apostles, except by supposing tradition to have preserved the memory of the fact, that the apostles united in drawing up a document which afterwards became the basis of the Gospel erroneously ascribed to them. Hence in his opinion the very titles of the Gospels used by Justin Martyr and by the Nazarenes or Ebionites, ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, and εὐαγγέλιον τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, afford a strong presumption that they were founded on a joint composition of the apostles. We have already seen how the case stands as to Justin. The title of the other work may very probably be referred to the peculiar tenets of the Ebionites, who adopted it. Those tenets were believed by that sect to have been held by the twelve apostles, and to have distinguished them from the apostle of the Gentiles. This distinction may have been intimated by affixing the name of the Twelve to the Gospel in which the doctrines supposed to have been peculiar to them

were exclusively contained. But Bertholdt even finds traces of the original Gospel in the writings of St. Paul. He thinks that the historical facts and allusions contained in those writings must have been drawn from some written document; and he believes it possible to determine the name and nature of the work. He observes that Marcion's Gospel was not inscribed with the name of any author, but was only entitled from the subject, *ὁ Κύριος*, or *ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν*. The same, he collects from various passages in which St. Paul refers to the authority of *ὁ Κύριος*, such as 1 Cor. IX. 14, XI. 23, may have been the title of the original Gospel, of which St. Paul, he thinks, used a copy. And hence he explains the fact, that the later followers of Marcion alleged their Gospel to have been written by the Lord himself up to a certain point and concluded by St. Paul: the Gospel used by that Apostle passed, in perhaps a somewhat altered shape, into the hands of the Christians in Pontus, and was adopted by Marcion as the foundation of his system. It needs scarcely be observed, that every step of this deduction is liable to strong objections. The supposition that St. Paul used any written document is arbitrary and improbable; there is nothing in St. Paul's situation or language which calls for it; and if the fact had been so, he could hardly have failed to allude to it more distinctly. The transmission of this Gospel through the Christians of Pontus

to Marcion is even contrary to what we know of his history. For he was excommunicated by the church of Pontus, and afterwards adopted a different canon from that which he had before acknowledged \*. This historical evidence therefore for the existence of the original Gospel amounts to very little; and it would have been fortunate for the hypothesis if such evidence had been as superfluous as Bertholdt believes it to be.

The general hypothesis however of an Aramaic original he conceives to be so firmly established by the internal phenomena of the Gospels as to be no longer a disputable point. But with respect to the particular forms which this hypothesis has hitherto assumed he is not equally decided. After stating those proposed by Bishop Marsh, Eichhorn and Gratz, he concludes that although they may all satisfy the conditions prescribed by the subject, still each is liable to objection as deficient in ease and simplicity, and that we have yet to look for the complete solution of the problem from future investigations. As one great difficulty is the seeming necessity of supposing one or more Greek translations of the original Gospel to have preceded the composition of our first three Gospels, he suggests the possibility of superseding this necessity, by resorting to Semler's theory, that the verbal conformity in

\* See Tertull. De Præscript. Hæret. c. 51. & 30.

the corresponding passages of our Gospels was produced by the alterations of transcribers\*. He does not imagine these alterations to have been designed to create an artificial harmony, but to have arisen naturally out of the variations in the manuscripts which the transcribers used. He supposes that when each of the manuscripts collated by a transcriber presented a different reading in a passage common to two or more evangelists, the transcriber would probably think it safest to conform the text of one evangelist to that of another, and that in this way the irregular and broken harmony of expression which we find in the parallel parts of our three Gospels might gradually be produced. But not to mention that the critical maxim here mentioned is not so natural and obvious as to have occurred to every transcriber, and that cases of such complete uncertainty as to call for its application cannot be supposed to have been very frequent, this mode of accounting for the phenomenon still remains liable to the objections opposed to it by Bishop Marsh †. And therefore, though this suggestion may possibly be found useful in the application of an hypothesis to particular passages, it does not seem

\* This theory was proposed by Semler, in his Notes to his translation of Townson's Discourses on the Four Gospels, vol. i. p. 223. On this subject the reader of German may consult the work of a very learned and independent thinker, J. E. C. Schmidt, *Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, § 35.

† Translat. of Michaelis, vol. iii. part 2. p. 338, 2d edit.

admissible as a general theory, and cannot be considered as of any great importance in the present stage of the controversy.

In the meanwhile the more ancient and obvious hypothesis, that each evangelist made use of the preceding, was revived with great learning and ability by Hug, Roman Catholic Professor of Divinity at Freyburg. His Introduction to the New Testament \* was completed (a part had appeared eleven years before) in 1808. It contains in a short compass a great mass of useful information, and much candid and ingenious criticism; and I know no work on the subject a translation of which would form a more valuable addition to our biblical literature. A new edition appeared in 1821, in which the author has noticed the labours of succeeding critics, and among the rest the following essay of the celebrated translator of Plato.

Hug adheres to the almost unanimous tradition of the earliest ecclesiastical writers, in assigning to the composition of the Gospels the order in which we now commonly read them. He believes St. Matthew to have been an eye-witness of all the scenes he relates, except those from which the history itself positively excludes him. From internal allusions to events which preceded by a short interval the destruction of Jerusalem, he infers that the writer must have lived to see the

\* Hug's *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*.

accomplishment of some predictions which he records (XXIII. 35. \* XXIV. 15), and that by these the date of his work may be determined. It must according to these indications have been concluded in the course of the year before that in which the final conquest of Judea was begun by the Romans, in the sixty-eighth year after the birth of Christ. The political circumstances of Palestine and the fanatical expectations of the Jews, who still cherished hopes of a temporal deliverer, were according to Hug the occasion which either wholly gave rise to St. Matthew's Gospel, or at all events fixed its character. It was designed in his opinion to counteract that mischievous delusion, and to alleviate, if not to avert, the impending calamity, by exhibiting in the person of Jesus the true Messiah, to whom the descriptions of the prophets really applied. Hence this work, though it adopted the narrative form, was not

\* Hug and Eichhorn agree in supposing the Zacharias here spoken of to have been the person whose murder is described by Josephus, D. B. J. iv. 5. 4, and that St. Matthew's Gospel assumed its present shape shortly after that event. But Eichhorn thinks that the Zacharias spoken of by Christ was the son of Jehoiada, whose murder is related in 2 Chron. XXIV. 21, and that the name of the later Zacharias was substituted while his death was recent. Hug imagines that Christ predicted the death of this Zacharias, the son of Barachias, but that St. Matthew, who saw the prediction accomplished, expressed his knowledge of the fact by using the past tense. But should this then have been the aorist ἐφρονέυσατε?

strictly speaking a history, but had a direct demonstrative and didactic object. For the more ready attainment of this object, the author did not scruple to depart from chronological order, and to bring together facts and speeches which were really separated by considerable intervals, whenever by so doing he thought it possible to impress the conclusion which he had in view more strongly on the minds of his readers. Hence too he frequently neglected little details which appeared to him irrelevant for this purpose, and likely to distract attention and weaken the one great impression which he wished to produce.

Though the general hypothesis adopted by Hug does not require that St. Matthew should have written his Gospel in Greek, yet as this is an almost necessary consequence of the relation in which he supposes this Gospel and that of St. Mark to have stood to each other, and as the supposition of an Aramaic original of St. Matthew is an essential element in most of the hypotheses which have been founded on the same basis with Eichhorn's, he has introduced a discussion of some length, to prove that our first Gospel is not a translation but an original. After stating his grounds for believing that the tradition which asserted St. Matthew to have written in Aramaic flowed from the single evidence of Papias, and that this was derived from the Nazarenes or Ebionites, who maintained their Gospel to have been the

original work of the apostle, the author traces in a very learned and luminous investigation the progress of the Greek language in Palestine from the age of Alexander to that of our Saviour. The result of the inquiry seems to be, that in the time of Christ several towns of Palestine were exclusively inhabited by Greeks, that Greek was the medium of intercourse between the Romans and the Jews, that the knowledge of it was very general in the cities and among the more educated classes, and that on the whole the number of those who knew no other language was greater than that of those who understood only the vernacular tongue of Palestine. Under these circumstances, and more especially if the evangelist when he wrote expected the speedy accomplishment of his Master's predictions in the destruction of the Jewish state, Hug thinks it highly improbable that he should have preferred an instrument of communication the sphere of which was already very narrow, and was soon to be still more contracted, to one of which the use was almost universal and even in the country for which the work was designed was the most extensively diffused. This general argument is confirmed by the fact, that no trace of the supposed Aramaic original appears in ecclesiastical history, that it was unknown even to the Christians of Syria where it must have been generally used and preserved, and that it escaped the researches of

Origen and all succeeding inquirers, who could discover no Aramaic document which bore any resemblance to St. Matthew's Gospel but that of the Nazarenes or Ebionites. The same conclusion is drawn by Hug from the text of the Gospel itself. The citations from the Old Testament, which occur there, generally coincide with the Septuagint; but there are some variations from that version which he thinks can only have been intended to adapt the passages quoted more closely to the peculiar views of the evangelist, and therefore cannot be ascribed to a translator. Instances of this sort he finds in Matth. XII. 19, XIII. 35, VIII. 17, XXVIII. 9, 16. On the other hand in Matth. XV. 9, a passage very loosely translated in the Septuagint is cited without correction according to that version; a piece of negligence inconsistent with the character of the supposed translator, who in other cases had taken pains to give an accurate independent rendering. The quotation in Matth. XIX. 5 from Genesis II. 24 supplies another very ingenious argument; the *οἱ δύο* in the Greek text has nothing in the Hebrew to correspond to it, and yet it is on this peculiarity of the Greek translation that the conclusion in v. 6. *ὥστε οὐκ ἔτι εἰσι δύο ἀλλὰ σαρξ μία* depends; and as this must belong to the author, it seems to follow that he wrote in Greek\*.

\* The German reader will find some additional arguments

The date assigned by Hug to St. Matthew's Gospel agrees with the statement of Ireneus preserved by Eusebius, H. E. V. 8, that it was completed at the time when St. Peter and St. Paul were teaching at Rome. For if the two apostles were ever there together, it must have been in the latter part of Nero's reign. And as St. Mark is uniformly described as the companion of St. Peter, it is natural to suppose that he was in Rome at the same time.

Adopting then this statement of Ireneus, which if it has not the weight of historical evidence contains at least nothing improbable, Hug conceives St. Mark's Gospel to have originated as follows. At the time when St. Matthew finished his Gospel the intercourse between Rome and Palestine, the theatre of war, was of course unusually active. Many emigrations took place from the latter country, and several in all probability to Rome; so that a copy of the new work, the first regular history of Christ's public life, could not fail soon to reach the Christian church which the apostles were founding there. It was read publicly for general edification in the Christian assemblies, and St. Peter added from his own recollection some explanations and remarks. These

on the same side of this question, in an article by Dr. Theile, in the *Neues Kritisches Journal der Theologischen Literatur*. Vol. i. p. 198—207.

were diligently treasured and committed to writing by St. Mark, who after the death of the apostles which soon followed made them public at the request of the Roman church. They consisted almost exclusively of corrections relating to the chronological order of the events, which St. Matthew's peculiar object had led him to neglect, and of additional details, which from the same cause he had omitted. In order to exhibit these corrections and additions, St. Mark drew up a fresh account of Christ's public life, taking for his basis the Gospel of St. Matthew, though without rigidly adhering to his text, assigning to the incidents which were there misplaced their proper order, and introducing into each narrative all the circumstances of which he had been informed by St. Peter.

These suppositions are undoubtedly easy and natural enough; but before we can decide how far they explain the relation between the two evangelists, it is necessary precisely to determine the object which St. Mark had in view. For he might either intend his own work to be a new improved edition of St. Matthew's, and so to supersede it, or he might only mean to draw up a supplement to the first Gospel, which should accompany it and increase its utility. One of these two ends he must have had before him; for that he meant, in the common sense of the word, to epitomize St. Matthew, is inconsistent not only with

Hug's supposition, but with the obvious fact, that his alterations are for the most part enlargements. It is not very easy to collect from Hug's language \* which of these two designs he attributes to St. Mark; and whichever we suppose, the comparison of the two Gospels presents almost equal difficulties. If it was St. Mark's intention to draw up, with the assistance of his notes, a complete and accurate history of Christ's public life, though in that case it might not perhaps have formed part of his plan to introduce any very long discourses or collections of miscellaneous sayings, still what he has actually done proves that he would not have omitted any facts or parables. On this supposition therefore we should be unable to account for the numerous instances of such omission which his Gospel presents. On the other hand, if we suppose him to have designed his work as a supplement to St. Matthew, it contains many things with which a reader who was in possession of the first Gospel might very well dispense. For though he is often more copious and circumstantial than St. Matthew, he is also sometimes much more concise. Hug indeed thinks that both the omissions and the abridgement may be explained from the same motive, and that when St. Matthew's narrative was sufficiently circumstantial and accurate, St. Mark, having nothing to supply and nothing

\* Vol. II. p. 115.

to correct, either altogether omitted the passage, or curtailed it. But it is evident that, without imputing to St. Mark inconsistency or the utter want of a definite purpose, we cannot ascribe these two effects to the same cause. If he omitted a narrative of St. Matthew because he was perfectly satisfied with it, his object must have been merely to supply the deficiencies of St. Matthew's work; and in that case he would never have related more briefly what he found already fully detailed. On the other hand, if he abridged such passages, this could only have been owing to his wish to make his history complete and independent of any other; and he would therefore wholly have omitted nothing. Hug however assigns another motive for the omissions, to which he gives the preference over that last mentioned. He supposes that St. Peter may have noticed the incorrect position of some incidents in St. Matthew's Gospel, but may either have neglected or been unable to assign to them their proper place, and that St. Mark on this account omitted them altogether. But though so far as St. Peter is concerned this supposition might be admissible, it is liable to strong objections so far as it relates to St. Mark. It would not only be highly discreditable to his judgment, but utterly repugnant to the habits and mode of thinking prevalent in that age, to imagine that he attached such importance to the arrangement of his subject, as to prefer wholly omitting an incident to running

the risk of misplacing it. His whole Gospel is but a string of fragments larger or smaller. Could the place in which he introduced two or three isolated scenes signify any thing to the reader? One very remarkable circumstance in these omissions is, that they include some scenes in which St. Peter himself was particularly concerned, as the commission of the keys, Matt. XVI. 17—19, the walking on the water, Matt. XIV. 28—31. Hug, who elsewhere lays stress on passages in which the mention of St. Peter is omitted by St. Matthew and introduced by St. Mark, explains these omissions by supposing that St. Peter, with the natural reluctance which a modest man feels to speak of himself, passed over in silence the occurrences in which he was a principal party, and that St. Mark therefore dropped them. This seems by no means a natural consequence of St. Peter's silence; but even if it were so, and if we should be willing to attribute to an apostle and to St. Peter a species of sensibility which on such an occasion would certainly have been out of its place, still this would only remove a part of the difficulty. Modesty might have induced St. Peter to be silent on the subject of the honourable distinction recorded in Matt. XVI. 17—19; and though we should not think it equally suitable to his character to be backward in confessing a fault, still if he had passed over the painful scene of his denial we might have ascribed this to natural weakness.

This scene however, distressing as the recollection of it must have been to him, he did not hesitate according to Hug's supposition to describe, in order to afford the means of correcting and enlarging St. Matthew's account in one or two not very material points. But the singular incident related by St. Matthew XIV. 28—31 could scarcely raise in St. Peter any scruple either of modesty or shame. For if the beginning represents him in an advantageous light, the conclusion is rather humiliating. Now it would be difficult to point out an instance in which St. Peter could feel himself more strongly urged to make some observation on St. Matthew's narrative, for the purpose of rejecting or approving, correcting or illustrating it, than in this very passage. For it is merely the addition of this scene in which he is the principal actor that transforms what would otherwise be a very simple and ordinary incident into a miracle, and one of a kind of which no other example occurs in the history of Christ, that is, a miracle performed with no other object than the display of supernatural power. Had this fact then been inaccurately related by St. Matthew, we should have been quite sure, under the circumstances supposed by Hug, to have found it more correctly represented in St. Mark. Its total omission can only be explained by supposing that it was rejected by St. Peter as utterly unfounded; a supposition which is not only improbable in itself, but

absolutely incompatible with Hug's opinion respecting St. Matthew's constant attendance upon Jesus, according to which he must have been present in the ship.

These difficulties, it must be observed, are not lessened by adding to Hug's view of St. Mark's design a supposition which has been made by others, that St. Mark meant to epitomize the work of his predecessor. For the operation implied in the word epitomize can only have consisted in omitting the Sermon on the Mount, and curtailing one or two discourses of extraordinary length. But though this may have been the effect of design, to suppose that St. Mark also rejected for the sake of brevity several short parables and narratives which would have added so little to the bulk of his work and so much to its value is a merely arbitrary conjecture, and the more improbable as he has made some trifling additions to St. Matthew's Gospel of fresh incidents and sayings not more important and interesting than those which he has omitted.

If a comparison of the contents of our two first Gospels suggests so many objections to this view of their mutual relation, the examination of their verbal discrepancies and coincidences will raise at least an equal number. Even in the parallel passages exhibited by Hug as most strongly proving the dependence of the one evangelist on the other the slightness of the variations which

disturb the harmony of expression is inexplicable, because it removes the suspicion, which might be excited by alterations more numerous and equally unimportant, that they arose from an affectation of originality. Nor can we account for these variations by supposing with Hug that St. Mark preserved throughout his work the peculiarities of his natural style, and treated the text of his predecessor with the freedom of an original author. For here we are struck by the same remark as suggested itself to us in considering Bishop Marsh's hypothesis. St. Mark might certainly have used such a freedom in the narrative parts, where a difference of expression was quite immaterial. But that he should have permitted himself to alter, without some good authority, what he found recorded by St. Matthew as the words of Christ, is a supposition quite unwarranted; and therefore all the variations between him and St. Matthew which occur in speeches of Christ must according to Hug's hypothesis be referred to St. Peter; an explanation which in several instances is so improbable, that Hug himself, as we see, does not think it possible always to resort to it.

St. Luke, in the introductory verses prefixed to his Gospel, evidently describes the motives which induced him to undertake his work, and the means by which he was enabled to accomplish it. Such being the object of his introduction, it seems nearly certain that if his Gospel had been founded

either on a document such as that imagined by Eichhorn, or on the works of St. Matthew and St. Mark, he would have made some allusion to these sources ; and accordingly the advocates of each hypothesis have drawn arguments in favour of it from this passage in St. Luke. Still all that can be collected from it with certainty is, that at the time when St. Luke wrote there were several accounts relating to the transactions which form the subject of his Gospel, that these accounts were inaccurate or imperfect, and that he believed himself able to give information which might be more safely relied on. To deduce any thing more than this from his language requires a rather subtle and elaborate argument. Hug enters into a very minute examination of these four verses, and takes great pains to prove that the words *αυτόπται καὶ ὑπῆρέται τοῦ λόγου* can be referred only to St. Matthew and St. Mark, and that the meaning of *παρέδοσαν* must be confined to a delivery by writing. His objections to taking these words in the larger sense, which is certainly the more obvious and natural are : first, that in order to interpret *παρέδοσαν* to mean an oral communication we must suppose an historical preaching of the apostles ; a supposition which he very justly rejects, and which we shall afterwards have occasion to examine more particularly ; and secondly, that if the accounts of *the many* were conformable to the tradition of the eye-witnesses, *καθὼς παρέδοσαν οἱ αυτόπται*, St. Luke

had no inducement to write, or at all events no ground for promising more certain information. But as to the first objection, there does not seem to be any necessity for restricting the tradition signified by the word *παρέδοσαν* to communications made by the apostles, and in public. For they were not the only eye-witnesses, nor public assemblies the only occasions of imparting such facts. And as to the second, all accounts not entirely fictitious of every transaction are founded more or less immediately on the reports of eye-witnesses; and it would be pressing the meaning of *καθώς* much too closely to infer, that because the relations of *the many* are said to be according to the tradition of the eye-witnesses they must therefore have been perfectly accurate. On the other hand, Hug's interpretation is exceptionable, not only because it needlessly and therefore arbitrarily narrows the sense of the words, but also on the same ground on which he himself objects to the other construction. If *the many* had only followed the example of St. Matthew and St. Mark in undertaking the task of composing a history on the same subject (for this according to Hug is the meaning of *καθώς*), and had deviated from them in the contents of their works and thus had committed errors which required correction, it is not very easy to conceive why St. Luke, instead of warning his friend against the inaccuracies of the modern accounts and referring him to the original

sources, should have thought it necessary to compile an entirely new history himself. And it seems impossible that, after alluding to the existence of two authentic documents, he should have described the object of his own work as being to communicate to Theophilus *τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*, and in a manner which evidently implies that it was not to be found elsewhere. But in fact, according to Hug's supposition, this could not have been St. Luke's object. For though it might have been possible to compile out of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark a third superior to either, yet its advantage over the other two would not have consisted in its greater historical fidelity, but in its combining the peculiar merits of both, the fulness of St. Matthew and the chronological order of St. Mark. To attain this advantage must have been the principal result St. Luke proposed to himself in the operation which Hug supposes him to have performed on the other two Gospels; and this he would certainly have expressed in a very different manner.

Hug's interpretation of the introductory verses, if admitted, would add to the difficulties we meet with when we proceed to examine the contents of St. Luke's Gospel according to his hypothesis. If St. Luke had consulted the works of St. Matthew and St. Mark without recognizing in them the hands of an *ἀυτόπτης* and a *ὑπηρέτης τοῦ λόγου*, there

would have been no inconsistency in imagining that he adhered to them only so far as they were confirmed by his own investigations, and therefore omitted some passages for which he had no other evidence. But as according to Hug's interpretation he himself ascribes to those works the highest authority, this supposition is excluded, and we are compelled to resort to some other mode of accounting for those omissions. To attribute them to the intention of abbreviating would be equally inconsistent with St. Luke's avowed and obvious design. Hug's mode of explaining them is new and singular. The longest passage contained in either of the other two Gospels and wholly wanting in St. Luke is the portion common in substance to St. Matthew and St. Mark, Matt. XIV. 22—XVI. 39, Mark VI. 45—VIII. 10. This portion in each of the evangelists follows immediately after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and concludes with the Feeding of the Four Thousand. Hence Hug conjectures that it may have been originally inserted by St. Luke in his Gospel, but that one of the early transcribers, after copying the account of the first Feeding, having been interrupted a while in his task, may have been deceived by the resemblance between the two incidents, and have resumed the narrative with the passage IX. 18, which was subjoined by St. Luke to the second Feeding. Accidents

of this kind are known frequently to have happened in the transcribing of manuscripts, and several critical conjectures have been grounded on this observation. But then the omissions occasioned by this cause have never at the utmost been supposed to extend beyond a few lines. The dropping of a passage so considerable as the portion in question, either as it stands in St. Matthew or St. Mark, would, I believe, be without a parallel in the history of literature. But Hug imagines that we may have lost by this ὁμοιοτέλευτον not only all that is contained in those two evangelists between the conclusions of the two Feedings, but also other matter which St. Luke had inserted there. This supposition might indeed be applied to explain some of the other omissions, but it renders the whole conjecture the more improbable; and there still remain several passages which raise a similar, if not an equal difficulty; so that this expedient is equivalent to little more than the confession of an insurmountable objection.

But as this is evidently the weakest side of Hug's hypothesis we need not press it any farther, and may postpone the consideration of the other difficulties which would arise on comparing St. Luke's Gospel with the other two till some more satisfactory solution of the first and most obvious difficulty shall have been proposed.

One of the most interesting and valuable contributions to this inquiry is the Essay by Dr. Gieseler, to which Schleiermacher alludes in his preface, *On the Origin and Early History of the Written Gospels*. It first appeared in a periodical work, and was afterwards published separately with considerable enlargements and additions. Gieseler conceives the only common source of our three first Gospels to have been oral tradition. This hypothesis he founds partly on the general character of the phenomena exhibited by the Gospels themselves, partly and principally on historical data, with which he thinks no other hypothesis can be completely reconciled. With respect to the former, he observes that, though great irregularity prevails in the verbal agreement and discrepancy of the three evangelists in the common sections, it is still subject to certain general laws. In the narratives, where the evangelists themselves are speaking, the most remarkable variations are found in the transitions and connecting phrases; but the more important the event, the greater is the harmony of expression. In passages where the introductory circumstances are differently related, the narratives frequently approximate to one another towards the close, and in the main point of the occurrence perfectly coincide. The verbal agreement is generally greater in reports of discourses of Christ than in relations of events; and the speeches of other persons are often given

in the same terms, though the circumstances which led to them are differently described. But in the discourses of Christ the same observation holds as in the narrative parts: that the conformity of language is proportionate to their importance and to the impression they were likely to produce on the hearers. The author has entered into the fewer details in this part of his essay, because from a review of the labours of his predecessors (of which he has given an accurate and useful summary) he has convinced himself that the internal phenomena of our three first Gospels may be satisfactorily explained, on the supposition of a written original Gospel, in a great variety of ways, and therefore that success in this respect can afford no argument in favour of one of these particular forms. The general hypothesis can only be tried by the test of historical criticism; and it is therefore the chief object of the work to shew that the hypothesis which it proposes is more consistent than any other with the spirit of primitive Christianity, with preceding and succeeding historical phenomena, and with every authentic account we have remaining respecting the origin of our three Gospels. This discussion is so interesting and instructive, that I regret I am unable to give more than an outline of it, which will not do justice to its learning and ingenuity.

The advocates of a written original Gospel have supposed, some that it was the composition of the

apostles themselves, others that it was only sanctioned by them, and designed for the use of their missionaries and converts. Gieseler has shewn, with perhaps a superfluity of argument, that the thought of committing to writing any of the scenes they had witnessed or the discourses they had heard could not naturally present itself to the apostles themselves in the ordinary course of their ministry. Literature was at the lowest ebb at that time in Palestine ; and even the second law, the sacred *δευτερώσεις*, in the possession of which the learning of the Jewish men of letters almost exclusively consisted, were transmitted by oral tradition, as they had been from the Babylonian exile. Eichhorn indeed has observed, that although these traditions were always communicated orally, yet the teachers were in the habit of drawing up written commentaries for their own use, which they seem to have communicated under an injunction of secrecy to their most intimate scholars ; and that others may have taken down what they heard from their masters, although these memorials were jealously confined to the schools of the learned till the end of the second century, when they were collected and published. Still it remains certain that it was in Palestine an illiterate age ; that even the art of writing was a rare accomplishment among the lower classes, to which most of the apostles belonged ; that they, who recollected the promise of their master, John

XIV. 26 (which however I cannot understand in the precise sense that Gieseler seems to affix to it), could not entertain any apprehension of a failure of memory ; that they could have no intention of substituting a new sacred volume for the books of the Old Testament, which on the contrary formed the text that it was one great object of their ministry to expound ; and that, however anxious they might be to establish a conformity among themselves in their preaching, it could never have occurred to them to effect it by means of a diplomatic convention upon the subjects they were to introduce, and the mode in which they were to treat them. What adequate motive then can be assigned, which could have induced the apostles, in their public capacity, to undertake a task so foreign to their character and circumstances, or even to adopt the work of another as a regular ordinary instrument for the propagation of Christianity? The advocates of the original Gospel, as we have seen, answer this question by alleging that some written document was required for the first missionaries and the churches founded by them. Here again Gieseler justly observes, that the first Christian teachers who applied themselves to the conversion of the heathen were the persons who were driven to Antioch by the persecution which followed the death of Stephen (Acts VIII. 1. XI. 19, 20.), and that the dispersion occasioned by that event among the mem-

bers of the church at Jerusalem was too sudden and violent to admit the supposition that those first founders of the church at Antioch took with them any written credentials or instructions. The *Ἐυαγγελισταί*, on the other hand, who were afterwards deliberately commissioned by the apostles, were undoubtedly chosen from the number of those who had either themselves witnessed a part of the life and sufferings of Jesus, or at all events had received a lively impression of all the circumstances of his history and character, the knowledge of which was necessary for the discharge of their office. Gieseler remarks, that the incident recorded Acts XV. 22—32 is a striking instance in which personal testimony was thought necessary to confirm the contents of a writing. And though it may certainly be said that the presence of two impartial witnesses was requisite in that particular case because the bearers of the letter were parties to the dispute which it was to decide, still this letter is a specimen of the sort of credential which the apostles, wherever they thought it necessary, might be expected to send with their missionaries, and also seems strongly to indicate that this necessity was not general, and did not even often arise. The language of the apostles in their epistles to the churches points universally at oral communication as the sole medium of public instruction ; nor is there in those of St. Paul to his two scholars and fellow-labourers the slightest

hint of any other mode by which they were trained and qualified for their ministry. On the contrary Gieseler sees in the passage 2 Tim. II. 1, 2, a full description of the manner in which religious truths were transmitted from the apostles through their immediate disciples to others, who were thus in their turn rendered fit instruments for the propagation of the Gospel. The general position indeed results so naturally from an impartial view of the subject, that it seems scarcely to receive any confirmation from the passages quoted by Gieseler from ecclesiastical writers in which they speak of the little attention paid to writing in the primitive times. There appears to be no reason for supposing that written documents of any kind entered into the general plan of the apostles for the diffusion of Christianity. Whatever was written seems to have been written on temporary occasions and for private use. The institutions by which the apostles provided for the stability of their work were quite independent of these incidental contributions, which derived all their value and importance from the station and character of their authors.

If however we reject the supposition of an immediate connexion between our three first Gospels, as well as that of their common relation to earlier historical writings, and assign them no other origin than oral tradition, it becomes necessary accurately to determine the nature of that tradi-

tion ; for those who to explain the harmony which we observe in these works refer us simply to the identity of their subject, and for the cause of their discrepancies to the peculiarities of the writers, instead of offering a solution of the problem, only betray either their inattention to the phenomena which constitute it, or their incapacity to comprehend its nature. Three accounts of the same series of transactions, delivered by independent eye-witnesses, could never, through whatever hands they might pass, naturally and without an intentional assimilation assume the shape exhibited by the common sections of the three first evangelists. After allowing full weight to the circumstances mentioned by Gieseler as tending to render the variations of their narratives, supposing them to be merely different forms of the same apostolical tradition, slighter than those we should expect in ordinary cases—the equality of the apostles in abilities and education, in situation and susceptibility for apprehending the scenes they had witnessed—the poverty of the dialect in which they reported them—the simplicity of the age, unambitious of variety in expression, and satisfied (as is the case in Homer and in the Old Testament) with relating the same things in the same words\* :

\* For specimens of this simplicity in the New Testament Gieseler refers us to Luke VII. 19. 20, XIX. 31. 34, Acts IX. 2—8, XXII. 5—11, XXVI. 12—18, Acts X. 3—6, 30—32, XI. 13. 14, X. 10—16, XI. 5—10.

after allowing, I say, the utmost possible efficacy to all these circumstances, still the correspondence of the three evangelists in matter and language in some passages, especially compared with their variation in others, is too exact to admit of being explained by any general causes. We are compelled, if we would derive our three Gospels from the reports of different narrators, to suppose that the conformity of these traditions, which so often extends to points so minute, was either artificial and conventional, or produced by a peculiar combination of circumstances. The former supposition Gieseler expressly rejects ; and indeed the very minuteness of the coincidences renders it quite incredible that they should be owing to any formal concert among the apostles ; and he mentions the characteristic feature and peculiar recommendation of his hypothesis to be, that it accounts for the perplexing phenomenon by merely pointing out its possible relation to certain known facts. The particular circumstances which he conceives to have occasioned that harmony in distinct traditions, of which we see the traces in our three Gospels, are the following :

The apostles appear to have lived together for several years after the death of Christ in the closest union at Jerusalem. They were during that time all actively employed in drawing over new converts and in preparing the most zealous and gifted of their scholars for the work of the mini-

stry. The constant theme of the public and private discourses by which they laboured to accomplish both these objects was the life, actions and speeches of Christ, which were the more deeply impressed upon their memories by his sudden and mournful end. If their deep veneration for their master led them to preserve his sayings with a scrupulous fidelity, greater even than that with which the scholars of their Rabbis retained every word that dropped from the mouths of their teachers, the events of his life were of at least equal importance in their eyes as the consummation of all the prophecies relating to the person and office of the Messiah. In the frequent repetition of the same passages from the public life of Christ they were on the one hand compelled to use a more than ordinary caution and accuracy of expression, in order to guard against the captious criticism of their adversaries who had often sought to entangle even their master himself in his speech; and on the other hand the latitude in which they might otherwise have indulged was naturally confined by their constant reference to the language of the Old Testament, on which their whole preaching was a continued comment. By these means, according to the author's view, there gradually and spontaneously arose in the church of Jerusalem an historical cyclus, not indeed so precise and determinate as to admit of no addition or variation of subject or expression, but still both in extent

and form confined within certain limits. In the passages which on account of their greater importance were most frequently dwelt upon the expression would at length become fixed; in others which were not so often repeated it would be still fluctuating, and vary in the mouths of different speakers.

To illustrate his position, that this series of narratives and discourses which formed the original oral Gospel might be transmitted from master to scholar with great uniformity and exactness, the author produces some historical parallels. He compares the apostolical instruction with the rabbinical and druidical traditions. The motive which Cæsar\* assigns to the Celtic priesthood seems likewise to have induced the greatest sages of antiquity to reject the aid of writing, and to prefer depositing their doctrines in the memories of their disciples. We are referred to the words which Socrates in the Phædrus† puts into the mouth of Thamus; to which may be added the two remarkable passages in Plutarch's Numa, c. 22, and Lycurgus, c. 13. Even the later history

\* Cæsar De B. G. VI. 14. Quod neque in vulgum disciplinam efferre velint, neque eos qui discant litteris confisos minus memoriæ studere.

† Ed. Bekker. I. p. 97. τοῦτο (τὰ γράμματα) τῶν μαθόντων λήθην ἐν ψυχαῖς παρέξει, μνήμης ἀμελετησία, ἅτε διὰ πίστιν γραφῆς ἔξωθεν ὑπ' ἀλλοτρῶν τύπων, οὐκ ἔνδον αὐτοὺς ὑφ' αὐτῶν ἀναμνησκομένους. κ. τ. λ.

of the Christian church affords particular instances of the use of tradition, which seem to Gieseler not only to illustrate his position, but from their repugnance to the general habits and literary spirit of the Christians of those times to indicate the extensive prevalence of oral instruction in the more simple apostolical age. Thus certain liturgical pieces were handed down for several centuries without being committed to writing\*; and the catechumens were strictly enjoined to refrain from the use of letters in learning and retaining the creed, and to engrave it by continual exercise on the tablets of their hearts.

The language in which the apostles usually taught during the period of their united labours at Jerusalem, and therefore that in which the oral Gospel was originally formed, was the Aramaic. But even before the foundation of the church at Antioch the apostles had frequent occasion to deliver the same narratives and discourses to the numerous strangers in Jerusalem who were only acquainted with the Greek language; and in this way was begun a Greek translation of the Aramaic cyclus, in which the operation of the same causes tended to produce the same uniformity of expression. This translation however was only completed at Antioch, where the Gospel itself underwent certain modifications, by dropping some passages and laying

\* Basil. De Spiritu Sancto, c. 27.

greater stress on others, so as to adapt it to the circumstances of the Gentile converts; and thus arose a distinction between what Gieseler calls the Gospel of the Circumcision and the Gospel of the Uncircumcision, the two stocks from which were derived not only our three first Gospels, but also the whole series of apocryphal Gospels, of which in other respects Gieseler takes nearly the same view as Eichhorn. In the meanwhile the apostles at Jerusalem, previous to their separation and departure for the purpose of propagating Christianity in foreign lands, exercised themselves in rendering the original cyclus into Greek, the language in which it was probable they would have most frequent occasion to deliver it, and with which their acquaintance was so imperfect that they must have stood in need of mutual assistance. They were by this means enabled to deliver even in Greek one and the same Gospel with scarcely greater variations than are presented by different copies of the same manuscript.

If our three Gospels are supposed to be so many different modifications of this *κείμενον* committed to writing, the most authentic historical accounts of their origin may be adopted in their fullest and most natural sense; and these in their turn explain and are confirmed by several peculiarities in the internal character of the Gospels themselves. According to the most authentic tradition St. Mat-

thew composed his Gospel for the Christians of Palestine, when he was on the point of taking his leave of them. St. Mark and St. Luke, the scholars of St. Peter and St. Paul, wrote theirs from the preaching of their respective masters, both out of Palestine. To the difference of situation and circumstances in the readers for which they were designed Gieseler attributes the relation which the Gospel of St. Peter recorded by St. Mark bears in its contents to that of St. Matthew, with which in Palestine it might have been expected exactly to coincide. St. Mark, writing for the church of Rome, omits a number of passages which derived almost all their meaning and importance from their application to the Jews of Palestine. St. Luke's Gospel contains numerous indications of that enlarged view of Christianity which gave to the Gospel, as preached by St. Paul, a form and an extent very different from the original tradition of the apostles of the Jews. St. John's Gospel was designed to satisfy the scruples, or refute the errors, of the philosophical adversaries and professors of Christianity; it presupposed the original, simple and generally intelligible cyclus, and formed a supplement to it; but as this was itself not precisely determined, so the supplement included some of its pieces. The variations which it exhibits in the common passages are to be accounted for by supposing, that these passages were not of very fre-

quent occurrence in the public ministry of the church at Ephesus, and hence had already undergone some modification there.

These general observations the author confirms by several interesting details, into which it would be impossible to accompany him without extending this notice to a disproportionate length. I feel it the less necessary to do so, because, although a comparison of the contents of our three first Gospels would certainly suggest many objections to this mode of deducing them from the oral original, these are not the chief obstacles which prevent me from admitting the theory here proposed. I find an infinitely greater difficulty in conceiving the formation of the original Gospel itself, according to Gieseler's view of it, than its translation, transmission and subsequent modifications and corruptions. Though I do not question the importance attached, more especially in the church of Jerusalem, to the public life of Jesus, as the fulfilment of the national prophecies, I am not the more inclined to suppose that the discourses of the apostles frequently assumed the shape of a direct narrative or recital. For if I would endeavour to form a distinct conception of their life and labours during the period of their joint abode at Jerusalem, according to the memoirs we have left of it, I must imagine their time and attention divided between three different circles. Either they spoke in places of public resort, where unconverted Jews com-

posed the principal part of their audience or at least that to which they exclusively addressed themselves, or in private meetings of the believers, in which, if there was no greater number of gradations, there was at least a distinction between the general assemblies of the converts and a select society to which the apostles admitted only their most familiar disciples, whom they were preparing to become their assistants and representatives. In their addresses to the unbelieving Jews, their ordinary topic was undoubtedly the accomplishment of the prophecies relating to the Messiah in the person and life of Jesus. But the character of these discourses must have been polemical, or at least argumentative. The great difficulty lay in surmounting the prejudices of their hearers, in opening their eyes to the substance of figures and types which had impressed them with erroneous notions of the character and office of the expected national deliverer, and so enabling them to apply the language of the prophets to things and events to which it did not always at first sight appear to correspond. The leading features of the history of Jesus, and particularly the concluding scenes of his life, were matter of public notoriety, and did not require to be directly related, still less to be circumstantially described, on these occasions, but could only be slightly alluded to, as in the speech of Peter, Acts III. 12—26, which may be considered a specimen of the mode in which the

apostles generally treated the subject. And even if they had frequently entered into details before this class of hearers, the narrative could never have been extricated from the controversial elements so as to compose a direct history ; still less could the variety of forms and expressions arising from the multiplicity of occasions on which these discourses were delivered by different persons be reduced to a single common formula. On the other hand in the larger assemblies of the church, where the general truth that Jesus is the Christ was admitted, the object of the apostles would be to build on this foundation, and to instruct the new converts in the relation which the religion of Jesus bore to the old law, and to explain to them the nature of his kingdom and the characteristics of his genuine followers. In the variety of topics comprised under these heads they might undoubtedly have frequent occasion to draw illustration and confirmation of their doctrines from the actions, and still more from the discourses of their master. But here not only was there wanting that unity of design which in discourses tending to the single point of proving Jesus to be the Messiah might be supposed to produce a conformity of thought and expression even among different speakers, but there would be still greater difficulty in separating the text from the comment, and still less probability that the wish to do so should occur to any of the hearers ; for the nar-

ratives and recitals would be commonly subordinate and incidental to the general argument, and derive from it their chief weight and meaning. Hence I cannot conceive that our Gospels represent in a literal sense the public preaching of the apostles. In their private intercourse with one another and their most confidential scholars, the scenes they had witnessed and the speeches they had heard, as they undoubtedly formed their most delightful recollections, might also be frequently the theme of conversation; and on these occasions they might sometimes be led to gratify the curiosity of their friends by anecdotes of which they had heard perhaps but a confused report, and wished to learn the exact details. And that to these communications we are indebted for some passages of our Gospels is not improbable; though when we consider how fully the time of the apostles was occupied with superintending the spiritual and temporal concerns of a large and rapidly increasing community; we shall not be disposed to expect many such instances, and still less to assign this as the origin of a collection embracing the whole public life of Jesus.

Gieseler has added to his original essay a second part, in which he investigates the history of the written Gospels down to the epoch of their collection and general reception in the Catholic church. This whole discussion is extremely luminous and interesting, but I think it establishes

no more than the negative part of the author's position, and that all the results to which it leads may be admitted without embracing his opinion respecting the precise nature of the apostolical tradition, on which the present question turns. The conclusion at which he arrives is, that in the primitive church, for upwards of 100 years after the death of Christ, no writings had acquired a canonical rank, or were considered as holy writ, or served any other purpose than that of private edification. The faith of the orthodox Christians rested solely on the testimony and personal authority of their teachers, the representatives and successors of the apostles. But when the Heresiarchs began to make use of books, which contained only mutilated and corrupted records of the primitive tradition adapted to their peculiar views, and which served both to unite and distinguish their followers and to attract others into their societies, the Catholic church, forced by their efforts into a closer and more public union, found it expedient to adopt the most authentic works of the apostolic age as a rule and a badge for her members; and thus our canonical Gospels, about the middle of the second century, were introduced into general and public use, and thenceforth became the objects of constantly increasing veneration. The opinion that our present Gospels were not viewed by the primitive church as holy writ, and as equal in authority and importance to

the Old Testament, is founded partly on traditions preserved by later writers, which, as they tended to lower the dignity of the canonical books, must have originated in an earlier age\*, but principally on some passages in the works of the apostolical fathers, and their general mode of referring to the speeches of Christ. The force of the author's argument will not be much weakened by the doubts which have been cast on the authenticity of these works; as their age, at all events, cannot be much later than that commonly assigned to them. But in some passages, where he very justly rejects the received opinion that *εὐαγγέλιον* signifies a written Gospel, he has himself, as Schleiermacher has observed, taken it in too limited a sense, that of a definite oral tradition of the public life of Christ. Nor does his hypothesis appear necessary in order to understand those passages of Ignatius in which the writer, in warning those whom he is addressing against the heresies of his time, instead of appeal-

\* See, by way of specimen, two passages quoted by Gieseler, Euseb. H. E. III. 24. *τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὴν γνώσιν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν κατήγγελλον τὴν οἰκουμένην σπουδῆς τῆς περὶ τὸ λογογραφεῖν μικρὰν ποιοῦμενοι φροντίδα.* And *Eclogæ ex script. Prophet.* c. 27. at the end of Clem. Alex. ed. Potter. T. II. p. 996. *Ὅτι οὐκ ἔγραψον δὲ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, μήτε ἀπασχολεῖν βουλούμενοι τὴν διδασκαλικὴν τῆς παραδόσεως φροντίδα τῇ περὶ τὸ γράφειν ἄλλῃ φροντίδι, μηδὲ μὴν τὸν τοῦ προσκέπτεσθαι τὰ λεχθησόμενα καιρὸν καταναλίσκοντες εἰς γραφὴν, τάχα δὲ οὐδὲ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως κατόρθωμα τὸ συντακτικὸν καὶ διδασκαλικὸν εἶδος εἶναι πεπεισμένοι τοῖς εἰς τοῦτο πεφυκόσι συνεχῶρον.*

ing to any records of the life of Jesus, sometimes refers them to his own testimony and sufferings for the cause of the true faith (ad Smyrn. 4. ad Trall. 10), and at other times to their bishop, who is represented as the rallying point round which he exhorts them to unite. For although these recommendations of subordination to the bishop and union with him, so frequent in the epistles of Ignatius, may not afford sufficient ground for questioning the age of those epistles and considering them as fabrications designed to support later pretensions of the Catholic hierarchy (though certainly the difference of language between St. Paul and Ignatius on this subject is very striking), still there is nothing in these appeals to the testimony and authority of the pastors of the church inconsistent even with the supposition that the canonical rank of our Gospels was at that time already established. Even Tertullian, after the four Gospels were universally received in the Catholic church, thought it safer to decline appealing to them in any disputed question of doctrine, and considered the apostolical tradition as the only sure foundation of Christian faith. And it is not only in controversy with heretics themselves that he urges this superiority of tradition over scripture; he even dissuades his believing brother (*frater*) from entering into any scriptural researches, and advises him to content himself with the *regula fidei*, the essence of all Christian

knowledge, *adversus quam nihil scire omnia scire est* (De Præscript. Heret. c. 14.) *Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit*, he says, quoting scripture itself to confirm his argument (Luke XVIII. 42.) *Non exercitatio scripturarum*. The same maxims continued to prevail, both in the eastern and western churches, till the Reformation; as they do, with the exception of the Protestant confessions, at the present day. The *regula fidei*, which both in its origin and its subsequent enlargements and modifications was independent of scripture, always constituted the principal and only essential part of the catechumen's religious education. The study of the scriptures was indeed, in the better ages of the church, recommended as edifying and instructive, but was never considered as necessary to ground the faith of a Christian, which rested on a distinct foundation, nor even as an indispensable requisite of a religious life. Not only among barbarous nations (as in the instances alluded to by Ireneus in the passage last referred to) and in illiterate ages, but at Antioch itself, in the most flourishing period of Christian literature before the Reformation, in short at the scene and time of the labours of Chrysostom, it was thought by no means inconsistent with a reputation for extraordinary sanctity that the person so distinguished was τῶν ἁγίων λογίων πάνπαν ἄπειρος (Theodorit. Hist. Eccl. V. 20.) Now we should not indeed expect that the real Ignatius, even if our Gospels when

he wrote had obtained canonical rank, would entertain the same apprehension of danger from the use of them in repelling innovations in doctrine which Tertullian's experience suggested to him. But, on the other hand, as the doctrinal tradition was in the time of Ignatius more fresh, and more vividly impressed on the minds of those whom he addressed, we cannot be surprized that whatever degree of circulation and authority the sacred writings had then acquired, he should have preferred appealing to the former, and to the teachers of the church, its guardians and expounders\*.

\* As what is here said may be misunderstood, and applied to the dispute between Roman Catholics and Protestants on the relative authority of scripture and tradition, a question on which in fact it does not bear, I think it proper to say a few words to guard against such a misconstruction, which I should regret the more as that dispute has been revived of late with extraordinary vehemence, and has even been taken up by a class of persons certainly the least competent, as well as the least inclined, to do it justice—political journalists. The passages above quoted from Tertullian seem to me to warrant the inference I have drawn from them, which is confirmed by the whole tenor of the treatise (*De Prescr. Hæret.*), and by other parts of Tertullian's writings, particularly *Lib. IV. Adv. Marc. c. 2. 3.* But these expressions cannot be used as arguments on the Roman Catholic side of that disputed question, without confounding different ideas and distinct epochs of ecclesiastical history. It was indeed necessary for an orthodox polemic in Tertullian's time, if he did not choose to entangle himself in an intricate, perhaps interminable, dispute with the heretics whom he opposed respecting the ge-

Gieseler also conceives that his theory is confirmed by the evangelical citations of the aposto-

nuineness of the scriptures adopted by them (for it might not always be so easy as in Marcion's case to refute them out of their own books), to appeal to an authority paramount to all scripture—the testimony of the apostolical churches, which had preserved at once the canonical scriptures and the unwritten *regula fidei*. This argument, which was undoubtedly felt more strongly at the end of the second century than it is now, is however perfectly consistent with Protestant principles; for there is a wide difference between the assertion that all the articles of the Protestant faith are contained in Scripture, and the assertion that they were originally deduced from it. But the tradition which is the subject of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants is something very different from the *traditio apostolorum* spoken of by Tertullian (De P. H. c. 21.); and the doctrine relating to it is of much later growth. Its progress through its several stages is admirably traced in a paper of Professor Marheinecke, to which I would refer every reader of German, in the *Studien*, a periodical work edited by Daub and Creuzer, Vol. III. pp. 96—200. It is indeed a favourite argument with Roman Catholics, and one which of late we have been forced to hear very often repeated: *The same church which has preserved the scriptures adopted by you Protestants as the sole rule of faith has also preserved the tradition which you arbitrarily reject.* But this is a sophism which assumes the point on which the whole controversy turns, namely, the identity of the primitive with the Roman Catholic church, in the very sense in which the Protestant must and does deny that identity. I must also observe, that in stating what I conceive to be an incontestable fact, that the maxims of the Protestant church with respect to the use of the scriptures are as different from those which prevailed in all ages, from the time of Tertullian down to the Reformation, as from those which now prevail in the Roman Catholic church, I would not be supposed to aim an indirect charge against the Protestant church,

lical fathers. These citations, with two exceptions, contain no reference to any author or writing. The form in which they are introduced is ὁ Κύριος λέγει, ὁ Χριστὸς λέγει, or something similar. The two passages which refer to a written authority, as one of them occurs in the second Epistle of Clemens which is generally admitted to be spurious, and the other in the beginning of the Epistle of Barnabus the original of which is lost, Gieseler thinks may be laid out of the question. But even when this is granted, the general form of citation is the same which we meet with so frequently in Justin, where he is undoubtedly quoting from books; and therefore these passages afford in this respect no ground for the presumption that they were derived from tradition. It will still remain a question whether the authors quoted from written Gospels, and if so, whether these were ours or apocryphal. In favour of the latter

and still less to intend it a compliment at the expense of all Christian antiquity. Both churches are consistent in the course which they pursue. The Roman church, conscious only of its unbroken unity, cannot attach any peculiar importance to those records which exhibit the life and doctrines of the primitive church, with which it conceives itself to be one and the same. The Protestant church, which arose out of a reflexion on the alterations that the primitive church had undergone and the desire of restoring its ancient purity, naturally and wisely keeps constantly in the view of its members the image of original Christianity contained in the sacred writings.

supposition are alleged the frequent variations from the language of the canonical Gospels, which however do not seem to surpass the latitude of quotation commonly indulged in by the early fathers, and the fact that one quotation of Ignatius was actually found by Jerom in the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and that one in the second letter of Clemens Romanus is reported by Clem. Alex. to have been contained in the Egyptian Gospel. On the other hand, Gieseler objects the improbability that the orthodox teachers, if they had recourse to written documents at all, should have made use of any other than the genuine relics of the apostolical school, and have sanctioned by their authority works which are known to have been of so very different and inferior a character. Eichhorn's answer to this objection of course would be, that before the end of the second century the difference between the contents of the canonical and apocryphal Gospels was not so great, nor so much to the disadvantage of the latter, as it afterwards became. A second objection is, that the apostolical fathers, in addressing different communities which according to Eichhorn's view used each a different Gospel, would not so confidently have appealed to passages which the persons they addressed might not be able to find in their books. But this objection not only assumes what in any argument on this

subject had much better be left undecided, the authenticity of the pieces attributed to the apostolical fathers—for an imitator need not be supposed so scrupulous—but implies what I think equally doubtful, that they would not have considered their authority a sufficient guarantee, to those whom they were instructing and admonishing, for the genuineness of the passages they quoted, or at least for their conformity to the spirit of Christianity. The third objection is, that if the apocryphal Gospels had been so generally circulated as the use supposed to be made of them by the apostolical fathers would imply, the canonical Gospels could not have been substituted for them throughout the orthodox churches without a resistance of which we find no mention or trace in ecclesiastical history, though in one instance recorded by Eusebius, VI. 12, disturbances were occasioned by such a measure. This argument however seems only to apply to the supposition that the apocryphal Gospels had acquired, in the communities which adopted them, a sanctity and authority similar to that which the canonical Gospels afterwards possessed; but this Eichhorn's opinion certainly does not imply. Still, though these arguments of Gieseler are not convincing, the alleged traces of a reference to apocryphal writings in those works which make any plausible claim to the authority of the apostolical fathers

are at least equally unsatisfactory \*. It must also be observed, that although the acknowledged antiquity of the greater part of these works is sufficient for the purpose of Gieseler's general argument, supposing it to be warranted by their contents, without assuming their authenticity, this authenticity is essential to the use which Eichhorn makes of these supposed quotations from apocryphal writings. For that a private Christian, who allowed himself the pious fraud of recommending his own compositions to general notice by an honoured name, should have happened to possess, and have made use of, one of the Gospels afterwards declared apocryphal, may prove that the distinction between canonical and apocryphal scriptures was not then established; but it evidently proves nothing as to the circulation of these apocryphal works, and above all cannot justify Eichhorn's conclusion (p. 153), that before our Gospels others quite different were in circulation, and were used by the teachers of the Christian church. It seems useless therefore to dwell longer on this subject, where the ground on which we rest is continually threatening to sink from

\* The *δαίμόνιον ἀσώματον* in the passage of Ignatius might have been a gloss of his own, designed to point the passage more directly against the Docetic doctrine; nor does it seem so violently improbable as Eichhorn would make it appear (p. 148), that it was afterwards transferred to the Gospel of the Hebrews.

under us. But if it were absolutely necessary to explain what is peculiar in the character of these quotations on the supposition that the works are genuine, we might adopt the opinion of an historical tradition, though not in Gieseler's sense, and without excluding the concurrent use, or even denying the superior authority of the written Gospels. That such a tradition, varying in different churches, may have existed till near the end of the second century, and may have preserved some sayings of Christ, and even some particulars of his life which are either not contained at all in our Gospels, or appear there in a different form, is in itself highly probable. Nor is there any difficulty in supposing that some of the more striking of these fragments might be used by a Christian teacher, even in addressing a distant church, before the canonical rank of our Gospels was established, when the tradition itself would of course naturally die away.

The hypothesis of an oral Gospel had already, when Gieseler wrote, been adopted by Paulus, and is again proposed, in the work to which we have more than once had occasion to refer, as one result of his inquiries \*. He however makes use of the hypothesis only to explain the relation between the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and in other respects differs considerably from Gieseler in

\* Conservatorium, p. 165.

the application of it. His interpretation of the introductory verses in St. Luke's Gospel is singular, and I believe peculiar to himself. He is of opinion that *διήγησις* there means an oral narrative, and that the many who undertook to set in order this oral narrative or Gospel were the *Ἐυαγγελισταί*, whose office he conceives to have consisted in delivering the history of Christ's life and actions. He conjectures that this *διήγησις*, though oral, bore the title expressed in the following words, *διήγησις περὶ τῶν—λόγου\**, and that the setting in order, *ἀνατάξασθαι*, is opposed to the writing, *γράψαι*, which constituted the novelty of St. Luke's undertaking. This oral Gospel however, according to Paulus, was not drawn exclusively from tradition, but in part also from written narratives of particular incidents, or of some short but remarkable periods, and from reports of discourses which had been committed to writing soon after the delivery. On the other hand, both St. Matthew and St. Luke made use not only of the tradition which had been fixed and reduced into form by the *Ἐυαγγελισταί*, but also of other information, and of some frag-

\* This conjecture, when applied as it is by Lessing and Bishop Marsh to a written document, appears, even if we should overlook the want of the article, sufficiently strange; for surely titles of such length were not usual in those days; but that the same title should be ascribed to an oral narrative, and therefore supposed to have become current in conversation, is still more extraordinary.

mentary written documents. To explain the relation of St. Mark's Gospel to the other two, Paulus adopts Griesbach's hypothesis, and supposes him to have made a selection from them, which he was enabled occasionally to enlarge and correct from the communications of St. Peter. As these results are only briefly stated, and not confirmed by any new details, and as the component parts of this hypothesis have been already discussed, sufficiently at least for our present purpose, we need not take any farther notice of this new combination of them\*.

\* There is in some points a resemblance between this theory of Paulus and that proposed by Sartorius, in a little work entitled *Drey Abhandlungen über wichtige Gegenstände der exegetischen und Systematischen Theologie*, 1820. Sartorius's conception of the mode in which our three first Gospels originated is briefly as follows: The first written records of actions and sayings of Christ were composed by one of the apostles, with the assistance or approbation of the rest, and thus acquired the weight of their united authority. The immediate occasion of undertaking this work was the publication of the Gospel at Antioch by unauthorized preachers, for whom some higher sanction appeared necessary. The design of the apostles was not to produce a connected memoir of Christ's life, but only to record in a solemn and durable manner so much of it as was necessary to confirm or illustrate the doctrines they delivered, and so to form a body of evidence to which they and their missionaries might safely refer in their preaching as the joint testimony of all the apostles. In the selection and combination of these narratives they were governed entirely by moral or dogmatical views, and neglected, as foreign to their purpose, both chronological order

Another work of Paulus deserves to be mentioned as an important contribution to this inquiry, though not exclusively directed to that object. This is his Commentary on the New Testament\*, which at present embraces only the

and historical connexion; though it might happen that a few incidents were related in the order in which they really occurred, on account of some moral or dogmatical point to which they all tended. In consequence of this composition there arose a new class of ministers in the church, the *ἐυαγγελιστάι*, whose office it was to commit to memory the contents of these written documents, and to deliver them as occasion required. The apostles, after their separation, were attended on their journeys each by his evangelist, who confirmed the doctrine which the apostle preached by an appropriate recital derived from those documents. Thus St. Luke accompanied St. Paul as his evangelist, and St. Mark was at different times the evangelist of St. Peter and St. Paul. The evangelists arranged the contents of their documents in the order which appeared to each most convenient for delivery (*ἀνετάξαντο διήγησιν*); they also occasionally inserted supplemental facts communicated by the apostles whom they attended; and each clothed his narrative in his own peculiar form of expression. St. Mark and St. Luke were at length induced to commit to writing the contents of their documents thus arranged and enlarged. St. Luke added some matter drawn from subsidiary documents. Who was St. Matthew's evangelist, or what relation his Gospel bears to the recitals of his companion, cannot now be ascertained. But in the composition of his Gospel he was guided entirely by dogmatical views, to which he made chronological order subservient. The reader will probably be satisfied for the present with this outline, and will not think that the part of this theory which is peculiar to Sartorius needs the addition of a comment.

\* *Philologisch-kritischer und Historischer Commentar über das Neue Testament.*

three first Gospels and a part of the fourth. In those parts of the evangelical history which are common to two or more of the three first evangelists the author exhibits a synopsis of their respective texts ; and he arranges all the parts in the chronological order which the internal data lead him to assign to them. To each section or synopsis is prefixed a view of its contents, in which he examines very minutely the historical connexion and the real nature of the facts related ; and *scholia* are subjoined to the text, containing a discussion of the philological and critical grounds on which the previous conclusions are founded. The nature of this plan necessarily brings our question respecting the sources of the first three Gospels repeatedly under discussion ; and no one who studies this subject can fail to derive many valuable hints from the learned and ingenious author. It is on this account that this commentary is referred or alluded to in the course of the following essay more frequently than any other work. And as these allusions presuppose a knowledge of the work, a few notes will be annexed, merely to render them intelligible to the English reader. Those who are able to consult Paulus's Commentary will also find it a very useful manual, containing a great mass of information, which for ordinary purposes supersedes the necessity of referring to other books. It is only to be regretted, that the author should have exerted so much ingenuity in the

abortive attempt to resolve the miraculous occurrences related in the Gospels into natural phenomena. It is true that his representation of those occurrences is consistent with the highest purity and dignity in the character of Christ, and therefore from the dogmatical point of view is in itself unobjectionable. But when it is compared with the language of the evangelists, it inevitably raises a suspicion either of a violent distortion of the facts in their accounts of them, or of some unworthy compliances, if not direct artifice, on the part of Christ. On the other hand, in an historical point of view, little or nothing seems to be gained by these explanations. For even if it should be admitted that the causes assigned by Paulus were capable of producing the effects ascribed to them, still they are merely matter of conjecture; and therefore, though they may be more comprehensible than a supernatural cause, have at least no greater historical certainty. Moreover though there may be some seemingly well attested instances of psychological phenomena similar to those imagined by Paulus, yet they are at all events extremely rare and extraordinary; and therefore to suppose a recurrence of such phenomena within a short period so frequent as is necessary for the author's purpose is in fact to suppose a temporary change in the course of nature, or at least does not bring the narrative within the sphere of ordinary history. Instead of satisfying

us, it only removes our wonder from one mystery to another. The experiment however, though it has failed on the whole, may perhaps be admitted to have thrown a valuable light on some obscure and perplexing passages, and every where deserves the attention of those who can detect an useful suggestion in the midst of a great number of fanciful conjectures.

I cannot speak with the same respect of the author's acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Greek language, as of his other critical accomplishments. He sometimes supports his interpretation by a construction so harsh and singular, that any one not acquainted with his philosophical candour might suppose him to be biassed by his theory, if it were not that similar mistakes occur in a number of instances where they are obviously quite disinterested.

It only remains to add a few words on the subject of the work to which the reader is here introduced. The volume now translated, though complete and independent in itself, belongs to a larger work, and is described in the original title-page as the first part of an *Essay on the Writings of St. Luke* \*. The remainder however has not yet appeared; and to prevent mistakes, or expectations which might never be gra-

\* *Ueber die Schriften des Lukas ein Kritischer Versuch. Erster Theil.*

tified, the title has been changed, so as to indicate nothing more than has been already performed.

The hypothesis proposed by the author in his introduction, that before the composition of our canonical Gospels detached passages in the life of Christ had been committed to writing, is by no means new. It seems first to have occurred to Le Clerc, and was adopted by Michaelis and other critics, and lately, as we have seen, by Paulus. Indeed it is so obvious and almost necessary a supposition, that it seems impossible to frame any hypothesis, except that of an oral Gospel, which can altogether dispense with it. Even they who suppose some of the evangelists to have copied from others, or to have made use of an original Gospel, are still compelled to resort to the former supposition for some auxiliary documents. Without these they would at least be at a loss to account for the origin of several of the parallel passages in St. Matthew and St. Luke, as, their two first chapters, their accounts of John the Baptist and of the Sermon on the Mount, and the part called the gnomology in St. Luke. Accordingly some of these passages have been supposed by most critics to have been drawn from such sources; so that the general hypothesis is almost universally admitted. But the farther questions, whether this hypothesis is alone sufficient to explain the phenomena of the Gospels, and if so in what manner it is to be applied, still

remain to be decided, and have not yet undergone much discussion. Mr. Veysie, in the work above mentioned (chapters vii. and viii.), contends for the sufficiency of this hypothesis; but he differs from Schleiermacher, both in his general view of it (for he supposes all the narratives which compose our Gospels to have been derived immediately from the apostles) and in his application of it; nor has he entered into the details which are absolutely necessary to account for the separate existence of the documents he supposes. The statement of the hypothesis given by our author is entirely peculiar to him, as well as his mode of applying it to St. Luke's Gospel.

It would however be doing great injustice to this Essay to consider it as an argument in support of an hypothesis. It is a critical inquiry, which, if it has no other merit, has at least that of perfect freedom and impartiality. That the result corresponds with the notions which we should independently have been led to form by the circumstances of the case, is only an indispensable condition, the fulfilment of which it was necessary to point out. Indeed the value and importance of the present work, with respect to the controversy we have been reviewing, does not consist in its offering a complete solution of all the difficulties which are the subject of the controversy, but in its proposing and pursuing up to a certain point a new method for arriving

at that end. This Essay may be considered not merely as the first part of a critical treatise on St. Luke's writings, but as the first step towards an analysis of our first three Gospels. Such an analysis, when completed, would not indeed itself decide the controversy; but it would be the most valuable contribution which has yet been made towards that object. Whether the author's occupations will ever allow him to continue the work he has begun, in either direction, is uncertain. That any one else should be found to prosecute it in the same spirit and with the same success, is rather to be wished than to be hoped. It has been the fate of this extraordinary writer to open a new path in every field of literature he has entered, and to tread all alone. Still the translator is not without hopes that the example here proposed may give an impulse and a direction to many whose profession or inclination leads them to cultivate this department of literature; and this was one of the motives which induced him to communicate this work to the English public.

But the value of this work does not entirely depend on its relation to the question we have been discussing. Considered merely with respect to the Gospel of which it treats, it deserves to be studied as a specimen of exegetical criticism which has seldom been equalled, and which cannot fail to excite the admiration even of those who do not admit all its conclusions. That these should

all produce an equal degree of conviction, and in all minds alike, was not to be expected. The reader will rather be surprised to find, that by the regular application of strictly critical principles so much light has been thrown upon a subject so perplexed and obscure.

Though the author's intention was not to write a commentary on St. Luke's Gospel, but simply to investigate its origin, and though he has never deviated into any topic foreign to his purpose, the inquiry itself necessarily involves the examination of several very important points relating to the contents of the Gospel. The discussions thus occasioned may, to some readers, appear more interesting than the investigation out of which they grow. As they are perfectly original and independent, they naturally lead in several instances to new results differing very widely from the opinions commonly received. When this is the case, the reader is requested merely to suspend his judgement till he has compared the view here presented with that to which he has been accustomed. Such a comparison will probably in general prove favourable to the former. But the end of the author's labours will have been equally attained, if his opinions shall only be rejected in the same spirit of impartial criticism in which he has himself adopted and endeavoured to establish them. To diffuse this spirit more extensively among ourselves in the study of the sacred

writings, where it has hitherto been either wholly wanting or confined to very subordinate points, was also the translator's principal object; and it is in this point of view, more than in any other, that he hopes this volume may prove an useful contribution to our biblical literature.

## PREFACE

BY

THE AUTHOR.

---

---

IN calling this work an Essay, I do not wish to be understood as if I were myself uncertain with respect to the accuracy of the premises on which the whole is built, or the propriety of the method which I have pursued. On the contrary, I certainly feel as to both that firm conviction which every one who publicly professes his opinions, if he would not act unconscientiously, ought to feel. As to the application in the detail, I have taken all means of enabling the reader to distinguish where I consider it more and where less sure and well-grounded; and this is likewise indispensable for one who seeks the truth, and, far from endeavouring to persuade, only desires that others who are conversant with the subject should seek it with him. But as the mind has a difficulty in disengaging itself from its habitual conceptions, and many men of re-

putation who make a serious study of these things have frequently none but habitual conceptions, their own or borrowed, I am far from expecting very general and still less require universal assent. On the contrary I shall be satisfied if the unprejudiced critical spirits among theologians who suffer none of their conceptions to become habitual, but reproduce every general view afresh in every particular case, and who therefore have not lost their feeling of the difficulties which cling to all the theories hitherto known—if these assign a place to the mode of explanation here proposed, or rather only more fully developed—for I do not certainly mean to represent it as new in all its elements—by the side of the other hypotheses, in order by degrees to put it farther to the test; in which case, by continued application, the truth will gradually disclose itself. But what I would wish above all to deprecate is the drawing farther inferences from what is here stated as to other points. I mean chiefly as to my view of the books of Matthew and Mark, of which view one side only of course can be shown in this inquiry, where those two evangelists are only partially compared with Luke; and this side I would request the reader before-hand not to take for the whole, which, if circumstances permit, I shall communicate after the completion of the present work. But my reason for calling this only an Essay is the inartificial connexion

of the parts, and the negligence in the diction. Both circumstances belong to the mode in which the work originated, and I had only the choice of publishing it in this state, or of deferring its execution to a very indefinite time; its transformation therefore into a more perfect and agreeable shape may be reserved for a second hand. Nor can I promise any thing better in this respect for the second part, which will discuss in like manner the Acts of the Apostles. Another inconvenience however, namely, that no one can read this little book without a Luke lying open by its side, and without making himself master of the section under discussion—this inconvenience is one which I could in no wise spare the reader. And I am the better pleased that it was out of my power to do so, as this is the best mode of keeping off improper readers, who, unacquainted with the original language and theological matters in general, still think that it concerns their piety to go hunting in works of this nature, to try if they can catch some scent of heresy in them. For this class of persons begins, particularly too with us, to multiply exceedingly, among high and low, learned and unlearned, and, without profit to others or themselves, to create a great deal of scandal, and perplex their neighbours' consciences. To bar their intrusion is indeed impossible; but it is at all events wholesome thoroughly to force upon them the con-

sciousness, that they do not understand what they are talking of; for they then bear their punishment with them in their conscience, and thus undergo that justice which I, for my part, would not wish to exercise upon them in any other manner. But as theologians themselves are beginning to bring into discredit the critical discussion of the sacred books, as if it were detrimental to the divine authority of Scripture, and as there are many who still do not understand the plain truth which ought in these subjects to supersede every other consideration, namely, that the most pure, simple faith, and the keenest investigation are one and the same thing, inasmuch as no one who wishes to believe what is of divine origin can wish to believe illusions, whether old or new, whether of others or his own—this being the case, I cannot forbear saying a few words on this subject, for the sake of minds already prepossessed, not of course as to the general question, but with reference only to the writer here examined.

If the agency of the Holy Spirit in the composition of the Scriptures is held to be of a specific kind, distinct from its working in the universal church and from its general agency in the disciples of Christ, there is always peculiar embarrassment in determining, on the one hand, in what it consisted in the case of the historical writings, and on the other hand, to what persons

it ought to be confined. By the view here proposed this operation is divided ; and that is the only difference, in this respect, between it and the common view. There is, first, the agency of the Divine Spirit in those who were witnesses of the events, and heard and reported the speeches of Christ ; by this they were enabled to apprehend every thing from the right point of view, and to report it in such a manner as to render the truth of the matter obvious, on the application of that degree of attention which whatsoever is ascribed in a higher sense to the Divine Spirit more especially demands. And of this agency I have taken pains to search the traces, and to point them out more carefully than is commonly done. In the second place, there is the agency of the Spirit in the person who collected and digested. For, in ascribing the result to human investigation and selection, I do not mean a technically critical process, which was foreign to those times and men, or that the governing principle could be any other than the spirit of Christianity recognizing its own work. Now if the compiler of our Gospel was one of whom it may seem doubtful whether, as he does not belong to the number of the Twelve, an extraordinary influence of the Spirit can with propriety be attributed to him, it is at all events safer that he should appear as the compiler and arranger only, not as the author, and that we

should have to look for the first and largest portion of the extraordinary agency not in him, but only in those who stood in immediate connexion with the Redeemer, who therefore received from him continual emanations of the divine Spirit, (and that at a time too early to distinguish between its ordinary and extraordinary operations) and to whom the promise was given, that the Spirit should *shew them that which was of Christ, and should guide them into all truth*, (John xvi. 13, 14.) And thus the authority of our writer appears to me at least to gain, instead of losing, when his work is referred to earlier works of original and inspired witnesses of the facts.

It was only after this essay was nearly finished, that a judicious and interesting treatise\* on a similar subject fell in my way. It coincides with me in many of the premises; on one of the points where we begin to differ I have towards the end incidentally delivered my opinion. Another is, that the author ascribes at too early a period to the word *εὐαγγέλιον* the sense of a digested collection of accounts selected from the life of Jesus; a confusion for which indeed the elder ecclesiastical writers themselves afford frequent occasion. But in this sense Paul could never speak of his Gospel; nor can I admit, in

\* Gieseler *Ueber die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der Schriftlichen Evangelien.*

this sense, any distinction between a Gospel of the circumcision and one of the uncircumcision. What farther follows from this, and in what relation in other respects his view stands to my own, I leave to the attentive reader to discover for himself.



# INTRODUCTION

BY

THE AUTHOR.

---

AMONG the many views hitherto presented of the relation which our three harmonizing Gospels bear to one another, that which represents each succeeding evangelist as having made use of the preceding, and that according to which all three drew independently of each other from a common source, have been maintained of late years, the former by Hug, the latter by its author Eichhorn, with the greatest display of industry and accuracy. These two learned and ingenious men combat each other with great mutual success. Many objections may certainly be made to Eichhorn's refutation of the hypothesis, that one evangelist made use of the other. But, even after rejecting what proves too much, or supposes too much that cannot be proved (and

this is the case with a great many arguments which Eichhorn carries too far into detail), it is still sufficiently evident that this hypothesis cannot be pursued consistently throughout our Gospels. And not only do material difficulties stand in the way of every other supposition also, as to which evangelist copied from another—and each possible one has found its advocates—but it is even evident that, according to Hug's modification of the hypothesis, in spite of the ingenious efforts of that learned man, no probable law can be discovered, to determine the manner in which the later evangelist in some passages repeats the former word for word without addition or abridgement, in others abridges him, and then again omits a great deal, or contradicts him, without giving a hint for the satisfaction of the reader (whom he is nevertheless supposed elsewhere to refer to his predecessor) as to the ground of the contradiction. In the same way, without assenting to all the arguments which Hug opposes to Eichhorn's hypothesis of an original Gospel, I think he has upon the whole succeeded in making the thing improbable in the eyes of all unprejudiced persons. In the first place, he certainly seizes very well on the main point, namely, that there was no want of any such original Gospel; that, in the earliest times (and in the earliest times a composition which acquired such authority, and became so fruitful in additions and new forms and modifications, must have originated)

in the preaching of Christianity, little or no regard was paid to the particular circumstances in the life of Christ, and still less could it be necessary to come to an agreement as to the circumstances which should or should not be made the basis of the history ; nay, that the very points to which reference was certainly made in the preaching of Christianity, namely, the lineage of Jesus as the son of David, and his resurrection, are either wholly wanting, or very meagerly treated in the original Gospel. Many other objections to this hypothesis, which have been very cursorily touched upon by Hug, acquire more importance when they are more closely examined, and kept longer in view. Eichhorn indeed appears to consider the real framer of the original Gospel as only a scholar of the apostles ; but since it is supposed to have been delivered to the first missionaries, as the credential too of their ministry, he evidently ascribes to it apostolical authority ; it must have been drawn up under the direction of the apostles, and approved of by them. Now how are we to reconcile this with the fact, that the author of our Gospel of Matthew, whom Eichhorn takes for an eye-witness, and therefore of course for the apostle of that name, found any thing amiss in the arrangement ? Why did he not make his objections at the proper time, before the publication, and take care that in a document, in which so great importance was to be attached to the connexion of

the parts in the main, all the details also should appear in an unexceptionable arrangement? But I will not insist upon this, as I am by no means prepared to subscribe to the fundamental position itself, respecting the author of our Gospel of Matthew. But if the original Gospel was delivered to the first missionaries by way of credential, they and their legitimate successors must have been the more cautious in endeavouring to secure genuine copies without either addition or curtailment, as we meet at a very early period with complaints of false brethren, and unauthorized preachers, who had crept into the church, from whom, if such a credential existed, they could not distinguish themselves by a surer criterion. If we find a difficulty in this (for of course the original Gospel was the more easily copied the smaller its bulk) that difficulty falls entirely upon the supposition that the Gospel was given as a credential. That the original Gospel should have been lost so early, in the multiplicity of translations and enlargements, is, under these circumstances, scarcely conceivable; since even many private individuals must have had a feeling which would lead them to prefer the original Gospel, though more meager, as being sanctioned by the apostles, to additions destitute of that sanction. If however we would rather deny the apostolical authority of the original Gospel, and consequently the design of making it serve as a general clue and a credential, we convert

it into a mere private undertaking of a scholar of the apostles; and then we are at a loss to imagine by what means one of these became so exclusively the basis of all other works of this kind, since the thought of drawing up an account of the life of Jesus might and must have occurred to a great number of persons in different quarters at nearly the same time; and still less can we conceive why precisely a narrative so meager gained such general preference over others almost contemporaneous, of which some at least were certainly more copious; unless it were that each preferred the one in which he found the least matter, that he might make the greater number of additions to it. After all, if one sets about constructing the original Gospel according to Eichhorn's directions, it turns out a very odd disproportioned production, on account of the great fulness of some passages, and the inconceivable jejuneness of others. If, to meet this objection, we ascribe all the copiousness of detail to later enlargements, we have nothing left but a bare synopsis, which, if we consider it as an apostolical directory for oral instruction, could have no other object than that of absolutely excluding other incidents of the life of Jesus as the basis of instruction,—a design for which it is impossible to discover any motive. If we consider it in any other light, it could only refer to more copious accounts; and its main object must have been the arrangement and succession of events. But on the one

hand, attention to this object would have been the less in the spirit of that age, as it was one to which no importance could be attached, either for the edifying of Christians, or the propagation of Christianity: and on the other hand, this arrangement and succession of events are not supposed, even by Eichhorn himself, to have been authentic in the original Gospel.

But if we can form to ourselves no lively representation of the mode in which, according to this hypothesis, the original Gospel took its rise, we certainly find the same difficulty in deriving our Gospels from the original Gospel. It is not only upon the hypothesis that John's Gospel was written after the others, and yet by the apostle, that one is at a loss to comprehend how, at the early period when according to this supposition our three first Gospels must have been written, all those translations and enlarged copies should have been in existence and in circulation: for neither will I insist upon this point, since to me this supposed relation of John to the other evangelists appears likewise improbable. For my part, I find it quite enough to prevent me from conceiving the origin of our three Gospels according to Eichhorn's theory, that I am to figure to myself our good evangelists surrounded by five or six open rolls or books, and that too in different languages, looking by turns from one into another, and writing a compilation from them. I fancy myself in a

German study of the eighteenth or nineteenth century, rather than in the primitive age of Christianity; and if this resemblance diminishes perhaps my surprise at the well known image having suggested itself to the critic in the construction of his hypothesis, it renders it the less possible for me to believe that such was the actual state of the case.

If I inquire now at what point the error began, which led such a man as Eichhorn to a conception so strange, and, when one attempts to embody it in a lively representation, so untenable,—I find its commencement in a dilemma not duly grounded, and its continuation in a rule laid down in my opinion without the requisite degree of critical caution. In the first place, why should the harmony of the three evangelists admit of no other explanation, than that they either borrowed from each other, or drew from *one* common source? Subsequently, at all events, there appear several common sources. Why should not we content ourselves with a plurality of them from the beginning, as some eminent critics have done, whom we should not too readily abandon? For in itself surely this often repeated alternation of common and peculiar portions of history points at nothing else than the previous existence of several sources, some of which the evangelists had in common, some not; and every variation in the arrangement of the common materials weakens

the probability of the basis having been formed by a single original document extending over the whole, in which, considering the great meagerness of the contents, the arrangement must have been the very thing of main importance. How, on the other hand, the arrangement might so frequently coincide, though the original sources were only partial, will admit certainly of a variety of conceivable explanations; and whoever assumes that our Gospels were composed partly by eye-witnesses who constantly accompanied Jesus, partly by later reporters, who however might receive immediate traditions from such eye-witnesses; whoever assumes this needs no farther explanation, and can dispense perfectly well with the supposition of an original Gospel. But even supposing one, yet the attempt to deduce it, *by collecting what is common to the three Gospels, and selecting again in this common part what is most concisely expressed*, is at any rate, in my opinion, not a very critical mode of proceeding. For, recollecting the great number of earlier Gospels, if it were possible to apply this rule to every trilogy of them, would not our original Gospel be sure to come out differently at each trial? Supposing again, that we were in possession of all these books, and set to work in this manner upon all of them together, should we not beyond all doubt obtain a still more meager original Gospel? Its restoration then according to this process altogether depends upon

the single circumstance, that precisely the three Gospels now extant have been preserved to us. Surely to think of restoring a lost work merely by expunging parts of some others supposed to have been derived from it, under such circumstances, without any distinct trace of citations or insertions, is an impracticable undertaking, which must therefore baffle even the highest abilities when they venture upon it. All this taken together must, I think, gradually disincline every one from this hypothesis, which it is impossible in any way to bring in a connected shape under the view of the mind.

But if we inquire further what we would substitute in the room of these two explanations, and whether there be any surer way of discovering what documents were probably in existence previously to our Gospels, and served as a foundation for them, the safer way appears to me to begin the inquiry in the first instance, not at the one end only, but at both. I mean that we must not only consider the Gospels, to see what may and must have preceded them, by means of which they have acquired the shape in which we have them; but we must also inquire how, according to the posture of things, the time, and circumstances, the composition of Christian history developed itself, and must compare the result of this examination with that of the former, and confirm the one by the other.

If we proceed in the first instance to answer this latter question, the result of what has been already said is, that we cannot think an original Gospel in Eichhorn's sense probable: that is, we cannot think it probable, that the first written memorial of the life of Jesus should have been a single narrative, peculiar in its kind, and on that account serving as a foundation for all that followed, extremely unequal, or uniformly meager, but extending connectedly over the leading incidents in the public life of Jesus. On the contrary, if we state the question thus: which is it natural to imagine the earlier, a single connected but scanty narrative, or many circumstantial memorials of detached incidents? we cannot help deciding in favour of the latter. For the first preaching of Christianity written accounts of the life of Christ were not wanted; and when Peter requires\* that the apostle to be elected should have been a follower of Christ from his baptism to his ascension, in the first place this is not to be taken literally, and moreover the object for which it was required was not that the apostle might be able to relate the incidents accurately, but because it afforded a greater security that he had imbibed the spirit of Christ, and correctly apprehended his doctrine. For

\* In a speech, of which, according to Eichhorn, Luke himself was the author. Acts i. 21, 22.

to particular incidents, even miraculous ones, no appeal was made; particular facts proved nothing, and were in general sufficiently well known among the Jews and Jewish proselytes. On the other hand, it might in a similar sense be said, that there certainly existed an original Christology, that is, a common outline of the proof of Christ's superior dignity, with references to passages of the Old Testament; though even this was not consigned to writing. It is to this that Paul refers, when he disclaims having received the Gospel from the apostles or from any man (Gal. i. 12.) But had it been necessary for a primitive preacher of the Gospel to set out with relating the details of the life of Jesus, in what way shall we suppose Paul attempted to maintain his equality with the rest of the apostles? Shall we suppose him to have professed that the Lord revealed to him in a vision the whole of his earthly life? This is an additional circumstance which renders an original Gospel, as a necessary instrument of the first preachers, and as the result of any agreement, extremely improbable. If then for the preaching of the Gospel written accounts of this kind were unnecessary, so that the apostles and the first active disciples had no need on this ground to employ themselves in the composition of written memorials; in this case, as we are surely not warranted in believing that they had leisure or inclination for superfluous

undertakings, but must conceive them abundantly occupied with the immediate duties of their calling, and always somewhat hard pressed in their ministry by unfavorable circumstances, it is by no means probable that Christian history, in any shape whatsoever, was the result of a spontaneous impulse on their part. Instead of this we must descend a step lower, and say that its first source was a reasonable and natural desire on the part of those who had believed in Jesus, without having had a knowledge of his person. These individuals would undoubtedly be glad to learn some particulars of his life, in order to place themselves as nearly as possible on an equality with their elder and more fortunate brethren. In the public assemblies of the Christians this desire was of course only incidentally and sparingly gratified, when a teacher happened to refer to memorable sayings of Christ, which could only be related together with the occasion that had called them forth; more copious and detailed accounts they could only procure in familiar intercourse upon express inquiry. And in this way many particulars were told and heard, most of them probably without being committed to writing; but assuredly much was very soon written down, partly by the narrators themselves, as each of them happened to be pressed by a multiplicity of questions on a particular occurrence, respecting which he was peculiarly qualified to give information; for writ-

ing became in that case a convenience and a saving of time. Still more however must have been committed to writing by the inquirers, especially by such as did not remain constantly in the neighbourhood of the narrators, and were glad to communicate the narrative again to many others, who perhaps were never able to consult an eyewitness. In this way detached incidents and discourses were noted down. We need scarcely apprehend at this day, in opposition to this probable account of the matter, the objection that the first preachers of Christianity, as well as its friends, were sunk in such a depth of barbarism, that but very few of them can be supposed capable of thus committing facts to writing. Not even with respect to the retaining and reporting of the speeches, do I conceive it necessary to enter into a refutation of this objection. For, though perhaps this facility in itself existed in a less degree among the Jews than among the Greeks, yet, on the other hand, the task was considerably lightened by the method of instruction in parables and aphorisms, and by the constant allusions and references to parts of the sacred writings universally known. Notes of this kind were at first no doubt less frequently met with among the Christians settled in Palestine, and passed immediately into more distant parts, to which the pure oral tradition flowed more scantily. They however appeared every where more frequently, and were

more anxiously sought for, when the great body of the original companions and friends of Christ was dispersed by persecutions, and still more when that first generation began to die away. It would however have been singular if, even before this, the inquirers who took those notes had possessed only detached passages : on the contrary, they, and still more their immediate copiers, had undoubtedly become collectors also, each according to his peculiar turn of mind ; and thus one perhaps collected only accounts of miracles, another only discourses, a third perhaps attached exclusive importance to the last days of Christ, or even to the scenes of his resurrection. Others, without any such particular predilection, collected all that fell in their way from good authority. But that the object of these first notes or collections should have been to comprehend particular days in the life of Christ, from morning to evening, is, according to my view, no less improbable than the assigned indications of such a design appear to me insufficient to prove it. Were these however much more considerable than they are, I should still entertain great doubt of the fact, on account of the strange appearance which the life of Jesus assumes, if we suppose so abrupt a contrast between some eventful days, in which all the incidents are crowded to the highest degree of improbability, and the long and almost vacant intervals between them. For to suppose that these intervals which in our Gospels are vacant were

like the other days, but that we have no account of them, is only to transfer the improbability from the life of Jesus to the history of the tradition relating to it. Many such collections then might have been in existence, greater and smaller, some simple, some composed of several others, not only before any one of them acquired public authority, that is, before it was made even in particular congregations the basis of public discourses as Holy Writ, but even before one of them assumed the character of a regular book with a beginning and conclusion. For none but an author who could possess the cheering conviction, that he had collected by diligent research an extraordinary treasure of detached narratives from all parts of Christ's public life at least, and withal had no room to hope that he could materially enlarge it,—none but such a one would have put his collection into such a shape, and thereby closed it. And no one of course will believe that any but collections so closed could have acquired public authority.

So far, proceeding from this point, we may carry with probability the history of Christian historical writing, and it is upon this that some former views of the three Gospels (see Paulus's Introduction, to which he also refers again in his Commentary), are mainly founded. But as the hypothesis of an original Gospel has been subsequently improved upon, and has grown current, it becomes necessary to go to work more accurately, and to propose in

addition the following specific question : Admitting even the existence of Gospels (that is, of finished collections used in public worship), which were immediately derived from collections of the kind we have described, is it possible to explain our three Gospels also in this way ? does not their great harmony, even in the arrangement, still oblige us to resort to one of the above-mentioned hypotheses, and to suppose either that one evangelist imitated the other, or that they uniformly adhered to an arrangement elsewhere proposed to them ; which model of their arrangement must at all events have been committed to writing, though it were subsequent to the narratives and collections we have imagined, and had been composed in the interval between them and the Gospels, and though it had even been drawn up with no other object than that of referring these widely different collections to each other, by whatsoever author, accurately or inaccurately, and therefore, neither with respect to its age nor its destination, deserved the name of an original Gospel ?

To determine this question, however, it is certainly not sufficient to do what critics in later times have almost exclusively contented themselves with ; that is, to compare with one another the several sections of the three Gospels, as they are common to all or peculiar to some of them. For in this comparison the attention is more or less diverted from the mode in which the several nar-

ratives in each Gospel are connected together, and made to follow one another, and we by this means lose sight of perhaps more than half the subject, of perhaps the best and surest intimations from which the origin of these books might still be deduced. Now since the comparative view of the subject has been hitherto pursued almost exclusively, it seems necessary for the furtherance of the object to follow up the one half in the first instance as exclusively with the other, and to endeavour, by examining each of these three books separately, observing at the same time in what manner and according to what rule or from what points of view the several incidents are connected together, and withal paying attention to the probable previous existence of detached narratives and collections—to endeavour I say in the first place to determine in this way whether it is possible or not for the book to have been derived directly or indirectly, and by what species of operation, from these earlier notes. Still the results of this task cannot be considered as in themselves completely decisive; but after having examined all the three evangelists in this manner, it will still be necessary to see whether their relation to each other does not contradict these results, and to determine whether any one supposition is absolutely necessary to understand that relation, or how many are possible, and what they are; and if several are possible, then it will be necessary to continue a process of elimi-

nation and approximation, advancing as gradually, and giving up as little as may be, till there remain only one supposition, and all scruples at all deserving admission which may still arise from that one having been removed as well as they can, a result in all respects satisfactory be thus obtained.

The whole of this task remains to be performed by those who would clear the criticism of our three Gospels from all hypotheses rather invented at random than found by any regular process. To the first part of this investigation, so far as it relates to St. Luke's Gospel, the following examination may it is hoped furnish a contribution the more impartial, as it has in view no general result extending to all the Gospels, but aims only at following the traces of this writer, rather for the purpose of discovering the relation of his first book to the second than that of his Gospel to the other two.

## GENERAL VIEW

OF

## THE GOSPEL.

---

SETTING aside in the first instance the introductory passage, which as a dedication certainly admits of being entirely detached, though it cannot be considered as common to both books, we distinguish, let it for the present be supposed quite arbitrarily, four main divisions into which the whole resolves itself. The first contains the accounts of the interval preceding the public life of Jesus, and comprises the two first chapters. The second consists of several accounts more or less closely connected together of actions and discourses of Jesus; the time, with the exception of that part which relates to his baptism by John not being precisely marked; the place, with the same exception, Capernaum, or its neighbourhood; at least there is a reference to the residence of Jesus at that place. This division extends to

ix. 49. The third contains similar narratives, but relating mostly to a journey of Christ to Jerusalem : its end we will not at present precisely determine. The last treats (generally in a more connected manner) of the last days of Christ, his sufferings and death, and his resurrection and ascension. This preliminary distribution will perhaps be the more readily allowed a preliminary indulgence, as it corresponds in the main with the different relations which our Gospel bears to the other two. For the first division in substance at least Luke has in common with Matthew, but not with Mark ; the second with few exceptions not only in substance but also in the mode of narration in common with both. The third division with some insignificant and in part doubtful exceptions contains incidents and discourses peculiar to Luke ; and indeed this portion, though I should not be inclined to close it exactly at xviii. 14, has been taken by others for a distinct composition, which Luke met with and incorporated in his Gospel. The fourth again is in substance, but not in the same degree as the second in form, common to all three, with the exception however of the greatest part of the narratives relating to the resurrection.

We now proceed to consider these parts separately with reference to the various possible modes in which the whole may have originated.

## FIRST DIVISION.

### CHAPTERS I. AND II.

It is impossible at the outset to avoid observing the great difference of style between the introductory passage and this section, since from very tolerable and well constructed Greek, which even makes some attempts at elegance, we suddenly drop into the harshest Hebraistic phraseology, so that one is loth to attribute both to the same hand; and from this circumstance alone a reader might be inclined to suppose, that this was a narrative which Luke found ready to his hand and placed without alteration at the head of his Gospel, as many allow that he inserted farther on the detached document above-mentioned likewise unaltered. This conclusion however would at all events be rather hasty. For it is conceivable that Luke, though he was able to write a period of moderate length and containing not much matter in good Greek, still, when he was entering upon a continued narrative for which he required more breath, might be obliged to resort to the Hebraistic style which was more familiar to him. It might even be imagined that, as we sometimes commit the writing of such dedications to a more

elegant hand, so he had his composed by some other person in a style more elegant than his own. Or again it might be said that the better Greek style was Luke's, but that he was drawn into Hebraisms where he had to render Aramaic materials, interspersed too with quotations from the Old Testament, in which latter he was obliged at all events to have recourse to the common translation.

Let this argument therefore be supposed to decide nothing. But if we compare the end of the first chapter with the beginning of the second, we can scarcely remain in doubt that the section from verse 5 to the end of the chapter was originally an independent whole. In the first place the 80th verse is an evident form of conclusion. For here let us lay down once for all a principle, which every one (with the liberty of course of allowing exceptions from it grounded on peculiar circumstances) will readily admit, that a continuous narrative never goes back from the particular into the general, unless when it totally drops its subject. On the other hand a particular incident related by itself presents no satisfactory conclusion, except where the form of the composition rigidly excludes every addition. This every one feels and adds some general clause; as a love-story in the popular style is never content to end with the marriage, but subjoins that the married couple were blessed with offspring, and lived for many years

in happiness. But when the same subject is continued and one particular incident follows another, such a return to the general is quite out of place and can never occur to a narrator of common sense. In the sequel we shall have occasion to apply this to many particular narratives concerning Christ, which are immediately followed by other particulars. And here we have in substance the same case, and the words, *And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit*, mark distinctly the end of a narrative. It might indeed be said that the history does not proceed immediately to speak farther of John, that the subject therefore is dropped, and that upon this occasion the account of his farther progress was not misplaced. But it must be considered, that in the preceding part of the chapter the birth of Christ had been already connected with the birth of John, and that the insertion of this general clause only breaks the chain of the narrative. To this it may be added, that if it were the same narrator who is proceeding in the second chapter, many things ought to be differently stated. I do not mean to lay any great stress on the circumstance, that the birth of Christ is already exactly determined in the preceding chapter by relation to the birth of John, and that a more precise date is here out of its place, and should rather have been inserted before by way of supplement to the unpleasantly vague description, *in the days of Herod*. There the author, if he is the

same, should have added, *a short time before the taxing*. This I say I shall not insist on, because it might be said that the taxing, let the account of it be correct or incorrect, which is here of no consequence, is not mentioned here for the purpose of fixing the date, though it happens to be particularly stated which taxing was meant, but merely to account for Joseph's journey to Bethlehem and Christ's birth there. But what combined with the former point appears to me decisive is, that the residence of Joseph and Mary in Nazareth, and Joseph's descent from David, are both mentioned here a second time, in a manner evidently implying that we did not know those facts before. A writer who repeated himself in this way would certainly not have dispensed with an allusion to the angelic message. That the expression ἐν ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ἐκείναις (ii. 1) proves nothing to the contrary, and contains no distinct reference to any thing that goes before, scarcely needs any detailed proof, especially as it comes immediately after that concluding clause and the song of Zacharias, and considering the exactness with which the different periods are determined in the preceding chapter, which would have led us rather to expect *now in the sixth month after those days*.

Thus then we begin by detaching the first chapter as an originally independent composition. If we consider it in this light somewhat more closely, we cannot resist the impression, that it

was originally rather a little poetical work than a properly historical narrative. The latter supposition in its strictest sense at all events no one will adopt, or contend that the angel Gabriel announced the advent of the Messiah in figures so purely Jewish and in expressions taken mostly from the Old Testament, or that the alternate song between Elizabeth and Mary actually took place in the manner described, or that Zacharias at the instant of recovering his speech made use of it to utter the hymn, without being disturbed by the joy and surprise of the company, by which the narrator himself allows his description to be interrupted. At all events then we should be obliged to suppose that the author made additions of his own, and enriched the historical narrative by the lyrical effusions of his own genius. But even in the historical part there is much which will not admit of being understood as literal narrative. In the first place the whole chronology depends on the circumstance, which the author was desirous of introducing, that the child in Elizabeth's womb leaped for joy at Mary's approach. Mary is on this account made to defer her visit till after the fifth month, and in order to leave no chasm in the whole the angel for the same reason is made to come to her no sooner; but immediately after the annunciation she sets out and stays three months with her cousin, a circumstance also very improbable on account of her own approaching nuptials, in order that upon her return

the birth of John might be immediately subjoined. Similar to this is the circumstance, that Zacharias is punished with dumbness for his unbelief and thus contrasted with Mary, who breaks forth under divine inspiration into songs of praise; and yet that, although his unbelief must long before have ceased, he does not recover his speech till the instant when, by confirming the name, he solemnly recognizes the angel's declaration of his son's calling. If to this we add the whole grouping, the angel coming to Zacharias and announcing the last prophet of the old covenant in the Temple, the same coming afterwards to Mary and announcing the advent of the Messiah in the despised Nazareth, the meeting of Mary and Elizabeth, the winding up of the whole by the restoration of Zacharias to speech and his hymn, which form the conclusion, there naturally presents itself to us a pleasing little composition, completely in the style and manner of several Jewish poems still extant among our apocryphal writings, written in all probability originally in Aramaic by a Christian of the more liberal Judaizing school, and of the general style of which a faithful image is conveyed in the early severe school of Christian painting. But poetical as the design is, it was unavoidably misunderstood when it came afterwards to be connected with the ensuing narratives, and was thus drawn more and more into the sphere of history. If I should be asked what was its object, or rather what was the

point of view taken by the author, I should be inclined to say, that it belongs to the period in which there still remained some disciples of John who had not yet come over to Christianity, and that it was designed to draw these over by pointing out, on the ground of facts and general tradition, John's real highest destination in his relation to Christ, but itself still expresses an expectation that the second coming of Christ would be accompanied by an outward aggrandizement of the nation. For though I cannot see here a literal historical narrative, or with Paulus consider every thing as derived from family records, yet neither would I treat the whole as fictitious; only the poet, as he is always at liberty to do, brought together circumstances separated in reality, and fixed in distinct imagery the fluctuations of tradition. If this be so, not only is the attempt to explain away the miraculous, which is always fruitless, in this case peculiarly unsatisfactory and abortive, when for instance it is proposed to explain the visions by fits of ecstasy, for which there is no cause assigned, especially as the narrative supposes that to see visions in the Temple was no unheard-of or uncommon thing, and the dumbness of Zacharias by an apoplectic stroke, which nevertheless did not prevent him from going directly home vigorous and in other respects in health. There are besides many other statements which I would rather explain by the occasion the poet had for them, and should not venture to pro-

nounce historical. To these belongs in the first place John's being a late-born child, which is evidently only imagined for the sake of analogy with several heroes of Hebrew antiquity. In the next place the relation between the ages of John and Christ, and likewise the consanguinity of Mary and Elizabeth, which it is besides difficult to reconcile with the assertion of John, (John i. 33.) that he did not know Christ before his baptism. The supposition of this consanguinity the poet may perhaps have adopted merely as a foundation for Mary's visit to Elizabeth. Perhaps too as Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron, and Mary as her kinswoman must be supposed to belong to the same family, he too had already conceived the idea of designating the high priest and king of his nation, by assigning to him on the one side a royal and on the other a sacerdotal descent,—a notion which we meet with also at a later period, but confined to apocryphal scriptures and writings of heretics. It is to be sure somewhat strange to find this supposition, which implies no more than a natural conception, coupled with an intimation of the supernatural conception of Christ; but the latter is after all far from being stated with equal distinctness, and is only occasioned by the question of Mary, who interrupts the angel in a manner which is in itself not very natural, perhaps only that he might be prevented from speaking too long together.

If we now proceed farther, all the remainder of

this division appears likewise to resolve itself into similar separate narratives. For we find clauses resembling that at i. 80, also after the vision of the shepherds, ii. 18—20, after the presentation in the Temple, ii. 40, and after the incident in Jerusalem, ii. 52. Only the 21st verse, which contains the account of the circumcision of Jesus, intervenes, and seems to force us even to give up the view we have taken altogether, and to return to the opinion that all was written in a continuous series; for it can originally have belonged to neither of the two narratives between which it stands, as it forms neither an end for the one nor a beginning for the other. It moreover evidently refers to our first narrative, and therefore must draw this also into the continuous series. But if it is our first author who is continuing his narrative in this chapter, since he must at all events, considering him as an historian, have been one who thought himself at liberty to make additions, he would scarcely have despatched the circumcision of Christ with such brevity in comparison with that of John, but in the absence of particular accounts would at least have delivered more circumstantially the certain and necessary facts. From him too I should have expected that, according to his precise mode of reckoning, he would have filled up the chasm, and have written after verse 21st something of this kind: *And Joseph and Mary remained in Bethlehem till the days of her purification came.*

Nor is it probable that any one writing in Greek would, in a continued narrative, have begun twice so near together with the same phrase, *καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι*. Hence a different view naturally presents itself, namely, that this verse was inserted by the person who first collected these separate pieces into one whole. As he evidently connected them together in an historical point of view, he found that between the first day and the thirty-third the eighth was wanting, on which he might know that the circumcision must necessarily have been performed. He therefore inserted this incident in the proper place; but with the greatest scrupulousness contented himself with merely saying what was necessary, and without adding any thing of his own he borrows the phrase from the narrative which lay before him, and was immediately to follow, and only refers to the direction given in the preceding narrative by the angel, and even this, whether purposely or unconsciously, in very guarded terms. This supposition unquestionably best explains the peculiar character of this statement, and its relation to all that precedes and follows it. Whether however the person who, chiefly by this insertion, gave to this series of detached narratives (contrary in part at least to its original design) the character of a continued memoir comprizing the most material points in the first portion of the life of Jesus; whether this person was the author or compiler, whichever we prefer

calling him, of our whole Gospel, or whether the latter found the original documents already so connected, we would rather leave for the present undecided, and can only say, that we do not recognize in this interpolation the pure Greek style of the introduction, and should thence be inclined to believe that this first collection was the work of an earlier hand.

If we now begin by examining the account here given of the birth of Jesus, and the events which accompanied it (II. 1—20), this may very well have been an independent narrative; for the main circumstance in it is the vision which appeared to the shepherds of Bethlehem simultaneously with the birth of Jesus; and this is one extremely well adapted to be related by itself, and also from the oral relation to be committed sooner or later to writing, if we take the whole as historical. The same is true if we choose to consider it, like the first narrative, as more of a poetical nature; for in this point of view also the description of a heavenly sign accompanying the birth of the Messiah stands naturally by itself. This view however I should not venture to prefer in this case, and least of all to assert that this piece was a continuation of the preceding; for there was here an equal opportunity of dilating in lyrical effusions, as well in the person of the angels as in that of the shepherds, since, according to verse 20, they return *δοξάζοντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεόν*. Yet has no advantage been taken

of this opportunity, and we can therefore recognize neither the same author, nor the prevalence of a poetical character, since this would necessarily have occasioned the introduction of more lyrical passages. Here therefore we must refer the main fact at least to an historical tradition. But upon this, if we seek grounds for an exact conclusion, there arises in the first place the question, from what source the narrative may be drawn? For two may be conceived, Joseph and Mary on the one side, the shepherds on the other. Of Joseph in particular it is unnecessary to say any thing, as well because no farther trace of him appears in the public life of Jesus, and it is therefore wholly uncertain how soon he quitted the scene, as that it would be quite indifferent for our purpose whether the narrative proceeded from him or from Mary, and we therefore confine ourselves to the latter. Of her it is said indeed, verse 19, that she kept all these words in her heart, and one might easily be induced to understand this as an appeal to her. But these words are contained in the concluding clause. Let us put ourselves in the situation of the narrator or the writer; when, by way of conclusion, he had mentioned the impression produced by the circumstance on the neighbourhood to whom it was related, it was too obvious and almost necessary for him to say something of its effect on Mary. This then is of scarcely any moment. But considered in itself the narrative

has not at all the appearance of having come from our Saviour's parents. For it would then have proceeded after v. 7. without changing the scene, in some such way as this: *But in the night, or early next morning, there arose suddenly a noise of shepherds, who came into the inn, and asked whether a child had been born in that house on the day before, and was lying in the manger; and they answered them yes, and brought them in, and they related how angels had appeared unto them, and so on.* This narrative would besides have communicated more circumstantially the manner in which the shepherds expressed themselves towards the child and its parents, and the conversation of the thronging multitude. For these were to the parents of Jesus the things immediately presented to the senses, and therefore the most vivid in their recollection; and this it is that determines the points on which every narrative, not an artificial one, dilates circumstantially, and those which it only touches briefly. On the contrary, according to this same criterion, it is exceedingly probable that the narrative, as we have it here, must be referred to the shepherds as its first source. For that which to them was most material and immediately obvious, the nocturnal vision in the fields, is the only circumstance treated in detail. What they found and did at Bethlehem was for them only the confirmation and publication of that circumstance; and precisely in

this light, and with this foreshortening, does it appear here in the narrative. This then being admitted as probable, it appears from the passage we are considering, that the shepherds related at that time what occurred to them, and that so the affair became known in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem. But no one certainly at that time set any thing down in writing on the subject; nor is it probable that the affair spread far, or that the knowledge of it was long preserved in the neighbourhood itself.

Presages may excite great attention, and set men's minds in strong commotion for the moment; but the more distant the thing at which they point, the sooner is the patience of men wearied, and they presently resign themselves to the *αὐτὸ δεῖξαι*; and the smaller the authority of the first reporters, and the more insulated the scene, the less capable is the incident of enlarging the sphere of its publicity. It is in the highest degree improbable that the account of this vision found its way at that time even so far as Jerusalem, and that when Christ made his public appearance and attracted notice, this as well as the following incident had been circulated. Had this been the case, the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem could not have taken place, nor even, if there be any one who will not admit it as a fact, have been invented; in that case too it would be almost astonishing that we find in our Gospels no hint, that

the reputation of Jesus among the multitude and the report of his being the Messiah were founded in part on such accrediting presages. We must therefore suppose that this story was only drawn forth from the dust of oblivion by the recollections of individuals after the fame of Jesus was already established, and therefore probably did not obtain farther publicity till after his death. But that it is neither an empty bubble, nor a fabrication designed to exalt the dignity of Jesus by such presages, we have an assurance, in the opportunity which the Christians of that district had to inquire of Mary, who must have known of it, or of the disciples with whom she spent most of her life, upon the subject.

Two inferences result from this view. In the first place, if we are inclined to consider the fact, on account of its marvellous character, as a peculiar dispensation of divine providence, we must not look for its object in its second operation, which it produced, so to express myself, after its revival—for at that time the faith in Jesus stood no longer in need of such stimulants and such supports—but only in its immediate effect on the shepherds themselves. These men, we may be sure, were deeply impressed with those expectations of the Messiah, which were beyond a doubt peculiarly on the stretch in Bethlehem, and one or other of the most pious had perhaps like Simeon prayed for a sign of the Messiah's advent. It was vouch-

safed to them, as the history informs us; and it is the satisfaction, not uncommon in such eventful times, thus granted to the aspirations even of individuals, which is remarkable and divine. But it would be strange, if we should wish to investigate in what the sign consisted, and what in particular the *δόξα Κυρίου* was. And still more strange does it appear to me, to see adduced in this inquiry as singularly important, the voucher of a traveller, who actually saw in Palestine *ignes fatui*, great *ignes fatui*, which sometimes parted and then met again. For the more frequent such phenomena, the more familiar must shepherds, above all men, accustomed to pass their nights the whole summer long in the open air, have been with them, and the less likely to consider them as a sign from heaven pointing at a particular event. And equally strange does it seem, that recourse should be had to the supposition that Mary, in a strange place, among a crowd of strangers, made it her first business to disclose that the child she was on the point of bringing into the world was the Messiah; and that although this disclosure did not so much as relieve her from the necessity of laying the child in the stall or the manger, still the shepherd of the house was so transported by it, that he confidently explained the *ignis fatuus* as a presage of the Messiah. An unwelcome dexterity this, as Socrates says, that would explain every thing so minutely,

especially in a narrative which evidently has not come to us from the first hand. It is just as if one should on the other side maintain, that it being admitted that the passage is not poetical, we have here of course literally the precise words of the angels. May it not on the contrary be very easily conceived, that these precise words had long been lost before the present narrative was committed to writing, and had been supplied in the most natural manner by others, such as the Christians used, to greet one another, especially in their public commemorations of the birth of Jesus. He who, in things of this sort, wishes to render all smooth and simple, is as wide of the mark as he who clings anxiously to the letter. They must be treated with the freedom with which they arose; the accidental must be separated from the essential, but the latter must then be kept clear and fixed.

The second inference is this. If the present composition originated in a subsequent oral narrative of this vision of the shepherds, we have no ground at all to believe that the historical matter in the first seven verses also flowed from this oral narrative. The latter probably began thus: *In the night after Jesus was born, shepherds were keeping watch in those parts.* The present introduction, in its greater fulness, is to be attributed only to the person who first committed the narra-

tive to writing, who, proceeding on the supposition that the proper abode of Joseph and Mary was Nazareth, either procured or devised (but the former appears to me the more probable) an explanation how it came to pass that Jesus was born in Bethlehem. Upon this a registry was mentioned to him; and though only a sacerdotal one was meant, yet he perhaps not being a native of Paléstine, confounded this with a more important but subsequent event, the census of Quirinus. To suppose an earlier Roman registry is surely, considering the circumstances in which Herod the Great stood, a strange and very improbable notion, and still more strange is the supposition that with this a sacerdotal registry was combined. For if the latter absolutely required every one to travel to the city of his family, the former could naturally have been performed only in the chief place of every district for its inhabitants, and therefore in many instances, as would have been the case with Joseph, the two registries must have clashed. This then being the origin of this introduction, it can give us no other information concerning the birth of Christ than what the writer knew from the narrative itself. But we ought certainly neither to take the liberty of making use of it as a chronological determination, nor to impose on ourselves the task of solving its chronological difficulties, an undertaking in

which, as its most indispensable conditions are wanting, so no one has yet met with the slightest degree of success.

What we read from 22 to 40 in chap. II. respecting the presentation of the child in the temple, which was combined with the purification of his mother, seems also to have been originally related and committed to writing without connexion with the preceding passage; for at the end mention is made of the return to Nazareth, just as though the parents had come from that place to Jerusalem, without notice being taken by a single word of their residence up to that time in Bethlehem, which would nevertheless have been so easy and natural. This narrative therefore knows nothing of that residence. Only I would not on that account understand the surprise of Mary at the language of Simeon, as implying that she herself did not know yet who her son was. For it is not certainly as the only sign which she received, but as one among several, that this incident can have been related. And notwithstanding the marvellous, of which it too has its share, it bears a purely historical stamp. For it is a circumstance too natural for a poetical fiction, that Simeon who, filled with expectations of the Messiah, had probably also prayed for a sign, when it had, we know not in what manner, been granted to him, breaks out, in the first instance only to himself and without taking notice of the parents, into an enthusiastic

apostrophe, and only addresses himself to them upon observing their surprise. And should any one even be inclined to suppose this also to have been originally a poetical and symbolical representation, why should the author, together with Simeon, have introduced Anna, who is not even made to answer any poetical purpose? and with an accuracy of description moreover, in comparison with which the principal character is far more negligently delineated? This trace leads us immediately farther, and indicates clearly enough that this narrative also is not to be referred to Mary and Joseph, to whom Anna and Simeon were alike unknown, but to one who obtained it directly or indirectly from the lips of this Anna who is so accurately described. And to this incident too the same remark is applicable as to the former, that it was certainly forgotten during the interval between the infancy of Jesus and his public appearance, and was only brought forward again at a later period. It could not but excite attention at the moment, and that in no slight degree, as we must suppose Simeon, should we even disclaim all farther acquaintance with him, to have been a well known and respected man. But the prospect of that which an infant was to be and perform in his riper years was too distant, especially in such unquiet times, when one shock followed another, to engage continued attention. Hence too Simeon, who needed only to be named

by her who first related this scene, appears now in the description of our author as an unknown person, whom he designates only by the qualities which appear from the transaction itself. An intentional suppression, in consequence of an understanding among the lookers for a Messiah, I cannot conceive probable. Of that there would surely be some slight intimation in verse 38.

That the last piece of this division too, Jesus's first visit to the temple, did not originally belong to the same context with what goes before, is rendered evident by a variety of marks. Verse 40, which some most strangely consider as the beginning of this last piece, against all analogy with I. 80. and II. 52, is a mere form of conclusion. Considered as a transition, it does not connect sufficiently; the passage would in that case have run, after the return to Nazareth, in some such way as this: *And the child abode here now, and grew and waxed strong in spirit, until he was twelve years old*, and so on. Language of this sort would have been really a transition; the resting in general terms, which we find in this verse, can only indicate a conclusion, just as in I. 80. and II. 52. This narrative is also distinguished by a rounder, and generally more Grecian structure, a peculiarity of which we lose sight only in the dialogue between Mary and Jesus, where the writer perhaps thought himself obliged to report as literally as possible. For in other

respects the narrative seems by its style not to have been translated from the Aramaic, but composed in the first instance in Greek. It can however be referred to no source but Mary. For of her travelling companions none would return with her to Jerusalem, and from the assembly in the temple the narrative cannot have proceeded, for the same reasons which prevented us from ascribing to Mary and Joseph the account of the shepherds' vision. And as the words πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα have here (v. 51) evidently a more Grecian sense than above, v. 19—for here they mean precisely the words which were interchanged between Mary and the child—an assurance is intended to be here given, that they were exactly reported. In this conversation, which, if it be not taken strictly (as shewing that Jesus's first object was merely to exculpate himself with regard to the long search, but that he of course related afterwards the manner of his staying behind), seems to betray an inexplicable indifference on the part of Jesus, we have also a sure pledge that the whole story was not a fiction, invented in order to have some remarkable anecdote of Jesus at the period when the mysteries of the temple and the law were first disclosed to him. But an inquiry respecting that period may certainly have given Mary the first occasion to relate this little incident, which, it is clear, left an impression on her chiefly on account of the stay which his thirst of knowledge induced Jesus to

make in the temple, and on account of the words, *οτι εν τῷς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με.* This point of view is also that of the person who committed it to writing, who, for this very reason, puts together the introductory circumstances somewhat carelessly, and thereby again distinguishes himself from the author of the preceding narrative; for it would have been far more to the purpose to mention here that it was the custom to introduce boys at twelve years of age into the temple, than it was necessary in the former passage to describe the sacrifices requisite at the purification. After all this, I do not suppose that any one will still be inclined, from the *αὐτοῦ* in v. 41, or the resemblance between v. 51 and v. 19, or v. 52 and v. 40, to infer one original author of all that we have hitherto read; for that *αὐτοῦ* may easily have been substituted for the name of Jesus by the person who annexed this narrative to the preceding; it is even not impossible that it may have belonged to the first penner of such a detached piece. The resemblance indeed of v. 52 to v. 40, and I. 80, seems more distinctly to intimate an acquaintance with those former passages, and to render it probable that this concluding clause comes from the person who annexed the present narrative to the preceding. It must however remain doubtful whether this person was the collector of the former pieces; and the purer Greek style, which we entirely miss in v. 21, that connects the preceding collection, renders this rather

improbable. Since however this superior purity prevails in the main throughout the whole narrative, and reminds us more than any thing that has hitherto appeared of the introduction, one might conjecture, that the compiler and arranger of the whole was also the first who committed to writing this last piece, after an oral narrative derived directly or indirectly from Mary, and annexed it to the earlier accounts of Jesus's infancy which he found already collected, so that we should here meet with his own hand again for the first time since the introductory passage. This however is a conjecture which does not admit of being more firmly established.

Thus then, by an apparently gradual annexion of several detached narratives, committed to writing independently of each other, to a piece which was originally composed not as an historical narrative, but as a poem, did the first division of this Gospel, according to these indications, take its rise. Now if we compare, without any prepossession, this and the corresponding portion in Matthew, we have two parallel successions of narratives, parallel in the stricter sense of the word, inasmuch as they have no single point, that is in this case no entire fact, in common, and also inasmuch as they are not at all supplemental to each other, but, on the contrary, the corresponding members of the two successions almost entirely exclude each other. Hence then if in any one point the narrative of

the one evangelist is correct, that of the other, so far as it relates to the same epoch, cannot be so. In the first place, if our history of the annunciation is true, then are the doubts of Joseph and their decision as related by Matthew inconceivable. For admitting even the improbable supposition, that Mary set out on her journey to Elizabeth immediately after the annunciation, without saying any thing beforehand to Joseph, and that the latter learnt her pregnancy and the angelic annunciation from a third person, during her absence; yet Mary, before she had come to an understanding with Joseph on this important point, must at least have felt some uncertainty, which however we do not observe in her language at the house of Elizabeth, and which would have rendered it impossible for her, without the greatest indifference for her espoused husband, to pass three months there. And what necessity was there for Joseph to decide this matter by himself before he had spoken to Mary? especially if, according to the supposition of Paulus, Mary, and therefore of course he too, had been previously apprised of the vision seen by Zacharias. If on the other hand Mary told him of her reception at the house of Elizabeth and the evident connexion between the two visions, he must have believed, even without the appearance of an angel. Whereas if we take away Luke's narrative, and consider that of Matthew by itself, the latter has nothing in it that is im-

probable. The passage then in Luke, and that in Matthew, which latter however is improperly, in order to distinguish it from the former, called a Nazarene account, since according to Luke Nazareth is Mary's dwelling-place also, cannot be brought to harmonize upon an historical and psychological view of the facts.

In the second place, the two narratives in Luke, of the shepherds at Bethlehem and the presentation in the temple, do not accord with the two in Matthew, of the adoration of the magi and the massacre at Bethlehem. The magi must have been at Bethlehem before Jesus's presentation; for not only does Luke make the parents return immediately after that ceremony to Nazareth, but, according to his statement of the whole transaction, there is not the slightest conceivable motive for a fresh prolonged stay in the strange town of Bethlehem. No ground for the supposition either of employment in Bethlehem, or of an intention to settle there, is afforded by Luke's narrative, or even consistent with it; and all its vividness is destroyed, if we imagine that Joseph's return to Bethlehem was merely omitted. In other commentators this is excusable; but one who enters into such minute historical deductions as Paulus does, should not have passed so lightly over the matter. The point must be allowed to be clear, when we take into the account, that Joseph went to Bethlehem solely on account of the registry, how ill Mary was accommodated

there in her labour, and how reluctant they must have been to undergo the fatigue of a double journey. Now had the magi arrived before the presentation, in that case, considering how near Bethlehem was to Jerusalem, intelligence would certainly have reached the former place, of Herod's inquiries after the birthplace of the Messiah, and that the magi discovered it by the direction thence obtained. Moreover the magi must have had the dream which warned them against returning to Jerusalem at Bethlehem, and it is much more probable that they related, than that they suppressed it. Must not Joseph now, considering Herod's notorious character, have conceived suspicion from these circumstances, and abandoned the wholly needless journey to Jerusalem? The flight into Egypt therefore is indeed very naturally connected with the visit of the magi, and the attention it excited; as Paulus too very clearly points out; but the journey to Jerusalem is inconsistent with it. The massacre of the infants at Bethlehem however is, at all events, in reference to Luke's account, an incident which, supposing even the wildest cruelty in Herod, cannot well be comprehended. For at how much less cost might he have attained his object, and how apprehensive must he have been of missing it at the time of the registry, notwithstanding his cruel edict, without a more exact scrutiny; how easy must it have been for him to learn to what part of the small town of Bethlehem the strangers

brought their costly presents, and therefore also that the child was no longer there! He is therefore supposed to have given vent to an utterly empty rage, while, on the other hand, he took no deliberate step to reach the dangerous child itself, which, had it even fled into Egypt, he might still have entertained great hopes of accomplishing.

Finally, the two successions of narratives rest on a totally different tradition one from the other, as must strike every person who impartially considers each by itself. Luke supposes every where that before the birth of Jesus, which took place only accidentally at Bethlehem, Joseph and Mary lived at Nazareth. Matthew, on the contrary, knows nothing of any accidental cause of the birth happening at Bethlehem, and clearly supposes that Joseph, but for the intervention of some particular circumstances, would have returned to Judea after his flight, and therefore manifestly takes that, and not Galilee, to have been his usual place of abode. All attempts to reconcile these two contradictory statements seem only elaborate efforts of art, to which one should not needlessly resort, or indeed should rather give no explanation at all. How then? Are we in general to pronounce the one series true, and the other false, or how are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulty? In such a sweeping sentence as that we should feel ourselves the less justified, as we have found in our series in Luke a portion which, being presented in

a poetical rather than an historical shape, immediately resigns the contest; while another, which bears in itself evident marks of artless and unadulterated tradition, will not yield its ground. We must therefore separate them and examine each apart.

In the first place then we shall observe, that our account of the annunciation can make no pretension to be admitted as history, in comparison with Matthew's relation of the scruples entertained by Joseph, and the mode of their removal; all we shall have to compare with the narrative in Matthew, will be the traditional foundation of the poetical piece in our evangelist, namely, that expectations had been excited in an extraordinary manner in Mary, previously to the birth of Jesus, that she was to bear the Son of God. Now this is easily reconcilable with Matthew's narrative. Mary might even, as it is natural to suppose, have communicated to Joseph the ground of her expectations; and still the latter, whatever degree of love and confidence, of piety and hope in the Messiah we may attribute to him, may, if these expectations were grounded on signs not perfectly clear or distinctly connected with actual events, still, I say, he may have fluctuated in his faith, and the nearer the necessity approached of coming to a final determination, have inclined the more to the side of doubt. We may then the more securely leave Matthew's narrative in the wise indefiniteness to which it confines itself; the traditional founda-

tion of our poetical account of the annunciation repels all the presumptuous interpretations with which vulgar hands would soil the sacred veil which they cannot lift. And precisely so far ought we to advance in investigations of this nature.

As to the second part of our series, we must contend that the narratives in our evangelist of the birth of Jesus and his presentation in the temple bear in the main a purely historical stamp; but is this likewise the case with those of Matthew? Has not the account of the magi in its inmost essence a completely symbolical character, tending, while it represents Jesus as immediately recognized by the heathen, to establish the right of Christianity to extend beyond the limits of Judaism, and in the persecution of the infant Messiah, to which the king of the Jews was urged by this very homage of the strangers, prefiguring the rejection of Christianity by the nation, peculiarly exasperated by the participation granted to the heathen? Hence too the interweaving of this narrative with passages from the Old Testament. And so this symbolical narrative, the origin of which is probably to be looked for on the eastern confines of Palestine, might have been brought into an artificial combination with a real fact; for that massacre of the infants can scarcely be a mere fiction. Here then Matthew, as having introduced some poetical elements into his narrative, would recede, and Luke would keep the historical field. Can it at

all lessen the credibility of the two evangelists, that each admitted into his history some passages not purely historical? Certainly not with a candid judge, who reflects, in the first place, that all this serves still only as a prelude to the proper subject of the history, which was the public life of Jesus; in the next place, that in the sacred books, which our authors had most before their eyes, and whence they and their contemporaries, from whom they received their accounts, and for whom they wrote, drew their chief intellectual food, that in these books poetry and history are nowhere kept quite distinct, and that they therefore neither could have, nor needed that discriminating sense which is peculiar to us; and lastly, how far, notwithstanding, their purity of feeling has kept them from the extravagance and romance of the exploded Gospels, the compilers or authors of which were possessed with the confused spirit of rabbinical Judaism. This contrast upholds our canonical evangelists in their just authority, and shews us the spirit in which they proceeded in its dignity and sanctity. And thus the critical investigation of the details, which it belongs to us to institute, may hold on its course without interruption.

It remains however to add a word more on the different notions assumed by the two evangelists respecting the abode of Jesus's parents, a point which it will be always difficult to clear up. The statement in Luke that Joseph and Mary had all

along resided at Nazareth, is found partly in the poetical passage, partly in the conclusions, which never retain the exactness of the narrative itself; it cannot therefore be considered as more than a very general supposition. Matthew's statement that they lived before the birth of Christ in Judea, is distinctly expressed only in connexion with that part of the narrative which is probably not historical, and therefore perhaps originated only in the supposition, that as Christ was born in Bethlehem, his parents also probably resided there. This supposition however is contradicted by the history of the shepherds' vision in Luke, which directly asserts that the place where Jesus was born was not the place where his parents resided. In order to draw over Luke to the side of Matthew, it would be necessary to suppose that this history had passed through a great many hands, and experienced a variety of additions, which is not very probable. In order to draw over Matthew to the side of Luke, it would be necessary to suppose that the narrative of the former, to which its citations give in general an air of learning, aimed at explaining in a learned manner (for a reflexion of some depth was requisite to discover that Joseph had reason to apprehend less from Philip than from Archelaus) the emigration into Galilee erroneously supposed to have taken place at a later period. Let the reader take his choice, for I have no third hypothesis at present to suggest.

## SECOND DIVISION.

### III. 1.—IX. 49.

HERE we find at the outset a close connexion down to IV. 15. But then comes another form of conclusion as marked as any of the preceding, which it is wholly impossible to consider as a transition from one subject to another, such as must occur even in a continuous narrative. How could one whose object was to write a connected history of the life of Christ, and therefore to relate, as far as lay in his power, the events on which Christ's reputation was grounded, speak in this place already of his reputation, and thereby give occasion only to the mistaken notion, that he had knowingly passed over a whole period? It is not even possible to explain verses 14 and 15 as a transition to the narrative which immediately follows of the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth. In that scene Jesus appears indeed as already celebrated; but not only so, for he appeals no less plainly to the miracles which he performs. Had then verses 14 and 15 been added in order to intimate the circumstances in which Jesus stood when he made his appearance at Nazareth, mention would in that

case have been made, not only of his reputation as a teacher, but also of his miracles. As the words now stand, they can proceed only from one, who here concluded his account of the commencement of Jesus's public life, and did not choose to add any thing farther. He naturally concludes in this way, that from this time forth Jesus taught publicly in his country and became celebrated.

Now in this piece, which is completely severed from that which follows, are united, in a manner which does not seem to admit of any farther division, the account of Christ's baptism, his genealogy, and the history of the temptation. It is however remarkable, that here too, as well as in Matthew, the last passage was originally connected with the first; for not only does the return from Jordan, IV. 1, refer to III. 3, but the expression, too, that Jesus was full of the Holy Ghost, refers to the descent of the Spirit upon him, III. 22; and IV. 1, admits of being immediately connected with III. 22, so that the genealogy seems only in a manner thrust in between them. This insertion also best explains the puzzling and ambiguous conciseness of v. 23, which gives so much trouble to the commentators. It is true that a degree of affinity is obvious between the genealogy and the two other subjects, so that they certainly might have been originally connected; for Christ's descent from David was no less a proof of his dignity as Messiah, than the testimony of John, and the divine mani-

festation which accompanied his baptism, and his victory over the devil. But the precise point which is the essence of the proof in the genealogy, is concealed from view by its being carried up as far as Adam ; nor do the two other narratives appear to have been connected as proofs of the superior dignity of Jesus, but as designating the commencement of his ministry, as is evident from the conclusion, with which view the ἀρχόμενος of v. 23, according to the opinion of the best commentators, also agrees. And this too is perfectly natural. That the baptism of Jesus was generally considered as an inauguration preparatory to his public life, we know from the Acts of the Apostles ; and if his temptation was taken as matter of fact, it was the more inevitable that it should be placed in the same period, as it was easy to collect that no such event had occurred since the time when Christ assembled some disciples about him as his constant companions. This fact too was easily connected with a symbolical notion, that it was by this victory over the evil spirit Christ earned the right of afterwards pursuing him every where, and expelling him. And in this way it is easy to conceive how these two incidents, as marking the commencement of Jesus's public appearance, came to be connected together ; for which reason they follow each other immediately as well in Matthew and Mark as here. How then did the insertion of the genealogy happen, and to whom are we to

ascribe it? I have no hesitation in ascribing it to Luke, that is, to the person who arranged the whole, and I suppose him to have lighted upon this genealogy separately, to have found no convenient opportunity of introducing it before, and at last from necessity, though not in the most convenient manner, to have assigned it the only place that was left. For he could not set it at the beginning of the first division, as he must then have gone back from Jesus to Zacharias. In that portion the most suitable place for its insertion would have been after II. 7, or after II. 20; but he seems to have been reluctant to separate what he found already joined. He might indeed also have placed it at the end of the first portion, at II. 40; but as this concluded with the return to Nazareth, and his next narrative began with the journey from Nazareth to Jerusalem, he naturally made this follow, and still postponed the genealogy. At the end of this narrative now it would have stood very strangely and ill, and so he had no choice left but to insert it between two passages which were already connected, in doing which therefore he prefers letting the joint appear rather conspicuous to adding any thing more than was absolutely necessary of his own. As to the genealogy itself, the best supposition, we may remark by the way, evidently is, that Eli and Jacob were half-brothers, and that two half-brothers had successively married the same woman. Only we must

go a step farther and say that one genealogy is that of Joseph's younger brothers, which a person not sufficiently informed, who either did not know or did not call to mind this circumstance, had procured from some quarter or other, and supposed himself to possess the genealogy of Joseph himself; a charge which we may readily allow to rest on our evangelist, who was perhaps not a native of Palestine, rather than on one of his predecessors.

Having thus explained the appearance of the genealogy in this place, if we now proceed to compare the account of the baptism and that of the temptation, as we find them both here and in Matthew, there appears certainly a considerable difference between the two texts, which renders it almost impossible to take them both for one and the same narrative, only differently translated; and what makes the variation surprising is, that the two incidents are connected together in the same manner, and in many points again so exactly correspond. That which is most easily explained is the relation between the two accounts of the temptation. As to the thing itself, I can neither consider it as an ecstasy—for we have no instances of states of ecstasy in the history of Christ—nor as a figurative representation of what took place inwardly in Christ. For had he entertained, even in the most transient manner, thoughts of such a nature, he would have ceased to be Christ, and this explanation appears to me the grossest outrage

that has been committed in modern times against his person. Since however we can as little allow it to pass for matter of fact, the most natural alternative remaining is to consider it, as others have done already, as a parable. Three leading maxims of Christ, for himself and for those who were invested by him with extraordinary powers for the promotion of his kingdom, are therein expressed : the first, to perform no miracle for his own advantage even under the most pressing circumstances ; the second, never to undertake, in the hope of extraordinary divine aid, any thing which, like the dropping from the pinnacle of the temple, as it does not lie in the natural course of things, would be merely prodigious ; lastly, never, though the greatest immediate advantage were by that means attainable, to enter into fellowship with the wicked, and still less into a state of dependence upon them ; and Christ could not express himself more strongly against the opposite mode of conduct than by ascribing it to Satan. That we find in this passage such a compendium of wisdom adapted to the Messiah and his apostles, and that it is precisely the developement of Satan's thoughts which is placed in the strongest relief, while the answer is kept in the back-ground, renders this view of the subject highly probable. In such a sense then Christ delivered this parable to his disciples ; for that one of the apostles should have invented it in the same sense, is less likely. It might however,

at the second or third hand, easily have been understood historically, and yet as easily, notwithstanding this misconstruction, pass unaltered in the main through a great number of hands. The order of the temptations as stated by Matthew is the most correct, if we look to the meaning of the parable; their transposition in Luke seems more calculated with a view to its outward dress; for it may be explained from the reflection, how improbable it was that Christ should have gone first out of the wilderness to Jerusalem, and thence again to the high mountain, when the mountain and the wilderness might rather be supposed to be near each other. All Luke's variations from Matthew are connected with this transposition, as the nucleus of all their conformities is the dialogue between Christ and the devil, which of course was most likely to be preserved unadulterated. We have here then an alteration, which however we cannot call a happy one, as it refers to something entirely foreign to the original design. In Mark the kernel has entirely disappeared, and nothing but the shell is left, with the addition of a prodigious feature, inasmuch as he brings Christ, one does not see why, into the company of wild beasts, which however could not have haunted what are called the deserts of Palestine in great numbers. That this parable, when once understood in a historical sense, was always related in connexion with the baptism of Christ, appears evident from

Mark, who seems to have had no other reason for not omitting the transaction altogether, and is in itself, as Christ himself probably laid it in this period, very natural, without recurring to an original Gospel. On the contrary, it is inconceivable how, according to Eichhorn, the little that Mark says of this matter should have been admitted into the original Gospel, precisely to open a door for a very dangerous licence of fancy in painting out these temptations of Christ.

As the history of the temptation, so the account of Christ's baptism also has undergone a remodelling in Luke. The difference of person in which the heavenly voice speaks is, to be sure, easily explained as a different translation from the Aramaic, in which no person was expressed, but in all probability there stood only *Behold my beloved son*. But the addition *ἐν σωματικῷ εἶδει* is at all events an insertion in Luke, probably to distinguish this descent of the Spirit from the incidents which frequently took place at the baptism of Christians, and were considered as signs of the Spirit taking possession of the Neophyte. In these cases the very symptoms from which the presence of the Spirit was inferred were the loud and enthusiastic expressions of Christian sentiments; but in the passage under discussion Christ prayed (another addition of our narrative), and as this in all probability was a silent prayer, there was no other way by which the descent of the Spirit could

be perceived but by the sight. On the other hand, the conversation of John with Jesus, which in Matthew precedes the baptism, is wholly wanting in our narrative, and as the heavenly sign is made the principal fact, and the baptism of Christ himself is mentioned only indirectly, the whole presents a very different character. And it must be confessed, as the connexion of the baptism and temptation, for the reasons stated, does not compel us to suppose an original Gospel, so these very variations of the one narrative from the other become, upon that supposition, only the more difficult to comprehend. To say now here too, though but incidentally, something of the matter itself: this heavenly sign cannot possibly have taken place in the presence of a great multitude of people; for traces of the strong impression which such an event could not fail to produce are altogether wanting. Christ must have been already baptized when the envoys of the great council came to the Baptist. This is so clearly proved by the thread of John's Gospel, that I am only surprised any one could suppose the contrary. John the Baptist then could not have described the Messiah as come indeed, but wholly unknown, had he been proclaimed in so public a manner; nor could he the next day have spoken to his disciples of this sign, evidently as of something that occurred only to himself. If John then was alone with Jesus at the baptism, it follows that all accounts of it can have been de-

rived only from his. Now this, as communicated to us by his disciple John, the son of Zebedee, makes no mention of a heavenly voice; it was only in the descent of the Spirit that, according to a promise granted to the Baptist, he received the divine testimony that this was the Messiah. Nor is it possible that, before this sign, he can have wished to divert Jesus from his purpose of receiving baptism, as he assures us that he did not previously know him. (John I. 33.) By what means however and in what manner John perceived that the Spirit rested upon Jesus, he does not tell us; and as they were alone, it is very possible that the language of Jesus was the sign which convinced him of the fact. Here then we have in both Gospels, in Matthew and Luke, narratives which have undergone alteration, and vary a little from the only account on which they can have been founded. As well their conformities as their variations may be easily explained by the sensible image which must have impressed itself on the minds of the hearers, when John's narrative was delivered in detached parts and perhaps not always quite alike, without the remotest suspicion of an actual adulteration to be laid to the charge of any one; only the conversation in Matthew betrays an arbitrary departure from simplicity for the sake of a supposed improvement. The rigid deduction of the sensible fact from these different narratives was not a want of that age and of those hearers, but

benefits only us, the critical generation, who for that very purpose have the original narrative, together with those derived from it, remaining.

Lastly, we have still left of this piece the account of John the Baptist himself, which precedes the actual description of Jesus's baptism. As to this, it results most distinctly from the comparison of Matthew and Luke, that both accounts are founded on a memoir, which though it paid no particular attention to the relation in which John stood to Jesus, and gave no account of the baptism of Christ, and was therefore probably not composed by a Christian, contained memorable passages from the public life of John, and beginning with his public appearance, concluding with his imprisonment, first describing his person and mode of life, next drawing the general outline of his doctrine with reference to the Messiah, then detailing in aphorisms its application to the different classes of the people, and lastly exhibiting his relation to the priesthood and to Herod, was a well-arranged and complete historical whole, such as, with the exception of John's Gospel, we do not possess concerning Jesus, as indeed it was easier to write such memoirs of John, whose public appearance was both shorter and much less diversified. This memoir now is epitomized differently in Matthew and Luke, but very fortunately for us in such a manner that the one affords a supplement to the other. Matthew even furnishes the means of cor-

recting a slight mistake in Luke, and both together enable us easily to construct the whole, as I have just described it, at least in the outline, though it cannot well have been of very great extent. That in this memoir the baptism of Jesus was not mentioned is clear as well from Luke, in whom the baptism would in that case surely have been also mentioned before the imprisonment, as from Matthew, who likewise evidently enters upon an entirely fresh theme where he begins his account of the baptism. But that this historical piece should have composed a whole with that poetical one which forms the commencement of our Gospel, merely on account of the *ἐν τοῖς ἔσχημοῖς*, I. 80, and *ἐν τῷ ἐσθήμῳ*, III. 2, this is a view which I cannot share with Paulus; those words are merely to be explained from the general notoriety of the fact, that John made his first public appearance in the wilderness. But should this discovery compel us to have recourse to an original Gospel? Will it be said that the connexion of the baptism and temptation in Matthew and Luke may be allowed to pass as founded on the nature of the subjects, but that their both prefixing a circumstantial account of John the Baptist clearly indicates some such common guide and source? I do not think this will be said, when it is considered how necessary an introduction of this sort was at a time when the recollection of John had already in general lost something of its distinctness,

and when moreover accounts of Jesus were beginning to be collected for such of his followers as could know little or nothing of his precursor from any other quarter, and how desirable therefore it must have been to find a memoir of the latter, from which every reader might extract the information which interested him most. Thus then did it happen that Luke, when he sought for accounts of the commencement of Jesus's ministry, met with these three sections, the abstract of the memoirs of John, the account of the baptism of Christ, and the history of the temptation, in a somewhat different form indeed from Matthew, but yet in the same order.

If however he found these three sections already connected, as I suppose, chiefly because I feel convinced that the genealogy, in the unnatural position in which it stands, must have been inserted after those narratives were connected together, and yet cannot consider it as an interpolation introduced after the whole was formed: in this case Luke loses the praise of the chronological determination contained in III. 1, which he has so long possessed, and which is usually rated so high as a proof of his more correct notion of historical composition. I conceive however that I am rather doing him a service in rescuing him from this praise. For this determination of time was to be sure very meritorious and seasonable in a memoir of John; but is it also very praiseworthy

in a biography of Christ to state more exactly when John made his first public appearance, than when Christ began to teach, or when he was born? And is it much to be commended that Luke distributed his dates unconnectedly and injudiciously in three different places? Had this determination proceeded from him, and been his merit, we should find it at the head of the genealogy, and he would have written, after his account of Christ's baptism, Ταῦτα δὲ ἐγένετο ἐν ἔτει &c. ὄντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὡσεὶ ἑτῶν &c. which would indeed have been of much more service to us. As it is, Luke is not the author of this date, but an earlier writer, who was unacquainted with the preceding statements, and here therefore it cannot be more exact nor more properly placed.

The subject of the narrative immediately following, IV. 16—30, is evidently the same incident which is somewhat differently related by Matthew XIII. 54—58. For had the incident here described preceded the other, the Nazarenes could not possibly have asked at Christ's second appearance, πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὐτή, which is however the point on which in Matthew every thing hinges. If the occurrence in Matthew was the earlier, Jesus could not say at his second appearance, *To-day is this Scripture fulfilled*, without referring in this address and in his subsequent vindication to his presence on the former occasion, in such a manner that our narrative, considering its great animation, must

have borne marks of it. Here then we have also two originally distinct narratives of the same fact ; but a third, after the plan of the original Gospel, which should contain only what is common to both, would be a very strange vague thing, for it would come to no conclusion. The two narratives moreover can only be reconciled, by supposing that of Matthew to be founded on an imperfect, merely incidental notice of the fact, and the conclusion to be an addition of a later hand, which framed that notice into a distinct narrative, and finding no mention of the tumultuous catastrophe, in which however it does not seem that there was any design against the life of Jesus, subjoined a very natural but indefinite conclusion. In Luke's narrative, on the other hand, it is precisely this catastrophe, and the manner in which things took this turn, after the approbation and wonder at first expressed, that is the principal point. The description is in the highest degree animated, but at the same time very free, and the Hebraisms are almost confined to the words of Christ, so that I cannot believe it to be a translation from the Aramaic ; I only think it may have been set down in Greek from an oral narrative of an eye-witness in Aramaic. Whether by Luke himself I would not decide. But his reason for assigning to the narrative this place, was undoubtedly, as has been already remarked by others, that he took this incident for the motive which induced Jesus to fix his

residence at Capernaum, and not at Nazareth; evidently without good ground. For the narrative itself presupposes a stay of considerable length in Capernaum, and not one of only a few days, and also a long absence from Nazareth. This must be felt by every one who gives himself up without a bias to the impression of the narrative, though Luke is excusable for not having felt it, because he was seeking a motive for that choice of residence, and deserves praise for so doing, so that upon the whole the very mistake speaks more in his favour than against him. Yet it is also conceivable, that although this may not have escaped him, he was nevertheless induced by the manner in which his next materials presented themselves to him, rather to assign to this separate narrative its place here, than to part what he found connected, or to introduce it too late.

For there now follow a great number of detached narratives, all either evidently derived from Capernaum, or at least according to every sign from that place and its neighbourhood, IV. 31—44; V. 1—11, 12—16, 17—26, 27—39; VI. 1—11, VI. 12—VII. 10. They shew themselves to be originally independent narratives, partly by their conclusions, and by the frequent recurrence, in a continuous narrative wholly superfluous and scarcely conceivable, of phrases respecting the spreading reputation of Christ, partly by their abrupt commencements, which make no pretence

to connexion with any preceding passage. There is however this striking distinction between the first and last half of these pieces, that the former merely contains accounts of miracles of Jesus, and all his discourse and instruction is kept quite in the back ground, or is mentioned only by way of introduction. while in the latter, speeches of Christ, either connected speeches or conversations or short pointed replies, are the main subjects, and the miraculous, where it appears at all, is mentioned only as the occasion. With this is connected another distinction, namely, that in the latter pieces those concluding forms which return from the particular to the general are scarcely ever to be found. Naturally enough; for a speech contains its conclusion in itself, and no one desires any thing farther, and in like manner a conversation is completed by a striking reply. This remark on the resemblance of the passages which follow one another, on their similar locality, and their want of connexion, leads of itself to the idea of two compilers, who, setting out from different points of view, procured information respecting Jesus from the neighbourhood of his usual place of abode; one inquiring only after his remarkable actions, the other only after his remarkable sayings; whether they themselves visited the spot, or found elsewhere opportunities of questioning natives who were his contemporaries. Both compilations fell into Luke's hands and he

communicates the one immediately after the other; perhaps even they were already united by the interposed narrative of the paralytic, which nearly preserves an equilibrium between the two characters. For this is a point which no one will presume to determine precisely. If we proceed to the details, several difficulties indeed will arise, but will also admit of being removed, and much additional confirmation will present itself.

The beginning of the first narrative, IV. 31, is so framed, that it may be connected by a simple comma with the end of the former. For there is no objection to reading *αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Καπέρναουμ*, and setting a full stop after *Γαλιλαίας*; it is indeed almost necessary to read so, as *ἐπορεύετο* by itself makes an extremely bad ending. This may have been done by Luke himself; whether it be that he was the person who first drew up the preceding narrative, and so blended with it the beginning of the following one, or that having assigned for particular reasons this precise place to the foregoing narrative, he allowed himself in this passage only, against his general rule, to alter a little the end of the one and the beginning of the other, or that verses 31 and 32 are actually a part of the conclusion of the foregoing narrative. Verse 37 certainly looks like a conclusion, and one might feel inclined to separate the passage which follows it, were it not connected in too distinct a manner,

so that the cure in Peter's house must be laid on the same day with this, or it must at least be supposed that the narrator so represented it, in which point indeed one who was in the habit of hearing Jesus every Sabbath in the synagogue, and exactly remembered nothing more than that this cure was wrought after leaving the synagogue, might easily make a mistake. But that on the same evening a great number of sick were brought to Jesus, must excite surprize, if he was then residing in Capernaum and therefore accessible every day. It can only be explained by his departure, which took place the next morning, and this therefore must have been fixed and publicly known, a supposition without which we cannot comprehend verse 42. For the mere circumstance of Christ taking a walk in the morning to a lonely place, could not of itself give occasion to a concourse of people and an attempt to detain him. In Mark I. 36, 37, Simon appears also to go in quest of Jesus with his other intimate friends, but that is only ambiguity or misapprehension. Jesus had gone before; the disciples follow, well aware where he was, though Mark's informant seems not to have had a distinct notion of this circumstance, and Simon only acquaints Jesus with the thronging and wishes of the people. Matthew, VIII. 14—17, passes over the departure altogether in silence, by which means the accumulation of cures, which he also mentions, is rendered completely unintelligible.

If on the other hand he seems immediately to connect this incident with another, which he distinctly relates to have happened at the entrance into Capernaum, this is in the highest degree improbable, and it is preferable to consider the words *καὶ ἔλθων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου*, as with him is so often the case with *τότε* and similar phrases, as a perfectly abrupt beginning, which proves no connexion with the preceding passage. We may also remark, that each of the three evangelists contributes indeed some particular circumstance respecting the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, and all are easily reconcilable, and it would therefore seem that all three narratives must be referred to eye-witnesses; but still we are not authorized to infer that these were actually members of Christ's domestic society; we must remember that Jesus was no doubt accompanied home from the synagogue, from time to time, by the most considerable of his approving hearers. But if the cure took place in the presence of these attendants, who must have been the persons that related it, it is extremely improbable that the impetuous Peter should have communicated before-hand to his mother-in-law, who was just then lying in a paroxysm of her disorder, for the cure could not otherwise have been observed, what had just taken place in the synagogue. It was also the less necessary, as Jesus had then been teaching a considerable time in Galilee, and therefore had al-

ready wrought a number of cures. For it is as an occurrence taken out of the midst of such a course of life, that the incident is related by Mark and Luke. I add but one observation; if we conceive Luke in this part of his book to be the actual writer, how strange and almost inexcusable would it be in that case to introduce into his book for the first time a man like Simon, who plays such a part in the whole life of Jesus, in such a way as this, quite without prelude and preface! How much superior in that case are Matthew and Mark, who premise the history which here follows! And how would it be possible that Luke should have had them both before him, and yet have written in this manner himself? One would rather suppose he had served as an example for their warning. The same remark holds if Luke had before him an original Gospel as a connected outline. But the case is quite different, if he is here too only communicating a document which he found already existing; since a person who related or set down this history by itself, for the benefit of one who knew independently of it who Peter was, could have no inducement formally to introduce and present him.

The incident recorded in the second narrative, V. 1—11, cannot possibly have happened after that cure of Peter's mother-in-law, but must have preceded it; nor can this narrative have been originally connected with the foregoing. The latter

is impossible, because Jesus's coming to the lake is not at all brought into connexion with the general fact, that he had preached in other synagogues of Galilee, and because Peter is not mentioned as a person who had been spoken of before. It is besides in itself a very strange proceeding of Paulus to connect the words ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ—καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ, with the preceding καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῆς Γαλιλαίας, and hence to draw conclusions respecting the order of the events. If these two passages were connected, a link was evidently wanting, which might have been restored in a few words, and which would therefore scarcely have been omitted by any one, to the purport, that Jesus had not only taught in the synagogues, but that, as he passed from one place to another, the people had flocked after him to receive his instructions. But this flocking and crowding of the people, which is represented by Paulus as a thing of perpetual occurrence, not connected with any particular occasion, is something altogether marvellous, and to the unprejudiced observer in the highest degree improbable. The former point, that the incident at the lake must have taken place before that which happened in Peter's house, ought not properly to stand in need of proof: but even eminent critics have taken the contrary view of the matter. If the author of this narrative supposed that a closer intimacy had been

already formed between Jesus and Peter, how could he have written so, εἶδε δὲ πολλὰ—καὶ οἱ ἀλιεῖς—ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἐν ᾗ ἦν τοῦ Σίμωνος? Must he not have said, *When Jesus was pressed by the people, he was glad to see Peter's ship, and entered into it, and called to Peter, who was washing his nets, to thrust out, &c.* Does not the transaction related in our narrative sound as if the parties were complete strangers? Not indeed so that Peter should not have known Jesus, if it were only from seeing him in the synagogue; but still so that at that time he had certainly never yet contracted a closer acquaintance with him. But this, it may be said, is to be laid to the account of the reporter, who being perhaps one of the multitude whom Christ was teaching, knew nothing of the terms on which he had been standing for some time before with these fishermen. But Peter himself, in what light does he appear under this supposition? After Jesus had rebuked a prophesying spirit, Simon takes the miraculous personage quite calmly home with him, and even the cure of his mother-in-law does not disturb his composure; but now that the great quantity of fishes comes after long and fruitless toil, and where he least expected them, now he thinks all at once that he cannot support the immediate presence of the holy man. This Simon would never surely have become the right Peter to found the church on! But this incident is certainly prior; only the

compiler, whose work Luke here again gives us unaltered, and who, regarding only the miraculous import, was less concerned about the natural order of the accounts which he collects, learnt this later, and as he learnt it annexed it to the other. Matthew IV. 18—22, and Mark I. 16, relate the same thing. Both, it is evident, chiefly from the point of view, that this was the mode in which Peter and his comrades became disciples of Jesus. Whether this was a generally received tradition, or whether they inferred it from the expressions *δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου*, and *ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ*, and whether rightly or not, is an inquiry the more difficult, as a close intimacy is only formed by degrees. That the impression which Peter here receives is such as he could only receive if this was the first sign which he had seen of Jesus, and that from this event a new tie is formed between them, seems clear. But this is perfectly consistent with the fact, that Peter's attention may have been drawn to Jesus before, that he may even have had conversation with him, as certainly appears from John. Only more must not be ingrafted upon John I. 40—42, than is therein contained, and we must not forget, that our narrative, the most circumstantial and exact of the three, does not on this occasion mention Andrew, who seems in Judea to have been more intimately acquainted with Jesus than Peter was. And I would not admit him as a welcome addition from Matthew and Mark, but would

rather believe, that they, from their point of view, imagined those two apostolic brothers must of course also have been called at the same time, as James and John were. For that the narratives of Matthew and Mark were either originally more hastily taken down, or were obscured by passing through a great number of hands, we also see from the circumstance, that in them the sons of Zebedee have no connexion with the other pair of brothers, and that the miraculous call was therefore a double one. This need not excite surprize. For in how many various ways, sometimes more, sometimes less distinctly and accurately, may the three disciples have related this to them ever memorable incident!

The third narrative, concerning the leper, leaves the place quite undetermined. Matthew does not fix it in a town, but on the road from the place of the Sermon on the Mount to Capernaum. One might hence conjecture, that the expression in our Gospel, ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, was only an incorrect report, for “after he had been in another city.” The almost verbal coincidence of Matthew’s narrative with ours is moreover confined to the decisive point, which in so simple an incident is certainly not surprizing. In the other parts they preserve the relation natural to two different narratives of the same transaction; and as in Matthew the affair is related in immediate connexion with the Sermon on the Mount, and with the occurrence which there follows

at the entrance into Capernaum, he had no occasion for such a conclusion as we have here. This conclusion, by the way, has in other respects quite the ordinary character, only the latter part of it is singular, and one should be more inclined to suppose that it proceeded from the compiler, than from the original narrator, as it does not distinctly express the general manner of life and habits of Jesus. Now if the first collection, as may be conjectured, terminates here, it is the more probable that the compiler embellished the conclusion in this manner. But when with this impression we proceed to Mark's narrative, it looks as if he had made something else out of this conclusion. He connects the increased fame of Jesus with the transgressing his injunction of silence, and as he represents the consequence of this to be, that Jesus was so beset with persons desiring assistance, that he could not enter quietly into any town, but was constrained to retire into desert places, and yet the people flocked from all sides to him, the explanation is clearly implied, that Jesus's principal motive in that injunction was to avoid being thus assailed. By this alteration the history assumes an almost apocryphal character; and if, on the one hand, we acknowledge the instruction we receive by this very circumstance from Mark's narrative, it is no less true on the other hand, that the comparison is the more unfavorable to him, as his

additions frequently tend to this sort of exaggeration. What induced him too, contrary to his usual practice, to relate this particular history unconnectedly, does not belong to our inquiry.

The following narrative of the paralytic, V. 17—25, although its subject is also a miraculous cure, and its conclusion in some degree resembles the preceding, I should still be inclined to consider as the first of the other collection. For the keeping of the marvellous in this resembles far more the subsequent narrative of the withered hand, than the preceding, of the leper and the prophetic spirit; the dialogue and the mode in which Jesus treats his adversaries, decidedly form the prominent part. It also speaks in favour of this opinion, if we choose to take this into consideration here, that Matthew also connects this narrative with that which follows in our author, and not with that which in our Gospel precedes it. Our author determines neither time nor place, which, considering the mode in which we conceive this compilation to have arisen, is very natural. Matthew fixes the place at Capernaum, as is also very natural. For where else could scribes from different quarters meet for the purpose of hearing Jesus? The time he fixes to be that of his return from his excursion to the eastern shore of the lake. Mark, who in the order follows our collection, cannot do this; but he adopts from Matthew the return, and thence explains the extraordinary concourse

of men, but at the same time on that account very judiciously passes over the Pharisees, who were assembled from various parts. These however might very well have been there, notwithstanding a short absence of Christ, of which, as it was not his usual time of travelling, they might not be aware. But the unusual and almost tumultuous exertions to introduce a sick man, a native of the place, and in whose malady delay could not have been attended with danger, scarcely admit of any other explanation, than by supposing what no account mentions, that there was reason to believe Christ would this time soon depart again; that is, that a journey to celebrate one of the festivals was at hand. Without some such adequate motive, no one surely would have permitted the disturbance here described in his house. Neither supposition however accords well with the great, and therefore evidently prepared entertainment which follows, and this too confirms the supposition, that this narrative was not originally connected with the ensuing one, but that they were brought together only by the obvious design of the compiler, their order in itself being quite accidental. This is also confirmed by the ensuing narrative itself.

For as to this history of the publican, V. 27—39, the conversation of Christ with the Pharisees is evidently the main point; this however would not have been intelligible without the fact, that

Jesus and his disciples had partaken of a repast at the publican's house. But as the doctors of the law would scarcely have waited without till the splendid entertainment was at an end, to begin the dispute, for they were sure enough to find Christ and his disciples at the usual time of public business the next day, this conversation could scarcely follow immediately after the banquet. Had this history therefore been related in a continuous thread with the former, we should have found them connected either in this manner: *Still they were minded after this again to question his disciples, for that the day before he had sate at meat with them at the house of a publican, with many other publicans and sinners: or thus: And he went hence to a great feast which a publican made for him, and from this the Scribes and Pharisees took occasion afresh, &c.* Ours however sounds quite like an independent narrative, which premises the circumstances necessary to be known, without concerning itself about any farther connexion. The phrase *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα* is much too vague to seek in it a view to any precise reference to the preceding passage. Mark, II. 13, adopting the same order, does not in fact establish any connexion with what precedes, only his strange, often repeated *πάλιν* forces the appearance of one, and he cannot forbear attaching the incident to something. He therefore fixes on the circumstance of the receipt of custom being situated without

the city by the side of the lake, and makes Christ go out thither and teach; which is in itself improbable, as in Capernaum the synagogue, the market-place, and as we have seen, private houses afforded him sufficient opportunity. But least of all was the vicinity of a great custom-house, where pursuits of an entirely different and distracting nature were perpetually carried on, a suitable place for teaching. This connexion therefore is made only for the sake of that more coherent form which is Mark's object. Neither has Matthew's *παράγων ἐκεῖθεν* any greater import, than other similar phrases in his Gospel usually have\*. On the other hand what we might be inclined most willingly to adopt from Matthew and Mark, is the simple way in which with them the words *ἀκολούθει μοι* may be referred to the *ἀνακεῖσθαι* immediately following, without that *καταλιπὼν πάντα* which in the narrative in our Gospel gives the incident a very singular appearance. Only, in the two other evangelists the fact of the great feast is not made so palpable to the sense, but the guests meet as it were unbidden. And we must therefore again allow our narrator the advantage in the lively representation of an eye-witness, and have only our option, whether we choose to understand

\* If *μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν* is commonly used to signify journeys to a distance, what more definite sense should our *παράγων ἐκεῖθεν* have? It will, I think, be difficult to find any.

ἀκολούθει μοι of the calling to the profession of a disciple, taking καταλιπὼν πάντα less literally as a brief compendium, and to consider the feast as given afterwards out of joy at this calling, or to suppose it was only on their return into the town that Christ called his host, who was then of course prepared to go with him.

We can hardly hesitate to adopt the former supposition; for the latter circumstance would scarcely have been included in the account; our narrator would have begun directly, Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τελευτῆς τις ὀνόματι Δεῦλις ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ δοχὴν μεγάλην ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Another circumstance which shows Matthew's narrative to be less immediate is, that he breaks the unity of the whole transaction by introducing John's disciples together with the Pharisees. In this addition every unbiassed reader, on comparing it with the narrative in our Gospel, will certainly perceive the perplexing alteration of a second hand which could not rightly explain to itself how the Pharisees came to appeal to the Baptist's disciples. The Pharisees evidently deemed it a fortunate discovery that they were able to lay hold of some external resemblances between themselves and the latter and so in a manner to claim them as their own, and thought themselves justified in holding out this example to Jesus, as it was notorious that he had himself received the baptism of John and that several of the Baptist's most intimate disciples had

gone over to him. But from John's disciples themselves the question would have been almost silly. Mark seems here too to have had before him both narratives, and to have wound his way doubtfully between them. I would moreover vindicate our narrative with respect to the last addition, verse 39, and remark, that it need not be supposed to have been borrowed from another place and only added here by an injudicious second hand. For it is not so much at variance with the mode in which the preceding figures of like nature are applied, to deprecate all intermixture of the new spirit with the old and with ancient forms. Old wine, it is true, is every where preferred, like old familiar usages, but at the same time we are not here, where the wine alluded to is a common light wine which never lasts many years and the growth of a country not particularly distinguished for its wines, to think of our high estimation of old rich wines in comparison with the new and rough. The old wine is indeed preferred, but this is no reason why a later vintage may not be more generous and of greater strength, and this was what Jesus meant of his doctrine and his spirit. And in this sense it is a softening addition; he would not take it ill that they did not yet like this new wine, but as usual held the old the better; the value of the new was to be proved by the taste, and the relish for it could only gain upon them by degrees.

The two disputes with the Pharisees, VI. 1—11, concerning the plucking of the ears of corn and the healing of the withered hand, were already connected together in the original narrative which forms the basis of this (as we see by the words *ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ*, which evidently refer to verse 1) on account of the analogy of the subjects, with the express remark that they did not both happen the same day. And this has likewise the greater weight of probability in its favour. For how could the same Pharisees, while Christ's justification of his disciples for eating the corn was still fresh in their remembrance, entertain the smallest doubt whether he would also heal on the Sabbath? Yet Matthew seems to suppose one and the same day when he says, XII. 9, *καὶ μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν*. But this *μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν* refers unaptly enough to *ἐπορεύθη διὰ τῶν σπορίμων*; and indeed his narrative here in general bears fewer traces of the immediate eye-witness. Let us only compare the way in which Jesus in our narrative, verse 8, bids the sick man, who probably sat begging at the door of the synagogue, rise and stand forth in the midst, and in verse 10 the graphic stroke *περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοῦς*, to which Matthew has nothing comparable. Our conclusion also, which describes only the passionate perplexity of the Pharisees, has in it something more probable than Matthew's, which points rather at a determinate plot. For the Pharisaical party in Caper-

naum was scarcely able of itself to form and prosecute one of this sort. Still more improbable is Mark's addition, III. 6, that they united on this occasion with the Herodian party against Jesus. So again, verse 5, he exaggerates what our eye-witness states very simply. The conversation in the fields is not given fully by our reporter, who indeed intimates clearly enough by the phrase *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* that he only subjoins the conclusion after the main argument.

The last piece in this collection is a report of the long discourse which was also delivered near Capernaum, known under the name of the Sermon on the Mount. The narrative of the healing the servant in Capernaum was no doubt originally annexed to this memoir, since it took place, as we see clearly from Matthew, immediately after it; and the hearer who afterwards recorded the Sermon seems to have observed the course of this occurrence also. The absence of a conclusion in this narrative is another sign that it did not originally stand by itself, but was only subjoined as an unimportant addition to a greater whole. With respect to the incidents which led to this discourse, our narrative tells us more than Matthew, who inserts it without any introduction; but the manner in which these additional circumstances have been almost universally explained does not seem to me the right one. In the first place, that Jesus passed the night on the mount

in prayer, which however in its literal sense no one can have known, is certainly not to be connected immediately with the occurrence itself. All that is singular in that circumstance disappears if we take notice of Matthew's hint, that Christ only entered into Capernaum after the discourse, and had therefore probably come not out of the town but from another quarter. And the easiest way of conceiving the transaction is evidently that it occurred on the return from a festival-journey, when he was surrounded by a double crowd; on the one hand by the caravan with which he had travelled, which had of course been joined by several parties on the road, and which, in order to crown the occasional conversations by the way now that he was on the point of returning to his place of abode, he wished to dismiss with a more explicit parting address. This numerous company had perhaps filled the inns, so as to render them too noisy for Jesus, who may have preferred, in the fine season of the year, and in a well known spot, to spend the last night in the open air, and accordingly have ascended the mount. His arrival however became known wherever the company passed the night, and if any travellers who were pressed for time went on late in the evening into Capernaum there also, and hence, on the other hand, a second crowd flocked together, some in want of relief, who had now been long in expectation of him, some friends and admirers,

who came out of Capernaum to meet him. In this way we have an explanation of the unusual concourse, which was the very circumstance that induced our narrator to do, what perhaps on the occasion of any other discourse he would not have done, to set before our eyes the whole sensible image how Christ, being on the point of coming down from the mount, on perceiving the unexpectedly numerous throng, first called to him his disciples, and when a great multitude even of these crowded up to him, collects the Twelve more immediately round his person, and so descends with them to the softer declivity, where in the first place he lays hands on the numerous sick and suffering persons, and then begins the parting address which he had designed for the companions of his journey who up to that time had been his hearers. To render this sensible image distinctly present to the mind is evidently the design of the whole introduction. How has it come to be considered, quite contrary to this design, as the account of an event which is in itself of much greater importance for the history of the life of Christ than this or any other particular discourse, namely, the choice of the Twelve, and their institution into their specific relation to Christ? The words, ἐκλεξάμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν δώδεκα οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε, do not at all warrant this. The word ἐκλέξασθαι can only derive its precise meaning from the context. That however does not at all fa-

your this opinion, for by it ἐκλεξάμενος is evidently separated from ὠνόμασε, and the latter is referred to an entirely different epoch, whether we translate *whom also he had before called apostles, or, whom also he afterwards called apostles.* If a connexion had been meant between the two, it must have run ἐκλεξάμενος δώδεκα καὶ ὀνομάσας αὐτοὺς ἀποστόλους. Instead of this, ἐκλεξάμενος stands so closely connected with καταβάς between προσεφώνησε and ἔστη, that it cannot possibly express a great, solemn and very important act. Would such an act here in a free description, of which conciseness is not the prevailing character, have been confined to a parenthesis? Were the healings, which are not treated in this manner, so much more closely connected with the discourse? This no one will assert; not even one who, as is I confess my own case, cannot perceive that the discourse contains any particular reference to future teachers, but is of opinion that it was addressed to a great company, on whom maxims which they had before heard are inculcated in a compendious form, to produce a final decision in them. In short so much appears quite obvious, when one considers these words in their true relation to one another and to the whole description in which they are interwoven, that supposing even Christ had at that time really chosen and ordained the Twelve, still our narrator was not aware of it, and did not mean by these words to inform us of it.

But do we learn from Mark that Christ really ordained the Twelve on this occasion? For the circumstance which he reports, III. 13, is of course the same which is related in our introduction. Most certainly! Only it too is taken from our narrative, and we have only to say, that Mark was probably the first person who so misunderstood it. Let us only consider how little keeping there is in his whole statement, from III. 7, after our account of the withered hand, down to III. 20. Christ withdraws, one does not know why, and a great multitude notwithstanding follows him, one cannot from the context guess for what reason, at least with such urgency and haste; he does not now adopt the most natural course, seeing that the step he had taken did not avail to shelter him from the plots of the Pharisees and Herodians, that of departing or going home, in which case every one would gradually have imitated his example, or of dismissing the people from him; instead of this he has a boat kept in readiness, ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτὸν, which scarcely admits of any other sense than this, that he might have it in his power at any moment to sail away if the pressure should grow insupportable, in order by this threat to keep the crowd in some measure under a check. He then heals a great multitude and afterwards ascends the mount, there calls to himself whom he would, so that one is forced to suppose he called many,

and forthwith sent them back again, and so separates Twelve for his constant society and his peculiar service. He then goes quietly home, meets, one does not know why again, with annoyance from his friends, and is charged by the Scribes also, without the least occasion, with having a devil. This series of incidents is utterly unintelligible, and the selection and institution of the Twelve, if it ever took place, cannot possibly have happened in this manner. But it is easy to see the process by which Mark's narrative took its rise, so far as regards the point which we are now discussing, for what follows does not belong to this part of the subject. He had hitherto followed Luke, not that I would assert with Griesbach that he had before him the whole of the present Gospel of Luke, but this collection he most probably had. He now comes to the sermon; the insertion of discourses of this kind did not at present (in which I perfectly coincide with Griesbach) form a part of his plan, probably because he could not yet foresee how much room the incidents would leave him. The introduction however to the discourse given in our Gospel was very acceptable to him; he naturally wished, as indeed he is particularly anxious for historical connexion, for an account of the calling of the Twelve, and understood our introduction in this sense. But still it came too suddenly for him after the machinations of the Pharisees and Herodians, which he had just introduced; he therefore

first took for his basis the general account, which in Matthew, XII. 15, 16, follows the history of the withered hand, omitting the quotation from the Old Testament, and on the other hand enlarging it and transferring hither the boat, whether from the passage which he found in Matthew before the Sermon on the Mount and which he has himself previously introduced, or from another authority, I would not decide; but this incident is certainly not derived from any original information\*.

Moreover, if the words of our narrative οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε are to be taken strictly, so that Christ himself used this term, which however I would not contend for, still I do not believe that it originated with him, but that it was gradually established among his friends. For otherwise this name would scarcely have been extended afterwards to others, and, beside Paul whom his extraordinary vocation might entitle to it, have been borne evidently in the same sense by Barnabas also. Or to say it at once, seeing that we have no distinct information on the subject, I do not believe that a solemn calling and ordination of all the twelve apostles ever took place, and a later collector of historical materials, who had inquired about it on the spot, would scarcely have received

\* Griesbach explains Mark's method of proceeding nearly in the same manner.

any where any other answer than that the peculiar relation of the Twelve assumed its subsequent form gradually and of itself. And this answer all the evangelists except Mark give us by their silence. Is not this however in itself too the most probable state of the case? Did it not depend very much on external circumstances whether any one could enter into this relation? And if Christ by an act of his pleasure had called the Twelve, would it be possible satisfactorily to vindicate his wisdom from the objection that men, evidently more distinguished than many of the Twelve, made their appearance after his death too soon not to have been of the number of his immediate disciples; and his goodness, in having himself chosen Judas and so disposed of his soul? a difficulty which is of far more easy solution if no particular call on his side was necessary. Under these circumstances I do not at all see why one should take pains, trying all possible explanations, some of them in the highest degree improbable, to shew how Jude the son of James, and Lebbeus who was named Thaddeus, may be one person. If neither Luke nor Matthew speak of the calling of the apostles, but each merely names the Twelve on a different occasion and therefore speaks of a different period, is it not possible that an alteration may have taken place, one of the two have died, or been called away by uncontrollable circumstances, and the other have taken his place? Have we a right, considering the nature of our

Gospels, to say, that if any thing of this sort had taken place, we must necessarily have found it in them? Or was it necessary that Peter should have mentioned this in order to ground his proposal, when he called the apostles to elect a successor to Judas? This is what no one surely will maintain.

As to the discourse itself, it is evident and acknowledged, that the narrative in Luke is founded on a different ἀπομνημόνευμα from that in Matthew. Our reporter seems in the first place to have had a less favourable situation for listening, and in consequence not to have heard every thing, and occasionally to have lost the thread of the discourse; he may besides have committed it to writing at a later period when a great deal had escaped his memory; or he may have intended his memoir for one to whom he believed a great deal might be unintelligible and unimportant, as the part directed against the Pharisees would certainly have been to a converted heathen. Again it may have happened to him too to insert unconsciously a great deal of analogous matter from other discourses of Christ; nay a part, I believe this for instance to have been the case with the denunciations, is perhaps an addition of his own in order to fill a chasm which he felt and did not know how to supply; a most innocent interpolation, which presented itself to him of itself in his uncertainty, and which, on account of the exact correspondence of each οὐαί to a μακαρισμός, cannot

even be called a corruption. That they are interpolations is proved by the very exactness of this correspondence, and especially by the last woe, which takes for granted a fact quite undemonstrable. The words ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω, which immediately follow, indicate clearly enough the interruption of the context. To enter farther into details does not belong to the present subject. On the whole, the parts which coincide with Matthew are not transposed, but in the same order, which, taken together with the identity of the beginning and conclusion, proves incontrovertibly the identity of the discourse. The comparison may also be of great service for the purpose of determining what has been inserted from elsewhere in Matthew's report, and at what distance from the end the reporter has returned to the discourse itself. But the notion that Luke borrowed his extract from this discourse from a Gnomology, that is, from a miscellaneous collection of sayings and speeches of Christ, appears to me very uncertain, at least utterly unsupported. For if, I will not say every speech, but the more copious, in a collection of this sort, were prefaced by introductions equally vivid in their imagery, the collection could no longer have been entitled to the name of an Anthology of aphorisms. It follows that Luke either found this piece by itself, but in that case he would certainly for the very reason that it contains the first specific mention of all the

apostles have given it an earlier place, or, which therefore remains the most probable supposition, the piece belonged already when it fell in his way to the second of our two compilations relating to Christ's stay at Capernaum.

The narrative of the Centurion's servant was probably annexed to it, because the occurrence itself took place immediately after the discourse. The expression ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ Ἰησοῦ, as it cannot with any regard to probability be understood in a merely general sense, and must therefore be referred to the preceding circumstance, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ, which the narrator, as I have endeavoured to render probable, represented to himself as the return from a journey; this expression indicates clearly enough the original connexion between the two passages. Matthew indeed interposes, in a manner not to be rejected, between the discourse and this miracle, the healing of the leper, which in our Gospel has been already related in the first collection. But for this very reason this history cannot have been left out of the second collection by Luke himself, but by the person who first combined the two compilations together, if even our original reporter mentioned it here. But as no trace of such an omission occurs in VII. 1 and 2, and the passage therefore must in that case have been more skillfully framed than we have ground to suppose, it seems to me probable that our original reporter made no mention of it at all. And how easily, at

the entrance into Capernaum, might a thing which was despatched in a few moments escape one of the multitude, who still, from the fluctuation usual in such crowds, might have an opportunity of relating the second incident with greater accuracy than another! In fact if we compare Matthew and Luke, here too I at least find more signs of a well informed eye-witness in Luke's narrative. The main differences are, that in Luke the servant is dying, in Matthew only labouring under a severe nervous disorder, and that in Matthew the centurion makes his appearance himself, in Luke sends messengers, and even two several times, to Jesus; for the more circumstantial comparison and threatenings, which in Matthew Jesus is made to utter in his admiration of the centurion's faith, may have been merely passed over by the reporter in Luke.

Now it is certain, that in the case of a *παραλυτικός*, in whatever degree he may have been *δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος*, there was still no danger in delay; and consequently such urgent haste, which detains Christ who was just returning at all events from a fatiguing discourse, and as it were arrests him at the very entrance of the town, admits the less of explanation. For detained he was at any rate and constrained to listen to the petition addressed to him, for which the moment, amid the pressure of a great accompanying multitude, was by no means favorable, though it was in his power to despatch

the thing itself with a single word. Had the sick man then laboured only under palsy or an arthritic disease, the modest centurion, above all men, would have waited till Jesus had reached home and was at leisure. But the second message is a circumstance which cannot well be imaginary, as indeed most of the commentators have felt. Only I would not precisely ascribe the alteration in Matthew to an attempt at abridgement, for he is sufficiently minute in his report of the speeches; but I would rather say that, as Luke's reporter let slip the healing of the leper, so Matthew let slip this fact and related it only at second hand, and that the variation was not an abridgement, but a misapprehension, such as may very easily be conceived. The great and almost literal coincidence in the speeches is notwithstanding not surprizing, particularly as there is something very characteristic in the centurion's language, and Christ's short expression, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, is very pointed and impressive.

Having now come to the end of these two compilations, for so I confidently call them, it will be well to pause a moment, and once more generally to compare our gospel with those of Matthew and Mark, to see whether in this whole portion the coincidence is so great and of such a nature, that to explain it we are forced to suppose either an original gospel, or a dependence of one Evangelist on the other. If for this purpose we first turn to

Matthew, neither supposition certainly can appear necessary. For had Luke had Matthew before him and consulted him in his work, he would have assigned a different place to the history of the leper, and would have been in no uncertainty as to the scene of the occurrence; which single circumstance is in my opinion equivalent in this case to all other proofs. In the same manner, had Matthew had Luke before him, he could not have helped connecting the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, and the numerous other miracles which followed it, with a departure of Jesus from Capernaum. For an historian, who has before him an account by which a fact is rendered more distinct and clear, will not give a more imperfect statement, which leaves the fact in obscurity. Such circumstances decide in this case what variation or coincidence in particular expressions can never determine. For the same reason Matthew did not know of the first of our two collections. But neither can he have been acquainted with the second in the shape in which it appears in Luke, as well because he has not completed his report of the sermon on the mount by adding its introduction in Luke, which would of course have been highly acceptable to him likewise, as because he relates nothing in the same order, except that with him too, IX. 2—17, the publican and his entertainment follow the healing of the paralytic, and with him too the plucking of the ears of corn and the healing

of the withered hand, XII. 1—14, are connected together. The latter circumstance, as in Luke himself we were compelled to consider both as one original narrative, proves nothing in respect to the collection, but it proves, what is confirmed by the great coincidence in the details, that the same narrative was the basis of Matthew's account, but that he makes free with the connecting phrases, even in the course of one and the same narrative comprising several incidents, and has altered ἐν ἐτέρῳ σαββάτῳ into μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν. For it is scarcely credible, independently of the remarks we have made above, that a walk in the fields before the time of the synagogue should have caused the hunger which Matthew describes. With respect to the former coincidence, it is the more remarkable, considering the numerous variations in the narrative of the publican, as the phrase παράγων ἐκεῖθεν connects this incident with the preceding in so loose a manner, that one can hardly venture to infer that the one took place immediately after the other. In the history of the paralytic Matthew leaves the place quite undefined, and it is only to this undefined locality that παράγων ἐκεῖθεν can refer, which appears strange, if with Luke we transfer the incident to the synagogue. And how should a person, who does not know where one incident happened, know that another incident occurred at a certain place immediately after it? Still as in Matthew both narratives are less accu-

rate than in Luke and thereby betray a passage through several hands, it is possible notwithstanding that they were derived indirectly from our collection, at the time perhaps when it contained only those two narratives which are the first in it. At all events these particular coincidences afford no ground for presuming an original Gospel, seeing that Matthew separates widely enough all the other parts contained in our collection, and relates them in wholly different associations. As to Mark on the other hand the supposition even of an original Gospel would not of itself be sufficient, and the most natural hypothesis we have left is, that he had before him our two collections already united, since with the single exception of Peter's draught of fishes he arranges every thing in the same order, and the variation, as well in the connecting phrases as in the narrative itself, may be explained, partly from the peculiar character of his mode of working up his materials, and partly from his having also had before him in particular passages the accounts used in Matthew, not directly to say the present Gospel of Matthew itself. Out of one or the other he had inserted, after his short mention of the temptation, I. 14—20, the incident which we read somewhat differently told in Matth. IV. 12—22, worked up in his own manner. But then meeting with the long discourse, the insertion of which did not enter into his plan, he introduces the two collections, also worked up after his

own manner, on which all that is necessary has been said in discussing the particular parts; what degree of historical certainty however he had, that these collections contained wholly or in a great measure events which happened earlier than those which he brings in afterwards, I am not at all anxious to decide, but should rather believe that his decision was governed much by his private opinion. He was still obliged to omit the draught of fishes, because he saw clearly that he had already in part introduced this occurrence from a different source, and he likewise left out the long discourse at the end \*, admitting only the introduction, which suited his purpose, and probably overlooked, not expecting it after the Sermon, the account of the healing the servant, which otherwise he would surely have used. Now if these suppositions are well founded, it is self-evident, that in this whole section Luke and Mark afford no certainty at all for the chronology of the details, but that particular incidents related in the first collection may have been subsequent to some recorded in the second; moreover, that in each collection occurrences may have been brought together which belonged to wholly distinct visits

\* The reason for which I suppose him to have omitted it is, not that he would otherwise have been obliged to explain to his readers too many Jewish tenets, but that he did not intend to admit at all in this first half of his work any discourses of considerable length.

of Christ to Capernaum, and hence that particular incidents mentioned in these collections may even have been subsequent to much that is recorded in the sequel. Whether however with respect to the chronology of the same occurrences which are differently placed and connected in Matthew, he affords any greater certainty, is a point on which we cannot here give a general opinion.

The part yet remaining of this second main division, which on the whole is common to the three Gospels, is divided as follows, by passages which discover themselves plainly enough to be beginnings of distinct and once independent narratives. VII. 11—50 cannot be parted; at VIII. 1 a new narrative begins; at VIII. 22 another; at IX. 1 a third, which proceeds as far as IX. 45; 46—50 is a little appendage, and with 51 the third main division of the Gospel begins. I have only one general remark to make on the subject of this subdivision, that I am at a loss to conceive how these beginnings have been in part so mistaken, that some acute commentators designate the passage VIII. 1—3 as the end of a memoir. If it had been said merely by way of conclusion, that Jesus set out presently afterwards on a journey, how should so accurate a description of his travelling companions have found its way into such a concluding remark? And does not the expression *καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων κατ' αὐτὸν* in

verse 4, evidently refer to the words *καὶ αὐτὸς διώδευε κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην* in the 1st verse? And how was it possible to overlook the circumstance, that it is precisely to this company by which Jesus was then immediately surrounded that the words *οὗτοί εἰσι μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου* are to be referred, which is necessary to give to the whole passage its proper finish and keeping? Whereas it is evident that VIII. 22 is not of a piece with that narrative. For the person who writes here *καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* knows nothing of the companions of the journey before described; otherwise he would either have said in general *οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*, or have dropped a word to mention that the women were left behind in this passage over the water. That really strange supposition, that VIII. 1—3 is a conclusion, must have originated in the phrase *ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς*, which, independently of other objections, cannot possibly be taken as a part of the preceding memoir, because that itself subjoins the Pharisee's entertainment, without any determination of time, to the account of John's message. This phrase, on the contrary, must certainly be ascribed to the compiler of the whole, who probably found only *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτι αὐτὸς διώδευε*, but when he assigned to the narrative its place, whether he followed his own conviction, or information which he had collected, that this journey was subsequent to John's message, in order to express his judgement on the point he inserted that phrase.

I entertain the same opinion of the same phrase, ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς, VII. 11, with which the first piece, which we will now examine more closely, begins. For I read here ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς, though Griesbach, in his last edition too, has adhered to the common reading. The evidence indeed appears to me to preponderate considerably in favour of the former, which however this is not the proper place to discuss; but super-added to this is the resemblance to VIII. 1, whereas at IX. 37 with the phrase ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς we find ἡμέρα also expressed in all the manuscripts. At the same time the matter itself adds peculiar weight to this side of the question. For as we know from Matthew, that the incident immediately preceding the healing of the servant took place on the occasion of a new entrance into Capernaum, it is in the highest degree improbable that Christ should the next day again have quitted his place of abode, which was also that of many of the apostles, where there must have been a variety of affairs for them to transact, and have set out on his way to Jerusalem. Let us therefore ascribe this expression ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς, with which the detached narrative could not begin, to the compiler who assigned to it its present place. The whole piece contains three sections, the raising of the widow's son, John's message, and the Pharisee's entertainment, the union of which in one whole may appear perplexing. A connexion indeed might be supposed to be indicated between the first two, inasmuch as the message seems to

be founded on what John heard of Jesus, which several commentators accordingly refer to this raising from the dead, whereof the fame had spread as far as Judea, on the frontier of which John was confined. But this is very improbable. The first narrative has all the air of proceeding from an eye-witness; now even if this person accompanied Jesus still farther, and was also an eye-witness of the following incident, still he could scarcely have any reason for referring these messengers, who, according to the above mentioned supposition, could not certainly have arrived within a fortnight afterwards (an interval in which many other remarkable occurrences must have happened) to that particular fact. Nor ought he in that case to have expressed this particular reference by the words *περὶ πάντων τούτων*. Should we now allow this phrase sufficient weight to destroy our whole view, and say that *περὶ πάντων τούτων* refers to all the miraculous acts hitherto performed by Christ, still even this would not be sufficient, as the miraculous is so scattered over our Gospel and blended with other matter, and as on turning back we find almost immediately the long discourse, and not miraculous facts. We are therefore reduced at last to the supposition, that this phrase is only another expression for Matthew's *ἀκούσας τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and thereby again entirely lose the precise connexion with the preceding history. The Pharisee's feast, on the other hand, is subjoined to the

message in a perfectly simple manner, without any distinct separation or distinct connexion. But one relation of the three sections to each other readily presents itself; John's message is evidently the nucleus round which the other two narratives coalesce. The reporter is very anxious to refer the words addressed to John's disciples by Christ to that which he had been doing just before. With this view he introduces the 21st verse, in which he particularly notices the blind. But he could not say, in the same manner, that Christ at that time had also raised many from the dead, and this therefore might easily induce the reporter, if he was in possession of that history of the miracle at Nain, to premise it, in order to verify at least the general assertion. In the same way, the person who took down the narrative of the message, or one who became owner of it, might be acquainted with no other instance of Jesus having, in a stricter sense, proved himself a *φίλος ἀμαρτωλῶν*, and this might induce him to annex the ensuing history, in order to shew the foundation of the charge which Christ puts into the mouth of his adversaries. The former might also very well be the case with our compiler, in the whole of whose materials no other instance occurs of a raising from the dead; and so perhaps he might be the first who, in order to justify the assertion *νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*, assigned this place to the history of Nain, which he possessed by itself. In this case the words *καὶ ἐπήγγειλαν* were the ori-

ginal beginning of the narrative of the message, as it was rather awkwardly connected by some one with general recollections which occurred to him, and were likely to occur to every reader. And this same narrator, from the same motive which gave rise to verse 21, might have annexed the history of the anointing at the Pharisee's feast, which follows almost immediately after the description φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. Whichever of these suppositions is preferred, it is difficult to conceive any other connexion between these three sections, and therefore no chronological succession must be looked for here. But each of these three several narratives is also too remarkable in respect to the relation of our Gospel to the others, to permit us to proceed without dwelling upon them a little longer.

In the first place then, in the history of the revival of the young man of Nain the most remarkable circumstance is, that it appears in no other evangelist. Considering the scanty number of instances of a restoration to life, and the power which they could not fail to possess above all other miracles of producing conviction, if we imagine the first propagators of Christianity deliberating on a selection of passages from the life of Jesus, which should be employed as proofs of his dignity as Messiah, we must find it inconceivable, that this history and that of Lazarus should not have been admitted among the first into the original Gospel,

especially as the account of the daughter of Jairus was admitted, from which the adversaries of Christianity, when they still heard that the Christians boasted that their Jesus had raised other persons from the dead, might be apt to infer there was not much more in these instances than in the former, in which Jesus himself expressly said, the maid was not dead, but only slept. Or are we to say, that the confidential disciples neglected this history because Jesus himself made no account of it, a false report having in this instance been spread concerning him, as he had not effected the return of life, but was only the first who discovered that it had already returned. On a supposition so extremely improbable, which can find within the whole range of natural combinations no tenable ground, and is forced to give way by every blow from whatever side it be struck, we will not seriously dwell. The absence then of this history and of that of Lazarus from our Gospels cannot well be explained, if we imagine their original common ground-work to have been a document framed for the purpose of the ministry by the joint labour of the apostles, or even only occasioned and sanctioned by them; nay, dropping even the notion of an original Gospel, and confining ourselves to our own hypothesis, this phenomenon is difficult to comprehend, if we suppose that the most intimate disciples of Jesus were, even in most instances, the persons who either themselves first committed

to writing the several incidents of his history, or at least related them circumstantially for the purpose of their being so recorded. For as to the raising of Lazarus, it is sufficiently evident from John that none of the Twelve could have been strangers to the occurrence, and in our narrative it would be an utterly groundless and most unnatural construction, to say that *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἴκανοὶ* were all disciples of a less intimate class, and that Jesus was not at the time accompanied by the Twelve; a supposition utterly improbable. Only under one view does the omission of these incidents excite no surprize, but seem natural, that is, if we suppose that the first written accounts originated in the efforts, and at the instance of persons, who, not personally acquainted with Christ, and therefore not in the same sense his contemporaries, sought for circumstantial accounts, and aimed at perpetuating by writing the voice of oral tradition before it died away. For on the one hand these persons had less courage to apply to the Apostles, who were busily engaged in the greater work of preaching and propagating Christianity, except in particular cases on an extraordinary inducement, and rather sought out friends and hearers of the second class; on the other hand they of course directed their researches principally to places from which they might hope for the most abundant harvest, that is to Capernaum and Jerusalem. At the latter place now the most recent

occurrences naturally left the deepest impression on the memory of men, and hence the portions of the three Gospels which are common to them consist chiefly of incidents from the different periods of Christ's stay at Capernaum, and his last stay at Jerusalem. What took place at other places could not so easily form a part of their common stock; on the contrary, instead of being surprized that we do not find it in all of them, we have reason to be glad that each was fortunate enough to preserve something of this sort. And the same cause have we to congratulate ourselves on this history of Nain.

As to the message of John's two disciples, the most interesting question for the point of view here taken is, whether the narrative in our Gospel and that in Matthew are originally different, or are to be referred to one and the same? for the decision of this question has no slight influence on the aspect of the whole matter. If we have before us here two entirely independent narratives of the same occurrence, we can scarcely help considering both the address of the messengers and Jesus's answer as literally reported. But the coincidence in the speeches is here so great, no thought being omitted or receiving a different turn except where our narrative inserts something and afterwards where it breaks off, that two reports so completely corresponding are highly improbable. If this be so, then our narrative is evi-

dently a re-modelling of the original, which was preserved purer in Matthew. Our author wishing to convey a lively image of the whole occurrence adds, at verse 20, how the messengers come and discharge their commission. Then in order to lay a foundation for Christ's words, he relates, at verse 21, that he had been just engaged in acts of healing; and we must conclude that he was not aware, from his own knowledge or the reports of others, of many other instances in which Jesus had made the blind to see, because he takes particular notice of this point. In the same way, in order to explain Christ's last words from verse 31, he relates, verse 29—30, how the different classes of the nation stood affected towards John and his doctrine. For I cannot prevail on myself to consider these two verses, differing in tone so completely as they do from that which precedes and that which follows them, as a continuation of Christ's discourse. The opposite view, that our narrative is the original and Matthew's on the other hand abridged, is improbable for this reason, that in that case our narrator would certainly have begun with verse 21. An immediate eye-witness will scarcely describe in a parenthesis the whole scene which forms the ground on which a particular incident is exhibited. Now since the motive which led to the form adopted in our narrative is precisely the same with that which caused the preceding history to be connected with this, we can entertain no doubt

that both were one, that the person who so remodelled this history also prefixed that which precedes, and subjoined that which follows it. But this could not have been the compiler of the whole; for he, instead of writing at verse 29 and 30, as if he had told us nothing of John's history before, would have referred to the former piece. But we may now ask farther, if verse 21 belongs only to the enlargement of our reporter who referred the words of Jesus, *ὃ εἶδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε*, to the immediate present, was then Jesus at that time actually engaged in the act of healing? Or is this quite unnecessary, as indeed Matthew says nothing of it, and did Jesus appeal only to that which they had it in their power to see at all times, and hear of in every place through which he passed? With this is connected a second question, namely, whether if no more than this was meant it was possible for Jesus, without assuming a tone of exaggeration quite unsuitable and foreign to his character, to use the expression *νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*, if it is to be understood in the literal sense, and we do not choose to presume that many instances of restoration to life occurred with which we are wholly unacquainted? The latter supposition is the more improbable, because in those general summaries, which recur so often in Matthew and Mark, wherein they mention all kinds of diseases and demoniacal maladies, raising from the dead is nowhere mentioned among the other miracles. Hence it

is certainly probable, that these words are to be taken in the figurative sense of spiritual death, as Jesus unquestionably often used them, and the more, as the allusion to Isaiah LXI. 1, in the words τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσι and πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, which has been already remarked by others, but which escaped the reporter in our Gospel, affixes to those words also a figurative sense. Not that the πτωχοὶ must be exactly the poor in spirit, but they who were not able to distinguish themselves in the legal sense, the πτωχοὶ κατὰ νόμον καὶ κατὰ παράδοσιν. These receive the tidings of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, which introduces a different measure of spiritual worth. But are we to suppose Christ, with an almost intolerable accumulation of metaphors, to have spoken the words χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται and κωφοὶ ἀκούουσι also in the figurative sense? Certainly not; either these are amplifying additions, perhaps of the original narrator, who may have introduced them in the place of some clauses which he had forgotten, or Christ began by referring in proper terms to his outward operation, and afterwards proceeded to describe the impression which he had also produced on the minds of men, but the expressions have been confounded by the narrator. In the same way the words of the messengers may by abridgement have been set in a false light. For John himself can scarcely have entertained a doubt respecting Jesus's character of Messiah, nor could he compromise his own reiterated testimony by in-

structing his doubting disciples to express their doubts in his name. But here another difficulty presents itself. If the occurrence took place when John was in prison, it is hardly credible that the two disciples can in the strictest sense of the word have been commissioned by John. For Josephus's narrative leaves no doubt that the dread of sedition was either the real cause which induced Herod to throw John into prison, or at least his pretext for so doing, with which therefore he would at all events have been obliged to act consistently; and under these circumstances it is not credible that his disciples should have had free access to him. But as this may probably enough have been introduced by Matthew, for the sake of conformity with his first mention of John's confinement, which is certainly premature, and as Christ gives the disciples an answer directly for their master, I would rather believe they were really sent by him, and that he was then still at liberty. And indeed the manner in which Jesus afterwards speaks of John to the people renders it improbable that he was in prison at the time. If then according to this view we put a rather different construction on the words ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν, and suppose the messengers to have said, *Thou art surely he who should come, and since thou doest besides such great things, what should we any longer wait for? ought not John with his whole authority forthwith to command by us all*

*who have been baptized by him to obey thee as Messiah, and to wait upon thy bidding?* by this construction we get rid of the strange appearance which the words now present, as though the very miracles of Jesus had raised doubts in the minds of John and his disciples, and the figurative part of Jesus's speech then evidently becomes the principal point. For in this he declares, that the course which the cause has hitherto taken is the right one, and that it ought to proceed in the same way without intermixture of any thing foreign to it. Whether however the discourses which in Matthew are subjoined to this, from XI. 20 to 24, or even to 30, belong to this interview, I do not wish to decide. That they are wanting in our alteration is no proof of the negative, but the *τότε* in verse 20 and the *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ* in verse 25 are certainly none of the affirmative, and other circumstances render it more probable that they are discourses of later date, placed here, as is so frequently the case in Matthew, on account of the similarity of import.

The third piece in this portion, the narrative of the Pharisee's entertainment, well repays the trouble of considering once more, whether the incident is or is not the same with that related Matthew XXVI. 6—13, Mark XIV. 3—9, and John XII. 1—8. Are we, in a narrative like this in our Gospel, which does not at all concern itself about the locality, to consider the merely inci-

dental expression ἐν τῇ πόλει, which only betrays, as every thing here does, a narrator who learnt the affair at second hand and but incidentally, as a proof that the incident could not have occurred in Bethany? Is it in itself probable, that Christ should, two different times, and both at an entertainment where the host's name was Simon, have been anointed by a woman, when no difference in the statement of place and time forces us to suppose such a repetition? Is it probable, if Christ had on a former occasion so decidedly defended the action, that his disciples would a second time so decidedly have censured it? Is it not more natural to suppose, that our narrative is only taken in a different point of view, for which reason the discourse of Christ with the Pharisee is here communicated, while the censure, which the disciples may have uttered at the same time, is omitted? Matthew on the other hand evidently connects the occurrence with the treachery of Judas, and for that reason omits that conversation. John almost seems to have had before him both narratives, but as his object is merely to correct them, he has no motive for mentioning Christ's discourse with the Pharisee; he only defends the other disciples from the suspicion of having taken part in the censure expressed by Judas, and the woman from that of being a sinner in the common sense of the word. Nor in fact did Simon say that she was so; the reporter only inferred it from the manner in which

Jesus notices the unuttered thoughts of his host, and afterwards ends by announcing to the woman herself the forgiveness of her sins. If then, in reading our narrative, we conceive that part which is only the narrator's opinion omitted, we may as easily conceive that Simon only took offence at the extraordinary respect shown to his guest, whereas he himself seems to have invited him only because he could not decently avoid it. Nor does it follow from Christ's words, that the woman was a sinner in the common sense of the word; for all that Jesus says is, that her action arose out of a fulness of genuine reverential attachment. Now if she was, as John informs us, the sister of Lazarus, a person who had been for a considerable time on terms of intimacy with Christ, he might very well address her, with a particular allusion quite unknown to us, in the words *ἀφένεται σοι αἱ ἀμαρτίαι*, which to most of the persons present who were acquainted with Mary would be unintelligible, but at the same time would excite in them no suspicion, and yet might afterwards give occasion to this misunderstanding, when the story was told to one, to whom the narrator believed it to be immaterial who this woman was. And precisely some such person appears to have reported it in this passage, with this natural but certainly not quite accurate supplement. But as this is exactly the same sort of comment and supplement which the preceding history of the message from John under-

went here, we have in this circumstance an additional confirmation of the conjecture, that both in their present form flowed from the same pen, and that the expression φίλος ἁμαρτωλῶν was the occasion of their connexion. A striking resemblance in manner is also visible in the circumstance, that here verse 38 is formed out of the words of Jesus in verse 44, just as verse 21 above out of verse 22, and just so has the reporter derived Simon's thoughts, verse 39, from verses 47 and 48. Is it indeed probable, that a Pharisee of reputation, at a great entertainment, should have allowed a person justly infamous throughout the town access to the room where he received his guests? If then the criminality attributed to the woman in our narrative is only an erroneous supposition of a later reporter\*, there is no farther reason why she should not have been the sister of Lazarus. On the contrary, in order to explain the whole scene, we require precisely such a supposition, that the person who could undertake and accomplish an action of this kind, without either being repulsed and forced to retire in a mortifying manner, or appearing per-

\* An inference, as it appears to me not better founded, from the words of Christ, ὧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον ἀγαπᾷ, is Paulus's conjecture, that Christ had healed the Pharisee of a slight bodily complaint, though upon our supposition it might with great plausibility be added, that it was a slighter kind of leprosy, since in the other narratives the host is called Σίμων ὁ λεπρός.

fectly extravagant and ridiculous, must on the one hand have had a right to be there and near the company, and on the other have been known beforehand to stand on terms of intimacy with Christ. And the more improbable is it that a similar incident should have taken place a second time. The narrative in Matthew moreover seems to be also from a second hand, unless we should suppose that there was a kind of general agreement to preserve silence for a certain time on incidents relating to the family of Lazarus. And thus we have here at the same time one of the most remarkable and instructive instances of the corrections of the other evangelists, which are really found in John; though it does not follow in respect to our evangelist, that John must have had the whole of his Gospel before him, of which he need not have been acquainted with more than this little piece.

Finally, I would also deduce from this narrative an additional proof, that if an original Gospel existed, it was unknown, at least as such, to the compiler of our Gospel, which would at all events, to say no more, render Eichhorn's construction of that original document inadmissible. In fact, supposing even that the narrative in Matthew comes from a second hand, yet the words of Christ reported by him, XXVI. 13, are certainly genuine. No one in the first place would have invented them, except perhaps a friend of the family

at Bethany, and he would then certainly not have omitted the name of the woman; but surely no one of the genuine apostolical school would have ventured to invent such words. If then Christ spoke them, they contain the most distinct direction to admit this passage of his history above all others into such a work. This incident therefore must have had a place in the original Gospel; and is it conceivable that the words of Christ, by which this very place was secured to it, were omitted? And would Luke then have hesitated, even if he considered the transaction here stated as the same, to admit also these striking words of Christ, which he might without much alteration as easily have inserted at the end of Christ's discourse to the Pharisee, or even at the end of the whole narrative, after the words *παραβούτου εἰς εἰρήνην*? I take this to be as good a proof as can in such cases be adduced, that Luke, as the author of our Gospel, had not before him nor was acquainted with the original Gospel, nor with those of Matthew or Mark in their present state.

We have already discussed the reasons for which the following narrative, VIII. 1—21, must be considered as a separate whole, with which what has preceded cannot have been originally connected; but it likewise presents some remarkable points. There was unquestionably more to be related of this journey, and indeed the words *συνιόντων δὲ ὄχλων πολλῶν* are inserted without any designation of time,

and can only be taken to mean, *When once upon this journey a great multitude had assembled.* From this single instance then we see that the original detached narratives had not always for their subject certain days, or other definite periods, but that frequently from a number even of remarkable incidents a few particulars were selected with some design or other and committed to writing, no notice being taken of the rest. The design of the present narrative, if we compare the beginning and end, cannot remain doubtful; it is to celebrate that company which attended Jesus and ministered to him, and undoubtedly also those women whose names are mentioned; and this is effected partly by drawing a comparison between them and his natural kindred, to whom he preferred them as his spiritual kindred, and partly by applying to them the parable of the sower, who in them found the good ground, which keeps the word when heard, and brings forth fruit. This being the sole scope of the narrative, all particular circumstances, the locality and details of that sort, are of course omitted, and much even might have passed between the parable and its explanation, which our narrator would have had no inducement to mention. This is confirmed by comparing Matthew and Mark on this head. Both of them, Matthew XII. 46—50, Mark III. 31—35, relate the answer concerning Jesus's relatives immediately after that healing of the demoniac which

in Luke is recorded afterwards, on occasion of which Jesus is charged by some with casting out devils by means of the devil, by others again is asked for a sign; but in both evangelists the parable of the sower follows immediately after the answer, and Matthew subjoins it with the definite phrase ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. If we add now that this same narrator, whom Mark though without determining the day exactly follows here, represents the parable as spoken at the lake, where Jesus certainly could not enter into so private a conversation with his disciples as that in which he explains to them the parable, and that Matthew, in relating how the relatives of Jesus were announced to him, uses the words ἔξω ἐστήκασι, from which it must be inferred that he was within doors at the time; if we take this into consideration it will be necessary, in order to reconcile the two narratives, to set out from these two points, that our narrative is not inconsistent with the fact that the miracle wrought on the demoniac and the discourse it occasioned took place on the same day, but that at the same time Jesus's answer derives its proper clearness and dignity from that reference to the parable which in our narrative is manifestly ascribed to it. Matthew's narrative therefore apparently introduces the parable too late, because the miracle and the conversation connected with it were most present to his mind. That the parable notwithstanding oc-

curred to him, and that he subjoined it, is most easily explained by supposing that the explanation of the parable was given after that answer of Jesus, when the people to whom he was then still speaking had dispersed. Our narrator on the other hand we must suppose not only to have omitted the incidents which were foreign to his purpose, and to have passed over the change of place as an immaterial circumstance, especially as he had not assigned any place at all, but also to have anticipated the explanation of the parable, that he might be able to conclude with Jesus's answer and that the answer might be completely intelligible to every reader, which proceeding must be acknowledged to be perfectly adapted to his purpose.

The best way then of conceiving the transaction is to represent to ourselves Jesus going forth in the morning to the lake, and there—of course among other things and in the progress of a longer discourse—delivering the parable of the sower. As he enters into some place quite unknown to us, for the incident must have occurred on a journey and not in Capernaum, the blind and dumb demoniac (if we choose to adopt both these circumstances from Matthew) is brought to him; he heals him; and now arises among the accompanying multitude, on the one hand the wish for a heavenly sign, and on the other the suspicion of a diabolical power possessed by Jesus, from which one should be almost inclined to conclude that it

was a place which then for the first time experienced his miraculous power. Jesus discourses on this subject, partly as he proceeds through the town, partly in the house designed for his reception. While he is yet speaking his relatives are announced to him, and, his mind still occupied with the discourse which he had delivered by the lake, he gives the answer which is the point of our narrative, and which our narrator alone has taken in the right sense. Upon this the multitude disperses, the sooner perhaps for hearing of this very reply; Jesus finds himself alone with his disciples, and on their inquiry explains to them the parable. In this way the whole is perfectly consistent, and I think no one can hesitate, on considering all the circumstances, to admit this connexion of the facts to be more natural than that exhibited by Paulus. But the relation which the two narratives bear to each other is evidently to be explained neither from an original Gospel, nor by supposing Luke to have had Matthew before him, or the reverse. There is no greater agreement between Luke and Matthew either in the parable or its exposition, than might naturally be presented by two perfectly independent reporters, in an image which so readily and so vividly imprints itself on the memory, and the difference of arrangement indicates any thing rather than an original common source. On the contrary it is obvious that we are indebted for our

narrative, with its remarkable fact of the ministering women, to some private connexion which cannot now be ascertained. Even in Matthew I should be inclined to deny the view of combining together the occurrences of one day; the narrator's view was directed to that part of the day of which no notice is taken in our narrative. The parable only occurred to him afterwards, and to it he subjoins in his usual manner several which were certainly not spoken at the same time. This appears to me evident from XIII. 36, where Jesus sends the people away and goes into the house. For it was certainly impossible, notwithstanding what Paulus says, that Jesus could explain the parable of the sower to his disciples in the manner he does, in the presence of the people; this therefore was certainly another dismissal after another assembling of the people. And indeed not only does the expression *χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς*, of which Paulus gives a rather elaborate explanation, and the quotation connected with it, evidently betray a misapprehension of the words of Christ previously reported, and a second hand, whether it be that of the compiler or an earlier one, but the conclusion also of this whole collection of parables, verses 51, 52, sounds very strange. Hence I cannot allow so much weight to the phrase in Matthew XIII. 53, *καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, μετῆρην ἐκεῖθεν*, as to believe, that what there follows is still immediately connected with that which

precedes it. That connexion was certainly interrupted at verse 24. It might otherwise be very convenient to say, that Jesus by no means neglected his relatives, as his answer would lead one to suppose, but that he really set out directly after for Nazareth, where the incident which Luke has already related soon occurred. This, as I have said, would for the moment be convenient enough, but it might not improbably be found exceptionable in the sequel, and I would not therefore build on so slight a foundation; especially as no place was previously designated in Matthew, and there is therefore nothing to which ἐκεῖθεν can be referred. Whereas if the narrative were strictly coherent, the narrator could not but have known also where the preceding incidents occurred, and would have mentioned it, as he states the place here, either before or in this same passage. How too are we to extricate ourselves between Matthew and Mark, if the latter lays the same claim to historical connexion, and yet makes the passage across the lake take place on the same day, IV. 35? In Mark's strange addition, III. 21—for strange it still appears to me, in whatever way it be understood and qualified—I would not seek any discovery of the relation then subsisting between Jesus and his kinsfolk. Nor should I be inclined to suppose any communication on that subject from Peter, which would certainly have been more definite, or would not have been made at all, if the mother of Jesus

had really suffered herself to become an instrument in the hands of his enemies. This addition belongs undoubtedly to the number of the accumulations and exaggerations which are so very common with Mark, both in the introductions to the several incidents of his Gospel, and in the general statements which he occasionally inserts to fill up a chasm. And perhaps this will become fully evident, as soon as we attempt to explain how Mark came to omit here the healing of the demoniac, which, according to the concurring testimony of Matthew and Luke, gave the first occasion to the report that Jesus himself had a devil. But this would lead us too far from our present subject.

That verse 22 must be considered as the beginning of a new narrative, and cannot have been written in connexion with that which precedes it, has been already intimated. The phrase itself *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν* proves this. Otherwise a phrase must have been used, which would either have distinctly affirmed, or distinctly denied, the incident to have taken place during the journey performed with the company so distinctly described above. But perhaps the determination of the other end of this narrative may require to be more circumstantially justified. In fact it might be asked, since three occurrences are here related, of which moreover the first two have a more definite conclusion than the last, why the remainder of this chapter is not considered as consisting of

three originally distinct narratives, or the beginning of the following chapter is not included in the same series. This possible objection gives me a wished-for opportunity of explaining more precisely what I mean with respect to these forms of conclusion, and in what cases they designate the end of an originally separate piece, and in what not. The description of the impression produced by the laying of the storm at verse 25 is certainly a return from the particular to the general, and so far marks the end of this particular incident. But as in the sequel the thread is evidently resumed, and the landing on the shore of Gadara is described as a continuation of the same passage, *ἀντιπέραν* in verse 26 unquestionably referring to *εἰς τὸ πέραν* in verse 22, it follows that the description in verse 25 is only a partial conclusion, after which the same narrative proceeds to a new incident. The same holds with respect to the end of the second incident; for that the healed man complied with Jesus's command, is a description of a subsequent event which interrupts the immediate connexion, and with which, if this occurrence had been related by itself, the narrative would undoubtedly conclude. But in the sequel the thread is resumed; for *ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέψαι*, at verse 40, evidently refers to *αὐτὸς δὲ . . . ὑπεστρέψεν*, verse 37. These three incidents then were originally interwoven in one and the same narrative; many other things indeed may have occurred during

this excursion, but certainly nothing which our reporter, who seems to speak quite in the tone of a spectator, witnessed, and thought worthy of a place by the side of the transactions here recorded. Hence also, by the way, I cannot believe, that after the return to the Galilean side any other miracle or other important occurrence, such as the entertainment at the Pharisee's house, preceded the restoration of Jairus's daughter to life; for the words *ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν· καὶ ἰδοὺ κ. τ. λ.* betray too clearly that this was the first remarkable incident. To me at least this seems a circumstance which may be more safely relied on, than the phrase *ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς* in Matthew IX. 18, definite as it apparently is, considering that even the most definite of this kind are not unfrequently misemployed by that Evangelist. And I am the more inclined to suppose such a misapplication in this case also, as the expression *ἐγερθεῖς* in verse 19 seems to involve the wholly inadmissible notion, that the conversation with the Pharisees, which Luke has also related above at V. 30—39, took place during the entertainment itself.—That the original narrative which we are here examining does not extend beyond the end of the present chapter, I infer principally from this, that in the following narrative, as in the preceding, all the parts are closely connected, partly by internal references, partly, where these are wanting, by an exact determination of the time, as at

IX. 28 and 37. If then both narratives formed one original whole, the words *συγκαλεσαμένους δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα* would unquestionably, according to the same law, have been better connected, either by a distinct reference to what had preceded, as is the case in the narrative we have been considering, or by a determination of the time, as in the ensuing narrative; the introducing them without a link, under these circumstances, most clearly betrays an interstice.

As to the narrative itself, VIII. 22—56, it betrays the eye-witness from beginning to end by its unreserved explicitness, and vivid mode of representation, but yet it does not explain to us the object of this passage of Jesus and his disciples to the eastern shore of the lake. None but a person, whose sole purpose was to relate the incidents of this passage unconnected with any thing farther, could entirely avoid mentioning its object; a biographer and one who was enlarging an original Gospel already existing and pervaded by a thread, which it was of course necessary to retain, would have intimated it had it been by never so slight an allusion. At the same time one might be almost led to conclude from our narrative, that Jesus on this occasion had no particular object in view. If he had meant to make a journey for the purposes of his ministry, and was prepared with his followers for that purpose, why should the deprecating intreaties of the

people in the neighbourhood of Gadara—for only these are mentioned in our narrative, nor could any but these have assembled within so short a time, if Christ, as is most probable, landed about midway on the eastern shore near the northern extremity of the district of Gadara—why should those intreaties have induced him to abandon all farther attempts on the eastern shore, when he could not even infer from their reception of him that which he might meet with in the town, and the road besides was open to him both northward and southward? For that he should have allowed so much weight to an inauspicious sign, is a supposition quite inadmissible. The intention which Matthew attributes to him, of escaping from the people, VIII. 18, is also improbable, for in that case, instead of landing at the same spot, and it seems evident that he set out from Capernaum and returned to it, he would have directed his course towards some other quarter, in order to withdraw for a longer period from the people. The easiest way of conceiving the whole occurrence is to imagine that the disciples had gone out in the boat to fish, that Jesus accompanied them—for why should he have always let the time so spent be lost for their instruction and the exertion of his whole influence on them?—and that it was only during the passage, that the thought of visiting the opposite shore occurred to him, which is very consistent with our narrative. In this way we un-

derstand why, without farther deliberation, almost as if it were a matter of course, they set out directly on their return, as soon at least as the vessel, after the storm it had encountered, was in fit condition. That the people, on the intelligence received from other boats which crossed before that in which Jesus came, assembled and waited to receive him, may be easily explained, by supposing that they had witnessed from the shore the danger which the boat had run.

If then the passage was thus unpremeditated, the two incidents related by Matthew, VIII. 19—22, on the occasion of the departure, are not in their place. And indeed it is in itself probable, that this is not the place to which they belong. For if Jesus had so pressingly exhorted several persons, who were not of the number of his ordinary companions, to undertake the journey with him, he would have been the less likely hastily to have abandoned his plan, and certainly would not have returned without making a more serious attempt. At the same time our narrative too implies the presence of strangers in the vessel. For even if the power exercised by Jesus over the elements was something new to the disciples, and appeared to them still more wonderful than his healing power, yet they cannot have asked *τις ἄρα οὗτος ἐστίν* but at the utmost *τί ἄρα τοῦτο ὅτι κ. τ. λ.* Now strangers we have in the vessel, supposing it to have gone out to fish, in the persons of the various necessary assistants, who of

course do not remain always the same, but are frequently changed. For that the incident should belong to so early a period, that the conceptions entertained of Jesus even by his more intimate disciples were not yet fixed and unalterable, no one will believe. On the contrary, the circumstance that the furious demoniac, who was so little among men and so seldom stayed long at home, addresses Jesus immediately in the words *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*, is a clear proof, supposing him even to have heard his name from the by-standers, that the opinion of Jesus being the Messiah had been already frequently heard on the right shore. But it is very strange, that Paulus should be inclined to date this incident as early as possible, because Jesus here still makes a considerable delay before he comes to the point with the demoniac, and therefore the unclean spirits cannot yet have been so much accustomed as it were to be cast out by him. For a closer inspection rather shews exactly the contrary. According to Matthew's narrative the demoniac supposes, even before Jesus had said any thing, that Jesus means to cast out the spirits which possess him, and proposes terms in their name. And if we examine our narrative more closely, it says in substance the same thing. Or how should it have happened that the address of the demoniac stands first, and that Christ's command to the devils, to go out of him, is only subjoined by way of narrative, if our informant had himself heard a command of Jesus preceding

that address? Besides, can we believe that if Jesus had really uttered his command, the spirits would have been long hesitating, and like children reluctant to obey would still have offered terms? Surely not! To me it seems quite clear, that the parenthesis *παρήγγειλε γὰρ κ. τ. λ.* is a very natural, but yet inaccurate supplement of our reporter, who having perhaps been busied in the boat, and stayed a little behind, came up at the moment of this address, and now supposed that it must have been preceded by a command from Jesus.

If then, to return from our digression, we have at all events other persons in the vessel during this voyage beside the more intimate disciples, the question very naturally arises, to which of these two classes our witness belongs? The circumstance just mentioned is by no means a proof that it could not be one of the disciples. For they were of course owners of the vessel, and one of them therefore must have stayed to give the necessary orders. On the contrary, if we consider the description of the healed man sitting at the feet of Jesus, we certainly recognize the language of a person who was likewise sitting there, and who took a very lively interest in the occurrence, one therefore of Jesus's immediate attendants. And when we proceed to the last incident, the reanimation of the maiden, and observe with what unreserved minuteness and in how unaltered a tone

even those circumstances are related which could have come within the immediate knowledge of none but Peter, John, or James, supposing, that is, what I hope every one will on mature deliberation admit, that εἰσελθεῖν in verse 51 (which Mark, V. 37, does not seem to have understood rightly, for in the street such a prohibition could be of no effect, nor of any avail, since people are always flocking from all sides to a house where a showy ceremony is to be seen) and ἐκβαλῶν in verse 54 are both to be understood of the chamber where the sick maiden lay, and that the expression πάντας could not comprehend those whom Jesus himself had taken with him into the house,—if, I say, we take all this into consideration, we can scarcely do otherwise than refer our whole account to one of those three disciples; at all events, even if the narrative proceeded from another person, we must suppose that person to have been one of Jesus's immediate followers, who for that very reason accompanied him as far as the house of Jairus, and procured information of the details which he could not witness from one of those three. Still the former supposition appears to me the more probable, though I do not mean to assert that one of them was the writer, but only the narrator; I suppose however that the narrative was committed to writing very shortly after, while the impression was still fresh and vivid. On the other hand if we consider the narrative in Matthew with a view

to the same question, to what class the witness belongs, we shall be inclined to ascribe it to one of the other class. For the mere circumstance, that the storm is much more circumstantially related in proportion than the occurrence on the shore, that here the description of the demoniac after his healing, his wish and Jesus's answer, are entirely wanting, this alone looks very much like one who did not come near Jesus, but was directed to stay with the boat. The alteration made here by introducing two demoniacs, in itself improbable, as it is not usual for madmen to contract a close friendship and intimacy with one another, might indeed admit of a different explanation, as other cases of a similar duplication are found in Matthew; but it may at least be also sufficiently explained from this supposition. For the circumstance of the madman calling his devils Legion is entirely wanting in Matthew; if this had not been related to the reporter, he could not know that the demoniac believed himself possessed by several devils; but if nevertheless the answers given in the name of the spirits and the wishes expressed were literally related to him, he would afterwards, in repeating the narrative or committing it to writing, naturally be struck by the plural number, and thence form the conjecture, that more persons than one so afflicted had met. If then the first author of the narrative in Matthew was a person of this class, he also stayed with the boat after the

landing at Capernaum, and therefore, as the passage back was fair and easy, could give no farther account of the circumstances connected with this incident than *Καὶ ἐμῶς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον διεπέρασε καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.*

The account of the re-animation of Jairus's daughter Matthew has from another hand, but likewise, as we see by the curtailments at the end and the inaccuracy at the beginning, from one not so immediate as the author of ours. For *ἀπέθνησκε* with us, verse 42, cannot mean she was dead, but only she was dying, was lying in the last agony, and so the father, who perhaps as *ἀρχισυνάγωγος* was upon the whole not favorably inclined to Christ, resolves to make the last experiment and invoke his assistance. And this alone I take to be the right construction. Whereas in Matthew *ἐτελεύτησε*, which could certainly mean nothing else than she was dead, is either a mistake or a curtailment, since the intelligence of her death having actually taken place, which is only brought by Jairus's servants after the occurrence with the woman having the issue of blood, is also omitted in Matthew. The manner in which Paulus attempts to reconcile this second message with the supposition, that the maiden was thought to be dead when Jairus went in search of Jesus, is unsatisfactory and unnatural. If Jairus felt and had expressed at home the assurance that Jesus could raise even his dead child,

it was surely superfluous and improper to send him word that the attempts to restore life had all proved ineffectual, and he might therefore forbear to trouble Jesus. But was there then a sufficient foundation for this belief in Jesus's power of raising the dead by laying on of hands, as the occurrence of Nain, supposing it even to have been of prior date, does not seem to have been very notorious in Galilee, and no traces are any where visible of another earlier instance? Would not Jairus, for that very reason, have said something to justify his belief and his expectation? And supposing even this to have been omitted, perhaps because Christ did not drop any particular expression of approbation, would Jesus in that case have thought it necessary, after the second message, to confirm Jairus's faith? On the contrary, every thing conspires to shew that Jairus only brought word the maid was dying, and that Jesus found reason from the ruler's more specific statements to withhold his belief even from the second message. An eye-witness now would scarcely have permitted himself such an alteration as this in Matthew; on the contrary, it betrays clearly enough a subsequent repeater, who, sharing the general conviction that the child was dead when Jesus restored it to animation, esteemed the preceding part of the transaction of less importance, and therefore overlooked the difference between those two stages, or even omitted them for

brevity's sake, which an immediate reporter would not have been likely to do, because the idea by that means conveyed of a man calling for the revival of a dead person would have struck him as far too unnatural. The 56th verse is a form of conclusion, and Christ's prohibition is only to be understood, in the most general sense, of his expressions in answer to the thanks of the parents. For it was certainly impossible to prevent the occurrence from becoming notorious, the man himself being a well known and eminent person, and having found Jesus in so numerous a company.

That the 1st verse of Chap. IX. must be considered as the beginning of a new narrative, and for what reason, has been already said. Against the unbroken original connexion of that narrative at least down to verse 45, objections could only be raised in the first half, and none but what may easily enough be removed. Ὑποστρέψαντες, verse 10, refers evidently to ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ διήρχοντο in verse 6, and whether Jesus had a particular reason for retiring with the apostles into solitude, or did it to give them an opportunity of completing their reports more quietly and to converse with them farther on their mission, in either case we are forced to connect ὑπεχώρησε κατ' ἰδίαν immediately with their return. For even in the first case, if there existed an urgent motive, why should he defer his retirement, and thereby only shorten and hurry that explicit conversation with his disciples,

which could not fail to be so highly edifying? The word *διηγῆσαντο* therefore expresses only the general preliminary statement of the disciples, and the question in verse 18, *τίνα με λέγουσιν εἶναι*, belongs to the inquiries which Christ proceeded to address to them upon that preliminary statement. Hence it clearly follows, that the account of the feeding of the multitude, which notwithstanding flocked in contrary to Jesus's expectation, is not an independent narrative, but the necessary mention of an unseasonably intervening circumstance. And this too explains the passage, 7—10, which at first sight seems to be inserted quite incoherently, and to destroy the connexion. For the intelligence which the disciples received on their way, of Herod's attention having been excited by Christ, and his wish, to them certainly not an agreeable one, to see him, seems principally to have hastened their return, and was in that case of course the first thing of which they informed Jesus, so that it would not be an improbable conjecture, that this intelligence induced Jesus to retire for some time as little observed as possible into another province, were it not that the feeding of the multitude was an action calculated to excite in a peculiar degree the attention of Herod's officers, and to give occasion to alarming reports from them, and that we have no ground for supposing Jesus to have made any considerable stay about this time in the northern and eastern

districts. Hence it is still the more probable supposition, that his retirement had no other object than an undisturbed prolonged intercourse with the intimate friends who had been for some time absent from him. However this may be, his inquiry, for whom the people took him, is evidently connected with the previous statement, that his fame had reached the ears of Herod, who had expressed himself on the subject of the current opinions respecting Jesus in a manner which gave ground for apprehension. This is still more evident from the perfect correspondence of the answer which the disciples give their master with the opinions which had come to the ears of Herod, so that the similar expressions, verse 7 and 8, are only an anticipation of these. All this considered, I at least have not a doubt remaining, of the connexion between this question of Jesus and the return of the disciples from their mission. Indeed what meaning could this question have, if it does not refer to a somewhat long and extensive social intercourse of the disciples with men of all classes, which Jesus had not shared, and on which they had not had daily opportunities of conversing with him? It is precisely because that connexion is entirely broken in Matthew, that the question in his narrative is so strange and unintelligible. One might indeed at first sight be induced, by the expression *οἱ ὄχλοι*, to refer the question to the multitude who had been fed, since only an occasional

concourse, not *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, men in general, can be called ὄχλοι. But what the apostles had before them on their mission, were likewise crowds from time to time collected round them, and therefore the expression here used in our Gospel is perhaps a more correct translation or abridgement of Christ's real question, than the more indefinite expression *οἱ ἄνθρωποι* in Matthew XVI. 13. Nor does the answer of the disciples discover that they referred Jesus's question to the multitude which had been fed. If they did, the multitude must have appeared to them in a light quite different from that in which John saw it, whose impression of its temper, according to his narrative, was, that by far the greater number was ready to proclaim Jesus King, which certainly distinctly implies a belief, for the moment at least, in his dignity as Messiah, and indeed that temper of the multitude it is which John takes to have been the motive of his hasty retreat. Yet this reference of Christ's question to that multitude, directly as it contradicts John, must be an essential condition of Hug's hypothesis, that in all our manuscripts of Luke much other matter and at the end the second feeding, on account of its resemblance to the first, has dropped out. This is indeed stretching the critical canon respecting the *ὁμοιοτέλευτον* far beyond its natural bounds, since an aberration of the eye cannot take place in a surface of this extent, except by the most singular accident in turning over one or

more leaves; nor do I believe that this little grounded supposition of that ingenious scholar will in other respects meet with any one's approbation.

But since in Matthew also Christ's question is widely withdrawn from its connexion with the mission of the disciples and annexed to the second feeding, and hence the integrity of our narrative might be disputed, I must incidentally remark, that I cannot prevail on myself to believe the second feeding, but am of opinion that it found its way into Matthew, and from him into Mark, because the former had before him two different accounts of the same transaction. To shew this from the passages in Matthew himself does not belong to this place. I only make one remark. To whichever of the two narratives we assign the priority, it is inconceivable that the disciples could, a second time, on a similar occasion, when the mode of feeding the multitude was discussed, be embarrassed on account of their scanty provision, and that they did not immediately call upon Jesus to do as he had done before. If then for this reason alone we should be inclined to admit but one such feeding, and therefore Matthew had before him two accounts of it, one shorter, and one more circumstantial, the first of these was, as we clearly see, connected with a retirement of Jesus caused by Herod's attention having been drawn towards him, on which occasion the narrative of the beheading of John was inserted; to the second was

annexed Jesus's question concerning the opinion of the people, only that between them there is related a little misunderstanding (arising out of the feeding) of an expression of Jesus, and his question is then followed by the history of what is called the transfiguration on the mount, with a determination of time nearly corresponding with ours. So that on this supposition we have precisely the same order in Matthew as in our evangelist, and thus the connexion in which our narrative exhibits the several incidents is completely vindicated against the apparent difference in Matthew. For even the statement of the place is, on closer inspection, only apparently different. In Matthew's first account of the feeding no place at all is marked ; we see at the utmost no more than that before he retired *εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν* he was in the neighbourhood of the lake, since it is said *ἀνεχώρησιν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ*, which cannot apply to Nazareth, the place last specified. The second account likewise fixes the scene of the feeding but vaguely (for Jesus is represented as coming from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon) near the sea of Galilee, and says he afterwards took ship and crossed over to the coasts of Magdala, while the question, for whom the people took him, is placed in Matthew on the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi. All this may very easily be reconciled, since what is indefinite in Matthew conforms without violence to the definite statements in our narrative, and what is indefinite

in it may very well be adapted to what is definite in Matthew. For our narrative, which from the beginning admits only what belongs to its own sphere of observation, may omit many incidents which occurred in the interval, and indeed it does not assert that Jesus's question was put at the place where the multitude was fed. On the contrary, this interruption having once occurred, many days may have elapsed before Jesus was so *καταμόνας* with his intimate disciples, as to be able to continue at his leisure the desired conversation on the subject of their mission. Hence this may have happened in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea as well as elsewhere, if indeed the expression *εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας* in Matthew is to be taken literally, and is not meant merely to describe very generally from this reporter's point of view the direction in which Jesus was at that time moving. The place of the transfiguration Matthew does not specify any more than our narrator. Nor is our account more difficult to be reconciled with John, who connects the feeding only by an indefinite *μετὰ ταῦτα*, VI. 1, with a return of Christ from Jerusalem to Galilee, without determining a place. On the contrary, his narrative assists us materially, by rendering it sufficiently evident, that Jesus cannot have been alone with his disciples long enough to hold a quiet conversation on this day or the next, which he spent with them, more perhaps constrained by wind and weather than designedly, in

Capernaum, and nothing prevents us from supposing him, immediately after the discourse on this Sabbath, to have set out, if it must be so, for the district of Cæsarea. For the expression *καὶ περιπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ* leaves full room for this and many other excursions in other parts.

If then we have no reason for doubting the connexion in which the parts of our narrative present themselves, the question arises, what is the point of view from which the different incidents, separated by intervals of many days and by many not less remarkable occurrences as well after as during the Apostles' journey, are associated in this narrative. I believe it will be impossible to find any other than the first intimations, which however now rapidly succeeded each other from several quarters, of the end that awaited Jesus. This was indicated, in the first place, by Herod's suspicious attention, which now precluded all hope of complete security even in Galilee, where Christ had before been tolerably undisturbed. If the disciples considered Christ's silent crossing to the eastern shore as connected with this, the feeding of the people who followed the Redeemer into Galilee might appear to them in the light of a parting meal. Now comes the stronger circumstance of Christ's own declaration, which Matthew also communicates from a different narrative, and with the express remark, that it was the first time Christ had spoken of his

impending sufferings. The history of the transfiguration has the same object; for the only part of Christ's conversation with the other two persons, which the disciples profess to have heard distinctly, was precisely that which turned on the manner in which Jesus was to fulfil his vocation in Jerusalem. So too in the narrative of the miracle wrought the next day, the point is that Christ says this time expressly what has never yet been mentioned on any similar occasion, though he was not always very well satisfied with like marks of popular applause, that, notwithstanding these expressions of admiration and praise, the people would still abandon him in his distress. That circumstances are related of these several incidents, which do not precisely stand in immediate connexion with the object we suppose, will hardly be urged by any one as an objection to the whole view. For all particular incidents became of course the more remarkable in themselves as Jesus's end approached, and as they themselves in any degree marked that approach. Hence one might say that the whole narrative was originally a circumstantial answer to the question, when and in what manner the disciples conceived the first presentiment of the mournful issue to which the cause of Jesus was to come in Jerusalem. On this subject inquiries could have been addressed, it is true, only to one of the Twelve, or of the few disciples who besides them belonged at that time to the number of

Christ's constant companions, and indeed it is one of these who, in my opinion, might probably have given an answer in this narrative. Only I would not assert, that it must have been precisely one of those who were present at the mysterious, and, according to the common supposition, miraculous occurrence on the mount. Our account of this scene sounds it is true very authentic, many important circumstances are still preserved in it which in Matthew are entirely wanting, and I should be inclined to maintain that it runs exactly as one of the Three, as soon as he thought it allowable, related the affair. Only one point I would have left open, namely, whether the narrator himself represented it as certain, that the two men who appeared were Moses and Elias, and thus adopted what seems to have been a half-dreaming thought of Peter, or whether this is only the inference of our reporter from Peter's recorded expression. The latter opinion seems to me at least the more probable. If the three Apostles related this occurrence subsequently to their most intimate friends, the latter could not fail to remember very easily the time when Jesus left them, accompanied by the Three, and passed the night on the hill, if they were but reminded of the miracle which was so immediately connected with it; and hence it is very natural that the relative date of an occurrence, which our reporter did not himself witness, should nevertheless be no less exactly determined than

others in this narrative, especially as the time when Jesus first expressed himself on the subject of his sufferings must certainly have been very strongly impressed on every one's mind.

Since then all this could have been exhibited in this order by none but an immediate companion of Jesus, we may infer, that on these things too our Evangelist had found means of procuring peculiarly good information, which indeed is every where confirmed by a comparison with Matthew. That the direction to the disciples on their mission could only be very concisely reported here, and not so explicitly as it is communicated to us by Matthew in chapter X., is a consequence of the wholly different object of our narrative. Moreover not only does that more explicit direction contain many things which were surely not said on this occasion, but without our narrative we should not at all know how to explain Matthew's telling us that, after delivering this direction, Jesus went about and taught, which it is not even probable he should have done when he was wholly without his usual companions, and yet leaving us in complete ignorance as to the proceedings of the missionaries and the time of their return to Jesus; so that all that follows is thereby rendered obscure and indefinite, since the expression ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, which occurs more than once, most obviously refers, even in XII. 1, to the absence of the Twelve, and therefore one does not know, whether John's message did not find Jesus

without his disciples, and one might be led to suppose it was not they whom he was compelled to defend for eating the ears of corn. In the same way the mention of Herod's language respecting Jesus comes we know not whence, without the slightest connexion, which is only the more broken by the interposed account of John's beheading; so that one scarcely reflects that the words *καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, XIV. 13, cannot well apply to this parenthetical narrative, but only to the first intelligence which gave occasion for it. The first description of the feeding, XIV. 15—21, has indisputably a great affinity with ours; but still there are too many variations to allow us to ascribe them merely to the translating; I should sooner be inclined to believe, that this account of the feeding and the anecdote of Herod which precedes it are derived indirectly from the narrative adopted by Luke. The anecdote of Herod might have suffered in some such way, by being detached from its original connexion and by the account of John's execution being inserted, as the description of the feeding might have done by abridgement, and indeed a greater stress seems to be laid on its miraculous character in Matthew than in Luke. But the account, evidently connected with this narrative, of what takes place during the passage back, shows that the history of the feeding must also be referred to a different original narrative; and hence may be seen too how great may be the coincidence

of two simple narratives of a simple occurrence, even without a common source. In the narrative adopted by Matthew therefore the mention of Herod's suspicions—on occasion of which the account of the Baptist's death was probably inserted quite parenthetically by a later hand—was only prefixed as shewing the occasion which led to Christ's retreat into the desert place and therefore also to the feeding of the multitude there, and the narrative concluded with the arrival at the district of Gennesaret. The second account of the feeding in Matthew, beginning at XV. 29, seems at all events to have passed through several hands, and to have been thereby disfigured in a variety of ways, admitting even the fact to have been a different one. For Christ's seating himself on the hill, as if that the sick might be brought thither to him and even the lame might trail themselves up, does not sound like the narrative of an eye-witness. As little can we explain the statement, that the people remained for three days with Jesus in the desert place, especially as no mention is made of teaching but only of healing. It was indeed possible, that Christ, especially if a conjecture prevailed that he was on the point of withdrawing finally or for a long time from the district, might be visited by sick persons in such numbers that he could not leave the place for three days; but on the other hand every one when healed would return home as soon as possible, and only

others from time to time come in their place. The twelve baskets too in our narrative are far more natural than the seven in this. For though the apostles might not all have been engaged in gathering the fragments, yet they would of course be gathered in all the baskets which were to be found, in order to expedite the work, as it was very late, and thus it is in the highest degree probable that they were gathered in twelve baskets; but here the number of baskets is very artificially conformed to the number of loaves.

The account in Matthew XVI. 13—28, of Christ's inquiring of his disciples what men said of him, is likewise obviously enough distinguished from ours, by the particular conversations of Christ with Peter, which are interwoven with it. But are we to suppose that Christ thus as it were in one breath delivered to Peter the key of the kingdom of heaven, and then called him a Satan, who did not *favour the things which be of God?* This is what no one will readily believe, but still we shall not on that account be inclined to break off the connexion with the preceding narrative at ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο, verse 21, since it does not appear how Matthew could have dated Christ's mention of his sufferings from this time, if Christ had not spoken of them immediately after. By a comparison of this narrative with ours, it becomes much more probable, that this solemn extolling of Peter was not uttered on this occasion, but room is certainly

left for the censure passed by Christ; for where our narrative, verse 23, notwithstanding Jesus had been addressing himself before to all the disciples, nevertheless begins as it were anew, ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς πάντας, there we may insert this particular conversation with Peter, which our reporter may have omitted, partly because it did not belong to his context, and partly from other causes, or even by accident. But by the insertion of the first address to Peter the whole scene in Matthew has evidently lost connexion and keeping.

That Matthew also connects the history of the transfiguration with this scene, and gives the same determination of time—for six days and eight days may mean the same period, if the first and last days are differently computed, and the phrase ὥσεί in Luke expresses precisely the uncertainty of the date—this circumstance proves indeed that Matthew's narrative was originally derived from one of Christ's constant companions; and in that case the two facts, Christ's question and that incident, can hardly have been combined in one narrative except from the same point of view as we have supposed in Luke. And indeed who can be surprised, that a question so extremely natural as the one above stated should have been proposed frequently and by several persons, and that so one answer knits the thread a little higher, another takes it a little shorter? Only this point of view being evidently not so distinctly prominent

in Matthew, but rather obscured, leads of itself to the suspicion, that the statement in his Gospel had already passed through several hands. This is confirmed by the manner in which he represents the transfiguration. For should it even be said, that one of Christ's constant companions, who had it immediately from the mouth of one of the three apostles, might have exaggerated the transaction into the marvellous, and thus unintentionally have altered many points, yet a person so circumstanced was on too intimate a footing with the Three, who as we see proceeded in this affair with their usual openness and simplicity, not to have been subject to their corrections; and therefore the alterations here, which are far from unimportant, are in all probability to be attributed only to a second hand. In the first place it appears in Matthew, whose account takes no notice of the intention of praying on the hill expressed by the word *προσεύξασθαι*, as if Jesus had taken with him the three disciples, merely that they might be witnesses of this marvellous scene. Moreover, the sleepy state of the three disciples is not at all noticed, and as they must be conceived perfectly collected and attentive, while notwithstanding nothing is mentioned of the conversation of the Two who appeared with Jesus, one perceives the exclusive direction of the reporter's imagination toward the marvellous. On this account the assertion, that the two figures were Moses and

Elias, appears here far more confident than in Luke, in whose narrative every attentive reader easily sees that it is founded merely on the expressions of Peter, in a state between sleeping and waking. What crowns the whole is, that the *διαχωρισθῆναι* of the men, before the cloud had rolled away, is not mentioned here, so that they appear to vanish away, and that Jesus enjoins the disciples to say nothing of the vision. If this had been the faithful and unadulterated narrative of an eye-witness, no one could ever have fabricated the circumstances, which in Luke bring the transaction so much nearer to what is natural and comprehensible, for that would have been manifestly repugnant to the spirit of those times. Hence I take Christ's reported injunction to be only a misconstruction of the very natural voluntary silence observed by the disciples. For to the unbiassed feeling it seems absolutely necessary, that, if Christ gave such an injunction, he must, without on that account being obliged to tell them every thing which it was perhaps proper to conceal, at least have undeceived Peter with respect to the conjecture he uttered if it was false, since he would otherwise have plainly approved of propagating this inaccurate representation of the matter at a future time. But if the conjecture was correct, if Moses and Elias did appear, which could have been ordained not for the sake of Jesus himself but only for the sake of the dis-

ciples with a view to the confirming of their faith, to what purpose the injunction? Did the other disciples stand in less need of such a confirmation? On the other hand if their silence was the spontaneous result of their awe of this to them obscure incident, on which Jesus did not seem inclined to enter into any explanation, then they could not possibly have addressed him himself with such a question as that concerning Elias, which besides, to be pertinent here, should have been expressed in quite a different manner. This therefore was probably also introduced merely on account of its analogous import.

In the same way we may remark likewise in the healing of the epileptic in Matthew a distortion into extravagance. In Luke's narrative it is left doubtful whether the disciples had made an attempt to cast out the spirit, or whether, as they were not now sent out with a peculiar commission by Jesus and he himself was near at hand, they did not conceive themselves authorized for such an undertaking, for we do not anywhere find it mentioned that they healed and cast out spirits in his company. In Matthew, on the contrary, it is quite clear from their question to Jesus, that they attempted it, and had not the power; and besides, Jesus's answer again is certainly not quite consistent with itself. For if fasting and prayer were particularly requisite for this purpose (and indeed Jesus himself had just come down from the hill, where he had been

praying, and perhaps, to judge from the circumstances, been fasting also), and the disciples were not at the moment in the same case, or even did not know it to be particularly requisite, they could not deserve his reproach that they only wanted faith, in whatever sense that word is to be taken. Here then incongruous circumstances seem somehow to have been combined, for as to Paulus's mode of reconciling all this, not only must it appear to many, as it does to me, in itself too artificial, but the view of occurrences of this kind, on which his explanation is founded, is too narrow, and even on that account alone inadmissible. And the confusion which I apprehend here in Matthew is so much the worse, as it does not appear either from him or Luke, to what the previous harsh exclamation of Christ, ὡ γενεὰ ἀπίστος καὶ δειστροαμμένη, properly applies, and therefore Matthew's addition might, on account of the word ἀπιστία, easily induce one to refer that address to the apostles, which would certainly be wrong. Here now occurs one of the rare cases in which Mark gives a key. He mentions among the ὄχλος some scribes, who were disputing with the disciples at the time, and therefore probably were drawing unfavorable conclusions from their refusal or inability to heal the sick child. For that the dispute was connected with this, is evident from the fact, that upon Jesus's question as to the subject of the dispute, the father came forward with his petition. These

scribes therefore, and the part of the ὄχλος, which took their side, are the γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, for the very reason that they refused to ground their belief on any thing but acts of this kind; and we may safely acquit the disciples of being comprized under this denomination. Matthew therefore either has had a less authentic reporter here, or perhaps only obscured the state of the case by his habit of annexing analogous matter.

What our evangelist subjoins, IX. 46—50, certainly does not belong to the preceding narrative, as it cannot be comprehended under the same point of view; unless indeed we suppose that it occurred almost immediately after the last healing, and is related here by way of appendix, just as the healing of the centurion's servant is annexed to the Sermon on the Mount. Matthew relates the same incident, XVIII. 1 and following verses, but the variations are here too very important. The question, in the first place, does not sound in Matthew like a dispute for precedence, or competition, but like a question concerning the measure according to which the value of each individual in the kingdom of God should be determined; whereas in Luke the disciples do not address any question at all to Christ; they do not even dispute, as in Mark IX. 35 and following verses, and hold their peace through fear when Christ questions them as to the subject; they only entertain thoughts, but these are thoughts of competition. As to the

identity of the fact nevertheless no doubt can be raised ; for an act like that of the symbolical presentation of a child is not likely to be repeated. But it can scarcely be conceived, that, if the apostles had only addressed to Jesus a question of such purely general import, any one would afterwards have converted it into something redounding less to their honour. On the other hand it is very easy to imagine, that a narrator may have expressed the less honorable fact in a more tender and on that very account more indefinite manner, as is the case in Matthew. Why he did not rather pass over the thing altogether in silence is evident, namely, not to lose Jesus's answers. But indeed even these, through the indistinct keeping of the whole subject, have lost very much in vigour and point. By our narrative one sees clearly, that it was the design of Jesus to eradicate to the last fibre all thoughts of such a pre-eminence, by teaching that a follower of his might possibly find an opportunity of performing only the smallest and most trivial actions, and yet might possess the highest worth and be as great as any other, provided those actions were founded on equal liveliness of faith and equal zeal for his cause. This is by no means clearly expressed in Matthew, and as he annexes here a variety of discourses, relating indeed to the subject, but evidently delivered under different circumstances, it becomes the more difficult to fix the true point of view for the first incident. Now whether these very addi-

tions withheld Matthew from subjoining the last part of our narrative, John's address and Jesus's answer, or whether he had it not, I would not decide; but this is the second, not unimportant difference. For unless we would suppose, that these two last verses are unconnected with the preceding passage, which is in itself very improbable, and by the word ἀποκριθεὶς \* is proved to be impossible, John's address must have referred to the language of Jesus just recited. Or are we to suppose that John was so absent, so little attentive to the discourse of Jesus, and so little struck by this significant act, as to have interposed a topic totally foreign? Moreover we see the allusion clearly enough in the words ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι σου, and John, perhaps indeed not entering deeply enough into the meaning of Jesus's words, means to say, that he and his fellow disciples had been so far from taking the doing of any act, whatever it might be, in the name of Jesus, for the thing of main importance, that they had forbidden it in one who did not belong to their society, the circle within which the question had arisen respecting the pre-eminence of one above the other. And this very circumstance clearly proves the assertion

\* For though this is far from always signifying an answer, yet it certainly never stands insulated, but is always a link which connects with something remotely or immediately preceding.

above made, that in Matthew much is annexed here too which was not spoken on this occasion, and that Christ this time accompanied the symbolical act with only a few words ; and indeed he does not enter into any discussion on John's language. Is it not besides more natural, and in a human point of view more noble, not to make precisely what was unwelcome and disquieting in the thoughts of the disciples, on which as it was but slightly conceived they required only a slight reproof, the occasion of a lengthened discourse, but to pass briefly and rapidly over it ? Of this incident also then the simple and unadulterated narrative in our evangelist alone gives us the correct image.

But before we quit this last part of our second division and proceed to the third, we have still two questions to answer. The first is suggested by our own hypothesis. If this portion of our Gospel also was not originally composed as a whole, but consists of several narratives unconnected with each other, did Luke find them already collected ? or, if he found them in their separate state, according to what law did he proceed in arranging them ? That he found them already connected we have no reason to suppose, for no point of view can be discovered, from which a compiler, who had any determinate object, should have united them. The two first pieces indeed might have belonged to the second collection, for discourses of Christ are by

far the most important elements in them. But not only do these want the same locality, they have also obviously a different character, and besides, the first is preceded by that narrative concerning the young man of Nain, which the compiler of the whole Gospel, considering his usual practice, cannot be supposed to have inserted between two pieces of a collection already made, since he could not have the same motive here as in the case of the genealogy. So that even this becomes very improbable, and we must content ourselves with considering these narratives as materials which came separately into Luke's hands, and therefore all that remains is to make an attempt to discover the law according to which he arranged them. Now if we cast a glance on what follows, and observe that this treats of Christ's last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, we are forced to confess, that, if the compiler of our Gospel had adequate motives for assigning to this next piece its present place, he could not but prefix our last narrative, in which Christ begins to speak of his sufferings, to the other, in which the conviction he felt of his impending end is everywhere clearly visible in his discourses, in his directions to his disciples, and in his denunciation of the Galilean cities now for ever abandoned by him. The two first narratives he seems, as the phrases ἐξῆς and καθεξῆς certainly afford ground to believe, to have introduced according to dates which he had procured, and so the third, respecting

the passage over the lake, finds its place quite of itself. As to the information which guided him in the arrangement of those first pieces doubts may be entertained. At the same time, as he evidently considered each of the writings which fell in his way, though they comprized several incidents without determining their respective dates, as an indivisible whole, it is most natural to suppose that he was governed by the beginning of each. He would therefore inquire whether the journey with the women took place subsequently to the revival at Nain, and therefore he prefixed that whole piece. This is probable, because even whole books are so frequently named from their beginnings; and perhaps his order would have proved quite opposite if he had been governed by the end, or had inquired what relation the end of one bore to the beginning of the other. At all events however I think we have now sufficient direction to judge how he really understood the task which he proposed to himself in the introduction, *καθεξῆς γράφαι*. That is, as he altered nothing in his materials, but left the more Hebraistic and the purer Greek as he found it, and did not in general blend beginnings and conclusions, so he has observed an arrangement adapted to the order of time only so far as it could be done without parting his materials.

The next question is, whether there appears in these events such a coincidence of arrangement between the three evangelists as to indicate either

an original Gospel, or a dependence of one evangelist on another. The original Gospel will certainly find in this part also little support, on account of the great difference between Luke and Matthew, both in the matter of the narratives (as, for instance, Matthew's narrative of the demoniacs in the district of Gadara, and others on which the remark has already been made, can scarcely be derived from the same source as those in Luke) and still more in the arrangement, in which there occur manifest contradictions, which would have been impossible if the authors of our Gospels had recognized an original Gospel even sanctioned only by the apostles. The only striking agreement is in the order of the feeding (in Matthew indeed the second), the question for whom Christ was taken, the transfiguration, and the healing which immediately followed it. But all this, as we have already seen, is to be reckoned only as one point, and as one against four, especially taking into account the circumstances above stated, can scarcely turn the scale. As little certainly could Luke here have made use of Matthew, or the reverse, without some notice being taken of the contradictions both in the facts (as in the account of the demoniac and of Jäirus) and in the arrangement, as, to mention but one instance, the narrative concerning Jesus's kinsfolk. So too Mark does not seem to have had the whole of our Gospel before him, but wanted as I believe the first and

second of the four narratives in this division, and was in possession only of the third and fourth, and I believe this even of the fourth, only because, like Luke, he prefixes the mission of the Twelve to the mention of the inquiries which Herod had made respecting Jesus, but then he immediately quits Luke and returns to Matthew.

---

### THIRD DIVISION.

IX. 51.—XIX. 48.

MOST modern critics who fix at IX. 51 the beginning of a separate memoir, which Luke inserted, as it was, in his book, call this a gnomology, and think it ends at XVIII. 14. Neither opinion seems to me quite correct. For a gnomology it contains too many matters of fact, and combines similar sayings too little; it seems rather to comprize what occurred and was said within a definite interval of time, and therefore of course in the order in which one thing followed another. As little can I discover at XVIII. 14 any trace of a conclusion, or, immediately after it, of a fresh beginning. That Luke, after having communicated from IX. 51 almost exclusively what we find nowhere else, here for the first time again joins the other evangelists,

can not decide any thing. For Mark is too dependent and subordinate to be taken into consideration in this respect, and as to Matthew, much that is found in him occurs even before this passage, and again he wants many not unimportant parts of that which shortly follows. Now if we pass by this arbitrary limit, and look farther on for something which has the appearance of a conclusion, we do not find it before the end of the 19th Chapter; there however is a perfectly distinct form of conclusion. For the last thing there mentioned is Christ's entry into Jerusalem; immediately afterwards particulars are related of his stay there, and between the two comes (verse 47 and 48) the general description of this period, how he taught daily in the temple, how the people hung upon his words, and how the priests sought to destroy him. Comparing now this end with the beginning, both seem most exactly to correspond. The beginning is the setting out for Jerusalem to suffering and death, the end is the last entry into it before the Passover, and so the first and most natural thought which presents itself is, that the whole piece is an account, by one who accompanied Jesus on this last journey, of all that occurred in the course of it which he thought remarkable. Many circumstances confirm this conjecture. The account does not indeed mark at the outset, as it does towards the end, the progress of the journey from place to place; it is for the most part throughout uncon-

nected, and only selects particular passages ; but it is precisely because the narrative proceeds from one incident to another, by the slightest connecting phrases, εἶπε δὲ, ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ, ἐρωτηθεὶς δὲ ἀπεκρίθη, and the like, and scarcely any incident has like the preceding narratives a conclusion which returns to the general, that we have no inducement to believe the several passages were originally separate. And as most of the incidents are either evidently related as having occurred by the way, or from their nature render it probable, we are rather led to the conception of a fragmentary journal, perhaps not committed to writing till a later period, and therefore not every where alike accurate in the order of time. Only to this conception an objection immediately occurs, in the circumstance that the beginning evidently relates a departure from Galilee. For if Christ had then set out from Judea or the other side of Jordan, his messengers could not have proposed to prepare him a lodging in a Samaritan village, and there was neither time nor space to send before him seventy disciples ; besides we evidently find him at XIII. 31 in Galilee, and at XVII. 11 on the confines of Galilee and Samaria. But from Galilee, as we know from John, Christ did not come, when he made his last entrance into Jerusalem ; after his last stay but one in the capital, he did not return again to Galilee, but abode partly in Perea, partly in Judea, and so came to the last Passover. Yet

this last entry is the very one related in the 19th chapter. The beginning and end therefore do not treat of the same journey; the whole therefore was not one originally connected journal. For supposing even we should be inclined to ascribe the journal to one who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem, and thence to Judea, and again to Jerusalem, yet he could not have confounded the two journeys in such a manner with one another; and even if he had nothing to relate of the residence in Jerusalem, he would still have taken care in some way or other to distinguish these two journeys for his readers, so as not wantonly to create for them difficulties, which could not but excite in them suspicions of himself. The idea therefore of a connected journal by a companion of Jesus we must certainly give up, but not by any means the thought of a journal altogether, for that is still no less clearly founded on the beginning and end of this whole division, and on a variety of traces scattered almost equally over all that intervenes. What then remains, except to say, that one who was not aware of another stay in Jerusalem having intervened between that departure from Galilee and this entry into Jerusalem had combined accounts of both journeys, for thereby alone the enigma seems capable of solution, in a manner consistent with the character of the whole division, and at the same time with John's accounts? And this conjecture is imme-

diately confirmed by the circumstance, that the last part, which belongs to the account of the second journey, shews a different character from the first, inasmuch as it is more closely connected, and proceeds in a much more strict geographical order. Such an amalgamation would indeed have been almost impossible, at least very violent, if the first journal had had a very distinct conclusion, so as expressly to bring Jesus as far as Jerusalem, or into its immediate neighbourhood, and the other a very distinct beginning, so as expressly to describe him as setting out from Perea or any specific district of Judea. But if this, as is certainly very possible, was not the case, then a compiler of this sort may either have connected two imperfect accounts immediately together, or he may even have inserted between them some detached narratives of occurrences which he had reason to refer to the same journey, supposing him to have taken the liberty of retrenching their beginnings and conclusions where they were rather long. But it may be asked, why, if this is the case, should this division be considered as an independent piece? Why should not the compiler of our Gospel, who, not being a Jew of Palestine, may very naturally have known nothing of Jesus's residence at Jerusalem during the Feast of the Dedication, have made this compilation of several journals and narratives himself? But to this I should be inclined to answer in the negative; for supposing even that the

first account did not distinctly conclude with an arrival at Jerusalem, and the beginning of the second did not distinctly mention the place from which he set out, yet something at least must have been cut away in combining them, and this is quite inconsistent with the method which we have seen Luke hitherto observe in the use of his materials, and which he unquestionably observes in this instance also, since he leaves standing the conclusion of the second account, which he would have been equally obliged to cut away in order in the same manner to join this account also with the following narratives of what took place at Jerusalem. And still more often would he have been compelled to do violence to his customary manner and method, in the case of more than two original journals being here moulded into one whole. At all events therefore we must ascribe this compilation to an earlier hand, and suppose that the compiler of our Gospel found this division already entire, in which case he could of course assign it no other place in his book than this.

This therefore being presumed as the most probable supposition, the task proposed to us is, to try whether we can discover the joints of the several parts which have been more artificially concealed by this compiler than by the preceding. The passage XVIII. 31—34 may be very probably considered as the address with which Jesus assembled his disciples round him at his last

place of residence, whether it was the country of Ephraim or another, previous to setting out for Jerusalem, and in that case the beginning of the second journal might be fixed here, so that the compiler would have been obliged to cut away but little, and indeed it agrees very well with John's rather indefinite statement, that Jericho was the first remarkable place on this journey. And from the exact resemblance of the passage we must also fix the beginning of the last journey in Matthew at XX. 17. But our first journal evidently does not reach in uninterrupted connexion so far as this passage. For in that case we should not read at XVII. 11. *Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας,* but merely *καὶ διήρχετο,* or *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτι διήρχετο,* for the journey to Jerusalem was of course, in a journal of this sort, announced once for all. One is also surprised, if in a connected journal of this nature Christ is brought no sooner than this to the confines of Galilee and Samaria—for this is evidently the true meaning of the phrase *διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας*—at observing how deficient in incidents the last part of his journey must have been, and one is rather inclined to conjecture here a detached narrative, the beginning of which the compiler preserved only because it was in this case clearly necessary to mention the scene. This conjecture gains some force from the blessing of the children which follows at XVIII. 15, where we should not expect a

through so great that the disciples should wish to keep it off, in a district so often visited by Jesus as the road through Galilee to Samaria, and indeed Matthew and Mark also appear to fix it, whether it be in Perea or in Judea, at all events in a district where Jesus was not a frequent visiter. If then probability inclines in favor of the conjecture, that not merely two accounts but several narratives relating to the two last journeys are here blended together, we must inquire farther, how far the original first narrative, which begins with IX. 51, extends? Here now we find ourselves strangely divided. For XIII. 22 is evidently a conclusion, since no one will think of considering these words as an introduction to the following narrative. Shortly before, verse 17 bears a similar character, and one might consider both as connected, and only suppose that the narrator, when on the point of concluding, recalled to mind something which was said at the time, and inserted it between them, and indeed the very concise comparisons in verse 18—21 are certainly too little for a separate memoir. Now do not these words, *Καὶ διεπορεύετο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας διδάσκων καὶ πορείαν ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ* look exactly like the last words of a narrator who had travelled in the company of Jesus to a certain point, and had given an account of the remarkable incidents which had occurred up to that time, but now finds himself induced by his own concerns either to stay behind,

or, for this may likewise be imported by the words, to hasten on before, because he wished to reach the end of his journey sooner than Christ's leisurely way of moving up and down through towns and villages, for the purpose of observing and improving the success of his disciples whom he had sent before, would have allowed him? for which reason the narrator breaks off with the words, *And in the same way Jesus now continued his journey to Jerusalem, always teaching and tarrying in the towns and villages on the road.* If we could adopt this supposition with certainty, we should have an assurance that every thing related between IX. 51 and XIII. 22 really took place on this journey, and if so in about the same order. But to this there arises a powerful objection much earlier out of the passage X. 38—42. There is no one but will with reason feel a repugnance to consider the Martha and Mary here mentioned as different persons from the sisters of Lazarus known to us from John chap. XI. under the same names. If then they are the same persons, a companion of Jesus can scarcely have made such a slip of memory as to relate a circumstance which happened in Bethany, as if it had taken place soon after the beginning of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. One might indeed obviate the difficulty by supposing this to be an addition from a later hand, but there does not even appear in the preceding context any induce-

ment for such an addition. Or if one should be inclined to say, that the narrator was induced, because he had anticipated the return of the LXX. which took place no doubt in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, to relate this circumstance which was contemporaneous at the same time, it would be necessary in the first place to extend this supposition to the preceding narrative also, X. 25—37, where it becomes still more improbable, and it is besides so lame an expedient that I would not lay hold of it without extreme necessity. If the force of this objection is allowed, the words at XIII. 22 will still be a conclusion, only not of the whole account beginning at IX. 51, but of a separate narrative, the beginning of which, if we do not choose to fix it at XIII. 10, is concealed from us by the compiler's mode of proceeding. In this case, we cannot allow the first narrative to extend farther than from IX. 51 to X. 24, and with respect to all that follows must leave it undetermined, or must form our opinion only upon arguments arising out of the matter itself, whether the compiler was right or not in placing it in this order. For that very anticipation of the incident at Bethany is a proof that we must not give him credit for having made close investigations into each particular fact. Although then I would not absolutely decide the point, it will be safer for the present at least to proceed upon this last supposition, and according to it to form our judgement respecting the value

of this collection of journals which Luke has introduced.

Returning now to IX. 51, we must say, that as far as X. 24 we have certainly an originally connected narrative. For should we even be inclined to take IX. 57 again for a fresh beginning, yet the expression *ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα* X. 1 too evidently refers to the words *ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* IX. 52, and even the appellation *κύριε*, which prevails throughout the whole narrative instead of the preceding *ἐπιστάτα*, or *διδάσκαλε*, appears so soon as IX. 54. If however the memoir ends with what Jesus said upon the return of the seventy, it gives us indeed the beginning of his last journey from Galilee, but connects with it immediately a fact which may not have happened till very late, and probably only a short time before the arrival at Jerusalem, namely the return of the seventy, and one must therefore consider the point which this mission has in common with the circumstances before related, namely the peculiar character of this journey, and the extraordinary preparations which Jesus made for it, as the real subject of the narrative. The first messengers seem to have had no other commission than to announce the coming of Jesus and his company and provide for their reception, and may therefore probably have been despatched before Jesus actually set out, but I would not decide whether they also came back before his departure, or whether their return has

been likewise only anticipated. Their previous return was not necessary, even on the supposition that the success which they should meet with in Samaria was to determine the road which Jesus should take; they only needed to meet him on the confines of Samaria. The incident also related XVIII. 11 and following verses, may belong to this period, though Christ did not afterwards in fact travel through Samaria, but crossed the river Jordan. Yet it is also possible, that the account in IX. 51—56 may mean nothing more, than that only one Samaritan village refused him entertainment. The following passages, respecting individuals who were invited or who offered to accompany him, on which we have already observed that Matthew has certainly introduced them in the wrong place, are perfectly suited to this. They suppose exhortations of Jesus, as well general as personal, to the following of him on this journey, on which at all events the temper of Galilee was to be thoroughly and decidedly manifested. Hence these passages, though one or two of them may be of later date, are very properly collected here at the outset, and of the outset I would understand the words πορευομένων αὐτῶν. The expression ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ is most naturally referred to the different roads which Jesus might travel, for this, under all circumstances, might not be a matter of indifference to every one. We must of course conceive the objects of these invitations to have been, not strangers or indifferent

persons, but diligent and well known hearers of Jesus, though not belonging to his ordinary society. Accordingly I would not translate the phrase *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα*, X. 1, *after these things*, for it would have been a strange measure to send out the seventy farther on in the course of this journey; I would rather translate it *moreover*, that is, at the same time with that invitation and that first sending. The denunciation too on Bethsaida and Capernaum, to which Christ now did not mean to return and where he had effected so little in proportion to the efforts employed on them, this he most naturally uttered when he took his final leave of Galilee where he had hitherto resided, not on occasion of John's message, Matthew XI. 20—24, when it would at all events have been expressed only in very qualified terms. Christ's language also at v. 21—24 stands in the most intimate connexion with the report of the seventy, who naturally brought accounts respecting the attachment of the lowly and the adverse disposition of the great; so that the whole is very coherent, and this coherence vouches fully for its correctness.

The expression *καὶ ἰδοὺ* in verse 25, certainly gives to the following occurrence the appearance of having happened just at the time when Christ received the seventy on their return. But as this is very improbable, unless we should make the incredible supposition that they were sent out so early as to be enabled to return soon after Christ

began his journey, we must either suppose this incident to be connected with the beginning and to have occurred immediately after it without any dependence on the anticipated return of the seventy, or we have only to recognize here the first instance of the close and cautious manner in which the compiler, the better to connect every thing, has cut away the proper beginnings of the several pieces. In other respects however the question of the *νομιμός* is a very natural incident in a journey on which Christ had sent missionaries before him, for the express purpose of announcing, with a distinct reference to himself, the approach of the kingdom of God. And it would be too much to infer, because Jesus laid the scene of his parable in the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, that he must also have related it in that district. For even supposing Jesus to have travelled that way, yet if no robbers had been heard of in that district within the memory of man he would have been compelled to lay the scene elsewhere. And so even through travelling in Galilee or Samaria he might have related the transaction of that district, if it was particularly notorious for robberies. But it is strange that it should not be universally recognized how closely the parable applies to the lawyer's real question, how clearly it expresses the truth that every one is a neighbour in the degree in which he possesses those sentiments which knit the bands of charity among men, and a

stranger so far as he is destitute of them, and how the *ποιεὶ ὁμοίως* of verse 37 refers to the *τοῦτο ποιεὶ* of verse 28, and means, *In this spirit go and love thy neighbour.*

In the following little incident, X. 38—42, the compiler has not been obliged to expunge the introduction, which certainly did not run more full and distinct than it is given here; and as it occurred on a journey we see how strongly he may have been tempted to incorporate it in his collection. That it does not belong to this place he undoubtedly did not know, and indeed this story, on account of its pleasing figurative import, was unquestionably repeated in various ways, without a precise specification of time and place and persons.

What we read at XI. 1—13 does not so distinctly express itself to have been spoken by the way, unless the compiler has deprived us of that information. But it is highly probable in itself, if we take *ὡς ἐπαύσατο* in the strict sense, and conceive, what is surely most natural, the ordinary seasons of prayer to be here alluded to. We have no reason to believe that Jesus neglected these, as this never appears among the charges of his adversaries, and in that case he would certainly perform his devotions in Capernaum, or wherever else he was residing, at the place publicly assigned for the purpose. He therefore found himself surrounded on those occasions by numerous spectators,

and the disciples could not easily take occasion, the moment he left off, to ask him for a form, which they undoubtedly desired not only as a compendium of his religious views, but also as something peculiar to his school and elsewhere unknown. Whereas on a journey it might very easily happen that they found him alone at the season of prayer; only we shall hardly be inclined to conceive this prayer to have been delivered so late as the last journey from Galilee. But the manner in which Paulus endeavours to reconcile our account respecting the origin of Jesus's prayer with its appearance in Matthew as part of the Sermon on the Mount will, I should think, satisfy few readers any more than myself. Under circumstances like those in which the disciples met Christ on the Mount, the throng of people who were expecting Christ behind them, and close to them the numerous sick who desired to be healed, such a request would scarcely occur to them; still less if at that time the choice of the Twelve was at hand. What answer could they expect but to be put off to a more favourable opportunity? And how little would he have satisfied their wishes if he had afterwards delivered this form to that great and very mixed multitude! Indeed how little natural and appropriate does this seem upon closer examination in itself! So that I have no doubt that this prayer was only inserted in the Sermon on the Mount by one who possessed only the prayer, without the account of the place and time of its

first communication. The occasion here mentioned is highly natural, and hence our shorter form of the prayer should probably be considered as the original, an opinion which of course is not meant to prejudice the use of the longer in public worship. Nor can I persuade myself that Christ's subsequent discourse, XI. 5—13, does not belong to this place, but was spoken on another occasion. The part of it which appears in Matthew VII. 7—11, is there evidently destitute of all coherence. Even here the expression *καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω* at verse 9 indicates a chasm, nor is the phrase *καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς*, verse 5, by any means a proof that the following words of Christ were spoken immediately after the Lord's Prayer; on the contrary it is more credible that Jesus had given several more circumstantial illustrations of the prayer, which have not been recorded, before he came to this easily remembered parable, and so again in the sequel. Still the reference of both passages to the Lord's Prayer is too clear to be mistaken. For one whose conception of the thought is not disturbed by the anthropopathic figure, the parable, verses 5—8, certainly contains a fine encouragement to perseverance and confidence in prayer and in all active exertions in behalf of the kingdom of God, according to the means which every one has of prosecuting them in particular cases to the best of his conviction. In the same way, much as the second passage, verses 9—13, when torn as it is in Matthew out of the context stands in need of explanation

to prevent it from being misunderstood, yet confining our thoughts to the objects of petition and entreaty presented in the Lord's Prayer we readily and easily accept the assurance, that God, in respect to his kingdom, will certainly not bestow on us useless and unavailing instead of really indispensable, and pernicious instead of desirable gifts. And together with this strong general assurance the passage contains a no less striking inducement to restrain too confident expectations in respect to more specific desires. Hence too the whole returns to the one thing needful, the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, to which all the petitions of the Lord's Prayer likewise point. But in Matthew, where the speech is torn out of the context, this reference is unavoidably lost and an equivocal expression substituted.

The next narrative, beginning at XI. 14, is so very indistinctly connected with what precedes, and at the same time so little introduced, that it affords the first striking instance of the manner in which the compiler, to produce the appearance of a connexion, has cut away the beginnings of the several narratives. But if we compare our account with that of the same incident in Matthew XII. 22—45, the advantage, in the important variations which distinguish them, is again on the side of ours. In the first place it appears very distinctly from verses 15 and 16 in our narrative, that, on the occasion of this healing, on the one hand the charge was made of its being wrought by means

of a diabolical power, on the other the desire was expressed to see a heavenly sign, *i. e.* something marvellous indeed, but which should not be performed by Jesus himself and therefore might give unimpeachable evidence in his favour; as if only such a sign, and not actions respecting which Jesus himself afterwards allows that others might also perform them, could attest his dignity as Messiah. In Matthew the charge alone is related at the same time; and the request of a sign at verse 38 makes its appearance without any distinct connexion with the preceding passage and therefore obscurely enough. Moreover after the maxim, *He who is not with me is against me*, Matthew digresses to subjects quite foreign to the occasion. For the ῥῆσις respecting the blasphemy against the πνεῦμα contrasted with the blasphemy against the son is not easily understood from this context, and still less what follows in him, XII. 33—37. On the other hand he introduces the passage respecting the return of the expelled evil spirit, which he omits here, only at the end of the reply to those who desired a sign, where it likewise is out of its place, while he entirely omits the images of light and the eye, which with us close the second discourse, and of which I should not be willing to say that they are here misplaced. The occasion is similar to one where we find similar matter, VIII. 16, only here the application is different, and that Christ uses an image more than once, but with a

different turn, is proved by several instances. In the same way the coherence of Christ's first discourse is, in our narrative, so perfectly clear, that I should be reluctant to believe that our reporter omitted the passage concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost because he had not a distinct conception of its import. On the contrary, it is only from its position between the two illustrations 21, 22, and 24—26, that the general declaration Ὁ μὴ ὧν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν derives its full determinate meaning, namely, that nothing short of an entire spiritual subjection of Satan can effect his sure and permanent expulsion from his particular holds, and that one who takes no part in the former, as was the case with the Jewish charmers, does more harm even in this respect than good. Moreover, in Christ's second discourse, the mode in which the mention of Jonas is understood in Matthew, verse 40, is wholly unsuited to the context and to the application which even there is made of it; and if we do not take this for a later interpolation, for which no adequate inducement suggests itself, it must be considered as an erroneous comment of the reporter, which he has mixed up with Christ's own words, of course without being conscious of it, a thing which might easily happen when his recollection had become dim and confused. In addition to the signs already adduced of Matthew's reporter having been so circumstanced comes the fact, that he omits the little incident related in

Luke, which intervenes between Christ's two discourses, namely, the admiring ejaculation of a woman in the crowd and the reply to it. An anecdote of this sort is not likely to be invented, nor is it such as any one would insert from any other context in an already organized arrangement of the details; while on the other hand it requires a fresh and lively recollection to mention in their exact place such little circumstances, which in fact derange the general order. And therefore we perhaps did Matthew too much honour in a former page, when we endeavoured to reconcile the place which he assigns to the announcement of Jesus's relatives, immediately after this narrative, with its position in Luke VIII. 19—21. For perhaps in this instance also he was only deceived by his memory. The occasion even of such an error may be pointed out. For in our narrative the ejaculation of the woman, *μακαρία ἡ κοιλία, &c.* follows after the figure of the return of the evil spirit, at the end of the first discourse. In Matthew this figure, by a slip of memory also, terminates the second discourse addressed to those who call for a sign. And how if he had confounded the woman's ejaculation and the announcement of the relatives with one another, because Christ's answer, which is so much alike in the two cases, was the point immediately present to his mind?

This being the case, we need also hesitate the less in the first place to fix this occurrence in the

last journey from Galilee, without being obliged either to assert or deny that it is the same journey with that mentioned at VIII. 1, and moreover to admit what follows from XI. 37 to belong to one and the same original narrative, and therefore in that immediate connexion with the preceding passage which is expressed by the words ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι. Nor indeed can we without violence to all analogy do otherwise. For if our compiler was one who invented connecting phrases, he would surely have framed some before XI. 1 and XI. 14. And by merely cutting away an introductory phrase the present appearance cannot have arisen, for then the very thing which he omitted must have been a discourse of Christ, which, as he has admitted several discourses of Christ without the least respect to any particular subject, is not at all probable. Now as in the preceding occurrence the expressions occasioned by the miraculous healing wrought by Christ render it probable that it did not take place at any of his usual places of abode, but rather at some place where he had never before performed acts of such a sort and therefore most likely on the road, so it seems probable that this was also a travelling occurrence, because it was not in itself a usual thing to invite strangers to the ἀριστον, though if Christ was only passing through a place such a thing may be conceived easily enough. For that ἀριστον was also used to signify the ordinary principal meal, which was

taken later in the day, will surely be difficult to prove, even for this dialect, so as to furnish a ground which may be relied on in this passage where nothing points at this incorrect use of the word. On the contrary if it had been a regular evening meal Christ would scarcely have neglected ablution, which would have been an intentional violation of custom that does not look at all like Christ. Since the common text now at verse 53 is in all probability perfectly correct, and the addition *καὶ ἐξεληθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖθεν* proceeds only from a very attentive listener to the narrative, who observed that Christ appears immediately after XII. 1 in the midst of a great crowd though no mention is made of his rising from the repast, we naturally ask, does what follows from XII. 1 belong also to the same narrative, or does this conclude with the end of the chapter? Verses 53 and 54 might certainly be considered as a general description of the temper which was excited or confirmed by these discourses of Christ, and therefore as a conclusion. But in the first place the expression *λέγοντος αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο* indicates something which took place immediately on the spot, but which being a confused and hasty transaction our reporter could only exhibit in its most general features; and besides, Christ's discourse to the disciples, XII. 1—12, refers so distinctly to both circumstances, to the hostile temper of the Scribes and Pharisees and to the hypocrisy they displayed in their invitation

and hospitable entertainment of him, that we have really no inducement to consider ἐν ὄψι merely as an artificial connexion; on the contrary, the following discourse loses in perspicuity and keeping if we separate it from this context. In this way it becomes very clear, that the vehemence of the dispute was the very occasion of that great concourse, which seems for this time to have freed Jesus from the importunity of the Pharisees and to have enabled him to enter into quiet conversation with his disciples. Only we are then very much at a loss where to fix the end of the entertainment, and cannot help feeling some surprize to find it nowhere mentioned. The most natural solution of the difficulty is this, that all these speeches of Christ directed against the Pharisees and the lawyers were spoken not during but after the breakfast, when the company had again left the house and might again be observed by the people. But if this be the case it must be said that the entertainment is in our narrative not described, but only mentioned for the sake of connexion; and it becomes probable that every thing passed quietly and peaceably at it, and that the Pharisee even came forward with his expression of surprize, or rather his reproof, on the neglect of ablution, only in the conversation which followed the meal and after various opinions had been expressed, and so gave Christ occasion for those discourses. This too is certainly the most natural conjecture, when

one considers the whole transaction with regard to custom and manners. But as little is XII. 12 to be considered as the end of the narrative. For after Christ had in the first place answered the request itself, and then on occasion of that spoken to the multitude (for it is only to ὄχλος that αὐτοῦς can be referred), he afterwards from verse 22 discourses again with his disciples in such a manner, that although his admonitions are immediately connected with the warning against πλεονεξία, as before with that against hypocrisy, still the prevailing train of thought is afterwards resumed, and fearlessness in the pursuit of their calling, and fear of him who can demand an account, are recommended.

We may therefore consider every thing from XI. 14 to XII. 53 as a connected whole, wherein we observe in several particular features traces of the journey. For the request itself, XII. 13, that Jesus would lend his aid to accelerate a partition of the inheritance, betrays such a resemblance to the incidents related IX. 57—62, that it seems most natural to consider the invitation which had been issued to attend upon Jesus as the occasion of such a request, which is otherwise not easy to explain. The mode of reverting from this interruption to the general subject, without continuing any particular topic or resuming the thread at any precise point, just as it must be conceived to happen when in a free flow of thought a predominant direction has once

been taken, this is a phenomenon which can neither be imitated by art, nor can result from an accidental concatenation of similar speeches and incidents, and is a tolerably sure guarantee for the unity and fidelity of this tradition. This is also confirmed in almost every instance by a comparison with the similar passages in Matthew. What we read in our Gospel at XI. 39 was evidently the first reply which Jesus could give to the reproof for the omission of ablution, and is therefore exactly adapted to this context; whereas in the long attack upon the Pharisees in Matthew, XXIII. 25, it not only looks weak after charges so much more severe, but has the appearance of a mere mislaid addition to verse 14, and even by the side of this would say nothing new or more important. The second reproof too with us, XI. 42, is taken from the repast, in which herbs of that sort were probably served up according to custom, and evidently stands here more naturally than in Matth. XXIII. 23. But it is particularly observable that in Matthew even in these charges, though the Scribes belonged also to the sect of the Sadducees which was not so attentive to trifles, still the address *γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι* is every where used, whereas here the reproof is directed only against the Pharisees, and it is not till the *νομικὸς*—to whom moreover if he had been a Sadducee, as such, verse 46 would not have been applied—it is not till he draws the last charge, by his emulation, upon his own

class also, that particular denunciations are added against the expounders of the law. This and the whole way in which the intervention of this very *νομιμὸς* gives a new turn to Christ's discourse, compared with the way in which in Matthew such charges as are rather aimed at the Scribes and such as are exclusively applicable to the Pharisees are confounded, all this taken together decides incontrovertibly in favour of the opinion, that what we read here at XI. 37—52, which can scarcely have been delivered by Christ twice in terms so exactly coinciding, was spoken by him originally on this occasion and in the order here exhibited, and that Matthew, who had no knowledge of the transaction, has interwoven the several denunciations in another discourse addressed to the Scribes, and so out of both has made a whole which is not arranged in a perfectly good and strictly intelligible order. For the first charge, of outward cleanliness being supposed to remove inward depravity, wants in Matthew its proper point; this in our Gospel is affixed to it by verse 41, which is evidently only to be understood ironically, whereas XXIII. 26, in Matthew sounds only like a conclusion subjoined by a different hand, perfectly analogous to the end of verse 23, in our Gospel XI. 42. The figure of the whited sepulchres, Matthew XXIII. 27, may appear a different one from ours of the hidden graves, XI. 44; but it is as natural to conceive that it arose out of a

dim recollection of ours, and was worked up into a figurative repetition of the thought which immediately precedes it. And the passage respecting the building of the prophets' graves is rendered the more unintelligible by the immediate connexion in which Matthew introduces it with the former idea, whereas with us, as it is immediately referred to the anti-prophetical overrating of external rites, its meaning is obvious if we only presume the fact that the expounders of the law were bound to take especial care to preserve the monuments of the prophets, and make up our minds to write *ἀρα*, which must be the true reading, at verse 48; the citation which follows will then be annexed to the question, as a warning that they would soon persecute the prophets sent from God in the same way as their fathers had done. So too XI. 52 with us has a much more distinct reference than the same denunciation in Matthew XXIII. 13, where nothing had been previously said of the *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*. But above all let it be remarked, that with us Christ appears from the beginning as the party attacked, whereas in Matthew, whether we begin with XXIII. 1, or with XXII. 41, he assumes completely the character of the party attacking.

The second discourse, XII. 1—12, issues entirely out of the foregoing, as we have already observed. Excited by the contrast, which was constantly growing stronger, between the hostile

deportment of the Scribes and Pharisees and their hospitable invitations and entertainments, Jesus represents to himself their hypocrisy as the leaven which penetrates their whole character and life, and that there might be nothing of this in the character and conduct of his disciples is the first point. Having been induced, even before the last insidious and malignant dispute arose, verses 53, 54, to express intimations at least, the meaning of which could not escape his disciples, of the mischief which awaited his friends from these very enemies, he might apprehend that his disciples might, by what had just occurred, be rendered the more uneasy as to the possibility of extricating themselves from the difficulties raised by these adversaries; and to tranquillize them on this head, and so to encourage them to the most cheerful confidence, is the second point. From these two all is to be explained, and one cannot but consider it as more natural and in better connexion here than in the general instructions to the disciples in Matthew X. 26—33, in which every thing seems very confused, and which profess indeed to refer to a mission of the Twelve, but without a single fact related in support of the assertion. Even of the declaration at XII. 10, certainly a very difficult one, I should be inclined to maintain that it belongs to this context much rather than to that in which Matthew has recorded it at XII. 31, 32. For there the *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* had

been mentioned as the divine power by which Christ cast out the unclean spirits; and I do not very well see how, in this precise sense, the blasphemy against the Son—which must there have been understood principally of the assertion that he himself had a devil—could be distinguished from the blasphemy against the Spirit, and both be in some degree contrasted with each other. Here, on the other hand, the πνεῦμα ἅγιον is the Divine Power, which was at a future time to animate and direct the disciples in the propagation and defence of the Gospel; and the contrast may be conceived in this way, If any one now resists the Son, the consequences of his sin may still be removed from him, but whoever shall in future also blaspheme the power of the Spirit, whose operations will be more rapid and forcible, will have no means of salvation left. And in this sense this language was perfectly appropriate to the occasion and calculated to encourage the disciples. Whereas in Matthew, chap. XII., the 31st verse indeed may belong to his context, but the 32d is quite foreign to it and seems to have been transferred to that passage from this in our Gospel. It remains to be observed, that this whole discourse can have been delivered only at a time when Jesus had already predicted his sufferings and when they were near at hand.

Of the last discourse to the disciples, XII. 22—53, it has been already observed, that though

it likewise connects itself directly with the immediate occasion, yet it returns to the train of ideas arising out of Christ's general frame of mind. This return seems most distinctly expressed in verse 32, which therefore, though without making a decided pause, comes in somewhat abruptly. It must after all be left to the reader's feeling, after these hints, to conceive the unity which exists in this passage, and to form a lively idea of the way in which all this may have been spoken consecutively. In doing which it will be understood of course, that we have before us here not a literal report but one made from memory, in which many details that filled up the outline have been lost, many more copious discussions purposely omitted, and only the main substance has been stated. At all events scarcely any one will be inclined to believe, that the admonition, 22—31, which is here the most immediate application Christ could make to his disciples with reference to what had been before said of the incident which had just occurred, has been transferred to this passage in our Gospel from the Sermon on the Mount, in Matthew VI. 25—34. There it is not well connected with the preceding passage, and what follows is wholly unconnected with it. It is impossible, considering the almost literal coincidence, to believe that this was spoken by Christ on two different occasions, and it therefore only remains to suppose that an ἀπομνημονεύμα of this ad-

monition found its way into the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, and that what we read in Luke subsequently at XII. 33, 34, was there prefixed at 19—21 (for it is difficult, considering the strong resemblance, to look upon this as a different discourse), and at 22—24 some analogous matter interposed from some other source, and that at 34 some additional sayings which were delivered on a different occasion and belonged to a different context may have been incorporated. What we read in Luke at XII. 35—48 and find in Matthew at XXIV. 43—50, though curtailed and imperfect, admits of explanation from the context with us, while in Matthew it is only forced in, so that this comparison also speaks very clearly in favour of the originality and integrity of our statement. For the parable of the Ten Virgins in Matthew XXV. 1, and following verses, is closely connected with the preceding passage XXIV. 36—42, while the intervening admonition to watchfulness addressed to the disciples has quite a foreign appearance. And particularly inexplicable, after the general exhortations in Matthew XXIV. 42 and 44, is the question introduced in verse 45, *τίς ἄρα ἐστίν, κ. τ. λ.* This with us, Luke XII. 42, is perfectly intelligible, from the preceding question of Peter, verse 41, whether the parable of the servants was addressed only to them, his most immediate confidential disciples, and therefore the rewards of vigilance were promised only to them, or to others also. For to this Christ answers only

indirectly, that there certainly is a distinction between mere servants and such as are set over others, but that only eminent fidelity and prudence give a claim to it. And because Christ elucidates this in verses 45 and 46, by the contrast of the result which follows when the master of the house has been mistaken in a choice of this kind and his confidence has turned out ill, this induces him to subjoin, in verses 47 and 48, the contrast to the parable before delivered at 36—38. For *ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοῦλος* and *ὁ μὴ γνοῦς*, verse 48, are evidently not the servant who was set over the rest, who indeed is also called *ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος* in verse 45, but they are, as the context clearly shows, *οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι*, verse 37, whose duty it was to keep every thing in readiness for their master's return and to open the door for him. And when Christ says, that among these servants were some who had not received any specific orders from their master, *ὁ μὴ γνῶς*, he gives plainly to understand that the parable was not confined to the Twelve, but had a wider range of application. This too is a species of connexion which clearly evinces that we have before us here an original and faithful account, for neither an accidental concatenation nor an elaborate combination of similar sayings could ever produce such allusions. Only verse 39 seems certainly not to belong to our context, for verse 40 has nothing to do with this image but is immediately connected with verse 38, and I cannot help supposing that this image was inserted here merely

on account of its external resemblance and owes its place to a later hand. But in the total absence of any evidence from manuscripts I do not venture to affirm this insertion to have been subsequent to the arrangement of our whole Gospel, so that the image might have been transferred hither from Matthew, but only later than that of the original reporter, so that the compiler of the whole found this addition already made. It is however remarkable, that Matthew's coincidence with this passage in our Gospel begins precisely with this extraneous addition, Matth. XXIV. 43, and that the figure has more relation to what is delivered in Matthew before, 36—41, only then the *γενεὰ* would be the *οικοδεσπότης*, and God the *κλέπτης*. But to decide on this point would not belong to this place. What we read in Luke XII. 49—53 has been abridged so as to omit the most delicate strokes, but in other respects is little altered by Matthew, in the instructions to the Twelve, X. 34, 35. But this too seems there rather to disturb the context than to belong to it; for verse 37 connects itself most naturally, without standing in need of what immediately precedes it, with verse 33. And the most delicate strokes of this passage were unavoidably lost in Matthew. For at so early a period Christ could not say, the fire was actually kindled, nor speak of his being *straitened till his baptism was accomplished*.

Although a connexion cannot be directly shown

farther than this point, yet it is highly probable that what follows was still spoken under the same circumstances. For it is the most natural of all excuses which men are wont to offer when it is too late for the *διαμερισμὸς* here spoken of, that they had not all understood equally well the signs of the times. This excuse therefore Christ anticipates, by showing that the signs of the times are as clear as the most unequivocal natural prognostics. And he then adds that, in respect to his person, even without any sign their conscience must tell them, in the very last moment of decision, what they owed him. So that I should not be at all inclined to consider these last verses as a passage which had strayed into this place from any other context, and indeed the words *ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν κρίνειν*, verse 57, distinctly refer to *τὸν καιρὸν δοκιμάζειν* in verse 56, and form the contrast to it. Nor is there any solid reason for conceiving what immediately follows, XIII. 1—9, to have been originally separate from the preceding passage. Besides, in that case the phrase, *ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ*, must have been a link purely fabricated by the compiler, of which we have hitherto met with no instance. The manner too in which Christ treats the occurrence perfectly corresponds, in its whole tone, to what has gone before, and yet not so obviously as to lead to the belief that it found its place here merely on account of the resemblance.

The case is different with the following nar-

rative, XIII. 10—22, which has a beginning similar to that in XI. 14, perhaps likewise abridged by the compiler; the original beginning may have expressly stated that Jesus was on his journey, as the conclusion represents him travelling onwards. Moreover ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν, is evidently equivalent to ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, and does not at all oblige us to lay the scene of the incident in a place where there were several synagogues, any more than ἐν τοῖς σάββασι implies a protracted stay. Nor is this at all proved by the words of the ruler, verse 14, for he wished to seem to take no notice of Jesus, and his real purpose was so obvious, that he had no reason to apprehend the objection that on the other days of the week Jesus would not be there. And indeed the whole form of his remonstrance, which was intended to be civilly expressed, had no foundation, for no one had come for the purpose of being healed, but Christ had of his own accord called to him the woman who was standing there without any such design. Verses 10—22 however I consider as an original whole, and cannot allow the concluding phrase at verse 17 to shake my opinion. This was perhaps intended to close the little piece, but the reporter added, verses 18—21, some short recollections of what Jesus had taught in the synagogue, and then ends with his departure. For that this is the connexion between these parables and the narrative we will admit with Storr, though he is not to be

sure in general a great authority in such matters, the rather as we have hitherto found in our Gospel no trace that can be relied on of an original whole so small as this comprised in verses 18—21 would be. Thus then the conclusion already observed at verse 22 is probably only the end of the separate narrative which began at verse 10, and the whole collection founded on Christ's last departure from Galilee would consist according to this, from IX. 51 down to this place, of six several narratives, IX. 51—X. 24; X. 25—37; X. 38—42; XI. 1—13; XI. 14—XIII. 9; and XIII. 10—22.

That here at XIII. 23 a new narrative begins which was originally unconnected with the preceding must certainly be evident to every one, for verse 22 can scarcely be considered as a transition to a new topic in the same report because it contains no point to determine that which follows. But especially a writer, who at verse 18, either added something entirely new so silently, or at least took so little notice of its connexion with what had preceded, cannot immediately afterwards have made a transition of such disproportioned length and to something of an entirely similar nature; he can only have introduced this period by way of conclusion. The beginning must in this instance also have been cut away by our compiler, unless we would suppose that many memoirs of this kind were ἀκέφαλα, which however can only

be considered probable in the case of shorter pieces, or of such as at the time of their being set down were designed for a larger collection. The question of the unknown person, if it had not an immediate specific occasion which has not been recorded, must from its import be most naturally referred to this journey, on which Jesus sent messengers before him to announce his coming and to invite his friends to join him, and their little success was obvious to every one. And besides, it could have been only in reference to the approaching catastrophe, which he had announced, that Christ could answer without farther comment, *Let every one strive to enter in at the strait gate, while it is still open.* This was not the proper place for the contrast of the great gate, which is always open to destruction, with which in the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew VII. 13, 14, this saying is embellished; and therefore though in Matthew this image has no proper connexion either with what goes before or what follows, still I should not be inclined to believe that it had been transferred to that passage from this discourse, but rather that Jesus had employed the same figure with a somewhat different turn on another occasion. For here his meaning seems to be to intimate particularly, that only the Jews of Palestine would meet with a peculiar difficulty in finding this narrow entrance, while of others not a few, but many from all quarters, would enter into the kingdom of God. Moreover

the expressions in verse 26 intimate pretty distinctly that this was spoken in Galilee. For there lived most of those who could boast of having stood in relations of hospitality to Jesus, and that he had taught in their streets and public places. On the other hand I see no reason for connecting this discourse with that in Matthew XX. 1—16. For though that begins, XIX. 30, with the same phrase with which ours ends, yet the meaning of the phrase, which like that of *He that hath ears to hear let him hear* and others of the same sort might be often repeated, is there different. If then, as we have said, Jesus spoke this in Galilee, we have the less ground for entertaining a suspicion of the phrase ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, or ὥρᾳ, (for it is the same thing) connecting the next incident, which must have occurred in Galilee, with the preceding, so that our narrative certainly reaches to the end of the chapter. Only I would not decide whether verse 34 originally belonged to it, and was not rather introduced subsequently like XII. 39. For such a personification of Jerusalem, while Christ was travelling in Galilee, has an improbable appearance, and the exclamation, which can scarcely have been uttered twice in precisely the same terms, stands more appropriately in Matt. XXIII. 37, during the days when Christ's public teaching in Jerusalem was drawing to a close. But are we to suppose that the mere expression οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφητὴν ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλήμ misled some one to

insert this ῥῆσις here, especially when any one might easily reflect that verse 35 could not possibly have been spoken in connexion with verse 34 in Galilee? Or should not this of itself be a hint to us to presume that verse 35 at least belongs to this passage, to the answer which Jesus gives the Pharisees for Herod, That he must stay yet a few days more where he was, and then journey quietly for a few days more through Herod's territory, after which he would leave Galilee entirely to them—so that I am perfectly willing that the word ἔρημος should be struck out here—and that he would not personally see them again till the feast in Jerusalem? In this way, if we suppose that εὐλογημένος κ. τ. λ. was an ordinary salutation at the feast, a strong and yet only accidental resemblance with Matth. XXIII. 38, 39, might easily arise, and this might have been the principal occasion of transferring verse 37 also to this passage, as perhaps it was from this passage only that the expression ἰδοὺ ἀφιέται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν with the addition ἔρημος was transferred to Matthew.

The passage XIV. 1—24 may also have belonged to the same original narrative, but only if we suppose, as we have conjectured, that it was prefaced at XIII. 23 by an introduction which we no longer read, and which more distinctly designated it as one intended to combine several topics not in themselves connected. And nothing is gained by refusing to admit this

supposition, for, considering XIV. 1—24 as an independent narrative, we still miss at the beginning of it also a specification of the circumstances, unless we suppose that the compiler himself took down this too in its present form for his compilation from an oral narrative. Moreover we have here again at verse 5 a striking proof, according to my impression, that our Gospel was not written by one person in consecutive order. For could any one so shortly after XIII. 15 have really related any thing so exactly similar without at least apologizing for the repetition by an acknowledgement referring to it? I think no one. Instead of this the whole sounds exactly like the immediate report of a spectator, who relates or commits to writing Christ's discourse at this entertainment, being one of considerable length, with its occasion. And how pleasing is it, that he has not disdained to communicate the first remark, though apparently referring to trifling externals and treating even these merely in the view of practical prudence! For in this very point its excellence consists, that without any appearance of depth and severity it sets in so clear a light the sentiments which lurked behind the fault that it censures. The maxim at verse 11 cannot indeed in this context have any other direct meaning than to remind the hearers of its being a very common case, that one who puts himself forward in the manner described is so humbled. It is taken differently indeed in

Matth. XXIII. 12; but a saying of this sort, for the very reason that it may be applied in an extremely varying extent, may have been frequently repeated. The occasion of the second speech, verse 12—14, our reporter has not communicated, probably because it lay less in the preceding conversation than in general expressions and in the whole demeanour of the host. At the same time the manner in which most of the commentators extricate themselves from the embarrassment occasioned, in consequence of that omission, by this seemingly harsh address is singular enough. But is there not in the expressions *μήποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ σε ἀνακαλέσωσι*, verse 12, and *ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι*, something which must strike every one as a gentle irony, which betrays itself even in the manner in which Christ in the last words, *ἀνταποδοθήσεται γὰρ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων*, adheres closely to the common notion without at all correcting it? And so it looks as if the host wished to take merit to himself for his hospitality, which is the more probable, if Christ's company and several of those who were travelling to the feast were invited, and he had invited in addition to these only his other friends. Lastly, in the parable, verses 16—24, the whole emphasis evidently lies in the peculiar nature of the pretexts alleged, that is affairs which if they had thought of the supper they should have deferred to another time, if they were really bent on attending the supper. And so he means

to suggest to the person who in verse 15 affects a great delight in the kingdom of God, that he is still attached to things which are continually driving out of his memory this great concern, and will lead him finally to neglect it. In Matth. XXII. 1 we read a parable the substance of which is similar; it is however not only far more complex, but the first part of it which corresponds with ours is also quite differently framed, inasmuch as the persons invited, without offering even the show of an excuse, turn in manifest contempt from the king's message, till his repeated admonitions provoke them to violence. This then is an instance of which we have but few. Our form of the parable is evidently the original, but it was afterwards remodelled by Christ, perhaps with others, into a larger and more comprehensive whole.

Since however these discourses were evidently spoken during the entertainment itself, and the expedient of which we made use once before is here inadmissible, it follows that our narrative extends only to verse 24. For the words *Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ* could not have been written in the same context with the preceding passage, without the end of the repast and the continuation of the journey having been at least intimated, if it had been only by a short phrase such as *ἔξελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐντεῦθεν* or one like it; and this would hold even if we could recur to a preceding common beginning of these narratives, which stated every

thing as having occurred during the journey. Here therefore there begins a new original narrative, the opening of which however, referred to in the word *συνεπορεύοντο*—and even the word *στραφεις* seems to require some such reference—has probably been also cut away by the compiler. The first passage, verses 26, 27, occurs also in Matthew X. 37, in the instructions to the disciples. But at so early a period, and before he had yet spoken of his own sufferings, Christ had no occasion to tell his disciples that they must be constantly prepared to meet the punishment of death, and even contribute to draw it on themselves by their persevering and faithful imitation of him; such language they would at that time neither have understood nor endured. Here the declaration, as it sets forth high claims, is addressed as a dissuasive to the heedless multitude; and in this way the following parables are intimately connected with it. The second of these is not subjoined without a material import, since it represents the calling of a disciple, not, like the preceding, merely as a perilous undertaking, but more definitely as a contest, and directs the hearer's attention to the physical superiority of the adversary, which was to be overcome by merely spiritual strength. The conclusion, verses 34, 35, is considered by many as not belonging to this passage because it occurs also in Matth. V. 13; without reason, I think, for the words are perfectly appropriate here. It was the

calling of one, who should at that time have become a disciple of Jesus, to help to prepare and quicken the whole mass of society; if he wanted the peculiar power for that purpose which had just before been more particularly described, the inevitable consequence would be, that he would become useless for the general cause and himself be lost in confusion; and this is expressed in the figure of the salt very appositely and also upon closer examination very exactly. It is besides highly improbable, if this particular εἴσις had been annexed from any other quarter, that the concluding phrase Ὁ ἔχων ὅλα, κ. τ. λ. should also have slipped in. But that Christ may have used this phrase very frequently needs of course no proof. Whether the following passage, beginning with XV. 1, still belongs to the same narrative, we cannot, if the commencement of that narrative has been omitted, determine with certainty. It is more probable indeed that a new narrative here opens, the matter of which our compiler knew to be an incident which happened on the road, or else he has suppressed the introduction which stated that to be the fact, or has arbitrarily incorporated it in his compilation, though this was designed to be an account of a journey. The latter case however is difficult to conceive, and the second supposition remains the most probable, since a separate narrative is much less likely to begin with Ἦσαν δὲ ἐγγίζοντες, than with καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτι, as we have often had it

before, or some such phrase. So much however is certain, that the abrupt expression εἶπε δὲ, XV. 11. and the similar one ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, XVI. 1, are not new beginnings. For not only are all these parables fully intelligible only when they are referred to the murmuring of the Pharisees at Jesus's intimacy with the publicans, but the words ἤκουον δὲ ταῦτα πάντα καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι evidently refer to XV. 2, so that we may conclude we have an original whole from XV. 1 down to at least XVI. 31.

Of the two shorter parables with which Christ justifies himself in the first instance against the Pharisees, we find the first also in Matth. XVIII. 12—14, but there with a different turn and in quite a different bearing, so that the two passages may very well be totally independent of each other. The second of these parables is to be sure of exactly the same import, and only an additional exemplification; but the repetition, though in an abridged form, of the same concluding phrase, by which unquestionably not a little energy is lent to the whole discourse, is a sufficient assurance that this parable too was not borrowed from elsewhere and annexed on account of its resemblance, but was spoken by Christ as is here described at the same time with the first. The third parable is so far an amplification of the other two, that whereas in the preceding Christ allowed the Pharisees the outward justice to which they laid claim and said nothing farther of them, in this he shows how with this

justice might be combined the most uncharitable severity, and exhibits this in a perfectly apposite case, the application of which to themselves under the given circumstances could not escape them. So neither will it have escaped their notice, that the exaggerated and ungrounded charges which the elder brother brings against the younger referred to their own excessive contempt of the publicans. For the *ἀσώτως ζῆν*, which the narrative itself alleges of the younger brother, need not be construed to mean any thing so low and profligate as that *καταφαγεῖν τὸν βίον μετὰ πορνῶν* which his brother imputes to him.

And thus the argument itself leads us to seek in the fourth parable a vindication of the publicans themselves, and as such it would most naturally draw forth that *ἐμμοκτησίξειν* of the Pharisees. But the right view of this parable is to be sure very much perverted if the steward, who after all had not committed any breach of trust on his own account nor was charged with it, is notwithstanding to be termed *οικονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας*, and we will not make up our minds to leave *οικονόμος* without an epithet and to refer this *ἀδικίας* to *ἐπήγεσεν*, and if the master who treats his servant in so arbitrary a way and discharges him without inquiry upon a secret information, and who besides discovers no higher measure by which he judges of human actions than prudence,—if this character is all along considered as a blameless man In that case certainly it is impossible to

show how and to whom Christ can recommend such a mode of proceeding, and all that can be done will be to interpret the application in verse 9 in such a manner, that the leading circumstances of the parable will appear mere ornament, and it will not apply to the doctrine which Christ means to deliver so closely even as the preceding parables; and this coming immediately after them would be an anticlimax too violent for me readily to admit. But if we take more into account those circumstances which have been almost universally overlooked, and so in some degree justify the steward, who may perhaps have procured his master great advantage, and now wishes, in a far more honourable manner than if he had himself directly embezzled any thing, with a part of those gains for which his master could not call him to a strict account to make himself friends among those who are more nearly connected with him, and whom the master might perhaps treat in an equally arbitrary and harsh manner,—upon this supposition a very close application may be shown in this parable also. The master represents the Romans, the steward the publicans, the debtors the Jewish nation; and Christ means to say, if the publicans in their calling and with that which they acquire in it and consequently by means of a violent and iniquitous state of things, which is therefore with reason termed *μαμμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας*, show themselves

mild, indulgent and beneficent towards their nation, the Romans, the enemies of the nation, will themselves in their hearts praise them; and so you have all reason to allow them beforehand, with a view to the time when this state of things is to cease, *ὅταν ἐκλιπῆ ὁ μαμμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας*, and when according to the expectation universally entertained with the end of the Roman dominion the *βασίλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ* was to begin, the right of citizens in that kingdom, and so to admit them into the *αἰωνίους σκηνάς*. In this way Christ vindicates those publicans who were his disciples and who acted like Zaccheus; but adds, that no such claim could be made by those who had not, with their worldly substance and in their foreign service, shown themselves trust-worthy and true to their countrymen; for in this sense alone the words *πιστοὶ ἐγένεσθε* are undoubtedly to be understood, since fidelity to the master cannot be the subject of the parable. And so too verse 13 stands here very naturally and gives a much more definite sense in this context than in Matthew VI. 24, where one is at a loss to see why *μαμμωνᾶς* is described particularly as *κύριος*; so that, considering the great literal conformity of the two passages, I should be more inclined to believe that this verse was preserved and recorded as a separate aphorism and so came into that place in Matthew, where several obscure and figurative passages of similar import are strung together.

For this very reason now it seems to me in the highest degree improbable, that the greatest part of what Christ says in answer to the sneers of the Pharisees does not belong to this place. How indeed should the same reporter who has hitherto related every thing to us with the most punctual fidelity act all at once so unlike himself? For verse 15 alone cannot have been Christ's answer. And even if the parable could be admitted to be tolerably connected with the last words of this verse, yet these words themselves, without farther explanation, are not at all coherent with the preceding matter. So that, should we even admit verses 16—18 to have been inserted by another hand, yet even in this case something material must have been omitted here by the reporter. But how should a later hand, if we examine the passage more closely, have come to make this interpolation here? For it is always against the rules of criticism to suppose such insertions, unless some probable inducement can be shown for them. But does verse 15 afford the slightest motive for transferring verse 16 to this passage from Matth. XI. 12, 13? and does verse 16 afford any for annexing verse 17 from Matth. V. 18, without so much as taking along with it the words immediately preceding it which would have been better adapted to restore a connexion? And what motive was there for citing, out of the numerous instances of Phari-saical perversion and confinement of the law men-

tioned in the sermon on the Mount, the particular instance adduced in verse 18, in which the mischievous perversion is much less striking, from Matth. V. 31? Before we supersede the labour of explanation in a manner so rough and uncritical, it is worth while to try whether we cannot find in this difficult discourse, the obscurity of which is at any rate not unintentional, a thread which may lead us successfully through it. If we consider now that Christ could not well cite the instance at verse 18 in illustration of his general position in verse 17 unless he had a specific case in view, and how exactly this instance coincides with the history of Herod Antipas; if we observe that there is something mysterious in this discourse, so that the reporter himself has perhaps rather faithfully recorded than exactly understood it, and that this is most easily explained by supposing it to contain allusions to this specific fact, though it is not necessary merely because Jesus speaks on this subject obscurely and in hints that this conversation should have passed in Galilee or Peræa; if moreover we refer the expression *ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλόν* in verse 15, which sounds too lofty for the Pharisees, to the men whose approbation they sought, and are led even by this to think of Herod; if we take all this into consideration, it becomes easy to find the connexion of the discourse in itself and with what precedes it. Christ then tells the Pharisees, who sneered at his vindication

of the publicans, the servants of the Romans, that they themselves served Herod, whose dominion was not less foreign and opposed to the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ than that of the Romans, and served him by giving a colour to illegal actions; that in former times the rigid sway of the law and the prophets was universally acknowledged,—for we must supply some such verb as ἐκυρίευσε, or ἴσχυσε, as the opposite to *εὐαγγελίζεται* in the preceding sentence,—but that since the kingdom of God had been announced and the hope of a new and better order of things generally diffused, they imagined that it was their duty, even at the expense of the authority of the laws, to support and maintain every thing—and in the opinion of many the power of Herod's family was one of these things—  
—which could facilitate this change according to their conception of it; that every one now began to act violently, that is, illegally, in respect to the kingdom of God, for this is surely the best explanation of *βιάζεται εἰς αὐτήν*; that in this way however it was not promoted, but only actions justified which were an abomination before God. Now if we compare with this the awkward manner in which the passage which we read at verse 17 is inserted in Matthew V. 18 between verses 17 and 19, so that the whole view there presented is thereby rendered indefinite and ambiguous, whereas every thing is perfectly coherent and intelligible if verses 17 and 19 in Matthew are im-

mediately united, and consider the indistinct meaning afforded by what we read here at verse 16 in Matthew XI. 12 and 13, where it is transposed and receives a different turn ; we cannot after this but entirely give up the opinion that these passages were transferred hither from the sermon on the Mount and the discourse upon John, and unless Christ made use of similar language on two different occasions we must rather presume the reverse. Since then the construction here attempted of 16—18 points out a satisfactory connexion in general, I satisfy myself as to particular difficulties, which even this interpretation still leaves, by supposing that Christ meant only to intimate what upon a single hint must have been more intelligible to his immediate hearers than to us, and I only derive from these difficulties a more lively conviction of the fidelity and self-denying exactness of the reporter.

And with this discourse the immediate scope of the following story seems also connected, nor can it possibly be separated from what has gone before, since it has neither a particular introduction nor a conclusion specifying or farther elucidating its application. Nor is there any general meaning by which it would assume a more independent aspect, which can be satisfactorily applied to it. For as an illustration of the doctrine of divine retribution it is subject to great difficulties, and as a plea for declining

the demand of signs and wonders it would greatly want due keeping. But if we suppose the whole description to be pointed at a man of princely rank, and consider the rich man as the representative of Herod's family, and then of course look upon Abraham's last speech as the real point of the whole, the application is very obvious: Abraham himself would be unable to refer such men, who with every assistance are in danger of neglecting amidst their earthly grandeur the kingdom of God, to any thing but Moses and the prophets; if you then by quibbling interpretations take from them their reverence even of these, you cause them to sink by degrees into a total incapacity, and no dispensation of the divine mercy itself can counteract the result of your dangerous proceeding. Many strokes in this parable tend unquestionably to give a prominence to this very particular allusion; others certainly, and a greater proportion than elsewhere, remain without a definite application, and can only belong to the image itself and serve to complete and embellish it. And it is perfectly conceivable, that Christ might wish, by a profusion of sensible imagery, to divert in some degree the attention of his hearers from the point of controversy, and to tranquillize their imaginations, that the dispute might not be rekindled and degenerate, as it had done in other instances on the part of his adversaries, into an excessive vehemence; and in this too I find a very natural cause why the

paraboli- cal form is so unusually predominant in this passage, and direct general assertions, which might be most apt to inflame the controversy, are only scattered at rare intervals. In the quiet instruction of his disciples and the people who resorted to him, Christ would scarcely have accumulated in this way parable upon parable. Should however any one object, that the result of this whole view of the subject is that Christ favoured the law more than the subsequent proceedings of his disciples would induce us to suppose, I should be inclined to say, in the first place, that where Christ appears as the defender of the publicans it was very seasonable to lay greater stress on this head, and in the next place, that Christ certainly intended to make the law in its utmost rigour (as is proved by his whole way of treating it in his speeches against the Pharisees and also by other expressions not connected with them) the foundation of his church, so far as a considerable portion of the Jewish nation was to form its first stock, and in this very spirit the Christians of Palestine afterwards acted.

The sayings immediately following, XVII. 1—10, are pretty generally considered as not belonging to this context but as having been spoken on other occasions, and we are referred to parallel passages in Matthew; but I cannot give a perfectly unqualified assent to this opinion. On the one hand the phrase *εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς* is too similar to the phrases XV. 11

and XVI. 1 to give us a right in the first instance to view it in a different light; the right to do so can only be acquired by showing that what is said XVII. 1—4 actually comes from elsewhere and does not belong to this context. On the other hand I do not see why, if the whole passage XVII. 1—10 consists of such borrowed pieces, as much at least should not have been said respecting the occasion of the first remarks, 1—4, as that of the last, 5—10. But in fact it is not at all difficult to find a connexion between these first sayings and the preceding matter. The murmuring of the Pharisees at Christ's intimacy with Publicans and sinners was evidently designed to alienate men from him, especially *τούς μικρούς τούτους*, which in this context is to be understood of the *νηπίοι*, the simple multitude who were used to follow the authority of the Scribes. And so too the *ἀμαρτάνειν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἐῖς σέ*, verse 3, is according to this meant principally of hasty, incorrect interpretations and judgments, which even friendly and impartial men might make. To avoid misapprehension, they are contrasted by Jesus with each other: Beware of enemies who, by malicious unjust censure, estrange men from you and thus seek to obstruct in every way the propagation of the kingdom of God; but if it happens that your brethren offend you in a manner outwardly similar, correct them in a different way, always in charity. Matthew indeed,

XVIII. 6, 7, coincides almost literally with our 1st and 2d verses, except in the inversion of the order; so that one can hardly believe that language so similar was used by the same speaker to the same audience on two different occasions. But though in Matthew this passage is followed by others relating to the *σκάνδαλα*, the whole does not form an appropriate answer to the question, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? and the thread dropped at verse 5 is not resumed before verse 10; so that one should be more inclined to believe that the expression *ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων*, which some one had erroneously understood of children, gave occasion to introduce this warning in that passage, where Christ had presented a child to his hearers, and that so this passage drew the rest of similar import after it. The resemblance, on the other hand, between our 3d and 4th verses and Matth. XVIII. 15 and 21, 22, is not so great but that the two passages might be conceived independent of each other. As an extract even from that discourse the passage in our Gospel would be too meager and too artfully put together. As to our second passage, verse 5—10, it is certainly perfectly coherent in itself, and I am by no means inclined to separate verses 7—10 from 5 and 6. On the contrary, after Christ had told the disciples that due confidence in the strength imparted to them and in the holiness of the cause entrusted to them would enable them at all times,

in the moment of emergency, to undertake and achieve what was necessary, however extraordinary it might be, (for more than this we are certainly not justified in ingrafting upon this form of speech in which the hyperbole seems to have been designed to increase its solemnity,)—after this it was perfectly natural that he should inculcate upon them, at the same time, not to expect on that account any external encouragements and advantages as a reward. Whether Christ also said any thing so similar to this as what occurs in Matth. XVII. 20 by way of answer to a totally different question of the disciples, on occasion of the healing of the epileptic who waited for him when he returned from the transfiguration on the Mount, this I am very willing to leave undecided, and refer only to what is said above on that head. But as little should I be inclined to assert, that these sayings are connected with the text which precedes them. Too many intervening passages must have dropped out, and more than, according to the method hitherto observed by our reporter, we have a right to expect, in order to pass directly from the train and course of thought hitherto pursued to the request *προσθές ἡμῖν πίστιν*. The expression also, *καὶ εἶπον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ κυρίῳ*, is suspicious, for these denominations are almost entirely unknown to the original reports which we have hitherto met with in our Gospel, and therefore very naturally suggest the thought that this was

subjoined at the end of a separate narrative by a later hand, from a different source.

How it may have happened that the following narrative, XVII. 11—19, contrary to the method of our compiler which we have hitherto remarked, has retained its original beginning, has been already mentioned. Much earlier he could not, on the supposition that it belonged to this same journey, have assigned its place, for so late as XIII. 31 and following verses Jesus was in Galilee and intended to remain in that district a few days more. Whether however the supposition itself was accurate we must not presume to decide, and should rather believe that our compiler, or perhaps even the arranger of our whole Gospel, when he examined this collection ascertained that point. At the same time we cannot consider it as improbable, since the route between Samaria and Galilee, that is, along the confines of the two districts,—for this, as I have before observed, is the only way in which I can understand *διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας*,—this route is best adapted for a journey so little hurried and which made such digressions on both sides of the road as this, on which Jesus sent the seventy before him and travelled after them at his leisure and probably followed their traces on both sides. Still it is a peculiarity of this narrative, that on close examination it leaves us in some uncertainty whether the lepers found themselves healed soon

after their departure from Jesus's presence, and therefore the one who returned found Jesus again nearly in the same place, or whether in compliance with his command they went to the priests, and it was only after this legal declaration that the Samaritan went in search of Jesus and gratefully presented himself to him. The latter is the most natural supposition, since there were few instances in which a leper could himself decide whether he were clean, and Jesus's question, verse 17, certainly sounds rather to that effect; but one cannot help feeling surprize, that this circumstance should not have been more distinctly marked in the narrative. And this suggests the thought, that the incident, which is well adapted for such an end, was related chiefly on account of its instructive import, and therefore in other respects rather negligently told. For this very reason I do not believe that the narrative extends beyond this particular incident. Christ's observation, verses 17 and 18, is its point, and hence it does not stand in need of any formal conclusion, though verse 19 might be considered as such. For this phrase occurs too often to be always ascribed to Christ himself, and it was too natural for the relaters of miraculous cures to close their accounts with it.

A new narrative therefore, without an introduction like most of the preceding and apparently from the same motive, begins in all probability at

XVII. 20. Whether our compiler had a traditional ground for assigning to it this place, we cannot decide; there is here so entire an absence of any sensibly striking occurrence, that it was a fortunate chance if there was any one who could give an inquirer information as to the time and place at which these conversations passed. But this question, which would otherwise have been somewhat obtrusive, might with the greatest propriety have been addressed to Jesus by a stranger in the course of this journey, on which he had sent the seventy before him to announce once more the kingdom of God. In this account moreover there is a great deal which argues it to have been drawn up by a disciple who was present with the utmost fidelity, if not without omissions. Christ's answer to the Pharisee is too finished in itself to be an arbitrary extract; on the contrary it can scarcely have been more explicit than we here read it. And how emphatic is this brevity and the whole turn of the reply in comparison with the following discourse addressed to the disciples! In answer to the Pharisee Christ does not enter into any such description of stages, of different epochs in the coming of the kingdom of God, but only says to him: In the way in which thou seemest to watch for it, expecting its appearance to be marked by outwardly striking events, it will never come to thee; thou needest not to look abroad, for it forms itself in the same circle in which thou art living, in that of teaching and instruction,

and is in fact already come. To the disciples on the other hand he says: That another revelation of the Son of Man was certainly at hand, but was to be preceded by times so distressing that they should anxiously wish for the appearance of that revelation. To enter here into a circumstantial comment, lies quite beyond the limits of my design; but without this every one, I should think, will feel, that we should certainly have lost, in the report of this discourse to the disciples, the Pharisee's question and Christ's answer to him, if we had here only an account from a second or third hand.

But if these points are to prepossess us in favour of our reporter, he must first be freed from the disadvantageous suspicion of having intermixed a great deal of matter not belonging to this place from other discourses of Christ. In the first place then we have to inquire how the correspondence of many passages with passages from the long discourse in Matthew XXIV. is to be explained. Unless we would detach verse 23—36 from all connexion with 21 and 22, which would surely be extremely arbitrary and violent, we cannot consider the two discourses as only different editions of one and the same. For should we even consent to admit ours not to have been spoken on the journey, but at Jerusalem, where Matthew evidently lays the scene of his, still Matthew mentions a different occasion according to which he takes in substance an entirely different course of argument. Nevertheless

particular passages are so similar, that one cannot easily believe they were spoken twice in these exact terms, but Christ addressing the same men would either have referred the second time to the first discourse, or have substituted other details, which were no doubt equally at his command. In my opinion now the same thing has happened here which we have met with frequently before. For let it be considered how excellently in Matthew XXIV. verse 42 follows immediately after verse 36, and how little the example of the days of Noah, as it is there stated, is adapted to these two sentences. For when God commanded Noah to build the ark at the proper time, this was equivalent to revealing to him the time and hour, and accordingly Noah announced them to his contemporaries. Now if the disciples had this same calling, the admonition to them, to watch because they did not know the hour, is not at all suited to this context. In the discourse in our Gospel, on the contrary, the example is introduced in reference to the rejection of Christ mentioned immediately before, which was then beginning and thenceforth continued in spite of all warnings and notices, and is perfectly apposite. So likewise in the former part of the chapter in Matthew XXIV. 27, the description of the rapidity and as it were the ubiquity of his παρουσία has no connexion with verse 26. For there Ἴδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ κ. τ. λ. evidently refers to Pseudo-Messiahs. But it could not be a ground for a warning not to

go out to them, that the Son of Man comes quickly and is every where at once, but that he certainly is not come so long as there are many who give themselves out for him. And how totally misplaced after this figure is the next verse 28! The irrelevancy becomes most obvious at verse 29, which by this interpolation assumes an appearance, as if the *σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ* and he himself following upon it were to come after that *παρουσία* which was to be like lightning, and as if therefore a double *παρουσία* were here spoken of, evidently indeed, but in the most confused manner, and less discriminated than they would be in the language of a Prophet, so that between the two Christ should have omitted nothing less than the whole history of the New Testament without a word of allusion to it. Whereas verse 29 links admirably with verse 24, which is itself as well as verse 23 only parenthetical, on which account at the conclusion the thread dropped at verse 22 is resumed. It seems therefore almost as if verse 26 was only a repetition of verse 23, for the very purpose of introducing verse 27, which in our Gospel is annexed to a saying similar in sound, but of totally different meaning. For with us not even the most distant allusion is made to false Messiahs. So that in fact we have nothing left of our discourse which is really suited to Matthew's context, but verse 31, in him verse 17 and 18; but among the much stronger and more pointed strokes verses 15, 16, 19,

20, these slighter ones make less impression, and are almost effaced, so that they might easily be dispensed with. And where lower down our Gospel unquestionably communicates the discourse contained in Matthew XXIV, it also sets other strokes in the room of these, and there certainly no one will discover an interstice, or an artificial alteration.

That the parable XVIII. 1—8 still belongs to the same context, is beyond a doubt. Intervening discourses, probably conversations, are wanting, and one sees that the reporter, forcibly impressed by what had been before said, was no longer fully susceptible of any form but the parable, which imprints itself so readily on the imagination and the memory. The mode in which the occasion of the parable related by him is connected with the preceding subject is sufficiently obvious. When the day of decision had once arrived, no one could do any thing but fly as hastily as possible, as Jesus had declared plainly enough. But he had predicted, at verse 22, hard times, undoubtedly the same persecutions which are more plainly described in the subsequent discourse, and upon this some disciples may have despondingly asked, how they were to act in order to pass through this season successfully and irreproachably. These inquirers then the Redeemer referred to unwearied activity in their calling, *μη̄ ἐκκακῆιν*, and continual prayer, *πάντες προσεύχεσθαι*, and to enliven his exhortation

subjoined the parable, of which again we shall too easily miss the full force, if we do not observe, that the injustice of the judge consists only in the harshness and capriciousness with which he delays his award. But the second parable, 9—14, many will not allow to have been spoken in this context. Yet the style of narration is so similar, and it is so easy here too to discover the connexion, that I can allow no room for these doubts, which have certainly arisen only from an erroneous view of the parable as antipharisaical. If some disciples expressed themselves despondingly on the subject of more calamitous times, which were to precede the destruction of the hostile Judaical polity, may not others, either at the same time or after Christ's instruction, have expressed themselves confidently and presumptuously, that if it came to the point they certainly would not be wanting? Have we not an instance of such temerity in Peter? And do we not know of others who esteemed themselves worthy of being the first in the kingdom of God? To persons so πεποιθότες ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, because they held themselves just, is the parable addressed, to show that one who is more impressed with the consciousness of what he wants, than what he has, stands the higher in the sight of God. The lesson is striking, and yet the form lenient; but it is only by being referred to a specific case of this kind, varying a little from its immediate contents, that the story becomes a real parable, and loses all

obliquity and indistinctness. And thus I cannot but recognize, in the passage from XVII. 20 to XVIII. 14, connected discourses and therefore one narrative, but one which, for the reasons above mentioned, was certainly not connected with that which precedes it, and to which I have no reason to believe that the following one originally belonged. Those critics indeed who make IX. 51 the commencement of a separate piece incorporated by Luke in his Gospel, the rest of which they suppose to have been composed by himself, appear to me to have no sufficient reason for terminating this piece here, and ascribing what follows again to Luke. For that this subsequent matter also occurs in Matthew and Mark is surely no reason. For why might not a piece of this sort, which cannot certainly have been designed as a supplement to Matthew and Mark, have contained something which likewise occurs in Matthew? And if one chooses to call it a gnomology, are not the two sections XVIII. 15—17 and 18—30 as well adapted to such a work as most of the preceding matter? Nor is it easy to conceive a piece of this extent, which was designed to be an independent work, without a formal conclusion, especially as it has such a beginning. As little does it discover the slightest trace of the author's re-appearance, which if it had existed could scarcely have been so totally effaced. Not only is the style in the following passages exactly the same, but even the

mode in which they are connected is not distinguishable from that immediate annexion, without reference or designation of time or place, which we have met with in almost every instance throughout this piece. So far therefore as this goes this passage might very well belong to the preceding. But what determines me in favour of the opposite opinion is this. If the preceding narrative XVII. 20 began without a designation of time and place, it most probably was not meant to extend beyond discourses internally connected with each other, which are here at an end. If it began with such a designation, and this has been lost only by the omission of the compiler, it would have noticed as it proceeded, though never so slightly, any alteration in time or place; and that the compiler should have struck out such a designation from the very middle of the narrative is certainly in the highest degree improbable and groundless. Now the following passage is scarcely in such immediate connexion with the preceding as to render such a notice of the date unnatural. In fact this presenting of the children at once, in a throng and pressure, for otherwise the disciples would not have interfered to prevent it, can scarcely be conceived under any other circumstances, than that Christ was on the point of departing from a place where he had been staying some time, (since a considerable degree of intimacy must be presumed before the people could have entertained such a thought)

and where they did not hope to see him again, and on that account wished to procure for their children some such lively and symbolical memorial of him. With this too Matthew and Mark agree, the former when he says XIX. 15, *καὶ ἐπιθείς αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας, ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ ἰδοὺ*, and so connects it with the following incident, and the latter when, after relating the presentation itself literally as Luke, he subjoins the following incident with the words *καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδόν*, which evidently indicate a departure. But this moment of departure is not the same with that of the preceding calm conversation between Christ and his disciples, and would therefore have been intimated. It is therefore more probable that our narrative is a new one. Whether it had an introduction, which marked this circumstance of the departure, and which was also cut away by the compiler because it contained a partial repetition of his general beginning, or was likewise *ἀκέφαλος*, because it proposed to describe nothing more than what occurred on this occasion of the departure, it does not become us to decide.

Respecting the place and time of this incident however there arise several doubts, the removal of which, though it is in itself quite indifferent where the incident occurred, is of importance to us, in order to determine where and how the accounts of the first and second journey in our collection meet. The most circumstantial statement of the place in Matthew is the strange one XIX. 1. *μετήρην ἀπὸ τῆς*

Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, which Mark X. 1 corrects by διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου for διὰ τῆς περαιίας. Adopting this correction, it still remains doubtful, whether we are to lay the scene in Perea, or in the ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας. For though the latter only are mentioned as the end of the journey, for what purpose was it mentioned that Christ had travelled through Perea, if no incident is related which happened there? If we do not adopt Mark's correction, and indeed I am not inclined to allow him much weight here, we must at least keep clear of a double caprice and extravagance of construction, first that of separating the words μετῆρξεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, as the end of one separate piece, from the words καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας, as the beginning of another, and next that of taking ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας to mean a part of Perea. The latter supposition is against the uniform use of the word ὄρια in our books, inasmuch as it always is followed by a genitive of the whole of which the ὄρια are a part, so that ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας can only be a part of Judea, not of Perea, and it avails nothing to say, that the addition πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου has made the expression intelligible to every one, as every one knew that no part of Judea lay on the other side of Jordan; for the description is still absurd, and could not therefore occur to any one, and other modes of describing this district must have presented themselves to every one in sufficient abundance. The former construction is equally

inadmissible. I might perhaps allow, that so negative an expression as *μέτρηέν ἐκείθεν* may conclude a narrative, be it short or long, when the departure mentioned is only from a particular place, but not when it is from a district which was Jesus's ordinary place of residence. And yet let any one try his philological sense, whether even in Matthew XIII. 53, 54, he ventures to part the words *μετῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν*, and *καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν*. If then we reject this expedient, what have we left, but to translate *ἦλθεν* not he came to the *ἄρια*, but he went to the *ἄρια*, so that it may stand for *ἐπορεύετο*, as, to confine ourselves to the same Evangelist, Matthew XV. 29, *ἦλθε παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, and to consider *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* as a more exact description of this journey, which is to return to Mark's correction and so to the doubt above expressed.

Now this doubt respects not only the place, but also the time. For if this blessing of the children is to be fixed in Perea, it may have taken place either on the journey to the feast of the Dedication, if, which is in itself probable, Jesus, after travelling along the confines of Samaria and Galilee, crossed the Jordan at Bethabara in order not to expose himself to the inhospitable treatment of the Samaritans, as he did not wish to travel at all rapidly, or it may have taken place during his last stay in Perea after the feast of the Dedication; and the latter supposition is in this case the more probable, because it could only have been at this time

that Jesus made any considerable stay with his disciples at any one place in Perea; the departure would then be to the scene of the resurrection of Lazarus. If on the other hand the blessing of the children is to be fixed in Judea, it may likewise have happened either on the journey to the feast of the Dedication after Jesus had returned across the Jordan, probably in the neighbourhood of Jericho, or when he was staying in Judea near the wilderness after the resurrection of Lazarus. And in this case also the latter supposition is the more probable, both on the same ground as in the former case, and because Matthew's expression, μετῆγεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, must surely import, that Jesus after that did not again reside in Galilee, and therefore Judea is represented as his place of destination, because it was his last place of abode. If then we adhere to the most probable presumption, the time of this incident must not be fixed in the journey on which he set out from Galilee, but either in the interval between the two journeys or at the beginning of the last journey. But which of these two suppositions deserves the preference can only be decided by the sequel of the narrative in the two Evangelists. If this declares itself in favour of Judea, we must content ourselves with supposing that the mention of the road through Perea in Matthew is a mere piece of information, to which no farther reference is made. The sequel now is as follows. That the conversation with the Phari-

saical youth and the passages connected with it, in Luke XVIII. 18—30, in Matthew XIX. 16—XX. 16 or at least as far as XIX. 29, in Mark X. 17—31, take place on the same occasion of the departure with the blessing of the children, seems manifest from all circumstances. We need not insist only on Mark's description *προσδραμῶν καὶ γυνυπετήσας*, which sounds precisely as if at the moment of Jesus's departure he had thrown himself in haste and with some degree of violence in his way, since not only does Matthew's *ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἰδοὺ*—for there is no reason for the interpunctuation—say exactly the same thing, but it is implied also in the word *ἐπηρώτησε* verse 18 in our Gospel, for this connects his question with Christ's declarations respecting the mode of receiving the kingdom of God, of which our verse 17 has preserved only the most pithy sentence. Whether the additional matter inserted by Matthew XIX. 30—XX. 16 belongs to this context, we may leave undecided. But after this all three Evangelists subjoin that definite prediction of Christ's approaching sufferings contained in Luke XVIII. 31—34, and subjoin it too as spoken at the departure for Jerusalem, and the question now is, is it more probable that this is also to be fixed at the same epoch and therefore belongs to the preceding narrative in our Gospel, or not? It is very conceivable that Jesus in setting out from his last place of abode is first surrounded by the inhabitants with their children, to take

leave of him, that then the Pharisee meets him, and that it is only after he has been dismissed, and the somewhat uneasy impression which Christ's speech had made on the disciples has been softened, that the journey actually begins, as Mark too X. 32, compared with what precedes, seems to intimate, and now Jesus assembles the Twelve about him on the road, in order to tell them definitely that his hour is now come. This too is the easiest way of explaining the coincidence of the three Evangelists in the arrangement without seeking a particular cause. Whereas if this prediction belongs to the beginning of the last journey, and the two other incidents to the time preceding either the feast of the Dedication or at least the resuscitation of Lazarus, this arrangement, even on the supposition of an original Gospel, is not easily explained. The very circumstance of its being the same in all, without the intervention of any material incident, is hardly conceivable, since this interval cannot have been destitute of remarkable occurrences. But still less does it appear possible that an original Gospel, especially when we are drawing so near to the last part of the history, should not have better distinguished the epochs by a few words, or that precisely these should have been lost, especially in our Evangelist, who is commended for his attention to dates. As little does the coincidence of arrangement admit of explanation from the circumstance that Mark had

Matthew, and Luke again Mark, before him. For Luke, on the very account of his attention to determinations of place and time, even if he had reasons for omitting the conversation on divorces, would at least have adopted these concurring descriptions of the place, especially as a different one had been stated in his Gospel shortly before. A more exact comparison will show, on the contrary, that Matthew and Luke have admitted two different reports of the two first incidents, and that Mark either had a third or compiled his from the other two with additions after his manner.

Admitting then the three incidents to be contemporaneous, the two first must have occurred when Christ was setting out for Jerusalem for the last time, most probably therefore from the district of Ephraim. For on his arrival at the last stage of his journey to the feast of the Dedication, he could not predict his sufferings in the manner here described, without prophesying falsely, unless we suppose that he had intended to remain between the feast of the Dedication and the Passover in Jerusalem, or, which would be in this respect the same thing, in the adjoining village of Bethany, and that he afterwards gave up this intention, which however is extremely improbable. As little can Jesus have uttered this prediction when he was setting out from Perea to the raising of Lazarus, for at that time he did not propose to go directly to Jerusalem. But even if we suppose the three inci-

dents to be simultaneous with Christ's last departure for Jerusalem, we shall indeed have adopted the most probable supposition in all respects, but shall not have explained every thing in the character of our narratives. The question in fact is, whether the narrative XVIII. 15—34, which according to this was originally connected, is terminated at v. 34, or whether it originally formed one piece with the ensuing farther account of this journey? The latter supposition will certainly appear highly probable; for how natural is it, that what happened at the outset should have been related as an introduction to the whole account of the journey! Only this objection presents itself, that in the following narrative the places are specified with an exactness which does not at all appear at the commencement; to which may be added, that, as has been already observed, verses 31—34 alone form a very natural introduction to the farther account of the journey, in which, on account of the mention of Jericho which immediately follows, the statement of the place is less missed, so that it still remains doubtful whether an introductory beginning has been omitted before XVIII. 15, or whether 15—30, notwithstanding its simultaneousness with 31—34, was yet a separate narrative, which stood in less need of a peculiar beginning, and proceeded from one who could not hear what Jesus said to the Twelve alone; in which case verses 31—34 would be an introduction to

what follows, and indeed Matthew, taken strictly, sets only this, not the other incidents, in close connexion with the last journey to Jerusalem. Still this uncertainty does not strike me as a reason for dropping the view which I have formed of this whole portion, nor can it even induce me to give up what, considering the harmony of arrangement in the Evangelists, appears so highly probable, the contemporaneous occurrence of these three incidents. Should any one nevertheless, on account of the construction of our narrative, prefer supposing that the blessing of the children and the conversation occurred earlier, then the similarity of arrangement can only be explained by the failure, common to the three Evangelists, of information relating to the stay during the feast of the Dedication and that in Perea and Judea, and this failure also is according to our view very conceivable. Much of what happened at the feast of the Dedication has certainly been assigned, not indeed in John, who distinguishes this stay from the following one, but in Matthew, to the last stay. It would otherwise be impossible to compress within the narrow compass of a few days what he relates on this occasion, besides the discourses reported by John. On the other hand, the stay in Perea and Judea was certainly not generally known, and they who first went in quest of particular accounts and gave occasion to written memoirs were not directed by

rumour to make inquiries in those districts. Then after Matthew had once stated the fact, *μετῆρσεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, and no doubt in the more definite sense above mentioned, he too could interpose nothing more between this little incident and the last journey to Jerusalem.

It remains however to adduce some arguments to confirm the assertion above made, that Matthew's account of the blessing of the children and the conversation with the Pharisee is founded on a different report from that in Luke. In the blessing of the children Luke passes over, as a thing which follows of course according to the language of Jesus, the actual granting of the request. On the other hand, he subjoins, verse 17, what Christ certainly said only after the performance of the act to his disciples, and no doubt in more explicit terms, which therefore ought to have no influence on the interpretation of *ποιούτων*, verse 16. Mark combines both narratives, but certainly not in the right way, and appears in this case also not to be an original independent authority. Matthew expresses more distinctly the wish of the parents, as it could only have been uttered by those who stood foremost and nearest; Luke, as those who were at a greater distance would say, they should be happy if Jesus could only touch their little ones. Evidently therefore here are two different reporters, and the most exact coincidence again only in the words of Christ. The

same is true of the following conversation, only that here variations appear in the words of Jesus themselves, which variations however originate partly in curtailment, as in Luke the omission of the question *πῶς ἐντολᾶς*, partly in a different version of the Aramaic, so that the reading in Matthew, *τί με ἐρωτᾶς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*, seems to render most accurately the words of Christ. In what follows, the narrative in Matthew is more circumstantial, but at the same time heavier. But from the point where Peter makes his appearance that of Luke appears to me decidedly the more pure and correct. Peter's expression in Luke contains only a plain comparison with the young Pharisee and the conviction, that they who possessed the one thing which he wanted could not fail of attaining the kingdom of God. Christ confirms this, and adds a promise, which expressly refers only to the dissolution of ties of blood and affection. In this Christ distinguishes two periods of the kingdom of God, that *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ*, and that *ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ*. According to the little that is recorded on this head in Luke, whose reporter breaks off here, Christ may certainly have spoken of the share his disciples were to have in his kingly office. But the reporter in Matthew has been so overpowered by this magnificent image, that he has prefixed it and thereby confounded the two periods, and so has not only obscured the whole, but also spoiled the effect by the anticlimax which this

proceeding rendered inevitable. So perhaps the mention of worldly substance may have slipped into his narrative unobserved among the ties of affection enumerated, and the question, of which as the conversation unfolds itself in Luke there was no need, may have been put by way of inducement into Peter's mouth. Mark in substance follows Luke so closely, that one cannot properly consider his as an independent narrative. He takes something also from Matthew, but what he himself furnishes cannot be considered as corrections from an independent source. The young man's confidence could not certainly affect Jesus with any particular prepossession in his favour, and the expression *οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασι* is undoubtedly a limitation from a later hand. For had Christ himself confined his former language in this way, the first impression produced by it must have been quite effaced, and there is neither room after these words for the *περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο*, by which the previous term *ἐθαμβοῦντο* is meant to be surpassed, nor is it possible after them to explain the question *τίς δύναται σωθῆναι*, for every thing was then resolved into a very perspicuous and even common-place thought. Now if Mark, as seems to be the case, in relating the blessing of the children and the conversation with the young Pharisee, had before him, together with Matthew, the account which we meet

with in Luke, he must have had it before it was connected with what goes before, and this would then be a fresh proof that a new original whole begins here. But for the purpose of determining how far it reached Mark affords us no aid, as he turns again directly to Matthew. In the prediction, XVIII. 31—34, Luke alone has the addition, verse 34, which does indeed at first sight appear to accord but ill with the openness and precision of Christ's discourse, and has been used by many to throw suspicion on that very precision, as if it were to be laid only to the account of the disciples and did not lie in the words of Jesus. But how has it escaped reflexion, that all the expressions in this verse, as Jesus at all events spoke in a language intelligible to his disciples and they were able to understand his meaning, can be only relative, and are meant to describe the imperfect degree in which they understood him, in comparison with the manner in which, after his resurrection, they came to perceive the necessity of his sufferings and the reference of prophetic passages to him? And that he of the Twelve, (whom Jesus then took apart and from whom therefore all accounts of this scene must be derived,) who related, perhaps to one who was present on the journey, the substance of this conversation, should have added such an expression, is so highly natural, that I am only the more inclined to

believe that our reporter, who was probably himself one of the company, incorporated this piece in his account from the mouth of one of the Twelve.

Without therefore precisely determining whether XVIII. 35 is an entirely new beginning, or whether it is connected with XVIII. 15, or only with XVIII. 31, let us inquire how far we can now pursue with certainty an uninterrupted context from this point. Verse 43 sounds indeed quite like a conclusion, so that we might suppose that the narrator broke off here, but the expression εἰσελθόντων διήρχετο, XIX. 1, refers so evidently to the words ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν, XVIII. 35, that we may safely presume the same narrator is proceeding, till at XIX. 28 we meet with a conclusion, from which one should almost infer, that the narrator stayed behind here on Christ's leaving Jericho, and makes Christ and his companions continue their journey without him. For in what follows the preceding narrative is not so distinctly implied. Only the circumstance of its beginning again with the specification of the place and a phrase very similar to XVIII. 35 renders the identity of the writer probable, and in this case the same original memoir would extend at least from XVIII. 35 to XIX. 48. For here, as we have already observed, the whole ensuing history is shortly summed up, so as to render it impossible to believe, that the same narrator meant to record directly after some particular passages from that period. In the first

narrative, the healing of the blind man, a double contradiction occurs between the three evangelists. Matthew, XX. 29, and Mark, X. 46, fix the incident at the departure from Jericho; Luke at the entry into that place. Matthew supposes two blind men; Mark and Luke only one. The course of the transaction is so exactly the same, that no one can imagine two or three incidents or three or four blind men. Seeing now that our reporter relates in the same context and with equal minuteness an affair which took place in Jericho itself, he is unquestionably entitled to the most credit as to the time; and I should be reluctant to strain his language, in order to make it appear that Christ had already passed through the town when he healed the man. So too, since Mark names the blind man and mentions him as a notorious person, we must give him peculiar credit as to there having been only one. Perhaps it was only the next morning, when Jesus was proceeding on his way from Jericho, that the blind man actually attached himself to his company, and the transaction then first reached the ears of Matthew's reporter; perhaps Mark's reporter, for Mark has unquestionably some peculiar information in this case, was an inhabitant of Jericho, who only knew or said that it happened at the gate of the town, and Mark followed Matthew in the more precise statement of the circumstances, but corrected the number. How Matthew, who

has before done something of the same sort in the case of the demoniac of Gadara, came to the notion of two blind men, whether, with the blind man, some one connected with him likewise attached himself to Jesus, and the narrative was by mistake applied to him also, or how else it happened, I do not venture to determine. The second incident, the night's lodging at the house of Zaccheus, is so immediately connected with the parable XIX. 11, by the phrase ἀκούοντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα, and at the end of it, verse 28, the phrase καὶ ἐπιπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν so distinctly states that this was spoken before Christ set out again from Zaccheus's house, that the preceding discourses and conversation, which are only reported in substance, verses 7—10, cannot but be conceived to have passed in the morning when Christ was on the point of departing, and the words ἐπεδέξατο αὐτὸν χαίρων to comprize the whole account of his reception in the house of Zaccheus. It must indeed have been known to many the evening before and have struck several as singular, that Christ lodged in this man's house, if the publican, as must be presumed unless we would force διήρχετο into the plusquam perfect, lived in the town and not farther on the road. But the διαγογγύζοντες could only have assembled round Christ and his host in the morning, when Christ, probably not at an early hour, as the company required time to meet and the remaining distance was not great, was on the

point of setting out again. Then the Phari-  
 saical bystanders murmured, then honest Zac-  
 cheus in joy and gratitude uttered vows of bene-  
 ficence, then Christ vindicated himself, though  
 rather addressing himself by way of leave-taking  
 to Zaccheus than to his adversaries, and then were  
 voices heard, that the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ would now be  
 manifested to the whole world, an expectation  
 which Jesus meant to check and to which he meant  
 to give a different shape by the parable. As to  
 this parable itself, it bears an affinity in one of its  
 elements, which is however here evidently rather a  
 secondary point, to that in Matthew, XXV. 14—30,  
 but yet I cannot consider that which is recorded  
 in Matthew as only an imperfect statement of  
 what was here spoken by Christ. For in the first  
 place, every hearer according to the occasion com-  
 municated by Luke, would rather have retained in  
 his memory the main feature, that of the hostile  
 citizens who would not that the εὐγενής should  
 rule over them and on that account were to be  
 destroyed upon his return, and have forgotten the  
 secondary feature of the ten servants. And in the  
 next place, even had the latter appeared to any  
 one the most important, at least for himself, he  
 would not surely have altered its character in com-  
 mitting it to writing or relating it again. For  
 here in Luke all the servants receive equal sums  
 and even the faithful servants make of equal sums  
 unequal gains, whereas in Matthew they receive

unequal sums and make with them gains proportionably equal, by which the application of this element of the parable is totally altered. But as little do I believe, that Christ on a subsequent occasion delivered a part extracted from our complex parable by itself thus altered; on the contrary, the opposite course is evidently the more natural. The parable too in the passage of Matthew where it occurs, is very little adapted to the context. For if it had been delivered in support of the admonition  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \sigma\delta\upsilon$ , Matth. XXV. 13, the slothful servant must have excused himself with the pretext, that he was on the point of beginning to make gain, but that his Lord took him by surprize. On the other hand, verse 31 connects itself extremely well with verse 13. Since then the parable does not belong to this passage in Matthew, I prefer supposing that Christ had previously delivered it in that simple form upon some occasion unknown to us, but one which rendered the unequal dispensations of providence to men an essential circumstance, and now resumed it, but with the alteration we have remarked, because here that inequality was not material; on the contrary, for the purpose of trying the servants, to ascertain how far confidence might be placed in them in their lord's enlarged dominion, it was better that they should receive equal portions.

The description of the last part of the journey, XIX. 29—48, is therefore most probably from the

same reporter; and I should even be inclined to ascribe the concluding period, verses 47 and 48, only to him, and not to the supposed collector of these narratives, though the words are at the same time the end of this whole collection. I should only say that this circumstance, of a narrative with so formal a commencement as IX. 51 and one with so distinct a conclusion as this here presenting themselves to a compiler who was investigating the history of this journey, may have operated very powerfully to strengthen his resolution of connecting the several narratives in this manner. But according to my impression I must most decidedly consider these words as the absolute conclusion of an original narrative, and not as a transition of one and the same writer from one subject, Christ's journey, to another, his residence at Jerusalem. Let it only be observed, how exactly similar are those which occur XXI. 37, 38, where as a transition they would have been totally useless and perhaps even incorrect. Moreover if this general description had been meant as a transition, that which follows must evidently have been subjoined as an instance to this general statement; but instead of this it begins like a separate narrative, intended for one who wished to learn something respecting Christ's last days in the temple and who therefore knew what he had to understand by the *ἡμερῶν ἐκείναις*. So that the idea of considering these verses as a mere link is one which I can by no means admit.

But I must also own, that even the words immediately preceding verses 45, 46, appear to me to stand in a manner midway between the conclusion and the foregoing narrative. They approximate to the former in generality, they are entirely devoid of the minuteness and vivid reality which we have hitherto observed; and I should be inclined to infer, that our reporter accompanied Christ only as far as the entrance into the city, and that from that point his road led him away from Christ, and he therefore has spoken only thus far with the vivacity of an eye-witness, whereas what passed in the temple, towards which indeed he might see that Christ bent his way, he adds only from hearsay, and therefore only in the most general outline. But in this case he may very easily have made a mistake, in assigning to this day of the first arrival what did not take place till a day later; and whoever adopts with me the conjecture just stated will not think of setting up our Gospel by the side of Matthew in opposition to Mark, who very distinctly fixes this incident on the day after, but will be of opinion that Matthew and Mark must settle this between themselves. And certainly Mark's statement on this subject, XI. 11, is too distinct, namely, that Jesus made no stay in the temple at that time, because it was late, but returned to Bethany, and he relates the affair afterwards, XI. 15—19, in speaking of the next day, too precisely, to allow the supposition that he is only re-

verting to a fact which he had omitted or which he had no mind to relate before, for in the latter case he would not have made use of the expression in verse 11, περιβλεψάμενος πάντα. Several difficulties on the other hand present themselves in considering Matthew's account, XXI. 1—17. Not only does verse 10 sound as if Christ, in order to reach the temple, was obliged to pass through a great part of the city, which however is not the case; but it is besides really too much to suppose, that Christ, admitting the statement in our Gospel that he set out in the forenoon from Jericho to be correct, performed this remainder of his journey with the slowness with which a numerous company must always travel, having been detained too in the last part of the way by the increasing concourse and salutations; that he then undertakes in the temple the difficult task of driving out the buyers and sellers, and still stays there long enough, after this whole throng has dispersed, to allow the blind and lame to assemble round him and to heal them; that after all this there are high-priests and doctors in the temple, against whom he had to defend himself, and that so at last he goes out of the city to Bethany. So that Mark's statement is incomparably more probable, and Matthew falls under the suspicion of having in this instance also combined in one historical account facts not connected with each other, as he has certainly frequently done with discourses.

But to the supposition, which so naturally results from the statement in our Gospel, that Jesus on the same day on which he set out from Jericho entered at least into the city and the temple, there arises another objection from John's narrative, who first shews us Jesus in Bethany, where a great entertainment is prepared for him, and only on the next day makes him go thence into the city, riding too in the same manner on the ass, and received with precisely the same salutations and greetings. If we believe that we have in Luke, even only from XVIII. 35, a continued narrative, one too derived from a companion of Christ's journey, as far as XIX. 48, it is impossible to reconcile this with the fact, that Jesus passed a night in Bethany between Jericho and that entry into the city. This therefore might urge us to give up our former supposition, to allow the concluding phrase which we met with at XIX. 28 its full force, and to suppose that Christ, when after ending the parable he had set out from Jericho, did indeed as verse 28 says proceed on his way to Jerusalem, but that he went the same day only as far as Bethany, and that what is related farther on, after verse 29, was the occurrence of the next day. But not to mention that we should then be obliged to resolve upon a similar separation in Matthew and Mark, where however it is favoured by no apparent concluding period, it is still impossible to conceive how our narrative, which from verses 29 to 44 bears such

strong marks of containing the account of an eye-witness, could have been composed in the manner it is, if Christ had set out the same morning from Bethany. For in the first place the expression *εἰς Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανίαν* could not any way have been used; and in the next place it is impossible to conceive why he should not have procured the ass in Bethany, where between evening and morning opportunities could not have been wanting of procuring one. There scarcely remains therefore any expedient, but that of supposing that the arrival of Jesus at Bethany mentioned by John, XII. 1, is the same with that mentioned by Mark, XI. 11, after the entry described by the three Evangelists, and after Jesus had been already, though but for a short time, in the temple, but that the entrance described by John is not that in our Gospel, which he passes over in silence; and this is most easily explained by supposing that he himself did not go into the city with the rest, perhaps because he was sent before to Bethany to give notice of Christ's coming. The next morning, after it had become a matter of complete notoriety that Jesus had already been in the city and the temple and would now come in again and henceforth return every day, we may suppose that a still greater multitude, freed from the doubts mentioned by John, joyfully went to meet him, and repeated on a larger scale the festive greetings of the evening before. This must appear to every one perfectly

natural, and not at all like several other cases, where the commentators, to reconcile the Evangelists, suppose a transaction repeated. For here the repetition is extremely natural in itself. And equally natural will it certainly appear to every one, that the three first Evangelists, supposing even that they had all written in a continued narrative and had mentioned Christ's second entrance into the city, still should not have repeated the description of the welcoming. And as easily may we suppose that Christ preferred riding to walking the second day as well as the first, especially as he had to expect a still greater crowd.—Yet on close examination of the mode in which John mentions this transaction we are no less naturally struck by the thought, that he does it rather with a controversial view, in order to divest this action of Christ, whether it belongs to the same or a former day, of all appearance of premeditation, which might have been attributed to it by rumour, perhaps by written narratives with which John was acquainted. For it is certainly with such a view that he so expressly says, that the reference of this perfectly accidental transaction to the prophetic passage was not made till afterwards by the disciples. As to what is said in Matthew, somewhat strangely indeed, of two animals, I can only explain it by the attempt to make the application of the fact to the passage in Zachariah as close as possible. Every other explanation appears to be lost labour. For

if Matthew is to be reconciled with the rest, it must have been properly the *πῶλος* which Christ bespoke for himself; but when the *πῶλος* is able to bear the weight of a man, though it has never yet been ridden, the she-ass no longer runs by its side, but has long left it to itself. And so this circumstance too confirms the opinion, that Matthew's narrative does not equal in originality those in our Gospel and Mark.

Having now come to the point which I consider as the close of this third portion of the whole, it appears to me not useless to compare once more the opinion of those, who make only the greater part of this portion, as far as XVIII. 14, to be an earlier piece incorporated by Luke in his Gospel, with the other two hypotheses, of the original Gospel, and the use made by him of Matthew and Mark. If the separate piece ended before the blessing of the children, it had no conclusion at all; it was a perhaps unfinished, at all events shapeless collection, which as little deserved the name of a journal as of a gnomology, and in which no plan at all is visible, so that it must be considered as quite accidental that it began precisely with the mention of a journey to Jerusalem. Now if Luke entertained a particular respect for the original Gospel, and this is implied in the notion of it, if it were only inasmuch as it was the work which of all his authorities had paid the most uniform attention to a *καθεξῆς*, ought we not

to believe that it would be his object to interrupt as little as possible the arrangement of this work? And what could be more desirable to him than, if he chose to insert such a shapeless collection, to attach to it whatever other materials he possessed for enriching his Gospel, relating to the time which preceded Christ's last stay in Jerusalem, that he might have occasion to interrupt only once for all the order of the original Gospel? The collection lent itself to this purpose the more readily, as it evidently begins in Galilee, lingers some time there, and at last leaves off without any specification of place. If on the other hand the collection extended as far as the point where we terminate it, then Luke could not but consider it in an entirely different light, and most probably as a closely connected whole, into which it would have been wrong to introduce this or that fact at a venture. And, which concerns our theory still more nearly, what motive can he have had for assigning to this collection its place before the section containing the blessing of the children, and not rather after this and the question of the \**Ἀρχων*, so as to have connected the circumstance *παραλαβὼν δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα* with the annunciation of the journey at IX. 51? So that on this ground even it is probable that the inserted piece reached farther, and that its end is the point supposed by us. On the other hand if this piece ended at XVIII. 14, and Luke, the Evangelist supposed to pay so much attention to

specifications of time and place, was here very unseasonably left to himself with the scene of his next narrative utterly undetermined, but had before him Matthew and Mark, are we to believe, that he compared and used them so negligently, as, when he here returned to them, not to have made any search for the place where he quitted them? For had he done this, how could he, supposing even that he had reasons for omitting the question concerning divorce, have let slip the specification of the place, so absolutely necessary to him here, which Matthew and Mark furnished? For which reason it seems in all respects most probable, that our collection reached as far as the arrival at Jerusalem, and only ends here. That the agreement with Matthew begins again at the section respecting the children is certainly most easily explained by supposing, that this and the two following pieces relate to the outset upon one and the same journey, namely the last. The whole collection may have originated with more or less of design. It is possible, that one who was compiling without any definite purpose, having met with several pieces evidently relating to Christ's journeys to Jerusalem, inserted the rest also between them. But it is also possible, that some one may have made it his express object, to collect narratives respecting Christ's last journey to Jerusalem. As it may be supposed, that the histories of the last days and passion

of Christ were procured in the first instance by the inquiries of more remote Christians, and that some were connectedly related, others put together from detached accounts, the same might be the case with the former object which is immediately connected with this. If this was so, it becomes still more probable that all the incidents furnished by our collection took place during some journeys of Jesus, only it remains uncertain which. If however we compare the several indications to which I have endeavoured to draw the reader's attention, it seems as if upon the whole the real order of all the parts was nearly that in which they are here placed; so that we must deem our Evangelist fortunate here too in having lighted on so good a source, and praise his judgement, if he preferred this collection to many other materials which may have presented themselves to him. The appearance too of containing several outsets of Jesus upon a journey to Jerusalem, which he did not accomplish, this according to our view is entirely removed. If the collector had the express object we have supposed, it is also very possible that he committed a great part to writing himself according to oral narratives; and in that case it was natural for him, as he designed them immediately for his collection, to give the separate sections neither introduction nor conclusion, and, as he could not assign specifications of place in every instance, to prefer omitting them altogether.

## FOURTH DIVISION.

### XX. 1. TO THE END.

IF we proceed now to consider this last part of the Gospel with a view to the question, whether the case is the same with it as with what has preceded, so that we must recognize in it not a single writer, but several penmen, whose records are only arranged by one compiler: we are struck in the first instance with the words already mentioned XXI. 37, 38, which, especially when XXII. 1, 2, are also taken into consideration, distinctly separate the two chapters XX. and XXI. from the same context with what precedes and follows, and exhibit them as an original whole, of which they are a perfectly natural conclusion. For if, without going farther than XVIII. 14, we there again represent Luke to ourselves as the writer, though with no other office than that of comparing and retouching, are we at liberty to believe that he would have made two passages so similar as XIX. 47, 48, and XXI. 37, 38, follow so close after one another, and would not rather have consolidated them in one? If he chose to introduce in the former passage such a general description as we find there, how could it

have happened that after the words ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, he did not subjoin the circumstance, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ἤυλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἔλαιῶν? And in like manner the circumstance πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὠρθρίζε πρὸς αὐτὸν was a perfectly natural adjunct to ἐξεκρέματο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων. And after having said generally in the former place καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι καὶ οὐκ εὗρισκον τὸ τι ποιήσωσιν, and citing afterwards a particular case, XX. 19, in which they were scarcely withheld by fear of the people from laying hands on him immediately, how can he, without the slightest reference to this, repeat the same thing at XXII. 2 in quite general terms? And if from XVIII. 14 Luke wrote in connected order, was XXII. 1 the proper place to mention the passover, which was of course the object of the whole journey, for the first time? Would not this have needs been done in the 18th or 19th chapter, or at the latest at the beginning of the 20th? On the contrary these words most distinctly betray, that a new memoir begins here, which was quite independent of the preceding and was not even moulded into one with the previous narrative by the compiler of the whole; for this impropriety could not possibly have escaped him. It is therefore impossible that either XXI. 37, 38, can have been written continuously with XIX. 47, 48, or XXII. 1, 2, with XX. 19; so that the 20th and 21st chapters are quite isolated.

If then we examine this by itself as an original

narrative, it makes no pretension to exact determination, or rigid unity of time. That the expression, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων, connects it only apparently with what goes before, has been already mentioned; but instead of the indefinite ἐν μιᾷ, a specific day before the feast might have been assigned, had the design of the narrator been directed to this object, and yet the origin of this introduction have been the same. Its conclusion is equally indefinite, as if it had selected one or more days of this period without knowing which. Nor is there any reason to believe, that every thing here related occurred on the same day; on the contrary, our narrative involves the supposition, though it does not expressly affirm, that after the first unsuccessful attempt the second, the account of which begins at XX. 20, was preceded by a fresh deliberation and a variety of preparations, since the ἐγκάθετοι must at least have been first procured and properly instructed, so that in all probability a spring has here been made, without mentioning it, from one day to another. Hence we are compelled to seek for a more inward unity, a theme which was proposed to the narrator, and this too is easy to find; it is the plots of the hostile priestly party, which preceded and were independent of the last scheme, which succeeded with the help of Judas. These we find connectedly, and therefore, in all probability, so far as they were disclosed by overt acts, fully related, but by one who had no opportunity

of informing himself as to the inward springs of the transaction, the deliberations and preparations of Christ's enemies. Hence as far as this theme reaches, that is down to XX. 47, all other circumstances are kept in the back ground; nothing is said either of what Christ taught or of healings, instances of which could not certainly have been wanting during those days. To this it might be objected, that in this case no mention would have been made of the question of the Sadducees, which evidently contains nothing calculated to ensnare Christ in any personal danger. But the fact seems to be, that this question interrupted Christ's second dispute with his adversaries, and that the general warning with which he concluded his answer referred also to the intervention of the Sadducees, and would not have been intelligible without mentioning it. For the first and second attempt are set in distinct contrast with each other; the first had an official character, they were persons deputed by the great council who openly called Christ to an account, the others were ἐγκαθέροι who assumed an appearance of perfect innocence, as if they had no design against him; the object of the first attempt was to draw him before the Jewish spiritual jurisdiction, that of the other to elicit something from him which might afford them a pretext for appealing to the Roman secular tribunal against him. Christ repels this attempt in a way that involves no contradiction with his in-

vitations to an union in a βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, which should be quite independent of civil circumstances. To this answer the question XX. 41—44 is evidently the second part. I too, Christ says as it were, will propose to you ensnaring questions, which you cannot answer without either being inconsistent with your theory or saying something for which I might instigate the Romans against you. For as they applied the psalm to the Messiah they could not answer otherwise than that David might call the Messiah his Lord, because he was to be a far more powerful king than he was himself, and this certainly implied above all that he could not be a subject of the Romans, and, like the house of Herod, even a servant. And who knows whether in discourses directed against Christ, which no doubt they did not neglect in the Synagogues and porches of the Temple, they had not availed themselves of this construction, in order to prove that Jesus of Nazareth could not be the Messiah. In this close connexion with the preceding occurrence this proceeding of Christ is perfectly intelligible and perfectly worthy of him, but loses both characters, according to my impression, if it be separated, and Christ made to act, in the spirit of this question, on the offensive. This connexion now is intimated clearly enough in our narrative. It does not state that the suborned questioners and the Pharisaical doctors, who had assembled with the appearance no doubt of

chance to await the result, had already departed, but only that they were silent, and this *ἑσίγησαν*, verse 26, may be connected as closely as we please with the *προσελθόντες δὲ τινες*. The *γραμματεῖς*, verse 39, who, to shew themselves the more unprejudiced and unconnected with those *ἐγκαθήμετοι*, assent to Christ's answer to the Sadducees, evidently belonged to the number of those who were privy to the conspiracy, and Jesus, whom this fact did not escape, now addresses his retaliating question to them; and because they had derived pleasure, though perhaps on this occasion it was not quite cordial, from the confusion to which the Sadducees had been put, he adds to his general warning against the Pharisees the comparative one, that he deems them far more dangerous and criminal than the Sadducees. Hitherto then every part of our narrative is exclusively determined by the theme proposed, but the remaining pieces XXI. 1—4 and 5—38 are no longer connected with it; and these were certainly subjoined an account of their immediate connexion in point of time with the last part of the preceding narrative, an addition extremely natural under these circumstances on the part of the reporter, and of the greatest value for his immediate readers. The *ἐγκάθετοι* had no doubt found Jesus already teaching in the Temple, and we should be forced to believe that in the course of these disputes the time had come when it was usual gradually to quit the Temple, and that

Christ could not besides have delivered a long antipharisaical discourse, such as is given in Matthew XXIII., even if we did not know from other proofs that this discourse is a composite performance. While Christ is giving the throng time to disperse, and looking at those who are going out, he observes the widow, and after he had at last left the Temple with his friends, the conversations and discourses related XXI. 5—36 took place.

In this way does our narration seem to have been formed and to have originated, if we consider it impartially by itself; let us now compare it also with Matthew's statements, to see whether the nature of the conformity between the two is really conceivable on the supposition that they availed themselves of a common original Gospel and different auxiliary pieces, and likewise whether it appears probable that Luke had Matthew and Mark before him. The mere similarity of arrangement in these sections, especially as Mark and Matthew interpose more or less matter between them and Matthew even omits one of ours, cannot certainly compel us to suppose here one common source. We cannot with any probability distribute the occurrences which are combined in our narrative over more than two days; now if in these two days, with the exception of the teaching, as it is described in our narrative by the expression *εὐαγγελιζεσθαι*, and perhaps some cures, which at all

events were not sufficiently remarkable to be noticed in days like these, nothing farther occurred of a striking nature during the time passed by Jesus in the Temple, how extremely natural is it in this case that the incidents should follow each other in the same order in several original narratives, though they had not the same design which seems to have been the foundation of ours! But the circumstance, that between Christ's entrance and the treachery of Judas nothing more than this is in substance related in all the three Gospels, cannot be explained from their being founded on a common original Gospel, but only from the fact, that none of the three had here the benefit of supplemental and auxiliary pieces. This common deficiency therefore cannot even render the existence of an original Gospel probable. On the contrary if we conceive an original document of this kind, as designed to form a basis for the preaching of Christianity and composed by a well-informed companion of the Apostles, we could not but feel a natural surprize at finding in it no mention, either of those Greeks who desired to see Jesus and who may be considered in a manner as the first fruits of the church from the heathen world, or of that voice from heaven, which cannot have come to the knowledge of John alone. But if we inquire with what degree of exactness the narratives of these occurrences coincide in the three Gospels, and whether from this a common source is rendered probable, we are imme-

diately, when we consider the whole of our narrative, struck with a circumstance which speaks very much against such a supposition. That is, the occurrences, the connexion of which is very apparent throughout our narrative, appear in Matthew totally and most distinctly separated. After Jesus had answered the persons commissioned to question him, it is said indeed in Matthew XXI. 45, 46, that the High Priests and Pharisees had observed that his parables were pointed against them, and sought to take him, but feared the people. But there is nothing to connect with this circumstance their holding a fresh deliberation; this follows only after another parable of Christ XXII. 1—15, which they had no reason at all to apply so immediately to themselves. Nor are they, as with us, the same persons who deliberate, but only the Pharisees; so that one quite loses sight of the connexion of this deliberation with the failure of the former attempt. This however, it may be said, is only the consequence of this very insertion of the parable. But even after this, when Jesus has answered the question respecting the tribute, Matthew makes these emissaries retire, XXII. 22, and the Sadducees come, on the same day indeed, but how late after no one can say. The Pharisees assemble again afterwards, but they depute only one of their body with a question not at all of an ensnaring nature, and upon this Christ addresses to those who were assembled his question from the 110th psalm. In Mark indeed it is the council

which deposes the Pharisees and Herodians also with the question respecting the tribute, but Christ propounds his question, how the Messiah is David's Lord, not to these, nor indeed to any individual; it has rather the appearance of a passage preserved from a discourse delivered in the Temple, whether on the same day or not we do not at all know; and just so detached, as if from another discourse, seems the warning against the Pharisaical doctors, though in other respects it is perfectly similar to that which we read in Luke.

What then, I ask, must have been the nature of the original Gospel, that narratives affording such different views can have arisen out of it? A question indeed for which we find no occasion, if we resolve the three Gospels into the smallest possible sections, and compare only these with each other; but it is a question certainly very essential to the decision of the subject. For to admit the original Gospel to be probable, we must be able to conceive it as a whole from our present Gospels. But for this it is not merely requisite to be able to conceive how it related the several incidents, for to this point the author of the hypothesis has unquestionably applied an astonishing degree of industry and sagacity, but also whether and how it connected them. As the examination of that hypothesis is not my immediate object here, it is enough for me to take this opportunity of pointing out the

necessity of proposing this question in the case of all incidents copied from the original Gospel, which one or two of our Evangelists connect immediately together, while the other separates them by interposing other matter, or at least makes a distinct break. In the present case there is scarcely any thing left to say, except that the original Gospel made the scenes follow one another without distinctly connecting or distinctly separating them, but that, in working it up, one Evangelist distinctly connected, the other distinctly separated them. But shall we not then find great inducement, if we prosecute this investigation, to form an idea of the original Gospel as an aggregate of several totally isolated narratives, which placed in perfectly uniform succession those parts which stood in a close connexion with each other, and those which did not? And is it possible to conceive such a document to have been the original composition of well-informed men, who had it in their power to make inquiries of the immediate eye-witnesses, or were even under their inspection and guidance? And if these permitted so strange a work, from which the most different representations might with equal reason be deduced, then the order of events in the original Gospel was quite accidental. And if we take into account its meagerness in many particular sections, we again fall into extreme confusion, in attempting to form an idea of its purpose. But should we even be willing to

suppose, that the several incidents were so placed after each other in the original Gospel that it was impossible to infer from it, in what degree they were connected together, (though such a want of precision can hardly be imagined otherwise than as completely intentional), and that on this very account one editor in Matthew supposed they were not connected and therefore distinctly separated them, the other in Luke supposed the contrary and therefore united them: still even this latter supposition will not bear application. For the connexion of the several elements in our narrative is much too slightly intimated to be an artificial one, and would certainly have been far more strongly marked, and more distinctly brought forward, had such been its origin. As it now stands it does not look at all like the work of a second hand which meant to correct and fill up an indefinite narrative, but merely like the narrative of a person on whose mind the course of events is impressed in its natural connexion, but who does not make it his particular business to disclose this connexion; not therefore like any thing secondary, but like something original. But as little probability is there that Luke had Matthew and Mark before him. For how could he have used, XX. 20, the strangely ambiguous expression, ἀπεστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοῦς δικαίους εἶναι, if he had found in Matthew the far more definite fact, that they had instructed and deputed some

of their disciples in conjunction with some of the Herodians? And in the same way how could he have helped exchanging, farther on at XXI. 5, his indefinite *καί τινων λεγόντων* for the more precise and progressively developed account in Matthew and Mark? Such a neglect of their assistance in order to remove deficiencies, which at least in the course of a comparison with them must have become very sensible, speaks much more strongly against this hypothesis, than conformity in particular instances in its favour.

But as this conformity is evidently very great we cannot avoid the question, whether the same memoir which Luke has inserted also formed the basis of Matthew's variously enlarged account. This acquires on the one hand no small degree of probability, when we find immediately, in the first section of the narrative, a coincidence in the two Evangelists even on a point which could only be the judgement and view of the narrators, that is, how the emissaries are to be supposed to have construed Christ's dilemma, especially as several modes may be conceived in which Christ would have applied every answer that they could give to it. If we choose to suppose two independent narratives which nevertheless agree in this point, then either Christ must subsequently have explained his intention on this subject to his disciples, or at least they must frequently have discussed the matter among themselves, and have all agreed in the

explanation. In both cases it is still equally singular, that both narrators express this in the same form, as the thoughts of the High Priests, and neither of them as the opinion of the disciples, or as Christ's explanation. On the other hand if these were really the thoughts of the emissaries, the narrator could have become acquainted with them only from a particular source, and it would again be improbable that such a source should have been accessible to two narrators independent of each other. Now if we suppose that Matthew introduced here after his manner the parable of the two sons, which is besides not exactly apposite here, and that having once begun to alter he also made some trifling alterations in the parable of the vineyard, whether we consider as one of these the certainly very inappropriate circumstance that the answer to the question, what the Lord would do with those labourers, is put into the mouth of the emissaries themselves, or with Eichhorn explain this as an incorrect version of the Aramaic original, still this supposition, though it may carry us through the first section, will not carry us much farther. For the variations then increase so as to render it probable that the origin of the difference is somewhat remote; and I should at least be inclined to say, that what formed the basis of Matthew's account originally, and before his peculiar enlargements, was a different written report of the same oral narrative, which has re-

lated some circumstances better than ours, but others also more defectively, and this, if we would abstain from artificial hypotheses, I take to be the most admissible explanation. In this way too we understand the more separate appearance of the several sections in Matthew, which again facilitated the insertion of much analogous matter. For that neither the parable of the two sons nor the question respecting the chief commandment belongs to this place is nearly certain, and even with respect to the parable of the supper the same is probable enough. But above all the long discourse against the Pharisees was only composed on the occasion of a short warning, such as is here communicated by Luke and Mark, out of several extracts from other discourses delivered at different periods, as we have already shown to be the case with several pieces; and hence it seems possible to justify in this point of view also the conclusion of our narrative, which knows nothing of this being the very last time that Christ taught in the temple, a circumstance that has only been inferred from the end of the discourse in Matthew, which probably does not belong to this passage though certainly very skilfully placed here, so that the determination of what passed during each day of the six which may have elapsed after Christ's arrival in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem cannot be attended with any great certainty.

The next little incident, unless it was transmitted

as a moral lesson, can scarcely have been consigned to writing by itself, but only as an appendage to a larger narrative. In the former case the compiler of the whole, or an earlier owner of our narrative if he possessed it by itself, could scarcely have assigned it any other place than this, and then it was in this enlarged form that our narrative lay before Mark. But whether this incident really happened at that time and therefore formed a part of the original narrative, or was afterwards introduced from elsewhere, I am at least decidedly of opinion that the last section of our narrative, Jesus's discourse occasioned by the contemplation of the temple, XXI. 5—38, was originally connected with the three first. This is proved by the conclusion itself, which cannot possibly refer to this section alone, since that contains no distinct mention of any teaching in the temple, and does not even clearly mark the time as being that of Christ's last stay in Jerusalem. To me too the indefinite and unsatisfactory mention of the occasion, *καὶ τινων λεγόντων περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, appears a palpable coincidence with the negligence of the preceding sections in this same respect; let the reader only compare XX. 20, 27 and 39, and remember what has been already said respecting them. As to this last section itself, our memoir of this discourse of Christ is perfectly connected and intelligible from itself alone. As the first introductory words of Christ are pointed only at

the destruction of the temple and the capture of the city, which is naturally connected with it, so the main question of the disciples has no other object, and Christ's explicit answer, if we consider all the circumstances in their mutual relation, does not go at all beyond the question proposed. The persecutions predicted are evidently only Jewish; the siege and destruction of Jerusalem is evidently the central point of the whole discourse, as we see clearly from the copious manner in which it is treated; this however could not have been the case, but it must have been a subordinate point, had Christ spoken at the same time of a later and far more important event, the consummation of all earthly things. The expression τὸ τέλος, v. 9, also evidently points only to the literal accomplishment of the words, that there should not be left there one stone upon another. Lastly, the admonitions to the Apostles, which are partly scattered over the discourse, partly collected at the close, bear all precisely the same stamp, and are all alike directly addressed to them; so that it would be impossible, without the greatest violence, to refer one to the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem, another to the end of the world. And how is one, without the harshest distortion, to refer the concluding words, v. 32, equally to two perfectly distinct and widely remote subjects of the discourse? All that could be alleged from our discourse alone in answer to this

would be, that the beginning of Christ's discourse seems to refer rather to the question respecting his *παρουσία* as we read it in Matthew, that celestial and other terrific signs are predicted in two different passages, v. 11, and v. 25, 26, which therefore intimates two different epochs, and lastly, that in our discourse likewise mention is made, though in a very abridged form, of a visible return of the Son of Man. But these are subordinate circumstances which if we had not Matthew's discourse, XXIV. 4—XXV. 46, no one would interpret in this manner, and they must therefore be explained merely according to the view which the examination of our discourse naturally produces, and are very intelligible under the supposition that nothing is here spoken of but the destruction of Jerusalem. For as to the beginning of the discourse, the main point is the λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε, and it was very natural for Christ to begin by saying that they must not allow themselves to be imposed upon by false annunciations, which however were all annunciations of the Messiah's kingdom; so that this notice, ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε, could only be proclaimed by those who came in his name. It was therefore necessary that this warning should be premised, even though the disciples had not inquired immediately respecting Jesus's return; and so the actual beginnings of the event predicted, inward disorders and military movements, which however are also considerably

antecedent to the entire accomplishment, very naturally follow. The circumstance of the heavenly signs being mentioned in two passages evidently arises from this, that the more exact description, which begins at v. 10, is interrupted in order to take up the mention of what was to occur previously with more particular reference to the disciples. The more immediate description of what belongs to the catastrophe itself is not resumed till verse 20, and to this verses 23 and 26 evidently belong; since *καὶ πεσοῦνται*, v. 24, *καὶ ἔσται σημεῖα*, v. 25, and *καὶ τότε ὄψονται*, v. 27, are evidently co-ordinate members of the description, the first describing the historical side, the second the physical, the third the high religious import of the events predicted, which last is made visible by the coincidence of the other two. Hence too verses 27 and 28 have obviously this connexion with each other, that the adversaries will recognize the Son of Man in his glory by the accomplishment of these things, but that the disciples ought to observe, at the very beginning of that which is closely connected with the catastrophe, that their liberation from the persecutions they will till then suffer is at hand. Thus the end and the beginning are closely joined, and our memoir presents us with a distinct image of the whole series of Christ's discourse, in which we find nothing essential omitted. And yet this memoir is by no means an artfully framed work, as if any one had pur-

posely omitted all that referred to the later and more important event and had put together only what belonged to the destruction of Jerusalem; and one who should maintain this would scarcely be able to colour his opinion with the slightest probability. On the contrary, our memoir appears to an unprejudiced observer as the unlaboured performance of an attentive listener, who had correctly caught the substance and connexion, had even retained the brilliant, impressive passages, but had omitted, knowingly or unknowingly, several particulars, and here and there perhaps had been hurried into alterations. There is for instance very clear evidence of a chasm in the words *τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, v. 10, whether it was that some intervening thoughts have been omitted, or that Christ was here interrupted by the disciples, and after conversing with them resumed the connected discourse. In the same manner verse 18 betrays a chasm or an alteration, for Christ would scarcely say, so immediately in succession, first *καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν*, and then *καὶ θριξὶ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται*, and yet neither of these two expressions can be supposed to have been inserted from elsewhere. Now if we compare the discourse as it stands in our Gospel with the statement in Matthew XXIV. 4—XXV. 46, and consider how impossible it is there to refer every part, as here, to the same continued subject, and yet on the other hand that even with the appli-

cation of all kinds of artificial and strained expedients there are no means of appropriating and distinguishing what is to be referred to these two so different objects, and if we add that this discourse is really too long, too complex, too exuberant in imagery for Christ when resting on the mount of Olives from the fatigues of a day spent in instruction, rendered more laborious by all sorts of controversies and difficult disputes: we must surely return to the opinion that our record is the more faithful one, and that in Matthew all that does not relate to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple is derived from another source, and is only collected here because the discourse and parable were recorded alone without any historical occasion and therefore could not be introduced by themselves, but adapted themselves to this speech better and more easily than to any before communicated. Here too then Matthew bears more the stamp of a later modelling, and Mark seems, as is usually the case with him where he overflows with a redundance of speeches, to give no more than an extract from Matthew. Now if we have found the best explanation of the degree and manner of the coincidence between Matthew and Luke in the three first sections of our narrative to be, that Matthew founded his account on another more hasty and unconnected record of the same oral communication, and that this slighter connexion rendered it the more easy

for a later hand to introduce extraneous matter and thereby to separate still more what belonged to one piece: this same supposition is sufficient to explain the relation between the two Evangelists in the two last sections. So that the original writer in Matthew omitted the little incident at the treasury, and also reported the following discourse abruptly, (preserving by way of compensation one or two outward circumstances more exactly), by which means he facilitated the introduction of those other fragments and parables by a second hand. That Mark has the incident at the treasury in common with Luke, is also best explained by supposing that he had before him our narrative, and, as we have it, in Greek. For the great harmony between them cannot be explained by a common Aramaic document, since the coincidence of two different translations in expressions like *ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος* and *βίος*, in the sense in which they are here used, would be scarcely conceivable.

Now if XXII. 1 is the beginning of a new original narrative, and we inquire into its extent, we meet with only one other sensible interstice before we come to the end, at XXIII. 49. This does not indeed bear the usual stamp of a conclusion, but yet upon closer inspection discovers itself to be one. For verse 48 indeed describes to us the end of the whole scene of Christ's death, as any one would describe it who meant to proceed with

his narrative, namely, that after Jesus had breathed his last, the hour too of evening prayer approaching, the people who had come to look on began to disperse; the prevailing impression is only very generally and slightly described. But how happens it that the following narrative, if it is a continuation of the preceding, is not at all joined in here? Why is it not said, that Joseph—we do not even learn whether he was present or not, which surely was as well deserving of mention as the presence of the women—as soon as he saw or learnt from some of the other acquaintance of Jesus, mentioned v. 49, that Jesus was really dead, and that there was therefore time for his interment, though but a hasty and temporary one, before the dawn of the Sabbath, went to Pilate, and in the evening, after the tumult which had hitherto prevailed had completely subsided, came and took away the corpse? I shall not lay much stress on the circumstance that it is only mentioned at v. 54, evidently very late if the whole is one narrative, that it was *παρασκευῆ*; but how comes it, that the more precise specification of the time, *σαββατον ἐπέφωσκε*, is not even in the slightest manner connected with the preceding *ᾠρα ἐνάτη*? This circumstance alone renders the connexion with the preceding passage at v. 50 extremely doubtful. But let us proceed to ask, what is the real object of the mention of Christ's acquaintance and of the women of Galilee, v. 49? Was this the proper place for

it, if it was only meant to notice their presence, and not rather verse 35 in reference to verse 27? Has it not quite the appearance, as if the reporter means to vouch the testimony of these spectators? This however he could only do, either at the beginning of this last scene, or at the most remarkable and incredible point, v. 44, 45, or at the end of his whole narrative, and that must therefore be here. But besides, if we consider verse 49 in its connexion with verse 48, must we not conclude that Jesus's acquaintance and the women departed with the rest of the multitude? Does this now accord with verse 55? Certainly not. If the two facts had been related in connexion with each other, it must either have been said, v. 49, that those persons remained there to see what would become of the body of Jesus, and so the narrative of the interment would have been introduced; or it must have been said at v. 55 that they returned with Joseph. And must it not have occurred to the same narrator, who, v. 49, mentions the *γνωστοὶ* as well as the women, that his readers would inquire whether of these *γνωστοὶ* none staid, or returned with Joseph to assist him in the interment? Would he not certainly have said a word or two on this subject, and at all events not have repeated the whole phrase, *γυναῖκες αἱ τινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, as if they had not been mentioned before, and as if he might not have said here with reference to verse 49, simply, *αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες*

κατακολουθήσασαι κ. τ. λ.?<sup>2</sup> All this taken together will, I think, convince every one who will place himself in the situation of one telling a natural story, that our narrative of the death of Jesus is quite foreign to the following narrative of the interment, and vice versâ, and that in this instance also the compiler of the whole has remained perfectly true to his praiseworthy rule, of altering nothing in his original documents for the sake of a better connexion.

Now if we examine more closely the piece we have thus limited, from XXII. 1 to XXIII. 49, there will appear a considerable dissimilarity in its parts. Two narratives are prominently marked, somewhat unequal indeed in extent, but in other respects very similar, both being as far as they extend circumstantial, exact and connected, namely, XXII. 7—23, and XXII. 39—XXIII. 49; what stands between the two, and before the first, is crowded, indistinct, abrupt and confused. The difference of character evidently points to a difference of origin, but is not owing to the one part being taken from the original Gospel, the other not, for the corruption of Judas certainly belongs also to the original Gospel. One should be more inclined to consider those two narratives as the real nucleus round which the rest accumulated, since these smaller pieces stand in no connexion with each other but each refers to one of these two narratives. I consider it therefore as most

probable that the smaller pieces were disposed in the proper place between the two main narratives by way of explanation and addition, and hence this partial whole derived its origin, and seems to have been found in this state by the compiler of our Gospel. To explain the mode in which Judas is introduced by the writer who penned the history of the Trial and Crucifixion, it was necessary to add an account how it was that Judas came to head the band sent by the council. But this could not be prefixed to the narrative of the treacherous act itself, but only to that of the paschal supper, because it was notorious that Jesus was arrested immediately after this, and therefore the deliberation must have taken place sooner; hence the description, Ἡγγίζε δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, which fixes the transaction at an indefinite time, only before the Passover itself. In the main narrative itself Judas would not certainly be described as ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, without any reference to the preceding passage, if the two narratives formed part of the same piece. That this supplement however is not from the hand of Luke, but was found by him in its present state, is evident from verse 2, which Luke, as this had been mentioned more than once in former sections, could not have written in this manner. But as little can this account have been an original, independent whole; in that case it would certainly have been more circumstantial, have stated time, oc-

casian and motives more precisely. The mention of Peter inflicting the wound must very naturally have suggested the question, how he came by the sword; and the owner of our two narratives, who combined them in this little piece, was fortunate enough, by way of reward for his attention to such little strokes, to obtain from one of the Twelve, directly or indirectly, the information, that after the last supper when they were on the point of setting out, Christ had spoken of swords which they would need, and thereupon two swords had been brought. In the same way he learnt, perhaps on the same occasion, perhaps on a distinct one, that Jesus had predicted to Peter his denial, which is also mentioned in the narrative, and that the same evening at supper he had praised the disciples, afterwards so easily dispersed, for the constancy till then maintained by them, and made them great promises. He procured only a compendious narrative of both circumstances, with an indication of the immediate occasion, and in the same shape reported it, and in this manner did the three sections, XXII. 24—30, 31—34, 35—38 originate, whether at the same or different times I know not, as supplements to the main narrative either obtained by inquiry or found by chance to which a place could only be assigned after the paschal supper, though their relative order is here quite accidental. I think this view will strike an attentive reader, who can for a moment

lay aside preconceived opinions, as having a great appearance of probability, and that it will afterwards very well bear a comparison with every other hypothesis. I therefore proceed immediately to a closer examination of the several sections.

If we compare our first section, XXII. 1—6, with the corresponding passage in Matthew XXVI. 1—16, one cannot but feel the difference between a narrative which is designed to state the transaction by itself, and one which only introduces it incidentally to elucidate another narrative. We are certainly not obliged to lay much stress on the word *τότε*, as it is used, v. 14, in Matthew, especially as the *τότε* in v. 3 also is not to be construed strictly. For if the High Priests had formed the resolution of destroying Jesus by subtilty only two days before the Passover, they could not have come to the conclusion, *not on the feast-day*. For the two days would be fully taken up in concerting their measures, and after the feast-day they must have expected that Jesus would very soon depart. On this account I do not believe that the *τότε* in v. 14 is to be understood as if Judas immediately after that entertainment had gone to the priests to offer them his treachery, for then they would not have needed such a meeting four days after. But when we see how Matthew here mentions this entertainment, which we know from John was given by way of welcome, we are almost irresistibly

urged to believe, that it was the object of the narrative to connect the two facts, and to represent the positive manner in which Jesus spoke of his approaching burial as the occasion which gave rise to the action of Judas. If indeed there was an original Gospel containing only an account of Judas's treachery in connexion with what Eichhorn calls the Transition to the history of the passion, and Matthew introduced the entertainment at Bethany from an auxiliary document the features and character of which are unfortunately too little known to us: then is this a mere semblance. But can any one think this probable? What motive had Matthew to insert the entertainment precisely in this place? If this motive was suggested by the auxiliary document, then it must have exhibited this same connexion, and in that case is in fact the sole authority for these sections, and it becomes quite superfluous to recur to an original Gospel. The more so as there is no room at all here for supposing a common text between Matthew and Luke, since on close examination Luke XXII. 1, 2, has nothing at all in common with Matthew XXVI. 1—5, and if we compare Luke, 3—6, with Matthew XXVI. 14—16, the whole resemblance reduces itself to the expression ἐξήγει ἐυκαιρίαν, which however was certainly not more likely to be repeated in two different versions of the same Aramaic original, than in two originally different narratives of the same fact.

Now if we view them as two originally independent narratives, and inquire which is the more faithful, we are compelled to answer, that ours contents itself with what was generally known among the disciples of Jesus. Nor does Peter appear to have known more of the matter; for in his speech previous to the election of a new apostle he describes the act of Judas by no more specific name, which might betray a more intimate acquaintance with his motives and the real course of the transaction. Nor does John appear to have been better informed; for though he ascribes exclusively to Judas the dissatisfaction at the anointing in Bethany, he nevertheless attributes to this dissatisfaction no such influence, but says, as our narrative, that the devil prompted Judas to betray Christ; which expresses plainly enough that the affair was inexplicable to the disciples, and therefore its particular circumstances unknown. Can we then consider this intimation of Matthew as any thing more than a bare conjecture? and is not our narrative again entitled to the preference, for having kept itself clear of all arbitrary presumptions of this kind? If however Matthew did not mean to intimate this, then he has only obscured the transaction by the interposition of a former event; so that in this respect also Luke is certainly not behind him.

The first main narrative now, XXII. 7—23, might leave a doubt as to its real design and ar-

gument. In the meanwhile, as we know from other sources so much of what was done and said on this evening, we cannot readily believe this was meant for a description of the whole evening. A closer inspection will I think satisfy us, that this piece was originally written as an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. To this necessarily appertained Christ's expressions, that he knew this to be his last meal; so likewise that no one knew beforehand of such an institution being designed, but that Christ only gave commission to prepare the Passover. These points only are touched upon; all others are entirely omitted. The disproportionate minuteness at the beginning admits of two explanations. On the one hand every unpractised writer and narrator is apt to deliver himself more explicitly at the beginning than he chooses or is able afterwards to continue. In the next place the framer of this narrative, who had the transaction indirectly, or in the most favourable case directly from an apostle, seems to have found in the manner in which Jesus gave the commission something marvellous, or at least very striking and remarkable, which certainly does not in fact belong to it; and he was thereby induced to relate this part more circumstantially than the rest. This point of view being fixed, there is much which, according to my impression, speaks very plainly in favour of the genuineness and originality of our narrative. The circumstance that

it was Peter and John whom Jesus sent to the city, which is wanting in the otherwise far more detailed narrative in Matthew, might easily, had the tradition passed through several hands, have been lost, but could not easily have been added by a later hand, unless it had been a pure fiction; and for what end should it have been invented? And must there not then have been more traces of ornamental fiction in the narrative? But I should above all be inclined to lay stress on the circumstance, that the corresponding parts of the narrative do not answer to each other so exactly as would certainly have been the case, since they lend themselves so readily to such an accommodation, had the account been worked up by a later hand, or been composed of scattered communications and reminiscences. As the reporter makes Christ say, when he takes the cup, that he shall drink no more of it, why does he not before as exactly determine the point of time: whether, when the Paschal lamb was brought on, Christ said, in distinct allusion to the Passover, he should eat no more of it, or at the first distribution of the bread, and more in allusion to the bread? This is evidently the natural fidelity of one who writes down from an oral narrative which had been delivered to him, simply according to his recollection; any one who wished more to sustain the character of author would here have improved his original. Equally remarkable and demonstrative, according to my impression, is the

similar circumstance in the institution of the Lord's Supper, that the form spoken over the cup does not exactly correspond to that spoken over the bread, and is not *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἶμα*, but *τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*. On this account I cannot at all assent to those who rank our narrative below that in Matthew, and even in what it really says wish to correct it from that. Why should not Christ have said at the beginning of the meal, that he should no more eat bread and drink wine? Must not every one of course have excepted the bread and the wine which Christ had then before him, and which he was preparing immediately to eat and drink? Is a man never to say, this is my last meal, but always, this has been my last meal? That Christ may also on this occasion have really spoken words which Matthew records, and which our reporter has omitted, as the *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, I will not directly dispute; but where both really contradict each other, I should be inclined to give the preference again to our narrator. Only verses 21—23 make me hesitate, not so much because it would follow from them that Judas was still present at the institution of the Lord's Supper, but because Christ would scarcely have made such an immediate transition from the words of institution to these. I am on this account inclined to believe that the original narrative concludes with verse 20, and that what follows belongs to the elucidations and additions introduced by the compiler between

the two main narratives. If he had learnt upon inquiry that Judas was present at the supper, and that Christ spoke in these express terms in the presence of Judas, it was very natural for him to mould this piece of information into an addition of this sort. And this conjecture is in some degree confirmed by the strange phrase, v. 23, τὸ τίς ἄρα εἶη, which we likewise meet with above, v. v. 2 and 4, and so too in the next addition, v. 24.

With as little introduction as the compiler annexed this piece of information to his main narrative, he now proceeds. For the words ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία refer immediately to the ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς. Supposing now this origin of the passage, it may be conceived that the order in which these discourses were delivered cannot be determined from our Gospel, and yet that this need not raise a prejudice against the order and accuracy of the main narrative. As little certainly as Christ would speak of Judas immediately after the institution of the supper, could it happen that, at the moment when the disciples were inquiring among themselves who could be the vilest or most unhappy of them, the opposite dispute should arise, who was the greatest? On the contrary, if we compare the account in John XIII. 4—17, with which our passage is evidently parallel, we cannot but believe that such a dispute did not take place at all on this evening among the disciples, but that it was only an interpreta-

tion (a very correct one certainly) of our reporter, that Christ spoke these words, which belong to the symbolical action of the feet-washing, in allusion to the former contests of the disciples; and this might easily have been expressed in such a way that our compiler understood the contest to have arisen the same evening. But if we ask ourselves how these discourses came to be recorded here, without the least mention of the symbolical act itself, we shall scarcely find a satisfactory answer, without admitting the origin of this piece to be such as we have supposed. If these discourses are only additions to the main narrative, referring to certain passages in it, such a mention of the discourses, without the accompanying act, may easily be imagined; if on the other hand the whole is one originally connected description of the evening, but erroneously arranged from lapse of memory, then such a separation of the words from the action would be scarcely reconcilable with this supposition and with the minuteness which prevails in the preceding part. And as little should I be able to form a notion of the scope and form of the auxiliary document, which contained these discourses as they stand here. This however could only come under discussion, if the hypothesis of an original Gospel were better confirmed in these sections, and there were any possibility of shewing in the first main narrative, a text common to the two Evangelists. But certainly no such text can be discovered. It is only where words of

Jesus are communicated, that the resemblance is here and there so great, that it might be imagined we had before us two different translations of the same narrative ; but even this idea must be abandoned when we consider the minuteness of the additions, which the one must have taken from this, the other from that copy, and of which, as arising in this way, it is impossible to form any distinct conception. Hence I can recognize here only two originally different narratives of the same event.

The next addition, verses 31—34, has quite the same character. Here too our narrative goes back only to what was immediately antecedent. Christ's prediction of what was to happen in the night was undoubtedly the first occasion that led to what he here says ; the reporter of our compiler, who only wished to relate to him how Jesus had predicted to Peter his denial, does not ascend so high. What must have been here the nature of a common text, and of the enlargements of either Evangelist, I should likewise be unable to discover. Eichhorn indeed himself gets rid of this task, by supposing that Luke did not take this from the original Gospel (although it is a section which he has in common with Matthew and Mark), but as well as the preceding addition, with which however it has evidently no connexion, from a different source. Such a supposition indeed was necessary to explain how it happens that Matthew and Mark make this to be said on the way, after

supper, whereas Luke makes the departure follow. But on the very supposition that it was not said till then, (and in this point the original Gospel was certainly correct), how did these discourses in Luke's other document come into immediate connexion with those spoken at the washing of the feet? And with how little deliberation must Luke have proceeded, if he did not strike them out here, and insert them from the original Gospel in the proper place? The narrator of these supplemental passages, as I suppose them, had no occasion precisely to determine the time; and the compiler who introduced them, but who did not wish to disjoint and break in pieces his principal memoirs, could assign the supplement no other place than before the second narrative; and we have not even any decisive reason for supposing, that he believed this to have been spoken during supper. Now although in some respects the account in Matthew on this head is more complete, yet I do not believe that it is quite free from subsequent enlargements. For it is something extremely improbable that Jesus, if he foresaw so exactly the days of his resurrection, and therefore could not but know that he should see his disciples again more than once in Jerusalem, should here have said on this occasion that he would lead them into Galilee. As little do I see, when Christ so decidedly addresses himself here to Peter alone—which is still more clear when we supply what

is omitted in Matthew from our narrative—how the other disciples come to make the same protestation for themselves. The last addition, v. v. 35—38, is quite peculiar to our Gospel, and related as imperfectly as the preceding. The connexion is easily restored, by combining what Jesus says at v. 35 with verse 30, and inserting the whole supplement between that and the following verse. The narrator passed over it there, for the very reason that it was addressed not to Peter but to all, and it only occurs to him on the question respecting the swords. If we would imagine the conversation to have taken place after the prediction of Peter's fall, then many intermediate links must be wanting, or even a new occasion; so that at all events the narrative would not be connected. Hence in this instance also the origin we suppose best explains all the phenomena. Moreover the very obscurity of the passage evinces most clearly, according to my impression, the genuineness and originality of this addition. For it is too obvious, that it was not Christ's intention to ask about swords, in order to set himself in a posture of defence against the approaching attack, for then how should two have been enough? Here then certainly, had the narrative passed through several hands, an explanation, though but invented, would have crept in, as in a connected narrative the ambiguity would probably disappear of itself.

The principal point now remains, to discover

the relation of the second main narrative, XXII. 39—XXIII. 49, to the corresponding passages in Matthew, and whether they have flowed from the same source. We have to observe at the outset, that unless our narrative is derived directly from Peter or John, the reporter manifestly relates at least only a part as an eyewitness, and a part from a second or third hand or from hearsay, without however sensibly distinguishing these two elements, but moulding all into one mass. For in the first place Christ's prayer could originally be known only to Peter or to one of the sons of Zebedee, as Matthew's account distinctly states. And of Peter's denial it seems according to John that none of the disciples but himself was a witness. Now that the account is derived from neither of these two is sufficiently evident from the circumstance, that what could only be known to one of these is the very part most superficially related. For Peter, James and John certainly would not have related this incident without mentioning that Christ took them apart with him. Our reporter therefore only learnt this compendiously from a third hand, and hence knows nothing of Christ's frequent return to the disciples. To the same origin I attribute the statement peculiar to Luke, inserted at v.v. 43 and 44, for these words are unquestionably genuine in our text. Is it possible that any of the Three can have related this, when Jesus,

each time that he returned, found them sleeping? Can they who were asleep have seen the Angel? And if he had strengthened Jesus, can they then have still seen the bloody sweat even in the darkness of the night? Here then our historian has evidently admitted something far less authentic, which he has collected from different, not equally pure sources. The most probable supposition however appears to me to be, that he has taken a poetical image for an historical fact, and so inserted it in this place. For that these moments, described by Christ himself as trying, were at a very early period embellished in hymns with angelic apparitions, is not improbable. It would indeed then follow, but this is in itself certainly not incredible, that the narrative was committed to writing not very soon after the incident itself; at the same time a few years are sufficient to render such a thing possible. In the same way Peter's denial is seemingly very circumstantially and accurately related; but yet verse 61 betrays that we have not here the account of an eye-witness. It is impossible that Christ should have stood during the whole time so as to be able to see Peter; for why should he not sooner have given him a warning look? But during this hour Christ was taken in out of the court to Annas; and if he had an opportunity afterwards of looking at Peter, this probably happened as he was led away to Caiaphas, and when some order was restored among the con-

fused throng. An eye-witness would scarcely have suppressed this circumstance; the secondary narrator did not observe how much reality was thereby lost, his attention being exclusively directed to exhibit with due exactness the literal accomplishment of Christ's words.

Now since our narrator does not speak throughout as an eye-witness, the question is whether he was such at all, and where. If he was an eye-witness of some transactions, still I do not imagine him to have been one of the Twelve, for they scarcely thought of writing down circumstantial narratives, but rather a different disciple of Jesus. He may nevertheless have been present at the arrest. For why should not several other friends have joined the company, and passed the night in the same garden, in order to be again with Christ as soon as morning came? These then were roused by the noise of the intruders, and so might have witnessed at greater or less distance what took place. And in fact the narrative from v. 47 to 53 seems to me to have this sort of tone. Still every one of course did not see all, but supplied what was wanting, on the spot, partly by conjecture, partly by inquiring of others who were present. So it is probable that no ἀρχιερεῖς and πρεσβύτεροι were present here, and the στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἰησοῦ certainly did not come in person; these are only inferences made by the reporter, not perhaps very well acquainted with

the state of things, from the words of Christ which he heard. He seems also before only to have heard the words of Peter, and to have been drawn into error as to the event by the hyperbolical expression of another. Perhaps then our narrator followed at a distance; but when Christ was brought into the High Priest's palace, he with the greater number was excluded, and all dispersed till morning. Hence Peter's denial is related circumstantially indeed, but not with the liveliness of reality, of which there are several traces besides that above mentioned. The mocking of Christ by the temple guard is also related only from hearsay, and so likewise Christ's hearing before the council; so that our narrator seems not to have made his appearance again before the scene at the governor's tribunal. That he was there from the beginning I would not assert; on the contrary, the first part of the scene is also related in a very summary and rather perplexed manner. At the same time every one could not of course hear all, and particularly what Pilate said apart to Christ could only be learnt by some other channel. Perhaps too an objection might be raised against the pretensions of our narrative to such originality, from the circumstance which is quite peculiar to it, namely, Christ's being led away to Herod; since John, whose narrative is so connected, and who seems to relate this part of the history from the beginning, makes not the slightest mention of it. But the transaction is too circumstantially de-

tailed to admit of a doubt, and our reporter seems to have had an acquaintance in the house of Herod who supplied him with this fact, as John seems to have had in the house of Annas. Either the whole affair may have escaped John's notice, if Christ, just after Pilate had taken him apart, was led away by another side, or he may have omitted it as a circumstance of little moment; since Pilate's view was certainly not to commit to Herod the trial of the cause, but only to hear what he knew of Jesus from Galilee. What appears to me most certain, as well from the details as the general tone, is that from the time when Christ is led out to crucifixion to the end of the piece the author speaks as an eye-witness. Only he certainly did not stand near the cross the whole time, but, as it would seem, more at the beginning than towards the end. For the conversation between Christ and his fellow-sufferers must have taken place early.

But a circumstance is here interwoven in the narrative, which can have been supplied by none even of the bystanders, namely, the rending of the veil in the temple. And from what quarter are we to suppose this account to have come? And how is the fact to be conceived? If it was the veil before the Holy place, the rent must indeed have been perceived by a great number of people. If it was that of the Holy of Holies, the priests only could perceive it; and is it possible they should not have done their utmost to conceal by all means

a fact, the interpretation of which, from the parables delivered by Christ in the last days, was so obvious? If this was done, how should information of the fact reach our narrators in Matthew and Luke? And even supposing this to have happened by means of believing priests, why do the Apostles in their discourses never avail themselves of this circumstance, which as a sign could not fail to produce so great an impression? Why not the slightest allusion to it in the epistle to the Hebrews? The same difficulty arises in the case of the outer veil, only that in this the prognostication is more faint; but on that very account the incident as a sign is less impressive, and therefore less probable; and indeed the commentators all understand the inner veil. Now by this total disuse the effect of the sign would have been lost, and so the divine purpose in it have completely failed. I do not believe therefore either that the Apostles were restrained by any consideration from mentioning this important event, or that if they had done so no trace of this would appear in the New Testament; and I therefore conclude that the case is the same with this incident as with that of the angel in Gethsemane. As soon as the merits of Christ and the advantages of christianity began to be represented under the figures which prevail in the epistle to the Hebrews, nay even upon the first gradual transition to this method of teaching, upon the first reception of the heathens, who were

not obliged to submit to the Jewish ceremonial law, and therefore did not participate in the Jewish expiations, such images as this before us might and indeed could not but enter into the Christian hymns. Now if we consider that in Matthew this rending of the veil is connected with the opening of the graves, from which however the dead do not shew themselves till the resurrection, and that this admits still less of being construed as matter of fact, we shall rather recognize in this instance also the same poetical origin, than have recourse to other elaborate and after all very unsatisfactory explanations. That such poetical images when isolated and detached from their context, the darkness and earthquake presenting so easy a transition, might be taken by some for historical facts, especially where the limits between poetry and prose are so wavering, is very conceivable. Nor do I apprehend that any one will see in this conjecture the intention of explaining away a miracle, which the incident, admitting it to be real, need not have been; were not the supposition of this fact repugnant to what actually took place, I would allow it to stand, and would leave to others the dispute whether it was natural or supernatural.

My next business is only to determine the character of this narrative, and to prove that although, as every thing related could not have been seen by the same person, some circumstances have been admitted into it by mistake as matter of fact

which were supposed to have occurred in the Temple at the same time that our narrator was at the place of crucifixion, yet it cannot hence be inferred that he does not speak even of the latter scene as an eyewitness, but gives an account in every instance drawn from secondary and in part uncertain sources. The distinction between that of which he may have been an immediate eyewitness and that which he must needs have had from another quarter is too prominently marked throughout the whole statement by the greater degree of reality and minuteness to admit of a doubt that he relates the former from his own actual observation. A comparison with the account in Matthew will render this still more clear. In Matthew no such distinction is perceptible; all is equally detailed, but also equally indistinct; and where our narrative only requires filling up from the accounts in John, there Matthew must be corrected. He makes Jesus be led immediately before the council, which we are therefore to suppose was already assembled; but he is certainly better acquainted with what passed at the hearing itself; he distinctly fixes the scene of Peter's denial in the palace of Caiaphas, but relates it with the same minuteness. His making the high-priests themselves spit in Christ's face and smite him, and his saying, after having related to us the whole hearing, XXVII. 1. *πρωϊας δὲ γενομένης συμβούλιον ἔλαβον*, is the confusion which naturally arises from

the narrator having been nowhere an eyewitness. So too afterwards in the hearing before Pilate, the peculiar anecdote of his wife's message is interposed most unseasonably in the midst of the disputes which are passing without, so as no one who was himself present at those disputes could have interposed it. The words too, *καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ*, XXVII. 36, compared with those which follow, v. 38, *τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λῆσται*, present an entirely false image of the crucifixion. These few strokes are sufficient ; and I believe every one who will follow their direction, and proceed to compare the two narratives with each other and with John, will agree that our narrative is that of an eyewitness who supplies only hastily what he had not himself seen, while that of Matthew is composed by a later hand from information collected without any ocular evidence. Nothing however seems more manifest than that they are from beginning to end two different narratives ; and indeed it can be only when a man's eyes are tired with looking for the original Gospel in other parallel passages, and every thing before him is floating and unsteady and the distinction lost between the identity of the subject and that of the narrative, that it is possible to see here a glimpse of a common text.

With the last part, from XXIII. 50 to the end, the case is precisely similar. If one considers how the first account of the resurrection, beginning at

XXIII. 55, breaks off at XXIV. 12, without leading to any result, and leaves the reader in uncertainty as to the real state of the case, one naturally asks, did this stand so and proceed no farther in the original Gospel? or was it there continued as Matthew and Mark have done, each after his manner, but Luke was in such haste to come to the history of the two disciples of Emmaus that he neglected to bring the former narrative to a conclusion? One is surprized to find in Eichhorn, who determines so precisely even to the particular phrases the text of the original Gospel, and distinguishes it from the additions, no precise information on this point; and one regrets that he too had grown tired before he had come thus far. If however we read on, and compare this account with XXIV. 22, 23, we see plainly enough that it is nothing but an amplification of these two verses, or a commentary upon them, and that the preceding incidents are only related so far as they had come to the knowledge of the disciples of Emmaus before they set out upon the road where Jesus joined them. Is it possible under these circumstances to resist the impression, that the first account originated only by way of reference to the second narrative? The latter is evidently the nucleus of the whole; and as it can have been set down with this degree of minuteness only from the original oral narration of one of the two, and therefore most probably of Cleopas who is therein

named, the most obvious inference is, that the first account also was drawn up from his farther explanation of what occurs in the narrative itself; probably therefore by the same person who committed the main narrative to writing. That this person however was Luke himself, is to me, according to what I have before stated, improbable, on account of the relation in which XXIII. 55 stands to 49. But on the other hand verse 55, on account of the *δὲ καὶ*, cannot be considered as an entirely fresh beginning; the preceding account too of Christ's interment is related but compendiously, and evidently with reference to what follows, for the words *καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφρωσκε*, v. 45, and *καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἠσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν*, v. 56, are evidently connected with each other. Verse 50 therefore is certainly the real beginning of the supplemental narrative, which opens with *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, like the principal narrative. This then in my opinion Luke found in its present state, and simply annexed it to his preceding memoir of the crucifixion, without more immediately connecting them together, which might very easily have been done by a few words. Let the reader only observe the *ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης* in Matthew, and the exactly similar link in Mark. For so far Luke, if he had chosen, might also have connected the two passages, as well as the other two Evangelists, supposing even the original Gospel not to have had any such connexion, but to have related the inter-

ment (though this would have been strange enough) as abruptly as Luke himself. But as all this renders it quite improbable that we have here to refer to an original Gospel, so verse 54 alone would render it incredible that Luke wrote connectedly, following the steps of Matthew and Mark; for in that case he would not have said here for the first time, *καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευή*. Let the reader only see how Mark, who pays diligent attention to connexion, introduces the same circumstance, XV .42; and the mention of *σαββατον ἐπέφωσκε* was also quite superfluous, as the ninth hour had been already mentioned above.

This original main narrative however must have closed with verse 43 or 44. For if one considers that the two disciples did not set out from Emmaus till after supper, and after having recovered from their first astonishment; that in Jerusalem they heard the narratives of the other disciples, and communicated their own; that then Christ appeared, and more time passed in the astonishment of his disciples and the proofs of his corporeal existence; one cannot believe that time was still left for such ample discussions as are spoken of in verses 45—47, unless Christ protracted his discourse till late in the night; and this an immediate reporter would certainly have noticed, as in the Acts of the Apostles it is occasionally related of Paul. Moreover Christ can scarcely have charged his disciples on this day to

stay quietly in the city till the effusion of the Spirit, for he had appointed them to meet him in Galilee ; this therefore can only have been said shortly before the ascension. Hence at v. 44 there certainly begins a later compendious addition, which having no exact date of place and time reports only the substance of the Redeemer's conversations with his disciples, and so likewise subjoins a very summary notice of the parting and Christ's ascension. By this appendix now we see how incorrect is the notion, that the accounts of particular events passed through a variety of hands in oral tradition with very little abridgement ; instead of which it plainly appears that they were at least compressed by the process. For it is impossible that an original narrative of Christ's parting can have been so short as this. Now if any one chooses to suppose that this conclusion, as it must at any rate be of later origin, is derived from the compiler and arranger of the whole, who thought it necessary to put a finish which was wanting to the whole work, if it were only from the general accounts which he found diffused : I know of no precise objection to this, and consider it happy, that as we were obliged to ascribe to him the beginning, so the end now proves to belong to him. Only I would not answer for the fact ; for it is just as possible, that the owner of our principal narrative, not having met with any more specific accounts respecting the days of

the resurrection, added this supplement, and that Luke, by this very circumstance that he found the whole rounded off and completely concluded, was restrained from instituting more exact inquiries respecting this period ; which, had they been made, could not have failed to produce for so diligent and successful an inquirer one or other of the histories which are known to us from other sources, or which are here intimated but not given at large.

· When I review the investigation which has thus been carried on step by step, and sum up the whole, it seems to me that though several of the details may be more or less open to objection, still the main position is firmly established, that Luke in this part of his work is neither an independent writer, nor has made a compilation from works which extended over the whole course of the life of Jesus. For we meet with too many isolated pieces which have no relation to the rest, and the character of the several parts is too different, to admit of either supposition. He is from beginning to end no more than the compiler and arranger of documents which he found in existence, and which he allows to pass unaltered through his hands. His merit in this capacity is twofold : first, that of the arrangement ; this however is the slighter of the two. For as he found much already connected, not only is the correctness of his arrangement dependent on his predecessors and much may be as-

signed to a wrong place without fault of his, but also the arrangement was by this rendered much easier than if he had found all the parts separate. But the far greater merit is this, that he has admitted scarcely any pieces but what are peculiarly genuine and good; for this was certainly not the effect of accident, but the fruit of a judiciously instituted investigation, and a well weighed choice.

# NOTES

BY

THE TRANSLATOR.

---

Page 36.

THE suppositions alluded to are made by Paulus, who quotes from Shaw's travels in Palestine a description of an ignis fatuus which that traveller thought very remarkable. Some such phenomenon Paulus imagines might have been seen by the shepherds, who, filled with high expectations by the language of Mary, might interpret it as a heavenly sign, announcing the birth of the Messiah. The angelic voices were nothing more than the thoughts of the shepherds.

Page 44.

Schleiermacher's remarks on the inconsistency between the two first chapters of St. Luke and St. Matthew are noticed in the second edition of Hug's Introduction, where an attempt is made to reconcile the two accounts, as well as to remove some other difficulties which have created embarrassment in the two first chapters of St. Matthew.

I. Hug thinks that notwithstanding Mary communicated the Annunciation to Joseph, still he might naturally entertain doubts, which could only be removed in an extraordinary way. This remark would perhaps be just, if it were supposed that the communication was made only after Mary had returned from her visit to Elizabeth. But if, as would in the case of

the Annunciation be most natural, Mary immediately related to Joseph the prediction made to her, coupled with the disclosure of Elizabeth's pregnancy (a fact which is represented as unknown both to her and Joseph at the time), in this case it would also have been more natural that he should wait for the issue of the prophecy ; and though he might still entertain doubts, he would have had no inducement to the determination mentioned by St. Matthew I. 19. On the other hand such a determination would most probably occur to him, if, as is clearly intimated by St. Matthew's account, he only discovered the pregnancy of Mary when it was considerably advanced. But this supposition is quite incompatible with the Annunciation. Hence Schleiermacher seems to be fully justified in his assertion ; though the particular case he puts here, which he himself observes is a very improbable one, might leave room for Hug's objection.

II. The visit of the Magi to Bethlehem must have taken place either before or after the Presentation. Had it taken place before, it would, as our author observes, have prevented the journey to Jerusalem. Hug prefers the other supposition ; but he seems to think that the whole force of the objection to it depends on the degree of precision with which we construe the words of St. Luke II. 39. He himself considers them as nothing more than a concluding formula, which need not prevent us from supposing many occurrences to have intervened between the Presentation and the return to Nazareth. It is true that St. Luke's silence would not prove that there was no such interval. But neither is it this alone which prevents us from filling up that interval with the visit of the Magi. It is his previous account of the compulsory nature of the stay which Joseph and Mary made at Bethlehem, and the inconveniences to which they were subjected there, that excludes the conjecture of their having returned thither. Paulus indeed conceives that Joseph might have had a variety of inducements, might have had work to finish, have wished to take leave of Zachariah and Elizabeth (who however did not

reside at Bethlehem), or even have designed to settle there, though he afterwards changed his plan. But surely under the circumstances under which St. Luke brings him to Bethlehem none of these motives are imaginable.

III. Hug thinks the massacre of the infants a natural consequence of Herod's notoriously distrustful character. He had been deceived by the Magi, and now wreaked his fury without farther inquiry on all the objects he could reach. But this indiscriminate fury, considering that the sole cause of it was political jealousy, is the very thing which to Schleiermacher seems surprizing. Did it naturally follow, because the strangers failed to bring him the intelligence they had promised, that the jealous tyrant should abandon all farther investigations on a subject on which he is represented as having felt such intense anxiety, and trust the safety of his throne to the event of an uncertain massacre?

IV. The arguments by which Hug attempts to reconcile the two Evangelists on the residence of Joseph are extremely slight and unsatisfactory. He admits that St. Matthew supposes Bethlehem to have been Joseph's usual dwelling-place. But he asks, was St. Matthew wrong? This however is not the question, but only whether he is consistent with St. Luke. Now nothing can be more evident than that, according to the account of the latter, Joseph was a total stranger at Bethlehem. Bethlehem was indeed, as Hug remarks, in one sense *his own city*, but clearly not in the sense that St. Matthew's account supposes. Here too therefore Schleiermacher's position seems to remain unshaken.

Page 52.

The name of Philip seems to have slipped from the author's pen by mistake instead of that of Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee.

Page 57.

That the scenes of the Temptation were only appearances

which presented themselves to the mind of Jesus during a state of ecstasy, is the opinion of Paulus, who compares the language of the Evangelists, Matt. IV. 1. ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, Mark I. 12. τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, Luke IV. 1. ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, with Revel. I. 10, ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι, and XVIII. 3, ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς ἔρημον ἐν πνεύματι, and describes with his usual ingenuity the train of thought which might have led to such a series of visions. He supposes it to have been afterwards communicated by Jesus to his disciples for their instruction, but thinks the circumstances too singular to admit of considering them as the mere dress of a parable.

## Page 72.

*A man of Peter's impetuous character.* It is on this impetuosity of Peter's character that Paulus grounds the supposition here alluded to, that Peter related to his mother-in-law immediately on his return from the synagogue the cure which Jesus had wrought there. To this supposed communication he ascribes a considerable share in the sick woman's recovery.

## Page 109.

The supposition here alluded to is Paulus's, who thinks the occurrence is brought within the range of comprehensible facts, if it be imagined that Jesus, arriving at Nain at the moment the funeral procession was coming out of the town, discovered at the first sight of the young man's face that animation was not entirely extinct, but that he was capable of hearing and obeying the command *I say unto thee, arise.* It need hardly be observed, that this representation of the case is, in the first place, extremely improbable, on account of the singular coincidence it supposes; for if animation had already returned it would have discovered itself within a few moments by some motion of the body. In the next place it is incomprehensible; for the language of Jesus is not that of

a person who has made such a discovery; nor would it have been at all natural in that case that he should have addressed himself in the first instance to the young man, but to his mother.

## Page 125.

The order in which Paulus conceives these incidents to have occurred is that in which they are related by St. Matthew. He supposes however, that the cure of the dumb and blind demoniac took place during the retreat of Jesus, mentioned Matt. XII. 15, and that the dispute with the Pharisees respecting his miraculous power took place after he had returned to a town on the shore of the lake, which Paulus conjectures to have been Tiberias. The visit of Jesus's mother and brethren (which he attributes to the instigation of the Pharisaical party) he supposes to have been made in the forenoon of the same day on which Jesus partook of the entertainment mentioned Luke XI. 37. Towards evening he goes out to the lake, and from the boat delivers the parable of the sower to the multitude, and explains it to his disciples. After delivering several other parables he dismisses the multitude, and immediately sets out for Nazareth, to undeceive his relatives on the subject of the delusion under which they laboured respecting him, Mark III. 21.

## Page 126.

Paulus interprets *χωρίς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει ἀντοίς*, *He scarcely ever spoke without employing figurative language.*

## Page 158.

According to Paulus's interpretation only the first part of Jesus's answer, Matt. XVII. 20, properly applies to the question of the disciples. He then proceeds to inform them, v. 21, though they have not expressed any curiosity on that subject, of the conditions necessary to prevent a recurrence of the disorder, namely, prayer and fasting, or, as Paulus explains it,

a well regulated habit of mind and body. Why this was peculiarly necessary to ensure the continuance of health in this particular case we are left to conjecture, without any assistance from the commentator.

Page 181.

Paulus thinks that St. Matthew and St. Luke may be reconciled, by supposing that on the morning preceding the Sermon on the Mount one of Jesus's disciples begged for a form of prayer, and that Jesus granted his request by introducing such a form in the course of his sermon; where Paulus cannot find any internal inducement to it, and is therefore the more inclined to suppose an external occasion, such as that mentioned by St. Luke.

THE END.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY THOMAS DAVISON, WHITEFRIARS.











/ Schleiermacher, F E J.  
St. Lulce

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY



