

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS.

BY REV. J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

THE recent appearance of two notorious works, of unequal merit, directed against the authenticity of the evangelical record, induces us to subject the evidence for the genuineness of that record to a critical examination. We enter upon this task with no arbitrary prejudices or axioms, but look for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We do not begin our investigations with any *petitio principii* analogous to that of the romancing Rénan,¹ "that the Gospels are in part legendary is evident, since they abound with miracles and the supernatural," or to that of the finessing Strauss,² who postulates criteria to determine the genuineness of a writing, which, applied to other writings than the Gospels, would sweep out of existence well nigh every monument of antiquity. Our object is simply to examine the evidence in our possession, to test it fairly, without any *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi*, and to see if it is sufficient to justify our reception of the evangelical record. In doing so we shall adhere to the order pursued by Strauss, whose work, in point of learning and scholarship, is incomparably superior to the superficial, fantastic, and flippant production of the author

¹ Rénan, *Vie de Jésus* (9th ed.), Introd. p. xvi.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu* (Berlin, 1864), pp. 40-47.

of the "Vie de Jésus." We adopt the order of Strauss, not because it is the best, but because we are prepared to dispute with him every inch of ground, and because we write against him. His book is brimful of mischief; and, although as yet not before the public in English, it will doubtless be so before very long, "for Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do." A brief analysis of that work will not be deemed out of place here. It professes to be a life of *Jesus*, not a life of Christ. It eliminates the divine, the supernatural, and the miraculous from the life of Christ, and takes up the biography of Jesus. It proposes to deal with the Jesus of history, not with the Christ of faith. It affirms that "the conception of a life of Jesus is the snare in which the theology of our time had to be caught and to be ruined." In a chapter entitled "The Different Works on the Life of Jesus" the author takes occasion to give pretty rough handling to all who differ from him, and to castigate particularly those who since the appearance of his first work have been his most successful opponents. As a specimen, we give his caustic treatment of Neander. "Neander's Life of Jesus Christ has three mottoes, from Athanasius, Pascal, and Plato: all the good spirits of theology and philosophy were invoked in this last stress, but the only motto setting forth the spirit of the book, and a biblical one to boot, is wanting; to wit, the passage Mark ix. 24: 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'" ² Ebrard, in particular, is denounced as "the representative of restored orthodoxy on the standpoint of impudence," while Rénan and Keim are hailed as welcome colleagues. Chapter II. takes up, *a*, the external evidence of the origin and date of the Gospels, and reaches the conclusion that it is wanting; *b*, the internal character of the Gospels, with the same result. Then follows, in two books, the life of Jesus. The first containing what pretends to be a historical sketch of the life of Jesus; the second, "the mythical history of Jesus, as to its origin and development," with the general result, which we put in the author's own words: "I

¹ Strauss, p. 5.

² Strauss, p. 31.

do not believe that matters are so bad, as has been maintained, that we cannot know for certain of any one saying which the Gospels make Jesus utter, whether he really did utter it. I believe that there are some which, with all that probability beyond which it is impossible to go in matters of history, we may ascribe to Jesus, and I have endeavored to indicate above the marks by which they may be recognized. But this probability approaching certainty does not extend very far, and it is even worse about the acts and events of the life of Jesus, excepting his journey to Jerusalem and his death. Little is established, and just concerning that to which ecclesiastical belief is peculiarly linked — the miraculous and superhuman in the acts and experience of Jesus — it is rather an established fact that it did not take place. But that the salvation of man should depend upon the belief of things of which in part it is certain that they did not take place, in part uncertain whether they did take place, and only in the least part beyond doubt that they did take place; that the salvation of man should depend upon the belief of such things, I say, is so absurd as to render a refutation unnecessary now-a-days.”¹ After this brief account of the whole work, we proceed to the consideration of the *external* evidence for the authenticity of the evangelical record; reserving the examination of the internal evidence for some future day.

Strauss (p. 47) admits that our four Gospels were extant towards the end of the second century, received in the church, and constantly quoted by Irenaeus in Gaul, Clement at Alexandria, and Tertullian at Carthage as the works of the apostles and apostle-disciples whose names they bear; but he calls attention to the circumstance that other Gospels were still in circulation, that the Gospel of the Hebrews and that of the Egyptians, the Gospels of Peter, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthias, and the twelve apostles were not only in use among heretical sects, but also frequently cited by orthodox teachers of the church, although at that time, and ever

¹ Strauss, pp. 623, 624.

afterwards, the four Gospels of our canon were considered as the truly reliable foundations of the Christian faith. The question why just these four, neither more nor less, were regarded in that light he answers in the language of Irenaeus¹: "The gospel is the pillar of the church, the church is diffused over the whole world, the world has four regions; it is therefore proper that there should be four Gospels. Again, the gospel is the divine breath or wind of life for mankind; now as there are four principal winds on earth, so there are four Gospels. Or as the world-creating Word is enthroned above the cherubim, the cherubim have four forms, so the Word has given us a four-formed gospel;" adding: "This singular argumentation must not be understood to intimate that said circumstances were the reason why Irenaeus received only four Gospels, neither more nor less; rather these four had at that time risen to pre-eminent esteem in the catholic church, which was earnestly striving for the unity of the faith, and Irenaeus sought to arrange this relation after the spirit of his age; but this arrangement shows that spirit to have been absolutely foreign to the spirit of our age — the spirit of intelligent criticism."²

We are surprised at this introductory paragraph, for it certainly tells decidedly against Strauss, notwithstanding the artistic skill with which he has *arranged* it. The fact that the four canonical Gospels were as early as towards the close of the second century regarded as embodying the only reliable groundwork of the Christian faith, and that in every section of the church, is surely highly creditable to the spirit of that age, a spirit which, so far from being credulous, was sufficiently critical to discard every spurious or apocryphal Gospel, and to fix upon the four canonical Gospels as alone entitled to confidence. Does the argus-eyed vigilance which presided over the canonical Gospels, the Briaerius-armed fortitude which flung every heretical, apocryphal, and uncanonical composition to the winds, not speak well for the critical acumen and integrity of the early custodians of the faith once

¹ Adv. Haeres., III. 11. 8.

² Strauss, p. 48.

delivered to the saints? The argumentation of Irenaeus, according to Strauss himself, was not the reason why that eminent Father received the four Gospels only, but shows that the four Gospels, so far from *beginning* to be recognized as authoritative, had long since been received, and were universally acknowledged to be authentic, and so thoroughly established as to induce Irenaeus to illustrate their four-visaged aspect by cosmical and heavenly relations. "Irenaeus died in the second year after the close of the second century; but he had sat at the feet of the venerable, and by him much venerated, Polycarp, who-himself had been the disciple of John, and had intercourse with other eye-witnesses of the evangelical history. Irenaeus, narrating this himself,¹ expressly and affectionately refers to the memorable information which Polycarp had received from the lips of John and other disciples of Jesus, adding that all was in perfect agreement with the scripture.² Are we nevertheless to suppose that Irenaeus did not hear Polycarp in any way refer to the Gospel of John, and yet did repose absolute faith in that Gospel,— he who used the pure word of the scriptures as a sacred weapon against heretics, the men of scripture interpolation, and of the apocrypha? To be sure this, as is obvious, brings us to John himself; but this support of the testimony of Irenaeus for our Gospels, and particularly for that of John, on Polycarp, and through him on John himself, has truly more authority than the supposition that the Gospel of John may have ap-

¹ Iren. adv. Haer. III. 3. 4; and especially his Epistle to Florinus in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 20 (Iren. Opp., ed. Stieren, I. 822).

² Epist. ad Florinus: "Vidi enim te, quum adhuc puer essem, in inferiore Asia apud Polycarpum, quum in imperatoria aula splendide ageres et illi te probare conareris. Nam ea quae tunc gesta sunt melius memoria teneo, quam quae nuper acciderunt (quippe quae pueri discimus, simul cum animo ipso coalescunt eique penitus inhaerent), adeo ut et locum dicere possim in quo sedens beatus Polycarpus diserebat, processus quoque ejus et ingressus vitaeque modum et corporis speciem, sermones denique quos ad multitudinem habebat; et familiarem consuetudinem quae illi cum Johanne ac reliquis qui Dominum viderant intercessit, ut narrabat, et qualiter dicta eorum commemorabat; quaeque de Domino ex ipsis audiverat, de miraculis illius etiam ac de doctrina, quae ab iis qui verbum vitae ipsi conspexerant acceperat Polycarpus, qualiter referebat, cuncta scripturis consona."

peared suddenly in the earlier years of Irenæus, say about 150, and that in the simplicity of his nature he reposed implicit faith in the same."¹

The testimony of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, during the first half of the second century, found in a fragment of his work, *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, given by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. III. 39, has been used by Strauss, Rénan, and the whole infidel school for the purpose of invalidating all respect for the genuineness of the first two Gospels. Let us see what it is. That ancient writer says concerning Matthew: *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*—"Matthew composed the sayings (of the Lord) in the Hebrew language, but every one interpreted them as he was able." That these *λόγια* denote the Gospel according to Matthew is admitted on most hands, even by Strauss. The term was so understood by all the patristic writers, and cannot well mean anything else, if we connect it, as we ought to do, with the notice of Papias concerning Mark, which immediately precedes the foregoing passage, and where the words, *τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*, are used as synonymous with *κυριακῶν λογίων*, for the sayings of Christ cannot well be separated from the works of Christ and still less can they be understood without the latter. In the same sense Ignatius (*ad Smyrna*, c. 3) calls the Acts of the Apostles *λόγια ἀποστολικά*. That Matthew composed his Gospel in Hebrew, that is in Aramaic, is not only asserted by Papias, but also by Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and others.² The testimony

¹ Tischendorf, Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst? Leipzig, 1865. A brief but most valuable contribution to the literature on the evangelical canon.

² Irenæus, *adv. Hæc.*, III. 1, in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 8: *ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφῇ ἐξηγήσας εὐαγγέλιον.*

Origen, in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25: *πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδοκῆτα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεῦσασιν, γράμμασιν ἑβραϊκοῖς συνεταγμένον.*

Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. III. 24, describes Matthew as *πατριᾶ γλῶττῃ παραθεὶς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον*. The same author relates, in Hist. Eccl. V. 10, that Pantaenus, after the middle of the second century, on a missionary journey to

of Papias is certainly not entitled to great respect, for the extracts from his work preserved by Eusebius abundantly justify the latter's estimate of his capacity, that he was a man of very limited intelligence (*σφόδρα σμικρὸν τὸν νοῦν*). But whatever may be said of him, the testimony of men like Irenaeus, Origen, and Eusebius deserves the very highest consideration. They do not enjoy the reputation of thoughtlessly repeating floating and unauthentic rumors, and they had, doubtless, good reasons, independent of the notice of Papias, for their assertion that Matthew's Gospel was originally composed in Hebrew. But where is that original Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew; and what authority have we to believe that Matthew's Gospel in Greek is identical with the Hebrew original? These are the real questions at issue, and we confess, they are almost impossible to solve. As to the first question, we have unfortunately no answer to make beyond the fact that it is no longer extant, and therefore have no means to determine, by a comparison of the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew with the canonical Greek Gospel of Matthew, whether the two are identical; but the universal reception of the Greek Gospel as that of Matthew by the very witnesses for the existence of an Aramaic original is certainly a strong argument for its genuineness; for if they had entertained any doubt of the genuineness of the Greek translation or version of Matthew they would have intimated as much. Moreover, there is no trace whatsoever of the existence of any other Greek version of Matthew's Gospel, and universal reception must here be deemed the strongest evi-

the Indies, found there persons acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew, to whom Bartholomew the apostle had preached, and left among them the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, which was preserved until that time.

The Synopsis s. s., appended to the works of Athanasius, says: τὸ μὲν εὐαγγέλιον ἐγγράφη δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ματθ. τῆ ἑβραϊκῆ διαλέκτῳ.

Epiphanius testifies the same, Haeres. XXIX. 9; XXX. 3; LI. 5.

Jerome, Catal. c. 4: "Matthaeus primus in Judaea propter eos, qui excircumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi hebraicis literis verbisque composuit; quod quis postea in graecum transfulerit, non satis certum est." So in many other places.

dence of the authenticity, on the celebrated canon of criticism laid down by Tertullian (adv. Marcion, IV. 5): "In summa si constat id verius quod prius, id prius quod et ab initio, ab initio quod ab apostolis, pariter utique constabit id esse ab apostolis traditum quod apud ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum."

The assertion that the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews is identical with the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel is simply gratuitous, but a comparison of all the notices concerning it which have come down to us renders it in the highest degree probable that it was a corrupted recension of Matthew, a spurious production, exhibiting some features of resemblance to our Matthew, but omitting much and adding more. It was held in very doubtful reputation, and, so far from being older than our Matthew, seems to be of later origin.¹ The hypotheses concerning the relation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to our Gospel according to Matthew are endless, but the few fragments of the former in our possession are insufficient to establish more than has here been stated. Certainly to place the apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews on a level with our Matthew, as Strauss does, is purely arbitrary, and critically unfair; for while the latter is before us in its entirety, well authenticated by the universal consent of the most ancient and reliable witnesses, the former exists only in insulated passages,² accompanied by conflicting notices, the most trustworthy of which brand it as a spurious production; its universal rejection, as opposed to the universal reception of our Matthew, is

¹ Epiphanius, Haer. XXX. 18: ἐν τῷ γούν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον, κατὰ Ματθ. ὀνομαζομένην, οὐχ ὅλην δὲ πληρεστάτην, ἀλλὰ νεοθευμένην, κ. τ. λ. The same author, l. c., gives us the following beginning of that Gospel: ὅτι ἄγενετό τις ἀνήρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὅς ἐξελέξατο ἡμῶς καὶ εἶπε· παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριίδος ἐξελεξάμενος Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν ζηλωτὴν, καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἠκολούθησας μοι.

² The fragments may be seen in Fabricius, Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Test., I. 355 seq.; Grabe, Spicileg. patr., I. 25 seq.; De Wette, Einleit. (2d ed.), 82 seq., et al.

certainly a strong negative argument in favor of the ground we have taken.

But we have still to account for the existence of our Greek Matthew. Its internal structure, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter, bears the impress of originality, especially in its citations from the Old Testament, which neither agree uniformly with the Hebrew text nor with the LXX, and, although for the most part taken from the latter, evinces a freedom of treatment more suited to the plastic moulding of an author than to the constrained action of a mere translator. If our Greek Matthew is an original production, it may be either the work of Matthew himself, or that of some apostolical man, who made it under the personal direction of the apostle. Either hypothesis may be substantiated. Matthew wrote for the Jews, to show them that Jesus of Nazareth was the expected Messiah. Jews were scattered over the whole world.¹ A double version of his Gospel, emanating from himself, the one in Hebrew or Aramaic, for the Jews of Palestine, the other in Greek, for the Jews of the dispersion, comports well with the evident design of the Gospel, and does not conflict with the above-mentioned notices of Papias and Jerome.

Enough has been said to show that the data at our disposal do not warrant a positive conclusion, and still less a satisfactory solution of the whole subject; at the same time, it is abundantly manifest that the absolute rejection of Matthew's Gospel as an authentic document by Strauss and his sympathizers is an illustration of the unfairness and arbitrary procedure which characterize that school. We shall hereafter sum up the whole evidence for the canonical Gospels and have occasion to state the argument drawn from the existence of the Peschito and Itala versions, from the recently discovered most ancient Syriac text, and the Codex Sinaiticus, which clearly establishes the fact that about, or soon after, the middle of the second century the four Gospels

¹ Irenæus, Origen, and Jerome say that it was written "for the Hebrews"; not for the Hebrews of Palestine only.

existed substantially in the same form in which we now have them; that the versions were made from the Greek text, and that the beginning of the evangelical canon must be placed at the end of the first century. Meanwhile we fully endorse Olshausen's remark concerning Matthew: "While all the Fathers of the church relate that Matthew has written in Hebrew, yet they universally make use of the Greek text as a genuine apostolic composition, without remarking what relation the Hebrew Matthew bears to our Greek Gospel; for that the earlier ecclesiastical teachers did not possess the Gospel of St. Matthew in any other form than we now have it, is established" (Echtheit, etc., p. 85).

The concurrent testimony of the ancient church makes the second canonical Gospel, that according to Mark, dependent on oral communications from Peter. The tradition, to be noticed presently, is more or less confirmed by the following data, drawn from the New Testament. Mark the Evangelist is identified with the "Mark whose surname was John," mentioned Acts xii. 12, 25, John being his Jewish name, and Mark his Latin surname. He was the son of a certain Mary, who lived at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 12), and to whose house Peter came after his deliverance from prison, and there found "many gathered together, praying"; he was probably a convert of Peter, who calls him "Marcus, my son" (1 Pet. v. 13), an expression which seems to imply that Mark was indebted to Peter for his new-birth, and certainly denotes a very intimate relationship. Mark was also a cousin (*ἀνεψιός*) of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10), and it was probably through the influence of the latter that he became early associated with Paul. The tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples cannot be substantiated, nor have we certain data that he was the young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body, who followed Christ on the night of his betrayal, and who, when seized by the young men, left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked (Mark. xiv. 51, 52), although this delicate mode of referring to himself is parallel to that of John (i. 40, xix. 26), and perhaps to that of Luke

(xxiv. 18). He accompanied Paul and Barnabas as their minister (*ὑπηρέτης*) on their first missionary journey, but, from some cause not known to us, he left them at Perga (Acts xiii. 13), and when Paul afterwards refused to take him as a companion on his second journey, he went with Barnabas to Cyprus (Acts xv. 36-40). At a later period we find him with Paul at Rome (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24). Still later he had joined Peter at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13), and was with Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during his second imprisonment at Rome, and expressed the desire that Mark should return to him to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11). He is said to have been the founder and first bishop of the church at Alexandria (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. II. 16; Hipp. Opp. p. 41). The testimony of the so-called Presbyter John, furnished by Papias (in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 39), in the beginning of the second century, of Irenaeus (adv. Haer. III. 1. 1; 10, 6), of Tertullian (c. Marc. IV. 5), of Clement of Alexandria (in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. II. 15; VI. 14, and Adumbrat. in 1 Petri), of Origen (in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25), of Jerome (Catal. c. 8, and Ep. ad Hedib. c. 11), of Epiphanius (Haer. LI. 6) and others, describes Mark as the companion and interpreter (*ἑρμηνευτής*) of the Apostle Peter. Although the testimony of these ancient writers is not identical in other particulars, they all agree in this, that Mark was the companion and interpreter of Peter. This well authenticated notice by no means contradicts the unquestionable fact that Mark aided Paul in the dissemination of the gospel; he felt attached to both, but more to Peter, his spiritual father, and there is nothing to preclude the possibility of his having been much with the latter.

The testimony of the Presbyter John, given by Papias (in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 39) we give for convenience sake in English: "And John the presbyter also said this: Mark, being *the interpreter of Peter*, whatsoever he remembered he wrote with great accuracy, not however in the order in which it was spoken or done by Christ, for he neither heard nor followed the Lord, but he was, as I said, afterwards a fol-

lower of Peter, who gave him the necessary instruction, yet not as a history of the Lord's discourses. So that Mark has not erred in anything by writing some things as he remembered them. For of one thing he was carefully attentive, not to omit anything of what he had heard or to falsify anything in said accounts." *The main point of this testimony is that Mark wrote his gospel from his recollection of the oral discourses of Peter.* This is substantially the testimony of Irenaeus (adv. Haer. III. 1, 1): *Μετὰ τὴν τούτων (Petri et Pauli) ἔξοδον Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρον, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρον κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.* Tertullian (c. Marc. IV. 5) says that the Gospel of Mark was called by some the Gospel of Peter ("Marcus quod edidit evangelium Petri affirmatur, cujus interpretes Marcus), and probably with reference to this relation calls Mark the author an *apostolicus* (c. Marc. IV. 2). The most explicit account, however, is that of Clement of Alexandria (in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 14): "When Peter had publicly preached the word at Rome, and declared the gospel under the influence of the Spirit, many present requested Mark, who had followed him from afar and well remembered his sayings, to reduce his discourses to writing, and that he after composing the Gospel, gave it to those who had requested it, which when Peter understood, he directly neither hindered nor encouraged it. And again, Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. II. 15) quotes from Clement's Hypotop. lib. VI. the following: "So freely, however, did the splendor of piety enlighten the minds of Peter's hearers, that it was not sufficient to hear only once, nor to recite the unwritten instruction of the divine preaching; but they persevered in all sorts of entreaties to solicit Mark, the follower of Peter, and whose Gospel we have, that he should leave them a written monument of the instructions thus orally conveyed. Nor did they cease their solicitations until they had prevailed with the man, and thus became the means of that writing which is called the Gospel according to Mark. They say also that the apostle, ascertaining what was done by revela-

tion of the Spirit, was delighted with their ardent zeal, and authorized the writing to be read in the churches. This account is given by Clement, in the sixth book of his *Institutions*, and confirmed by the testimony of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis." Clement says, moreover (*Adumbratio in 1 Petri*, Oxon. p. 100) : " Marcus, Petri sectator, palam praedicante Petro evangelium Romae, coram quibusdam Caesareanis equitibus, et multa Christi testimonia proferente, penitus ab eis ut possent, quae dicebantur, memoriae commendari, scripsit ex his, quae a Petro dicta sunt, evangelium quod secundum Marcum vocitatur." Origen (in Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* VI. 25) also traces the Gospel of Mark to the oral discourses of Peter. Jerome (*Ep. ad Hedib.* c. 11) accounts for the origin of Mark's Gospel thus : " Marcum, cujus evangelium Petro narrante, et illo scribente compositum est"; and (*Catal.* c. 8) more explicitly : " Marcus, discipulus et interpres Petri, juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romae a fratribus, breve scripsit evangelium, quod quum Petrus audiisset, probavit et ecclesiae legendum sua auctoritate edidit, sicut Clemens in sexto hypotyposeon libro scribit." And Epiphanius (*Haeres.* LI. 6) reports : *εἰδὼς δὲ μετὰ τὸν Μαρθαίου ἀκλόουδος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ρώμῃ ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ εὐαγγ. ἐκδέσθαι καὶ γράψας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτ. χώραν, κ. τ. λ.*

The main difference in these accounts is, that between Irenaeus, who says that Mark wrote his Gospel after Peter's death, and Clement, and those who wrote after him, according to whom the Gospel of Mark obtained the sanction and approbation of Peter himself. Midway between them is the testimony of Papias, who says that Mark kept a faithful record of the discourses of Peter at the time they were delivered. On the simple hypothesis that Mark began his work during the life of Peter and completed it after his death, this apparent divergency disappears, for we cannot suppose Mark to have begun his work without the apostle's sanction; he may even have had it completed, and secured for it Peter's authority, and still not have delivered it for

circulation until after his decease. The apparent contradiction in Clement's own statements, that Peter neither hindered nor encouraged the undertaking (Euseb. VI. 14), and that he publicly sanctioned it with his authority and recommended its circulation (Euseb. II. 15), has been conciliated by the supposition that Peter neither encouraged nor hindered the work at first, but afterwards approved of it ("licet fieri ipsum non jusserit, tamen factum non prohibuit"—Ruffinus).

Whatever may be said of these minor differences, the main point of all this testimony, that Peter directly or indirectly influenced the composition of Mark's Gospel, that it is founded on the oral delivery of that apostle, derives the strongest possible corroboration from its *universal reception* as a canonical Gospel in the early part of the second century, and from internal characteristics, which strongly point to a Petrine origin. The manner in which certain matters affecting Peter personally are treated, deserve particular notice and one or two illustrations may not be out of place here. In Matthew xvi. 13-19, Peter's reply to our Lord's question is followed by Christ's declaration: "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona," etc.; it is wanting in the parallel passage, Mark viii. 29, although we find there an account of Peter's want of faith, which is not mentioned in Luke. It is Mark who records the history of Peter's denial more minutely, and under more aggravating circumstances (xiv. 66), than the other evangelists, brings out the direct bearing of Christ's reproof to Peter (xiv. 87), and records the special message to Peter (xvi. 7), which is not found in the other Gospels.

Strauss and Rénan reject this Gospel with as little ceremony as possible. There is nothing new in what they say; it is simply the old rationalistic, destructionist argument. It is first argued that the evidence of Irenæus, Clement, and Eusebius being contradictory, the only remaining evidence of Papias is cut up, torn to pieces, and misconstrued with the general result that it must relate to another, more fragmentary, and less logical work than our Gospel according to Mark. Of course the whole of this illogical procedure de-

pends upon the interpretation of the first sentence of the testimony of Papias: *ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μὲν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*, "whatsoever he remembered he wrote with great accuracy, not however in the order in which it was spoken or done by Christ." Strauss argues "that everything depends on the meaning of *οὐ τάξει*; for if Papias thought Mark wrote not in the *right order*, we have to determine what the *right order* was; that the reference could not be to the order of John's Gospel, which Papias did not know; that he knew a Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew, and Greek *digests* of the same, but that the order of Mark's Gospel does not so materially differ from the arrangement of our Greek Matthew as to warrant the assertion of Papias; that Papias in accounting for the want of order in Mark's Gospel by its dependence on the discourses of Peter, who is said to have only occasionally discoursed of Jesus, *denies not only the right order, but all historical order*, in the narrative of Mark; that such order is not more wanting in our Gospel of Mark than in any of the other Gospels, and that Papias, if we thus construe his assertion, could not refer to our present Gospel according to Mark, but *must* have had before him an altogether different writing; that the condition of our present Gospel according to Mark, so far from showing a greater dependence on Peter, exhibits such dependence in a less degree than the Gospel according to Matthew, and shows a dependence on Matthew incompatible with the statement that its author drew his information from the discourses of Peter; that since the description which Papias furnishes of the Gospel of Mark does not fit our Gospel according to Mark, and since he accounts for its origin by the existence of a relation which does not account for the existence of our Gospel according to Mark, the testimony of Papias does not relate to the latter, and is consequently worthless." But it is patent that, while we have no coercive interpretation of the language of Papias, it contains nothing to justify the extraordinary construction which men of the school of Strauss give it. Whatever be

the meaning of *ὁὐ τάξεσ*, it is clear that it does not mean disorder, imperfection, and incorrectness; for Papias distinctly affirms that Mark "wrote with great accuracy," and was guided by the principle "not to omit or falsify anything that he had heard." The words taken as they stand in the context, without any violent disruption from the connection in which they occur, mean nothing less or more than that Mark did not record the works and words of Christ in the exact order in which they took place, but in the order in which Peter was wont orally to describe them. The language of Papias passes no censure on Mark, but intimates that that evangelist records the sayings and doings of Christ with the utmost fidelity in the order pursued by Peter. The whole theory of an epitomized compilation or digest is purely arbitrary, which sound criticism must and does unequivocally condemn and reject. The obvious design of Papias was to bear testimony to the scrupulous fidelity of Mark as an evangelist, and it was doubtless this fidelity which caused his Gospel to be received from the beginning, and by the consentient voice of the church, as a canonical Gospel. Moreover, the scriptural notices concerning the evangelist make it abundantly clear that his early adoption of the Christian faith, his intimate relations to Peter, Paul, and the other founders of the church, gave him the opportunity of the utmost and most authentic familiarity with every particular of the evangelical history, and placed him beyond the necessity of extracting from or compiling the writings of other men. His Gospel, as a whole, is a unit in style, language, and manner, and the freshness and vivacity of those portions of it in particular which are not found in the other Gospels evince an originality that ill comports with the constrained action of a mere copyist, compiler, or epitomizer. We cannot, therefore, see in the testimony of Papias anything that conflicts with the contents and condition of our Gospel according to Mark, and adding his testimony to that of Irenaeus, Clement, Jerome, and others, consider the genuineness and canonicity of that Gospel well established.

The questions relating to its internal condition will come up hereafter.

The third canonical Gospel is ascribed by the general consent of ancient Christian writers to Luke, the beloved physician, the friend and companion of Paul, and author of the Acts of the Apostles. Luke is mentioned by name only three times in the New Testament, Philem. 24, Col. iv. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 11; these epistles are generally believed to have been written by Paul during his imprisonment at Rome; in the first passage he is designated as Paul's fellow-laborer, in the second, as the beloved physician, in the third, simply as Luke. That the Luke of Philem. 24 is identical with the Luke of Col. iv. 14 is evident, from the fact that in both places his name occurs in connection with the same men (cf. Col. iv. 9, 10, 12, 14, with Philem. 10, 23, 24). From the statement Col. iv. 11 (cf. vs. 14) it cannot be inferred that he was not of the circumcision. We are absolutely without any certain historical data as to his origin and conversion, but we have an unlimited supply of conjectures, which the curious may find in the dictionaries and introductions. Some have endeavored to identify Luke the Evangelist with Lucius of Cyrene (Acts xiii. 1), a Christian teacher at Antioch, who, again, has been supposed to be identical with the Lucius mentioned Rom. xvi. 21. This hypothesis is based on the form of the name Lucas, which is evidently a contraction, but of Lucanus, and not of Lucius. The contraction of Lucanus into Lucas has an analogy in Silas from Silvanus, and some support from the title of the Gospel in Codd. Vercell. and Corb. in Mabilon's Museum Ital. I. 111, which reads, *Evangelium secundum Lucanum*.¹ The tradition that Luke was not only a physician, but also a painter, is of mediaeval origin, and a pure fable. Nothing positive is known of the events belonging to the close of his life. The first Christian author who notices

¹ Lange's conjecture that Luke was one of the Greeks who came to Jesus shortly before his death (John xii. 20), and identical with the Aristion of Papias (*ἀριστιεύων = lucere*), is founded on a very doubtful and bold etymology, which few are prepared to recognize. Cf. Lange, *Leben Jesu*, I. 252.

the personal relations of Luke confines himself to the data of the New Testament, but afterwards, and especially in the Middle Ages, many particulars concerning him were set in circulation, which need not be repeated here.

The testimony in favor of the authenticity of this Gospel is by no means so meagre as Strauss would make us believe. The oldest testimony for its genuineness as the production of a disciple of the apostles, is the existence of the Acts of the Apostles, which on internal grounds must be ascribed to an apostolical man, and which on external and internal grounds is uniformly ascribed to Luke. The concurrent testimony of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement, the Peschito, the Muratorian fragment, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, declares Luke the author of the third canonical Gospel, an apostolical disciple, and an author who wrote on the most authentic information. Let us glance at these notices. Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* III. 1, in *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* V. 8) says: "And Luke, the companion of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel preached by him" (i.e. Paul). The manner in which Strauss disposes of this statement exhibits a degree of assurance which would hardly be credible, if we had his opinion only on oral report. He thinks "that the reference to a book necessitates the supposition that Irenaeus speaks of a different work from the Gospel of Luke, because the Gospel which Paul preached was different from that which we have now in the third or any other Gospel, inasmuch as the burden of the apostolical and the most ancient preaching did not consist of a detailed biography of Jesus, but gave only a short proof of his Messiahship from the prophecies of the Old Testament, of his resurrection from the dead, with an occasional account of the atoning virtue of his death, the institution of the holy supper, or the quotation of some of his memorable sayings; that Paul was the last man to couch his discourses in such historical forms, for owing to the lateness of his admission to the apostolate he could hardly know all the details of the life of Jesus, nor did he seem to attach importance to them" (1. c. p. 53).

What authority has Strauss for these statements? If he can only produce his own opinion and critical acumen, we beg leave to decline that kind of testimony, and give decided preference to that of Irenaeus, who must have known at least as much of the matter as the oracular Strauss, especially as the account he gives (l. c. III. 14) of the contents of the Gospel proves that in the book preserved to us we possess the same which he knew. It does not suit his purpose to discuss the other testimony; but we shall presently find him making the most of an opinion of Eusebius and Jerome, and trying hard to pull to pieces the prologue of our Gospel. A man who sets up as such a prodigy for learning, candor, and honesty ought to have a less convenient memory, which generally enables him to forget facts that make against his theory. He has not a word to say about Tertullian, who actually says that the Gospel of Luke was sometimes ascribed to Paul ("Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent"), or of Origen's statement, that the Gospel of Luke was recommended by Paul (*τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν, τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον* in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25), or of the valuable notice in the famous Muratorian fragment, to wit: "Tertio evangelii librum secundum Lucam. Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eum Paulus, quasi ut juris studiosum secundum adsumsisset, nomine suo ex opinione conscripsit. Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne. Et idem prout, assequi potuit. Ita et ab nativitate Johannis incipit dicere." As to the opinion of Eusebius (l. c. III. IV.) and Jerome (Catal. Script. Eccl. p. 7), that when Paul uses the words "according to my gospel" in Rom. ii. 16 and 2 Tim. ii. 8, he refers to Luke's Gospel, it is admitted on all hands that it is erroneous; but it proves how strongly and universally the participation of Paul in the production of the third Gospel was acknowledged in the early church.

In the prologue of our Gospel, Luke accounts for its origin thus:

"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely

believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word ; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed."

From the language of the prologue Strauss draws the following inferences :

1. "That at the time when the author of the third Gospel wrote there was already a considerable Gospel literature extant, which he reviewed critically."

2. "That since he distinguishes the many compilers of the Gospel history from the original eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, whose traditions were worked out by the former, he does not seem to know any Gospel of exclusively apostolical authorship."

3. "That since, in order to excel his predecessors, he does not specify some peculiar source of information, e.g. the instruction of an apostle, but simply that he had diligently inquired into all things from the beginning, it does not seem as if he were the companion of an apostle, in which light the author of the third Gospel has been regarded from ancient times."

These inferences, excepting the first, are far from just ; they are neither logical nor honest.

1. It is evident from the language of the prologue that the author of the third Gospel was acquainted with many Gospel histories, which he critically reviewed. But the result of that review could hardly have been satisfactory to him, for otherwise he would not have resolved to compose his Gospel. Who the πολλοί were, the author does not state. He must refer to more than *two* authors and his reference cannot therefore be limited to Matthew and Mark ; moreover, he does not speak of Gospels, but only of certain statements or memoirs (διήγησις), fragmentary accounts, and, as he describes them, as mere attempts or undertakings (ἐπιχει-

ρησαν) he cannot well mean the apocryphal Gospels, which did not exist at that early period, nor hardly the Gospels according to Matthew and Mark, which were of apostolic origin. Hence the conclusion of Origen (in Hieronymus, Homilia I. in Lucam) seems to be just: "Hoc quod ait, 'conati sunt,' latentem habet accusationem eorum, qui absque gratia Spiritus Sancti ad scribenda Evangelia prosilierunt. Matthaeus quippe et Marcus et Johannes et Lucas non sunt conati scribere sed scripserunt."

2. It cannot be inferred with certainty from the language of the prologue either that the author of the third Gospel knew not the Gospels according to Matthew and Mark, or that he knew them. He does not refer to Gospels at all, but to certain *diegeses*, and as he expressly distinguishes the authors of said *diegeses* from the original eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, he cannot mean the authors of the first two synoptical Gospels, who belonged to the latter category; and it is altogether immaterial whether he knew them or not, because the account he gives of the sources whence he drew his information connects him immediately and directly with the original eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. This will appear from what we have to say.

3. The author of the third canonical Gospel does specify peculiar sources of information:

a. Direct *oral* communication from the apostles, who were the original eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. He says explicitly: *καθὼς παρέδωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου* (cf. Acts i. 21, and John xv. 27). No language could be plainer than that here used by our Evangelist; he includes himself explicitly among the number of those to whom the original eye-witnesses and ministers orally communicated the things most surely believed among them; and how in the face of this express declaration Strauss can venture upon his inference that the author of the third canonical Gospel was not the companion of an apostle, we can only explain on the well-known principle, "none so blind as those who *will not* see"; but this is almost

too charitable a construction, for Strauss designedly substitutes his own *oratio obliqua* for the language of the prologue in the Gospel, and omits all reference to the important *ἡμῶν*, which we have italicized above.

b. Many written documents, attempts, or essays, more or less fragmentary, but confessedly emanating from apostolical tradition, of which he felt fully competent to make a critical use, "having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first." Adding these results of a candid examination of the prologue to the above-mentioned testimony of the most trustworthy early writers, we reach the opposite conclusion of the leader of the destructionist school, viz. that while he labors hard to make it appear that the author of the third canonical Gospel is not Luke, the companion of Paul, we hold that he is the author; that while he seeks to invalidate the testimony by unfair twistings and misstatements, we consider it entitled to respect, and sure to survive his assaults and aspersions.

Before passing on to the fourth canonical Gospel, the section of Strauss's book entitled "Further Evidences for the first three Gospels" requires to be noticed. Turning to certain passages in the canonical Epistles, which are generally believed to furnish testimony for the early existence of the Gospels, Strauss dispatches them without much ceremony in the most arbitrary manner. The striking coincidence of 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 with Luke xxii. 19, etc., relating to the institution of the holy supper, he explains by the arbitrary dictum, that the author of the third Gospel took his account from the Epistle, without condescending to notice the circumstance that the date of the Gospel most probably coincides with that of the Epistle, and that, while the former was probably written at Caesarea, the latter is known to have been indited at Ephesus; nor does he seem to perceive that that remarkable coincidence, on any hypothesis as to date and place of composition, is a strong point in favor of a Pauline participation in the origin of the Gospel. On a matter so important and difficult we have a right to insist

upon something more than oracular utterances. He admits that Heb. v. 7 contains an undoubted reference to the agony in Gethsemane, recorded in all the synoptical Gospels, but thinks it too general to determine whether the author of that Epistle was indebted for his account to any canonical Gospel or to the current evangelical tradition. This is a strong concession on the part of Strauss, and the simple circumstance that, with all his ingenuity, he could not well say less, is a clear proof of the weakness of his position, for although he seeks to fortify it by the parenthetical remark that the date of that epistle is not fixed, it is acknowledged on all hands that all the synoptical Gospels were probably extant at the time of its composition, which seems to coincide with the siege of Jerusalem by the armies of Titus. He also admits the reference of 2 Pet. i. 17 to the transfiguration of Christ, and the identical words in which Matthew records the voice from heaven to have spoken (cf. Matt. xvii. 5, who has, however, the term *ἐν φ* for Peter's *εἰς δὺ*; and Mark ix. 7; Luke ix. 35, where the words *εἰς δὺ*, κ. τ. λ., are wanting), but rejects that passage as an evidence for the early existence of the synoptical Gospels, to wit, that of Matthew, because the second Epistle of Peter is one of the latest writings of the canon, and its testimony, consequently, does not take us back further than the end of the second century after Christ. Here again we have a bold dictum, contradicted by the most competent critics, who are agreed that the language, range of thought, and scope of that Epistle, point to an origin which coincides with the closing years of the Apostle Peter, say A.D. 66-68, and argue strongly for the existence of one or all the synoptical Gospels some thirty years after the death of Christ.

Equally unfair and sweeping are Strauss's assertions concerning the testimony of the apostolical Fathers. He begins, as usual, with doubts cast on the genuineness of their writings, and on the early origin claimed for them, seeking thus to prepare the way for his work of destruction. Here, again, we have no reason to substantiate his doubts and insinuations,

but fresh oracular utterances, although he reluctantly concedes that the pretended Epistles of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp, as well as the so-called Shepherd of Hermas, contain in part allusions and in part references to passages and incidents recorded in the three synoptical Gospels. But the manner in which he attenuates that concession and attempts to account for every allusion and reference to the contents of the canonical Gospels, by his unique assertions and innuendoes, shows the true animus of the man. He says, e.g. "If the pretended Ignatius writes to the Romans (cap. vi.), 'It is better for me to die in Christ than to rule over the ends of the earth, for what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, but suffer loss in his own soul,' or if Barnabas includes among other exhortations which allude in part to the Epistle of Paul, and in part have no parallel in the New Testament, the following: 'Give to every one that asketh thee' (cap. x. 2), it is clear that the one thought of the saying of Christ which we read in *Matt.* xvi. 26, and the other of the saying found in *Luke* vi. 30 and *Matt.* v. 42; but such allusions render it difficult to determine whether they drew their information from our Gospels, and indeed from any written source, or from oral tradition. But even their express references to sayings of Christ do not lead us any further. If Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philippians (cap. vii.) says: 'Pray the all-seeing God that he lead you not into temptation, as the Lord said, "The Spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak,"' we cannot mistake the reference to Christ's exhortation in Gethsemane (*Matt.* xxvi. 41) and to the petition of the Lord's prayer (*Matt.* vi. 13), but it is doubtful whether the author had these sayings from the same source from which we have them. The existence of scriptural sources must be assumed, if Barnabas (cap. iv.) introduces the saying, 'many are called, but few chosen,' with the words 'as it is written,' or if the author of the second Epistle of Clement (cap. ii.), after quoting a passage of Isaiah used in the Epistle to the Galatians, continues: 'and another scripture says: "I came not to call the

righteous, but sinners''; but in the former instance the scripture denotes, doubtless, the apocryphal book of Ezra, while in the latter the citation of an evangelical notice as holy scripture in connection with a book of the Old Testament indicates a very late origin of the Epistle; while even here we cannot know whether the scriptural source employed was just one of our Gospels (Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14, ix. 13).''

It is hardly necessary to expose the fallacies, quibblings, and distortions of this extract. They are self-evident to any candid reader, who will take the trouble of perusing the context in the apostolical Fathers; we will only say that the application of such a criticism to any writing extant, the work of Strauss not excepted, must destroy all belief in any and every thing that cannot be reduced to the test of the senses. The value of the testimony of the apostolical Fathers we intend to state after we have done with Strauss's strictures, for the above extract is only the forerunner of his artillery.

The circumstance that the sayings of Christ as quoted by the apostolical Fathers sometimes differ from those which we have in the canonical Gospels, and sometimes are not found at all in them, is to Strauss further proof of the worthlessness of their testimony. To take but one illustration. In the first Epistle of Clement (cap. xiii). we have, in an exhortation to humility, the following words of the Lord Jesus, "which he spoke, teaching equity and long-suffering, for he said: Be merciful, that ye may obtain mercy; forgive, that ye may be forgiven; as ye do, so it shall be done unto you; as ye give, so it shall be given you; as ye judge, so ye shall be judged; as ye are kind, so shall ye find kindness; with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." Strauss thinks the allusion to Matt. vii. 1 unmistakable, but the enlargement so deviating, that it can neither have been taken from Matthew nor from Luke, who, in the parallel passage (vi. 37, etc.), enlarges upon the text of Matthew, but in a different manner, but that the author of the first Epistle of Clement seems to have drawn it from some other Gospel. There

would be force in the stricture of Strauss if we had only such involved and complicated citations and allusions as those to which he refers; but considering that the writings of the apostolical Fathers have many distinct and unmistakable quotations from the canonical Gospels, the inference lies near that they were familiar with those Gospels, and in the habit of quoting them as we quote them; and if here and there we encounter verbal differences, or expansions and enlargements, we are not any more compelled to refer them to other Gospels than the verbal differences, expansions, and enlargements which modern authors and preachers constantly interweave in their productions. Such variations are as common now, as they were then, and they are less excusable now, for the circulation of the scriptures is incomparably greater now than it was at that early period. The fact, which even Strauss, with all his finessing, is compelled to admit, that unmistakable references to and quotations from the canonical Gospels occur, and, as we shall show, abound, in the writings of the apostolical Fathers, is sufficient for our purpose, for it proves that at that early period the Gospels were well known and quoted as authentic records of the sayings and doings of Christ. And if we find more in them than we are enabled to verify from the Gospels we have the remarkable saying of John that "there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written" (John xxi. 25); and it must be confessed that this declaration of the beloved disciple, the bosom friend of Jesus, is at least as valuable as the oracular utterances of Strauss, and accounts for much which he declares to be unaccountable. What we mean is, not that the words of John cover *all* uncanonical notices of the sayings and doings of Christ, or of incidents in his life, but that they undoubtedly cover many; for that oral tradition influenced the writings of the earliest Christian authors cannot be questioned; nor does the presence of real apocryphal matter in the writings of the apostolical Fathers affect their

testimony for the genuineness of our canonical Gospels, for the fact that the apocryphal notices were at a very early period identified, and that many of them are manifestly the corruptions and interpolations of a later day, is of sufficient weight to cause us to attach the utmost value to the incidental and undesigned testimony for the genuineness of the canonical Gospels derived from the writings of the apostolical Fathers.

Passing on to Justin Martyr, the genuineness of whose most important writings is admitted even by Strauss, and who flourished under the reign of Antoninus Pius, A.D. 138-161, we have another illustration of the unfairness and one-sidedness characteristic of Strauss. That famous Apologist refers repeatedly to what he calls ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, the memorabilia of the apostles (e.g. Apol. II. 98; Dial. c. Tryph. pp. 328, 331, 332, 333, 334, etc.), which he calls also εὐαγγέλια, Gospels (Apol. II. p. 98: οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν), sometimes also εὐαγγέλιον, Gospel (Dial. c. Tryph. p. 227: τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα), and declared to have been written by the apostles and their companions (cf. Apol. II. p. 98, and Dial. p. 331: ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνους παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι), and to have been read publicly in the religious assemblies of the early Christians along with the prophetic writings (Apol. II. p. 98, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκειται). We give these passages in full in order to show that we do not wrong Strauss in charging him with unfairness, for in their face he deliberately states that Justin Martyr does not say that the sources to which he referred were any or all of our Gospels. He had no occasion to say so explicitly, but we think he says enough when he calls the memorabilia the Gospels, declares them to have been written by the apostles and their companions, and to have been held in such great esteem that they were read publicly at church along with

the prophetic writings, especially when it appears that Justin's citations from these memorabilia exhibit frequently a literal agreement with our Gospels. Of these citations we will speak more fully below, but the facts of the case as stated are sufficient to convict Strauss of unfairness, which is the more apparent from his convenient mode of suppressing the text of the aforesaid passages in Justin Martyr by stating in a foot-note that, as they may be found in any introduction to the New Testament, he need not specify them in detail. His book is expressly written for the benefit of the German *people*, as contrasted with theologians, and of course introductions to the New Testament, bristling with Latin and Greek quotations, are found in the libraries of the common people! When it suits the convenience of Mr. Strauss, he is ready enough to quote *in extenso*, with comment and digest, passages which may be found in those self-same introductions, but the nature of the above passages accounts for their non-appearance in his book, which instead gives us the oracular information that Justin took his term from the Memorabilia of Xenophon, that the passage Apol. II. p. 198 is regarded as an interpolation, and that the foundation for Justin's ascribing the authorship of the Gospel to the apostles and their companions was the natural supposition that memorabilia of Jesus could only have been written by persons who were on terms of intimacy with him. It would be satisfactory to have the foundations of Strauss's opinions, but as he does not condescend to furnish them, we prefer to receive the ancient and well-authenticated view, that the memorabilia of Justin designate our canonical Gospels.

After enlarging at length on certain incidents and events connected with the life of Jesus, which are not found in our canonical Gospels, Strauss concludes that he must have consulted other Gospels and sources of information. On this point we agree with him, but when he infers that the canonical Gospels and uncanonical writings were held in the same reputation, and that the origin of the former cannot be traced back to the apostles and their companions, and that therefore,

by implication, they cannot be received as authentic documents, he draws conclusions unwarranted by the premises. There are a great many considerations passed over by Strauss in silence which are of the utmost importance; e. g. those relating to early corruptions of the text of the canonical Gospels and to the corruptions and interpolations of the uncanonical writings; a thorough and searching examination of these questions, conducted on sound and fair principles of criticism, cannot fail to yield the most satisfactory results for the genuineness of our canonical Gospels; but we need not dwell upon this matter now, as we intend to conclude this Essay with a synopsis of the cumulative character of the evidence for the integrity of the canonical Gospels, and therefore pass on to a more detailed account of the citations from the canonical and uncanonical writings in the works of Justin Martyr.

Many passages in his works exhibit a *literal* agreement with our Gospels, e. g. Dial. c. Tryph. ed. Col. p. 301, with Matt. viii. 11, 12; p. 333 with Matt. v. 20; Apol. II. p. 64 with Matt. vii. 19; he also cites passages from the Old Testament as Matthew quotes them, cf. e. g. Apol. II. pp. 74, 75, 76 with Matt. i. 23; ii. 6; xxi. 5. In other passages there is an agreement in matter, with slight deviations in form, cf. e. g. Apol. II. p. 64 with Matt. vii. 21, where Justin has *οὐχί* for *οὐ*; Dial. p. 384 with Matt. xvi. 4, where Justin has *αὐτοῖς* for *αὐτῇ*; greater deviations of the same kind occur in Dial. p. 268, cf. with Matt. iii. 11, 12, and Apol. II. p. 63 with Matt. v. 34. Other passages give the idea in a condensed form; cf. e. g. Apol. II. p. 63 with Matt. v. 22, where Justin says: *ὅς δ' ἂν ὀργισθῆ, ἐνοχός ἐστιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ*, and Apol. II. p. 64 with Luke xii. 48, which Justin condenses into *ὃ πλεον ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός, πλεον καὶ ἀπαιτηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ*. In other passages, again, we have a combination of several and different gospel statements, e. g. Apol. II. p. 66 combines Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 4, thus: *Μὴ φοβείσθε τοὺς ἀναιρούοντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ δυναμένους τὴ ποιῆσαι φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα εἰς*

γράφειν ἐμβαλεῖν. Justin uses more freedom with historical notices, some of which are combinations from Matthew and Luke (cf. Dial. p. 308 with Matt. i. 18, etc. and Luke ii. 2, etc.; also Apol. II. p. 75 with Luke i. 31, 32, 35, 38; Dial. p. 815 with Matt. iii. 13, 16, 17), while others are not recorded in our canonical Gospels (e.g. Dial. p. 308 seq. and p. 816). The latter probably flow from oral tradition, possibly from apocryphal Gospels, but the whole matter is too much veiled to warrant the expression of any positive opinion. Justin's quotations agree for the most part with passages in Matthew and Luke, sometimes with Mark (cf. Dial. p. 333 with Mark iii. 17) and occasionally with John (cf. Apol. II. p. 94 with John iii. 3; Dial. p. 342 with John iv. 10, etc.); his writings abound moreover with allusions to evangelical passages. His deviations, combinations, and contractions are accounted for from the fact that he quoted from memory; this is evident from his quoting Old Testament authors in the same manner (cf. e.g. Apol. II. p. 86, with Psalm xxiv. 7; Dial. p. 228 with Jer. xxxi. 31 etc.), and from the variations of the same passage quoted in different connections (cf. e.g. Apol. II. p. 62 with Dial. p. 324; Apol. II. p. 95 with Dial. p. 326; Dial. p. 308 with p. 253). Enough, we trust, has been said and shown to justify our remarks on the unfairness with which Strauss and others deal with the writings of Justin and other ancient authors. If they had written scientific treatises on the evidences, we should exact greater accuracy of statement, but writing, as they did, on the most diverse subjects, and mostly in a familiar style, their quotations from the Gospels have all the freedom which in conversation, in epistolary compositions, and even in sermons, are of daily occurrence. The incidental quotations, undesignated references, familiar contractions and combinations, are *prima facie* pledges of their genuineness. Were they spurious they would exhibit greater conformity to the language and context of the evangelical record; and when we find Justin silent as to the *names* of the evangelists, we expect that he had no occasion to use them, adding that it was his habit

to cite also other sacred authors, without mentioning their names (e.g. in *Apol.* II. p. 86 he quotes *Psalm* xxiv. 7; *Dial.* p. 295, *Psalm* xix. 5 and *Isa.* xxxv. 2; p. 315, *Joel* iii. 27, etc.).¹

It is at this point in his work that Strauss pauses to sum up his argument against the genuineness of the synoptical Gospels thus: ² " Even admitting the testimony of Papias on Matthew and Mark as authors of evangelical writings, whose credibility, as we shall show, leaves room for doubt, yet our first Gospel, in its present form, is neither the work of the Apostle Matthew, nor the second that of Mark, the assistant of the apostles, and, while as to the Gospel of Matthew we know not the relation in which it stood to the apostle's work, how much was added to it, and through how many recensions it did pass, as to Mark's Gospel we do not even know whether it has any connection whatever with the Gospel of Mark mentioned by Papias. As to the author of Luke's Gospel we know from his own prologue that he wrote rather late, as a secondary writer, who wrought up older materials; this opinion, as we shall soon see, is not in conflict with those passages in the book of Acts in which we seem to hear a companion of Paul. Certain traces that our first three Gospels existed in their present form we do not find before the middle of the second century, that is, a whole century after the time when the principal events of the history they contain took place; and nobody will be able to maintain with reason that that period is too short to render the introduction of unhistorical elements into every part of the evangelical history conceivable."

Our reply to this bold and bald assault has in part been given above under the respective heads; and as it has been made to appear, we trust, that the individual positions of Strauss are untenable, so we hope to show, after we have followed him in his assaults upon the fourth Gospel, that his aggregate position is false, and that the formidable citadel

¹ For further particulars, see Guericke, de Wette, etc

² *Leben Jesu*, p. 61.

which he vaunts to have erected, will prove to have been built in the air, without the foundations of truth and uprightness, and we have no doubt that the solid, strong argument in favor of the genuineness of the evangelical writings will grow stronger and assume more symmetrical proportions by every result of sound criticism, while the phantasm of Strauss will speedily dissolve into mist.

(To be continued.)

ARTICLE II.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF DIVORCE.

BY REV. JOSEPH TRACY, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.

As preliminary to any investigation of this subject, it is necessary to remark that divorce, or "putting away," mentioned anywhere in the Bible, was not a judicial act performed by a court. The husband desiring divorce from his wife did not bring her into court, and charge her with some offence for which she ought to be divorced. No court inquired whether she had committed any offence, or if so, whether her offence was such as to justify a divorce. No court ever heard and recorded the husband's decision to divorce his wife. There was no statute authorizing any such proceedings. The husband himself, at his own discretion, or indiscretion, acted as complainant, witness, judge, jury, and clerk of the court. He made out the writing of divorcement, gave it to her in her hand, and sent her away, and that was all. From this she had no appeal, except to the day of judgment. It might be a very wicked proceeding on his part, but it was legally valid. It released her from the bonds of marriage, so that she might lawfully "go and be another man's wife" (Deut. xxiv. 1, 2). This implies that another man might lawfully take her to be his wife.