

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.
THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS.

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

(Continued from page 384.)

TURNING to the fourth canonical Gospel, Strauss says it would be well for it if the external evidence for its genuineness were as good as that for the synoptical Gospels. He begins with an attempt to invalidate the notice of Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. III. 39), that Papias cited the first Epistle of John (*κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολῆς*), 1, by aspersing the scholarship and judgment of Eusebius, who may have been mistaken in identifying the citations of Papias with passages in the first Epistle of John; 2, by denying that the first Epistle of John and the fourth canonical Gospel had the same author. But since his first assertion is purely arbitrary, the notice of Eusebius, who was a learned man and saw the writings of Papias, has its full weight of importance; and since his second assertion is contradicted by the facts of the case, resulting from the closest scrutiny of both writings, and concurred in by the most competent and reliable authorities from the earliest times, his objections fall to the ground. His conclusion that the silence of Papias concerning John's authorship is unfavorable to its genuineness amounts to nothing more than a subterfuge, for, apart from the incidental character of the notice in Eusebius,

the silence of Papias cannot be of any moment to a man like Strauss, who refuses to believe Papias when he breaks silence and speaks in plain terms.

Strauss notices the argument for the authenticity of this Gospel based on the passage John xxi. 24, and rejects it. That passage is generally regarded as an addition made by foreign hands, probably the presbyters of the Ephesian church; but without discussing the theories of the authorship of the last verses of that chapter, and indeed of the last chapter itself, one fact speaks for itself, that the testimony it gives for the veracity of the record of the fourth Gospel has stood the ordeal of the criticism of the early church, and cannot be invalidated by the arbitrary tests of the Tübingen school; they must first get rid of the whole Christian literature of the first three centuries, before they can touch the Gospel of John on internal grounds; but as they have not yet accomplished that task, even formidable to hands so well skilled in destruction, we need not further enlarge upon this particular point.

The testimony of the apostolical Fathers is unceremoniously set aside by Strauss, on the ground that, if the fourth Gospel had been acknowledged and received in the church for fifty years as the work of the apostle whose name it bears, its influence on the writings of the apostolical Fathers and other works of the second century ought to have been greater, and to have appeared in a more distinct form than mere superficial allusions or references. This remark of Strauss rests on the supposition that the Epistles of Ignatius originated in the middle of the second century, whereas the martyrdom of Ignatius is generally believed to have taken place some time between A.D. 105 and 108, probably A.D. 107; so that the Epistle bearing his name, if authentic, must have been written not later than that period; the Epistle of Barnabas was written between A.D. 107 and 120; the Epistle of Polycarp not long after the martyrdom of Ignatius (cf. Polyc. Ep. c. XIII.); now if the fourth canonical Gospel was written about A.D. 90, the supposed interval of fifty years between

the publication of the latter and that of the Ignatian Epistles dwindles down to a period not exceeding seventeen years. This simple comparison of dates, derived from the most authentic sources, puts an end to the Straussian argument, and renders any and every allusion or reference in these writings to the fourth Gospel of the utmost importance; for such allusions and references clearly show that the fourth Gospel was received as an authentic document immediately after the death of the evangelist. Ignatius (ad Philad. c. 7) says: οἶδεν γὰρ (τὸ πνεῦμα) πόθεν ἔρχεται, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει, in manifest antithesis to John iii. 8, and thus exhibits a familiarity with the fourth Gospel; while the following quotation (ad Rom. c. 7) contains evident allusions to passages in this Gospel; Ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ἄρτον οὐράνιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς, ὃς ἐστὶν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πόμα Θεοῦ θέλω, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Polycarp (ad Philipp. c. 7) has a distinct reference to the first Epistle of John, whose author is manifestly identical with that of the fourth Gospel; the reference is to 1 John iv. 3, and the passage reads thus: πᾶς γὰρ, ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστι. Even Barnabas (Ep. c. VI.) contains an allusion to John i. 14, and (cap. XII.) to John iii. 14. We may also add the manifest allusion to John x. 7, 9 in Ignatius (ad Philad. c. IX.), where Christ is called Θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς.

In the middle of the second century we meet with clear traces of the use of the fourth Gospel as the work of an apostle in the writings of Catholic, Heretical, and even Pagan authors. First we have the testimony of Justin Martyr, which Strauss rejects chiefly on the ground that his phraseology, which exhibits a most striking resemblance to that of John the evangelist, may be accounted for from his familiarity with Philonic ideas, although he is evidently at a loss to find an explanation of Justin's conception of the Logos, which in the main agrees with that of John, and seeks to cover his perplexity by laying stress on the term παράκλητος not being found in the writings of Justin; the coincidences he thinks may be accidental, or sufficiently explained by the

supposition that John and Justin had recourse to the same sources of information, viz. the Alexandrian philosophy of religion and the Jewish-Christian typology of that age. It is by no means uncommon to hear such references to recondite literature, which may impress the illiterate with a sense of the author's learning, but can hardly satisfy scholars, who want proofs, and not oracular sayings founded on a literature which the author fails to verify by explicit reference to the particular work, book, chapter, and verse. As a rule, such vague references to entire classes of works without any specification, may be set down as a *deus ex machina* and a *petitio principii*, and as a strong proof of the author's consciousness of the weakness of his position.

Strauss considers only one passage in Justin of importance; it occurs Apol. I. 6, and reads thus: ὁ χριστὸς εἶπεν, ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἄπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσι ἐστὶ. Here the reference to John iii. 3-5 is unmistakable and undeniable. Strauss says it is only apparent, because the first part of the passage is found in the Clementine Homilies (Hom. XI. 26) thus: "If ye are not born again with living water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," with the remarkable variations, that Justin and the Clementines have ἀναγεννηθῆναι instead of John's ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, βασιλεία οὐρανῶν instead of John's τοῦ Θεοῦ, the second person plural instead of John's third person singular in the verb, etc.; and the last-named variations are also found in Matt. xviii. 3: "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"; that we have obviously the same saying in various forms; man's indispensable beginning *de novo* is expressed in Matthew by men becoming as little children, in Justin by being born again, in the Clementines by being born again in baptism, and in John by being born from above of the Spirit; that this spiritual birth would be contrasted with natural

birth is self-evident, and that since we find, both in the Clementines and in Justin, an expansion of that idea to which the turn of the impossibility of a real return into the mother's womb may readily be conjectured to belong, and that if the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the original source of that expansion, the agreement of Justin with the fourth Gospel might be readily accounted for by both having derived their information from said apocryphal Gospel, without the necessity of Justin's acquaintance with the fourth canonical Gospel.

This accumulation of conjectures based on conjectures, Strauss wants us to receive as a satisfactory account of a most striking coincidence of thought and language between John's Gospel and Justin's apology; but as the conclusion he draws is purely arbitrary, it is not necessary to enter upon a detailed discussion of the particular links in his chain of reasoning, and we think that the variation in unimportant terms of Justin's language from that of John is satisfactorily explained by its being a free quotation, which is manifest from the explanation with which he introduces the passage, which must be considered to exhibit an unmistakable and undeniable reference to John iii. 3-5. But all doubts of his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel must vanish if we find him, in addition, ascribe his doctrine of the divine nature of Christ to *τοῖς διὰ Χριστοῦ διδαχθεῖσι*, and perceive in the statement of his idea of the Logos predicates such as *μονογενής*, etc., which cannot well be derived from another source than the Gospel of John. He has, moreover, many other references to that Gospel, e.g. his comparison of the church of Christ to a vine, planted by God and the Redeemer (Dial. p. 337), his statement that the living water is given by Christ to those who through him love the Father (Dial. p. 342), and his designation of the miraculous birth of Jesus as that of one not born of human seed, but of the will of God (Dial. p. 286), cannot be explained as coincidences, but argue a thorough familiarity with the fourth canonical Gospel; this is quite clear from the last reference, which contains a variation from

the present Greek text of John i. 13, but exhibits a conformity with an ancient reading $\delta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\delta\eta$, instead of $\text{o}\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\delta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$.

The proof for the early existence of the fourth Gospel derived from the recently discovered Philosophumena, falsely ascribed to Origen, is by no means convenient to Strauss, who tries hard, but ineffectually, to nullify it. It is immaterial whether the author of the Philosophumena was Cajus of Rome, who flourished at the end of the second century, or Hippolitus, who flourished at the beginning of the third century, for they contain information drawn from Gnostic writings with indubitable quotations from John's Gospel, taking us back to A.D. 125, and showing that those early Gnostic authors were in the habit of quoting this Gospel. These extracts in the Philosophumena (ed. Em. Miller. Oxon. 1851) furnish distinct references to our fourth Gospel. Those from an Ophitic writing cite John iii. 6; i. 3; vi. 45; iv. 10, and v. 37 (Philos. V. 7, pp. 106, 107, 112; c. 9. p. 121; c. 8. p. 109); those from the *περάται*, another Gnostic sect of that age, cite John iii. 17; i. 1-4; viii. 44, and x. 7 (l. c. V. 12, p. 125; c. 16, p. 134; c. 17, pp. 136, 137); in the account of the Docetae we have a quotation of John iii. 5, 6 (l. c. VIII. c. 10, p. 267); we further learn from L. VII. c. 38, p. 259 that Apelles, the Marcionite, used the Gospel of John, from L. VII. c. 35, p. 194 that Valentinus refers to John x. 8, and Basilides to John i. 9; ii. 4, and viii. 56 (l. c. L. VII. 22, p. 232; VII. 27, p. 242; VII. 27, p. 270). The strictures of Strauss exhibit great weakness and much sophistry; e.g. when he says that although the references in the Ophitic writing are unquestionably to John's Gospel, they do not amount to much, because the age of that writing is not given, it is manifest that this is a question of secondary importance, because the Philosophumena are known to have been written either at the end of the second or at the beginning of the third century, and the fact that this and the other Gnostic writings are referred to by name affords sufficient evidence that they were well known,

and that they were genuine productions ; or when commenting upon the passage relating to Basilides (l. c. VII. 22, p. 282), "and this," says he, "is what is said in the Gospels : He was the true light that lighteth every man, coming into the world" (cf. John. i. 9), which shows that Basilides, writing about A.D. 125, knew and received the fourth canonical Gospel. Strauss says that the formula of quotations "says he," or "he says," is used rather vaguely in the *Philosophumena*, because it sometimes occurs in connections either where an individual had not been mentioned by name or where several persons had been introduced ; we have a clear case of sophistry, because Basilides had been named. The same remark applies to his other strictures in which he endeavors to mystify clear and plain references by the introduction of irrelevant matter. All these labored efforts of mystification, of confusing what is plain, of mixing up irrelevant matter with the subject in hand, show the weakness of his position and the strength of the proof for the early existence of the Gospel of John from the *Philosophumena*.

The fact that Valentinus designated his aeons by the terms *λόγος, ἀρχή, μονογενής, ζωή, χάρις, κ. τ. λ.* affords proof of his familiarity with the fourth Gospel, notwithstanding the assertion of Strauss, that Irenaeus fails to specify passages from John on which the Valentinians based their theory ; whereas he cites many such passages from the synoptical Gospels and the Pauline writings, and that the Johannean references appear only in a postscript from Ptolemaeus ; for the fact is that Irenaeus (adv. Haer. III. 11. 7) describes the Valentinians (*qui a Valentio sunt*) as "*eo, quod est secundum Johannem, plenissime utentes,*" and furnishes (l. c. I. 8, 5) a full account of the Valentinian exposition of the prologue to John's Gospel. The fact that Heracleon, the disciple of Valentine, wrote a commentary on John's Gospel early in the second century, important fragments of which are preserved in that of Origen on the same Gospel, is the strongest kind of testimony for the high authority which that Gospel enjoyed at that early period ; a testimony which cannot

be affected by the attempts of the infidel school to assign to it the latest possible date, in order to make to appear that the Valentinian system was not indebted to John's Gospel, but had an independent origin.

It is an undoubted fact that the Montanists drew largely on the Gospel of John for their peculiar views of the Paraclete; and although Strauss positively asserts that it cannot be shown that they made use of that Gospel, we have the testimony of Irenaeus to the contrary, that certain antagonists of Montanism rejected the Gospel of John as spurious because it favored the Montanistic doctrine; if the antagonists of Montanism rejected this Gospel on that ground, it is surely logical to infer that the Montanists used it, and as Irenaeus flourished some twenty years before the end of the second century, his testimony must be regarded as decisive on this point; his words are: "Ut donum spiritus frustrentur, quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum Patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quae est secundum Joannis evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit." This fact is of the utmost importance for the early existence and genuineness of the Gospel of John, seeing that it virtually involves the testimony of the whole church of the second century, for if the church had doubted the genuineness of that Gospel, the assertion of such doubts would have been the most complete and effectual reply to the views of Montanus. These facts are sufficient, we think, to upset the fine-spun theory that the Gospel of John was the product of the gnostico-montanistic movement (Strauss, l. c. p. 69).

As the existence and acknowledgment of the fourth canonical Gospel at the time of the later Gnostics and Montanists are placed beyond all doubt, Strauss feels constrained to admit it; but concentrates all his powers on the demolition of the testimony of Irenaeus and other witnesses, in order to pave the way for his rejection of the Gospel as the work of the apostle John.

He admits that the recently discovered conclusion of the

Clementine Homilies contains undeniable references to John ix. ; x. 3 ; that the fragments of Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis (A.D. 170), have unquestionable allusions to 1 John v. 6 seq. and John xix. 34, or both ; that Tatian and Athenagoras make unmistakable reference to our Gospel, and that Theophilus of Antioch (about A.D. 169) cites it formally thus: ὁθεν διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ ἀγίαί γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν κ. τ. λ. (ad Autolyc. II. 22), but seeks to nullify his testimony by finding fault with him for not telling us how he knew that the Gospel whose opening words he cites was composed by John. The value of this objection may be determined by the consideration that this selfsame Theophilus wrote a commentary on the four Gospels, which was read by Jerome (cp. 53, vir. ill. 25), and that the positive statement of so well-informed a man will be received as important testimony by all critics who do not ask for impossible information. After this slur on the testimony of Theophilus, Strauss proceeds to tear to pieces that of Irenaeus, which, to judge from the amount of labor bestowed upon it by him and kindred spirits, is a veritable bugbear to them. It is indeed very direct, clear, and weighty, as the reader may judge for himself: Ἰωάννης, ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπνεύων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ. τ. λ. (adv. Haer. III. 1, 1). This testimony Strauss rejects on the following grounds :

1. Because Irenaeus does not tell us *how he knew* that John was the author of the Gospel, and because, while he justifies his exposition of a passage in the Apocalypse (xiii. 18) by an express reference to “the testimony of those who had seen John face to face” (adv. Haer. III. 3), he does not say that he had the notice in the above extract from Polycarp.

2. Because even if he did authenticate his statement by reference to those who knew John, such reference would be inadequate, for he cites the authority of the selfsame witnesses for matters which nobody believes.

We reply, 1. That Irenaeus in a letter addressed to Florinus, his friend, and former fellow-disciple of Polycarp, states

that he remembers distinctly "the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse; his coming in and going out, his manner of life, the form of his body, his addresses to the people, how he dwelt upon his familiar intercourse with John and others that had seen the Lord, how he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord, of his miracles and doctrine, all of which Polycarp used to declare, agreeably to holy writ, as he had received it from those who had been eye-witnesses of the Word of Life. These things I then heard attentively, according to the mercy of God vouchsafed to me, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart, and these same facts I am always in the habit, by the grace of God, to call faithfully to mind" (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 20). The information contained in this extract specifies explicitly the source of Irenaeus's knowledge; Strauss finds it convenient to suppress the salient point of this passage, although he cites from the same epistle to Florinus a phrase which occurs only two or three lines before it, and actually introduces it. Irenaeus says that he saw his friend when he was quite young (*παῖς ὄν ἔτι*, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 20, 5; *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*, adv. Haer. 3, 4, and Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 14, 3), and Strauss argues that the recollections of so young a person could have been of no weight in determining the question of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, even if he did see it, because the circumstance of his not remembering in old age any notice of Polycarp respecting that Gospel would hardly have deterred him from pronouncing it of apostolical origin when he saw it, if it suited him in other respects. This singular chain of reasoning is contradicted, (*a*) by the statements of Irenaeus himself that John wrote the fourth Gospel, and that he *did* remember the oral testimony of Polycarp with minute accuracy of details, attaching so great a value to it as to be always in the habit of faithfully calling it to mind; (*b*) by the circumstance that *παῖς* does not necessarily denote a young boy, but here plainly designates a young man in the first

flush of early manhood ; (c) by the general character for fidelity which history has handed down to us concerning Irenaeus, of which Eusebius has preserved a remarkable illustration in a postscript to his treatise on the Ogdoad, to wit : " I adjure thee, whoever thou art that transcribest this book, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by his glorious appearance when he shall come to judge the quick and the dead, to compare what thou hast copied, and to correct it by this original manuscript, from which thou hast carefully transcribed. And that thou also copy this adjuration, and insert it in the copy " (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 20). Is it probable, we ask, that so cautious and faithful an author would exhibit the easy and accommodating spirit which Strauss insinuates him to have possessed ? Thus much for his first objection. .

We reply, 2. The Rabbinical description of the kingdom of God which Irenaeus gives on the authority of the ancients who had heard John (adv. Haer. V. 33, 3), and which Strauss adduces in justification of his sweeping judgment, was delivered by Irenaeus as an oral tradition, doubtless because it favored his chiliastic opinions ; and if, misled by those opinions, he gave currency to that tradition, he simply shares the fate of all men — he erred, and *errare humanum est* ; and the fact that this tradition is neither found in John's Gospel now, nor reported to have ever been found in it, is really an argument in favor of the integrity of that Gospel, and does not affect his statement that John was its author, nor does it affect his testimony that the preaching of Polycarp was in agreement with holy writ, for in the latter case he had the evidence of his own senses, while in the former he simply reports a floating tradition, without specifying that *he* had it from Polycarp, or that it formed part of John's Gospel. The circumstance that an author has here and there erroneous statements cannot affect those parts of his writings whose truthfulness can be established by the clearest evidence. If occasional errors or mistakes in a writing are to be deemed sufficient grounds for its rejection, there is perhaps not a single work extant that would not be wiped out of existence.

The circumstance that the Alogi seem to have denied the apostolicity of the fourth canonical Gospel was mainly, if not wholly, the result of their peculiar tenets, which were utterly incompatible with the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, so emphatically taught in the Gospel of John. Strauss thinks, however, that they had other reasons besides those arising from dogmatical prejudices for the rejection of that Gospel. These reasons, which he considers cogent, relate to alleged discrepancies between the Gospel of John and the synoptical Gospels. They noticed the omission of the narrative of the childhood of Jesus in the Johannean Gospel, which after stating that the Word had become flesh and dwelt among us, and noticing the testimony of John the Baptist and the gathering of the first disciples, passes at once to the account of the marriage at Cana; that in the Johannean account of the baptism of Jesus connected with his journey to Galilee no room is left for the forty days of the temptation inserted by the synoptists, and lastly, that while John makes our Lord keep two passovers, the synoptics mention only one passover. The first point is sufficiently answered by the scope and complementary character of John's Gospel, the second, by the fact that a careful comparison of the Johannean and synoptic Gospels shows that while John omits the history of the temptation he also omits the detailed account of our Lord's baptism furnished by the synoptists, so that the complementary character of the fourth Gospel applies also here, and that the order of the Johannean account, so far from contradicting that of the synoptists, corroborates it, for it represents Jesus coming to the Baptist (on his return from the wilderness) at chap. i. 29, and the Baptist bearing record to the miraculous phenomena which accompanied the baptism of Jesus; the Baptist refers to them in the past; the baptism of Jesus must therefore have taken place before he bare witness of him, and as we learn from the synoptists, that immediately after being baptized Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, and from John that before setting out for Galilee he was with the Baptist, while the synoptists make

him return to Galilee at the end of the temptation (Luke iv. 14), the narrative of the latter might appropriately be inserted before John i. 29. In John we have simply an incidental reference to the baptism of Jesus in a conversation of the Baptist with his disciples, while the synoptical Gospels give us a distinct history of it; Strauss finds it convenient to represent that incidental reference in the testimony of John as a history of the baptism of Jesus, and thus to manufacture a discrepancy.

Concerning the last of the above objections of the Alogi, and of course adopted by Strauss with emendations and variations, we will speak presently, and dismiss their objections with the remark, that the alleged discrepancies, every one of which can be explained and accounted for by the complementary character and general design of the fourth Gospel, are really proofs of the genuineness of our Gospel, because a forger would have studiously avoided all such discrepancies for fear of exciting suspicion.

Strauss, however, considers the Alogi to have greatly erred in rejecting on dogmatical grounds not only the Gospel but also the Apocalypse of John, because he considers it an established fact that the two works are so radically different in point of animus and form, that if the apostle John is the author of the Gospel, he cannot be the author of the Apocalypse, or if he is the author of the latter, he cannot be the author of the former. This lever, which the Alogi failed to use, Strauss is not slow to apply; his object being to justify his rejection of the Gospel, he reiterates the argument of the Tübingen school based on the alleged irreconcilable differences between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, however, without committing himself to the adoption of their conclusion, that John being the author of the Apocalypse cannot be the author of the Gospel, and puts the case hypothetically, that if John be the author of either work, it is more probable that he is the author of the Apocalypse than of the Gospel. There is nothing new in his statements, which are vague enough, and hardly deserve any notice at our hands. He

thinks the religious point of view of the two works irreconcilable, and affirms that the author of the Apocalypse exhibits the narrowest Jewish exclusiveness, while the author of the Gospel manifests the broadest liberality. No contrast could be more perfect, he says, than that while the author of the Apocalypse sees in Jerusalem the centre of the millennial reign of Christ, the author of the Gospel declares the difference between Jerusalem and Gerizim annulled in respect to God being worshipped in spirit and in truth, that while the former represents Paganism as the antichristian principle, the latter regards Judaism as the proper kingdom of unbelief.

The arbitrariness of this supposed contrariety may be illustrated by a single reference. Take, e.g. the prophecy of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi.), which has no temple, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it (vs. 22). Is this Jewish exclusiveness? Is this representation of the heavenly city not diametrically opposed to the Jewish idea of the temple being the centralization and highest type of the worship of God; and does it not illustrate in the sublimest manner the words of Jesus to the Samaritan woman, that they that worship God must worship in spirit and in truth (John iv. 24)? Again the solemn invitation (Rev. xxii. 17), "And the Spirit and the bride say Come; and let him that heareth say Come; and let him that is athirst come: and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely," cannot be interpreted as an expression of Jewish exclusiveness, but has its perfect counterpart in the words of Jesus to the Samaritan woman (John iv. 10, 14), and especially in his exclamation at the feast of tabernacles: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink" (John vii. 37).

Equally just and true is the alleged diversity of temperament and tone which Strauss sees in the Apocalypse and the Gospel. He says that the epithet "apostle of love," which has been given to John, is derived from the character of the Gospel and the first Epistle, for the character of the Apocalypse would rather award to him the epithet "apostle of wrath and vengeance." He admits, indeed, that the Gospel

also exhibits a spirit which sternly insists upon the exclusion of all ungodly elements, but maintains that, while the evangelist dwells chiefly on the redeeming, gathering, and uniting activity of Christ, the author of the Apocalypse takes peculiar delight in the delineation of the divine judgments on an ungodly world.

But it is apparent that John as evangelist reports what Christ said, whereas in the Apocalypse his sole duty is to do what he is bidden, and faithfully to communicate what had been revealed to him. In the Gospel he is the biographer; in the Apocalypse, the prophet. The spirit of the Apocalypse is the spirit of prophecy, and the author of that book records with fidelity the divinely ordered course of events. And those who find fault with the severity of the divine judgments in the Apocalypse, will and do equally censure that severity in other portions of the sacred scriptures. The individuality of John, from the nature of the case, is more strongly marked in the Gospel, written *ἐν τῷ νοῦ*, than in the Apocalypse, written *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*; and we will show that the points of agreement in the two works are infinitely greater than the differences.

The contrast, finally, which Strauss observes in the language of the Gospel and the Apocalypse, and on which he seems to lay peculiar emphasis, can be easily accounted for by the circumstances of the case as well as by analogy. He admits that the Apocalypse was written sometime between June A.D. 68 and January A.D. 69: the Gospel was most probably written between A.D. 90 and 100. We have, therefore, an interval of from twenty to thirty years between the date of the Apocalypse and that of the Gospel; and that interval is surely sufficient to explain the greater readiness and freedom of language characteristic of the latter as compared with the less flexible Greek of the former, for John's protracted residence and labors among Hellenists must have rendered him familiar with their language (Greek), while the peculiar speculative tendencies of Asia Minor which he combated and made tributary to the Gospel, abundantly

account for the philosophical terminology of his Gospel as contrasted with the Hebraistic terminology of the Apocalypse. The former, moreover, was written ἐν τῷ νότ (1 Cor. xiv. 14), the latter ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (Rev. i. 10); that is, the language of the Gospel conformed to the language of the world and to the habits of thought current among Hellenists, while the language of the Apocalypse conformed to the language of the inspired record of the Old Testament, to the cherished associations of the Jewish Christians, their theocratic origin, and the habits of thought current among Hebrews. Lastly, a similar difference in language, style, and even range of thought, in works of one and the same author, produced at different periods of his life, is by no means uncommon, and holds especially good of the very best authors.

We said above that the individuality of John is more strongly marked in the Gospel than in the Apocalypse. This is emphatically denied by Strauss, who strives hard to make him a violent, vindictive, bigoted zealot, and to show that some of the notices in the synoptical Gospels relating to the temperament of John have their counterpart in the Apocalypse; thus he sees in the vials of the wrath of God and the lake of fire of the latter the same spirit which animated the sons of Zebedee to ask the Lord whether they should command fire to come down from heaven to destroy a village of the Samaritans that refused to receive Jesus. On such accommodating principles of exegesis and such one-sided views there is no telling what may not be accomplished; we are therefore by no means surprised to hear Strauss assert that there was a bitter jealousy between Paul and John; that the former says *ironically* of the latter that he seemed to be one of the pillars of the church (Gal. ii. 9), while the latter (whom for convenience sake he now supposes to be the author of the Apocalypse, although he plainly disbelieves that also) is made to return the compliment by designating Paul and his followers as Nicolaitans and Balaamites, on the supposition that Paul is intended to be hit in the words "which say they are apostles, and are not" (Rev. ii. 2). With such an

exegesis it is not difficult to supply any portraiture ; but we need hardly enter upon a detailed examination of the data on which Strauss bases his portraiture of John, and may content ourselves with saying that in the Gospel and the Epistles of John we see his individuality come out in almost feminine receptivity (e.g. in his tender relation to the Saviour, who singled him out as the guardian and protector of Mary), blended with a masculine firmness and decision well comporting with the synoptical notices and the spirit of the Apocalypse. He was a whole-souled man who knew no middle course ; he was wholly for or against a thing ; his character may be described by the French phrase "*il est entier*," as Ebrard puts it in an interesting article on John, in Herzog's Real-Encycl. VI. p. 723 ; or be forcibly illustrated by the ancient hymn :

" Volat avis sine meta,
 Quo nec vates nec propheta,
 Evolavit altius.
 Tam implenda, quam impleta,
 Nunquam vidit tot secreta
 Purus homo purius." —

lines which Olshausen appropriately selected as the motto of his commentary on John.

Before we pass on, the resemblances of the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse may be briefly referred to in justification of the ground we have taken in animadverting upon the objections of Strauss. The three works exhibit :

1. Identity of doctrine, e.g. Christ is represented as the eternal Son, one with the Father, the Only Begotten ; as Light, Truth, and Life ; as the Spiritual Food of men (Rev. ii. 17) ; as the Logos, the Sole Revealer of the divine counsel (Rev. v. 5) ; as the Lamb of God, the future Judge of the world. They teach his atoning sacrifice ; the work of the Holy Spirit ; the ceaseless enmity of Satan, whose appearance in serpent form is recognized in all three (cf. Gen. iii. 1, etc., with John viii. 44 ; 1 John iii. 8 ; Rev. xii. 9).

2. Identity of temperament, as disclosing the profound,

ardent, all-absorbing, and pure love of John (cf. Rev. vii., xxi., xxii.).

3. Identity of language, statement, and diction. Compare, e.g. the terms *μαρτυρία* and *μαρτυρεῖν* in Rev. i. 2, 9; vi. 9; xi. 7; xii. 11, 17; xix. 10; xx. 4, with John xix. 35 and 1 John i. 1, etc. *ὕδωρ ζωῆς*, Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 17, and John vii. 38. *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Rev. xix. 13, and John i. 1; 1 John i. 1. The most remarkable agreement in point of language and subject-matter is the result of comparing John xix. 37 with Rev. i. 7. In quoting Zech. xii. 10 the evangelist has a striking deviation from the LXX.; and the author of the Apocalypse, citing the same passage, has the same deviation from the LXX., and a perfect agreement with the evangelist. These are only a few illustrations; many others may be found in Guerike, *Einleitung*, pp. 550, 551, and the works cited by him. This identity is the more valuable because it is purely incidental and undesigned, because the scope and form of the several works are as different as they can well be, and because there are obviously many differences of thought and language, which in their turn furnish a new argument for the authenticity of the respective writings.

We come now to the last objection of Strauss, founded on the alleged discrepancy in the account of Polycarp, the disciple of John, as to the proper time for the observance of the Passover and the notice in the Gospel. The Christians of Asia Minor were wont to celebrate the Lord's supper (the Christian paschal feast) on the fourteenth day of the month of Nisan, because they held that our Lord ate the paschal supper on the evening with which that day commenced. On the other hand, the bishop of Rome maintained that this day was not binding on Christians; that as it might fall on any day of the week, the eucharist ought not to be celebrated on that day, but on the following Sunday, as the day of the resurrection. This controversy came up for the first time in the year 1621, when Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, visited Anicetus, bishop of Rome. The former appealed to the circumstance that he had always observed it on that day with

John, the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles with whom he associated (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 24, 16). Strauss maintains that this declaration of Polycarp is in manifest conflict with the fourth Gospel, according to which Jesus did not partake of the paschal supper at all, but instituted the holy supper on the evening of the preceding day, that is, on the thirteenth day of the month of Nisan. In reply we have the authority of Maimonides and Appolinarius of Laodicea (Greswell, Diss. XLI. Vol. III. p. 170 seq.), that the proper beginning of any feast-day was reckoned from the night which preceded it. The fourteenth of Nisan, though not strictly considered a portion of the festival (cf. Joseph. Antiq. III. 10, 5) was popularly regarded as such, and from the putting away of leaven, which took place as soon as it commenced, and the cessation from servile labor (cf. Mishna, "Pasach," IV. 5) was usually spoken of as the "first day of unleavened bread" (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12. See Joseph., Antiq. II. 15, 1, who speaks of the festival as lasting *eight* days, and cf. Lightfoot in Marc. XIV. 12; Friedlieb. Archaeol. § 17, p. 42; Ellicott, Life of Christ, p. 291). On that evening, that is, the beginning, and not the end, of the fourteenth of Nisan, our Lord sat down to supper, and that supper (John xiii. 1) cannot be regarded as different from that referred to by the synoptists, whose language precludes the possibility of its being another than a paschal supper. The alleged discrepancy falls therefore to the ground. Our limits forbid the discussion of this difficult subject, but we refer the reader to the valuable notes in Ellicott (l.c. pp. 291-293) and the able article "Pascha," in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie.

The irrepressible Strauss, having spent almost all his ammunition, reserves for a parting salute sundry objections; e.g. that the evangelist refers twice to "the high priest of that year" (John xi. 49-51; xviii. 13), which statement could not mean anything else than that the incumbents of the high priest's office changed every year, whereas a Palestinian apostle ought to have known better, and recollected, in particular, that Caiaphas remained a number of years in

office. The inference of Strauss is by no means conclusive, for the words "of that year," τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, are emphatic, and equivalent to "of that memorable year, the year of the Redeemer's death," so that the specification of the person who filled that office was important; the evangelist simply referred to the prophetic character of the high priest, without the design of indicating the duration of his office. The disparaging remark of Strauss that the evangelist's obvious familiarity with the Old Testament does not necessarily imply his being a native of Palestine, or even a Jewish Christian, because the originally Jewish basis of the Christian churches and the important bearing of the Old Testament on the new faith might induce and enable Gentiles, e.g. men like Justin Martyr, to acquire such familiarity, amounts to nothing, for it is purely arbitrary, and a poor way of dealing with an important fact, which stubbornly resists the blows of the German destroyer. Equally insignificant and arbitrary is the remark that the apostle, of humble origin and originally a Galilean fisherman, could not have acquired in old age such an intimate acquaintance with Alexandrian and Philonic speculation as the author of the fourth Gospel manifestly possesses. From what we know of the receptivity of John's character, of his long residence in Asia Minor in the midst of theosophizing Jews and Jewish Christians, of Gentiles and Gentile Christians, of the complementary character of the fourth Gospel, of the deep and passionate love of the Redeemer, which glows in it, we should indeed be surprised at any other result than that which we possess in it, and, putting together all the varied objections, strictures, and criticisms, are at a loss to form even the remotest conception of the character of a Gospel which Strauss would require John to have furnished. We are satisfied that he himself does not know; for his vocation seems to be to destroy and not to build up. He revels in delight at the thought of having destroyed the foundations of our belief, and is utterly indifferent about everything else. He bids us fling aside the Gospels as ecclesiastical fabrications, and gives

us the consolations of his own creed — *credo nihil* — a nothing, a dream, a universal blank.¹

He now reaches the conclusion, — how logical the reader will be prepared to determine, — that, while the examination of external testimony yields the result that the first three Gospels show traces of their existence, although not in their present form, soon after the beginning of the second century, sufficiently plain to indicate that the rudiments of their subject-matter emanated from the country where the events recorded did take place, the fourth Gospel did not become known until the middle of that century, with plain marks that it did originate on foreign soil, under the influence of a philosophy unknown to the first followers of Jesus; so that, if in the former case, it is possible that in the interval of several generations lying between the events and their record in its present form, mythical and unhistoric elements did creep in, in the latter case the admixture of philosophical

¹ Let the reader judge from the following extract whether our opinion of Strauss and men of his stamp is not well founded. Lützelberger (*Die Kirchliche Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen*. Leipzig. 1840) says that his investigations have convinced him that it is a fixed and indisputable fact "that all our Gospels are merely the productions of the later theology in the Christian church, which represented the life of the Lord, as faith, the times, and circumstances brought it about"; that, indeed, "the whole so-called history of the kingdom of God is the product of theological imagination, and the events the result of the doctrines"; and that also "the main point" of Christianity is nothing but "a dream"; "*I mean the doctrine of Christ.*" Or hear the confessions of a former disciple of the Tübingen school (H. Merz, *die Jahrbücher der Gegenwart*, p. 16. Stuttgart, 1845): "I wanted with the one hand to seize Christ, reluctant to abandon Hegel with the other. But whence was to come a vitally strong historical portrait of the Saviour, after it had been for four years critically dissolved for us? Matthew, Mark, Luke: mythical poetry! John: didactic poetry! The Acts: a diplomatic record of Jewish and Gentile Christianity; the last two chapters spurious! Ephesians: spurious! Philippians: spurious! Colossians: spurious! Thessalonians: the second, at least, spurious! Timothy, Titus, and Philemon: all spurious! The Epistles of John: spurious, if the Apocalypse is genuine! The first and second Peter: spurious! Hebrews: spurious! Jude: spurious! Revelation of John: genuine — genuine Jewish; genuine Ebionite; genuine unevangelical! This was our biblical theological school-satchel which we carried away from Tübingen; this was the food for heart and spirit which we received in the hospitable house of speculative criticism."

construction and conscious fiction becomes highly probable (Leben Jesu, p. 79).

The conclusion we reach after an examination of the external evidences for the authenticity and genuineness of the canonical Gospels is, of course, diametrically opposed to that of Strauss, and will be given in a synoptical form after one or two opinions on the fourth Gospel, which fully corroborate the position we occupy. They relate rather to internal than external evidence; but as Strauss, as we have seen, constantly trenches upon the former, we need hardly apologize for their production. "Were we wholly ignorant concerning the author of the fourth Gospel and without a single external testimony, the whole impression it produces upon us, — the deep, ardent love to the Redeemer, carried by a holy enthusiasm and disclosed in every word; the fulness of the Holy Spirit which that Gospel exhibits; the fidelity which conforms even the minutest traits to the whole portrait of Christ, — all would constrain us to conclude that this Gospel could only have been written by an eye-witness of the glory of the only begotten Son, by a disciple familiar with and near to the events of his life, by the disciple, in short, who did lean on the bosom of the Lord" (Krabbe, Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu). And once more: "Had we remained without any historical notices concerning the author of the fourth Gospel, internal grounds, such as the nature of its language; the freshness and vivacity of its narrative; the accuracy and precision of its statements; the peculiar manner in which John the Baptist and the sons of Zebedee are referred to; the enthusiastic love and whole-souled attachment which the author evinces for Jesus; the irresistible charm which is shed over the whole, ideally-conceived, evangelical history; the philosophical contemplations at the beginning of the Gospel — would yield the result that the author of such a Gospel could only have been a native of Palestine, an immediate eye-witness, an apostle, a favorite of Jesus; only that John whom Jesus held bound to himself by the whole heavenly charm of his doctrine; that John who did

lean on the bosom of Jesus, stood by the cross of Jesus, and whose later abode in a city like Ephesus proves that philosophical speculation not only attracted him, but that he also understood how to keep his ground among philosophically educated Greeks”¹ (Credner, Einl. p. 208). The author of the last extract is far from what we should call orthodox; he is, in fact, noted for arbitrariness and scepticism; but on that account his opinion is all the more valuable.

We now proceed to a synoptical review of the external evidence in favor of the genuineness and authenticity of the four canonical Gospels; adopting the order pursued by Tischendorf in his able and timely pamphlet (*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* Leipzig. 1865). With him, then, we start with the indisputable fact that our four Gospels were known and received in every part of the church during the last decades of the second century; according to the concurrent testimony of Irenaeus at Lyons (last decades of second century), Tertullian at Carthage (last decade of second century), Clement of Alexandria about the end of that century, and the probably Roman author of the so-called Muratorian Canon, about 170.¹ To the same period the Syriac version known as the Peschito takes us, although the date of its origin cannot be verified by positive proof; the Itala, however, the oldest Latin version may be proved to belong to even an earlier date; for the translator of Irenaeus (about the close of the second century) and Tertullian (in the last decade of that century) follow one and the same text, so that it must have had considerable authority at that time and consequently have been several decades old (l. c. p. 7).

We learn that Theophilus, bishop of Antioch in Syria, and Tatian (who flourished about 170) wrote harmonies on the Gospels. Jerome designates the work of the former as a joining together of the sayings of the four evangelists into one work, and seems to refer also to a commentary, which, however, was either identical with, or part of one and the

¹ This date is derived from the author's reference to the episcopate of Pius (about 142-157) in the words *temporibus nostris* and *nuperrime*.

same work.¹ One of his works, still extant, "Ad Autolyceum" contains citations from Matthew, Luke, and John. For the notices of Tatian's work we are chiefly indebted to Eusebius² and Theodoret,³ the latter of whom was personally acquainted with it. Tatian, like Theophilus, seems to have made a harmony of the Gospels, which he called by the significant name Diatessaron, "the gospel formed of four"; although his heretical notions may have led him to take unwarranted liberties with the text in that work (see Eusebius, as cited below), his apology (*λόγος πρὸς Ἑλληνας*), which has come down to us, has unmistakable references to the Gospel of John. The two lost works, however, are more important by far than simple quotations, for both having the design of producing the evangelical history in the form of a harmonious whole, the inference is inevitable, that the works themselves fall into a period when the four Gospels were already considered to constitute a finished whole, and that if the date of both works cannot be put much later than the middle of the second century, the use and reception of all four Gospels had been decided long before (Tischdf. p. 11).

Without laying stress on the citations from the synoptists in the work of Athenagoras of Athens (A.D. 177) and the language of his contemporary, Dionysius of Corinth (A.D. 170), who designates the writings of the New Testament as "the sacred writings of the Lord" (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 23), or the evangelical references of two apostolical Fathers, Polycarp and Ignatius, the unquestionable reference in Polycarp's Epistle (ad Phil. c. 7) to 1 John iv. 3 is of great importance, because it is an indirect testimony as early as the second decade of the second century (the Epistle having been written soon after the death of Ignatius, A.D. 115) for the existence of the fourth Gospel, as the Gospel and the Epistle must have the same author.

¹ Jerome, Ep. 151, ad Algas, 9. 5. Theophilus qui quatuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens ingenii sui nobis monumenta reliquit, haec super hac parabola in suis commentariis locutus est.

² Hist. Eccl. IV. 29.

³ Theodor. Haeret. fab., I. 20.

The testimony of Justin Martyr, however, is most valuable. His second apology (A.D. 161) has comparatively few references to the evangelical writings, but the first (A.D. 138) and his dialogue, lying about midway between the apologies, abound in citations from and allusions and references to the synoptists and also to John, which, as well as the general term by which he is wont to designate the Gospels (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*), render it highly probable that their canonical authority was fully established in his time.

Passing on to heretical testimony, we have the significant statement of Irenæus (in the second half of the second century) that "the Gospels are so firmly established that even the heretics are witnesses for them and that every one starts from them in order to establish his doctrine" (adv. Haer. III. 11, 7 "Tanta est autem circa evangelia haec firmitas, ut et ipsi haeretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsi egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam"). We know from Irenæus that the Valentiniæans freely used John's Gospel (adv. Haer. III. 11, 7), and that they derived the doctrine of their first Ogdoad from the first chapter of this Gospel (adv. Haer. I. 8, 5); and Hippolytus gives us Johannæan sayings of the Lord as used by Valentinus (VI. 35, "He [Valentinus] says, the Saviour says: 'All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers,'" John x. 8). But the Valentiniæan system affords equal evidence for the synoptical Gospels; e.g. Valentinus saw his demiurgus¹ in the centurion of Capernaum (Matt. viii. 9; Luke vii. 8), made the dead and resuscitated daughter of Jairus (Luke viii. 41) the symbol of his Achamoth,² applied the words of Jesus (Matt. v. 18) to his ten aeons as represented by the numerical value of the Iota,³ and turned the case of the woman diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, and healed by our Lord, into a figurative representation of the sufferings and deliverance of the twelfth æon.⁴ Surely this marvellously fantastic transformation of the simple words of the Gospel affords a

¹ Iren. adv. Haer., I. 7, 4.

² Iren. adv. Haer., I. 8, 2.

³ Iren. adv. Haer., I. 3, 2.

⁴ Iren. adv. Haer., I. 3, 3.

striking proof of their canonical authority as early as the first decades of the second century (Tischendorf, p. 22).

Ptolemaeus, in his Epistle to Flora, preserved by Epiphanius, has several citations from Matthew and one from John, and Heracleon actually wrote a commentary on the latter, a fact which proves not only the indubitable authority of that Gospel about the middle of the second century, but confirms also the statement of Irenaeus, that the Valentinian system was dependent on John's Gospel. (Epiphanius [Haer. 41] makes Cerdo, who, according to Irenaeus [III. 4, 3], was with Valentinus at Rome during the episcopate of Hyginus, the successor of Heracleon.)

Hippolytus shows as much for the first half of the second century, since the Naassenes and the Peratai, two of the most ancient Ophite sects, were wont to incorporate passages from the Gospels with their doctrines; he produces, in the case of the former, citations from Matt. vii. 13, 14, and from John i. 3, 4; iv. 21 seq.; iv. 10 (Philosophum., V. 6, 8, 9), and in that of the latter, John iii. 14; i. 1-4; iii. 17; viii. 44 (Philosophum., V. 12, 16, 17).

The dependence of the Montanists for the idea of their paraclete on John is highly probable, more especially since the Alogi, their opponents, rejected his Gospel, and ascribed it, as well as the Apocalypse, to Cerinthus, the heretical contemporary of John. This latter circumstance is certainly a very strong argument for the great antiquity of the Johannean Gospel.

Basilides, who lived in the reign of Hadrian, but whose commentary in twenty-four books on the Gospel can not be proved to have related exclusively to our Gospels, has verbal citations from John and Luke (Philosophum., VII. 22, 27, where John i. 9; ii. 4 are undeniably used, and Philosophum., VII. 26, where Luke iv. 35 is applied), and refers to Matthew's account of the star of the wise men (Philosophum., VII. 22).

Marcion, as we learn from Tertullian, originally acknowledged all our Gospels, and only afterwards presumed to change and amend them (Tertull. adv. Marc. IV. 3; de carne Christi, 2).

Celsus wrote his book against Christianity about the middle of the second century. We are indebted to Origen, who answered it, for many passages from his work which show that the substance of his assaults was chiefly drawn from our Gospels. He seems to refer to the four Gospels in his strictures on the presence of angels at the resurrection, saying that according to some two angels were present, according to others only one. Origen understood the first of Luke and John, the second of Matthew and Mark. He made a similar use of other accounts in the Gospels; e.g. he cites and criticises, after his manner, the narrative of the worshipping magi, whom he calls Chaldeans (I. 58), the flight of Jesus to Egypt (I. 66), the appearance of the dove at the baptism of Jesus (I. 40), his miraculous birth (I. 40), our Lord's charge to the disciples in Matt. x. 23 (I. 65), the agony in the garden (II. 24), the Saviour's thirst on the cross (II. 37), the words of Jesus, that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, etc., in which he pretends to recognize a garbled Platonic saying (VI. 16), and many other passages. He refers to John by saying that Jesus had been asked by the Jews to work a miracle in the temple (I. 67), he finds fault with Jesus being called the Logos (II. 31), and mocks at the flowing of blood from the side of Jesus (II. 36), etc.

That Celsus did not quote from oral tradition, but from the evangelical writings we know from himself, for he says (Origen, 2, 74): "And all this we have taken from your own writings; we want no other testimony, for you fall on your own sword"; and plainly intimates that, although he had other sources of information, he discriminated between them and the writings of the disciples of Jesus, in the words (Origen, cont. Cels. 2, 13): "I might adduce many things that have been written of Jesus according to truth, but very different from the writings of the disciples of Jesus; but I will let this alone" (See Tischendorf, l. c. p. 28).

The preceding testimony of the early Fathers, heretics, and an acknowledged enemy of Christianity yields the result that the synoptical Gospels, as well as that of John, were used and recognized as authentic as far back as A.D. 125.

The argument for the still higher antiquity of the four Gospels drawn from the early existence of the apocryphal Protevangelium Jacobi (*Διήγησις καὶ ἱστορία, πῶς ἐγεννήθη ἡ ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκος εἰς ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν* is its complete title), the Acta Pilati (the first part of the so-called Evangelium Nicodemi), and the more heretical Evangelium Thomae has been developed with great skill by Tischendorf (l. c. pp. 29-41), with the general result that the first two of these apocryphal works must have been composed during the first decades of the second century, that they are substantially identical with the writings, known by those names, which are still extant, and that the evident reference of the former to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, brings the date of their composition down to the last decades of the first century, while the equally manifest dependence of the latter on the Gospel of John lays the date of that Gospel in the last years of that century.

This result is reached by the following considerations: Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Tryphon, and in his first Apology (A.D. 138), furnishes several notices relating to the birth of Jesus which agree only with the Protevangelium Jacobi, and not with the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The hypothesis that Justin may have drawn his information from another source, e.g. the lost gnostic work, *γέννα μαρίας*, and the Evangelium Petri, is purely arbitrary and untenable, while the whole tendency of the Protevangelium indicates the prior existence of the canonical Gospels; and if the date of the Protevangelium seems to fall in the first decades of the second century, the gospels of Matthew and Luke, to which its references are limited, cannot have been composed later than during the last decades of the first century.

The same Justin refers twice in his first Apology (A.D. 138) to the Acta Pilati, for the confirmation of the various incidents of the crucifixion and the predicted miraculous cures of Jesus (see Apol. I. 35 and 48). In the former passage Justin cites Isa. lxx. 2, lviii. 2, and Ps. xxi. 16, 18, affirming the fulfilment of those prophecies, and concluding thus: "And that

this did happen, you may see from the acts written under Pontius Pilate"; in the latter he cites Isa. xxxv, 4-6, and concludes: "And that Jesus did this, you may see from the Acts written under Pontius Pilate." A similar, but still more explicit reference to the Acts of Pilate, may be seen in Tertullian's *Apologeticus*, 21. Tischendorf, who has diligently compared the ancient MSS., and given us the result of his collations and investigations in his text of the *Evangelia Apocrypha*, reaches the conclusion that our present *Acta Pilati* are in the main identical with the work used by Justin and Tertullian, and as the work itself is manifestly dependent in its account of the judicial proceedings on the Gospel of John, and in that of the crucifixion and resurrection on the synoptical Gospels, and as that work was cited by Justin as early as A.D. 138 in a manner showing that it was considered authoritative in his time, the date of its composition must belong to the beginning of the second century, and is of the utmost importance with respect to the date of the canonical Gospels, and especially of that of John, which must have been written before the beginning of that century (cf. Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, Prolegg. p. liv sq.).

The *Evangelium Thomae*, in use among the Marcossians and Naassenes (as testified by Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I. 20, and Hippolytus, *Philosophum.*, p. 101, coll. p. 94), originated about the middle of the second century. Although we know it only from fragments which have come down to us, and more or less deviate from one another, yet their contents constitute an important testimony for the genuineness and early antiquity of our Gospels, for they show plainly that the book was designed to fill up the gap in the early life of our Lord which exists in the four canonical Gospels, and that the evangelical canon of that age was such as to encourage historical invention in that direction.

Another testimony in favor of the canonical Gospels is the general character of the aforesaid apocryphal writings, which Tischendorf (l. c. p. 40) puts thus: "The great contrast of the latter to the former, in form and substance, in language

and thought, in conception and treatment, bears testimony for the holy origin of our canonical Gospels, compared with which the apocryphal writings appear like the last, limping followers (of an army)."

The recent discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus by Tischendorf furnishes additional and incidental testimony for the existence of the evangelical canon at the beginning of the second century. That famous and most ancient manuscript on parchment extant, contains the entire Greek text of the Epistle of Barnabas, the first five chapters of which were, until that discovery took place, only known from an old Latin Codex. In that Latin text, occurs the following passage at the end of chap. iv: "Adtendamus ergo ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati, pauci electi inveniamur." The words *sicut scriptum est* were regarded as the interpolation of a Latin translator, but the original Greek text in the Codex Sinaiticus has the passage from Matthew with the introductory words, "as it is written"; and this vindication of the Latin text of an Epistle which cannot have been composed later than the beginning of the second century, yields the important result that its author cited the first canonical Gospel as *scripture*, for this formula was used to distinguish holy writ from other writings (cf. Matt. iv. 1, etc., Luke iv. 1, etc.), and that consequently at that early date the Gospel of Matthew had canonical authority.

The absurd re-assertion of the long since discarded notion that the passage from Matthew, "multi vocati, pauci electi," in the Epistle of Barnabas is a citation from the fourth book of Ezra, viii. 3, which reads, according to the Latin and Ethiopic texts, "nam multi creati (Eth. adds *in eo* [i.e. *mundo*]), pauci autem salvabuntur," carries its refutation on the face, and requires the inventive faculty, or "faith," of a Strauss, to be seriously entertained.

Tischendorf (l. c. pp. 46-50) very justly maintains that this direct, canonical authentication of Matthew's Gospel really involves that of the other Gospels. The circumstance that during the first three quarters of the second century

the balance of testimony seems occasionally to favor Matthew or John or Luke, or two of them together, does not prove that at the same time the one was authenticated and the other not authenticated. The comparatively scanty monuments of the literature of that period which have come down to us, and the characteristics of the several Gospels which made Mark incomparably better adapted for purposes of citation than Matthew, conduce to the probability that they render mutual testimony each to the rest. This probability is increased by the early references to the Gospels as one harmonious whole, without any specification of the authors of the respective Gospels, as well by Justin Martyr's allusion to Tertullian's distinction of the evangelists, according to which some were the disciples of the Lord and others companions of the apostles. In this way only can we account for the existence of harmonies of the four Gospels soon after the middle of the second century, and understand the symbolical argumentation of Irenaeus, why there were just four Gospels, neither less nor more. The absence of all controversy on the evangelical canon in the second century, moreover, is a significant fact, taken in connection with its universal reception at the close of that century.

The question of the canonicity of our four Gospels must have been settled at the beginning of the second century. During the fearful struggles and commotions of the infant church, at the time of her rapid extension, the church canonized the Gospels and other apostolical monuments from the hands of Paul, John, and Peter, not, however, in a formal manner by resolutions or decrees, but in the simple order of nature. The notices of the life of Christ from the pen of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John would be eagerly received as authentic records, and regarded as precious legacies left to the church. Luke sent both his works to Theophilus, and his circulation of them surely would not excite doubts of their genuineness in the minds of those who received them from him. The same holds good of the Epistles of Paul, the first of John, and the first of Peter. If John composed his Gospel

in Asia Minor, would those churches to which he ministered and gave his Gospel, which were the immediate sureties of its genuineness to all the rest, entertain any doubts of its genuineness? There is no valid reason to question the correctness of the account of the origin of John's Gospel which Eusebius gives us on the authority of ancient notices (Hist. Eccl. III. 24); viz. that when John saw the first three Gospels, which had been distributed among all, he testified to their truth, but missed the history of the beginning of Christ's ministry; and being urged to supply the deficiency, acceded to the request of his friends.

“The four Gospels and the other monuments of the apostolical age must have been extant during the last decades of the first century. Their authority was immediately vouched for by the names of their authors, and the apostolical churches in their turn were sureties for them. With the death of the authors their writings became still more sacred and precious, and, after the emancipation of the church from the synagogue, were necessarily regarded worthy to complete and enlarge the canon of the Old Testament. Warranted as this supposition is *per se*, it could not be confidently asserted if it were not confirmed by multiform considerations belonging to the history of the canon of the second century” (Tischendorf, l. c. p. 50).

The testimony of Papias, which Tischendorf omitted in its proper historical place, and on account of its vagueness considers separately, with results similar to those given above, need not be repeated here; we enter, therefore, the domain of the textual criticism of the New Testament, where the opinion of no living author is entitled to greater respect than that of Tischendorf, to whose indefatigable labors we are indebted for a species of evidence for the genuineness of the New Testament canon which can hardly be said to be generally known to scholars, and still less to those who depend for their information on their public teachers. It is to be hoped that the evidence of textual criticism, so happy in the results it has already produced, may speedily occupy

a prominent position in the lectures of professors of Christian evidences in our colleges and seminaries. These results are as follows; there is no doubt that the earliest Latin version of the Gospels was made soon after the middle of the second century, for the Latin translator of Irenaeus (just before the close of that century) and Tertullian (during the last decade of that century) wrote in undeniable dependence on that text. That earliest version,¹ at least in its main features, is still extant;² “for our oldest documents for that text emanating from North Africa, the home of Tertullian, receive for many of their readings the confirmation of two ancient witnesses (Irenaeus and Tertullian), so that even those sections of the text which are not found in their writings, must be supposed to agree with, or at least come very near to, that oldest redaction. But the discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus carries us much further, for the Sinaitic text, which competent scholars on paleographical grounds pronounce to have been written in the middle of the third century, exhibits so striking an affinity with the oldest Latin version, that it must be considered to be in essential agreement with that text from which the first Latin translator, the originator of the so-called Itala, made his translation; and that this text was not of an isolated character is evident from the agreement with it of the recently discovered most ancient Syriac text of the Nitrian MS. of the beginning of the fifth century, of Origen, and others of the earliest Fathers. This Syriac text is analogous with the Itala in the twofold proof to be noticed forthwith, for the most

¹ It had to pass through many stages. Revised by different hands in the third and fourth centuries with reference to the Greek text, Jerome, towards the close of the fourth century, made it the basis of his text, with diligent comparison of the most authentic codices of the old Latin version and those Greek codices on which that ancient Latin version was based. This version of Jerome gradually became the Romish Vulgate, whose text had, again, experienced many modifications and corruptions, when it was finally set forth as the only authorized version of the church of Rome, by Clement VIII., A. D. 1592.

² Tischendorf's *Evangelium Palatinum*, Lipsiae, 1847, edited from a MSS. of the fourth or fifth century; also *Codex Graeco-Latin. D.*

recent investigations place it beyond all doubt that the Peschito version, commonly said to belong to the close of the second century, presupposes the existence of the Nitrian text, so that this latter must have originated about the middle of the second century" (Tischendorf, l. c. pp. 63, 64).

We have, therefore, the important fact that about the middle of the second century the four Gospels were translated into Syriac and Latin. These translations, however, prove more than the harmonistic works of Tatian and Theophilus on the Gospel (of about the same period), viz. that the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, as well as those of Luke and John, were at that time extant in the forms in which they are known to us now. The hypothesis that insulated citations of the earliest period seem to have been taken from the *Evangelium Secundum Hebraeos*, and not from Matthew, and that the third Gospel continued at that time in the supposed original form, to which the modern interpretation of the testimony of Papias has given rise, is completely set aside by the oldest Latin text of these Gospels, at least as far as the middle of the second century is concerned; nor is there left room for the supposition that the Latin text had then only been recently made by an unknown hand from earlier materials different in form, and that their disfigured recensions were unskilfully considered by the Latin church as the originals, for in this respect the Nitrian Syriac text supports the Itala, except that its Gospel of Mark has been lost with the exception of the last four verses. Cureton, who discovered and edited the Nitrian text, supposed that the Gospel of Matthew in that text "was built upon the original Aramaic text" (Preface to Syriac Gospels, p. iii); but his supposition is contradicted by the agreement of the Syriac text of Matthew with the most ancient Greek and Latin documents. But we have still a far more important result of textual criticism, which in the opinion of Tischendorf affords evidence that all our Gospels have to be brought down to the beginning of the second, if not to the end of the first, century.

“For while on the one hand the text of the Sinaitic MSS., as well as the oldest Itala text, belong to the use of the second century, it is on the other hand by no means difficult to prove that the same text—its superiority over other documents notwithstanding—has in many respects departed from original purity, and presupposes an entire text-history. Here we are not exclusively limited to the Codex Sinaiticus, this or that MS. of the Itala, with Irenaeus and Tertullian, but we may include all those text-vouchers which in part are necessarily, and in part most probably, to be traced back to the second century, and reach the result of the undeniable fact that a rich text-history lies already back of it. We mean to say that even before the second half of the second century, when repeated copies of our Gospels were made, not only many mistakes of transcribers took place, but that sometimes also the expression and sense of single passages were changed, and sometimes greater or smaller additions from apocryphal or oral sources were made, not excluding even those changes which testify in particular for the early collection of our Gospels into a canon and originated in the collocation of single parallel passages. If this is really the case, if an important stage of the text-history of our four Gospels lies really before the middle of the second century, before the time when canonical authority and the more firmly established ecclesiastical order cast up an ever-growing dam against arbitrary modifications of the sacred text (and we engage to furnish elsewhere full proofs on his head), we have to claim at least half a century for this history. Are we therefore not constrained to fix the beginning, for we dare not say the origin, of the evangelical canon at the end of the first century? and does not this result grow more certain from the fact that all the historical factors of the second century, which we have produced without holding anything back, have been formed to agree with it” (Tischendorf, l. c. pp. 66, 67)?

We have now fulfilled our promise, and given the result of our investigation of this most important, most interesting,

and very difficult subject. This result cannot be considered in any other light than that of a triumphant vindication of the genuineness, authenticity, and canonicity of the evangelical writings. We have followed Strauss step by step through his labyrinthine wanderings; we have given him a fair and patient hearing, and endeavored to meet his objections, strictures, sophistries, and perversions with calmness, to expose their fallacy and, we are sorry to say, not unfrequently their dishonesty, by an appeal to the very record which in his judgment is fatal to the genuineness of our Gospels. How far we have been successful the reader must determine from the *pros* and *cons* as they lie before him. We have also given a synopsis of the whole evidence in the order of Tischendorf, and carried, we hope, conviction to the minds of our readers that the boasted impregnable fortress of Strauss cannot hold out against the truth; that on the testimony of the early Fathers, on the testimony of heretics, on the testimony of Jewish and Pagan enemies of Christianity, and lastly on the testimony of textual criticism, the four canonical Gospels are the genuine products of the evangelists whose names they bear; and that the chain of evidence for their genuineness, consisting of so many and apparently incongruous links, is nothing short of wonderful, and affords a striking illustration of the manner in which God's never-failing providence overrules evil for good, and makes all things work together for good to them that love him.