

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

THE END OF LUKE'S GOSPEL AND THE BEGINNING OF THE ACTS. TWO STUDIES.

BY THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D., LATELY PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE.

I.

At the close of his Gospel, Luke, or whoever may be the author of the Gospel called by his name, subjoins immediately to the account of the risen Christ's visit to the eleven, on the evening of the resurrection day, the narrative of the ascension. In doing this he gives no notice to the reader that any interval of time passed between the two events longer than that between early morning and early evening. At the beginning of the second narrative, however, we find him declaring that the ascension took place forty days after the resurrection, and that there were repeated interviews between Jesus and the apostles in this period of time. If Luke had not written a second book, no other explanation (of the end of the Gospel) could have been admitted, save that he conceived of the ascension as taking place on the same day with the resurrection. But the first book has been almost uniformly interpreted by the second. There has been a general agreement that Luke threw together in a summary way, at the close of his first narrative, the last events which he had intended to include in it, without pointing out their distance from one another, — without that historical perspective, in short, which we should expect from a practised

VOL. XXXIX. No. 156.—OCTOBER, 1882. 75



historian. Perhaps he designed to be more full when he should continue his narrative of the events subsequent to the departure of Christ from the presence of his disciples. This continuation, or second book, he may have already projected, and meanwhile Theophilus, an 'instructed' Christian, had already so much knowledge of the great facts of the life of Christ that a brief notice was all that was here demanded. The ascension pointed in two directions,—towards the life on earth thus glorified at its close, and towards the kingdom of heaven, begun by apostolic labors and by the presence of the Holy Spirit, for which Christ's going away was essential.

Very little difficulty has been found by most of the commentators in attempting to reconcile the two narratives. Thus, Euthymius Zigabenus, in commenting on Luke xxiv. 50, simply says: "He [Jesus] led them out not then, but on the fortieth day after the resurrection. For the evangelist passed over (*παρέδραμεν*) the intermediate events." And it is enough to refer to Ellicott's lectures on the life of Christ as expressing the current modern opinion on this point.

Meyer, however, a careful, able, honest, and Christian scholar,—one who changed many of his opinions between the publication of the first editions of his commentaries and his death,—took quite another view of the relation between the end of Luke and the beginning of Acts—a view which he continued to take as long as he lived. There was a two-fold tradition, he thought; one of them to the effect that Jesus ascended to heaven on the very day of the resurrection (Luke xxiv.; Mark xvi.); the other, that he remained on earth quite a number of days (Matt.; John), or, more definitely, forty days (Acts i.): "Luke in the Gospel followed the first tradition, but in the history of the apostles the second; which, therefore, he first became acquainted with after composing his Gospel, or, what is more probable, then first made his own."

We might say here that the first Gospel makes no mention at all of the ascension; and the same is true of the fourth,

as far as direct historical statement is concerned, although the ascension is referred to more than once. And again, the end of Mark seems to be founded chiefly on Luke, and has in itself, we must believe, no independent authority. Now, as there is no evidence from any other source except the Gospel of Luke of an ascension in the evening of the day of the resurrection, the most that can be said is that Luke supposed when he wrote his Gospel that the ascension followed the resurrection by a few hours, but that afterwards, when he wrote the Acts, he discovered his mistake, or that he now believed and "made his own" what he had doubted before.

1. Our first inquiry will be: Can this be by any possibility admitted, if we admit also (what Meyer decidedly admits) that the Gospel of Luke and the Acts belong to the same author, which may be held to be as well established by Zeller, Lekebusch, and others as the authorship of any books of the New Testament, unless some of Paul's Epistles be excepted? We also assume that the person called Luke, and spoken of in the Acts and in some of the Epistles as Paul's companion, was, as Meyer believes, the author of the two books mentioned. We further assume that the Gospel of Luke, as Meyer holds, was composed between the seventieth and the eightieth year of our era. This, however, is not necessary to our argument; for if we put it later, as the Tübingen school have tried to do, the probability of two traditions in respect to the time of the ascension becomes less and less.

This companion of Paul, whom we will call Luke, and who, as nearly everybody holds, in his narrative of events in the life of Paul where he uses the pronoun "we" borrows from no other person's journal, records his own companionship with the great apostle, first, in Acts xvi., then again in Acts xxvii. He goes with the apostle from Philippi on his last journey to Jerusalem, is with him at Caesarea, and went with him to Rome. He was with him when the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written, and

only Luke was at his side when the second letter to Timothy (which I hold to be genuine) was penned, probably near the close of the apostle's life. Thus his attendance on the apostle must have included portions of the time between the years 52 and 62 A.D.; and if the letter to the Colossians belongs to a later period, his intimate acquaintance with the apostle must have begun before the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written, and have continued through several years afterwards. That in those years of close intimacy with Paul Luke had never heard of Christ's spending a number of days on earth after his resurrection, while yet the apostle taught the Corinthians the story of Christ in this shape, seems to be entirely incredible. For it is manifest that the presence of Christ among the twelve on the evening of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 5) was that recorded by Luke as then taking place; and the manifestation of Christ to the five hundred brethren, to James, and to all the apostles were all subsequent to this. How, then, could Luke fail to know of these events of such importance, which Paul knew of, and believed to have taken place after the resurrection evening? And how could Luke have failed to find accounts of these subsequent events in the narratives to which he refers in the prologue to his Gospel?

Considering, then, that the author of Luke's Gospel was one and the same person with the author of the Acts, that he was acquainted with the ascension when he wrote his Gospel, and must have known long before what Paul taught and received, in the many years of his familiar intercourse with the apostle, we can accept of no other explanation save that which looks on the end of chap. xxiv., probably from vs. 44 onward, as containing a summary of occurrences which, if historical exactness had been followed, were separated from the resurrection by a considerable interval of time.

2. We may draw from the narrative in Luke xxiv. 13-35 a subsidiary argument which makes it probable that Luke himself would have regarded the resurrection day as too short for including the ascension also. Here we are directly

concerned, not with the true state of the case, but with what would naturally be the impressions of the evangelist. The two disciples who went on that day to Emmaus, distant sixty stadia from Jerusalem,—or somewhat over seven English miles,—reached their destination at a time which is described in the words, “It is towards evening, and the day is far spent.” The description of the time may be, we allow, incorrectly translated in the Authorized Version, and in the recently published revision which follows it. *Ἐσπέρα*, Luke’s word for evening, like *ὄψια*, which is alone used by the other evangelists, has a meaning not exactly corresponding with our evening. Both words may include a part of the afternoon; and here *πρός* implies that *ἔσπερα* was not yet reached. It was not the time denoted in the words *inumbante vespera* of Tacitus (Hist. iii. 19), nor the *δειλη ἔσπερα* of the Greeks, especially of the later writers (e.g. Appian, Hispan. § 114), *the later evening*, but an earlier part of the day. So while *ὄψια* in Matt. xxvii. 57 was considerably later than the ninth hour, it was in Matt. xiv. 15 early enough for the feeding of the multitude before night-fall. And yet in the same chapter it is used to denote a time not long before dark. And again, Luke, in ix. 12, uses the expression *ἡ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν* of a time early in the afternoon, after which the feeding of the five thousand took place. In the present case, it was late enough for the disciples to use the time as a reason why the stranger should stay with them, that is, to stay over night. Let us now suppose that the walk to Emmaus was commenced before midday, and required three hours nearly for its completion, as the interesting discourse would naturally make the progress somewhat slow, and that an hour or an hour and a half was consumed in the preparations for the meal and at the table. Thus the return of the disciples cannot begin till after three, or about half-past three o’clock. The return,—naturally at a quicker pace than that of the morning’s walk,—might be accomplished by half-past five or a little later. Then the interview of the risen Lord, and the walk of a mile and three

quarters to Bethany or Olivet, with the moments spent there until the ascension, would bring that event to a time quite too late, in the early part of April, to be fully discernible.

We do not, of course, mean to say that Luke made such calculations as these, and sifted with such minuteness every part of the history he was writing; but it is fair to argue that the compression of the events into the small space of time allowed to them ought to have been felt by the evangelist to be a crowding of events together which needed an explanation. Supposing the resurrection and the ascension to be myths, it would be easy to say that their relations to one another might be loosely adjusted; but if they were real events, no such difference of traditions as Meyer conceives of seems to be possible. And here we can appeal to John xx. 19-23, as containing the narrative of the same scene which Luke records (xxiv. 36), and as harmonizing with it substantially in regard to time. Only the time of day which we have assigned to the narrative in Luke, in order to give all fair weight to the possibility of the ascension taking place that same evening, would need to be brought down somewhat later in the evening.

3. We cannot reconcile the beginning of the Acts, on Meyer's view, with what one would expect from a conscientious man. If Luke had become convinced, after finishing his Gospel, that he had misstated a very important portion of the history of the Lord, he would have corrected the unintentional errors to which he had in his Gospel given currency. Instead of doing this, he refers to his Gospel in a way that puts a stamp of truth on it, and he seems unconscious of having said anything which he would now retract. The former narrative contained, he says, an account of the works and words of Jesus until the day when, after giving charges to his apostles, he was taken up into heaven; and then comes in a statement of what he did, and how long he stayed on the earth in a visible form. If verse 3 is intended as an alteration of his earlier book, it is inserted, we must believe, in an underhand way. He identifies the two accounts, and makes no explanations. He ought certainly to have

omitted, in that case, the words ἀκριβῶς and τὴν ἀσφάλειαν in his prologue, or have altered the end of the last chapter of his Gospel.

4. The considerations thus far advanced are confirmed by a peculiarity of Luke's composition, which appears chiefly in the Acts, where as a writer he was freer and more independent than in the structure of his Gospel. This peculiarity appears when he makes mention of the same event more than once, and may be described as the introduction of new particulars into the second or repeated narrative. The comparison of examples of this peculiarity will lead us to conclude that he did this purposely. The cause lay not in his forgetting particulars at the first mention of an occurrence and supplying the defect afterward, nor in following two manuscript authorities. It may be accounted for by his taste for lively narration, or by a desire to make mention of things at a place where they are especially needed. In support of this last explanation it may be alleged that in nearly all the cases the second mention (or the third, in one instance) is found in speeches coming directly from the principal person in the history. But we by no means assign any great weight to these suggestions, and are content to set forth the facts as they are.

Another less obvious peculiarity of Luke is a tendency to summarize, where many writers would have expressed something at greater length that they might avoid a certain incorrectness of expression. The most noticeable example of this is found in Acts xiii. 29: "And when they [see vs. 27] had fulfilled all things that were written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a tomb." Here the several actors who caused the death of Christ are grouped together [see vs. 28] with Joseph of Arimathaea, who actually took him down from the tree and laid him in the tomb. A person unacquainted with the narratives of the Gospels would think that they who procured Christ's condemnation buried him also; but Luke did not think so. Joseph was waiting for the kingdom of God, and had not

concurrent with Christ's enemies; (see Luke xxiii. 50-53, where *καθελών* and *ἔθηκεν* are the words used in Acts, only that they are in the singular in the Gospel.)

Another example, which no one could misunderstand, is found in Luke i. 80, "and the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel." Here the child was, without question, not in the deserts from his infancy upward, but the three predicates are joined together, for brevity's sake, by one subject, τὸ *παιδίον*.

But to return to the more important peculiarity of Luke which we noticed just above: the first example of it we draw from chapters x. and xi. of the Acts. In chapter x. certain Christian brethren accompany Peter to Caesarea, and the narrative consists of a simple statement of facts, together with the speech of Peter touching the leading points of the gospel. In xi. 12, "certain brethren" are spoken of as "these six brethren," who went to Jerusalem with the apostle, no doubt, to corroborate his words spoken in his own defence. But of more importance is the new matter in xi. 16, where we first learn that Peter's prejudices against baptizing Cornelius gave way on the recollection of the Lord's words (Acts i. 5) respecting the baptism with the Holy Spirit.

Another instance of this peculiarity is found in the three-fold narrative of the conversion of Paul. Two of these are given to us as coming in public addresses from the apostle himself. Both of them Luke might well have heard; since he went to Jerusalem with the apostle, where one of them was spoken, and may have been with him at his hearing before Agrippa, as he was certainly with Paul on the voyage to Italy. In the historical narrative (chap. ix.) we find only, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest," without the words "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." These words belong to the speech before Agrippa, and are, without question, intruded into chap. ix. by some harmonizing copyist, but are found in no Greek manuscript.

The remaining new matter in chap. xxvi., besides these

words, is the specification of the time when the vision appeared to Paul. "At midday I saw a light from heaven," and the very important commission to preach the gospel of forgiveness to the Gentiles. In chap. ix. nothing is said of this; but Ananias is told by the Lord Jesus that "Saul is a chosen vessel to carry Christ's name before Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel."

And again, when the speech in chap. xxii. is compared with the narrative in chap. ix. we find several differences, such as that touching the effect of the vision on Paul's companions; the important addition giving an account of the apostle's trance at Jerusalem; and his new commission to preach the gospel to the Gentiles. This last particular, of course, could not appear in chap. ix.; but it shows either the freeness of Luke in treating his materials, or his fidelity in introducing his matter when it came in his hearing from the apostle's lips, or possibly his use of detached portions on what he judged the proper occasion,—all of which portions may have been familiar to him in his long intercourse with Paul. He might have narrated everything in chap. ix.; but he chose, from some reason or other, to reserve it and let it come from the apostle himself.

Another instance, and the last that we shall adduce, of this peculiarity is furnished by comparing Acts xix. 21, 22 with xxiv. 17. From the first passage we learn Paul's purpose to go through Macedonia and Achaia, and that before starting on his journey he had sent two of his helpers to the first mentioned province. From the second passage, it appears that he effected his purpose, and, as he had intended, was soon on his way to Syria (xx. 2, 3), Jerusalem being his objective point. If, now, we possessed no other information in regard to his movements, we should take it to be nothing strange that his tour extended over the countries of Europe where he had planted churches, and that he had the best of reasons for visiting the holy city. On discovering, however, from the Epistles to the Romans (xv. 25-28) and the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. ; ix.), that these journeys,

aside from the ordinary work of the apostle, had in view the special object of making collections for the poor Christians at Jerusalem, we should wonder at Luke's making no mention of this important object, which in its consequences gave a new turn to Paul's life afterward. But as we read onward from the bare notice (xx. 1, 2) of his visit to Macedonia and Greece, and reach his defence of himself before Felix (xxiv. 17), we find that it is there brought out, in the words, "Now, after many years, I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings." Luke postpones this mention of Paul's special business at Jerusalem until after he had been through all the trying scenes there, and had been conveyed to Caesarea. He must have had the facts in his mind all the while, as he had come to Jerusalem with the apostle.

Is it possible, after the considerations brought forward in this study, to doubt that Luke was perfectly aware, when he closed his first book, that Christ did not ascend to heaven on the evening of the resurrection day? Is it not quite credible that he made his brief summary of events that took place until after the ascension, with the intention of speaking of them, or of some of them, again in a second narrative, to which they would be an appropriate beginning? And is not the relation of the end of the Gospel and the beginning of the Acts explained by his habit of composition when he felt called to make a renewed mention of the same portion of the evangelical history?

II.

SOME REMARKS ON ACTS I. 1-12, ESPECIALLY ON THE WORD *συναλιζόμενος.*

The ascension of our Lord is the event which separates between his personal and his spiritual presence in the world. When he committed the interests of the kingdom of heaven on earth directly to his apostles, he left them not alone but promised them the Holy Spirit. This promise was the principal subject of his last words with them before he went to the garden; he repeats it after his resurrection. But when the Spirit was to come and, in a sense, to take his place he did not

at once let them know. For a time his plan seems to have been to appear to them as to a whole body, or to portions of them, or to large numbers of believers, or to single persons, in order that the belief in his resurrection might be deeply fixed in their minds. He did not even detain them in Jerusalem during this time of waiting, but suffered them to revisit their homes in Galilee, and recruit themselves, before the great work in Jerusalem should begin. They were, in fact, not yet fitted for their work; and this interval was the time of preparation. It continued forty days; during which, from time to time, he appeared to them, or to some of them, making them sure that he still had an earthly form. Luke's expression is, δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὄπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς, that is, "at intervals through forty days making his appearance to them, or letting himself be seen by them." Or as Chrysostom explains it (Op. ix. 18, ed. Migne), "Luke did not say 'forty days,' but δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα· ἐφίστατο γὰρ, καὶ ἀφίπτατο (or ἀφίστατο) πάλιν." Διά is thus used in Acts v. 19, where an angel of the Lord opens the doors of the prison, διὰ νυκτός; and in Acts xvii. 10, where the disciples sent Paul out from Thessalonica, not *through*, but *at some time in the night, by night*. So in xvi. 9, a vision appeared to Paul, διὰ νυκτός, certainly not continuing through the night. And so in Acts xiii. 31, "who was seen for many days," ἐπὶ denotes *in a space of time reaching over* many days (cf. xvi. 18). So in Latin *per* is used; as in Sueton. Caes. § 45, "per somnum exterreri solebat," not *through*, but *in* sleep.

Either one or two of these visits of the Lord Jesus are especially noticed by Luke. From verse 6 onwards, the place of his meeting with his apostles was Mount Olivet, which Luke called Bethany in his Gospel; and it is remarkable that he makes in his second narrative (Acts i. 12), no mention of the place, taking it for granted that Theophilus must have remembered what was said in the first narrative (Luke xxiv. 50). It is worthy of notice, also, that he conceives of the apostles' return to Jerusalem as being made towards a common upper room, and that others besides — the women, and Mary the

mother of Jesus, and his brethren — were with them. Why should these women come to the feast of Pentecost a number of days beforehand, unless a summons had been sent to them, (either individually by him or by some apostle), from the risen Saviour?

Going back now to verses 4 and 5, we ask whether the meeting of Christ with his apostles there mentioned was the same with that spoken of in verse 6, or, in other words, was it on the *resurrection* day, or was it some earlier meeting at Jerusalem? and what sense are we to give to *συναλιζόμενος*? The great body of Protestant commentators hold to a reference in verse 6 to verse 4, as speaking of the same gathering. Meyer considers that which is spoken of in verse 6 to be a later meeting on the resurrection day. The Greek interpreters explain *συναλιζόμενος* as meaning "while taking food with them"; the Latin interpreters, the Vulgate, the Catholic church, and some few Protestants, among whom so able a commentator as Meyer is to be counted, agree with the Greeks. Our Authorized Version and the new revision insert the marginal note "eating with them." It is to these two points that the rest of this study will be devoted.

1. Do verses 4 and 6 refer to the same gathering of Christ and his apostles, or must the narrative of a later day begin at verse 6? This point may be considered without discussing the meaning of the word *συναλιζόμενος* immediately; for, whether we render it "while *taking meat with*, or *being assembled together with*," in both cases there is a certain abruptness and want of connection between the three first verses and the fourth. We may naturally conceive that "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" was the leading thought in Luke's mind, and that verse 4, as well as the following ones, bears on that important point. But this Christ would do on occasions when he met with his disciples; and this, without question, was one cause of his remaining on earth. One of these meetings is now spoken of, and is loosely connected with the preceding part of the narrative by *καί*. But the whole matter turns on verse 6, —

on οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες ἡρώτων. Here observe, first, that in some passages where μὲν οὖν are found in connection with οἱ and a participle, the οἱ and the participle are together the subject; and in others οἱ is the subject, and the participle expresses the secondary or qualifying notion. Examples of this latter relation between the two occur in Acts viii. 25, "they, therefore, when they had testified and spoken"; in xv. 30; xxiii. 31, and in the present instance. In xvii. 30; xxiii. 22; xxvi. 4, 9, there is no associated participle (ὁ μὲν οὖν χιλιάρχος, τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους, τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου, ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν). In the example in verse 6, the sense is not *they who came together*, but οἱ alone is the subject: "*they, therefore, when they came together,*" not, as De Wette takes it, "Die nun so zusammen gekommen waren." For the formula μὲν οὖν cf. A. Buttmann, § 149, 16. Οὖν evidently refers back to verse 4, or rather to αὐτοῖς in verse 4; and verse 4 itself is shown, by being placed after the mention of the appearances of Christ through forty days, not to refer to the evening of the resurrection day. When, therefore, we notice the connection between verses 4 and 6, we can hardly help believing that the apostles came together, by appointment or direct suggestion to their minds, as in the case recorded by Matthew (xxviii. 16), τὸ ὄρος, οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. They had not remained in Jerusalem since the week after the crucifixion; but now, when the outpouring of the Spirit was at hand, they are summoned to meet the Lord for the last time on earth. Συνελθόντες implies that they were scattered before,—and we may suppose that they were summoned from their old homes in Galilee, and with them the women, who might not have gone to the pentecostal feast on ordinary occasions. The time of this convention was the morning of the ascension day.

2. But what is the meaning of συναλιζόμενος? In order to answer this question we must draw upon our reader's patience, for the word has a very curious history which cannot be dispatched in a few words.

There are three verbs in Greek having the common form

άλίζω, two of them beginning with *ά*, and the other with *ά*. *Άλίζω* or *άλίω*, a rare word, meaning *to roll*, is represented in the classics by the derivatives, *άλινδέω*, *άλινδήθρα* (rolling place for horses); and *έξαλίσας*, *έξήλικα*, the three last of which occur in Aristophanes. With this we have no concern. Of the other two, *άλίζω*, *collect together*, with its compound, *συναλίζω*,¹ in good use from Herodotus downward, has a common origin with *άλής*, *confertus*, with *άλία* (some *ήλία*), an *assembly*, or gathering, and with *ήλιαία*, a place where the Athenian dikasts first met, whence they are called Heliasts.

The words *άλίζω*, *συναλίζω*, *collect*, *assemble*, with no more difference of sense than their more common synonyms, *άθροίζω*, *συναθροίζω*, appeared first in Empedocles, Herodotus, and Hippocrates, and stood their ground down to the latest period of Greek literary composition; although the explanation of them in glossaries and lexica seems to show that they were not terms of common life in later times. There are sixteen instances of them in Herodotus, four in Hippocrates, one in a fragment of Empedocles, several in Xenophon, one in Plato (Cratylus, 409 A), and two in Euripides. Aristophanes has *συναλιάζω*, a Doric equivalent to *συναλίζω*.² Some of the later writers who use one or the other of them are Josephus, Antiq. xix. 7, 8; 9, 4; Lucian, De Luctu, chap. 7; Appian, Hispan. § 61, de B. C. i. § 132; iv. 65; v. 140; Plutarch de Plac. Philos. (902), where it is said that in the process of sifting, things such as seeds, *έπι τὸ αὐτὸ συναλιζεται*, so that in sifting, beans and chick-peas, in a body, take different places. So again Jamblichus (in Vit. Pythag.) speaks of a class of persons "who gather together for the sake of sight-seeing," *συναλιζόμενον τόπων θεᾶς ἔνεκα*; and Athenæus, lib. ii. p. 40, C., explains *θαλία* by the fact that *θεῶν χάριν ήλιζοντο*; intending to say, if I understand his words, that it was composed of *θεός* and *άλία*, denoting a sacred banquet. The verb *άλίζω*

¹ Other compounds, *άναλίζω* (see below) and *έξαλίζω*, a conjecture of Valckenaer, Schol. in Nov. Test., p. 301, perhaps had no existence.

² Comp. Ahrens de Gr. Ling. Dialectis, lib. ii. p. 90.

occurs also in Theodoret, Hist. iii. 1 and iii. 15. For other passages where *ἀ.* or *συνα.* occurs in ecclesiastical writers, comp. Sophocles (lexicon, s. v.). I have noticed *συνάλισις*, which is not to be found in the common lexicons, in the life of Nicephorus by Ignatius (de Boor's Niceph. Opusc. Lips. 188).

Nowhere does a middle form of *ἀλιζ.* or *συναλιζ.* *colligo*, occur, although many interpreters have regarded the participle in Acts i. 4 as belonging to the middle voice of this verb.¹ In fact, no such form was needed, since the passives of a number of verbs, meaning *to gather*, freely take a neuter or deponent signification in Greek; so in Latin, *congregor* is neuter in such examples as Tacitus, Ann. i. 30. Nor need we go beyond the New Testament for parallel instances. *Συνάγω* is so used in John xviii. 2 (and Jesus *πολλάκις συνήχθη ἐκεῖ*, etc.), and in other places noticed by Grimm s. v. So also Josephus says, (de Bel. Jud. vi. 6), *πολλοὶ καὶ συνείκοσιν ἀθροίζονται*, "they assemble twenty together," to eat the passover.

Besides this *ἀλιζω*, there is another similar form from *ἄλας*, denoting *to salt*, or *to make salt*, *to give salt to*, in which last sense Aristotle uses it in his Hist. Animal. viii. 10. In the other sense it occurs in the New Test. twice or three times, in Matt. v. 13, and in Mark ix. 49, where some authorities insert it twice. In the Septuagint it is found in Lev. ii. 13, to which one of the examples in Mark seems to refer. It is found also in Ezek. xvi. 4, *οὐδὲ ἀλι ἠλίσθης*, and in Isa. li. 6, in the version of Symmachus, who mistook the meaning of his original. Another passage is found in Ezra (iv. 14), which the Septuagint entirely leaves out, but which the Complutensian edition gives us in a translation of the Hebrew, by *καὶ νῦν οὖν καθὼς ἄλας τοῦ ναοῦ ἠλισάμεθα* (where *ναοῦ* stands for the Hebrew word *בַּיִת*, here denoting *palace*, and which the margin of King James's version correctly renders), "we are salted with the salt of the palace" = *we receive the king's salt*, or salary.

¹ Comp. *συναλισμένον* in Manetho, below, which cannot be from this verb.

A compound verb directly derived from *ἀλλίζω*, *to salt*, has evaded my search. There is, however, as I must believe, a rare verb *συναλλίζομαι* in the middle voice, tracing its paternity to *σύναλος*, *taking salt with*, which Philoxenus has preserved in a gloss (Eng. ed. of Stephanus, vol. viii.), and explains by *consalineus*, a Latin word of equal rarity. From this a middle or deponent form may be readily derived, denoting *the taking of salt*, or a meal, *with another*.¹

The quantity of the *a* in these forms deserves notice. "Ἄλς and its derivatives have a short alpha; *ἄλης*, *ἀλλίζω*, *colligo*, and words connected with them, a long alpha, with the exception of *ἄλς*. This is expressly asserted in the Etymol. Mag. ed. Sturz. (marginal page 61, line 50), and is confirmed by a line of Empedocles which Macrobius cites (Saturnal. i. 17), where Macrobius says that "the sun is called *ἥλιος* ὅτι *συναλισθέντος πολλοῦ πυρὸς περιπολεῖ*, ut ait Empedocles, *οὔνεκ' ἀναλισθῆεις μέγαν οὐρανὸν ἀμφιπολεύει*." The sense of the verse is that, because consisting of collected or conglobated fire, he travels round the great heaven. Sturz in his Empedocles and in his ed. of the Etymol. Mag. alters this into *ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἀλισθῆεις* etc., but the quantity is not thereby affected. A later testimony to the length of the *a* in *ἀλλίζω*, *colligo*, is given by Euripides, Herc. Fur. 411, 412, compared with the antistrophe, 428, 429, where *βίοτον οὐδ' ἔβα πάλιν* answers to *ἄγορον ἀλίσας φιλῶν*. Accordingly, in the Heraclidae, v. 404, where Scaliger and Barnes read *συναλίσας*, Musgrave and Elmsley put into the text *εἰς ἐν ἀλίσας*, which suits the end of a trimeter better, and is received by later scholars.²

The interest of this discussion, as far as passages in the

¹ Thus *εὐθήμων*, *εὐθήμονέομαι*, Plato (the active is quite late); *εὐλαβής*, *εὐλαβετόμαι*; *συνεδρία*, *συνεδριόομαι*; *σύνοφρος*, *συνοφροόομαι*. But the examples are not numerous. The derivation is easier from *σύναλος*, as far as the sense is concerned, than from *συν-αλίζω*, and no *συναλίζω*, *I take salt with*, is found.

² Ἄλης has a long alpha in a fragment of Callimachus (in No. 86 of Bentley's Coll., ed. Ernesti, ii. 458), in a choliambic verse. In a corrupt fragment of Hesiod preserved by Strabo (vii. p. 322), *ἐκ γαίης ἀλόους*, *a* would be short if *ἀλέας* were the true reading, but modern editors of Strabo have altered it into *ἐκ γαίης λάδους*.

Scriptures are concerned, lies in the word *συναλισθῶ* of an anonymous translator of Ps. cxli. 4, preserved in Origen's Hexapla (Migne's Origen, vi. 1133), and in Acts i. 4,—mainly in the latter. In the Psalm, where Symmachus and our version give the correct meaning, the Sept. according to the Cod. Alex. has *οὐ μὴ συνδύσω μετὰ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτῶν*, the Cod. Vat. has *συνδοιάσω*, and the Sinaitic, *ἐνδοιάσω*; which last reading looks like a copyist's blunder. Symmachus has *μὴ συμφάγοιμι τὰ ἡδέα*, and the anonymous translator, *μὴ συναλισθῶ ἐν ταῖς τερπνότησι αὐτῶν*. The sense here seems to be, *may I not gather with them at their delights*, or delicacies. The translation *may I not eat with*, however, has been given to the word here, which is wholly improbable; for if *συναλίζομαι eat with*, exists, it is certainly found in the first aorist middle, and a word in so little use would not be likely to have the passive and the middle aorist forms both. The Syriac has a form from a root answering to the Hebrew *רָבַץ*, *I will not eat salt with*, or, possibly, to make a covenant with (?); while the Hebrew has *רָבַץ*, *eat with*.

The early translations seem to follow the Septuagint. Thus the Old Latin, as given by Sabatier from two MSS., is *combinabo*, and Augustine in his enarratio of Ps. cxl. (cxli.) *combinabor*, explaining the passage of the wicked, "cum quibus non est habenda societas." Jerome gives the sense of the Septuagint in the words of the Vulgate, "non communicabo cum electis suorum." The interpretation of Theodoret is *ἐμοὶ μὴ εἴη τις πρὸς αὐτοὺς κοινωνία*. We have thus a singular puzzle. How came the Septuagint to give *συνδύσω*, which must mean *pair or join with*, for the Hebrew verb denoting *to eat*? This word probably determined the word *συναλισθῶ* of the anonymous translator; and yet the Syriac may be appealed to, in connection with Symmachus, to show that the translator meant *may I not eat with*. All the Greek versions mistake in respect to the word rendered *dainties* or delicacies. Whether any further light may be shed on this point, I know not; but it is altogether most probable that *συναλισθῶ* is from *συναλίζω*, *colligo*. The

translator took the word denoting *to gather* or *assemble with*, and expressed the sense which, as he thought, belonged to the text, that of meeting with persons in their festivities.

But are there any other instances of the occurrence of *συναλίζομαι*, *comedo*, in the Greek language? I must believe that there are two, one of them belonging to the second, and the other to the fifth, century of our era. Besides these there are none to be found, unless in quite late periods; and I have fallen upon no trace of these, if there are any. One tolerably, if not altogether, clear example of such a verb in such a sense is found in Manetho's astrological poems. These productions, composed under the Roman empire, are divided into three portions: the first, consisting of the second, third, and sixth books, was written, according to the most recent editor, Köchly, not before M. Antoninus nor after Alexander Severus, and probably in the reign of the latter (between A.D. 138 and 235); the fourth book must have been written before Valens, who died in 378; while the first and fifth books of the old editions, called the fifth and sixth by Köchly, were written after the fourth, thus belonging to the end of the fourth or to the fifth century.¹ The passage containing the word from *συναλίζομαι* occurs just at the end of Köchly's sixth, or the older editor's fifth, book. The author is speaking of a woman born under the conjunction of certain heavenly bodies, and says that she will be *πῆμα λυγρῶ γαμετῆ συναλιζόμενον κακοῦθες*. The Latin translator renders the participle by *congregans*; being ignorant, it would seem, that the short alpha demands a derivation of the word from *ἄλς*. If, then, any word from that root existed, this must be referred to it; unless the author or authors, whom Köchly declares to be "ignorantia metrorum et ingenii stupore simillimos," mistook the quantity of the second syllable. We have seen that the same error in regard to metre was found in the early text of Euripides, but the sense and measure concur in favoring the derivation from *ἄλς*.

¹ Compare Köchly's preface to his Didot edition, pp. vi, xvii, xl. The same recession appears in a small volume of the Teubner Series of Greek writers.

The only other instance hitherto adduced where *συναλίζομαι*, *eat with*, is to be found, occurs in the Clementines; not in the passage from the sixth Homily which Meyer cites,—where nothing of the kind is to be found, unless it be *άλῶν μεταλαβεῖν*, at the end of the Homily,—but in a passage repeated in Homily xiii. § 4, and in the two Epitomes, the older of which appears in Cotelerius, and the new one, almost identical with it, was published by Dressel from an Ottobonian ms. of the Vatican. Besides these three places, which are but three forms of a single original, *συναλίζομαι* is used in the epistle of Clement to James, which precedes the Homilies (§ 15), in the old classical sense.

Beginning with this last mentioned place, we find the Christians to be there compared to persons on the deep. They are told to expect all manner of afflictions, as sailing on the great and troubled sea, which is the world; being sometimes despondent, persecuted, hungry, thirsty, naked, scattered, in great straits; sometimes, again, united, collected together, enjoying quiet (*καὶ πάλιν ὅτε μὲν ἐνούμενοι, συναλιζόμενοι, ἡσυχάζοντες*). Another reading, which Dressel prefers, is *συναυλιζόμενοι*, a common word which is intruded into the text in the three other places presently to be examined, as well as in Acts i. 4, and elsewhere. The reading given above is plainly best suited to the context, being demanded by *σκορπιζόμενοι* in the previous part of the sentence. And in the free translation attributed to Rufinus (in Migne's Clement, under the text),—*quippe qui et dispergendos se nonnunquam noverint, sed aliquando etiam congregandos*,"—the same reading is supported.

Putting this passage out of account, we come to the three others. In them all Peter tells Clement's mother that, so long as she is a heathen and unbaptized, she cannot eat with the Christians. Even relatives for that reason must be separated at table. But when they are baptized, *τότε δὴ αὐτοῖς καὶ συναλιζόμεθα* (*συναυλ.* in Epit. 1., *τότε αὐτοῖς* according to Epit. 2 and Hom. xiii. § 4). It might be claimed, possibly, that the sense of Epit. 1 is *then we even lodge with*

them, i.e. not only take food, but lodge. But this cannot be the sense or the reading. For here the Recognitiones will show how Rufinus understood the disputed word, and that he read *συναλ.*, not *συναυλ.* The passage is translated by Rufinus from a text of the lost *ἀναγνωρίσεις*, or *Recognitiones*, closely similar to that of the Epitomes and the Homily. We transcribe a part of it from Gersdorf's edition of the Recognitiones (Lib. vii. § 29, p. 167): "Sed et illud observamus, mensam cum gentilibus non habere communem [in Hom. and Epit. *τραπέζης ἔθνικῆς μὴ μετέχειν*], nisi cum crediderint et recepta veritate baptizati fuerint, ac [?] trina quadam beati nominis invocatione consecrati; et tunc cum eis cibum sumimus [Hom. and Epit. *συναλιζόμεθα*, with the variant *συναυλ.*, as before]. Alioquin etiam si pater aut mater sint, aut uxor aut filii aut fratres, non possumus cum eis mensam habere communem [*συνεστιῶσθαι*]. Quia ergo religionis causa praecepta hoc facimus, non tibi injuriosum videatur, quod non potest filius tuus una tecum sumere cibum [*τὸ μὴ συνεστιῶσθαί σοι*], usquequo eadem tibi sit quae illi sententia fidei."

It is almost certain that Rufinus, who has the words "cum eis cibum sumimus" in his text, must have there found *συναλιζόμεθα*, and not *συναυλιζόμεθα*. And that he thought that there were two verbs with the same letters is shown by the translation given on another page, *congregandos*, to the word *συναλιζόμενους* occurring in the letter of James to Clement, — if the translation there given be really his.

The force of the argument from the sanction given to the meaning *eat with* by Rufinus might be broken by showing that the word *συναλ.* with this sense was a late interloper into the Greek language. We regard this to be quite possible; but as the time of its entrance into the Greek language cannot be shown; and as it certainly was in existence before the Clementines were written in the second century of our era, and before or as soon as the Old Latin versions of the New Testament appeared, it might easily have imposed upon the more ignorant of the early translators.

But may there not be force in a remark of Casaubon (in his *Animadv. in Athen.* ii. ch. 3) on a passage of Athenaeus already cited (*supra* p. 606). The great scholar there says, “*Etsi ἀλιζεσθαι et συναλιζεσθαι generali notione congregari significant, sine finis discrimine, fuere tamen qui de convenientibus ad coenam condictam proprie putarent usurpari. Ita usus est Athenaeus illa voce.*” Here it is noticeable that Casaubon was not acquainted with the argument for two verbs, identical in form, from the length of the alpha. And, moreover, the derivation of *θαλία* from *θεός-άλια* would not now be thought to deserve attention. Valckenaer, however, in his *Scholae in Act. Apostol.* (*Select. e Schol. Valck. i. 362, Amstel. 1815*) follows Casaubon in his view of the meaning of the participle, besides adopting the reading *συναλιζομένοις* proposed by Hemsterhuis. “Because,” says he, “those who used a common table were said *ἀλῶν μεταλαβεῖν*, hinc factum ut *ἀλιζεσθαι et συναλιζ.* coeperint in usu significare *in unum locum congregari cibi capiendi gratia*. Et hinc manifestum erit cur vetus interpres Latinius reddideret *convescens*.” But he prefers the reading of Hemsterhuis, and understands it of the sacred supper. But in his *Opuscula* (ii. 277) he rejects the conjecture *συναλιζομένοις*, because the Christian Fathers found the nominative in their copies, and understood the word as denoting *familiariter cum aliquo vivere, ejusdem mensae participem; salem simul edere*, and supposes without reason that Peter’s words in Acts x. 40, 41 are to be explained by this passage. He also refers to the Clementines (*Hom. xiii. § 4*) as supporting the same use of the word. But he does not seem to affirm positively that two words from two different roots existed.

We come now, in the next place, to the inquiry how far the word *συναλιζομαι*, *eat with*, is recognized in the ancient lexica and glossaries. The answer must be that for the greater part they make no mention of such a word, and seem not to know that it exists. They generally explain *ἀλιζω*, *colligo* and *συναλιζω* by *ἀθροίζω*, *συναθροίζω*, and *συνάγω*. Thus Photius, Hesychius, Suidas. In Hesychius we notice

that *συναλισθείς*, *συναθροισθείς*, and *συναχθείς* serve to interpret *συναλιζόμενος*, which leads to a suspicion that the present in Acts i. 4 is thus explained by the aorist. In the *Onomas-tikon* of Julius Pollux, among the words for partaking of food this does not appear, as was remarked long ago by Erasmus. In the *Etymologica*, the *Magnum* and *Gudianum*, we find *ξυναλιζόμενοι* or *ξυναυλιζόμενοι* explained by *συναθρο-ζόμενοι ἢ συνεσθίοντες*, and then *παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλας* is added to show how it could be synonymous with *συνεσθίοντες*.

Coming to the works of Christian writers, we fail to find in those of the ante-Nicene age any reference to the word as occurring in our text, or to the verse itself. Luke xxiv. 37-39 is cited by Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion.*, iv. § 43), and Acts x. 41 is cited in the Ignatian epistle to the church at Smyrna. And may it not be fairly argued that if the meaning of *eating with* had been already fastened on this word we should have known of it by more than one citation of that early period?

There can, however, be no question that such a sense was attached to it some time in the second century. The early Latin expresses the word by *vescor*, or by *convescor*, which Jerome adopted. Another word translating it into Latin is *convensor*, which seems to point towards *συναυλιζόμενος*. *Simul convivens* appears in the Cod. Bezae (D) although D itself has *συναλισκόμενος* in this place. In the Latin version of the Cod. Laudianus (E of Acts) *vescens* appears; with which the venerable Bede agrees, who, as Dr. Scrivener, after Dr. Mill, thinks (*Introd.* 2d ed. p. 147), must have had this manuscript before him when he wrote his *Expositio Retractata* of the Acts. The Eastern versions seem all to agree with the Greek interpreters of the post-Nicene period in rendering this word by some equivalent to partaking of food.

After the Nicene period the authority of Chrysostom and others helped the general spread of this explanation. Chrysostom refers to Acts i. 4 in at least five different passages. It occurs twice in the first Homily on Acts (§§ 3, 6, Op. Chr. ed. Migne, ix.), three times in that in Princip. Act. iv. (§§ 104, 107, Migne iii. 1). In the first passage he says:

“Nor was he [Luke] content with the forty days, but he adds also a table, in reference to which, as he proceeds, he uses the words *καὶ συναλιζόμενος αὐτοῖς*. And this the apostles always regard as a proof of the resurrection.” Again, in § 6 Chrysostom says (p. 22 ed. Migne), “Inasmuch, then, as we take food with Christ, and have a common table with him [*συναλιζόμενοι Χριστῷ καὶ τραπέζης κοινωνοῦντες*]”; where he evidently refers to this passage, although he is speaking of Christian baptism. In the other three places he explains the word by *κοινωνῶν τραπέζης*, or by *τραπέζης* only, or by *οὐ δεόμενος τραπέζης ἔτρωγεν*. The word is constantly interpreted by him, as if the people did not understand it.

Theophylact on Acts i. 4 says that in a space of forty days *αὐτοῖς συνηλιζετο κοινωνῶν ἁλῶν καὶ κοινωνῶν τραπέζης*, where he arbitrarily joins *συναλ.* with forty days, and conceives of Christ as partaking of food with the apostles through that period; whereas the word is used of a single event. Oecumenius gives the same explanation, which is found also in the Panarion of Epiphanius (in Haeres. 66, § 35, and probably in Haeres. 20, § 3). Theodoret, again,—who, as we have seen, uses the word *συναλ.*, *colligo*,—gives the sense of *eating with* to it in this passage in the Dialogue Inconfusus (ed. Sirmond-Schultze, iv. 119). After citing the first words of vs. 4, he adds that Peter more distinctly says, “We who eat and drank with him after he rose from the dead” (Acts x. 41). For,” continues Theodoret, “since to eat is a peculiarity of those who have to do with the present life, the Lord of necessity proved his resurrection to those who hold not the truth by eating and drinking.” And this he supports by Christ’s ordering something to be given to the daughter of Jairus, and by having Lazarus, whom he raised from the dead, his companion at a feast.

We reach the conclusion that there was a verb identical in form with the passive or middle of *συναλιζω*, *colligo*, of late origin as far as can be known, and of extremely limited use. The importance given to it by esteemed and learned Fathers does not seem to have given it any currency; at least, I

cannot find that it went down into the Middle Ages. Sophocles in his lexicon has no place for it, and I cannot find it in modern Greek lexicons. It seems very improbable that Luke should have used such a word.

But why did he use *συναλιζόμενος*, *assembling with*, when the verb occurs nowhere else in his writings or in the New Testament, and so many synonymes were at hand? I am unable to give an answer; unless, possibly, it was associated in the evangelist's mind with the *collecting* or *mustering* of the apostles — a sense which it has in the classics. But no answer is due to those who would discover in this form a word of the very greatest rarity.

The use of the present participle is Meyer's principal argument against giving the sense of *gathering* to the word; while if we could translate it *taking bread with them*, the tense would be all right. But the verb in the passive with a deponent meaning can denote, if I mistake not, both the transitory act of being assembled or meeting with another, and the permanent condition of being in a meeting; so that *συναλιζόμενος* = *ὅτε συνηλιζετο* might be used here without grammatical difficulty. A somewhat parallel passage, in this respect, occurs at the very end of the Iliad:

εὖ συναγειρόμενοι δαίνυντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα

where the modern editions since Heyne have generally preferred this reading to *συναγειράμενοι*.

It seems harsh in English to speak of a single person being assembled, or having been assembled, with others. But this need not trouble us in Greek, at least in the Greek of the New Testament. Thus Jesus *συνήχθη μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ* (John xviii. 2), which our English translators render *resort*, perhaps to avoid harshness of expression.

It may be, also, that the substitution by early interpreters of the meaning *eating with* for *being assembled with* had reasons of its own. The passage in Luke xxiv. 42-53, by disregarding the marks of time, may have led many to think that the narrations in Acts i. 4 and Luke xxiv. 49 were identical. This, when the word *συναλιζομαι*, *eat with*, was

discovered, helped to establish a false harmony. And Acts x. 41 aided in giving currency to this meaning, which the word in Luke was not conceived to have from the beginning. The text thus became — honestly on the part of the interpreters — a convenient ally to those other texts which established the human, sensuous nature of our Lord, against heretics, who denied it or made as little of it as possible.

A somewhat subjective difficulty which some persons cannot fail to find in the interpretation of *συναλ.* by *eating with*, and which we share in, is this: As vs. 4 is closely joined with vs. 6, and vs. 6 points to the day of the ascension, it must follow that our Lord took food on the very day of that great event. But as his taking food after the resurrection is clearly intended to be a proof of his being in a body (comp. Luke xxiv. 41, 42), the reason for his so doing had already ceased. No one doubted who he was when they were assembled in Jerusalem or at Mount Olivet. It seems thus to have then become uncalled for and gratuitous.

We have finished our proposed task, except that we had intended to prepare, and had actually prepared at some length, a sketch of the history of the interpretations of this passage, which would be chiefly confined to the opinions of Protestant commentators, since Jerome's *convescens* has held the Catholic church in fetters. It is singular, however, that a Catholic, Laurentius Valla, the celebrated humanist, first broached a new opinion respecting Acts i. 4 and the word *συναλιζόμενος*. Erasmus adopted his opinion, and since his time Protestants have very generally given up the early explanation. But they have not all been successful in their treatment of the word. Some, as Calvin and Erasmus, — the latter doubtfully, since he translated it by *congregans se cum illis*, and by *congregans illos in idem loci*, — resort to the middle voice for an interpretation of the word. Others neglect the tense, which creates the difficulty. Rosenmüller has *quum congregasset*, as if it were an aorist; with whom, in substance, Bloomfield (*having gathered together*), Heinrichs (in Köppen's New Testament), Kuinöl, and Olshausen

agree; several of whom also regard it as in the middle. Other opinions may be found in the *Critici Sacri*, or in J. C. Wolff's *Curae Philologicae*. Beugel has *conventum agens*; a considerable number, *conveniens cum illis*, its equivalent; to which two latter renderings there can be no objection. De Wette gives *indem er mit ihnen versammelt ward*, and remarks that Theophylact in his interpretation *κοινωνῶν ἄλλων* followed a false etymology. Alford follows this remark, without giving any interpretation in English. Plumptre, in Ellicott's series, thinks that Jerome's *convescens* rests on a mistaken etymology. But the question of sense precedes that of etymology, provided two words with the same form existed. Jacobson, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, notices the marginal reading of the Authorized Version, and simply states that Josephus assigns to the word the meaning preferred in the text. Howson, in Schaff's *Popular Commentary*, goes back to the signification *eating with* of the margin, and thinks the authority of Chrysostom with his followers, and of Jerome, decisive in the matter. Thus in the latest commentary the new direction given by Meyer is accepted, and some others have followed the same able leader. Whether it shall be thought that we have given good reasons for a different judgment or not, this will be the most remarkable instance in which a word nearly unknown to the Greek language, not even mentioned by modern lexicographers either of classical or of New Testament Greek — (the Paris ed. of Stephanus, Robinson, Grimm), has found a footing in the exegetical works and the versions of more than one church. You may search for it in the early times, and you find it everywhere; you may search for it in Greek, outside of this passage, and except in two obscure authors you find it nowhere.

We close this Article with a very brief statement of the order of events as they seem to arrange themselves after the second Lord's day succeeding his resurrection.

1. The apostles returned to Galilee. There they had the interview with Christ recorded in John xxi. At this time,

also, the great gathering with the body of the Galilean disciples may have taken place, "as Jesus had appointed."

2. By a similar appointment, forty days after the resurrection, he met at Jerusalem the apostles and some others of his nearest friends, especially the most devoted Christian women, with his mother and his brethren. We have already remarked that the presence of these female Christians at the feast of pentecost, and so long before the feast, is fully accounted for by a summons from the Lord.

3. The events between vs. 4 and vs. 12 all occurred on ascension day, and from this time it was that they waited for the promise of the Spirit to be fulfilled, which should begin the spread of the new kingdom of Christ.

ARTICLE II.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MONOTHEISM AMONG THE GREEKS.

BY DR. EDWARD ZELLER. — TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY
EDWIN D. MEAD.

THE subject with which the present Article has to deal has claims upon our interest from more than one side. If it is a grateful task, in and for itself, to follow the history of the human mind in one of its highest relations and among one of the most cultured peoples, the attraction of the task is greatly enhanced if it is connected with other questions of the most universal importance. And this is precisely the case in the present instance. The history of religion has to do with no more important fact, none which takes deeper hold of the spiritual and moral life of mankind, than the origin of monotheism and the rise of Christianity, but also none the thorough historical understanding of which is attended with greater difficulties. It is then fortunate that we meet, in a people so well known as the Greeks, a process which offers for the one of these facts — the genesis of monotheistic faith —