

Gospel tradition. It is obvious, for example, that Luke regards Nazareth as the residence of Joseph and Mary from the first (i. 26; ii. 4), whereas Matthew seems to represent them as selecting Nazareth for their new home after the birth of Jesus and the return from Egypt, only because they were afraid to return to their old home in Judæa, thereby fulfilling an ancient prophecy (ii. 23). Throughout his preface, as throughout his version of the Triple Tradition, Matthew always bears in mind that Jesus came to fulfil the prophets as well as the law. The birth from a virgin (i. 25), the birth in Bethlehem (ii. 6), the return from Egypt (ii. 15), the massacre of the children in Bethlehem (ii. 18), and the residence in Nazareth (ii. 23) are all spoken of as the consequences of prophecies. It is scarcely fanciful, also, to see some reference to the infancy of Moses, and the slaughter of the Israelitish children by Pharaoh in the massacre of the children of Bethlehem by Herod.

Passing next to Matthew's version of the Triple Tradition, we note first the prominence given to the law. Instead of giving a chronological account of our Lord's acts and sayings, Matthew prefers to collect a mass of doctrine into one continuous discourse, known from early times as the Sermon on the Mount. This discourse follows almost immediately (iv. 11; v. 1.) on the commencement of His public life; and it contains the new law of the new kingdom. The Sermon on the Mount corresponds to the law given on Mount Sinai, and a thread of contrast runs through the former, comparing in each case that which had been said "of old time" with that which the New Lawgiver prescribed, and showing that in each case the new law, though more gentle, was also more stringent and more exacting than the old. "Depart from Me, ye workers of iniquity" (Lu. xiii. 27) is expressed by Matthew (vii. 23), "Depart from Me, ye that work lawlessness;" and this word "lawlessness" is found four times in Matthew, and not at all in the rest of the Gospels. Luke recognizes that no jot or tittle is to pass from the law till all be fulfilled; but nowhere in Luke shall we find the strong language which declares (Mat. v. 19) that he who breaks, or teaches others to break, one of the least of the commandments of the law shall be called least in the kingdom of God.

The genealogy traced from Abraham, and the stress laid on prophecy, as well as the prominence thus given to the law, all suggest that this book was primarily intended for Jewish readers; and this supposition is confirmed by the whole tenor of the Gospel. Matthew finds less space than Luke for the parables which point to the inclusion of the Gentiles, and more for those which point to the exclusion of the workers of lawlessness and of the unworthy Jews. He alone among the evangelists has the saying, "Many are called but few chosen;" and the distinction between the "called" (*κλητοί*) and "chosen" (*ἐκλεκτοί*) is the more remarkable, because Paul uses the two words almost indifferently, and Luke (though he too has the parable of the unworthy guests) has not ventured to use *κλητοί* in Matthew's disparaging signification. But Matthew, more than the rest of the evangelists, seems to move in evil days, and amid a race of backsliders, among dogs and swine who are unworthy of the pearls of truth, among the tares sown by the enemy, among fishermen who have to cast back again many of the fish caught in the net of the gospel; the broad way is ever in his mind, and the multitude of those that go thereby, and the guest without the wedding garment, and the foolish virgins, and the goats as well as the sheep, and those who even "cast out devils" in the name of the Lord, and yet are rejected by Him because they "work lawlessness." Where Luke speaks exultantly of "joy in heaven" over one repentant sinner, Matthew in more negative and sober phrases declares that it is not the will of the Father that one

of the little ones should perish; and as a reason for not being distracted about the future it is alleged that "sufficient for the day is the evil thereof": see above, (10), (11), (12), (13), (28), (29 c), (50), (52). It is far-fetched to suppose that these subjects are selected or amplified in antagonism to the doctrine of Paul. The condition of the Jews, their increasing hostility to the Christians, and the wavering or retrogression of many Jewish converts when the hostility became intensified shortly before and during the siege of Jerusalem,—this may well explain one side of Matthew's Gospel; and the other side (the condemnation of "lawlessness") might find an explanation in a reference to Hellenizing Jews, who (like some of the Corinthians) considered that the new law set them free from all restraint, and who, in casting aside every vestige of nationality, wished to cast aside morality as well. Viewed in the light of the approaching fall of Jerusalem, and the wavering or retrogression of great masses of the nation, the introduction into the Lord's Prayer of the words, "Deliver us from the evil," and the prediction (xxiv. 12) that "by reason of the multiplying of lawlessness the love of many shall wax cold," will seem not only appropriate, but typical of the character of the whole of the First Gospel.

Besides the fulfillments of prophecy mentioned in the preface, Matthew sees several others (6), (25), (43), (44), (54) which are not mentioned in the Triple Tradition, and these applications of prophecy sometimes contain obvious confusions. For example, Matthew sees in our Lord's entry into Jerusalem a fulfilment of the prophecy: "Thy king cometh . . . sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." The repetition seems to denote one animal, after the manner of Hebrew poetry, and only one is mentioned by Mark and Luke; but Matthew, applying prophecy more closely, speaks of two, and adds (xxi. 7) "they brought the ass and the foal and cast their clothes upon them, and he sat upon them." Again, in speaking of the "potter's field" (xxvii. 9), he quotes, as from Jeremiah, a prophecy that is really from Zechariah xi. 12 (the word translated "potter" is rendered by Ewald "treasury"; and [though Aquila has *πλάστην*] the LXX. has *χωνευτήριον*, "foundry," neither of which renderings will suit Matthew's application). Again, though Luke speaks of the "sign of Jonah," Matthew alone makes Jesus publicly declare that, as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale (xii. 40), so He shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; and such a declaration, exciting no questioning in the disciples, nor wonder in bystanders, appears in the highest degree improbable, and looks like a later application. It will be remembered that Matthew alone has the inaccurate statement that the murdered Zachariah was the son of Barachiah (xxiii. 35); and perhaps an inaccuracy resulting from a lapse of memory may explain, not only the use of the name of Jeremiah above, but also the quotation "He shall be called a Nazarene" (ii. 23), which is found in no existing book of prophecy. Similarly (perhaps) Mark, through lapse of memory on the part of those whose tradition he records, quotes (i. 2), as from Isaiah, according to the correct reading (the A. V. reads "prophets"), a prophecy composed of two passages, the first of which is from Malachi, and only the second from Isaiah. It must be remembered that, without the modern means for rapid reference, verification was a much harder task than now, and much more trust was necessarily given to memory.

Few new miracles are introduced by Matthew into the body of his work (15), (21), (31), (34). Two of these consist of acts of healing; and two are connected with Peter, viz., Peter's partial success in walking upon the waves, and his (supposed) extraction of a stater from the mouth of a fish. But the words implying the latter miracle have possibly arisen from a misunderstanding; at all events

they leave in the mind "a doubt whether, in this instance, some essential particular may not have been either omitted or left unexplained" (Farrar's *Life of Christ*, vol. ii. p. 46).

In its moral teaching this Gospel lays special stress upon the sin of religious ostentation and hypocrisy. In a strong passage (xii. 33) consistent undissembling wickedness is preferred to dissembled wickedness, and the Pharisees are described at greater length than in any of the other Gospels. Yet this Gospel does not always dwell upon the dark side of Christ's doctrine. It preserves also some of the Lord's most "comfortable" sayings: the blessings upon the meek and merciful; the saying that the angels, of the little ones always behold the face of the Father; and above all that saying which is a gospel in itself, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden," &c. (xi. 28-30).

In speaking of the date of Matthew's Gospel, so far as it can be determined from internal evidence, we must remember that, if the work be composite, the fact that some of Matthew's additions are clearly late will not show that others may not be early. The saying, for example, that the disciples shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man shall have come (x. 23), seems to be an early and unaltered reminiscence of a saying of Jesus, which was not generally adopted in the tradition because of its recognized difficulty at a later date. It is possible that Matthew may consider the coming of the Son of Man fulfilled primarily in the transfiguration; for whereas in their prefaces to the transfiguration Mark and Luke write, "There are some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God" (Mark adds "coming in power"), Matthew substitutes for "kingdom of God," &c., "the Son of Man coming in His kingdom." But, whatever may have been Matthew's theory, the difficulty of the utterance in Matt. x. 23 implies its early date. On the other hand, a decidedly late date seems implied in the expression "up to this day," which is twice found—once in the addition xxvii. 8 (the potter's field) and again in xxviii. 15 (the bribing of the guard by the chief priests). Yet these additions appear to be in the style of the writer both of the preface and the appendix, and of the other passages peculiar to Matthew.¹ It would follow that all these passages are of a late date, not added to the tradition till long after the death of Christ. The interval must have been long enough to allow, for example, the "potter's field"—and this argument holds whether the story of the potter's field (xxvii. 8) be historical or not—first, to acquire the name of the Field of Blood, and

¹ Want of space renders it impossible to state the grounds on which it seems probable that Matthew consists only of (1) the Triple Tradition; (2) extracts from a book or tradition of the words of the Lord from which Luke also borrowed; and (3) an introduction, framework, and appendix, all added by one hand; though possibly the introduction and appendix, being borrowed, the former from an Aramaic source, the latter from a Latin source, may show differences of idiom not wholly concealed by the overlying style of the author who works up the materials. A similar use of the particles *δέ* and *καί*, and of participles, runs throughout almost all the non-traditional narrative parts of Matthew; and the rhythm of the sentences is very similar. But the linguistic evidence has not as yet been so selected, classified, and concentrated as to obtain any certain results. And until this is done, inferences drawn from isolated phenomena are likely to be very misleading. For example, it has been inferred (Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 502) that the use of the form *Ἰησοῦαλῆμ* once only in Matthew (xxiii. 37, in a passage almost identical with Lu. xiii. 34, whereas Matthew uses *Ἰησοῦδλῆμα* eleven times) proves that Matthew borrowed the passage in which it occurs from an Aramaic source. Now it is true that other reasons make the hypothesis of an Aramaic source for the identical passages in Matthew and Luke extremely probable; but this use of *Ἰησοῦαλῆμ* is quite insufficient proof. For a comparison of Paul's use of *Ἰησοῦδλῆμα* (Gal. i. 17, 18; ii. 1) and *Ἰησοῦαλῆμ* (Gal. iv. 25, 26) will show that the same author might use the one form geographically and the other in a higher style, theologically or rhetorically. And this may possibly be held to explain the use of *Ἰησοῦαλῆμ* by Matthew in the highly rhetorical passage in which alone it is found.

secondly, to retain that name for so long a period (nearly at least a generation) as to make it possible for a writer to speak of the acquisition of the name as a far distant fact, writing that the name is still borne, even "to this day." The same expression in xxviii. 15,—where it is said that the false charge against the disciples, of stealing the body of Jesus, is commonly reported "unto this day" by "the Jews,"—warrants the same inference; and this inference is corroborated by the remarkable use of "the Jews." The author of the Fourth Gospel, writing at a much later date, habitually speaks of "the Jews" as an alien race, quite separated from the Christians; but this is not in the manner of the synoptistic tradition.

The uncertainty in which Mark left the resurrection of Jesus would naturally seem to later writers to require to be removed; and accordingly we find that Matthew adds to the vision of angels (two instead of one) a manifestation of Jesus Himself. But the whole of this narrative (xxviii. 9-20), though apparently in Matthew's style (*cf.*, for example, the remarkable use of *οἱ δέ*, without the *οἱ μὲν*, in the sense of "others," in xxviii. 17 with that in xxvi. 67), and though containing internal evidence of being composed long after the events narrated (xxviii. 15), is nevertheless strangely disjointed. Yet its very defects, its disconnectedness, incompleteness, and abruptness, indicate a date earlier than that of the more connected and completer narratives of the Third and Fourth Gospels. Matthew separates from Mark's narrative at the departure of the women from the tomb, having previously given an account (repeated by no other evangelist) of the resurrection from the dead of a great number of "saints," who "went into the holy city and appeared unto many." To Mark's simple statement that the women "found the stone rolled away" Matthew adds a graphic account of a glorious angel visibly descending from heaven, filling the keepers with fear, and rolling the stone away. Then, immediately after the women have departed with the angelic message, to bid the disciples to go to Galilee, Jesus suddenly appears to them. They clasp His feet, while He repeats over again the message that the disciples must go to Galilee there to behold Him. Without any further mention of the place of meeting, the disciples are said to have gone to "the mountain, where Jesus made agreement (*ἐράξατο*) with them (to meet them)." To avoid this dislocation, there has been suggested the desperate remedy (Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 582) of rendering *ἐράξατο*, "laid down the law," with reference to the Sermon on the Mount; but the probable solution is that Matthew here extracts and separates from its context some ancient tradition which is obscured through want of its framework.² Again Matthew tells us that, upon this mountain, only the eleven were present, and that while some of them worshipped, others "doubted." This statement is of value as evidence that it was acknowledged, even so late as the compilation of Matthew's Gospel, that some at least of the manifestations of Jesus were of such a nature that, while they brought immediate conviction to some beholders, they did not at once convince others, even of His nearest disciples; in other words, the manifestation of Jesus depended upon other considerations than the mere physical sense of sight. But, on the other hand, the statement seems quite inconsistent with the supposition that in previous manifestations in or near Jerusalem Jesus had been recognized and worshipped by all the eleven. The last words of the Gospel represent Jesus as commissioning His disciples to go into all nations, preaching His gospel, and baptizing in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The thought con-

² In a somewhat similar manner the author of the Second Epistle of Peter speaks of "the holy mount" (2 Pet. i. 18), assuming that his readers would understand the definite reference to the mountain of the transfiguration.

tained in these words furnishes a suitable termination to the Gospel; but there is every probability that we have not here the exact words of Jesus Himself. Not to speak of the introduction of the later baptismal formula, "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," the rest of the vocabulary is not found in the words of Jesus as recorded in the Triple Tradition, but is peculiar to Matthew. For example, (1) the word μαθητεύειν (xxviii. 19) is used three times by Matthew, and nowhere else in the New Testament, except once in the Acts; (2) the expression συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος (xxviii. 20) is found five times in Matthew, and nowhere else in the New Testament, except once in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and (3) the word τηρεῖν (xxviii. 20), used by Matthew six times, is used once only by Mark, and not at all by Luke.

It is noteworthy that Matthew makes no express mention of the ascension of Jesus. But it is possible that he considers this final manifestation on the mountain-top to have terminated with the ascension; for Matthew, describing the farewell of Jesus, appears to have in his mind the picture, contemplated also by Daniel, of the Son of Man endowed with all power and seated on the clouds of heaven. Compare Daniel vii. 14, "ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ἐξουσία," with Matthew xxviii. 18, "ἰδοὺ μοι πάντα ἐξουσία." And this perhaps may explain the twice repeated saying of Matthew, that some of the disciples should see the Son of Man coming. The manifestation of Jesus upon the mountain in Galilee, commissioning His disciples to go forth to make disciples of all the world, and claiming all kingdoms for Himself, might well seem a fulfilment of these two prophecies (x. 23; xvi. 28), as well as a fitting close to the book of the Gospel.

Additions peculiar to Luke.

Additions and Peculiarities of Luke.—The principal passages peculiar to Luke are:—

(1) i. 1-4, the dedication to Theophilus; (2) i. 5-25, the vision of Zacharias; (3) i. 26-38, the annunciation; (4) i. 39-45, the meeting of Elisabeth and Mary; (5) i. 46-56, the song of Mary; (6) i. 57-80, the naming of John and the song of Zacharias; (7) ii. 1-7, the journey of Mary to Bethlehem; (8) ii. 8-20, the vision of the shepherds; (9) ii. 21-35, the song of Simeon; (10) ii. 36-40, the prophetess Anna; (11) ii. 41-52, the child Jesus found in the temple; (12) iii. 1, the precise date of the commencement of the public life of Jesus; (13) iii. 5-16 (except vers. 8 and 9), the teaching of John the Baptist; (14) iii. 18-20, Herod imprisons John; (15) iii. 23-38, the genealogy of Jesus from Adam; (16) iv. 13, the devil departs from Jesus "for a season"; (17) iv. 14-30, Jesus preaches at Nazareth; (18) v. 1-11, the miraculous draught of fish and the call of Simon; (19) v. 17, preface to the healing of the paralytic; (20) v. 29, "No one having drunk old wine desireth new," &c.; (21) vi. 12-13, preface to the choice of the apostles; (22) vi. 24-26, "Woe unto you that are rich," &c.; (23) vi. 32-35, "Love your enemies," &c. (in language peculiar to Luke); (24) vii. 1-10, the healing of the centurion's servant (in language peculiar to Luke); (25) vii. 11-17, the raising of the widow's son at Nain; (26) vii. 21, 22, the acts of healing wrought before John's disciples; (27) vii. 36-50, the sinful woman and the parable of the two debtors; (28) viii. 1-3, the names of the women who accompanied Jesus; (29) ix. 51-56, James and John wish to call down fire on the Samaritans; (30) ix. 61, 62, "No one having put his hand to the plough," &c.; (31) x. 1, the appointment of the seventy; (32) x. 17-20, "I beheld Satan as lightning," &c.; (33) x. 25-37, the good Samaritan; (34) x. 38-42, Martha and Mary; (35) xi. 1, "Teach us to pray," &c.; (36) xi. 6-8, the friend persuaded by importunity; (37) xii. 13-21, the rich fool; (38) xii. 21-22, "When the strong man armed," &c.; (39) xi. 27, 28, "Blessed is the womb that bare Thee," &c.; (40) xii. 32, 33, "Fear not, little flock," &c.; (41) xii. 35-38, "Let your loins be girded about," &c.; (42) xii. 47, 48, "But that servant that knew not his lord's will," &c.; (43) xii. 49-50, "I came to send fire on earth," &c.; (44) xii. 54-57, "When ye see a cloud rising," &c.; (45) xiii. 1-9, the Galileans slain by Pilate, and the parable of the fig-tree; (46) xiii. 10-17, the healing of the woman bound by Satan; (47) xiii. 23-27, "Are there few that be saved?" and the answer; (48) xiii. 31-34, "Go tell that fox," &c.; (49) xiv. 1-6, the healing of the dropsical man on the sabbath; (50) xiv. 7-11, "Sit not down in the highest room," &c.; (51) xiv. 12-14, "When thou makest a dinner," &c.; (52) xiv. 15-24, the discourteous guests; (53) xiv. 28-33, "Which of you intending to build a tower," &c.; (54) xv. 1-10, the lost sheep (different in

Matthew), and the lost piece of silver; (55) xv. 11-32, the prodigal son; (56) xvi. 1-12, the unjust steward; (57) xvi. 14-31, Dives and Lazarus, with preface; (58) xvii. 7-10, the master must be served before the servant; (59) xvii. 11-19, the grateful Samaritan; (60) xvii. 20-22, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation," &c.; (61) xvii. 28-30, "It shall be as in the days of Lot," &c.; (62) xviii. 1-8, the unjust judge; (63) xviii. 9-14, the Pharisee and the publican; (64) xix. 1-10, Zacchæus; (65) xix. 11-27, the parable of the pounds (different in Matthew); (66) xix. 39-44, "If thou hadst known even thou," &c.; (67) xx. 18, "Whoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken," &c.; (68) xxi. 18, "There shall not an hair of your head perish," &c.; (69) xxi. 23-26, "There shall be great distress in the land," &c.; (70) xxi. 28, "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up," &c.; (71) xxi. 34-38, "But take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting," &c.; (72) xxii. 14-16, with parts of 17 and 18, "With desiring have I desired to eat this passover with you," &c.; (73) xxii. 31-34, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you," &c.; (74) xxii. 35-38, "When I sent you without purse," &c.; (75) xxii. 43, 44, the angel strengthening Jesus; (76) xxii. 48, 49, "Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?" (77) xxii. 51, the healing of the wound of the high priest's servant, (78) xxiii. 5-12, Jesus is sent by Pilate to Herod; (79) xxiii. 13-15, Pilate proposes to release Jesus; (80) xxiii. 27-31, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me," &c.; (81) xxiii. 39-43, the penitent thief; (82) xxiii. 48, 49, the crowd beat their breasts and return; (83) xxiv. 12, Peter sees the linen clothes in the open tomb; (84) xxiv. 13-35, the walk to Emmaus; (85) xxiv. 36-49, Jesus appears and eats in the presence of His disciples; (86) xxiv. 50-53, Jesus parts from the disciples near Bethany, and they return to the temple.

Before speaking in detail of the passages peculiar to Luke, it will be convenient to consider his avowed purpose in writing, and some peculiarities of his style. The dedication to Theophilus, a name which is now believed by many to be merely typical of every reader who is so far "loved of God" as to be admitted into the church of Christ, states that the author purposes to write an account "in order," and implies that many previous "attempts" (ἐπιχειρήσαν, a word implying impotence; cf. Acts ix. 2, 9; xix. 13) at similar compilations had not been "in order"; further it informs us that the object of the treatise was not to tell the reader anything that was new, but rather to give him an ampler knowledge of the certainty of those things which were then and always had been fully believed in the church, even as they had been handed down by those who had been from the beginning eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. Without going so far as to affirm that the word handed down (παρέδοσαν) excludes written tradition (Westcott's Introduction, 186, 203), it is at least remarkable that Luke distinguishes between the "eyewitnesses" and those whose attempts he disapproved,—saying that the latter attempted to draw up a "connected narrative," whereas the former merely "handed down" the facts. This amounts almost to a denial on the part of Luke that any "eyewitness" (that is to say, apostle) had up to that time written any narrative (so far as Luke knew) of the life of Christ. It implies also that the words and deeds of the Lord had been recorded by many without arrangement, and that the author purposed to arrange them. The literary and artistic purpose of the author appears in words and phrases, as well as in the conceptions. Writing perhaps principally for readers to whom the Greek of the

1 But possibly this passage is also found in Matt. xxi. 44.
2 The genuineness of this passage is doubtful.
3 The genuineness of this passage is doubtful.
4 The clause describing the ascension is omitted by Tischendorf.
5 It is very doubtful whether the aorist tense (ἐπιχειρήσαν) necessarily implies (Westcott, Gospels, p. 186) that "St Luke speaks of the 'attempts' as of something which had no influence at the present . . . (attempted, not have attempted)." In the New Testament the proper distinction between the aorist and perfect cannot always be maintained as it can in classical Greek. For example (Mk. xiv. 9), our A. V. rightly renders ἐποίησεν, "she hath done what she could," and it would seem absurd to say that the aorist ἐποίησεν represented an action "which had no influence at the present," in the face of the following words, "Throughout the whole world this also that she hath done (δὲ ἐποίησεν) shall be spoken of for a memorial of her."

original tradition would be in many respects distasteful, he substitutes more classical words for many that are used by Matthew and Mark in the Triple Tradition (see above, p. 796). Even the use of "sea" to denote the Lake of Genesareth, is objectionable to him, and he always substitutes "lake." The Latinism κοδράντης for farthing (Mat. v. 26; Mk. xii. 42) is altered or omitted by Luke. He prefers πορεύομαι to ἰπάγω. Versed as he is, and as his readers would be, in the metamorphoses of the heathen stories, he shrinks from applying the word "metamorphosed" (Mat. xvii. 2; Mk. ix. 2) to the transfiguration of Jesus, and substitutes (ix. 29) "became different." He dislikes repetitions also, as much as he dislikes low-class words: compare v. 32, 33; vi. 10; viii. 21, 15, with the corresponding passages in Matthew and Mark; and note especially, in the cure of the palsied man (Mat. ix.; Mk. ii.; Lu. v.) how Luke not only avoids the word κράββατος, for "bed" (noted by Phrynichus as objectionable, Lobeck, p. 62), but also, to avoid repetition, uses three substitutes in succession,—(v. 18) κλίνη, (v. 19 and 24) κλινίδιον, (v. 25) ἐφ' ὅ (or ὁ) κατέκειτο, where Mark is content to use the objectionable κράββατος four times. When writing in his own style he is fond of long and sonorous words, such as διάδος for δός (Mat. xix. 21; Mk. x. 21; Lu. xviii. 22), διαμερίζομαι, διαγογγύζαν, and the compounds of διά generally; compare also his use of περιποιούμαι (xvii. 33, correct text), and of ζωογονεῖν (ib.) for σώζειν.

The question of Luke's style is specially important because the striking differences between certain portions of his Gospel which are all, though in very different styles, found in his Gospel alone (occurring neither in the Triple Tradition, nor in the parts which Luke has in common with Matthew or in common with Mark), might naturally induce even a careful student to believe that they are composed by different authors. For example, take as a criterion the use of καί and δέ. In classical Greek, and indeed in almost every Greek except the ultra-Hebraic, the particle δέ is of constant occurrence. The fact that it does not occur more than six or seven times in the whole of the Apocalypse, and not at all in the first book of the Maccabees till chap. iii. 36, would naturally lead us readily to believe that the former was written by a Jew who knew little of Greek literature, and that Jerome was right in saying that the latter is a translation from a Hebrew original. Applying this test to Luke, we find that in the 80 verses of Luke's first chapter, it occurs 16 times, while in the 19 verses of x. 25-42 it occurs 16 times; or in other words, δέ is (proportionately) used more than four times as often in the ninth chapter as in the first. This suggests the inference that Luke's introduction has an Aramaic origin. But if we turn to the Acts we find that in the first chapter, containing 26 verses (or 19 verses of narrative and 7 of a speech), δέ occurs only twice; whereas in the ninth chapter, which contains 43 verses, δέ occurs 35 times. Yet an Aramaic origin has not been thought, by any consensus of competent authorities, necessary or probable for the first chapter in the Acts.

Although, therefore, it is possible that the first two chapters of Luke may be a direct translation from an Aramaic original, yet there is an alternative. The alternative is that Luke, a man of letters and skilled in composition, consciously or unconsciously adapted his style to the subject, feeling that a different style was required on the one hand by the Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis, and on the other hand by the graceful domestic narrative of the contrast between the sisters Martha and Mary.

This will be made all the more probable if it can be shown that Luke had studied and imitated the LXX., and in particular the Greek Apocrypha. Words not used (or seldom) by Matthew and Mark, but by Luke and the Apocryphal writers, are ἐπίβλεπον, ἀποστασθέντων, ἐπιβάλλει in the sense of "belonging," ἐπισιτισμός, the use of ἕψιστος for God, στιγμή, ἀντιβάλλειν, εὐθετος,

περισπᾶσθαι, καιρὸς ἐπισκοπῆς, δοχῆ, and λυσίτελεῖ. But far more striking than mere words (for Matthew and Mark might be shown to have some peculiar words in common with the Apocrypha) are the sentences in the Apocrypha which seem to have suggested similar sentences in Luke. For example, compare Luke's story of the rich fool (xii. 19) with the following passage from Sirach (xi. 18): "There is one that gathereth wealth from his overhead and pinching; and this is the lot of his reward. In the hour when he saith, I have found rest, and now let me eat of my good things, even then he knoweth not what season shall pass away, and he shall leave these things unto others and shall perish." Again, in the parable of the unjust judge, there is a striking similarity between the words (xviii. 8) "Though he bear long with them (μακροθυμῶν), I tell you He will avenge them speedily," and (Sirach xxii. 22), "And He will surely not delay; nor will He bear long (μακροθυμῶν) with them"; so also between (i. 42) "Blessed art thou among women," and (Judith xiii. 17) "Blessed art thou, O daughter, by the Most High God, above all the women that are in the earth"; and between (vi. 35) "Love ye your enemies . . . and ye shall be the children of the Highest," and (Sirach iv. 10), "Be as a father unto the fatherless . . . and thou shalt be as the son of the Highest." Occasional similarities of thought and even of words are found between Matthew and Mark and the LXX. Apocrypha; but it cannot be said of either of them, as it can of the Third Gospel, that it is saturated with the LXX. diction. In many cases there is an allusive use of LXX. words. For example, Luke (xxiii. 51), telling us that Joseph of Arimathea had not "consented to" the wicked decision of the Pharisees against Jesus, uses a word not elsewhere used in the whole of the New Testament. Why? Because the word is used by the LXX. (Exod. xxiii. 1) in a passage expressly prohibiting combinations for false judgment: "Thou shalt not consent with (συγκαταθήσῃ) the unjust to become an unjust witness; thou shalt not be with the stronger side to do ill; thou shalt not add thyself with the multitude to shut out judgment." Again, when Luke (xxiii. 49), telling how the "acquaintances" of Jesus stood at a distance from the cross, uses the word "γνωστοί"—not elsewhere found in the synoptists,—there can be little doubt that he has in his mind the passage from the LXX. (Ps. lxxvii. 9), "Thou hast put mine acquaintances (γνωστούς) far from me." Compare also the use of ἐγκαθέτους, only found once in Luke (xx. 20), with the use of the word in the LXX. (twice only) Job xix. 12; xxxi. 9. See also a similarity implied between the aged Abraham and Sarah on the one hand, and Zacharias and Elisabeth on the other, in the similarity between "προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν" (Gen. xvii. 11) and προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις" (Lu. i. 7).

Our conclusion must be (1) that as Luke has copied the Triple Tradition, and the words of the Lord common to himself and Matthew, by alterations of words and phrases, so and much more has he modified other traditions or documents which he has introduced into his work; and (2) that those portions of the part of the Gospel peculiar to himself which have a more archaic and Judaic rhythm and vocabulary than the rest may be either translations from Aramaic documents, or imitations, conscious or unconscious, of the books of the LXX.—natural adaptations of the style to the subject, like the language of Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar as compared with the less simple and dignified language in his English plays of the same date. It is probable, however, that when the evidence is more thoroughly classified than it has hitherto been, it may at least demonstrate the existence of different documents in Luke, whether translations or not.

Impossible though it is here even to summarize the evidence, we may give the reader a conception of the nature of it. Attention has been called above to the use of the form δ Κύριος, "the Lord," in narration, as being an indication of late authorship. But this form occurs several times in the body of Luke's Gospel: namely, in the passages containing the raising of the widow's son at Nain (vii. 18); the appointment of the seventy (x. 1); the rebuke of the Pharisees (xi. 39); the preface to the parable of the faithful and just steward (xii. 42); the healing of the daughter of Abraham bound by Satan (xiii. 15); the parable of the sycamore tree (xvii. 5, 6); the parable of the unjust judge (xviii. 6); the story of Zacchæus (xix. 8); warning to Simon Peter (xxii. 31); Christ's look (xxii. 61); and the verse where it is said that they found not the body of the Lord Jesus (xxiv. 3). Many of the above passages certainly show signs of translation; and when we remember that the Gospel of the Hebrews (see below, p. 818) always uses the form δ Κύριος, and never δ Ἰησοῦς, we see herein a confirmation of the theory that these passages in Luke are translations from Aramaic. Another testing word is Ἱερουσαλήμ. Luke uses Ἱερουσαλήμ about twenty-six times, Ἱεροσόλυμα only three times (ii. 22; xix. 28:

xxiii. 7). It has been shown above that the latter form is sometimes used geographically by writers who use the former rhetorically or historically; but it is certainly remarkable that in ii. 22 and 41 the two forms should be used, apparently in the same sense, ἀνάγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ and ἐπαρέωοντο . . . εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Many other test words might be mentioned, the converging evidence of which, added to the internal evidence of thought (and perhaps corroborated by the evidence of special forms, e.g., ἄλλαν for ἄλλον), may possibly hereafter enable future critics to distinguish with certainty between the different strata of Luke's narrative. But no certainty is possible in the present condition of the evidence. There has been abundant labour but insufficient classification of evidence, and no attempt at all to represent it in a concentrated form.

Passing now to the consideration of Luke's additional subject matter, and reserving the supernatural element to the last, we will speak first of the doctrine. The key-note is struck in the song of Zacharias, and repeated in the first sermon of Jesus in Nazareth. The object of the messenger of Jesus is (i. 77) "to give us knowledge of salvation" by "the remission of sins," by reason of "the tender mercy of our God, whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us to give light to them that sit in darkness;" and the object of Jesus Himself (iv. 18) is "to preach the gospel to the poor," to "heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind." All through the Gospel (or at least the parts peculiar to Luke) there appears to a greater degree than in the First or Second Gospel the contrast between light and darkness, God and Satan, sin and remission of sins, culminating in the triumph of forgiveness and mercy; so that in the very last words of Jesus to His disciples (xxiv. 47) the proclamation of "repentance and remission of sins" is made the prospect of the future gospel to all nations.

The law of Moses appears at first sight inconsistently magnified, almost in an Ebionitic spirit, throughout the first two introductory chapters of the Gospel, and afterwards put aside. But there is no inconsistency. Paul himself says that the Saviour placed Himself at His birth "under the law," and hence it is that Luke, with an almost anxious elaboration, details the exact fulfilments of the law not only by the parents of Jesus, but also by those of His messenger. Hence also it is that in a single chapter of the introduction the word "law" occurs more often than in all the rest of the Gospel put together. For when Jesus attained to manhood, He was no longer under the bondage of the old law, which had now attained its fulfilment in the new law of the remission of sins through love. Yet the law is not trampled on, but only superseded by development; it was only "until John;" yet not "one tittle" of it can fail (xvi. 16, 17).¹ True to its principle of contrast, this book gives Satan a prominent position. When Satan departs from Jesus, he departs only "for a time" (iv. 13); Satan causes diseases and binds a daughter of Abraham;² Satan is beheld by Jesus in a vision cast down from heaven; he enters into Judas (xxii. 3, not mentioned by Matthew or Mark); he demands the Twelve that he may "sift" them; see above (16), (32), (46), (73). But this need not denote (as is thought by Keim) an Ebionitic source; the same recognition of the ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους appears in the Acts and the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, which no one suspects of Ebionitic tendencies (Lu. xxii. 53; Acts xxvi. 18; Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12; Col. i. 13). Something more than the principle of contrast may, however, be required to explain the sharp demarcation between rich and poor. We do not find in Luke that qualification of the

¹ Compare the strong language of Luke xvi. 16, and the contrast there between the "law" and the "kingdom," with the similar but much weaker language in Matt. xi. 12, 13, where the contrast is almost lost.

² Note that Luke alone in the description of the cure of Simon's mother-in-law (iv. 39) tells us that Jesus rebuked the fever.

epithet "poor" which Matthew (v. 3) inserts, "the poor in spirit." He enforces the hampering disadvantages of wealth, pronouncing a woe upon them that are rich; gently rebukes the "cumbered" Martha; exhorts the rich to entertain the poor; and dooms the rich fool to a sudden and disappointing death, while Dives is consigned to unalterable torment,—(21), (34), (46), (51), (57). But if this seems to savour of Ebionitic thought, let it be remembered that the principle of contrast is even more systematically applied to illustrate the power of the genuine Pauline faith in the parables of forgiveness. As Lazarus is contrasted with Dives, and the grateful Samaritan with the ungrateful Jewish lepers, and the merciful Samaritan with the heartless priest and Levite, and even the trivial anxieties of Martha with the simple devotion of Mary,—so in the stories of forgiveness, the publican finds his foil in the Pharisee who prays by his side; the woman "which was a sinner," and who "loved much," contrasts with Simon, the churlish host, who loved little; the prodigal younger son with the envious elder son; and the penitent thief on the right with the impenitent thief on the left. All these stories, as well as the tale of Zacchæus, and the lost piece of silver, and the lost sheep (peculiar to Luke in language, though the same subject is found in Matthew), magnify the power of forgiveness, and repentance, and faith, for the most part "without works"—contrasting the instantaneous and complete victories of emotional faith with the inferior results of a long life of ordinary and prudent respectability,—(27), (54), (55), (81), (66), (64).

The universality of the Gospel is more marked in Luke than in Matthew or Mark. The seventy missionaries appear to be emblematic of the preaching of the gospel to the seventy (or seventy-two, see Westcott's *Introduction*, p. 374) nations of the earth. The preference of the Gentiles to the Jews would seem to be indicated at the very outset of the public life of Jesus in the sermon at Nazareth (iv. 16-30), if we could accept this as chronologically and historically accurate. Besides the statement of Jesus in the Triple Tradition, that His kinsmen were those that heard the word of God and did it (Luke prefers this expression to that of Matthew and Mark, "doing the will of God"), Luke gives us another assurance that God's special blessing is reserved, not for the mother of the Saviour, but for those who do the word of God. The inclusiveness of the author breaks down the barrier between Jesus and the Samaritans; the sons of Zebedee are rebuked for desiring to call down fire on a Samaritan village; a just Samaritan shames both priest and Levite; and a grateful Samaritan puts nine Jewish lepers to the blush,—see (31), (17), (39), (29), (33), (59).

In connexion with this, the gentler and more inclusive side of the gospel teaching, it may be mentioned that Luke lays especial stress on the part played by women alike in discerning the providence of God, in ministering to Jesus, and in eliciting some of His most helpful utterances. The songs of Mary and of Elisabeth, and the testimony of the prophetess Anna, are found nowhere but in the Third Gospel; in Luke, for the first time, the mother of the Lord begins to assume a wider province,—she it is, and not Joseph, that ponders in her heart the words of her divine Son, and her sufferings are made the subject of inspired prophecy (ii. 35). Luke alone thinks it worth while to record at some length the names of those women who accompanied Jesus and contributed to His support; he alone knows of the devoted faith of Mary and the domestic anxieties of Martha; he alone records the cure of the afflicted "daughter of Abraham," the truth-eliciting exclamation of the woman who invoked a blessing upon the womb that bare Him, the story of the woman who "loved much," and the parable of the woman rejoicing over the lost piece

of silver. Luke alone holds up the fate of Lot's wife as a warning; nor do we find in any other Gospel the touching utterance of Jesus to the weeping "daughters of Jerusalem." The other synoptists concur with Luke in pronouncing a blessing on the man who gives up father or mother or lands or houses for Christ's sake, and the sense of fitness has induced the scribes of several MSS. to insert in Matthew and Mark the word "wife" as well as "mother"; but it has no legitimate place except in the version of Luke. It is true indeed that Luke, so far from giving to women the prominent part assigned to them by Matthew and the interpolated Mark, and even by the Fourth Gospel, in attesting the resurrection of Jesus, carefully places their evidence in the background; but the evidence of impressionable witnesses might naturally be subordinated by a writer (perhaps a physician too) who was collecting the traditions of the church into an historical narrative. In any case, it is noteworthy that the word "woman" occurs in Luke almost as many times as in Matthew and Mark put together.

Probably the most perplexing part of Luke's doctrine is found in the parables of the unjust steward, the unjust judge, and the friend persuaded by importunity. In the last two of these the argument appears to be,—"If an unjust or indolent man can be goaded by importunity into granting requests, much more will assiduous prayer prevail with the Father in heaven;" in the first, "If the fraudulent show forethought in providing for their earthly future, much more should the children of light show forethought for their eternal future." Although it is quite possible that our Lord drew a contrast (with something of irony) between the single-mindedness of earthly ambition and the scattered energies of those whose aim is righteousness, yet it is difficult to believe that He uttered these parables in their present shape, or that they are entirely free from misunderstanding. The last two of these three parables (as they stand) seem at variance with His teaching in prayer, which bids us remember that the Father knoweth what things we need before we ask them; and the right moral to be drawn from the unjust judge would seem to be, "Although the unjust judge may be won by importunity, do not suppose that importunity can prevail with the just Judge." It is to be observed, however, that the language and style of these parables (differing from that of the Triple Tradition) make it somewhat improbable that we have here in Luke's narrative the exact words of Jesus; see (36), (56), (62). As regards the great day and the coming of the Lord, Luke appears to distinguish (more than Matthew and Mark) between the ultimate coming and the fall of Jerusalem, which was to precede it. As Luke distributes the discourses which Matthew connects with the twelve into two parts,—one connected with the twelve and the other with the seventy,—so he distributes the discourse on the coming (which Matthew reports as one continuous discourse uttered at Jerusalem) into two parts,—one uttered at Jerusalem, and dealing principally with the fall of Jerusalem (xxi. 6-38), the other uttered on the way to Jerusalem, and expressed in more general terms (xvii. 20-37). As a preparation for the coming, Luke lays stress on constancy and directness of purpose. No man who puts his hand on the plough must look back (30); better not to begin the tower than leave the tower unfinished (53); remember Lot's wife (61). The coming is spoken of as possible at any moment—suddenly and without observation (60); and the disciples are exhorted to wait as servants for their master, with their loins girded (41 and 42), avoiding surfeit and drunkenness (71). When the master or king returns, ignorant disobedience will be less severely punished than the disobedience of knowledge (42); and those who have not increased the "mina" or pound intrusted to them, will be less severely punished than the rebels (65), who will be slain.

Luke (like Matthew and Mark) predicts a time of trouble; but he sees somewhat clearly, beyond it, the dawn which is to precede the rise of the kingdom. Destruction falls, not by chance, but on all that do not repent (45); all must strive to enter the strait gate (47), for not those that were first called shall enter in (52). Much more clearly than in Matthew and in Mark is the future fall of Jerusalem described, as the result of a siege and capture; and the slaughter of the citizens, the scattering of the nation, and trampling down of the city are mentioned, with details for which we vainly look in the first two Gospels (59). It is not concealed that the disciples have much tribulation in store, and that they must use all prudence to protect themselves (74). But a term is set for all these troubles; Luke (omitting the remarkable saying of Matthew and Mark that the Son Himself knoweth not "the hour") declares that the trampling down of Jerusalem will be only till "the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." Then will come a time of "distress," not, however, now for Israel but for the Gentiles (69); and amidst convulsions of nature the Son of Man will come. In the hope of this coming, the disciples are to lift up their heads (70), remembering that not a hair of their heads will be injured (68). Certainly the comparatively cheerful tone of the discourse on the coming, combined with the joyful and triumphant tone of the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel, indicates an author writing at a time when the fall of Jerusalem was an accepted fact, and the establishment of a new and spiritual Jerusalem recognized as a sufficient consolation,—a time when the church, not yet troubled by systematic persecution or by serious desertion (Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, Engl. ed., vol. i. p. 96), was still sanguinely looking forward to the moment when the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled, and the Son of Man should suddenly come.

The supernatural narratives peculiar to Luke, and found in the main body of his treatise, are the miraculous draught of fishes, the raising of the widow's son at Nain, the healing of the woman bound by Satan, the cure of the dropsical man, and the appearance of the angel strengthening Jesus,—(18), (25), (46); (49), (75). The first two suggest to many minds a symbolical interpretation, and raise the question whether they (and possibly some of the other miracles) may be emblematical rather than historical. This question cannot suitably be discussed in these pages; but one or two observations may be made. That Jesus wrought instantaneous cures cannot be contradicted, being proved by the whole texture of the Triple Tradition, as well as by the indirect testimony of Paul. That He also had the power of raising the dead no Jew could well doubt or dispute. Elijah had raised a child from the dead; still more notably Elisha, even when dead himself; some (interpreting the prophet literally) said that Ezekiel (Ez. xxxvii. 7) had done the same. But whatever the inferior prophets had done He who was at once the Prophet and Messiah could not fail to do. Still less could heathen converts suppose that Jesus was inferior in power to Æsculapius. It was therefore certain that, whether the traditions and books of the church contained or omitted any record of a raising from the dead, the church would believe from the first that Jesus possessed and employed this power. Different readers will give different weight to the considerations for and against the authenticity of Luke's narrative of the raising of the widow's son. Many will be so far influenced by the extreme beauty of the story (and perhaps by the fact that the custom of early burial among the Jews might reduce this, like the case of Jairus's daughter, to the level of natural though marvellous events) as to believe that in it we have, not legend, but history; but no one who can weigh evidence at all will maintain that the evidence for this miracle is equal to the evidence for the

raising of Jairus's daughter. Luke's other principal miracle, the draught of fishes, is also considered by many to have arisen from metaphor misunderstood. It is connected by Luke with the calling of Simon Peter, an incident mentioned both by Matthew and by Mark; yet neither Matthew nor Mark describes or gives the slightest hint of any such miracle in connexion with the calling of Peter. In the next place, the metaphor describing the apostles as fishermen and converts as fish, borrowed from Jeremiah perhaps (xvi. 16), is applied by our Lord both to the apostles, as "fishers of men," and to the preaching of the gospel, which he describes as a "net" catching all sorts of fish, bad and good. As the sea in the Old Testament is regarded as the type of "sin," everything favoured the addition and development of this metaphor. Accordingly Philo (*Creation*) describes fishes as typical of the lowest kind of unenlightened existence; and Clement of Alexandria addresses a hymn to Christ, as the fisher of men catching fishes with the bait of eternal life from the hateful wave of the sea of vices (*The Instructor*, iii. 12). It is of course possible that the developed symbolism which we find in Clement may have been entirely the effect, and in no degree the cause, of the narrative in Luke v. 6; and in any case the full discussion of this question would require more space than the limits of this article allow.

Passing now from the main body of Luke's Gospel, we come to the introduction, which name we may give to the first two chapters, describing the birth and childhood of Jesus, and the birth of His forerunner John, the son of Zacharias. The doctrine of the miraculous incarnation, although distinctly stated in Matthew's Gospel, nevertheless required further confirmation. This doctrine appears to have been spoken of from the earliest time, in language which might give rise to different conclusions, according as it was interpreted literally or metaphorically. For example, in the Apocalypse, "the Man Child who was to rule over all nations with a rod of iron" is said to have been born of a woman who was "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars," who, after her son had been "caught up into heaven," fled "into the wilderness where she hath a place prepared of God" (Rev. xii. 1-6). It seems certain that the writer represents by the woman, not the Virgin Mary, but the Church—the Spiritual Israel; and in later times the letter of the Church of Lyons (Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 1) speaks of the "Virgin Mother" as having her children restored to her from the dead (meaning that the church received back, as martyrs, those who had first recanted and then renounced their recantation). Justin Martyr also protests that, even though he should not be able to prove the pre-existence of Jesus, and even though it should appear that He was born man of men, yet it would still be true that He is Christ; "for," adds he, in his dialogue with Trypho (chap. xlviii.; or, ed. Morell, p. 267), "there are some, O my friends, of our race,¹ who confess Him to be Christ, but who declare that He is man of men, to whom I do not assent: nor would very many that have formed the same opinions as I have say as they say, because we have been commanded by Christ Himself not to follow the teachings of men, but the proclamations made by the blessed prophets, and taught by Him." The expression "not very many" (ὄλιγοὶ) indicates that (a) even in Justin's time (150 A.D.) a large though not very large number of Christians in Samaria or Judæa believed that Christ was the son of Joseph, and that (b) a principal part of the evidence for the contrary belief was based upon "the proclamations of the prophets." On the other side, what

¹ Another reading *ἑσπεύον* would make Justin refer to Jewish Christians; but the inference would remain unaffected.

germs of wild and fanciful doctrine were in the air may be inferred from the Gospel of the Hebrews, which will not allow that Jesus had even a human mother, but speaks of His mother as being the Holy Spirit (Kirchofer, p. 451, and *cf.* p. 454). In opposition to these divergent but heterodox beliefs, it became increasingly necessary to maintain the doctrine that Jesus was at once a man, born of a human mother, and divine, born of the heavenly Father; and this needed to be reaffirmed now, during the prosperity of the church in a somewhat less apologetic tone than characterized the narrative of Matthew.

When we speak of Luke's "supplying the deficiencies of Matthew," we must not be supposed to mean that Luke had before him, or even knew the existence of, Matthew's Gospel. It has been shown above that he probably knew of no apostolic written narrative (see p. 806 above). Though Matthew's was probably written some years before Luke's Gospel, very many years might elapse before a treatise used in one church or province might be recognized as authoritative beyond its original boundaries. But by "supplying the deficiencies" we mean that the conscience and faith of the church required in Luke's time some further and more vivid embodiment of the spiritual truth involved in the incarnation than was contained in the unsupplemented narrative of Matthew.

For example, it was not a sufficient argument against the Jewish slanderers who asserted that Jesus was born of adultery, to say that Joseph, when purposing to put Mary away, was warned by an angel in a dream to give up his purpose. Something more positive, and in a higher tone, not a dream, but an angelic visitation, was needed to confirm the divine origin of the Son of God. Moreover, in order to set forth still more emphatically the subordination of John the Baptist to the Lord, it was needed that the church should know that the prophet (who himself also had his own birth heralded by angels) was from the first acknowledged by his parents as the mere forerunner and messenger of Him that was to come, to whom, even in his mother's womb, the infant prophet did obeisance. Further, when Jesus was born, it was not enough that wise and learned men from the East should come to worship Him. It was necessary to show that the poor and simple toilers of the earth, typified by night-watching shepherds, were also privileged to behold His glory, and were the first to hear with the ear of faith the divine message of the birth of the Redeemer.

The testimony offered to the divine Son of David by Zacharias, who represents the priestly tribe of Levi, and by Elisabeth, who was one of the daughters of Aaron,² and the blessing of Simeon, and of Anna who is said to have been of the distant tribe of Asher,—all this emblematic homage from Israel to its Redeemer would be inadequately replaced by Matthew's brief story of the flight into Egypt; and, although refusing to feed a frivolous curiosity with frivolous legends on the childhood of Jesus, the church would naturally cherish the story which told how the youthful Redeemer, when missed by Mary and Joseph, was found in His Father's house. A narrative of this kind, not vulgar nor colloquial, and yet not too refined or scholastic, but framed both in language

² The importance attached to the co-operation of Levi with the "Lion of the tribe of Judah" is clearly seen in the very early (before 135 A.D.) apocryphal book entitled *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Sinker, p. 104), in which "Christ is spoken of as coming forth from the two tribes of Judah and Levi, as typical of His twofold office of King and Priest." The symbolism of Origen, as regards Zacharias and Elisabeth is far more fanciful; he sees (*In Evang. Joann.*, ii. 27) in the meanings of Elisabeth ("the oath of my God") and Zacharias ("memory") a reference to the birth of John ("the gift of God"): "ἐκ τῆς περιθεοῦ Μνήμης κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ὀρκον τὸν περιθεοῦ πατέρα" (Luke i. 73).

and in thought on the model of the best Greek Apocrypha, setting forth in the sacred vocabulary of the LXX. the earliest Christian psalms and hymns that had been committed to writing, would be justly felt by all the churches to tend to edification, and would soon find a place in every assembly for Christian worship.

But the resurrection, even more than the incarnation, required amplifications. If Matthew had left gaps in his introduction, still more serious were the deficiencies in his appendix to the traditional gospel. Although Matthew had added something to the mere suggestions of a resurrection contributed by Mark, he had not added enough. More proof was required, tangible proof, if possible. The women, it is true (according to the narrative of Mat. xxviii. 9), had held Jesus by the feet, but the disciples themselves were not recorded to have done so; and, besides, the increasing reverence of the church shrank from the thought that the body of the risen Saviour had been actually touched (Jo. xx. 17), even though He might have offered Himself to the touch of His disciples. As far therefore as the evidence went, it was open to the Jewish septic to call the manifestations of the Lord delusions, or at best visions, and to apply to them the words of the angel (Tobit xii. 19): "All those days I did but make myself visible unto you, and did neither eat nor drink; but ye beheld a vision." Against so formidable an objection, no proof could better commend itself to a close student of the LXX. (such as Luke assuredly was) than a narrative describing how Jesus ate in the presence of His disciples (xxiv. 43). Again, whereas the conclusion of Matthew's narrative leaves Jesus (except by inference) still on earth, Luke omitting the apologetic details which had now become unnecessary, or even liable to perversion (*eg.*, the Jewish slander that the Lord's body had been stolen from the sepulchre, and the fact that some of the eleven disciples "doubted" when they saw the Lord, apparently for the last time, upon the mountain), describes how Jesus was not parted from His disciples till He had produced complete conviction in all of them, and had opened their minds to understand the scriptures.

Still, even with these important additions, the appendix of Luke seemed to some, and perhaps to Luke himself, incomplete; and, accordingly, either Luke himself, or some early editor or very early scribes, inserted in the appendix several further additions:—(1) that Peter saw the grave-clothes of Jesus lying in the open tomb (xxiv. 12);¹ (2) that Jesus proved His identity to His disciples by showing them His hands and His feet; (3) that He fed not only on the emblematic "fish" but also on the "honeycomb" (xxiv. 42); and lastly, (4) that He ascended into heaven (xxiv. 51). Perhaps the same hand added, in the account of the agony at Gethsemane, the description of the angel from heaven who appeared, strengthening Jesus, and of drops as it were of blood falling from Him to the earth. It is by no means improbable that Luke himself added these passages in a later edition of his own work, as authoritative traditions which had subsequently become known to him; and two or three of them, in somewhat different shapes, will present themselves to us subsequently in the Fourth Gospel.²

¹ It is most improbable that this passage has been interpolated in Luke from the Fourth Gospel (xx. 4-7); for the passage in the Fourth Gospel is fuller than in Luke, and the tendency of copyists is rather to amplify than to curtail. Besides, there are traces that Luke and John are both different versions of the same tradition, differently understood.

² Unless these additions were made by some authoritative hand, it is not easy to see why they should have been adopted by so many of the best MSS.: no such additions are found in the appendix of

Language of the Original Tradition.—It is probable that the Jews, and more especially those in Galilee, were (like the Welsh in the present day) bilingual; and the question has therefore been raised whether our Lord, in His teaching, spoke Greek or Aramaic. If He spoke Greek, then the Aramaic words *Talitha cumi* and *Ephphatha* (Mk. v. 41; vii. 34) must be supposed to be specially addressed to the young and the illiterate, who would best understand the national dialect. But the names Cephas, Boanerges, given by our Lord to His Galilean disciples, and the use of Aramaic in His own prayer ("Abba, Father"), and in His last utterance (as recorded by Mat. xxvii. 46; Mk. xv. 34), indicate that both for Himself and for His disciples Aramaic and not Greek was the natural tongue. Although therefore it cannot be denied that Greek, even in Jerusalem (see Acts xvii. 2, indicating that Greek would have been understood, though they preferred "Hebrew"), was generally intelligible, yet the scanty evidence derivable from our Lord's words is that He habitually used Aramaic.

The testimony of Josephus tends in the same direction. He, though a man of education, composed certain books first in his own tongue (pref. to *Wars*, 1). He also tells us that he found it a laborious task to render the history of his country in Greek, "an alien and strange language" (pref. to *Antiqu.*, 2). It is to be presumed that he wrote in Aramaic partly for his countrymen in Judæa; but he adds that it was also for the sake of "Parthians, Babylonians, and remotest Arabians, and those of our nation beyond Euphrates, and the Adiabeni" (pref. to *Wars*, 2). Making every allowance for exaggeration, we are justified in drawing from the fact that Josephus thought it worth while to compose books first in Aramaic the inference that a large number of readers in the East would be more likely to read Aramaic than Greek.³

But it has been thought that the use of the LXX. in our Lord's quotations from the Old Testament shows that He spoke Greek. The answer is—(1) Even if all the quotations in the synoptists from the Old Testament exactly agreed with the LXX., the agreement would by no means prove that our Lord used the LXX.; for, in translating Hebrew into Greek, the translator might naturally translate the Hebrew quotations from the Old Testament into the corresponding LXX. version, to which his readers were accustomed. This he might do, even though the LXX. did not quite accurately represent the Hebrew; just as, in translating into English a Latin book, with quotations from the Vulgate, we should naturally use our English version, without considering whether the English exactly represented the Latin. (2) But, in the second place, there is scarcely a single quotation⁴ in the Gospels from the Old Testament that exactly agrees with the LXX. when the LXX. differs from the Hebrew; and many of the quotations differ slightly both from the

Matthew. Again, unless they are additions (not forming a part of the first edition of the Gospel), it is hard to see why any of the best MSS. should omit them, since they would recommend themselves to all readers and copyists.

³ The statement of Josephus (*Contra Apion.*, i. 9), that "he alone understood (μόνος αὐτοῦ σοφιστῆς) the information brought to the Romans by deserters from Jerusalem during the siege, must be regarded as a piece of bombast. For is it credible that a Roman army before a besieged city should have had with it no other interpreter besides one recently captured prisoner? Nevertheless, this exaggeration may be taken as an indication that the lower classes in Jerusalem could not, as a rule, speak Greek; for Josephus assumes this, as a matter of course. Greek, of course, would have been perfectly intelligible to any educated Roman if the deserters had been able to speak it.

⁴ An exact illustration may be derived from the Latin translation, by Rufinus, of the *Clementine Recognitions*, in which (Sanday, *Gospels*, p. 161) "the quotations from the gospels have evidently been assimilated to the canonical text which Rufinus himself used."